

PLACES OF BECOMING

GATHERING URGENCY IN CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL THEATRE

MA Thesis Theatre Studies

Utrecht University

NELE FRIEDA BEINBORN

Student number: 5622069

Supervisor: Dr. Liesbeth Groot Nibbelink

Second supervisor: Dr. Chiel Kattenbelt

ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on a strong contemporary movement of urgency that lies in contemporary society and expresses itself in the motivation to “do something”. This notion is located within the practices of theatre in order to examine whether theatre projects with a political intention behind them can and do contribute to this sentiment in a certain way. With the help of Foucault’s concept of heterotopia (*Of Other Spaces*), Chantal Mouffe’s theory *On the Political*, and Erika Fischer-Lichte’s *Transformative Power of Performance*, a concept is developed that describes the possible motivation inherent in theatre projects that deal with political issues. The definition is refined by Deleuze’s concept of ‘becoming’ and Claire Bishop’s thoughts on participation in combination with Jaques Rancière’s theory of *The Emancipated Spectator*. Contextualised in the contemporary, the concept of metamodernism – meaning neither postmodernism, nor modernism itself but at the same time neither of them – serves as a useful indicator for both the sentiment and the performances for a new structuring of sensuality of which the urge for action is characteristic. The concept is put into use by analysing two theatre projects of different sorts: *Unified Estonia* (2010) by the Estonian collective Theatre NO99 and the project *Web of Trust* (2016) by Amsterdam-based director Edit Kaldor. While one of the projects focuses on the forming of a fictional party and thus already obviously operates on a political level, the other project start off on a personal level of distress and moves further to bigger political structures as it progresses.

The thesis concludes with an analysis of the usability of the concept of Places of Becoming and argues for new theories and strategies in order to emancipate an audience, appeal to their reason and motivate an action that leads to the change of the current system.

I loved you in springtime.
I lost you when summer came.
And when you pulled backwards,
I wanted you, I needed to
to make me better

The Decemberists - *Make You Better*

THANK YOU

LGN.

AIF, MER, MIS, and the awesome nonsense support group.

LSS & SJP.

You know who you are and what you can do. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
1 INTRODUCTION	5
2 RAISED BY DECONSTRUCTION	9
3 PLACES OF BECOMING	15
4 GATHERING URGENCY	23
POLITICAL CRITICISM IN THE AGE OF THEATRICAL REPRODUCTION	23
TESTING 1,2,3	26
5 CONCLUSION	29
6 BIBLIOGRAPHY	32

I INTRODUCTION

“I find quotes in the beginning of books sound so wannabe-clever. Every dork thinks that when they open with the words of Oscar Wilde, Brecht, or Kafka, that their punishable attempts at writing immediately turn into literature.”

The kangaroo in Marc-Uwe Kling’s *Kangaroo Chronicles*¹

This quotation stems from the first book of Marc-Uwe Kling’s *Kangaroo Chronicles* that circles around a kangaroo that lives with the artist Marc-Uwe. The kangaroo is a communist and originally from the German Democratic Republic, but also lived in Vietnam during the war. Together with Marc-Uwe, who writes best-selling books that criticize capitalism, it overthrows the bureaucracy of daily life, and constantly engages in the fight with right-wing extremists. It even corrects and criticizes their graffiti. The reason why this quotation is at the beginning of this master thesis is – apart from the joke that it is fitting because it criticizes quotes in the beginning of books – is the urgency and the funnily portrayed notion that lie in these books about the kangaroo that shows that every little step against the prevalent system is a step against the system – however small it may be. Moreover, the series of books by Marc-Uwe Kling show a specific irony and sincerity at the same time. The fact that he is often asked whether he really lives with a kangaroo or whether he made everything up is also a question that is asked with little alterations in the context of theatre. Is what we see on stage real? And to what extent is our reality coined by the things we see on stage? Can theatre influence us in

¹ Translated from German by Sarah Cossaboon & Paul-Henri Campbell.

² The facebook-page of the ZPS gives an interesting insight in the bureaucracy of the project: It was

our thinking, and possibly even motivate us to act, to engage politically, even if it is just with our next-door right-wing populist-supporter?

This thesis examines places, in which these motivations have a ground to grow. I term them Places of Becoming. They occur in contemporary politically orientated theatre projects and are fuelled by an urgency that lies in our contemporary society.

The main reference point for the definition of Places of Becoming is Michel Foucault's concept of heterotopia that is grounded in the notion that we live in the "epoch of simultaneity" (Foucault 1984, 1). Globalization and the digital age have not only increased the potential of simultaneous processes but have also decreased distances, be they spatial or temporal. Now, almost 50 years later, the sentence "We are at a moment, I believe, when our experience of the world is less that of a long life developing through time than that of a network that connects points and intersects with its own skein." (Foucault 1984, 1) is not as revolutionary as it was, but stating the obvious. A linear structure is no longer the main frame for addressing things, nor are clear dichotomies and yes-no-decisions. It is rather a "both-neither" relation as Robin Van den Akker and Timotheus Vermeulen state in *Notes on Metamodernism* (cf. Van den Akker and Vermeulen 2010).

Similar to that notion of simultaneity is the thought of counter-sites that Foucault develops in *Of Other Spaces*. While utopias present themselves as society in a "perfected form", heterotopias are "counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested and inverted." (Foucault 1984, 3) These sites are situated within sites that are already existing, they are a bubble of ideals in a world of reality, but not without *raison d'être* because with constituting themselves they also constitute reality and life as it is.

With this thesis, I want to argue for a notion of theatre not as a closed system in itself that is locked inside a theatre space. Instead, theatre takes forms that go beyond the blackbox and the auditorium and pushes through the borders of amusement and theatrical representation into the socio-political sphere.

While Jill Dolan titles her approach – that is somewhat similar to the one found in this thesis – *Utopia in Performance* and claims that she believes "in the possibility of a better

future, one that can be captured and claimed in performance“ (Dolan 2005, 3), this thesis goes a step further and moves beyond the frame of utopia.

In my opinion, utopia is not enough in the sense that it is too much. Having a perfect ideal in mind to be reached is per se a good thing, yet the awareness that it will never be reached is somewhat disappointing. Taking smaller steps both in imagination of the ideal and in realizing it seems more rational and actually doable. Using the term utopia limits the possibilities from the very beginning, it raises expectations that cannot be fulfilled and at the same time remains a fairy-tale-like construct that hovers over us like a magically glistening cloud. In Jill Dolan's definition

The utopian performative's fleetingness leaves us melancholy yet cheered, because for however brief a moment, we felt something of what redemption might be like, of what humanism could really mean, of how powerful might be a world in which our commonalities would hail us over our differences. (Dolan 2005, 8)

Her argumentation stays in the subjunctive, always focussing on what could be. In terms of radicality, her concept is rather situated on a personal emotional level, not on a broader socio-cultural level. Also, she argues that utopian performatives show a possibility of a different future, the affect stays in a suggestive mode, losing itself in the romantic possibilities on how theatre can affect an audience-member personally.

