Nigerian nationality was for me and my generation an acquired taste – like cheese. Or better still, like ballroom dancing. Not dancing per se, for that came naturally; but this titillating version of slow-slow-quick-quick-slow performed in close body contact with a female against a strange, elusive beat. I found, however, that once I had overcome my initial awkwardness I could do it pretty well.

—Chinua Achebe

Thus opens the Nigerian writer Chinua Achebe’s new collection portraying his life growing up in colonial Nigeria as a ‘British-protected child’. Achebe acknowledges that he inhabits – and embodies – the ‘middle ground’ between colonialism and postcolonialism. Whilst he has fond nostalgia for his imperious school teachers, he craves for an independent, strong and free Nigeria, but also laments the failings and difficulties of a country in disarray. The above analogy sums up Achebe’s postcolonial ambivalence. ‘His’ dancing comes naturally, driven by a drum beat, but he is also attracted to the colonial quickstep, a European import, acquired, refined and ‘cultured’. Argentinean dance scholar Marta Savigliano writes about her identity and the tango dance with similar ambivalence: it is the ‘locus of [her] identification … ever since [she] moved outside of her culture’ (Savigliano 1995: 12). She recognizes that it is a stereotype of her culture but that she still needs it as her cultural prop. Yet as a woman in a male-dominated postcolonial South American world, it is a dance where she can find some space to ‘decolonize’ herself doubly:

Tango is the main ingredient in my project of decolonization because I have no choice. It is the stereotype of the culture to which I belong. If I reject my stereotype I fall, caught in nowhere. Caught in endless explanations of what I am not and justifications of what I am. Caught in comparisons with the colonizer. By assuming the tango attitude and taking it seriously, I can work at expanding its meaning and power. My power, actively tango. Tango is my strategic language, a way of talking about, understanding, exercising decolonization. (Savigliano 1995: 16)
Such is the importance of dance in a person’s life, strong identifications carried with them, in this case a dance borne out of rural displacement, ‘a tense dance’ (Savigliano 1995: 30) of embrace and healing in a time of separation and violence.

*Dancing Cultures* is a volume featuring and exploring dance as it relates to culture. As terms, ‘dance’ and ‘culture’ share a lack of concreteness: they are – they become – in their doing. Culture, a politically charged concept, is a creative process, one of integration as much as differentiation, and the boundaries between the two cannot be clear-cut. It is also an essential premise of this volume that there is a close relationship between dance and social change. Our contention is that dance does not simply ‘reflect’ what happens in society or serve a particular ‘function’, but that it is often as central to social life as music and other universal forms of expression. We would like to suggest, therefore, that anthropology has much to gain from giving due attention to dance in its multiple forms and social contexts.

One of the objectives of this collection is indeed to demonstrate that a focus on dance has the potential to reveal domains of individual experience and social life that remain hidden from view in an exclusive focus on the verbal. Dance makes meaning, but in different ways from the verbal, since as Farnell reminds us, ‘body movement [can] provide human beings with a resource for action in a semiotic modality that frequently elides spoken expression but is never separate from the nature, powers, and capacities of linguistically capable agents’ (Farnell 1999: 343). Dance is often performed together with music, song, sometimes poetry or other oratorical performance, as in the West African traditions of praise singing. To reflect the entanglement of dance with other elements, it has become increasingly frequent to use the term ‘performance’, and several contributors in this volume do so deliberately. But there is also a conscious choice to retain the term ‘dance’ because bodily movement is our primary focus, and because many studies of performance in anthropology have emphasized music at the expense of a holistic approach to what bodies do (see Moore 1997; Wade 2000; Askew 2002; Ebron 2002; White 2008). Can dance, then, simply be equated with body movement?

**The Nature of Dance**

In the 1960s and 1970s, as the anthropology of dance was being established as a sub-discipline, the question of its object of study seemed urgent. There was heated debate on the nature of ‘dance’. Most dance scholars agreed with Mauss (1973 [1935]) that dance movement and its evaluation varied cross-culturally, but there was disagreement as to whether the study of dance should be subsumed within that of music, whether dance necessarily possessed a purposefully aesthetic dimension, whether it had to be addressed to an audience to qualify as ‘dance’, or whether movement had to be recognized as ‘dance’ in a given cultural context to be worthy of study. Much of the debate is summed up in Hanna (1979a) and in the comments and reply that followed her theoretical review.

The debate has faded somewhat, and few scholars now attempt to come up with a universal definition, even though, as Wulff notes, ‘dance anthropologists seem to converge on a consideration of bounded rhythmical movements that are
performed during some kind of altered state of consciousness’ (Wulff 2001: 3209). What this points to is that dance is usually experienced as set apart from ordinary movement. This is true whether people join in the dance or simply watch it, even though the two positions are often experienced in very different ways. James captures this conversation between everyday and performative movement when she writes that ‘the performative and experiential aspects of the various formal genres of patterned movement, ritual, marching, and dancing are not just a spill-over from the “ordinary”
habitus, but derive their power partly by speaking against, resonating ironically with, this very base’ (James 2003: 78–79). In an earlier text she had pointed to a dialectical relationship between dance and non-dance, suggesting that this was ‘because the world of non-dance is to a large extent a bodily world too: a world of work, of sexuality, a world of physical effort in battle, a world also of submission to the imposed disciplines of timing and spatial movement’ (James 2000: 141).

Gell (1985) argued rather for the ‘spill-over’ perspective in his work on Umeda dance, suggesting that the difference between dance and everyday movement was simply one of style. For Gell, the movement style people adopt when dancing defines a context in which the rules differ from those of everyday life, while referring back to it in a symbolic way. Whether one finds resonance with one view or the other depends on the social context and the theoretical perspective of the researcher. To give another example, phenomenologist Sheets-Johnstone looks at dance as intimately connected to the human capacity to produce movement before anything else goes on: ‘It forms the I that moves before the I that moves forms movement. It is the foundation of our conceptual life’ (Sheets-Johnstone 1999: xxi). Or, as she states later on: ‘In the beginning, after all, we do not try to move, think about movement possibilities, or put ourselves to the task of moving. We come straightaway moving into the world; we are precisely not stillborn’ (Sheets-Johnstone 1999: 136, original emphasis). What we find useful, for the purposes of this volume, is the notion of a conversation between dance and non-dance movement. This notion informs the theme of ‘dance and culture’ running through this volume.

