Contents

List of Figures vii
Series Editors’ Preface viii
Notes on Contributors xi

Reflecting on Political Performance: Introducing Critical Perspectives 1
Alex Flynn and Jonas Tinius

Part I Ethnographies of Political Performance in Developing Contexts

Section 1.1 Interventions
1 Re-imagining Political Subjectivities: Relationality, Reflexivity, and Performance in Rural Brazil 33
Alex Flynn
2 Performing Transformation: Cultivating a Paradigm of Education for Cooperation and Sustainability in a Brazilian Community 53
Dan Baron Cohen
3 Embodying Protest: Culture and Performance within Social Movements 82
Jeffrey S. Juris

Section 1.2 Development and Governance
4 Embodiment, Intellect, and Emotion: Thinking about Possible Impacts of Theatre for Development in Three Projects in Africa 107
Jane Plastow
5 Resistant Acts in Post-Genocide Rwanda 127
Ananda Breed
6 Governance, Theatricality, and Fantasma in Mafia Dance 147
Stavroula Pipyrou
Part II  Theatre as Paradigm for Social Reflection: Conceptual Perspectives

Section 2.1 Theatre and Tradition: Politics and Aesthetics

7 Aesthetic, Ethics, and Engagement: Self-cultivation as the Politics of Refugee Theatre
   *Jonas Tinius* 171

8 The Invisible Performance/the Invisible Masterpiece: Visibility, Concealment, and Commitment in Graffiti and Street Art
   *Rafael Schacter* 203

9 Whose Theatre Is It Anyway? Ancient Chorality versus Modern Drama
   *Clare Foster* 224

Section 2.2 Political Theatricality

10 Theatre in the Arab World – Perspectives/Portraits from Lebanon, Syria, and Tunisia
   *Rolf C. Hemke* 261

11 Pussy Riot’s Moscow Trials: Restaging Political Protest and Juridical Metaperformance
   *Milo Rau* 279

12 Reinventing the Show Trial: Putin and Pussy Riot
   *Catherine Schuler* 286

Section 2.3 Theatre as Ethnographic Method: Ethnography as Theatrical Practice

13 For a Verbatim Ethnography
   *Nicholas J. Long* 305

14 The Anthropologist as Ensemble Member: Anthropological Experiments with Theatre Makers
   *Caroline Gatt* 334

*Index* 357
Reflecting on Political Performance: Introducing Critical Perspectives

Alex Flynn and Jonas Tinius

Rural Santa Catarina in sub-tropical South Brazil, and Mülheim, a pleasant German city in the post-industrial Ruhr valley. As editors, our field sites are strikingly different and hard to imagine side by side. In Brazil, you arrive along a dusty track to huge concrete gymnasia where state meetings of Latin America’s largest social movement, the Landless Workers’ Movement (MST) take place. Cows stand idly in pens in adjacent fields. Coaches that have transported hundreds of people to the meeting line up in parking lots nearby. Sentries bar the gates and word of mouth communication from a leader is required before they allow you to pass. A brief exchange and they either swing open the broad wooden gates or they turn you back. Once beyond the perimeter, in this rural location outside a small town in the Brazilian interior, the meeting itself is abuzz with energy, people going hither and thither, camping down on a concrete floor in a mixture of tents, old mattresses, and dusty blankets. The meeting will last four days and there is excitement and anticipation about the programme, of which a key part will be the dramatic performances, the mística. Images line the main hall. Sebastião Salgado’s series on the Landless Workers’ Movement has pride of place, hasty photocopies of his work strung out down the full length of one wall. Stands of prize vegetables demonstrate what organic farming can produce. There are pumpkins, squashes, courgettes, apples, and tomatoes proudly on display in a political statement that counters the hegemony of the agroindustrial companies, such as Cargill and Monsanto. On a stage at the front of the hall, there are Brazilian flags, movement flags, and flags of solidarity: Palestine, Bolivia, and Venezuela. A few people are readying a rudimentary mixing desk and public address system. People mill around, waiting for the performance to begin, wearing the red MST baseball cap and the red MST t-shirt, with
Che Guevara or Fidel Castro’s image printed on the front and lyrics from a Silvio Rodriguez song, printed on the back. The *mística* will open the day’s meeting and coordinators are rounding people up and ushering them into the main hall. There is much fidgeting, much rustling of notepads, chewing of pens and then silence, before the performance starts.

There are fewer cows at pasture in Mülheim. You approach the Theater an der Ruhr down a suburban street in a genteel neighbourhood not far from the region’s post-industrial sites. The tree-lined avenue throws glimpses of the theatre premises itself, an elegant 19th-century country house, established as part of a spa complex for public health. Flanked by a freshwater pool, the gardens, designed by the architect Baron von Engelhardt, conduct you through stone terraces and sweeps of steps to the entrance of the theatre, where cosmopolitan artists sip gin in a well-appointed foyer. Theatrical lighting highlights current and former performers, blown up in posters where they strike dramatic poses. Theater an der Ruhr literature sits organised in neat rows on tables, behind which smiling bilingual interns offer to assist and translate. A savvy crowd of theatregoers float around from the foyer to the bar area, where red curtains and carpet, spacious high ceilings, and stucco plaster complement a small stage for seminars and presentations, decked out with a stark black lighting rig and simple table and chairs. There are several performing spaces, and the corridor to the main auditorium transports you from the openness of the public area to an atmosphere altogether more intimate. Again, portraits, paintings, and theatre placards line the wall, to where a large and heavy double door marks the entrance to the reason why people have come; this is where the performance will take place.

Much anticipated and much contested, these instances of performance which occur in dusty towns of the Brazilian interior and in a well-appointed, state-funded German theatre, although seemingly so different, offer important points of analytical similarity. Indeed, these points of similarity can be found in all the performances that are described by the contributors to this volume. Although they occur across three different continents, play to vastly different audiences, and draw numbers of participants from the tens to the hundreds of thousands, they all have qualities that lead us to analyse them conceptually as *political* performance, a choice of term which we will explain a little later in this introduction. What links these political performances for us as editors is a conviction that there is something immanent to their happening that can be perceived as both an ethnographical reality and
as an analytical proposition. There is a powerful ethico-aesthetic quality inherent to these political performances that moves people, one that causes them to reflect and therefore consciously decide that they will interact with the world in a different manner. The audience and performers in these performances experience a deep sense of introspective interrogation, and through this ethical and affective inquiry of the self, in a shared space, those people present come to new understandings of the world, together.

