

# The How & Why of New Basics

by Paul Hartman  
Wheaton, Maryland

## Introduction

The one single thing that probably represents the only significant controversy in modern square dancing concerns the new movements, sometimes also called new basics, that flow into square dancing at a rate of about one-hundred and fifty per annum. This article is designed to discuss this phenomenon, to bring out various aspects, and to dissect it. It is not, however, intended to take one side or the other, and should not be so interpreted. So, just stretch out your tired, aching dancing feet, relax, and think along with us. Maybe, just maybe, you will hit upon the thought that will put aside this divisiveness in our favorite pastime and thus help bring into it millions of people who would enjoy it immensely. What is equally as important — we need the ingredient that will help us prevent most of these people from leaving square dancing within a relatively short period of time.

Nobody can really say when the influx of new movements began. Theoretically we could suggest that there must have been a time when *Allemande left* was new to square dancing. Essentially in this analysis, we are not concerned with the happenings preceding 1947 or 1948. That time is crucial because it ushered in a type of square dancing wherein the entire square, or as many persons in it as possible, moved at the same time, executing basic movements in a rather extemporaneous manner, a kind of square dancing which today we call modern western square dancing. The preceding type is now known as old-time square dancing.

How would you like to be square dancing today without *square thru*, *spin the top*, *swing thru*, *curlique*, *star thru*, *wheel and deal*, *trade*, and *Dixie style to an ocean wave*? Almost every dancer who has been in the activity five years or less would say he could not imagine square dancing without these basics.

Yet most of these basics, and many more in constant use today, were not known or generally used about fifteen or twenty years ago. It would take very little space on this page to list all the basic movements in existence in 1957. Consider that at that time within twelve weeks a non-dancer was able to master square dancing and dance to any caller anywhere.

Why, then, did we have to complicate things to such a degree that a person must have a traffic engineer's degree to attend any everyday club dance which is supposed to be fun? What made it necessary today for people to attend a course of at least thirty-five weeks (an entire square dance season) to learn the rudiments? Why is it that even after graduating they cannot attend a normal dance with any degree of confidence?

What has caused this situation to develop, and should it be permitted to prevail? Moreover, should the square dance movement allow this trend to continue and to encourage even greater complexity? If not, can anything be done about it? How is it possible to stop it? Finally, will putting on the brakes be beneficial or will we be throwing the baby out along with the bath water? These are questions that have been, and are, plaguing all responsible professional, as well as amateur, leaders in the movement.

## The Early Years

Up until the western movement began, we danced essentially the way our forefathers did for many, many decades. The only new thing before that time was an occasional new tune to which callers set some of the existing, familiar, very simple basic patterns. One was the song *Bell Bottom Trousers*, used so successfully by the late Chuck Zintell of New Jersey right after World War II. This new thing caught on, not because there was anything new in it, rather because the song was very popular, particularly with returning servicemen, and so it was a natural rouser at dances.

Shortly thereafter, at the popular International Folk Dance Festival in Chicago, many visiting callers were exposed to a brand new thing, a contraption called the *Allemande Thar*. When visiting local callers introduced it at home, it met with a great deal of opposition from folks who had been square dancing for many years, doing fine without any such devilish concoction.

The late Dr. Lloyd Shaw provided a number of innovations (new basics, if you will) which resulted in many cat-calls by conservative groups all over the country. The same applies to the late Ed Durlacher, who was not so much an originator of new basics as a popularizer of them, through his many records, appearances in eastern

schools, and immensely popular dances in New York City. But it took the genius of the versatile and inventive Joe Lewis to come up with that magic something to set fire to the new basic of all basics — the modern square dance movement. He did it by writing a singing call to *Alabama Jubilee*, a tune that was hitting all popularity peaks around 1948. The figure he used required that each of the eight dancers in the square perform simultaneously through the entire dance — a rather novel innovation at that time. Thus the diminutive Joe Lewis of Dallas, joined the ranks of the immortal greats, Ed Gilmore, Jim York, Les Gotcher, and numerous others, all undisputed leaders of their time. When there were some occasional new things to introduce — maybe one or two a year at most — they did not hesitate to do so. Other callers followed eagerly, as soon as they heard of it in those days of very limited communications among the leaders. One peculiar contortion comes to mind in this connection: an indescribably awkward, arm-twisting, back-jerking thing called *Dosi Mountain Style*, and Joe Lewis used it even in the singing call to the song *Down Yonder* on his own label.

