

The Tangible and Intangible: Dance and the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage

In memory of Dr. Violet Cuffy, 1966-2021

(key words: Dance, Embodiment, Heritage, UNESCO)

This article returns to issues raised in the pages of this journal regarding dance in the context of UNESCO's 2003 adoption of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.¹ Bakka and Karoblis' article published in 2021² refuted the proposal made by Iacono and Brown in 2016³ to replace the Convention's term 'Intangible Cultural Heritage' (ICH) with the concept of 'living cultural heritage'. However, Bakka and Karoblis' response was written in the spirit of 'a discursive unity'⁴ and, sharing in this spirit, I aim to consider both articles with the aim of highlighting how the discourses surrounding safeguarding ICH and those that consider dance as a significant part of culture might inform one another.

The discussion that follows is shaped by my experiences working on a project led by Dr. Violet Cuffy, a Creole specialist in the field of tourism, that drew together researchers, policy makers and practitioners to explore approaches to safeguarding Creole Intangible Cultural Heritage.⁵ This experience highlighted for me what Bakka and Karoblis emphasise as the importance of UNESCO's aims to counterbalance cultural and economic inequalities, the impact of which threaten the sustainability of many older traditions, particularly in what they refer to as the 'global south'. However, my experiences as a dancer and dance teacher, born and educated in the UK, suggest that, even in this economically privileged part of the globe, the cultural significance of dancing is all too often undervalued and dance practices are vulnerable to being irretrievably lost. From this perspective I have long been interested in debates regarding the cultural significance of dance that have relevance to Iacono and Brown's article.

It is important at the outset to emphasise a significant area of agreement between the two articles: each pay tribute to UNESCO's efforts to expand the concept of heritage beyond the emphasis of the Convention of 1972 on artefacts and the physical environment.⁶ Both sets of authors value UNESCO's move to support the continuation of cultural practices and recognise how this changing approach to culture also reflected the organisation's aim to counter 'Europe being overrepresented' in The World Heritage List.⁷ That the significance of cultural practices to communities is now well recognised is thanks to the work of those twentieth century anthropologists, sociologists and philosophers who paid attention to the significance of *how* people go about their activities. It was the sociologist and anthropologist Marcel Mauss, who within western academia in the 1930s, first identified 'body techniques' as 'the ways in which from society to society men know how to use their bodies'.⁸ As the century continued, academic interest in bodily- being fuelled the 'corporeal turn' that was influential across many disciplines. There is not space here to explore the complexities of an array of approaches to corporeality.⁹ What is important, in this context, is that within a number of academic fields the embodied dimension of a whole range of practices became better understood in terms of their cultural significance. This shift in the conceptualisation of human actions has implications for the value accorded to all forms of intangible cultural heritage, including dance.

In contrast to their general grounds of agreement, a key criticism by Bakka and Karoblis of Iacono and Brown's text is that the latter authors fail to recognise how the Convention is not an academic discourse but an international agreement forged by UNESCO in order to counter the negative impact of globalisation upon local cultural practices. Referring to Wittgenstein's (1953) notion of 'language games' they propose:

An international convention and a free general academic discourse would be two examples of two quite different language games...¹⁰

Bakka and Karoblis thus criticise Iacono and Brown for their approach which 'takes a text which belongs to the legal domain and integrates it into a discourse of academics without any changing critical notification of changing discourses'.¹¹ Here then is the crux of Bakka and Karoblis' critique: Iacono and Brown are invested in the language game of academic discourse which is too orientated towards the concerns of (privileged) academia and related cultural practices rather than those of an international body whose aims, in developing the Convention, were shaped by recognition of continuing cultural inequalities on a global scale: '...it was not initiated from the western or northern side of the world, but rather from countries that felt unjustly treated by that side'.¹²

This perspective informs Bakka and Karoblis' further critique of Iacono and Brown's discussion of how, depending on the genre and society in question, there are more or fewer opportunities for 'an amount of agency individuals have in innovating the dance.'¹³ For the former pair of authors, such a statement is revealing of the latter's misunderstanding of the Convention which seeks to 'support practices that resist intentional innovation even if changes will occur' in order to counteract 'the sweeping power of globalisation and related processes of commodification, international exchange and international tourism.'¹⁴ Their critique is developed further through the dismissal of Iacono and Brown's positive seeming endorsement of 'the increasingly rapid transmission and transformation of dance as living cultural heritage as it takes place across social and cultural time and space, unrestricted by geographical boundaries'.¹⁵ For Bakka and Karoblis this statement positions the earlier authors' approach as one which prioritises 'mobile dance artists in the cosmopolitan world.'¹⁶ Similarly Bakka and Karoblis critique Iacono and Brown's references to dance 'on its own terms' and 'dance in its entirety' as revealing of the world view of hegemonic forms of (western) contemporary dance 'which define themselves as the only artistically valid dance form, names it dance, defines its terms and ignore all other kinds of dance.'¹⁷

