tain aspects of Korean music, such as gliding tones, sharp juxtapositions, and heterophonic structure, in which a group of musicians plays the same melody in different meters. When he returned to New York, in 1961, he found that "the whole scene had opened up. Abstract Expressionism is dead; there's Pop Art. La Monte [Young] was here from California, Joe Jones was making his musical, automatic, self-playing instruments, George Maciunas was around, George Brecht was doing very minimal kinds of things." Corner was involved with these people, who were soon to form the Fluxus neo-Dada music group, but also with more "traditional" avant-garde musicians, like Malcolm Goldstein, whom he met while in graduate school at Columbia University, and James Tenney, an experimental composer in residence at Bell Telephone Laboratories. "All of these people kept on being professional musicians and composers in the strictest sense." Corner, Goldstein, and Tenney organized Tone Roads concerts at the New School, where they played compositions by Charles Ives, Carl Ruggles, Edward Varèse, Cage, and Feldman, as well as their own works. They included Fluxus performances and events on their new music program. "None of these worlds was incompatible. All of these people were around, and if you were at all interested in painting, poetry, or dance, you met them. People would use each other in their works. The barriers were breaking down; everyone brought in special qualities."[60]

In May 1962, Corner and Higgins had organized an evening of performance at the Living Theater. The program included Higgins's *Two Generous Women*, three renditions of La Monte Young's *Poem for Chairs, Tables, Benches*, Philip Krumm's *Lecture on Where to Go From Here,* with sound by Corner, and Carolee Schneemann's *An Environment for Sounds and Motions*, made with Corner and performed by Judy Ratner, Yvonne Rainer, Malcolm Goldstein, Arlene Rothlein, and Andre Cadet, with lighting by William Linich. Schneemann, a painter at that time, lived with Tenney; Arlene Rothlein was a dancer who was married to Malcolm Goldstein.[61]

Through Corner—who was friendly with Rainer—Schneemann, Tenney, Goldstein, and Rothlein began attending the Judson workshops.

Concerts #3 and #4 were distinctive not only because they represented a consolidation of the group and its identification with the Judson Church, but also because the composers played a large role in the performances themselves. The dancers and nondancers who choreographed works for these concerts had moved beyond their models of Cage and Cunningham. In terms of the relationships of dance to music as well as in terms of the kinds of structures and movements in the dances themselves, those choreographers who danced with Cunningham, either in his company or in his studio, showed a marked departure from the essential features of his work.

Rainer twice used romantic music: Berlioz in *We Shall Run* and Rachmaninoff in *Three Seascapes*. Paxton made a piece of music for his collaboration with Rainer, *Word Words*; the "music" was a separate physical activity, performed on a different night. If Cunningham's dance need not be related to Cage's music, except that they existed in the same time, Paxton posited an even more distant relationship between the elements. Philip Corner's dance, *Certain Distilling Processes*, was primarily a musical experience, in which the movement of the dancers served as conducting cues to the musicians. Some of the dances had no music; others used music in a more "traditional" way: choreographers used preexisting accompaniment or asked one of the available composers to create a piece specifically tailored to their piece. In terms of the choreographic structures, repetition and improvisation emerged as two modes neither Cunningham nor the other influences on the group (except Ann Halprin) were accustomed to use. The movements themselves ranged from those generated by tasks or instructions, as in Carolee Schneemann's *Newspaper Event*, to the even, quotidian jog of *We Shall Run,* to the violent, single-minded whacking with instruments of *War* (by Robert Huot and Robert Morris), to the pantomime of Paxton's *English,* to the lyricism of Arlene Rothlein's *It Seemed to Me There Was Dust in the Garden and Grass in My Room.*

Again the concerts were structured in slightly asymmetrical, unexpected ways. Concert #3 consisted of nine dances, each one this time considered a single unit. It began with *We Shall Run*, a grand dance that others might have turned into a finale. It continued with *Giraffe*, a solo of almost violent energy by Emerson, then Paxton and Rainer's low-key, repetitive nude duet *Word Words*, then Summers's *Suite*, which again seems like a natural finale. But instead of breaking for intermission after *Suite*, the evening continued with Scothorn's *The Lazarite*, a solo. Then came intermission, followed by Rainer's three-part, repetitive solo *Three Seascapes*, Herko's tough solo *Little Gym Dance Before the Wall for Dorothy*, Davis's crystalline pas de deux to radio music, *Field*, and finally, Schneemann's physical collage of materials, movements, and bodies, *Newspaper Event.*[62]

On the next night, there were also nine dances, but Paxton's *Music for Word Words* was treated like a prelude to the concert itself, so the numbering of the dances began with his *English,* again a large-scale group piece. Lucinda Childs's *Pastime*, a solo, followed, and then two contrasting duets: Brown's *Lightfall* and the Huot-Morris *War*. Intermission followed, then another large group dance, Deborah Hay's *City Dance*; Rothlein's solo; Judith Dunn's duet *Index*; and the final piece, a huge-scale finale with twenty-two performers, Corner's *Certain Distilling Processes.*[63]

Jill Johnston announced the blossoming of the Judson group as a new

entity in her review in the *Village Voice*, nearly a month after the double concert. She celebrated Judson's anarchic variety.

> In the Judson concerts there is a big, pliable, inchoate matrix of independent, original activity which knows itself even while looking for itself. The core of dancer-choreographers engaging in these concerts, as well as those who drop in and out, constitute a kind of loose, free-wheeling phalanx which is more than enough to fill that uncomfortable vacuum left by the decline, around 1945, of the first modern dance.
>
> One of the good things about the Judson concerts is the indiscriminate attitude of including just about as many dancers or nondancers (in as many kinds of actions and movement) as seem willing to participate. The programs may tighten up later on, but for the moment a certain amount of indiscrimination makes the most encouraging situation for everybody concerned. If that sounds provisional, I would add that I think it's great to be as inclusive as possible, because it's more like life that way. On a large, unwieldy program many experiences are available, and you can love it or hate it or fall asleep and not be too concerned about getting your trouble's worth every foot of the time.
>
> Be that as it may, there have been enough dancers on these programs to make the boat rock with dangerous excitement. The possibilities of form and movement have become unlimited. There is no way to make a dance; there is no kind of movement that can't be included in these dances; there is no kind of sound that is not proper for accompaniment. Only the integrity of the performer is at stake, the integrity to do the business at hand, to be inside that business, so that the action and the performer become one. The sluggish run of a non-dancer can be as moving and important as the beautifully extended leap of a dancer.[64]

Johnston saw in the Judson work correspondences with her rhetorical notions of modernity, freedom, and democracy—a generous, all-embracing celebration of the variety and vitality of American life. But even Maxine Munt, a more traditional, judgmental critic, wrote in *Show Business,* "Over the past year or so [the choreographers involved in the Judson workshop's] programs have ranged from benumbing boredom to intense concentration for the watchers, and if the boredom averages one half of the evenings the remaining half is worth a walk from any point of the city."[65]

For Johnston, Rainer's *We Shall Run* was a particularly resonant dance, celebrating the heroism of ordinary people.[66] Accompanied by the "Tuba Mirum" section of Hector Berlioz's *Requiem*, the dance consisted of seven minutes of jogging by twelve dancers and nondancers, in various floor patterns. The dancers lined up at the side of the room and waited for a moment, then began their inexorable movement, arms held waist-level as they jogged regularly in clumps. Occasionally one or two people broke out of their groups to run alone. Finally, the groups swept together to form a central, slowly whirling vortex that pulled each person firmly into it.[67] The dancers in the first performance were Trisha Brown, Lucinda Childs, Philip Corner, June Ekman, Ruth Emerson, Malcolm Goldstein, Sally Gross, Alex Hay, Deborah Hay, Tony Holder, Carol Scothorn, and John Worden.[68]

Rainer later wrote of her use of repetition in *We Shall Run*:

> I have rarely used the kind of repetition that causes "one thing" to go on for a very long time, as La Monte Young has done in music and David Gordon and Simone [Forti] Whitman have done in dancing. *We Shall Run* bordered on it. It was a 7-minute piece for 12 people with a very bombastic portion of Berlioz' *Requiem*. The only movement was a steady trot, but the constantly shifting patterns and re-grouping of runners were as essential to the effect as the sameness of the movement. The object here was not repetition as a formal device but to produce an ironic interplay with the virtuosity and flamboyance of the music.[69]

Despite its apparent simplicity, *We Shall Run* was not an easy dance to perform. Childs recalls:

> It was the very first piece on the evening, and it was my debut in the whole Judson thing. We all came out, and I remember worrying that I was going to forget it. I had my own solo the next night; I was a total nervous wreck. The piece was very complex. You had to go over here and make a little circle, and come back here and make a big circle. It was hard to keep it in my head. But we did it. You broke off from the group here and there, but you always had to remember where you splintered out to. You couldn't just drift, and if you got in the wrong group you wouldn't know what they were doing.[70]

Tony Holder made his own score of flip cards in order to remember the sequences of groupings. Although Rainer had made a written score in the form of floor plans, she did not use her own score to teach the group.