In the early days of innovation in western square dancing, the term new basic (or just plain basic) was not known as such. New basics as such often just happened. They were the unintentional product of the imagination of a caller who was creating a patter call figure or who was writing a singing call and needed some words to fit the rhyme in the patter or to fill a few measures of a particular piece of music. The most vivid example of this is the creation of the *ocean wave*. In about 1949, when Bob Hall of Glendale, California, wrote a very fine pattern call entitled *Riptide*, the square dance term *ocean wave* had not been created. He had no inkling he was creating a new basic, but he did use the expression, "Like an ocean wave you hang on tight" as fill-in patter to describe a line of dancers who finished doing the *do-sa-do* all the way around and ended in a line facing alternatively. Such positioning in square dancing was so radical at that time that five lines of fine print were required to explain how to get into it.

*Riptide* became the tried and true hot-rodders' figure and was used in its entirety for a number of years until some enterprising caller, somewhere, realized that such a line of four people facing alternately could also be used as an individual item in other figures. The *Ocean Wave* then became a basic which has not only endured for years, but without which we would not have the current multitude of other basics requiring the wave's positioning.

When Bob Hall wrote *Riptide*, the majority of people who were square dancing had never heard

of him or his invention. His figure was extremely complicated and only the hot-rod crowd of the day was able to get through it flawlessly (on the third or fourth try). But it was the "in" thing of the day. The group that had sparked the new western movement accepted it, and therefore those who did not take to it were either "not with it" or considered poor dancers. The conservatives of the day shouted, "You're ruining square dancing," but the "in" crowd just waved them aside and said they didn't understand where the future of square dancing lay.

## 1957- The Turning Point

Everyone seems to have been content with the way things were until about 1956 or 1957. This contentment with the status quo pertains particularly to the leaders within the movement at that time, some of whom had turned fully professional, earning their livelihood by calling locally, by traveling all over the country, by making recordings, and through writing and producing square dance publications. Thus, 1957 could be considered a great and significant turning point, a revolutionary year in square dancing, for it was then that the first new basic (in the sense of present-day new basics) made its debut.

This item was the *Square Thru* — not a new figure, but a new basic concept to be used liberally with any and all figures at any time. This invention was as radical for square dancing in its day as splitting the atom was for all of mankind. With one fell swoop, it provided , a brand new dimension for the caller and, hence, its acceptance was quite spontaneous and without much opposition. As was customary in those days, when communication among callers was essentially by means of personal contact, this innovation was brought to the various areas (from California where it was originated) by traveling professional callers. Before anyone could say *Left Allemande*, the *Square Thru* had become the rage.

One sure sign of a new basic's acceptance seems often to be its use in a singing call, and not long after its introduction Bob Graham used the *Square Thru* in a recorded singing call entitled *Call Me Up* on the BelMar label (75 rpm). He also used another fairly new call - the *Dixie Chain*. These two new basics seem to have awakened the imagination of the slumbering square dance giant.

But one ingredient was still missing - a communication among the callers who were (and generally still are) operating independently without national unity and cohesion, although in almost all areas they were and are banded together in

fraternal groups with varying degrees of strength, accomplishment, and service to the members. In the very recent past an organization known as Callerlab has been created and shows promise of filling the void that has existed all these years.

At that time, however, without the many current periodicals and note services for callers and without the leadership potentialities of Callerlab, the local callers associations encouraged exchanges of material among the members. Alas, there was little new material to exchange. When an out-of-town, professional caller arrived to call a dance, all callers were in attendance, eagerly trying to memorize any new patterns; not too infrequent was the sight of the local caller who, paper and pencil in hand, was trying to copy all the new ideas and figures.

Such local enterprising callers would often make these gems available to their colleagues at the next meeting of the local association. These gems, gathered by the traveling caller bit by bit, here and there throughout his travels, helped greatly to stimulate square dancing locally, to keep it vibrant and to prevent boredom from setting in.

Among the first to broaden the practice of exchange of material beyond the local association level were the Fontana Swap Shop in the East and the Square Dance Callers Association of Southern California in the West. The success of these efforts is proven by the fact that both are still in operation. But it took the enterprising genius of Les Gotcher to make the movement come alive and become buoyant.

## The Les Gotcher Influence

Throughout his extensive travels in the late 1950's and early 1960's, Les Gotcher was able to demonstrate his superb talent and mastery of patter hash calling. Throughout his travels he also provided national cohesion, bringing news of callers' activities from one area to another and always giving freely of advice and new material to the local boys. At the same time he listened patiently, absorbed and took with him the gripes and problems, as well as new ideas, of the local group. He rapidly became the idol of the local dancer and caller and in April 1959 gave birth to the first callers' note service.