It is certainly important to recognise, especially in the context of UNESCO, how the assumptions that inform the artistic values of much of what is termed 'contemporary dance' are not 'universal' but are situated within the hegemonic discourses of modernism and postmodernism and thus primarily reflect the values of a cosmopolitan elite allied to western-orientated aesthetic values.¹⁸ In contrast to their earlier approach to heritage, in developing the draft for the 2003 Convention, UNESCO recognised that the concept of 'outstanding universal value' that informed the 1972 Convention does not apply to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Rather they state that:

International recognition is based on the importance of this living heritage for the sense of identity and continuity of the communities in which it is created, transmitted and re-created.¹⁹

UNESCO also recognize that the processes of globalization and social transformation:

... give rise, as does the phenomenon of intolerance, to grave threats of deterioration, disappearance and destruction of the intangible cultural heritage, in particular owing to a lack of resources for safeguarding such heritage.²⁰

Moreover, the 2003 Convention specifies:

...consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.²¹

This Convention was clearly targeted at those community-based cultural traditions at risk from 'the processes of globalization and social transformation'.²² For Bakka and Karoblis this informs a clear distinction between what they consider to be two opposing views of culture:

The first approach aims to strengthen and give value to the cultural diversity and local expressions of the world, bound in time and space continuum of their practices. The second aims at marketing dances as global, commodified, shared culture, removed from traditional locations for practice and local communities...²³

It would, however, be overly simplistic to assume that all dance in the Global North is positively aligned with a global, postmodern commodity culture. For example, there is a long tradition within the field of contemporary dance that, rather than pursue the values of an international market for the kind of spectacle often associated with elite dance practices, instead focusses on fostering equality and mutual understanding through embodied interactions.²⁴ This has perhaps been recognised through the recent inscription of the Practice of Modern Dance in Germany which emphasises its importance to fostering community (although due to its particular historical context the addition of this practice to UNESCO's list may yet prove to be controversial).²⁵

In the specific example of the UK, dancers have often struggled to sustain their practices. For example, Deborah Baddoo's work to develop archives of twentieth century Black British dance attests to how diasporic heritage has been experienced through dancing within the hegemonic cultural space of a former colonial power. However, she has identified dance practices that, while important to Black British identities, are now vulnerable to being forgotten.²⁶ British 'new dance', which in the later part of the twentieth century prioritised the values of equality and community, has also struggled for survival in the neo-liberal arts environment.²⁷ Yet, during this same period, the potential of dance to 'liberate' British society was recognised by the influential dance academic, Peter Brinson, who spearheaded efforts to advocate for dance in a British education system in which its status was marginal.²⁸ His mission was 'to raise dance's status and in doing so to help break down social, cultural and racial barriers'.²⁹ However, after a period in which dance became better established in education, recently, as a field of study in the United Kingdom, it is increasingly vulnerable to changes in policy and funding.³⁰ The result has been a drop in entries for GCSE dance of 48% from 2010 to 2021³¹ and large cuts to departments of dance in higher education.³²

Like many dance educators I am concerned by such changes which seem to devalue the cultural significance of dancing. In contrast to Bakka and Karoblis' assertion of the distinctness of the discourse surrounding the Convention from that of (dance) academia, what my experience suggests is that Bakka and Karoblis do not take into enough consideration how dance, as a field of study, has had its own struggles with academic discourse. Moreover, I consider longstanding debates within the dance field, such as how a practice incorporates change whilst retaining its identity, or the relationship of documentation to the practice itself are of relevance to the larger, but younger, exploration of ICH.³³ The difficulties faced by those aiming to sustain those practices within the dance field which fall outside the priorities of established dance institutions resonate with the findings of those concerned with the safeguarding of traditional cultural practices.

