

The claim
exigencies
undertakes
tical circur
reactionary
agree inste
preserve th
beyond scr
don virtual
what could give the body's presence or its vanishing urgency over other
visions?

Notes

- 1 Roland Barthes, opened up for consideration this approach to bodily writing most palpably through his attention to the physical circumstances surrounding his own profession as a writer in, among other writings, his autobiography (Barthes 1977).
- 2 The concept of kinaesthetic empathy is inspired by dance critic John Martin's conception of inner mimicry (Martin 1965).
- 3 The *Oxford English Dictionary* identifies two meanings for the archaic word 'theoric', one pertaining to the theoretical and the other to the performative. In resurrecting this term, I am trying to gesture in both directions simultaneously.
- 4 Cunningham's influence on this duet between Clio and Terpsichore is explicated more fully in my book *Reading Dancing: Bodies and Subjects in Contemporary American Dance* (Foster 1986).

WORLDING DANCE AND DANCING OUT THERE IN THE WORLD

Marta Elena Savigliano

A version of this essay was originally published in 2009

Prompted by the late twentieth-century, and still growing, interest in World Dance evidenced by the emergence of this rubric in US college circles, bookings in performing venues, funding agencies invested in arts and cultures, and the attention devoted to it by dance critics and scholars, as well as by dancers and dance lovers, I propose to consider some questions related to the discursive formation of this field. These questions are entangled with ethico-political concerns, especially as they pertain to the reproduction of otherness—othering practices and obsessions with the otherness of others. What does “world dance” actually represent at this historical conjuncture? What is the effect of imposing “world,” as a qualifying categorization, on “dance,” as a set of aestheticized movement practices, in the era of so-called globalization? How does this totalizing framing (the “world”) work to supplement and expand the Dance field as it fixes differentiations within it? How are dances from “out there” selected to be included or excluded from World Dance? What kinds of institutional investments, technical knowledge, economic interests, aesthetic and ethical assumptions, political arrangements, pleasures, and desires participate in the process of worlding Dance?

To world, to globalize [...] dance

Much like global culture, World Dance can be subjected to unsettling debates regarding its “reality” or actual “existence” out there, and politically concerned scholars also have to wonder about the field's productive or expressive relationship to late capitalism's socioeconomic and political structures. Regardless of the focus or position one might wish to assume, nothing is worlded without the intervention of an agential subject doing the worlding. And though “worlding” is not unique to one culture or to this time in history, it does seem to coincide with moments of imperialist movement when circumscribing the world is possible, and even necessary for the sake of managing populations and identities (Kadir 2004, Radhakrishnan 2001).

World Dance is a representation, a relatively new way of putting together, conceptualizing, and validating “other” dances, rather than a plain discovery of their presence in the world. World Dance institutionalizes into the Dance field an enriching and disruptive flow of “other” dances and dancers, imposing containment and order by framing some (not all) into the World. World Dance operates through disciplinary techniques that reshape the “other” dances’ presentational and pedagogical forms, along with the beliefs and values associated with them, their circulation and purposes, and the bodies and experiences of those who practice them. In order to get at “what World Dance is,” the substantive makeup of World Dance also requires us to address the condition of the “others” through whom the field is constituted (Abou-El-Haj 1997). What kinds of differences within or beyond the world of Dance does World Dance allude to and install? Are the “others” in World Dance at the peripheries or at the metropolitan centers of the “world-system”? Do they belong to the underdeveloped or developing “third world” (*vis-à-vis* a developed “first world”) or to the “local” in tension with the “global”? Where does World Dance happen? Do the “others” in World Dance practice World Dance before reaching the sites of World Dance selection, distribution, and validation? At what point and how do they become othered? Who among the “others” participate in the making of World Dance and where does their status as World Dance practitioners become legitimated? How do some “others” attain this status, through what practices and specific representations of “otherness” *vis-à-vis* those who do not make it into World Dance? And what are the benefits and losses of participating as “others” in the making of World Dance? Conversely, are consumers of World Dance, especially when learning to practice World Dance themselves, “others” to World Dance? What are the politics and the ethics involved in these multiplications of otherness? Does World Dance open a space for renegotiating “otherness” as a site of “neighborly” relations?¹ If so, who can afford to enjoy this privileged encounter of cosmopolitan bliss in globalization?

World Dance represents others’ dancing as it designates a specific market for the consumption of a particular kind of dance that works at fascinating with difference as it elicits culturally progressive cosmopolitan values. Scholars, critics, professional artists, and presenters work transnationally as “cultural intermediaries,” selecting and shaping the kinds of dancers and dancing that constitute World Dance (Bourdieu 1984, Haynes 2005, Negus 2002). All dancing (that “thing” that dancers do) obviously takes place in the world, but not all of it amounts to World Dance. I am calling attention to this obvious fact because World Dance, as a rubric, has the effect of putting together dancers who do not identify as “world dancers,” and of piling up dance practices usually unrelated to each other. World Dance, thus, as a category of dances, denotes a specific “worlding” of dancers and dance practices that are being newly incorporated into the world of dances that deserve the Dance field’s attention—a field sustained by scholars, critics, presenters, sponsors, practitioners, and spectators/consumers of dance primarily located in the United States and Europe. World Dance is a *classification* applied

to newly “discovered” dances and dancers who, while all along doing their dancing thing out there in the world, now have been *worlded differently* so as to fit the Dance collections under globalization. World Dance reframes difference as a political resource and allows us to imagine a globality of multicultural harmony that transcends boundaries of nationality, ethnicity, and race.

