
It is January 2020 and the US territory of Puerto Rico is in a state of emergency, again (still). Following the magnitude 6.4 earthquake in Tallaboa, Peñuelas, on 7 January, a series of earthquakes continue to rattle the archipelago (Ortiz 2020). Already struggling under the cruel austerity measures implemented by the Fiscal Control Board as they continue to wait for federal disaster aid allocated in 2017, Ricans are sleeping in cars, in tents pitched on mountain tops, and on cots in parking lots (Ortiz 2020; Miami Herald Editorial Board 2020). Colonial subjects of the US for 122 years, enduring environmental disasters exacerbated by the catastrophe of colonial neglect is nothing new for Puerto Ricans.

Writing in, with, and through these dual disasters (both “natural” and unnatural), author Sandra Ruiz opens her profoundly necessary and timely book — Ricanness: Enduring Time in Anticolonial Performance — by noting that “Hurricane Maria is a chief instance of how the Rican body [...] continuously enacts permanent endurance practices to cultivate an existence under colonial time” (1). In the introduction, “A Living Colonialism, or Simply, the Aesthetic Life of Ricanness,” she turns to the photographic work of diasporic Puerto Rican artist Adal Maldonado (aka ADÁL) to consider how his series Puerto Ricans Underwater/Los ahogados (2016) anticipates what she names “Rican endurance” in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria. The series depicts clothed Puerto Ricans holding their breath in bathtubs filled with water and everyday objects; a performance of fortitude “against the national current of death, disease, and debt” (5). Lest we turn away from the discomfort of witnessing Ricans drown (metaphorically?), Ruiz argues that we must look at “the most painful but promising inquiries of subjugation at the scene of the enduring body” in art, activism, and everyday life under unsovereignty (2). Ruiz mines the pedagogical within the aesthetic to ask what Rican subjectivity can teach us about “alternative ways of being and becoming,” about “bearable ways of ‘doing time’ with our own bodies” (10). Challenging both conventional conceptions of endurance art as chosen labor situated within linear time and the predominant reliance on normative historiography in postcolonial inquiry, Ruiz focuses on insurgent nonlinear aesthetic breaks in imperial time that extend “the brief time of the event into a cyclical, looping eternity, which models the eternal recurrence of colonial practice[s]” (12).

As I began reading Ricanness, I had visions of Ruiz underwater. Feeling discomfort in my body, I envisioned hers submerged. I imagined Ruiz holding her breath under the weight of a canon, a set of “pale accounts of existence” (148), concepts, and intellectual movements that disregard our Brown, our Rican, bodies. I imagined her enduring the erasure she encounters in those spaces; those conceptual spaces that make my chest tight, my body stiff, and my breath shallow. As if she anticipated that some readers might turn away from not only the photographs
of Ricans under water, but also from the disciplinary modes of inquiry that erase them, Ruiz calls on us to persist. She asks us to purposefully engage “those philosophical questions often barred for people of color—either because existentialism and phenomenology are types of thinking already ‘owned,’ or because they constitute an intellectual luxury far removed from everyday minoritarian struggles” (163). Her resolve, as a Puerto Rican woman, to engage fields in which she is the unwanted Other paves a way for other “Others” to enter these barred and owned epistemologies so that we can “stare past the horizon with apprehension, longing, pain, and pleasure [...] in the long pursuit of liberation and continual existence” (12). Midway through reading Ricanness my visualization of a drowning Ruiz shifted. Still under water, but somehow not drowning, she extends her hand (perhaps as she imagined Fanon extending his to her) and pulls me into the text.

She names performance studies as the vehicle that allows her to travel the theoretical terrain laid by those uninterested in accounting for minoritarian subjects (13). Performance studies taught her “to recycle and co-opt dominant narratives” so she could see herself (18). Ruiz steps into intellectual times and spaces that I dare not go in order to demand an account of queer Rican existence, to document and begin historicizing Brown existentialism—a condition she describes as waiting to be wanted (137). Somewhat paradoxically, Ruiz refuses to wait. She does not want to be wanted by dominant narratives, so she blazes an alternative pathway toward the horizon and beckons us to follow. Extending Antonio Viego’s work in Dead Subjects: Toward A Politics of Loss in Latino Studies (2007), Ruiz asserts that wholeness and wantedness are not the only pathways to liberation. Holding firmly onto what she has learned about Brownness as “always already oriented toward transformation” from our mentor José E. Muñoz, she suggests “There’s a way to read with and through unwantedness [...] that does not destroy the futural prospects of the subject under a looping colonialism” (27, 25).

