

On the Embodied Critique of/in Performance

The disidentification of the co-participants in a performative situation allows fluid variations of bodily experiences released from the ties of specialisations within “the field of performance” – specialisations such as actress, critic, performer, dancer, dramaturg, producer, etc. This very challenging situation dehierarchises both the mode of criticism and the performative act, stimulating an experimental search for creative links between systemically/unconsciously divided forms of creativity, potentially embodying them into a performative discourse beyond the closed-circuit of the dominant art production of the existing. In-between the fragments of five contemporary performances that explore and/or relativise the relations between audience, critic(s), performer(s), and devisor(s), this contribution involves a critical perception of the function of the critic(ism) in a performative situation. In the proposed context, embodied critique is a feature of a live and ever changing collage of performative bodies actively involved in a specific here-now dissensual situation, aiming at establishing speech (which emerges in performance as experiment) rather than a presentation (a product, a commodity, a spectacle).

Keywords: disidentification, subjectivation, collage, extension of the staged, dissensuality, speech, *And So On and So Forth, Ka-boom, No One should have Seen This, Suddenly Everywhere is Black with People, The Ristić Complex*

Nenad Jelesijević is a critic and theorist of contemporary performative arts, film and interrelated practices. He researches critical art, the aestheticisation of resistance and potentials of disidentification. He has a PhD in philosophy and theory of visual culture. He co-organises projects within the Kitch Institute and is a part of the performance tandem Kitch.

nenad.jelesijevic@guest.arnes.si

On the Embodied Critique of/in Performance

Nenad Jelesijević

How to embody critical thought, reflection, comment, suggestion, in order to perform it – not exclusively on stage? How to empower one’s potential of such embodiment in times of cyborgisation? It is actually about the re-emancipation of the thought-practice, the junction that has been systemically disintegrated, separated, divided, professionalised. It is about descent from the closed field of expertise (of performer, of critic), to the open field of the common.¹

Critical aspects of the *existing*

Guy Debord comments the images collaged in his films, or rather in his (but not *only* his, in terms of the nature of the sources of the materials used) multi-layered puzzles, directly, openly attacking the paradigm of the spectacle. While doing that, his personal statement (thought) does not interfere with the documentarist dimension of his films at all; on the contrary, by highlighting the technological and ideological background of the images/spectacle processed by the film (industry), he enables a critical distance toward the very spectacle he uses to address spectators, at the same time opening the question of the dualism between the spectator and the film/its author. Such an obvious shift from fictionalising and mythisation to an actually inexistent “objective view” is a kind of active propaganda that – taking into account all of its subjectivism – allows many extensions for a collective viewing, or, at least, the viewing that opens the (notion of) collective. Thus only an active personal enunciation makes the collectivisation (of a certain personal view) possible – making possible a way to the political and the exercising of politics. The examples of performances I am going to provide suggest such extensions.

Theodor Adorno’s and Max Horkheimer’s concept of culture industry is the background of Adorno’s claim that the capitalist order tends to absorb all potential criticism of art, turning it, wherever possible, into the (favour of) reproduction of the existing conditions. Even though art reflects “society’s needs”, it is in the first place (converted into) an industry driven by desire for profit. It maintains as long as it is being paid off. With its non-conflictual functioning, art makes obscure the fact that it

¹ This article is based on my text contribution to the 15th International Symposium of Theatre Critics and Theatre Scholars *The Critic is Present or: Towards the Embodied Criticism* organised by Sterijino pozorje, the International Association of Theatre Critics (IATC) and Bitef, held in Novi Sad and Belgrade, 16–20 Sep. 2015 (<http://www.pozorje.org.rs/2015/simpozijum15eng.htm>).

is already dead (Adorno 24). We anticipate the link of Adorno's notion with the much later notion of necrocapitalism (Banerjee) – the accumulation of power through the subjugation of life to the power of death, or, the system of biopolitical applications of the paradigm of death that preserves and maintains the *existing*.

Wolfgang Fritz Haug develops the term commodity aesthetics in order to describe an intensive and dynamic linking between the aesthetic and the commercial, actually the links that soften and abolish the virtual distinction between the two paradigms. Like the commercial goods that transform their sensible and utilising characteristics into an image, for the purpose of acceleration of selling, an artwork with the potential for politically emancipatory influence preserves only a reminiscence of that potential when transformed into a “production unit” and “communicated presentation” – a merchandise article (Jelesijević, “Umetnost”) on the art market of the culture industry.

