

'Fvooom! Just Like That'

24 moments of perception in Robert Breer's films

Ute Holl

'I'd really like to have my films go *Fvooom!* just like that – one split second [...] But somehow that's not the way perception works.'

Robert Breer during an interview at the 1966
New York Film Festival

1. 24 images per second

Robert Breer's films perform surgery on cinema's open heart; they let it pulse 24 times per second, thus pumping a flow of images into the cycle of visibility: lines and colours, symbols and material matter. As the human eye cannot grasp the individual image, it has to keep synthesising. Figures and shapes, frogs and crows, barking dogs, sleeping men, photos of leaders and typography. It is impossible to look at, to observe 24 images per second. One must simply let the brain run with it, see what happens subliminally below the threshold of conscious perception, see what is put together automatically in the optical subconscious as a result of the images' frequency: more than the sum of its parts, less than the multitude of the painted details. Perception works with time and waits to see what it can do. 24 times per second lines, surfaces, and layers of colour end up as figures, structures, contours, or images. Figures appear and disappear. Every time we see a film by Robert Breer, it looks different. Some images disappear; others are carved deeply into the memory and stay with us. We never jump into the same stream of images twice.

2. Bolex

New American Cinema – experiments on 16 mm, standing apart from the power of the big studios, *independent* – came about due to cheap material for the home format; and

ever since World War II 16-mm processing laboratories were built for the home front, for the newsreels. Pioneers of the American avant-garde, Deren and Hammid, the 'angry young men' of the post-war era, Anger, Brakhage, Mekas, the stars of the 1960s, Cassavetes and Warhol, all experimented on 16 mm. And all of them did so with the Bolex-Paillard, the 16-mm precision instrument from Yverdon, a Swiss clockwork of a camera, setting the pace of the avant-gardes: three fixed lenses, continuously adjustable speed, and a spring drive with a winding handle. As independent as possible. From the start of his career in 1952, Robert Breer also worked with his father's Bolex, which allowed precise stop-motion montages. Exact to one hundredth of a second, image by image, exposed at home on a DIY animation stand. Assembled and projected image by image, sometimes shown simply among friends, sometimes in galleries or at festivals. Breer's *Fist Fight* (1964) was shown at the 1966 New York Film Festival. He is shown in conversation with Jean-Luc Godard, who had shown his *Le Petit Soldat* (1963) at the previous year's festival.¹ Photography is truth, says the photographer in Godard's film; and cinema is truth 24 times per second. Breer reverses this statement: '*somehow that's not the way perception works.*' An individual image does not contain a cinematic expression. A single frame does not provoke movement. Film is perception in relation to the frequency of images. It deceives the eye and disappoints expectation.

3. Eyewash

Robert Breer's films are eye-cleansing devices; they wipe the sleep from the eyes, pull away the veil of usefulness, let us see for the sake of seeing, let us watch

without aim or purpose, perceive whatever may reveal itself from the corners of our eyes, inattentive, so that the unplanned sneaks into our vision. *Eyewash* (1958–59) starts with blurred pictures, lets them swoosh past, washes our vision with mixed images. In Breer's films we see ourselves seeing.

4. On a whim

The point of Breer's films is to confuse our usual way of looking at things. They're 'whimsical', as the critics like to say.

5. Pre-cinema cinema

Robert Breer's films are personal and subjective, increasingly close to the bone, always dealing with the private and even, in the case of *What Goes Up* (2003), with private parts. At the same time they are cool products from the laboratory, experiments with old devices, optical toys from the 19th century, magic drums, image sequences viewed through slots on a rotunda, zoetropes, vitascopes that let us experience how the brain processes what the eye sees. Or the simple thaumatrope, a twirling piece of cardboard, fusing two individual images on either side of it into a single one, as used by Breer in *Bang!* (1986) to water a flowerbed through a waterfall. Or the mutoscope, a flip book mechanised with a crank handle, a mini daylight cinema giving the illusion of motion to static images. Breer built such devices in the 1950s and 1960s to run his painted pictures in series, faster or slower depending on how the viewer felt, and independent of a projector. *Independent*. Infinite loops: we can see as many images as we want, as quickly as we can.