I agree with Jill Dolan's opinion and beliefs when she says

I believe that being passionately and profoundly stirred in performance can be a transformative experience useful in other realms of social life. Being moved at the theater allows us to realize that such feeling is possible, even desirable, elsewhere. (Dolan 2005, 11)

For my further research in the direction of theatre's potential to affect social structures, her approach is however not as helpful because the performances she describes and analyses are thematically and intentionally not related to what my research entails as the performances Dolan uses engage her on an emotional level. However, what her research shows is that there is a transformative power to performance. An important aspect for this thesis to bear in mind is also her notion that theatre, "even if it doesn't change the world, certainly changes the people who feel it." (Dolan 2005, 19) and those who feel will eventually be those who do.

This thesis is structured in three main parts: The first part chapter 2 “Raised by Deconstruction” examines the reason for the motivation that is generated in Places of Becoming. In this chapter the “structure of feeling” of metamodernism is explained further and taken into the context of theatre. The third chapter then serves as a definition of the concept of Places of Becoming. Theories employed here are Foucault’s *Of Other Spaces*, Chantal Mouffe’s theory *On the Political*, and Erika Fischer-Lichte’s *Transformative Power of Performance*. The definition is refined by Deleuze’s concept of ‘becoming’ and Claire Bishop’s thoughts on participation in combination with Jaques Rancière’s theory of *The Emancipated Spectator*. In chapter 4 “Gathering Urgency” two case studies will be analysed with regard to the principles of Places of Becoming: *Unified Estonia* (2010) by the Estonian collective Theatre NO99 and the project *Web of Trust* (2016) by Amsterdam-based director Edit Kaldor.

2 RAISED BY DECONSTRUCTION

Starting in Ancient Greece, theatre has always been a place of or a reason for gathering. The term derives from the Greek word *theatron*, "the place to watch from", and thus technically describes the auditorium, the place from which the audience watched the ongoing on stage. In a broader sense, however, theatre as the place to watch from could also be interpreted as the place from which the world is seen. Theatre as a space that enables to see the world as it is portrayed on a stage, a stage that has the ability to make different worlds come to life that are out of reach or out of the mind of the spectator. In theatre, everything that is worth watching can be combined. Theatre enables to watch the distance from up close. *Theatron* thus could also be seen as a place to show alternatives, that enable a different view on the world. Theatre itself as a concept, not as a place, but theatrical practices that allow a view on the unknown as an aspect that naturally allows an audience or a single spectator to reflect on their own world, their own decisions and their own needs. Of course this is a highly hypothetical topic, as Hans-Thies Lehmann also suggests in *Postdramatic Theatre*: "Perhaps theatre can never know whether it really 'does' something, whether it effects something and on top of it means something." (Lehmann 2005, 180). It can never know but artists sure can try and according to John Jordan it is about time that something happens. In his essay *Performing Against the Suicide Machine. Notes for a Future which is not what it used to be* he states that "History is knocking on the door. So many of us know this culture needs rethinking completely and that we need entirely different ways of being and sharing our human and non-human worlds." (Jordan 2015, 112) If history knocks on the door, then the questions that have already climbed through the window must be: What are we to do? And how? And why is no one doing anything?

Honestly, I don't know. Just like many others. However, I feel that something needs to change, because somewhere something has gone completely wrong and we are the generation who has to live with decisions that are made today. The dreading word sustainability hovers over all decisions that are made, whether that means leaving a supportive community out of spite and misinformation or appointing a muppet as a candidate for one of the most high-ranked positions on earth, it all affects us. And moreover,

It feels like we are in a similar moment of transition as the 1930s, a time where there are numerous possible doors that history could open. But most of us continue to live life as normal and make theatre as if we were still in the late twentieth century, with its sweet promise of progress, its visions of a future better than the past. Those days are over. (Jordan 2015, 111)

How to get out of this? How to move beyond this, how to move past the promise of progress and actually see it realized? How to move past the visions of a better future and actually make one? The answer is as simple as heavy and pathetically loaded, as the story that brought me to it. It was an evening in December, when I visited Edit Kaldor in her studio in Amsterdam to see a rehearsal of her project *Web of Trust*. On the way back to the train station a metal construction on the train bridge that I was about to walk under caught my eye. "DOE IETS" it said and hovered over me. A short research brought to the fore that the construction is an artwork by Dutch artist Serge Verheugen that aims at motivating people to stop talking and start doing. Aimed for a personal individual level, the sculpture became my motivation for the project and reminded me every time I walked by that there is something to be done and that we are the ones to do it.

The feeling that something has to be done and the urgency that lies in this feeling, this overall discontent almost, shows itself in contemporary political theatre in two ways. First there is a certain radicality, that is most of all apparent in the works of Zentrum für Politische Schönheit. Their most recent project in collaboration with the Maxim-Gorki Theater in Berlin was called *Flüchtlinge Fressen – Not und Spiele*. The title is a reference to the Roman principle of "Brot und Spiele" (bread and circus), making use of the homophonic comparison of "Not" (distress) and "Brot" (bread) and circled around an arena in the middle of Berlin that was inhabited by four live tigers. Refugees were invited to engage in a Roman gladiator fight with the tigers, several were willing to. The projects main aim was to get the German parliament to abolish an article in the transportation restraint, that prohibits airlines from transporting passengers without valid visa.²

² The facebook-page of the ZPS gives an interesting insight in the bureaucracy of the project: It was labelled as a presentation of Roman law enforcement to get permission for the use of space by the Berlin municipality. The project was about to be stopped when the responsible department complained that the use of the space eventually was not what was agreed on in the first place. ZPS unceremoniously organized said lecture and continued with the project. More information about the project on: <https://www.facebook.com/politische.schoenheit/?fref=ts>.

Another drastic example, that shows its radicality in a more subtle, subversive way even is discussed further in chapter four. *Unified Estonia* (2010) by Theatre NO99 demonstrates the forming of a party with the campaign that leads to the first big assembly of that party. Polls showed that the party "Unified Estonia" had enough supporters to actually be founded and consequently partake in the Estonian general elections. Compared to the project by Zentrum für politische Schönheit, this project finds its radicality in the structures of a political system, makes use of them, and publicly lays open corrupt structures of existing Estonian parties on the internet. The event ended in a staged political convention with 7,000 people attending and was one of the biggest theatre events in Europe.

