

Democratic Bodies? Reflections on «Postmodern Dance» in the United States and Finland

Hanna Järvinen

ABSTRACT

By looking at how 'postmodern dance' signifies in the dominant American and local Finnish contexts, I offer a critical reading of how the notion of 'democracy' is intertwined with particular dancing bodies and ideas of nation and ethnicity. This requires a historical outline for how 'democracy' entered the discourse of dance, and specifically, how its meaning has shifted in relation to the canon of the art form. Using the contrast between the hegemonic centre and what is constituted as a (geographic, linguistic, ethnic) periphery reveals how 'democracy' is used in contemporary dance discourses to obfuscate power relations inherent to art and its institutions, especially in relation to the agency of dancers.

ABSTRAKTI

Vertaamalla kuinka eri tavoin 'postmoderni tanssi' käsitteenä merkityksellistyy vallitsevassa amerikkalaisessa ja paikallisessa suomalaisessa kontekstissa, pyrin kriittiseen luentaan 'demokratian' käsitteen sitoutumisesta hyvin erityisiin tanssiin ruumiisiin ja ajatuksiin kansakunnasta ja etnisyydestä. Tämä vaatii sivupolkua demokratia-käsitteen historiasta tanssin diskurssissa ja erityisesti tavoista, joilla sen merkitys muuttui suhteessa taidemuodon kaanoniin. Hegemonisen keskustan ja (maantieteellisesti, kielellisesti, etnisesti) periferiaksi määritetyn erojen kautta paljastuu, kuinka 'demokratiaa' käytetään nykytanssin diskurssissa hämärtämään taiteen ja sen instituutioiden valtasuhteita, erityisesti mitä tulee tanssijoiden toimijuuteen.

Democratic Bodies? Reflections on «Postmodern Dance» in the United States and Finland

Hanna Järvinen

Introduction

Switching from one cultural context or historical period to another often causes a sense of disturbance: words that connote in a manner that seems obvious and self-evident in one time and place suddenly no longer make sense. How and what kind of dance is connected to 'democracy' is a case in point. In the following, I offer a critical reading of how the notion of democracy is intertwined with particular dancing bodies and ideas of nation and ethnicity. Using the contrast between the hegemonic centre and what is constituted as a (geographic, linguistic, ethnic) periphery reveals how democracy is used in contemporary dance discourses to obfuscate the power relations inherent in the apparatus of art and its institutions¹, including academic research on dance.

As a discourse of power, art functions in anything but a democratic manner: decisions about aesthetic value are not voted on, not even by the 'citizens' who are subjects to its 'state'. On the contrary, the institutions of art seek to limit who may be considered its subjects and what may be validated as art. (Bourdieu 1995, esp. 40–43) In other words, for something to be considered art, it is subjected to the discourse of art, which will inevitably result in uneven power relations between subjects.² From the perspective of political agency, therefore, it is difficult to resolve notions of democracy (majority rule and social equality) with this kind of inherent elitism of art as an apparatus (notions of 'masterpieces' or authors as representatives of a period, style or 'nation'). To unpack what 'democratic' signifies in dance requires attention to specific cultural contexts and a longer history of power relations; a

tracing of how the uses of 'democracy' have shifted in relation to what is and is not considered 'art' in dance.

Democratic Exports

Writing on art dance at the turn of the twentieth century, critics rarely use the term democracy. However, in *Modern Dancing and Dancers*, J. E. Crawford Fitch (1912, 27) applies it to separate ballet from other forms of dance: 'If dance is essentially the art of democracy, springing out of the gladness of the crowd, the ballet in its origin is aristocratic.' Fitch is one of the early twentieth-century authors who truly created the foundation of the hegemonic narrative of how dance as a cultural practice developed and how its different forms relate to each other: the claim about dance as 'the art of democracy' follows his argument against dance as mere 'amusement', whether in ancient societies or in the ballroom (Fitch 1912, 15–24). Fitch and his contemporaries not only represent dances associated with the upper classes and European courts as the pinnacle of human civilisation, but they also separate staged art dance (dance subject to the apparatus of art) from dance as social practice in order to associate the former with 'high art' and the latter with 'popular culture'. This exemplifies the European heritage of dance history, as well as how that history associates with the author's subject position – it is hardly surprising that for a British author, aristocracy correlates with 'high art' and has a positive connotation.