Even through anthropologists are no longer trying to define ‘dance’, we are still faced with the issue of naming the practices we write about in a way that the people involved will recognize. This is a challenge since dance may be a universal practice, but as a semantic category it is fairly Eurocentric. Gore (2001), for example, reminds us that many West African languages do not have a specific word for ‘dance’. In Wolof, ‘dance’ is best translated as fecc, but beyond the professional scene this refers to popular dances and has a distinctly female connotation. In Spencer’s (1985a) work on the Samburu of Kenya, dance is spoken of as ‘play’, while in Brazil, Lowell Lewis (1992) found that trying to understand capoeira, usually described by practitioners as dança-luta (dance-fight), led him to explore the categories of ‘game’, ‘sport’, ‘play’ and ‘martial art’. Gore suggests that perhaps we should not try to isolate dance in culture, not only because this is the product of the ‘deeply-ingrained Eurocentric habit of conceiving of art as compartmentalised and specialised practice’, but also because this devalues performance in ‘socially and ritually significant contexts’ (Gore 2001: 33). Yet we must find ways of talking and writing about it without
going back to the earlier anthropological blindness to the multiple practices that constitute dance. There is no single solution to the challenge of capturing dance in emic terms while not losing sight of its specific qualities, and most contributors in this volume follow Wulff’s (1998) suggestion that we should search for dance, loosely defined as patterned rhythmical movements, while redefining our object of study every time.

From Dance as Exotica to the Anthropology of Dance

The study of dance in anthropology is almost as old as the discipline itself.1 Inspired by Herbert Spencer’s (1857) work on music and Durkheim’s (1915) *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, founding figures of anthropology such as Marrett (1909), Radcliffe-Brown (1922), Malinowski (1948) and Boas (1930) mostly looked at dance as a component of ritual. Dance was not acknowledged as a practice worthy of study in its own right. Marrett (1909) saw dance as a component of religious practice, but did not spend much time elaborating on its significance. Radcliffe-Brown (1922) dedicated a chapter of his Andaman monograph to music and dance, which he suggested generated a collective ecstatic state that worked to bind society together. In other words, the ‘function’ of dance, within the functionalist paradigm of the time, was to regulate the emotions and desires of individuals so as to make them conform to the interests of the group.

In what is probably the most detailed ethnography of dance in the first half of the twentieth century, in the very first issue of the journal *Africa* Evans-Pritchard (1928) used his work on the Zande funeral beer dance, the *gbere buda*, to launch a scathing attack on Radcliffe-Brown’s functionalism. Evans-Pritchard argued that whereas there certainly were ‘functional’ dimensions in the *gbere buda* – such as the socialization of children or a space in which to ‘canalise the forces of sex into socially harmless channels, and by doing so to assist the processes of selection and to protect the institutions of marriage and the family’ (Evans-Pritchard 1928: 458) – dance events also exacerbated individualistic tendencies:

Anyone who watched several beer dances would see quarrels and could not subscribe to the statement that the dance was always an activity of perfect concord in which individual vanity and passions were completely socialized by the constraining forces of the community. Radcliffe-Brown has not recognized the complexity of motives in the dance. (Evans-Pritchard 1928: 460)

For Evans-Pritchard, the totality of social structure was contained in community-wide events of this kind. In support of his argument he paid careful attention to the songs, organizational structure and spatial patterns of the *gbere buda* and, to a lesser degree, movement. In fact he did not provide much description of movement, but an often overlooked element of his study is his dozen or so snapshots of a single performance of the *gbere buda*.2 Those photographs were taken at such close intervals that a whole section of the dance could be reconstituted by flipping through the
shots in chronological order, in a manner reminiscent of Julie Taylor’s *Paper Tangos* (Taylor 1998). Of course, in the paradigm of the time, a single event was taken to stand for a long-standing practice, and Evans-Pritchard did not have sources at his disposal to account for historical changes in the *gbere buda*.

The study of dance did not expand much in anthropology until the 1960s, with the notable exception of Mitchell’s *Kalela Dance*, a study of urban ethnicity on the Zambian Copperbelt (Mitchell 1956). Now regarded as a classic Marxist work coming out of the Manchester School, the study tried to make sense of the contrast between the songs, which spoke of ethnic differentiation in the languages of the region, and the distinctively smart, European dress of the participants. There was little description of movement and other elements in the *kalela*. The mind–body dichotomy inherited from the Platonic-Cartesian tradition, as well as a long-standing bias towards the verbal as a key to human thought, are often cited by dance scholars as the main factors behind this relative neglect. Ironically, it was partly the recognition by social linguists in the 1960s that ‘body language’ constituted an integral part of language that paved the way for a booming interest in the body in the social sciences. Hanna (1979b) also pointed to the bourgeois Puritan ethics in which she argued many European scholars were raised. In this view, dance was a useless form of entertainment that would distract people from serious work and life as good Christians. In her comprehensive review article on moving bodies, Farnell (1999) added that anthropologists interested in the body had long feared accusations of biological reductionism, and therefore shied away from it. Drawing on Ardener’s (1989) idea that anthropologists’ awareness of events depends on the ‘modes of registration and specification’ available to them, Farnell also argued that anthropologists were often blind to body movements because they lacked the tools to register, record and analyse them. Indeed, dance scholars have often pointed out that watching and writing about dance was best done by people who possessed a form of ‘skilled vision’ attuned to rhythmic movement. Thus Wulff (1998) noted how her informants, in this case ballet dancers, could tell that she had been a dancer from the way that she was watching them. What this vision may consist of is now being explored by interdisciplinary projects reaching far beyond the confines of anthropology (e.g., Brown, Martínez and Parsons 2006). In the meantime, our collective experience as anthropologists of dance suggests that it is the integrated outcome of focused attention, observation of multiple performances in a given context over time, and to some degree experiencing movement through one’s own body.

It is hardly a coincidence, then, that it was only when dancers became anthropologists in their own right that dance took on new life as a topic of study in anthropology. One of the under-acknowledged pioneers was African American dancer Katherine Dunham, who studied anthropology at the University of Chicago in the 1930s. Dunham carried out ethnographic fieldwork throughout the Caribbean from 1936 onwards, spending years in Haiti in particular, and incorporated movement she had learned there into her choreography (Kolcio 2010). Dance, she thought, was the ultimate form of embodied ethnography. Later, Gertrude Kurath (1960), a student
of Franz Boas, sought to bring mainstream anthropological research methods into the study of dance. From the 1970s onwards, new generations of anthropologist-dancers began to criticize earlier approaches for not paying sufficient attention to the practice itself, and for describing dance ‘in terms of adaptive responses either to the social, the psychological, or the physical environment’ rather than as a social phenomenon in itself (Farnell 1999: 350). In very broad strokes, the anthropological study of dance since the 1970s has developed in four interconnected, partially overlapping directions: the American-British anthropology of dance that came out of ethnomusicology and dance studies, and which some proponents refer to as ethnochoreology or dance ethnology; the continental European folklorist school; the semasiology school derived from structural linguistics; and the study of dance within wider anthropological themes. Most anthropologists of dance have been influenced by several approaches simultaneously.