“Lipstick Revolutionaries,” chapter 1, reinterprets the intentions and performative effects of Lolita Lebrón’s insurgent femme revolutionary act: an armed attack in the US congressional chamber on 1 March 1954. Positioning Lolita’s political act within the realm of aesthetic spectacle, Ruiz argues that she forced a pause in “historical, colonial, and masculinist” time by offering her life as a subject whose only material property is her death (39). In chapter 2, “Running Out of Time,” we travel from the figure of the insurgent femme to the hypermasculine Brown male body, from paused time to constrained time as evidenced in Papo Colo’s 1977 performance, Superman 51. Ruiz reads Colo’s “flawed” superman attempt to run fast despite the weight of the cape on his back (made of 51 pieces of rope and wooden planks) as a performative manifestation of the “durational gravity” experienced by sexualized, racialized, and colonized men of color. Moving into the space of heteronormative domesticity in chapter 3, “Countdown to the Future,” Ruiz asks us to consider the Rican subjects who endure cramped micromanaged time within the toxic space of abjection and abuse, as portrayed in Pedro Pietri’s The Masses Are Asses (1974). Still underwater, readers are denied a deep breath of fresh air as Ruiz takes us from Pietri’s locked bathroom, rank with the smell of excrement, to Ryan Rivera’s Body/Pysche (2002) performance videos, which leave us with shallow, anxious breaths. In this chapter, “Looping Sensations,” spectators/readers experience the queer affective intensity of waiting-with and waiting-on the late Rivera, whose endurance practices (bashing, not breathing, crying) played at the edge of life and death. Taken together, Ruiz’s analytical sites demonstrate how Ricans interrupt, rearrange, fold, fast forward, rewind, and mirror time not only to reveal the effects of colonial violence, but to teach us how to hold our breath and wait them out—to survive white supremacist colonial heteropatriarchy.

Though her book focuses on Ricans in the diaspora, her theorization of alternative ways of being through anticolonial performance is not bound by colonially imposed borders between here (US) and there (Puerto Rico); Ricans endure “regardless of where they build ground” (2). Ricanness offers so much not only to the fields of performance studies and Puerto Rican studies, but also to Ricans like me, Ricans wanting “a relational way to imagine, dream, and con-
struct alternate forms of living under colonialism, across bodies of water” (172). And so together we hold our breath and we breathe, together we labor in time and press pause on the master’s imperial clock, together we acknowledge the limitations of a “purely spatial analysis dominated by borders and nationalism” (153) to “land on something else we haven’t yet dreamed up” (29).

— Jessica N. Pabón-Colón
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In this slim but masterful volume Paloma Martinez-Cruz applies “the optics of cultural analysis” to understand how “people of indigenous and Latin American extraction are the targets, and survivors, of oppressive colonial food chains […] through the logic of neoliberal policies and colonial and patriarchal fantasies” (118). The book “submits that food provisioning constitutes an urgent entry point into the fight for the life chances, dignity, and economic agency of indigenous, mestizo, Chicano, Mexican, Latinx, and Latin American peoples” (3) and proposes that every day we are obliged to vote and also to fight. Every meal is a vote: for a just or unjust food system, and therefore a fight for a vision of life, justice, and future.

In her first book, Women and Knowledge in Mesoamerica: From East L.A. to Anahuac (2011), and in this one, the author celebrates “radical mestiza feminist epistemologies,” including healing practices and foodways as kinds of knowledge transmission by women who are consistently both exploited and undervalued (13). In this book, she turns her attention to colonial logics in foodways that “attack indigenous and mestizo life chances, dignity, and ecological stewardship” (13). Drawing on Chicana theorists, especially Gloria Anzaldúa, Martinez-Cruz deploys the concept of mestizaje as a “feminist, spiritual vision of productive disruption” (6). By noting the ways that coloniality of power and thought infect food provisioning and dining, she makes the energizing observation that the colonial mind can
be “reconfigured and reimagined so that decolonial imaginaries and practices may emerge as its challenger” (9). This deadly serious and critical objective is carried out with her characteristically razor-sharp wit and keen observations, shaped by her trajectory as a literary scholar, cultural studies professor, and performance artist; readers will both shake their fists and laugh out loud at her wickedly astute observations and critiques.

Martinez-Cruz begins the book acknowledging the “72 labors” that make any meal—and her book—possible. This Zen concept of gratitude toward all of the many—often unacknowledged—contributors to any communal effort sets the tone of the book overall. This starting point of recognition and acknowledgment furthers her centering of the many ways that Indigenous and mestizo ideas, labor, and love persist even though they are marginalized and their misconstrued and misappropriated facsimiles are all the rage.

