



Issue 1
Volume 1

Warwick Performance and Politics Network

working papers



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WARWICK

The Warwick Performance and Politics Network Working Paper Series contributes to the development of 'politics and performance' as an emergent area of interdisciplinary research, by creating a space for the rapid publication and discussion of works in progress.

The papers published in the series reflect cutting-edge work in this field and will become a point of reference for the growing interdisciplinary community of researchers addressing performative governance and the intersections between politics and performance.

Published by The University of Warwick
ISSN: ISSN 2051-1213 (Online)
October 1st, 2012

Editor: Claire Blencowe

Volume 1 (2012)

Issue 1: Shirin M. Rai, *Political Performance: Reading Parliamentary Politics*

Political Performance: Reading Parliamentary Politics¹

Shirin M. Rai, University of Warwick

Abstract

This paper develops a framework to examine the co-constitutive nature of performance and politics and to suggest that such a framework is critical to promoting an interdisciplinary approach to understanding our complex world. The framework is constituted along two axes – one that maps individual performance, which is nevertheless socially embedded; the other that charts the effects of performance. Although the paper takes as its empirical example the Indian parliament, it does allow us to reflect upon analysing broader social and political institutions, movements and events through the prism of performance and politics framework.

Key Words: *claim-making, performance, parliament, representation, body, space, liminality, audience*

¹ My thanks go to Molly Andrews, Niraja Gopal Jayal, Sumi Madhok, Nirmal Puwar, Janelle Reinelt, Michael Seward and Nick Vaughan-Williams for reading and commenting on drafts of this paper. Their comments and suggestions were invaluable in revising this paper. Thanks also to the Leverhulme Trust for its generous funding of the Gendered Ceremony and Ritual in Parliament research programme (2007-11), which in part funded the writing of this paper. The shortcomings are, of course, mine.

Introduction

In this paper I develop an interdisciplinary politics and performance framework across two axes to study political claim-making in democratic states. The first axis includes the body, the stage, speech/voice and performing; the second includes authenticity of representation, mode of performance, liminality and resistance. A focus on reception/audience links the two together. Through this framework I demonstrate how a focus on performance allows us to ask different questions about political representation and claim-making. I suggest that by focusing on *how* the claims of representation are made, where are they made and why, we can challenge some claims to representation by bringing into view the person/subject that is the representative as well as the subject/citizen that is represented. The testing ground for this framework is parliamentary politics in India.

Parliament is an important institution of governance. It not only makes laws and holds the executive accountable, but it also makes a claim. This claim suggests that parliamentary members not only represent different constituencies defined by district or number, but also different identity groups and interests - that they are representative both *de jure* and *de facto*; not only are they authorized to represent, they also in fact somehow claim to collectively mirror the society and nation at large. The 'representative claim' in this context is thus institutional and is crucial to democratic claim making (Saward 2010). If this claim is seen as valid - through the shaping of parliamentary membership by regular, free and fair election, for example - then the parliament is seen to be democratic; if not, then parliaments and indeed democracy as practiced is held in doubt. Claim-making is then central to democratic practice. Citizens and the state both make claims of representativeness – functional, normative and somatic. Issues of identity, representativeness, legitimacy and authenticity become important to claim-making. Claim-making can be read as a socially embedded set of performances that present some collective aims or norms or ways of doing politics (Giugni, McAdam and Tilly, 1999). As a result, claim-making also reflects the differences among citizens and between citizens and the state – it is not always stable and can be challenged. Together, the claim-making by citizens and the state forms the warp and weft of representative politics in democratic systems. There is a rich literature in the field of political science on claim-making and representation (Pitkin, 1967; Saward, 2010). However, very little work has been done on *how* the representative claims are made – this is largely read off from institutional practices and norms. Overlooking the processes through which claims are made is a serious limitation to our understanding of claim-making and of representative politics; it is a gap in democratic theory that this article will fill.

As Saward has noted, claims of representativeness don't just happen, can't be immediately read off either the institution or the subject (who is the representative or MP) but are *made*, which brings the processes of claim making into our critical ambit: "Looking through the lens of the representative claim leads us to question a range of institutions and factors normally taken as settled...to see the field of the representable as constantly expanding and contracting, rather than as fixed or stable...Crucially, it can also help us to bring ideas of cultural and aesthetic representation into our thinking about political representation..." (2009: 2-3). This is important to underline because we become aware of claim making only through the mode of performance through which representative individuals and institutions (actors) affect their audience (represented). Claims of representativeness are complex to make, to stabilize and to have accepted generally. Unlike descriptive claims – say for example 'I am a British citizen; I have a British passport' – a claim to British-ness is a complex claim that encapsulates a particular understanding of identity politics, political history, a social positioning that is recognisably inscribed in public imaginary, and a relational matrix which might place 'the British' in contrast to 'the Other'. Thus the repertoires of performance that we have access to are influenced by social relations – relations of class and gender, ethnicity and language –that allow us to make certain choices and not others. The complexity of claims of representativeness brings the *processes of claim making* into our critical ambit as well as the *identity of claim-maker* – man, woman, race, caste, class, dis/ability are all markers of identity that intersect which are reflected or not in representative institutions, bringing into view – if we are alert to these markers – the legitimacy or otherwise of claims to represent and the nature of representation itself (Mansbridge). Here, I explore whether a focus on performance allows us to ask different questions about claim-making and representation - *how* the claims of representation are made by both institutions and individuals, why are they made in the way that they are? Where are they made? Who makes claims and how? Can we challenge some claims to representation by bringing into view the person/subject that is the representative, the subject/citizen that is represented as well as the aesthetics and performance of institutional power?