> She wanted everybody to learn it. She'd walk around and talk you through it and play the music. Then we'd literally run through it. And then she would say, "Yes," or "Start that part sooner." We would run, then clump together, then run. We'd do diagonals or short straight lines or circles or spirals. I thought it was very complicated, though the movement wasn't complicated. And I thought everybody else was so much smarter than I was, because they could remember it and I couldn't.[71]

Explaining the work to those of his readers who perhaps were accustomed to seeing or reading about story ballets and dramatic modern dance, Allen Hughes wrote:

> In Miss Rainer's *We Shall Run*, 12 dancers ran to a movement from Berlioz' *Requiem*. Sometimes they ran as a pack, sometimes they divided into groups, sometimes they huddled for an instant, but only as a respite from the gentle, rhythmic running that almost became hypnotic before it ended. And all the while, the singing of Berlioz went on. Crazy you think? Non-dance? Who's to say? If it isn't dance, what is it?[72]

To Johnston, the dance was expressive in a way that the more abstract works of Cunningham perhaps were not, but subtly so:

> Standing in a line, before they began to run, with impassive attention, [the performers] looked like what they were: people. No "attitudes," just waiting to execute the play. Then they ran, an even jog (not always in step, or course), running and running, back and forth across the gymnasium, moving in compact groups—a pervasive collective feeling, as the rhythm accumulated insistence, that finally bloomed absolutely heroic. The heroism of the ordinary. No plots or pretensions. People running. Hooray for people.[73]

Giraffe was a dance that Emerson characterizes as full of "violent, casting-the-body-around movement, which was very liberating to me."[74] She did not use a chart or chance score in choreographing the solo, but instead used movement that "was invented without thinking about it beforehand. It had a lot of energy, crashing up and down out of the floor. It was quite a rough dance to do; my feet would always be calloused and scabbed afterwards. At the time it was nice to be able to put out all that energy and to feel very strong." The dance had nothing to do with giraffes or their movements. The title, Emerson explains, was just "a kind of handle" for the dance. "I always wanted to have titles that were just one word, as a matter of personal taste." Reviewers, however, were determined to find a connection between the wildness of the movement, the musical score by McDowell, and the title. "Of course," Emerson notes ironically, "what we were really trying to do was to get away from those kinds of connections."[75]

Natalie Jaffe, who reviewed a later performance of *Giraffe* in the *New York Times*, writes, "Ruth Emerson, with the aid of some chilling, undisciplined jungle sounds, evoked the regal separateness of a giraffe in a piece as strong and watchful as the beast itself."[76]

Emerson's second performance of *Giraffe*, reviewed by Jaffe, was on a program of work by young choreographers, produced by Contemporary Dance, Inc. at the 92nd Street YMHA in April 1963. The auditions for the jury for that program had already been held before the Judson concerts #3 and #4 were organized, and several of the Judson group had brought dances to the auditions. Paxton's and Rainer's dance *Word Words*, third on Concert #3, was a stinging response to the snobbish attitude of the jury toward downtown work. Paxton explains:

> We had introduced some pieces for a small group of people who held sway at the YMHA, hoping for a wider audience and a chance to do work. It later got back to us that one of them had said, those people at Judson all look alike to me. So we made this dance that was done as a solo, a solo, and then as a duet; the same movements each time. I don't know exactly what we did, but at least there was room for comparison. The title was mine; it was one of a series of self-reflexive titles.[77]

The dance was a ten-minute sequence of movements, performed first as solo by Rainer, then by Paxton, then as a duet by both, in exact unison. The movements contributed by Paxton were complex, Cunninghamesqu actions, as Rainer recalls, "quite challenging for me to do; I hadn't pe formed any of that in public although by that time I was pretty proficie at it." Rainer's contribution included twisting poses and very tiny, repet tive gestures.[79]

According to McDowell,

> She did a long, seven-minute, like, solo, while he leaned against the wall, and then came out and did a long solo. And then after a while you realized that it was exactly t same dance—while she leaned against the wall. And then she came out and they did t same together. So the whole dance lasted, like, 20-plus minutes. And in rehearsal it w pretty boring, and they decided, like, the day before, that they were going to take their clothes, and that made it very interesting, and the audience was like this, y could have heard a pin drop.[80]

Rainer does not accept this apocryphal account.

> *We* didn't think the dance was boring. We had tried it out in Rauschenberg's loft for audience of Bob and Judy Dunn and Rauschenberg. It felt all right to us, and they lik it. So we did it.
>
> Steve [Paxton] wanted us to look as much alike as possible. He thought of gori suits, Santa Claus suits, playing around with our faces to re-draw them so they'd lo alike. That didn't work. And then we decided on a chaste version of nudity. We we afraid that in the church it would upset some people. We asked Al Carmines; he said didn't mind. At that time it was illegal to dance totally nude. We obeyed the law: I wc pasties and we both wore g-strings.[81]

Because the program ambiguously credits the choreography of *Wo Words* to "Steve Paxton (with Yvonne Rainer),"[82] several of the criti attributed it solely to Paxton. Hughes expresses his appreciation for t repetitive structure of the dance in emphasizing the movement for its ov sake:

> Perhaps you would have preferred one of the more sedate offerings of the eveni Steve Paxton's *Words Words* [sic], which he and Miss Rainer did wearing only what French call "caches-sexes." This was, in effect, a dance in the nude, and its purpose evidently to show that after the first surprise, nudity makes no difference at all. dance was dignified, and by showing the same choreography three times (as a solo each of the performers plus a repetition as a unison duet), Mr. Paxton made sure t

the dancing impressed itself upon the spectator as the significant aspect of the whole thing.

At the end, the performers might as well have been wearing fur coats for all the difference their lack of apparel made.[83]

Johnston saw the costumes as a comment on the standard modern ance costume, the leotard and tights which are suggestive of nudity. She ound the dance ultimately rather puritanical. And like Hughes, she did ot appreciate the title's indication of the dance's structure.

Mr. Paxton and Miss Rainer danced the former's *Words Words* [sic] naked—that is, naked except for one or two items required by law. The exposure was a natural extension (removal) of the revealing tights and leotards most dancers wear. And if the shock at first distracted from the dance, the novelty wore off soon enough and you were left with two bodies (you could watch the bodies, too) in a dance that was classically pure and not terribly interesting....If the length of the dance and the absence of contact (neuter, sexually) were meant to offset the nudity, I didn't mind. But I wouldn't have minded some relationship either. Since they both performed with total clarity and self-possession, anything would seem possible, in retrospect at least.[84]

The fourth dance on the program was Elaine Summers's *Suite*, which ohnston simply described as "funny and well-timed, much better than the 'oodstock version."[85] Munt thought it "trite, but fortunately short."[86] his time the "Galliard" was danced by Rudy Perez, Summers, and John 'orden; "Sarabande" [sic] again by Emerson; and "Twist" by Trisha rown, Philip Corner, Ruth Emerson, Malcolm Goldstein, John Herbert [cDowell, Gretchen MacLane, Perez, Arlene Rothlein, Carolee :hneemann, Carol Summers, Elaine Summers, Jennifer Tipton, and 'orden.[87]

The fifth dance, Carol Scothorn's *The Lazarite*, was an homage to oris Humphrey, who had died in 1958.[88] Scothorn had been awarded the cond Doris Humphrey Fellowship at the Connecticut College American ance Festival, in 1962. Part of the fellowship included the performance e for a new work, and Scothorn first performed *The Lazarite* at the Festi-l on 11 August 1962. The musical accompaniment was by Daniel Jahn.[89] unt thought the dance "sentimental and oddly 'old,' but [Scothorn] is a od performer." According to Rainer, "it had a lot of early modern dance ovements, Humphrey-like swings." Johnston thought the dance "com-unicated the idea that 'there is no death.'"[90]

After intermission came the sixth dance, Rainer's *Three Seascapes*, ich she had already performed on the March 5, 1962 program at the aidman Playhouse. Rainer describes the dance as:

[A] solo in three parts: 1) Running around the periphery of the space in a black overcoat during the last movement of Rachmaninoff's Second Piano Concerto. 2) Traveling with slow-motion undulations on an upstage-to-downstage diagonal during La Monte Young's *Poem for Tables, Chairs, Benches*. 3) Screaming fit downstage right in a pile of white gauze and black overcoat.[91]

She calls the first section of the dance "an even more ironic use [than in *We Shall Run*]" of the interplay between repetitious movement and flamboyant music, especially because she used a "bad recording" of the Rachmaninoff accompaniment. "The 2nd episode of the same solo is probably the purest example of repetition in my work: traveling on a diagonal with slow-motion undulations of pelvis and vague hand gestures....The movement was simple enough so that it could be observed as 'one thing.'"

Although to some the dance might have simply seemed like three disconnected actions, Marks, reviewing its first performance, found dramatic meaning in every part. She thought the second section suggested that Rainer was at sea, making her way "through imaginary waves to the squalling of chairs pushed across the lobby floor," and that in the third section Rainer "awoke screaming from a nightmare."[93]

Johnston, reviewing *Three Seascapes* in 1962, admired Rainer's Gertrude Stein–like use of repetition in several of her works, and noted the rigorous formal quality in this dance:

In *Three Seascapes* Miss Rainer makes three incidents employing the same method even more stringently. First she dog-trots all over the stage, and sometimes lies down and gets up, wearing a black coat, to a luscious and amplified movement from the Rachmaninoff Second Piano Concerto. Two, she progresses ONCE across the stage, like a slow-motion spastic, if you can believe it, to the accompaniment of a number of tables and chairs moaning, scraping across the floor in the lobby....And three, she puts her black coat over a long piece of white gauze, lies down under both, and has a beautiful fit of screaming in a flying mess of coat and gauze.[94]

Lelia K. Telberg, writing about the first performance in *Dance Observer*, simply labeled *Three Seascapes* "far out."[95]

One way that *Three Seascapes* functioned didactically was in its use of quite disparate sound accompaniments. Although Rainer did not use any traditional, metrically corresponding choreography with music, she did list three types of sound that, even if set against movements that correspond to them in no way, provided expressive overlays for those movements. The powerfully romantic music, the repetitive, dissonant "new" music, and the violent sounds issuing from the dancer's own body were three of a number of possibilities of the relationship between sound and movement; i.e., the movement could correspond to the sound, counterpose the sound, or exist independently of it—and if independent, the movement could take on the expressive meaning of the juxtaposed sound.

