

DAMP DREAMS :  
SOME PROBLEMS WITH DANCE IN BALI



MARK HOBART

*T* SOME PROBLEMS WITH BALINESE DANCE

HAT WHICH DISTINGUISHES THE CHOREOGRAPHIC ART OF BALI IS TRADITIONAL character. The dances, the dialogues, the choruses, have been repeated in exactly the same way for centuries. A dancer would never dare modify them, and I'm not referring to a body position or a step but not even the movement of one finger. And yet these ritual dances retain a living beauty and an extraordinary youthfulness. When watching them, one has the impression of seeing the bas-reliefs of ancient Khmer monuments come to life: what appears before us is the supernatural world of the celestial nymphs that covers the walls of the temples of Java' (Prunières 1931).

'There is no word in the Bali language for "art" or "artist". In Bali, art is not a thing but a profound sentiment, indefinable and indefinite [...] Dancing is a ritual, dance poetry, movement created by the soul, possessed and conquered' (Fels 1931)<sup>1</sup>.

'Dance is the main art form of Balinese culture and is performed at main temple festivals and ceremonies, especially for the cycle of life and death. Taught and kept in secrecy in villages, halls and palaces, the dances that tourists witness in hotels and specially constructed stages are merely a fraction of the dance scene.'

'In many cultures dance and drama are important to pass on customs and mores from one generation to the next. Such is true in Bali where dance & drama has historically been used to pass down cultural values through the tales of Ramayana, Mahabarata and other epic stories from Balinese history. It is interesting to note that the Balinese never tire of watching these dances even though they may have seen them umpteen times before and know each movement by heart<sup>2</sup>.'

The serious study of dance in Bali encounters the problem of how to extricate it from more than a century of European – and now Balinese and Indonesian – fantasy. Granted the singular place Balinese dance has held in

the world of non-Western performance, there has remarkably been virtually no critical analysis of received accounts, of its history and social background, or of the relationship between Balinese and outsiders' understandings. Despite reviews of the pervasive Orientalism to which Bali has been subject (Boon 1977; Vickers 1989; Picard 1996)<sup>3</sup>, as the quotations above suggest, not all that much has changed.

Awash as we are with reiterated truths, what do we actually know about theatre and dance? As Bali was only finally conquered by the Dutch between 1906–1910, what kind of knowledge we have of the pre-colonial period is salient. What impact did the demise of the *ancien régime* and the advent of cultural tourism have on performance? Are we seriously to accept, as do most commentators, the colonial dogma that Balinese culture was effectively untouched by conquest? What were the circumstances under which accounts were written? For what purposes? How were the authors themselves positioned and implicated? For what readership were they designed? How have Balinese imagined and represented their own theatrical practices at different times? Indeed, what attitudes do Balinese take to the documentation, classification, understanding and analysis of their theatre, dance and music as cultural products? Are such issues as central, say, as concern with the quality of performance, or with addressing the demands of changing circumstances, audience tastes and new media like radio, television and VCDs? It would seem that, far from knowing all there is to know about Balinese dance, we are still struggling to work out what questions we might intelligently ask.

A further problem is that, anecdotal stories apart, the actualities of performances in pre-colonial Bali remain uncertain. The result is an open season for retrojecting onto an imagined past whatever has suited the needs of particular authors. Unfortunately, accounts from the colonial period and later are not problem-free either. De Zoete and Spies' magnificent pioneering *Dance and drama in Bali* set itself the task of introducing the various main genres of Balinese theatre to a readership with no background to Indonesia. However, Spies was a key figure in the romanticization of the island and in helping to forge the hegemonic account that subsequent works replicate, largely uncritically (Vickers 1989: 105–24; Hitchcock and Norris 1995). Later works, like Banded and deBoer's *Balinese dance in transition*, had different aims, namely to describe what had happened to theatre and dance since de Zoete and Spies. More recently Dibia and Ballinger's *Balinese dance, drama and music* broke new ground in including how Balinese, not just Europeans and Americans, approach their performing arts. However, as the sub-title suggests, this is an introductory guide, rather than a critical account.

