

REAL PROFESSIONALS?

Andy Warhol, Fred Herko, and Dance

Paisid Aramphongphan

Of all the Judson Dance Theater dancers, Andy Warhol was “absolutely fascinated with” Fred Herko, the relatively unknown Judsonite who jumped out of a window to his death in 1964.¹ Prior to Herko’s untimely death, Warhol had captured his dance on film. Recently preserved and made available for public screening, *Jill and Freddy Dancing* (4 minutes, silent, black & white) is a gem of a short. It brings together Herko and the *Village Voice* dance critic and Judson Dance Theater champion Jill Johnston, showing their dancing on a New York rooftop, anticipating the rooftop dances of Trisha Brown a decade later. From above, the camera shows the rectangular shape of their dancing space that, cordoned off with railings reminiscent of the ballet barre, is like an outdoor dance studio. The film starts with Johnston, tall and slim in a long dress, with long hair, standing on a chair close to the middle of the frame. She unwinds her arms and sways her hips in a rhythmic motion. Herko, slim, muscular, shirtless and in tights, enters from the left with a regal bearing. He dances around her, executing precise balletic turns and arresting jumps. Johnston holds her own as Herko goes all out. Later they dance opposite one another, feeding off each other’s movement. His torso erect throughout, Herko is formal as he approaches her, taking deliberate long steps with arms raised high in the balletic fourth and fifth positions. Johnston faces him and responds to his movement, sometimes mirroring him but deliberately adding her own looser twist, at times seemingly drunk.

Despite the everyday rooftop setting and Johnston’s free-flowing movement vocabulary, the duet harkens back to the *pas de deux* in classical ballet. The apotheosis of the love story, the *pas de deux* showcases technical bravura and formal elegance. However, unlike the classical format in which, adhering to strict gender roles, the danseur supports the ballerina in her turns and lifts, here Johnston and Herko show their individual movement styles while also dancing together. Instead of ballet footwear they wear ankle boots (Herko) and casual slip-ons (Johnston). When he circles around her, she is not an object of desire, but appears to be enjoying herself. He moves with an intense, almost raw quality; she sways her body to the rhythm of her own tune.

Made in a period of Warhol's early filmmaking, later known for "minimalist" films depicting stillness or everyday activities, the film is quite unusual in what it depicts: a dance occurring in a stage-like space. The casting adds another historical layer to the work. Known today for *Marmalade Me* (1971), the landmark collection of her dance writing from the 1960s, and the classic lesbian separatist text *Lesbian Nation: The Feminist Solution* (1974), Johnston had trained in modern dance in the 1950s and felt like a misfit due to the strict gender demarcation and its corresponding roles and movement styles. "I'm sure I wanted to be one of the boys," she later reflected in a lecture given in 1991.² In her autobiography, she describes the early 1960s as her "transvestite" phase, during which she constantly had to negotiate the difficulties, especially as a mother, in fitting in with binary gender expectations. The year after the film's shooting, she met and developed a romantic relationship with Lucinda Childs, another Judson choreographer (whom, or whose shoulder rather, Warhol captured on film in *Shoulder*, 1964). As for Herko, Sally Banes, in her foundational study *Democracy's Body: Judson Dance Theater, 1962–1964* (1983), characterizes his work, along with several others, as having "the theatrical, often humorous, baroque style." This performance aesthetic emerged partly out of camp sensibility and the queer subculture of which Herko (and Warhol) were part, and it was rejected, if not openly denounced in homophobic terms, by the more art-world-connected side of Judson that has since dominated its history. Further, while Judson's dance ethos signaled a turn away from technique and towards everyday task and movement, Herko, having trained at the American Ballet Theatre School, remained a resolute ballet dancer, even executing balletic moves and turns on roller skates in his 1963 *Binghamton Birdie*. They were both, in short, outsiders even among the experimental set. *Jill and Freddy Dancing* shows two people dancing together, while also providing space for queer voices—or queer bodies, rather—to shine.

GET IT TOGETHER?


