
International Symposium of *Estudis Escènics*

I'm Playing! Formats, Devices and Apparatuses of Interaction (in Relational Theatre)

Institut del Teatre, 13, 14 and 15 October 2020

Rapporteurship by
Verónica NAVAS RAMÍREZ

Table of contents

Preliminary note

DAY 1. 13 October 2020

Institutional welcome

by Magda PUYO (Director General of the Institut del Teatre) and Carles BATLLE (Director of Cultural Services)

Presentation of the Symposium

by representatives of the Organising Committee

Conceptual framework. Óscar CORNAGO and Roberto FRATINI

Ludic-theatrical devices. Jordi FONDEVILA and Constanza BLANCO

Lecture. Jordi CLARAMONTE

Why All Aesthetics Is Relational and Why What Bourriaud Calls Relational Aesthetics Stinks?

Lecture. Manuel DELGADO

Life is Pure Theatre. Truth and Pretence at the Level of Relational Interaction

Ludic-theatrical device. Marc VILLANUEVA and Gerard VALVERDE

El candidato (o candidata)

Ludic-theatrical device. Clara TENA, Mar MEDINA and Aimar PÉREZ GALÍ SUSANA

Lecture. Anxo ABUÍN

Immersive Theatres. Rototaza's Autoteatro

Lecture. Paulo Antonio GATICA COTE

Theatre in Times of Pandemic: Social Distancing as an Aesthetic Category

Lecture. Christina SCHMUTZ

Playing with the Devices Vol. 2 – The Utopia of an Understanding

Roundtable

by Stefan KAEGI, Mónica RIKIĆ and Roger BERNAT,
led by Constanza BLANCO

DAY 2. 14 October 2020

Gran Casino IT (*speed dating*).

Presentation and ludic-theatrical devices:

MOS MAIORUM | *Turba*

Judith PUJOL | **An active participation in the process of dramaturgical creation of the performance**

Verónica NAVAS RAMÍREZ | *La Ciudad*

MAMBO PROJECT | *Iaia*

LAST | ***Tiranès Banderes. The construction of a symbol as a performance***

Paula PASCUAL DE LA TORRE | **Protocols of intimacy: programming and craftsmanship of the immersive theatre experience**

Laura CLOS, 'Closca', Pau MASALÓ, Xesca SALVÀ and Marc VILLANUEVA MIR | **Prospective Actions (Catalunya 2004-2018)**

Ludic-theatrical device. SOCIETAT DOCTOR ALONSO

El Desenterrador. Mètode per a l'excavació de paraules

Ludic-theatrical device. NYAMNYAM

A quatre potes

Debate on the ludic-theatrical devices presented

led by Roberto FRATINI and AGOST PRODUCCIONS

DAY 3. 15 October 2020

Presentation. David PÉREZ

The Live Museum: From Mausoleum to Theme Part

Ludic-theatrical device. ERRO GRUPO

Jogadouro

Ludic-theatrical device. La Farinera

Farinera, et guanyaràs el pa amb la suor del teu front

Conclusions

by Roberto FRATINI, Óscar CORNAGO, Constanza BLANCO, Carles BATLLE and Verónica NAVAS

Verónica NAVAS RAMÍREZ

Preliminary note

This a report full of holes and voids, but also of squares.

A priori, the choice of this format is due to the will to leave a written account in chronological order of “what happened” during the three days of October 2020 in the symposium *I'm playing!*, the third of the journal *Estudis Escènics*. It features a whole spectrum, ranging from the most recorded transcription to the summarised document and the periphrasis, the imprint, the trace or the mark.

Nevertheless, if you continue reading, you will soon realise that “one thing are the ideas and another what happens.” The jumping dynamic of *I'm playing!*, with simultaneous events (for the sake of the programme) or overlapped events (for contingency), meant, for participants, a choice: yes or no. The situated reading of these pages involves dialoguing with the person writing this article, who participated in the symposium in three different ways: as a rapporteur, a lecturer, and, always and above all, a spectator.

This explains why the documentary nature of this report is eclectic and can be understood as a non-ruled guide — or a summary of twenty thousand words — to be read in issue 46 of the journal of the Institut del Teatre. Some of the holes or events that have not been recorded here can be covered with articles that the authors of the lectures, presentations or devices have contributed to the journal, although perhaps deviated (or corrected, or nuanced) in relation to what was heard and seen in October 2020 in the venues of the Auditorium, the Teatre Estudi or on the streets of Montjuïc (from the Atrium of the Institute to the Teatre Grec). Anyone who had the privilege to be there then and of reading the issue now will possibly resort to memory to apply criteria or rigour and faithfulness concerning the event and its record. And this is how it must be.

Moreover, here you will find small “squares”, tentative formatted encyclopaedic openings as footnotes with the aim of contextually framing the enunciation of the symposium and those who participated in it, and also of broadening the referents contributed. This, along with all the foregoing, provides to the whole of the last issue of the journal a logic of hypertext — ergo, relational — completely coherent with the focus of the symposium.



DAY 1. 13 October 2020¹

Institutional welcome

by Magda PUYO (Director General of the Institut del Teatre)
and Carles BATLLE (Director of Cultural Services)²

Teatre Estudi, 13/10/2020, 9.30 am

The Director General of the Institut del Teatre³ Magda Puyo highlights that since 1957 the journal *Estudis Escènics*,⁴ despite a time hiatus, has been devoted to reflection. Moreover, three years ago it began organising an international symposium like this one.⁵ In terms of the focus of the symposium, Puyo notes that the meeting, closeness and socio-political and economic resistance would be the common features of relational art, the poetics of interaction and so on. When the human experience is the “project”, there is no room for passive spectators, she claims.

Moreover, and in relation to the circumstances (it is the first autumn of the pandemic),⁶ Puyo stresses, on the one hand, “contradiction” as the essence of the symposium, which strengthens, if possible, the need to exist; and, on the other, she outlines the irony of the situation experienced and how art can overcome negative inertias previously acquired. For these reasons, and before giving the floor to Carles Batlle, she recalls the words of Nicolas Bourriaud: “It seems more pressing to invent possible relations with our neighbours in the present than to put our faith in happier tomorrows.”⁷

1. The videos of some of the symposium events can be consulted at the Arxiu Audiovisual de les Arts Escèniques de Catalunya (AAAEC). Provided the video is available, it will be linked to a referenced footnote after the title of the event. This rapporteurship is an abridged, referenced and written version of the contents of the symposium. For an exhaustive panoramic view of this event, we recommend consulting the visual source.

2. Video: http://aaaec.institutdelteatre.cat/media_objects/avalon:2094.

3. Henceforth, IT.

4. That of 2020 will be number 45 of this journal. Further information at <http://estudisescenics.institutdelteatre.cat/index.php/ees/index>.

5. Always held in autumn, the two previous symposia were *Theatre and City. Pre-Existing Scenographies* (2018) and *I Am Contemporary! Strindberg and Today's Theatre* (2019).

6. On the dates of the symposium, Catalonia is subject to the restrictions provided for in Resolution SLT/2546/2020 of the Official Gazette of the Government of Catalonia (DOGC). Some of the measures that are tightened with the aim of enabling “the decrease of social interactions, both in public and private spaces” are: the limitation of the seating capacity in cinemas and sports venues at 50%, regardless of their size and physical characteristics; the limitation to six people in family or social meetings; the cancellation of activity in games rooms, casinos and bingos; the maintenance of catering activity through, exclusively, delivery or take away services from the establishment by appointment, and so on. All the aforementioned cases are included within the 18 special public health measures to contain the COVID-19 epidemic outbreak, which stress “individual commitment and a cautious and self-protection social behaviour.” Source: DOGC <https://dogc.gencat.cat/ca/document-del-dogc/?documentId=884110> [Last accessed: December 2020].

7. BOURRIAUD, Nicholas. *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon: Les presses du réel, 2002, p. 54.

For his part, Batlle, Director of Cultural Services, briefly reviews the symposium with a first reference to the playful component of the title (*I'm Playing!*). The holding of the event and the contents addressed and which derived from it will nourish the journal of the next year, focused on research, creativity and contemporary creation. Batlle highlights the “irony” of this year pandemic situation in relation to the thematic choice of the symposium — “relational aesthetics” and the protocols applied to theatre — as well as the “onsite presence”, the age of resistance that the symposium team “has wanted to maintain against the elements.” Those responsible for organising it through videoconferences during the lockdown⁸ are Carles Batlle Jordà (IT, Barcelona), Anxo Abuín González (Universidad de Santiago de Compostela), Constanza Blanco (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona / Institut del Teatre), André Carreira (Universidad del Estado de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Brazil), Óscar Cornago (Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas [CSIC]), Jordi Fondevila (IT) and Roberto Fratini (IT).⁹

Batlle ends by pointing out that *Estudis Escènics* is an academic journal that brings together written material but that the symposium it organises will have the same spirit as the issue it deals with through the holding of a series of activities, dynamics, debates and structures different from the usual ones and that include (among others), roundtables (structured as games) or speed dating (Gran Casino IT) of presentations and ludic-theatrical devices in different indoor and outdoor venues.



8. The Spanish government declared the state of emergency on 14 March 2020. One of the direct consequences is the limitation of freedom of movement of people (Article 7. Provision 3692 of the Spanish Official Gazette [BOE] no. 67 of 2020, <<https://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2020/03/14/pdfs/BOE-A-2020-3692.pdf>>), resulting, among other measures, in home lockdown. This limitation was gradually relaxed from 2 May of that same year with an asymmetric easing throughout Spain. From that date, citizens were permitted, among others, to go on the street with time limitations to walk or exercise.

9. Organisation of the third international symposium of the journal *Estudis Escènics* (Organising Committee and Scientific Committee): <<https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/organitzaci%C3%B3>>

Presentation of the Symposium

by representatives of the Organising Committee

Conceptual framework. Óscar CORNAGO and Roberto FRATINI

Ludic-theatrical devices. Jordi FONDEVILA and Constanza BLANCO

Teatre Estudi, 13/10/2020, 9.40 am

Conceptual framework. Óscar Cornago and Roberto Fratini

Óscar Cornago, who had to be onsite, has been unable to leave Madrid, where he lives, because of the COVID-19 mobility restrictions and participates via Zoom. In this way, those attending the first session can to listen to Cornago and see him on the front wall of the Teatre Estudi, a kind of “involuntary” screen provided by the auditorium’s architecture. They will soon see Cornago and the slides that he will share to illustrate his presentation

Óscar Cornago opens the conceptual framework in accordance with the ideas and methodologies that have inspired the symposium co-organising group. Before continuing, however, he suggests reciting a “brief mantra (for the symposium and for life)” inspired by John Cage and asks those attending to join in. Cornago moves his image from the screen and shows us the sentence, recites it and encourages us to recite it with him. “One thing are the ideas and another what happens.” When what happens, he continues, does not match what happens, saying the mantra not only “fills the body” but now has a comforting, *celebratory*, purpose. (The researcher will always keep in mind an audience that he does not see, given that the webcam in the Teatre Estudi focuses on the lecturers’ table rather than the audience.) With a critical sense of humour, he notes: “I don’t know if you have done it or not. You don’t have to do the first thing someone tells you through a screen.”

After the collective mantra (recited by some of the people present, but not all), Cornago speaks of the *Basic Programme of the Bureau of Unitary Urbanism*,¹⁰ by Attila Kotanyi and Raoul Vaneigem (published in 1961 in issue 6 of the *Internationale Situationniste*), and he highlights the notion of non-participation in the urban environment. Fifty years later,¹¹ he recalls, *TIME* has chosen us a person of the year, but not in the era of the body, but in that of the screen and the social media, and this is how the American magazine welcomes the new world, *your world*, as the cover says (Cornago shares it with us). It is, he comments, about a world of offers to participate in everything and at the same time. Like those present, he says, “public works that choose to participate.”

The cover is related to Pierre Bourdieu’s *Raisons pratiques. Sur la théorie de l'action*, published in 1994 and that speaks of the exploitation of the

10. Available in Spanish at: <<https://sindominio.net/ash/isoseixanta5.html>>, retrieved from *Internacional situacionista, vol. I: La realización del arte*. Madrid: Literatura Gris (Traficantes de Sueños), 1999. [Last accessed: December 2020].

11. 2006 <<http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,20061225,00.html>> [Last accessed: December 2020].

environment through the resources to make it sustainable and live better, and about the economy of the means to open habitable, uncertain, spaces, where we can move, faced with the economy of results, which is what had existed until then. It was in the 1990s when this way of research was established as a form of art, of generation of knowledge faced with a practical and sensitive form. Cornago complements it with the written sentence in figure 1: “Bordieu defines practical reason by the capacity of exploiting the immediate resources of the environment, the ‘potentialities inscribed in the body of agents and in the structure of the situations in which they act or, more precisely, in the relations between them’ (1994).”

