14

Dismantling Road Blocks: Non-Violent Resistance of the Palestinian-Israeli Group 'Combatants for Peace'

Chen Alon

Combatants for Peace is an activist movement founded in 2005 by former fighters, Israeli and Palestinian, determined to abandon the vicious circle of violence. Committed to non-violence, the movement's aim is to put an end to Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories, to stop the Jewish settlement project in the West Bank and to establish a Palestinian state alongside the State of Israel, with East Jerusalem as its capital.[1] This chapter discusses the activities of one of the movement's five regional groups – the theatre group 'Tul Karem-Tel Aviv' – that comprises 15 Palestinians and 15 Israelis and practices a unique form of the Theatre of the Oppressed method.

In recent years, the Theatre of the Oppressed method created by Brazilian director and philosopher Augusto Boal has become one of the most popular and useful types of theatre worldwide. Since its inception during Brazil's military dictatorship of the 1960s, the Theatre of the Oppressed has been part of the field of social and community-based theatre. Its aim was to function among specific homogeneous communities, at the centre of which were the members and groups of society, namely non-actors;[2] the Theatre of the Oppressed has expanded since the 1980s – when Boal's writings were first published in English; today, hundreds of groups practise the Theatre of the Oppressed in many places worldwide. In Israel and Palestine, the practice and research of the Theatre of the Oppressed are still in their infancy. Only a minority of theatre creators and social activists in the region is familiar with the possibilities offered by the Theatre of the Oppressed, its variety of methods and techniques.

Some of the initial rituals of the Combatants for Peace movement, such as the exchange of personal stories and testimonies, were performative. As co-founder of this movement, I found myself the only member familiar with the practices of Theatre of the Oppressed, and most significantly with the function of Joker – not only a theatre director but also facilitator, teacher, political leader, ethnographer and researcher. As such, I believed that the movement could benefit from establishing its own activist theatre group. It was difficult, however, to persuade the Palestinian members that theatre-making can in any way relate to political activism. For them, making theatre with Israelis was perceived as compliance with normalization which they rejected, as engagement in cultural activities in times of struggle, even as collaboration with the oppressor. It took 2 years of cooperative theatre-making and building of mutual trust to establish an awareness of the impact of theatre as a political instrument and even as a non-violent weapon.

One should keep in mind that the present depiction is written with an awareness of the paradoxical telling of one story that is in fact two – Palestinian and Israeli. Furthermore, the violent past experiences of the members of Combatants for Peace and their respective societies dictate the different dynamic readings, interpretations and narratives of the concept 'violence' and of its opposite, 'non-violence'. Different interpretations of violence are part of this polarized process: to this day, Palestinians find it difficult to see the act of throwing stones at Israeli tanks as violence. For them, it is an act of defiance symbolizing the asymmetry of heavily armed oppressor and unarmed, oppressed civilian. To Israelis, it is similarly difficult to perceive the soldier manning the checkpoint as violent. For them, he acts in self-defence. Consequently, there are also two different approaches to the concept of non-violence.

Boal speaks of the cathartic, transformative moment that is unique to the *Theatre of the Oppressed*[3] – a moment in which the 'I' turns into 'we'. Not dissimilar to Victor Turner's concept of *communitas*, this moment normally occurs in a homogeneous community. Our group, however, is polarized. It consists of Palestinians and Israelis who share a vision but have differing affiliations, memories and experiences. We therefore seek three phases of communitas: one for each subgroup, and a third one for the entire, polarized group.