A political uprising is also what is at stake in *Web of Trust* (2016) by Edit Kaldor, that will also be discussed more detailed in chapter four. Originally starting out as the union of people that share a discontent in politics, capitalist structures and the consequences of bureaucracy. The piece makes use of an internet platform, that is tested and eventually put into action during the performance in order to connect people with similar problems or needs to those that have already started to tackle the roots of the problem. As well as the other two examples briefly addressed here, the piece builds on the participation of the audience. This *trend* is the second big stream that can be noticed in contemporary theatre pieces. In different ways, they all aim to motivate an action from the audience, be it to actively fight for the rights of others, to use their own right to form a democratic society, or to offer support to others. An underlying yet explicit intention of changing current structures is apparent in these performances. They could be seen as microcosms that show how things could work, demonstrate the mechanisms of society in general and democracy in particular that could then potentially be transferred from the theatrical setting or framing to a broader socio-cultural sphere. After all,

theatre is the place where an action is taken to its conclusion by bodies in motion in front of living bodies that are to be mobilized. The latter might have relinquished their power. But this power is revived, reactivated in the performance of the former, in the intelligence which constructs that performance, in the energy it generates. (Rancière 2009, 3)

Of course, this is not done with the moral pointing finger. The mechanisms in question go deep into educational science and psychology which cannot be covered in the frame of this thesis. The dramaturgies employed in the case studies do not necessarily use a radical in your face structure but an indirect, yet obvious approach. As Hans-Thies

Lehmann points out in *Postdramatic Theatre*, "it is not a new insight that theatre is reliant on indirectness and deceleration, on a reflecting immersion in political topics. Its political engagement does not consist in the topics but in the forms of perception." (Lehmann 2005,184) These forms of perception are specific to theatre and specifically found in theatrical projects. Perceiving them as fictitious yet sincere turns the attention towards reality. While holding up the theatre-sign and referring to its structures, it becomes clear in the analysis of the two case studies in chapter four that the topics are not of prime importance in the theatrical representation. Other than that, the form of presentation and as a consequence thereof the form of perception always has to be seen in the context of theatre itself. One important aspect is that a theatrical form does not exist on its own but always needs an audience – regardless of its involvement in the performance itself – to construct what Erika Fischer-Lichte calls the "autopoietic feed back loop", that is a key-feature of performance and also discussed in the following chapter as a main reference point for Places of Becoming. The fact that it is an *autopoietic* feed back loop underlines theatre's self-referentiality, that Florian Malzacher sees as a main feature of contemporary political theatre,

a theatre that keeps the necessary self-reflexivity of the last decades but avoids the traps of pure self-referentiality. That understands contingency not as merely arbitrary and an excuse for relativism but as a call for active engagement to counter its consequences. (Malzacher 2015, 20)

While avoiding the meta-levels of self-referentiality, this kind of theatre also avoids the deconstruction of itself that goes in line with the self-referentiality. By taking contingency as a call for active engagement, as Malzacher suggests, contemporary political theatre goes one step further and moves beyond deconstruction to a "pragmatic idealism" (Van den Akker and Vermeulen 2010). Robin van den Akker and Timotheus Vermeulen see this as one of the main features of metamodernism, a "structure of feeling", that is "characterized by the oscillation between a typically modern commitment and a markedly postmodern detachment." With their theory, they do not argue, that postmodernism is completely overthrown and no longer relevant in contemporary artistic practices. However, they do believe that postmodern tendencies are taking another shape in the discourse of metamodernism that "engages with the resurgence of sincerity, hope, romanticism, affect, and the potential for grand narratives and universal truths, whilst not forfeiting all that we've learnt from postmodernism." (Turner, Notes on Metamodernism) More concretely, metamodernism or metamodern structures are raised

by postmodernism's deconstruction, new forms of artworks fluctuate between sincerity and irony, employing the one while not entirely losing the other, but not focusing on either and creating a "both-neither" relationship that captures the contingency that Florian Malzacher sees in contemporary political theatre. It is also a way of not being too specific, a technique to explore possibilities, not by deciding for one but by mapping them out and being aware of the numerous possibilities that the contemporary offers.

The millennials know too much of today's exploits, inequalities and injustices to take any meaningful decision, let alone position themselves on a convenient subject position, yet they appear – from the political left to the political right – to be united around the *feeling* that today's deal is not the deal they signed up for during the postmodern years. (Van den Akker and Vermeulen 2015, 58)

There is a danger in this, that is captured by following quote from Marc-Uwe Kling's *Die Känguru Offenbarung*. At one point the kangaroo says: "Do you know what happens when you keep all the doors open? There's a draft, my friend! You will get ill!"³ And it is true, the overload of possibilities does create a draft, or at least a movement between the possibilities and complicates the decision but at the same time making choices more meaningful. This both-neither feeling can also be widened to society in general. A lack of wanting to chose because there is no need to leads to an overflow of possibilities and potentials that are never fully discovered. At the same time, an in-between is created, a new space that lies between decisions, that balances between this and that, "it is a pendulum swinging between 2, 3, 5, 10, innumerable poles." (Van den Akker and Vermeulen 2010) It never stops swinging and that is the fascinating aspect of metamodernism, that even though it describes something that is not moving, because there is no movement – in a metaphorical way – towards a certain direction, it does not stand still either. As Van den Akker and Vermeulen state that "metamodernism moves for the sake of moving, attempts in spite of its inevitable failure; it seeks forever for a truth that it never expects to find." This can also be found in idealistic or even utopian portrayals of society that bare the potential of being realized as something to strive for and if working towards a bigger reason or picture does not change the world in its entirety, then it at least leaves some things changed into the direction of this ideal. In the

³ My translation. Original: "Weißt du was passiert wenn man sich immer alle Türen offen hält? Dann zieht's mein Freund! Dann wird man krank!" Kling, Marc-Uwe. 2014. "Die Känguru Offenbarung" (Berlin: ullstein), 229.

artworld of our society, that is shaped by capitalism and neoliberalization, "there is no need to dig deep or look far and wide for the figure of utopia" (Van den Akker and Vermeulen 2015, 57). Imagining a different world is nothing unusual, neither is deciding to do things differently than the generation before.

3 PLACES OF BECOMING

As already suggested in the introduction, Places of Becoming are the places where a spark hits inflammable material in a metaphorical sense. They contribute to triggering a motivation, a movement of mind or a way of thinking that brings along change. Places of Becoming offer the space where motivation can jump over and is transferred in order to engage (politically) with one's surroundings. The main critique point of this notion, of art wanting to do something is that it is utopic, an ideal that is never going to be achieved in a successful way and that it is not art's purpose to change things. Art for art's sake is a valuable sentiment and by suggesting that it has the potential to do more in some cases, I am not refuting that sentiment. I am also not arguing, that every piece of art should have the intention of changing society, critiquing current structures, or making the world a better place. However, art and specifically performance art is one of the few ways we know as a tool to cope with things and to engage with the world around us. It is nevertheless a useful way to spread awareness and raise hope in situations that seem without exit. Places of Becoming describe not a space-place, but more of a timeplace, a moment, an instance of shared time in a shared space, a situation that can be taken further and when done so, reaches a motivation that continues the thought that was behind the situation. Of course, the spatial parameter is somewhat important as it makes use of the theatre as a gathering place and a place for imagination, for *other* situations, as Foucault's concept of heterotopia already suggests.

