

revista
brasileira
de estudos
em
dança



An underdone past: toward a historiography of dance from an anti-colonial Marxist perspective

Luciana Gomes Ribeiro

RIBEIRO, Luciana Gomes. An underdone past: toward a historiography of dance from an anti-colonial Marxist perspective. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos em Dança*, vol. 01, n. 01, p. 211-229, 2022.



ABSTRACT


This article emphasizes the challenges in researching the History field of knowledge focused on the dance practice and its productions, particularly when organized as a curricular component in a major in dance - an undergraduate course. The crisis that is faced with the colonizing recognition of knowledge is analyzed here from an anti-colonial Marxist perspective where the questioning of the contents and the historical narratives take center stage. In addition, one may wonder what position the knowledge of the official history of dance occupies. How to intersect the knowledge that has already been produced with the reality and the subjects' stories of the present time? In this sense, this historiography of dance ends up underlining what has been, and still is, hegemonic and what has been made invisible. The underdone past, that exists and lives in the present, carries in itself the contradictions and the condition for reshaping and transformation.

KEYWORDS history; dance; dance historiographies; Marxist anticolonial perspective.

RESUMO

Esse artigo destaca os desafios em se pesquisar o campo de conhecimento História debruçado sobre a prática da dança e suas produções, particularmente quando organizado como componente curricular num curso de formação superior em dança – uma licenciatura. A crise que se atravessa diante do reconhecimento colonizador de um conhecimento é aqui analisada a partir de uma perspectiva marxista anticolonial onde os questionamentos diante dos conteúdos e das narrativas históricas tomam um lugar central. Para além, se pergunta que lugar ocupa os conhecimentos da história oficial da dança. Como fazer cruzar os conhecimentos já produzidos com a realidade e as histórias dos sujeitos do tempo presente? Dessa forma, nessa historiografia da dança acaba-se destacando o que se constituiu e ainda se mantém como hegemônico e o que foi invisibilizado. O mal passado existente e vivido no presente, que carrega em si as contradições e a condição de reelaboração e transformação.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE história; dança; historiografias da dança; perspectiva marxista anticolonial.



An underdone past: toward a historiography of dance from an anti-colonial Marxist perspective

Luciana Gomes Ribeiro (IFG)¹

¹ Professor at Federal Institute of Goiás/campus Aparecida de Goiânia, teaching in high school, in the undergraduate of Dance program and in the master's degree program in Arts Education - PROFARTES. Doctor in History from the UFG. Author of the book "Breves Danças à Margem", 2019 (Brief Dances at the Margin, 2019). Contact: luciana.ribeiro2@ifg.edu.br

A degree in Dance, offered by a Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology, in the city of Aparecida de Goiânia, in the state of Goiás, Brazil, South America. Layers and layers of peripheral capitalism. The course was developed in 2013, having as one of its principles the establishment of a concrete, historical and dialectical relationship with the demands and needs related to the cultural and artistic context of Aparecida de Goiânia city, also the metropolitan region of Goiânia and the State of Goiás, specifically concerning dance, aiming to strengthen and consolidate local artistic manifestations in effective and active dialogue with national and international artistic productions, broadening and deepening the scenario with other formats and dance collections historically constituted.

The History field of knowledge gets new outlines when it focuses on these principles. In this approach, Time is not something natural and evident, it is a cultural construction. It means dealing with filters and relevant networks of life meanings. It is to say that Time is not unique and consequently History is not unique; on the contrary, it is, as a field of knowledge, precisely the identification and understanding of the stories production that has their own plural meanings. History deals with the criteria selection and the importance of events, making them explicit, investigating and problematizing them. These observations are essential for the comprehension of the variety of stories produced, which are here addressed to the various writings and narratives about dance. Even because these stories are also responsible for the production and understanding of dance knowledge through explicit or implicit conceptions in the ways of presenting and narrating them. For Koselleck (2006), History is a game between three spheres of time: the existential dimension, the set of past facts, and one's knowledge and conception of life. Each of these spheres of times relates to each other, influencing and being influenced. So History is perceived in its own historicity.

From it one can deduce that, outside the narration, the events themselves are mute; they only speak because they have been inserted into a certain combination among them. So there are no "naked facts": the facts are always dressed up, everything depends on how this is done, by the "tailoring" of the historian. (Bodei, 2001, p. 66) (*our translation*).