She identifies the “disconnect between elite society, its Edenic ideas about gardening and seasonality, and the realities of agricultural employment” (26). In a parallel fashion, Mexican cooking by Mexicans is often passed over while the “Columbus effect” enables white entrepreneurs to profit from its “translation” to “broader” audiences. Comparing co-optation of Mexican food by late-to-the-game chefs to the takeover of Southwestern territories by settlers colonists, which ideologies of manifest destiny permitted, she notes that both require a framing of such goods (the food and the land) as “untended” and “available.” Only a systematic erasure of the long-standing custodians of that food and land through the violence of both genocide and cultural depredation could create the conditions for such piracy. She lambastes the “restaurants that have been adapted to conform to Anglo demand for Mexican fare at reasonable prices,” restaurants that pass for “Mexican” in many US towns, as a kind of “culinary brownface,” a performance of exaggerated ethnicity that “constitutes a form of calculated racial oppression in the vein of the blackface minstrel show” (46). In a funhouse mirror-like fashion, Martinez-Cruz notes such restaurants “are not imitations of Mexican eating and dining conventions, but rather, like with minstrelsy, imitations of the Mexican imitation of Western dining” (47). Reading menus, restaurant décor, and even patron-waitstaff interactions like literary texts, she unpacks how “authenticity” comes to serve as a badge of approval by folks who have spent, she notes, zero time in the Southwest or Mexico but are seduced by performances of “Anglo ideas about ethnicity” and the “festification” of mock Mexican food that originated in the chain fast-food restaurants Taco Bell and Chi-Chi’s, not Mexico. Mexican entrepreneurs and food workers are often obliged to engage in this fictional representation, “an Anglo-facing staging of ethnicity,” in order to survive in the low-profit-margin zone of what US-Americans are willing to pay for “Mexican” food (50). While Anglos in the US have demonstrated a consistent hostility toward people of Mexican ancestry, their long-standing obsession with what they think of as “Mexican” food may be the most palatable setting for thinking about the incongruity of the popular combo-platter of anti-Mexican nativism and pro-Mexican appetites.

But the book is not entirely or even mainly critique; it is also a celebration of restorative justice projects like the Homegirl Café, a sister operation to Homeboy Industries in Los Angeles, a space where food preparation and hospitality become a venue for a “new value system that challenges patriarchal and colonial logics, and forms the technology by which mestiza consciousness is transmitted” (66). In the Homegirl Café, “the generative ritual of offering and receiving food” becomes “a seed life of community transformation” (66). This goes beyond the momentary act of caregiving—which is in itself meaningful—that is also a longer-term act where “one can discern the full ideation of a new mestiza counterstory reshaping the public imaginary in the culinary marketplace” (87).

In 2000, Martinez-Cruz and I were both part of a transnational working group organized by the Hemispheric Institute of Performance and Politics of New York University, and we remotely met with the Brazilian scholar of theatre and performance studies, Zeca Ligiéro, based at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. The New York–based scholars mentioned we had been working on the concept of resistance, and wondered how Brazilian scholars, espe-
cially those working in Indigenous and Afro-Brazilian spaces, conceptualized resistance. Ligiéreo laughed and said, “In Brazil, we eat the Other.” In Food Fight! Martinez-Cruz quotes Josée Johnston and Shyon Baumann’s characterization of the neocolonial desire to “eat the other” (52). It is clear that the voracious appetites of many people in the US involve a desire to devour Mexican food and also to swallow, sublimate, and ignore the painfully obvious and hypocritical dependence on Mexican people not only for obvious things, such as labor, but also for sustenance in a more profound sense: “it’s a fight to invigorate both imagination and action around the most utopian, yet most fundamental, of human rights: a world in which everyone is fed, and no one is harmed” (16).

— Alyshia Gálvez
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The Peyote Dance, an album set mostly to the late poetry of Antonin Artaud, is Patti Smith’s second collaboration with Soundwalk Collective, a New York–based experimental sound outfit, and third altogether. They first worked together on the 2016 album Killer Road, and since The Peyote Dance was released on 31 May 2019, they published another album, Mummer Love (November 2019), in which they explore the work of another French poet whom Smith admires: Arthur Rimbaud. The latter poet has loomed large in Smith’s work since her early days as the leading poetess of New York’s punk rock scene. In retrospect, Artaud can be found looming in the corners of her poetry, gradually entering her music performances (she did a concert dedicated to him during the exhibit of his works of paper at MoMA in 1996). In Peyote Dance her fascination with Artaud finally comes into full display.

Stephan Crasneanscki, who—together with Simone Merli—is the principal member of Soundwalk Collective, traveled to Sierra Tarahumara to record onsite, using the instruments that the local Rarámuri make for their own purposes. Smith’s sections were added later: “Listening, reading and improvising to the tracks in the New York studio allowed Smith to channel Artaud’s spirit” (Soundwalk Collective 2020). Apart from the opening track, “Una Nota Sobre el Peyote” (A note on peyote), read by acclaimed Mexican actor Gael García Bernal, the album features Artaud’s poems “Tutuguri: The Rite of the Black Sun” and “Tutuguri: The Rite of the Black Night,” “The New Revelations of Being,” “Alienation and Black Magic,” “Basalówala Aminá Ralámuli Paísila,” as well as Smith’s original song “Ivry,” named after the clinic near Paris where Artaud spent his last months after being released from Rodez mental hospital in May 1946.
Artaud sailed to Mexico in January 1936. During his stay there, he undertook a perilous journey by train and on horseback to Sierra Tarahumara, where the Rarámuri people lived in relative isolation for centuries. A long-time user of opium and heroin—prescribed for medical purposes early in the century—Artaud went through withdrawal, which made his journey through rugged terrain even more difficult. His goal was to take part in the peyote ritual, which the local villagers still practiced despite centuries of attempts by the Roman Catholic Church to prohibit indigenous religious practices. Upon his return, he wrote that the local villagers “are living in the style that predates the Flood” ([1947] 1976a:3). That is no longer the case. In the late 1980s, a road was cut all the way up to the high plateau of Sierra Tarahumara, and with it came the loggers who cut the ancient pine trees, and the drug cartels who brought violence and made this “ancient race” their vassals.¹