World Dance thus responds to an expansionist imperative of the Dance field immersed in the cultural politics of globalization. World Dance seems to be inaugurating a vast “new world” of dancing possibilities for the contemplation, consumption, and revitalization of dance scholars, artists, practitioners, and audiences. At the same time, World Dance enables selected dancers and dancing, previously outside the knowledge and awareness of presenters, funding agencies, teaching positions, and scholarly interests, to join Dance (the “field”) under certain conditions and adjustments. World Dance also carries promises to capture a wealth of mobility and mobilization capabilities (people dancing out there in the world) running subversively and/or unproductively in the wild.² World Dance, from this viewpoint, is truly the promise of a New World.

World Dance as a symptom

World Dance, made up of newly discovered dances, is an addition that challenges the Dance field as we know it, rendering it “old,” and situating it in the world—and down from its “outworldly” position as Art. The encounter between new World Dances (and their historical depth in “other” locations) and the old (and taken for “canonical”) field of Dance has the potential effect of installing all dancing in the world, in geopolitics, and of provoking a reassessment of Dance as a universal aesthetic expression, above and beyond politics. World Dance adds to the (now old) Dance world, but it also reworlds it by locating it in the world. The Dance field, however, has been struggling to neutralize the impact of World Dance by way of two maneuvers: first, by introducing a cultural relativism borrowed from the field of Anthropology (establishing that cultures are “different but equal,” and thus ignoring the fact of the forced articulations through colonizing globalization); and second, by installing Choreography as a universal strategic tool for making dances.³ The rest of this essay will be devoted to exploring these maneuvers in an attempt to understand the worlding of World Dance.

World Dance is a symptom, as it were, of Dance under globalization. It conceals at the same time as it reveals the integration of newly discovered dancing territories in the world of Dance as we know it, opening the (old) world of Dance to revitalization but also to the risks of the new, namely the risk that new dancing and dancers will contend for legitimacy and resources in the expanding field of Dance. Reworlding Dance allows for the mobilization of others (other dancers and their dances) as they enter a dance world ruled by “the” Dance: Ballet, of course, but also Modern, Postmodern, and above all, Choreography. How wild can this newly found world of dances get? What if that dancing taking place out there in the world is not easily accommodated in the Dance World and its

ruled? Imagine if its accumulation (a process that occurs simultaneously with dance worlding's expansion) should activate chaotic disruptions in the field, question its worlding, and lead it into alliances with decolonizing or postcolonial critical factions. World Dance might develop a resistance to globalism. Differing positionalities, those established under "subaltern studies," "postcolonial studies," "minorities discourses," or "subjugated knowledge," could sustain their critical force under the umbrella field of World Dance studies or histories without being recuperated into a relativistic collection of "different perspectives" on "different dances." Could World Dance move away from reproducing differences and the endless replication of the same (i.e., danced otherness)? Under what conditions would World Dance undo the obsession with the otherness of the other? Envision World Dance as a radical rubric, capable of taking over and replacing Dance as a field, but World Dance might be confined by birth to represent the Other of Western or Westernized (i.e., Western-assimilated) Dance.

A cartography of dance knowledge

Two ways of worlding have been at play in bringing "new" and "other" dancing into the Dance field. Dance scholarship has developed inside and outside dance departments, following a fracture established by the archival location of its chosen objects of study. The fracture does not necessarily follow the objects' sites of "origin" (claimed belonging) in geopolitical terms such as West and non-West, First and Third World, or North and South. Two different "archives," as it were, have housed collections of movement practices, following differing paths as they identified, categorized, and analyzed their findings: One is "the" Dance archive in the Arts; the other, the archive of "dancing" (socially structured and meaningful movements)⁴ in Anthropology.

Scholars at the Dance-Arts archive have documented, historicized, and critiqued professional artists and performers, their works, schools, and lives, with most but not all stemming from hegemonic centers of art production with noticeable international impact. The cosmopolitanism and *déclassé* status (here meaning beyond/above class distinctions) of these professionals of aestheticized, presentational movement practices reached selected international (world) audiences and created an international network of collaboration with creative and promotional criss-crossing, transnational effects.⁵ This collection has been kept in the Arts under the rubric of Dance. Dance historiography worked at accommodating all information predating these artists (from Greek mythology to court dances) as conducive to the artists' works. Any other dancing occurring alongside these artists was addressed either as a nostalgic remnant of the past (festivals, folk dances), as recreation of the masses (ballroom, social dances), or as entertainment for the masses (cancan, vaudeville, cabaret, music hall). Aside from perfunctory entries, especially when artists used these "less artistic" dances as sources, this vast diversity of dancing practices was to become the object of study in folklore collections or social history collections, finding a difficult fit in

the Dance collections of the Arts. Evolution (of the Dance form) and evaluation (of the dancing qualities conducive to their stratification with "the" Dance as the measure) served as the organizing criteria of the Dance collections and as the tools for the narrativization of Dance as history.

