The Poetics of Ruptural Performance
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Every day, do something that won’t compute.
—Wendell Berry

Understanding alone can do little to transform consciousness and situations. The exploited have rarely had the need to have the laws of exploitation explained to them.
—Jacques Rancière

We are sorry for this inconvenience, but this is a revolution.
—Subcommandante Marcos

The set-up of Renee Gladman’s (2003) novella, The Activist, is this: News reports claim that a major urban bridge has been destroyed by an activist group called the CPL. Some contend that the bridge fell on its own. A group of angry commuters claims that the bridge is, in fact, still standing—and demands the right to drive across it. Finally, a group of Canadian scientists called in by the president determines that there never was a bridge: “not clear it was a crossing point,” their report states (28). The head paramilitary officer assigned to track down the CPL bemoans, “Instead of a hunger strike, they’re issuing a logic one,” but goes on to say that he doesn’t know what that means (49). Members of the group are rounded up, but are then broken out of jail by their comrades. Their escape from jail coincides with a sudden increase of graffiti around the city, most often expressing only the word, “No” (117).

I open with this story from Gladman’s book because it illustrates the kind of performance activism I try to get at in this essay, and which I am calling “ruptural”—a kind of activist performance that resists legibility. It is the performance of the logic strike. While this essay did originally
begin as a manifesto, and perhaps it still is one, I don’t mean to argue against other, more clearly communicative activist performances, but rather to complement, complicate, and confound them.

In this essay, I argue for and trace out the critical characteristics of legibility-resisting forms of performance activism that are distinct less because of a communicated message of their content and more by their qualities as performance. This emergent mode pays a particular debt to the pranksterism of Abbie Hoffman, the détournement of the Situationists, and the absurd enactments of Dada performance. These interventions are best known today through the practices of culture jammers, including the staged performances of Reverend Billy and the Church of Stop Shopping, The Billionaires for Bush, and the Yes Men. While ruptural performance can be seen as a strain of culture jamming, it is one that diverges from the dominant model epitomized by the work of Kalle Lasn and Adbusters. Those practices emphasize activism that moves at the level of signification through “subvertisements” and “billboard liberation” that “rebrand” and “uncool” corporations by contesting the corporate/branded image with the ecological, economic, and social consequences of the products that underlie their profit line. Such a mode of culture jamming speaks in the grammar of advertising as it seeks to disrupt it. In so doing, such culture jamming is characterized by a clarity of message even as it subverts the advertisements it “jams.” Ruptural performance, however, jams up the meaning-making process itself. It willfully confuses the issue, and utilizes the very bafflement that ensues as a strategic advantage in challenging power.

At the risk of constructing a false binary, I propose that the obverse of ruptural performance is Guy Debord’s ([1967] 1995) “spectacle.” Debord explains that while the society of the spectacle is indeed an “accumulation of spectacles,” he distinguishes that “the spectacle is not a collection of images; rather it is a social relationship between people that is mediated by images” (12). While he calls it a Weltanschauung (worldview), it is more than an ideology or a veil of false consciousness. Rather it is “the very heart of society’s real unreality” (13), and in that materiality extends the alienation of the production of the commodity to its consumption: The spectacle produces “isolation” through the shift from “doing” to “contemplation,” where “the spectator’s alienation from and submission to the contemplated object... works like this: the more he
contemplates, the less he lives” (23). Ultimately, the spectacle as “social relationship” represents the triumph of the commodity-image, the “ruling order’s . . . uninterrupted monologue of self-praise” (19), whereby “the commodity completes its colonization of social life” (29). In understanding the spectacle as not merely spectacles, but a modality of experience in which separation and contemplation flatten the encounter with presence, Debord proposes “situations” specifically to intervene at the level of experience.