In Warhol's *POPism*, Herko gets the most mentions among Judson dancers and choreographers in the early 1960s. In addition to *Jill and Freddy Dancing*, Herko also starred in major Warhol film experiments, including the *Kiss*, *Haircut* and *Screen Test* series, not to mention his solo role in *Rollerskate/Dance Movie*, a film version of *Binghamton Birdie*. Here Warhol follows Herko as he dances and skates around town (footage from this shoot is unfortunately unavailable for viewing as of this writing). Yet Warhol's picture of Herko is a rather grim one. Herko never made it, Warhol writes, "turned down at auditions all over town." He becomes an archetypal figure in Warhol's account, which describes Herko:

He could do so many things well, but he couldn't support himself on his dancing or any of his other talents. He was brilliant but not disciplined—the exact type of person I would become involved with over and over and over again during the sixties. You had to love these people more because they loved themselves less. Freddy eventually just burned himself out with amphetamine; his talent was too much for his temperament. At the end of '64 he choreographed his own death and danced out a window on Cornelia Street.

Warhol paints Herko as a “left-over” of show business with a bad drug habit who eventually, he suggests, kills himself. This despite Warhol’s mentions in the same text of Herko’s scholarship to the American Ballet Theatre School, his work off-Broadway and on tours, as well as appearances on television. Gerard Forde, who is writing a biography of Herko, corrected Warhol’s (and others’) misrepresentation of Herko in a paper presented at the Herko symposium in October 2014 at New York University, “Send Three and Fourpence, We’re Going to a Dance: Misreading Fred Herko.” Forde has researched and corroborated many of Herko’s accomplishments, including his dancing on the *Ed Sullivan Show*, rare footage of which he shared with the audience during his presentation. Herko also co-founded and played a key role, Forde tells us, in the early years of the New York Poets Theatre, a key, early 1960s nexus point that provided a platform for diverse practices that, aside from poetry and theatre, included Fluxus, Happenings, experimental dance, music, and film. In his book *Judson Dance Theater: Performative Traces* (2006), Ramsay Burt also calls out Warhol’s “distortion” of Herko’s life and work, its basis on the “stereotypical . . . sad, young homosexual outcast” figure. Instead, Burt points out that, among his experimental dance peers at the time, only he and another Judson choreographer, Yvonne Rainer, now well established in art and dance history, had had evening-length concerts. Both Forde and Burt also dispute Warhol’s suggestion of suicide as a cause of death; suicide would imply Herko’s intention, for which, they note, we have no clear evidence.

Despite and, as I want to suggest here, *because* of his rather “distorted” view of Herko, Warhol was fascinated by him, this “very intense, handsome guy in his twenties . . . who conceived of everything in terms of dance,” so much so, it seems, that he couldn’t function in everyday life. “Too gifted to lead ‘regular lives,’” people like Herko, Warhol writes, “were also too unsure of themselves to ever become real professionals.” In everyday usage, to become a professional, of course, does not mean to gain mastery over one’s specialized field alone. It also implies transformation, a becoming, connoting the stripping away of personality and affect. One could say it is akin to becoming more like a machine, which Warhol famously said he wanted to be in an oft-cited interview with Gene Swenson, “What is Pop Art?” published in *ARTnews* in November 1963, the same period as the making of *Jill and Freddy Dancing*. On the other hand, though this was in no way unusual in Warhol’s circle at the time, what could be more unprofessional than drug use?³ Warhol describes Herko as having the “classic symptom” of amphetamine use, that is to say, “intense concentration but! only on minutiae.” He elaborates:

That’s what happens to you on speed—your teeth might be falling out of your head, the landlord might be evicting you, your brother might be dropping dead right next to you, *but!* you would have to, say, get your address book recopied and you couldn’t let any of that other stuff “distract” you. And that’s what happened to Freddy—instead of concentrating on the main idea of his dance pieces, he’d get all involved with fixing an arrangement of feathers or mirrors or beads on a costume, and he was never able to see



Andy Warhol, *Haircut #1*, 1963, 16mm film, black and white, silent, 27 minutes at 16 frames per second.
©2014 The Andy Warhol Museum, Pittsburgh, PA, a museum of Carnegie Institute. All rights reserved. Film still courtesy The Andy Warhol Museum.

his choreography jobs through to the finish. At one point when he really needed money, he decided to sell marijuana, but he couldn't concentrate on that, either, and wound up handing it all away to friends.

Seeing something through to the finish, concentrating on the right things, selling the product as opposed to giving it all away—being a professional, in short—these are, of course, what Warhol was especially good at. Known since his commercial art days in the 1950s for his work ethic and reliability, Warhol shifted his focus to gallery art in the early 1960s and kept a regimented, product-oriented work cycle, churning out silkscreen prints in his studio, aptly called The Factory.