No wonder, then, that the earliest example I have found to explicitly associate staged art dance with democracy dates back to 1915–16, when the Russian

impresario Sergei Diaghilev brought his company, the Ballets Russes, to tour the United States and Canada. Lacking all the star dancers from their European triumphs, on whom the advance publicity had focused, the managers of the tour at the Metropolitan Opera quickly shifted the publicity campaign to argue that in this company, every dancer was a star, and that because every dancer was equally good, the company was artistically democratic – a word designed to appeal to American audiences. (Järvinen 2010) In contrast, contemporary Western European media tended to represent Russia as a 'backward' autocratic state and Russians as not-quite-European.³

Somewhat paradoxically, the Ballets Russes exemplifies the kind of art that emerged due to the democratisation process of the Russian state. A period of general unrest following the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5 resulted in the 1905 Russian Revolution and the transition from an absolutist to constitutional monarchy in the foundation of the first Russian State Duma. However, the 1906 parliamentary reform in the autonomous Grand Duchy of Finland made this part of the empire the first country in the world to grant its citizens universal full suffrage (including the right to run for elected office).⁴ The Finnish case quickly became a point of contestation in the Russian Duma: the Constitutional Democrats («Kadets») and liberals hoped that the new constitution in Finland would enforce constitutional order in Russia proper, whilst the more conservative nationalists saw the autonomy of Finland as a threat to the unity of the Empire and a refuge for revolutionaries. (Khripachenko 2014, esp. 20)

In the arts, the 1905 Revolution meant partial relaxation of censorship and emergence of a new kind of public discourse on art, even if the Revolution's aftermath saw increased repression and censorship of culture as well as severe punitive measures directed against those deemed responsible for the unrest. Certain representations of the body and sexuality—including those staged by the Ballets

Russes – only became possible after the Revolution as sexuality, the idea that sexual acts were constitutive of an individual's personality, was associated with the principles of liberalism and constitutional democracy in Russia. (See Järvinen 2014, 200–201, 211–18, 222–25)

In light of this political history, it is significant that democracy is first associated with the Ballets Russes by an Estonian political exile to the United States, Jaan Sibul. As Ivan Narodny,⁵ Sibul wrote several articles on Russia, ballet, and the Russian Ballet for *Musical America*. This magazine was the soapbox of the Musical Bureau of the Metropolitan Opera, who footed the bill for Diaghilev's American exodus. In marked contrast to his earlier articles to the same publication,⁶ Narodny (1915) contrasts the Ballets Russes with the 'decadent artificiality, preconceived emotions and fossilized formalities' of French and Italian ballet, and argues that the company 'strive[s] to keep to the traditions of the race', notably Russian folklore, which has ensured that '[w]hile it is aristocratic politically, Russia has remained democratic artistically.'

However, as the democratic art of the Russians failed to impress,⁷ Narodny again shifted his argument. In *Dance*, he argues that

The art of dancing, as it stands to-day, promises much encouragement for to-morrow. [. . .] The past belongs to the aristocratic ideals, in which the Russian ballet reached the climax. The French were the founders of aristocratic choreography; the Russians transformed it into an aristocratic dramatic art; to the Americans belongs the attempt at a democratic school. (Narodny 1916, 261)

However, Narodny's grounds for concluding that '[t]he future of the art of dancing belongs to America, the country of the cosmic ideals' are quite atypical for the period. The cosmic, he argues, is a development of democratic ideals that will no longer be tied to any past

tradition or race. Positing Isadora Duncan as a first, failed attempt at 'democratic expression', he claims that 'American art naturally lacks fundamentally national elements.' (Ibid., 263–67)

Instead, it is the art of cities and ragtime's syncopated rhythms:

The symbolism of the city is destined to take the place of the symbolism of the country. The New York plasticism will be also the plasticism of Paris and Petrograd. The ethnographic and aristocratic era in the art of dancing has reached the climax of æsthetic development. We are entering the era of cosmic art. (Ibid., 267)

Essentially, Narodny gives American dance the task of both being and representing democracy: democracy is a quality of America, the country without nation or race. As with Flitch, this democratic dance is not tied to individual artists. As far as I know, this is the first time American art dance is joined with democracy as a political credo in a manner that later becomes a staple in American dance history. Some 85 years later, in 'Dancing Democracy', Ann Daly (2002, 8) represents American modern dance as a conscious struggle for democracy in opposition to the European tradition of ballet:

the self-consciously democratic endeavor of modern dance [. . .] that sought to distinguish itself as a democratic art form, in response to the perceived elitism of the European ballet.

