Bob Lockyer

Bob Lockyer, former executive producer for dance programs at BBC Television and founding chair of Dance UK, was interviewed by Douglas Rosenberg at the University of Brighton in 2008. This interview was transcribed from video.

Douglas Rosenberg: I'll start off with some history—basic stuff: how did you start; what were you thinking; what was your plan; what happened; how did you get to where you are; how did you get to this point here—?

Bob Lockyer: Well, my professional working life was at BBC television. Television at that time (and I should say that when I left it ceased to be) was a creative medium. Writers were writing for television—the television play. It happened in America, it happened in Europe, it happened in England and elsewhere, but the major problem [was] that choreographers making dance programs weren't getting a chance. There was dance on television, but that was mainly either replays, or things that were brought into the television studio. I mean, it's hard to remember when I started; the idea of videotape was very new. The idea of a digital camera—I don't even know if it was Mr. Sony's dream or not—if there was a Mr. Sony. The first bit of videotape, which I would actually keep in my wallet to show people [was] two inches wide. You couldn't cut it directly, and it cost a vast amount of money. But, I really felt that choreographers, if we could find some choreographers, should use the medium of television. A national broadcasting organization was the only way to do it, because you didn't have lightweight equipment.

Actually, the first chance I had as a director was working with Lynn Seymour on a project, which was based on the poem "The Swan." I've actually got [to get] it out to look at tomorrow—just to see how good or bad it is—because I haven't decided whether I am going to screen it at something. It lasted fifteen minutes, was set to a string quartet, and it was totally created for the camera. In fact, it was much more created for the camera than was planned because, for various reasons, we ran out time and, at the last moment, we had to reduplicate shots to make up the time. The thing was, it was being what I call 'washing line.' The washing line is the music, and then we had to fit the visuals to the washing line; the music wasn't written afterwards.

That was the first thing we did and then [because of] various funding difficulties, nothing else happened; we were bringing in works and making work in the television studio of stage works, but we were not making creative works. That chance came at the BBC when Mrs. Thatcher decided, in her crusade against the BBC, that the BBC had to have twenty-five percent of its output made by independents; that immediately allowed us to go to work with the arts council. And so, dance for the camera was born as a result of Mrs. Thatcher's right-wing attack on the BBC, trying to make production companies make work. That was the birth of dance for the camera.

DR: As far as the starting point . . . it would be helpful to have a date.
BL: You see, it must be . . . I think we're talking the late eighties, I think. I'm terribly bad about dates. I'm just always looking ahead; I'm never looking back. I suppose I should have looked up and seen—but I think it must be the late eighties, early nineties; it's about ten

years. Where are we now? About ten or twelve years. Out of that collaboration with the arts council, we made over fifty films; which is quite something.

DR: So let me ask you, because you sort of slid into this notion that dance and television went together, or should go together. Can you go back now and talk a little bit about why? First of all, what was your interest in dance? And second of all, why did you think the marriage would be valuable?

BL: Well, I got into dance because I'm dyslexic. In the days of live television, you had to prompt actors. You prompted actors with a little button that you pressed, and that cut out the sound leaving the studio and leaving the transmitters. So, you gave them a prompt from the prompt corner in the theater. And I got that completely up the spout one day and was sent home from the BBC; it was: "Go home at once!" Then I was called back and they said, "Oh, you must work with Margaret Dale," who was sort of an ex-dancer who worked at the BBC doing dance programs. She mostly brought the Royal Ballet into the studio. But, she worked with [Birgit] Culberg, and various other people, bringing them into the studio to make work, to make television versions of stage works. I started working with her and got involved with Peter Wright, who came in as a television director for a time, before he went back to the theater. I started writing scenarios of short dance films, some of which were made, and some weren't. I just felt absolutely, just strongly, that the choreographic eye was something that was important to bring to the screen. I think there are choreographers who are not interested in it in any way at all; it just does not cross their mind. They don't understand what the camera can do. I mean, I think, it's where the moment of creation happens. In making a dance for the stage—it is in the rehearsal room [first]—then it ends up on stage. In making a film, you have the rehearsal process, the shooting process, and the creation really happens in the cutting room. Certain choreographers are not interested in that process at all. Others of them will just stay there, working away, discovering what one frame, two frames, can do to the whole meaning of the complete film, and are really fascinated by it. That's what we were trying to do—what I was trying to do—was to give them another form of expression.