A rigorous anthropological analysis of what occurs in such milieus therefore prompts questions whose consequences for studies of the social are profound. How can we conceptualise the unique second-order reflection of embodied acting of roles that can take place on any stage? What are the potentials of considering political performances as a genre of critical social inquiry? How do these capacities relate to institutionalised structures, political aspirations about democracy, and basic tenets of human development, such as freedom and equality? In this book, the interstices of anthropology, theatre studies, and development studies are the starting points for an analysis that explores how the potential of performance has not only been under-explored by practitioners in its current guise, but has also been under-theorised by scholars within these fields.

Rationale

This collection aims to provide an interdisciplinary analysis of political performance, juxtaposing ethnography and anthropological theory to highlight how dimensions of aesthetics and politics can interrelate to create new forms of sociality. This, we argue, is key to understanding how political performances can make innovative contributions to international development and political debates on the role of artistic expression, as people’s experiences and wishes for social, economic, political and cultural change can entirely determine what development and transformation mean on a quotidian level. In Rolf Hemke’s chapter on political theatre in the aftermath of the Arab Spring, a participant in such a performance describes very aptly what we see as the central contribution to the theoretical and ethnographic corpus of this book:

We try to reflect with our means, with the means of theatre. Theatre is a method to observe, from some distance, what is happening to us. On the basis of the objectification through one’s own work, we can try to understand what changes have occurred and how the crisis
is affecting us. Although we’re just small pieces in a large puzzle, we can describe this puzzle much more accurately when going into detail. (Hemke, this volume)

As the Jasmine Revolution in Tunisia demonstrates, performance and ritualised stagings can be defining in their potential to create radically affective bonds between actors and audience. By focusing on ‘humans embodying other humans’, as German philosophical anthropologist Helmuth Plessner described it (1982: 146), contexts of political performance can provide a rich field for anthropological explorations of people’s own reflections on humanity, sociality, change, and aspiration.

We argue that these affective and reflective aspects of cultural politics are considered marginal in mainstream development discourse, yet are entirely intrinsic to the wider processes upon which such a discourse is premised. As such, this book aims to create new pathways in which critical anthropology can theorise instances of reflected action with an intended transformative telos, and therefore development as change, while anchoring our ethnographies in contexts that are pertinent to the international development community.

Our main theoretical concerns therefore organise, but also draw upon, the ethnographic contributions presented in this volume. Key to the theoretical underpinnings of our contribution is to make clear the difference between dimensions of performance as deliberately reflective, metaperformative actions and performativity as action intended to incite transformation. Our terming of the ethnographic realities presented in this volume as political performance follows from this conceptual differentiation. Following this important distinction, we also wish to establish the ‘political’ as a space where dissent can be articulated, even if it may not result in what can be conveniently termed as ‘revolutionary’. Following Chantal Mouffe therefore, political performance for us opens the possibility of a more nuanced analysis that can better perceive ethical dimensions of transformation of the self, the collective, and of interests, in their potential if not in their immediate impact.

Linked to this idea of ‘impact’ is our contention that the articulation of these discrete transformations of the self and therefore the elaboration of new collective political subjectivities is a process that grounds wider instances of development. In her contribution, which puts forward both academic and practitioner perspectives, Jane Plastow argues that transformation through performance and commitment to dialogic approaches can result in lasting outcomes as opposed to asserted impacts. In this vein, this volume aims to highlight how the potential
of performance has not been realised by development practitioners in its current incarnation of Theatre for Development (TfD). Through the mobilisation of diverse ethnographies, we also aim to explore how political performance offers possibilities for both wider political transformation and also self-transformation. As such, we see a pathway into more subtle readings of the negotiation of how political self-transformation occurs in contexts that can often be subject to dichotomous power-resistance readings. This tension between ethics and politics is felt perhaps most keenly in the counterpoint that can exist between aesthetics and politics: Rafael Schacter, Alex Flynn, and Jonas Tinius, amongst others, all touch on the subtleties of how a performance is staged; the tensions between rehearsal and performance, and how this impacts on people’s own projects of self-transformation elaborated within collective spaces. These tensions are important to highlight if we are to consider performance as a method of research. Through Caroline Gatt and Nicholas Long’s contributions, this volume aims to put forward performance as a means of reinterpreting research design and output, and understanding such antagonistic points of encounter is intrinsic to this project. Clearly, we do not seek to offer political performance as an ethnographic phenomenon or research technique that is without its problems; on the contrary, the element of critique that runs through this volume calls into question performance as a means of emancipation, the efficacy of performance as a development tool, and also the legitimacy that the complex multiple roles that academics involved as practitioners (or vice versa) can exercise. Indeed, we hope that readers of this collection will find these points of contention productive and be stimulated to engage in the following debates.

**Key concepts**

In this book, we argue that political performance can bring about radical changes in people’s conceptions of themselves and their understanding of wider political subjectivities. Having studied a diverse range of such instances of performances, the need for an analytical tool with which to synthesise what occurs in such processes becomes evident. Recognising this necessity, we propose the concept of *relational reflexivity* as a means to productively theorise what we argue are the key dimensions of political performance. This term, which underpins the volume’s theoretical approach, prompts questions that are explored in each of the contributions: what is the role of relationality? What are the roles of audiences and collectives that are always implied in performances? How
is collective meaning elaborated from within relational contexts and yet premised upon reflective processes? Any desire for change implies a conceptualisation of the status quo and conscious envisioning and imagination of a desired state of being; the very possibility of reflection is derived from intersubjective interrogation.

In the elaboration of this definitional proposition, we have drawn together what we consider to be important theoretical perspectives on performance, the political, and relationality, while also attempting to mobilise them in a precise and specific manner. For example, the adjective ‘political’ is often interchangeably ascribed to a wide variety of collective expressions, ranging (not exclusively) from performance arts, Brechtian and post-Brechtian theatre, bodily alterations, and gender performativity, to reperformances of the European drama canon. Once concepts such as ‘performance’, and ‘political’ become all-encompassing and almost tautological, their significance as meaningful reference points for either analytical scholarship or applied practitioners is rendered irrelevant. As such, in the following paragraphs, we seek to outline the theoretical positions that underpin the analytical tool that we propose.