The dominant ultimatum of the art(work) as a market product – deeply criticised in notions on commodity aesthetics (Haug), the society of the spectacle (Debord) and the culture industry (Adorno and Horkeheimer) – is a condition that requests the figure of critic as a specialised, canonised and classified profession, vocation and occupation, rather than a (political) body. The critic's body is neglected in favour of her/his absence or quasi presence, which is justified, if justified at all, by the need for objectivity. The critic's absence, his/her “disembodied body”, is a sign of the bureaucratic, standardised role of contemporary criticism that, alike mainstream journalism, tends to “keep things simple and stupid”, in order to make them easily “understood”, which is, again, a justification of avoiding a multi-layered thoughtful approach to the problems opened by an artistic intervention of any kind.

Contemporary performance is, in that frame, simplified to a staged show that should only be watched/consumed and (re)sold, while the critic is actually understood as a sales promoter; her/his speech is often shrank to a commercial language of short stimulating messages sent to spectators/consumers, typically culminating in bald promo slogans such as “Not to be missed!”, “A stunning performance!”, and alike inventions of the British-American type of entertainment business. The artificial spaces created by such discourse are robbed of opportunity for debate, they are dominantly privatised and profit oriented, even in cases when designed to appear as public ones. They are, in that sense, *non-spaces* (Bauman 130). Indeed, they are a great spatial reflection and also a specific social performance of neoliberal “democracy”. Spectators' bodies in such spaces are typically quasi-socialised. They are rather a proof of the “democratisation” of the field of culture, based on the principle of commercialisation: pay-to-see, and even be involved in an accompanying talk that makes you believe you are co-participating. Actually, the mode of participation is of key importance, which is the reason for it to be propulsively recuperated by the existing.

Together, the critique of the spectacle, the notions of collective viewing, the critique of the culture industry and its necro extensions, and commodity aesthetics make a starting point toward re-articulating the role of the critic(ism): not in the direction of reviving the modernist approach to analysis that has almost vanished, but rather in the way of imagining and developing approaches able to take into account various possible ties, crossings and intersections between “the seen” matter and “the reflected” one (the reflection of “the seen”).

Toward multi-layered performative situations

An art(work), understood as a situation of creativity that emerges within a specific space and at the same time shapes it – the space that *whoever* could ultimately enter, as conceptualised by Jacques Rancière: a construction of a space for a subject, where whoever is counted, as it is a space of establishing the relation between having and not having a part (*Nerazumevanje* 51) –, is a political notion that establishes a condition of participation in its emancipatory sense. Such a situation unavoidably abolishes the paradigm of art as a show/self-referential spectacle, allowing a time-place for the self-organisation of *all* involved in the creative processes. It actually means a rupture in the existing, a groundbreaking relativisation of usual roles, following the principle of taking into account both one’s individual and collective affinities.

In other words, the conscious gesture of declassification, despecialisation and the disidentification of the involved subjects – their bodies – opens up a space of experimentation; a space of speech (speech as a condition for experimenting, for exchange) rather than of presentation (tied with the logic of product, of commodity, aimed to finalisation, perfection, spectacularisation) – “As we speak, we change, and as we change, we transform ourselves and the future simultaneously.” (Kornegger 17) Opens up a possibility for setting up a performative collage of fluid variations of bodily experiences released from the ties of specialisations – of actress, critic, performer, dancer, dramaturg, producer, etc. This very challenging situation dehierarchises both criticism and the (stage or non-stage based) performative act, stimulating a live search for creative links between systemically divided, separated and restricted forms of creativity, potentially joining and embodying them into a situation that emerges beyond the closed-circuit of the dominant mode of art production in the existing.

Rancière argues about the collage in art as another name for hybridity. At the same time he warns that the collage can only reflect an innocent surrealist encounter between the “umbrella and the sewing machine”, but can also significantly contribute to establishing the conditions of disclosure of the hidden or less visible links between two at the first sight unrelated phenomena (*Emancipirani* 21). The latter is the case of

Martha Rosler's work *Bringing the War Home: House Beautiful*, where she combines photographs from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan with various commercial advertisements that promote the American dream. Her gesture creates strong semantic contrasts between "here and there, us and them", which is her comment on the bourgeois ignorance toward neoimperialism. Again, it is about effective multi-layered puzzling, although we cannot ignore the corruptness of art incorporated in the institutional agenda (being a part of galleries' and museums' programmes).