Curt Sachs's *Eine Weltgeschichte des Tanzes* published in 1933 (translated into English as *World Dance History* in 1937) (Sachs 1963) broadened the scope of Dance by reaching into yet other dancing, that of (selected) non-like-us peoples from past and present. His crossover move was made possible by extending the diffusionist evolutionism of Schmidt and Graebner's *Kulturkreis* school to accommodate dancing from all over the world to a World Dance History consistent with a primitive-to-civilized scale of progress. Sachs's is thus a worlding that enriches the Dance archive in the Arts, without disturbing its organizing principles, as he slips into the archives of Anthropology—which leads into the second set of dancing collections under consideration (Kaepler 1978, Youngerman 1974).

Anthropology has served as an archive for "other" dancing, dances outside Dance or loosely connected to Dance mainly as a source of inspiration. These collections have moved, following Anthropology's dilemmas of affiliation, between the Social Sciences and the Humanities. As part of the doings of people without history (cold history or eternal present),⁶ dancing out there in the world was worlded as a signifying human behavior (a universal trait) and as a cultural expression of social organizations. Texts often cited as enabling this incorporation of dancing in anthropological discourse include Marcel Mauss's 'Les techniques du corps' of 1936, published in *Sociologie et Anthropologie* in 1950 and translated into English as 'Techniques of the body' in 1973, and Franziska Boas's *The Function of Dance in Human Society* of 1944. These inaugural works on dancing, supplemented by a long list of anthropological works on the social import of physicality and expressive culture, are narrativized through two strands of interests (and concomitant schools of thought): On the one hand, they conform to the scientific collection of empirical data on gesture, postural habits, physical behavior, motor habits, and non-verbal communication dating since at least the 1940s,⁷ and, on the other hand, to the socio-cultural collection of ethnographic data on patterns of movement, movement structures, and other symbolic and semantic interpretations of embodied social action since at least the late 1920s.⁸

These collectors of other moving bodies coincided in the common goal of understanding the operation and social function of diverse physical actions and ways of performing across cultures. An interest in universals of the human body and universals of human behavior, and their possible linkages, can be traced throughout the discussions. As these researchers reached out to a world made up of different ways of living together (other societies with "cultures" of their own), regardless of these scholars' intentions, their efforts had the effect of lumping humankind into a single population (a shared biological and social base) while simultaneously installing questions of discrimination (given that their sociocultural arrangements were different, and that, in the last instance, some were better than others). Proof was to be found in the very enterprise of the archives.

The "primitive," as a placeholder of difference on the scale of progress and civilization, served as a justification for conquest and for the ensuing studies. Race figures prominently as an organizational tool in these collections, and its biological, psychological, and social moorings often slip into one another by way of "culture" and observations on "cultural difference."⁹ If "culture" and later on "ethnicity"¹⁰ displace "race" (and "tribal") as the paradigmatic units of anthropological study, the biology/social ambiguity is retained and unresolved. Heredity and descent, and their close, murky link to "tradition" make a quasi-automatic connection to the racialization of cultures and racism. Difference is thus reinscribed in culture as more than distinction, race (by way of tradition) being the unmentioned supplement.

Other dancing bodies are redundantly othered in this scheme of anthropological things. Bodies (already implicated in "culture") are brought back as "embodied culture," calling attention to the doubled-binding of bodies as pertaining to a specific "culture" and as subjected to a world politics that colonizes as it turns peoples into population.¹¹ Reworlding Dance by including other dancing as collected by dance ethnographers expands the holdings of the archive, but leaves out a multitude of doubly removed others (the objects and subjects of ethnographic study) who are doing their dancing thing. Again, the ethnographic encounter remains to be accounted for, even when it is being reflected upon and critiqued.

The fact is that our collecting continues, perhaps because, paraphrasing Baudrillard, in the last instance collectors collect themselves (Baudrillard 1994). We should address what, specifically, we are trying to collect, if other(ed) dancing seems to help us collect ourselves. I am tentatively proposing that dancing out there in the world—the "opening" that as of yet has not been collected and, by extension, has not been worlded—points at an inoperative,¹² an excess of life still available for the revitalization of collector's worlds—and archives. World Dance is another collection, an addition to the two main archives (Dance/Art/Dance Studies and "other" dances/Anthropology/Dance Ethnography) I have been discussing. It is housed at the thresholds, moving in between the two as the collection of other(ed) artistic dancing. Under archival efforts (which attempt to represent, replicate, protect, and save dances from their practitioners' ongoing innovations), World Dance works at capturing the dancing that occurs out there in the world.

At the World Dance collections

What composes the World Dance collections? How do these distinct dancing "cultures" and "subcultures" get to be identified, coded, and brought together, and to what effect? The maneuver of their inclusion into World Dance entails an exclusion that needs to be addressed. There is a Dance master who makes World Dance possible, who worlds dances as a set while establishing the master's own position outside the set, passing a discriminating judgment, as it were, on the nature of the collection by identifying what does and does not belong in it, under what requirements, and submitted to what kinds of adaptation.