Since the 1990s, he continues, the institutions have realised that theory begins from practice. Thus, with the institutionalisation the means become the end, so that they have to be rethought, which is a problem. Moreover, Cornago notes, the theory formulated from the other side of art is interlinked and this is an *a priori* good but has the risk of the colonising power to impose a phantasmagorical and devouring relation about art.

Óscar Cornago then draws an “impossible” history (based on the notion of a one-way linear story) of the fields of experience but possible (understood as a past, present or future possible), and he does so by consulting it in three main “oracles”:

“Oracle no. 1” is determined by the two diagrams of the previous slide, which relate to Black Mountain College,¹² “the American Bauhaus under the shelter of the German one,” in Cornago’s words. The example of Fuller helps him to demonstrate the role of the university, which saw the arts as ways of research, of doing things “in another way”. The two structures shown do not have a fixed use, which the researcher relates to the museisation of the *performance* and the mainstream commercialisation of art.

In the case of “Oracle no. 2”, Cornago returns to situationism — a story of successions in search of coherence, he argues, with the arts as a form of political or social intervention — and also recalls Guy Debord, co-founder of the Internationale Situationniste, and the French philosopher’s awareness of “the capacity of history to put an end to practices.” Debord is the author of *The Society of the Spectacle* (1957), where he develops, among other issues, the notion of “social spectacle”, with the audience as an element integrated into the work, into the everyday space, and the problem derived from the spectacularisation of the non-spectacular.

When it is the turn of the third oracle, which has a *decolonial* and gender nature, Cornago takes the opportunity to point out that the focus of the symposium is participation, although in the opening session there are no women. He then places himself in Argentina, in Buenos Aires, with the introduction of the happening and the use that the Lacanian Óscar Masotta and other artists made of it, focused on “imports” as a museum artefact, mainly not in the version of body and exhibition, but on the opportunities offered by the space; in other words, the “museum of happening”, “actions aimed at causing something else.” Cornago explains that the happening within the

12. USA, 1933-1957. Further information at: <https://www.blackmountaincollege.org/about/>.

museum is common, but Masotta used it with the objective of reaching beyond the “work”, as Dora García reinterpreted in 2015 in *El helicóptero*.¹³ According to this, Masotta’s objective was to make visible the workers of the sugar industry by using the art spaces as places of confrontation “with the outside, which what exists.”

This is how Cornago wishes to approach the symposium: as a three-day activity in which everyone will be an actant in a theoretical-practical dramaturgy, aware that what is important is not the product but the provocation beyond the performance space; the least visible participation, the common space, the physical confrontation with “what is burning here”, because “there will fires,” he states. This is how he suggests, on the third day, a table of conclusions that tells of the “fires and bonfires (more or less unproductive)” experienced.

And he ends by reciting the sentence “And what is burning here?”,¹⁴ which, along with the audience, he will repeat three times as invocations or mantras, to confront ourselves with it.

* * *

For his part, Roberto Fratini begins by stating that “*I'm Playing!*” is a desire prior to the pandemic and a “pleasant conspiracy in captivity between March and June.”

We are living in a context, he continues, in which everybody is performing¹⁵ in an existential script marked by protocols that limit us, as they do not leave room to risk or are determined by a magic axiom that prevents any form of transmission. This is how the symposium was born out of the demand for what quantum physics calls *observables*, the current praxis.

The dramaturgical paradigm traced, Fratini notes, is practice as a form of immanent connection with what is happening. The game board that Debord produced during his final years¹⁶ summarised premises and paradoxes of situationism. The summary of these paradoxes in art would be transferred to the objective of overcoming the *bina*rity of theory and praxis as unfaithful and mutual theories.

Fratini believes in the antagonism between “taumaturgy” (which dominates our era) and dramaturgy, and in the need to be able to confront “so much taumaturgy” with a rogue notion of dramaturgy. For this reason, the form of the symposium embodies these two principles: mobilisation of conspiracy thought and a lot of *incidentiality* articulated in “different degrees of turbulence”.

13. Those devoted to Masotta are the first and third chapters of a wider documentary project. One of the excerpts of the film, shot at Tabakalera - Centro Internacional de Cultura Contemporánea (San Sebastian), is a happening called *El helicóptero*, under the same name of the one Masotta created in 1966. One of the special features of *El helicóptero*, as a collective event, is that audience and actors are the same. Dora García explains this in “Dora García. El helicóptero”: <https://vimeo.com/152147995> (Tabakalera Vimeo channel) [Last accessed: December 2020]. Further information on the Masotta’s performative side in “Y Masotta cometió un ‘happening’”: https://elpais.com/cultura/2017/10/09/babelia/1507542025_086590.html (Babelia, 17/10/2017). [Last accessed: December 2020].

14. “¿Y aquí qué está ardiendo?” in the original in Spanish.

15. In the original in Spanish he uses the first person plural.

16. *Le Jeu de la guerre* ('A Game of War'), 1965.

This is how the speed dating Gran Casino IT (programmed for the second day of the symposium) is built around the evolution of the meaning of the word *casino* (from club of noblemen to brothel, confusion or beehive),¹⁷ with the aim of “playing in different tables”. The symposium, beyond the notion of “participatory theatre” and all Bourriaud’s principles,¹⁸ does not waive participation as an end, but rather pursues the creation of a framework in which it is intervened by specific gestures.

In this way, he continues, participation does not aim at turning spectators into performers but into “what they are”, and should not be understood as a framework of guarantee of the community but as a design of a shared artefact and a role design. Coexistence would be achieved through the artefact and would therefore be an “artificial” coexistence.

As for the relation of those attending the symposium and the event itself, Fratini advocates overcoming the terms *poetic* and *aesthetic relativity* within the systems of relations and interaction, specified in the desire for participants to make the event their own. It would be a tergiversation or an expanded notion of the concept of postdramatic theatre: the Organising Committee sees risk and game as a substance of a dramaturgy displaced by the programming, both for those who design it and those who renegotiate the rules of the game (where it is necessary to differentiate between *apparatus* and *device*). Thus, it becomes necessary to have an organic vision of dramaturgy based on overcoming the concept of *programmatic*, and move towards viralization, “the artist-programme that uninstalls the existing programmes.”

In the conceptualisation of the symposium we find an “encyclopaedic park of terms”, from “autoteatro” to participatory theatre (full of connotation and prejudice). The board game and other board forms of playful interaction have an outstanding place; as does the concept *board* as a framework of active knowledge based on the displacement of elements and the possibility of reorganisation, as the French philosopher George Didi-Huberman understands it, Fratini recalls; or the “board of interactions and conflicts” which, for the anthropologist Manuel Delgado, is “the lie of the city”. The symposium will also include dramaturgies and designs of interactive frameworks.

Precisely, interaction and mediation have been, as Fratini points out, the focus of curatorship. The organisers believe they have inherited types knowledge of a dramaturgical nature; or, rather, dramaturgy as an organisation based on dissidence, in the line of the artistic action group Sabotaje Contra el Capital Pasándoselo Pipa (SCCPP).¹⁹

Ludic-theatrical devices. Jordi Fondevila and Constanza Blanco

Constanza Blanco tells us what the Organising and Curatorial Committee understand by “ludic device”. The unlimited and expansive quality of contemporary theatre is embodied in the vast range of relations between audience

17. *Berenjenal* in the original in Spanish (which in the original sense means ‘field of aubergines’ but has the meaning of ‘mess’). Reference to the etymological evolution of the meaning of the word in Italian, Fratini’s mother language.

18. Nicolas Bourriaud, the author of *Esthétique relationnelle* (1998), previously referenced.

19. Further information at: <https://sindominio.net/fiambrera/scpp/index.htm> [Last accessed: December 2020].

and play. Contemporary theatre is the most complex system of relations and, to define it, we need (linguistic) digital resources such as programming, re-setting, systematising, device, artefact, link and development phase. In the framework, Blanco places as key elements both the combination and multiplication of possibilities such as approaching the phenomenon from observation rather than opinion or judgement.

The artist and co-organiser of the symposium emphasises the role that the audience has had in “opening towards the possibility of a co-creative meeting in real time,” in the need for a new way of conceiving a creation layer by layer. Thus, she wonders which aesthetic parameters a piece should have to be considered relation or device. Would these be agreements or rather disagreements, controversies?

Beyond this, and resorting to the concept of Michel Foucault's²⁰ *device* and later Giorgio Agamben's *apparatus*, Blanco sees the symposium as a system of relations that will shape an experience in which those attending decide how the action develops. This involves producing a dramaturgy in which the user designs the experience and in which the challenge is, however, both a stable and flexible system in the unpredictable. It is precisely in the capacity to foresee everything that cannot be foreseen that the ludic event takes on greater value to remove the audience from centuries of passivity. To this end, the ludic-theatrical devices will be essential.

* * *

Jordi Fondevila recalls his professional beginnings in the field of the performing arts, with the “naive idea of changing the world,” an idea which over the years it has been confirmed is complex and has become an obsession, despite being aware that it was a self-attributed responsibility, not his own.

Fondevila speaks of “future” from the recurrent obsessions, he points out, to know which would be the 21st century performing arts and their role, and believes that the revision and reformulation of the immersive experience will be paramount, because of the maximum responsibility of the forms in the world that is being reshaped, marked, for the time being, by a “strong dehumanising agent.” The theatre director and professor at the IT wonders: “Where is everything that makes us human in essence? What will enable us to return to the essence of everything that links us with *this*? What are the contexts of reconnection with ourselves? How to form part of the world? What is the way of communal reflection? Which button should we press to turn the performing arts into drivers of transformation, humanising spaces to manage to recover the common feeling of sharing life and objectives, and where do we see the other as an ally rather than an enemy)?”

He finds the solution in “sitting again in a circle”, a very important step from his point of view.

The greatest responsibility of the 21st century live arts, he argues, will be to activate the live channels of reflection, to achieve humanising spaces, because it is where the strength of the craft lies and from where it is necessary

^{20.} Roberto Fratini will also mention him in the concluding session of the last day. Christina Schmutz will explore the concept in depth in the presentation “Playing with the Devices Vol. 2 — The Utopia of an Understanding”.

to build. Thus, he emphasises the link between live art, conscious proactive behaviour and immersive experience in relation to co-authorship as a path to be followed and shaped together. He ends with the question of which new performing art the world that is being shaped now will need and which responsibility it will take. To end, he questions in which framework the piece develops in the absence or ritual or pre-conception: from the crisis of the immersive experience, humanising arts and its transformative power.



Lecture. Jordi CLARAMONTE

Why All Aesthetics Is Relational and Why What Bourriaud Calls Relational Aesthetics Stinks?²¹

Teatre Estudi, 13/10/2020, 10.45 am

Relational thought is the one Aristotle unfolds in his Poetics by explaining catharsis as a relationship between core and denouement. Or Marx's in Capital when he grants a key role to the relationship – often conflictive – between forces of production and modes of production.

Relational thought is what we need to understand to what extent the most varied artistic projects can only have a political effectiveness and capacity for transformation by being loyal to themselves and their internal need.²²

Roberto Fratini introduces the lecture by Jordi Claramonte, a philosopher specialised in modal aesthetics, who he considers a representative of the “ideal profile of a synergy between reflection and action” or of the “action between artistic and political self-organisation”, and anticipates the content of the lecture defining it as a discussion of the real and self-fictional framework, or an anthropological discussion of the relation.

Claramonte starts by pointing out the etymological coincidence between the words *theory* and *theatre*, which in ancient Greece alluded to the action of “seeing” from some distance (although Greeks also had other words to define theatre and, specifically, its actions and practices, such as *drama*). On the blackboard there are three words in capital letter written in chalk: from top to bottom, RELATIONAL, COLLABORATIVE, COMPLEX.

Theatre or *theory* and *drama* are, therefore, contradictory and complementary principles both in artistic practice and in theories, and more or less active according to the modes. Claramonte will focus on the conceptual “hug” and the understanding of collaboration.

In relation to the story of the Internacionale Situationniste during the 1960s, previously mentioned by Cornago, the philosopher recalls the holding of the Second Vatican Council, where ten years before (1959) mass was established as “participatory theatre” (until then the clergy said it mostly in Latin and behind a curtain or with their back to the parishioners). Claramonte argues that it is necessary to revise these antecedents of theatricality in such a “Catholic and sentimental” country as Spain.

Next, he develops the concepts on the blackboard.

21. Video: <http://aaaec.institutdelteatre.cat/media_objects/avalon:2095>.

22. Summary of the lecture. Source: symposium website: <https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/jordi-claramonte_cat>.