“Tutuguri: The Rite of the Black Sun” comes from Artaud’s long poem *To Have Done with the Judgement of God*, which he recorded for the French radio in November 1947, only months before he died (4 March 1948) of undiagnosed rectal cancer. With this and other recordings he created in the months leading up to this death, Artaud made a lasting mark on sound and radio art. *The Peyote Dance* is not an attempt to emulate or expand on Artaud’s inimitable vocal gestures. Instead, Smith’s recitation of his verses is composed, clear, and devoid of any excesses. She resists the impulse to read eruptions of glossolalia in his poetry as textual screams. To great effect and even clinical accuracy, in the finale of “Alienation and Black Magic,” she delivers his word jumble in a barely audible whisper, as an incantation aimed primarily to oneself.

Soundwalk Collective creates a landscape of sounds that Artaud might have heard during his stay in the village of Norogachi: the howling of the wind, crackling of leaves and branches, swishing of rattles, beat of the drums, creaky strings, and noises that seem to resemble the rhythmical scraping of rasping sticks of Peyote sorcerers that Artaud described in his first reports from his journey ([1947] 1976a:5). In these performances of Artaud’s poems, it is the sound, not only the voice, that creates a gradual buildup and brings to the surface the drama that resides deep within his poetry. Smith does very little singing on these tracks. But then, the penultimate track, “Ivry,” breaks into rhythmical and peaceful, almost eerie, song. It’s a respite before death. The album closes with a track whispered—in Rarámuri, I presume—in a voice that seems to finally reintroduce Artaud’s verses into the landscape from which they poured into his tortured psyche.

*The Peyote Dance* is a powerful, and at moments strangely enjoyable, listening experience. It is a recorded performance, and also a publication of Artaud’s poetry in a different medium (Smith and Soundwalk Collective use already existing English translations). It often left me wondering what it does that other publications could not? I preordered the album and downloaded it the day it was released. I went on listening to it, for months, as one does these days: at my home, on my way to work, in my car, on airplanes. But I did not really hear it until late one night this winter when I found myself, *The Peyote Dance* pouring from my earbuds, in San Francisco’s Mission District. “At this point there enters a certain Faith,” Artaud wrote in a text from 1925, “but let all coproloquists listen, all aphasiacs, and in general all the disinherited of language and of the world, the pariahs of Thought. I speak only to them” (1976b:107). And there they were. The addressees of his calls were right in front of me, on these greasy pavements, and not in the hills of Tarahumara or pavilions of Rodez. The psychic upheaval of Artaud’s Tarahumara writings is animated by three powerful forces: mental illness, addiction, and the Spanish-speaking Rarámuri. They are no longer separated by great geographic, institutional, and historical distances that separate France and Mexico, the psychiatric hospital in Rodez and the Paris boulevards, Ivry and northern California, 1948 and 2019, and even New York’s Electric Lady Studio.

1. For more on the destruction of this region of Chihuahuan state, see the documentary film *Voices of the Sierra Tarahumara* (Brewster and Gehm 2001).
and Mission Street. The landmarks of Artaud’s psychogeography are no longer scattered in time and place: one can find them on a single block of Mission Street, and in many similar corners of California.

The black earth is here, “stinking the same way it embalms,” “kaffir of urine,” “urinary camphor” ([1947] 1995:181). There are bodies on that ground, dozens of them. Prostrated on cardboard, covered with blankets and sleeping bags, surrounded with odd pieces of clothing and footwear. There are voices and shouts, many of them in Spanish. Some of them could be migrant workers from the Tarahumara region of Chihuahua, displaced by poverty and the onslaught of drug traffickers. And there are four “prophets” standing in front of the entrance to the BART underground station, shakily reading from the Old Testament. “[...] no one understands well enough ‘the salivary power of the cross’/ and that the cross is a stream of saliva spat on the words of thought” ([1947] 1976a:100). An old (old?) Black man approaches me, saliva oozing down his lip, and addresses me with mangled or made-up words. “[...F]or it is through doctors and not through the patients that society begun [...] and there is nothing like an insane asylum for gently incubating death / and for keeping the dead in incubators” ([1947] 1995:161). Now, decades later and half a world away, the hospitals are emptied, so that the mentally ill are locked out and exiled ever further to the edges of society. And the cruelty of that expulsion is nowhere more visible than here in the Mission District, that frontier of gentrification.

