

Meghan: Last time I think I forgot to actually do the introduction part of the opening, but hello! I'm Meghan Varner, and this is my dad, Murlin Varner.

Murlin: Hey, there.

Meghan: And this is another episode of An Incomplete History of Dance. I was gonna make a crack about it getting a little bit more complete by the month but, like, that – it – it's negligible. And it's not that funny. Anyway. So, uh, yet again something a little bit different this time. We're gonna be talking about the construction of, and performance of sexuality in dance. I already apologised to Dad once for this one but sorry, Dad, you are gonna have to hear me talk about this. Um – [laughing] Um, most of the research that I'm working off of comes from a paper that I did in college about asexuality in dance, um... which is in terms of people – don't make the science joke, Dad, I'm not talking about mitosis and you know it – Oh, yes, so [crosstalk] such a –

Murlin: [crosstalk] Meiosis.

Meghan: Oh, I'm s- It's been a while since I did bio, ok? [crosstalk] I don't remember which –

Murlin: [crosstalk] Yeah, you wanna talk about sex you gotta talk about meiosis, not mitosis.

Meghan: [reluctantly] I mean, I was talking about like – asexual. I said asexual, so like [crosstalk] that was the bad joke and that was why –

Murlin: [crosstalk] Ahh, asexual. You mean, you mean like yeast budding.

Meghan: I – I don't actually, which was what I was gonna get into because when we're talking about asexuality in the context of the human being, that is a person who is not – who does not or rarely experiences sexual attraction. Um, that has nothing to do with what their sexual behaviour might be, I... am going to make that very clear now in case you're listening and you're not... exposed to queerness? People can make all kinds of choices and your attraction does not dictate what you do. So. Wanna make that clear because a lot of people are weird about that. Anyway, uh, the point of that little aside was that a lot of this research was done from the perspective of looking for examples of dance that takes sort of an asexual stance on relationships? Um, and the ex- exploration of 'can we have an asexual dance?' Um... and there's a couple of yes answers, but most of them felt like 'yes, but' because I was looking specifically for... like an asexual romance sort of aspect of it, which I say that and probably we all can go, "Oh yeah, that's hard to find." But yeah, so that was kind of the original approach of the research to this, and there's still a lot of that in here, but also there's so little that actually exists out there that it becomes very much a survey of how sex appears in dance overall, and the sort of societal impressions of dance in that context. Was I rambling there? [laughing]

Murlin: Eh, well, you know.

Meghan: Ok, well. I made it through that speech anyway. Ok, actual stuff and not just me talking about, like, [dramatically] the framework of my research. Um... I don't think it would surprise anybody to – if I said that, like, Western dance has often been associated with, um, sexual behaviour. Um... [laughing] There's a sixteenth-century moralist who believed that, and this is a quote – "Through dancing, many maidens have been unmaidenened."

I'm – I'm – I'm so, so curious if that was like, literally this person believed that to dance was to lose, um... your virginity, which is a stupid construct anyway but we're not getting into that, or if it was just like, "Oh, if you have danced, then eventually you will have sex with the person you dance with," like I literally can't tell, 'cause some of these people had some weird beliefs. But anyway! Dances will

be made based around a choreographer's sense of morality, as pretty much all art is. You know, we comment on something or we tell a story with a protagonist who we support in some way, or a protagonist who we give failures to because they didn't live up to our own morality. Like, you know, art just is that way. And so, because sex often has a lot of moral values ascribed to it, sex comes into play when you have any sort of moral stance especially for dance because it's physical. And in American society we have this big thing about, like, touch and physical contact and physical intimacy being inherently sexual.

Um... you know, it's like that – that trope where, like, the person is teaching the other person how to do something and they, like, move their body to do the thing. And it's so weird watching as a dancer because that's just, like, how you learn to do physical things. Somebody, like, puts their arm on your shoulder and goes "Ok, uh... put your shoulder blade down" and you're like "ok yeah," and you're not thinking about, like, how sexy this person is you're just thinking about doing the thing, otherwise you're not gonna be able to do the thing right.

This is a pet peeve and I have gone off on a tangent. Um. I'm right though.

Murlin: [laughing]

Meghan: Thank you for that supportive laugh.

Murlin: You're welcome.