This perspective leads me to have more sympathy than Bakka and Karoblis with Iacono and Brown's arguments, especially in relation to their preference for the term 'living' rather than 'intangible' heritage. UNESCO, in writing about the drafting of the Convention use the term 'living' to emphasise how such heritage is continuously 'created, transmitted and re-created.'³⁴ However, according to Bakka and Karoblis, the term does not feature in the text of the Convention itself due to its closeness to the biomorphic metaphor of the 'organic state' which they report became associated with fascism. In the metaphor of the organic state, as described by Bakka and Karoblis, ruling is ascribed to the head, power to the hands and spatial action (e.g. dancing), to the legs. Notwithstanding any fascist links, this metaphor is also a pertinent illustration of the approach to the body/ mind relationship that dancers have historically struggled against in attempting to gain recognition of the value of dance. Iacono and Brown's argument may thus be understood within the context of ongoing discursive explorations of the precarious positioning of dance knowledge within academic traditions which have privileged mind over body. In referring to the existential phenomenology of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Pierre Bourdieu's explorations of the 'habitus' and, to a lesser extent, Anthony Giddens' analysis of structure and agency, the authors follow a now well-trodden path to recognise how changing philosophical and sociological approaches to what Iacono and Brown term 'mind-body-society -environment- artefact' relationships have (positive) implications for recognising the significance of dance.³⁵ In the past, tendencies to conceptualise mind as having executive control over the body have supported instrumentalist approaches to the dancing body allied with a hierarchy of human activities in which dancing was subordinated to thinking. The result was that the individual agency of the dancer was all too often set in opposition to the world of 'others' - conceptualised as social forces or norms - leaving little space to consider the extent to which embodied creative actions are a form of agency. It is hardly surprising then, that Iacono and Brown, along with dance researchers before them, have drawn on those theorists who may be interpreted as moving against established binaries of mind/body and self/other.³⁶

In contrast, Bakka and Karoblis are not convinced that Merleau-Ponty, Bourdieu or Giddens 'really wanted or managed to overcome binary logic in general'.³⁷ Leaving aside whether it is possible to claim what these authors wanted to achieve, all three may be interpreted as having sought to resolve some of the problematic aspects of dualist approaches to mind/body and/or self/other or individual agency/ social norms.³⁸ Giddens' Structuration theory posits a level of human agency within social systems³⁹ as does Pierre Bourdieu's theory of 'habitus' and field.⁴⁰ The latter's emphasis on embodied experience has led to his work being particularly influential on approaches to dance that aim to move beyond reducing dancing to the mere

replication of convention while nonetheless recognising how individual expressive acts are culturally situated.⁴¹ There is also certainly evidence of Merleau-Ponty's attempts to postulate a philosophical re-orientation regarding the interrelationships between self-other - world. His work has also been very influential on a number of approaches to dance that focus on embodied experience and hence, in drawing on his theories, Iacono and Brown can be understood to be aligned with key discourses within the dance field which draw on existential phenomenology as a means of countering the dualist concepts of body/mind and self/world, that dancers have struggled against. If, as Bakka and Karoblis suggest, Merleau-Ponty's final work is considered, it can be seen how the interplay of the visible and the invisible and the tangible and the intangible are caught up in this philosopher's concept of 'flesh' through which the sensible body is enmeshed in the world.⁴² This approach to embodiment is likely to continue to influence dance given the relevance of Merleau-Ponty's work to Shaun Gallagher's more recent development of an 'enactivist' approach to cognition which proposes 'an integration of brainy and worldly processes'.⁴³

In the face of complex philosophy, Iacono and Brown seek to identify how the theories they draw on can be related to dance. However, as Anna Pakes has underlined, such attempts to counteract dualism are often mired in philosophical complexities.⁴⁴ It is possible this is the case here. For example, in trying to make Merleau-Ponty's philosophical explorations clear, Iacono and Brown risk reducing the mind to the intangible and the body to the tangible. While they are at pains to suggest that these come together through 'the perceptual and emotional forms of intercorporeality'⁴⁵ there is potential even so that they may be read as returning inadvertently to the (dualist) assumptions that lead to a dance being defined as some mental (or intangible) substrate.

This leads me to why, in contradistinction to Bakka and Karoblis, I consider the term 'intangible' problematic in relation to safeguarding ICH since the term may be tacitly understood as suggesting that, in some way, ICH exists in abstract terms separate from its actual manifestation. While this may be regarded as an esoteric argument, relevant within academic discourses but not to the implementation of an international agreement, I consider that it reveals a mindset that can have implications with regards to the practicalities of implementing the 2003 Convention.