6. Repetition

Every time we see a film by Robert Breer, it looks different. Some images disappear; others are carved deeply into the memory and stay with us. We never jump into the same stream of images twice: 'the next time you see the same thing your experience of it is different because it's the second time you've seen it,' states Breer in an interview with Yann Beauvais.² Repetitions bring images back and change them at the same time. They short-circuit time. This can be annoying, as in the soundtrack of *LMNO* (1978), a piano. Looped? Practised? In the film *Fuji* (1974) the drawn image of a tumbler rolls around the screen again and again, seen from ever-changing perspectives, knocked over on a train journey by the judder of the tracks that transfers into the drawing. Into the image. Images fly by like landscapes past a train window. The film only lets the images rest after it has repeated the same thing often enough, 24 times per second. Stills are repetitions in the viewer's eye. Not yet the truth.

7. Flip book

In the beginning there was the flip book, the folioscope, created by Robert Breer out of curiosity: an experiment for hungry artists, an experimental setting – then, all of a sudden, art. In the 1950s in Paris. Dots, lines, series, squares flipped into motion. *Un cinéma de poche*. 98 sheets, 98 black and white images, portrait format, bound at the bottom. Sheets of 9.3 x 12.8 cm. Breer's flip book was the first to be considered art in the art world; it took its place in a gallery, in Denise René's exhibition *Le Mouvement* in April 1955, based around Europe's kinetic avant-garde, from Vasarély to Tinguely, Breer's European anchormen.³

The title of his flip book was *Image par Images*. Image by image. Sheet by sheet, metonymic viewing, 98 times, that could be converted into cinematic terms: 4 seconds of *cinéma de vrai, cinéma de vérité*. *Image par Images* was mechanised by Breer with his father's Bolex in Detroit. 3 x 4 inch Breer pictures in sequence. *Image by Images I* (1954), first film, first loop, *film en boucle*. Later Breer painted onto 4 x 6 inch paper cards that he projected and then photographed with his camera. 24 images, 24 frames. Mechanisation plus time equals transformation: dot turns into line, line turns into perspective. Motion, animation, creating dimension. Projection defines space and time. In the 1960s everybody in New York made flip books: George Brecht and Jack Smith, Stan VanderBeek and Andy Warhol.⁴ And once again, encore, Robert Breer, with *Flix* (1967).

8. From scratch to flicker

From line to light. A cross, a line, a stickman moves through the picture, draws his lines in the sand, suddenly has a dog and is drawn along by it – or do we just think that? *A Man and his Dog out for Air* (1957) is a film of lines, *méthode graphique*, scratched, from scratch, onto paper, animation in its purest form, halfway between the figurative and the abstract. Spatial illusion. The line turning into a man and his dog out to draw breath, take in fresh air, was the supporting film to Alain Resnais' *L'année dernière à Marienbad* in New York's Carnegie Cinema. Animated movie and zeitgeist. Repetition. This was not a first for Breer. He did not start with a line, but a black square, spinning, with channels running through it, filling up with colour, falling apart. *Form Phrases* (1952)

is a study of figure, perspective and movement, following studies by early experimental filmmakers Hans Richter, Viktor Eggeling and Walter Ruttmann. Like them, Breer looks for force fields in light and motion; he comes to filmmaking as a painter: 'As a painter I was working out of Bauhaus traditions. [...] It is true that my films had their roots in European experimentation of the Twenties.'⁵ *Form Phases I–III* are patterns and observations of early avant-gardes. *Form Phases IV* is the first to arrive in the 1950s; it uses flickering, effects in the pure light and logic of the frequencies, and light oscillations, beyond form and figure. Rapid alternation of brightness and darkness results in flickering in other films by Breer, too. *69* (1968) starts off with a hard flicker. And *Fist Fight* (1964) is already playing with frequencies, to the sound of a concert by Karlheinz Stockhausen who also plays with frequencies. Images and tone colours. Oscillographies. *Eyewash* flickers, the effect amplified by playing with different colours. The spectrum of cinematic motion effects is endless, from the dot on a surface to the oscillation in the room.