A central and unique feature of non-violent struggle is the fact that the strategy and the tools of the struggle and its aims are identical and not separate. It is important to note that the concept of 'non-violence' is not characterized solely by the absence of violence, but precisely by the fact that it is nearly always one side, the non-violent one, that absorbs the violence of the other, violent side.[4] The reflection and the experience of Combatants for Peace have taught us that non-violence is first and foremost a performance, because its deepest goal

is not to defeat or to win power, but to *show*. In our case this means showing the enemy, the world, a transformative image of power relations, and at the same time showing that this image exists as reality, made of the same social, historical and human matter. Dr Martin Luther King Jr repeatedly argued that the aim of non-violent struggle is not to defeat the adversary, and assuredly not to bring about its downfall and humiliation, but to establish a new and equal justice, stressing equal rights and creating dialogue and a culture of equal rights. The means to achieve this aim must be as pure as the aims of the struggle itself.[5]

The interdisciplinary research field of art and non-violent struggle is surprisingly sparse. Apparently the reason for this is that the field itself, integrating art and activism, also termed by practitioners as 'artivism', has only recently begun to flourish, research of the field developing along with it.[6] One of the pioneers in non-violence research, for example, Gene Sharp, makes only brief mention of the use of the arts, including theatre, in the field of non-violent struggle. There are evident performative elements in Sharp's scheme, in the form of political satire in humorous skits, plays and singing.[7]

From its inception, our activist theatre group has operated under the tension of an inevitable polarity: the need (mostly represented by Palestinians) to present activism and resistance against the occupation, versus the need (mostly represented by Israelis) to construct dialogue and establish trust within the group. This tension has been explained by social psychologists specializing in inter-group relations. The oppressed side is more interested in action in respect to power relations and oppression and their political foundations – collectivization of the discussion. The privileged side generally attempts to direct the discussion to a personal, individual, emotional – 'non-political' – level.[8]

Through direct action: The Shuffa performance

Bearing this principle in mind, and being aware of the urgent need of our Palestinian partners, subjected to close scrutiny and pressure by their surroundings (again, a performative concept), preference was initially given to activism on the ground.

A decision was reached to postpone to a later stage proper theatrical activity, characterized by dialogue and reconciliation. The reasoning was that any direct action would include performative elements that would allow us to reflect on the process as in direct theatre.[9] The group defined its vision as the aspiration

to reach a point where the group's common non-violent struggle would be essentially realized by means of theatre and performance.

In the early phase of theatrical work, it already became clear to the group that the most urgent issue was that of the heaped cinderblocks used to obstruct entrance to the village Shuffa. The group decided on a direct action of dismantling the roadblock, which held the most destructive significance for the Palestinians villagers, as it had turned the road – previously linking the village of Shuffa and the city of Tul Karem – into one accessible exclusively to Israeli settlers and soldiers. This was not the first direct action taken against barriers in the territories, but it was uniquely designed in performative terms. So was the agreement that the shared design of the act following the event would be carried out in a group with theatrical means. This constituted a link in the protracted circular process to which we were obligated – of action and reflection.[10] Among other things, this process enabled examination of the connection between direct actions and different forms of activist theatre that we strove to develop as a shared, polarized, Israeli-Palestinian culture of non-violence.

Planning the action thus included conscious performative elements: first, the choice of stage and action – the space in which it would take place and the specific action it would follow, namely the action as 'a display', presenting the Tul Karem-Tel Aviv group to its 'new audience', most importantly the Palestinian inhabitants of Shuffa; second, the group determined who would be 'the actors on stage' – those who would dismantle the roadblock, Israelis and Palestinians together; and facing them, who would serve as spectators at the performative events: an audience of Palestinians and Israelis who would watch the action but not take active part in it. Moreover, we knew that besides the invited audience, an audience not officially invited was certainly expected – soldiers and settlers. Some members of the group, Israelis only, were assigned as a buffer between the soldiers and the action itself. Their role was to speak a previously written text about the non-violent principles of the group and the fact that its Israeli members were former soldiers. This, done calmly and persuasively, was an attempt to mitigate any violence by the military forces present. Eventually the action, surprising us, took place exactly as planned, right up to dismantling the roadblock, without any resistance by the soldiers and settlers. This was primarily due to the controversial (among the Palestinians) act of unceasing calming talk with the soldiers, and our affirmation that the event involved a non-violent group and non-violent action.