However, in his attempt to characterize contemporary activism, *Dream: Reimagining Progressive Politics in the Age of Fantasy*, Stephen Duncombe (2007) proposes that spectacle is itself the basis for protest, and that the distinction of the spectacle and the situation is merely “semantic” (130). Instead, he proposes “the ethical spectacle”:

> Our spectacles will be participatory, dreams the public can mold and shape themselves. They will be active: spectacles that work only if people help create them. They will be open-ended: setting stages to ask questions and leaving silences to formulate answers. And they will be transparent: dreams that one knows are dreams but which still have the power to attract and inspire. And finally, the spectacles we create will not cover over or replace reality and truth but perform and amplify it. (17)

There is much to be gained from Duncombe’s (2007) schematization here. And what I wish to do is revise and amplify it by challenging his dismissal of the distinctive character of “spectacle.” Most significantly, this requires distinguishing that the spectacle is not just a thing to be seen, but is also a *mode of performance*. Interventionist performance, particularly that which seeks to challenge and disrupt the values, and especially the experience of the society of the spectacle, is a different modality of enactment, rather than a variation of spectacle.

While performance interventions share with spectacle the qualities of being dramatic and theatrical, what distinguishes them is that they disrupt the *experience* of daily life, a rupture of the living of social relations—what activist Reverend Billy calls “the necessary interruption” (Talen 2000, xiii). The interruption, which Walter Benjamin (1968) might call the “sudden start” or the “shock” (163), creates the space for
and initiates the experience of a ruptural performance. What follows is an attempt to trace out rupture as a modality of performance that means to disrupt, or at least to fuck with, the spectacle.

1. Ruptural performances are interruptive.
2. Ruptural performances are becoming-events.
3. Ruptural performances are confrontational.
4. Ruptural performances are baffling and confounding.
5. Ruptural performances enact becoming-a-problem.
6. Ruptural performance gives rise to the virtuosic multitude.

This listing is meant in no way to be prescriptive, exhaustive or limiting. Rather, it is intended to be a provisional, necessarily incomplete cataloguing of the features of some contemporary activist performances. Ruptural performance is perhaps best thought of as an emergent form that functions in support of a diversity of tactics that includes marches, sit-ins and long-term community engagement and mobilization.

Ruptural Performances Are Interruptive

In some way these performances halt, impede, or delay the habitual practices of daily life. They intervene at the level and in the midst of the quotidian. Such performances engage the “necessary interruption” which seeks to make conscious what is habitual so that it is available for critique. In this way it shares Debord’s (2002) notion of the constructed situation: “the concrete construction of temporary settings of life and their transformation into a higher, passionate nature” (44) is inherently interruptive as it “asserts a non-continuous conception of life” (48). They seek to destabilize what the Russian Formalist Viktor Shklovsky (1965) called the “automatism of perception” (13). For Shklovsky, the role of art is to undo “habitualization,” which he says, “devours works, clothes, furniture, one’s wife, and the fear of war” (12). Such a reclamation of perception Shklovsky calls “defamiliarization” (13), for which the Russian phrase is priem ostranenie, and which translates literally as “making strange.” Brecht (1964) realized the political potential for this concept as the Verfremdungseffekt, which is foundational in that
it focuses on the experience of making the familiar strange as much as the transmission of a political message. In the speed-up of a contemporary life characterized by images and simulations, these performances engage what Brecht’s associate Walter Benjamin (1968) calls the “interruption of happenings” that estranges the “conditions of life” (150). It is this interruption, Benjamin suggests, that allows performance to obtain the “special character [of] . . . producing astonishment rather than empathy” (150). Interruptive performance, however, occurs not at the level of representation, but on the field of presence. It is achieved by “putting a frame” around experience that produces what Richard Bauman (1977) calls a “heightened intensity” or “special enhancement of experience” (43).

The Brazilian group, Opovoempé (“people on their feet”), for instance, has performed their Guerilha Magnética (Magnetic Guerilla) and other intervenções (interventions) throughout public spaces in São Paulo. In 2006, they composed and performed Congelados (Frozen), a series of intervenções, throughout the city’s supermercados. The per-
formances consisted of simple and improvised ensemble compositions constructed through the use of the theatrical practice known as View-points: gesture, repetition, spatial relationship, and kinesthetic response. The piece, in its basic performance of the actions of shopping, defamiliarizes those activities. The “choreography” that constitutes the “dance and music of buying” only gradually becomes evident, as the repetition of the banal gestures of shopping begins to mark their strangeness as performance (Esteves 2009). Though the content of the action is not overtly political—it does not scream its ideology—it makes the encounter with shopping, and especially its mindlessness and repetitiveness, seem strange.