If we agree that a) claims to represent are performed and therefore cannot simply be read off institutional practices and norms, and b) that performance is embedded in social relations, then we need to outline *how* the claims of representation are made and what does the way in which claims are made tell us about politics, political institutions and democratic practice. In this paper I focus on representativeness of political institutions, in particular of parliament², although the framework of analysis I present here can be, I suggest, used to study the representation and representativeness of social movements and groups also. I outline a political performance framework (PPF), which has two axes. Along one we can map the markers of

² The issue of representativeness of social movements and groups is not included here. On authenticity and social movements/groups, see Saward, 2008, and Chapman and Lowndes, 2009.

representation – the body, the space/place, words/ script/speech and enacting or ‘acting out’, performing. Together, these four markers encapsulate performance. Along the second axis we can map the markers of performing – authenticity, mode of representation, liminality and resistance (of and to) representation. These four markers allow us to make judgements about the affect and effects of performance, its legitimacy and its transformative or integrative power. PPF also allows us to understand the overlapping of performance - the ‘thin’ performativity of Austin (contingent, agential) and or the thick performativity (culturally embedded repeated acts) of Butler to understand how subjects and subjectivities are produced, received and contested in political institutions³. PPF goes beyond the Austinian performativity based on speech acts by including other aspects of performance – acting, liminality and theatricality; it also goes beyond Butler’s concerns about subject formation, by bringing into play material and subjective elements thus far regarded as disparate – the body, the stage, words/speech and performative labour. Further, PPF analyses how performance presumes an audience (in and out of view of the performers) – actors anticipate an audience, bring it into play, respond to its reaction even half-way through the performance, shape and reshape the performance in the light of their reading of the audience and many times make the audience part of the performance. PPF mediates structures — and agency; while actors perform representation, they do not do so in a vacuum – social relations embed them as cultural histories, political economy, norms and rituals. These social relations fundamentally affect performance, which in turn re-presents these social relations to culturally produced “subjects capable of “hearing” such utterances” (Brassett and Clarke, 2012:4). However, while PPF builds on these insights it also insists that social relations are mediated through performance – understood, imbibed, interpreted, made visible, resisted or alternatively, taken for granted, as read.

Some theoretical interventions

In building this framework I have been influenced by the following: 1) the ‘thin’ and ‘thick’ understanding of performativity put forward by Austin and Butler, as well as Bourdieu’s conception of the social world in terms of performativity and embodied dispositions or ‘habitus’ 2) the neo-Marxist literature on the contemporary commodification of both the material world and the world of experience and perception – the spectacular comes to re-present the ‘real’, the material and the experiential (Debord); what Appadurai has termed ‘mediascapes’ and ‘ideoscapes’ (1990), reproducing social hegemony (Gramsci) ; 3) the feminist literature which emphasizes the gendered nature of social relations as well as on the nature of political institutions, norms, rituals and everyday practices (Butler, Rai, 2010; Waylen, 2010) 4) Postcolonial literature (Said, Hall, Spivak, Mbembe, 1992), which shows how the experience of colonialism and the

³ For a discussion of performativity and international political economy see Brassett and Clarke, 2012; Langley, 2010.

emergence of the 'postcolony' affects representation, politics and performance as well as the reading of these by the 'Other' (the Western audiences; 5) the literature on social anthropology and political sociology (Geertz, Crewe, Turner, Goffman) that allows me to examine the affect and effects of everyday, the banal nature of ritualised performance as well as those of the hyper-visible ceremonies which awe audiences, invoke subjectivities and circulate and reproduce performative power; and 6)) and the work of theatre and performance theorists (Schechner, Roach, Reinelt), which focuses on how democratic claims in terms of dynamic processes of transformation and consolidation transacted in public through specific acts, roles, scenarios, and effects. I use the terms performance and performativity in the following ways: Performances are actions or events that are relational, reflexive and self-conscious. 'Performativity' is a philosophical term, following J.L. Austin and Butler to mark the efficacy, success or failure of performance at achieving its intended effects (Reinelt, 2002).

When Judith Butler famously commented on Simone de Beauvoir's claim that, "one is not born, but, rather, *becomes* a woman," and argued that "[i]n this sense, gender is in no way a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts proceed; rather, it is an identity tenuously constituted in time - an identity instituted through a *stylized repetition of acts*", she opened up a field of study of gendered claim and meaning making – how gendered power reproduces itself through stylized repetition which have an affective resonance and in turn normalises particular gender orders. However, Butler has been criticized on the one hand for privileging structural (gendered) relations over agency on the one hand, and on the other hand for her "focus on 'the (subjected) self' rather than on the social relations of political (inter)action, and the specific historical conditions of particular social transformations" (Lovell, 2003:1). Goffman also studied performance but analyzed everyday rituals through which we all perform our identities and therefore our politics – gesture, salutations, address, recognition and blanking - in sum, 'impression management'- he emphasised that individuals negotiate their way in performance of these rituals arriving at the socially embedded frame, not creating it (1971). In parliament and political institutions more generally, this framing leads to different performances, affect and reception. Bourdieu has also examined performativity, which he suggests leads to entitlement, where performativity is embedded in the structures of social inequality; indeed that aspiration is the product of the *habitus* (1991): "the effectiveness of the words depends upon social institutions and the position or status within those institutions of the person who speaks the words" (Lovell, 2003: 3). In performance studies this is what Richard Schechner calls 'restored behavior'—how performances are made up of previously learned and executed actions which repeat as well as alter the received understanding of their meanings through time (2006).

Roach has argued that to ‘perform...means to bring forth, to make manifest, and to transmit. To perform also means, though often more secretly, to reinvent” (1996:xi). Political ceremony and ritual are thus critical to both the legitimacy of the state and its institutions as well as to those who work within them. Ceremony, through its hyper-visibility – state openings of parliament, for example or summit photo shoots - enthrals those who ‘must be rendered susceptible’ and through obscuring dominance through, ritualisation and routinisation – asking questions in parliament, making speeches etc - they mask the mechanisms through which dominance is exercised on an everyday basis. Ceremony and ritual also harness the aesthetic – buildings, murals, songs as the symbols of power to display power. Ceremony and ritual are also important because in re-presenting power they also attract disruption of the flows of power; in disrupting a ceremony or undermining ritual performance we also notice the performative ruptures that signal opposition to the assumed coherence and legitimacy that the state performs. Power circulates, sediments, as well as is challenged through the performance of politics and the state. The affect and effect of the performance underpins the levels of legitimacy and authority at both the institutional and individual level. The argument here, that I build upon, is that political performance is embedded and embodied, mediated by social relations and can therefore only be studied in relational frames. Further, PPF extends the study of individual performance of these stylized repetitions of acts to analyzing institutional ceremony and ritual as modes of representation. I have argued elsewhere that together these ritualised acts constitute, reflect, reproduce and challenge dominant social relations and that transgression of ritual norms and performance quickly unbundles reputations of both institutions such as parliaments and individual MPs.