This issue – of either holding dialogue with the army or ignoring it in direct action – remains controversial. We suggested to the Palestinians to set aside the

basic political assumption held by the group, according to which we are all in the same boat – oppressed by the army and not negotiating with it. We were sure that this assumption, in this situation, effectively served those in power. However, the reasons for a dialogue with the army were not solely pragmatic. It seems that both ethically and politically there is no reason for the oppressed to communicate with the oppressor while the boot of the latter remains on the neck of the former. A more complex observation of the situation as a theatrical scene shows that through the dialogue, the soldiers and officers become participants in the action against their will. It even demands them to make moral decisions, allowing for their transformation. Despite the fact that in their helmets and bullet-proof vests they look impervious to transformation, sealed, impenetrable, we insist on seeing the transformational potential within them, their humanity. Through engaging the oppressors in the space of action with a dialogue that subverts the foundations of Boal's homogeneous model – denying any dialogue with the oppressor – we turn them from spectators into spect-actors.[11]

Usually, of course, we fail. In this case too, the success of the action was cut short in the second phase. After dismantling the roadblock, we stopped at the next obstacle with the intention of marching together back to Shuffa along the road that was forbidden to Palestinians. However, as soon as we began to march, the soldiers fired stun grenades immediately followed by rubber-coated bullets at us. Ten participants were injured – half of them Palestinians and half Israelis.

Figure 12 With IDF soldiers becoming spect-actors, 'Tul Karem-Tel Aviv Theatre Group' is performing near the village of Izbat-Tabib in 2013. Photo by Combatants for Peace.

Site-specific invisible theatre and the vision of a utopian space

Boal's first book briefly recounts the Invisible Theatre technique,[12] and his second book, *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*, surveys its technical development in depth.[13] Essentially it consists of the covert mounting of a piece of provocative theatre in a public place, so as to cause discussion and debate among unknowing 'spect-actors'.[14] Boal emphasizes that Invisible Theatre is first and foremost theatre: it is perceived as a play, including actors who play characters and a prearranged text. The chosen subjects for invisible theatre are of utmost importance to the actors and spect-actors. Invisible Theatre is only staged in public spaces that are not defined as theatre spaces, and only to an audience that does not know that it is an audience.[15] 'Invisible theatre is not realism, it is reality.'[16]

In conventional theatre, the consent of the audience and theatre-makers is that the architecture can add and remove meaning in accordance with the needs of the play. The same space can be a fifteenth-century open field or an American kitchen in the 1950s.

In activist theatre, the space is a dimension in itself,[17] and in the polarized model, it is sometimes even the decisive element.

Site-specific theatre is usually dependent on the given space defined by the architecture.[18] In the case of a performative resistance group, site-specific theatre actually depends on the political context, as place is not merely architectural space but also charged with the political significances of the system of power relations that functions on and in it. With an intimate performative process, it often becomes a utopian space, enabling one to experience and imagine a place in which external power relations are cancelled and no longer exist.[19] However, in such cases, neutralizing the power relations from actual reality and leading to their apparent disappearance effectively reaffirms their presence.

The concrete embodiment of polarization in space facilitates mobility and transformation of the individual, the single-nation group and the polarized plenary group. The possibility of imagining and then embodying crossing borders between polarized spaces within the framework of theatrical exercises – in which one can cross the imaginary 'line' and appear next to or inside the opposite group – is charged with performative utopian potential.[20]

Boal contends that the non-violent performative act constitutes trespassing.[21] The fact that non-actors create a theatrical space for themselves challenges the accepted perceptions of 'who is allowed where'. This is a fundamental principle

of the main technique of the Theatre of the Oppressed, Forum Theatre. Its ethics and aesthetics require and transgress an additional border, as it enables the oppressed (the spectators) to go on stage and replace those who have already trespassed (the protagonist/s).

The choice of a liminal space, between two areas – between two roadblocks that separate Area A and Area B,[22] when it is unclear whether we are in Area B or C and the authority is not defined – has led to many conflicts with the army and to several grotesque situations. One of the main elements in oppressed space is the issue of observed and observer – the oppressed are already in strange/alien spaces, controlled through monitoring and surveillance.[23] Similar to hegemonic space, at the roadblock we find ourselves in a space under observation, a fact replete with theatrical implications.[24] The space is undefined, but nonetheless it is a space we have defined as ours. We have gradually developed a type of connection with the area as a performative space. We have chosen to act in the space in which we are being observed by soldiers and military cameras, by settlers and by Shuffa farmers.