At their foundation, Opovoempé’s pieces are rupture-producing machines: “The interventions intend to cause rupture of communication barriers, revelation of humor and play, change in the use of public space, and the manifestation of latent contents or social tensions previously unnoticed” (Esteves n.d.). That rupture is specifically political—particularly in mobilizing the poetic state of quotidian settings. Guerrilha Magnética performances are intended “to break apathy and indifference, to install a creative atmosphere of play and to reveal the poetic content of the city.” In O que se viu que você vê (What was seen that you see) (2007), the ensemble performed a structured improvisation with newspapers at the busiest intersection in São Paulo at Avenue Paulista (figure 12.2). The inspiration for the performance was local newspapers’ silence on a spate of police brutality cases in the area. However, at least as important as the protest against police violence and the news media’s complicity was the production of an extended dance that was intended to compel the audience that drove and walked by the performance to “see” their city again. As the ensemble moved along a preplanned path from a police substation to a tram stop to a homeless encampment and to a freeway overpass, the group constructed striking and dynamic images and actions intended to interrupt passersby so that they would re-see their surroundings in order to reconnect and reinvest in them.
Figure 12.2. The author in performance with Opovoempé in the Guerrilha Magnética, “O que se viu que você vê” (What was seen that you see) (2007) on a freeway overpass and on Avenue Paulista. Photos by Christian Castanho.
Ruptural Performances Are Becoming-Events

Thus, they do, as Dell Hymes (1975) suggests, “break through into performance” (11). And while their boundaries are unstable and unfixed, it is the ruptural performances’ “eventness,” their status as singular in time and space, which enables the presencing that the spectacle confounds. Alain Baidou (2007) puts it this way: “This other time, whose materiality envelops the consequences of the event, deserves the name of a new present. The event is neither past nor future. It makes us present to the present” (39). The instability of the boundaries of the event is also equally significant. Ruptural performances tend to confound boundaries of the real and artificial. The actual event of performance is generated by means of artifice, yet is one in which audiences often don’t initially realize that they are in a constructed situation.

In ruptural performances, audiences often first suspect that something isn’t right, but are not sure if something is actually amiss. Ultimately, though, the “breakthrough” occurs when audiences realize that things aren’t normal, they are strange, and we are in the midst of an event. It is this eventness (and the anticipatory process of becoming-event) that enlivens the occasion of the here and now. And that temporal immediacy is captured well by Benjamin’s (1968) invocation of Jetztzeit or the “presence of the now” (261). One becoming-event that has been performed around the world is the “whirl.”

The whirl consists of a group of fifteen or more people entering a sweatshop store a few at a time (most often a Wal-Mart, thus the sometimes-used moniker: “Whirl-Mart”) who move empty shopping carts throughout the store. Once all performers are inside and with carts, the participants create a single line of carts that snakes throughout the store, splitting and refiguring as the snake of carts meets up with blocked aisles and shopping customers (which must look like a Busby Berkley dance sequence to the overhead security cameras). During the hour or more of the performance, if asked by management, security, employees, or customers what they are doing, performers respond kindly with “I’m not shopping.” As performers make their rounds, it is the employees who first encounter the becoming-event, then the customers, then management (who begin manically communicating on walkie-talkies), and finally security. When security gets wise, it’s time to return the carts and
exit the store. As ruptural performance, the whirl does not make any specific claim on protesting the many things one could agitate against—sweatshop labor, poor treatment of store employees, predatory business practices, etc.—given that most people present could recite this litany of wrongs. Rather, the whirl enacts the becoming-event of “not shopping,” which in itself can be read as an engagement against over-consumption, Wal-Mart’s imperialism, unfair labor practices, or ecological devastation.

Ruptural Performances Are Confrontational

By confrontational, I don’t necessarily mean aggressive, though they may be that. Rather, ruptural performance emerges, as Benjamin (1968) says

Figure 12.3. The becoming-event of performing the whirl.
of epic theater, when a “stranger is confronted with the situation as with a startling picture” (151). Ruptural performance is thus distinguished from the “revelatory” performance that unmask the hidden truths (though it may also do this). In our age, what Marx called the “secret of the commodity”—that its price masked the alienated labor that produced it—is now exposed. We know, for instance, that many of the products we buy are produced by sweatshop-, child- and slave-labor; but we have developed what Adrian Piper (1996b) calls “ways of averting [our] gaze” (167).