Daly proposes that dance is a civic space, where diverse groups of people come together in kinaesthetic empathy and dialogue, and a practice where audience participation in the creative process and in performance cultivates citizenship. In other words, democracy (a political system) is used as a shorthand

for moral ideals of social equality that are opposed to the elitism of (explicitly foreign) ballet.

This juxtaposition speaks of the predominance of aesthetic thinking in the application of the term 'democracy' in dance; in other words, 'the politics of art lies in its aesthetic function,' (Kowal, Siegmund and Martin 2017, 5). Independent of any explicit political message or struggle. As a historian, I find that such aestheticisation ignores both the agency of dancemakers as producers of culture and the uses of power in designating something as art.⁸ Postmodern dance' is a case in point.

Legacies of the Cold War

Sally Banes coined⁹ the concept 'postmodern dance' in the 1980s to differentiate the experimental American dance of the 1960s from American modern dance. Postmodern dance is therefore not *postmodernist* in style or character nor is it dance during or reflecting postmodernism as a historical period. As something that comes after, Banes's postmodern also connotes aesthetically surpassing, as well as superseding, the modern; the terminological choice is indicative of canon formation, a creation of 'vanguard' art in opposition to contemporaneous forms. Consequently, as Susan Manning (1988) argued already in 1988, given subsequent developments in art dance, the Judson Dance Theater could equally be classed as the last instance of modernism.¹⁰

The ghost of American modern dance is even more evident in Banes' evocation of democracy. As Clare Croft (2015, esp. 16–17, 67–71, 87–92) shows, during the Cold War, the State Department of the United States made two crucial moves in strengthening the association of American dance and democracy in its export of American art as anti-Communist propaganda. First, in order to create in modern dance an 'original' American art form in modern dance, the State Department explicitly excluded the European roots of American modern dance; and second, American

art was framed as the export of American ideals of democracy and freedom, in which the civil rights struggles of American minorities were represented as dissent emblematic of the superiority of the political system over Communism. In other words, America was great because it allowed protests even though these protests arose from a lack of representation in a purportedly representational democracy. Moreover, as Hannah Kosstrin (2013, esp. 6–7) argues, American modern dance could represent an ideal of the nation only after the suppression of the actively political left-wing modern dance tradition of the 1930s.

Therefore, when Banes credits the Judson Dance Theater and American postmodern dance as creating *Democracy's Body* – the title of her 1983 book (Banes 1995) – she continues the political discourse of the Cold War. In postmodern dance, European legacies are absent, and contemporary European dance follows the American example, or, in the words of Banes herself, 'Pina Bausch represents a local German outgrowth of certain American first-generation postmodern concerns.' (Banes and Manning 1989, 15) American dance is the dance of the desirable political system, regardless of whether this system or the dancing bodies thus named truly correspond with either principles of democracy or the population of America (Burt 2006, 22).

In contrast to *Terpsichore in Sneakers* (Banes 1987), *Democracy's Body* (1995) emphasises the collective participation and shared ideas in the Judson group, as well as their connections to artists in New York more generally. Yet, given how Narodny framed American art as the art of ragtime and skyscrapers, Banes' use of 'democracy' is rather conspicuously white, as is the history she narrates of American avant-garde and vanguard dance (Banes 1995, esp. xvi–xvii). In her argument, democracy functions as an aestheticisation that unintentionally downplays the contemporaneous political struggle for representation taking place in the dancing bodies of, for example, Alvin Ailey's American Dance Theater at the 92nd Street

YM-YWCA a few miles north of the Judson Church (Kowal 2010, esp. 1–7).

Moreover, the two most cited examples of explicit political protest in the Judson canon, both based on Yvonne Rainer's *Trio A – Convalescent Dance* (1967) and *Trio A with Flags* (1970), postdate Banes' periodisation. In this way, explicit participation in political action becomes the result of formal interest in everyday movement and compositional practices rather than a question of agency or affective reaction to perceived social injustice. Art becomes the ur-site of politics, reducing agency to aesthetics. As Kowal (2010, esp. 244–54) notes, the stakes of black bodies resisting political oppression through everyday movement were quite different from those of white artists taking on the proscenium space, even when both sought to transform what was framed as 'normal'.

Shifting Qualities of 'Democracy'

As the American political system is currently reminding us of all the arguments against democracy from Plato onward (see Christiano 2015), it is high time to ask what purpose 'democracy' serves in the dance historical context: what are the attributes given to these 'democratic' bodies and whose bodies get excluded from the definition? Any universalism that equates democracy with righteousness undermines the freedom of artistic agency that 'democracy' is evoked to serve. In other words, we ought to pay more attention to what justifications are given for calling certain dance forms 'democratic', as such justifications are neither self-evident nor necessarily indicative of a positive political or aesthetic development.