Due to the proximity of the military surveillance camera, soldiers constantly approached our gathering. The regular presence and intervention of the soldiers at encounters had different effects on the polarized group. On a fairly regular basis, the following scene ensued: we sat in a circle at the foot of the olive tree, between the two roadblocks. An officer and soldiers arrived, and immediately perceived that Israelis and Palestinians were sitting together. They asked 'Who are you?' We replied, 'Human beings, and who are you?' The officer said, 'I am in charge here, you are forbidden to be here'. We: 'Who is "you" and what is "forbidden"?' and then confusion took over: the officer said 'You are in Area C' and we said 'No, this is Area B'. For 3 years, we had never met a soldier, officer or policeman who could officially define the 50-metre space between the two roadblocks. This fact surprised us, but also helped, enabling us to turn the situation into Invisible Theatre.

Who is in charge? Unidentified power in a blocked area

We did not know ahead of time that the blocked area would serve us as a work space for an extended period of time, but realizing this we began to consolidate different strategies of Invisible Theatre. On the one hand, we inhabited an imaginary space, utopian, from which we sought to achieve a dialogue, equality

and justice; on the other hand, reality itself penetrated into the same space. We chose a strategy that would not allow external interference to cancel the encounter for which we had gathered. Travelling to the Occupied Palestinian Territories, where different laws and borders restrict our presence either individually or as a group, is part of the principle of the non-violent struggle.[25] Our defined aims were to eliminate disruptions, create a protest and confront our internal needs as a polarized group, experiencing external interference in different ways. In other words, one of our aims was to show understanding of and sensitivity to the emotional and political needs of both sides of the polarized group. We asked ourselves how we might protest together by means of theatrical activity against the incursion and trespassing of the army into the intimate lives of the group, while also preserving one of the central principles of Theatre of the Oppressed – making invisible oppression visible.[26]

Our initial tactic against military interference was to sit in a circle and, when we noticed soldiers on patrol, two previously selected Israelis from the group would go and speak to them. The result was positive, as the group's representatives embarrassed and confused the soldiers, and consequently we were never asked to leave the place. Nonetheless, our talking to the soldiers led to feelings of resentment among the Palestinians, despite their appreciation and understanding of the motive – to avoid conflict between them and the army.

Figure 13 Making oppression visible. 'Tul Karem-Tel Aviv Theatre Group' performing near the village of Shuffa in 2009. Photo by Einat Gutman.

They contended that avoiding conflict did not serve the group's aims, but established an element of normalization. They were also concerned about how things might look to Palestinians in the 'audience' of this Invisible Theatre.

In response to the feelings and needs of the Palestinians, and wishing to examine additional modes of action, we initiated responses based on theatrical games and playing. In one encounter, aware that in a matter of minutes the soldiers would show up and disrupt the meeting, I suggested playing 'King of Movements', a game that would warm us up and prepare us – as in Theatre of the Oppressed – for the encounter with the oppressors in reality. Invisible Theatre allowed us to determine the conditions of the situation and create a different reality, imaginary and subversive.[27]

In the 'King of Movements' game, a volunteer leaves the circle and the group decides who will initiate the movements and the sound. When the volunteer returns, the group is to imitate the leader's movements without exposing him/her. The volunteer stands in the centre and tries to detect the focus of changes in movement. When s/he discovers who is 'king', the 'king' goes out and a new leader is chosen, and so on. When the soldiers arrived as expected and asked 'Who is responsible for the group?', we suggested that they join the game and work it out for themselves through the rules of who is the 'king'. They were taken aback and stood aside. Even though the action we practised was only a protest against oppression rather than direct confrontation, it created a new link in the encounter/conflict with the soldiers.