Ruptural performance is thus less a critique of false consciousness, and is more about the experience of the encounter of returning the gaze to that which one avoids in order to maintain acceptance of the inequities of the contemporary social orders. Bruce Wilshire (1982) gets at what I’m talking about when he describes phenomenology as a “systematic effort to unmask the obvious” (11). In fact, this quality is what Michael Fried (1968) complained about as the central quality of Minimal Art: its “stage presence” or “theatricality” where “the work refuses, obstinately, to let him alone—which is to say, it refuses to stop confronting him” (140). And in this way, ruptural performance owes as much to Minimalism as it does to Dada. Ruptural performances, like Minimal Art, are characterized by a “concrete thereness,” that Barbara Rose (2000) holds to be a “literal and emphatic assertion of their own existence” (216). In this way, ruptural performances diverge from Adbusters-style culture jamming that focuses on the play of representation, emphasizing instead the experiential encounter of material presence. The sensorial act of confrontation that ruptural performances enact is itself a fundamental component of the action.

Such a sensuousness of ruptural performance’s mode of confrontation occurred on February 29, 2008, two days before the Russian election that resulted in the victory for Vladimir Putin’s apprentice Dmitry Medvedev, when the Russian “art-anarch-punk gang” (Dolcy 2010, n.p.) Voïna (War) confronted patrons of the Timiryazev Museum of Biology in Moscow with a display of sensual gratification in the form of a “collective fuck action” (www.indymedia.org). Five Russian couples surreptitiously disrobed and proceeded in an extended session of group sex as a bearded man with a top hat and tuxedo held aloft a sign that read, “Fuck for the heir bear cub.” The phrase is a play on Medvedev’s name, which is derived from the Russian word for bear (medved). Though Thomas (2008) described the “stunt” as
a “wry commentary on the handover of power—decried by opponents as undemocratic” (n.p.), it is certainly more than a straightforward piece of political agit-prop. If for no other reason, this can be determined by the wildly divergent interpretations of the act as it has been disseminated on the Internet. Some read it as a critique on the undemocratic qualities of the Russian election (Thomas 2008), some as offering support for the incoming president (existentia_dada 2008), some as animal rights protest in defense of bear cubs (Heer 2008), and some even as a “Crazy Russian Teen Orgy” at teen-orgies.com. But even more than any of these interpretive acts, the event of performance is constituted by the materiality of the confrontation by live bodies in the midst of public sex.

Similarly, in Voina’s “Humiliation of Cop in his Own House” (2008) action days before Medvedev’s inauguration, the group entered a Russian police station, pasted photos of Medvedev throughout the building, formed a human pyramid to recite a poem by Soviet dissident D. A. Prigov, and attempted to serve the officers tea and cake. In this work it is the confrontational act of performing what they call “innovative art-language” within the state-controlled space of the police station that constitutes “vivid political protest art” (Dolcy 2010, n.p.)

Figure 12.4. Voina’s “collective fuck action,” “Fuck for the Bear Cub” (2008) in the Moscow Biological Museum.
Figure 12.5. “Humiliation of Cop in His Own House” (2008): Voina reads poetry from a human pyramid of dissident poetry and serves tea and cake to police.
Ruptural Performances Are Baffling and Confounding

Rather than engaging a pragmatic approach to efficient communication that disables so much political art, ruptural performance is indebted to Mary Overlie’s concept of “doing the unnecessary.” For Overlie (2009), the “unnecessary” action undermines performance’s “efficiencies” (McKenzie 2001) by doing that which is not called for in habitual activity: “In these unnecessary activities the body, senses and objectives leap into alertness because they do not know the routine. The body and the mind are put in a state of high awareness and therefore function with thrilling accuracy stretching performance into extraordinary performance” (Overlie 2009, n.p., under “The Unnecessary”). Thus ruptural performance is paradoxically Minimalist and Maximalist.