In addition to new figures (to be memorized by the caller), he also provided advice and instruction in various phases of calling, striking at topics which he, on his own initiative, decided required attention or concerning which he had received inquiries while on the road. Many a caller who

enjoys great popularity and success owes Les Gotcher a great deal, for without the mailed monthly material some of them might never have gotten beyond the very elementary mechanics in square dance calling.

Many of the basics that dancers take for granted these days were introduced to callers across the nation via Les Gotcher's subscription material. Probably the most noteworthy items in this connection are *Wheel and Deal* and *Star Thru*, introduced in April and August 1960, respectively.

From the inception of Gotcher's material in April 1959 and through the next six years, 106 new basics made their appearance in his sometimes printed, sometimes mimeographed pages. Of these, seven were fully accepted and withstanding the real test of time, have become an integral part of the square dance movement. They are: *Centers In (Out)*, *Wheel and Deal*, *Star Thru*, *Substitute*, *Cross Fold*, *Turn Thru* and *Curlique*.

The bulk of the items introduced in Les Gotcher's material never made it at all — seventy proposed and introduced new basics failed to gain any appreciable acceptance in the square dance world. Among them are such concoctions as: *Cross Your Corner*, *Cross the Walk*, *Thread the Needle*, and *Full House*.

Another interesting thing is that of the basics which Gotcher introduced and which have become an inseparable part of today's mainstream dancing, only about half caught on immediately upon introduction. Some of them did not acquire popularity for months, and in some instances, years after their introduction. For example, *Centers In (Out)* was introduced in 1959 but did not gain full acceptance until about 1964. On the other hand, *Wheel and Deal* became an instantaneous success upon introduction in April 1960. As a matter of fact, just prior to publishing this new basic in his materials, Les Gotcher tried it out on the road and, among other places, he taught it and used it in his figures in March 1960 at the Washington, D.C., Spring Festival. The response was unbelievable — it caught on like wildfire and every attending caller began to use it immediately afterward.

Another phenomenon that was with us during about one half of the sixties was the attempt to string two or more basics together, assign the combination a name composed of segments of the original names of the basics which comprised it, and call it a new basic. The *Swing Star Twirl* (*Swing Thru*, *Star Thru*, *California Twirl*) is a typical example and is probably the single longest surviving member. Under such an

arrangement it is not beyond the realm of feasibility to have a *SquareStar-Twirl-Star-Swing-Thru* (*Square Thru*, *Star Thru*, *California Twirl*, *Star Thru*, *Swing Thru*). But whether anyone would wish to dance it or call it is debatable. This idea has not left us and is revived periodically in such items as *Half Tag*, *Trade*, and *Roll* which is currently enjoying a measure of popularity.

A similar idea is family groupings. In this concept, the very kernel of a basic is taken and other basics are coupled with it. Thus, the idea of *Wheel* (from *Wheel and Deal*) is taken and anything the caller wishes can be added. For example, two lines of four facing in would *Pass Thru* and then the call would be *Wheel* and *Substitute*. The same principle applies to *Clover* and anything. As after a *Double Pass Thru*, the caller could call *Clover and Substitute*. *Curlicross* is a more recent example as is *Toptivate*. Proponents of this concept say that an entire family of things can be built around key words of an established basic like *Spin the Top*, by using the word spin to indicate the use of that basic and by adding other key words in similar fashion. Thus, such items as these could be created: *Spin Star Thru*, *Spin Star Twirl*, *Spin the Gnat*, *Spin Allemande*, *Spin Paso*, *Spin the Daisy*, *Spin to all Grand*, etc. This concept was actually aired in Les Gotcher's notes by Milton Lease of California in 1965. Such grouping attempts are still with us and show no signs of abating, although every so often, particularly when new proposals in this vein reach outlandish proportions, we do find nationally-known choreographers decrying their practice.

## Gimmicks

Finally, there is another type of basic which in reality is not a basic at all, but which, nevertheless, has to be included in any write-up of basics, because it is used in the manner of a new basic and because it influences the movement. This item is usually called a gimmick for lack of a better or more descriptive name. The most famous gimmick which has endured the test of time (as no new item has so far) is the *Teacup-Chain*, created by Mrs. Pat Lewkowicz of Austin, Texas in 1948. Having the unique feature of keeping everyone busy doing something different, the *Teacup-Chain*, like the early new basics, was created not for the purpose of becoming a new item for universal square dance use. Rather Mrs. Lewkowicz created it for a demonstration, as a one-time item. But because it has such beauty, grace and flow, and because it is not too easily mastered, the *Teacup-Chain* has become a favorite with dancers everywhere and is considered a sort of test to determine the mettle and

prowess of a square dancer in the initial years of his or her dancing experience.