We often chose to ignore the soldiers as a tactic. On one such occasion, as we sat in a circle, the soldiers shouted from the road, 'Who is in charge?', and we did not reply but continued to play our childish games. 'Hello, I'm talking to you,' shouted the patrol commander. We did not reply. The soldiers joined their officer and asked 'Who is in charge of the group?' We remained silent and continued to ignore them. The soldiers noticed the Israelis in the group, and realizing they were not authorized to deal with Israelis in that situation, summoned a civilian police patrol car. The policeman who arrived immediately entered the circle and aggressively asked in Hebrew and Arabic, 'Who is responsible for this group?' Again, we did not answer. The policeman stood confounded, wondering what to do. Suddenly shots were heard – first the sound of a single shot and then a volley. The atmosphere became charged as everyone tried to discern the source of fire. Only after a few seconds, as the embarrassed policeman took his mobile phone out of his uniform pocket and the sound of shots as its ringtone became evident, was that 'source of fire' revealed. In the

ensuing silence, he answered the call, his voice greatly lowered and, while he was leaving the circle, the group burst into laughter, giving new meaning to the concept of comic relief, resonating Boal's definition of catharsis in Theatre of the Oppressed. The written situation that included gathering in the space and deliberately ignored those representing the powers that be also included the policeman as a spect-actor, interacting in the Invisible Theatre – writing, directing and playing his own role.

Utopia displaced: An experience outside Palestine or Israel

The performative principle operating in the space of the action can be compared to a certain extent to some avant-garde artistic processes, such as Happenings. Boal relates to the concept of a Happening when he defines Invisible Theatre, while emphasizing that it differs from Happening and guerrilla theatre.[28] Francis Babbage contends that Boal needed to distance himself from the new and experimental theatre phenomena of the 1960s to which he was exposed in the United States. Babbage explains that the reason for this distancing was his strong nationalist sentiment in the time of struggle against dictatorship. Those years led him to stress the authentic Brazilian culture of the Theatre of the Oppressed.[29] Susan Lacy – a performance artist who, in the early 1970s, engaged in social issues by means of place-dependent community performances with local residents – connects Theatre of the Oppressed and performance art. Lacy asserts that they are connected not only in their temporal proximity, but also in their aesthetic and thematic similarity. Lacy compares Kaprow's demand to add to art the possibility of concealing from the audience the fact of its being a spectator or present at a work of art, with the principles that Boal outlines for Theatre of the Oppressed in general, and Invisible Theatre in particular.[30] To support this claim, she cites a relatively early statement by Boal: 'If you make any change within the theatre – a theatre that has a proscenium, a stage, an arena, or a combined version of stages – this is but reformism, you are not really changing anything. We believe that you can go any place and make theatre.'[31]

Elsewhere, Boal clarifies that he also considers Happening and guerrilla theatre to largely preserve the old theatrical patterns.[32] Lacy contends that these types of performance allow artists to embody different characters (personae) concomitantly – the experiencing, the reporting, the analysing and the activist.[33]

Lacy bases this on her contention that 'man is political', in the sense of an unbroken line of artistic experiencing that embodies the journey from the personal to the public.[34] In connection with this theory, linking between Theatre of the Oppressed and theories of performance art, one should comprehend the events of the polarized group in spaces that are obviously not theatre performances venues.

Two principles combine to define these events as polarized invisible Happenings: space and time that are neither Israel nor Palestine, undefined areas – occur beyond the space and time of the conflict, beyond its signs and representations.

In the year 2009, the group was invited to Ireland and England. This visit to a space that was neutral for the two groups allowed performative and theatrical events that were not possible in the conflict zone. The Irish and British hosts functioned as part of the event, but their presence was that of observers. (Customarily at a Happening there are several degrees of participation). The local audience experienced the event neither as life nor as a work of art, but as an intermediate experience in between.[35] The sense was one of space and time detached from reality for a while, and the event created and presented conciliation, tranquillity and harmony, an experience detached from reality and concomitantly constituting the concrete reality of the polarized group.