9. Stroboscopy

Persistence is to vision as animation is to the gaze. Motion in cinema is stroboscopic, activity of perception, synthesis of superimposing frequencies, creating motion where there is really only a sequence of individual static images. From 16 stimuli per second onwards, the eye starts to flicker, switches perception, tunes in and moves into the world of rapid image sequences. From small differences perception creates the illusion of movement. Breer connects images that have no connection with each other: 'Breer's invention was to abolish all of the slight variations and to project a

continuously repeating strip of film in which each frame was essentially independent of the others.’⁶ He turned independent images into *independent* movies. From the centre of this crazy stream of images, as film historian P. Adams Sitney writes, a new static structure appears, ‘an affirmation of the static in the center of the greatest speed that cinema affords.’⁷ An image from the eye of the storm of images. The afterimage effect, the inertia of the retina, retains areas of lights and colours. Stroboscopy extracts movement from intermittent light. In his montages Breer systematically juxtaposes stroboscopy against the persistence of the afterimage effect. In this way we see fast and very slowly at the same time in his films.

10. Avant-gardist and extra-vagantist

Robert Breer is a hybrid; his films are interfaces between avant-gardes, European and American. From the corners of our eyes we can detect both in his films. And leaps in time, from the 1920s to the 1960s. Breer, the *missing link* or break: ‘A [...] European aspect of my work might be that it is more conventionalized than that of the Americans, [...] I like this idea of limitations which you break all the time.’⁸ A gentleman from Detroit breaks with European conventions, with continental paradigms. Even with his favourite filmmakers, such as Jean Vigo, the poet among the documentarists who turns water into light in a film about an Olympic swimmer. Refraction, the breaking of light-rays. *Excuse me while I break the rules*. In America he comes across the New American Cinema, Anger, Brakhage, Kubelka, Baillie. Breer does not join any groups; he does not join in. He films for a fellow artist only once: *Homage à Tinguely’s ‘Homage to New York’* (1960).

Switzerland/USA mirror image. Breer observes the avant-gardes while crossing their borders, their light walls and sonic barriers. *Bang!* (1986).

11. Rotoscoping

An out-of-focus close-up, much too close, of a face, glasses and nose, in front of a train window; behind it Mount Fuji flies past. The face is converted into lines; it vanishes into the lines, into the drawn contours. While the movement continues, the substance of the image changes, the Japanese face vanishes into the glistening screen. In his film *Fuji* (1974) Breer uses a new process and a new device, rotoscoping, to transfer films into drawings, image by image projected onto a sheet, a drawn abstraction of photo reality. Real images are traced into sketches for animation. Contours are emphasised, images become impressions, recordings become inscriptions. The rotoscope was invented in 1917 to transfer filmed life into lines, for the animation industry. But Breer does not subject the lines to economy or simplification. The painted tracking shot through a park in *Swiss Army Knife with Rats and Pigeons* (1980) is intricate and astonishing. In *Fuji* and, who knows, on Fuji stock, he sketches a train ride along the volcano. He follows the outlines of the pictures of the journey with a few brushstrokes. Mount Fuji remains a triangle that moves, yet still remains unique and in its place. Breer sketches the world into motion, sets perspectives in ink, rhythmises ink-rendered elements, places formalised moments from rotoscoped material next to each other. Superimposition of the filmimages becomes simultaneity in rotoscoping. So the rotoscoped sequences are flowing and fractured at the same time. Roofs of houses moving

past look like Japanese characters. The characters again remind us of the photographed images in the film. These also reoccur and remind us that those inscriptions used to be film, and that film used to be writing: Cinematography. In the rotoscoped material we watch ourselves wondering about images and signs. From a train window in Japan.