Relational	Collaborative ·	Complex
<p>Present in all artistic practices. Claramonte recalls the philosopher Santayana²³ and his idea of art as a “cooperation of pleasures that do not let any of them to be established and take hold of all the field”, and this is how the aesthetic phenomenon emerges.</p> <p>To speak of the “relation” of relational aesthetics, it is necessary to be situated, he states. With reference to Cornago’s speech, he recalls that “the ideas are the ideas” but emerge from places, from bodies. This is how, he argues, relational aesthetics is built as cooperation of pleasures that have emerged in a situated landscape, as it provides something that was not there before. And, based on this, he asks himself: “Who uses the ideas and why? Who places them? Who makes decisions?” In this context, there will always be a character of departure and return.</p>	<p>According to Claramonte, it only takes place when we work in a situated context that enables this situation to be addressed: the “articulation” will only be so if the agents (artistic, social, political...) who participate maintain the functions. Therefore, the articulation cannot be rigid but is necessarily social. Moreover, the abyss between <i>organisation</i> and <i>artist</i> vanishes (for instance, expressed in the blurring of the difference of wages). In order to ensure social articulation, the “differential” must disappear: if the articulation does not situate “you” among peers, it is not so. And it must also be political. “Like in a paella,” Claramonte recalls, there must be many things.</p>	<p>Complementarity and collaborative are inherent to all that is expressed. He recovers the ideas of social sciences, botanic or biology; the relation with the relation itself and with contrariety. In this respect, in the words of the philosopher Nicolai Hartmann,²⁴ he recalls that “everything that exists is a complex” (people, social systems, systems of interaction and productions).</p> <p>To continue speaking about it he draws on the idea of <i>strata</i>, because, despite their connotation of rigidity, of order, they define conditions of possibility which are prior to and inherent in artwork, for example in music the timbre (with material sonority), rhythm (time, beating, duration, link with the organic), melody (which enables memory and the establishment of threads) or harmony.</p> <p>Although the avant-garde has been, he argues, “master of beheading”, it would be necessary reconsidering the matter basis of what we do, and which becomes clear in times of collapse. Paraphrasing Cornago again, Claramonte states that “what happens is not something else, and something else is what happens,” in other words, the base is not seen until it feels threatened; today (in a pandemic context), by the biosphere and everything inorganic (with enough strength to “end with everything” if it is exercised during enough time). Moreover, it is necessary to consider the organic, “the bodies that come into play and must work so that the psychical event is relevant.” Finally, the adjectivised social appears.</p> <p>Claramonte also attaches value to the body, which situates and has to do with the recognition of animalism and co-dependency, and the biosphere.</p>

Next, Jordi Claramonte sets out the idea that we must try not to reduce philosophy to the poetic commentary of the justification of one’s own decisions, but to have a broader thought, and it is here where he located modal aesthetics.

The philosopher draws on concepts such as Lorenz’s attractor or anamema to illustrate the cooperation of complex elements as a dialogue between what is gravitational (centripetal, decanted, landed) and what is radiational (centrifugal, experimental). If we made an attractor of the evolution of the situation of art since situationism, Claramonte notes that we would see an alternation, for political-social reasons, of immersive and repellent moments. To understand it, he suggests visualisations or diagrams such as Lorenz’s attractor, precisely because it has two logics: centrifugal and centripetal (as in the case of flamenco repertoire, which does not exist *per se*, but responds to these logics). Thus *repertoire* would equal *stability*. While Aristotelian Athens speaks of *power* and *act* to define the change, Claramonte prefers the philosophical system of Megara (neighbouring city), built on the modal city, which embraced the contradiction through four relative modes: necessary, contingent, possible and impossible. In the centre there would be the effective and the ineffective; in other words, what happens, inseparable from the ideas, which can also be reportorial (as part of a shared

23. George Santayana, 1863-1952. Quotation not found.

24. 1882-1950. Quotation not found.

language). This is how Aristotle brings together novelty and combination to shape theatre.

To the previous elements, Claramonte adds the term *dispositional*: talents, crafts, abilities... He considers that we play on a given repertoire, but “what happens” happens on the return trip. And he ends by recalling Samuel Beckett, who “skirted round the limit of his own arrangement”, in the play *Waiting for Godot*,²⁵ but that, like James Joyce’ *Finnegans Wake*,²⁶ he asks for a knowledge of the repertoire to be written.

A dignified aesthetic culture must combine and ride between the “cores” of arrangement and repertoire, Claramonte argues. The anthropological power of the outcome will lie in what the “toolbox” enables. A good repertoire, he ends, “reveals things that one did not know, although, in order to avoid limiting oneself to this and becoming *sclerotised* we need expansion and access to the risk.”



25. *En attendant Godot*, written in French in the late 1940s and published in the early 1950s.

26. Published in 1939.

Lecture. Manuel DELGADO

Life is Pure Theatre. Truth and Pretence at the Level of Relational Interaction²⁷

Teatre Estudi, 13/10/2020, 10.45 am

From a certain relational perspective — such as Erving Goffman's microsociology — face-to-face interaction is conceived as a social circumstance during which individuals show their acceptance of the norms of mutual acceptability. The relations established are subject to a game of adaptive transformations that enables us to accommodate the meanings to a criterion which is never of truth but of verisimilitude. In this perspective, the issue of the “real” identity of the subject and, therefore, the possibility of sincerity do not fit. The truth is not presented here as a quality immanent to a self that ensures and guarantees the possibility of communicating it to the others, but as an attribute conferred on the individual by an audience that plays in the actuality of the situational context. The person, then, is no longer an entity half-hidden behind the events, but a mere formula to behave appropriately.²⁸

The anthropologist Manuel Delgado starts the lecture by recalling that in the film *Charade*,²⁹ the character of Cary Grant exhibits different personalities and, until he does not assert himself as a good man, Audrey Hepburn's character doubts who he really is. This is the question that Delgado contributes: we cannot know what people think, or what they are thinking right now. And, beyond, is it important? Because, he argues, we cannot complicate our life with sincerity.

Delgado continues the lecture by mentioning the sociologist Erving Goffman, a photo of whom is projected on the screen. Goffman, closely linked to the University of Chicago, of relational tradition, is known, among other research, for the situated study of microsociology in the 1959 book *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*,³⁰ where he explores among other elements an environment such as that of the boarding school (where someone may be included permanently and stigmatised). This leads Delgado to the definition of “situation” as an entity of its own merit to be considered from the social event, with a life of its own that can be vivisected (in analytical and material understanding terms as a relation), in which the objectivity lies in the relation between things (in the tradition of structural linguistics). Nothing can be thought if it is not in relation to something.

27. Video: <http://aaaec.institutdelteatre.cat/media_objects/avalon:2096>.

28. Summary of the lecture. Source: symposium website:
<https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/manuel-delgado_cat>.

29. *Charade*, film directed by Stanley Donen in 1963 starring Cary Grant and Audrey Hepburn.

30. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 1959.

This is how we say something relative to what we have inside and that is shared with others; speaking from the inside, Delgado continues, is a fiction, because the inside is the result of a communicational event, and the subject is the result of the relation. Hence everyone grants mutual credit in gestures, words and extraversions of personal truth.

Microsociology sets out the presumption of frankness as a fundamental requisite. Delgado wonders if it should be questioned. Otherwise, what are situated perspectives?

Delgado does not suggest any approach to reality other than in social terms (therefore, he discards psychology). He wonders why individuals should ritualise the actions of the others and notes the concern for repetition.

The ultimate end of our values, he considers, is “to give a good impression, to save face and cope with situations”. He links it, referring again to the film *Charade*, to the fundamental principle of the relational approach: the forced relations between individuals based on simulacrum, double agents, trackers, and so on. In this context, Erving Goffman is interested in the “crumbs of the social”, in Delgado’s words, where we find fundamental information. In the day-to-day observation we discover the non-existence of a social order as a guide of the institutions or prompter, but individuals find themselves in the paradox and with the warning that they have to keep at bay an imminent outburst, because at any moment something can happen and the change is very easy. Fanaticism, Delgado believes, is what always prevents the unsettling of the public and social order (always precarious, by the way).

Two samples of the aforementioned would be, from the social point of view, “the art of giving explanations, of knowing how to behave” (for example, during a game consisting of drinking, it would be allowed to say silly things, but not to later throw up in the taxi). Moreover, in the field of fiction, sitcoms would exemplify the maintenance of a permanent waterline at risk of being surpassed, but there is a request for predictability.

And thus comes the definition of *situation* as “a negotiation, on the fly, of what the hell is happening.” At a moment when we are all masks (in reference to Santayana), what interacts? There is always a physical and time demarcation that needs to be taken care of, with the corresponding penalty and rites of reparation if it is crossed.

However, “holes” are also created among us, which enables Delgado to return to the concept of sincerity and introduce that of *imbecile*, described as whoever plays at being sincere and saying what they think (like someone who does not laugh at a joke because he does not find it funny, despite the convention). Otherwise, an imbecile would be whoever does not understand the game. What is socially requested, in contrast, is “to look good, to come up to scratch”. And what would be needed otherwise are the aforementioned rites of reparation: demanding apologies, convincing the other that we have not done what we have done, or that something has prevented us from being ourselves (because we were angry, sad or drunk, for instance). Because, he argues, better to apologise than to ask for permission. But, what is the game? “What are you playing at?” he asks us.

In this game, all the details betray (oneself and the rest) and the situation must be defined: appropriate framework, participants and roles, prior structure and of each meeting, stipulation of meaning... In short, an operational consensus or agreement with "the real" and, consequently, with what would be an infringement.

Delgado refers to *Etnografías extraordinarias: gentes, espíritus y asombros en Salto, Uruguay*, by Sibila Vigna Vilches,³¹ in which the anthropologist writes an epilogue on the social life of ghosts and on questions such as when and where they manifest themselves, the wait, the expectation or the daily notion of the term. The ghost, as an "apparition" in front of the audience, would be the apotheosis of the speech unfolded. By extension, all the characters would be actors (and there would be no difference between the terms).

Everything is related to Goffman's microsociology and the symbolic interactionism of George Herbert Mead, creator of the concept of self, understood as what one is: the way everybody thinks of themselves based on what others see. This is how the subject perceives himself or herself. Examples derive from it such as the search of evidence to know if the audience is listening or not (the *amen* in gospel masses, for instance). Therefore, the self is a "comedy"; like poker, a game in which everybody must guess what the other holds. Delgado argues that interaction consists of this; communication informs us about this: the transmission of truth is a manoeuvre based on the strategy focused on how the other wants us to appear.

Delgado ends the lecture with the words of Canetti,³² for whom we are only the masks, what the others see (and all they fear there may be behind). But behind the mask there is nothing, he points out, except a corporeal mass that tries to be loved, although it never deserves this love.



31. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2020. Delgado also highlights its prologue, written by William A. Christian Jr.

32. 1905-1944. Writer. Reference not found.

Ludic-theatrical device. Marc VILLANUEVA and Gerard VALVERDE

El candidato (o candidata)

Teatre Estudi, 13/10/2020, 12.30 pm

1969. In the troubled context in the aftermath of May 1968, L'Impensé Radical, an anarchist bookshop specialising in mostly unknown strategy games, opened its doors in Paris. Its aim is unique: to manage to decipher, through games, the mechanisms of the political power and domination practices. Fifty years later, El candidato (o candidata) recovers one of the board games produced by L'Impensé and invites you to a performative game in which spectators become players and representatives of a political party and part of an immersive device. El candidato (o candidata) proposes a ludic situation as a reflection on the mechanisms of production and perpetuation of power.³³

,

33. Information on the theatrical device. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/el-candidat_cat.

Ludic-theatrical device. Clara TENA, Mar MEDINA and Aimar PÉREZ GALÍ

SUSANA

Teatre Estudi, 13/10/2020, 4.30 pm

SUSANA is a board game. There is something preeminent in how we formulate a discourse that sometimes hinders the task of thinking freely. This game seeks to dodge it. SUSANA is a way of “lowering” the ideas and mixing them. It is a tool to start to speak of things that we had not considered yet. SUSANA is a game that can be downloaded and built free of charge at: <www.susana.club>.

SUSANA is a way of generating knowledge by talking, not through a learnt knowledge and a pre-conceptualised theory. It would be a kind of teacher-free maieutics or that displaces the teacher in the figure of the cards. The main issue remains at the core and based on it each participant in the game is a source of resources for dialogue.³⁴



34. Information about the theatrical device. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/susana_cat.

Lecture. Anxo ABUÍN

Immersive Theatres. Rototaza's Autoteatro

Auditorium, 13/10/2020, 4.30 pm

Within the current experience of de-spectacularisation of the theatrical and the performative, and of inclusion of intermediality in its more interactive sense, we must assess as particularly interesting the work developed since 1998 by the company Rototaza (Ant Hampton and Silvia Mercuriali) based on the concept of "autoteatro". The aim would be to approach pieces such as The Quiet Volume or Etiquette by challenging the idea of the social body of the study of the role of the non-spectator in these kinds of practices, located within the sphere of the global networks that fit in intimate and unconventional spaces.³⁵

,

35. Information on the lecture. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/anxo-abu%C3%ADn_cat.

Lecture. Paulo Antonio GATICA COTE

Theatre in Times of Pandemic: Social Distancing as an Aesthetic Category

Auditorium, 13/10/2020, 5 pm

Lockdown has fostered the extimacy and rewarded a series of more or less “community” initiatives. Balconies, linked “at first sight” or recorded and shared through the mobile phone in real time, have been resignified as spaces of participation in collective rituals and practices. Specifically, in this symposium the lecturer suggests reflection on the performance and relational aesthetics in a post-lockdown (and possible re-lockdown) situation; in other words, subject to medical-judicial logics such as social distancing or other protocols of hygienic and “responsible” behaviour”.³⁶



^{36.} Information on the lecture. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/paulo-gatica_cat.