Finding new territories to exchange identities: The example of a football game

Schechner, following Geertz and his reading of different human behaviours as symbolic acts,[36] claims that a tight link exists between performance, ritual (religious or other) and sports. The difficulty in separating the shared components in these fields raises the question what differentiates them, and leads the observer to discern the functions they serve, the place in which they occur and the social circumstances of their existence.[37] Moreover, the expected behavioural codes of both their active participants, the actors and the spectators at the event, differ and therefore provide different experiences to everything concerning the event.[38]

Towards the end of the group's intensive journey in Ireland, aiming mainly to deepen the internal theatrical process, the group decided to take a break and go to the beach at Donegal in western Ireland. It was a short distance from the work space. The spontaneous arrangement for all the group members included a football game that divided the members into teams, set up goalposts and

meticulously followed the score. Despite the fun and leisure framework, a sports game ostensibly devoid of importance, the question arose how to divide the group. One of the participants suggested Palestinians against Israelis, another suggested mixed teams ('We're Israelis and Palestinians here, but also men and women, and that's a more significant factor where football is concerned'), and then a suggestion was made and unanimously accepted – to integrate: we would play in mixed teams – Palestinian-Israeli and men-women – but each group would be defined in advance as a national group. In other words, there was an unconscious desire in the group not to disconnect completely from the reality of the conflict, to continue to imagine ourselves within our national framework. The mixed team, through the football game, displayed nationalism by imaginary means, representations and symbols: for all those present – spectators and players – it was agreed (as in theatre) that the game being played was between Israel and Palestine. The entire process was accompanied by quips and laughter, jeers and jokes, as well as cheers of encouragement and booing inspired by and related to reality. The irony and the laughter continued even after the game, when 'Israel' beat 'Palestine' to a 7:3 score, mainly due to the fact that none of the Israelis scored even one goal, which were all scored by Palestinian players. The latter taunted the Israelis (as part of the imaginary reality that establishes mutual relations with the reality of the dispute): 'You're not players, you were just statistics, we could have played without you'; while the Israelis replied: 'What does it matter? Whatever you do, in the end Israel wins . . .' It seemed as though the Irish and British watching us didn't really understand us. It was once again cathartic to laugh, let go, roll around until we could hardly stop, Palestinians and Israelis, caught up in the way in which reality, game and performance had all intertwined.

32 Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Postdramatisches Theatre* [post-dramatic Theatre]. Frankfurt/Main: Verlag der Autoren, 1999; see Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*, trans. and with an introduction by Karen Jürs-Munby. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

33 Post-structuralism was formulated as label by American academics to denote the heterogeneous works of a prominent French and some American intellectuals in the 1960s and '70s (Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, Judith Butler, and Julia Kristeva) closely related to postmodernism. See Jacques Derrida, *Grammatologie*, 1983, *Dissemination*, 1995; Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacres et Simulation*, 1981; see also: Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History?*, see Richard Schechner, *The End of Humanism*, 1982.

34 Hans-Thies Lehmann 1999, Ibid., pp. 30–1.

35 Ibid., p. 31.

36 Ibid., pp. 466–9.

37 Das politische Schreiben. Essays zu Theatretexten. (2002), Hans-Thies Lehmann, see Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Das Politische Schreiben* [Writing the Political]. Theatre der Zeit, Recherchen 12, Berlin 2002, p. 12.

38 Guy Debord, Kommentare, II, *Die Gesellschaft des Spektakels*. Berlin 1986 [La Société du Spectakel].

39 Ibid., pp. 14–15.

40 Ibid., p. 19.

41 Ibid., pp. 16–17.

42 (35) Ibid., p. 15, quote by György Lukács (1885–1971).

43 Jan Deck, in 'Politisch Theatre machen', in *Politisch Theatre machen*, Hrsg. Jan Deck und Angelika Sieburg, transcript Verlag, 2011; S. 11–28, S. 11/14. See Nikolaus Müller-Schöll, André Schallenberg, and Mayte Zimmermann, *Performing Politics*, Politisch Kunst machen nach dem 20. Jahrhundert, transcript Verlag, Bielefeld, 2012, pp. 7 and 136, pp. 136–48.