In globalization there is an increasing awareness of untapped, intangible sources of wealth that pertain to the mobilization of life, that follow collective arrangements according to techniques and disciplines working outside or beyond established institutions, that strangely generate vitality as they consume physical energy, that require little investment or compensation, that disappear as they happen and that run on account of desire, belief, and life itself. Some of these sources have been recuperated as Art, but a large number run wild in the unwelcoming Anthropology archive as "popular culture" or "tradition." Dances (a category not necessarily assumed by their practitioners) are detected out there, at the margins of state apparati or not exhausted by them, crossing over nationalist, classist, and racist borders, negotiating resignifications.

World Dance is an institutionalizing project that organizes, according to UNESCO's recommendation of November 15, 1989, this "intangible patrimony of humanity," establishing administrative and scholarly order in its collection. Not all dancing will attain the status of collectible, or UNESCO's legitimation and support. But World Dance as a new field and collection at universities and at UNESCO does work as an archivist-driven net that places allegedly "vulnerable" practices into a framework of competition—for survival, for appreciation, for conservation through documentation and research, for preservation through education, and for dissemination through sponsored national and international tours.¹³

Choreography, at a distant privileged position, as the creative, innovative, progressive dance-making force, the truly artistic undertaking that makes dances happen, excludes as it includes world dances serving as the threshold's operator. Choreography is beyond dance, in the sense that it has no particular form to keep, and yet it makes dances possible. Moreover, Choreography can make anything into dance by capturing its constitutive movements, and it can set anything to dance by instilling mobility. Given these astonishing capabilities, Choreography, a strategic tool systematically developed in and claimed by the Western dance tradition, can accommodate World Dance as a technical and inspirational source. However, it handles with difficulty its own integration into World Dance as one among other practices for decision-making concerning movement composition. Choreography stands out as a *processor of differences* in World Dance's inclusive thrust. Choreography determines how World Dance will incorporate a compound of cultural relativism values and collectionist interests (of old and new, aristocratic or popular, classy or rowdy, theatrical, club, slum or street, ritualistic, sacred or profane, group, partnered or solo, homosexual, heterosexual, transsexual, or asexual, erotic, puritanical or blasé—and all of the above, according to continents, nations, and regions, as well as global trends, and foremost of ethnic but once again culturalized and racialized dances)¹⁴ and of preservationist interests. Here the category of the "traditional" introduces a new set of contested and overlapping distinctions into the worlding of World Dance.

As such, Choreography allows for the emergence of fusion dances and other "misfits" that could eventually make their way into World Dance, such as spoken

dances, contact improv tangos (see Festival Cambalache), postmodern aboriginal dance/rituals, Chinese Hip-Hop (see HipHop Dance Fest), Senegalese Butoh (see Acogny/Yamasaki Fagaala), and Modern Indian dances, to mention only a few. Choreography enables a world traffic of, and a trafficking in, dances, much like the English language (which cross-cultural and intercultural choreographers tend to use in their creative communications), and as such operates as an exclusion (from World Dance) that includes all dances, and as an exception (in the collection) that rules the dance archive. World Dance is thus composed of traditional, ethnic, and some fusion dances “other” to Ballet, Modern, and Postmodern (traditionally Western but practiced worldwide). World Dance, however, is not restricted to dances untouched by Western-inspired dance forms. The World Dance collections also house those fusion dances that, while borrowing from “participatory” or “presentational” and mostly Western forms, retain the signature elements of “cultural” difference—showing their resilience to transformative forces, be it local or foreign, but usually attributed to Western modernity and its polluting influence. The World Dance collections, like all sponsored archives and collections, must be exhibited to the public.

Displaying and preserving World Dance

Exhibiting an intangible collection like the World Dance collection is not impossible, but it is challenging. Museums open their collections to public view by working at contextualizing their objects, following carefully selected narratives in terms of scientific classifications, aesthetic affiliations, thematic affinities, geopolitical and historical frames, structures of production, author's *oeuvre qua* creative development, and so on. Presenting world dances requires a similar work of reconfiguration that entails fetishizing movements, selecting, fragmenting, recomposing, and reinterpreting them, and then also disavowing the operation. Take, for perfunctory examples, the staging of a ritual dance (i.e., the danced aspect of a ritual, excluding its constituent efficacy at conjuring something) or a street dance (i.e., the most striking moves, excluding its openness, improvisational, competitive, and fleeting bond-making capabilities). Staging, regardless of the format, introduces a context that excises the impetus for, and nature of, mobilization (the “how these dances come to be”) by installing a performer/audience structure in a venue or space charged with differing significations and established requirements. These signifying requirements (virtuosity, compositional intelligibility, interesting variation in terms of phrasing, sequencing, and group formations, flux in energy levels, spatial coverage, defined trajectories) are impositions already installed with a Dance audience that the world dance performer must address whether s/he chooses to make them present or absent.

