

JUDSON

THE ATTITUDE

JOHN HOWELL

What a lot of dance performances this season has made clear is that there's a widespread and still growing choreographic interest in the whole bag of dramatic tricks left out when dance got minimal—story, persona, props, costumes, lighting, text, mixed-media and music. Of course these elements never really vanished from downtown dance, but they were either on the "no" list, ignored by choreographers busy stripping down their vocabularies to the essential core. Or they were used in such a minor way as to be relatively unimportant. Over the last two or three years the pendulum has been swinging back, and young choreographers are reveling in theatrical pizzazz. Even the movement-for-movement's sake/structure school is beginning to dress up, dance to the beat, and get physical. That's not to say that a regression is taking place; theater is often approached thoughtfully by choreographers who have learned not to take it for granted.

One part of this recent turnabout is a fascination with a major source of contemporary dance theater, the Judson Dance Theater of the early 60's. Last January, the Bennington College Judson Project sponsored an exhibition of videotapes, scores, and photographs at NYU's Grey Gallery (documented in a valuable catalog, *Judson Dance Theater: 1962-1966*) and then, in April, sponsored—with Danspace—two programs of reconstructed Judson performances.

Judson was, of course, a loosely associated group of choreographers with no formal program or manifesto; what they had in common was Robert Dunn's workshop based on Cageian principles, and a collective ambition to throw up for grabs the rules, definitions, and expectations about what dance was. Judson's most basic assumption was that anybody could make a dance, and that a "dance" could be what that person or persons made. From that wide-open tenet came a performance vocabulary still being explored today: the body as objectified machine and unmediated physical material, the use of game-like structures, task activity as dance movement, ordinary clothing as costume, uninflected phrasing of everyday movement as dance material and structure, incongruous juxtapositions of actions and objects, a significant use of other media, chance proce-



Deborah Hay's *Ten*

Photo: Nathaniel Tileston



Pop #2 by Edward Bortonn

Photo: Nathaniel Tileston

dures as choreographic blueprints—the list goes on. However, Judson represents an attitude of free-wheeling curiosity more than a codified set of principles, and is therefore probably the best kind of performance legend, one that demands to be subjectively reinvented to be called up as a resource. But Judson has been *too elusive*, a buzzword with only a vague, general significance, partly because there's almost no film or videotape documentation to show how the performances actually worked. So a reconstructed revolution in this case seemed to be not just an academic pastime but a real necessity.

Some quite different approaches to old work proved how the truly radical Judson idea could push its way through the inevitable aura of reverence and detached histor-

ical curiosity. Lucinda Childs' *Carnation* (1964), which was apparently exactly recreated by its choreographer/performer, gave away nothing to eighteen years of intervening experimentation: it was an unqualified stunner. Childs' absurdist actions—sticking curlers on a colander worn like a crown, jamming sponge-curler "sandwiches" into her mouth, repeatedly running up to and jumping onto a spot on the floor—were precisely timed, wacky images which created a hilarious and slightly eerie portrait of a human machine running amok. On the other hand, Yvonne Rainer's *Trio A* (1966), the model of uninflected, non-technical yet tightly structured dance, was performed by the choreographer who had not rehearsed it since August 1981 (until that time she had rehearsed it daily as an exercise). Rainer's efforts to negotiate her own