The term Places of Becoming is borrowed from an essay by Sebastian Kirsch, titled *Theater, ein anderer Raum*, in which he describes the relevance of Foucault's concept of heterotopia in the context of theatre. Kirsch clarifies that heterotopic spaces open up within existing spaces – contrary to utopias that are according to Foucault "sites with no real place" (Foucault 1984, 3) – and are therefore subject to the constant processes of change, that are present in the existing constellations and structures. In his original lecture *Of Other Spaces* Foucault describes theatre as a heterotopia: theatre has the capability to "bring[s] onto the rectangle of the stage, one after the other, a whole series of places that are foreign to one another" because theatre "is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible" (Foucault 1984, 6). This juxtaposition and Foucault's other principles that distinguish a

heterotopia enable theatre to categorize theatre itself as a heterotopia and to create heterotopias on stage or in the frame of a performance. Sebastian Kirsch terms this feature of heterotopias as indicating an "inner outside"⁴ (Kirsch 2015), this inner outside suggests that there is also an inner inside, like in a nesting doll, this process only ever stops once the smallest doll, the smallest inner outside is revealed. This goes in line with Kirsch's notion of a promise that is inherent in Foucault's counter-draft to utopian thinking, the promise that there is an inner outside, that includes the

highly political search for pores, gaps and holes in the sets of rules, that structure everyday life of places, spaces and institutions. Or put differently it is about looking for openings in the already existing, that maybe can be places of becoming. Such places are never a given in themselves. Instead, their possibilities are yet to be found, they are to be created and – even if it costs an effort – everyday anew.⁵

This entails that heterotopias are not a given, nor a fixed entity in our society. Their existence as well as their creation is as ambivalent as the sites that they are the counter-sites to. Openings in the already existing might be points of attention that were not clear before, changes in the structure that are possible when combining different factors, possibilities, that were not on the radar before, but are actually a solution to very prominent problem. But where to find them? In breaking with the structures of institutions, of set ways and allowing different structures, other techniques and strategies to inspire and maybe even take over. In theatre, inviting reality in, blurring the border between real and fiction, creates the kind of places that occur in heterotopic structures. Places of Becoming derive from these counter-sites that according to Foucault are located in every society and serve to some extent as counter-sites to counter-sites in the way that they offer antagonism within the counter-site itself. Openings in the already existing can also be seen as openings *within* the already existing, focussing on gaps and pores and places between different viewpoints, opinions, that are inherent in existing

⁴ My translation. Original: "inneres Außen"

⁵ My translation. Original: "Es bedeutet vielmehr die hochpolitische Suche nach Poren, Lücken und Löchern in den Regelwerken, die den Alltag von Orten, Räumen, Institutionen strukturieren. Anders ausgedrückt, geht es darum, im Bestehenden nach Öffnungen zu suchen, die vielleicht Orte des Werdens sein können. Solche Orte aber sind niemals von sich aus gegeben. Stattdessen sind ihre Möglichkeiten erst zu finden, sie sind zu erschaffen, und zwar, auch wenn es Mühe kostet, jeden Tag von Neuem."

structures and orders. Finding loopholes in the existing that constitute an otherness is as Kirsch already says, result of a "highly political search".

There is a political component inherent in the concept of Places of Becoming. Not only because the intention behind the situations in which they occur is grounded in a political insight and aims at a bigger political structure, but also because they are to motivate political engagement by examining the existing structures. In this context, Chantal Mouffe's theories are helpful, as she gives a clear definition of "the political" itself and the way it comes into existence. According to Mouffe, the political is defined as a "space of power, conflict and antagonism" (Mouffe 2007, 9). A space that is opened up in between the opposing powers, where "the dominant consensus is challenged" (Mouffe 2015, 71) that Mouffe takes further in her concept of *agonism*:

Agonism is a *we/they* relation where the conflicting parties, although acknowledging that there is no rational solution to their conflict, nevertheless recognize the legitimacy of their opponents. They are 'adversaries' not enemies. This means that, while in conflict, they see themselves as belonging to the same political association, as sharing a common symbolic space within which the conflict takes place. We could say that the task of democracy is to transform antagonism into agonism. (Mouffe 2007, 20)

We could also say that the heterotopias are agonistic spaces. Not because they trigger agonism or are a site for agonistic power struggles, or because they are a result of agonism, but because they enable an agonistic relation between counter-site and encountered (thus initial) site. The term "counter-site" that Foucault chooses, implies a struggle, that can be further examined through the lens of Mouffe's agonism. Seeing the two different kinds of spaces as "adversaries" instead of "enemies", takes out the negative/positive aspect of the idea of "countering". To illustrate this, a football match seems appropriate. First of all, there have to be two teams in order for the match to take place. Even though there is a favouring feeling for one of the teams, the other team is an opponent that is as legitimate to be participating in the match as the team that I am rooting for. The same goes for the two kinds of spaces: Both are important, because one would not exist without the other. This interdependence is also highlighted in the fact that both are equally acknowledged in society and personal attitude or taste, or even the state of my personality determine whether I am situated in a crisis heterotopia or a normative societal space. There is no right or wrong in this relationship, just the almost physical effect that two opposing forces have on each other and their in-between.

Even though I suspect that this was not intended in the original, the translation of “Orte des Werdens“ to “places of becoming“ links closely to Deleuze’s notion of ‘becoming’.⁶ Cliff Stagoll describes this as a “characteristic of the very production of events”, the progressive form of a process that also manifests itself in the term ‘becoming’. It is further “the pure movement evident in changes *between* particular events” (Stagoll 2010, 26). ‘Becoming’ is then a form of in-between-ness, a liminality, something that cannot be described as a state, because a state of being is considered to be constant, but rather as a way of evolving, a processuality, a movement from one state to another.

In relation to performance art, Adrian Parr takes into account that Deleuze’s ‘Becoming’ “helps us to describe the process of change indicative of performance art; an event that in its singularity concomitantly expresses a multiplicity of relations, forces, affects and percepts” (Parr 2010, 31). Considering this, the ‘becoming’ of performance is not only how the performance itself comes into existence but also the becoming that a witness of this performance undergoes while perceiving it.⁷ This also points to the transformative experience of performance, that opens up a process of change through the instant of production between events. Erika Fischer-Lichte describes this phenomenon in her *Ästhetik des Performativen* in the chapter “Liminalität und Transformation“.⁸

⁶ Taking into account that translating is moving something from one event (the uttering of a phrase in a specific language) to another, translation itself is a form of “becoming“.