A comprehensive study is beyond the scope of this article. Instead, a critical review of what we presume we know is long overdue. Sceptical as my argument is, my aim is positive: to encourage serious reconsideration of theatre and dance in Bali. The idea that dance was ancient, widespread, popular and demotic, and the defining feature of Balinese culture is, I submit, largely a western fantasy driven by its own imperatives. Rather, there was, in most European senses of the term, almost no dance in Bali until after conquest and the arrival of tourism in the 1920s and 1930s. European colonialists and tourists expected the natives to dance. And the Balinese obliged their conquerors brilliantly – *inter alia* by inventing *Kebyar* (see below). Balinese dance began life in effect as an international phenomenon, the outcome of a double encounter of Europeans and Balinese – notably through tourism and international exhibitions.

What exactly am I arguing? First is a problem with method. Pre-colonial textual references to performances are not of themselves necessarily informative, because what terms refer to changes. Balinese continually rework dance. Pre-conquest *Lègong* was probably virtually unrecognizable from its present forms. Retrojection and anachronism are the bane of Balinese dance studies. While it would be relatively simple to string together references from the patchy sources on pre-colonial performance either to support or to refute my argument, both are 'scissors-and-paste' history (Collingwood 1940: 257–66)<sup>4</sup>. Such exercises in positivism are distinct from a critical interrogation, which calls for both an understanding of the background, motives and interests of outside commentators, and the lived worlds of Balinese at the time. We need to rethink how we – and, crucially, Balinese – understand performances and appreciate these in the full complexity of their different contexts.

For the record, I am not claiming that there were no performances in pre-colonial Bali that we might loosely label 'theatre' or 'dance'. Courts were notionally patrons of the arts<sup>5</sup>. But quite what is at issue? Part is a semantic problem. Part is ignorance of Balinese categories. It is necessary to distinguish dance from theatre because the creation of the phenomenon of 'Balinese dance' involved the determined and meticulous stripping out of singing, dialogue, narrative, philosophy, and historical and cultural referents, which marked theatre at least as scholars knew it from the 1930s on. 'Dance', as it came to be, required a separate label for a quite distinct phenomenon.

What is it about dance in Bali that is so special? If princely courts entertained themselves and visitors with occasional performances, how did Bali differ from most other stratified Asian societies? Were they not to have held dances, now *that* would have been interesting. What is supposed to

make Bali distinct, however, is that dance was popular. But was it popular in being widespread, frequent, accessible, public and engaging a substantial proportion of the populace? Or did it emerge from and exist for ordinary people? I doubt either was the case. Another argument for the special status of dance in Bali is that it constituted a privileged trope through which to understand Balinese culture more broadly<sup>6</sup>. What, however, singles out dance as against a whole host of other cultural practices?

Maybe I am barking up the wrong tree. Perhaps it is its religious or ritual nature that singles out Balinese dance. By the 1930s, we have accounts of plays such as *Calonarang*<sup>7</sup> and *Basur* being performed when Balinese felt threatened by disease or witchcraft, and *Topèng Pajegan*<sup>8</sup> as part of temple ceremonies (*piodalan*), or dances like *Réjang*, *Baris Gedé* and *Mèndèt*. We need to be cautious. For example, *Réjang Déwa*, which ‘has now become the standard in many villages throughout the island’ (Dibia and Ballinger 2004: 56), and which many villagers swear is ancient, was choreographed in 1988 by Swasti Wijaya Bandem from STSP. In North Gianyar, where I worked from 1970–1972, *Baris Gedé* consisted simply in ordering the nearest youths to hand: ‘Oi! Grab those spears. Now walk up and down three times.’ *Mèndèt* comprised elderly women desultorily offering holy water and incense to shrines, while caricaturing dance movements delightfully replete with gestures most Europeans would consider obscene. Balinese, indeed, now often say that religion and performance are inextricable. However, this articulation is modern and relates to the need to make Balinese religion acceptable to the Indonesian state<sup>10</sup>. Then again, the relationship between what westerners usually call religion and what Balinese call *agama* is a twisted tale (Fox 2002). What constitutes dance, what religion, when and according to whom? Designating dance in Bali as religious raises new problems and explains little<sup>11</sup>.