Performance has both affect and effects. As Thrift points out the importance of affect in human life has the power akin to a ‘major natural force that we cannot sidestep’ (2003:2020). In contemporary societies this affect is of course secured and harnessed, not always directly or immediately, but by the relentlessness of the 24/7 media. In the mediatised world of contemporary capitalism, performance in the here and now can have an exaggerated affect that is worthy of study as it congeals instantaneously to frame as well as connects with specific moments – ‘history in the making’ focuses our attention on specific aspects of performance on the institutional stage. Further, performance has effects as well as affect – both conscious and unconscious; that speech, movement and stage call forth different effects that help us understand the world in different ways (Thrift, 2003). Also, performances of grief, trauma or of joy can call forth publics and can be instrumental in the reshaping of public life (Welch, 2011). At the level of studying affect, the folding in of affect into our analytical frame allows us to challenge the Habermasian binaries of rational/irrational in the building of publics and public spaces and of deliberation as the most important normative filter of representation (Levin and Schweitzer, 2011).

The structure of the paper is as follows: the first two sections outline PPF through its two axes; the next two sections illustrate PPF analytics through institutional and individual performance; following this, the paper outlines the role that an audience plays in receiving, interpreting but also affecting performance, before concluding with comments on the affect and effects of performance and claim-making in and through political representation.

Mapping political performance: the first axis

Below, I argue that the first axis of PPF with four intersecting elements reflects as well as gives form to social relations in the performance of representative claim-making. I expand on each of the four elements:

1. *The body in/on view* – At the level of the individual representative what are the somatic norms that operate within political institutions? How are representative claims made in the context of these operative norms? What embodied identities are performed? What claims do they make? What attention do they command? How does the presence of different bodies challenge the somatic norm operative within institutions? Do bodies transcend their materiality to signify particular political motifs, legitimate particular regimes and challenge specific hierarchies through performing everyday political rituals? As Diana Coole has argued, “Since democratic processes tend to rely on situations where face-to-face encounters occur, the way bodies affect communication is especially important for understanding normative phenomena like exclusion” (2007: 413). In conceptualising the body I understand it as embedded in social relations. This means that the body though discrete is also relational; it is positioned within social frameworks in relation to other bodies. These relations are historically specific, culturally contested and affect the ways in which bodies are viewed, represent/are represented, consent and resist. As I have argued above, political performances are marked by embodied identities. This effect then enables or disables performers’ ability to re-present to, as well as to represent their constituents, their interests and indeed, themselves. Bodies in and out of place can be more or less affective as well as effective (Rai, 2010). This focus on the body allows us to bring into view in our analysis the materiality of the human condition – through colour, voice, deportment and dress. Within institutions we can ask questions about these relational bodies: what sort of body, what embodied identities does it perform? In what spaces/places is it more or less visible, comfortable? What attention does it command? What claims does its presence make? Does the body in view also hide other bodies? Is it able to transcend its materiality to signify particular political motifs, legitimate

particular regimes and challenge specific hierarchies? Sex, colour, caste or sexuality all play out differently in performances and their reception.

2. *Staging representative claim-making* - The body on view doesn't perform in a vacuum; it does so in space/place/time. The backdrop, the stage, the symbols, the entry and exit points shape the kind of politics that is performed, the shifts and struggles that take place – who constructs, reflects, claims and polices the space of politics. In other words, it matters whether claim making take place in or outside state buildings, particular event spaces or historical non-state spaces.

From everyday spaces to grand architecture, everyday objects, props and symbols of power and privilege, the stage of politics matters not only in a functionalist sense – its appropriateness in terms of acoustics for example – or even in its reflection of the culture in which parliaments are embedded (Goodsell, 1988), but in terms of the re-presentation of statehood, sovereignty and legitimacy (Rai, 2011; Parkinson, 2012). It matters also because it allows us to ask different questions about political institutions and their place in our past and present readings of national histories. Lefebvre's admonition that we take "into account localities and regions, differences and multiple (conflictual) associations, attached to the soil, to dwelling, the circulation of people and things, in the practical functioning of space" (1976-78, cited in Brenner and Elden 2009: 360) allows us to see how the changing social and political relations find spatial reflection within representative buildings, as new 'space invaders' (Puwar) make demands for visual representation through portraits and statues of different bodies. In other words, it matters that some bodies occupy some spaces within the parliamentary buildings and others do not, or occupy different spaces – the chamber, the seating, the well of the House, the Central Hall are all areas inscribed by gendered histories and political contestations. Further, the space within parliamentary institutions spills out of these internal boundaries – MPs and ministers speak to the public, citizens gather, demonstrate and celebrate in outside the precinct of parliament, but within what might be considered audible reach; the live televising of parliament beams the proceedings into homes of citizens and the packaging of these by news channel makes accessible but also frames the proceedings taking place inside parliamentary buildings outside. Affect and effect then work together to make staging/space of representation representative or unrepresentative, open or closed, accessible or inaccessible, protected or vulnerable – from which are read the tropes of democratic practice, accountability and legitimacy.

3. *Words/Scripts/Speech/Voice* - Focusing on speech-acts Austin noted that “The uttering of the words is, indeed, usually a, or even the leading incident in the performance of the act...[and] the performance of which is also the object of the utterance...” (); speech acts are thus self-actuating in this ‘thin’ version of performativity. Butler, however, sees words and their repetition as bringing into being as well as regulating and challenging power and its effects. She has noted, for example, that words “Both sustain and threaten the body through modes of address” (1997:5). Declarations – institutional and individual – require scripts and speech, which are learnt and re-produced for affect but also have effects in the Austinian sense. While much has been written about speech acts, we could by focusing on embodied identities, also talk about voice in which these acts are made⁴ – well modulated, ‘cultured’ voices as opposed to those deemed ‘shrill’ (on grounds of gender) or ‘rough’ (on grounds of class/caste). We could then also read both the affect and effect of voice/s that occupy spaces – shouting interrupts institutional processes in parliament, produce sounds. This conception of voice is of course different from ‘voice’ as representative of points of view; however, it is not unrelated as its reception remains marked by social relations. Sound also allows us to read politics – sound often ‘territorialises’ spaces; people protest outside institutional buildings to create a din in the distance as a reminder of their protest, even while the actual words might not be intelligible. Similarly, institutions use sounds to discipline, call attention to or even to drown out voices or actions.

4. *Performing and performative labour* - What sort of performance takes place on particular political stages, by different bodies in view? What scripts are written, memorized, rehearsed and performed? Which scripts are overlooked, forgotten? Why are certain performances more/less affective/effective, legitimate, inspirational, awe inspiring, revolting? What moments of/in performance bring people together, create ruptures, discipline and disrupt? What the relations are between bodies that discipline and those that disrupt?