⁷ Taking this as a starting point, further research could be conducted with focus on the extent that an audience is affected politically, personally, emotionally after visiting a performance. An investigation like this would entail field studies of audiences and a follow-up monitoring related to the intentions of the performance to create a general audience-oriented study that Jill Dolan and Erika Fischer-Lichte have already conducted on a subjective individual level. Statistically proving this power of performance, however, would transform performance, theatre and all its beautiful features that most of the time are not possibly to be put into words – let alone numbers – into a numerical study that would leave phenomena like these out of the equation.

⁸ As mentioned earlier, translation enables a becoming of a different sort, as the translation of Fischer-Lichte’s work shows: The title of the English version *The Transformative Power of Performance - A New Aesthetics* already entails this transformation that – at least in my reading – is not the main focus of Fischer-Lichte, but rather the characteristics of performance and its (be)coming into existence. If not indicated otherwise, quotations from this book refer to the English edition. The equivalent chapter to “Liminalität und Transformation“ in the English edition is included in the chapter “The performance as event“, 161 and 174.

According to Fischer-Lichte, the transformation that derives from a “liminal experience“ refers to “the nature of performance as event“ (Fischer-Lichte 2008, 174).⁹ She further describes this as a “state of liminality“ (Fischer-Lichte 2008, 175), a phrase that seems paradoxical, considering that the transition of one state to another cannot be described with another state of being. Liminality thus describes the process of ‘becoming‘, a passage or transformation between two states of being, that is connected to the characteristic of performance as an event. Consequently, liminality refers to the event, that constitutes itself in the moment of the liminal experience. Hans-Thies Lehmann describes this as “present of performance“ (Lehmann 2005, 141) and postdramatic theatre itself as “a theatre of the present. Reformulating presence as present [...] means, above all, to conceive of it as a process, as a verb“. Again, the translation opens up another kind of interpretation: present as a gift. Understanding present as a gift, and understanding now as something that is given to those who perceive it, opens up the door that belongs to the threshold of liminality. As much as this metaphor makes do, “we make do with understanding this presence as something *that happens*“ according to Lehmann (Lehmann 2005, 143f.). In the original the highlighted term is *sich ereignet*. *Ereignen* as the corresponding verb to *Ereignis*, that translates to event, leads to the thought that presence constitutes an event, or a *happening* for that matter, that is defined by its temporal existence in the present. In principle, liminality derives *from* the happening of the event as much as the liminality can be grounded *in* this event. Eventually the now is always a threshold to cross between the not yet and the just now. Thinking the now itself as ‘becoming‘ underlines the processuality of time while at the same time highlighting that liminality can only occur if this processuality, the conversion from one point in time to another, from one event to another is actively perceived.

The term Places of Becoming relates to a physical placing of the moment of becoming. In relation with Erika Fischer-Lichte’s theory of performativity, the space in which Places of Becoming occur is a performative space, that “opens special possibilities for the relationship between actors and spectators and for movement and perception.“ (Fischer-

⁹ Here, the translation does not add but take away some of the meaning that Fischer-Lichte originally addressed. By distinguishing in German between “Liminalität“ and “Schwellenerfahrung“ (=threshold-experience) the active component of crossing a threshold is taken out of the equation in this context.

Lichte 2008, 107) While Fischer-Lichte starts from architectural-geometrical spaces that serve as a persistent “container“ for any activity and then moves to the parameters that define performative spaces in these architectural-geometrical spaces, Places of Becoming derive from performative spaces. Neither are they dependent on the spatiality that leads to the creation of performative spaces, nor is the physical location of those spaces of much importance as only the performativity created in these spaces is an important factor for the development of Places of Becoming. Even though the term suggests a physical location, there will never be a sign that points to a specific place on earth and labels it “Place of Becoming“, just like there are no signs that label theatres, asylums and shopping malls as “Heterotopia“ (or Disneyland as “hyperreal“ for that matter). The point is that these places are not entirely places, and not entirely moments, but something that is a combination of the both of them. Of course, Fischer-Lichte’s categorisation of performative spaces is helpful in the constitution of what she calls “autopoietic feed back loop“ that is a useful parameter in the concept of Places of Becoming.

Erika Fischer-Lichte developed in *The Transformative Power of Performance* a theoretical approach that describes the relation between performer and spectator. The main achievement from this “new aesthetics“ is the “autopoietic feed back loop“ that she describes as “ever-changing“ and “self-generating“ and characterizes the dynamic that derives from a performance event (cf. e.g. Fischer-Lichte 2008, 50). The essential aspect of this concept is the constant relationship between the persons involved – be they on the perceiving or portraying end of the string that is then tied to a loop in the instance, of the *Ereignis*. This constant exchange of feelings and energy is important for the performance itself and for the concept of Places of Becoming. It is not a question-answer-game but more of an impulse-response-dynamic, that is not explicitly visible or recognizable as such. However, the feed back loop is a fitting phenomenon to compliment the motivating component of Places of Becoming as it describes the relationship as a sort of mechanism that is set into motion in the context of a performative event. This connection is not to be underestimated since, “in the aesthetics of the performative, generating emotions and inducing a liminal state go side by side and cannot be separated from one another.“ (Fischer-Lichte 2008, 177)

The emotional relationship that is established through and with the feed back loop in the context of the performance is created both equally by actor and spectator. It is not a one-sided relationship, where one is expecting something from the other, but an interdependent relation that builds on what is given and received to eventually “produce a form of consciousness an intensity of feeling, an energy for action.” (Rancière 2009, 14) This energy does not derive from the actor or the spectator but from this interdependence, from the connection between the two of them.

It is not the transmission of the artist's knowledge or inspiration to the spectator. It is the third thing that is owned by no one, whose meaning is owned by no one, but which subsists between them, excluding any uniform transmission, any identity of cause and effect. (Rancière 2009, 15)

According to this, a spectator-actor relationship is always also an agonistic one. A countering one, one that is located on different stages, yet nonetheless on the same eye level. In *Places of Becoming* it is not a “I’m showing you what I can do”-situation, no exhibition of achievements or plain showing off but rather a “You could do this, too”-mentality. Of course, it is a fine line between those sentiments and a dramaturgical challenge that is not always met successfully. Claire Bishop also builds on Rancière’s notion of emancipation when she says that “the relationship between artist/participant is a continual play of mutual tension, recognition and dependency.” (Bishop 2012, 279) She builds further on this by stating that “this desire to activate the audience in participatory art is at the same time a drive to emancipate it from a state of alienation induced by the dominant ideological order – be this consumer capitalism, totalitarian socialism, or military dictatorship.” (Bishop 2012, 275) The drive that has already been described in chapter two is also a drive to emancipate, one of the strategies used for this goal is participation. Claire Bishop discusses different techniques and strategies in detail in *Artificial Hells*. The important factors for *Places of Becoming* are what Bishop concludes with regard to Christoph Schlingensiefel’s *Bitte liebt Österreich* (2001), that I will not discuss in detail here, but draw from the conclusions that Bishop states in reference to this controversial and relevant project in a context of both political theatre and participatory art. The element that triggered the outrage among the population of Vienna, regardless of their political disposition was not the display of the container itself, but that the behaviour that circled around the topic of asylum seekers, mirrored the behaviour practised in reality.