For a number of years, the *Teacup-Chain* remained unrivaled as the testing device in square dancing. But eventually its preeminence was challenged by such items as the *Island Chain* (upon which an item known as *Ride the Ferry* was superimposed), *Chain the Glade*, *Beer Mug Chain*, *Split Teacup Chain*, *Arky Teacup Chain*, *Ocean Chain*, *Rotary Chain*, *Everybody Chain*, *Dixie Cup Chain*, and others of the chain variety. Gimmicks, as Les Gotcher christened them, went even beyond the chain series and eventually included such crazy-quilt things as the *Bucket of Worms*, *Load the Boat*, *Unload the Boat*, *Sink the Boat*, *Barge Thru*; and other similar concoctions. The latter was quite beneficial, because one part was lifted from it and has become the extremely popular *Trade By*.

In the general sphere of gimmicks, mentions should also be made of the many variations of the *Grand Square*, such as *Grand Prowl*, *Star Prowl*, *Grand Slam*, *Rainbow Stroll*, *Grand Spin*, and others.

While the first half of the 1960's brought about a number of movements based on a series of arm turns (*Swing Thru*, *Spin the Top*) usually done from *Ocean Waves*, the second half of that decade saw the introduction of another family of revolutionary design, a series of maneuvers across the square. The *Spin Chain Thru* started it all and was followed in relatively short order by *Relay the Top*, *Relay the Deucey*, *Spin Chain the Gears*, *Cast a Shadow*, and the most recent *Motivate*, all of which have gained acceptance for a time and could also easily fall within the gimmick category whether they'll remain in use, only time will tell.

Over the years many callers and dancers have complained about the names assigned to the new creations. Their lament in many cases seems to be justified; there surely is no description for execution in names such as *Flutter Wheel*, or *Motivate*, and certainly not in *Tootsie Roll And*. No creator of a new basic seems to have come up with a completely new word, such as *Allemande*. New words are surely not difficult to create and could add a great deal of uniqueness to square dancing.

## New Basics - Pro and Con

This analysis would not be complete without tribute to two exceptional leaders. The late Chuck Raley is one of them. He felt that our hobby might be misunderstood by the non-initiated because there was a period of time in the early 1960's when we were assigning gambling names to our new basic (*Wheel*

and Deal, Acey Deucey, Shake the Dice, etc.) He stopped this outpouring quite effectively by creating the movement *Circulate* which was lifted out of the *Acey Deucey* and has enjoyed tremendous acceptance ever since then. The other person is the incomparably industrious Bill Burlison of Ohio who has compiled for all of us the most comprehensive Encyclopedia of Square Dancing, which catalogs and describes in alphabetic order some two thousand so-called basic movements that have crept into square dancing since the beginning.

Obviously, since their introduction into modern Western square dancing in the mid-fifties, new basics have had their proponents and their detractors. The proponents delight in them and are eager to try anything that will spring from the fertility of a creative mind. In the very early stages, in the late fifties and early sixties it was not too difficult for a caller and for the interested dancers to master the few new items that came along each year. As the decade wore on and the so-called new basics were created in ever increasing numbers it became proportionately difficult for all to learn and respond automatically to the five or so new basics which came along each month. By the end of the sixties and during the first half of the seventies there have usually been ten or more proposals of new devices presented to the square dancing public each month. Naturally many of these items have not been very danceable and so the dancers and callers who try them all out have become increasingly discerning and have been discarding infinitely more of them than they have been accepted.

This proliferation has resulted in the creation of a number of note services to which callers (and dancers too) may subscribe for less than \$20.00 per year. The most notable such services have been those produced by Bill Peters of California, Will Orlich of Florida, Jack Lasry of Florida, and by the Square Dance Callers Association of Southern California (the latter still going strong after about two decades of faithful service). The two national magazines have also devoted space in each issue for the exploration of a limited number of selected new ideas.