In this perspective, the curricular components of a dance education that deal with History must recognize the spheres of time and the narrative processes that produced and still produce the dances' histories. It comes into question when the Historical narratives are presented as unique references for dance production, and particularly acknowledged and highlighted as models for research and systematic study of dance, that is, for and in academic production. Currently, in Brazil, these issues are also emphasized from the colonial process problematization and the particularities that were brought by the colony condition.

In the case of dance, the possibilities of experiencing it and also of registering it are related to the various conceptions one has of it and, mainly, if what one does is considered dance, if it is considered art. This is one of the biggest problems in the creation of dance histories in Brazil. In most of them the concepts that established the criteria for selection and relevance, and consequently what went in and what was left out, are not explicit. This has led to a naturalism of the facts themselves and, consequently, of their evolutionary functioning and ordering, as well as an essentialism to the dance phenomenon. The concreteness of this in dance echoes directly in its development. As in modernity concepts create experiences (Koselleck, 2006), it makes Benjamin's "Angel of History" unable to stop repeating the past, consolidating the "permanent state of exception" experienced mainly in the progressive conception of History consolidated in this same modernity. (Ribeiro, 2010, p. 117) (*our translation*).

This situation was present in the field of dance history in Brazil in general until quite recently. Roberto Pereira wrote an article published in 2007 entitled "Livros de História da Dança no Brasil: porque eles merecem ser lidos" (Books on the History of Dance in Brazil: Why They Are Worth Reading - *our translation*) in which he made a detailed survey of this production at that time. Pereira showed how the number of publications has increased considerably and, in particular, how the historiographical profile and perspectives of these productions have changed significantly. The publications on dance History in Brazil only came about in the 80s and there were seven of them². Besides an inefficient distribution, these first writings were written by former dancers, journalists and dance critics - who were also

² Nos passos da dança ("In the dance steps"), by Maribel Portinari, 1985. Pequena história da dança ("Short dance History"), by Antônio José Faro, 1986. Imagens da dança em São Paulo ("Dance images in São Paulo"), by Cássia Navas, 1987. A dança no Brasil e seus construtores ("Dance in Brazil and its creators") by Antônio José Faro, 1988. A dança teatral no Brasil ("The Theatrical Dance in Brazil") by Eduardo Sucena, 1989. História da dança ("The Dance History"), by Maribel Portinari, 1989 and Danças populares brasileiras ("Popular dances in Brazil"), by Helena Katz, 1989.

former dancers and journalists. This number doubled in the 90s, the great majority being biographies and cartographies of regional and local contexts, including dance festivals. This new profile made explicit not only a greater care for particularities, but also the effort to bypass the great gap that exists in the field of recording, cataloging and also the accessibility of documents and memories of dance in Brazil. As the materials found are always extensive and diverse, their organization and promotion become a great contribution to both areas: Dance and History.

In the first five years of the first decade of the 2000s, the number tripled. And this number kept growing, and so did the historiographical care. Today one can already count on the initiatives of research groups³ and productions that are ever more meticulous and that present relevant and unsettling questions in order to contribute to the production of knowledge in the field of Brazilian Dance Historiography. The most recent productions seek accuracy in terms of information about events and, above all, they construct questions and answers while respecting and valuing the particular contexts of dance. There is a widening of facts and dance memories. The manipulation of a myriad of archives and especially the production of many stories coming from the same archive enables the understanding that these - as organized collections of certain events - are somehow finished, but at the same time are endless (RICOEUR, 2007). And so, one can think more critically and purposefully about the History of Dance disciplines within the several specific dance training courses.

Dance Historiography and Marxism

³ As is the case of the International Seminar on History(ies) of Dance(s), whose second edition took place in December 2021 and of which this text is an unfolding. The event was organized by the Research Group in Memory and History of Dance/CNPq-UFG, the Post Graduate Program in Performing Arts at UFG, the Post Graduate Program in Dance at UFRJ, the Post Graduate Program in Cultural Performances at UFG, the National Association of Dance Researchers/ANDA, Studies in Brazilian Dance History at UFRJ and the Descentrados Network.