#### HOW DANCE GOT INTO BALINESE THEATRE

There is no single story as to how Bali became identified with dance as an international brand. Here, I have space for only two strands. The first, as Michel Picard has shown, is how cultural tourism demanded a new kind of performance. Beginning in the 1920s, the Dutch organized weekly dances to attract visitors at a growing number of hotels in Denpasar. Existing Balinese theatre was unsuitable for many reasons. It lasted all night; it was extemporized to adjust to audience reactions; the singing was strange to western ears; the lengthy dialogue was in Balinese; westerners were unfamiliar with the stories. The answer was radically to re-imagine theatre as dance.

The problem of duration was resolved in the same way as at the Bali Hotel – that is, by the juxtaposition of short dances and, in the case of dance theatre, by the reduction of a dramatic genre to an accelerated series of the most spectacular episodes (Picard 1996: 141).

After the Paris Exhibition of 1889, Central Javanese music and dance had been hailed in Europe as ‘high’ art. However,

[...] unlike Javanese dances, appreciated by European connoisseurs since the end of the last century, Balinese dances acquired the prestige that they have today only after becoming tourist attractions (Picard 1996: 135).

So, most of what we know as dance in Bali emerged to meet foreign tastes.

To satisfy this demand, dance had to be radically re-imagined. What is at issue is nicely encapsulated in the Indonesian name given to this genre, *tari lepas*, ‘free dance’, that is dance detached from all contexts of cultural performance, branded and franchised as uniquely and authentically Balinese. It is in this sense that I use dance in what follows, as opposed to theatre, which I take to be the kinds of dramatic stories Balinese performed for themselves. This leaves what Europeans, and now sometimes Balinese, understand by dance appropriately problematic<sup>12</sup>.

Decontextualizing took several forms. *Baris*, *Topèng*, *Jauk* and *Tèlèk* were extrapolated from theatre and religious rites. Other dances, such as *Panyembrama* and *Olèg Tamulilingan* were choreographed for western audiences, the latter at the request of an English impresario (Coast 2004: 105ff). Some, like *Lègong*, were so stripped down that it is difficult to know quite what relationship they bore to their precursors.

The Balinese were far from passively compliant in the creation of dance. From their first encounter with the Dutch, Balinese rulers had been preoccupied with how to deal with these alien beings. Conquest shattered the Balinese vision of the world and left them urgently seeking a suitable medium through which to relate to the new rulers with their mysterious wishes. Put this way, *kebyar* becomes partly a complex act at cultural translation. In 1971, the late Cokorda Gedé Agung Sukawati gave me his account, which contained fascinating glimpses of how Balinese purposefully set about determining Dutch predilections. Living opposite the Hotel Bali in Denpasar and through becoming a guide, the Cokorda inferred what Europeans wanted was art. Realizing that Balinese could neither appreciate nor deliver what the colonial masters wanted, the family decided to lure to Ubud the only foreigner they knew who seemed to have the right qualifications, the then bandmaster to the Sultan of Yogyakarta, Walter Spies. The outcome was a celebrated chapter in the history of the romanticization of the island.

By the late 1990s, Bali had grown into a multi-billion dollar tourist industry. How is dance implicated in all this? On the one hand, dance is constitutive of Bali as a brand in a highly competitive market. As the island is increasingly built over with unplanned industrial development, what distinguishes it from its Asian competitors if not its artistic culture (*seni budaya*), exemplified by its most accessible form, dance? Dance has also become a major industry. No one is sure, but tourist dances probably account for well over 90% of performances, except perhaps on a few festival days. The musicians and dancers are shipped not in buses, but packed together in the back of trucks that are used otherwise to transport cattle and merchandise. Balinese dance epitomizes the brute commoditization of labour. Fels' vision of dance as 'poetry, movement created by the soul, possessed and conquered' now has a darker sense.

The commoditization of dance in Bali adds a twist to Adorno and Horkheimer's analysis of the culture industry, in that it is not, as in America, one among many industries, which happens to specialize in the production of new cultural forms for mass markets. In Bali the sale of 'culture' now comprises many of the island's major industries and has come to constitute what Bali itself is. The industrial tail now wags the cultural dog.