44 Jan Deck, in 'Politisch Theatre machen', Eine Einleitung, II. Künstlerische Strategien, in: *Politisch Theatre machen*, Hrsg. Jan Deck und Angelika Sieburg, transcript Verlag, 2011; S. 11–28, S. 14.

45 Ibid., p. 26.

46 See Ernst Bloch *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* (3 vols.: 1938–47), *The Principle of Hope*, MIT Press, 1986.

47 See Lehmann 1999, p. 459; see also Lehmann 2002, p. 13.

48 See *Performing Politics*, 2012, Ibid.; see Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Das Politische Schreiben*, Ibid., p. 13.

Chapter 13

1 As recounted by Simon Critchley, 'The Stone', *New York Times*, 2 January 2011, http:is/opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/01/02/stoned/.

2 The two archival photographs are from the WWI collection of the Photothèque of the BDIC-Musée d'histoire contemporaine. Musée des Invalides, Paris, France.

3 Susan Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003.

4 René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977, p. 36.

5 Smadar Lavie, Kirin Narayan and Renato Rosaldo (eds), 'Ritual, Violence, and Creativity', *Creativity/Anthropology*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993, p. 303.

6 Richard Schechner, *The future of ritual: Writings on Culture and Performance*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993, p. 256.

7 Samuel Hynes, *The Soldier's Tale, Bearing Witness to Modern War*. New York: Viking, 1997.

8 Ian Maxwell, 'The Ritualization of Performance (Studies)', in Graham St John (ed.), *Victor Turner and Contemporary Cultural Performance*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2008, pp. 59–60.

9 Maxwell, Ibid., 60.

10 This exhilarating word is British author Salman Rushdie's, as he describes his own response to the Iranian *fatwa* declared on his life. 'I decided', he coolly remarked to a packed New York audience overseen by scores of police, 'to treat it with an ignoral'.

11 Johannes Fabian, *Anthropology With an Attitude: Critical Essays*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001, p. 4.

12 Clifford Geertz, *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988; p. 113.

13 Don Handleman, 'Why ritual in its own right? How so?' *Social Analysis*, Vol. 48, No. 2 (Summer 2004), pp. 1–32.

14 Handleman, Ibid., 16–17.

15 Elias Canetti, *Crowds and Power*, trans. Carol Stewart. London: Phoenix Press, 2000 [1960].

16 Richard Schechner, 'Living a Double Consciousness', in Catherine Bell (ed.), *Teaching Ritual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, p. 25.

17 John Keegan, *A History of Warfare*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993, p. xvi.

Chapter 14

1 Combatants for Peace website: http://cfpeace.org/?page_id=2

2 Augusto Boal, *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*, trans. A. Jackson. London: Routledge, 1992, pp. 1–5.

3   Augusto Boal, *The Rainbow of Desire*, trans. A. Jackson. London: Routledge, 1995, pp. 72–3.

4   Ronald B. Adler and Neil Towne, *Looking Out/Looking In: Interpersonal Communication*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1999.

5   Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., *Strength to Love*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

6   Jan Cohen-Cruz, *Radical Street Performance: An International Anthology*. London: Routledge, 1998; Toby Emert and Ellie Friedland (eds), *Come Closer: Critical Perspectives on Theatre of the Oppressed*. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.

7   Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Non-Violence*. Boston: Porter Sargent Publisher, Boston, 1973, pp. 148–52.

8   Ramzi Suleiman, 'The Planned Encounter as a Microcosm: Psychosocial Perspectives', in R. Halabi (ed.), *Israeli and Palestinian Identities in Dialogue: The School for Peace Approach*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2000, pp. 31–47.

9   Richard Schechner, 'The Street is the Stage', *The Future of Ritual: Writing on Culture and Performance*. New York: Routledge, 1993, p. 86.