DR: You're sort of articulating an arc of activity from, more or less, restaging choreographic works for television to—towards the end of your work, which you did at the BBC—creating work out of whole cloth. So, that's quite an arc and the end product is quite different, I think.

BL: Totally different.

DR: So can you talk about how that evolution occurred? And what occurred in that evolution?

BL: Well, I suppose working for a public broadcast . . . I absolutely believe the best stage work should be made available to as many people as possible. And, as the touring costs of dance companies increased enormously, the opportunity of seeing work, I felt, was terribly important. That's what I mainly did; most of my time at the BBC, I was a director who brought stage works into the studio, and re-created them. But, what I then discovered—that I knew—was the whole idea that screen-time and stage-time is something that is very, very different. [When] you are directing something that then already existed, you had to be very careful not to let the cat out of the bag too early, or you were left with a bag. If you're dealing in a narrative, which is a story line, there were needs for reaction, counter-reaction, because everybody by then had a television, and understood the language of television,

and the screen. They understood the screen language, which didn't necessarily work with the stage work. And that's what I was trying to do, was to give choreographers—directors liked to work with choreographers—the opportunity to understand that. [To] use what the screen can do, and what the juxtaposition of shots can do, because the frame is all you have. Whereas, on the stage, you are sitting there and you have no proof where the audience is actually looking. Some people may be looking into the eyes of the person sitting next to them or looking at the stage, but not looking at the center of what the choreographer was thinking about. In a funny way . . . I always said that . . . if you . . . bring a work into the studio, to film a stage work, you actually don't need all those things with the lighting, because the lighting is there to direct the audience at what to look at, what the choreographer wants people to look at. So, in fact, the lighting and the cutting of the script are almost identical.

DR: So where was the transition point, then, for you?
BL: Well, there was never really a transition point, because they both kind of went along in parallel. I mean, the other problem is one of cost. If you were doing a work that was already created, it's actually the creation costs that have been paid for—the dancers have danced them, and worked them. So, if you take something like a Lloyd Newson or DV8 work, "Enter Achilles," which we did, or "Strange Fish," the film versions, which are totally different from the stage versions, which actually came at the end of the production period. They had been produced, they had worked on the stage, they had toured—perhaps in some cases for a year or eighteen months—and then they were re-made with original performers for a film. That process was very exciting and very different, because what happened was, in both cases, the setting of them became totally realistic. In "Enter Achilles," it moved from a strange stage set into an old disused pub—in real spaces—and the dancers re-inhabited this old pub with all its furnishings.

DR: So, how did that happen?
BL: Well, that was a decision that Lloyd made with some discussion with me, mainly on his own. He jut knew that what works in the theatrical space would not work in television. You are so used to seeing reality, whether it's a war in Iraq, or you're watching nature programs, it's based on reality. Therefore, that's what he . . . that's how he did it. I think that the whole idea of the theatrical would not have worked; a great ramp stage that lifted up like a craggy mountain at the end is a very theatrical thing. So, the whole thing changed, and in the same way, time-wise, it shrunk from ninety minutes to a television hour. So, forty minutes of the material was cut away, for the reason that one close-up can tell you a lot more than a three-minute dance, perhaps. And that, I think, is something that choreographers have yet [to understand]—that you actually, with small gestures, are telling enormous stories.

DR: When you're talking, I'm thinking of the parallels between what you're describing and literary translations from text, books or fiction, to cinema. There's a . . . I never thought about this before . . .
BL: Yeah, there's a great similarity . . .