Under these circumstances, an interesting tension emerges between the demands of industry for the mechanical reproduction of dance and the elite national art academies, which claim a European-style conservatoire model of excellence. If the economic impact of the culture industry is fairly obvious, the political implications have gone less noticed. As Benjamin wrote:

'For the first time in world history, mechanical reproduction emancipates the work of art from its parasitical dependence on ritual... But the instant the criterion of authenticity ceases to be applicable to artistic production, the total function of art is reversed. Instead of being based on ritual, it begins to be based on another practice – politics' (Benjamin 1969: iv).

Politics has come to permeate performance. After all, what is more political than the bland naturalization of feudalism? And, a hallmark of the New Order was a genre, borrowed from Java, and endlessly reproduced. In *Sendratari*, a spectacular mass dance ballet, the dancers silently mime to the dialogue of a single *dalang* (or puppeteer) (Hough 1992)<sup>13</sup>, in a (presumably unintended) caricature of the political order itself.

Bali's increasing dependence on its industrialized culture is reflected in its new commercial mass media. BaliTV, launched as the medium of Bali's cultural arts, for 19 hours each day reproduces for Balinese an imaginary island of endless beautiful dances and ceremonies, which is even more insidiously

political. Commercialization has come full circle because it is widely rumoured that, instead of receiving fees, dance troupes pay for the privilege of performing on TV, which is now unashamedly advertising, straight-faced, under the banner *Pulau Dewata* – the Island of the Gods.

## BALI AS DIFFERENCE

Another way that Bali became linked with dance was through exhibitions. Most spectacularly, the Paris Colonial Exposition of 1931 brought Bali to Europe and to the attention of European intellectuals at a crucial moment. The Dutch constructed a special East Indies Pavilion, the highlight of which was dances by a full Balinese troupe. It was an unequal encounter. One of the musicians, Anak Agung Gedé Ngurah Mandera, remarked afterwards: 'We were hidden away, we Balinese, like serfs, and we saw little of Paris or foreigners' (Coast 2004: 42). In a sense, the European visitors to the Exposition saw equally little of Bali and its theatre. As the quotations earlier make clear, as with contemporary tourism, what they saw had been largely pre-articulated for them along familiar Orientalist lines.

Within the broader scheme of things, Bali was significant insofar as it was different in ways that fitted European needs. That Balinese theatre occupies an important niche in the theoretical world of performance, through the work of Artaud, is not accidental. As Savarese put it:

Artaud was not in fact interested in Balinese culture; he used the Balinese performance because its extraneousness to his own culture made it possible for him to delineate a difference. Artaud, finally, did not want to increase knowledge about Balinese dance but to use it to create a short-circuit [...] Artaud's vision distorted the meaning of a tradition and a culture of which he was essentially ignorant: the Balinese performances represented something very different from what they actually were, but something nevertheless necessary for him (Savarese 2001: 71)<sup>14</sup>.

Ironically, Bali's greatest asset, whether to artists, scholars or tourists, was not what it was, but what it was not – its difference. If, as Baudrillard argued, the basic commodity that underpins consumer society is not a positivity (a particular good or service) (Baudrillard 1970), but promising access to difference then Bali, epitomized by Balinese dance in its exquisite, timeless, ritual, arcane Otherness, was beautifully designed to fit tourists' and aesthetes' predilections.

## PROBLEMS OF CULTURAL TRANSLATION

Lurking in the background is the question of cultural translation. If in Bali conventionally there was no word for art, nor was there a word for dance<sup>15</sup>. Balinese generally referred to theatre, shadow plays and non-narrative dance simply as *sesolahan* or *igelan* (in high and low Balinese respectively), and acting, singing, dancing or acting as a puppeteer as *masolah* or *ngigel*, perhaps best glossed as 'performance' and 'performing'. Tempting as it is to dismiss the confusion as trivial, misunderstandings not only continue to thrive, they bear on the asymmetrical relations of power that westerners have long exerted over Balinese and are loath to relinquish (Hobart 1990).

Among the problems – here assuming Balinese and 'western' ideas of dance (the latter itself deeply contested) to be commensurate – two are immediately relevant. First remains the curiously colonial-looking presupposition that western categories of analysis are ontologically unchallengeable and *ipso facto* epistemologically sufficient to describe and comment on the entire congeries of practices of a society with a quite different philosophical and cultural history.

