
Speaking as an Act of Self-Empowerment: Theatre Installation and Technical Mediation Device in the Museum. *Numax-Fagor-Plus*, by Roger Bernat

Christina SCHMUTZ

cschmutz@telefonica.net

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE: PhD in Performing Arts from the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and the Institut del Teatre. She studied Philology and Economic Sciences (Fribourg, Germany). In 1998 she arrived in Barcelona with a scholarship for contemporary playwriting. In this city, with Frithwin Wagner-Lippok, she mainly brought to the stage texts by contemporary German playwrights such as Falk Richter, Igor Bauersima, Sybille Berg, Roland Schimmelpfennig, Anja Hilling, Elfriede Jelinek, Oliver Kluck and Kathrin Röggla (Festival Grec, Festival de Sitges, Nau Ivanow, Espai Escènic Joan Brossa, Festival Videoart Loop, Teatre Tantarantana). Since 2006 she has also got involved in theoretical-practical projects on postdramatic and postspectacular theatre with lectures and as an active member of the Working Group Performance as Research, IFTR International Federation of Theatre Research and GTW (Gesellschaft für Theaterwissenschaft, society for theatre sciences). She teaches theoretical and practical courses at the Institut del Teatre and at Eòlia.

English translation, Neil CHARLTON

Abstract

Based on the example of the production *Numax-Fagor-Plus* by the Catalan director Roger Bernat, the article discusses the paradoxical structure of a technical device while establishing relations with aspects of a “monolithic” behaviour of social media spectators with users who tweet and post, and while raising issues concerning autonomous and free action. The technical transmission of the text is important for the development of the theatre production *Numax-Fagor-Plus* in the fragile framework of the museum, in principle outside theatre. This article *mediated* by a “technical device” matches the idea of postspectacular theatre – to introduce distances to enable the emergence of the “third mediator” – and works as spontaneous participation in the sense of postdramatic theatre. The seemingly direct contact in the “dialogue” in which the spectators might be willing to engage, prepared for the self-empowerment of the talks among the audience before the start of the scenic realization, becomes ironic proof of its illusion, visualised as a mere monitoring of a technically suggested behaviour. The scenic realization makes clear how those attending work as a mass, how they relate with each other and how they act with the text “on demand”, while subjecting themselves, from the outset, without challenging it, to a rule that is nowhere explicitly mentioned. Based on an apparent freedom, they are

almost cynically led towards a test of obedience, and now they paradoxically experience a much wider and notable freedom: what happens if I don't subject myself to it?

Keywords: postspectacular, postdramatic, technical device, self-empowerment, mediation, era of the narrative, end of dialogue, current communication culture

Christina SCHMUTZ

Speaking as an Act of Self-Empowerment: Theatre Installation and Technical Mediation Device in the Museum. *Numax-Fagor-Plus*, by Roger Bernat

“The type of dialogue we are dealing with today mainly reveals one thing: the time of dialogues is over. The time when we talked to each other is behind us. We are entering a new era of the narrative. This era we are living in is distinguished by people that are enthusiastic exclusively about their own narratives, without any need or desire to learn about the other side of the story [...]. The competition revolves around which opinion attracts more attention, who makes himself or herself heard the most...”

With these words, Amir Reza Koohestani (2018: 1) diagnoses the end of dialogue, talk and negotiation in our current communication culture although we are all permanently online, permanently connected; in other words, we communicate with each other almost at any time. In this “new era of narrative”, speaking mainly takes the form of a monologue presented through means such as self-representation. Koohestani sees this new era as a period of pure statements, which are mainly limited to summarising and reproducing current headlines, trends and images, at whose centre, concerned with itself, the expression of opinions and the simultaneous control of their effect have become a kind of self-representation. Work on the social effect of one’s own opinion represses the critical discourse and opportunities to debate in real time.