After *Three Seascapes* came Herko's *Little Gym Dance before the Wall for Dorothy*, dedicated to Dorothy Podber, a friend of Herko's.[96] Johnston describes the dance in two contradictory reports:

> Fred Herko's *Little Gym Dance Before the Wall for Dorothy* is a wonderful vignette: coming in straight out down the middle, removing jacket and boots, and sauntering off casually straight out down the middle.[97]

> I recall with wry affection Herko's *Little Dance Before the Gym Wall for Dorothy* [sic], in which he confronted the audience with his typical blend of audacious vanity and cynicism, then danced rings around himself in another characteristic mixture of technical finesse and baroque flourish, and finally swaggered off like the impossible renegade and accomplished dancer that he was.[98]

Whichever version is correct, Maxine Munt only commented, "Fred Herko is indeed the enfant terrible and his *Little Gym Dance*. . . shouted 'look at me, look at me'; he has yet to prove he belongs with this group."[99]

William Davis's *Field* was the eighth dance in Concert #3. Like Rainer's *Three Seascapes*, *Field* played with the ambiguities of expressive dramatization that emerge from juxtapositions of separate items. But in *Field* the movements were not always accompanied by the same sounds; the dancing was fixed but the sounds were indeterminate. *Field* was a duet for Davis and Barbara [Dilley] Lloyd. The dancers wore transistor radios attached to belts. The program credits the musical accompaniment as follows: "for Mr. Davis, radio station WABC; for Miss Lloyd, radio station WINS."[100] Both stations were popular music stations that interspersed rock music with news reports and commercial announcements.

According to Davis:

> I was interested in different kinds of partnering images in the context of the double sound source, some from social dancing, some from concert dancing, ballet partnering. And I imagine there was inevitably a certain ironic commentary on those "two hearts beating as one" images. But I was also, of course, very involved with the physical problems and possibilities of lifting, counterbalancing weights, supporting; with the evolution of those configurations, and how they can arise out of two related solos, or resolve back into two related solos. I was trying to work out some interesting variations on some classical themes.
>
> While there were quite a few lifts of various kinds in the dance, and some short bits of social ballroom dancing, there were also many sequences where the relationships were just those between two people dancing in the same space, sometimes fairly distant from one another.[101]

The dance lasted for around fifteen minutes, and both dancers wore leotards and tights. Lloyd also wore crystal earrings and a bracelet, "as a slight echo of a 'comedy of manners' quality in parts of the dance," Davis recalls. "Also, I was associating crystal with radios."[102]

The movement was not improvised, but at times the correspondences with the words or music on the radios struck spectators as impossibly apt. Johnston wrote in her review, "I have to mention that just when they came lyrically together Miss Lloyd's radio decided to broadcast 'Moon River.'"[103] Davis wore a knee pad because he had hurt his leg during rehearsal. His radio broadcast a news report on a baseball player who had hurt his knee.[104]

> It may have seemed occasionally that the movement was either improvised or designed flexibly so that we could pick up on things that occurred in the sound, because "meanings" arose frequently and radio broadcasts are obviously not predictable. But, given the character of the movement (although I think this would happen with almost any movement) and the range of material broadcast by both stations, certain expressive coincidences were inevitable. They were part of the nature of the piece. In performance, we were not reacting to anything in the sound.

The physical fact of the radio's closeness to the body, seeming almost a part of the dancer's body, also gave the sound accompaniment a special expressive value.

> There was a moment when I was standing behind Barbara [Lloyd], supporting her in attitude, with my right hand resting at her waist, near her radio, and our left arms together out in 2nd position. She was on relevé, and as she centered the attitude balance, I carefully turned off her radio, and stepped slowly back away from her to the rear of the space. My radio continued to play as I stood at a distance, and Barbara held the balance a very long time in silence. She finally stretched it out into arabesque, and then stepped out into the next sequence of movement and turned on her radio again.
>
> Remy Charlip talked to me at some length about that moment, which he thought appalling. He said it was as though I had stifled her, or strangled her. I was startled at that interpretation, because my conscious intention was to focus on the precarious stillness of the balance, to suspend the sound as the movement was suspended, like a held breath. But, Freudian considerations apart, I suppose it was a perfectly appropriate reaction, since one of the things I wanted with the radios was that sense of separate, personal aura coming from each of us.

About the title, Davis explains that, like *Crayon* in the first concert, the word resonated with various sorts of meaning.

> I was thinking of an electro-magnetic field, or a field of superimposed radio waves. Of an invisibly patterned or loaded atmosphere, an emotional field. And also of field in the sense of a physical space, a field of action.[105]

The ninth dance was *Newspaper Event*, choreographed by Carolee Schneemann. Schneemann had been making collages and paintings since the early 1950s, and, after graduate school in painting at the University of Illinois, she moved to New York in 1961 with the composer James Tenney.

Through Tenney, Schneemann met Corner and Goldstein. Tenney worked as composer-in-residence at Bell Telephone Labs in New Jersey, where he met Billy Klüver, a Swedish engineer who was interested in avant-garde art, occasionally assisting artists with technical aspects of their work and making touring and financial connections between artists and the Swedish government. Through Klüver, Schneemann began to go to environments and Happenings; she appeared in Claes Oldenburg's *Store Days* in February 1962, and in May she created her own "display" in collaboration with Philip Corner, *An Environment for Sounds and Motions.*[106] She began taking dance classes with Arlene Rothlein, whom she met through Goldstein, and Corner suggested that Schneemann join the choreography workshop then meeting at Rainer's studio. There she first worked on *Newspaper Event* and a children's fantasy unrealized until 1969, *Banana Hands.*[107]

Schneemann's sensibility was a sensuous one, luxuriating in colors, textures, moving forms. Influenced by Artaud, whose *The Theater and Its Double* she had read in 1960, as well as by Wilhelm Reich, D'Arcy Thompson, and Henri Focillon, she evolved a personal aesthetic that was nature-embracing and emotionally charged. She rejected chance methods and the Zen serenity that informed other artists' use of everyday things in their natural states. She wanted to use "what moves me," she wrote not "the Fro-Zen, the expanse of slight sensation, the twist to existing conventions: not to be shocked, disturbed, startled, not to exercise the senses thoroughly....to be left as you were found, undisturbed, confirmed in all expectations."[108] In regard to aleatory techniques, she also felt the need to take a position:

> I don't work with "chance methods" because "method" does not assume evidence of the senses; chance is a depth run on intent, and I keep it open, "formless." "Chance method" is a contrary process for my needs and a semantic contradiction which carries seeds of its own exhaustion in its hand clasp of chance-to-method. Method as orderly procedure, way to classification, arrangement—like a bag into which gestalten insight allows chance to pour; what might happen, possibility, unpredictable agent, unknown forces...so corralled, netted, become a closing in. Depth run of it—"chance," is way of necessity to surface and tentacled riches are not captured by method.
>
> Process with material/image leads exploratively, spontaneously. Chance, recognition and insistence with discoveries *is* field of action. Visual-kinesthetic sources are not abstract-theoretical conceptions for my process. In bearing. Slug and release—fling it out and pull in the nets; expect to be surprised.[109]

Schneemann's paintings sometimes had moving parts in them. She saw her "concretions"—performances—as extensions of those painting-constructions. "Performers of glass, fabric, wood...all are potent as variable gesture units: color, light and sound will contrast or enforce the quality of a particular gesture's area of action and its emotional texture." But at the same time, she acknowledged an interest in the differences between the relatively static object and the performance-in-time. The audience might be more active physically in a performance but, she felt, ironically, it is visually more passive when confronted with fleeting sensations and images.

> The force of a performance is necessarily more aggressive and immediate in its effect—*it* is projective. The steady exploration and repeated viewing which the eye is required to make with my painting-constructions is reversed in the performance situation where the spectator is overwhelmed with changing recognitions, carried emotionally by a flux of evocative actions and led or held by the specific time sequence which marks the duration of a performance.[110]

In making her concretions, Schneemann used space and time as additional components in which to extend the articulation of elements she used in her static constructions; for specific aesthetic reasons, she was not interested in editing the material to meet theatrical expectations.

> I have the sense that in learning, our best developments grow from works which initially strike us as "too much"; those which are intriguing, demanding, that lead us to experiences which we feel we cannot encompass, but which simultaneously provoke and encourage our efforts. Such works have the effect of containing more than we can assimilate; they maintain attraction and stimulation for our continuing attention. We persevere with that strange joy and agitation by which we sense unpredictable rewards from our relationship to them. These "rewards" put to question—as they enlarge and enrich—correspondences we have already discovered between what we deeply feel and how our expressive life finds structure.[111]

Schneemann used the word "concretion" to define her performances because she held that through gesticulation and gestation the "fundamental life of any material I use is concretized." With dancers that gesticulation could occur in any part of the body as well as through the voice.[112]

In *Newspaper Event* each of seven dancers was assigned body parts: spine, Arlene Rothlein; legs/face, Ruth Emerson; shoulders/arms, Deborah Hay; neck/feet, Yvonne Rainer; hands, Carol Summers; head, Elaine Summers; fingers, John Worden. Schneemann herself was "free agent/crawling." The dancers used the assigned body parts as the source and focus of their movements. In a sense their goal was to create objects rather than to dance.