### ***On The Plus Side***

In defense of the new basics the proponents and supporters have claimed that new material is absolutely necessary for the survival of square dancing. They continue to maintain that if no new material were to come into square dancing, they would soon tire of doing the same worn out things and would seek another hobby because of sheer boredom. They are also convinced that, if it had not been for the constant flow of new material, we would not have been able to pull from it the real gems of the past, jewels that have endured the

test of time such as *Swing Thru*, *Spin the Top*, *Flutter Wheel*, *Wheel and Deal*, *Star Thru*, *Square Thru*, *Circulate*, *Curlique*, *Tag the Line*, and many, many others which today are the mainstay of the average square dance anywhere.

Proponents also say that they have nothing against square dancers who are not interested in these new-fangled concoctions and that they do not try to impose their desires for the latest and mostest upon others. They also claim, however, that many more dancers would not only accept new items, but would be happy to dance them, if callers were to present them in a competent manner. According to the proponents' claims, far too many callers will not take the time and make the effort to learn the new material and, instead of presenting the new things, these callers will denigrate them. Many such callers in leadership positions have denounced new creations for so long and so vociferously that numerous dancers have been infected by this biased attitude and have become even more vocal denigrators than their teachers. Some supporters further aver that of the dancers who annually leave square dancing, a certain percentage depart strictly because they became bored doing the same old things every time they attend a dance.

These feelings on the part of the supporters are not new by any means. They claim that in past years, primarily in the early and mid 1960's, countless interested dancers who enjoyed the challenge presented by new material left square dancing because there was so much opposition to new material and because they were castigated for wanting to dance to it. Other proponents simply gave up in frustration crawled into a club and danced there in a ho-hum fashion. In the second half of the 1960's, however, a small number of proponents, mainly on the East Coast, refused to submit. They were extremely enthusiastic, were prepared to invest much time and effort in mastering much of the material, and began to support the few callers who feel likewise and who presented the material for which these dancers were clamoring. At first this very small group followed such callers as George Campbell and the group was generally known as the hot-rodgers or the go-go crowd for lack of a more suitable name. Eventually they became the so-called challenge dancers who are now well organized. They have callers who cater to them almost exclusively, they attend their own annual challenge conventions, and work like zealous missionaries to convert average square dancers who show promise. This group is, of course, on the extreme outer end of the square dance spectrum and is considered by many to be the radical left arm of square dancing.

### ***But On The Other Hand***

Opponents of all this new material can, therefore, be considered the conservative right wing. They claim and also with justification, that the new material, which is and has been flowing into square dancing like an ava-

lanche, is hurting the activity. They have a countering thesis or opinion for every justification presented by the proponents of new material. The opponents, for example, say that no additional new basic movements are needed. They are convinced that the existing material, if exploited properly, permits a caller to be so versatile that he can call numerous challenging dances without ever being repetitive and without ever running the risk of becoming boring. They feel that it is a downright imposition to expect dancers to keep increasing their knowledge and have to respond, rather automatically, to an ever increasing number of complicated specific commands. By the same token, a new dancer has had to increase his learning time in the past ten years from 25 to 35 or more weekly lessons.

Many average leaders as well as square dancers, i.e. neither proponents nor opponents of new basics, but rather dancers in the general mainstream area, are seriously concerned that we are deterring many potential new dancers from entering our hobby by demanding too great a commitment of time and effort, what with the need to go through classes for an entire season and then having to attend at least two, and possibly three, dances each week, in order to be able to keep dancing with their square dancing friends.

There are also far too many opponents whose feelings have been hurt by proponents who look down on them because they cannot execute the latest basic or cannot recall how to do a basic that came out five years ago, enjoyed popularity for about six months, and then floated into oblivion. By the same token the proponents have not gained much popularity by squaring up only with their own clique and by going as far as setting up squares in advance for the entire evening and even recording them on little dance cards.

Another oft-expressed criticism questions the wisdom of having to spend time and effort to learn something new, only to find that it is not used again after a month or so. In this same context, many callers — and they are, of course, the backbone of the square dance movement — complain that they do not have enough time to waste on mastering new material which will be obsolete in four to six weeks. In this connection it must be mentioned that square dance calling in most areas today is extremely competitive and that every caller wants to draw larger crowds of dancers. Most of them, therefore, believe that they must excel over their fellow callers. One way to do so is to devote some time to studying something novel and presenting it during the next dance. This approach has created a vicious circle in many areas: if there are ten callers in one area, for example, and each learns and presents one new item, then each must learn a total of ten new items in order to stay abreast of the competition. Because the overwhelming majority of callers work at regular jobs for their livelihood, they are simply unable to cope with this problem. The result is that they become very frustrated, decry the influx of new

material, and become vociferous opponents. Far too many good callers who kept many dancers happy over the years have simply hung up their microphones. In such situations, every departing caller takes with him a number of dancers out of the square dance movement.