Koohestani’s diagnosis makes two things clear: the ambiguity of the technological innovations that (at least we must consider it in this way) are conceived to facilitate dialogue but in contrast degrade it to a mere articulation of one’s own statements; and the tendency to attribute to oneself the right to express one’s own opinion. This “self-empowered” speech occurs above all in social media. In the field of the performing arts, the social issue that, in this way, results from technical transmission devices has recently found a paradigmatic echo in Roger Bernat’s theatre production *Numax-Fagor-Plus*.¹ This director has worked since 2008 on a new aesthetics, which

1. Concept: Roger Bernat, based on the film *Numax presenta*, by Joaquim Jordà. Dramaturgy: Roberto Fratini. Historical research: Pablo González Morandi, with the collaboration of former workers of the Numax and Fagor Electrodomésticos factories. Performer: Núria Martínez-Vernís. Visualisation device: Matteo Sisti. Video editing: Ramiro Ledo Cordeiro. Sound: Cristóbal Saavedra Vial. Technical director: Txalo Toloza. Coordination: Helena Febrés Fraylich. Production assistant: Ricard Terés. Photography: Jorge Nagore.

places the audience centre stage. As he explains in an interview with Óscar Cornago (2016: 215) about his first production in this genre, *Domini públic* (2008), “the dialectic between who is looking — the spectator — and those doing — the actor — explodes when the stage and actors disappear.”

Based on the scenic situation of Bernat’s *mise-en-scène*, the ambiguity of the technical device can be discussed as an ambiguity of self-empowerment and on behalf of others. To give an impression, we will first provide some details. The spectators are seated face-to-face in two semicircular rows, leaving an open space in the middle. In this way, the situation looks like an assembly. On the right and left there are screens where dialogical texts are continuously projected.



Arrangement of the audience at the start of the scenic realization. Screenshot of FFF Roger Bernat / Blenda’s videographic material. Photograph: Christina Schmutz.

The title *Numax-Fagor-Plus* refers to the issue of the decline of two big Spanish factories — Numax (in the 1970s) and Fagor (by 2004) — through the reenactments of two assemblies of workers in these factories. The white goods factory Numax, threatened by bankruptcy, was saved thanks to the workers’ fight against whole redundancies and its transitional self-management in the 1970s. Joaquim Jordà’s documentary *Numax presenta*, from 1972, depicts these events. Many years after the self-management of the factory, which finally closed down, Bernat invited its former workers and those of Fagor to reenact one of the Numax assemblies, featured in Jordà’s documentary, and recorded these reenactments. The name *Fagor* refers to the historic mass redundancies of the Basque cooperative of the same name while the adjective *plus* represents its own artistic production.

The *mise-en-scène* features, as part of the screenings, short edited videos of the recorded reenactments and of the historical document. Meanwhile, it scenically recreates the situation of an assembly with the arrangement of the seats on the open stage. The text screenings are mainly taken from the dialogues in the documentary and the reenactments.

In the scenic realization of 11 July 2014 at the Festival Grec, in Barcelona, the performer Núria Vernís-Martínez, in the first quotation screened, starts reading aloud:

MERCÈ: Today, 3 May 1979, we the workers of NUMAX are facing a delicate situation... After two and a half years fighting to keep the factory open and ensure ourselves a job... through the efforts of all the workers... coping with clients, suppliers, banks, creditors... we find ourselves in a compromised situation.

The next text screening suggests that the performer should address the audience in the back rows, thereby clearly breaking the fictional situation.

(Pause. The PERFORMER looks at all those seating in the back rows): Can you hear me at the back?

The third screening follows:

FEMALE SPECTATOR IN THE LAST ROW *(reading aloud)*: Yes, yes, go ahead!
(Bernat, 2014).

After this initial situation, the spectators read the other lines, first reluctantly and later more fluently. In this process they seem to increasingly identify themselves with the assembly situation. Apparently, they understand the text screenings as an exhortation to read them aloud, following the example of the performer. Each new text screening is preceded by a sibilant sound, a sound technically produced that recalls a lash, while evoking violent connotations. This challenges the impression that a collective free decision-making process is taking place here. Moreover, the texts screened contain explicit instructions. The spectators subject themselves to an apparently implicit rule of reading the lines aloud and following the instructions screened as if they were stage directions for actors. Over time, they become very eager to act, change their voice tone and modulation, and seem to wish to enter into mutual competition as actors.

The recognition of the lines as texts from the video excerpts taken from the documentary and featured during the scenic realization and from the assemblies, “staged” by Bernat as reenactments, attests the historical authenticity and strengthens the illusion of also forming part of this self-empowerment, as it is performed. Meanwhile, this self-recognition reveals its arbitrary technical use; in other words, the possibility of being manipulated oneself, here and now. To some extent, it produces a later historicity of the present scenic realization while suggesting the possibility of fictionalising history. In this way, in the audience’s participation an interweaving of these two levels occurs.