Meghan: [laughing] Um, there's... [sigh] This part gets into a little more about society and not dance committing it in particular, but there tends to be an expectation that if there is a romantic relationship being portrayed in some kind of art or media, that the relationship will be consummated via sex, because that's just been so normalised by our like heterosexual – heteronormative culture. Allonormative too. Um, allo- in this case being related to the words, allosexual and alloromantic, which are just the opposite of asexual – no sexual attraction – and aromantic – no romantic attraction. This has been a crash course in queer terms. Moving on! [laughing]

What... [sigh] this means... Why it matters. Is that the arts have a power when it comes to challenging or reinforcing how we look at the world. And... Uh, there are a lot of cultural hang-ups about sex. Uh, there are either expectations that certain people must be sexually available to others, um, you get that most often with marginalised people, um, but there's also expectations that men must always be horny, that that's just what being a man is. Um, there's expectations that certain people have no sexual agency and would not participate in sex, or that they have no sexual agency in the sense that you don't need their consent to engage in sex with them. And so it's incredibly important to navigate these questions, in terms of artists, because we uphold these different ideas or we challenge them in our work, and we have to be conscious of what we're doing and what we're saying. If you're only ever exposed to, for instance, straightness in art, when you first perceive queerness you're going to see it as abnormal, even though it's naturally occurring, not just in humanity but in many species. Um, your picture of normal is built from incomplete information, so you don't actually know everything that's out there in the world. And that's why art has to reach out into different corners of the world.

It's ok to sexualise art. It's ok to sexualise dance. Um, it has a really long legacy, western concert dance has a really long legacy of having sexual connotations, especially from the work of the twentieth century on, because of various social influences that we'll talk about later on, but as a whole it's developed a reputation, because dancers use their bodies. You know it's one of those things... It's similar, in a sense, to the idea that if you wear, um, [sarcastically] revealing clothing that

you are sexually promiscuous. It's a similar concept. Um, dancers will wear things like leotards and tights. Uh, dancers use their bodies including body parts that are typically considered shameful by the general population. Um... yeah. There's a lot at play in the perception of a dancer's sexuality that a dancer doesn't necessarily get control over, so it kind of becomes a question of how to take back that narrative and control, um, the sexualisation of yourself of your own self as a dancer and your dancers as a choreographer.

It's difficult to say what makes a dance sexy, 'cause everyone has their own definition of it, right? Um, different people are attracted to different things – [while laughing] different people are attracted to different people, [laughing] let's be real here, like... even just in terms of if there's something where, like, the male dancer is super sexy but you don't like men, you're not gonna see the dance as being super sexy. Um, but also there are sort of socially accepted signals of sexuality, uh, certain movements that are considered seductive, um – gestures, facial expressions, body parts being moved even. And so, you know, there's an element of just looking at what people are saying about something and accepting that as the truth in the sense that, people see things as sexy or not sexy and that's just how it is, and then also analyzing things from the point of view of saying “well, here's what the movement is, and this is generally perceived as, or generally not perceived as sexy.” And you know, uh [laughing] it's fun for me to discuss because I get it wrong. Um...

And what I mean by that is there's a piece, uh – *La Spectre de la Rose*, and I'm sorry, that was terrible French, I didn't even try. Um... but it was actually a piece Nijinsky was in, before he, um, started really choreographing. And the first time I heard of it was wi- in a reading for dance history class, um, and it described the piece as being significantly more sexual than previous ballets had been um to the point where it was like “Oh. Oh, ok.” Um, and we saw a video of a performance of it, and to me nothing stood out as being particularly suggestive. And I assumed that because of the amount of time that had elapsed [laughing] it was like a hundred years, right? Um. I assumed that it was just a matter of different time periods. And then the class discussion afterwards other people in the class talked about oh yeah that was really sexual and I just remember sitting there going oh so I missed a cue. Um, like I literally missed a social cue in there. Um, so that's – that's one of the interesting points to be made, is that because there is no standard concept of sexiness, it's a cultural thing it's a personal thing um it is important to kind of look at what are you saying with your movement who are you saying it to. Um, what do you think is sexy versus what is your audience going to think is sexy when you're trying to make a statement you know either having sexuality in your dance or rejecting it. Um, and you know if you wanna just kind of make a dance and let the chips fall where they may in that context, that's a choice, too, but you gotta consider what you're doing basically.