Here, I examine the act of *performing* – I understand performing as comprising acting out in a specific moment/space or event in which one or more individuals interpret through their actions a text/story/script/idea for another group of people, the audience. The focus on the body outlined above alerts us that interpretation is not simply verbal – performance encapsulates both, bodily acts as well as speech-acts and that holding the two together allows us to fold in both these into performance, together with the anticipation and reception of the performance. Also, while some acts are recognized because of their ritually repeated nature and therefore prescribed for actors, the anticipated hostility of the audience can also lead the actors to performatively interpret their script in ways to minimize that hostility. Further,

⁴ Thanks to Nick Vaughan-Williams for bringing this to my attention.

there is the issue of timing⁵. Affect is maximized by correct timing and the opposite affect occurs if it is not. Also, repetition itself suggests constraints as well as spaces for intervention that are either timely or not – in performing a ceremony or ritual for instance that has been authorized either through institutional rules or through precedence, the actor can claim validation; the opposite would be the case if such authorization is struggled over or denied. Timing and event also go together – performing disruptive acts at particular times (when the Head of State is speaking for example) or over a period of time (when parliament might have to adjourn because of a lengthy disruption) might be in the MPs’ individual party political interests, for example, but it might be injurious of collective reputations of the MPs as well as of reputations of parliament.

Mapping political performance: the second axis

While the four elements of performance outlined above can be read as aspects of the context of performance, issues of agency allow us to study the affect of performance and through this its effectiveness and also need to inform PPF: First, is the issue of *authenticity of representation* – legitimacy of representative claim-making is often attributed to this quality, but can we pin this down? Saward focuses on a specific aspect of authenticity – that of legitimacy of claim-making (2008) of the unelected representative. Authenticity is an interpretive category (Alexander, 2006) as well as contested, but critical to claim-making. But can anyone re-present and represent another authentically? Is this always relative to the positionality of the representative and represented; Spivak’s answer to the question she famously posed – ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’ – was that the subaltern cannot speak when represented by others, but that we can still point to the space of that absence to be politically alert to the inequalities of voice. Alexander argues that “authenticity is an interpretive category rather than an ontological state. The state of authenticity is arrived at, is contingent and results from process of social construction...” (2006:7) and therefore, we can also say that it is always contested, unstable and open to re-interpretation. The processes of social construction, as we have seen above in relation to Butler’s analysis of gender, are stabilized through performance – those that resonate with the audience and those that do not either help congeal or contest the claim to authenticity of representation.

Second, is the issue of the *mode of representation* – Modes of representation are framed within recognisable cultural narratives and symbols. Individuals might choose from a bundle of scripts or meanings; the bundle however, remains historically specific. As Geertz emphasised, through performances we tell stories – to

⁵ My thanks to Emma Crewe for pointing this out to me.

ourselves and others about ourselves and about others. How we view our representative institutions and our representatives then becomes part of the story that we are able to take away with us – that which resonates with our reality outside the moment; contrariwise, the distance between representative and represented is underlined, emphasised if that resonance is not there – for ritual to be visible is to diminish its power because then questioning it becomes more possible. Stories thus make meaning: this meaning making, of course, does not as Bruner (1996) has so well argued, take place in a vacuum – it is interactional, it allows for an awareness of alternative meanings and scripts, and it is framed within common cultural narratives and symbols. This constructivist understanding of learning to perform allows Bruner to suggest that individuals learn through action-based representation, iconic or image-based representation and through symbolic or language-based representation. Further, although Bruner does see language based representation as more sophisticated of the three, he regards these modes of representation as only loosely integrated and sequential. Words as well as scripts then matter – our recognition of these words and our use of scripts – formal or informal - matters because it shapes our representation of our and others' subjectivities. But do we represent just with words? Do we not also represent through non-verbal communicative modes – the clothes and ornaments that we wear, for example? And through gesture – of recognition and greeting as well as of overlooking (blinking)? Here Goffman's work is particularly useful. Learning to perform is of course also historically embedded and therefore social in character – parliamentary institutions provide 'scripts' and courses to train new entrants, for example, in how to be 'good parliamentarians' through which certain forms of normative behaviour is privileged. Individuals might choose from a bundle of scripts or meanings; the bundle however, remains historically specific; choice then is framed by, the subject's habitus – both their social and their institutional worlds.

Third, we often see that actors in particular moments are able to 'go against the grain' – political frisson has sometimes real and long lasting results and at other times it fizzles out quickly, without ensuing change. Thus, while performance can consolidate power, because "performances precipitate degrees of liminality, they are [also] capable of transforming social relations" (Alexander, 2006:13). Turner has defined *liminality* as a 'threshold' between these two different existential planes: "...a realm of pure possibility whence novel configurations of ideas and relations may arise" (1970: 97). So, it would be important to study why some performances produce this liminality and others do not and with what affect. In his book, *The Forest of Symbols*, Turner outlines for us key elements of liminality based on the ritualised performances of 'becoming' men and women in the Ndembu tribal groups of north western Zambia. In the transition from childhood to adulthood, there is liminality attached to a state of 'no longer being classified' as a child and 'not yet being classified' as adults; it is through the rituals prescribed by the social group that individuals are

able to leave this liminal stage and become reintegrated into the social system. This inbetween space/place/time is symbolized, Turner argues, often modelled on 'processes of gestation and parturition', and often regarded as dangerous (Douglas, 1966) because they are neither one thing nor the other, defying classificatory limits (Turner, 1970:97)⁶. Although Turner does not make this explicit, the state of liminality also suggests danger perhaps because it flattens out the social hierarchies within which individuals are situated; "...The liminal group is a community or comity of comrades and not a structure of hierarchically arrayed positions", Turner argues (p. 100). This can, then, allow members of the group to be in a stage of reflection outside the normal boundaries of socially constructed and accepted rituals, facts, ideas and sentiments; deconstruction of the unthinking acceptance of configurations of ideas and practices becomes possible as ritualized enactments of belonging are seen not as whole but as its constituent parts (p. 105). There is thus, in liminal time "a certain freedom to juggle with the factors of existence" (p. 106). However, as I have argued above, these liminal moments are not disembodied – they have, Turner accepts, "fairly narrow limits. The neophytes return...[once they go through the transition ritual, they] become once more subject to custom and law" (ibid.). While some scholars have stretched the liminal moment – even enough to call it 'permanent liminality' (Szokolczai, 2000), I would like to hold on to the temporariness of the concept in the context of representative performances.