The examples of the five performances that follow are based on the hybridisation of gestures able to co-create heterogeneous, collaged, multi-layered performative situations. They are readable patterns of successful reflection of certain links between phenomena that deserve to be revealed.

Fragments of five performances that explore and/or relativise relations between audience, critic(s), performer(s) and devisor(s)

*Ka-boom*²

I experienced Oblivia as a prolific group of performers, and wrote in an article that they are capable of creating a *performance that directs itself* (Jelesijević, "Performans"), by inventing the fluctuation or the course of the performative, by building scenes and choosing their self-directing (not directed by director) actions alongside, in real time; in other words, by the consequential implementation of both personal and collective decisions of the performers in the space-time of performance. Even though we know and feel that it is not quite like that, we can find certain convincing extensions to such a paradoxical claim while attending their performance *Ka-boom*. "What can be done if everything has already happened?" is the question that it raises – one that is important and at the same time "wrong" (in case of not accepting the postmodernist supposition of the end of history/art). However, nothing is wrong with the wrongness of that question. On the contrary, setting it was necessary, as well as trying hard to answer it in an effort to understand how (too) general it actually is, maybe even empty – as, in fact, what has already happened was only that which actually happened to ourselves, more precisely, to you or to me (as subjects). Thanks to that clearly communicated subjectivation – the diversion of focus to the very individual level – , while attending the performers' confused mechanical and repetitive movements, I not only got and thought about various associations (there was plenty of time to devote myself to contemplation), but I also got an impression and feeling of loss despite having a good

² Data on the performances is provided at the end of the text.

sense of orientation, abilities and knowledge: it was the typical sense of identification with the staged – spatialised – messages.

The simple point of stressing the consideration of individual and yet common matters is that even the extremely hysterical mediatisation of reality (along with its history) cannot compensate the personal bodily experience in the time-space of a (performative) situation. That seems to be an important, key message of *Ka-boom* that otherwise sets up a vigorous communication of the light, sound, conceptualisation and realisation of the performance, including unpretentious, yet efficient costumes that contribute their part to the slight ironisation of the civilisational faith in the future, in steady progress. The theatrical landscape of alienation is created not only by the frozen moving images of the protagonists and the tireless running of one of them (while repeating “Running makes me happy!”), but also by their efforts to bring the stage technique, mechanics and technology across the border between the stage and the audience. Although hopeless, the situation of alienation created in that way gives space to humour, intelligence and solutions that will never mean a “happy ending”, at least not in the classic theatrical meaning of that expression, but rather an *extension of the staged* beyond the stage. The activation of the imaginative potential of all those present in the space is certainly an additional condition for that. The opening up of that condition is a very important dimension of communication between the performers and the viewers, and the critics and the readers, if the performance tends to be a critical one, if it wants to be a temporary common space of reflection.

Suddenly Everywhere is Black with People

That condition or, better, that field of opportunities, is even more open in the performance *Suddenly Everywhere is Black with People* (*De repente fica tudo preto de gente*), even though on a different performative level that rises up from a specific, very bodily approach. The performance space is set to support it, to inevitably gather together audience and performers. There are no serious choices for the audience except the decision to enter into a space that reminds us of a boxing ring. This ultimately simple organisation of the space that initiates and holds the coordinates of the performance’s live dramaturgy is a very powerful gesture. It allows it to run, to actually happen: within a fence. Indeed, its symbolic, but at the same time realistic, coercion establishes the condition of crossing the border of the allowed.

In this case, the embodiment is achieved by the literal mixing, juxtaposing and confronting of bodies – of *all* the bodies present in the space – , supported by discreet yet efficient elements of sound and light. Even though it is obviously clear who is the performer and who is the guest, that initial division rapidly gets relativised

thanks to the very (choreography of the) action, which is immediate, intensive and uncompromising. The relativisation of roles is not achieved by an “audience-friendly” approach; on the contrary, the audience is somehow sophisticatedly ignored, but at the same time taken (into account) completely seriously. This ignoring constitutes the condition for a collective view(ing), which is, however, at the same time and inevitably, individual. Such an attitude of the performers/dancers originates from the theme: the subordinated position of blackness, or, better, the situation of blackness/whiteness. It is immediately clear that the theme is not only in the background, that it is not just a conceptual frame, but that it is treated as very alive, situated here and now. We are potentially convinced that the situation is not only staged, but rather a genuine one: even though it is onstage, we are well aware of its reality beyond the stage.