> The source of emphasis, of internal focus and projective insistence was to determine all functions or actions in relation and contrast to the overall movements of the body. Phrasing, duration, repetition, the "scale" of gesture, would all be improvised within the centralized and overlapping movements generated by the instructions. The ruminative, meditative attitude evoked in working concertedly, in making something with the hands seemed a basic sensory value rarely explored publicly.[113]

The performers entered with cartons full of newspapers. Schneemann brought in benches and stools. The dancers "unfold and throw newspaper cascades in the central area, fast as possible. Thickest amount of paper in the center, then outward...in a circular sweep." Each dancer then followed his or her instructions. Rothlein and Emerson were to use horizonality; Hay was to use the refrain "I'll huff and I'll puff" both as energy and in her voice. Rainer's instructions involved making a huge pedestal out of newspapers, becoming tiny and then large, engulfing someone. Both Carol and Elaine Summers were instructed to "make yourself a little something to wear from the newspapers." Carol Summers had a vocal refrain, "That's beautiful," while Elaine Summers's line was "I need breakfast." Worden's actions were meant to be private and self-indulgent, and if anyone came near the "little something amusing" he was making, his response was to call them "you little prick" or "you dumb ass." Schneemann, as the free agent, timed the action, which lasted for ten minutes, and also planted flags on performers, crawling with the flag in her mouth to do so.[114]

Newspaper Event was based on the idea of "an organism interchanging its parts (phagocyte)." Schneemann outlines five principles in her construction of the piece:

> 1) The primary experience is the body as your own environment. 2) The body within the actual, particular environment. 3) The materials of that environment—soft, responsive, tactile, active, maleable (paper...paper). 4) The active environment of one another. 5) The visual structure of the bodies and material defining space.

Schneemann had watched the dancers in the workshop using random movements, chance methods, and nontechnical movement, but was disappointed that they seemed to be working as autonomous entities even in group dances. Her response, in *Newspaper Event,* was to provide a framework within which they could interact physically and spontaneously.

> I wanted touch, contact, tactile materials, shocks—boundaries of self and group to be meshed and mutually evolving. *Newspaper Event* was a first attempt to provide specific instructions through which contact and improvisation could activate neglected thresholds of awareness. Individuals would create their own activity and its momentum, while responding to and incorporating the "intrusions" and unexpected conjunctions with others....There was no underlying basis of abstract structure or rule, no pre-determined movement patterns.[115]

Jill Johnston thought *Newspaper Event* a "mad orgy" that was an "attraction."[116] Allen Hughes was intrigued by the performance, even though he thought its effect was partly accidental.

> Did you ever see a dance accompanied, decorated and—in a sense—dictated by the shredding of newspapers? I am not sure I have either, but in this program Miss Schneemann had a number of dancers involved in what was titled *Newspaper Event*, and I assume she thought what they did was dancing. Perhaps it was.
>
> In any case, it was surprisingly intriguing visually, and it actually—if accidentally—built to a climax despite its improvisational character. Each dancer had been given an action-motif to perform as he or she went through the business of tearing up the papers and romping in them, and these motifs collided in many interesting ways.
>
> One girl, for example, rolled on the floor, another went through the motions of dressmaking with papers, a man knelt on the floor, and from time to time dancers jumped on his back. Other dancers had other characteristic movements. Unfortunately, they had also been given motifs to speak at random, and these weakened the impact of the whole.[117]

Concert #4 began with an unnumbered item, perhaps meant to be a prelude or an overture: Steve Paxton's *Music for Word Words.* It consisted of the inflation and deflation of a twelve-foot square "transparent plastic room with arms and legs. Paxton inside, deflating room into costume which was worn as he left. Rainer with tape recorder catching ambient sounds: audience entry, vacuum cleaner, deflation."[118] The "music" was performed separately from the dance; *Word Words*, on the previous night, had been performed in silence. Paxton was specifically interested in creating a situation that contrasted with Cunningham's method of collaborating with composers. He also cites Aileen Passloff's influence; in some of her concerts, the music came in between the dances. "You had music, dance, music, dance. It was music for the dance, but everything came sequentially, not simultaneously."[119] Munt, commenting that Paxton and Davis had "galvanized the atmosphere and at the same time added to the excessive length and repetition" on the first night's concert, disapproved of *Music for Word Words* and thought Concert #4 "not as good" as the previous night. "Shame on you Steve Paxton," she wrote, "for the monotony of *Music for Word Words*, fortunately I had a good book with me."[120]

The dance that was numbered one on the printed program was Paxton's *English*, performed by Trisha Brown, Lucinda Childs, Ruth Emerson, Deborah Hay, Tony Holder, Shielah Komer, Paxton, Rainer, Rothlein, Linda Sidon, and Jennifer Tipton.[121] Paxton describes the dance:

> Group configurations done no faster than a walk. Pedestrian activities mimed in middle section. Properties: 3 plastic screens, 6-½′ × 3′ hung at thirds of the performing space width, 1 & 3 near audience, 2 upstage. Skin-colored make-up over face and brows.[122]

Tony Holder's recollection is that Paxton again made a score using sports photographs.

> There was a chorus that marched across the stage. People would face in different directions and mime some everyday object or event—cooking or washing—and then they'd

> go back to the chorus. The chorus just marched back and forth. One or two soloists performed the score, which had to do with a catcher jumping up in the air and game positions. You'd go from one position to another, and how you made the transition Steve [Paxton] didn't really care.[123]

Childs thought *English* was less hard-edged, more loosely constructed than *Proxy*.[124] According to Rainer,

> "*English*" was another one of Steve [Paxton]'s intricate, Jesuitical titles. "English" is one of those words that both is itself and stands for something—both symbol and sign. Again he was involved with trying to make everyone look alike. So all of these people soaped out their lips and eyebrows and put on pale, fleshtone pancake makeup. We all came in with these pie-faces, marching in a line, some people facing forward and some people facing backward. Then there were a lot of moving configurations, taken from group photographs, in which each person had one role in the group. It would start in one place, and then one person at a time would walk to another point—say, on a diagonal—so that the whole configuration would gradually be repositioned. One of the poses was a "tango-kiss," in which Steve and I went downstage center, I bent backwards, and he bent over me.[125]

Lucinda Childs was the first person in the Judson workshop who asked Philip Corner to compose music for her dance. The dance was *Pastime*, item number two on Concert #4. *Pastime* was a solo in three parts, a succinct statement involving three different angles of viewing the body and its movements. Childs says that it lasted for eleven or twelve minutes,[126] but a program for a later performance lists its duration as five minutes.[127] In the first section, Childs walked along a predetermined pathway: entering the gym; turning to the right, then walking downstage for a few steps and further downstage right; then along the length of the gym, in front of the audience; then turning left to walk upstage.[128] The movement happened primarily in her right leg, "going in and out, isolated," and involved standing in profile repeatedly.[129] After a blackout, Childs appeared inside a blue jersey bag, sitting on the floor.[130] The same kinds of movements were done by the right leg, but this time coming in and out of the bag, expanding and contracting its shape. Childs had already performed this section as a student at Sarah Lawrence and had made this part of the dance partly as a satire on Alwin Nikolais, who often used stretchy fabrics and various props to distort the shape of his dancers' bodies. This part of *Pastime* might have reminded viewers also of Martha Graham's *Lamentation* (1930), a solo that used such a costume expressively to create a tension and contraction of the body in a highly visible shape. For Childs, the "bag section" in *Pastime* was meant to be humorous. "It was funny to see this foot slowly going out of the bag. I could stretch the bag the entire length of my body. At one point it completely flattened out. And people

laughed at that section." In the final section, Childs presented a back view of her body, with her head dropped down so that her face could be seen from the top. "It was like another profile."[131]

Childs wanted the sounds of water to accompany her dance, and she had made a tape herself. But she couldn't isolate the sounds of water from ambient sounds, and she asked Corner to help her.[132] As Corner remembers:

> She had recorded a few drips and drops of water on a cheap tape recorder and then asked for help with it. I listened to the material and said, "Would you mind if I just started from scratch? Let me take the idea of water, but I think I can do better."
>
> She said "Fine," so I did a piece with the spray and gurgling of faucets, and I made three different pieces for that dance. I made more music than I needed, because you couldn't tell exactly how long Lucinda's dance was going to last. That clarified something: that the music, in formal terms, was endless. I wasn't doing something with a built-in climax, movement, or necessity. I was doing something that had endless variety, but was essentially constant. The kind of thing La Monte [Young] was doing at the time is the other end of the same pole. It doesn't matter if you have one event that never changes or a hundred thousand events which are changing all the time.
>
> At that time it seemed not to be enough. Just to stay with that for seven or eight minutes? It took me a long time to do it. But since then I've done a lot of pieces that go on and on, including a piece that was one note lasting for five days.
>
> The music for *Pastime* also turned out to be prophetic. My Korean name means "Contemplating Waterfall," and it was given to me by my calligraphy teacher. I have realized that I have a very passionate feeling for water, and I've since done many water pieces.[133]

Paxton remembers Childs's early work, especially *Pastime*, as "like haikus. Terse. And she was another glazed performer, but on her it looked fantastic, maybe because she has a mannequin's face, and one is used to their impassiveness. Her face simply projected in some way." The "bag section" reminded Paxton strongly of Graham and Nikolais. "It had a slightly ironic quality, but always very cool and very concise. Everything seemed quite considered and quite right and very calmly done."[134]

Childs auditioned *Pastime* for the Young Choreographers Concert at the YMHA, and it was accepted, she thinks, "because it probably had some vaguely traditional look." She remembers that the jury selecting the dances were shocked by the work of the Judson choreographers.