Audiences already have been trained for what to expect and how to evaluate a dance performance according to their familiarity with the (choreographically crafted) Balletic, Modern, and Postmodern dance forms designed for stages

(Foster, 1986). This unavoidable framework for World Dance transforms the alluded world dance (as it is practiced out there in the world) into a World Dance that points at it, like a placeholder in the intangible collection. This complex maneuver cannot be undone or compensated for through lectures or informative theater notes.

Teaching, in order to revitalize the World Dance collection, follows a similar path, this time in terms of pedagogical adaptations: adjusting to the space of a studio; to the time frames and frequencies established in schedules; to the lack of available musicians/accompanists; to defining a vocabulary and systematizing signature moves, steps, phrases, sequencing; to “counting” movement progressions; to the one-instructor-per-class model, even if multiple instructors teaching simultaneously are key to the form; to grade-format evaluations, and so on. This excruciating process conducive to World Dance preservation *at the archives* could be addressed as “cultural” translation, but that would be a misleading (and lazy) euphemism.

This is not to say that World Dance at the archives is fake or lacking in quality, and even less an admonition that “it shouldn’t be done.” What I am interested in getting across is that World Dance is a practice in itself. And that under the guise of Dance, World Dance is always already fusion. World Dance is happening at that threshold where mobilized/mobilizing life (as it occurs out there, in the world) is processed for recuperation, and in order to revitalize Dance. Processing here means enabling as well as disciplining; producing and repressing. Recuperating here means giving a set form: institutionalizing, organizing, administering, accounting, mapping, classifying, framing into intangible production something out there that is tangibly unproductive; and turning a source into a resource.

Worlding dances as desire

Toward what ends should we invest knowledge/learning about that intangible called World Dance? Dance studies, as a discipline, must face these entanglements of knowledge and desire in general, and more so when it comes to World Dance. What is legitimating this object, and the ends (justifications) inscribed in it? What is arranging this desire to learn, and to learn about world dances? We must admit that we are in the machine of global capital, that our learning is being financed (Spivak 2004, 557 *et passim*). The hard questions rush in: Who benefits from introducing a World Dance perspective into Dance Studies? Dance is a wild field when it comes to getting away with unchecked pervasive ideologies structuring difference (racism, sexism, classism, culturalism), and dancers and dance scholars enjoy the privileges of sanctioned ignorance—the pleasures of toying, irresponsibly and unaccountably, with carefully disciplined bodies as if they were to be found in nature, with sentient embodiments as if founded in trained yet intractable memories, with displacements of identities onto bodily movements severed from subjectivities, with access to imagined exotic otherness as if it were actually the embodied essence of dancing others.

These licenses to play with world dances are serious, not so much because of culturalist ethical concerns (lack of respect for others' traditions, appropriations, fetishizations, or misrepresentations). Focus on these kinds of concerns, when addressed formally as in "anti-racism," elicit moral responses (shame and guilt) that obscure serious political "anti-racist" reflection and action.¹⁵ Seriousness here concerns the distribution of resources, the pay-checks: *the directionality of the pay-checks in World Dance as it circulates in globalization*. Opening up the Dance field to World Dance does not automatically beget the necessary material shifts that would enable institutional access and support the necessary competition for resources that would transform power relations in Dance. Who keeps the World Dance collections? Who finances World Dance in globalization? Who owns the modes of production of World Dance? Who gets to decide which dances and dancers qualify as worldly? Who gets to present World Dance, where, and for the spectatorial pleasure of whom? Who provides the dancing labor? Who migrates with little more than world dancing labor to sell for his/her subsistence in the World Dance metropolis of the world? Who has no choice but to dance their way into the world and who world-dances for the heck of it? And who gets to write the stories about how this is happening, choosing what to tell and what to ignore? Framed in terms of "otherness," world dancers' aspirations (the Other's desire) remain unaddressed and even enigmatic to those running the Dance field—and, presumably, to the others themselves.

Dancing into World Dance

While still wondering about what is at stake in World Dance and its connections to globalization, I would hope that world dancers would jump into the conversation. Here we face a problem from the outset: "World dancer," anyone? Let me rephrase: do any dancers, whether in Dance or out there in the world, identify as a *world dancer*? I have not located a single one. Not yet. Practitioners of a World Dance form, yes; applicants to World Dance teaching positions, yes; World Dance scholars, maybe—especially when pushed into territorial feuds within dance studies; but world dancers per se, no. World Dance is something we do—under duress (i.e., within the confines of Dance festivals, Dance departments, Dance anthologies), but the rubric, as of yet, has not entered the complex realm of subject-ive formations. World Dance remains exogenous to dancers, who practice and hold the knowledges that compose this threshold in between the Dance/Art/Dance Studies archive and the dancing/Anthropology/Cultural Studies of Dance archive. World Dance is a collection of discrete, rare objects (specific "other" dances) that materialize only through the labor of selected dancers (chosen out there in the world) who perform within the parameters of the Dance field. Entering World Dance entails considerable maneuvers in terms of translation and translation.¹⁶

Dancers who wish to (make a living by) enter(ing) World Dance must learn to accommodate themselves to the dictates of the World Dance pedagogical and

presentational formats, and to the parameters of World Dance promoted aesthetics and values. A myriad of translations take place in this process, as well as endless validating voyages between "home" and "abroad." Two recurrent (and thus apparently) necessary efforts include: first, the work of teaching scholars, critics, and students on how to "read" and, hopefully, appreciate the particular (aspiring) World Dance form; and second, the job of tailoring the given World Dance form to the requirements of the (well-established) pedagogical and presentational settings.