The first of these directions really took off in the United States with the creation of the Congress for Research on Dance (CORD) in 1965, whose first publications appeared in 1969 (Grau and Wierre-Gore 2005), and the Society of Dance History Scholars (SDHS) in 1978. The founders were dancer-scholars from various disciplines, and some of them like Kurath, Judith L. Hanna, Anya Peterson Royce and Joann Kealiinohomoku, were also anthropologists. While trained in European classical ballet, they all did research in dance in other parts of the world and tried to push the emerging field of dance studies in North America to regard all dance forms as equally worthy of study. One of Kealiinohomoku’s (1983) early papers, originally published in 1970 and in which she argued that classical ballet was not an artistic apotheosis but rather a form of ‘ethnic dance’ among others, is considered to be a landmark in this respect. Because of its origins in Boasian anthropology, an early concern of this school was to record ‘Native American’ dances before they disappeared completely. The anthropology of dance in Northern America is now shared between dance studies and anthropology departments and, although the salvation perspective has been largely abandoned, the study of ‘Native American’ or creolized performance in America remains important, as exemplified by Scarangella-McNenly’s and Nájera-Ramírez’s chapters in this volume. In dance studies, which combine scholarly training with dance practice, a bias towards European and American theatrical genres often remains but classical ballet no longer dominates and, since the late 1980s, a plethora of studies of modern, postmodern and contemporary dance have been published (Foster 1986, 1996; Novack 1990; Franko 1995, 2002; Morris 1996; Desmond 1997; Burt 1998, 2006; Grau and Jordan 2000). The University of California, Riverside, is central to this trend and offered the first doctoral programme in dance studies in the United States, and US-trained dance scholars have increasingly integrated anthropological approaches (see Foster 2009). Recent work in dance studies has also integrated philosophical approaches to movement and power (Martin 1998; Lepecki 2004, 2006), and indeed there has been a growing concern with the politics of the movement in relation to issues of race (Albright 1997; DeFrantz 2002, 2004; Foulkes 2002; Gottschild 2003; Chatterjea 2004; Manning 2004), gender (Burt 1995; Albright 1997; Banes 1998) and ability
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(Albright 1997). In the neighbouring field of dance criticism, until recently few individuals straddled the boundaries between practice, scholarship and critical writing on dance. Sally Banes, who worked with cross-disciplinary performance companies in Chicago in the 1970s and later wrote extensively on experimental dance in New York, is a prolific exception (Banes 1983, 1994, 2003). Importantly, American dance anthropology has begun to turn its gaze on the world beyond the confines of North America (e.g., Shay 2002; Hahn 2007; O’Shea 2007; Foster 2009; Sloat 2010). Foster charts this development well in the introduction to her Worlding Dance edited volume (Foster 2009).

There was a British movement related to the American one, but with differences in emphasis and contexts of research. In Britain, ethnomusicologist John Blacking’s work on the Venda of Southern Africa (e.g., Blacking 1970, 1971, 1985) was a turning point: he worked alongside American colleagues to bring the anthropological study of dance to the same level as that of music (Blacking and Kealiinohomoku 1979). Blacking was not a dancer himself, but some of his students were, most notably Andrée Grau, who has greatly contributed to the development of the discipline in the UK. Georgiana Gore, a dancer trained by Ronald Frankenberg in the anthropology of the body, has helped to establish the anthropology of dance in France.

The second direction has its roots in studies of folklore in continental Europe, particularly in Eastern Europe, Germany and France. Although much discredited in dance scholarship since the 1970s, Curt Sachs’ (1937) ambitious classification of the world’s dances was a foundational text. Sachs was working within the Kulturkreis diffusionist ideas that dominated Germanic anthropology at the time, and reproduced the unfortunate assumption that the dances of ‘primitive’ people reflected the primitiveness of their culture. His emphasis was on European folklore, however, and there is a degree of continuity between his work and that of later continental scholars working on French, Hungarian and other Eastern European folklore such as Martin and Pesovár (1961), Jean-Marie Guilcher (1963) and Roderyk Lange (1975). This approach has been mainly concerned with classification and description of the formal characteristics of dance, often with a tendency to neglect their historical and political context. This is due in large part to the regionalist agenda contained in such research (in the French case) and to the political framework within which East European scholars were forced to work throughout the cold war.

The third direction has equally placed the emphasis on the formal characteristics of movement, but from the perspective of linguistic analysis. In the 1970s, anthropologists of dance began to draw on sociolinguistics, semiotics, Hall’s (1968) ‘proxemics’ on the dynamic use of space in human thought, and Birdwhistell’s (1970) ‘kinesics’ to analyse dance as a form of language or non-verbal communication. Drawing on her fieldwork with the Ubakala Igbo in Nigeria, Judith Hanna (1979b) used communication theory to suggest that the holistic aspect of dance, as well as its capacity to encapsulate multiple meanings, accounted for its potential to supplement and even transcend verbal language. Others, like Adrienne Kaeppler (1971, 1985, 1993), Drid Williams (1976a, 1976b, 1982, 2004) and Brenda Farnell (1994, 1995), drew on Saussurian linguistics,
semiotics, Rudolf Laban’s movement theory and feminist theory. These analyses focused on the capacity of human movement to produce metaphors and other categories of meaning in a way comparable to but different from verbal language. In this approach, the meaning of movement could be accessed through long-term fieldwork and appropriate recording methods (movement notation and video) followed by structural analysis.