Upon entering the performance (space), I immediately started feeling the need to do something, to start moving in order to somehow support it; the situation made me think not so much about the whole of the moving image or the passivity of the audience in it, but rather about how it would be great to join the performers in their physical efforts. As I was not brave enough to do it (my headache was only an ironic sign that the body never lies when the subconscious speaks), I devoted myself to the spectrum of feelings provoked by the gradual developments of the performers’ moves: a slight claustrophobia, the discomfort of a possible clash with someone and the excitement of being present in the middle of such an abundant happening, simply admiring the honest power of the vortex of bodies.

However, the truthfulness of this performative situation is not a result of a play/acting, but of an authentic bodily experience. The audience is a target, an obstacle, an undefined, flexible mass of “material” that also defines and forms the very space, and at the same time an aggregation of actual, live people, of bodies that are – as actually clearly shown through the performance – considered equal with the performers’ bodies. The key idea realised within such a spatial and sensorial organisation is that it is not enough to only understand the problem of the blackness and the systemic oppression that follows, shapes and reproduces it, but that it is necessary to feel it with various senses. It is also important to somehow announce that the consequences of involvement in the problem/situation (and the performance) cannot in any way be avoided, that our participation of any kind and in every case leaves certain traces in the live situation, just as the performers leave physical traces on us, also (and in particular) the material ones, which is achieved on the level of slightly hidden, but exactly for that reason more powerful, gesture. The performers’ bodies are actually painted in black, and the paint is constantly and progressively transferred to the audience’s bodies, by random, accidental and intentional physical contacts, in a dancing whirl created by the intense movement of the “tribe” of performers in a rather claustrophobic, crowded space of action.

And So On and So Forth

A quite opposite performative situation can be experienced in *And So On and So Forth*, a performance emerged from the collaboration between the groups Via Negativa and Oblivia. Unlike the chock-full space of *Suddenly Everywhere is Black with People*, here we face a specifically created *emptiness of the stage*, at various levels, and purely factually at the starting point of the performance, when six performers stand in the last line of auditorium, behind the audience's backs, each speaking into his/her own microphone.

The powerful, expressive, distinctive and brutal presence of the empty stage/space gives us space and time to think about its possibilities, provocativeness, alienation, artificialness, magic, flatness, three-dimensionality, and so on and so forth, or, in other words, its potentiality. However, exactly the fact that the performers are actually present allows the space to be empty in its full glory. Their presence on one side of the space stresses their absence on the other one. The release or emptying, even evacuation of the space/stage can be understood as a wish to divert attention from any form of visualisation and staging that can be easily perceived – from the perspective of radical critique of representation – as a function in service of the discourse of spectacle. The stage that breathes in its own rhythm, totally freed from the weight of the performers or the burden of their/any appearance, tells us that its territory is potentially wider than it appears in its usual coordinates, that it possibly extends beyond the physical limits of theatre. I read that situation on the level of a statement: our expectations from an artificial space dedicated to stage events are too often taken for granted. I felt that the stress on the presence of the bare stage decomposes the very notion of a stage event. I caught myself imagining a utopian perspective: the stage is actually everywhere for the purpose of avoiding its own institutionalisation.

On the level of concept, *And So On and So Forth* brings to light the potentiality of death. It deals with it simultaneously on two levels: on the one hand through the usual optics of the corporeality of the performative, on the other through the specific speech of the stage as an equal “subject” that also enacts an autonomous gesture. That hybrid dimension of realisation – of catching a balance between the activity of live bodies and the emphasised architecture of the stage, lighting and its overall expressiveness – is its big advantage.

Even more interesting is the phenomenon that can be noticed in-between the fragments of spoken or otherwise embodied contents of the performance. The stage appears as an autonomous structure and from time to time evades the usually expected control over its functions, which is actually a consequence of the activity of the “seventh performer” appearing in the form of an audio-visual intervention: it is a vertical line of light that “scans” the space, followed by a significant sound, somewhat

reminiscent of a heart-monitoring device. Such very meaningful stage's (apparent) escape from control deserves further experimentation. Such experimentation can potentially contribute to reflection on what we actually do in the deeply political sense when we commit our bodies to the purpose of a (stage) representation, which can be compared to the urge of pledging bodies in a situation of resistance.