Participatory formats are proposed and rapidly spread that suggest that spectators can access the scenic action but without any critical self-perception of major significance in theatre. Less often, like here, the ambiguity,

due to mediatisation and, in given cases, possibly deliberate, of the technical innovations and devices is taken into account. In *Numax-Fagor-Plus* the technical device consists of text screenings that fulfil an important function for the scenic realization given that they remain in operation instead of actors. In this framework, it is decisive not to understand “scenic realization” as the presentation of a previously prepared sequence but, following Erika Fischer-Lichte (2004: 22), a theatre event “that, as a process of experiences, emerges from the interaction of all participants; in other words, from the meeting between actors and spectators. Thus, all those physically present in the space participate in its genesis; the here and now always appears and is experienced in a special way as a present, and meanings previously given in another place are not transmitted but rather meanings that have emerged during its development are presented first.” Seen in this way, the “scenic realization” is characterised not so much by the situation staged but, above all, by its “quality as an event.”

In the present scenic realization, a female performer briefly appears only at the beginning, acting as an exemplary spectator and, therefore, as a model of action, to move to the last row of the stalls soon after the start of the realization, thereby remaining in the background and outside the field of attention of those attending the event. Following the attitude of the performer, the spectators always read the spoken text based on the screenings; also when she is not present. Thus, the performer gradually disappears during the scenic realization so that the presence of the spectators emerges increasingly stronger, until it prevails. In this way, there is in fact a levelling of the hierarchy between those present, and finally an egalitarian situation; in other words, those taking part in the scenic realization and its means of production are aligned. The resources of the spectators are even greater because they could complete what they read at any moment with contributions of their own and unexpectedly; at the same time, they obey — also the performer, who at first “experiences” it in an exemplary manner — the “rule” of reading, which has become “prevalent”. Elsewhere² I describe the way this text appears in the scenic realization as *text treatment*. This appearance, that is, this *text treatment*, has the features of fulfilment of a rule, and therefore it can be called *instruction fulfilment*. In this sense, the performer appears from the beginning with a dependency that challenges her status of autonomous performer. The situation, the presence of the performer and her performance with the technical device, and the text that is presented and that suggestively demands to be read generate together a social situation in which the spectators are compelled to speak in public. Empowerment on behalf of others becomes self-empowerment.

Although — as happened in some scenic realizations — some spontaneous manifestations that minimally divert themselves from the text screened gradually appear and cause laughter or other emotional reactions among

2. Christina Schmutz' doctoral thesis, *La dimensión crítica del teatro de Roger Bernat, René Pollesch y Christina Schmutz/ Frithwin Wagner-Lippok: uso de texto y reflexión crítica en la conjunción de teoría y práctica: una aproximación fenomenológica a Numax-Fagor-Plus, Kill Your Darlings! Streets of Berladelphia y els suplicants//conviure a bcn*, 2018. <<http://catalagclassic.uab.cat:80/record=b2038641>> [Last accessed: December 2019].

the other spectators, most of them generally remain loyal to the text of the screenings. Apart from these exceptions, the spectators do not develop their own text, while relinquishing — at least partly — the opportunity for self-empowerment that the situation offers them, which they can understand as an empowerment on behalf of others and, therefore, “exploitable”. Everything suggests that the situation offers the immediate participation of the audience and their own conception of the scenic realization as substitutes for the vacancy left by the performer.