Though the linguistic approach was not taken up widely within the discipline, in large part for methodological reasons, it remains influential if not always explicitly acknowledged. Most importantly, it helped to generate new conceptual and analytical tools for the anthropological study of dance. It was probably the most sophisticated in challenging the Eurocentric division between dance and non-dance movement or verbal and non-verbal domains of action, and Williams’s Saussurian ‘semasiology’ (see Williams 1982) was important in challenging the view that movement necessarily stood for something else. Though not a movement specialist per se, Jackson (1983) acknowledged this problem but offered a different perspective when revisiting his earlier fieldwork on initiation rituals among the Kuranko of Sierra Leone. Confessing that his earlier obsession with decoding the ‘meaning’ of dance and other Kuranko bodily practices had yielded very little, he called for anthropologists to treat such practices as phenomena in themselves, not necessarily reducible to something else:

The meaning of body praxis is not always reducible to cognitive and semantic operations: body movements often make sense without being intentional in the linguistic sense, as communicating, codifying, symbolising, signifying thoughts or things that lie outside or anterior to speech. Thus an understanding of a body movement does not invariably depend on an elucidation of what the movement ‘stands for’. (Jackson 1983: 329)

The fourth direction is more diffuse, and could best be described as a trend rather than a school or a movement. Since the late 1980s, the study of dance has slowly made its way into the various fields of mainstream anthropology, from social anthropology to medical anthropology, material culture studies, and even cognitive and evolutionary anthropology. Social anthropologists with an interest in dance, some of them dancers themselves, have not identified exclusively with the anthropology of dance, and have also looked at dance in the light of current topics such as gender and sexuality (Cowan 1990; Thomas 1993; Washabaugh 1998), ethnicity, identity and nationalism (Daniel 1995; Mendoza 2000; Castaldi 2006; Wulff 2007), migration and identity (James 1999), transnationalism (Wulff 1998), postcolonialism (Ness 1992; Savigliano 1995) and patronage and the changing place of the arts in society (Hughes-Freeland 1997, 2008). Studies of dance have also been shaped by regional writing traditions in anthropology (Fardon 1990). Studies of masquerade in West Africa, for example, often emphasize how this type of performance relates to intergenerational politics (de Jong 1999, 2007; Argenti 2007; Pratten 2008), whereas a number of recent ethnographies of dance in East Africa
have often been concerned with questions of conflict, displacement and memory (James 2000, 2007).

Taken together, the contributors in this volume draw on all four directions. However, there are important differences in background, and whereas some identify themselves as anthropologists of dance, others would rather be described as social or cultural anthropologists who happen to do research on dance alongside other aspects of the societies they study. Whereas some set out to study dance out of personal interest and long-standing practice, others were drawn to it as they found that the people they were working with spent a great deal of time dancing.

This volume is different, then, from works such as Helen Thomas’s *Dance in the City* which expressly only “locates dance within the spectrum of urban life in late modernity” (Thomas 1997: x), and features dances such as the jitterbug, stripping, aerobics, ballroom and rave. The present volume is more diverse and wider-ranging geographically. It is also different from Desmond’s (1997) collection, *Meaning in Motion*, which draws on cultural studies and feminist theory, and focuses almost exclusively on theatrical dance practices. As anthropologists, we are interested in tracing the flows and movements of dance, its social significance as well as its carriers such as migrants and tourists. Our unity here is in our desire to recognize creativity and agency in the dance. This collection also follows on from Paul Spencer’s edited collection *Society and the Dance* (Spencer 1985b). Spencer’s volume showcases an excellent range of anthropological analyses of dance performed in societies from the Venda of South Africa and the Lugbar of Uganda to Tonga and the Highlands of Papua New Guinea. Each contribution in Spencer’s volume addresses theoretical approaches to the anthropology of dance, be it dance as safety valve, as vehicle of social control, or as ritual drama. As Spencer writes: ‘society creates the dance, and it is to society that we must turn to understand it’ (Spencer 1985b: 38). But there is also a focus on ‘traditional’ dance forms and on small-scale societies; our volume, by contrast, emphasizes the interconnectivity of styles, the movement of people on a wider scale, and the role of nation-states in shaping dance practices.

**Dance and ‘Culture’**

In the 1920s and 1930s, the American Culture and Personality School and the German *Kulturkreis* ideology both assumed a straightforward, unproblematic relationship between dance and culture (Youngerman 1974). The continuity with these early approaches is evident in the massive Choreometrics project (Lomax 1968) begun in the late 1960s to collate and explore examples of dance across cultures. Underpinning this project is the (Maussian) idea that physical culture (stance, movement style, gesture) is a component of culture. In traditional societies, this connection was suggested to be very much apparent: a fish-cutting action in Eskimo movement patterns could be seen to be translated similarly into Eskimo dance (Polhemus 1993: 9).

Although these approaches have been much criticized since then, the idea that there is a straightforward relationship between dance and culture remains implicit in many studies of dance. This is problematic, however, and is all too often
predicated on an older anthropological notion of ‘world cultures’ as bounded and homogeneous entities. Even though anthropologists of the colonial period often had more sophisticated ideas about the heterogeneity and changing nature of ‘culture’ than is often acknowledged (Brumann 1999; Hannerz 1999), this view was one of the cardinal sins anthropologists have been accused of ever since Writing Culture (Clifford and Marcus 1986) and the concomitant postmodern turn. Brumann summed up the problem in an article which sparked strong reactions from both defenders of the concept of culture, to which Brumann himself belongs, and those who argued that it had become too charged to be salvaged: ‘The major concern of the sceptical discourse on culture is that the concept suggests boundedness, homogeneity, coherence, stability, and structure whereas social reality is characterized by variability, inconsistencies, conflict, change, and individual agency’ (Brumann 1999: S1). Does it follow that we should simply abandon the search for dance in culture, or dance and culture? On the contrary, we want to suggest that the concept of culture may help us to explore the aesthetic dimensions of social life, not least because the very people whose lives we try to understand have appropriated it to a variety of ends. One of the inadvertent successes of anthropology is that its most cherished concepts have taken on a life of their own far beyond academic circles. We also wanted to invite contributors to reflect on the validity and usefulness of ‘culture’ in its various modalities. When adults spend hours trying to force specific movement styles into the bodies of children, it is about more than creating perfection for a single show, as the seriousness of Balinese children’s dance training in McIntosh’s chapter attests. Following Hannerz, we propose retaining the ‘core understanding of culture as consisting of meanings and practices acquired (in varied ways) in social life’ (Hannerz 1999: S19), while also challenging the notions of boundedness, homogeneity and fixity that are always too ready to creep into our analyses because they make it easier to construct a coherent narrative. In other words, we would like to explore ‘culture’ as it relates to dance, albeit without overemphasizing its significance in determining what people do. As the chapters in this volume seek to demonstrate, dance can be used by anthropologists to understand and comment upon culture.