Also, a good percentage of the number of new dancers whom each caller brings into square dancing is lost to the movement with each departing caller.

Another criticism often voiced by the opponents is the loss of emphasis on dancing. They feel that the new basics, particularly those combining three, four, and five other basics, are so demanding of the dancers that they rush through them in jerky, close-order-drill fashion, rather than executing them smoothly in a flowing dance pattern. The terminology, too, comes in for brickbats. The names of most new movements have nothing to do with square dancing and what is more, they are not at all directional and their names offer no clue to their intent. The basic movement *Chuckaluck* is one good example and *Tootsie Roll* is another. Some concern was expressed that the latter might be followed by a rash of basics in the same vein such as *Milky Way*, *Mounds*, or even *Butter-finger!*

Conservatives have suggested that one way to stem an onslaught of new material would be for everyone to refrain from revealing the name of the originator. They contend that as soon as a new movement is created it is used everywhere and thus becomes public property. It is, in effect, in the public domain. This approach would discourage creation of silly and inconsequential material, a practice allegedly engaged in by callers who seek only self-aggrandizement. The creator of a good basic will present it anyway because he believes it to be good and because he cares more for square dancing than for his own personal popularity. Radicals claim that, although there is some merit to the idea, it would nevertheless inhibit the free flow of all ideas which, as has been proven in the past, provide us with jewels among lots of trash.

## **So Where Are We?**

There is, of course, some truth in arguments offered on both sides. The radicals grant that there have been many basics which didn't make it because they were not good. But they contend that all of them were fun to try and that they enjoyed experimenting. They also say that if every new item that came along had not been tried, square dancing may never have discovered the many wonderful basics that make up today's dancing and have truly enriched the recreation. The conservatives do not disagree with this basic premise, but they maintain that a traveler need not necessarily drive over each gutted country road to get to the big city.

A glimpse of hope toward the solution of the problem is Callerlab, a relatively new professional organization of callers, which has debated this problem at length and has decided that one of its committees will review and periodically endorse one or more new basics (if any), for mainstream dancing. This approach works fine, but it has so far neither caused fewer new basics to appear, nor has it deterred callers from using numerous other new basics in addition to those approved by Callerlab. But, at least, there is some glimmer of hope on the horizon.

There is one thought that has not been subjected to much discussion. Perhaps no one has thought about it in quite the following terms. Square dancing is the only recreation in which a person cannot learn the fundamentals relatively easily and then go on to practice and practice in order to improve his skill. Take bowling, for example. A person learns the basics and then goes on week in, week out, to throw the same size ball down the same alley at the same pins arranged in the same manner. For years and years. Should he or she drop out for a month or even a year, he or she can come right back to a recreation that hasn't changed the rules, and with a bit of practice regain the previous skill. Is it possible that we lost people in square dancing, never to regain them, because we keep constantly changing the basics we use? Do we deter people from coming into square dancing (or returning to it) because it takes too much time to learn? These questions may never be answered, but they do seem deserving of thought.

## In Conclusion

In conclusion, the reader may be left in the same quandary as before — should he accept the idea of new basics or should he oppose it? Are new basics a necessary evil or must they continue to be an integral part of square dancing? Are new basics synonymous with progress in square dancing? And if so, will square dancing become extinct without the progress provided by new basics? These and other related questions have plagued all objective, responsible leaders and dancers for the past fifteen years. There is, unfortunately, no simple, easy answer. An understanding of the differences among leading elements and their philosophies is, however, a prerequisite for arriving at some solution. It is hoped that this article has helped to sort out the facts in the controversy and has clarified, with frankness, points and areas which have been clouded.

Having read this article, many might tend to say, "But the solution is easy, let's adopt a middle of the road approach". That path is, of course, the most difficult to follow, for who is to decide — and how many will agree with him' (or her) — where the middle of the

road lies? Moderation would surely seem to be the cornerstone for the successful continuation of the growth of the square dance movement. But, who is to say who the moderator should be? Maybe the best solution would be no solution at all — let the controversy rage on while the average, mainstream dancer continues to enjoy himself naturally, choosing to dance to those callers who give him the fare which he enjoys and for which he pays.

*After all is said and done, the only measurable success of a caller is the fact that he repeatedly draws large crowds wherever and however he calls a dance.*