10 Sanjoy Ganguly, *Jana Sanskriti: Forum Theatre and Democracy in India*. New York: Routledge, 2010, pp. 88–9.

11 The term *spectator-actor* was coined by Boal in his first book *Theatre of the Oppressed* in which he discusses for the first time the concept of 'Forum Theatre', pp. 139–42. In Boal's second book, *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*, Adrian Jackson writes in the translator's introduction that 'spect-actor' is a Boal coinage to describe a member of the audience who takes part in the action in any way; the spect-actor is an active spectator, p. xxvi.

12 Augusto Boal, *Theatre of the Oppressed*, trans. Charles A. McBride and Maria Odilia Leal McBride. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1979, pp. 143–7.

13 Augusto Boal, *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*, trans. A. Jackson. London: Routledge, 1992, pp. 277–88.

14 Ibid., p. 241.

15 The spaces that Boal notes as suitable for invisible theatre are streets, railway stations, ferries, restaurants, etc. Ibid., p. 277.

16 Ibid., p. 286.

17 Jill Dolan, *Utopia in Performance: Finding Hope at the Theatre*. Ann Aarbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005; Baz Kershaw, *The Radical in Performance: From Brecht to Baudrillard*. London: Routledge, 1999; Jan Cohen-Cruz, *Radical Street Performance: An International Anthology*. London: Routledge, 1998.

18 Fiona Wilkie, 'Mapping the Terrain: A Survey of Site-Specific Performance in Britain', *New Theatre Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 70 (2002), pp. 140–60.

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

20 Ibid.

21 Augusto Boal, 'Preface: The Unruly Protagonist', in *Theater of the Oppressed*, New Edition. London: Pluto Press, 2000, p. xxii.

22 In accordance with the Oslo Agreement, Area A is under Palestinian civil and security control, Area B is under Palestinian civil control and Israeli security control and Area C is under Israeli civil and security control. See: Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov (ed.), *The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: From a Peace Process to a Violent Confrontation: 2000–2005*. Jerusalem: Institute for Israel Studies, 2005. [Hebrew].

23 Giorgio Agamben, *State of Exception*, trans. Kevin Attell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

24 Sonja Kuftinec and Chen Alon, 'Prose and Cons: Theatrical Encounters with Students and Prisoners in Ma'asiyahu, Israel', *Research in Drama Education*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (2007), pp. 275–91.

25 Gene Sharp, *Non-Violent Resistance*, trans. Y. Amit. Jerusalem: Mifras Publishing House, 1984; p. 145. [Hebrew]

26 Augusto Boal, *Theatre of the Oppressed*, trans. Charles A. McBride and Maria Odilia Leal McBride. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1979.

27 Augusto Boal, *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*, trans. A. Jackson. London: Routledge, 1992, p. 277.

28 Augusto Boal, *Theatre of the Oppressed*, trans. Charles A. McBride and Maria Odilia Leal McBride. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1979, p. 147.

29 Frances Babbage, *Augusto Boal*. New-York: Routledge, 2004, p. 21.

30 Suzanne Lacy, 'Activism in Feminist Performance Art', in Jan Cohen-Cruz and Mady Schutzman (eds), *A Boal Companion: Dialogue on Theatre and Cultural Politics*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006, p. 93.

31 C. B. Driskell, 'An Interview with Augusto Boal', *Latin American Theatre Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (1975), p. 75.

32 Augusto Boal, *Theatre of the Oppressed*, trans. Charles A. McBride and Maria Odilia Leal McBride. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1979, p. 147.

33 Suzanne Lacy, 'Debated Territory: Toward a Critical Language of Public Art', in Suzanne Lacy (ed.), *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Seattle: Bay Press, 1995, p. 174.

34 Ibid.

35 Victor Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre; The Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982.

36 Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, trans. Y. Meisler. Tel Aviv: Keter Publishing House, 1990 [1973]. [Hebrew]

37 Richard Schechner, *Performance Studies; An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2002, p. 26.

38 Ibid.

Performance Studies in Motion

International Perspectives and Practices in the Twenty-First Century

Edited by
Atay Citron, Sharon Aronson-Lehavi
and David Zerbib