No One should have Seen This

No One should have Seen This (*Tega nihče ne bi smel videti*) is an interesting experiment of mixing theoretical and performative inputs onstage, in the form of a hybrid event. This lecture performance is built on the idea that "the theorist and the performer enter a relationship where they do not 'seek for a common language' but do the exact opposite – they do not even out their discourse differences, they exaggerate them" (*No One*, performance announcement).

"Dear Katarina," says the theorist, "I as viewer of your performances, which deal with the radical body and energy consumption, connect to them my feeling of deep unease, which can be so strong that I rather decide not to see some of your performances, even though your work is of immense interest to me ...". In a way, the performer comments: "Dear Bojana, I know from the very beginning all of this is bullshit. Why are the two of us here today? Who put us together and why? Instead of producing a new performance, Jablanovec [the one responsible for concept and direction] combines old material into some kind of lecture performance bullshit we've seen a hundred times before." (*No One*, performance announcement)

Such a "confrontation" of a theoretical presentation and a live act obviously and even intentionally reveals the formal differences between two forms of expression, still at the same time trying to interrelate them. The fact that the two protagonists do not seek a common language, as the performance obviously shows the impossibility of a "productive" communication between them, can be understood as an effort *to perform juxtaposition*.

That effort is successful on the very point of division, misunderstanding and conflict between two statements: the theorist claims that the self-referential critical acts of the performer are a failure, whilst the performer hysterically laughs, in the middle of her madness, as a reaction to some of the theorist's notions. Here the question arises of the quality of critique posed by one who has no experience performing. We can also read some further connotations from the quoted performer's comment, even though it could be only a joke. But exactly that joke is what makes this case interesting, as it addresses the figure of the director who is not present onstage. However, the absence of the director

opens some further associations, not only regarding his possible involvement in the performance (or actual exclusion from it), but, for instance, of involving whomever is present in the space, that is, the audience and the technical staff.

Aside from these connotations, this performance can also be understood as an attempt to decompose the usual context of a stage event that commonly tends to be mediated, commented, theoreticised, archived and, finally, canonised, always post festum, in a postponed manner. “Theory” is actually suddenly tempted by the stage, which is otherwise its object of investigation. The theorist (lecturer, writer, critic), challenged to be present and act in real time, is perceived as a static subject (interpret(ation) out of its usual surrounding), whilst the performer is a dynamic subject in its common environment. The theorist’s body (the expression includes its critical stance) is visible, audible and touchable. However, it is a question of form that the body acts in order to achieve a performative potential. The lecture in that sense does not seem like a productive idea thanks to its (expected) form of one-way communication. The theorist’s staging can also be seen as a spectacularisation of theory, as translating it into a certain super-presentation, a show. The theorist’s heavy task is potentially liberating, but it seems that liberation is only possible if the theoretical approach/presentation is abolished. It seems that more complex occurrences in space than the bare reading of theory are the condition for the “embodiment” of the theorist. The performance proves that the theory in the space of a performance reaches potentiality only if actually performed – by the performer. It is not said that that performer cannot be a theorist.

Being a theorist as well, I experienced this performance as a clear sign of the possibilities of the relativisation of roles and positions. I somehow adopted it as a specific (performed!) warning on the delicacy of performing, of exposing the performer’s body and intelligence to the public, critics, directors, producers ... but also to her/his own permanent and even infinite self-reflection. This performance is undoubtedly one of the few that challenged me to actually use the body to perform, instead of only reflecting upon the work of others. Isn’t the only possible embodiment of critique possible (with)in the body of performer – the one who actually performs?

The Ristić Complex

The thoughtfully and emotionally conceived dynamics of the emotional machine of the performers’ collective body in the theatre performance *The Ristić Complex* (*Kompleks Ristić*) is effective. I cried while watching both the final rehearsal and the première, especially during the scenes of the floor cleaning, the entrance of the tanks, the singing of the song “Bilećanka” (“we hear the echo of steps”), and listening to Nirvana’s song in the background (“here we are now, entertain us”) that somehow anticipates a

grotesque repetition of the *mise en scène* of the (Yugoslav) society of the 1990s in the present time. While immersed in such a music mix, which is also an effective use of text, of manipulating with the collective unconscious through the use of pop music, we are more than clear that the so called transition time will never end, but that we are standing in a specific space – both in regard to the (stage) space of the performance and the spaces that it conceptually refers to – , namely, the Southeast, not the Northwest. That atmosphere is (unintentionally constructed) indirect context able to bring in hope in spite of all the emotional clutter; we are nevertheless the ones who can contribute to the displacing of structures and the effects of post-socialist capitalism.

