Philip Auslander, Rebecca Schneider, and Diana Taylor (Auslander 2008; Scheider 2011; Taylor 2003). These discussions of records and reconstructions would at many points accord productively with the claims of this collection, and at other times problematize them. On another front, since the nation-state is a prominent entity in the anthology, the emphases of transnational studies (for example, on diasporic cultural production and on cross-border patterns of exchange) provide a rich body of insight to complement and counter this collection's tendency to focus on national categories.

It is inevitable that some scholars who favor interdisciplinary work will see the absence of these and other discussions as an omission; hopefully, they will also see it as an opportunity. By turning the field's gaze inward with this collection, the editors have facilitated some much-needed temperature-taking. They have intervened in a sticky debate, producing results that should be both contested and respected. The scholars collected in *Dance on Its Own Terms*, by supplying at times provocative answers to enduring questions, have ensured that we will continue to debate not just the vagaries of dance's many histories, but the vagaries of its many historians.

Seth Stewart Williams
Columbia University

Notes

1. I should mention that Catherine Turocy was, for some time, my boss. Having loved working with her, I no doubt lack for objectivity.

2. Lawler discusses the problem of pictorial records as source material throughout *The Dance in Ancient Greece* (1964), a theme that also crops up in many of her earlier articles. She weighed in on such questions to humorous effect in a letter to *The Classical Journal* (1965, 267).

Works Cited

Auslander, Philip. 2008. *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Franco, Susanne, and Marina Nordera, eds. 2007. *Dance Discourses: Keywords in Dance Research*. New York: Routledge.

Franko, Mark. 1989. "Repeatability, Reconstruction and Beyond." *Theater Journal* 41(1): 56–74.

Lawler, Lillian. 1964. *The Dance in Ancient Greece*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

——. 1965. "Are They Dancing?" *The Classical Journal* 60(6): 267.

Schneider, Rebecca. 2011. *Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Reenactment*. New York: Routledge.

Taylor, Diana. 2003. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Dance and Politics

edited by Alexandra Kolb. 2011. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang AG, 348 pp., photographs, 1 table, notes, index. $87.95 paper.
doi:10.1017/S0149767713000156

It is common for many dance artists and scholars to move within nations and between countries as part of their professions. With this multitude of lived, global trajectories comes the awareness of site-specific, issue-specific, and audience-specific views on dance, work with dance, and reception of dance. One such intriguing aspect concerns different articulations of dancing the political, and of defining, debating, and comparing its forms, affects, and effects. What were the political factors behind the arrests and killings of Indonesian classical dancers between 1965 and 1966 (Larasati 2013)? How can these historical events be related to the desires of today's European choreographers to create political dances without explicit political content or identity politics (Hammergren 2012)? Why was dance made a tool of foreign policy and exported across the world during the Cold War by both the Soviet Union and the United States, and why does this not happen today (Franko 2007, 17)? Why has the field of Dance Studies taken so long to recognize the established tradition of investigations of the interrelations of migration and dance (Scolieri 2008, v)?

With questions like these in mind, it is timely to see the publication of an anthology on dance and politics that seeks to explore "the implications of dance in the explicitly political realm" (xiii). As editor Alexandra Kolb herself states, the definition of the expression "an

explicitly political realm" is ambiguous; but, as the articles show, this can be a fruitful point of departure for investigating different meanings, as well as for provoking our understanding of the limits of the concept of "the political."

In her introductory chapter, Kolb sets a framework for various meanings, and articulates four basic modes by which dance and politics can interact: through the content of dance, through its genre and form, through its impact on external political reality, and through the effects of state and governmental politics on dance itself. I find this a very useful model, which could benefit from being read in tandem with Mark Franko's essay, "Dance and the Political" (2007). Franko's work includes a differently articulated description of the kind of politics we use when we speak about dance and politics. He writes about the power of dance to make and unmake identity; the way in which interpretation is inferred in articulating the political; the relation of dancer to choreographer (which is a political relation); how dance acts in its role as public art; and dance's "social conditions of possibility," or how it is performed and produced (2007, 16–7). This broad definition can, of course, risk emptying "the political" of its interpretative force, but it still seems congenial to the understanding of the concept from a perspective that is not geographically limited.