> Lucas Hoving was freaking out. Yvonne [Rainer] did *Ordinary Dance*. Steven [Paxton] came out and ate an apple. [Hoving] said at some point, "For this they studied ballet?" We were all going to Mia Slavenska's class every day. By then I had stopped studying with Cunningham, because I was involved with Jimmy [Waring]. Everybody seemed to be going to Slavenska, so I went too. You had to keep your body together, even though there was a dichotomy between the discipline of that technique and the actual activity you were involved in.[135]

Louis Horst, reviewing *Pastime* at the YMHA, complained that Corner's music "sounded as though all the plumbing at the Y was out of order."[136] Jaffe thought the dance expressed the alienation of people in the modern, mechanized world. "Lucinda Childs...condensed a world of blankets into a dance to the sound of water, rushing maddeningly in and out of enormous automatic washing machines. It...left one with the feeling that laundry is not the only thing that comes out of the machine spotless and without human character."[137] Johnston called it "an intense, cryptic solo of three episodes, including a very difficult part, moving so slowly, seated in a piece of manipulated material."[138]

Childs had grown up in New York City, where she was born in 1940. As a child she had taken dance classes, but she aspired to be an actress. At fifteen, she began taking classes from Hanya Holm, who had come to the United States in the 1930s as an exponent of Mary Wigman's technique. At sixteen, Childs went to Colorado to study in Tamiris's summer session and, after performing with Tamiris, decided to become a dancer. Tamiris encouraged her to go to college at Sarah Lawrence, where Childs studied with Bessie Schönberg, Judith Dunn, and visiting teachers, including Merce Cunningham. On graduation she moved to New York City and immediately began classes at the Cunningham studio, where she had also attended classes during school vacations. While in college, she had studied with Nikolais. "Until Merce [Cunningham] came along, I was very interested in Nikolais' composition process, the way he would get people to build phrases. He was interesting, and I was very interested in Beverly Schmidt [who danced with Nikolais]. I would come into New York just to see her solo concerts."[139]

Trisha Brown's *Lightfall*, a structured improvisation for herself and Steve Paxton, was the third dance on the program. Based on "violent contact" improvisation Brown had been investigating with Simone Forti and Dick Levine, *Lightfall* was a series of stillnesses and perchings, to music by Simone [Forti] Morris.[140] The music was a tape of Forti whistling. Paxton and Brown would jostle up against each other in a high crouching position, then one would leap up on the other's back.[141] Paxton recalls, "I never fully comprehended the structure. We got it together in kind of a rush, and it was a bit of a tease to remember. There were sections of leaping up onto each other's backs, running sections, and turning sections. It had a casual movement quality with quite a lot of really rigorous endeavors."[142] Munt thought *Lightfall* "a total disappointment after [Brown's] *Trillium* [performed at the Maidman Playhouse] last season."[143] Johnston, however, admired Brown's use of improvisation and relaxed spontaneity.

> Using the simple action of waiting (football style, hands on knees) as a recurrent "base," the dancers initiated a spontaneous series of interferences—ass-bumping and back-hopping—which were artless, playful excursions in quiet expectancy and unusual surprises. Miss Brown has a genius for improvisation, for being ready when the moment calls, for being "there" when the moment arrives. Such facility is no mere tongue-wagging, but the result of an interior calm and confidence and of highly developed kinesthetic responses. She's really relaxed and beautiful.[144]

The next dance was a collaboration between Robert Morris and Robert Huot, two artists. Called *War*, it consisted of the two men, dressed in "armor" that was a collage of found objects, whacking at each other with sticks and releasing white doves, while La Monte Young played gong music *to Henry Flynt, April 1960.*[145] Rainer recalls *War* as "incredible."

> The whole place was in darkness, and La Monte [Young] was up in the cage. He very slowly made the gong vibrate with soft beats. That went on for a good five minutes. The lights went up, these two guys in these outlandish costumes released two pigeons and ran toward each other, yelling and screaming at the top of their lungs, beat at each other with wooden weapons, which splintered, and the lights went off. And that was the piece.
>
> They had padding and one of them had a shield with a picture of Eisenhower on it. It was somewhere between medieval and pop art.[146]

Henry Flynt, to whom Young had dedicated his composition, was one of the composers who had participated in the series at Yoko Ono's loft in 1961. Rainer went to Flynt's concert there and reports that "the outstanding event of the evening was Henry Flynt holding a taut rubber band up to his own ear and plucking it."[147]

Paxton describes *War*, which he did not like:

> The came on dressed like Tweedledee and Tweedledum, hugely camouflaged and armored, with wooden swords and gauntlets, and they whacked away at each other for a while. They really laid into each other. And then at the end they released doves from the interior of their costumes, which flocked up to the ceiling. It was a very successful piece in terms of the audience reaction. I thought it was a piece of shit. Where was the concept? What was this political cartooning that was going on? I just didn't understand it, I suppose.
>
> Something as light-hearted as that just went right by me. I was very seriously interested in self-reflexive titles and pedestrian movements. There was an anti-war movement then, certainly an anti-nuclear movement, but this didn't seem about that, this was just preposterous.[148]

Listing *War* as one of the "attractions" of the series, Johnston writes that the piece was "Bob Huot and Bob Morris dressed (smothered) in the most incredible, gorgeous panoply and trying to kill each other for real."[149]

After intermission, Deborah Hay's *City Dance*, number five on the program, followed.[150] Jill Johnston called it "an imaginative abstraction of hurried motion in complex, dispersed patterns."[151] According to Emerson,

Hay had made a score for the dance by "collecting data," listening to the sounds outside her basement apartment and timing them over several days.[152] The dancers (Brown, Childs, Emerson, D. Hay, MacLane, Paxton, and Rainer)[153] wore leotards and tights with different everyday items; Brown, for instance wore a scarf, Paxton a headband, Rainer gloves, and Emerson a pointed hat.[154] The music is credited to Richard Andrews.[155] Perhaps *City Dance*, too, was seen by those who looked for dramatic meaning as a piece about the loneliness of modern life.

Dance number six was Arlene Rothlein's *It Seemed to Me There Was Dust in the Garden and Grass in My Room*, dedicated to Mary Rudman, with music by Malcolm Goldstein.[156] Made in honor of Rothlein's aunt, who had recently left a mental institution, the dance was a lyric solo.[157] Paxton and Childs both remember only that it was "romantic."[158] Munt thought Rothlein's solo was "the one outstanding event of this evening. . . . [Rothlein] is a lovely lyrical dancer with a true feel for movement, light as a feather, but again, oh so long."[159] Johnston writes:

> And Arlene Rothlein she was a sweet breath of spiced lilacs in her solo *It Seemed to Me There Was Dust in the Garden and Grass in My Room.* I loved this mixed-up patchwork piece, even though several transitions were awkward because a few gestures were not truly assimilated.[160]

Rothlein, born in New York in 1939, began to dance while a student at Erasmus Hall High School. She studied at the New Dance Group, with Mary Anthony, and at Cunningham's studio.[161] By 1963 she was performing with James Waring.[162] She also auditioned for the YMHA concert and was chosen to perform her solo there. Jaffe thought Rothlein's dance on the Young Choreographer's Concert, like Keen's *Dawning*, contributed to her own feeling that "modern dance is a most perfect medium to communicate the tensions of our world, with a laugh and poignant loveliness in the bargain."

> *It Seemed to Me There Was Dust in the Garden and Grass in My Room* by Arlene Rothlein was also full of meaning and perception. It turned eclecticism into a nightmare and made one wonder if the dilettante is not the unhappiest man on earth. Miss Rothlein-managed to convey in one short piece all the exhaustion of trying to keep up with every period of music and dance while achieving real involvement in none.[163]

Judith Dunn's *Index,* a duet for herself and Steve Paxton, was number seven on the program. The music was by Robert Dunn.[164] Although Judith Dunn had participated in Robert Dunn's choreography class as an assistant, she had not made any dances of her own in the class. She had stage-managed Concert #1 at the Judson and danced in several dances on that first program, but *Index* was the first piece she choreographed and showed

publicly since joining Cunningham's company. The chance to do her ow choreography soon led to her leaving Cunningham to work on her owr Judith Dunn believed strongly in the value of chance as a choreographi method, and she used aleatory techniques to create *Index*. The movemer phrases included Dunn giving Paxton five coins while he held his hanc behind his back, Dunn leaning against Paxton with her back arched an her hands behind her head, then sliding down to the floor and stepping o her hands. The dance took Dunn several weeks to make, and she consic ered it quite elaborate. When she finished the dance, she realized that seemed dramatically expressive. "It was all about conflicts, and I didn start out to make it that way at all."[165]

According to Paxton, "it had a lot of references to indexes, includir index fingers. One of the things I had to do was hop turns, very quickly, i arabesque—an airplane or helicopter propeller image—rolling onstage."[1

Robert Dunn describes the music he made for *Index*:

> I prepared a score for [a] small chorus of 6 to 8 people, giving each a set of cards wi instructions for performing vowel and consonant sounds, and asking them to prepa vocal events from their own combinations and sequencing of these, following certa guidelines. In rehearsal and performance I served as conductor, controlling the densi of the sound by signalling the performers as to entries and silences, varying loudnesse and choice of events. The concert was in the downstairs gymnasium of the church, ar the chorus was placed behind the audience seated on bleachers, in a small cage probab for the storage of sports equipment. It was purposefully made to resemble in effect tl electronic music of the day, without the sizable expense of electronic gadgetry, ar perhaps with a somewhat troubling extra dimension from its live human source.[167]

Jill Johnston does not write about the dance in terms of the accident expressive value Judith Dunn saw in it, but in purely formal terms:

> This is a long, impressive dance combining many rigorous or lyric phrases and "events What I liked especially was a phrase near the beginning when Miss Dunn leans agair her partner, looks at him long and soft, turns and slides slowly down his torso. Asi from the beauty of contact, I liked it because it was one of few moments when Mi Dunn relaxed from the neck up. As a dancer of fine command and technical accor plishment, she could afford to be more indulgent. Another arresting episode was jagged succession of tense pretended balances followed by lunges of one at the oth around the neck to make both collapse and crash on the floor.[168]

The final event of the evening was Philip Corner's *Certain Distillir Processes,* a musical composition in which four dancers (Davis, Raine Rothlein, and Beverly Schmidt) were the conductors of seventeen "pe formers" who made music on a variety of objects. The performers wer Ansel Baldonado, Joseph Bloom, Joseph Byrd, Michael Corner, Phil Corner, Robert Dunn, Malcolm Goldstein, John Herbert McDowell, Cha

lotte Moorman, Eric Regener, Joshua Rifkin, Barbara Salthe, Stan Salthe, Carolee Schneemann, Florence Tarlow, Philip Wofford, and Vincent Wright. Norma Marder sang.[169]

Corner had given each dancer a score of calligraphic drawings. The dancer-conductors made gestures according to their interpretations of the drawings, and then the musicians assigned to watch certain dancers reinterpreted those gestures into sounds.[170] Thus the composer's score became music after two sets of translations by several sets of autonomous groups, in much the same way that Paxton hoped his dancers would learn the dance at a remove from the personal mark of the choreographer.

Beverly Schmidt remembers:

> Philip [Corner] came over to the house one day, and he had a big roll of butcher's paper, and he had made a graphic score, that looked like calligraphy. He gave each performer a copy of it, and we just worked on our own. We did not come together until the end. I interpreted it in my own way. I don't know if all the conductors had the same score. I just very conscientiously studied the score. I did something that was very set, very specific, and very detailed. And then there was a group of musicians who followed me. I didn't see them before hand, and they didn't know what I was going to do, I guess. But they had certain cues to pick up from me.
>
> I remember that one of the performers—maybe it was Yvonne [Rainer]—came up with a solution that involved putting a sweater on and taking it off. And I thought, "Gee, that's interesting; I got a totally different interpretation of it." It was based on a purely visual thing, a shape. I somehow related the shape in the space of what I did to the picture that I saw. And since I had a background of abstraction in working with space and shape and time, it was easy enough to connect to that. I also had costumes, and I remember putting things on and taking them off, but it was less pedestrian; it was different. I never really got into the pedestrian style of what the Judson people did. There was a contingent there that made everything very leisurely, the way it would be in real life. I never took that up as a style.[171]

Johnston found *Certain Distilling Processes* "an amazing musical event" and the seventeen performers "intriguing."[172] Munt thought both final events—Schneemann's *Newspaper Event* on Concert #3 and Corner's *Certain Distilling Processes* on Concert #4—were, predictably, "production numbers," and boring ones at that, "nothing more than exercises in improvisation for an acting class, or a group of first graders, or twenty minutes of self-indulgence, sometimes vulgar, sometimes silly, but never evocative."[173]

With her review of Concerts #3 and #4, Maxine Munt concluded that "within this group they are already beginning to quote each other, to achieve the sameness of look and performance, which could become a dead end."[174] Jill Johnston was far more sanguine, even enthusiastic:

> The revolution in dance is upon us. The revolution has been going on for fifteen years. But now the numbers of people are impressive. Just a little over a year ago you could still despair over the rare occasions when you might see the few isolated choreographe who made anything worthwhile because they were proceeding (and continue) alone make dance within themselves and of the present moment.

Johnston singled out Rainer as "the greatest thing since Isado crossed the Atlantic, or St. Denis saw that Egyptian cigarette poster, or ar other important moments you can think of in the lives of sever astonishing ladies a few decades ago."[175]

Concerts #3 and #4 were a historical step for the Judson worksh group for a number of reasons. First, they represented a consolidation well as a broadening of the group: They were the first fruits of the cooper tive activity that had matured independently of Robert Dunn's class, ar they were the product of other networks of artists outside the Warin Cunningham circles. The musicians and visual artists played a far great role as collaborators in these concerts, on the whole, than they had in t past. Second, the range of dances on the program showed not only t variety of choreographic and technical styles, but also the consideration the roots and branches of modern dance, its past and its future. These we dances, like Scothorn's *The Lazarite,* that stood firmly within a particul tradition; dances, like Davis's *Field,* that proudly called on a number dance techniques while experimenting with the theatrical aspects in a avant-garde manner; dances, like Summers's *Suite* or Childs's *Pastime,* th manipulated or satirized historical or personal styles. There were al dances, like Rainer's *We Shall Run* and Paxton's *English,* Schneemann *Newspaper Event,* and Corner's *Certain Distilling Processes,* that redefine the physical activity necessary to define an action as a dance. Nondan movement was called into service as material for a dance, raising t aesthetic point that the material that goes into a dance may not be t criterion that distinguishes it as an art work. Third, as discussed above, t relationship of dance to music was investigated and resolved in a variety ways. Fourth, the relationship of language to dance, both in titling and the performance itself, was examined. The nature of costumes—from t near nudity of *Word Words* to the shaggy armor of *War* to the leath jacket and boots of *Little Gym Dance Before the Wall for Dorothy*—w similarly scrutinized. Like Pop artists, the Judson choreographers we fascinated by the everyday and put mundane objects and activities in the dances in ways that "made them strange," as the Russian Formalist criti had described in literature. A newspaper used as clothing or as somethi to shred and play in; a radio blaring banally as the background for a r mantic pas de deux; references to football and other athletics, to soci dancing, to daily activities—all these elements were a way of making t viewer stop to examine more closely the things one ordinarily takes f granted. And finally, the choreographic structures themselves depart

from traditional methods in that they often focused on the movement itself, calling attention to its details in a way very little choreography had before. Rather than an image, a story, an atmosphere, or a phrase, the various choreographic strategies (repetition, improvisation, task instructions, "one thing," frozen moments) foregrounded the movements, the smallest possible segment of a dance work. In many ways, the dances were expressive—they seemed to be "about" alienation, rebellion, human vulnerability. But very often through formal techniques of distancing—as in *Certain Distilling Processes,* the photographic poses of *English,* the chance scores of *Index,* the nudity of *Word Words,* the cartoon violence of *War*—a sense of humanity shone through, a human scale and intimacy that early modern dance once had but eventually lost.

4

The Plot Thickens

On 28 and 29 April 1963, Yvonne Rainer presented an evening-length wor in five sections for six dancers. The work was called *Terrain.* The first cor cert held in the sanctuary of the church since the workshop had begun th previous fall, it was also the first event that used the title Judson Danc Theater in its publicity. The advertisement in the *Village Voice* in the issu before the concert gives the following credits: "Music: Philip Corner, J. S Bach. Essays: Spencer Holst. Lighting: Robert Rauschenberg. Dancers Trisha Brown, William Davis, Judith Dunn, Steve Paxton, Albert Reic [and Rainer]." Rainer had asked the workshop whether it would sponsor solo evening (solo in the sense of presenting one person's choreography) and the group approved.[1]

Rainer had been working on *Terrain* since the fall of 1962, and he concerns in this dance are clear extensions of her explorations since eve before Robert Dunn's class: the use of traditional dance forms threade through with subversive, out-of-whack elements; repetition; the use of lar guage in dance; the incorporation of natural movement and games; "loon bin" material; the fragmenting of movement and sound in a collag format; the permission for the dancers to make choices and exercise free dom within an overall structure.

On 1 December 1962, Rainer had completed several of the solos fror *Terrain,* and these she performed on "A Program for Sounds and Bodies, at Beverly Schmidt's loft, 2 Pitt Street, titled *from the solo section.* Th program also included *Animals* by Susan Kaufman with music by Josep Byrd; *Lovely Music* by Philip Corner; *Three Tape Pieces* of music b James Tenney; *Lamentations of Jeremiah* by Malcolm Goldstein; an *Second Finale* by Philip Corner. Rainer performed four of the five solc from *Terrain*: "Spencer Holst #2 ('On Evil')," "Walking Solo," "Deat Solo," and "Spencer Holst #1 ('On the Truth')."[2] The two Spencer Hol solos were identical in terms of their choreography. They began with somersault and the arms then rising to overhead with a sharp flapping c the palms, then a sudden drop into plié, the arms opening to the side wit

into functional terms. "He is not interested in making a technical 'process,' an invention, like a new kind of musical instrument or any systematic machine, that could be used by artists for composition or execution of work. At the moment, he says, he continues to enjoy contributing a functional unit for one specific purpose."[24]

Concert #5 was performed at America on Wheels, a roller skating rink at Kalorama and Seventeenth Streets in Washington, D.C. on 9 May 1963. According to Steve Paxton, Yvonne Rainer and Judith Dunn went to Washington in order to meet with Alice Denney, and they selected the rink as the site of the performance. He remembers that the rest of the participants arrived at the rink for the first time on the day before the performance.