As Clare Bishop (2004, 77–78) points out, what may have seemed indicative of democracy or moral good a few decades back can seem insufficient or outright false today, as

political, moral, and ethical judgments have come

to fill the vacuum of aesthetic judgment in a way that was unthinkable forty years ago. This is partly because postmodernism has attacked the very notion of aesthetic judgment, and partly because contemporary art solicits the viewer's literal interaction in ever more elaborate ways.

The postmodernism that Bishop references is not to be confused with 'postmodern' as the term is used in art dance, but the postmodernist focus on qualities other than the aesthetic has influenced the principles for evaluating dances, including postmodern or contemporary dances, today. In other words, postmodernism requires that postmodern dance be discussed in terms of economic, political and discursive power relations. Bishop continues,

It is no longer enough to say that activating the viewer *tout court* is a democratic act, for every art work – even the most 'open-ended' – determines in advance the depth of participation that the viewer may have with it. [. . .] The tasks facing us today are to analyze how contemporary art addresses the viewer and to assess the quality of the audience relations it produces: the subject position that any work presupposes and the democratic notions it upholds, and how these are manifested in our experience of the work.

In other words, Bishop reveals the fallacy in how postmodern dance practices are viewed as 'democratic' simply because they involve the audience or question the organisation of the (proscenium) stage. Although it may well be argued that the bodies of postmodern dance are 'democratic' in terms of how parts of the body or different kinds of movement are treated, to understand this *as art* already brings about specific power relations. Moreover, calling such practices 'democratic' obfuscates what kinds of subject positions dance presumes, strengthens, or undermines: where

are those dancers and dance aficionados whose bodies this ostensibly democratic art consistently racialises, excludes, and persecutes?

As Banes (1987; 1995), Foster (2002), Burt (2006) and others point out, the Judson artists were crucial in the shifting of the role of the choreographer from the author figure responsible for every step and gesture in the composition towards that of a facilitator in a given performance situation, or author of tasks or structures through which a performance practice gets framed. What Bishop's point underlines, however, is whether this shift produces democracy in art dance – something I see as rather moot as long as the choreographic composition is credited to the name of a singular author. The power inherent in the authorial subject position is exemplified in the case of *Trio A*, originally conceived as a choreography anyone could do, but gradually 'copyrighted' by the choreographer, Yvonne Rainer (2009, esp. 16). Even dance scores or task-based works are not democratic as choreographic processes because their author is always-already epistemologically privileged over the performers or participants – this is the case even in works like Deborah Hay's Solo Performance Commissioning Project (1998–2012), where the choreographer and dancer engage in a degree of negotiation over the choreography.

The more one delves into the conjunctions of American dance as a dance of, by, about, and as democracy, the more obviously 'democracy' becomes a rhetorical device serving to represent American dance as better and more 'advanced' – whatever that might entail – than that of other places in the world. In this manner, the notion of democracy has been made to serve a canonising function that turns any other dance into a belated, derivative, or outmoded development, whilst connecting American dance with the political ideal of democracy in a move that is essentially nationalistic in nature. Which is what brings me to my comparison with Finland.

'Postmodern Dance' in Finland

In Finland today, 'postmodern dance' seems almost interchangeable with 'contemporary dance'. Historically, the terms emerge almost simultaneously in the 1980s. They have since replaced the third term used at that time, 'new dance', which derives from the British usage and the eponymous *New Dance* magazine by the X6 collective. However, due to the lack of historical understanding of how these terms relate to corporeal practice – what qualifies as 'postmodern' or how 'contemporary' differs from 'postmodern' – in discussions with dancers trained in Finland in the 1990s, I have found that few of them understand the genealogy of the 'postmodern dance' they were taught as being part of the textbook continuum of dance stemming from the Judson Dance Theater in the 1960s, albeit not limited to this group.¹¹ In part, this may be because postmodern dance did not come to Finland from America; rather, the crucial locus in the early 1980s was the Amsterdam School for New Dance Development (SNDO), where American, British, European, and Asian art dance traditions came together. Several generations of Finnish dancemakers have graduated from this school, and once back in Finland, spread the gospel of contemporary dance. In one of the few texts about postmodern dance from the 1980s, Arto Hyvönen (1985) lists Jaana Turunen, Sanna Kekäläinen, Riitta Pasanen, and Soile Lahdenperä, as well as, conditionally, Jorma Uotinen, as 'postmodern dance' in Finland. Uotinen's background was in jazz dance and ballet, whereas Kekäläinen graduated from the London School of Contemporary Dance, with connections to SNDO, where Turunen, Pasanen, and Lahdenperä all studied. However, Hyvönen does not discuss this genealogy.