A historiographical approach to dance from a Marxist perspective will be presented, and afterwards how this perspective is linked to the colonial question, thus assuming an anti-colonial stance. This exercise is part of the History of Dance and the Body I and II methodology, taught in the Dance course at the IFG/Campus Aparecida de Goiânia. The Marxist perspective has historical materialism as its method of analysis, interpretation, and production of knowledge. And here I make some highlights, based on the notes of Fernandes (2020):

1. it is assumed that materiality, that is, reality, is what generates human theories. So theory is the result of material reality as transposed to our thinking head;
2. however, reality is contradictory, dialectic, and carries with it the possibility of its negation, it means that reality is in movement, it is alive, it is a human production;
3. therefore, the dialectic and historical conception of reality, that is, the understanding that reality and the theories about it are human productions that carry within themselves their contradictions, is fundamental in the marxist comprehension;
4. and, finally, the praxis issue. The position that the human being occupies in the given reality, in other words, the exercise of being in reality, of proving the truth that has been raised, identified, interpreted;
5. concluding that it is not enough to interpret, or identify, or contemplate, it is necessary to transform.

In this way, historical materialism allows us to understand that things do not appear from nowhere and that choices are not only individual, nor free, appearing or disappearing within a context. It leads to the awareness of the very historicity (Gramsci, 1978) of reality, of existence, of the productions of concrete life. The problematization that is constructed in front of the dance phenomenon starts from the identification and understanding of the processes of production of its existence. In this perspective, the materiality of dance and the objective spaces where it takes place are searched for, emphasizing that in Marxist praxis the subjective conception of reality is also understood as historical fact, as "the historical subjectivity of a social group" (idem).

The methodology, according to these disciplines, is directed towards the historiographic comprehension of dance, considering and identifying the several ways of producing life and of humanity, from two interpretation keys:

a) the forms of social structure and organization - the concrete production of life that makes power relations explicit: dominant X dominated, official X unofficial, and that in capitalism gains different and complex contours; b) and the ways of comprehending the world - systems and logics of thought, levels of human knowledge. And these two keys of interpretation are intersected by two main categories: 1. body, as production of relations and meanings, that is, focusing on the historical-social production of corporeity; and 2. Distinct human dimensions, listing the practical-utilitarian dimension and, on the other hand, the aesthetic-sensitive dimension, recognizing that the human being lives in many worlds from different keys, and that one does not go from one world to another without the respective key, that is, without changing the intentionality and the respective way of appropriation of reality (Kosik, 1976).

In the practical-utilitarian relation, the subject tries to fulfill a determined human need and, therefore, the subject values the objects according to their utility or capacity to fulfill it. (...) In the artistic creation, or man's creative aesthetic relationship with reality, the subjective becomes objective (object), and the object becomes subject, but a subject whose expression has already been objectified not only surpasses the framework of subjectivity, surviving its creator, but can be shared, when already fixed in the object, by other subjects. (Vázquez, 1978, p. 56) (*our translation*).

The History disciplines in the Dance course at IFG, from this perspective, seek the reflective exercise of social practice, starting with the identification of the several dance narratives and their links and also the social functions provided by the students, which is followed by the problematization of the social relations that produce these narratives, these stories, crossing with their means of production, the institutions and/or communities that produce them, their subjects, and the phenomena themselves. Ask yourself: Do bodies produce dances? Do dances produce bodies? We are confronting the daily understanding and the concrete reality of the production, the permanence and the transformations of dance practices based on the historical narratives produced about them, and stimulating the critical consciousness of this reality with the objective of social transformation.

In the context of the undergraduate course, what is evident is that there are still very strong taboos and prejudices about the social place of dance brought up by the students in their reading of their personal and social reality. Conflicts and contradictions are made explicit. A state of being of

things still predominant. The dance phenomenon reduced to isolated, abstract techniques, or skill, and ONE technique. The dance production process is reduced to mechanical imitation and execution, and also to obeying norms. And, in the light of this, we are set out to identify and understand the deficiencies, limitations, and partialities of these readings, theories, and discourses that make up the historical narratives of dance in general, that is, of this hegemonic social reality of dance.

It is identified that there are narratives that overlap with others, that oppress others, that subordinate others. This statement points to a society that is divided by antagonistic classes. One dominant and the other dominated. One hegemonic and the other subordinate, oppressor and oppressed. Gramsci (2017) presents the concept of hegemony as that which predominates between consensus and force. A class is dominant in two ways: it is ruling, through the cultural hegemony of allied classes, and, it is dominant through the political hegemony of opposing classes. It is the political and cultural hegemony of a social group over the entire society.