A recent essay by Diedrich Diederichsen helps us see the discursive structure behind Warhol's remarks on Herko. Drawing on Jean-François Lyotard, Diederichsen contrasts, on the one hand, "focus and intention," and, on the other, "intensity and wastefulness."⁴ Focus and intention result in productivity in work and regular life (or, more accurately, capitalist modern life). Intensity, on the other hand, entails wastefulness, seen as outside the time-values grid of modern life, such as inscribed onto "the romantic margins of leisure, of bohemianism, and puberty." Herko fits this image, becoming, to Warhol, the epitome of intensity ("Gee, this person is an incredible dancer. High-strung and neurotic maybe, but really creative," he describes his reaction to Herko, before, he writes, learning of amphetamine symptoms). In Herko, Warhol sees the refusal or inability to participate in what Diederichsen would call focus and intention, or, we would say simply, to get it together. Herko is cast as the emblematic figure of the "intense" outside of regular life. On the other hand, if Herko, as Warhol writes, conceived of everything in terms of dance, implying a connection between dance and non-regular life intensity, Warhol seems to have conceived of everything, including art-making, in terms of regular life: "Why do people think artists are so special?" Warhol wonders in *The Philosophy of Andy Warhol* (1975). "It's just another job."

GET MARRIED?

There is reason to believe that Herko, too, shared the view of dance as the intense outside of regular life. Writing about the choreographer Paul Taylor in the downtown mimeographed journal *The Floating Bear*, Herko praised Taylor's late 1950s choreography which had anticipated Judson-style experiments, from a dance piece in which nothing happened to the use of sound from everyday life such as the rain or the pre-recorded time announcements on the phone, made in collaboration with the artist Robert Rauschenberg. By the early 1960s, however, Taylor had moved away from experimental work to more popular concoctions. In symmetrical formations the dancers in his breakthrough piece, *Aureole* (1962), executed vigorous and graceful movements corresponding, in a conventional way, with the musical counts and cues of the music by Handel. "To some of his artistic colleagues," including John Cage and Rauschenberg, "this was a sellout, a decision to be popular rather than original; they never forgave him," Alastair Macaulay writes in a recent review of the

Paul Taylor Dance Company, noting further that *Aureole* “initiated a new orthodoxy, which soon positioned Mr. Taylor at the center of American modern dance.” In 1962 Herko was also harsh in his assessment: it used to be that “Mr. Taylor made dance because he loved making them—he loved to dance them . . . It was lovely to watch Paul Taylor.” But now “it is hard to watch Paul Taylor working at his job. A job is not interesting or exciting.”⁵

Taylor did not respond to Herko’s attack on the record, but there is one mention of Herko in his memoir, *Private Domains* (1987), in the context—where else?—of his ruminations on professionalization. At this point in the text the young Taylor is weighing the pros and cons of hiring a “full-time, professional” agent. “Must then be careful about picking the right agent,” he says to himself. “Involvement with wrong one would be suicide—as bad as marriage. Suddenly, a flash of dancer Fred Herko, who hadn’t married but had taken drugs and jumped from a window to his death.” Taylor conflates the risk of getting the wrong agent with getting married, a suicidal move, like taking drugs and jumping from a window. That the metaphor of marriage comes up is telling in an era when a heterosexual marriage provided, to many queer men and women, an alibi of “regular life” (the choreographer José Limón, with whom Jill Johnston studied in the 1950s, for example, was married. “José was a gay man, what some people now call a queer married man, whose dances were absolutely heterosexual,” recalls Johnston in *Secret Lives*). Further, Taylor’s rumination came at a time when he was leaving behind his days of making experimental work in collaboration with his avant-garde art friends who, like him, were not exactly in the mainstream of post-war American mores, sexual or otherwise. If Warhol describes Herko as “brilliant but not disciplined,” getting an agent, which in Taylor’s mind could be as bad as getting married, is the ultimate disciplinary move, a “real professional” act necessitated by various factors: finance, the desire to reach a wider audience, ambition perhaps—but, as Herko was wont to say, not love.

GET A HAIRCUT?

Instead of working at his job, Herko shone somewhere else, such as in haircut parties. Warhol’s *Haircut* films, also 1963, capture the haircut parties that Billy Linich, their mutual friend, used to give. At these parties friends would gather, enjoy each other’s company, and Linich would cut their hair for free. *Haircut #1* features Herko, Linich, their friend John Daley, and the choreographer James Waring, who was also Herko’s teacher. Linich’s name is usually associated with Warhol and The Factory, but he also designed lighting at Judson, not to mention the lighting in this film; Waring was a key influence on many Judson choreographers, not only Herko but also David Gordon and Aileen Passloff. The film gives us a rare group portrait of Herko and friends who represented the Judson and queer subculture overlap, one we normally don’t hear about in Judson Dance Theater history. Warhol calls them the San Remo/Judson crowd, San Remo referring to the local bar frequented by “a lot of fags,” with whom he became friends.