This contradiction is the core of Schlingensiefel's artistic efficacy – and it is the reason why political conversion is not the primary goal of art, why artistic representations continue to have a potency that can be harnessed to disruptive ends, and why *Please Love Austria* is not (and should never be seen as) morally exemplary. (Bishop 2012, 283)

This contradiction also shows that Places of Becoming have a strong connection to reality, to real structures that – if acted out explicitly like in Schlingensiefel's iconic container-piece – can cause more disruption than real events already do. So, Places of Becoming offer a stage, a platform that enables to disrupt reality by displaying it. To come to a full circle here, Schlingensiefel's container and its surroundings is both a heterotopia countering existing political structures and decisions and Place of Becoming because it also combines the other features described above.

In summary, it can be stated that Places of Becoming then follow the principles of counter-sites. In order to be a Place of Becoming, the site is an opening in the already existing that counters the notion of the latter. It shows an alternative that is not necessarily visible at first sight. The countering aspect is also given in the agonistic component of the concept, creating Places of Becoming is also always creating an agonistic space that offers opposing viewpoints to clash and collide and the deriving power to flourish the thought of change that lies behind the creation of these places. Places of Becoming have always also a transient component that lies in their character of becoming. This constant of change is comparable to theatre's ephemerality that – even though fleeting – establishes situations in which a connection is established that is constituent for the performance itself and is a key feature of Places of Becoming. This connection enhances a relationship that can persist throughout the performance and extends to a socio-cultural sphere. The next chapter will illustrate these principles with the use of two examples.

4 GATHERING URGENCY

POLITICAL CRITICISM IN THE AGE OF THEATRICAL REPRODUCTION

If the parliament can do bad theatre, then we can do good politics.
Tiit Ojasoo in *Ash and Money*¹⁰

This was the main idea behind Theatre NO99's massive project in 2010, that was titled NO75 and culminated in a party convention that 7,000 people attended. Building up to this event, the campaign of Theatre NO99's party "Unified Estonia" was divided in three parts: an online election school, that was published on their YouTube channel, campaign commercials and posters, and a constant press coverage of the project, that was ensured with several side events that took place in the 44 days from the first announcement to the convention in May 2010. The main source for analysing this project is the documentary *Ash and Money* (NO55) that Theatre NO99 published in 2013. Next to a chronological documentation of the events, the film also features scenes from a discussion with Edgar Savisaar, the mayor of Tallinn that took place after the project was finished. The outreach their project had, is clear in his discussion. Theatre NO99 challenged the Estonian democratic system with their project, that is still widely discussed in terms of political interventions and activist structures.

Using tactics of mimicry, NO99 sampled the most outrageous propaganda slogans of their competitors for their own campaign and remixed them into a crude melange of xenophobic and neoliberalist catchphrases while constantly appealing to national unity as a common emotional denominator. (Römer 2015, 173)

This use of mimicry, of just doing what is already being done and exhibiting the structures and techniques publicly and openly, simply even, so a transparency of wheeling and dealing is generated, creates a counter-site to the existing, operating system. *Unified Estonia* challenges the existing parties, the party fights fire with fire, while at the same time keeping up a criticality that is held up by the theatrical frame, that was not always clear to the public, as Tiit Ojasoo stated in a talk about staging democracy in Amsterdam, in June 2016: "We said that our next theatre project is going

¹⁰ Since the documentary is only available in Estonian language with English subtitles, all quotations from this documentary refer to the corresponding subtitles.

to be the founding of a party. By the time we said that we are founding a party, everybody had forgotten about it being a theatre project.“ Theatre had taken over reality in this case and the party *Unified Estonia* gained power and potential voters, so the possibility of actually founding the party and participating in the general elections was tangible. In terms of content, this result is alarming, considering that the statements were extreme forms of those that were already existing in other party manifestos. Hopefully, the potential voters of *Unified Estonia* were aware of that and based their decision on their belief in theatre.

By laying open the structures of a corrupt system, the counter-site where mechanisms in politics are transparent not only raises awareness but also triggers another emotion that can turn into political energy: outrage. Moving from a no longer silent consensus to a dissensus, convincing people to disagree is a technique, that NO99 have practised in the course of the long-term project NO75 with smaller projects, that serve as laboratories. One of those actions was *NO76,8 Action: When 200 will become 6500* that is also shown in the documentary *Ash and Money*. Actors gather in a theatre space, they are all dressed in black suits, clap and chant in the direction of the audience “We love you! We love you!”, the audience claps along and smiling faces are captured by the camera. Singing, chanting and dancing are used to build up the central scene of the try-out: One actor asks a girl from the first row to come on stage. She is standing in the middle of a theatre space, facing the audience. The audience is asked whether no one would like to keep her company because she is standing there alone. People get up and join her, more and more people are entering the stage until the fronts of those on stage and those in the auditorium harden. This radicalisation is interesting. There is nothing at stake, no consequences to one action or the other, yet those who sit stay seated in their observing position, creating power struggles without being aware of them. What this experiment shows is that not making a decision is also a decision and that a full consensus can never be reached. Agonism is what is in the air and also perceivable through the refusing attitude of the people who stay seated. From the documentary it is not clear how the experiment ended and whether the sitting people could eventually be convinced or convinced themselves to join the others on stage. However, the outcome that is visible in the documentary reveals a tension between two forces, a radicalisation that is fruitful in the motivation of actions. This situation itself already created a Place of Becoming because it started from an acted out hypothetical situation that got more and

more serious in the moment that a relationship was established and furthered. What became out of this situation is an important factor for the further course of events with regard to *Unified Estonia*.