> It was a hot, muggy, Washington eighth of May, and the skating rink was huge and really hot. We had to climb around up on a moveable scaffolding to do the lighting. The lights hadn't been touched for years, and there was a layer of dust over everything. We were there until about two or three in the morning, doing the lighting, with Alice Denney, who had a pair of roller skates on and had gotten quite drunk, playing the organ with her roller skates and calling out "Remember this one Billy?" We got the lighting done and had a run-through on the afternoon of the concert and realized that our performance was so long that we had to shorten the intermission and, I think, omit one. Some of the dances happened at the same time, but the main reason for that was that we had a vast space to fill. We didn't know how many people were going to come, so we set up islands of seats in various places in the rink. And the performance lasted for four hours and fifteen minutes. I danced in eight pieces including quite a lot of *Terrain*.[25]

Rainer, however, felt that she was not at all involved in the organization of Concert #5. Although Paxton says that he did not know Klüver very well until the time of the concert, Rainer remembers him as a friend of Rauschenberg's and Paxton's, and it was Rainer's impression that Paxton and Rauschenberg went down to Washington to choose the space, and that they, with Klüver, selected the participants in the concert. She remembers that about fifty spectators came to watch. "The place was unbelievably hot; I felt like a fried egg. But we were all ecstatically excited about the place, and doing the work in that place."[26]

Seventeen dances were given during the evening; with six of the dances occurring two at a time, there was a total of fourteen events. Five of the events were actually the five sections of Rainer's *Terrain*. Seven of the dances had been seen on earlier Judson Dance Theater group programs: Judith Dunn's *Index*; David Gordon's *Helen's Dance* and *Mannequin Dance*; Paxton and Rainer's collaboration, *Word Words* (accompanied by Paxton's tape recording of *Music for Word Words*); Paxton's *Proxy*; Trisha Brown's *Lightfall*; and William Davis's *Field*. Five of the dances were new. Robert Dunn remembers planning the order of the events with

as much care as he had orchestrated the concerts at Judson, beginning here with the delicate *Trillium*, Brown's solo, in a small spotlight in the exact center of the huge rink, continuing with the contrasts set up between the three sets of simultaneous dances and the fragmented *Terrain* threading its way through the entire evening. The "Bach" section of *Terrain*, with its compendium of movements from the previous sections and the grand yet spare joy of its musical accompaniment, swept through the rink as the concluding dance in the concert. The audience was given a map on the program that told them where each dance would take place.[27]

Trillium had first been performed at the Maidman Playhouse on the American Theater for Poets series, on 24 March 1962. Maxine Munt, in her review of that concert, calls it "the high point of the evening," and notes that it was built on "two movement themes: a sitdown fall and hand stands." Jill Johnston, also writing about the first performance of *Trillium*, praises it for its spontaneity. "The short dance grows, flowers of its own natural accord from its first physical impulse of simply getting up and lying down. It spreads internally, so to speak, and Miss Brown is a radiant performer." Brown herself describes the rules she set up for *Trillium* as follows: "I could stand, sit, or lie, and ended up levitating. In this dance I did not notify myself of my intentions in advance of the performance."[28]

Paxton, who had been learning to improvise with Brown and Forti, and who performed in Brown's *Lightfall* in Concert #4 and later in the evening in Concert #5, thought that *Trillium* was "a very beautiful dance."

> It had a handstand in it and a lot of very beautiful, indulgent movement. Trisha [Brown] told me that a trillium was a flower that she had found in the woods. I'd never seen one; I thought it might be a very large number. She said that she used to pick them in the woods, but by the time she got home they would be wilted and faded. And that's what she thought about movement. It was wild; it was something that lived in the air.
>
> It was odd to see a handstand in a dance at that time. It was odd to see people off their feet doing anything but a very controlled fall.[29]

Brown's movement style was quite different from that of dancers who worked with Cunningham, like Judith Dunn or William Davis. Davis remembers that in *Trillium* Brown was "elastic and floppy. After you watched her for a while, you realized that what might seem quite disturbing or dangerous she had completely under control. I remember that in *Trillium* she fell and touched herself in surprising ways."[30]

The second event in Concert #5 was Judith Dunn's duet for herself and Paxton, *Index*, which took place toward one end of the rink at the perimeter, and, at the same time, Albert Reid's *Bird Solos*, near the center of the space. Reid, who lived with William Davis, had first become involved with the Judson group when he performed in *Terrain*. He had met Rainer in

ballet class at the Joffrey studio. Reid was born in Niagara Falls, New York, lived there for ten years, then moved to Canada with his family. As a small child he sporadically took classes in tap dancing, ballet, and gymnastics. But his primary activity was singing. His entire family was musical, and Reid was trained both in piano and singing. When he was eleven, his family moved to Los Angeles, where Reid sang professionally in a boy's choir. At Stanford University, Reid majored in drama, performed in the school productions, and met Davis. Reid's interest in dance was rekindled, and since there was no dance department at Stanford, he studied modern dance with James Truitte at Lester Horton's school in Los Angeles and ballet with Carmelita Maracci. Maracci advised him to go to New York to study ballet with Antony Tudor. After graduating from Stanford and spending a year in the army, stationed in California, Reid moved to New York. He had already seen performances by José Limón's company and Alwin Nikolais a year or two before that, at the American Dance Festival in Connecticut, and soon after settling in New York, he decided to study with Nikolais. Nikolais encouraged Reid to come to the day classes for professional dancers, and Reid supported himself by typing cables at night for American Express. He modestly recalls that "at that time there were so few male dancers that you were always encouraged; even if you weren't good you had opportunities to perform." Reid joined Nikolais's company, and when the first Concert of Dance was held at Judson Church in 1962, he was performing in Spoleto with Nikolais. In 1963 he left Nikolais to work on his own choreography, and he also danced in various other choreographers' works; in 1964 he joined Cunningham's company in time for the world tour. Reid had choreographed *Bird Solos* for a performance at the Henry Street Playhouse. When he performed it again in Concert #5, it was his first participation in the Judson Dance Theater as a choreographer. Looking back on *Bird Solos,* Reid feels that,

> It wasn't a very good piece; it seems like a silly dance. It was literally that: just bird imagery. When I made it I was excited about it, and then it seemed old-fashioned and corny, and I never did it again. Maybe some of the movement in it was interesting, but not the way it was structured.
>
> In fact, I never work with structures; I've never been attracted to games or abstract mathematical formulas. I always have a movement idea, or an interpersonal idea, and the dance emanates from that core reason for the piece. The idea suggests images or movement sequences, and the coherence and logic in the piece comes from working around the core, like building a little pearl around a grain. In that sense I don't think of myself as avant-garde. As a dancer I felt very connected and excited by a lot of the things that went on at Judson, but as a choreographer I felt out of key. I was never attracted to that way of constructing things.[31]

Still, the atmosphere at Judson was one that allowed Reid to experiment with choreography in his own way, giving him a chance to find out i what directions his choreographic inclinations would take him.

After *Index* and *Bird Solos* came *Helen's Dance,* by Gordon, and the the first two sections of *Terrain,* "Diagonal" and "Duet." An intermissio followed, and then Gordon's *Random Breakfast.* A duet for Gordon an Setterfield, it was a collage performance of six sections. According t Gordon, the dance was planned as a trio that included Yvonne Rainer, bu after one rehearsal with Rainer, Gordon decided he wanted to work wit Setterfield only. Gordon describes *Random Breakfast* as a "lavish escapad that included at least a dozen costume changes, innumerable accessorie props, sound cues, and complicated timing. Two of us were to do it i thirty minutes. It was the piece, I remember thinking, that would brin modern dance to an abrupt end." Gordon intended this pastiche as a sar donic comment on "the Judson Church Dance Factory Gold Rush in whic choreography ran rampant."

> The policy of the Judson Dance Theater was that no choreographer could be turne away, or rather, there was no policy, because no one would take the responsibility (making qualitative judgments on the work of anyone else. Unlike many of th participants, who were able to perform in each other's work and, in some instance begging to establish durable associations, I dealt with the situation as a voyeur, which a tendency of mine....[Judson] and other show business manifestations were the s courses of *Random Breakfast.*[32]

The first section, "The Strip," was a dance for Setterfield. Dressed in long blue velvet gown that belonged to Waring and had numerous sma buttons down the front, long gloves with more buttons, a hat, pearls, and fur stole, she performed a strip tease to "authentically brassy strip music Gordon says that,

> She looked like Queen Mary taking her clothes off in public. She walked in a circ forever, taking off one thing at a time, all those buttons to open, the dress, a petticoa a long-line brassiere, garter belt, stockings, bloomers, limping along in one high-heel shoe, never breaking the rhythm of the circular walk. She was somehow extraordinari genteel parading in the circle and dropping her clothing. She discarded all the clothi in a neat pile so that when she was done she could stoop down and gather it all up t gether in a huge bundle. The dowager empress had become a naked rag lady....
>
> For the first performance...I had not questioned the convention of dancers weari tights and leotards as a substitute for nudity and Valda ended up in flesh colored tigh with an extra pair wrapped around her tits.
>
> Her performance was contained, refined, subdued, and incredibly funny.