In the capitalist form of social organization, the production and exchange of goods occur in the abstract, that is, both through the alienation of the production process, where there is no involvement with the whole and no recognition of what is produced, and also, through the exploitation of labor power. It is then understood that the domination process in contemporary capitalist society is still based on the exploitation of labor and the expropriation of cultural and natural assets. The bonds are made through power and property. The capitalist mode of production has not been overcome, it is still a society divided between those who own the means of production, the capitalist subjects, and those who do not own the means of production and need to "sell" their labor power, the objectified working class. There is still segregation, inequality, and exploitation.

As such, the expression of cultural hegemony, that is, the predominant values in the context of dance within the capitalist form of social organization, correspond and serve to a specific social class, which is the bourgeois class. The standards that still predominate and prevail are those of a white body, when not white, thin, when not thin, objectified, fetishized. Standards of being a woman, when not docile, empowered, virtuous,

harmonious, and spectacularizing movements, etc. And this is not only linked to ballet, nor to the dances guided by the Art Institution, it runs into and infects popular productions such as the ballroom dances.

Market relations do not exist in a vacuum, but relate to and appropriate other forms of discrimination and inequality according to the interests of the system. Since capitalism influences not only material economic relations, but also the production of subjects - according to what Engels warned us about - there is a mediation between class and the categories of race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nationality, and questions about which bodies are read as 'normal' according to each society.

As people become exploited or exploiters in the capitalist system, the system does the 'incorporation of prejudice and discrimination that will be actualized to function as ways of subjectivation within capitalism.' (Fernandes, 2020, p. 86) (*our translation*).

The hegemony of dance formats, genres, and representations is sustained by occupying the several spaces of knowledge production and diffusion, as well as obeying and doing justice to an ideological construction (Mészáros, 2004), that is to say, it is a false reproduction of reality⁴, which coexists with the bourgeois order. This hegemonic thought that corresponds to a liberal bourgeois ideology indicates very solid postures of a dance universe, of a real and concrete imaginary that constructs behaviors, subjectivities, prejudices, traumas, and exclusions. And, consequently, it is not denied here that a Marxist ideology exists, and this ideology is put as emancipatory precisely because it is partial, for two reasons: because reality is in movement, and, mainly because it is committed to clear purposes of transformation and to overcoming the established reality.

(...) in our liberal-conservative culture the socially established and dominant ideological system functions so as to present - or misrepresent - its own rules of selectivity, prejudice, discrimination and even systematic distortion as "normality", "objectivity" and "scientific impartiality". (...) In the liberal-conservative capitalist societies of the West, the ideological discourse dominates, to such an extent, the establishment of all values that very often we do not have the slightest suspicion that we have been led to accept, without question, a certain set of values to which one could oppose a well-reasoned alternative position, together with its more or less implicit compromises. (Mészáros, 2004, p. 57) (*our translation*).

⁴ A fake reproduction precisely because it does not recognize its structural determinants. It prints ideas and concepts to the facts, but not admitting this, it presents itself as neutral and, for this reason, even tends to hide what really happens. (Mészáros, 2004)

Therefore, the history subjects and the place of the IFG dance degree itself - a geographical and symbolic social place - are placed in their concrete conditions as an exercise of confrontation and social transformation. What is the meaning of a degree in Dance in the metropolitan region of Goiânia, in a city with more than 500 thousand inhabitants and close to the capital? Who are the dance makers of this place? Are we able to dialogue with them? What is the importance of a college education for these makers? Is it important? Does it bring social mobility? Are there any echoes in the already structured and institutional field of education? These are some of the questions that are present and implicit for this reflection and production. The disciplines of body and dance history are thought and developed based on the recognition of this hegemonic mindset that is indicative of this concrete condition of a dependent capitalism. The historical analysis of dance knowledge production is based on a critical relationship through the structures that make up the dance existence production and that respond to the dominant interests of the capitalist

And dance is a phenomenon that, being here, in the field of knowledge production established through the methodological analysis of reality, is guided by the specificity marked by differentiation, while hoping to ensure the possibility of an agreement based on a sharing of principles and not procedures, as Maria Cecília Minayo (1994) puts it. In other words, the exercise is to look at the historical narratives of dance, of what arrives and how it arrives, seeking to identify, analyze and differentiate the various historical-cultural contexts of dance and their identity and contradictory structures. It is also an exercise to select interpretative keys for reflection on the relations between dance and history from the social, political, economic and ideological aspects.