The essay “The Peyote Rite among the Tarahumara,” which Artaud wrote in Rodez in late 1943 or early 1944, is not a memoir, or a delayed travelog, or even a fictional story; this writing was the very means of Artaud’s reordering of his own psyche. It is a trace left in the eternal present of the text of one of the most astonishing performances of a recovery of the mind after a schizophrenic collapse, in spite, and not as a result of a “treatment” that included over 50 electroshocks and years of near starvation in mental asylums of wartime Europe. Artaud’s journey to the land of the Tarahumara, by boat, by train, on horseback, on foot, in his dreams was a rope he threw himself across the abyss of time and of psychic disintegration, which helped him to come back and retrace his steps into language. Artaud, who was suicided by society, performed a miracle of regaining the capacity for symbolic thought. In doing so, he effectively brought himself back from the socially dead. Society’s cruelty has evolved since then. It is demanding of these pariahs of Thought to accomplish feats it would never ask of itself.

— Branislav Jakovljević
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Emerging only in the 1980s, the complex assemblage of critical Disability studies and theatre studies is still a developing field. There are not enough scholars doing this work, and, with accessible performances only recently becoming standard across international theatre communities, it is unsurprising that there is not much written about performers with intellectual Disabilities. Tony McCaffrey provides close readings of several key case studies in Incapacity and Theatricality to challenge fundamental performance frameworks and principles, including aesthetics, semiotics, and mimesis, through the lens of critical Disability theory. With prose that gently questions the construction, representation, and inclusion of intellectually Disabled artists, McCaffrey suggests that the theatre incapacitates such acts of public discourse but yet renders those acts more intense, more open to a range of different modalities of perception and sensing (a re-distribution of the sensible) and reveals in the incapacitation or deconstruction of the customary social framing of these acts new and different ways of thinking, acting, and doing. (13–14)

Especially integral to critical Disability studies and theatre studies is McCaffrey’s assertion that theatre with Disabled performers neither has to be a learning experience for the audience nor does it have to assume the audience is non-Disabled. Rather, theatre with Disabled performers provides an opportunity for dialogue between audience and performer that offers more than reflection: it maintains the potential to challenge and reframe how intellectually Disabled people are perceived and treated off the stage.

This book is a valuable contribution to Disability in performance and aesthetics. Each chapter closely engages with scenes of intellectually Disabled performers and addresses various injustices common for this community such as institutionalization, infantilization, lack of autonomy, and many others. McCaffrey opens with an exploration of John Cassavetes’s 1963 film A Child Is Waiting and the complexities of spectatorship within Disabled performances. The second chapter delves into Chilean dramatherapist Aldo Gennaro’s performance with residents of the Lorna Hodgkinson Sunshine Home, considers Chris Noonan’s 1980 documentary Stepping Out, and concludes with a discussion of Robert Wilson’s work with autistic performers. Interestingly, these first two chapters offer rich descriptions of cinematic moments because they are about performances documented on film, which reflects McCaffrey’s desire to trace a larger history of performance and intellectually Disabled people. I imagine that the archival remnants of pre-1980s performance is scarce, and by turning to film McCaffrey acknowledges that performers with intellectual Disabilities existed before 1980 but lack representation in theatrical archives.

The third chapter is organized into three sections: the first considers Christoph Schlingensief in Freakstars 3000 (2004); the second is an extended analysis of three productions by the Australian-based Back to Back Theatre. The final section connects the concluding moment of Back to Back Theatre’s performance of Ganesh Versus the Third Reich (2011) and the greater sociopolitical complexities that intellectually Disabled theatre addresses, and ultimately the support networks essential to doing this work. In the final chapter, McCaffrey speaks from his personal experience of working with Different Light Theatre Company in Christchurch, New Zealand, for 14 years. This ending grounds his arguments in the present and looks toward the future.
In chapter 2, “Mirror Stages: Aldo Gennaro and Robert Wilson,” McCaffrey explores Wilson’s much-touted adoption of Raymond Andrews, a Disabled (hard of hearing) black adolescent in the late 1960s, and considers how that experience inspired Wilson to work with autistic poet Christopher Knowles. That is, Wilson’s caring for people with Disabilities inspired him to make inclusive work, and empowered him to come forward about past experiences with his own Disabilities. This narrative could be analyzed through the lens of critical care studies, and in particular through James Thompson’s “Towards an Aesthetic of Care” (2015), which examines the white male privilege of taking care of someone who is not a part of their biological family, while also learning about care from them. This argument is complicated because it does not acknowledge the labor that the person who is being cared for is giving back to the caregiver. While this section of the book demonstrates the innovative aesthetic possibilities of working with mixed-ability creation teams, it lacks engagement with the construction of Disabled people as being inspirational for art projects, the intersections of race and Disability, and the complex politics of a non-Disabled person using a personal relationship with a Disabled person as means to create work “inspired” by them. Wilson’s own admission of using the aesthetic of slowness to “fix” his stuttering contributes to a discussion about institutionalization, medical diagnosis, and cure culture (Clare 2017; Anderson 2017; Kafer 2013). The idea of fixing, curing, or rehabilitating behavior to conform to normative expectations is fraught with anti-Disability rhetoric, and so taking this into account while then plunging into a discussion about Wilson’s “inspired” performance technique is complicated. McCaffrey focuses on a Disability-led technique in which Knowles performs and the other performers mimic what he does, erasing the need for memorization. McCaffrey notes that this technique is used frequently in mixed-ability creative teams. It remains unclear, though, whether this section of the book shifts the focus away from the Disabled performers and more onto Wilson’s desire to interrogate his own experience of intellectual Disabilities, or if it demonstrates the relationship McCaffrey is trying to explain: intellectually Disabled performers/performances offer space for all people (non/Disabled) to engage critically with their own experiences of the discourse around intellectual Disability.