Finally, we evidence *resistance to claim-making*. Some claims are accepted, others neglected and still others mocked or rejected outright. Bhabha notes both "mimicry", and 'menace' in performative moments (1994). To study this resistance is critical to our understanding of claim-making, especially as this resistance can be enhanced or subdued through the way in which the media reports claim-making. First, resistance to representation takes place when individuals and groups demonstrate outside and inside institutional spaces to challenge the legitimacy of representatives and political leaders – we often see demonstrators outside parliaments and often there are disruptions to parliamentary proceedings by MPs. Second, where representational performances are concerned resistance is manifested, in Homi Bhabha's words through "mimicry", which is also 'menace' – where hegemonic codes are challenged but through words that are recognised by the hegemon; narratives are subverted in the language that is dominant; scripts revised in often small registers, which are significant in their revisions of familiar texts (Alexander, 2006: 15). Third, resistance can also take a more passive form – overlooking, ignoring, disregarding, not paying attention to the performance or staging of political spectacles can also be read as oppositional; it undermines the dominant discourse and creates wrinkles in the smooth narrative of power. Finally, humour is often used to resist power's narrative – "the subject's deployment of a talent for play and a sense of fun which makes him

⁶ A similar attention to the non-fixability of identity and the deployment of excess and the grotesque to move between identity/spaces of the postcolony/colonial is found in Achille Mbembe's work (1992).

homo ludens par excellence...enables subjects to splinter their identities and to represent themselves as constantly changing their persona; they ...constantly [undergo] mitosis, whether it be in 'official' spaces or not" (Mbembe, 1992:6). The claim to representation is often challenged through cartoons, the telling of jokes and teasing those who make such claims (Shehata, 1992:75). However, at the same time, hetero-normative humour is often used to undermine the marginalized still further – women, people of colour, homosexuals, all have to deal with racist/sexist humour as political rhetoric (Weaver, 2011).

Through the two axes of PPF we can understand performative claim-making. I visualise this framework in the following way –

Table 1: **Performative Claim-making in Democratic Systems:**

The body	*			
Space/place				
Words/Scripts/Speech/Voice				
Performing/performative labour				
Reception/Audience	Authenticity of representation	Mode of representation	Representative liminality	Resistance to representation

*The boxes represent the different aspects of this framework that can be combined to empirically research how claims are made.

Thus far, we have, however, said nothing about who is the performance for? There is an old saying in Hindi 'The peacock danced in the forest? Who saw him?' If there is no audience then can there be a performance? How is the performance, by the body in view through the staging of politics, received, in which spaces? How does the reception affect the performance itself – what social relations come into view through studying the reception of a political performance? How do we map this reception and its affect on the performers/performance? Below I discuss this important aspect of PPF.

The Reception/Audience and/of the Performance

Kershaw makes the point that it was in the Victorian era that spectators gave way to the audience: “theatre attendees were encouraged to think of themselves as a collective paying attention to sound, particularly to words, rather than as individuals primed to enjoy the delights of scopophilic excesses. A parallel shift”, he notes, “in the term for the audience’s space, from ‘spectatory’ to ‘auditorium’, underlines the point” (2007:224). In terms of the audience of representatives, we can suggest that another move is made – from audience to constituents or more broadly to citizens, who are predisposed to be interlocutors of the political performers in parliament. If, as reception theory posits, a text needs a reader, a performance a spectator and art a viewer and that those that receive also interpret, but within boundaries of imagination set by the text, performance or art, then the neglect or ignoring of the narrative can be seen not as something fixed, as presented by the author, performer or artist but as an act that is mobile, stretched and challenged and struggled over. As Saward has noted: “representative claims only work, or even exist, if ‘audiences’ acknowledge them in some way...” (2006:303; also see Hay and Rosamond, 2011). To ignore the message, to turn one’s back on it, to walk past it, without stopping to look, to speak over it can be a subversive act of ‘reading’. Such challenges to as well as the shoring up of the authorial voice depend upon the extent to which the reader and viewer are able to or wish to be complicit in the reading; the codes of narrative need recognition or rejection if the spectator is to interpret text, performance or objects (Kate Davy, 1986). However, it is important also to note that the ‘reading’ of the performance by an audience is done largely with the familiar, easily available, ‘dominant’ codes rather than those that are unfamiliar and against the grain, which is how power is reproduced. And then there is also the question of the corporeality of the audience – what makes up the body of the audience and how does this absorb, respond to or reject performance? Gendered work has suggested that jokes made in public by women are often not recognised, that the same suggestion made by women in a meeting are overlooked while the man is commended for it, that accents of speech makers affect the reception of the message and that anticipated hostility of or validation by an audience can shape performances.

To illustrate PPF and to outline the affect not only of the actor/institution but also of the audience let me introduce and analyze different but intersecting aspects of institutional as well as individual performances, in the Indian parliament⁷.

⁷ I carried out research on women in the Indian parliament over a period of ten years. The interviews cited here were done through this period. This research was funded by the Nuffield Foundation.

Illustrating PPF: telling stories about institutional performance and politics

Claim-making through ceremony and everyday ritual of representation

Rhodes and Bevir have argued that state is a series of contingent cultural practices (2010). They have focused on the everyday practices of ministers, bureaucrats and employees, on rules and regulations that govern these practices and the stories that are told about governance through these practices and how these might be interpreted. Other scholars have outlined how political rituals - parades (Warner, 1959), elections (Banerjee, 2011), opening of parliament (Johnson), coronations (Shils and Young, 1953) Prime Minister's questions (Lovenduski) – legitimise the state and its authority. One way that we can study the performance of power is through studying, I have argued elsewhere, the ceremony and ritual through which institutions and individual actors re-present and represent themselves and their citizens/audiences/constituents (Rai, 2010).

Take for example the ritual of 'vote of confidence' in parliament. These are tense moments when the government is potentially under threat. Because of this tension, the potential for disruption of the ritual is high – from both those that are leading the charge against the government, and from the government benches under threat. On 22 July 2008 the United Progressive Alliance coalition government faced a vote of confidence. The vote was very close (in the end the government won by 275 votes against 256 for the opposition) and tensions ran high in parliament. When the result was announced disruptions erupted with allegations of bribery and intimidation. At this point the Speaker decided to play national song (Vande Matram) to mark the closing of the session. The reaction was immediate – the rowing members quietened down as no one wished to show disrespect to the national song. Of course, these moments do not last – the disruption resumed in the next session but for that moment the members stood still in response to the sound of music and perhaps experienced *communitas*. In doing so, perhaps, the institutional solidarity that is experienced by members as members rather than as party political opponents is reinforced, alerting them to the importance of maintaining decorum for the 'greater good' of institution that makes a claim to represent citizens.