Against this backdrop of an extended concept, it is interesting to note that only one author in *Dance and Politics* makes a clear distinction between real and purely symbolic politics. Roger Copeland's main thesis is to critique the ways in which "the growing emphasis on traditional and popular culture . . . is played at the *expense* of individual Western choreographic 'authors'" (55). He thereby denounces scholars who have a vision of choreographic authorship, "which conceives of the dancemaker as 'laborer and collaborator' rather than 'inspired genius'" (40). This in turn leads Copeland to make a distinction between genuine political action in the real world, and the "purely imaginary" and symbolic substitutes for serious political work performed by academic scholars (62). There is, indeed, much to discuss in this densely written chapter, but in relation to my initial paragraph, I find it crucial to highlight local geographies and hence the difference between his description of the state of dance studies and choreography in the United States, and the aesthetics favored by many choreographers working in Europe. I would argue that the emphasis on collective work that Copeland sees as only a scholarly preference reflects the manner in which many European choreographers of a younger generation would describe themselves and their dances. Hence, it is not an academic analysis made in the ivory tower, but a real danced politics in the public sphere, created in order to explore issues of ownership, aesthetic criteria, and the nature of so-called immaterial labor. In this case, both Copeland's and my own understanding of the interaction between dance and politics are deeply marked by the local context in which they are articulated.

A positive effect of the selection of authors and themes in *Dance and Politics* is how the different articles can be made to speak to one another. In this manner, they open spaces for readers to engage in tracing dialogues, even if they are not explicit in each chapter. Alexandra Kolb's analysis of work by choreographers Johann Kresnik and David Dorfman disputes Copeland's division between real political action and symbolic substitutes. In her striking comparison of the work *Ulrike Meinhof* (1990) by Kresnik, who was a member of the German so-called Baader-Meinhof Group, with Dorfman's dance about the Weathermen/Weather Underground (a far-left organization in the U.S.), Kolb succeeds in showing how choreography can compel us in meaningful ways to critically reflect on the activist practices of terrorist organizations in different countries. Her analysis makes it clear that we need to historically and geographically contextualize the intellectual space from which we are evaluating the political effects of choreography.

Another example of this dialogic nature is to read Victoria Marks's text on her choreography *Not About Iraq* (2007) as a comment on Kolb's analysis of Dorfman's *Underground* (2006), in which the American consumerist society and political climate of apathy and disengagement play a central role. When Marks was working with her own choreography, she asked questions concerning political engagement: "Could I make a dance that directly confronted the current political moment without being didactic? Could a dance be a forum in which to better understand my own

problematic sense of citizenship?" (225). In this compelling essay, Marks reveals a completely opposite attitude to ignorance and political apathy, and she articulates the possibility of a heightened concern for the suffering and violence of others, even if the events take place far away. Ramsay Burt's emotive analysis of work by Teresa De Keersmaeker and Tino Sehgal adds to this perspective of personal engagement with his focus on political affect. He points to how "performances of powerlessness and vulnerability" (259) have the power to appeal to our individual imaginations of where we stand in relation to war, and to social and physical degradation.

What is particularly intriguing about *Dance and Politics* is how it makes the reader aware of the power of dancing, with its potential to create both positive and negative effects. In contrast to Victoria Marks's empowering narrative on the ways in which dancing and politics merge and to Burt's insistence on how performance can make beholders aware of their own material presence, Suzanne Little provides a sharp and convincing critique of how the political fails in dance when a choreographer tries to represent the "traumatic 'real' in performance" (234). Little's analysis focuses on the reference to the Abu Ghraib photographs in Douglas Wright's dance work *Black Milk* (2006), and shows how choreography "aimed at critique seemed perversely to reinscribe the original humiliation tactics and power hierarchies of the political realm that created them" (233). Little's insightful text places the context of the live performance event in the forefront of the discussion. She notes, for example, that the dancers, unlike the Abu Ghraib prisoners, have beautiful, aesthetically pleasing, healthy bodies, which removes much of the horror from the event. She also underlines how the photographs themselves are "bound up with performativity" (249), and when they are kept in circulation through performance they will continue to re-enact the unequal power structures that originally contrived them.

The multifaceted views on the power of dancing prevalent in the anthology speaks to the socio-cultural and political force of this human, corporeal practice to a much greater degree than if we simply conceived of dancing as a universally valid kinesthetic pleasure and as "inherently related to ideals such as dignity, equality, justice, and peace" (210). Naomi M. Jackson points this out with elegant clarity in her text on dance and human rights. She should also be praised for the excellent way in which she extends the anthology's mostly Western focus, for example by placing the attacks against dance by the Taliban in Afghanistan side-by-side with the cabaret license in New York that often prohibits social dancing in the city.