Made up of six one-hundred-foot rolls, *Haircut #1* shows Linich give Daley a haircut from different angles, while Herko and Waring just hang out with them. The way the camera fixes a stare on the action, similar to how Linich concentrates on Daley as he patiently trims the latter's hair bit by bit, suggests a permeating sexual tension. Though not involved with the haircutting per se, Herko directs us to the haircutting with his gaze at the men. At times he also looks flirtatiously into the camera, as if inviting us into the scene. Unlike the others, he is in the nude, except for a cowboy hat and his ballet slippers, looking used and worn, signifying his (intense?) dancer identity. In the fifth reel, sitting cross-legged on a chair, he switches legs left and right slowly, revealing his crotch in a now-you-see-it-now-you-don't kind of play. Yet the flirting and the sexual tension are also defused by the casual languor of the haircutting and the chit-chatting, as if they had all the time in the world (Linich takes his time, and at least to this viewer it's actually quite unclear if much hair is being cut). Relations in the film are affectionate and temporally drawn out, rather than pointedly erotic or climactic, an effect further enhanced by the sixteen-frame-per-second projection rate (Warhol's preferred projection speed).⁶ Haircutting as a social act, then, rather than something to be fitted in one's schedule. As Waring is quoted as saying in Daley's piece on haircut parties published in the November 1963 issue of *The Floating Bear*, it was "a timeless and sexy party."

GET DISCIPLINED?


Most of us don't throw haircut parties these days. We also tend not to dance without an alibi, a specifically circumscribed situation: a dance floor, a dance class, unless we're "intense," like Herko, who, Warhol writes, "danced in leaps whenever he went," who "would just dance and dance until he dropped." Two years before Herko's death, Warhol had his big break, a solo show at Stable Gallery in New York, in which he showed the works that have since become canonical: the *Marilyns*, *Red Elvis*, the *Coca-Cola Bottles*, among others. Also included in the show, placed prominently by Warhol on the ground rather than on the wall, were two of his *Dance Diagram* paintings. In this series Warhol appropriated images from commercially available diagrams teaching people how to dance, here the male and female versions of the Lindy tuck-in turn. Instead of portraying dance as an artistic medium, or as a practice of freedom, such as implicit in his account of Herko, Warhol took the diagram images from Home Instruction Dance Course material. In the comfort of your own home you can dance, but in a way instructed by a mass-produced manual that teaches people how to move in a similar way, to the same music included with the instruction kit. The diagrams discipline, normalize; they tell you how literally to comport yourselves, especially in this case, as Leanne Gilbertson argues, in gender normative ways.⁷

Social dance, of course, is not all uniform; it doesn't automatically turn us into machines, as anyone who has participated in the Lindy Hop would agree. Like concert dance, it is a form with its own history, meaning, and tradition; it also provides occasion for fun, connections, even a community (such was the case with the Lindy Hop, which had a long history as part of 1920s and 1930s African-American culture). In the early 1960s context, another dance move was all the rage: the Twist. It was



Above: Andy Warhol, *Jill and Freddy Dancing*, 1964, 16mm film, black & white, silent, 8 minutes at 16 frames per second. ©2014

The Andy Warhol Museum, Pittsburgh, PA, a museum of Carnegie Institute. All rights reserved. Right: Photographer unknown, *Andy Warhol in his studio at Carnegie Institute of Technology*, ca. 1948, Collection of the Andy Warhol Museum, Pittsburgh, PA, a museum of Carnegie Institute. Images courtesy The Andy Warhol Museum.



heavily promoted by the film and music industries, including Chubby Checker's cover hit "The Twist," the film *Hey, Let's Twist* (1961), and its accompanying soundtrack by the Joey Dee and the Starlites' "Peppermint Twist," which replaced Chubby Checker's song at the number one spot in January 1962 (the film also brought to prominence the Peppermint Lounge frequented by Warhol and his crowd). Other recording spin-offs, such as the Beatles cover hit "Twist and Shout" (1964), followed, as well as dance instruction guides. Herko included a variation of the Twist, the Suzie-Q, in a dance piece he choreographed in 1962 called *Once or Twice a Week I Put on Sneakers and Go Uptown*.