DR: Because you're thinking about dance as the original text . . .
BL: Yes . . .

DR: Which is being translated, in a way, in the same way that any other text would be translated . . .

BL: Yes—so yes, I think that's it. Except, often in a dance situation you have . . . the music is actually again, the washing line . . . and you can't take four bars out of the original piece of music, if it's something incredibly well known. But, you can do it if the music has been written and it can be re-written or re-used. I mean, [that was] the advantage of just using Lloyd's piece, as an example. It was a montage, it had a soundscape; you could play with the links of all those things. Cut out a verse, in other words, and lose the two minutes of that [verse], but shorten it all.

DR: So, were you aware . . . was there a consciousness at all of what was going on, what was afoot, when you were making this kind of work? It was a pretty huge change, a pretty powerful cultural phenomenon.
BL: Yeah, I think there was a political move at the BBC at the beginning, which was the BBC as a patron, an arts patron; and that certainly was one of the pushes. Whether that came as a result of what we had done . . . they suddenly started writing about it, and it was in the annual report. As the importance of the BBC as a patron of the arts, whether that came first or we were first . . . I have a feeling it came after, I think we were leading the way. I mean, I pushed at a slightly open door. I'm not sure that they knew what they were getting, but we succeeded in winning successfully quite a lot of awards with the project, so I think it was quite exciting. But then, politically, it has now completely changed; the whole process of commissioning has changed, and it has sadly fallen off the table.

DR: But, for better or for worse, you created a model.
BL: Yes, yes, we created a model and I was incredibly lucky that I then went around the world talking about it, and teaching it, so I was quite lucky that way. And that, I think, was a bit [of a] strange way, because I was on the staff and getting a salary . . . and there were down times. If I could fill the down times by going somewhere, I was out of their minds and out of the way. So, I was incredibly lucky. I went to Australia and worked with various people there, went to Canada a couple of times, and BAMF, where I met Katrina McPherson, [while] working. I mean, so I was incredibly lucky.

DR: As is everyone else in the community. Again, for better or for worse, you created a model.
BL: We created a model, whether it was the right model or not, I'm not sure. The problem was the one model is then taken up, for good or for worse around the world, you might say, almost. But, I mean, it was a model of plurality—if that's the right word—yes, a plurality of funding. It allowed a broadcaster and two major arts funders, or people, and the company itself, to come in with the amount of money you needed.

DR: So let me just state this question again: For better or worse, your activities, left, or created a model that became the dominant model. If you could reflect on that a little bit and start off by describing what this model is, first of all.
BL: I suppose "Dance For The Camera" created a model—the BBC and the Arts Council created a model, which was taken up around the world. [It] was the idea that teams of people, a choreographer and a director, come up with an idea, a creative idea. They submit that on one side of paper. Originally, they then went away with development money, and if they were lucky with the development [money], they went to the commissioning stage, made the work at the end, and we as the commissioning editors—like in all films—came

in, looked at it, accepted it, or didn't accept it. That's it, briefly. The idea was that it allowed [us] to have a large number of people coming in, putting in ideas, and then slowly working down to people who were getting the commission. I think, on the whole, that [it] was quite successful. The problem was, over the ten years, more people wanted to come in, and there was an encouragement of the new people. I think if there was a criticism, it was the old stages, or the people on a learning curve of experience [who] didn't get a chance to have another go, or two goes or three goes. You're not going to make a masterpiece- or perhaps, you are going to make a masterpiece the first time. Perhaps not the second, but it's the third, fourth time [you] begin to understand the language you're working with. I think there was, then, the whole problem of the duration. I think we were all very concerned, but certainly the powers that be at the BBC wanted something that would fill the television slots. And to actually make a twenty-minute dance film—twenty-five, thirty minutes, or whatever the necessary slot—takes a lot of time, and a great deal of money. So that's why fifteen minutes, for example, was the maximum we did for the dance on the camera. We did five and we did nine, and I think the sort of ten-minute slot was the best. [It] was manageable in the budget, and in the time, and actually with the people, working with the people, [they] could actually do [it] with the money that they were given. I mean the thing was that we were absolutely insistent that the creative team actually did get some money out of it. So often in arts things, doing things for love becomes so important; but I think it's important that you actually earned your bottom dollar.