McCaffrey’s turn, in the last two chapters, to interdependent processes and interconnected relationships is palpable: the art is reliant on the support provided by those supporting the work. Interdependence in this sense is defined by Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha in her book *Care Work*:

> We see the liberation of all living systems and the land as integral to the liberation of our own communities, as we all share one planet. We attempt to meet each other’s needs as we build towards liberation, without always reaching for state solutions that inevitably then extend its control further over our lives. (2018:28)

Piepzna-Samarasinha’s assertions cited here recognize the interaction and ultimately the aesthetics engaged in McCaffrey’s book. *Incapacity and Theatricality* explores performances that challenge state “solutions” for intellectual Disabilities and offer possibilities of collaborative and innovative work instead. For example, McCaffrey finishes his third chapter:

> [Analyzing] the continuing questions being asked by and of this form of theatre in terms of the agency, autonomy and emancipation of actors with intellectual disabilities, the systems of care and support needed to generate such development, and the wider philosophical and political implications of these networks of care, support, and emancipation. (35)

The care that is demonstrated through close readings in this final chapter, replete with examples of interdependence in practice, emphasizes the interaction, generosity, and learning that occurs when working with intellectually Disabled artists in New Zealand and ultimately internationally.

McCaffrey moves discourse surrounding Disability and performance away from narratives reliant on inspiration porn or providing a lesson on Disability to the audience. By
pushing the analysis to critical theatre theory (the scholarship surrounding Disabled performances has—until this point—relied on fair representation and inclusion, identity politics, and Disabled content), McCaffrey has paved the way to shift discussions to aesthetics, affect, and audience engagement, and moves beyond ableism to advocate for more intellectually Disabled work.

—Jessica Watkin
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*Performing Turtle Island* is a critical and thought-provoking new addition to the growing field of Indigenous theatre scholarship focused on Canadian Indigenous performance. The book continues the important work that centers Indigenous voices in technique, experience, and content established by the 2016 anthology *Performing Indigeneity* edited by Yvette Nolan and Ric Knowles. While previous scholarship in Indigenous performance is rich with identity narratives, this new work intervenes by championing methodologies for decolonizing the stage through embodiment, language reclamation, Indigenous-centered text analysis, and land-based theatre scholarship. This allows the contributors to reach consensus in the collective embrace of methodologies of decolonization, sovereignty, and the collaboration of Indigenous knowledges with the prevailing Western theatre tradition. Yet within this consensus, the essays in this volume are satisfyingly specific to each writer and community they represent. This specificity is crucial as it moves away from outdated notions of pan-Indigenous practice—a move that is a critical intervention of the editors, who advocate for putting sovereign practices into dialogue with one another, nation to nation, both from within and beyond Turtle Island (xix).
The collection features 11 diverse genres of work ranging from Indigenous performance scholarship, to artist’s autoethnographic accounts, dramaturgical analyses, an interview, and a piece of creative writing. It offers a panorama of Indigenous performance through a multi-disciplinary perspective, highlighting Indigenous dramaturgs, performers, directors, teachers, and playwrights. Many featured in the book are long-time leaders in the field of Canadian Indigenous performance, including artistic director Yvette Nolan, actor Michael Greyeyes, playwright and poet Daniel David Moses, and theatremaker and theorist Floyd P. Favel. Each contributor—whether long-established or a relatively new voice in the field—brings refreshing attention to Indigenous epistemologies that center Indigenous voices, methodologies, and experiences in performance, troubling a history that places Indigenous performance on the fringe rather than at the heart of the scholarship.

The anthology is divided into two broad sections. The first part, “Critical Self-Representation in Production and Training,” delves into the process of Indigenous performance creation. Essays in this section focus on modes of decolonizing the artistic process itself, engaging with each writer’s journey to challenge settler-colonial ideals of performance and embrace uniquely Indigenous models, or form new paradigms that engage both. This is especially successful in Michael Greyeyes’s essay, “Stranger in a Strange Land: Views from an Indigenous Lens,” based on the keynote address of the conference that launched the book. Greyeyes draws upon his experience as a film actor in order to propose an Indigenous-centered actor training method, one focusing on embodiment and a practice for learning Indigenous languages for performance. This work sets the tone for the essays to come, achieving the editors’ goal of bringing multiple performance methodologies into dialogue. Similarly, “Decolonizing Counterpoints: Indigenous Perspectives and Representations in Classical Music and Opera” by Spy Dénommé-Welch and Catherine Magowan uses their own working relationship as a model for intercultural collaboration in music cocreation and troubles the Indigenous/settler artistic process, which has historically favored the colonizer.