Dwelling on the historical exercise is to understand the ruptures and permanences in the production of dances by and in humanity. It is unfeasible to focus on the whole, so we start with what makes sense, what corresponds to the micro and macro social context, with the concrete local reality intertwined with the production that is recognized nationally and internationally. The historiographical analyses of the dance field of knowledge gain a real challenge when seeking to disclose historical and

cultural aspects of dance that designate its meaning and the achievement of its goals as a social practice. Starting from here, from the concreteness of our reality in relation to the institutional, with the established, and, mainly conducted by a production of knowledge in movement that analyzes, intertwines, criticizes, breaks up, transforms, justifies and presents unfoldings and, in this way, perceives what is in dispute. This place that one wants to occupy, build, produce, research. Of a past that only makes sense in contact with the present, of the present to question the past, what is placed as past, what exists, what seems not to exist.

We want to know and identify dance aesthetics and poetics produced in the academic context, which ones and how they were and are legitimated, how they were and are placed in a broader context of social organization, of power relations and domination, and of division by social classes. What ruptures have they produced? What social bonds have they created and, above all, whether these ruptures have been consolidated by creating new dance scenarios and aesthetic traits or not. What social and aesthetic principles have thickened these ruptures? What has remained as principles or has been retained and absorbed by the hegemonic structure of ideological knowledge production that turns reason into an entity, by the production and teaching/learning of dance in the service of a bourgeois order? We have to think about the contradictions that emerge from the ruptures themselves and what, in fact, allows us to maintain as a rupture and what does not. Some aspects or the whole are captured by the larger structure of capitalism and then, in fact, are no longer of that place, even becoming conservative. It is the old in the guise of the new.

It is important that the rupture movements and the legitimized trajectories of dances are known, so that these historical transformations can be understood and apprehended from them in confrontation with the very reality to which the course and its subjects are inserted. The intersections of time layers exist. What are and are not academic dances locally? How are they structured? What is there? Nothing? What dances are made? How is it done? How do these dances operate in the field of the aesthetic dimension? What comes and what doesn't come with them? How are they organized? Do they mobilize? Do they have adhesion? Does it have recognition? Does

it have legitimacy? What did/does it have? Why? We have to identify and reflect on what exists in the local reality of mixtures, of confusions, of precariousness, of understanding, how this gets there, where this knowledge places me socially, what is done with it. Accepting these confusions, these dirties and, above all, not forgetting that these noises, the precariousness and arbitrariness are part of power disputes, of hegemony disputes, of ideas of existence. This is to appropriate and understand the dynamics of dance historiography, identifying historical aspects of the development of the Dance phenomenon relating them to conceptions of body and human dimensions, particularly the aesthetic-sensible one.

Here the challenge of confronting the now in the History field is to trace the social constructions of dance, the mismatches, the inventiveness, the oppressions, and the oppression histories in the periphery of capitalism, where the legitimacy problem gains very distinct contours due to colonial practices. That is, of the relationship of hierarchies and subjugation. And, by proposing to face these contradictions and inequalities, the curriculum of the Degree in Dance course at IFG includes the study and research of collections that come from the popular classes, from workers and what and also how these collections resist as being distinct in relation to the hegemonic production and development of dances. It is distinct as an experience of the body, distinct as production/relation with knowledge and its transmission, in the face of the experience and access to the dance phenomenon. By proposing knowledge beyond that one produced and conducted in the Art Institution, including the recognition that there is an institutional construction for art that comes from a social-scientific-cultural context, the production of knowledge is already broadened to contexts that are wider than the aesthetic dimension, encompassing different spaces of sociability and social bonds. It is also understood that these collections and other knowledge of dance, are in opposition to the maladies that the capitalist system imposes, since they do not directly correspond to its ideology.

Therefore, historiographical analyses of dance need to know and recognize that there are dances that are produced based on other principles, but that hardly resist because they do not have the social apparatus available for their development and empowerment. This is also why, in addition to

expanding the universe of dances, it is important to guide the relationship to be established with each and every dance/body, questioning and building what is, in fact, understood as a critical, active, full, and emancipated relationship. Transforming life/experience/existence. So, what is thought? It is vital to say how one thinks about school, not in a reformist perspective, but revolutionary. What and how does one think about cultural production? The production and experience of dance? So, what we are looking for is the transformation of the places where knowledge is produced so that several dances can be recognized as legitimate, because they are people's productions. For this to happen, it is necessary to think about what we are, what we have, how we are, and what structure we have.