Second, most accounts assume an unproblematic transparency between the object of inquiry and the frame of reference. There is a circularity in representing Balinese practice as dance *tout court*. If nothing else, out of good intellectual manners, we should first ask how Balinese have articulated their own dramatic practices, indeed whether they constituted a distinct category. Quite simply, it is tautological and essentialist to represent dance simply as dance (Goodman 1968)<sup>16</sup>. The question is what people have represented as dance – and, more importantly, represented dance as – under different circumstances and to whom. For Bali, a plethora of possibilities present themselves. Among the most obvious are theatre/dance as a religious offering required to complete rites; as the practice of disciplined self-transformation; as exemplifying techniques of mastery over body and mind; theatre as social commentary and criticism; and, more recently, Balinese 'dance' as a brand label, a means of livelihood or a way out of poverty. The presumption that we know what dance is and how to translate it is old-fashioned Eurocentrism refried.

As this discussion has been theoretical, let us consider how it might bear on the important question of appreciating the body in dance. The fact that dancers universally have bodies makes the step of projecting a culturally specific western model onto Bali alluring<sup>17</sup>. Balinese, however, imagine bodies differently according to several possible schemes. One popular model indicates the degree of disjuncture. On this account, Balinese bodies are labile. They are

capable of reshaping themselves through will, but can easily be entered (*karangsukang*, 'trance'), or can disintegrate into constituent parts. So mastery or command over the body is important. This is quite different from the mechanical metaphor of control, widely used in Europe to discipline bodies. By contrast, Balinese imagine different body parts as having different proclivities, which the disciplined human must weave into an elegant working whole. Similarly pre-conquest polities depended on the ruler managing to command the agreement of other lords and ordinary subjects to pursue a common venture<sup>18</sup>. Bodies and the world are not separate but affect one another. So dance, in instantiating momentary mastery, helps order the world, while material process always brings the threat of rupture. In practice, a lifetime of work (through *manusayadnya*, life cycle rites), discipline and care are needed to develop a mature being. The distinctive grace and poise of trained Balinese bodies is not achieved casually.

## AN ALTERNATIVE ACCOUNT

By way of social background, it is useful to appreciate that, behind the appearance of luxury in the tourist sector, much of the capital is foreign and Bali shares many of the problems of the rest of Indonesia. Parts of the island remain desperately poor. During his voyages in the 1850s, Alfred Russell Wallace remarked on the abject poverty and misery of ordinary Balinese in contrast to the wealth and comfort of the rulers. The economics and politics of pre-conquest Bali run counter to fantasies of an island where dance and music were popular pastimes. The image of traditional Balinese villages as full of beautiful young dancing maidens and throbbing *gamelan* orchestras is anachronistic. Until the second half of the twentieth century, most villagers could barely afford everyday clothes, far less the gilded ornamental costumes and expensive *gamelan*, which were owned mostly by the courts and by some richer village groups<sup>19</sup>. Bali is not alone in having depended heavily on patronage for the arts.

A long period of centralized rule ended in 1651 and Bali was thrown into 150 years of internecine struggle between rival warlords. Many were low caste upstarts who butchered or connived their way to power. The theatrical celebration of an unchanging world order, founded upon noble aristocratic values, in which kings were mostly heroic, wise and just, and their subjects loyal, devoted and happy is starkly juxtaposed to the terror of sudden death, enslavement, rape, pillage and poverty that was most people's lot<sup>20</sup>. It was

probably close to a condition with 'no arts; no letters; no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short' (Hobbes 1914, ch.13). However, in Bali, arts and letters articulated a vision of society that stood in such magnificent contrast to, and denial of, what was actually going on.

Bearing in mind the difficulties of determining quite what the names of genres referred to, let me offer a suggestive sketch of the development of theatre and dance.