Raising the ire of conservative critics, the Twist signaled a new freedom in youth culture and in sexuality (see the 1992 documentary film *Twist* for a cultural history of the dance). Yet, arguably, it was the music industry that fuelled and profited most directly from the Twist craze. This would be in line with what thinkers such as Marshall McLuhan suggested at the time and what Ernest Mandel would argue in his classic text *Late Capitalism* (1978, first published in German in 1972): in essence, that leisure had been folded into the totalizing effects, including in social relations and everyday life, of mass culture and industrialization. Hovering between fun, participatory good times and uniformed, disciplined movement, what art historian Benjamin Buchloh describes as participation through consumption in the "trivial ritual of mass culture," the *Dance Diagrams* go right to the heart of the matter.⁸ They embody Warhol's artistic practice, emblematic of the post-Abstract Expressionist, 1960s subjectivity, one that David Deitcher has unpacked in his essay "Unsentimental Education: the Professionalization of the American Artist." In it he foregrounds Mandel's work and discusses the educational background of Warhol and his pop art peers such as Roy Lichtenstein, the first generation of American artists who were "professionally educated in university art departments, or in fully accredited, degree-granting schools."⁹ The training Warhol and peers received, Deitcher argues, combined "the ethos of aggressive productivity," following what he calls "the productive imperative" in culture-at-large, with a more romantic, non-utilitarian notion of art. It is this dialectic "between aesthetic and utilitarian forms; between handicraft and assembly line; between originals and copies" that structures much of pop art and certainly Warhol's breakthrough work in the early 1960s.¹⁰

Although not officially part of his modern artist training, dance played an important role in Warhol's artistic formation and coming of age. Warhol liked dance, participated in the modern dance club during his college days at Carnegie Tech (now Carnegie Mellon University), and dancers formed part of his social circle after his move to New York in 1949, living with them in his shared apartment. Dance and queer urban subculture overlapped as Warhol made his way in the city in the 1950s. They continued to intersect in the 1960s, as at Judson and in Warhol's films like *Jill and Freddy Dancing* and *Haircut #1*. With the *Dance Diagram* canvases at his Stable show, Gavin Butt tells us in *Between You and Me: Queer Disclosures in the New York Art World, 1948–1963* (2005), Warhol practically owned his queerness, the association of dance with gay men and effeminacy unmistakable to the audience. (It's

worth noting the special case of Johnston here as well. All in all the queers around Warhol were men. When Johnston started going out with Childs, she writes in her autobiography, there was no other out lesbian couple in their circle, contributing to her sense of alienation among her seemingly “laissez-faire” avant-garde colleagues and friends, who included queer men).

At the same time, the early 1960s also saw Warhol’s transition to art world prominence and the birth of the detached and dandy Andy that we have become familiar with. His work also moved away from the more explicitly queer artwork of the 1950s, work that had usually been described as feminized and decorative. Looking back to this period in *POPism*, Warhol casts Herko’s body as the queer dance body that, from his ambitious, art world-focused perspective, is located at the margins. It’s not, of course, that the queerness is displaced onto Herko’s body; Warhol’s body was never exactly in the norm, either, with his “slightly swish dancer’s walk and his limp wrists,” as Victor Bockris describes him in *Warhol: The Biography* (1989). It’s also not that Herko’s body actually departed from the norm; in *Jill and Freddy Dancing*, he appears fit, with a conventionally attractive, toned body. Rather it’s the get-with-the-program industry and industriousness that Warhol projects as the other to Herko’s “fascinating” body, which becomes the emblem of non-instrumentalized—and non-instrumentalizable—intensity. Dance in this scenario also becomes the other to art and its exchange value-based production cycle, what Warhol would soon call “business art.”

In his *Philosophy*, Warhol describes the talents of superstars at the Factory, which would have included Herko, as “almost impossible to market.” Rather than objects with exchange value, Herko’s (and his friends’) creative labor was physical yet intangible, like the fleeting rooftop dance in *Jill and Freddy Dancing*, like the social relations recorded in *Haircut #1*. On the other hand, Warhol’s early 1960s breakthrough and transformation stood at the cusp of a recasting of creativity in culture at large. As Joshua Rothman recently observed in “Creativity Creep” on *The New Yorker* website, “it’s now difficult to speak about creativity without also invoking a profession of some kind.”