DR: Well, I'm using the term "model," but part of the model . . . once again, if you could go back and sort of talk about this. You described some formal constraints, which lead to the residual effect of, in a way, this sort of short attention span.
BL: Yes, I think I, yes . . .

DR: Do you want to just go with that?
BL: Yes, I'm trying to yes, I suppose, for better or for worse, the dance for camera projects set up a formulaic system. It was very much based on television and the whole idea of television, and sustaining how long people could watch television for. I always think that you don't actually watch television—you listen to it. You move out of the room, you go onto this . . . it's very rare that you sit there glued to the television. You listen to it while you stroke the cat, have a cigarette, glass of wine, or whatever. So, it was working within the formats of television that these projects were devised. And what was fundable, and what was acceptable would get screen time. So that's why they were a series of short, short films, and not hour-long films. Also, budget-wise, one was never going to get a budget that would allow a choreographer to make an hour-long dance film. In fact, I don't think, even now, there is anywhere a choreographer that could make an hour-long dance film without some training, knowledge of the medium. Perhaps there is now. But I don't know . . . whether they would actually want to is another thing. So, I mean, we built this thing, but the other great regret about "Dance For The Camera" was the actual distribution of it. It was designed for television to have one transmission, or two transmissions. And that's all it got, and they were forgotten. The great problem with dance, with dance itself on stage, is that there's no past. If you are a student who is studying dance now, and you want to know who Martha Graham was, then you can dig out the old movies of Martha, because they are actually available. But if you were looking at dance in the United Kingdom, it's very hard to look

up, and find footage of the Ballet Rambert, for example, in the fifties, or early Christopher Bruce; all those things are not there for you to look at as a dance student. And I think that is a problem. Also, students of dance for the camera, which now, [there are] seemingly courses are starting up all over the place, they have no idea of the past, or what people have done. The work of David Hinton, and his work "Touch" and "Birds," and those sorts of things, and his work with Lloyd are not really available for study. So, everybody starts new, which I think is one of the great sadnesses.

DR: One of the other things that I wanted to talk to you about a little bit, because I keep coming upon new things, one of the things that I've been thinking a lot about lately, is the nature . . . or not nature, of the actual curating in the screendance community. For instance, a festival shows ten or fifteen films—they have nothing to do with each other; there's no relationship, you have to make a relationship. So, it's like walking through a gallery seeing paintings of fifty different people. So again, for me, it's become the status quo; and for me, it's a big concern. I don't know if you want to talk about that. Things like genres in dance films . . .

BL: I think what we did at the BBC, at the arts council . . . we made a number of films, fifty films; and the development of the work in Australia, in New Zealand, in Canada. Everyone was so excited that they actually made their five films. They were very proud and then showed them, and the idea of dance screen exhibits, and dance screen festivals opened up. And everyone said "how wonderful" or "gosh, how not wonderful." We've now got to the stage where there is a body of work, a considerable body of work. I have no idea how much, but I suppose there must be 5–10,000 small dance films around. But, there's really no one who knows anything about them, or who can get a hold of them. You know, there are a number of curators who curate the festivals, but often their festivals are just screening what has happened in the latest films. They're not saying, well what I'd like to do is a film series about the work of one particular choreographer/director or however; or one period of time. There is a sense that being able to look at your past, no one is actually looking, and writing, and talking about the art form. And, it's funny that that's what we need to do. We need to be proud of our past and be extremely critical of the work that has gone—but creatively critical about it. We just can't say it's all rubbish, but why we think it is rubbish . . . and writing about how people are using the language, the choreographic language, and the filmic language, and that's not happening. Well, it's not happening as far as I know in the UK, I don't think it's happening anywhere, and that is a great loss. Because, whatever it is, it's actually having a body of work that you can read about things. You can say to people, "here, have you seen this article by somebody?" You can print it off; it may be on the web, but when you print it out and read it, the art form has come of age. At this moment, I don't think we have come of age; we're still in the playroom I think.