12. The time cinema takes

Tempus fugit, time takes a flight, *Time Flies* (1997), flying watches, whizzing minute hands, an old man who snores and loses his time. Can't be Breer! 'The way to deal with time is to take your time. And for me, the time duration was seemingly endless, and therefore static in a sense, well, you see, it's consecutive, but all on the same level.'⁹ The fragmented time of cinema becomes duration and moves on the planes of a Möbius strip on which the times keep returning. Family photographs of old holiday sites, drawings that reduce them, refer to them, separate themselves from the photographs, yet return on the film strip. Every time we see a film by Robert Breer, it looks different. Some images disappear; others are carved deeply into the memory and stay with us. We never jump into the same stream of images twice. The brain produces its own space and time in cinema, says Breer. 'You make it linear by your consciousness, it might be linear in physical time but it's also that you set up action and response and that this is constantly going on in your brain,'¹⁰ he stated in 1983, in Paris, in an interview with Yann Beauvais who translated this into French and condensed it slightly: 'Tous cela devient linéaire par le truchement de notre conscience.' Actually, it should not be 'truchement' but 'travaille de notre conscience'. The work of perception.

In 1963 in New York Breer had remarked, 'I think of film as a "space image", which is presented for a certain length of time. [...] In film, the period of looking is determined by the artist and imposed on the spectator, his captive audience.'¹¹ Time does not pass, it runs, flies. In the film *Time Flies* (1997), a girl watches a naked woman sleeping. Her mother? Herself in reverse, shot after time has flown by? Time and age meet in the film, by far exceeding any diegesis or biography; they become passages of life itself, circular as are all rites: 'It's consecutive, but all on the same level.'¹² Time flies, but it will not get lost in film.

13. Collage

Another step takes us right into the heart of the substance and transubstantiation, the miracle of 1954: *Un Miracle* (1954). No longer forms, but stuff, collage, stuck-on things animate images and with blasphemy: the film, mounted with the help of Pontus Hulton, shows Pope Pius XII as he presents himself at the window and entertains the audience with tricks: a juggling pope whose head gets mixed up with the balls. In the reverse shot are the people, *populus romanus*, plebeians and well-to-do who are happy and wave their paper arms. After the miracle a creation from material, *Recreation I* (1956–57), cubist stuff that frees itself of paper, stuck-on things becoming unstuck, measuring tape and penknife, film reels and mice, photographs, inscriptions and cut-out animation, things that catch the eye, and a wound-up tin chicken that leaves traces where it walks with its inky claws. In collaging, in photo montages per second, Breer becomes possessed by the spirit of Dada, mixes typography and newspaper pages, draws lines from threads, becomes anti-

authoritarian: as such, Hitler, Napoleon and the militarist are the material that collages shape into clowns: *Jameston Balloos* (1957). Breer’s material collages from the 1950s disconnect and connect the senses, very arbitrarily and very fast, stretching and over-stretching them. ‘Breer makes “collage” films in which vast numbers of disparate images are rushed, rapid-fire, past the viewer, causing a sort of visual orgasm.’¹³ Sheldon Renan read this same term in Breer’s work: ‘One doesn’t actually see any one picture, but has the impression of thousands. It’s a form of visual orgasm.’¹⁴ Breer connects the ‘orgasm’ to seeing the disparate. We cannot read up on this. We can only do it.

14. In between movement

In Breer’s films all sorts of movements take place at the same time: camera, object and material movements such as flowing ink or paper that gets un-scrunched, animated motion, the motion of the film track, stroboscopic, hallucinated movements, moirés, colour oscillations, etc. There is not a single fixed point of view in the films. Maybe this is the reason for all those pilots and divers everywhere.