His clothes and costumes kept in a trunk at the Factory, “the rest of his belongings scattered around downtown in different friends’ apartments,” Warhol’s Herko is the perfect image of resistance to the norms and progression of “regular” modern life. Someone once described him, Warhol writes, as “a seventeenth-century macaroni.” Ultimately, Herko’s body could be said to represent to Warhol everything that he was not, the idea of not getting it together hovering in the background: a projection, perhaps a fantasy, even a repressed desire.

NOTES

1. Unless otherwise noted, this and subsequent Warhol quotations are from Andy Warhol and Pat Hackett, *POPism: The Warhol Sixties* (Orlando, FL: Harcourt, 2006 reprint [1980]). Signaling more interest, research, and scholarship to come, Herko was the subject of a week-long series of programs in New York curated by Gerard Forde, including a symposium organized by Joshua Lubin-Levy at New York University (<http://www.freddieherko.com/>). Special thanks to Forde, Daryl Chin, and Carrie Lambert-Beatty for astute comments and careful readings of earlier versions of this essay. Thanks also to Greg Pierce, assistant curator of film and video, the Andy Warhol Museum, and Claire K. Henry, senior curatorial assistant, The Andy Warhol Film Project, for kind assistance with my research inquiries.

2. Jill Johnston, "How Dance Artists and Critics Define Dance as Political," lecture delivered to the American Dance Guild, New York, 1991, reprinted in Johnston, *Secret Lives in Art: Essays on Art, Literature, Performance* (Chicago: Chicago Review, 1994), 93–95. On her experience in the early 1960s, see chapter 7 of her *Autobiography in Search of a Father: Mother Bound* (New York: Knopf, 1983), 108–49.

3. See José Esteban Muñoz's chapter on Fred Herko, "A Jeté Out the Window: Fred Herko's Incandescent Illumination," in his *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 147–68. Muñoz frames Herko as a queer speed freak, provocatively theorizing the utopic potentiality of such a figure. In Muñoz's framework, drawing on the Frankfurt School theorist Ernst Bloch, Herko's story, including the grim interpretation told by Warhol, enables us to look back and forward to a future that is not yet here, a resonating, alternative vision that questions the premium placed by society today on efficiency and results.

4. Diedrich Diederichsen, "People of Power, People of Intensity: The Nietzsche Economy," *e-flux* 19 (October 2010), <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/people-of-intensity-people-of-power-the-nietzsche-economy/>.

5. Fred Herko, "Paul Taylor—A History," *The Floating Bear* 17 (January 1962), reprinted in *The Floating Bear: A Newsletter, Number 1–37 (1961–1969)* (La Jolla, CA: Lawrence McGilverly, 1973), 239. For Macaulay's review, see "A Barefoot Rebellion Storms Lincoln Center," *The New York Times* (March 14, 2012), <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/15/arts/dance/paul-taylor-dance-company-at-david-h-koch-theater.html>.

6. My reading of the film is much indebted to Douglas Crimp's insightful and interpretive account of Warhol's films, especially in terms of affect, queer relations, and temporality. See Crimp, *"Our Kind of Movie": The Films of Andy Warhol* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012).

7. Leanne Gilbertson, "Bodies Out of Time in Place: Queerly Present in Andy Warhol's Factory and Beyond" (PhD diss., University of Rochester, 2009), 65. On the dance diagram paintings, see George Frei and Neil Printz, eds., *The Andy Warhol Catalogue Raisonné 01: Paintings and Sculptures, 1961–1963* (London: Phaidon, 2002), 78–85.

8. Benjamin Buchloh, "Andy Warhol's One-Dimensional Art: 1956–1966," in *Andy Warhol*, October Files 2, ed. Annette Michelson (Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 2001), 1–46, first published in *Andy Warhol: A Retrospective*, ed. Kynaston McShine (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1989), 39–61.

9. David Deitcher, "Unsentimental Education: The Professionalization of the American Artist," in *Hand-Painted Pop: American Art in Transition 1955–1962*, ed. Russell Ferguson (Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art, 1992), 95–120.

10. There is a suggestive echo here in dance: Judson choreographers such as Trisha Brown and Lucinda Childs had liberal arts degrees; their dance training had been integrated in the modern, higher educational curriculum. In contrast, Herko's training in music and dance—at Juilliard and the American Ballet Theatre School—followed more closely the traditional, conservatory model.

PAISID ARAMPHONGPHAN is a PhD candidate in history of art and architecture at Harvard University. This article is adapted from a chapter in a dissertation-in-progress, "The Languid Dances of Andy Warhol and Jack Smith: A Choreo-History of 60s Art and Queer Culture."