Part two, “Performance in Dialogue with the Text,” takes a dramaturgical turn and features essays that emphasize the often-complicated relationship between text and performance. The section explores plays and stories that are both Native written (as in Archibald-Barber’s excellent “Performing the Bingo Game in Tomson Highway’s The Rez Sisters”), as well as Native portrayals by non-Native writers (Nolan’s essay takes us on a journey through her 2009 staging of George Ryga’s The Ecstasy of Rita Joe [1967], for example). Both Archibald-Barber and Nolan’s essays do the important work of recentering Indigenous perspective in textual analysis, highlighting an Indigenous dramaturgy that analyzes the text through Indigenous ways of knowing in two distinctly different plays. A particularly compelling essay in this section is Dione Joseph’s “Cradling Space: Towards an Indigenous Dramaturgy on Turtle Island.” In it, Joseph gestures to Indigenous dramaturgy as a land-based practice that situates the relationship to the land as the underpinning for all aspects of Indigenous storytelling. Joseph offers her notion of “cradling space” as a project that embraces an “ontological perspective on embodiment” (136) defined by an alternate relationship to time and space. This approach also advocates for an inclusive worldview that is grounded in tribal specificity and a rejection of a pan-Indigenous dramaturgical approach (133).

The book closes, appropriately, with what the editors call a “poetic alternative to the formal essay” (xxvii). Floyd P. Favel’s poem, “Red People, Red Magic,” is an insightful reflection on a life in Indigenous performance, which ends with a hopeful note about the possibilities of the future of the field, “the act of Performance and the act of Ritual / meet at the level of the higher self, / the next dimension closest to this human world / where spiritual beings dwell” (208).

While the selections in this volume focus on Canadian Indigenous performance, this text makes an important intervention in the field of Indigenous performance; it offers new performance paradigms that advocate for a practice based on Indigenous knowledges in dialogue with non-Indigenous modes of creation. The methods outlined in Performing Turtle
Island further a return to sovereign Indigenous models of creative expression that can be used in conversation intraculturally, among tribal nations; and interculturally, between Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultures. As a result, this book will be of interest to anyone engaged in Indigenous, intercultural, or Canadian studies, as well as performance and theatre scholars. An exciting thread in the book—which appears in multiple essays—advances a methodology for an Indigenous performance form and practice, as it does in Michael Greyeyes’s call for Indigenous-specific performer training and Dione Joseph’s Indigenous dramaturgical method that is land-based and community-driven. This book will further serve an important function in Indigenous performance in countries beyond Canada, filling a gap in the dearth of critical work in this field in the United States that will be useful to theatre educators and act as a prototype for centering Indigenous voices critically in performance and performance studies.

— Sara Pillatzki-Warzeha

Sara Pillatzki-Warzeha (Dakota/German) is a PhD student in Theatre Historiography at the University of Minnesota. She also holds an MFA in Theatre Performance from Minnesota State University–Mankato. Her research centers on Indigenous storytelling and performance and Indigenous intercultural artistic collaborations. In addition, she is a director and theatre educator. sarapw@morris.umn.edu
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In the neighborhood of Metaxourgio in Athens, Theodoros Terzopoulos’s Attis Theatre stands alone, away from the traditional theatre districts of the city, in an old neoclassical building amidst dilapidated mansions and warehouses, tiny Pakistani and Chinese shops, sex workers, drug dealers, trendy galleries, and bars. Carrying the Phrygian name of Dionysus and founded in 1985, Attis is the home of Terzopoulos, the Greek-born, Berliner Ensemble–trained director who broke new ground with his 1986 staging of Euripides’s The Bacchae. Drawing his influences from folkloric traditions of Asia Minor, Vsevolod Meyerhold and Bertolt Brecht, Martha Graham’s technique, Jerzy Grotowski and Tadashi Suzuki’s training, but also his study of Bauhaus and Russian constructivism, Terzopoulos has, for the past 35 years, developed a spare, highly stylized scenic language that prioritizes physicality over text and ritual over representation. His method consists of leading the actors, through exhaustive physical preparation, to tap into, release, and extend their physical energy, diffusing it through a highly active diaphragm to the entire body. The process leads the actors to an exalted state of consciousness and physical presence from which voice, language, song, and movement emanate. This is what Terzopoulos terms the Dionysian body and is the medium par excellence of his theatre.

In Dionysus in Exile: The Theatre of Theodoros Terzopoulos, a publication that followed a 2011 symposium held in Berlin to honor the Greek director, a productive connection is drawn...
between Dionysus — the exiled, itinerant God — and Terzopoulos’s own experience of displacement, as the son of a family of refugees from Asia Minor. The volume further examines Terzopoulos’s work method, which — as Erika Fischer-Lichte argues in her preface — consists of a “process of un-learning [...] equated to the tearing apart of the actors’ culturally formed body, while the development and training of the new techniques function as rebirth and transformation into a new wholeness” (13). The book is organized into four sections that examine: the anthropological and political perspectives of Terzopoulos’s work; the body of the actor; the role of breath, voice, and language; and the position of his work between cross-culturalism and “Greekness.”