Judith Butler offers perhaps one of the most cogent discussions of the distinction between performance and performativity.\(^3\) Having developed J. L. Austin’s theory of speech acts\(^4\) with regard to an analysis of gender identity and articulation, she writes:

There is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; identity is performatively constituted by the very ‘expressions’ that are said to be its results. (Butler 1990: 25)

Operating on the basis of work made possible by Foucault’s ‘archaeological work’ (Baert 1998: 116), Butler elaborates the performative dimensions of ‘rules of formation which stipulate the conditions of possibility of what can be said’ (Ibid.). As Butler puts it:

One exists not only by virtue of being recognised, but, in a prior sense, by being recognisable. If language can sustain the body, it can also threaten its existence. [...] Even if hate speech works to constitute a subject through discursive means, is that constitution necessarily final and effective? Is there a possibility of disrupting and subverting the effects produced by such speech? (Butler 1997)

For Butler, performativity is thus a reiterative and cited power (not limited to speech acts) which produces the phenomena that it also
regulates. In other words, each performance of, say, gender, also contains the possibility of its performativity, that is, its execution or enactment. When the Australian-Bosnian model Andrej Pejić self-identifies as ‘in between genders’, preferring ambiguous pronouns and modelling for both male and female designers, such performances on the catwalk are perlocutionary acts; they already enact the transformations they imply. There is thus a nuanced and perhaps deliberately ambivalent discrepancy between creating a reflexive and artistic gesture towards an audience (a performance of queer identity) and articulating one’s own transformation through this gesture (a performative act).

Although Butler’s distinction is vital in developing a critique of essentialism (cf. Rorty 1989), it also risks denigrating the performance-aspect in favour of the performative-aspect and thus overemphasising the ‘perlocutionary force’ over the thoughts and reflections on performance’s affects and effects. What this volume intends to propose is to highlight these slippages by shifting attention from teloi and physical transformation to their reflection and deliberation. We believe that such a singular focus on performativity (what is done by means of performance), which is akin to a development discourse prioritising impact, obscures the relevance of (self-) reflexivity on how and what is done and performed.

The concept of ‘the political’ in the context of performance and performativity is no less problematic or ambivalent (Butler 2013). Yet it offers similar potential for a productive refocus on negotiation and the idea of process with a concomitant emphasis on the dimensions of reflexivity that are part of such an approach. Rather than understanding ‘political’ as an adjective indicating instrumentalisation, ideology, or an applied teleological practice, we understand it to be a critical term highlighting deliberation and dissent. Inspired by Chantal Mouffe’s elaboration of the term (1993, 2008, 2013) and what she labels ‘agonistic pluralism’ (Mouffe 1999), we consider the political in our conceptual discussion of relational and reflexive performances to be those kinds of performances that problematise negotiation and process, rather than propagate fixity and identity.

Central to Mouffe’s reconceptualisation of the political is a critique of the postulation of a rational public sphere, ‘where power and antagonism would have been eliminated and where a rational consensus would have been realized’ (Mouffe 1999: 752). In such a universal-pragmatic model of ‘democratic’ politics, there is no space for the conflictual dimension and ‘its crucial role in the formation of collective identities’ (Ibid.). In foregrounding antagonism, Mouffe de-universalises our notion of political subjects. For her ‘the political’ refers to forms of antagonism inherent
to all dimensions of human society that emerge and are constituted by social relations. ‘Politics’, we agree with Mouffe, refers to the ‘ensemble of practices, discourses and institutions that seek to establish a certain order and to organize human coexistence in conditions that are always potentially conflictual because they are affected by the dimension of “the political”’ (Mouffe 1999: 754). This observation rests on a key proposition: seeing ‘the other’ in political discussion no longer as an enemy to be eradicated, but as an ‘adversary, i.e. somebody with whose ideas we are going to struggle but whose right to defend those ideas we will not put into question’. Such a conceptualisation of pluralist politics includes and conceptualises the ‘subversion of the ever-present temptation that exists in democratic societies to naturalize their frontiers and essentialize their identities’ with the aim to be receptive to ‘the multiplicity of voices that a pluralist society encompasses, and to the complexity of the power structure that this network of differences implies’ (Ibid., 757).

The notion of the political as defined by process and dissent is deeply significant for our mobilisation of relationality. We understand the idea of performing to transform to be premised within a relational, precarious, and collective context, and as such we mobilise and extend Nicolas Bourriaud’s (2002) theory of relational aesthetics. Bourriaud is an art critic and theorist and became well known for his curation of visual artists of the 1990s. Bourriaud argues that these artists cannot be interpreted using outdated notions of art history and art objects and instead puts forward the idea that the value of their work is premised on its potential to bring together the audience as a harmonious community, thus facilitating the creation of shared meaning. We extend Bourriaud’s theory of how meaning is elaborated through intersubjective encounters by applying his theory to ethnographic instances of political performances by groups, often in interaction with institutions, in movements, or on stage. Following Bourriaud, we suggest that political performances create ephemeral, precarious, and collective spaces akin to the temporary democratic communities that Bourriaud terms ‘micro-utopias’. Similarly, we understand these spaces and practices as fundamentally relational. However, in our anthropological development of this line of thought, we elaborate the relational to encompass the intersection and interaction of juxtaposed and imbricated values and spheres – aesthetic, cultural, social, political.

What is particularly productive about Bourriaud’s conceptualisation of art works (or performances) as a starting point for intersubjective encounters is the debate that his writings have produced. Claire Bishop’s critique of Bourriaud draws heavily on Mouffe’s articulation
of antagonism to ask ‘what types of relations are being produced [by relational art], for whom, and why? (2004: 65).

Bourriaud wants to equate aesthetic judgment with an ethicopolitical judgment of the relationships produced by a work of art. But how do we measure or compare these relationships? The quality of the relationships in ‘relational aesthetics’ are never examined or called into question. (Ibid.)

Bishop argues that, in the contemporary art world, works that Bourriaud classifies as exemplifying the tenets of relational aesthetics may create intersubjective relations, but they also stray dangerously into the territory of exclusivity to which only the privileged few have access. She cites the observations of an art insider recounting how many art world professionals he met at a Rirkrit Tiravanija exhibition. The artist conducted a performance in which he cooked a vegetable curry and pad thai for those people attending. This cosiness, in what is supposed to be an ethicopolitical intervention, is problematic for Bishop. Addressing Tiravanija’s work, which sits as an exemplar of Bourriaud’s theory, Bishop criticises the homogeneity of voices that make up these intersubjective relations and calls into question therefore not only the emancipatory potential of this ‘micro-utopias’, but also the intentions of the agent who has created the possibility of these relations.