Another aspect that is worth mentioning and impressive – apart from the glorious party convention – is a short clip that was shown at the convention. It involves actor Andres Mähar, standing on a roof with the Estonian flag in his hand.¹¹ First, he states that he is a small part of a community, a small but still important part. After an introductory sentence like this, one would expect a speech that focuses on emotions, on sentiment and (yet another) speech on how important it is to be an active part of society. Instead, Andres Mähar breaks loose: “Fuck off, since you don’t like that my children play in the sandbox because we have a large yard and you, Centre Party, raised my land tax to five times what it previously was for that.” He breaks out into a rant, telling internet commentators, fanatical members of parties to “Fuck off”. “Give me back the hope that Estonia is a normal, small country where human relations aren’t limited to the words: ‘Fuck off!’” His speech is a powerful claim to those that support politicians that they do not believe in while telling those who want to change something that there is no hope. Reactions from the audience range from laughter to sincere shamefacedness by the looks of their faces. This moment, the moment, where someone stands on a rooftop and shouts out what is wrong and tells politicians and non-voters what is wrong with them is the most powerful in the documentary. Positioning this element straight after a performance of a pop song that celebrates Estonia and ends with the words “Estonia, Estonia, Estonia, oh my God.” breaks the joyful, amused, and at the same time highly ironic mood and makes the truth-telling from the rooftop as powerful as can be. Hence the reactions in the audience that get more extreme the more Andres Mähar obsesses into everyday issues, that are relatable and show the flaws in society. “You should be young! You should be furious! Furious!” he screams almost in agony, complaining about the young generation and precisely hits the problem with this. There is no direction, just like the metamodern pendulum swings and pulls itself back again, there is no clear direction, because there are too many. As portrayed in the documentary, the final shot of

¹¹ The clip can be found on YouTube (unfortunately without English subtitles): Kāi Perse - Andres Mähar https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVO_EoebNSo.

the clip is how Mähar walks to the edge of the roof, still holding the Estonian flag, his back to the camera. According to the documentary, after this emotional clip, the party leadership is appointed. The dramaturgical arch with which the clip is embedded in the party convention underlines the sincerity and urgency of the whole project. The agonism between needing to do something and not doing anything becomes clear.

The point is not whether anything changed in a moment, the point is that this was one battle in a long war. I think it was a totally important battle.

Tiit Ojasoo in *Ash and Money*

And the war rages on. In 2015, NO99 staged a musical called *Savisaar*, a tragical story based on politician Edgar Savisaar. NO99's engagement is persistent, bringing to the table the responsibility that a project like *Unified Estonia* brings along. However, as already mentioned earlier, the responsibility is not inherent in artistic practices, but with this project, NO99 started something that is not finished with the end of a performance or the fall of a curtain but is a long time process that keeps on going. The processuality, the becoming of the project, the transition between events is not over in this case.

The effect that *Unified Estonia* had on national politics in Estonia is indicated in the documentary. Bribe money issues are laid open, politicians come clean about where the money for campaigns comes from, just like Theatre NO99 taught in their election school. The impact of a theatre project, the pressure that this artistic undertaking generated is admirable. Empowering people to understand and see through what is being done to them by politicians, and that this can only be affected by engaging in politics is a cause that is summed up in another quotation of Tiit Ojasoo from *Ash and Money*:

If you can't deal with politics, then politics deals with you.

TESTING 1,2,3

While *Unified Estonia* operates on the party level of political structures, *Web of Trust* starts on a personal level and moves from there to the broader structures. It is a different, yet no less effective approach when it comes to realizing that something needs to be changed and requires action. *Web of Trust* premiered at the Kunstenfestivaldesarts in Brussels in May 2016. It is a project by Edit Kaldor and collaborators from all across Europe who engage in an online platform. In the theatre, only two performers, Rufino Henricus and Edit Kaldor herself are present. They are

sitting in front of a huge screen, that shows the website, that is tested, and videochat-windows of the other performers and participants. In addition to that, Edit Kaldor switches between a collaborative document and a repository of previous cases that were connected through the platform. New posts that come in deal with personal issues that have deeper, broader causes, like not being able to access the beach anymore because it is privatized, or needs that circle around the topic of housing, all of them somewhat displaying the consequences of a neoliberal society: that something always falls by the wayside. In the digital space that is created, people are connected with people that wither have the same problem or have a different problem that structurally is the same in order to find a solution together.

The digital space, in which people meet that would never meet in real life, is already a counter-site to the real world, a heterotopia 2.0, that comes into existence on the internet, a space that is by definition in-between spaces and has countless possibilities to open up gaps and pores in existing spaces. Augmented reality comes to mind, or – a little simpler – the fact that people talk to people online whom they would never talk to on the street. The anonymity of the internet opens up possibilities that have been discussed in detail elsewhere already, however, in this project, the sense of community grows stronger through a broadband connection. Through the course of the performance, the platform is tested, tried out and improved. The landing page still needs to be written, something is clearly coming into existence here.

It is an ideal to be tried and tested.

It is an idea to be tried and tested.

collaborative document in *Web of Trust*

Characteristic of *Web of Trust* is the testing structure, that is apparent in many levels of the production. Taking into consideration that over the course of the performances changes have been made to the structure as well as the layout of the piece, underlines its processuality and theatre's feature of being ever transformative and never fully finished. This thought of thinking on in terms of processing and trial and error, of debugging the system can serve as a metaphor for changes in society. In general, making choices, testing out those choices and reflecting on the choice made and the possibility to adjust the choice is luxurious. Being able to choose again and to try out alternatives because there are so many alternatives is a characteristic of our time. The

fact that these decisions are never completely made draws on the notion of metamodernism, the pendulum mentioned above, that pulls to one side and is pulled back again as soon as it reaches an extreme position. *Web of Trust* does not take a specific stand. Of course, the needs and concerns of people are in the foreground but an extreme political viewpoint is not portrayed. Thus, the agonism that a Place of Becoming would entail is something that is not present on first sight. Within the performance, there are no opposing forces, that are actually visual or perceivable. It is a one sided viewpoint that the audience is presented with, the persons appearing already form an alliance against the big bad system, the broader structures controlled by those in power. An empowerment on a smaller level, an emancipation from the structures that control does not happen as such. Instead it unites people with a goal, a broad one to be true, but nonetheless a goal to improve the situations of individuals by tackling broader structures. As stated in the document that is written collaboratively during the performance, an ideal is an idea, or is taken back to an idea, a concrete plan for action.

The open structure of *Web of Trust* allows for the audience to step in and share their ideas. The possibility to participate digitally is a given in the third and last part of the performance. Audience members are invited to join the platform, to help out and to reply, to chat and to videocall people whom they could offer help or want to engage with.

The participatory aspect is “not an automatic formula for political art” (Bishop 2012, 283). Yet, it gathers movement in the auditorium, awareness even that something needs to be done and that it is worthwhile to try it with the means we have come to know. Of course, social media websites like facebook are used for that matter, too, but taking it into one’s own hands to start a new platform, a new movement that grows on this platform generates a different energy. Making use of the gathering in a theatre to have a testing group, to have verbal feedback, a verbalized feed back loop, that builds on the presentation of a proposal enables the performance to grow. It enables a development of the performance, the performers and their platform that eventually can lead to a motivation of changing structures, a DOE IETS.

5 CONCLUSION

As suggested in the introduction and defined in the central chapter of this thesis, Places of Becoming combine theories that in combination describe places that generate motivation for action and political engagement. By analysing two seemingly different projects it became clear that these Places of Becoming are inherent in theatre forms, that have the intention to engage politically with the surrounding societal issues and the audience.