Our thinking on the relationship between dance and culture is informed by a number of anthropological studies which have explored this theme, sometimes implicitly. In her groundbreaking work on contact improvisation, Cynthia Novack (1990) showed how this practice, which developed in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s, made a conscious attempt to infuse movement with a free-flowing, non-gendered, egalitarian ethos. Modern dance had already emerged in the first half of the twentieth century as a reaction against the highly codified classical ballet tradition, but the Californian students who experimented with ‘contact’ in the 1960s sought to go further in breaking down the boundaries between male and female, choreographer and dancer and performer and audience. The improvisational quality of the practice, in which movement was generated by the constant flow of energy, and by chance variations in the points of contact between two bodies, also challenged the utilitarian idea that individuals could be in total control of their
actions at all times. Practices of this kind not only reflected, but also helped to shape radical transformations in white, urban, liberal American culture over two decades by giving young, middle-class urbanites committed to egalitarian ideals a space in which to try them out on their own bodies. Novack interpreted the decline of contact practice in the 1980s as an effect of cultural changes in America during which egalitarian ideals receded to the background, and the experimental, free-flowing quality of movement in contact practice came to be seen as messy and in need of technique and control.

Ness’s (1992) landmark study of sinulog dancing in Cebu City, in the Philippines, also explored the dance and culture theme, but here culture was understood as the outcome of a highly localized urban history. Looking at three forms of the sinulog (a Christian ritual, a dance drama and a ‘cultural’ exhibition dance), Ness examines the ways in which significant aspects of Cebuano culture, such as impermanence, fluidity and the importance of using space in an optimal way in a crowded city, were embodied in the various versions of the dance. She also considered how social inequalities and postcolonial history left their mark on the bodies of sinulog performers in ways that were left mostly unspoken.

The suggestion of culture embodied or sedimented in the moving body is apparent in other dance analyses. Barbara Browning (1995) subtitles her study of samba, ‘resistance in motion’, describing the dance as a form that narrates a history of cultural contact between Africans, Europeans, and indigenous Brazilians. Samba dancers themselves speak about the practice as a way of articulating their cultural identity, just as second-generation Puerto Ricans in the United States claim to be dancing salsa to ‘reconnect’ with their culture (Skinner 2007a). The obligatory fake tan – the ‘brownface’ look as McMains (2006: 109–70) refers to it – in dancesport Latin dances is the theatrical representation of Latinness for a transnational, predominantly white competitive culture. This ‘darkening’ of the body through dance can be contrasted by the ‘whitening’ complaint that Brazilian capoeira is becoming detached from its authentic, ethnic and folkloric roots (Downey 2005: 169–85), a black art becoming a white sport (Frigerio 1989).

Hughes-Freeland refers to a similar embodiment of social life when she says that ‘dance is a refraction of social life, not simply a reflection’ (Hughes-Freeland 2008: 108). The Javanese court dances in her study are a highly disciplined practice, a high art with a system of etiquette that refracts normal social practice. They are used as a form of ceremonial body diplomacy to maintain relations between people and are more than just a means of cultural expression. Javanese court dances are held to belong to the nation; they are a feature of national identity taught to the young and staged for tourists (see Hughes-Freeland, this volume; see also McIntosh, this volume). But their meaning is not fixed, and neither is the social life they form part of; it is open to the subjective interpretation of audiences and dancers alike. Here culture is fluid because it is located in the changing interaction, over time, between performers and audiences or patrons. The codification, training and rehearsal practices that come across in all the contributions in this volume also remind us that dance cannot exist outside socially constructed conventions of movement.
Dance movement is always created within a schema of aesthetics and agreed codes of gender expression (Hanna 1988; Desmond 2001).

A concern that is central to many of these studies is that of the location of individual agency in social change. Mauss (1973) perceived in the 1930s that every bodily activity, from those requiring years of training to the seemingly natural, such as walking and running, was shaped by people's social environment. Bourdieu (1977) built further on Mauss's ideas and developed the notions of ‘habitus’ and ‘hexis’ to explain the ‘role of habitual bodily and spatial practices in social action’ (Farnell 1999: 347). But Bourdieu did not have the specific qualities of dance in mind. Dance movement carries aesthetic dimensions, a projection of energy and an intended communication between performers and audience that gives it a specific potential to transform human experience in multiple ways. It is in this sense that dance is a powerful form of social action; it is part of the social fabric and not simply a reflection of it. Paraphrasing Shakespeare in Hamlet, the contributors in this volume agree that ‘the dance is the thing’.

This is also suggested by Schieffelin whose work on ritual performance in Papua New Guinea remains highly influential. For him, the Aristotelian divide between a ‘world of spectator which is real and a world conjured up by performers which is not’ or has a ‘virtual or imaginary’ reality (Schieffelin 1998: 200), prevents us from grasping the relationship between performance and the ‘social construction of reality’. In the Kaluli Gisaro ceremony, the performers sang with nostalgia about the landscape their audience was emotionally attached to (Schieffelin 1976). People would be so moved by the performance that they would often end up attacking the dancers and burning them on the shoulders with torches. It is not that the Kaluli are unable to conceive of the performance as a virtual world, Schieffelin argues; it is rather that they take it as a provocation. We would agree with Schieffelin in suggesting that in many cases the fusion of realities in the experience of the participants may well be how performance accomplishes something unique.

Globalizing Dance Practices

‘Participation in competitive ballroom dancing involves dancers in transnational systems of aesthetics, social networks and cultural codes that work through both body and mind’, Jonathan Marion (2008: 1) writes. For Marion, culture is produced through activity, in this case by ballroom dancing. An activity, then, is also a site of culture for Marion (2008: 1). He continues, by suggesting that ballroom dancers are ‘practically’ – quite literally – a ‘tribe’ of dancers with a collective identity, the shared experience of a translocal ballroom culture of practice and competition which exists side-by-side with members’ own national culture (Marion 2008: 25–28). The same might be said of tango, salsa and jive dancers sharing their interest or, more widely, of any social group with a shared practice to which people commit much of their lives. This culture-as-practice thesis rests upon ‘the institutionalisation of action’ (Marion 2008: 25). Frederik (2005) criticized this thesis in an exchange with Marion (2005a, 2005b) in Anthropology News. There, Marion described his translocal field sites, the very similar competition spaces around the Western world where professional dancers
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come together to compete. Sharing the ballroom standard, Marion describes these dancers as a self-defining, self-affiliating ‘community’ (Marion 2005a: 18). Frederik (2005) disputes the possibility of such a clear-cut division between the practice studio where dancers train and the competition space where Marion interviews dancers who have competed. He argues rather for a continuation, a flow between the local and the translocal as competitors relocate their activities. Community is more than the theatrical presentation of dance choreography at competition and, as Skinner (2007b) argues, developing Frederik’s point, the anthropologist should follow that translocation from studio to competition site, and share the journey and its meaning for those involved rather than just interview competitors about their performances. Culture does not just manifest itself in competition practice; it is there in the minds and bodies of the dancers but cannot be so easily delineated, or else all practices from ablutions to driving would lead to all sorts of cultures. Wulff (1998: 146) writes of a ‘touring culture’ in her study of transnational ballet, but it is a culture with a small ‘c’, one reactivated as each tour starts afresh. Caroline Picart (2006: 21) details ‘studio culture’ differing from one part of the city to the next, and studio etiquette – detailed training and common practices – differing more broadly from the ‘street’ styles and practices found in the social dance night clubs where swing, jive and salsa predominate. She characterizes it as Old World versus New World (Picart 2006: 15). Furthermore, Marion’s culture of practice denies a sense of internalization, interpretation or imagination (cf. Anderson 1991) held within the dancer, or alternatively the feeling of belonging that might not be apparent in the competitors, or might be faked like the excessive representations of sexuality and heteronormativity in the routines. The meaning of the dance is not straightforward and is very often independent from the dancer, as the philosopher Suzanne Langer (1953) points out; so too, perhaps, the relationship between dance and culture.