There is a big possibility that your buried emotions awake during the performance. The general impression was that the emotional states freely flow from the stage to the auditorium, while its seriousness goes back to the stage, which brings the most important dimension to the performative *complex*: the here-now situation emerges from the processed initial motives (critical theatre's heritage), yet not only the aestheticised, staged – at least we wish to believe that – , but also an articulated comment of the current circumstances/condition that we Post-Yugoslavs (including those born after the end of the Yugoslav Federation) have found ourselves. The effect of the performance emerges from the established situation based on a conceptual approach: the emotional dimension of the sensible is emphasised to an (even pathetic) level able to influence especially those critical bodies who understand and feel the wide context of the project (Jelesijević, “Kazalište”).

The embodiment of critique in disidentification

Embodied critique, if understood in a connotative sense, may be a feature of a live and ever changing collage of performative bodies. The embodied critique that can be read in the statement of the performer of *No One should have Seen This* is an example of a decentralised critical intervention. It is a live voice of the protagonist who has taken a chance to express her attitude toward the very organisation and conception of the stage event that she performs in. The embodied critique can be literally felt in *Suddenly Everywhere is Black with People*, as performers enact it in a clear, reduced and strong, physical manner, leaving material consequences on the audiences' bodies. In *Ka-boom*, the performers stress the need for a personal(ised) bodily experience, their critique is actually embodied in the ironic statements and absurdity of the action they enact. The brutality of the empty stage of *And So On and So Forth* is the consequence of a radical reduction of the performers' presence, of their displacement, or, presence in a relativised spatial context, behind the audience's backs. Exposing the emptiness stresses the non-participative dimension of the stage, yet anticipates the urge of

participation. The situation actually embodies the critique of theatrical emptiness, of the conditions and possibilities of the theatre space as a space of paradox and tensions resulted from the dualism between the (notions of the) performers and audience: despite its corruptness in the context of the culture industry, that space still offers a relatively safe, productive shelter (for criticism). *The Ristić Complex* stresses the emotional through a specific choreography of bodies joined into a collective body, in an attempt to embody a very personalised comments on emotional chaos, anger and suffering caused by the decay of what was a fragile embryo of common in the former Yugoslavia, with strong reference to its film and theatre counterculture.

The question that hopefully rises in-between the fragments of this contribution is a question of opening the space of performance, and, consequently, of the role of the critic(ism) in any kind of performative situation. Rancière defines and proposes dissensus as an organisation of the sensible without a reality hidden beyond appearances and with no single regime of presentation and interpretation of a given that imposes its obviousness (*Emancipirani* 32). The performative works being rather a space of speech than of spectacle are on the way to reaching such an organisation of the sensible, and at the same time almost always open the critical question of the sense/ways of their own existence in the existing, or, how to avoid acting in favour of the reproduction of the existing, and falling into the trap of commoditisation.

The notion of embodied critique is therefore unrelated to the question of ways, techniques and contexts of presentation in the artificial condition of the institutionalised spaces, but rather to rethinking the political emancipation of the spectator, the performer, and the critic, necessarily including the dispositif of the spectator as a critic and performer, the performer as spectator and critic, and critic as spectator and performer, that is, the notion of disidentification – as a need/desire to immerse oneself into a different “role” in order to abolish barriers between systemically and unconsciously fortified roles. Disidentification – which is, according to Rancière, nothing else than radical subjectivation, “a crossing of identities [...], a link[(ing) of] a being to a nonbeing or a not-yet-being” (*Politics* 67) – is therefore a condition for the “embodiment” of emancipatory, dehierarchised critique. Opening the space of performance implies understanding it as not limited to the modes of performing “art”, but includes manifestations and implications beyond it. For instance, a street protest in the context of a people’s uprising against the existing system of representation is actually a very dynamically collaged performative situation (of collectivisation, related to the abovementioned collective viewing), or, a performative form of dissensus. The embodied critique is therefore a feature of a live and ever changing collage of performative bodies actively involved in a specific here-now situation. Their co-participative gestures in it contribute to its potential of dissensuality, devising speech instead of presentation.