15. Remembering/forgetting

The loose connections between Breer’s images do not lend themselves to coherent storylines. Never-ending transformations do not allow for a linear time-structure, no forwards and backwards, no anticipating of what may lie ahead: ‘The result is that the “collage films” such as *Image by Images I* and the “line films”, such as *Par Avion* and the various hybrids in between all defy either anticipation or memory.’¹⁵ Memory is challenged and encouraged, supposed to find new anchorage. In

this way, cinema functions like dreamwork. It does not organise its affinities chronologically but according to similarities. Like a picture puzzle. The film remembers, unlike us. Cinema lays the traces, we linearise them: ‘this is constantly going on in your brain.’¹⁶ Cinema is more powerful than chronology and reorganises the images in the long run. Memory in Breer’s films is created as an impression under time pressure. 24 times per second. A black crow flutters about between the images and, where it appears, marks the time. ‘Goodbye, Robert,’ somebody shouts in the soundtrack, and a young girl in the street, on a photograph, looks into the sun’s evening light, her hand raised in a wave. Every time we see a film by Robert Breer, it looks different. Some images disappear; others are carved deeply into the memory and stay with us. In the recursion of the films we watch ourselves remembering. This is the reason for Breer’s affinity to Resnais, because their images bear no resemblance at all.

16. Black screen

In between images there are long periods of black screen. Black frames. Black squares. Frames that define cinema space beyond the scope of the film. Seeing is projected onto itself.

17. Rhythm, sounds

Breathing (1963), gasping for air, panting, miaowing, barking and the wind in the trees are sounds on which Breer builds his films: channels to the world in the acoustic. But he also mounts mechanical rhythms, for example the rattling of the train and the buzz of the camera in *Fuji*; or he gets Noel Burch to rattle through

the text in *Recreation* in a machine-like staccato. Typewriter-like. Breer's work with sound spectrums oscillates between Murray Schafer's soundscaping practices and Pierre Schaeffer's *Musique Concrète* that isolates sound elements from tape recordings and remounts them without regard for their origins. Breer also collaborated with Schaeffer's antagonist, Karlheinz Stockhausen, whose composition *Originale* was played to the screening of *Fist Fight* in New York. In *Bang!*, finally, Breer makes fun of his own hardness of hearing and alternates noise – helicopters, jet fighters, gunshots – with silence. Typography becomes the scream for the deaf man; the eyes do the job of ears. Job-sharing of the senses. According to Breer, sound has always been secondary to him: 'What I wanted to emphasize was the visual structure. And sound had a way of taking over. So I always put my sound on afterwards.'¹⁷ However, the soundtrack often starts before the pictures do: inversions of the senses' work.

18. Beautiful red colour

In the tradition of Bauhaus and the Abstraction/Création group, of Kandinsky, Mondrian and Klee, Alpers and Rauschenberg with whom he becomes acquainted in New York, Breer experiments with colours as materials and force fields, and translates this from painting to film. He mixes watercolours, chalk, pens; he glues coloured cellophane onto slide glass, projects and refracts light, and breaks the rules of the brush. 'I could see that green and red did not make grey as it does on a palette but makes a kind of yellow. It's common knowledge now that mixing projected light is different from mixing pigment, so I wanted to speculate on what would happen if I changed

form radically in the same way...'¹⁸ Light and colours have already been used in *Form Phases* to disrupt and transform figure and pattern. And to disrupt the conventional organisation of emotions in film colours: 'You can mix up symbols and convention: a red can be a red, or it can be blood, or it can be confused.'¹⁹ In film red can flow. In painting it cannot.

19. Elementary structures: family

Breer borrowed his first camera from his father, an engineer and 3D film amateur. Later on he used photographs and film recordings of his children, the family, family holidays, the houses the family lived in, the cat on the veranda. Is there a better family picture than that of the family's lawn-sprinkler, endlessly moving back and forth? Later films are dedicated to his children. It was boring but unavoidable to use the family in his work, says Breer: 'a ready source for material, that was familiar to me and real and yet could be kept second in importance to the formal construction...'²⁰ The forms of the family expand in the montage's seriality. *Fist Fight*, unlike any other of Breer's films, is autobiographical. In it he contemplates and manipulates still images from his past in what is apparently a moving family album. Black-and-white photographs of his wife as a girl, of himself at his work table, of children, a wedding party, and many friends and personal scenes are scrambled together with fragments of cartoons [...] The personal material blends into the animations and fragments without assuming a privileged emphasis.'²¹ The montage of snapshots crosses out the elementary structures of kinship. Children, looking innocently into the camera, are, after the editing

process, confronted with things they should never have seen. Different generations meet, but all at the age of twelve. Relations in film are not stable. Others are mixed into the images and become family, *familiar*: crows and beetles, The Beatles, fighter jets, drawn by the father’s hand.