I was talking a little bit, just like a tiny bit earlier about the sort of legacy of sexualisation in dance and how 20<sup>th</sup> century dance especially gets into, um, the sexuality of dance, and one of the big, big examples of this is gonna be Martha Graham. Laughing. Uh the original essay this is based off of and I'm just gonna take my time to say this because it's very important to me that I call this dude out as much as possible. There's this one man, Deresiewicz, he believed that dance was highly sexualised, um – in I think the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, early 21<sup>st</sup> – no I have my source right here hang on. Ok yeah, so the early 21<sup>st</sup> century he writes this article saying that [pompously] “the body in dance – especially the female body – is being reduced, more and more, to an object of sexualised display.” And then he proceeds to hold up Martha Graham as a pinnacle of non-sexualised feminine dance. [laughing] Now, Martha Graham [laughing] Martha Graham is well-documented by scholars and just anybody who ever worked with her or worked with somebody who worked with her – like this is something that gets passed down in her codified, like, dance style – as being somebody who believed that

sexual activity was intrinsically important to the proper performance of her work. Graham would tell her female students to move their vagina. Um, there – there are – there are Graham teachers, and I think possibly Graham herself, although this is more anecdotal and I don't wanna – I haven't read these sources in a while so I don't know if that was backed up by anything in them, but, um, there are definitely people who will tell you that to do Graham work, you have to have had sex. Um, like... [pause] She was very, very big on sex, and especially, uh, cis women having sex, as a transcendental spiritual thing. You know, to her that was just something really, really important that she wanted to – that informed, like, all of her work. Um, you were supposed to move from your vagina. And... you know... she created entire works, um, about, um, female sexual attraction and, um, women having sex.

It can be really powerful and valuable to have that, um, Martha Graham's work has been that for many, many people. Um, but I also think that there is a danger, when this particular approach and kind of work becomes the only option, um, that dancers are then not given a space where they can choose not to engage in sexualisation and not to be sexy and, um, to not ever bring it up at all, even? Um. Whether or not you are perceived in a sexual light should really be under your control. Like, you can't control whether or not somebody's attracted to you but, um, you should be able to have the power to say, "Hey, drop that thought." You know?

There's – this brings me to... [gibberish noises]

Murlin: Was that a different language?

Meghan: [laughing] No, that was me having a brain fart.

Murlin: Ah, you fart funny.

Meghan: Thanks. I fart out my mouth, it's called talking. Um, so, uh, there was in the process of researching this a list that I came across, which was like "Top Twelve Most Outrageously Sexual Dance Moments" or something like that. Um, oh: "Twelve Outrageous Sexual Moments in Dance History." There we go. Um. But the thing is most of the things on the list, if you are reading that list fast and your eyes happen to skip over the word 'nude' in the descriptions, most of those dances don't sound outrageous at all. They might sound like a little weird like ok that's interesting ghat you decided to put that onstage but not outrageous in a sexual way. For instance Anna Halprin's *parades and Changes* made this list, um, but the moment that this, um, article author described as being sexual was apparently nothing more than the dancers stripping off their clothes and wrapping themselves in paper... which... Yeah, they get naked. But what exactly is sexual about wrapping yourself in paper? What I'm getting at here is that we have a tendency as an audience and as a culture, to view the naked body as being inherently sexual, um... when it's just a body without clothes. [laughing]

Murlin: And that's... more American than everywhere.

Meghna: I know. Yeah.

Murlin: You go to – you go to Europe and it's not quite the same thing since every beach is full of naked bodies.

Meghan: Yes, exactly, it's very very much a cultural thing and it is definitely um America-centric, this part of the conversation Um. But also because America tries so hard to be like everywhere in people's thoughts, it's worth examining 'cause I think theres – you know. It's the – its' the cultural

imperialism that America tries so hard to continue perpetuating, um. But yeah. No, you're super right. Um...

There are pieces that can be held up as examples, for instance um Oliver – Oli – that's Olivier [pronounced Oliv-ee-ay] isn't it? Yep.

Murlin: What?

Meghan: [laughing] Uh, you know when it's Oliver but it's got the 'l' in front of the 'e' it's usually Olivier, right?

Murlin: Guess it could be, is that a last name?

Meghan: It's a first name, but also the last name and the name of the dance are both French, so.

Murlin: Oh, well. I don't know French.

Meghan: This is why I like writing things down. I don't have to pretend I know how to pronounce things. I learned all of my words from reading books, I never talked to people as a kid. Anyway, uh, Olivier Dubois' *Tragedie*, I'm not even gonna try and pronounce that French-y-ish. [exasperated] What was that? French-y-ish. I'm so sorry. I'm not going to try and pronounce it with a French accent, there we go, I made it through that sentence. Um.