The analysis of *Unified Estonia* and *Web of Trust* has shown that in the performances there is the potential for motivation of action. The outcome however stays on a level of potentiality rather than making use of this potential. This stands to reason as expecting that Places of Becoming facilitate actual change that is visible immediately would be naive.

But politically-engaged theatre offers the more complex and necessary possibility that whilst eradicating difference it also analyses it at the same time. It does not create an artificial outside of pure criticality and neither does it have to lure in apolitical identification. Theatre is the space where things are real and not real at the same time. (Malzacher 2015, 30)

Real and not real at the same time describes what it is and what the performances discussed entail. The campaign of *Unified Estonia* was real and it merged with the “unreality” of the intention of the party, creating a place for forces to take over. The cases in *Web of Trust* are real, the people are real, but the reality of the platform to work stays desirable. Despite this connection of fiction and reality, ideal and everyday structures can form something that enables people to do something.

During the development phase of *Web of Trust*, the question of how to engage the audience came up very frequently. How to make an audience do something, force them to act, to make use of what is in front of them was a major issue. From encouraging them to exchange phone numbers with their seating neighbours to sending a text message to a local politician, the suggestions ranked from connecting to causing an insurgence. The idea of planning these interruptions made me feel like I was staging a revolution, the feeling that something big was about to happen spread inside me. In the end, those ideas were abandoned. A simple invitation was uttered in the performance, a

proposal to participate and it was widely accepted. Slowly, more and more people engaged, showing me that inviting has a power that forcing has not. Forced participation in theatre is a topic in itself, nonetheless in Places of Becoming the participation is grounded in free will.

Thus, the strategies of participation cannot be revolutionized in terms of the motivation for this participation. Places of Becoming do enable a discourse that circles around the motivation but the actual catalyst for political action or political engagement in the sense that existing structures are countered cannot be pinned down nor defined clearly. In order to so, a long-term field study would have to be conducted, that monitors an audience after the visit of a performance and monitors their actions and decisions, their thoughts and opinions on certain topics. This would be more of a sociology field research than a topic for a theatre studies thesis.

Moreover, one needs to keep in mind that thoughts cannot be controlled. It is desirable to share thoughts and opinions and to persuade people of them because they are 'right', but who is to say that they are? It is a moral dilemma that is addressed at every panel discussion that involves an artist who is politically engaged. Are they not telling people what they already know, because their audience shares the mind-set already? Are they not positioning themselves above others when telling their audience what to think and how to act? Patronizing an audience, brainwashing them even is too far off the fine line between emancipation and propaganda. Situated naturally on the in-between, Places of Becoming sit directly on that line and flatten it depending on the circumstances and the form they take. Like a balloon that is pressed to the floor, the contact surface of Places of Becoming increases with their level of accessibility.

Kant's *Sapere Aude* comes to mind. Dare to know. Dare to be wise. Dare to use your own mind is what an audience should take with them, when leaving the auditorium. An emancipation from pre-chewed information, opinions and statements is the desirable outcome of a performance that generates a Place of Becoming. Regarding current political on-goings, this is also exactly what society needs right now. Not believing those who claim to speak the truth but instead critically questioning what they are saying, whether that is true and what impact it has on an individual – be that me or anyone else – and whether that impact is worth supporting.

New theories and strategies are to be tried out and tested in order to achieve the intention. This intention unfortunately will always stay an ideal that is never to be achieved but the trace of the intention is enough to say that it did achieve something. So trying out new theories and possibilities, finding new forms and new ways to engage audiences in thought and in theatre in general to make use of the transformative power, the “reenchantment of the world” that is achieved by transforming its participants (Fischer-Lichte 181).

The analysis also shows that Places of Becoming are places of disruptions, that they cause disruptions. Disruptions in the perception of the system that we are participating in and that our society is built on. These disruptions allow for a distanced perception that enables a viewpoint of alternatives, of ways to achieve those alternatives without working from outside the system. A revolution that works from within, not from the outside, that makes use of the openings in the already existing and eventually broadens, spreads these openings.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bishop, Claire. 2012. *Artificial Hells. Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso.

Dolan, Jill. 2005. *Utopia in Performance. Finding Hope at the Theater*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. 2004. *Ästhetik des Performativen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. 2008. *The Transformative Power of Performance. A New Aesthetics*. Transl. Saskya Iris Jain. London/New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias. Online source: <http://web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/foucault1.pdf> (last accessed August 14, 2016.)

Jordan, John. 2015. "Performing Against the Suicide Machine. Note for a Future which is not hat it used to be." In *Not Just a Mirror. Looking for the Political Theatre of Today*, ed. Florian Malzacher, 104-114. Berlin: Alexander Verlag.

Kirsch, Sebastian. Theater, ein anderer Raum. *standpunktgrau magazin*. Online source: <http://www.standpunktgrau.de/article/theater-ein-anderer-raum/> Published February 9, 2015. (last accessed August 14, 2016).

Lehmann, Hans-Thies. 2005. *Postdramatic Theatre*. New York: Routledge.

Malzacher, Florian. 2015. "No Organum to Follow. Possibilities of Political Theatre Today" In *Not Just a Mirror. Looking for the Political Theatre of Today*, ed. Florian Malzacher, 16-30. Berlin: Alexander Verlag.

Mouffe, Chantal. *On the Political*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2014. "Artistic Strategies in Politics and Political Strategies in Art." In *Truth is concrete. A Handbook for Artistic Strategies in Real Politics*, eds. Steirischer Herbst and Malzacher, Florian, 66-75. Berlin: Sternberg Press.

Parr, Adrian. 2010. "Becoming + Performance Art" In *The Deleuze Dictionary*, ed. Adrian Parr, 29-31. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Rancière, Jaques. *The Emancipated Spectator*. London: Verso, 2009.

Römer, Christian. 2015. "Theater No99. Crossing the Line." In *Not Just a Mirror. Looking for the Political Theatre of Today*, ed. Florian Malzacher, 171-175. Berlin: Alexander Verlag.

Stagoll, Cliff. 2010. "Becoming." In *The Deleuze Dictionary*, ed. Adrian Parr, 25-27. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Turner, Luke. 2015. "Metamodernism: A Brief Introduction." Notes on Metamodernism. <http://www.metamodernism.com/2015/01/12/metamodernism-a-brief->

introduction/ (last accessed August 14, 2016).

Vermeulen, Timotheus and van den Akker, Robin. 2010. Notes on Metamodernism. *Journal for Aesthetics and Culture* 2:2010 Online source: DOI: 10.3402/jac.v2i0.5677. (last accessed August 14, 2016).

_____. 2015. Utopia, Sort of: A Case Study in Metamodernism. *Studia Neophilologica* 87: 55–67. DOI: 10.1080/00393274.2014.981964 (last accessed August 14, 2016).