20. Frog film haiku

The filmed pond. A drawn frog leaps in. Plop. Breer’s cinema produces haikus. By the minute. Mixes impressions taken from reality, forces realities on us that come leaping across artistic techniques. *A Frog on the Swing* (1988). A tracking shot across water-lily leaves, at exactly the right speed for turning them into the tableau on the screen: the frog greets Monet. In the meantime the montage disrupts the calm: aeroplanes and helicopters in the sky, whistling bullets, yelling children. The frog greets Marinetti. A drawn hare is shot dead. Plop. Greetings to Dürer. A frog leaps; the garden swing swings into the void.

21. Measures against Plato’s cave

Breer is not a big follower of old cinema as a tunnel of perception, with the audience tied up in a cave with projection from the back: ‘a captive audience nailed down to their seats in a black room’. Therefore he prefers to plan his work for galleries, museums and mutoscopes, even for television or the video rental shop – but maybe he does not plan for others at all. ‘I don’t make films with any particular audience in mind. I don’t know whether I make them for myself: I make them by myself, and that’s closer than for myself.’²² Breer’s cinema is determined by

the expansion of possibilities to see, not by understanding. Look over your shoulder. Observe from the corner of your eye. Fish an image from the flood or the frog pond.

22. Silence

When the sound stops, always abruptly, audience members hold their breath. Only after a while does the visible take over the frame. ‘I do have long periods of silence, helpful silence where the image has to take over.’²³ Breer’s cinema jumps between ear and eye to keep perception open.

23. Cinema and painting

Right into the boom of the serial, into the 1950s age of abstractions and of the operational, Breer mounts the unique, painted by hand, brushstrokes, self-glued, art objects, serial singularities, and shoves the auratic work into mechanical reproduction. Film projection interrupts the age of painting. Perceived as painting, film becomes a crystal image, ‘*Fvooom!* just like that,’²⁴ as in the wish expressed by Breer during an interview. ‘A painting can be “taken in” immediately, that is, it is present in its total self all times. My approach to film is that of a painter, that is, I try to present the total image right away, and the images following are merely other aspects of and equivalent to the first and final image. Thus the whole work is constantly presented from beginning to end and, though in constant transformation, is at all times its total self.’²⁵ For André Bazin the difference between painting and cinema lay mainly in the framing that, in painting, directs attention towards the centre but in cinema directs it towards something beyond the frame: ‘everything that the screen shows us is designed to spread infinitely into the universe.

The frame is centripetal, the screen centrifugal.²⁶ Annette Michelson adapts this thesis to unearth the moment of a subversive operation in Breer's films; Breer was not interested in telling a story, but in opening up direct access to the object. 'In America, the work of Robert Breer, for example, has an immediacy produced by the elimination of narrative, as plot, or plot reconceived as progress, involving a complex visual logic, high speed of images, the use of subliminal vision. All these factors articulate a cinematic aspiration toward the condition of the "object" instantly apprehended, an aspiration shared by our most advanced painting today.'²⁷ Films like those of Robert Breer allow us to see things and their transmission at the same time. And feel it.