One of the themes addressed in this volume is that of how dance practices move and become globalized as a result of the mobility of those who perform them. Inevitably, those practices become transformed in the process, as evident in the chapters by Skinner, Hughes-Freeland, Neveu Kringelbach and Nájera-Ramírez. In the literature, Pietrobruno (2006) looks at urban salsa as a transnational dance that has moved all over the globe since the 1980s. It has migrated through the dancers; it ‘travels to new locations through the bodies, minds, and memories of its dancers’ (Pietrobruno 2006: 2), shifting between cultural heritage and leisure commodity. Pietrobruno uses salsa to explicate urban life for South and Central American migrants in Montreal who identify with the dance. She also describes the historical habitus of the dance which – for all its transnational movements – continues to retain physical elements from its past, such as the European partner dance format, Cuban rumba foot isolations or Afro-Cuban bent knees and empowering contra body motion. The salsa dance is following the well trodden path of the other Latin dances7 and their appropriation into ballroom and dancesport. They are all examples of globalization: ‘[D]ance culture based in lived realities … channeled into the capitalist economy, rendered more restrictive, codified at the level of movement vernacular, and refigured in terms of American and British culture’ (Pietrobruno
Competition in dance, and its commoditization in a world of flow, migration and diffusion has, we argue, not resulted in a divorce between dance and culture. Rather, both ‘carry’ each other.

**Dance, Nation, Identities**

The capacity of dance to encapsulate a multiplicity of messages, and to remain open to interpretation, means that it lends itself particularly well to embodying identities in the making. Dance is not fixed outside the bodies of performers and is therefore malleable enough to be manipulated according to context, ideology, and purpose. As Reed puts it, ‘dance is a powerful tool in shaping nationalist ideology and in the creation of national subjects, often more so than are political rhetoric or intellectual debates’ (Reed 1998: 511).

Daniel’s (1995) study is an illuminating example that speaks to this theme. She explains that rumba was selected and promoted as the national dance in post-revolutionary Cuba because it had been associated with the Afro-Cuban working class since the nineteenth century. Rumba was therefore a more appropriate means for representing socialist ideology than ballet, son and other popular dance forms.

But the authorities were not entirely successful in spreading rumba to all segments of society, a reminder to us that the ways in which people appropriate dance practices can never be completely controlled from above, an aspect that comes across in different ways in the chapters in this volume by Lüdtke, Neveu Kringelbach, Nájera-Ramírez and Carrausse. This is also the point made by Askew (2002) in her study of nation building and musical performance in Tanzania. Askew points out that nation building only happens when nationalist ideologies are reappropriated ‘from below’ and that musical performance (which in this case includes dance) has been central as a vehicle for Tanzanians to explore and imagine what their postcolonial nation was made of.

Alongside these examples, studies of dance and politics have multiplied since the early 1990s, as Reed (1998) identified more than a decade ago. In addition to exploring the ways in which dance practices can be co-opted to promote or contest political agendas, a number of studies have begun to pay due attention to the role of various institutions, bureaucracies and funding agencies in shaping dance. In her study of Irish dance, Wulff (2003, 2007), for example, discusses the multiple ways in which promoting and controlling dance – along with the Irish language – have been an integral part of the Irish national project since the late nineteenth century. In fact dance has been more successful than language in many ways because it helped to maintain a sense of Irishness among the diaspora in Great Britain, North America, Australia and New Zealand. Wulff also links the nationalistic aspect to other important issues in the redefinition of contemporary Irish identity, showing, for example, how dance becomes again and again entangled with religion and moral politics, as well as debates about authenticity, tradition and modernity in national culture. The lack of hip use in the dance style points to long-standing histories of Christian puritanism. It might even be possible to moot a postcolonial Irish moving body, Wulff (2003: 190) suggests.
Indeed the darker moments of national histories often leave their marks on dance practices. Looking at tango in Argentina, Taylor (1998: 71) shows how the dance became the trope for a culture of terror deep-seated within the country. For Taylor, tango was her research gatekeeper: ‘[w]hat the tango says about Argentina, the nation that created it, illuminates aspects of Argentine behaviour that have long puzzled outsiders’ (Taylor 1998: 1). Dance has also become a productive avenue for looking at the self-fashioning of national gendered bodies, as in Archetti’s (1999) work on how various constructions of masculinity in Argentina are played out through dance (tango) and sport (polo and football). This is a useful reminder that national identities always intersect with other identities shaped by gender, generation, race and class, and nowhere is this as evident as in performance.

The Chapters

The contributions to this volume engage with dance through the following themes: dance and globalization; tourism, social transformation and dance; and dance, identity and nation. These themes are considered in sections. The first, especially, engages with the movement, spread and commoditization of dance, be it the diffusion of jive as part of processes of American urbanization, the commercial transnational touring of national ballet companies, or the commoditization of a danced healing ritual in southern Italy. The second theme links chapters exploring the impact of tourism upon local indigenous dance and identity in Java, Panama and Native American Canada. The chapters in the third section consider the relationship between dance, nation and identity, with studies of national and migrants’ dance groups, and children and young citizens growing up in nations where dance retains a political status. Taken together, the chapters in this collection examine the many dimensions and locations of Dancing Cultures.