What renders Bernat’s scenic realization so ambiguous and theoretically interesting, despite the relatively low use that the audience makes of their freedom, is that in fact this immediacy — a recurrent feature of postdramatic aesthetics — leads to confusion. The technical device of the text screenings contains, as a core of Roger Bernat’s aesthetics (and not only in this scenic realization), a clever and paradoxical interweaving between self-empowerment and empowerment on behalf of others. Far from making the spectators speak in an *immediate* manner, giving them the freedom to define their own “destiny”, at least not that evening, a *mediation* takes place there. In fact, even a dual mediation: the spectators transmit *for themselves* a text already technically mediated, and it is not the actors who, as usual, serve them the whole text already completed. This communication *mediated* through the technical device corresponds to a fundamental feature of André Eiermann’s postspectacular theatre (2009): the demand of again introducing distances in the theatre communication between the stage and the audience, of making the so-called “third mediator” appear. This is what Eiermann calls the third party based on Jacques Lacan’s triangle relationship (1996), which introduces an otherness in the two-sided relationship between audience and stage. Moreover, the fact that at least some spectators not only take on their new “role” willingly and enthusiastically and try to “perform it” the best they can but above all *how* they do it also has clear features of a spontaneous participation in the sense of postdramatic theatre (Lehmann, 1999) and, considering the most recent aesthetic development, also of immersive theatre. The fact that the performer remains in the shadow reveals this strategy of absence, and with this the aspect of otherness enters into play: in the direct relationship between the action on the stage and the spectator’s experience a gap emerges in the absence of physical speaking actors through the technical device of the text screening and the disappearance of the performer, a gap that can now be filled by a third party. In this way, the supposed “offer” of an immediate control of the scenic realization — and, therefore and exemplarily, of the destiny itself of that evening — suffers a clear “setback”.

Nevertheless, the scenic realization, seen superficially, seems to be a particularly provocative case of theatre participation that makes the common devices in theatre explode: it is a “scenic device that is activated with the participation of the audience” (Cornago, 2015: 267). Instead of taking place in a conventional theatre, it was held at the Archaeology Museum of Catalonia. In the fragile environment of the art exhibition, the performative treatment of the institution itself and the observer generates unease. This defines the expectations since the start of the realization itself and suggests

a participatory style. The place embodies an environment different from a usual theatre. It is a special type of public space, where the access to it creates expectations related to the visit to a museum. The places and events triggering special expectations involve “devices”: specific rules and discourses are linked there. According to Michel Foucault (1978: 119-120), a device includes heterogeneous elements, related to each other through given shifting links that, as a whole, fulfil a strategic social function. Beyond this, the device is linked to the existing relations of power. Thus, for Foucault it became a conceptual resource to give a name to the functioning of a society that lies on the structures. Both in the *theatre* and the *museum*, the spaces, the discourses, the institutions and the authorities are networked in a shifting manner, so that they meet social needs and reflect the structural power in a more or less critical form: in the first case, they meet the need of a current reassertion (of the self) staged by the actors in front of a physically present audience through the presentation of a more or less fictional narration; in the second, they meet the need for preservation and exhibition, which are invariable in time, of fleeting, tangible or intangible events. Thus, the device comprises given discourses and rules, as well as things said and taken for granted, and acts as a network that we can weave between the elements and the existing power relations. Wolfgang Neurath (2017) notes, within the concept of device, the contraction of the exterior physical with the imaginative mental: “Foucault’s thought is located at a boundary, it seems to come from outside but it represents a particular amorphous variant in social history, because he understands social powers as a political occupation of the body and mind.” In this way, social forces and forces of individual spontaneity are interwoven in the subject: “The subject is divided, subjected, to some extent the bearer of strange forces, and enabled; in other words, he or she suffers and exercises power.”

In this crossroads and superimposition of power and the intersubjective and subjective empowerment, in its participatory approach and in the proximity with the installation, *Numax-Fagor-Plus* is in principle comparable to the installations by the German-British artist Tino Sehgal. As happens in his installations, which he calls “constructed situations” and that are influenced by conceptual art, minimalist art, choreography, performance art and artistic installation,³ the so-called “performers” generate contact with the museum visitors, following their instructions, and they involve them in the action through dialogues, songs or choreography. In the same way that in Bernat’s participatory settings, visitors become aware of their presence: “Sehgal himself acknowledges that, in his work, the visitor is made aware of his or her own presence in the situation created by the installation” (Burt, 2010: 276). Although, in contrast to Bernat, Sehgal shows his works exclusively in institutions outside theatre, such as galleries and museums, “the experimentation and exploration of the rules undertaken in the experimentation are a basic feature” (Umatham, 2011: 169) in him too.

3. Sehgal’s works are exclusively exhibited in museums (MOMA, Venice Biennale [Golden Lion Award 2013], Guggenheim, Tate Modern, Dokumenta Kassel, etc.). Taking photographs, advertising and reproduction are strictly prohibited.