- In the late seventeenth century, stable government collapsed, life became anarchic. Balinese developed *Gambuh* and *Wayang Wong* celebrating a noble ordered world.
- In the nineteenth century, upstart rulers claimed fabulous genealogies (*babad*), while masked *Topèng* subsequently legitimized such rampant status-climbing.
- With the collapse of royal power, after 1915, popular dance-opera *Arja* promptly began to flourish, which celebrated the lives of ordinary Balinese.
- Simultaneously, a spectacular new music and dance style, *Kebyar*, sprang up in precisely the village in North Bali, Jagaraga, where the Dutch had first set foot to conquer Bali.
- After 1910, as the Dutch established their administration and tourism begins in earnest, Balinese suddenly (re)discovered dance. *Lègong*, seemingly moribund, was resuscitated or re-imagined; *Jangèr* was created<sup>21</sup>.
- In 1942, as Dutch colonial rule collapsed before the Japanese invasion, cross-dressing dance, *bebancihan*, suddenly became the vogue.
- In 1965, following a supposed communist coup and the execution of some 100,000 people in Bali alone, *Derama Gong*, spoken theatre in ordinary Balinese, burst into fashion.

How are we to relate this to the received accounts of dance?

#### SOME CONFUSIONS

The meetings between westerners and Balinese often involved misunderstandings. What about the beautiful dancers, epitomized by the little *Lègongs*? As Vickers noted, a persistent tendency to eroticize Balinese often veered towards fantasies about pre-pubescent girls and Balinese as objects of paedophilic desire (Vickers 1989: 95–130). The advent of tourism inevitably

required dance to conform to such projections. An American visitor in the thirties observed of tourist performance in Denpasar, that it

[...] has also attempted to inject as much sex as possible into the dances, and sex is the one quality that is almost entirely absent from the Balinese dance, therefore its appearance strikes a false note<sup>22</sup>.

There is a countervailing risk of sanctifying the Balinese. The Dutch doctor, Julius Jacobs, suggested another face when he wrote about how one king 'offered him a dancing girl as company for the night and recounted how some of the court dancers were in fact prostitutes, whose livings supported the rajas' (Vickers 1989: 87). During fieldwork, elderly women would recount to me how their parents, fearing the attention of rapacious aristocrats, sometimes used pre-emptively to scarify the most beautiful. Did the notoriously randy princes, whose power over their subjects was hard to challenge, actually treat the *Lègongs* as sexually untouchable<sup>23</sup>?

Such misunderstandings often rested on unrecognized differences in cultural presuppositions<sup>24</sup>. One of the most celebrated is about theatre. Clifford Geertz famously depicted Balinese kingship as 'a theatre state in which the kings and princes were the impresarios, the priests the directors, and the peasants the supporting cast, stage crew, and audience' (1980: 13). An entire category of South East Asian polity rests on an image of theatre, which Geertz imported from Europe without ever inquiring what Balinese conceptions might be – so leaving them constituting their politics through a model of which they had no inkling. Remarkably, no one even commented on it.

Similar presuppositions bedevil discussion of creativity in Balinese dance. Europeans and Americans presuppose evolution and progress to be good. So, artistic and cultural production is ideally innovative. For many peoples, however, a previous order may be the ideal. Then, creativity involves re-imagining the past differently or more perfectly. Much Balinese creativity arguably consists in elaborating, rather than going beyond the received framework, a proclivity underwritten by Balinese social structure, which largely comprises corporate groups. Such groups are exceptionally efficient at organizing activities, but tend to be conservative. If one Balinese opens a successful art shop, café or dance group, soon after fifty similar places will spring up.

There is, however, a more interesting sense of creativity, linked to crisis. When the existing order breaks down irreparably, Balinese are driven furiously to articulate some new order, as the links indicated above between social disruption and theatrical innovation suggested. Further confusion arises when Europeans and Americans insist on identifying the creative genius behind a

dance or composition, because for them the knowing and creative subject should be an individual. Balinese, by contrast, tend to stress the degree to which a finished composition or choreography is inevitably the work of a complex agent<sup>25</sup>, which may be one reason westerners' hagiography of Balinese star dancers often ends in disaster. Cross-cultural studies of performance need to engage not just in critical history but also with different, potentially incommensurable, cultural presuppositions without sliding back into Eurocentrism.

Balinese can be equally caught up in their own presuppositions. A striking aspect of the explosion of supposedly original *kebyar* dances is the way they are locked into an ever-inflating portrayal of royal opulence, the rigid codes of which lead to wonderful absurdities. Gold crowns and gilded vestments may look fine on princes and princesses, even if bearing no relation to historical actuality. But quite what is up when padi finches, fisherman and farmers in rice fields are decked out in gold? However, if *kebyar* suffers from cultural involution, we may question whether it is any more closed and inward-looking than western ballet and contemporary dance.