Lecture. Christina SCHMUTZ

Playing with the Devices Vol. 2 – The Utopia of an Understanding

Auditorium, 13/10/2020, 5.30 pm

Linking with Michel Foucault, in recent years the elements of theatre have increasingly been analysed as devices; in other words, as the crystallisation of architectural discourses, regulatory decisions, laws, and scientific, moral and philanthropic doctrines. The concept of device points to the analysis of power relations in the cultural field (and to the possibility of its aesthetic subversion).

*The game with hybrid speech manners raises the utopia of an understanding in the theatrical devices. It is related to the physical part of the text material, to a “music of the meaning”, to a gesture which is not at the service of a representation of the characters of their individual expression. Then, a situation of common experience may emerge that constitutes a relational space among all those present and represents a paradigm of democratic social communication. As Michel de Certeau would say, “what happens if we play with the devices?” In other words, are the strategies of the powerful – i.e., the powerful laws of theatre – subverted by agile and mobile tactics?*³⁷



37. Information about the lecture. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/christina-schmutz_cat.

Roundtable

with Stefan KAEGI, Mónica RIKIĆ and Roger BERNAT,
led by Constanza BLANCO³⁸

Teatre Estudi, 13/10/2020, 6.15 pm

Mónica Rikić, Roger Bernat and Constanza Blanco are there while Stefan Kaegi (Rimini Protokoll) participates by Zoom from Geneva. We will see him projected on the same wall on which we saw Cornago in the morning.

The roundtable will have a dynamic of questions characteristic of a board game. It will be a “joint” experience, as Constanza Blanco explains, but the arrangement of the room (audience on the tiers, guests on the stage) and neither will the perspective. Moreover, the only webcam that enables Kaegi to see what is happening in the room will be pointed at the guests, located on the stage. Moreover, the absence of Kaegi’s body will be replaced by that of a spectator, who will act as a medium.

Roger Bernat points out that the rules are explained during the game. However, Constanza Blanco gives some basic guidelines before starting. Each participant (on the stage) has some chips with which they can attack, question, interrupt or defend themselves. The order of play, which will be always the same, is established by a throw of the dice, with Paula in Kaegi’s place. The last key and catalysing element of the dynamic will be a “question tombola”, a box with different numbered balls which include questions aimed at the guests, previously formulated by an audience (different from the audience in the room). Blanco also invites the audience in the room to participate. The time limitation of each guest to answer the questions will be 90 seconds, but it will be possible to add half a minute in the case of using one of the cards also given. After each guest answers, the others can, through the chips, attack, question or interrupt what their companion has said.

The dynamic of the roundtable is recovered based on some of the questions and answers formulated.

38. Video of the roundtable: http://aaaec.institutdelteatre.cat/media_objects/avalon:2099.

Question	Channel	Answers	Answer ³⁹
No. 15: What is your relationship with the programmers? Do you know if they understand your proposals?	Question tombola	Roger Bernat	They are the mediators between the artistic overproduction of the world and the limited number of audience, and they channel needs.
No. 1: Why are you called "father" of robots? Why are you interested in AI?	Question tombola (nominal question)	Mónica Rikić	Answer to the first part of question 1: It is the title of a project and a friend of mine called it like this. Answer to the second part of question 2: In the human condition of the machine, but what most interests me is the social impact on our lives. The approach of Western society to the non-human other always takes place from an upper stance, but, for the first time, the robot is placed as a peer or superior.
No. 12: Is there a premise or a reflection prior to the dramaturgy of a relational or interactive theatre?	Question tombola	Stefan Kaegi	We always work unilaterally. What is the role of the spectator within the game, then? "Going down to the stage", make the communication path more horizontal. This, which today is common sense, is running the risk of not respecting any form of performance. In this emblematic case, it is interesting to ask about the role of each spectator (who can occupy a conflictive place, like someone working in firearms trafficking). ⁴⁰
No. 4: How to generate meaning in life? Is game a metaphor of life?	Question tombola	Mónica Rikić	There are many ways of living and playing. The game is the core of my practice, as practice is of my life, so the answer is yes. The game strategies can help us live different lives or distance ourselves to get closer to it.
		Stefan Kaegi	In relation to [Theodor] Adorno, ⁴¹ remember that the game shows that reality is not all, as it constructs a world with all the characteristics of reality; thus, the world we validate might be different. ⁴² We should teach us to stop living unsatisfactorily.
No. 13: What is the most enjoyed artistic experience during the lockdown?	Question tombola	Roger Bernat	Rescuing books from the library at home. Reading is a feeling that I had not had for a long time (something shared by many, I guess).
Have you presented your work outside Europe? Has it been received in countries where it was not as common?	Roger Bernat answers from the table to the other two guests	Stefan Kaegi	Yes; in Cairo we had to negotiate with censorship, which wanted to approve what the actors on stage could or couldn't do (for example, they couldn't play dominos). Or in the United States, where terms like finger or arse are not considered family-friendly. Kaegi is interested in what can and can't be done in the different societies, and this not only involves looking at totalitarian countries.
No. 10: Where is the line that separates art from technology? Does it exist?	Question tombola	Mónica Rikić	They meet when they are both used or when they are used instead of the other (art used as technology or vice versa). I think the line is completely subjective. The point of art with technology is that it must not be strictly productive: it enables us to imagine new uses and imaginaries that involve it. So, there is freedom of play with meanings and utilities.

39. In contrast to most of the texts of the rapporteur, some of the answers included here, because of direct or summarised transcription of the originals, use the first person of singular.

40. With reference to *Situation Rooms* (2013), a piece by Rimini Protokoll, the company of which Kaegi forms part.

41. 1903-1969.

42. Reference not found.

Approximately half an hour after beginning, Roger Bernat says that he feels violated by the game rules, which do not include everyone (audience). He feels that the game “soils” them and he wants to stop playing. Blanco suggests, therefore, changing the *tempos* so that they can expand their outlook. She also suggests introducing the questions of social media (most in the tombola come from there). With an audience, Bernat argues, where there is no “la crème de la crème of the thought of the Peninsula” (a sentence that awakens mass laughter), it is possible to take the dynamic towards a more interesting place, where everybody can play and not only be spectators and, at the same time, the anonymity of the questions of the social media is left behind.

Kaegi takes the opportunity to ask for a change in the direction of the web-cam (from the stage towards the tier/audience), arranges his space (which has gradually darkened as night approaches) and puts on some headphones.

The following table brings together some of the questions asked later by the audience, to whom they were addressed, and the answers formulated:

Question	To whom	Answer
Why did you leave architecture? (Question asked to Bernat by a former professor of architecture.)	Roger Bernat	Paul Valéry speaks of architecture as an enveloping and immersive game in which one must move around, and the arts of theatre and music as something in which people remain still in the seat. ⁴³ He is interested in the place in which the construction takes places in time, not in space.
They ask about childhood games.	Roger Bernat	He does not remember the game, but he does remember that he played with a ZX Spectrum, his first technological device.
What did you play at when you were a child?	Roger Bernat	He recalls that the filmmaker Lars von Trier says that he works in cinema to be able to play as an adult to all those games children did not want to play. ⁴⁴ Theatre leads him to the idea of solitude, and he feels more alone when surrounded by people. He asks himself what his/their place is amidst “these kilometric distances”.
When do you work with AI you only work with robots?	Mónica Rikić	Robots are the personification of AI, but not all must necessarily be androids. “Robot” is, mainly, an intelligent artificial entity.
What do you think that it has not been done? What is necessary to foster in the field of relational and immersive theatre? What does it concern us and we work with? (Question formulated to the three.)	Stefan Kaegi	Individualisation (masses is a synonym of danger); technology, which takes on the role of enabling or providing simultaneous though not combined multitude devices; a new distribution of the space (not in the proscenium manner); to move towards nature.
	Mónica Rikić	She believes that the most immersive reality that exists is theatre (provided virtual reality glasses are ignored). Not everything can be replaced by virtual reality; therefore, let us be fewer, but let's be more present. To cross experiences that are always different, purely virtual and in the first place, video games are naturally interactive and digital, and they must be seen as a medium of artistic expression <i>per se</i> .
	Roger Bernat	He has no idea where it is heading or where he is heading. The screen now represents the world and he has already developed two online projects, but he is lacking the bodies. For inspiration he always ends up looking at “things from the past”.

43. Reference not found. David Pérez will also cite the author the third day of the symposium, in the presentation “The Live Museum: From Mausoleum to Theme Park”.

44. Reference not found.

Question	To whom	Answer
Theatre has to do with a community as it addresses diverse people. In this respect, is there a crisis of the common space? How has the pandemic changed theatre and where is it taking it? (Question asked to all three.)	Mónica Rikić	The common is the homogenous, hatred of difference. They have destroyed culture, leaving the dominant companies of the collective imaginary (Netflix, Spotify, etc.). Faced with this, culture has the responsibility to open new ways and to contribute. Thus, she hopes new less dystopian imaginaries will emerge.
	Roger Bernat	The theatre of the last few decades is pathetic, moralising and thoughtful, unable to affect where the pandemic has put us. We have built a world in which we are unable to be together or leave a place for those who die. In line with what Kaegi said earlier, hope is occupied by vacant spaces. Theatre must be open while the audience chooses.
	Stefan Kaegi	He wonders about theatre as an insurgent place for anti-pandemic. Theatres still have the same departments to carry out their current duties, and they need to reinvent their structure. But they must be inclusive as occupants of the public place. If they don't, the media won't.
The newspaper <i>The Guardian</i>⁴⁵ says that the Arctic ice melts seventy years ahead of the predictions, with the consequent influence on the rise of the Atlantic, desertification, etc. How does this affect them as creators? Does the set of climatic and environmental circumstances affect the concept of culture? How? The questioner explains that he does not do so out of "wise humanism", but out of concern for the scale of the future. (Question to all three.)	Roger Bernat	He opposes "catechetical spectacles" on desertification or any other subject.
	Mónica Rikić	Critical spaces for reflection are needed to escape the apocalypse
	Stefan Kaegi	He chooses to focus on the development of his "performative telepresence." He wonders where his body has gone and why perhaps if "the body" channelled what he meant, he would do better than "the screen". [Paula, designated as a "medium", has left the stage at a half-way through the roundtable.]
Where is the pleasure of transgression in a game without rules?	Roger Bernat	In the possibility of reformulating them, not of abiding by them.
In a scenario of general obsession with the best, the extent of success, the culture of effectiveness and efficiency, what do you think is Divine Mercy? (Question to all three.)	Stefan Kaegi	Would the concept point to the play on words: the mercy of those who are broken or those who look at them?
Given the non-answer (or confused answers) of the guests, the person questioning says that they have heard about the concept some time. Rikić asks for clarification.		
	Roger Bernat	He recovers the contradiction noted by Kaegi (the Divinity of our time is not exactly merciful).
The person asking encourages the guests to become familiar with the concept (not only linked to Christianity) in order to understand much of what is happening now and "leave the matrix."		
Roberto Fratini, in the audience, refers to some of the comments. He considers that COVID-19 and its metanarrative have been "providential" for a part of the political class and the economic interests. "Common" and "communal", as well as "participatory theatre", do not greatly interest Fratini. In this respect, a very common "COVID format" was the choir, understood from the impolitical community (single body which could not be questioned). But politics happens in a community and in the public event, like theatre. The future requires reconstructing the public sphere (the concept of "public" which is now given by default), and theatre will recover its dignity when the urgency is greater than the positive in COVID.		

Constanza Blanco ends the session revealing that the boycott of the game exercised by Bernat was envisaged within the dynamic, as well as the fact that she was responsible for some of the questions of the tombola. Blanco comes from the Latin American context, in which, she notes, the supposedly overcome Elizabethan stage is still a reality.



45. The person asking makes reference to an article published by the English newspaper that same day. DICKIE, G. "The Arctic is in a death spiral. How much longer will it exist?". *The Guardian* (13 October 2020) <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/ng-interactive/2020/oct/13/arctic-ice-melting-climate-change-global-warming>>.

DAY 2. 14 October 2020

Gran Casino IT (speed dating)

MOS MAIORUM

Turba

Auditorium, 14/10/2020

Mos Maiorum is a theatre group from Barcelona specialising in documentary and protest theatre that aims to place the spectator within the performance situation using immersive formats. In this way, contrary to what happens with the viewing of an audiovisual documentary, the spectator becomes an experiential and empathetic witness to what is being explained.