Aspiring "world dancers" (identified by specific World Dance forms such as Odissi, Hula, or Samba; or by geopolitical identifiers such as Balinese dance, Senegalese dance, or Cambodian dance; or by a combination of national and sociofunctional markers such as Javanese court dance or Tibetan temple dances; or by referencing dance practices pertaining to minorities such as North American or South American Native and Tribal Dances—criteria which are duly specified when specialists and practitioners find it pedagogically and promotionally convenient) must *talk* willing dance students and curious scholars *into* valuing and recognizing the form that they embody and practice. As a result, teaching how to appreciate and/or practice a world dance requires one to ascribe to a worldview composed of culturalist interpretations imposed from above (those of the Dance field) that, while representing the triumph of the global, always reinstalls a reconfigured local call. This relocalization of difference (into "native," "courtly," "sacred," "Senegalese" (as if representing a whole nation), or alluding to renowned localized, rooted sensibilities such as "tango" and sexualized passion or "samba" and racial democracy) builds up a fascinating (exotic), diverse (multicultural), and politically correct (leveling and all-inclusive) world buffet of dancing choices catered to anti-racist whiteness with recruitment of people of color. There is no visibility and no chance of landing a position or a job in World Dance without learning these relocalized translations and without, in turn, owning and teaching them back.

In addition, successful "world dancers" must agree to accommodate themselves to the available presentational spaces, the rehearsal and teaching studios, and the expected pedagogical formats of dance classes. The pace at which a world dance is taught and the judgments on the results of world dance classes, as well as the tensions between the validation of creative vis-à-vis preservationist concerns attached to particular world dance forms, impose technically frustrating and often irreconcilable conditions upon teachers and students alike. Transmitting World Dance in globalization entails a process of loss-in-translation, even when that knowledge is imparted by expert teachers. The losses are both qualitative and political: Teachers in World Dance are required to fetishize the dance form, the culture it stands for, and even themselves as representatives of both. Importing dancing bodies and knowledges as World Dance does not amount to articulating the Dance field to the "dancing happening out there in the world." World dancers incorporated as scholars and practitioners in small numbers, as enriching supplements, with few resources at their disposal, and under exigencies

of assimilation frequently coded as “professionalism” while retaining “authenticity” (the allure of differently rooted “traditions”), are unable to bring the outside and rupture the terms of incorporation into the Dance world.

World Dance is a site of convoluted “otherness” in other regards as well. Not all professional “world dancers” are racially or ethnically “others”; some practice World Dance forms as a choice. These dancers, frequently but not exclusively, cosmopolitan white women, are driven by modernist sensibilities to search for a cultural elsewhere either to question their own socio-ideological positionings or to expand their aesthetic and even ethical horizons (Hannerz 2006, Nava 2002). They enter World Dance as “others” to racially, ethnically, and thus more “authentically” validated “world dancers”—the ones practicing the dances of the cultures to which they belong. Entanglements in terms of otherness here multiply as dances, the practices, which intersect with physicalized, racist readings of embodiments as well as with issues of access indicating the interventions of class and geopolitics. World dancers practicing dances other than those culturally, nationally, or racially ascribed to them, follow “elective affinities” made up of identifications and follow desires, in conjunction with opportunities to enact these cross-overs. They enter conflictively into World Dance on at least three accounts: as others to more “authentic” world dancers, as not other enough to Dance, and as (especially when racial identifications intervene) the wrong others to World Dance.

Belonging, in World Dance as in global culture, is a murky issue. In globalization, roots (those of the “authentic” world dancers) are transportable and transported, affinities (those of the “wannabe” world dancers) are available, consumable, and subject to choice. Dictates of “legitimate” representation are installed as part of the marketing of differences, summoning some into translatable (and thus assimilated/ assimilatable) “nativism” and others into tasting, and even serious practicing of “multiculturalism” with certain restraints. These World Dance populations, however, are required to maintain their differences under the peril of canceling out World Dance as a supplement to Dance. In sum, these misunderstandings are encouraged and repressed in World Dance, given that World Dance works under the assumption that there are “real” differences out there that are brought into Dance in pristine form and without causing deformations—the assumption being that hybridization and fusion come later, as creative and exploratory exercises under Dance–Choreographic control.

Much as in Ethnomusicology, and its more recent offspring of World Music, World Dance permits a permeability affordable specifically to artists with ethnographic inclinations as well as to ethnographers with artistic interests (Feld 2000), who, given certain conditions of marketability, collaborate on uneven footings and with uneven results. The resources available to professional “world dancers,” however, are scarce when compared to those of World Music, whether they are “natives” or “native-inspired,” and the necessary embodiment of World Dance performances, unlike the disembodied circulation of World Music recordings, establishes a permanent demand for the physicalized performance of perceived

differences. In this sense, “native-inspired” world dancers, no matter how authentically other they perform, are required to include physically authentic “Natives” (or people perceived as such through racialized traits) in their presentations and are forced to share recognition, resources, and opportunities—not necessarily equitably. This is a condition imposed by Dance as a restrictive marketable art: World dancers on both sides of the “native”/“native-inspired” divide, in order to succeed, must collaborate as they transmit World Dance, cooperatively traversing assimilation and translation, and dissimulating these impositions.