The importance of Bishop’s influential critique of relational aesthetics here is to relate her emphasis on antagonism with concerns around the structure of a political performance; while Bishop questions how open-ended such works as Tiravanija’s curry kitchen may be, we interrogate the emancipatory vocabulary of participatory theatre; what are the dimensions of spontaneity and script that lie behind political performances? How might political performance, as much as the exhibitions of contemporary art, be subject to different interpretations of ‘rehearsal’ and ‘performance’? How can ‘antagonism’ be connected to dissenting performers and those out of step with prescribed choreography?

In such a vein, an antagonistic critique of relationality reinforces our conviction that the ‘political’ in performance denotes process over fixity. Participants’ reflections on the status quo, and their desire for change, are not necessarily the tools with which the ‘now’ can be turned into the ‘then’, but rather the basis for articulations of eu-topias and contested collective meaning. In our understanding of the antagonistic political, artists no longer produce political theatre, but instead produce it politically.
Thus understood, ‘the political’ in our discussions of ‘performance’ directs our analytical perspective to a critique of instrumentalist rationalities in and beyond development, performance, and theatre studies. Rooted in a critique of instrumentalised art performances, often related, but not limited, to TfD, we seek to reorient scholarship of political performances or the political of/in performances from dichotomous ideas about structure vs. agency, power vs. resistance, and institution vs. individual towards a focus on the potential for self-reflexivity and the desire for self-determined transformation.

Performance, development, and change

Although the contributions of this volume are interdisciplinary, the approach and questions posed in this volume are at heart anthropological: How do I articulate selfhood, subjectivity, or belonging? How do groups, institutions, and movements imagine and articulate themselves as collectives? How do we perceive ourselves in relation to others? This volume, then, asks less ‘Is power challenged, or reproduced in political performances?’ than ‘How do people create precarious relational spaces to negotiate shared meaning by reflecting on their situation, and, by performing to transform, articulate where or who they want to be?’ We believe that such an approach can make an important contribution to issues of development that sit beyond the mainstream understandings of the term. Post-development scholars such as Arturo Escobar have placed great emphasis on development solutions that are specifically premised on social movements and place-based politics (2004: 220), and we contend that political performance is intrinsic to this reconceptualisation of how development can take place. Escobar argues that processes which attempt to go beyond conceptualisations of the ‘third world’ are being enacted by self-organising, non-hierarchical networks that are place-based and thus mobilise at a local level (while engaging with transnational networks). However, Escobar highlights that although such movements of people provide the most realistic opportunity for re-imagining and re-making local and regional worlds, these processes of dissent are subject to two important questions:

What are the sites where ideas for these alternative and dissenting imaginations will come from? Second, how are the dissenting imaginations to be set into motion? (2004: 220)

We argue that analysing political performance through the concept of relational reflexivity can both lead to better understandings of the
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sites through which new political subjectivities can emerge, and also, through our focus on the way meaning is elaborated in relational spaces, how they can be set in motion. By speaking deliberately to development contexts from an anthropological point of view, the book prompts a vocabulary that sees the aesthetic, the transformative, and the performative as parts of the same conversation about social and political realities.

Following Escobar's emphasis on solutions that can re-make and re-imagine political subjectivities rooted in colonial and imperialist tropes, this book's analysis of political performance builds on and develops the praxis of TfD that for many audiences, represent a straightforwardly didactic tool. The ethnographies of Jane Plastow in Uganda and Ananda Breed in Rwanda foreground how development practice that encourages deep personal reflection on process and negotiation can prompt action and knowledge in entirely separate ways to that directed by the direct impositions of TfD, with its emphasis on results.

From the 1950s onwards, theatre was recognised by development practitioners as a valuable tool. In a manner which scholars like Dale Byam (1999) term as propaganda for colonial government development policies, theatre was utilised by development practitioners to disseminate ideas such as immunisation, sanitation, and cash crop production. As such, development interventions have historically employed theatre in a limited sense, which as Zakes Mda (1993) has stressed, was merely concerned with disseminating development messages, or conscientising communities about their objective social political situations. This situation has indeed persisted; even today theatre is still commonly used in educational programmes relating to HIV in Sub-Saharan Africa, or in wider programmes to ‘educate’ people about gender equality. However, theories that underpin more progressive uses of political and theatrical performances began to evolve from the 1970s, based on Paulo Freire (1973, 1975) and Augusto Boal’s (2000) reconceptualisations. Penny Mlama has identified what she terms as ‘Popular Theatre’ as having the potential to act as a counterpoint to the development process. For Mlama, popular theatre becomes a mode of expression based on people’s genuine participation to ‘assert the culture of the dominated classes ... making people not only aware of but also active participants in the development process’ (1991: 67). The use of theatre and other forms of performance in this new and radical context of empowerment has attracted huge interest from scholars, practitioners, and activists from around the world with instances of activity encountered across the global south. The Zapatista movement in Chiapas (Barmeyer 2003; Kampwirth
1996), the Mothers of the Disappeared in Buenos Aires (Borland 2006), and the movement to oust President Fujimori in Peru (Moser 2003) have all employed instances of theatre and performance outside of traditional development settings to mobilise communities, while Femi Osofisan (1999) in Sub-Saharan Africa and Jacob Srampickal (1994) in India, among others, have highlighted how theatrical performances are increasingly employed by communities to intervene in political debates.

This interest has come about because, used in these settings, political performances have been employed in a free, profoundly embodied, and non-rehearsed way. Through a reflected and embodied methodology, these performances have elicited recognitions of personal transformation that more straightforward programmes of TfD have mostly ignored. What is interesting about these more open-ended performances are the inherent connections to participation and participatory models of development. As Bill Cooke and Uma Kothari have compellingly illustrated in Participation: The New Tyranny (2001), the mechanisms of participation are easily suborned to accommodate the interests of sponsors, with their powerful and often ideologically driven agendas. One such agenda that can underpin participatory development, as highlighted by Maia Green (2000) and Harri Englund (2006), is the denial of poor people’s capacity to bring about change for themselves. In this book we explore how political performances can dialogue with more genuine models of participation through activating the creative potential of interaction and discussion inherent in people’s lives. Unlike more didactic models, some of the instances that our contributions explore detail how performance can create spaces that incite people to act out their lives and the issues that are important to them in an emergent, rather than prescribed, fashion. In this sense, these performances, which prioritise negotiation over propaganda engage, as Jane Plastow understands it, with a different ideology to limited ideas of participatory development that can underlie current development thinking. Even to the most reactionary of the development community, it is clear that change in development cannot be brought about in a sustainable manner through an imposition of values and ideals. Engaging with participants in political performances can reveal the fallacy of equality as a feasible aim of development, shifting notions towards more realistic notions of equality as participation (Englund 2011).