After extensive documentary and anthropological research on the subject, Mos Maiorum regularly uses the verbatim technique. Verbatim is a theatrical technique that creates a dramaturgy from interviews and sound recordings that the performers reproduce as faithfully as possible, with all their pauses, stresses, imperfections and nuances, creating an effect of veracity that blurs the actor and transports the testimonies of the recordings directly to the scene.⁴⁶

Ireneu Tranis, member of Mos Maiorum, along with Alba Valldaura and Mariona Naudín will be in charge of the presentation. This time, in the first line of the stage, there is a line on the floor that Tranis points to the audience and that delimits the distance between her and the audience.

The company has the same name as its first piece (2016), set around the Spanish/European Southern border. With the performance space, they then recreated a “borderline feeling”. The performers passed through the audience with tripods of light, which illuminated them and at the same time got them to move.

Mos Maiorum defines their performance practice as “immersive documentary theatre that uses the verbatim technique”. In this technique, the voice of the speaker reaches the performers through headphones. Tranis, therefore, speaks of headphones to support the “metaphor of the medium”, which she defines as the journey of her body through other people and other moments.

The group focuses on the creation of a piece in phases: 1) selection of a theme, 2) anthropological and sociological work, 3) sound interviews, and

46. Summary of the paper. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/mos-maiorum_cat?authuser=0.
More information about the company on their website: <https://es.mosmaiorum.info/>.

4) creation of the piece itself. Regarding the company's pieces, Tranis highlights some constants: the presence of the audience within the performance space; the documentary genre approached from "first-person" experimentation, with a direct spectator-character dialogue through the witnesses, and the rational understanding of the body. The company sees theatre as a place to think, to put issues in the public sphere and to be there. For Mariona Naudín, says Tranis, the company's wish is to make a "naked and raw" documentary theatre; to convey, in the least biased way possible, what they have picked up from the places they have travelled and are talking about. For her, she continues, it would be to understand the subject in the most intimate and humane way possible.

The company's second piece, *Gentry* (2018),⁴⁷ explores the theme of gentrification. *Turba*, the latest creation (premiered at the Festival Temporada Alta 2020), has been motivated by the group's concern about the rise of populism and the protests against the sentencing of the Catalan independence process in the autumn of 2019.⁴⁸ Hence the focus on the mass movements, "an effervescent state in which anything is possible." On the other hand, says Tranis, the pandemic has highlighted the revolution and the need for bodies. But at this point, the question is: has the revolution been mythologised?

Finally, to end the session, she proposes a verbatim practice. She asks three volunteers to choose an interview on YouTube with a public figure that interests them. She then asks that they try to hear only his voice and that everyone simply reproduces what they hear: "Don't try to say what he says," says Tranis, "but sound the way it sounds." The speaker added that they should try not to "add" gestures.

Time is running out and only one of the three planned practices can be done. The person doing it asks if, in addition to listening to the video, they can watch it.⁴⁹ From the tier, a kind of séance is being attended, with a practitioner who attempts to experience a verbatim, but which could be read in the performative key of possession.



47. Winning project of the Premi Adrià Gual 2017 of the Institut del Teatre.

48. The *Turba* research process began in 2019, before the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

49. The rapporteur did not note down Ireneu Tranis' response.

Gran Casino IT (speed dating)

Judith PUJOL

An active participation in the process of dramaturgical creation of the performance

Auditorium, 14/10/2020

The company Obskené (Spain) and Teatro Ojo (Mexico) presented in 2014 the Gran Rifa d'un fabulós viatge a Mèxic at the Tàrrega International Theatre Festival. It was a new theatrical form that offered spectators a dialogue about this recent history of Spain: the mass exile to Mexico, a country that hosted all the citizens fleeing the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939).

The beginning of the performance was simple: it offered spectators the chance to take part in a raffle for a wonderful trip to Mexico. To participate, spectators had to answer the question: What would you take to feel at home away from home? The two companies opened a new performance space in Tàrrega, Sinaia, to receive the participants who brought the objects that responded to this question. During the festival, the Sinaia space became an exhibition of these personal belongings, which enabled all visitors to ask themselves about exile again. The draw took place on the last day of the festival, in a festive and public event.

This presentation aims to reflect on the strategy of the artefact that made it possible to activate the desire to participate by moving its objective (from the performance to the raffle) and making participation an engine for rethinking history, a dramatic axis of the performance.⁵⁰

Judith Pujol, member of the Obskené company and part of the artistic team of the *Gran Rifa d'un fabulós viatge a Mèxic*, offers a presentation on the project premiered at Fira Tàrrega 2014 created in collaboration with the Mexican cultural platform Teatro Ojo.⁵¹ It takes on a classic format, with a discursive presentation and audiovisual support (screening of slides and videos).

Pujol points out that the question posed to the participants in the raffle — “what would you take to feel at home away from home?” — was built on that of “as if...”, with the intention of generating reflective, corporeal and playful participation.

The experience was constructed as a “real day-to-day drama”, in the dichotomy between theatricality and reality; while the fair (dramaturgical device) had theatrical elements (and a spectacular setting, Fira Tàrrega), the trip (prize) was real. When asked by the audience, Pujol explains that

50. Summary of the presentation. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/judith-pujol-i-ricard-soler_cat.

51. <http://teatroojo.mx/>.

Obskené and Teatro Ojo never considered the possibility of completely fictionalising the experience and that the prize was an invention.

In the Sinaia space, participants could sign up to participate in the raffle and be eligible for the prize. The sine qua non conditions were: 1) bring an object that answered the question (and leave it for the whole time of Fira Tàrrega), and 2) fill in a question sheet (the answers were the dramaturgical basis for the script of the final event). The objects – traces, visible/searchable materials for the successive participants – built the exhibition space. Photos were also collected, giving the site a memorial character.

The participation mechanisms were conceived through a desire to enter “through all channels”. The communication strategy was mostly conducted through offline channels: handing out flyers, door-to-door information in the neighbourhood, banners on the streets, and advertising on local radio through an advertising spot. The strategy (dramaturgical, communicative) they adopted was an expanded conception of time built around the question, activating both the desire and the gesture of participation. The issue had to be tied to the home, to the land, but open enough for everyone to identify with it. From a rhythmic point of view, the extended time of the experience contrasted with the “adrenaline” of the raffle, the final moment.

The general objectives, Pujol points out, were to rethink history, move the experience to the bodies and put the focus of the artefact on the participants and the question.



Gran Casino IT (speed dating)

Verónica NAVAS RAMÍREZ

La Ciudad

Auditorium, 14/10/2020

Verónica Navas presents the performative lecture *La Ciudad*, the eponymous title of her latest piece,⁵² with material taken from the device, ergo of the spectacular relationship designed, ergo of the piece, an issue she considers a “total boycott” of the genesis of the piece and a rethinking of the dramaturgical issues that underpin it: “at what distance and to what extent.”

The lecture, like the piece on which it is based, will aesthetically-dramatically play on “domestic technology” — defined between spectacular convention (agreed, distant and, in this case, digital) and domestic (accessible, known, everyday) — and will alternate simultaneous projection of fragments of video (live and delayed), still images and letters, with recorded talks or addressing the audience, in a kind of modal decline of the urban and intimate discourse of *La Ciudad*.

The creator comments that the piece is born out of the vital and creative need “to be very quiet”, as well as the interest in investigating “what compromises the viability of a piece” and what the artist’s audience expect (and vice versa) in this pact full of conventions which is, she considers, the spectacular relationship, the live event. In this respect, Navas wonders when the piece emerges, when the piece becomes itself.

La Ciudad is also born out of wondering about the usual position of a body and where it is looking. Notice that it is becoming more and more oblique, leaning down (looking at the phone held in the hand, looking at the computer screen resting on the table). Conversely, when the gaze is frontal, it finds the other (human). It is from this desire for dialogue between the alternating gaze towards the inert material and the bodies (fictional or not) that make up the audience that Verónica Navas builds the performance device, with nine spectators and a performer sitting around a screen-table on which there are, superimposed, layer by layer, objects (tangible) and projections (intangible); all with a sound envelope that recovers fragments of an urban and subjective anecdote.

Thus, the piece is constructed, simultaneously, forming layers and piercing, from the physical point of view and from the dramatic point of view, respectively. It also does so from the poetics of the piece or, rather, from the latter; because the information that reaches the audience is “torn from where it belongs”, in the creator’s words, “bit by bit; because it’s small, it’s part of it.” There is no story from the Aristotelian point of view. The idea of layered construction demands insistence, not repetition.

52. Premiered within the programme of the Antic Teatre at the Grec Festival de Barcelona 2019 (11 to 21 July) and revived at the Festival TNT — Terrassa Noves Tendències 2020 (9 to 11 October).

This takes place in a piece folded in itself, in a completely centripetal universe, with a poetics that asks the viewer for a gesture of approach, of pouring out. Navas concludes: “There is a pattern, but there is no order; there is arrangement, but there is no commandment; there is evidence, but there is room, there is doubt.



Gran Casino IT (speed dating)

MAMBO PROJECT

Iaia

Auditorium, 14/10/2020

Iaia is the new creation by the Mambo Project. A piece about memory and oblivion where grandmothers, our grandmothers, talk and fight dementia.

Who are we when we are no longer? What's left of us? In Iaia, the spectator will share a table in the family dining room of the grandmother's house, gradually weaving the saved memories of our grandmothers' generation. Staged reconstructions sifted through the gaps left by the pathological loss of memory framed in a confusing space-time where ellipses will mark the rhythm of history.

Iaia is a work in process, and Mambo Project will present a brief sample of the performance and dramaturgical device.⁵³



53. Summary of the presentation. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/mambo-project_cat?authuser=0.

Gran Casino IT (speed dating)

LÀST

Tiranés Banderes. The construction of a symbol as a performance

Teatre Estudi, 14/10/2020

Performative lecture in which the team will present their working hypothesis when dealing with the dramatic design of their next piece. Tiranes Banderes reflects on the obvious parallels between the construction of a symbol and the development of a project as agreed fictions and the constant process of renegotiating conventions.

Atheists and believers welcome. Agnostics, stay away.⁵⁴



54. Summary of the presentation. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/last_cat?authuser=0.

Gran Casino IT (speed dating)

Paula PASCUAL DE LA TORRE

Protocols of intimacy: programming and craftsmanship of the immersive theatre experience

Exhibition room, 14/10/2020

The aim of this research is to analyse the strategies through which immersive theatre articulates interaction with the audience. In particular, the hypothesis that intimacy — as a condition, situation or emotion — is the most characteristic and fundamental element of the phenomena of participation that occur in the immersive format.

Paula Pascual de la Torre is a creator and actress, member of the company Calatea (www.calatea.es). In recent years she has specialised in performance creation linked to participatory and immersive languages.

As part of the master's degree in Theatre Studies (MUET) at the Institut del Teatre with the UAB, she is writing her dissertation "Protocols of intimacy. Programming and craftsmanship of immersive theatre". In this participation in the Symposium she will explore this research by deploying some of the elements in an experiential way. Attendees will be invited to get involved at this point in the process and then be able to exchange ideas.⁵⁵



55. Summary of the presentation. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/paula-pascual_cat?authuser=0.

Gran Casino IT (speed dating)

Laura CLOS 'Closca', Pau MASALÓ, Xesca SALVÀ
and Marc VILLANUEVA MIR

Prospective Actions (Catalunya 2004-2018)

Mercat de les Flors, 14/10/2020

An interactive multimedia installation that focuses on six social conflicts that have affected Catalonia in recent years and examines the tension between police control and new ways of using public spaces.

This installation received an award at the 2019 Prague Quadrennial of Performance Design and Space⁵⁶ [project⁵⁷], a meeting that has been held since 1967 and is one of the great European events in the world of stage design. In the lobby of the Mercat de les Flors there is a roundtable turned into a kind of large game board, map or model; a scenario where a series of everyday elements (needles, balloons, forks...) allude to some of the clashes between law enforcement and protesters that have taken place in Catalonia in the last fifteen years: since the closure of a group of undocumented migrants in Barcelona Cathedral in 2004 until the rally "Aturem el Parlament" in 2011, from the eviction of Can Vies in 2014 to the eviction of the Expropriated Bank in 2016 or in the 1 October 2017 referendum, as well as the protests against the sentence of the case of La Manada in 2018.

Sit at the table with these objects in front of you and put on your headphones. You will hear a narration of the events related to each of these protests, mixed with utopian reflections that, from a performative and performance design point of view, are provided by six Catalan stage designers (Anna Alcubierre, Paco Azorín, Cube.bz, Silvia Delagneau, Max Glaenzel and Eugenio Szwarc), who were asked to think of set designs related to each of these conflicts. Artistic and scenographic current events find a common territory in this installation with political current events, while the space is revealed to us both in its condition as a meeting point and as a scene of conflict. A dialogue between social conflicts and performance design based around demonstrations, occupations and the construction of barricades. A look at the revolution... seen from the set.⁵⁸



56. <<http://pq19.institutdelteatre.cat/es/>>.