This is the World Dance scenario onto which we are thrown as world dancers and cultural intermediaries, worlded differently and yet encountered in the process of making World Dance. An ethics should be shaped in terms of World Dance (not in general terms, but in terms of a practice like Lacan’s ethics of Psychoanalysis) where we make decisions, decisions to recognize our worlded differences and to act upon them, implying not only formal acknowledgments—as in anti-racism—but also the redistribution of resources (knowledge, opportunities, jobs, to name a few)—as in a committed anti-racism (Goldberg 2004).

World Dance as neighboring

What if dancers out there in the world decide to reserve the right not to enjoy the privileges of entering World Dance as others, refusing, as it were, to participate (Hardt and Negri 2000) as dancers encoded through sovereign trans-coders of the Dance field? I am thinking of dancers giving up translatability as practitioners of different dances, and instead establishing their presence in the world as neighbors rather than as “others” or as “the same.”

I have chosen to address here, briefly and experimentally, the notion of *vecinos* (neighbors) and *vecindad* (neighborliness) as instances of proximity—which do not constitute an idyllic relationality, but rather a permanent negotiation based on the encounters among others as infinite multiplicities without (and outside) the “same” as an identitarian foundation. These negotiations would set into motion the constitutional threshold of difference (Badiou 2001, Reinhard 2005).¹⁷ Would “neighbor-ing” help to rethink issues of “collecting otherness,” of appropriation and fetishization in World Dance? How would “neighbor-ing” reconfigure World Dance encounters as we reconsider identity and belonging in globalization?

These dancers would install partially articulated neighborhoods of movements rather than discrete dance forms and traditions or dance entities *qua* things: dancers invested in outdoing the New Age attitude that reduces the Other to a mirror image or to a means of self-realization and self-enrichment; and on the other side of the World Dance divide, dancers who refuse to represent “otherness” as they seek to enter the Dance field, with its hold on knowledge and resources as well as its troubles and deficiencies. This encounter would not amount to a unity or a synthesis of conflicts, but “to a mode of sustaining conflict in politically productive ways” (Butler 1997, 269, original emphasis). Butler is proposing to develop a

sense of alliance, a new kind of conflictual encounter that would stay away from reinscribing and resubordinating differences to a politics of "inclusion."

Neighboring? In World Dance, as we currently know it, differences are recognized and incorporated as "other" (other dances, other dancers). A politics of permanently negotiating alliances would entail reestablishing the parameters and methods of the whole Dance field. Obsession with difference coupled with peaceful coexistence will not deliver more than excessive, sentimentalized empathy (Kamboureli 2007).

Although renowned political philosophers and influential postcolonial critics have not taken up Dance as a field of inquiry or object of serious interest, Dance as corporeal movement and mobilization offers the possibility to encounter a wild outside to Empire's sovereign rulings. World Dance, in particular, can be thought of as an open-ended, unlimited possibility of movements, dancers entering one by one, as singularities that amount to a "not All" (Reinhard following Lacan 2005) or to the "multiple without One" (Badiou 2001). Rather than a form of classification and an emergent discipline, World Dance would thus participate in the making of an untotalizing alternative to globalism, based on *decisions* (not on observations or accommodations to prescriptions) to expose our movements to the world.¹⁸ These ethico-political decisions would entail dismantling otherness and differences as sources of identity and belonging, risking explorations into dissolution and betting on chosen, eventful reconstitutions. World dancers affiliated as neighbors, neighboring as we move each other into dancing, outside rubrics, disciplines, and traditions. Beyond difference, otherness, and marginality, dancing as moving the outside.

Notes

- 1 These thoughts have been prompted by recent attention on the part of philosophers such as Derrida (1997) and Badiou (2001) to rethink "otherness" and what in the Humanities has come to be termed the "ethical turn" (often linked to the thought of Levinas) in the face of the violent, catastrophic conflicts experienced in the twentieth century and their current escalations.
- 2 For a discussion of the concept of "*el afuera*," that I'm translating as "out there" and "outside" throughout this essay, see Foucault (2004).
- 3 For a historical analysis of the term, see Foster (2009). I use Choreography with a capital 'C' to connote the privileged status given to the ability to create or read meaningful and/or effective configurations of movement based on abstract notions such as space and time. For an insightful discussion of the role of the choreographer in modern dance, see Martin (1992).
- 4 This is a compound definition that tries succinctly to reflect dance anthropologists' efforts to find a way to critique the imposition of the view of a eurocentrically informed observer (who would see and interpret all cultural complexes involving dancing as only "dance" or as not dancing) over the Native's point of view. Historical accounts of dance anthropology repeatedly point out the methodological difficulties of fitting studies of "dance" into the scientific paradigm guiding comparative studies of culture: reliable

observation techniques; establishment of variables and parameters of classification; coherent interpretive frameworks for evaluating social relevance. Much of the discipline has been devoted to providing answers to these questions in terms of universal human behavior, of reflection of social structures, and of symbolic potency. For discussions of divergent terminology and ensuing perspectives in dance anthropology (which some refuse to call dance, favoring "human movement," "moving bodies," etc.), see, for example, Castaldi (2005), Farnell (1999), Kaeppler (1978), Reed (1998), Williams (2005).