DR: It seems to me that much of the feeling, in general, now is simply based on circumstance. So in other words, there's funding for this or that, the circumstance is that it produces some films; or we started a festival, and they've gotten entries from a hundred people. So, the circumstance is that they show these. It's reactive rather than proactive.

BL: Well yes, it's much . . . yes . . . are you going to be proactive, or are you going to be reactive, as you say. I think, you know, it's much easier, in a funny way, to be reactive than it is to be proactive. You know, it's easier to say, "look I've got these twenty-five films which

I've discovered, which are wonderful, and we've got to have some money to screen them." That's [more] possible to get together [than to] say "I want to commission these twenty-five people to make films based on—" or whatever the thing, you know the idea, the concept is: loneliness, oneness, whatever; to find that kind of money to commission work, is incredibly hard. It's also the same thing of not having a past; you if you can't get hold of people's films to say, "look this is Laura Taler: I'd very much like to get Laura to make a film about being a refugee, or about being a stranger in a new city." Or whatever the concept is, it's very hard to get, very, very hard—certainly in the United Kingdom. Looking at the cinema, and more and more in television as well, it's a totally written medium, the whole understanding of funding is for the written word. It is the script; everyone can have their opinion on a script it can be re-written—people can talk for hours about 'ands' and 'buts'; and should scene 14a come before14c; and what about if we transport it all to New York, wouldn't that be better because I don't think we can sell it in the Midwest if it's Ipswich in the east part of England, it's got to be in America, and we can give you more money for it. They've got something in their hands that they can work on, but if you're working on a choreographic idea, which is a physical idea, it is incredibly hard to explain what it is. To explain to somebody who has no knowledge of movement, no knowledge of the person you're fighting for, that's the difficult thing. Choreographers, some are wonderfully articulate about their work, and some aren't, and that's the really difficult thing. How do you describe a dance film if you're going off to raise funding for it?

DR: Which would bring up the question, how do you describe a dance?
BL: Yeah.

DR: Once you begin to describe movement, you demystify it, and it becomes . . .
BL: Well, well you know, I was just thinking, Pina Bausch was in London a few months ago with "Café Muller." I think everybody in that audience had a different view about what it was all about. What were those people pushing their way through those chairs, opening those big doors and making their way into the room? What was it all about? Why was it gray, strange, and what was it? That's the wonder of it, is that it's actually working. You know, you switch on the telly and there are the mean streets of New York and the hallowed police car, you are immediately there, knowing where you are. The excitement about pure movement, I think, is that you're not quite sure where you are; although, we might understand so much more than people realize, by how people sit, what they do, how they walk. We know so much about people from that; I mean, body language tells all. Body language is ninety percent of communication. We do know what people are feeling if you go somewhere; you can see whether people are happy or sad; you can tell through body language, and that's what you can certainly do, I think, on film. Dance film is not about dancing on the screen, it's not Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers, it's something other than that. It's interesting how little dancing, dance-screen work may have in it. I mean, you [can] choreograph with an eyebrow as excitingly as you can with a *grande jeté* across the stage; in fact, more powerfully. I think there are various moments in big movies where, if you start looking at them, there are sequences where there is no language at all. I'm getting ready to deliver this lecture, I was looking at the *The Leopard*, Visconti's film, and there's this party at the end, which lasts about twenty-five minutes. There's very little dialogue, and what dialogue they have doesn't matter to the story at all. You get the whole collapse of this man, the Prince

going down, and suddenly discovering that old age is taking over, and youth is coming in, and the society that he has been brought up in is slowly beginning to collapse. It ends with, well it doesn't end but . . . with a wonderful scene, in close up of Burt Lancaster with a tear just coming into his eye. It is an amazing screen work. I've also looked at *Mon Oncle*, the Jacques Tati film. [In that film], the language doesn't matter; it's not mime, it's the use of real movement, in these cases, real historical settings that are coming to tell you things—telling you a great deal.