57. <http://pq19.institutdelteatre.cat/wp-content/uploads/Prospective_Actions_ca.pdf>.

58. Summary of the paper. Source: symposium website:
<https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/prospective-actions_cat?authuser=0>.

Ludic-theatrical device. SOCIETAT DOCTOR ALONSO

El Desenterrador. Mètode per a l'excavació de paraules

Teatre Estudi, 14/10/2020, 1.15 pm

The Unearther focuses on the word and its relationship with the body and action. The body of words is the property they possess, not only of creating and designating the physical world but also of generating an ethical world, a political system, and a social order.

Unearthing is a pedagogical mechanism around words, language, dialogue and ethical values that shape us that allows everyone to collaborate in order to exchange knowledge and improve the ability to reason, listen and jointly construct a speech.

The permanent unearthing invites those who visit and experience it to enter into a double reflection through a practice, on the one hand, on the use of words, language and its mechanisms and, on the other, on certain fundamental values of our community and their role and theoretical and practical meaning in contemporary society.

It is a conversation shaped and guided by an expert where, with a series of rules that participants learn and must respect, we will try to unearth a certain word and arrive together at the original “meaning”, based on which to work.

It is in the joint process of researching this deep and primordial meaning of the word that, through this mechanism of regulated conversation, the mechanisms, “senses”, contradictions and paradoxes of language and the word in their common and shared use appear.⁵⁹

Before the device is activated, the presentation takes place of *El Desenterrador. Mètode per a l'excavació de paraules*, published by the Institut del Teatre in the collection Materials Pedagògics.⁶⁰ Sofia Asencio, member of Societat Doctor Alonso, thanks for the context and explanation of the framework. The book, she says, is another state of practice, a place they never thought they would reach.

As a company, Societat Doctor Alonso focuses on creating performances; that is, building work, exhibiting the piece, and also conducting research, which is its focus of interest and wherein lies the prior freedom.

In the case of *El Desenterrador* (since 2013), the research was so important that it revealed a tool that never became a show. Over the years, in Asencio's words, the company has been “the generator and spectator of a tool that has shown its way.” They are part of the base team, in addition to Societat Doctor Alonso (that is, Asencio and Tomás Aragay), Jordi Claramonte

59. Summary of the session. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/el-desenterrador_cat?authuser=0.

60. SOCIETAT DOCTOR ALONSO [et al.]. *El Desenterrador. Mètode per a l'excavació de paraules*. Barcelona: Institut del Teatre de la Diputació de Barcelona, 2020.

(who wanted to do a piece based on words), Jaime Conde-Salazar, Bárbara Sánchez and Silvia Zayas.

The idea behind the research is to “unearth what words are.” Towards the beginning of the previous decade (and the practice), Asencio noted that the form was empty; that the words had no content; and that the fact that this happened during a time of economic crisis did not “help” either. She wondered: “What about values that don’t activate a force in me that makes me react?” It is from this place that they generate an imaginary based on the fact the words are buried and that it is necessary to go against the flow, to unearth them. And so the image of making a hole arises, an action that, in return, generates an adjacent mountain (even if it is the result of an indirect action).

Jordi Claramonte, also present, recalls, in the words of Agustín García Calvo,⁶¹ that man is the only being that possesses the apparatus of language as a free mechanism, as opposed to the written word, which demands technology (paper, pencil...).⁶² As words belong to everyone, he says, they don’t belong to anyone, and this becomes a kind of guide that leads the team to unearth words with more people.

Hence the first meeting was held in Figueres,⁶³ with a box of biscuits “in the centre”. At that time (2013) they understood that everything is mixed underground, but that sometimes an excavator finds a piece and this piece “already has something of a container”. When this happened, they ate a biscuit to stage a moment of celebration.

Thus, continues Asencio, the unearthings of each year were generating new tools that in turn were nourishing the practice, to the point that in the end they realised that *The Unearther* did not need novelty but repetition, as a small frame-device of rules. It was the practice itself that made the instrument (like the musical) perfect. Therefore, the intention of each unearthing would not be to know more; rather, the articulation — which means every word every day, with the people there — is what counts.

Claramonte comments that the values “are there”; even if they are buried, even if time passes, spurious parts remain,⁶⁴ and the important thing is to understand what kind of situation has happened for it to be buried. With the tool they seek collective intelligence, because what they are dealing with is what it refers to (more lucid). This is how they generate an ethic of research and prospection.

The speech contains references such as Edward C. Harris,⁶⁵ who we recall as a “great founder of contemporary archaeology”, and the composer Aaron Copland, for the work on timbre and harmony.⁶⁶

61. 1926-2012.

62. Reference not found.

63. Festival Ingràvid 2013:
<http://www.figueres.com/programacio-ingravid-2013-festival-de-cultura-contemporania-de-lemporda/>.

64. “Cachos” in the original Spanish.

65. Born 1946.

66. 1900-1990.

At this point, Asencio walks to the excavation, which is about to begin. She defines unearthing as a path downwards with values in all strata: the organic, the inorganic, the psychic, and the objectifiable. Whoever “directs” the unearthing does a job through the others (participants), in which it goes “intentionally” down without return and where the importance does not lie in capturing meaning or in the search for the purpose understood as “therapy” of dynamics, but in the practice of doing.

Asencio recalls that the device has had a journey over the years and has gone through “different houses”. Since the first unearthings in 2013, the tool has been separated from the idea of a performance and works with different groups, including secondary schools and the Lledoners prison,⁶⁷ where interns and educators are involved, and where the team understands that there are places where the tool takes off, because words, in different contexts, make more sense. *El Desenterrador* is also revealed to be a “textual machine”. It is thanks to this fact that Societat Doctor Alonso is compiling a dictionary of excavated machines, from which the text for his piece *Y los huesos hablaron*, released at the Grec Festival in Barcelona in 2016, emerges.⁶⁸ They have also found that when they hold four- or five-day workshops, *El Desenterrador* takes on the dynamics of Socratic maieutics.

In short, it is not a question of dialogue or consensus but of rapprochement, of refinement (critical or uncritical). The practice is not done to be seen, although the conditions of the symposium will make some of the people sitting on the tiers participate (there will be rotation), while the rest will watch.

Before starting the unearthing, Sofia Asencio gives four more directions: 1) to try to find the inside of the word and what it can accommodate (“there are words with a very large spoon”, she illustrates); 2) that there be an initial silence not to judge the word, because “the mental muscle is very difficult to control, and so it is put on hold”; 3) to follow the other (she notes it as the most important point); and 4) that questions be asked.

Some biased words about “what's going on” in the unearthing:

I distinguish between logos chiamsus or dodging;
“let the language emerge, let it sound”;
capturing a tendency for participants to “self-organize” language and meaning; eating and talking, same flow;
whoever enters it goes to what we do not know, although from the outside the same work is done (with a little perspective);
when the concept is overrated it loses its real value; excavation of “pleasure”;
the ease of the word is the difficulty of the group.



67. The unearthings in Lledoners were in October and November 2017. Source: SOCIETAT DOCTOR ALONSO [et al.]. *El Desenterrador. Mètode per a l'excavació de paraules*. Barcelona: Institut del Teatre de la Diputació de Barcelona, 2020, p. 154. (Contexts where the unearthing tool has been incorporated.)

68. <<https://www.barcelona.cat/grec/arxiugrec/es/espectaculo/y-los-huesos-hablaron-o>>.

Ludic-theatrical device. NYAMNYAM**A quatre potes**

Teatre Estudi, 14/10/2020, 4.30 pm

A quatre potes is a performance device that revolves around 24 benches built collaboratively, as a prelude to the piece. These benches, understood as a construction system, shape the performative space, creating action-disruption situations, which generate the dramaturgy of the piece. It investigates the possibilities of the format of performative installation, creating a space of action of common free movement between audience and creators. In this way we investigate the appearance of everyday life in the scenic event, the boundaries between the format of different situations that do not normally happen in the same context, and the possibility that these “scenes” generate a strange place between reality and fiction. At the conceptual level, it activates ideas such as craftsmanship understood in a broad way, the gesture as a (micro) political action, the feedback that puts into circulation logics close to ecology, and the exploration of social imaginaries as nourishment for contemporary thought and practice.

The activity presented at the Symposium has been developed together with El Graner Centre de creació de dansa i arts vives and La Marina neighbourhood, where it is located. It has been done in collaboration with Salva Sanchís, Pedro Pineda (TMDC), Dianelis Diéguez, Imma Solé, various agents from the Marina district and the lighting design by Anna Rovira.⁶⁹

Fifteen wooden benches and twenty-nine people take part in the practice on the stage of the Teatre Estudi, while the rest of the audience will watch from the tiers. The dynamics of the relationship between the participants and the benches take place in the movement of each other through space, and in the relationship between the bodies (objects or humans) and the adaptation of each other (with adoptive tendencies, later) mainly through gaze and distance. They share the stage with the volunteer-participants Ariadna Rodríguez and Iñaki Álvarez (Nyamnyam), Dianelis Diéguez and Salva Sanchís, who will read texts with directions for body and apprehension (with ideas that are malleable enough, they say, so that everyone can enter).

At the end, there is a more discursive-explanatory section and dialogue with the audience.

Nyamnyam explains that *A quatre potes* has two years behind it and has changed as a project; they have gone from working with tables to working with benches (sometimes they work with constructions *ex professo* and other times with the material they find and consider valuable).

As for the material of the benches (wood), Ariadna Rodríguez says that this conditions the way the body of work develops in each context of activation. In this respect, the ideas that the group believes work for them are

69. Summary of the presentation. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/nyamnyam_cat?authuser=0.

recycled with each residency or context due to “ecology”. Xesca Salvà, set designer and participant, believes that this is a “physical” device.

Dianelis Diéguez says that *A quatre potes* has been “permeable to joint learning” since its genesis in the Marina district, where El Graner is located, a centre for the creation of dance and living arts in which Nyamnyam works, thanks also to the activation and collaboration of residents in the neighbourhood. This is where the idea of “bench” comes from.

The device, clear and flexible, is born from the desire to generate a space with others, and by undertaking a journey, of personal and mutual recognition. It also advances as specific questions are asked: how to inhabit a space of thought and composition? How to inhabit a space? What imaginaries do we share with communities? What does “being in a neighbourhood” mean and what kind of membership does it appeal to? How is a group formed?

This question leads to talk about Imma,⁷⁰ a participant in the process who is not physically present during the meeting but who has been key to the development of *A quatre potes*, for Nyamnyam to “find a channel”. In this respect, when it comes to the body of work and commitments, the group does not appeal to a quantitative question but a representative one, they say, and this is where the concept of social project makes sense: they do not want a joint work, but of “closeness”, with whom they meet along the way. The work arises from walks, conversations and moments shared with people in the neighbourhood. They also argue that social interaction is a natural desire of Nyamnyam, but that in no case should the artist be forced, and this is something that institutions usually do.

Iñaki Álvarez points out that the relationship they have has a lot to do with time (in Valencia it was two months, but in La Marina, two years), and that a necessary change is needed when they leave. They work to give a gift to the neighbourhood, though whether they like it is another matter.

They also emphasise rigour: if you want a spectacular result, you need time to work, a good technical-artistic team, and so on.

For her part, Salva Sanchís comments that she was fascinated by the reversal of work logics, especially in terms of process time, with very different experiences, people or places, impossible to fit into traditional production systems. In the successive openings to the public of *A quatre potes*, Sanchís observes a progressive process of convergence and dispersion of ideas. In this respect, Diéguez comments that the identity of artistic work has to do with perception (it only exists insofar as it is perceived), and considers it an act of respect for joint knowledge.



70. Imma Solé, teacher at the Institut Montjuïc.

Debate on the ludic-theatrical devices presented

led by Roberto FRATINI and AGOST PRODUCCIONS

Teatre Estudi, 14/10/2020, 6.30 pm⁷¹

“Dramatúrgies del debat” is a set of games for viewers and artists to talk about what has been seen on stage. At the I’m Playing! symposium, in the absence of any shows to talk about, we decided to apply some of the dialectic games to the general theme of the symposium and to the content of the presentations or actions undertaken by other participants.

In this way, the audience is offered a dynamic of free conversation for about an hour and a half following the conversation guidelines contemplated by the “Dramatúrgies del debat” project. The chosen protocols are developed as if it were a forum, an assembly or a meeting, as there are no “artists” or “audiences”.

The “Dramatúrgies del debat” project is available on the website ddd.barcelona, which for technical issues cannot be connected now.⁷² The project consists of about sixty conversation protocols, a manifesto and other writings on the condition of the audience.