Murlin: Yay.

Meghan: Thanks. Anyway. *Tragedie*. Where all the dancers were naked the entire time and only got dressed when they came out for curtain call. This performance, um, resulted in the audience just kind of... losing the shock value of seeing the dancers'... um, genitalia, like the fact that they were naked just stopped registering after the first few moments of "oh what was that," because it wasn't about the nakedness, you know? Like, you're watching a dance. Nobody's breasts or penis are gonna be moving in the same way that the rest of their body's moving, they're just along for the ride! Um. You're watching a dance and you're seeing people's arms and legs and head and spine dancing, um, you don't... you stop caring about the more sexualised body parts, because those aren't the ones that are doing all the work. And a familiarity with something like nudity, um – like Dad said, you know, if you're used to seeing the naked body in context, then it's not as shocking, it becomes much less sexual. Um... like how in Victorian times or whatever it was like "Oh, ankles, how scandalous," but like, I – ankles aren't sexy anymore. They – they could be if that's your thing, but they're not, like, societally sexy anymore. Um... And so, when it – when you're looking into how to control the perception of a dance's – a dancer or a dance's sexuality, um, understanding how to desensitise people to body parts is an important factor. Um. Continued exposure decreases sexual mystique. [laughing]

This also gets into the concept of things like the striptease. More overtly sexual dance forms, um – things that are designed for sex, burlesque, striptease, pole-dancing, things like that – not designed for sex, but like – titillation. Um. It is the tease factor that makes these things enticing to people, um, who like it for the sake of titilla- titillation. Um... It's the fact that they are wearing clothes, they are doing things with their body, that you don't... quite get to be involved in. Um, I'm especially thinking of, like – you know, your basic striptease here, because of the fact that – if they just drop their clothes and get naked right away, it's not a striptease. I mean, they're stripping. But there's nothing teasing about it. Um, it's the actual act of the – the play of it, the performance of it, um, that makes people interested in that way. You know? Like... [laughing] You're just like, "I am not gonna respond to that one." Um. [laughing] Sorry. [quietly] Ahhh.

But it – it's the fact that – it's – it's the act of, like, anticipation that gets people interested in it. Um. It's almost like a – I mean, it is a performance. It's like a game, almost, um. I'm just really stuck on the word 'tease' within the concept of the striptease, like that's the whole point of it, and, um – it's not inherently sexy to just get naked. It's how you get naked that also affects it. Um, and that's how to build sexuality into or out of a dance, um, if you are playing with nudity at all. Look at how they are getting naked.

There's also the option of saying that – or, not saying, but never even raising the question of sex at all in a dance. Um, creating a dance where that just isn't brought up. And there's – I think there's a couple ways to do this, but the one way that I have an *example* example of is by having a dancer who does not engage with the audience or with other dancers, um, or with their own body in a way that could be taken as sexual. Um, and the specific example I'm thinking of here is Yvonne Rainer's *Trio A*, um, and postmodernism as a whole. *Trio A* is kind of held up as, like, this pinnacle of postmodern dance, um, sort of exemplary of the, like, No Manifesto concept and all this stuff they were trying to get into, which... is a longer thing I would like to do at – its own episode on, but what we're really getting at here in this context is saying 'No' to seduction.

Judith Lynne Hanna talked about it and one of the key ways that Hanna said was, like, how *Trio A* portrays a lack of sexuality is the fact that the dancer does not engage with the audience. Um, the gaze is constantly averted, the head moves and never really meets anyone's eyes – and then that brings us to my next fun little question, 'cause this is just a series of questions and dances that I'm using as case studies feeding into each other. Um, can you portray a lack of sexuality, of sexual interest, while maintaining a sense of human connection? Because if you take the dancer out of the equation as a, like, fellow person, then yeah, there's probably not gonna be as much, um, of a sexual intent behind anyone's audience interpretation because generally people like to, you know, have some kind of human connection. But how do you show, maybe, um... how do you show a platonic connection, how do you show an asexual romantic connection, um – intimacy without sexual connotation. And now we're gonna get to my favourite part 'cause this is the one that, um, I saw, in real actual life, um, that actually started me thinking about this way back when.