DR: So if you were now to describe any situation you want to describe, and see it through, what would you imagine dance film to be? If you could imagine a new era . . . maybe it's the same as before. If you could make it all up, what would your vision be?
BL: I'm not sure what my vision would be. I'm not sure if my vision would be very different from when I started out, which was giving people the opportunity to use the medium, and explore the medium in a new way. I think I would like—if I was given a million- or five-million dollars, or whatever—is to work with two or three people who I admire [and] to carry forward an idea which we could work towards in a different way, which may lead to something, to finding out something new. But, I think it takes time, and it takes creative time, and I think that's certainly, in choreography and in dance screen time, that's not what's there; there is not a possibility of really sitting down and thinking of ideas and storyboarding ideas, which you can then take somewhere. That's what I would like to see. I would like to be given three, twenty-minute films or something; to commission three people who I admire enormously to make three different projects. I think it might take us into different areas.

DR: I'm also thinking about the transition. Your work was made for television.
BL: It was made for television because that's where I worked, and that's where the opportunities were. Television is this monster that ate material, and instead of showing another ballgame, why don't we show a bit of art? That's really why, I mean, I felt very strongly that the arts should get, and dance in particular, should get their moments of glory on telly.

DR: That's fine . . .
BL: I think what has changed now, is that with multi-screens, with everything, with the digital age, with the lowering of the common denominator, it's become very different. The problem is, you know, the worldwide web and being able to download projects. But, whatever you can do, whether you're pay-to-view or [however] you are going to get that money, that initial money [must come] from someone to make the project. Whatever happens, you may open up the possibilities of screenings. [Wherever] you do it, it's there, and you can see it on your telly, or wherever you watch it: on your mobile phone or your computer. The initial funding has got to be there to make the film. Or, you can go away and of course make something, shoot it on your mobile phone and transmit it on YouTube, or however you do it. Some of it is, I'm afraid, crap; a lot of it is crap. But, it's giving people time, really, to think. Thinking time and development time, which is most important.

DR: So at the beginning, the translation issue . . . for instance, *Laurence of Arabia* was made for the wide screen; it suffers when it's viewed on television. So, the opposite of that: the work that's made for the television screen has been taken, again, fully formed and . . .
BL: Put on the big screen . . .

DR: But when brought into the festival situation and projected really large, there's not much thought about what happens in that translation. Do you know what I mean? I wonder if you have any thoughts about that; the way that dance film has just migrated from one venue to another without some sort of context or consideration; if that's an issue.
BL: I don't mind where it's [screened], as long as it's screened well. I don't mind whether it's appearing on the small screen or a big screen. I object if it's clipping bits off the top, or if it's slightly out of focus, or those things. I'm very surprised sometimes at how good something made for the small screen appears on the big screen. Then again, the amount of what you can get away with when it's only being the tiniest amount of space on your television screen . . . when you blow it up, there becomes, suddenly, a bloody big hole in it or something. You know, continuity goes to somewhere- I don't know. You don't necessarily notice on a television screen, but you do notice when it's blown up large. In the wonderful world of high definition, [there are] going to be even more of those changes; things are going to be made clearer. You know, as the technology gets better, it shows everything. Whereas in the days where the technology was very simple and very straightforward, it was black and white, or perhaps in color, you could hide an awful lot of things behind it. Now you can see it, if you look at old movies and things. We're now so used to wanting to see it all—warts and all—but that all costs a great deal of money.