This is not to dismiss many important features of the Convention. UNESCO's stated aims and, in addition, the Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage set out in 2015, seek to ensure the relevance of ICH to communities and its close relationship to 'tangible cultural and natural heritage'.⁴⁶ The use of the term 'safeguarding' in the 2003 Convention, as opposed for instance to 'preservation', in itself signals UNESCO's aim to protect practices so they can retain their place in people's lives rather than become preserved for future historical interest. Nomination to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Urgent Need of Safeguarding thus requires a safeguarding plan which, along with a timetable and proposed budget, must 'contain concrete measures and activities that adequately respond to the identified threats to the element.' The safeguarding measures should be described 'in terms of the concrete engagements of the States Parties and communities' describing 'the key activities that will be carried out' and 'mechanisms for the full participation of communities, groups or, if appropriate, individuals in the proposed safeguarding measures.'⁴⁷

However, an inspection of the key categories of safeguarding measures suggested to support nomination to the above list reveals identification, documentation and research high up the agenda. Such a requirement perhaps belies an approach to cultural heritage consistent with the mindset of an international cultural elite. It has resonances with those approaches to dance that tends towards abstraction of the identity of a dance from instances of its performance. Within theatrical and academic contexts there may often be found an emphasis on the tools required to reproduce a dance as ‘tokens’ of a particular ‘type’- for example a notated score, video or even a three-dimensional animation. The ontological status of such data in relation to the identity of a dance work raises complexities that have been explored in detail by a number of philosophers.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, in terms of international, theatrical dance traditions such an approach is consistent with how established companies sustain their practices so that dance works can be restaged with new casts. However, when practices are not part of a cosmopolitan performance culture, similar attempts to identify them may overly shift attention to those aspects that serve their being listed and catalogued. It is significant that Mounir Bouchenaki, former UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture proposes:

In order to safeguard intangible heritage, it needs also to be ‘translated’ from its oral form into some manifestation of materiality, be it archives, inventories, museums, audiovisual records.⁴⁹

Bouchenaki follows this statement to recognise that this will require ‘great thoughtfulness and care with regard to the most appropriate methods and materials chosen for this task’ to guard against ‘freezing intangible heritage into documents.’⁵⁰ Yet, as Jessika Eichler observes, drawing on her analysis of how Andean Carnival celebrations in Oruro (Bolivia) and Barranquilla (Colombia) were constituted as ICH, the complex process which requires local understanding to ‘enter global recognition processes’ may raise questions regarding who has access to ‘these spaces of negotiation’.⁵¹ Similarly, in the introduction to a volume devoted to questions the 2003 Convention raises for music, Barley Norton and Naomi Matsumoto point out that there have been many concerns raised querying how the process of inscription can guard against ‘the dangers of a self-perpetuating cycle of international oversight that may unwittingly lead to disenfranchisement rather than advancing social justice.’⁵²

At the very least, the complexities of the inscription process may add to the cost of specialist support towards a nomination. This could result in limited resources being diverted from practical steps to ensure the circumstances which enable the practice to thrive. Or the necessary expenditure might even deter the completion of an application. As Violet Cuffy observed in relation to the safeguarding of Creole cultures of Small Island States (SIDS):

The capacity of SIDS to deliver operational excellence in the area of ICH knowledge creation and innovative state-of-the-art research is constantly undermined by other pressing priorities.⁵³

Moreover, the question of identifying which practices are to be listed and/or nominated to UNESCO and what does or does not constitute a particular practice, can be fraught with political implications:

The fact that intangible heritage derives its existence from the human skill and performance of a practice, tradition etc. also attributes certain power of

interpretation and in a way ownership to cultural bearers... Processes of recognition thus play an important part in legitimising one form or the other, in officially adopting one discourse or the other, in integrating one narrative as part of a collective account or the other. This, in turn, inevitably affects the way practicing communities, groups and individuals may exercise their right to participate in cultural life.⁵⁴

As David Hughes found in relation to Japanese Folk songs, some communities can be wary of engagement with the process of external ‘designation’.⁵⁵ In the case of Dominica, Violet Cuffy’s experience of the on-the-ground realities of attempts to sustain Creole traditions revealed a guarded attitude to international involvement in the Creole culture of this Small Island State whose annual independence celebrations provide opportunities to take pride in local heritage. Drawing also on my experience of the ephemeral nature of dance, we advised, in a similar vein to Hughes’ findings, that fostering the events which bring people together to share their culture is of key importance to its safeguarding. Further, we advised that it is important that the interactions and debates through which changes are negotiated (and which inevitably reflect attitudes to wider social changes) are recognised as an integral part of the practice to be safeguarded and are ‘understood to be founded in concerns regarding the vulnerability of cultural identities’.⁵⁶ As an example, the Dominican Bélé tradition allows for people to draw on movement outside the recognised steps in a manner that provides for inclusion but, depending on others’ responses, these may or may not be more regularly incorporated into future performances.⁵⁷ The importance of documenting more than the practice itself, so as to capture (changing) attitudes relating to it, is consistent with practices in ethnography: in the context of safeguarding ICH the ethnomusicologist Terada Yoshitaka proposes that ‘audiovisual media is regarded as a living and organic site where comments and critiques are incorporated throughout the entire process of filmmaking.’⁵⁸