Illustrating PPF: telling stories about individual performance and politics

The body in/on view

The first aspect of political performance is the body in view. What happens when hitherto excluded bodies occupy institutional spaces imbued with histories of discrimination? This was the question that Nirmal Puwar asked in her book '*Space Invaders: Gender, Race and Bodies out of Place*'.

Women's bodies in the Indian parliament have been marginal bodies – there have been few female bodies in/on view but because of this they have been more visible. They have also been marked by class and caste – there have been more elite bodies than not. Recently, the issue of 'foreignness' was raised in relation to Mrs. Sonia Gandhi, reminding us of what 'authentic' subjectivities are read off indigenous as opposed to foreign bodies. Female bodies in the Indian parliament are attired entirely in Indian dress – sari or salwar kamiz, while men sport both western and regional dress. This marks them out in the cultural context in different registers of formality than the men. Here are two influential women in Indian politics – Indira Gandhi and Sushma Swaraj; one the erstwhile Prime Minister, the second the leader of opposition in the current parliament. And this is what the latter had to say about the issue of 'homeliness', inspiration and representation: "One of my achievement is that while Mrs. Gandhi was seen with respect and awe, an ordinary Indian woman didn't think that she could be like Mrs. Gandhi. But when she sees me, she thinks that she, her daughter can become like me. This is my life-time achievement...Mrs. Gandhi was a class apart; I am the woman next door; I have created this aspiration in the ordinary woman of India" (interview, 2005). As the photos show, these are two different women. The image of Mrs. Gandhi reflects her elite background, while that of Swaraj emphasises her 'homeliness'. Mrs. Gandhi looks rather aloof and stern Sushma Swaraj wears a *bindi* and has *sindhur* in her hair, which most Hindu women would identify with. The sophistication of Mrs. Gandhi's saris was notable – her clothes reflected the occasion; for elections campaigning you often saw her in cotton saris and full sleeve blouses, with her head covered. On state visits abroad Mrs. Gandhi was attired in silks, short sleeved blouses and was perfectly coiffured. Awareness of her place in India's political history and the space she occupied in the moment both influenced the affect she sought to create. Mrs. Swaraj, however, insists on her affect as a homely woman who is not interested in presentation – despite being proud of the affect of that homeliness. That the cultural and social markers create affect can also be seen in the statements of OBC (lower caste) political (male) leaders : "JD(U) veteran Sharad Yadav, a critic of the legislation, asked in June 1997, "Do you think these women with short hair can speak for women, for our women..." (The Hindu, March 9, 2010)

The staging of performance – space/place of parliament- Let us take the issue of space that women and men occupy in parliament. In archival photos of the Indian parliament we see one of the Ladies' Room. Here, we find all the accoutrements of a genteel existence that ladies require – a place of calm and of rest, with comfortable sofas and a dressing table at which to touch up the face before sallying forth into the world of men that lies just beyond. Not visible but also present are the day beds on which to take a siesta after lunch and a kettle for tea. When women first entered parliament this was a busy room – to be in the 'other spaces' of Central Hall was not considered appropriate unless one's presence was necessary for an official engagement. Men occupied the Central Hall – they sat there to talk, to network and even to have their lunch. As the composition of parliament changed – more women, younger women, more assertive women became visible within the parliamentary precincts - the Ladies Room fell into disuse. Today, it looks rather forlorn and dusty, with no evidence of occupancy during the session. Today, both women and men congregate and network in the Central Hall. This challenge to the dominant gender institutional mores didn't happen suddenly – it happened slowly but surely. Churchill remarked that we shape buildings and then buildings shape us; here we can also see the opposite. In this case, the ritual was not created (it was suggested through the presence of a gendered space), but through an interaction between what has been and is then negotiated, women in parliament have arrived at, as Goffman would put it, at a different way of being in the parliamentary space; they have resisted the suggestion of separation. Undermining what was presented as a gendered space through non-use is a powerful way of creating new social mores and everyday rituals and resisting earlier ones.

The Ladies Room in the Lok Sabha

Words/Scripts/Speech/Voice

Here we take the example of Lalu Prasad Yadav, MP. He was the President of the Rashtriya Janata Dal political party which was part of the the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government; Yadav was the Minister of Railways from 2004 to 2009. He comes from a poor, rural social background, is from a lower

caste (OBC) and is not part of the westernised political class that dominated the Indian parliament for decades. His performative presentation of self evokes not only his caste positionality but also that of his class. He speaks in colloquial Hindi, the language of the 'common man', to subvert dominant, Westernized class position through mimicry and humour that entertains as much as it menaces those in parliament. In 2008, while presenting the Railway budget, he decided to read a poem, which he first spoke in Hindi and then as MPs from the opposition benches protested, translated in heavily accented, broken English as follows:

*Everybody is appreciating that I have done tremendous work,
Every year I have earned crores and crores [of rupees] everyday
They are saying Lalu Yadav has planted a fruit tree
Every year it will grow a mile to give fruit.*

The house dissolved into merriment; the Speaker commented that after this performance "there won't be any problems with the railways"! This recitation was posted on YouTube straight away and has attracted 35,119 hits. The comments of viewers both in and outside India show embarrassment that an Indian Minister can play the fool in this way: "is that parliament or chai shop (at oldage home) ???" wrote MrNoob49 (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lwyc_E1hqTs). Mbembe gives many such examples of excessive and grotesque words/speech that challenge the commandments of the state – both by those within and outside its ambit (1992). In this performance Yadav uses words to perform his class/caste, but also to underline his effectiveness – both as a Minister (making a profit for the railways) and as a politician (able to connect with the rural and largely marginalized voice of the Indian, lower caste peasantry).

Performing - Performing in parliament has affect in different spaces and on different constituencies. In the formal deliberations inside the parliamentary chamber, a scrutiny of the debates show that women are often overlooked during Question Hour, the Speaker's comments (other than the current, first woman Speaker) on women's interventions are often patronising, and that in moments of disruption in parliament women are either absent or unable to contribute because of the levels of noise. In other performative moments in parliament women have played out gender in a completely different way. Take for example the introduction of the Women's Reservation Bill in Rajya Sabha in 2008. The minister, H. R. Bhardwaj, was introducing the Bill in parliament during the UPA government's first term on the 7 May, 2008. Anticipating disruptions in the House, Mr. Bharadwaj took his seat between two women ministers and was 'guarded' by some women MPs to ward off any attack on him by opposition members. When he stood to introduce the Bill, an opposition member from the Samajwadi party did try to snatch the copy of the Bill from the minister's hand. At this point the Union minister Mrs. Renuka Chowdhury pushed a Samajwadi member away. The fact that the minister was 'protected' by women MPs was widely reported.