As Kolb argues in the preface to the anthology, there has been a lack of books with a comprehensive and overarching view of the relationships between dance and politics. However, there have been numerous exhibitions and conferences addressing the theme, including the successful "Communications: Dance, Politics & Co-Immunity" symposium that took place in Germany in 2010 (http://dance-tech.tv/video-category/giessen). Nevertheless, in this symposium, as sometimes occurs in other such conferences, dance was included as only one part in a much wider definition of "aesthetic practices." *Dance and Politics* is therefore useful because of the insights it offers about theatrical dancing, and because it paves the way for further important investigations. Given the impact of global perspectives on dancing, one crucial issue to explore is the question of how danced politics travel between cultures, societies, and local aesthetics. This approach could perhaps help us understand why choreography focusing on "radical form—as a new way of producing, disrupting, or interrogating the definition of meaning" (from Kolb's introduction, 17) cannot be encountered in the same way by different groups of audiences and scholarly interpreters, as for example a dance in which urban relations and intra-communitarian issues are central. It would also highlight additional aspects of the broad spectrum between perceiving dance politically and conceiving the politics of dance.

Lena Hammergren
Stockholm University

Works Cited

Dance-Tech TV. "Video Category Archives: Dance and Politics, Giessen, November 11–14 2010." http://dance-tech.tv/video-category/giessen (accessed February 10, 2013).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0149767713000156 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Franko, Mark. 2007. "Dance and the Political." In *Dance Discourses: Keywords in Dance Research*, edited by S. Franco and M. Nordera, 11–28. London and New York: Routledge.

Hammergren, Lena. 2012. "Spaces of Encounter: Dancing Democracy in the Nordic Region." In *Dance Spaces: Practices of Movement*, edited by S. Ravn and L. Rouhiainen, 39–55. Odense, Denmark: University of Southern Denmark.

Larasati, Rachmi Diyah. 2013. *The Dance That Makes You Vanish: Cultural Reconstruction in Post Genocide Indonesia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Scolieri, Paul. 2008. "Global/Mobile: Re-orienting Dance and Migration Studies." *Dance Research Journal* 40(2): v–xx.

Directing the Dance Legacy of Doris Humphrey: The Creative Impulse of Reconstruction

by Lesley Main. 2012. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press. xi + 190 pp., photographs, notes, bibliography, index. $29.95 paper.
doi:10.1017/S014976771300020X

Who was Doris Humphrey? And what was her work? We could ask these questions about any figure in dance. The search for definitive answers would be clotted with interventions and interpretations, hearsay and deliberate refocusing. A new dance work inextricably combines concept with performance, but there's no foolproof way of preserving the entity composed of that created object and the performers who brought it into being. In the other arts, reliable documents can be consulted: a written text, a musical score, a recording of the original performance. That history can be taken for granted and left alone—or it can be used to create new histories of up-to-date interest. In dance, textual verifications either do not exist or have inherent shortcomings that alter the work. All dance performance works change over time, along with our understanding of crucial meta-definers like meaning, quality, and style. So it is tricky to assume that we know a dance, even one we have seen.

Lesley Main, who has undertaken the rehabilitation of Doris Humphrey in the UK, gained her perception of the choreographer from her teacher, Ernestine Stodelle. At the beginning of her book, *The Dance Technique of Doris Humphrey and Its Creative Potential*, Stodelle quotes her mentor: "I always thought students should learn principles of movement and be encouraged to expand or embroider on those in their own way" (Stodelle 1978, vii–viii). This remark, taken with Stodelle's title, pigeonholes Humphrey as a teacher, not an eminent choreographer. When I looked at my own copy of *The Art of Making Dances*, I found I had underlined the same words, plus the sentence that precedes them in Humphrey's introductory chapter: "I never believed in teaching with a set vocabulary of movements, hardened into technical sequences" (Humphrey 1959, 19). Humphrey assumed that these words would fall on fertile ground, given what she foresaw as "the astonishing spread of the modern dance through the educational system." Her book is matter-of-fact—a teaching manual for dance composition students. She hoped it would contribute to a developing theory of choreography, but not, I think, to the erasure of her own choreographic accomplishment.

There is no urtext for any of Humphrey's early dances, except for a few primitive films. Her unfinished autobiography, published first in 1966 by Selma Jeanne Cohen's *Dance Perspectives* and completed by Cohen, ends in 1928 when Humphrey, Pauline Lawrence, and Charles Weidman departed from Denishawn and began making independent work. All the Labanotation scores were made late in Humphrey's life or after her life, when second thoughts and generational slippage had occurred. Aside from scattered references to moments in Humphrey–Weidman's and Limón's dances that illustrate her theory, *The Art* doesn't tell you how *she* choreographed anything, or what any of these dances should look like in its entirety.

After Humphrey's death in 1958, professional productions of her dances became rare. I first saw a few of them done by the José Limón company in the early 1960s, but today you'd have to do some digging to find one. Re-reading Humprey's book, dance academics of the 1980s perceived Humphrey as dictatorial, a stern formalist, despite her many offbeat opinions. When her dances are performed now, they usually represent the earliest, experimental