How ICH can be documented and defined is a challenge made more complex where the motivation for its nomination for inscription to one of UNESCO’s lists is its legal protection. The relationship of the safeguarding of ICH to international treaties and the law are regarded by specialists in the field to reveal many complex issues that have still to be resolved.⁵⁹ Dance scholars will be aware of similar complexities in relation to intellectual property-type rights and the documentation of dance: in parallel to Anthea Kraut’s exploration of attempts to claim copyright ownership of dance,⁶⁰ the concern for the legal protection of ICH is categorised by Wend Wedland in terms of two different attitudes: ‘positive’ protection aims to obtain intellectual property rights with regard to ICH for the purpose of commercial gain and/or with the aim of stopping others obtaining such rights; ‘defensive’ protection aims to preventing the gaining of intellectual property rights. Wend also reports that the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) recognises their approach, that conceives of ICH in this way, is opposed by some communities and that even where accepted an ‘intellectual property dimension’ is only part of the solution to protect traditional cultures.⁶¹

These legal concerns reveal how, in practice, those safeguarding ICH can rarely ignore the reach of globalised economic forces. The reliance of ICH on financial input from the tourism industry is an oft debated example of ‘the replacement of social value with monetary

value’:⁶² the funding that tourism brings is often much needed but inevitably has repercussions for the representation of local culture.⁶³ One tactic, proposed by Michel and Michel, in relation to the Mauritian and Rodriguan Segas (inscribed in 2014 on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity), is to educate the practitioners working in the tourism sector with regard to their cultural heritage so they ‘become aware of the histories and values that motivated their Creole practices.’ Such training is viewed as ‘a useful means to maintain the sustainability of Creole practices in a manner which continues to valorise Creole heritage. This they argue ‘could lead to the recognition of those values by the new generation and a more proactive participation to the demands of the tourist industry which is informed by a post-colonial discourse.’⁶⁴

In an era when young people inevitably engage with global cultures, Penda Choppy pays attention to the ways in which Seychellois Creole informs local youth culture. Amongst the examples she gives is that of the Seychellois musician Jarimba’s use of traditional proverbs explaining that ‘he taps from Seychelles Creole because it is his identity and it is what makes his songs unique’.⁶⁵ Jarimba’s mix of sega and reggae may hardly meet the demands for transgenerational continuity or the adherence to locale UNESCO expects of ICH. Nevertheless, this example reveals the ways communities draw on a combination of local and global cultures to ensure the continuation of their heritage. A similar conclusion as to the importance for young people of fusions with more up to date and widely known cultural forms is made by David Hughes.⁶⁶ Choppy’s example also reveals how marginalised communities may seek to establish a position in relation to hegemonic cultural forces by developing alliances which cut across national boundaries to propose a different set of values. This is also revealed in Marc Lints’ proposal for Creole Cultures as a shared cross-national entity to be inscribed as ICH in order to emphasise the values of ‘Kreolitude’ which ‘aims today at offering an alternative to the current “merchant civilisation”’.⁶⁷

These more recent examples of tactics to sustain globally marginalised Creole cultures reveal the increasingly complex weave of local and global values and cultures. Twenty years on from the 2003 Convention, a generation has grown up in a world in which culture can be shared almost instantaneously through digital means or captured in a virtual realm. Yet, conversely, liveness has become a valuable part of the ‘experience’ economy.⁶⁸ For those concerned with the continuation of cultural activities, be they considered primarily as ICH or dance, the future will hold both new opportunities and challenges.

For dance and the ICH that is UNESCO’s target, in facing the years ahead both discourses have much to learn from one another. What UNESCO understands as intangible cultural heritage is intertwined with a continually powerful episteme which informs the language and implementation not only of international treaties but of many policies that relate to cultural practices, including dance. UNESCO’s Convention states their consideration of ‘the deep-seated interdependence between the intangible cultural heritage and the tangible cultural and natural heritage’.⁶⁹ Yet, in a context in which to be valued (or even provided legal protection) cultural practices are required to be ‘translated...into some manifestation of materiality’, this relationship seems to be weighted towards the tangible. The precarity of many dance practices that do not have access to the necessary resources to undertake such a ‘translation’ may not be so different to the plight of many examples of ICH. In the face of the continued (dualist)

privileging of mind over body there is a need to emphasise those strategies that support the activities and interactions which facilitate the continuation of practices. Whether this culture is termed ‘intangible’, ‘living’, or even ‘embodied’, the important thing is to foster its potential to bring ‘human beings closer together... ensuring exchange and understanding among them.’⁷⁰

Notes

¹ UNESCO (2003) *Text of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Internet page available at URL: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention> Accessed 9th May, 2022.