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Aesthetic Theory*. [Ästhetische Theorie. 1970.] London: Continuum, 2004.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata Bobby. "Live and Let Die: Colonial Sovereignties and the Death Worlds of Necrocapitalism." *Borderlands e-journal*, 5.1 (2006). <http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol5no1_2006/banerjee_live.htm>.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Tekoča moderna*. [*Liquid Modernity*. 2000.] Ljubljana: *cf, 2002.
- Debord, Guy. *La Société du spectacle*. Paris: Buchet-Chastel, 1967; film *La Société du spectacle*, 1973.
- Haug, Wolfgang Fritz. *Kritika robne estetike*. [*Kritik der Warenästhetik*. 1971]. Beograd: Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije, 1981.
- Horkheimer, Max & Adorno, Theodor W. *Dialektika razsvetljenstva: filozofski fragmenti*. [*Dialektik der Aufklärung*. 1944]. Ljubljana: Studia humanitatis, 2006.
- Jelesijević, Nenad. "Performans, ki režira samega sebe." *MMC RTV Slovenija*, 14. apr. 2015. <<https://www.rtvsl.si/kultura/ocenjujemo/performans-ki-rezira-samega-sebe/362837>>.
- . "Kazalište-pozorište-gledališče-teatar, kraj, kjer živi svoboda." *MMC RTV Slovenija*, 1. okt. 2015. <<http://www.rtvsl.si/kultura/oder/kazaliste-pozoriste-gledalisce-teater-kraj-kjer-zivi-svoboda/375251>>.
- . "Umetnost je trgovski artikel." *Dialogi* 41.9 (2005): 23–42.
- Kornegger, Peggy. *Anarchism: The Feminist Connection*. The Anarchist Library, 1975. <https://archive.org/stream/al_Peggy_Kornegger_Anarchism_The_Feminist_Connection_a4>.
- Rancière, Jacques. *Emancipirani gledalec*. [*Le Spectateur émancipé*. 2008.] Ljubljana: Maska, 2010. (Transformacije 27).
- . *Nerazumevanje: Politika in filozofija*. [*La Méésentente: politique et philosophie*. 1995.] Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, 2005.
- . "Politics, Identification, and Subjectivization." *Identity in Question*. Ur. John Rajchman. New York in London: Routledge, 1995. 63–70.
- Rosler, Martha. *Martha Rosler*. Web. 4. 9. 2015. <<http://www.martharosler.net>>.

Data on Performances

And So On and So Forth (In tako dalje in tako naprej). Oblivia, Helsinki & Via Negativa, Ljubljana. Conceived and devised by the performers: Grega Zorc, Rok Kravanja, Anna Krzystek, Anita Wach, Magnus Logi Kristinsson, Timo Fredriksson. Concept and direction: Bojan Jablanovec. Première: Ljubljana, 2014. <<http://vntheatre.com/projects/irresolvable/and-so-on-and-so-forth-2/>>.

Suddenly Everywhere is Black with People (De repente fica tudo preto de gente). Marcelo Evelin/Demolition inc., Brazil. Created and performed by: Andrez Lean Ghizze, Daniel Barra, Elielson Pacheco, Hitomi Nagasu, Jell Carone, Loes Van der Pligt, Marcelo Evelin, Márcio Nonato, Regina Veloso, Rosângela Suildade, Sérgio Caddah, Sho Takiguchi, Tamar Blom, Wilfred Loopstra. Première: Rio de Janeiro, 2012. <<https://vimeo.com/86154513>>.

Ka-boom. Oblivia, Helsinki. Devised and performed by: Timo Fredriksson, Magnus Logi Kristinsson, Anna-Maija Terävä, Annika Tudeer. Première: Helsinki, 2014. <<https://vimeo.com/104385398>>.

No One should have Seen This (Tega nihče ne bi smel videti). Via Negativa, Ljubljana. Text: Bojana Kunst and Katarina Stegnar. Lecturer: Bojana Kunst. Performer: Katarina Stegnar. Concept and direction: Bojan Jablanovec. Première: Performance Studies International Conference, Zagreb, 2009. <<http://vntheatre.com/projects/via-nova-series/no-one-should-have-seen-this/>>.

The Ristić Complex (Kompleks Ristić). SMG Ljubljana, HNK Rijeka, Bitef Belgrade & MOT Skopje. Direction: Oliver Frljić. Dramaturgy: Goran Injac and Tomaž Toporišič. Performers: Primož Bezjak, Uroš Kaurin, Jerko Marčić, Nika Mišković, Draga Potočnjak, Matej Recer, Blaž Šef. Première: Belgrade, 2015.