The difference or peculiarity of *Numax-Fagor-Plus* is that participation here involves a diabolic trap because the theatre devices *seem* visibly and politically vulnerable, but as *technically mediated* they are not suppressed but are irreplaceable, and therefore are even reasserted. To recover the link with Koohestani's initial thesis, we must recall the social context in which the issue of unsolicited speech in public situations arises. Despite its validity, which will not be the subject of my reflections, this interesting statement at least arouses the issue of how to assess unsolicited speech in public situations with this background. The spontaneous individual contribution to the public discourse is considered, and rightly, a sign of a democratic, emancipated and active attitude that participates in social life. However, we might suspect, with Koohestani's words, that this speech can be interpreted – in the supposed conditions of prevalence of mediatised narratives – completely the other way round, as a mediatically “influenced” narrative and banal in itself. It might happen that the tendency to a narrative of one's own unfolds an emancipatory effect, while making free subjectively developed statements emerge at any moment and in any device but that, at the same time, the space for negotiation in dialogue of more complex conclusions becomes narrower, driven by technical devices. These devices must be understood as concrete or abstract structures, in Foucault's sense (1978), in which social power-knowledge appears. If, on the one hand, these structures of power and knowledge, supported by technical devices, produce and foster “opinions”, they are formed based on pre-manufactured patterns of statement and, finally, they introduce them in the discourse, as valid “narratives”; whereas on the other they are just *apparently* the expression of the social dispute between individuals. Seen in this way, the conversion of “one's own opinion” into the narrative, mentioned by Koohestani, would primarily avoid the formation of one's own opinions. In these paradoxical circumstances, self-empowerment would be facilitated to unsolicited speech but it would also lose its social meaning in the coexistence in dialogue, that of a competition between freely chosen opinions and attitudes, which, finally, is to the benefit of the ongoing dynamic development and the gradual and adaptive remodelling of a democratic society. The technical installations that would facilitate such a self-empowerment do no more than further strengthen this ambiguity between manipulation and empowerment.

In daily life, occasions continuously arise when ambiguity might emerge: every mobile phone is, to some extent, a means to urge people to talk and, at the same time, a technical device to integrate the individual into the interests of a very powerful market. For some time, cultural criticism has noted that the innovative technical devices, like those that currently mark above all the use of digital technologies, promote uniform behaviour and communication, for instance in the so-called “filter bubbles”. The media expert Martina Leeker (*TdZ*, 2018: 7-18), in an article on aesthetic strategies in digital cultures, argues that nothing original is any longer developed to achieve satisfactory communication but we minimise the importance of everything and enchain reference after reference. Moreover, this loss of what is one's own contrasts with a demand, subjectively perceived, to reinvent oneself continuously.

Also here the illusion of self-realization seems to be confronted with pure external control. The observation of the loss of originality and irrelevance is undermined by the experience of the social demand for incomparability and omnipresence: the promise of this new universalism lies, moreover, in being connected and being able to enter into contact with everything and everyone, at any time. The empirical discrepancy between this aspiration and this promise, on the one hand, and the failure experienced along with the disillusion of this aspiration, on the other, mainly raises the issue of fundamental autonomy of the acts of speech in public: what dependency do we have when we state our opinion using prefigured patterns or technical devices that inadvertently determine for us this way of speaking and, even perhaps, our own “opinion”?

After the basic pillars of postdramatic theatre — the inclusion of the real as artistic material and the opening of the fourth wall; that is, face-to-face communication — were corrupted by its commercial cornering, Eiermann, faced with the emancipating function of postdramatic theatre in its time, currently relies more on the new strategies of absence and, therefore, the postspectacular formats. The opportunity this presents is that the theatre event is only completed by the phantoms and the poetry-otherness artistically created. In this way, the aesthetic strategies, which force the formation of this otherness and make the spectator fall into a hole, which later can be filled through her own activity, form, according to Eiermann, the basis of truthful empowerment.