² Bakka, Egil and Karoblis, Gediminas (2021) ‘Decolonising or Recolonising: Struggles on Cultural Heritage’, *Dance Research* 39 (2) Winter, pp. 247-263.

³ Iacono, Valeria La and Brown, David (2016) ‘Beyond Binarism: Exploring a Model of a Living Cultural Heritage for Dance’, *Dance Research* 34 (1) Summer, pp. 84-105.

⁴ Bakka and Karoblis (2021) p.248.

⁵ Cuffy, Violet, (2018-2020) ‘Dominica as a Centre of Excellence for the Preservation & Celebration of the Creole Culture through Language, the Arts and its indigenous Kalinagos’. Information available at URL: <https://gtr.ukri.org/projects?ref=AH%2FR004498%2F1>

⁶ UNESCO (1972) *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Internet page available at URL: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/convention/> Accessed 9th May 2022

⁷ Iacono and Brown (2016) p.86.

⁸ Mauss, Marcel (1979) *Sociology and Psychology*, London: Routledge Kegan Paul. The essay ‘Techniques of the Body’ was first published (in French) in 1935 based on a lecture in 1934.

⁹ I attempted a survey of some of this field in studies for PhD: Carr D.J. (2007) ‘Embodiment, Appreciation and Dance: Issues in relation to an exploration of the experiences of London based, ‘non-aligned’ artists’. Internet page available at URL: <https://pure.roehampton.ac.uk/portal/en/studentTheses/embodiment-appreciation-and-dance>

¹⁰ Bakka and Karoblis (2021) p.249.

¹¹ Bakka and Karoblis (2021) p.249.

¹² Bakka and Karoblis (2021) p.250.

¹³ Iacono and Brown (2016) p.102.

¹⁴ Bakka and Karoblis (2021) p.258.

¹⁵ Bakka and Karoblis (2021) cite Iacono and Brown (2016) p.103.

¹⁶ Bakka and Karoblis (2021) p.260.

¹⁷ Bakka and Karoblis (2021) p.258.

¹⁸ Nabirye, Mercy and Conquet, Angela (2022) ‘Curating and Producing Dance’ –Inclusion and Intersectionality Podcast Series: Society for Dance Research. Internetpage available at URL: <https://anchor.fm/societyfordanceresearch/episodes/Episode-1-Curating-and-Producing-Dance--with-Mercy-Nabirye-and-Angela-Conquet--Chair-e1o2kh1> Accessed December 2022

¹⁹ UNESCO (n.d) ‘2000 Onwards and the Drafting of the Convention’. Internet page available at URL: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/2000-onwards-00310> Accessed 9th May 2022.

²⁰ UNESCO (2003).

²¹ UNESCO (2003).

²² UNESCO (2003).

²³ Bakka and Karoblis (2021) p.260.

²⁴ The recent Society for Dance Research symposium on Inclusion and Intersectionality (Society for Dance Research with C-DaRE, Coventry University and Candoco Dance Company 19-20 November 2021) evidenced the development of work in this area.

²⁵ UNESCO (2022) ‘Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Practice of Modern Dance in Germany’ Internet page available at URL: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/the-practice-of-modern-dance-in-germany-01858> Accessed 22.12.22. That this may yet prove to be a controversial step relates to debates regarding key