This book therefore engages with a contemporary intellectual art tradition that envisages political performance as a ‘particular conjunction of contemplative thought, reasoned action (praxis) and creative production (poiesis)’ (Lambek 2000b: 309). As such, throughout this book, we
are detailing the dynamics of a generative process by which, for example, theatre as art and as performance creates a nexus of techniques which can energise spaces with the capacity for change.

Structure of the book: situating contributions

Each of the contributors intervenes in debates pertaining to relational reflexivity in separate ways pertinent to their disciplinary standpoints. The contributions come from different disciplines, but as editors we have structured the book to ensure a productive dialogue between these differing approaches.

The first part of the book, ‘Ethnographies of political performance in developing contexts’ looks at how performances are mobilised in diverse parts of the world to bring about change. This first part is itself split into two sections, the first of which is entitled ‘Interventions’. Alex Flynn’s chapter opens this section, discussing how the *mística* of the Landless Workers’ Movement of Brazil can be understood as a performance through which change is imagined through the collective elaboration of meaning. The chapter highlights how the MST’s stylised form of performance is latent with the pedagogy of Paulo Freire, intending to enable movement members to envisage change within themselves and also collective change in the conception of political subjectivity. Flynn highlights how the spaces in which these performances occur are wholly relational; *mística* performances are embedded into the cultural politics of the MST and are used to open meetings at which hundreds of people are in attendance. In these performances, however, the MST community is represented as embedded within wider schemes of the global political economy; the political symbols of the movement flag, the Brazilian national flag and anthem, and the props that signify the reach and power of multinational corporations all go to demonstrate how political subjectivities elaborated in relational and reflexive spaces are never disengaged from the spheres in which MST leaders understand their struggle to take place. One of the interesting facets about *mística*, however, is the extent to which the performance is subject to control. In the closing section of the chapter, Flynn highlights the tensions that exist between the spontaneity of expression and the improvisation of artistic expression to call into question, from the standpoint of theatricality, the kinds of meaning that can be elaborated by individuals in these relational and reflexive spaces.

Dan Baron Cohen’s contribution equally draws attention to Brazilian issues of marginalisation and powerlessness, albeit from a point of view
which is more characterised by his work as a practitioner in a small community in the Amazon. Baron Cohen foregrounds the concept of transformance as an activist cultural politics, a practice that builds performances through pedagogy, singing, and the creation of poetry. As with the mística that Flynn discusses, Baron Cohen’s work demonstrates that seemingly obscure performances in marginalised spaces are anything but unconnected; indeed, both mística and Baron Cohen’s work highlight the consciousness that small communities have of global and local frameworks. Central to Baron Cohen’s work as a practitioner who mobilises performance is the concept of transformance pedagogy. Drawing upon 15 years of ethnographic research, and resisting a clear delineation between academic and activist roles, Baron Cohen illustrates his conceptualisation of transformance pedagogy through his work with young artist producers and how these young people transform their violent lives, streets, and schools in the city of Marabá. Central to his thinking is the idea that transformance pedagogy distinguishes between crude narcissistic empathy and reflexive empathy. Baron Cohen argues that the former is merely an uncritical identification, whereas the latter is inherently affective; a quality that leads to questioning and analytic identification. Sensitive to his position as an activist and practitioner, Baron Cohen echoes Flynn’s questioning of performance and how anthropologically it is merely a technique within a wider field of social relations. Although both authors argue that performance can generate radical new understandings of self and change amongst disempowered communities in Brazil, as with much ‘participatory development’, such processes can be open to manipulation within a wider political framework. Nevertheless, both authors, aware of these critiques, refer to performance’s unique artistic language, and its key role in the transformation of sentimental empathy into reflexive empathy in Baron Cohen’s work, and marginalised rural aspirations to mainstream political subjectivities in that of Flynn.

To complete this first section, Jeffrey S. Juris’ chapter, while also focusing on performance and intervention, specifically puts forward an analysis of the transformative capacity of embodiment and affect, at both macro and micro levels. Juris explores the links between concepts and mobilisations of culture and performance in social movements to make observations on the power that political performance can have. Based on ethnographic data from contexts including the Occupy movement and the movements for global justice, Juris argues that it is through what he terms cultural performance that alternative meanings, values, and identities are produced, embodied, and publicly communicated.
within social movements. It is important to note here that such performances are often constructed by media-savvy organisers. As Juris highlights, some groups may operate a mass media oriented strategy that explicitly relies on performance for achieving visibility. For Juris, as for Flynn and Baron Cohen, many of the participants and activists with whom these authors have worked consciously reflect upon the performative, aesthetic, and ‘practical’ dimensions of their performances. How these reflections are premised within wider, collective notions of protest tactics is a key contribution of this section.

The second section of Part 1, entitled ‘Development and Governance’ opens with Jane Plastow’s chapter, which, seeking to move away from TfD and toward experiential learning through development/image theatre, combines ethnographic analysis with an illustration of the use of performance in developing contexts. With reference to projects undertaken by the author, the chapter explores how relational and reflexive performances have been used with marginalised social groups in three Sub-Saharan African contexts. Plastow highlights how such techniques have been employed to explore participants’ lives: their concerns about violence, gender, and schooling. Her work illuminates the generative process whereby, through performance and the use of the body, participants come to their own understandings of questions that were emergent: that is, not outlined as one of the goals of the session. As such, the idea of dialogic learning is fundamental to Plastow’s work and echoes Baron Cohen’s commitment to processes, which engenders a learning through dialogue between individuals. As with Baron Cohen’s work, the body is central in this methodology in the way that it promotes a self-reflexive, and fundamentally democratic activity that evokes the potential of participants’ transformative responses within a relational sphere. In this way both Baron Cohen and Plastow emphasise how relational and reflexive performance can be put toward development goals, going beyond the simplistic notion that theatre is effective in development contexts because it allows illiterate people to learn and participate. Indeed, both authors stress that such a commitment to dialogic approaches to theatre making, with and for communities of the marginalised, can result in lasting outcomes as opposed to asserted impacts.