Jerome Robbins' *Opus 19/The Dreamer*. As with all art, there's a lot of different interpretations of this. Um, interestingly PNB, Pacific Northwest Ballet, they're the ones who put on the show that I saw, um, and their official blog post about it did describe this dance as being a romantic connection, whereas I saw the show that they put on and said, "I don't think that's romantic at all." So, you know, your mileage may vary, it comes very much from what lens you're coming from. I come from a queer asexual lens, so I don't immediately see a man and woman dancing together onstage and think, "oh, they're in love," whereas straight people are more likely to because they're more used to seeing that just in general and assuming that. Um, it's all about what your picture of normal is, right?

Most of the choreography between the two leads, um, is mirroring or the ballerina shadowing the male lead. Um, the whole time they are intensely aware of each other – uh, there's this moment where she bourrées around him, echoing this phrase of movement that he'd done already – but there's no impression ever that they're trying to seduce each other, for my understanding of the piece. Um, they're just people dancing together. Uh, there's a scherzo section in which many of the movements – um, it's a lot of female dancers doing movements that are – they're not like, beautiful or sexy, they're not the ethereal sylphs of romantic ballet, they are doing, like, hand-flinging gestures and these, like, little ponies, that resemble what you might do if you're just goofing off with your friends, um, not trying to impress somebody that you wanna sleep with. Um, later there's a part where the two leads come together, and instead of, you know, one of those *pas de deus* where they're like, "let me touch your leg and hold your waist and look longingly over my shoulder at you,"

it's just like, they make playful hand gestures. Uh, it's a feeling of, of play, of friendship, of trust in a way that we don't get with your more traditional *pas de deus*, uh, where the connection is about, uh... Honestly, a lot of *pas de deus* give me this sense of pining, which is a really weird thing to say when they're literally holding each other, but, um – I could probably write a whole essay about that, but we won't get into that. Um.

Murlin: [relieved sigh]

Meghan: [laughing] You're like, "this is already enough, don't make me do more," huh? We'll save – we'll save "Meghan analyses the *pas de deux*" for later. Um... You've – this is my pet project. This is what happens when I don't get research done in a month, I... break out the old research and go off forever about it. But yes! So, the whole point of the piece is about the relationship between the two dancers. Uh, New York City Ballet describes, uh, the characters as being counterparts – you know, the male protagonist and the female counterpart, um, because it is centred around the male dancer, um... But – they – to me they read as though they are two different aspects of the same person. Um, and I – I will support this with a fact, um – the final pose in the dance looks like one single, two-headed person. Um, the man holds out his hands and they each rest their head in one of his hands, um, and their feet are positioned so that it looks like there's just one, um, set of legs, standing in a single B plus position. And, you know, other people have observed – [sigh] this is a quote from the guy I don't like who said the nonsense about Martha Graham being somehow *not* sexual, um, but – he said that there is "a sense of comradely equality" that "pervades the relations between the sexes," which is just such a weird way of putting it, like just say that Jerome Robbins makes dances about friends. Calm down. Anyway, um.

There – like I said, there are moments that you could perceive as romantic or even sexual, but the most explicit one is just a hug. A really tender hug. Um... and considering everything before that is this like dreamlike mirroring where they're just kind of discovering each other and feeding off of each other's energy, and then the scherzo which is this playful section, it's really differ- bleh. It's really difficult to interpret the hug as any- um. Anything other than like, an asexual romantic relationship. And I, again, for me the interpretation is really strongly platonic. Um... and it's incredibly intimate! The whole thing is about this relationship! But there's not really anything, like, straight-people-gonna-go-home-and-do-it-afterwards about it, you know? Um, you can have deeply emotional and satisfying relationships, you can portray those relationships onstage, um, without having to imply that they will somehow consummate it. I use that word very purposefully, because, you know, that's the word that gets applied to the act of having sex after your marriage to make your marriage "real." Um... it's this idea that's pervasive even today of saying that a relationship is not real if you do not have sex with each other. Um... so yeah, intimacy. [laughing] In, um, ways beyond simply a sexual and romantic relationship tied together.

It makes sense for 20<sup>th</sup> century dance to have been sort of focused on dealing with sexual relationships the way that, um, I believe much of it has been. Um... you know, choreographers were coming out of an era where we had story ballets featuring romance, which in the traditional heterosexual mind, is a prelude to marriage and childbirth, and again marriage with that implication of consummation of it – the wedding night – um, and then it progressed into an era where people were testing sexual boundar- boundaries, in terms of gender, orientation, how open you are about your sexuality, um... And dance is a physical art, it makes sense that people would use it to explore, um, those thoughts that were coming into play more and more throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and are still, you know, heavily at play now.