Effectiveness too is gendered of course. The liminal moments when women in parliament are able to achieve *communitas* are rare given the constraints under which they operate – but they do occur. Take for example the case of the Women’s Reservation Bill that was first introduced in 1996. In a moment of frustration and anger at the opposition to its introduction, Geeta Mukherjee stood up and asked other women in parliament to walk out with her – creating a disruptive moment of great affect; walking across party lines many women MPs did walk out of the chamber. Did this mean that women have been able to challenge party whips since? No. But in that moment many did responding to the Mukherjee’s appeal to their conscience and against the prejudice of the opponents of the Bill.

Reaching/audience

In a mediatised world, the televising of parliamentary proceedings and the packaging of these into news bites for the 24/7 news channels has expanded the audience of MPs exponentially. In a country with low literacy rates this media-led re-presentation of members’ performance becomes even more powerful. “[M]ediatisation [is] a crucial process in dispersing performance throughout culture” (Kershaw, 2003:227). Scenes of disruption in parliament during the WRB debates were packaged for the national audience by commentators regretting the state of Indian democracy and public ethos. The subtext of the falling standard discourse is often one that censures non-elite modes of speech, action and performance in parliament – the crude language, the loud voice, the interruptions and the bodily aggression are communicative modes that the early urbane and sophisticated members would have found abhorrent. Newspaper articles, civic reports and judicial commentary all point to this issue of falling standards because of corruption, lack of education, erosion of institutions, proliferation of parties and the undermining of strong government. These reports in turn then create a sensibility among citizens that parliamentarians “are generally selfish, power-hungry, greedy, dishonest hypocrites and power merchants for whom the nation comes last and the welfare of the people is at the bottom of priorities. Their only concern is to amass wealth and somehow get to and stay in power...The people are aghast and, and what is worse, they feel helpless.” Subhash Kashyap; The Tribune; http://www.tribuneindia.com/2005/specials/tribune_125/main2.htm

During the recent mobilisation against corruption by Anna Hazare, Om Puri, the actor (*East is East*) had this to say about Indian MPs, who were refusing to accept Hazare’s revisions to the Lok Pal Bill: "Yeh anpadh hain, inka kya background hai? Aadhe se zyaada MP ganwaar hain...", and that “that he feels "ashamed when an IAS or IPS officer salutes a *ganwar* (illiterate) who is a *neta* (political leader)”. Such denigration of

MPs is popular, even though it bears no resemblance to facts: “According to Parliament records, of the 545 Lok Sabha MPs, 260 are graduates and 142 are post-graduates. Twenty-four, including two women MPs, have doctorates. Of the rest, 20 MPs are under matric (high school), 32 are matric and 47 have completed their Inter or higher secondary classes. Eight parliamentarians have done diploma courses and nine are undergraduates”

(<http://www.thehansindia.info/News/Article.asp?category=1&subCategory=5&ContentId=3274>).

Speaking with staff working in the audio-visual section of the parliament one becomes aware that MPs request the CDs showing their intervention in debates so that these might be reproduced and distributed to their constituents to prove the effectiveness of the MP in representing the interests of their constituency. To be seen to be effective, MPs have to be seen; to be seen very often they have to occupy parliamentary spaces that are of interest to the camera. While disruptive behaviour is not supposed to be televised, it often is, incentivising members to behave in ways that will get them noticed and therefore filmed. There is some concern among senior parliamentarians that televising proceedings has created a new audience for parliamentary work, but also undermined the reputation of parliament because of encouraging members to behave badly. Others worry about educating their audience – managing expectations of their constituent is an important issue; one senior MP told me “Our constituents also need to hold MPs accountable, but for what? Not for cleaning roads but to represent the interests of the whole constituency!” (6.12.05, Mahajan). Similarly, another senior MP complained that when she was involved in national issues – foreign affairs or women’s empowerment – “this went against me [in the Lok Sabha] because editorials were written that I was busy in everything else except my constituency...small issues of opening this and closing that... provision of drinking water is not my problem; it should be that of the MLA to ensure this. I found that really distressing...” (7.12.05; Alva).

But the general public and the specific constituents are only one part of the audience to which the MPs are performing. There is the internal audience also – how do other members receive a performance makes or breaks reputations. A senior woman MP said, “Lok Sabha is all sound and fury signifying nothing...everyday there is something going on...there is no time for reflection or making considered contribution [to debate]; you go prepared but you can’t speak...so many people are wanting to speak you get hardly any time...I found this a profoundly frustrating experience” (ibid.). She also commented “Women are often called *maun* [non-participative, dumb] MPs, but I think the MPs job is not only to speak but to get the work done...but this is

not recognised (ibid.). The performative then stands in for effectiveness in a time of spectacularised representation of parliament and its working.

Finally, the audience also includes the party leaders in parliament – to impress them is to progress in party politics and as a consequence within parliamentary hierarchy. This is the most difficult audience to research. Oratorical skills, putting one's body in view of the cameras, obeying the whips and seen as representing important electoral constituencies are all in the mix when members are evaluated for promotion. However, also in the mix is what is not visible – the family, the networks, the status, the length of service of members within the party. So the performance and the presence go hand in hand creating layers of interpretation by the party leaders, which then shape the staging of government and opposition in parliament – who sits on the front bench, who speaks and who doesn't.

Conclusion

PPF, as we have seen above, not entirely a new framework – elements of each one of the four aspects outlined above have been theorized by sociologists and cultural theorists (Alexander, Austin, Butler, Featherstone et.al.; Goffman; Hall, Spivak, Mbembe), anthropologists and geographers (Crewe, Rose and Thrift, Crouch), political theorists (Lukes, Walzer, Apter, Saward) and theatre and performance theorists (Schechner, Roach, Reinelt). PPF brings the different elements of political performance together to explore whether our study of political institutions, such as parliaments, can tell us something about how the performative/performance can shed new light on politics and power – specifically, to explore if and how performance is co-constitutive of power hierarchies even as it is framed by these.