Ananda Breed’s contribution to this volume furthers Plastow’s concerns with notions of development that sit outside mainstream development discourse. Breed’s chapter problematises resistant performances in the context of post-genocidal Rwandan gacaca courts and local dramatic performances, calling into question how performance intersects
with notions of restorative justice in Sub-Saharan Africa. Breed proposes that performances of justice and human rights have served as international platforms for ‘truth-telling’ and nation-building (see also Breed 2014) and she analyses the overlap between actual court proceedings and their immanent understandings of law-as-performance (Alexander 2011; Benjamin 1978). In foregrounding the use of theatre for dialogic negotiations between past atrocities and present juridical systems for reconstruction and reconciliation, Breed draws attention to how performance can serve as means through which to better understand notions of justice without succumbing to ethnocentrism. Breed draws on Erika Fischer-Lichte’s elaboration of the transformative power of empathy within the co-presence of the performance space derived from an encounter with ‘otherness’ (see also Caroline Gatt, this volume, and Fischer-Lichte 2004). Similarly, and yet from a different starting point and a different *telos*, she argues that the theatrical space offers critical distance to evaluate and reflect upon the political, emotional, and juridical frames of the genocide. These can be conceptualised in and of themselves as enablers of significant relational socio-political events. Her work, inspired by her multidisciplinary training in development, political studies, anthropology, and theatre studies, provides multifarious perspectives on and theoretical implications for the study of theatrical frames as alternative and evocative ‘stages’ for the emergence of hidden transcripts and relationally reflective moments of reconstruction in post-genocide Rwanda.

This book’s preoccupation with notions of development that can remain overlooked is well served by Stavroula Pipyrou’s chapter. From an ethnography of N’drangheta mafia dancing, Pipyrou argues that whilst such affective fields of cultural politics as performance may be considered marginal in mainstream development discourse, they are entirely intrinsic to the wider processes upon which such a discourse is premised. Having trained as a dancer herself, Pipyrou’s chapter resonates with the emphasis on the body that is made by several other authors in the book. Pipyrou’s concept of ‘embodied observation’ furthers the ongoing debate in all of the chapters as to the lines between researcher and participant, which itself hints at the use of performance as a research method, a subject that is addressed in the second part of this book by Caroline Gatt and Nicholas Long. Being able to interact with N’drangheta mafiosi through dance allowed Pipyrou a privileged access, as public dance performance is perceived as a living part of N’drangheta where politics and aesthetics meet. Through the theorisation of this performance therefore, Pipyrou’s chapter unravels the aesthetics of the
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political, thereby revealing an aesthetics of Mafia governance: how people interact with it, how people reflect upon it, and importantly, how an administration which is entirely parallel to the state is constituted through the deliberately porous boundaries of affect, emotion, and power. Performance in this sense becomes a means to understand public engagement, territorial patronage, and embodied governance.

The second part of this collection, entitled ‘Theatre as paradigm for social reflection: conceptual perspectives’ moves from questions of political intervention, governance and development to approaches that, while premised in ethnography, seek to conceptualise theatre and performance from historical, political, and aesthetic standpoints.

The first section of this second part, ‘Theatre and tradition: politics and aesthetics’ opens with Jonas Tinius’ exposition of the philosophy of theatre as reflection through a discussion of a contemporary German theatre institution and its critical engagement with a refugee project in an abandoned asylum camp in the post-industrial Ruhr valley. Tinius highlights his informants’ own rituals of reflecting and conceptualising the engaged social and political role of theatre as a publicly accountable institution, yet also explores the ethical quandaries that emerge from a concern with aesthetic questions rather than pedagogic interventionism. Tinius’ chapter reinforces the editors’ concerns with locating the reflexive and relational at the heart of performance; his enquiry centres itself upon an analysis of the heightened intensity of conscious ethical behaviours that emerge from political theatre rehearsal processes, a practice that Tinius, citing Helmuth Plessner, describes as revealing because it is where ‘humans embody[...] other humans’. Situated thus, amid concerns of artistic labour and self-cultivation, Tinius’ chapter opens this second part by touching on what will become iterative and resonant themes in the wider collection: the interplay of politics and aesthetics; the transformation of the ethical self as well as wider political subjectivities embedded within relational contexts; and the question of how we can better understand the reflexive and self-cultivating dimensions of performance, rather than reducing political theatre to simplistically staged interventions in wider schemes of power. For Tinius, as for Flynn, political performance is not a mere reproduction of schemes of power; holding placards and conducting a protest march is not simply a sideways take on more formal and state incorporated rituals that incarnate the procession of power. The perspective argued for here offers a pathway into more subtle readings of the negotiation of political self-transformation, often overseen by dichotomous power-resistance readings. Tinius’ ethnography demonstrates how marginalised people
seek to instantiate an ethico-aesthetic political subjectivity through the use of their bodies within a global political situation to which they are marginal and in which they are precarious.

The precariousness and the invisibility of the marginalised are also themes that Rafael Schacter takes up in his chapter, which traces the communicative dimensions of illicit performance art in Denmark and its implications for conceptualising the public sphere and political discussion. Drawing on his fieldwork and experience with the world of independent public art, Schacter juxtaposes a European context with the other contexts explored in the book and thereby avoids reiterating the trope of development in developing countries. Furthering a perspective on local instances and emic representations of performance, Schacter’s ethnography discusses two artists who have created a precarious dwelling within the capacious functional engineering spaces of Copenhagen’s central rail station. Crucial to his chapter is the idea that a particular subset of independent public artworks, which have been carefully hidden and revealed in complex performative ways, offers a pathway into conceptualising the linking and severing of relations between performer, artist, and audience and at the same time the invitation to reflect upon this process. As revealed in Schacter’s ethnography, this dwelling is as much a place to stay as a performance of illicit invisible art, and as a political statement articulated against the neoliberal closing down of hitherto public urban space. Schacter subverts the idea that public street art is about the visibility of tagging and reputation gained to foreground the fundamentally relational idea that for these artists, commitment to politicised performance matters more than fame; the status of the self is less important than allegiance to the social body. As such, performance becomes not merely the instrument through which material is produced; embedded in wider communities of meaning and driven by a desire to reflect on political subjectivities, it is an ethico-aesthetic statement and therefore a product in and of itself.