From a Marxist perspective, the production of knowledge is in movement, and establishes criticisms, sets out the contradictions, and accepts movements. And even the very place of knowledge production is in dispute and in movement, approaching or being transformed by the people who occupy it and become part of it. That is why these places are disputed. That is why the undergraduate dance course was created, thinking about how to reach more and more people, and how to reach several different dance makers. It is guided by several questions that are embedded in the dance historiographical analysis, since they are echoes of established narratives, of its absences, of the places that dance occupies in a university course. How does one produce dance from a university trajectory? What does it ensure, or should it ensure? Critical thinking? Social insertion and mobility? Autonomy of action and professional production? What limits and challenges does the university present to reality?

This is studying and producing in the History field, in the dance historical productions. To make History. It is to identify opportunities, but much more, one needs to create the conditions for these opportunities to arise. This implies changing the structure, this is the radical transformation of society. Changing the relationship with the body, with the experience and production in dance, observing the contradictions present in reality, the various social subjects and recognizing the determination of ideologies that guide the practical social consciousness of class societies (Mészáros, 2004). "*Without this, the internal structure remains completely unintelligible*" (idem,

p.67). It is necessary to establish a critical perspective of what already exists as legitimate production of dance histories, that is to establish a concrete, historical and dialectical understanding of the places and the political-social importance they occupy, because there is a real social struggle. And this is what underlies the practical social consciousness of the mother, the neighbor, the coordinator and the other teachers in the school, the fifty dance academies in the city, the TV programs, the dance industry and market. The path is long...

This is a production of historical dance knowledge marked by the perspective of class warfare and the recognition of a capitalist structure that subjugates the whole of social life. Thinking that the embarrassment or discomfort or inferiority felt by being another dance is subjective, but what underlies these feelings is historical, concrete. It is the result of the standardization of hegemonic models ideologically constructed by idealized images and naturalized hierarchies of body and dance in order that certain values and ways of appropriating, developing, and accessing dance are presented as more important, more accurate and/or more true. It is necessary to know what was and what is established as hegemonic and why. And historical knowledge has the challenge of establishing two ways to confront this reality: to instrumentalize, that is to say, to make it known and to act within the current scenario, the academically hegemonic histories, seeking the enlargement of the conditions of production and development of dances, as well as to facilitate the possibility of utopia, of radical social change, which is the exercise of production that confronts and overcomes this hegemony. These productions are fights, organization, mobilization, union with the greatest agendas of life. Stressing concrete demands. It is necessary to write, to produce workers' histories, of how we are, how we organize ourselves, what our trajectory is. Even to confront exclusion, oppression, expropriation of what exists.

Dance and anti-colonial Marxism

Even new dance phenomena that are reviving the academic universe, academic dance, and large dance markets such as festivals and research centers, still seem to be held up by the bourgeois order, since they are indicated as confrontations of body, movement, techniques, gender,

race, presenting them as issues in themselves constitutive of contemporary society, without naming what in fact structures such issues and confrontations. It is necessary to change the body objectification and instrumentalization, in the high performance market which is spectacularized, competitive, full of exploitation and oppression, and is also exclusionary, fetishized, consumerist. This cultural texture composes, feeds, and coexists with the endless accumulation by the owners of the means of production. When we incorporate the knowledge and social agendas of the working class in isolation, that is to say, apart from those who need to sell their labor to survive, or agendas that differ from the bourgeois order, they are easily adapted and incorporated as new market demands. That is attached to profit and to fetish. It is necessary to question if dance productions are based on the fetishism of individuality, or if they are effectively placed as coming from social subjects, collectives, groups inserted in a society based on class fight. If not, this is the reification of real people according to the roles of oppressor and oppressed. As Sabrina Fernandes (2020) emphasizes, if the contradiction of the system is maintained, if the systemic contradiction perseveres, there is no escape, individually, from the formal and symbolic contradiction of being against the current order while it is in place.

So in a capitalist, class-divided society, moving toward "class consciousness" is precisely going beyond. Beyond the understanding of the exploited worker in the world, the class consciousness encourages action to change this reality collectively. It is a group of people in the same condition - exploited workers, underlining that there are levels of exploitation and fragmentation, even if in different roles, times and places. This means understanding oneself in this place/condition - of one who is alien to the process that produces one's own existence, inferiorized, exploited, expropriated, subjugated, dehumanized, in relation to the other class that dominates and exploits. This is already a huge step of awareness towards transformation and social overcoming. It strengthens the fight. However, as Mészáros (2004) says, even the most positive forms of awareness of the fundamental social conflict have long been affected by the structural

limitations of class confrontation. This is related to colonialism and here I present the anti-colonialist position.