Above I have argued that performance is constitutive of and constituted by dominant social relations and that they both help as well as disturb the circulation of power and that it highlights the role of affect in politics and helps us understand how political performances hold disparate interests, histories and visions of the future together against all odds, “while at the same time embodying the possibilities of evolutionary, transgressive and disruptive change (Rai, 2010:287)”. Thus performance has both affect and effects; as Sara Ahmed has argued “emotions play a crucial role in the “surfacing” of individual and collective bodies through the way in which emotions circulate between bodies and signs” (2004:117). I have also argued that audiences/citizens first respond to political situations, politicians and policies through affect and we hope to create affect when we either support or oppose these. We have also seen how the mediatisation of

parliamentary proceedings is most often packaged in highly negative and emotive ways in the media, generating cynical sensibilities among the citizens and undermining the representative claim of democratic institutions.

Political institutions can thus, I have argued, best be analyzed through a performative lens, which allows us to make judgements about the authenticity, legitimacy and liminality of both claim-making and claim-makers. It does so by holding together in one frame the body, state, speech and performative labour that goes into institutional and individual performance through which claims are made – it allows us to analyze different but connected elements that go into a performance and in so doing let us read the power flows, circulations and disturbances that performance can generate. We allows us to note that even though political performance is tethered to recognisable patterns it is also dynamic and unstable – in part because of the interpretive mode of performance and in part because the moment of performance is itself inherently liminal and fluid. By analyzing parliamentary or other political institutions through the lens of performance we are able to see the dynamic, the unexpected as well as the structural frames, allowing us a more nuanced analytical framework to study politics. We are also then able to review, assess and critique the claims that representatives make – taking note of who they are and how they represent themselves, their positionality, the spaces they occupy and are able or not to command, and their relationship with their audiences in anticipating, framing or responding to their demands. In doing so, we are also able to scale up our analysis to the level of institutional claim-making – how the affect of representative performances frames the reputations and the claim-making by institutions. PPF thus seeks to reveal the historical arch that connects deep political and discursive power to its contemporary performance; to make the argument that state formation is also cultural revolution and that certain discourse, performances and representations find greater resonance, reception and recognition than others, depending upon the dominant ideas of that historical time (Corrigan and Sayer, 1985) . The event, the performance then becomes part of a repertoire with a long history of social relations. To map this theoretical framing of performance and representation is the task of PPF. A study of political performance then allows us to open up the field of political analysis at the level of individual and institutional representation to a more creative, connected and critical gaze.

References

- Ahmed, Sara 2004, *Affective Economies Social Text*, 79 (Volume 22, Number 2), Summer, pp. 117-139
- Alexander, Jeffrey, 2004, Cultural Pragmatics: Social Performance Between Ritual and Strategy *Sociological Theory*, 22:4 December
- Appadurai, Arjun, 1990
- Apter,
- Austin, J.L., 1975
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*, trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity.
- Brassett, James and Chris Clarke (2012) Performing the Sub-Prime Crisis: Trauma and the Financial Event, *International Political Sociology*, 6, 4–20
- Butler, J., 1990. *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge
- Butler, Judith, *Excitable Speech*,
- Chapman and Lowndes, 2009
- Coole, D., 2007. Experiencing Discourse: Corporeal Communicators and the Embodiment of Power *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 9, 413–433.
- Corrigan, Philip, and Derek Sayer. 1985. *The Great Arch: English State Formation as a Cultural Revolution*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Crewe, E., 2007. *Lords of Parliament: Manners, Rituals and Politics*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Debord, Guy
- Durkheim, E., 2001. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, translated by C. Cosman. Oxford:
- Edward Said, 1978, *Orientalism*
- Finlayson, A., 2007. From Beliefs to Arguments: Interpretive Methodology and Rhetorical Political Analysis. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 9, 545–563.
- Foucault, M., 1977, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin
- Giugni, McAdam and Tilly, 1999
- Goffman, E., 1971. *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goffman, E., 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, MA:
- Goffman, E., 1977. The Arrangement between the Sexes. *Theory and Society*, 4, 301–332.
- Goodsell, C., 1988. The Architecture of Parliaments: Legislative Houses and Political Culture. *British Journal of Political Science*, 18 (3), 287–302

- Hall, S. (1997), 'The work of representation', in S. Hall (ed.), *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices* (London: Sage and The Open University)
- Kershaw, 2003
- Kertzer, D., 1988. *Ritual, Politics and Power*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Levin, Laura and Marlis Schweitzer, 2011, 'Editorial, Performing Publics' *Performance Research* 16:2, pp. 1-6
- Lukes, S., 1975. Political Ritual and Social Integration. *Sociology*, 9, 289–307.
- Mansbridge, J. (2003), 'Rethinking Representation', in *American Political Science Review* 97, 4
- Mbembe, Achille,
- Pitkin, H.F. (1967), *The Concept of Representation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press)
- Puwar, N., 2004. *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies Out of Place*. Oxford: Berg
- Rai, Shirin M.(2010) 'Analysing Ceremony and Ritual in Parliament', *The Journal of Legislative Studies*,16: 3, 284 — 297
- Reinelt, 2002, *The Politics of Discourse: Performativity meets Theatricality*, *SubStance*, Issue 98/99 (Vol. 3, Number 2&£) pp. 201-215
- Reinelt, J. (2011), 'Rethinking the public sphere for a global age', in *Performance Research* 16, 2
- Roach, Joseph, 1996, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*, Columbia University Press
- Said, E., 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Saward, Michael, 2010, *The Representative Claim*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Saward, 2008, 'Authorisation and Authenticity: Representation and the Unelected', *The Journal of Political Philosophy*
- Schechner, Richard, 2006, *Performance Studies. An Introduction* , New York: Routledge
- Shehata, Samer S. 1992, 'The Politics of Laughter: Nasser, Sadat, and Mubarek in Egyptian Political Jokes' *Folklore*, Vol. 103, No. 1, pp. 75-91
- Shils, E. and Young, M., 1953. The Meaning of the Coronation. *Sociological Review*, 1, 63–81.
- Spivak, in Featherstone et.al.;
- Szokolczai, Arpad, 2000, *Reflexive Historical Sociology*, London: Routledge
- Thrift, Nigel, 2003
- Turner, Victor, 1970, *The Forest of Symbols*, New York: Cornell University Press
- Weaver, Simon , 2011, *The Rhetoric of Racist Humour: Us, UK and Global Race Joking*, Farnham: Ashgate Publishing
- Verba, S., 1965. If, as Lipsitz Thinks, Political Science is to Save our Souls, God Help Us! *American Political Science Review*, 62, 576–577
- Walzer,

Welch, Kate, 2011, Performance Research 16:2,