Another strand of postmodern dance derived from performance art, especially feminist performance art. The early work of Kirsi Monni, for example, or Reijo Kela's site-specific projects, and much of the work of the Suomussalmi group, belong to this tradition. Given the close ties performance art in Finland has to visual

arts and physical theatre, the monikers 'postmodern' and 'postmodernist' have added to the confusion about what, exactly, 'postmodern dance' might be. Lack of research and historiography of art dance contribute to this confusion: the only dissertation on postmodern dance in Finland, Aino Kukkonen's (2014) *Postmoderni liikkeessä*, focuses on the work of Uotinen, Kela, and Kekäläinen at the turn of the 1990s, at which point various 'postmodern' dances had been seen and taught in Finland for nearly a decade.

Like Banes' Judson books, Kukkonen's thesis reveals the power historians wield in categorising dance and defining what is remembered and how. Kukkonen (2014, 10–11, 23–30) situates postmodern dance in theories of postmodernism, allowing her to separate her Finnish cases from the Anglo-American discourse. The early histories of postmodern dance in Finland, including practitioners with much stronger genealogical connections to American postmodern dance than Uotinen, Kela, and Kekäläinen have, are relegated to the background. Transitional figures – notably Ulla Koivisto, who, like Kela, studied with Merce Cunningham in the 1970s – are excluded from this narrative, where Cunningham lies somewhat awkwardly between modern and postmodern.

Of the choreographers she discusses, Kukkonen (2014, esp. 75–76) only notes the 'democratic performance space' in Kela's work, and presents this as Cunningham's influence. She does not posit that Kekäläinen, Uotinen or Kela would have been 'democratic' in either their working methods or aesthetics – despite repeating the claim that the postmodern dance of the 1960s was about 'freedom, democracy, and feminism' (ibid., 33) and associating democracy with the working methods of the key production house of New Dance in Helsinki, Zodiak, led by Monni (ibid., 64, 155). In this manner, democracy loses its focal role in connecting the desirable movement of dancing bodies with the ideal of a nation or with a group that would be purportedly

more democratic than its contemporaries.

Nowadays, the heterogeneous forms that are associated with 'postmodern dance' in Finland do share a vague understanding of contemporary dance forms as 'more democratic' than modern dance or ballet – less focused on the figure of the choreographer, more reliant on improvisational techniques and movement in which all parts of the body are used. However, these 'democratic' qualia are not associated with locality (the Republic of Finland) or ethnicity (Finnishness). Contemporary dance is not seen as 'democracy's body' or as this democracy's body, but rather an elitist endeavour that is inherently international – a proof, if anything, of the Westernness of this part of the world. This speaks of the different history and difference in what kinds of dance and whose dancing bodies qualify as representative of democracy in Finland.

In Finland, ballet was very much a Russian import; for decades, its primary stage was the former theatre of the Russian garrison in Helsinki, Aleksanterinteatteri. As in Germany, the roots of non-balletic art dance were closely tied to women's gymnastics and eurhythmics: free-form or 'barefoot' dance mostly emerged from Finnish dance and sport enthusiasts who returned after studying in German-speaking countries (e.g. Laakkonen and Suhonen 2012). Bordering the Soviet Union, Finland was a target of the propaganda tours of the State Department of the United States, resulting in visits by American companies in the 1960s. However, like the other Nordic countries, Finland also has dancing bodies explicitly associated with the nation-state, a century and a half of history of performed folk dance (*kansantanssi*, *tanhu*). After Finnish independence in 1917, folk dances were advocated by temperance movements and women gymnasts, for whom the controlled, symmetrical corporeality of these dances represented the acceptable, correct form of Finnishness, excluding the lewd, unruly, and often drunk bodies of actual Finns dancing, as well as the competitiveness of sport. As in the contemporaneous

forms of modern dance, the aesthetic ideal was the nationalist ideal of the new republic, justified with racist rhetoric: the wholesome, robust, healthy body engaged in regulated physical activity was also a white, *Finnish* body. In the 1930s, the folk-dance movement had strong ties with National Socialist Germany, to the extent that there were arguments made for folk dance to be excluded from the dancing ban during the Winter and Continuation Wars.¹² If anything, it is still this kind of dance that is seen in nationalistic terms as 'the people's body', as something anyone can practice.