The conversation begins with the protocol Oviedo:

Oviedo begins as a traditional meeting between the audience and the artist. After ten minutes of conversation, the moderator will interrupt the dialogue and ask that the first ten minutes of the same dialogue be repeated accurately and in detail (word and gesture). After five minutes of experimenting, he will interrupt again and ask for the last five minutes to be repeated. Oviedo relies on the enormous power of repetition to banish theatricality, expose the absurdity of what is said in general, and allow new things to be thought of while always being said the same. Oviedo is stubborn and old-fashioned.

And it continues with Albacete:

Due to the nature of this protocol, it will be appropriate to allow the audience to accept the game to have a preparation and “mental warm-up” time of at least five minutes. There are only two rules: the first is that no intervention or response can last more than thirty seconds (participants therefore implicitly agree that when the referee’s bell marks the end of their turn, they must stop); the second is that if more than fifty seconds elapse without anyone speaking, the debate will end (so there is the possibility that the debate will end within minutes of starting).

And continues with Logroño:

Security personnel are advised for this conversation protocol. The presence of the artist and his show is optional. Logroño philologically reproduces the circumstance of the ancient symposium (which meant drinking heavily in the home of individuals, with the option of becoming a philosophical dialogue).

71. What follows (in italics) is the script that Roberto Fratini and Agost Producciones prepared for the session, and that Miquel Valls, a member of the group, has provided to us. Below, the report notes complement the script. More information about the cultural association Agost Producciones at: <<http://www.agostproduccions.com/>>.

72. Information updates June 2021.

One rule: everyone present must consume the wine or alcoholic beverage they prefer. It's not a tasting: the goal is to reach a certain level of intoxication. The debate will start gradually only after the third glass. Anyone who does not drink does not speak.

And continues with Jerez:

Suitable for audiences with strong stomachs. Jerez has only one rule: any turn of speech (be it a question, an observation, or an answer) must include swear words, slander, blasphemy, attacks on decency, sexual winking, eschatological references, and other verbal excesses. The real acrobatics of the protocol will be to give in to this linguistic disinhibition (which is offensive in itself) without offending anyone directly or raising your voice. In short, it is a matter of upsetting the linguistic register without transforming the gestural register.

And finishes with Altamira:

Depending on the variant applied, specific technical conditions may be required. The protocol is carried out in the dark and whispering. If the artist is present, participants may not be able to locate him. In this case, the artist himself will determine the tone of the talk by addressing the audience in a low voice. It is recommended to perform the same protocol with very sensitive ambient microphones, which capture and amplify the whispers. A sound designer could alter sentences and speeches with real-time effects, and distort the phenomenal nature of the space where the debate takes place. In this case, a certain agglutination of delay and distortion effects could progressively weaken the insight of the acts of speech. The moment all the sentences collapse into an ocean of echoes, resonances, etc., Altamira will end and the lights will come on.

Miquel Valls, a member of Agost Produccions, and Roberto Fratini, creator of the “*Dramatúrgies del debat*” (ddd), will be responsible for activating some of the protocols that make up the dramaturgies of the debate, in a particular session when the artist-piece will be displaced by days 1 and 2 of the symposium, objects, this time, of inflected relation, in a play with the public.

Fratini will begin with a statement: “Belief in what is said is secondary to what is believed to be said.” The rules of the protocols, “encrypted, hidden”, are consistent with the stated principle.

Next, some biased notes about the protocols.

The Oviedo protocol is activated under the question “What do you want to add to what has happened in the last two days?” Oviedo’s *hidden* rule is that the audience is allowed to speak for five minutes, and after that time they are forced to repeat everything they have said. They operate a memory and conceptual synthesis, but above all, the inclination of the participants to return to their self five, ten or fifteen minutes earlier. It is, therefore, a pure play of acting and drama of the moment.

The Albacete protocol recalls a question from the previous day⁷³ and the reaction of Roger Bernat, which one of today’s participants would explain in relation to the position of the director of *Domini públic* in the world and the apocalyptic problems that confront us with the situation of a hypothetical ending. Another participant also states that Bernat understands redemptive,

73. Seventh question (from the second round) asked at the roundtable, led by Constanza Blanco and involving Stefan Kaegi, Mónica Rikić and Roger Bernat.

evangelical and non-apocalyptic art (neither evangelistic nor “catechetical”). There are also those who believe that Bernat did not answer the question in the sense in which it was asked, and that there is a possible “ethics” in the “ways of doing things”, not necessarily linked to thematisation or arguments. Because we’re supposed to be talking about how artists approach ideas, but not how art reconnects us with certain forgotten forms of the self.

The Logroño protocol invites you to do what the ancient philosophers did: drink (this time it will be red wine and in a small glass) and talk. While one intervention advocates safeguarding the complexity of art, another advocates devices. It is observed that non-rhetorical questions cause the speaker to inhabit the centre. Other ideas that have arisen are that theatre is elitist, that the culture of politicians does not serve to cushion art, or that theatre has an untimely, uncomfortable component.

With the Jerez protocol come explicit comments on the reasons why the politico-social restrictions motivated by COVID are the same as those of the closure (of cinemas or theatres, for example). He warns that the state must guarantee the existence of public space, but not become its owner. Also (alcohol and permanence and commitment to practice are doing the work) it is explained that the culture that makes possible the crisis derived from COVID is not Mercury in retrograde, but because of capitalism. The latest remarks allude to the need for circumstantial thinking and the conviction that making art is a waste of the money received from politicians.



DAY 3. 15 October 2020**Presentation.** David PÉREZ

The Live Museum: From Mausoleum to Theme Part

Auditori, 15/10/2020, 10 am⁷⁴

This presentation addresses the growing acceptance of the cultural framework of the live arts in contemporary art museums. A trend that has become widespread over the last decade with the emergence of multiple exhibitions that incorporate performance and choreography into the portfolio of temporary exhibitions. At the heart of many of these proposals are immateriality, temporality, and direct interaction with the audience outline a new curatorial strategy that questions the objectual aspect of artistic work and inserts the body and action (of performers and spectators) into the core of the exhibition apparatus.

Through some case studies, a critical reflection of the paradigm of the living museum is proposed that relates the transformations of the exhibition apparatus through the incorporation of the live arts, with the new experiential and cognitive regime of globalised capitalism, and the centrality that experientiality, participation and the body occupy in the cultural, social and economic metabolism of contemporaneity.⁷⁵

David Pérez begins by talking about the “live arts” as the cultural act that focuses on the experience, with practices that appeal to what is established.

In the term *museum*, the “central” idea is that of the collection, a space consecrated as history, and this has a correlation with the mausoleum, the consecration of great names and men.

Pérez is therefore interested in “activating the mausoleum, because conjunctural life is what is outside”; recovering life in the second degree,⁷⁶ in reference to Paul Valéry.

He approaches the museum from a spatial and *objectual* logic, in which time, *between* works and rooms, is a gap. In theatre, on the other hand, it is the other way around: we find, he says, the work driven by the action of some subjects, with a temporal logic. This requires different ways of caring. Both

74. Sastre's previous presentation, “Emerging Dramaturgies, Relational Devices And Invasion Theatres In Today's Balearic Theatre Panorama”, was not done. The information can be consulted on the symposium website: https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/mart%C3%AD-b-fons-sastre_cat.

75. Summary of the presentation. Source: symposium website: https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/david-p%C3%A9rez_cat?authuser=0.

76. Quotation not found.

spaces produce fictions: historical memories (which aspire to build the space of the present) or dramatic theories (as a relationship with the subjects, in a kind of game of duplications and mirrors related to the truth, located and contingent, of the experience).

The speaker focuses on the “how” of the evolution of the *white cube* (museums) and *black cube* (theatre) devices, and on the ways of attention developed in the spaces. In this line, live art exhibitions would superimpose the spaces; history is presented as a lived, corporeal and energetic world. They are, therefore, grey areas, new space and time configurations that dislocate the mortuary logic of the museum apparatus. In other words, he says, they are a new fold of living history. Hence the question of how the live gallery has been made acceptable.

Pérez is now addressing the relationship between exhibition practices, discourses and institution. That's why he talks about the exhibition's models of effectiveness, how art exhibitions work, the effects on space, time and audience, and how they pass this through discourses of building models of effectiveness and verification systems.

In this context, he places the following phenomena chronologically:

1. Intermediate practices. Pérez introduces the model of the studio in the gallery, from which time is derived. It is accompanied by a critique of marketing and an emphasis on live action. They are characterised by the entry of temporal logics (such as happening and performance), environmental (installations, environments) and participatory logics (such as some happenings of Allan Kaprow or the Fluxus movement).
2. Minimalism and an exhaustive analysis of the conditions of perception and attention of the spectator through the space. In this model, the gallery is understood as a space for experimentation in which the body of the spectator emerges; an open space between the work and its body. Criticisms also arise for a certain “theatricality”, for the loss of autonomy of the work and for the topological consciousness of the space.
3. Discursive shift of the arts and the advent of curatorship, through conceptual art, which conceives the space of the gallery as that of reading from the semiotic model, full of linguistic signs. The viewer becomes a radical reader here. Pérez appeals to notions such as “concept” and “discourse” in relation to the theories of John L. Austin or Jacques Derrida, and to the performativity of language. This causes the collection to begin to be perceived as an archive, a key moment in understanding the movements of appropriation and reactivation.
4. Relational art (from Nicolas Bourriaud). The exhibition begins to be perceived as a social art, as a relationship between the audience and the space and the exhibition, and the idea of the spectator as a co-author arises. There is a perceived identification between art forms and political event, the consensual opening of politics, and the suppression of fictional mediation. The gallery was born as a space for the production of ways of sociability.

In this context, the curator is also born, who works with the collection, helps build it and arranges it in the space to make it talk, to create narratives. In the last fifty years, the importance and attributions of curators have grown far beyond the arrangement of the collection, and have moved towards socialisation and educational approaches. The articulations of the cultural and economic sphere perceive a transition between practice and reception, cultural management and the construction of frameworks.

Pérez provides Lois Keidan's concept of live arts (within the new British Labour and the culturalization of the economy), according to which culture in neoliberal societies does not function as a resource; or as a way of life or as a good, but as a resource (understood through "exaltation" in the manner of Friedrich Schiller).

In this context, Pérez recalls, the cultural collapse of the archives in different cultures is due to the fall of the museum as refuge of translation. The museum is also defined in other terms in which the activation of the archives matters (from the culture of heritage to that of processing). In addition, connectivity and immediacy demands are generated.

Neoliberalism promotes the idea of culture as a resource: it involves administration by creative economies and cultural factories. It also fosters it for individuals, for whom culture becomes an asset that enables network competition. All this is accompanied by a process of cultural *eventualisation* in relation to the devaluation of the heritage function, and in the interest in the use of culture as an asset. Jean-François Lyotard thus speaks of the need to "put culture into action", a phenomenon embodied in the proliferation of events.

The "live museum" would thus be the "accommodation" to the museum's new metabolism, which points to the exhibition as an organisational processing of audiences, performers and social relations. A government that appeals to cultural reason is beginning to emerge. Here, according to Pérez, museums not only adopt the cultural framework but also begin to be perceived in an association of values.

Experience,⁷⁷ in line with the concept of *liveness* developed by Philip Auslander,⁷⁸ would be a rhetoric that works both in the presence and in the mediatization of live forms of interaction. The ideal fulfilment of real time would be the absence of time, because we are in a continuous present. What is art?, Pérez asks. And he answers "time"; the idea of "time" can be taken out of the present and out of the immediate reaction and interaction of the narrowing of time. The need for interaction and updating is re-assessable, and has to do with life in general and the devices around us. With this idea of time as art, of time as a subject, he ends.

During the dialogue with the audience of the presentation, Roberto Fratini comments on the notion of "culture" as the journey of the soul towards itself, where accidents and, perhaps, "catastrophic illuminations" occur. He says the new museum insulted the traditional model. The fact that admission

77. "Vivencialidad" in the original Spanish.

78. AUSLANDER, Philip. *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture* (1999).

to the old museums (remember the *horror vacui*, the apparent disorder) was often free, exposed visitors to the incidental experience, with the works as attractions. The contemporary museum, on the other hand, is not made up of attractions because much of it is not very attractive. He notes more museum solemnity and emphasis at the Guggenheim than at the Vatican Museums. The relationship arises with theme parks and possible common experiential economies. In short, Fratini is annoyed by the idea of defending a new paradigm of neoliberal culture that insults the old museum with simplifications.



Ludic-theatrical device. ERRO GRUPO**Jogadouro**

Itinerant action in the street, 15/10/2020, 10.30 am

Jogadouro is a workshop/practical action of the ERRO Grupo aimed at anyone interested in exploring the procedures that promote situations of collective games, specifically in street art, not exclusively actors or people related to the world of theatre.