- figures' relationships to Nazi Germany documented in Karina, Lilia and Kant, Marion (2004) *Hitler's Dancers: German Modern Dance and the Third Reich*. Trans. Jonathan Steinberg, New York: Berghahn.
- ²⁶ Carr, Jane and Baddoo, Deborah (2020) 'Dance, Diaspora and the Role of the Archives; Dialogic Reflections upon the Black Dance Archives Project', *Dance Research*, 38 (1) May: 65-81.
- ²⁷ Claid, Emlyn (2016) 'Messy Bits', in Colin, Noyale and Sachsenmaier, Stephanie (Eds.) *Collaboration in Performance Practice: Premises, Workings and Failures*, London: Palgrave, pp259-279, p259.
- ²⁸ Brinson, Peter (1991) *Dance as Education: Towards a National Dance Culture*, London: Routledge, p. xv.
- ²⁹ Nugent, Ann (1996) 'In Memoriam: Peter Brinson', *Dance Research Journal*, 28(1) Spring: 126 – 129, p. 126.
- ³⁰ Some of the most detrimental policy decisions are reported by Public Campaign for the Arts. For example: 'Help protect expressive arts subjects from the EBacc'. Internet page available at URL <https://www.onedanceuk.org/resources/children-and-young-people/help-protect-expressive-arts-subjects-in-the-ebacc/> Accessed 9th May 2022.
- ³¹ Cheshire Dance (2022) 'The Stark Reality: 2022 GCSE Dance and 'A' Level Entries', Internet page available at URL: <https://www.cheshiredance.org/general/the-stark-reality-2022-gcse-dance-and-a-level-entries/> Accessed 16th December 2022.
- ³² Dance HE (2021) 'Government's intention to go ahead with the cuts in HEI arts funding'. Internet page available at URL: <https://www.dancehe.org/news-and-events>
- ³³ For a summary of longstanding debates regarding the ephemeral nature of dance relevant to questions that arise in relation to ICH more generally, see Ali Bresnan's entry on the philosophy of dance in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* and particularly sections 1.1 Problems of Identity and Reconstruction, 1.2 Dance as Ephemeral Art and 3.1 The Primacy of Practice.
- ³⁴ See UNESCO (n.d.) '2000 Onwards and the Drafting of the Convention'. Internet page available at URL: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/2000-onwards-00310> Accessed 9th May 2022.
- ³⁵ Iacono and Brown (2016) p.90.
- ³⁶ For example see Sondra Horton Fraleigh (1987) *Dance and the Lived Body*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. Fraleigh proposed how the existential phenomenologists argued against instrumental attitudes to the body associated with approaches to teaching dance technique which position the body as object.
- ³⁷ Bakka and Karoblis (2021) p.254.
- ³⁸ Carr (2007).
- ³⁹ Cassell, Philip (1993) 'Problems of Action and Structure' in Cassell, Philip (ed.) *The Giddens Reader*. Palgrave, London.
- ⁴⁰ Bourdieu, Pierre (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, translated by Richard Nice, Cambridge, USA and London UK: Harvard University Press.
- ⁴¹ For example, see Morris, Gayle (2001) 'Bourdieu, the Body, and Graham's Post War Dance', *Dance Research*, 19 (2) pp.52-82 or Mitra, Royona (2015) *Akram Khan: Dancing New Interculturalism*, New York: Springer.
- ⁴² Merleau-Ponty, Maurice (1969) *The Visible and the Invisible*, translated by Alphonso Lingist, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- ⁴³ Gallagher, Shaun (2019) 'Precis: Enactivist Interventions', *Philosophical Studies*, 176: 803-806. Gallagher can be understood to build upon phenomenology and pragmatism, paying tribute to the foundations developed in Merleau-Ponty's interdisciplinary study of embodied cognition in Gallagher Shaun (2014) 'The Shadow of the Transcendental: Social Cognitions in Merleau-Ponty and Cognitive Science,' in Bremmers, Chris, van der Heiden, Gert-Jan, and Reynaert, Peter (2014) *Corporeity and Affectivity: Studies in Contemporary Phenomenology*, Leiden: Brill.
- ⁴⁴ Pakes, Anna (2006) 'Dance's Mind-Body Problem', *Dance Research: The Journal of the Society for Dance Research*, 24 (2): 87–104.
- ⁴⁵ Iacono and Brown (2016) p.92.
- ⁴⁶ UNESCO (2015) 'Ethics and Intangible Cultural Heritage'. Internet page available at URL: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866> Accessed 9th May, 2022.
- ⁴⁷ UNESCO (2021) Urgent Safeguarding List: ICH-01 Form. Internet page available at URL: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/forms> Accessed 18th August 2023.
- ⁴⁸ See for example Armelagos, Adina and Mary Sirridge (1978) 'The Identity Crisis in Dance', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 37(2): 129–139; Goodman, Nelson, (1976) *Languages of Art: An Approach to a*

Theory of Symbols, Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company Inc; McFee, Graham (2011) *The Philosophical Aesthetics of Dance: Identity, Performance and Understanding*, Hampshire: Dance Books.

⁴⁹ Bouchenaki, Mounir (2004) 'Editorial', *Museum International* 56 (1-2) 'Intangible Heritage', pp 6-10. Internet page available at URL:<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000135863> Accessed 9th May 2022, p.9.