DR: You mentioned earlier the Lloyd Newson, the DV8 stuff, which was rife with content—I mean it was deep work. Again, what seems to happen in most, in many, movements, as more and more people come to the form, what lasts *is* form. So it seems like you might see a hundred dance films now—and in my opinion most of them would be more formal: a dancer in the rain, a dancer in a building—without any sort of depth . . .
BL: Yeah I think there is a danger, but I think this has to do with being young, and growing from things you want to do with your friends. You think, "gosh, isn't it wonderful? Where can we go film?" I think if I see another disused factory, where everyone clomps along in a disused factory, everyone seems to have to make their film in a disused factory. A lot of it, no thought is given to it. What is the disused factory bringing to what you're dancing about? You could just take the dance, and put it on stage, and it would be just as viable. In fact, it might be better because what you're doing is just filming a piece of dance. You're not using the film camera to say something different in the editing process. When people say, "Let's record my dance," that's what a lot of people are doing. You've got to make the first dance step you make believable. If it's not believable in the context that you're dancing it in, you've lost your audience straight away. If you lost them, then it's no more than a pop video.

What we are trying to do is something that has more meaning, which requires thought, rather than sitting watching a pop video. I think that's not what people are being taught, or thinking about—the actual contextualization of their movement, and their film—and what the idea [is]. Is there really a true idea, and is theatric movement the way to express this idea, on film or on the screen? And often, that's not it; often, you just have a very nice piece of dance that could have happened on the stage, which people film. What Lloyd Newson did, was take a stage work and the ideas—intellectual ideas—behind the stage work, which may have been two to three years of intellectual study and thought, and rehearsal, and then 18 months of performance with a group of actor dancers, which then was squeezed

out and made, condensed down to a piece of screen work. In that condensing down—because that's what the screen does, it condenses down—all you want is a shot of me and a shot of somebody, and there is an interaction taking place that we don't necessarily have to express in a dance way or in a melodic way; so it's actually what dance movement, dance screen movement is . . .

Where does the art form fit in, if it is an art form? It doesn't fit in the world of the cinematic literature. It doesn't fit in the world of television criticism because there isn't any around the world. It doesn't fit with British Film Institute cinema or all those things because it's not cinema. It's not in the movement of the art film business, which is the big business at the moment really. So it has its practitioners, but it doesn't have its supporters and that's the major problem. I think in the next two to three years, [we have] to find a way, [by] finding supporters who will write about it, talk about it and be able to screen it. And then I think it'll be able to grow.

DR: It's, ironically, kind of a blank screen right now . . .
BL: Yeah. Dance film comes out of, and it's part of, the television and the movie business and the role of the producer and the executive producer, in that business is a very creative and important one. And I think that the role of the independent artist working alone in his garret, or her garret, making this product, is quite difficult. I mean, I think if you're a writer, you may well send chapters of your book to somebody you trust to look at. On the screen, I think that there is a sense that you have got to share as a dance filmmaker. If you're making dance film, you've got to share that work with other people in the creative process. Film is a shared creative process. In a funny way, you can now do it on your computer at home in one room. When I started, it was always a community that you were working with—your film editor or your video editor—who were working together. He would suggest things and you would suggest things, and you say, "Well I don't like that, but I like *that*. What if we combine those two?" I think that dance making, films and television programs have always been a community activity . . . And, I think that there is a danger of becoming just a one-man band, a solo thing. You get so focused in on what you want that you cannot necessarily, we say, see the wood through the trees. I think that the use of somebody coming with a clean eye to it is terribly important and that [it] would help a great number of films that I see. I mean, the theater in Europe has dramaturges and things like that, and I think that it's not just an isolated form. It's a people, it's a form where you need input all the time, and I think as much input as you can get makes your film that much better.

DR: We could talk forever. Let me ask you, is there anything that I haven't addressed that you . . .
BL: No, I can't think . . . can I think? No, I don't think there is. Leave that for another time. ■