Faced with an empty stage, without personnel, the spectators become performers. They leave behind their status as spectators and take on the stage action. The technical device generates their *self-empowerment* and their emancipation from the status of passive spectators. The effect is strengthened by the slow disappearance of the performer. The technical device is so transparent that the spectators might also rebel against it. They have free reign, they can read or not, they can also modify texts or stage directions, reading differently or a little differently, or rather stop carrying out stage directions, or follow them in part or differently. The self-empowerment of the spectators even reaches, as such, the design completely free of scenic realization; in other words, even its total disintegration. In fact, the thesis of self-empowerment does not revolve around the issue of whether they really leave the suggestive framework — thereby *using* it paradoxically for real — but rather whether they *might* leave it; in other words, whether the offer exists, whether there is an open space of possibilities, whether it can be experienced as such (in the realizations I have attended, the spectators have not exploited their possibilities and their freedom thus far).⁴

In this way a gap is created between possibility and realization, in this case between reading and speaking; in this gap, a question emerges: who produces the text? Who speaks? Are they really emancipated spectators? Or will perhaps the authorised voice of the setting appear through the masks of

4. Sartre says in *Les mouches* (*The Flies*) that people are not aware that they are free: Jupiter recalls Egiste “le secret douloureux des Dieux et des rois, c’est que les Hommes sont libres. Ils sont libres, Égisthe. Tu le sais, et ils ne le savent pas.”

the characters, solicitously adopted by the spectators? This question leads to the second reading, completely different, of the scenic realization. The spectators' behaviour enables an obvious relationship with aspects of the social media to be established, whose users tweet and post and think they act with freedom and autonomy. This is why the scenic realization not only means that the scenic emancipation of the spectators can be experienced but also embodies exactly the opposite: the way those attending work as a mass that can be manipulated according to a rule, "authorised" moreover by a technical apparatus, by a device. They follow instructions and docilely recite a text "on demand". They subject themselves to a rule that has not been explicitly indicated anywhere. The apparent freedom of expression appears in the "read", pre-printed, marked reality, dramaturgically prepared by others. Blindly obedient, they accept their own self-control and their self-limitation instead of exploiting the opportunity to have something to say. They simply follow the current, immerse themselves in the supposed normative structure of the micro-society of the scenic realization. To express their own opinion, they should place themselves outside the group and dare to keep a distance.

Bernat's scenic installation appears in this way as a sarcastic farce of the illusory freedom of a community that gives up, submissively, to the most minimal authoritarian direction technically transmitted. This second reading shakes faith in the freedom of expression of autonomous individuals capable of spontaneously expressing their opinion. It also raises the question of whether the talks and discourses between people are not far more pre-figured than we imagine. A transparent and democratic formulation of the social norms does not protect from totalitarianism through the back door. In this way, the scenic realization distinguishes a trivial dichotomic scheme between good emancipating participation and bad theatre of performance, in an aesthetic analogy with the dichotomy between oppressed and oppressors in the workers' fight. Thus, it is possible to interpret the same scenic realization in the opposite sense. The other side of the coin of the technical device as an instrument of liberation is the technical apparatus as an oppressing complex. The device can become a place of taming, an instrument of oppression, provided what the spectators recite is set down: their behaviour has been manipulated by the success of the *mise-en-scène* "as a business model." The scenic realization oscillates between these readings, while confronting the enablement of freedom with the trap of manipulation. The social parallelism is clear: social media also pretend to be transparent but act as authoritarian structures of power. Everything recalls companies such as Google, Facebook, Amazon and Microsoft, which promote the "surveillance capitalism" (Zuboff, 2018) as a business model. This corresponds exactly to what Foucault meant by "device". Thus, the scenic realization works in terms of its technical configuration as a *demonstration of a device*, and at the same time precisely as this device.

The issue of the supposed freedom and self-responsibility of the spectators can be described as "guided emancipation of the spectators"; in other words, whether we should see the apparently enabled emancipation of the spectators rather as a consequence of an aesthetic manipulation. The

self-empowerment manipulated by the spectators is only possible thanks to a technical device: it is a *manipulative* empowerment. The technical device is so transparent that the spectators might rebel against it; it is a non-explicit rule, but clear and distinguishable. However, the spectators accept their self-empowerment while speaking and shaping the development of the scenic realization. Otherness as a postspectacular characteristic of the scenic realization allows for both interpretations. If we assert — in the social field — that theatre generates models of authentic participation in the performance, *Numax-Fagor-Plus* is in this sense also a configuration in which reality is both *authentic* (the spectators can speak) and *non-authentic* (in fact, they only say what they are told). The speech of the spectators also has features of a public exposition, which in an exaggerated way we could see as posing, as a positive self-representation. In its turn, we see Koohestani's forecast of the "era of the narrative" reflected in this self-representation. The illusion of a communication freely chosen between free people, when in fact some technical devices suggest desired actions, refers to a decisive conclusion mainly in view of the world trend towards the rise of right-wing populist stances: the possibility of free verbal expression is far from being a free formation of wills.