But there's also the fact that a lot of that perception, I think, comes from the audiences sort of oversexualising things that I think dancers don't necessarily look at the same way. Um, we are in some ways desensitised to the sexual nature of a touch, because we are so used to touching each other. Um, we are used to getting naked in front of each other when we change backstage. Um... [laughing] It's very much, almost like a cultural gap I think, sometimes, where you put a dance onstage and it's not intended as sexual but because of the difference where you are coming from, a group of people that are used to certain things, and the audience is not necessarily, um, up on dance culture that same way, um – the audience is going to perceive things as perhaps more sexual, um, and that you can't really escape until you [laughing] like, really dig into societal pressures and the assumptions that we have around, like, touch and physicality. But, um, it's good to be aware of, and... I don't know, I just think there should be more stories in dance and not just stories, but like, dance concepts – premises – um, not just where we don't bring up sex at all, but where you bring up sex and 'no' is the answer. Um... where you can actively reject that, and not just have it either be "there's no sex" or "there is sex" like – there should be a question of it, and the ability to back off from that question.

And that's my personal thing about it, because I think that's important, and that is how we could get some asexual rep in a context where dance is not always, you know, structured around a story and it's difficult to... it's a difficult thing to portray without words, because for a lot of us it takes a lot of explanation to really get into what it means to, like, have any sort of asexual or aromantic relationship. Um, and again I'm largely focused on the asexual aspect of it because that's my personal experience and this is more about the sex than the romance, um, but... yeah. We can do it but we have to examine how we do it. And that's my... big long speech about it. So yeah, kind of an overview of different dances that can be held up as examples, um, and where these attitudes come from a little bit, but... yeah. This is secretly also a dance philosophy podcast. [laughing] So how was that, Dad, are you cringing from the number of times I said the word 'sex'? [laughing]

Murlin: Nah, I got desensitised.

Meghan: [laughing] I mean that's good. That's the point, right? [laughing] Um, I don't know. [crosstalk] Any questions?

Murlin: [crosstalk] In my line of work, we always use the word reproduction.

Meghan: You – the biology stuff? Science?

Murlin: Mm, yeah.

Meghan: Yeah.

Murlin: Yeah.

Meghan: Well, yeah, 'cause you're also talking specifically about the act of reproducing.

Murlin: Right, you know.

Meghan: [laughing] Um.

Murlin: We're – we're – you know, copulation, intercourse, reproduction.

Meghan: [crosstalk] Yeah.

Murlin: We use big words and that way the kids only blush a little bit.



Meghan: [laughing] I'm just remembering all the times in, like, honours bio in high school, our teacher would be like "Ok, I'm just gonna say this word a bunch of times until you all stop laughing." Then the problem is that made it more funny. Mostly, it's just like, the string of saying the word over and over again.

Murlin: Mm.

Meghan: But yeah. Eventually desensitisation works, even if you do it in a funny way. [laughing] But yep. Yeah, I don't know. Any closing thoughts from you, my mostly willing captive audience?

Murlin: Nope. None whatsoever.

Meghan: Ok, well, thanks for sitting here and listening to me talk about this forever. Um.

Murlin: Oh, you're welcome.

Meghan: [laughing] All right. Um... Thank you again to my teachers as always, um, for giving me the tools I needed to learn this stuff and research this stuff, and also, like, literally in my dance history class, the space to, like... I lost my train of thought 'cause Dad just did a thumbs up emoji on... [laughing] Um, specifically in dance history literally giving me the chance to create the essay that this particular episode is based off of. Um, [quietly] thank you to my teachers – [in a singsong voice] Thank you to Dad for sitting here with me, listening to all of this, um. [seriously] Thank you.

That's that on this one, and... Um. Check out the transcripts and sources on my website, which is [Varner-arts.com](http://Varner-arts.com), and I believe that's with a hyphen in the middle... Yes. Varner, hyphen, arts. Um, and... Yeah. We'll have another one up at the end of next month. Subscribe or follow or whatever the word is for your particular podcast service and I... hope you enjoyed this session of me talking for a very long time about dance and sex. 'Cause it's an important topic and I will never shut up about it. All right. Cool sign off goes here.

Murlin: Ok.