Domenico Losurdo (2018), an Italian Marxist thinker has a chapter in his book "Western Marxism", which is: from "proletarian only" revolution to anti-colonial revolutions. Here he explains how there is an awareness of Marxism in relation to the wars in Europe where slave masters fight for the consolidation and strengthening of slavery - including liberal intellectuals who fought for a democracy and values such as freedom in Europe, turning a blind eye to the colonial process and the enslavement and genocide of other peoples and their cultures. At the same time it was understood that the countries that suffered the colonization process, even if they managed to achieve political independence, this was not linked to economic independence, and they would continue to suffer the oppression exerted by some great power. This puts Marxism back in a fighting position, for the real problem was then to end, on a world scale, the capitalist-imperialist system.

The Congress of the East Peoples, held in Baku in the summer of 1920, right after the Second Congress of the Communist International, tried to reiterate and officialize this point of view. This congress felt the need to complement the motto enclosing the Communist Party Manifesto and the inaugural vocative of the International Workingmen's Association. The new motto was: 'Proletarians of all countries and oppressed peoples of the whole world, unite!' Now, alongside the 'proletarians', the 'oppressed peoples' also emerged as full revolutionary subjects. (Losurdo, 2018, p. 53) (*our translation*).

The fights can start from the identification of common interests, in this case, the joint confrontations of difficulties and oppression, which go through several issues, but are interconnected by the common denominator that is the labor power exploitation and the expropriation of symbolic, social, and cultural resources. And who are we, the working and exploited bodies? Does dance education target, or at least consider, working and excluded subjects? The working class - those who do not own the means of production. What do working-class dances look like? Is it possible to establish this category of analysis? What are its features? Who makes up the working and oppressed class? Black men and women, indigenous people, peasants, people who are undermined in their cultures, by a bourgeois class, white, male dominated, cisgender, heteronormative ideology. What do these subjects have in common? They are oppressed and dehumanized, inferiorized in their social

condition and value. In various layers and levels, they are/we are several subjects who are oppressed, coerced, crossed by a bourgeois world conception. Hollowed out, oppressed.

This is a parameter/posture already inaugurated in the very production of histories and fights. To understand, denounce and to fight against. It is anticolonialism. The anti in the perspective of negation - pointing out its opposition and confronting this condition. It is the call to consider the fights of histories and collectivities in History. We have to recognize the colonial condition, understand and denounce its structures, fight against it knowing that overcoming it is linked to radical social transformation. As José Paulo Netto (2011) states, the project of modernity that has reason as its center has two dimensions: 1) the manipulative, instrumental, and controlling dimension, to rationally control nature linked to the former, 2) an emancipatory dimension ensuring freedom and autonomy to the subjects, to rationally organize society. However, this project built the bourgeois world and made from reason an entity to sustain and consolidate capitalism, through the exploitation and expropriation of one class to sustain the other. The clashes in the field of reason were determined by interests and forms of social and material development.

The colonization process was a project that guaranteed an absurd advance of capitalism sustained by this appropriation and reason conditioning of science to justify people's exploitation and expropriation. Do we want to appropriate this science, or do we recognize this appropriation? And what is the purpose of this place of analysis and reflection? Dance for what and for whom? What do you want to sustain as dance? This is presented as a possibility of fight, of an exploited class and exploited peoples mobilization or a dispute based on popular movements. It is a serious and risky matter to accentuate this perspective for the dance area. Recognizing these places and forms of organization and mobilization as well in/for/within dance to make life more pleasurable and fulfilling for more people. The bourgeoisies of the ruling class have always been against the self-organization of the workers and exploited people in general. By calling the working class, the workers of the whole world - those who need to sell their work force to minimally sustain their survival and to be socially inserted - to

organize and fight against the opposing, oppressing class - the owner of the means of production - the social organization based on capitalism is finally understood and, as such, the dance that is produced, its various forms of developing, existing and resisting, is the fruit of this class fight. And it is also the fruit of this capitalist social structure, of all its oppression and exploitation, and also of its resistance, confrontation, struggle.