Clare Foster equally shifts the focus from developing contexts to rethink the particular trajectories and ideologies that characterise the study of European performance history. Foster’s contribution therefore enters into dialogue with Schacter’s and Tinius’ accounts by emphasising the extent to which theatre performs and reperforms anthropology. Foster suggests that the history of performance studies and anthropology share common and increasingly contemporary agendas which seek to move beyond the limited notion of ‘going to a play’ to explore the ritualised, symbolic enactment of individual identity and collective meaning-making. Key to Foster’s chapter is the idea of the theatrical
event, pre- and post-drama, as a relational ritual and public event, which she explores through the conceptualisation of chorality. Foster argues that literary drama, together with a late 19th-century European interest in the authentic, marked a significant shift in ideas of theatre towards the object on stage and away from a concept of theatre as relational ritual and public event. This shift still influences attitudes to theatre today, and has had a profound impact on approaches to theatre historiography. Drawing on a range of anthropological, classicist, historic, and performance-based perspectives, she contends that we should not take our received notions of modern theatre as a normative given. In fact, an analysis of a classicist perspective on chorality, relationality, and reflexivity, she argues, throws a critical look at how we understand theatre in other periods and places. Theatre before the 1880s, and most recently experimental forms of theatre (see Gatt, this volume), were performed not only for audiences, however, but explicitly about them:

The audience were the performers, and the city the set: there was no ‘off stage’ in an Athenian dramatic festival. The city itself, in the visual field of spectators, was a geographical participant in the narratives. (Foster, this volume)

The second section of Part 2, entitled ‘Political theatricality’, examines more closely how theatre makers have articulated performance within paradigms which are more formally theatrical. Rolf Hemke’s work concerns the practice of theatre and its arts-based aesthetic responses to political upheavals. His chapter contributes important perspectives on the politics of aesthetics within the theatre and issues of private symbolism and dramatic writing in the context of political unrest. As the editorial note that prefaces his chapter highlights, the text-based performances that Hemke describes as part of his work for the Theater an der Ruhr (Tinius, this volume) are not political in the sense of an overarching, ideologically driven interventionist practice. Nor do they extend from the theatrical ‘scene’ or ‘stage’ to those outside of actual theatre buildings (though Meriam Bousselmi’s performance installation Truth Box has been placed in public spaces, churches, and streets). Instead, they throw light onto artistic and literary engagements that seek reflection upon conflictual political contexts through socio-psychological artistic readings. They enable a different view onto the semiotics of political artistic reflection and meaning-making. By relocating political struggles into the realm of the artistic process rather than the ‘performance’, rehearsal practices, performance spaces, dramatic
metaphors, audience responses, and many more aspects of a supposedly ‘traditional’ theatre context become laden with adversarial and political meaning. As we suggest in this introduction, these artistic processes therefore become relational spaces within which reflection and political discussion initiate intersubjective and artistic transformations.

This tension between process and product, which Foster problematises, is further explored in the juxtaposition of two contributions which focus intimately on Pussy Riot, albeit from very different perspectives. Filmmaker, theatre director, and founder of the International Institute for Political Murder, Milo Rau offers an explanation of his motivations behind his ‘retake’ on the Pussy Riot trial, which resulted in the sentencing of three of the collective’s members. In this translated, reprinted, and recontextualised interview, Rau discusses his most recent project Moscow Trials. Embedded in a series of theatrical and documentary reenactments, the Moscow Trials reperformed the judicial trial that caused widespread dismay both within and without of Russia. Rau’s reenactment brought together members of Pussy Riot, lawyers, journalists, and other members of the Russian public to perform and reflect upon the trial. In the interview, he notes that the transcript for the trial was only loosely agreed upon, leaving space for spontaneous interventions and reactions, thus allowing both participants and performers to think through the relation between rehearsal and improvisation, script and spontaneity, and performance and performativity. In the text, he contextualises the idea of a reenactment in the political act of ‘making-visible’ previously unmarked and unreflected relations between people and institutions, law and art, and religion and the public. Rau’s remarks also problematise the idea of historical reperformances and the reception of western activist art in Russia: what is significant about the performance of Moscow Trials is that while the act it reperformed garnered widespread critical support internationally, within Russia Pussy Riot was subject to widespread condemnation. Indeed, Rau’s own performance of the Moscow Trials was interrupted and ultimately stopped by people claiming to be part of the Russian Federal Migration Service, and then later by a group of Cossacks accompanied by a film crew. As such, the Moscow Trials, although iterative in many senses, is more than mere repetition through iteration. As Rau argues, his work goes beyond the simulation of a juridical process; rather it is a reperformance that is continually open to spontaneous reinterpretation, calling into question the tensions between audience and performer and the differences between aesthetic and political gestures of justice that Breed’s chapter also touches upon.
Theatre, for Rau, therefore becomes more than a medium for the transmission of information, a point which Catherine Schuler advances in her contribution written about the original performance, the show trial of the Pussy Riot members. Schuler describes how the trial occurred and provides a contextualisation of the incident in Christ the Saviour Cathedral in Moscow that resulted in three members of the collective being found guilty of criminal hooliganism, a charge that is premised upon the action being understood as a premeditated hate crime against the Russian Orthodox faith, rather than a political performance calling into question the relationship between Vladimir Putin and the Russian Orthodox Church. Indeed, as Schuler notes, comments indicating that the women were making expressive avant garde art appear only twice in the court judgement, reinforcing the idea that Pussy Riot’s intervention was not an artistic performance, but mere profane graffiti: the defacing of a sacred space. Schuler’s contribution calls into question the motives of the Russian justice system, but also questions Pussy Riot’s intentions in staging this performance within a theoretical framework that she argues would not make sense to the people who were in the church. As such, Schuler raises the question of performance and audience, and for whom Pussy Riot’s performance was intended, noting that international celebrity support, such as Madonna’s act of stamping on an Orthodox cross, did nothing to help the members of the collective sentenced to two years of confinement in a labour camp.