⁵⁰ Bouchenaki (2004) p.9.

⁵¹ Eichler, Jessika (2021) 'Intangible Cultural Heritage, Inequalities and Participation: Who Decides on Heritage?', *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 25 (5): 793–814. p. 801.

⁵² Norton, Barley and Matsumoto Naomi (2018) 'Introduction: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives on Music as Heritage.' in Norton, Barley and Matsumoto, Naomi, eds. *Music as Heritage: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge, p.3.

⁵³ Cuffy, Violet (forthcoming) Advancing a Centre of Excellence, in Cuffy, Violet and Carr, Jane (eds) *Creole Cultures in Changing Global Contexts: Safeguarding Creole Intangible Cultural Heritage*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

⁵⁴ Eichler, Jessika (2021) p.796.

⁵⁵ Hughes, David, W. (2018) 'Safeguarding the Heart's Home Town: Japanese Folk Song as Intangible Cultural Heritage', in Norton, Barley and Matsumoto, Naomi (eds.) *Music as Heritage: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 144-167.

⁵⁶ Cuffy, Violet and Carr, Jane (eds.) (forthcoming) *Creole Cultures in Changing Global Contexts: Safeguarding Creole Intangible Cultural Heritage*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

⁵⁷ Carr, Jane, Cuffy-Weeks, Delia, Hargoe, Narh, Ofusu Terry and Yartey, Nii Tete (forthcoming) 'Embodying Creole Heritage: The Dominican Bélé', in Cuffy, Violet and Carr, Jane (eds.) *Creole Cultures in Changing Global Contexts: Safeguarding Creole Intangible Cultural Heritage*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

⁵⁸ Yoshitaka, Terada (2018) 'Audiovisual Media and Performing Arts in Danger' in *Music as Heritage: Historical and Ethnographical Perspectives*, Barley Norton and Naomi Matsumoto. London: Routledge, pp. 61-78.

⁵⁹ Waelde, Charlotte (2018) 'ICH, Contemporary Culture and Human Rights,' in Waelde, Charlotte, Cummings, Catherine, Pavis, Mathilde and Enright, Helena (eds.) *Research Handbook on Contemporary Intangible Cultural Heritage: Law and Heritage*, Cheltenham UK and Northampton MA: Edward Elgar, pp.139-164.

⁶⁰ Kraut, Anthea (2009) 'Race-ing Choreographic Copyright', in Foster, Susan (ed.) *Worlding Dance*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp, 76-97.

⁶¹ Wedland, Wend (2004) 'Intangible Heritage and Intellectual Property: Challenges and Future Prospect', *Museum International*, 56 (1-2) 'Intangible Heritage', pp. 97-107. Internet page available at URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000135852> Accessed 1st August 2022 p. 99.

⁶² Norton, Barley and Matsumoto Naomi (2018) p. 6.

⁶³ Combie, Christientia and Cuffy, Violet (forthcoming) Tourism Development in Creole Spaces: a Saint Lucia Island perspective, in Cuffy, Violet and Carr, Jane (eds) *Creole Cultures in Changing Global Contexts: Safeguarding Creole Intangible Cultural Heritage*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

⁶⁴ Michel, Didier and Police-Michel Daniella (forthcoming) 'Valorisation of the Intangible Creole Heritage in Mauritius: A Case Study,' in Cuffy, Violet and Carr, Jane (eds.) *Creole Cultures in Changing Global Contexts: Safeguarding Creole Intangible Cultural Heritage*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

⁶⁵ Choppy, Penda (forthcoming) The Rejuvenation of Arts and Culture through Folklore in Cuffy, Violet and Carr, Jane (eds) *Creole Cultures in Changing Global Contexts: Safeguarding Creole Intangible Cultural Heritage*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

⁶⁶ Hughes (2018).

⁶⁷ Lints, Marc (2019) 'Inscription of Creole Cultures to the Intangible Cultural Heritage of UNESCO', slide share, Internet page available at URL:

<https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/creoles-cultures-kiltir-kreol-cultures-cr-oles/wiki/inscription-creole-cultures-intangible-cultural-heritage-unesco> Accessed 18th August 2022.

⁶⁸ Pine, Joseph, and Gilmore, James (2019) *The Experience Economy, with a New Preface by the Authors: Competing for Customer Time, Attention, and Money*, Harvard Business Review Press: Boston.

⁶⁹ UNESCO (2003)

⁷⁰ UNESCO (2003)