24. Breer's key on the chain that creates time

Robert Breer's films no longer simply raise the question of what a filmic image might be, but rather what it does: what it does to perception, and what perception does to images. The time, for example, that links the individual elements with its duration: 'time duration was seemingly endless, and therefore static in a sense, well, you see, it's consecutive, but all on the same level. I think this is a key, and I've made steps in this direction. But I think most of our films are tendencies. I'd really like to have my films go *Fvooom!* just like that – one split second. You wouldn't have to pay; you'd come in and go out. But somehow that's not the way perception works.'²⁸ To be perceived film images must be ironed out, 24 per second. In random order. The cards can be shuffled arbitrarily. Perception sorts images in hindsight, for the duration, opens up meaning and new directions. That's the way perception works.

- 1 For transcripts of the discussions see: *Film Culture. America's Independent Motion Picture Magazine. The N.Y. Film Festival Issue*. No. 42, Fall 1966, p. 13 ff.
- 2 *Films, Floats & Panoramas*. Robert Breer. Éditions de l'oeil, St. Étienne, 2006, p. 166.
- 3 Christoph Benjamin Schulz, 'Il faut tourner la page', in: *Kunsthalle Düsseldorf, Daumen Kino / The Flip Book Show*, ex. cat. Düsseldorf, 2005, pp. 70–85, here p. 72.
- 4 See Schulz, 'Il faut tourner la page', as above, p. 117.
- 5 Unpublished interview with Robert Breer, as quoted by P. Adams Sitney, *Visionary Film. The American Avant-Garde 1943–1978*. Oxford, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, p. 28.
- 6 P. Adams Sitney, *Visionary Film*, as above, p. 279.
- 7 P. Adams Sitney, *Visionary Film*, as above, p. 279.
- 8 Unpublished interview quoted from P. Adam Sitney, *Visionary Film*, as above, p. 282.
- 9 Robert Breer on His Work, in: *Film Culture*, No. 42, as above, pp. 112–113, here p. 113.
- 10 Une interview de Robert Breer. Notes et traduction de Yann Beauvais. New York, 15 novembre 1983, in: *Films, Floats & Panoramas*, pp. 125–139, here p. 135.
- 11 Guy L. Coté, Interview with Robert Breer, in: *Film Culture*, No. 27, Winter 1962/63, pp. 17–20, here p. 17.
- 12 Robert Breer on His Work, in: *Film Culture*, No. 42, as above, p. 113.
- 13 Sheldon Renan, *An Introduction to the American Underground Film*. New York, 1967, p. 129.
- 14 Guy L. Coté, Interview with Robert Breer, in: *Film Culture*, No. 27, p. 20.
- 15 Sheldon Renan, *An Introduction to the American Underground Film*, as above, p. 129.
- 16 Une interview de Robert Breer. Notes et traduction de Yann Beauvais, as above, p. 166.
- 17 Charles Levine, Interview with Robert Breer, *Film Culture*, No. 56–57, 1973, pp. 55–68, here p. 61.
- 18 Une interview de Robert Breer. Note et traduction de Yann Beauvais, as above, p. 158.
- 19 Guy L. Coté, Interview with Robert Breer, in: *Film Culture*, No. 27, 1962/63, pp. 17–20, here p. 17.
- 20 Une interview de Robert Breer. Notes et traduction de Yann Beauvais, as above, pp. 157–169, here p. 168.
- 21 P. Adams Sitney, *Visionary Film*, as above, pp. 278–279.
- 22 Robert Breer on His Work, in: *Film Culture*, No. 42, as above, p. 113.
- 23 Charles Levine, Interview with Robert Breer, in: *Film Culture*, No. 56–57, 1973, p. 62.
- 24 Robert Breer on His Work, in: *Film Culture*, No. 42, as above, p. 113.
- 25 Guy L. Coté, Interview with Robert Breer, *Film Culture*, No. 27 as above, p. 17.
- 26 André Bazin, 'Malerei und Film', in: *André Bazin, Was ist Film?* Berlin 2004, pp. 224–230, here p. 225.
- 27 Annette Michelson, 'Film and the Radical Aspiration', in: *Film Culture*, No. 42, pp. 34–42, here p. 42.
- 28 Robert Breer on His Work, in: *Film Culture*, No. 42, as above, p. 113.