More specifically, Jonathan Skinner opens the volume with a chapter about dance style transitions: how dances diffuse, mutate and feed into each other and how dancers co-opt and create moves. The examples here are primarily the American jive story as it developed out of the swing era when urban migration, racial tension and new technologies of musical production and reproduction were coming into play. The dance became an alternate public sphere for new urban arrivals – the rural disembedded but not disembodied – who used their bodies as currency, a dance community in the dance hall or in the block party. This dance is an illustration of globalization theory, the Americanization of a dance turned global and eventually franchised and marketed as a retro modern jive (ceroc) to appeal to the imaginative nostalgia of more contemporary generations seeking to connect and reconnect with others as well as themselves. Other social dances such as salsa and tango follow similar storylines, hybrid dance imports and exports turned to by new cosmopolitans in a newly globalized world.

Helena Wulff continues the theme of globalization and dance with an ethnographic analysis of international – or, rather, transnational – ballet and its funding. There is an uneasy duet danced here between high art dance and the less aesthetic commercial marketing and financing of its practice. Wulff looks at the
similarities in ballet culture between old ballet centres such as Paris and London, and how they contrast with the more brash and aggressive marketing and patronage found in New York at the American Ballet Theatre. Despite the heterogeneity of ballet marketing, often now with a populist slant to it, Wulff found that dancers and business were highly aware of their company-space and its relationship with other ballet centres, thus suggesting that globalization and transnationality do not necessarily imply deterritorialization or the loss of identity. Dancers, more so than company marketing specialists, wrestled with what they perceived as the extreme opposites of the cultural capital of their dancing and the market capitalization of their product (more recently sold as tickets, merchandise, memoirs and even souvenirs, such as Nureyev’s costumes and jewellery). Corporate sponsors such as tobacco companies buy into ballet to legitimate their ill-gained economic capital with cultural capital: ‘capital laundering’ in the world’s capitals. There is both heterogeneity and homogeneity in the transnational cultural processes in these ballet company worlds, Wulff concludes.

‘We were bitten by the beat, if not by spiders, and we used it to counter the disconnect of our stressed-out, over-burdened, spirit-starved modern lives … We used this music to dance together, to try to heal ourselves, to drive away negative emotions, to invoke the spirits of our ancestors, offer support for each other … to temporarily break away from our everyday stresses’. This is the commentary made by an Italian-American pizzica enthusiast who learnt pizzica in New York City. It is relayed in Karen Lüdtke’s chapter on tarantism, a dance cult from Salento, Southern Italy, associated from medieval times with the tarantula spider, and pizzica, the traditional music of the region and a symbol of local identity. With a resurgence in the 1990s, both local music and dance are now a tourist attraction. Not only that, tarantism and pizzica have been adopted as modern identity-framing activities as well as commercial interest practices: in a modern Europe of cosmopolitan citizens, these revamped ‘old traditions’ allow Salentines to negotiate different levels of regional, national and continental identity, to retain a niche in an increasingly porous wall. A political tool, a fun practice, a financial asset, a tourist ad: pizzica is no longer just a source of healing and spirituality. It has changed significantly and grown in its importance as well as its meaning. In large part this is a response to the forces of globalization: cultural commoditization but still with a strong local bite to it.

Tourism has become the main driver of social transformation in the second section in this volume as Scarangella-McNenly, Hughes-Freeland and Theodossopoulos attest. In examples from different parts of the world, the nature of performance and the politics of cultural meaning are unpacked. Linda Scarangella-McNenly looks at traditional song and dance in cultural tourism amongst some Coastal Salish, a First Nation people of British Columbia. Though their Híwus feast house is open to the tourists’ gaze, Scarangella-McNenly contends that the Salish ‘open’ ceremonies are not just staged versions of authenticity. The tourists are, in fact, witnesses of ‘tourism as ceremony’, as she describes it. The Salish are not just Foucauldian disciplined natives (see also McIntosh, this volume) staging authentic exotic performances in public spaces. They play an active role in the production, expression and experience
of ‘the Native’ under tourist scrutiny, with Bear, Eagle and Mountain Lion dances owned by specific performers just as much as their costumes. Ownership, however, comes with genealogical and spiritual relationships with the community and the place, the dances embodying the performers’ relationships with their ancestors and exemplifying their local rights and privileges. The tourist ‘cultural revivals’ taking place at the Hiwus feast house are thus just as much for the locals as well as the visitors. They become complex public spaces of cultural interaction that challenge modernist static and essentializing views of culture and authenticity, dance as authentic in terms of verisimilitude and genuineness, originality and the production of meaning. In his now classic analysis of tourism amongst the Maasai in Kenya, Edward Bruner (2005: 47) describes the tourists’ view of the dancing and hosting given to them as a form of ‘experience theatre’, a space where host and guest meet and interact, an imaginary space constructed with ‘realism’ if not authenticity. Scarangella-McNenly draws on Bruner in her analysis of the Hiwus feast house performances.

In the following chapter, Hughes-Freeland makes broader use of Bruner to make sense of dance events and culture in tourism-dependent environments in South-east Asia. Hughes-Freeland’s focus is upon dance culture as the pattern of relationships between performers, audiences and students of dance. These relationships change gradually, or are transformed dramatically by the tourist encounter or the loss of a patron. Hughes-Freeland explores the degrees of participation and interaction in dance tours to Laos and Indonesia, staged dance events, and dance lessons for visitors and students. Her approach is transactional in that she is interested in the relationships around the dance rather than in its commoditization and market value. Increasingly, cultural tours include workshops for tourists to participate in. Should the tourist stay longer and study the dance, then they change category from tourist to student or scholar. The art of cosmopolitanism in this context is to be able to negotiate shifts along these continua, as the Salentines in Lüdtke’s chapter have learned: Didik Nini Thowok is a Javanese choreographer able to move between the dance school where he teaches, parts of the island where he learns local traditions, and embassy evenings overseas where he performs.

The final chapter in this section, by Theodossopoulos, celebrates ‘indigenous tourism’ amongst the Embera of Parara Puru in Chagres National Park, Panama. The Embera both dance for and with the tourists visiting them: local animal dances, and rumba and cumbia dances adopted and made local. The former are often animal imitations, not far removed from some those studied in the Choreometrics Project, a dance representing the everyday natural environment of the Embera: the dance leader representing a flower stamen with fellow dancers as petals; a line of dancers imitating the moving body of a snake; a dancer imitating a hummingbird drinking from a flower. These dance occasions are explained by the Embera as a working and reworking of their culture, a strengthening and consolidation of their cultural traditions for themselves as well as their tourist visitors. Furthermore, Theodossopoulos addresses the politics of Embera cultural representation and the typically inappropriate and unfounded exoticization of indigenous groups. This
Western aesthetic creeps into academic notions of (in)authenticity in dance as well as tourist expectations. Theodosioupolous’s suggestion is that it is more productive to concentrate upon the cultural distance between the tourist and the performer rather than to fall into essentialist debates about ‘dancing culture’ as authentic or inauthentic representations of the people concerned.