The notion of audience and an awareness of what is being produced for whom points toward the difficulties in researching performance and indeed employing performance as a research method. This latter concern is at the heart of the third and final section, entitled ‘Theatre as ethnographic method: ethnography as theatrical practice’. Opening this section, Nicholas Long argues for the value of Anna Deavere Smith’s ‘verbatim’ technique of documentary theatre as a means of anthropological knowledge transmission. Long outlines the technique’s potential, the obstacles it has encountered in practice, and some possible ways in which these might be overcome, if performance can really be mobilised as an alternative form of research enquiry. Long’s chapter signals one of the more general aims of this collection, which begins with an exploration of ethnographic instances of political performance and intervention, before seeking to mobilise theoretical conceptualisation to suggest new pathways which could be of theoretical and practical use. In particular, Long argues that verbatim techniques of documentary theatre represent an exciting new possibility for ethnographic representation, perfectly suited to the intellectual needs of an anthropology currently undergoing
the ‘affective turn’ (see Long 2013: 4). It also carries considerable potential as a means of informing debates in fields such as development and social policy, both because of its capacities to reveal the experiences and stories of real people and because of the therapeutic benefits that people may experience from watching (or performing) their lives and memories on stage (see for example Nicholson 2009; Paget 2010; Stuart Fisher 2011). In analysing documentary theatre, Long develops a new theory for understanding ethnographic sociality. Theatre as a means of education, he argues, rests upon its capacity to create actual (if temporary) and affectively charged relations between and among both audience members and performers. As a means of ethnographic representation, Long’s approach draws attention to ways of focusing on and accessing people’s marginalised subjectivities, aspects of social life that can elude documentation in textual transcription and speech (see also Gatt, this volume).

This volume’s concern with practice as well as theory is furthered by Caroline Gatt’s contribution, which provides a practice-based retrospective and prospective exploration that engages the concept of research theatre. This presents two main challenges: how to approach parallel, non-institutional research traditions within Euro-American spheres and how to move beyond the text-focused practice of ethnography. Gatt’s ethnographic exploration investigates how relational and reflexive performance can inform ethnographic practice. The contribution offers anthropology and development practitioners a means to generate processual understandings that shift from text to embodiment. Her ethnography and analysis build on more recent theoretical and methodological shifts towards performance-ethnographic experiments in anthropology, yet remain in dialogue with more historical discussions (see Foster, this volume). Gatt considers the engaging aspects of performative anthropology, foregrounding the possibility of performance practice to inform anthropological projects from research design to methods, through to presentation. This shift in how the research process can be conceptualised, she argues, has the potential to regenerate anthropology’s key concerns in three specific areas: a consideration of subaltern knowledge beyond textual representation; new and performative understandings of reflexivity in intersubjective contexts; and the processual paradigm of the co-presence of researcher and informant.

Conclusion

An anthropological perspective that can adequately theorise dimensions of political performance and the elaboration of new political
subjectivities, and therefore the underpinnings of processes of development and change, is urgently needed. The essays in this volume throw light upon the potentials of such an approach; from issues of justice in Rwanda, to pedagogy amongst marginalised communities in Brazil, to the aesthetics of invisibility and dressing up as a pink fairy to put forward a political statement, the book's contributors draw methodological and epistemological implications from ethnographic research of broad fields of inquiry with important theoretical interdisciplinary resonance.

Throughout this book, we seek to foreground the idea of the transformative; performance, it is often argued, can have an emancipatory potential in its capacity to enable people to reflexively understand where they are, and therefore where they want to go. However, following from Jane Plastow's contribution, we do not necessarily understand this transformative potential as an immediate resistance to existing structures of being, feeling, or acting in the world (Abu-Lughod 1990, Hirschkind 2006, Mahmood 2001). Rather, it is the more subtle potential to induce, enable, and encourage reflection on the status quo of any individual or social group. By focusing on the reflexive aspects of action, the dynamic play between rehearsal and improvisation inherent in any performance, and the engagement with, management, and emergence of potential ways of being (as an individual or group), we highlight aesthetic and ethical dimensions of what may become antagonistic processes; political performance is not about a homogeneous group of people trying to shout down a dichotomous ‘other’. Therefore, although we agree with and wholeheartedly support political performance as a means of engaging with politics that is available to all (Cohen-Cruz 2010), our approach is premised upon reflexivity. Participation in political performances operates within a context that cannot be ignored; relations cut the network (Strathern 1996) and not all relations are equally privileged (Bishop 2004).

This book understands relational reflexivity in performances as itself a form of ethical and political change. The contributors to this volume share an agitated concern, however, that this refers to more than a self-satisfied and all-too-evident assumption that this is all there is to say; the ethnographic is committed to describing action in a nuanced way that highlights the reflexive dilemmas, radical aspirations, and social contexts of any performance. The ethico-aesthetic, highlighted by ethnography, denotes the multiple ways in which such reflected actions turn aesthetic praxis into ethical poiesis. In this way we respond to post-development discourse and its emphasis on creating opportunities for the re-imagining and re-making of local and regional worlds.
As Arturo Escobar asks and yet also prefigures, where are the sites from which alternative and antagonistic imaginations will emerge and how are these new political subjectivities to be elaborated and also shared? Relational reflexivity describes the performative imbrication of the reflected and creative management of transformative potential. The ethical dimension of political performance is evident in the narrative telos any performance, even improvised, implies. It is in this sense that this volume speaks of the socially and politically transformative potential of relational reflexivity; our definitional proposition is both a description of ethnographic realities and also a conceptual analytical approach. As such, this volume aspires to be of practical use in the theoretical elaboration of works which confront the interrelation of relationality and reflexivity, and the contested process of re-imagining political subjectivities. It is through the engagement of aesthetics and politics that we can perceive and conceive how people around the world perform to transform.

Notes

2. TfD in its simplest sense refers to instances of theatre used as a development tool. TfD encourages actors to engage in performances using music, singing, and/or dance. The goals of these performances are often pedagogical in nature, relating to issues of health or gender relations. In the last twenty years, as part of the participatory turn in development discourse, stated goals have started to include empowering communities and listening to their concerns, with the objective of voicing and solving their own local issues. This shift from the colonial and didactic to more ‘inclusive’ programmes can be perceived by Ananda Breed’s definition of TfD as an ‘egalitarian method to access and distill information, working with communities to create a self-sustaining tool for dialogue and from that dialogue to affect policy. TfD creates an infrastructure for communities to define themselves by developing systems of communication that identify key issues, implement solutions, and establish partnerships between resource groups’ (Breed 2002).
3. Many of our contributors distinguish these concepts with regard to their own specific context and approach. Those discussions that we consider to be both well-written summaries of existing debates and key contributions to them are, in particular: Fischer-Lichte (2012); Korom (2013); and Wirth (2002).
5. Of the many works that discuss the concept of the political in its anthropological ramifications, we would like to highlight: Barry (2001); Collier and Ong (2005); Fischer (2003); Habermas (1971); Latour (2004); and Rose (2007).
6. On this point, Raymond Geuss (2008) has explored the relation between the concepts of revolution, utopia, and imagination. For him, they are all hinting at that which is completely different; the other side of the wheel of fortune, Fortuna, revolves (Tinius 2013).
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