The representation of folk dance as an eternal form embodying not the state (Finland) but the nation (ethnic Finns) is related to how 'classical' is used in 'classical ballet' or 'classical Indian dance' to lend these forms a homogeneity and a history that erase their twentieth-century invention (Genné 2000; Banerji 2017). Yet, as the nationalist opposite to the elitist and international art dance, their positioning emphasises Finland's past as a colony (annexed first to Sweden and then Russia), 'where the national [ballet] company becomes a staple of the state's ability to escape the «belatedness» of their emergence as nations', to use André Lepecki's (2006, 126) formulation. The belated emergence of art dance in Finland includes both ballet – the Finnish National Ballet being founded in 1922 – and postmodern dance, which only makes its appearance in the 1980s.

However, if we consider that even in American parlance, 'postmodern dance' was only established with Banes' work in the early 1980s, to function much like earlier labels as promotion of a specific narrative of what American dance is and should be, then this belatedness immediately seems less drastic. Hyvönen (1985) essentially reviews *Terpsichore in Sneakers* five years after its publication and attempts to apply its tenets to Finland. Moreover, if one notes how, in any local form that dance takes, many strands of inspiration and different histories of dancemakers come together, then the local form can no longer be seen simply as

a poor copy of the American original from the 1960s; rather, it becomes a hybrid, much in the manner that these 'originals' were: the Judson Dance Theater emerged from a fortuitous coming together of artists from different fields interested in exploring what can be done as dance or performance, with the generous support of the community that formed their audience and favourable critics who spread knowledge about their work, notably Jill Johnston.

In Conclusion

«Postmodern», once imported to a different historical and local context, causes confusion that reveals its politics; and the prevalence of the Judson Dance Theater in (textbook) histories of dance exemplifies the hegemony of American narratives of the history of dance as an art form. A canon is a prescriptive narrative of aesthetic development and signification, where contemporaneous forms are represented in a stylistic hierarchy in which whatever is framed as the vanguard is never neutral. Research is one means of canonisation (e.g. Dodds 2011, esp. 2–3), while curricular and pedagogical choices are another. Because Banes' books are the key texts taught whenever 'postmodern dance' is evoked, it is important to note what narratives they support and undermine, and to read them in the light of different historical and local contexts.

I hope to have shown that 'postmodern dance' not only depends on definitions of American modern dance, but that to call this dance 'democratic' continues a nationalist argument about the superiority of American dance, and a century of connections between (white) American dance and democracy that both obfuscate the plurality of art dance in America and exclude genealogies and corporealities beyond the United States. 'Democracy' and its adjectival form are used to focus attention on hegemonic white bodies in a manner that aestheticises the political and conceals presumptions about what kinds of corporealities are accepted as 'quotidian',

'pedestrian', or 'normal'. Assumptions about whose dancing bodies are 'democracy's body' – the difference in signification between 'Finnish dance' and 'dance in Finland', for example (see Roms 2011) – require a sensitivity to diversity that seems the more urgent in democratic states where nationalist parties have co-opted ideas of the nation. In the transposition of the term 'postmodern dance' to a context where it no longer signifies in a nationalist fashion makes visible some such uses of power, including the association of 'democracy' with 'vanguard art' or the truly anti-postmodernist reliance on aesthetic judgment.

Notes

- 1 In the Foucauldian sense, art could be called an apparatus (*dispositif*): a system of relations between material and discursive practices that has a strategic function of control in society. For Foucault, institutions are discursive formations that create subjects of power and seek to immobilise particular specific subject positions. (Foucault 1980, 194–198; 1982, esp. 222; also n2 below).
- 2 Foucault (2001, 817–849) discusses the author as a specific kind of subject, but he never relates that subject position to art as an apparatus or institution, nor does he discuss the other kinds of subjects validating something as art.
- 3 In France, the Revolution of 1789 had done away with the three-estate system, whereas Russia retained a four-estate system (as well as the Julian calendar). Consequently, French commentators on Russian affairs tended to liken Russia to their Ancien Régime (*ibid.*, also Mikkeli 1999, esp. 146–47). The United Kingdom, of course, still upholds a two-estate system in the bicameral parliament.
- 4 In 1809, Tsar Alexander I granted the newly annexed Finland a Diet that included the same four estates as the Riksdag of the Estates in Sweden. As with most regimes retaining estates of the realm, this form of national assembly was democratic to a very limited degree, leaving large sections of the population without representatives or political rights. Before Finland, only New Zealand had granted active suffrage for women.