Jogadouro is a performance that refers to two classic texts of Spanish Golden Age drama e: La vida es sueño, from 1636, and El gran teatro del mundo, from 1655, by Pedro Calderón de la Barca. The action is carried out through a proposal of interaction with the environment, people and space, which allows a playful meeting between all those who are part of the context at the time of the performance.⁷⁹



79. Summary of the device. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/erro_cat?authuser=0.

Ludic-theatrical device. LA FARINERA***Farinera, et guanyaràs el pa
amb la suor del teu front***

Teatre Estudi, 15/10/2020, 12 noon

It's a role play against real estate speculation and gentrification.

It builds a micro-society through five social roles: Economic Power, State Representatives, Media, Middle Class, and Precarious Workers.

This is the day of the inauguration of Farinera, a new avant-garde real estate project to be built. Precarious workers are the protagonists, who decide to make a last attempt to stop the destruction of the neighbourhood, which causes a chain of events that ends up forcing the authority of the state and economic power, along with the Middle Class and the Precarious workers themselves, to resolve the conflict in an assembly. Here each group will defend its position within the conflict, and finally it will be the power of the state, through a public vote, who will decide whether or not to build Farinera architectural project.⁸⁰

,

80. Summary of the device. Source: symposium website:
https://sites.google.com/institutdelteatre.cat/simposi2020/cat/programa/farinera_cat?authuser=0.

Conclusions

by Roberto FRATINI, Constanza BLANCO, Carles BATLLE
and Verónica NAVAS⁸¹

Teatre Estudi, 15/10/2020, 1.30 pm

Those attending, in representation of the Organising Committee and sitting on the stage of the Teatre Estudi, from left to right, are Constanza Blanco, Carles Batlle and Roberto Fratini, accompanied by Verónica Navas, responsible for the written rapporteurship, followed by an account of the previous three days.⁸²

Carles Batlle recalls that “*I'm Playing!*”, the third annual symposium of *Estudis Escènics*, is a source of nourishment for the academic journal. The symposia (or conferences, colloquia, debates...) held⁸³ try to answer a recurring question: how can the academic world and research be located in a context like ours. Thanks to the coherence required by the internal structure of “*I'm Playing!*”, Batlle points out that the classic symposium format has been overcome, and this is how the contents have gone from the most traditional academic communication (discursive, illustrated with a power point, etc.) to strictly performative or hybrid formulas that have opted for the circulation of the audience through different events. For the closing, Carles Batlle asks the attendees for a “normal and ordinary” debate, which will facilitate its “transcription”, since the symposium, beyond its “fleeting” status as a live event (face-to-face, physical) or online, there will be “partial” documentation of “useful materials and instruments” published in the next issue of the journal, including the rapporteurship by Verónica Navas.

Navas opens the conclusions by questioning the objectivity of the endeavour and favouring subjectivity, both partial and unquestionable. She continues to share various anecdotes. The first is that, in parallel to the symposium, the 53rd International Fantastic Film Festival of Catalonia is being held in Sitges, which, due to the extraordinary situation this year, has decided to enable an online window so some of the films can be seen outside the iconic and traditional physical location.⁸⁴ And it has happened that people applaud from home,⁸⁵ a gesture that Navas considers both a collective recognition

81. Video: <http://aaaec.institutdelteatre.cat/media_objects/avalon:2102>.

82. The recording of the weekly radio show *Això és un drama!* (iCat, Catalan Audiovisual Media Corporation - CCMA), will be on the frontier of the symposium (and outside of this rapporteurship) led by Txell Bonet and directed by Rafel Plana. It can be listened to in full on the CCMA website: “Un programa de ‘simposi’, també coneugut com a ‘botelló escènic’”. <<https://www.ccma.cat/catradio/alacarta/drama/un-programa-de-simposi-tambe-conegut-com-a-botellon-escenic/audio/1081684/>> [Last accessed: June 06/2021].

83. More information in the section “Simposis i Jornades” of the website of *Estudis Escènics. Quaderns de l'Institut del Teatre* <<http://estudisescenics.institutdelteatre.cat/index.php/ees/pages/simposis-jornades>>. [Accessed: June 2021].

84. 155 films were screened through the Festival's online Virtual Hall, more than half of the programming. More information at: <<https://sitgesfilmfestival.com/cas/noticies?id=1003646>> [Last accessed: June 2021].

85. Phenomenon widely covered by the community of fans of the festival on the social networks, and that can be tracked with the hashtag #Sitges2020.

and a personal celebration. The collective and physical recognition of the applause in the hall⁸⁶ has been displaced, this year, by the comments on the networks.

Óscar Cornago also recalls that in the opening of the symposium he mentioned the well-known expression “One thing is ideas, another thing is what happens” (“what happens” as a thing, as a subject) and the desire that, in the words of Navas herself, the symposium was an event that breathed and developed for 72 hours. These concerns about the experience and “what is burning” (second question from Cornago, three days ago), reminds the speaker of the latest film by Oliver Laxe, the eponymous (no question, this time) *O que arde* (2019), popularised, among other things, by the awards received at some festivals,⁸⁷ “elitist” participation environments discussed the day before during the dynamics of the “Dramatúrgies del debat”, conducted by Fratini and Agost Produccions. In this respect, Navas considers that it is precisely in that session where the true conclusions of the symposium arose due to the nature of the discussion (irreverent, regulated, fictional and true) during the day, a discussion activated in turn by what each participant had experienced until then. This makes Navas think that it is in the discussion that “what happens, what exists” takes place.

Through her personal anecdote, Navas comments that *O que arde* was the second film she saw during the lockdown after a long time without watching any, without “being a spectator”, which is her passion. The film that preceded it was an adaptation of a play built on “misunderstanding”, according to Navas, of doing nothing more than an audiovisual planning of a dramatic text, and not even being useful as a playful artefact, as entertainment. The erroneous essence on which this last film is built is what Navas thinks is really “burning”.

She also recovers the idea discussed the day before about theatre as an elitist medium as “not everyone gets there” (as opposed to cinema, which is highly popular). Clearly understanding this as a cultural issue, Navas discusses paternalism or a possible desire to reach everyone, and questions who everyone is and, beyond that, what is popular, what a body needs, what levels of care each experience requires, how far artistic and cultural expressions go, and so on.

Navas considers that the film *O que arde* has a “slow” temporality that assimilates to the person’s breathing as he watches it (regardless of whether he does so in the theatre or in bed, with a tablet close enough to the face to validate – or not – the sensation of abstraction of the black box). Moreover, the narrative time of the film is assimilated to the filming times based on waiting for what is to be shot. In this respect, Navas provides the example of fire, and finds a parallel between the recurring invocation that, from the verb, is made throughout the footage and the fact that the team had to wait for a real fire

86. The tradition of applauding before and after each screening is well known in the vast community of Sitges Festival fans.

87. One of them was from the Cannes International Film Festival, which, in its 72nd year (2019), awarded the Jury Prize to the film directed by Laxe and written by Santiago Fillol.

to happen to shoot it. The actual shooting was, at the same time, contingent, inevitable and essential for the film to be what it is.

And this is where chance comes in and one of the most beautiful shots of *O que arde* emerges: the appearance of a horse on fire riding through the embers. “Catching” this extraordinary image, Navas considers, is an example of fact and latency (Claramonte might argue), reasons that connect with the already discussed relational theatre, where *relational* would be a dispensable epithet rather than a qualifier. Since theatre is always related, perhaps the questions that should be asked are rather about the bodies that each piece relates, as well as the spatial and temporal design, always through a consciousness towards the sensitive awakening of the implicit spectator.

Returning to the film adaptation he contrasted with Laxe’s film, Navas wonders how far our “tolerance of fire” will go to keep up with cultural products until “something changes”. Because while theatre may not be and should not be democratic, the aesthetic experience, enjoyed from any everyday practice, should be. Thus, theatre alone would be another way of working on it.

Navas also shares concerns about social media as fictional frames of life (and governed by non-human rhythmic tempos) or the actual non-influence of the pandemic, given the collective attempt at social fiction to go on “as if nothing” (in a veiled allusion to the “new normal”). And a wish: “We do what we do with the body we have now.”

To close, remember some expressions heard during the previous days: slow time, return to the circle, return to the pattern, play with the norm, appeal to sensitive experience, public spaces (or not), responsibilities as spectators with the (relational) ecosystem, the topic treated as an argument or from the design of a situation, etc.

Roberto Fratini points out that the reality of the symposium, or at least this is how it is perceived, is that, despite the will, some of the central issues will not be resolved. It is reminiscent of a traditional tale cited by Vladimir Odóievski to talk about the “untimeliness”,⁸⁸ fundamental in our theatre-ludic relationship, between the theatrical and the ludic dimension. The “ludic devices”, far from being theatrical avant-garde, what they do is archaeology, and they will only serve our context if they produce a revelation.

In this respect, the symposium lacks spaces for game theory, with a tradition that includes titles and names such as *Homo ludens*, by Johan Huizinga⁸⁹ or Roger Caillois with *Man, Play and Games*. Caillois, he explains, divides children’s games into four categories: *mimicry* (based on simulation), *alea* (chance), *agon* (competition), and *ilinx jilx* (vertigo, loss of control). Each existing game has some (or all) of these parameters. Fratini insists that some analytical or classifying categories with a certain history, such as those mentioned, could be applied when speaking of “new theatrical formats”.

There is also a pedagogical misunderstanding: the game that treats adults as children to make them go through very basic experiences that do not

88. *Destiempo*, in the original Spanish.

89. 1872-1945.

invent anything. In contrast, he states that in the theatrical context the game only makes sense if it is for adults, that is, if one understands the non-parity of conditions, the multisensory capacity inherent in the *ludus* and its bad and dirty aspect (as opposed to the experimentation-laboratory environment). Similarly, a device, if it is for adults, must work regardless of whether or not the participant is benevolent. In short: “ludic theatre does not mean children's theatre with a variation for adults, because it is not part of the myth that we have to be children again.”

The first intervention by the audience, by Marc Villanueva, expresses the concern for the lack of space for discussion, moments of relationship to collect what was happening during the symposium and reflect on it, especially with regard to ludic-theatrical devices, which he considers samples of practice as research and therefore subjects of dialogue and exchange. A doubt as to why the symposium, with a few exceptions, did not generate a common language.

Sílvia Ferrando, an IT professor, wonders aloud “what's left”. She agrees with Fratini in his generally paternalistic attitude towards those fields of the theatre that he considers need improvement and, in contrast, they are treated with excessive care. She thinks it would help to put the devices into play to see how well they connect with the audience. Our time offers very little for reaction and has a constant feeling of “docile obedience”, but considers that the audience “dares more” the stronger a device is. The way would be to spin ideas, weave, create continuity; also questioning what we believe is not working in order to reclaim its agency. *Relational* would imply an emancipatory will.

The third intervention is made by the same guest who, two days before, during the roundtable, asked the first question from the audience. He points out that the good part of the symposium is the ability to make the listener think, to “give work”. He considers that he has seen and heard about *what* (games, formats, devices, etc.), about *why*, about *how*, about *when*. So the question is *where*: do the devices explored at the symposium feel comfortable in a space established as a stage? He believes that it would be necessary to do this documentary work of studying and recording the place where these types of works can happen, something that Roberto Fratini defines, next, as a “topological taxonomy (as a discourse about the place) of interactive theatre.

The fourth speaker wonders if the fact that we are an adult “leisure audience” is related to the understanding (from artistic creation or from participatory benevolence) of ludic and childish play theatre. In this regard, Fratini believes that the answer can be found, on the one hand, in the fact that some creators mistakenly believe that spectators need to be children again; and, on the other, in the fact that a part of the audience accepts this sociocultural task of “innocence”. In contrast, it would be possible to use the proposed game-device “perversely” (for example, the slide), according to which it would become a device, which includes notions of risk or resilience. In a summary of what Foucault is proposing, says Fratini, *device* is the apparatus that, while in use, is using you. The success of the device lies in the lightness of the device.

The fifth intervention, by Cristina Cordero, questions whether we are prepared for subordination, for non-response to instruction: is the dramaturgy of ludic-theatrical devices prepared for disobedience?

Also from the audience, and in relation to amended paternalism, Andrea Bel considers that a way to escape it would be to consider spectators as players-citizens, social political bodies located in a place (game board) where they develop a role. Fleeing the idea of passivity, then, would mean accepting the game and, therefore, a simulation of political action with results. In response, Fratini says that the interesting rules of being obeyed are those that are discovered as paradoxes. Interesting choices are difficult, he insists; that the audience will never know if they are making the best decision from an ethical and strategic point of view.

Roberto Fratini, to end the session and also in response to Villanueva's concern, agrees that possibly the symposium could have included more, but refers to its already mentioned etymological meaning (to meet for a drink) and says that it may be unfair to consider that it should be fundamentally inclusive (apart from issues such as saturation of the programme), when there are other more informal interstitial spaces.

Carles Batlle closes the session thanking the whole team and with a special mention of Ferran Adelantado's "organisational efficiency".