Ruptural performance embraces the notion that the political message is sometimes not immediately clear, and instead embodies what Artaud (1958) calls “the poetic state” (122). Rather than the clarity of agit-prop performance’s political messaging, ruptural performance is characterized by “true dreams and not . . . a servile copy of reality.” This “attack on the spectator’s sensibility” (86), Artaud says, is a form of “direct action” (87). As such, it aligns with contemporary activism in the resurgence of neo- Situationists and neo-anarchists like CrimethInc (2004), whose Recipes for Disaster: An Anarchist Cookbook instructs its readers on “direct action” (which they consider to be the “opposite” of “representation” [13]) that “sidesteps regulations, representatives, and authorities” (12). In their advocacy of replacing “representations of sex” with “real sex,” they assert the theatrical dimensions of direct action: “It’s time to stop being spectators and start being actors” (201).

The materiality of direct action and Artaud’s (1958) emphasis on the “immediacy” (123) of the poetic state occur at the “rupture between things and words” (7) and thus conjoin the phenomenological literalism of Minimalism with the willful nonsense of Dada in producing a “concrete expression of the abstract” (64). If Brecht (1964) moves from the spectacle’s “ooh” to Epic Theater’s “Aha!” (Duncombe 2007, 146), then Artaud adds the element of “huh?” Ruptural performance puts the strange back in estrangement. In this way, the rupture is, following Adrian Piper (1996a), “catalytic.” In Piper’s Catalysis series, the work of
art was but a “catalytic agent between myself and the viewer” that creates an “ambiguous situation”:

For Catalysis IV, in which I dressed very conservatively, but stuffed a large white bath towel into the sides of my mouth until my cheeks bulged to about twice their normal size, letting the rest of it hang down my front and riding the bus, subway, and Empire State Building elevator; Catalysis VI, in which I attached helium-filled Mickey Mouse balloons from each of my ears, under my nose, to my two front teeth, and from thin strands

Figure 12.6. Adrian Piper’s *Catalysis IV* (1970), riding a crosstown bus with a towel in her mouth. Performance documentation: 5 silver gelatin print photographs, 16” x 16” (40.6 cm x 40.6 cm). Collection of the Generali Foundation, Vienna. Copyright by Adrian Piper Research Archive Foundation Berlin and Generali Foundation.
of my hair, then walked through Central Park and the lobby of the Plaza Hotel, and rode the subway during morning rush hour. (43)

Piper (1996a) explains that familiar structures of sense-making “prepare the viewer to be catalyzed, thus making actual catalysis impossible” (45). In this way, the work of art/activism can be as Félix Guattari (1995) says an activity of “rupturing sense” (131)—and in its uncategorizability, its uncontainability, and its ungraspability (Mackey 1997, 52), it is no longer easily dismissed as the known object of political performance.

Ruptural Performances Enact Becoming-a-Problem

Ruptural performance seeks to “escape the tyranny of meaning” (185), to use Barthes’s (1977) phrase, and thus resists being easily managed by the spectacle. This unruly, fugitive quality is central to the aesthetics of ruptural performance. And in very particular ways, it points to the fundamental questions about performance activism in the age of crisis. A great deal of scholarship on performance activism focuses on the curative and healing (psychological and social) properties of performance. Perhaps this is due to the role of the important work of Augusto Boal in both theorizing and developing a practice for performance as a mode of social intervention. But the emphasis on celebratory and playful elements of performance activism may obscure the primary and necessary characteristic of performed activism—that it is inconveniencing, disruptive, annoying, and often willfully asshole-ic.

The history of performed activism is replete with actions that are not utopian, charming, or blissful. The precedence for the abrasiveness of contemporary Ruptural performance can be found in the Black Panthers’ occupation of the California State house, Abbie Hoffman’s throwing of money on Wall Street traders, AIDS die-ins on the streets of New York, the Zapatistas marching by the thousands into Mexico City armed with wooden guns, and the Black Brunch protests by #BlackLivesMatter activists who recited at white brunch establishments the names of African American victims of police violence. These performances employ a form of activism that is impolite, and which is considered by some to be the “wrong” form of activism (its obnoxiousness does not take the form of a reasoned argument). Ruptural performance is disruptive to the daily
practices of those who come across the performance, or who are come across by it. Thus, the becoming-event quality of ruptural performance is also a condition of becoming-a-problem—an irritant form of confrontation at the level comprehension and the quietude of one's day. As a form, mode, and practice of culture jamming, ruptural performance embraces the static, feedback, and distortion that disrupts the ear when an audio signal is jammed.