Roger Bernat's highly ambiguous setting in *Numax-Fagor-Plus* can be considered as a dialectic break down of the performance in an empowerment thesis, as well as the antithesis of incapacitation. The manipulative theatre setting is comparable to a pre-revolutionary situation, not only in terms of the content but also structurally: it leads — as apparently in keeping with its concept — to a kind of real fiction, which also partly works. But, in addition, the resistance to the claim of having to irremediably "participate" leads, finally, to dealing with the issue of assimilation or resistance. In this way, the immediate experience of the spoken texts is experienced once as *self-empowerment* and once as *manipulated self-empowerment*; in other words, as a generally *paradoxical* experience, which turns out to be critical precisely because of this unavoidable paradox: it denounces the existing social situation or the passivity of the audience in a common theatrical situation; it differentiates in a dichotomic scheme between what is bad and what is good in the oppressed and the oppressors in the workers' fight, showing, firstly, how the oppressed also suggestively pressure their peers and, secondly, that the lack of protest is not only due to the oppressors but also to the conformism of the mass faced with the democratic commitment; it takes an existing social and theatrical system to crisis, while widening the space to performance options that have so far passed unseen.



Bibliographical references

- BURT, Ramsay. "Performative Intervention and Political Affect: De Keersmaker and Sehgal". In: KOLB, Alexandra. *Dance and Politics*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2010, pp. 268-279.
- BERNAT, Roger, FFF. *Numax-Fagor-Plus*, 2014 [online]. <<https://www.catalandrama.cat/es/>> [Last accessed: 17 January 2019].
- CORNAGO, Óscar. *Ensayos de teoría escénica. Sobre teatralidad, público y democracia*. Madrid: Abada, 2015.
- "Uno va al teatro a ser manipulado. Una conversación con Roger Bernat". *telondefondo, Revista para la Crítica Teatral* (Argentina: CABA), No. 24, pp. 214-226.
- EIERMANN, André. *Das postspektakuläres Theater. Die Alterität der Aufführung und die Entgrenzung der Künste*. Bielefeld: [transcript] Independent Academic publishing, 1999.
- FISCHER-LICHTE, Erika. *Ästhetik des Performativen*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2004.
- FOUCAULT, Michel. *Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*. Berlin: Merve, 1978.
- KOOHESTANI, Amir Reza. "Das Ende des Dialogs". *Theater Heute* (Berlin), No. 8 (June 2018), p.1.
- LACAN, Jacques. *Die vier Grundbegriffe der Psychoanalyse. Das Seminar*. Translation from French into German by Norbert Haas (1973). Berlin: Quadriga, 1996.
- LEEKER, Martina; BISCHOF, Andreas; MARKUS, Joss. "Wir erfinden uns und die Dinge gerade neu". In: *Theater der Zeit* (Berlin), No. 7-8 (August 2018), pp. 25-31.
- LEHMANN, Hans-Thies. *Das postdramatische Theater*. Frankfurt: Verlag der Autoren, 1999.
- NEURATH, Wolfgang. *Von den Dispositiven der Macht und ihrer sozialen Morphologie* [online]. <<http://medienimpulse.at/articles/view/1028>> [Last accessed: 18 December 2018].
- PARISER, Eli. *The Filter Bubble. How the new personalized web is changing what we read and how we think*. Original edition from 2012. English into Spanish translation by Mercedes Vaquero. Barcelona: Taurus, 2017.
- SARTRE, Jean-Paul. *Les Mouches*. Paris: Gallimard, 1943.
- UMATHUM, Sandra. "Es regiert das abstrakte Konzepttheater". In: HINZ, Melanie; ROSELT, Jens (Eds.). *Chaos und Konzept. Proben und Probieren im Theater*. Berlin: Alexander, pp. 150-171.
- ZUBOFF, Shoshana. *The age of surveillance capitalism. (Das Zeitalter des Überwachungskapitalismus)* Translation from English by Bernhard Schmid. Frankfurt: Campus, 2018.