- 5 Literally 'John of the People'. A writer and critic, Sibul had spent some time in jail in Russia due to his revolutionary activities (New York Times 4 April 1906; Poole 1906; Narodny 1909, esp. 201).
- 6 On 13 July 1912, Narodny (1912a) spoke of ballet as 'nationally aristocratic in character'; on 20 July 1912 (Narodny 1912b), he wrote: 'Of all Russian arts of the stage, ballet is the most aristocratic and the oldest.'
- 7 The disintegration of the ensemble and the poor quality of the principal dancers in the Ballets Russes was quickly evident for those American critics who had seen the company in Europe, such as Carl Van Vechten. Van Vechten's (1917, 149–61) detailed analysis stamped the company mediocre, 'the dregs of the Russian Ballet.'
- 8 As Peter Osborne (2013, esp. 49, 71, 75) notes, a crucial issue here is how the aesthetic dimension fails to account for the ontological specificity of art.
- 9 In the so-called 'Terpsichore in combat boots' debate (Manning 1988; Banes and Manning 1989) Banes insists that 'post-modern' was a term used by practitioners (Banes and Manning 1989, 13), and 'Post-Modern Dance' had been the title of a special issue of TDR in 1975 (K[irby] 1975). Yet, Banes' books established the term as a stylistic category in practice as well as research.
- 10 Pouillaude (2009) makes the same argument to separate contemporary European art dance from American postmodern dance; see also Osborne (2013, 47–51).
- 11 Who qualifies as a member of the Judson Dance Theater and why is a great example of canon formation.
- 12 See Hoppu (2008) and Laine (2015). Finland was the only country participating in the Second World War that banned all social dancing in 1939–44, with a partial dancing ban continuing until 1948 («Suomalaisen seuratanssin historiaa» s.a.).

Works Cited

- Banerji, Anurima. 2017. «Intermediary Incorporation: Negotiating Cultural (Over)flows in Indian Classical Dance.» Paper presentation at the PSi#23 Conference, Hamburg, 11 June 2017.
- Banes, Sally. 1987. *Terpsichore in Sneakers: Post Modern Dance*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Banes, Sally. 1995. *Democracy's Body: Judson Dance Theatre, 1962–1964*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Banes, Sally, and Susan Manning. 1989. «Terpsichore in Combat Boots.» *TDR* 33 (1): 13–16.
- Bishop, Claire. 2004. «Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics.» *October* 110: 51–79.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1995. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Edited by Randall Johnson. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burt, Ramsay. 2006. *Judson Dance Theatre: Performative Traces*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Christiano, Tom. 2015. «Democracy.» In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/democracy/>.
- Croft, Clare. 2015. *Dancers as Diplomats: American Choreography in Cultural Exchange*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Daly, Ann. 2002. «Dancing Democracy.» *Dance Research Journal* 34 (2): 8–11.
- Dodds, Sherril. 2011. *Dancing on the Canon: Embodiments of Value in Popular Dance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Flitch, J. E. Crawford. 1912. *Modern Dancing and Dancers*. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott and Grant Richards.
- Foster, Susan Leigh. 2002. *Dances that Describe Themselves: The Improvised Choreography of Richard Bull*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