This condition of becoming-a-problem reminds us of the real work that constitutes enacting rupture, and the labor of activism that exceeds such practices of “activism lite” such as Facebook petitions. To make of oneself a problem is to exceed the condition of a rhetorical practice of persuasion, but further to operate as an intruder into the consistency and continuity of others’ quotidian practices. This intrusion, as a refusal of stability of meaning, legibility, and closure, irritates through its fugitive status—its refusal to be pinned down.
And it is this quality that simultaneously makes the Occupy movement both innovative and infuriating. From news magazines to academic monographs, Occupy is taken to task for its unwillingness to “occupy” a clear and cogent political platform. Headlines ask, “What does Occupy want?”—accusing the occupiers of political naiveté for not simply promoting a slate of political initiatives. But it is Occupy’s status as an “open” performance and set of performances that has enabled a flexibility to speak to a diverse assemblage of political practices and social injustices—to engage with inequality at the level of multiplicities and the vast intersecting and reinforcing mechanisms that constitute a performance complex of power.

Ruptural Performance Gives Rise to the Virtuosic Multitude

In the Occupy movement, we can identify a final element of ruptural performance—the virtuosic multitude. Paolo Virno (2003) describes the virtuosic as an activity that (1) finds its fulfillment or purpose in itself and (2) does so in the presence of others (52). It is in the virtuosic—that is, the refusal to reify or objectify oneself into stability—that ruptural performance reinvigorates the publicity of the public sphere, enacting what Virno calls “radical disobedience . . . which casts doubt on the State’s ability to control” (69). The virtuosic multitude enacts the affective charge of presence that moves at the heart of performance. From the durational performance of encampment to the dynamic embodiment of the human microphone, Occupy is a movement that cannot be separated from the condition of bodies moving. What Occupy has to teach us about ruptural performance is that the collectivity of action produces the affective encounter with intensities. For John Protevi, it is the political affect of “active joy” that undergirds the semantic and pragmatic elements of the Occupy movement (Protevi 2011). But Virno’s notion of the virtuosic implies a more particular modality of experience in the “doing as an end unto itself.” Such encounters are what psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (1990) calls “autotelic” and which form the basis for what he names the “optimal experience” or “flow” (67, 3). Flow helps us understand the performative intensity of the virtuosic as the charged affect of the dissolving of self and act.

As flow, ruptural performance constitutes the virtuosic multitude in its enactment. That is to say, in its embodiment, it brings into being the
conditions of possibility for radical disobedience. Thus constituted, the virtuosic multitude can further realize itself through a full diversity of tactics. Ruptural performance need not stand alone in the arsenal of resistance. If, as CrimethInc (2008) puts it in the title of their field manual, we should “Expect Resistance,” then ruptural performance functions to produce resistance that breaks expectations through intensities of radical disobedience and critical intervention.
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NOTES

1 Opovoempé was founded in São Paulo, Brazil, in 2004 by Ana Luiza Leão, Christiane Zuan Esteves, Graziela Mantoanelli, Manuela Afonzo, and Paula Lopez. For more on Opovoempé, see opovoempé.org.

2 The Viewpoints, first conceived by choreographer and theorist Mary Overlie (and revised by theater director Anne Bogart), works to challenge what Overlie calls the hierarchical “Vertical” theatrical system that privileges plot and character over other theatrical elements. Overlie has developed a full reconceptualization of theatrical practice, as well as specific rehearsal procedures, training exercises, and performance strategies to encourage performers and directors to engage on the “Horizontal” (Overlie 2013, 2006, 1999). Each element, or Viewpoint, of the stage is of equal value in its particularity: Space, Shape, Time, Emotion, Movement, and Story. Bogart has broken these down differently into nine aspects under the two general categories of time and space: tempo, duration, kinesthetic response, repetition (elements of time), spatial relation, shape, topography, gesture, and architecture (elements of space) (Bogart and Landau). For a discussion of the politics of Viewpoints in relation to contemporary activism, see my “Dog Sniff Dog: Materialist Poetics and the Politics of ‘the Viewpoints’” (2015).

3 In 2011, Voina members Nadezhda Tolokonnikova, Pyotr Verzilov, and Yekaterina Samutsevich left the group to found the infamous punk rock protest group, Pussy Riot (see Baranchuk, chapter 16 in this volume).