Multiculturalism and globalization assume inter-cultural contact in principle to be fruitful. However the extraordinary cultural encounter that is Balinese dance hardly seems to have fostered deeper understanding.

Balinese dance remains primarily acceptable so long as it promises to embody exoticism and difference. That hot tropical island of the imagination must still be there to offer  
visitors damp dreams.



REFERENCES

- BANDEM, I MADÉ & DEBOER, FREDERIK EUGENE, *Balinese dance in transition*. Second Edition (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- BAUDRILLARD, JEAN, *La société de consommation* (Paris: Gallimard, 1970).
- BENJAMIN, WALTER, 'The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction', accessed online at: <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/benjamin.htm>.
- BOON, JAMES, *The anthropological romance of Bali* (Cambridge: University Press, 1977).
- CLIFFORD, JAMES, 'On ethnographic authority', in *The predicament of culture: twentieth-century ethnography, literature and art* ed. J. Clifford, 21-54 (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1988).
- COAST, JOHN, *Dancing out of Bali* (Singapore: Periplus, 2004).
- COLLINGWOOD, ROBIN, *An essay on metaphysics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940).
- , *The idea of history* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946).
- DIBIA, I WAYAN AND BALLINGER, RUCINA, *Balinese dance, drama and music: a guide to the performing arts of Bali* (Periplus: Singapore, 2004).

- FELS, FLORENT, 'À l'exposition coloniale: danses de Bali.', *Vu journal de la semaine*, 173/8 (1931): 995.
- FOX, RICHARD, 'From text to television: mediating religion in contemporary Bali'. PhD dissertation (University of London, 2002).
- GEERTZ, CLIFFORD, *Negara: the theatre state in nineteenth-century Bali* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980).
- GOODMAN, NELSON, *Languages of art* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968).
- HISS, PHILIP HANSON, *Bali* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1941).
- HITCHCOCK, MICHAEL & NORRIS, LUCY, *Bali, the imaginary museum: the photographs of Walter Spies and Beryl de Zoete* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- HOBART, MARK, 'Who do you think you are? the authorized Balinese', in R. Fardon, ed., *Localizing strategies*: 303-38 (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1990).
- HOBBS, THOMAS, *Leviathan* (London: Dent, 1914).
- HOUGH, BRETT, *Contemporary Balinese dance spectacles as national ritual*. Monash Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Working Paper 74 (Melbourne: Monash University, 1992).
- INDEN, RONALD, *Imagining India* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990).
- MOERDOWO, RADEN MAS, *Reflections on Balinese traditional and modern arts* (Denpasar: Udayana University, 1977).
- MINER, HORACE, 'Body ritual among the Nacirema', *American anthropologist* 58 (1956): 503-7.
- PICARD, MICHEL, *Bali: cultural tourism and touristic culture* (Singapore: Archipelago Press, 1996).
- PRUNIERES, HENRI, 'Musique et danses Balinaïses à l'Exposition Coloniale de Paris', *Journal de Genève*, 16 October 1931.
- SAVARESE, NICOLA, 'Antonin Artaud sees Balinese theatre at the Paris Colonial Exposition', *The Drama Review* 45/3 (2001): 51-77.
- VICKERS, ADRIAN, *Bali: a paradise created* (Ringwood, Victoria: Penguin, 1989).
- , *Journeys of desire* (Leiden: KITLV Press, 2005).
- DE ZOETE, BERYL & SPIES, WALTER, (London: Faber, 1938).

NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Both Prunieres and Fels are cited in Savarese (2001: 72 and 66) as commentaries on the Paris Colonial Exhibition of 1931.
- <sup>2</sup> [http://www.marimari.com/content/bali/best\\_of/dance.html](http://www.marimari.com/content/bali/best_of/dance.html), <http://www.balihotels.com/info/dancebali.php>. Both are tourist sites accessed 2nd. August 2005.
- <sup>3</sup> My thanks to Richard Fox, Peter Worsley and Adrian Vickers for their comments on the draft of this article.
- <sup>4</sup> To Collingwood, scissors-and-paste was opposed to historical and cultural understanding, which involves a dialogue between scholarly analysis and appreciating events as the participants themselves did.
- <sup>5</sup> Establishing what actually went on behind idealized or hagiographic representations of courtly life is exceptionally difficult; see Vickers (2005).
- <sup>6</sup> Such synecdoche (using part to typify the whole), as Clifford (1998) argued, is an established, but problematic, method in social and cultural anthropology. Bali is a notable casualty of this method, where a single image like theatre promises to reveal the complexities of Balinese culture as a whole.
- <sup>7</sup> Accounts of each genre can be found in Dibia and Ballinger (2004).
- <sup>8</sup> Interestingly, Moerdowo (1977: 68) dates *Topèng Pajegan* to 1919.
- <sup>9</sup> The role of STSI (The Indonesian Academy of Arts, later ISI, the Institute of Arts) Denpasar in codifying, standardizing, promoting and determining what constituted dance is crucial.

<sup>10</sup> Visitors are often given a neat division of dance into *Wali* (offerings, 'sacred' dances performed in temples), *Bebali* (semi-ceremonial dances, which supplement ritual) and *Balih-Balihan* (dance for entertainment). This classification was invented by a committee of Balinese intellectuals in 1971 in response to perceived threats to Balinese culture from tourism and even its authors now admit it does not work.

<sup>11</sup> Anthropologists use ritual as a residual category for whatever appears to defy rational or material explanation and is therefore deemed 'symbolic'. Here, calling dance 'ritual' or 'symbolic' merely defers analysis. If anything, it is the European obsession with projecting fantasies onto Bali that is 'ritual' and requires study.

<sup>12</sup> There was almost certainly much local variation within Bali. And the dichotomy between 'authentic' and tourist performances was complicated by becoming part of the singular dialogue or heteroglossia that is contemporary Bali.

<sup>13</sup> Suharto (or his wife) was often dubbed the '*dalang*' behind New Order machinations.

<sup>14</sup> We necessarily represent something *as* something else (Goodman 1968). At issue is the kind and purpose of representation.

<sup>15</sup> Terms for training, judging and commenting on dance and theatre remain primarily technical and aids to performance. The vocabulary of aesthetics has had to be borrowed from Europe and is supplementary, comprising dollops of the ethnic gloss and cultural marketing that westerners demand – and duly receive, for a price – of the authentic Balinese dance experience.

<sup>16</sup> As accounts suggest pre-colonial theatre lasted for days, even the idea of a discreet performative space and time is questionable.

<sup>17</sup> I take it that universalist and naturalist accounts are cultural. Even were they not, such schemes would be little use in explaining what makes Balinese dance different.

<sup>18</sup> Philosophically, this account draws, among other things, upon Balinese rescensions of *Sāmkhya*, in which material process is tripartite, comprising spontaneous activity (*rajas*), rational ordering (*sattwa*) and objectification or inertia (*tamas*).

<sup>19</sup> That *gamelan* and costumes were loaned to client villagers for practice does not transform the relations of power.

<sup>20</sup> Vickers (2005) offers a fascinating analysis of how Balinese articulated this period through the idealized figure of the desiring, bellicose and artistic prince.

<sup>21</sup> Granted its iconic status, unsurprisingly stories and histories of *Lègong* abound (e.g. Moerdowo 1977: 90–97).

<sup>22</sup> Hiss (1941) cited in Picard (1996: 141). Whether Balinese considered it absent is another question.

<sup>23</sup> Coast (2004: 33) records the military commander abducting a fifteen-year-old dancer with the connivance of two *rajas* as late as the 1950s.

<sup>24</sup> This critical study of absolute presuppositions Collingwood argued to be the study of metaphysics proper; see his *Essay on metaphysics*. A serious study of Balinese theatre should perhaps start with how Balinese judge performance. For example, actor-dancers listen to the *angkiang*, literally 'the breath' of the music and, conversely, musicians work to the *angkiang* of the dance. The dialogic quality also emerges in how dancers talk of the necessary condition for extemporizing, *saling enyuhin*, to make a path for your fellow actors, without which performance dies on stage. The most fascinating is *taksu*, what makes a particular performance come to life, what makes an audience forget they are watching theatre and become absorbed, what imbues an actor with something special.

<sup>25</sup> On complex agency, see Inden (1990).