When *Random Breakfast* was performed in Concert #7 at Judson Churc Setterfield wore pasties and a mirrored g-string.[33]

The next two sections—"Prefabricated Dance" and "The Seasons"

Rauschenberg had been involved in dance as a costume, decor, and lighting designer since 1953, when he designed costumes for Merce Cunningham's *Septet*. In 1954, he collaborated with Paul Taylor, among other things supplying a dog that cued the beginning and ending of one dance, *Resistance*. The relationships with Cunningham and Taylor continued alongside Rauschenberg's development as a painter, making collages and combine-objects that mixed processes of painting, various methods of transferring images from other sources, and the incorporation of ordinary or extraordinary objects. Born in Port Arthur, Texas, in 1925, Rauschenberg first began to study art after service in the Navy, at Kansas City Art Institute under the G.I. Bill of Rights. He then studied at Academie Julian in Paris; at Black Mountain College and at the Art Students League in New York. Returning often to Black Mountain after moving to New York in 1949, he became friendly with John Cage, Merce Cunningham, David Tudor, Buckminster Fuller, Jack Tworkov, Robert Motherwell, and Franz Kline. He performed in Cage's untitled performance at Black Mountain in the summer of 1952. After working with Cunningham for seven years, Rauschenberg became the company's lighting designer and stage manager in 1961, traveling with the company when it toured (until 1965). Also in 1961, Rauschenberg participated in a performance at the American Embassy in Paris in honor of David Tudor, who was beginning a concert tour of Europe. While Tudor played Cage's *Variations II,* Rauschenberg, equipped with contact microphones, painted a painting. The other performers were Jean Tingueley, Niki de Saint-Phalle, and Jasper Johns. The following year, the same group commissioned a script from Kenneth Koch: *The Construction of Boston,* performed at the Maidman Playhouse in May 1962, was fifteen minutes long, with a cast that included the painter Frank Stella, curator Henry Geldzahler, and the dancers Steve Paxton and Viola Farber. As part of Rauschenberg's contribution, Farber and Paxton inhabited a small furnished apartment on stage and performed a series of everyday activities, beginning when they got out of bed. Rauschenberg also built a rainmaker. The Stewed Prunes, a comedy team, announced various events, and Merce Cunningham directed. Tingueley built a cinderblock wall that finally closed the stage off from the audience, ending the performance.[40]

Rauschenberg had been involved in Judson Dance Theater since its beginnings; he had visited Robert Dunn's classes, and participated in the weekly workshop sessions. He did lighting for concerts and helped in various other ways. He was also involved socially, for he and Paxton lived together. But *Pelican* was Rauschenberg's first venture into choreography on his own.

Rauschenberg gives different accounts of how he decided to make *Pelican*. He claims that Alice Denney had already printed the program and mistakenly listed him as one of the choreographers. "I'd just come along to kill myself on a bunch of rotten ladders five hundred feet up in the air at the roller rink," he says. "I remember Trisha [Brown] helped me name the piece out on Alice [Denney]'s back porch." However, since the flyer Paxton made seems to have been distributed even before the program for Concert #5, as noted above, and it also listed Rauschenberg as the choreographer, and since Rauschenberg rehearsed the dance for three weeks before its performance, his story seems suspect. Perhaps, though, there was earlier publicity distributed by Alice Denney that announced the program. Rauschenberg has also said that:

> The more I was around Merce [Cunningham]'s group and that kind of activity, I realized that painting didn't put me on the spot as much or not in the same way, so at a certain point I had to do theater myself.... I like the liveness of it—that awful feeling of being on the spot, having to assume the responsibility for that moment, for those actions that happen at that particular time.

According to yet another account, Rauschenberg has said that after Alice Denney showed him the skating rink, he decided to use roller skates in a dance and he learned how to skate.[41]

Rauschenberg's method in choreographing *Pelican* was the same as his method in painting or other artmaking: He explored the materials at hand, subjecting them to certain limitations.

> Since I didn't know much about actually making a dance, I used roller skates as a means of freedom from any kind of inhibitions that I would have [as a performer]. That already gives you limitations—puts you in a certain area that you must deal with....
>
> I auditioned dancers for the piece; and to my surprise, I found that dancers who had skated when they were children, and some of them quite well, couldn't roller skate now because of their dance training. They froze, and it was very awkward. They needed a kind of abandon to actually do it. You see, in their thinking, dancers have a going dialogue between themselves and the floor, and I had put wheels between them and the floor. They couldn't hear the floor any more, and their muscles didn't know where they were.[42]

Rauschenberg has also stated that using roller skates was a "gimmick that would disguise the fact that I couldn't dance." He contrasted his own "lack of danceability" with Carolyn Brown's elegant, dancerly line and precise technique, as she danced in pointe shoes. At first, however, he tried to make a pair of pointe-shoe roller skates by putting ball bearings on the pointes. "It would be her equivalent to skates," Rauschenberg explains.

"But she nearly killed herself on them, and so I thought that wasn't such a good idea and that just dancing on pointe looked just as abstract as rolling around on skates."[43]

The dance was a trio for Rauschenberg, Carolyn Brown, and Per Olof Ultvedt, a Swedish artist who was in New York on a visit. First they rehearsed in Rauschenberg's loft on Broadway, then in a Brooklyn roller-skating rink. The dance lasted for twelve minutes, according to one account, and twenty to thirty minutes according to another account. All three performers wore sweatsuits. To a tape collage Rauschenberg had made from various sources, including march music by Handel and Haydn and sounds from the radio, television, and movies, the two men entered the rink from one end, rolling horizontal to the floor. Each traveled on a set of two bicycle wheels joined by an axle. When they entered, they were hidden by huge winglike constructions made from parachutes. Carolyn Brown moved down the center line of the rink on pointe, while the men rolled down the edges of the rink and, having reached the opposite end, spiraled around, switched paths, and, rolling back to their starting points, swooped around to pick Brown up as she returned along the center line. They partnered her, lifting her and carrying her as they skated in circles and figure eights, until finally they exited, each man kneeling on his axle. Rauschenberg remembers that "It had a flow to it; it had to, because you couldn't stop very well, and everything was moving pretty fast. The main movements were starting and finishing. Those are always the toughest moments in theater: getting on and getting off."[44]

According to Calvin Tomkins:

> [*Pelican*] turned out to be highly romantic in feeling, with the two men in their fantastic parachutes circling and occasionally lifting the ballerina, who wore toe shoes and a sweat suit. There was some anxiety that one of them might drop the incomparable Carolyn Brown, but both Rauschenberg and Ultvedt worked hard at learning to skate, and Carolyn Brown declared afterward that she was never worried. *Pelican,* at any rate, was the hit of the festival.[45]

In Concert #5, *Pelican* was followed by Paxton's *Proxy*; Gordon's *Mannequin Dance* performed simultaneously with Brown's *Lightfall,* for herself and Paxton; another intermission; then Davis's *Field*; and finally, the last two sections of *Terrain*—"Play" and "Bach."[46]

Both the audience and the performers were delighted with the concert. An article in the *Washington Post* on the Pop Art Festival singled out the dance concert as the "most important feature" of the entire festival.

> The program was a long and arduous one, with an extraordinary melange of dance, calisthenics, acrobatics, recitals, poetry, imitations, strip teases, rollerskating, and music. Held in the vast expanses of a roller skating rink, it continued the informal and impromptu air of the Happenings. Chairs were set in groups around the rink so that the audience was surrounded by the performers, who wove in and out of the chairs. [Alan] Solomon pointed out that "the occasion was so stimulating to them (the dancers) that they elaborated and invented as they went along in an unprecedented way. The result was a unique involvement between artist and audience. In this sense it was a major occasion the equal of which I can't recall.
>
> "The performance was a stringent program where you could still feel the classical structure of the ballet with definite sequences, in spite of the improvisation and Happening quality."[47]

Paxton recalls that,

> It was a glorious concert. I was high for days and days afterwards. It was not only very different than performing in New York, but it was that we had finally achieved a kind of transformation of theater, because the audience was as active and mobile in making choices about what to see as we were active and mobile in running from place to place to perform, changing our performance style from piece to piece. It made me feel very strongly the differences in the pieces. We had, at one fell swoop, a full panorama of our work in this vast space, almost all at once. And it was very, very amazing. It was also incredibly tiring.
>
> It was very hot in the rink, and it finally started cooling off about midnight. And we finished at 12:15 or so and got to Alice Denney's house, where we were staying, at 1:30 to 2:00. I remember that it was cool at that point, and that there was a full moon, and the mockingbirds were mewing and calling because of the brightness. It was a blue sky at night. And I remember lying there in a state of fatigue and ecstasy with this incredible moon filtering through a tree and brightness all around. I felt that in this performance, Concert #5, the work and the thinking and the organization concept had all come together to make something that was new and full and rich. And I was really pleased to have been there.[48]

Both *Terrain* and Concert #5 were watersheds in a number of ways. *Terrain* was a choreographic achievement for Rainer and a revelation for her dancers and spectators about the nature of dance movement and the identity of a dance. Concert #5 was an expansion in terms of the use of space, new audiences, moving outside of New York, the strengthening ties with the artworld. Although the dancers did not feel identified in terms of their work with the Pop Art exhibition in Washington, Rauschenberg was a pivotal figure involved with both aspects of the event. And certainly connections could be drawn between the factual realism of much of the work at Judson and the new, figurative paintings of the Pop artists. The use of sports images, of flags, of popular genres and Hollywood myths, radio music, and even of the ballerina image served as raw source material for the Judson choreographers, just as highways, beer cans, Coca-Cola bottles, and pictures of Marilyn Monroe served the Pop artists. The found gesture—whether from everyday life or "commercial" dance—was used in