- Foucault, Michel. 1980. «The Confession of the Flesh.» In *Power/Knowledge*, edited by Colin Gordon, 194–228. Translated by Leo Marshall and Colin Gordon. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1982. «The Subject and Power.» In *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, edited by Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, 208–26. Great Britain: Harvester Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2001. *Dits et écrits I, 1954–1975*. [Paris]: Quarto Gallimard.
- Genné, Beth. 2000. «Creating a Canon, Creating the «Classics» in Twentieth-Century British Ballet.» *Dance Research* 18 (2): 132–62.
- Hoppu, Petri. 2008. «Auttakoon Terpsichore!: Kansantanssit, tanssi-ihanteet ja kontrollointi.» In *Kansanestetiikka*, edited by Seppo Knuuttila and Ulla Piela, 207–24. Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 87. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hyvönen, Arto. 1985. «Postmoderni tanssi.» *Tanssi*, no. 3: 13–15.
- Järvinen, Hanna. 2010. «Failed Impressions: Diaghilev's Ballets Russes in America.» *Dance Research Journal* 42 (2): 77–108.
- Järvinen, Hanna. 2014. *Dancing Genius: The Stardom of Vaslav Nijinsky*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- K[irby], M[ichael]. 1975. «Post-Modern Dance Issue: An Introduction.» *TDR* 19 (1): 3–4.
- Khripachenko, Tatiana. 2014. *National Challenges to Decentralization: Autonomy and Federation in the Russian Liberal Discourse, 1900–1914*. PhD diss., Central European University, Budapest.
- Kosstrin, Hannah. 2013. «Inevitable Designs: Embodied Ideology in Anna Sokolow's Proletarian Dances.» *Dance Research Journal* 45 (2): 4–24.
- Kowal, Rebekah J. 2010. *How to Do Things with Dance: Performing Change in Postwar America*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Kowal, Rebekah J., Gerald Siegmund, and Randy Martin. 2017. «Introduction.» In *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Politics*, edited by Rebekah J. Kowal, Gerald Siegmund, and Randy Martin, 1–24. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kukkonen, Aino. 2014. *Postmoderni liikkeessä: Tulkintoja 1980-luvun suomalaisesta tanssista*. PhD diss., University of Helsinki.
- Laakkonen, Johanna and Tiina Suhonen. 2012. *Weimarista Valtoihin: Kansainvälisyys suomalaisessa tanssitaitteessa*. Teatterimuseon verkkojulkaisuja 1. Helsinki: Teatterimuseo. Accessed 11 June 2017.
http://www.teatterimuseo.fi/wp-content/uploads/weimarista_valtoihin_www.pdf.
- Laine, Leena. 2015. «Tanhut, nationalismit ja sukupuoli.» In *Urheilun toinen puoli*, edited by Heikki Roiko-Jokela and Esa Sironen, 223–48. Suomen Urheiluhistoriallisen Seuran vuosikirja/Finlands Idrottshistoriska Förenings årsbok 2015. Accessed 11 June 2017.
<http://www.subs.fi/subs-vuosikirja-2015/>.
- Lepecki, André. 2006. *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the Politics of Movement*. London: Routledge.
- Manning, Susan. 1988. «Modernist Dogma and Post-modern Rhetoric: A Response to Sally Banes' 'Terpsichore in Sneakers'.» *TDR* 32 (4): 32–39.
- Mikkeli, Heikki. 1999. *Euroopan idea: Eurooppa-aatteen ja eurooppalaisuuden pitkä historia*. Helsinki: SHS.
- Narodny, Ivan. 1909. *Echoes of Myself: Romantic Studies of the Human Soul*. New York, NY: International Library Publishing.
- Narodny, Ivan. 1912a. «Fundamentals of Russian Ballet.» *Musical America* 13 July.
- Narodny, Ivan. 1912b. «History of the Russian Ballet.» *Musical America* 20 July.

- Narodny, Ivan. 1915. «Russian «Rebels» to Bring Us New Ballet Art.» *Musical America* 13 November.
- Narodny, Ivan, ed. 1916. *The Dance*. Vol. 10 of *The Art of Music*. New York, NY: National Society for Music.
- New York Times*. 1906. «Russian Republic Near, Declares Leader Here.» 4 April.
- Osborne, Peter. 2013. *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art*. London: Verso.
- Poole, Ernest. 1906. «Till Russia Shall Be Free.» *The Saturday Evening Post*, 7 April.
- Pouillaude, Frédéric. 2009. *Le Désœuvrement chorégraphique: Etude sur la notion d'œuvre en danse*. Paris: Vrin.
- Rainer, Yvonne. 2009. «*Trio A*: Genealogy, Documentation, Notation.» *Dance Research Journal* 41(2): 12–18.
- Roms, Heike. 2011. *What's Welsh for Performance? Beth yw «performance» yn Gymraeg?* Research project website. Accessed 11 June 2017. <http://www.performance-wales.org/>.
- «Suomalaisen seuratanssin historiaa.» s.a. In *Suomen tanssipalvelin*. Accessed 1 August 2017. <http://tanssi.net/fi/tausta/historia.html>.
- Van Vechten, Carl. 1917. *Interpreters and Interpretations*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

BIOGRAPHY

Dr Hanna Järvinen works as a Lecturer at the Performing Arts Research Centre of the University of the Arts Helsinki, Finland, and as a Senior Researcher in the Academy of Finland research project 'How to Do Things with Performance?', 2016–20. She is a docent in dance history at the University of Turku and Honorary Visiting Research Fellow at De Montfort University, Leicester. A specialist in early twentieth-century dance,

her interests lie in the epistemology and ontology of dance, especially issues of authorship and canonisation. Besides works in her native Finnish, she is the author of *Dancing Genius* (Palgrave Macmillan 2014), and her articles have appeared in, for example, *Avant*, *Dance Research* and *Dance Research Journal*.