- 5 Wong (2009) and Hammergren (2009) address such complex cases of "international artist."
- 6 See Lévi-Strauss's (1966) argument in favor of cold versus hot history societies and Fabian's (1983) critique of the ethnographic present.
- 7 See Efron's *Gesture and Environment* (1942) and La Barre's "The Cultural Basis of Emotions and Gestures" (1947). Comparative studies on gestures and sign language among North American Indians had been developed previously by Mallery (1972 [1881]).
- 8 See Mead's *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1961 [1928]), Benedict's *Patterns of Culture* (1934), and Bateson's *Naven* (1936), as well as Mead and Bateson's photographic study of Balinese dance, *Balinese Character* (1942).
- 9 Franz Boas, who trained more than a dozen prominent American anthropologists (including those first writing on dance), wrote endlessly and critically about race, conducting research in all fields of physical, linguistic, and cultural anthropology, debating the complexity of racial differences, racial intermixing, and racial antagonism. See Boas's collections of essays from the 1890s to the 1930s in *Race, Language and Culture* (1982), and in *Anthropology and Modern Life* (1962).
- 10 For an informative discussion of the uses of "ethnicity" in Anthropology, see Cohen's essay "Ethnicity: Problem and focus in Anthropology" (1978, 379).
- 11 See Foucault's discussion of biopolitics and race in *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975–1976* (2003), and Giorgio Agamben's *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (1998).
- 12 On the concept of the "inoperative," see Agamben (1998) following Jean-Luc Nancy's *The Inoperative Community* (1991).
- 13 See UNESCO's Recommendation on Intangible Cultural Heritage at www.unesco.org/heritage/intangible/recommendation/html, accessed February 13, 2004.
- 14 Note that this list *qua* catalogue is tellingly incomplete and it should be, given the nature of collections.
- 15 For a discussion of the distinctions between "anti-racialism" (concerned with the categories and concepts of "race") and "anti-racism" (focusing on removing the structures that reproduce the conditions of racism), see David T. Goldberg (2004).
- 16 Srinivasan (2009) and Chatterjea (2009) extensively address the labors of translocation and translation that world dancers must undergo both as practitioners and as scholars.
- 17 Following Badiou's discussion in "Does the Other Exist" (see *Ethics* 2001), to the point of which I am capable, the "same" sets up a paradox in that, on the one hand, sameness as identity should be dismantled given that "infinite alterity is quite simply what there is" (every being is nothing other than an "infinite deployment of differences"); and, on the other hand, the "same" (i.e., what there is not) is "what comes to be" through processes of truth, "the labor that brings some truths into the world." In his view, "it

is our capacity for truth—our capacity to be that ‘same’ that a truth convokes to its own *sameness*—that deserves our attention given that “only a truth is, as such, *indifferent to differences*” (emphasis added). Rather than an ethics of difference, invested in recognizing the other so as to respect “differences”—and the consequent reproduction of identities based on the “same” principle of differentiation (which is nothing other than the identity of the wealthy West)—Badiou proposes to focus on the problem of recognizing the “same,” and on elaborating an ethics of “truths in the plural” which should be, simultaneously, specific: ethics of politics, of love, of science, of art. For a helpful, critical discussion of Badiou’s tendency to fall back into a universalism of sameness by foregrounding the power of thought to produce equality and cast off differences, see Santner (2005, 125–29). Making use of Agamben’s proposal of an entirely new sort of logic that stresses the noncoincidence of every identity with itself (and thus avoids operating in terms of memberships in bounded sets of totalities set against each other), Santner introduces new ways to conceive of ethical responsibility.

- 18 Stressing the possibility of intervening by way of decisions does not amount to simple voluntarism. We are immersed in a social world, structured and overdetermined. However, a new conceptualization of subjectivity that highlights, following Agamben, the noncoincidence with oneself, coupled with the emergence of an eventful situation (a situation that provides new possibilities but that cannot be produced at will) allows for agency. Agency here would be the decision to not follow the socially scripted and to open up to the unknown. Badiou theorizes this possibility in terms of “truth-processes,” that is for taking advantage as it were of a sudden rupture, a dissonance, a contradiction in the social fabric interpellating us into being as members of a totalizing set in confrontation to other totalizing sets. Fidelity to this disorganizing event and experience, keeping close to its materiality and uniqueness, amounts to a decision to risk recognizing the tears and engaging in the processes of their elaboration. In Santner’s terms, “one cannot give oneself the possibility of new possibilities. Something must *happen*, something beyond one’s control, calculations and labor, something that comes from the locus of the Other” (2005, 123).