The third and final section in this volume is concerned with the ways in which dance shapes and is shaped by national, regional and youth identities. In the four chapters by Neveu Kringelbach, Nájera-Ramírez, Carrausse and McIntosh, the agency of states and institutions (national theatres, universities, schools) is central in shaping moving bodies, but these bodies in turn appropriate performance to pursue their own agendas.

In the first chapter in this section, looking at the appropriation of a national dance culture ‘from below’ in Senegal, Neveu Kringelbach charts the genesis of the ‘neo-traditional’ genre of dance fostered by colonial school theatre, and developed further after independence by the Senegalese National Ballet and its offshoots. Designed to create the illusion of a unified nation, the genre was a cornerstone of the nation-building project while also projecting the image of Senegal’s first President, Léopold Sédar Senghor, as a powerful leader and a patron of the arts. While the fortunes of the National Ballet declined with Senegal’s economy, neo-traditional performance was successfully appropriated by various groups who had been marginalized in the new nation, particularly the Jola of Casamance. Neveu Kringelbach shows how numerous Casamançais dance troupes were established by migrant associations in Dakar in the 1960s and 1970s, and how their staging of Casamançais ‘traditions’ contributed to the articulation of a regional culturalist discourse. As the younger generations of Casamançais performers came of age, however, these troupes introduced changes designed to enlarge the repertoire of identities they were able to speak to, from regional to national and even transnational.

In the second chapter in this section, Nájera-Ramírez looks at *ballet folklórico* as another example of the choreography of a new national culture that became successfully appropriated by people at the margins. *Folklórico* dance was developed shortly after the Mexican Revolution of 1910 from the merging of classical ballet and regional folk dance as a way of showcasing the cultural diversity of the nation while simultaneously legitimizing its unity. By the 1930s, the Mexican state sponsored efforts to collect folk dances from throughout Mexico, and to integrate them into the school curriculum. The Ballet Folklórico de Mexico, founded by Amalia Hernández in 1952, was instrumental in codifying the genre. But it was in the United States that the genre truly blossomed in the late 1960s and 1970s, Nájera-Ramírez suggests, because it became associated with the Chicano civil rights movement. This was important in maintaining a sense of common identity across the Mexico–US border. Even more importantly, *folklórico* groups in the United States now used their performances as a way of displaying the richness of Mexican heritage, thereby using a fairly recent dancing culture as a tool to instil discipline and pride into the bodies of younger Chicanos.
In the third chapter of the section, Carrausse’s study of university student dance societies in South Korea, continues with the theme of dance, youth and transnationalism, even though here the transnational dimension is imagined rather than real. Carrausse begins this two-part chapter with a description of ‘traditional’ Korean mask dances and their material culture, all shaped by the successive influences of Buddhism, Confucianism and shamanism. The first part brings to the fore the aesthetics contained in these dances, such as the importance of creating a feeling of suspension and the texture of flowing energy. These aesthetics also place value on maintaining a physical distance between male and female bodies, and the magnificent costumes are designed to ensure that skin-to-skin contact never occurs. While these dances are still practised by many young Koreans, in the second part of the chapter Carrausse shows how, in recent years, a growing number of students in Seoul have become aficionados of simple, modern choreographed forms and global dance styles such as salsa and jive. For Carrausse, these dances do not embody a disaffection with Korean culture; rather, they enable youths under considerable social pressure regarding educational achievement to experience the collective fun, freedom from constraints and veiled eroticism of dancing in a socially acceptable space.

In the fourth chapter of the section and final piece in the book, McIntosh looks at the dance training of children in a village studio (sanggar tari) in Bali. At the sanggar, children learn Balinese dances, of course, but as McIntosh suggests, drawing on Foucault’s work, much more is going on within the process of choreographic transmission. The lengthy preparation process leading up to a performance involves adult teachers forcing a specific movement style into the children’s bodies, dressing them in incredibly elaborate costumes and applying flamboyant make-up. During this process, McIntosh shows how the children are doing more than becoming highly competent dancers: they also internalize the power of the older over the younger, and socially appropriate ways of being male and female. Balinese notions of good citizenship become almost literally ‘bent’ into their bodies. The younger children are less competent dancers than the older ones, but their young selves also seem to have more of a capacity to ‘resist’ the culture of the dance. In a strong sense, then, dance in rural Bali ‘makes’ persons.

It is our hope that this collection will further illuminate the significance of dance practices in social life and spark fresh debates across the fields of anthropology and dance and performance studies.

Notes
1. For comprehensive reviews of anthropological approaches to dance, see also Kaeppler (1978), Hanna (1979a), Spencer (1985b), Reed (1998), Wulff (2001), Williams (2004) and Grau and Wierre-Gore (2005). Royce’s (1977) book is both a review and a discussion of the various theoretical approaches used in the anthropology of dance until the 1970s. It was republished with a new introduction twenty-five years later (Royce 2002).
2. Evans-Pritchard’s extraordinary collection of photographs has been made available on-line thanks to an AHRC-funded digitalizing project led by Christopher Morton at the Pitt Rivers Museum: http://southernsudan.prm.ox.ac.uk/index.php. Also see Morton (2009).
3. See Kolcio (2010) for a comprehensive review of the role of the six most important dance associations in the development of dance studies in American academia: CORD and SDHS, but also the American Dance Guild (formed 1956), the American Dance Therapy Association (1966), the American College Dance Festival Association (1973) and the Dance Critics Association (1974).

4. Also see Banes, Harris, Acocella and Garafola (2007) for informed commentaries on Banes’s work and a compilation of her writings as a dance critic.

5. See especially Youngerman (1974) and Castaldi (2006) for a critique of Sachs’s text.

6. Dance can also relate to the abnormal, to the extremes in society, or even to the divine, such as in trance dancing, which is associated more explicitly with the deities and their possession of the dancer in vodou dancing found in Haiti and West Africa (Friedson 2005), and implicitly in the clubbing scene (Jackson 2004).


8. Ballet was also promoted in Cuba, but to a lesser degree than rumba. In Cuba, ballet was introduced through the Russian school and did not, therefore, carry the same associations with bourgeois entertainment as it did in Europe.
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