One can identify and produce historiographical narratives of the base movements of dances. Which base? The concreteness of the subjects' lives, their existence production, or the fights for existence conditions, of life, of dance, of life-dance. The desires and frustrations, the deviations, and the re-significations. The new and other meanings given from the concrete experience in that concrete reality. Versions of academic dance in the city of Aparecida de Goiânia, guided by a bourgeois ideology and also by resistances, struggles and inventions. To emerge, to insurge. What comes of the artistic movements produced in the academic place of reflection and distancing? Are there popular schools of dance in the Freirean sense created from organized social movements? Attention should be paid to which perspective one is working from: presupposing ignorance in the Other or presupposing the Other's own ignorance?

So, we recognize that the dances of the working people, the oppressed, exist, and in many moments have placed themselves as resistance to this hegemony of the oppressor class, affirming themselves as being distinguished from it in this place of not wanting to oppress, to exploit, to suffocate, to exclude the other, the different. Because these are the principles that sustain the ruling class and structure contemporary social life, and that from an ideological construction formerly of neutrality, and nowadays of atomization, pulverization, and decentering (Eagleton, 2005). And it structures itself and all its institutions are structures to that purpose, because that is how it stays on top, dominating, oppressing without appearing to oppress. Here, there is a fear that one will fall into the fetish of particularism, that one will deny scientism, that is to say that one will deny the universal for a fetish of particularity. An appeal to ultra particularism.

In this way, it is emphasized at this conclusion that the place that guides this reflection is the field of scientificity, the exercise of analytically

and carefully looking at reality, considering its various versions and layers, highlighting even its unfinished and moving characteristics. A place of knowledge and history production that is built on social conflicts and revolves around property and labor. Conflict, contradiction, discomfort, and utopia. Finally, through the categories, the perspective of analysis of reality, and the productions, Marxism and its anti-colonial stance meet the world perspectives and the knowledge and social transformation production on which this work is based. But what would be the underdone past? It is not a matter of positivity or negativity. An underdone past in the sense of a short past, made of a dubious execution, which is based on the real and that, because of it, is what gives flavor, life and movement. So the past that is placed in this condition of an underdone past is the assumption of a transitory posture, which carries in itself the contradictions and the condition of re-laboration, transformation, revolution.

Referências

BODEI, Remo. *A história tem um sentido?* Tradução de Reginaldo Di Piero. Bauru: EDUSC, 2001.

EAGLETON, Terry. *Depois da teoria: um olhar sobre os Estudos Culturais e o pós-modernismo.* Tradução de Maria Lucian Oliveira. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2005.

FERNANDES, Sabrina. *Se quiser mudar o mundo: um guia político para quem se importa.* São Paulo: Planeta, 2020.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. *Concepção dialética da história.* 3ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1978.

KOSELLECK, Reinhart. *Futuro Passado contribuição à semântica dos tempos históricos.* Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto Editora PUC - Rio, 2006.

KOSIK, Karel. *Dialética do concreto.* Tradução de Célia Neves. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1976.

LOSURDO, Domenico. *O marxismo ocidental: como nasceu, como morreu, como pode renascer.* Tradução de Ana Maria Chiarini. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2018.

MÉZAROS, István. *O poder da ideologia.* Tradução de Paulo Cezar Castanheira. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2004.

MINAYO, Maria Cecília de Souza (org). *Pesquisa social: teoria, método e criatividade.* 28ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2009.

NETTO, José Paulo. *Introdução ao estudo do método de Marx.* São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2011.

PEREIRA, Roberto. Livros de história da dança no Brasil: porque eles merecem ser lidos. In: NORA, Sigrid (org.) *Húmus 2.* Caxias do Sul: Lorigraf, 2007.

RIBEIRO, Luciana G. *Breves danças à margem: a constituição de uma história artística da dança em Goiânia (1982-1986)*. 2010. 407 pgs. Tese. (Doutorado em História) Programa de Pós Graduação em História da Faculdade de História, UFG, 2010.

RICŒUR, Paul. *A memória, a história, o esquecimento*. Tradução: Alain François et. al. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, 2007.

VÁZQUEZ, Adolfo. *As ideias estéticas de Marx*. Tradução de Carlos Nelson Coutinho. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1978.

VOZA, Pasquale e LIGUORI, Guido (org). *Dicionário Gramsciano*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2017.

Recebido em 11 de maio de 2022
Aprovado em 11 de julho de 2022

REALIZAÇÃO



UFRJ

Anda

associação nacional de
pesquisadores em dança