Taking the concept of exile as the vantage point from which the director creates, the essays in this volume collectively argue that Terzopoulos’s experience of nonbelonging gives his theatre a unique insight into questions of history, identity, and tradition. For Kerem Karabog˘a, his “otherness,” in relation to dominant cultures (first as an Asia Minor refugee in Greece, and later as a self-exiled artist living in East Germany during the Greek dictatorship), is cultural alienation transformed into a force of energy (157). This has allowed Terzopoulos to move freely within a broad range of dramaturgical traditions (from Euripides, to Heiner Müller, to Giannis Kontrafouris), destabilizing all elements of performance through a process of deconstruction, analysis, and resynthesis that allows for, as Georgios Sampatakakis writes, “a renewed aesthetics and patterns of thought to emerge” (30). This process is best exemplified by his stagings of Greek tragic texts — but not exclusively. Revealing how Terzopoulos has employed his scenic language within a wide range of dramaturgical choices are the essays of Georgios Sampatakakis, who examines the sociopolitical questions raised in Prometheus Bound (2010); Penelope Chatzidimitriou, on performing the collective trauma of the Greek Civil war through the 2009 production of Mauser; and Konstantinos I. Arvanitakis, who offers a reading of the exilic experience from a psychoanalytical point of view in his essay on Alarme (a play based on the correspondence between Mary Stuart and Queen Elizabeth I, staged in 2011).

The role of the actor’s body holds a special position in Dionysus in Exile. Through its various contributions, the volume offers insights into the preparation of the Attis actor (Savvas Stroumpos), and the relationship between body, language, and speaking as a physical act from linguistic (Dimitris Tsatsoulis), cognitive (Gonia Jarema), and ontological (Frank M. Raddatz) perspectives. The argument that emerges from the collection is that it is precisely the quest for the Dionysian body — the undoing of the actor’s body from its everyday cultural identity and its restructuring, through copious training, into an archetypical body — no longer culturally conditioned but universal — that makes Terzopoulos’s theatre a transcultural experience for audiences and actors alike. In her preface, Fischer-Lichte highlights the relationship between the exalted body in Terzopoulos’s theatre and in non-Western ritual traditions. Equally, the influence of European critical discourse and Asian traditions on Terzopoulos’s theatre are substantially dealt with (see for example Matthias Dreyer’s and Freddy Decreus’s contributions respectively). However, the overall impression in the volume is that, with the exception of Kerem Karabog˘a’s chapter on the reception of Terzopoulos’s work in Turkey, the discussion of tragedy, exile, and the ritualistic body is conducted from a Eurocentric perspective and misses voices that would illuminate the relevance and reception of Terzopoulos’s work in, for instance, the Global South, Africa, and the Middle East. In that respect, even Etel Adnan’s introduction — as the only Middle Eastern woman contributing to the volume with a note on her encounter with Terzopoulos’s work — does not fill that gap.

Complementing Dionysus in Exile’s breadth of perspectives on the impact, process, and reception of Terzopoulos’s work is Decreus’s The Ritual Theatre of Theodoros Terzopoulos, an in-depth study of the director’s practice, influences, and method. Starting with the importance of myth in Terzopoulos’s work, moving through his manipulation of time and space, and ending with a discussion of the mechanics of the actor’s body, Decreus’s book begins by contrasting interpretations of myth in poststructuralism, postdramatic theatre, and the classics, to what
Decreus terms Terzopoulos’s “mythic worldview”: a sensibility that is akin to Raymond Williams’s concept of the “structure of feeling” (Williams 1966) and refers to a way of being in the world, of comprehending the world through myth, as opposed to interpreting the world of the myth (a connection made more explicit in Sampatakakis’s contribution to Dionysus in Exile [30]). For Decreus, it is this mythic worldview that leads Terzopoulos to engage with texts—classical or contemporary—that deal with the archetypal antagonism between human action and the divine or political order.

Decreus’s focus on myth as the primary material of Terzopoulos’s theatre adds significantly to the discussion of the transcultural appeal of the director’s work and offers the reader a broad and more inclusive understanding of the relevance of his theatre and the applicability of his method across cultures. The third chapter of the book examines Terzopoulos’s conscious departure from the Hegelian tradition in his approach to Greek tragedy and introduces non-Western interpretations of the myth of Dionysus, to argue that Terzopoulos “repeatedly stresses the need ‘for the dark, hidden, suppressed and dangerous side of the material’” (57). Referencing Jean-Pierre Vernant’s Myth and Society in Ancient Greece (1974), Decreus situates Terzopoulos’s work in that breaking point between oral and written tradition, a valuable argument to illuminate not only how Terzopoulos works with the text of Greek tragedy, deconstructing it to its structural elements, but also how he works with the audience, seeking to make them participants in the theatrical event “bound to get under the spell of language, as part of an oral message” (62).

Drawing examples from specific Attis productions, supported by archival photography, Decreus shows how, far from being an interpretation or representation of the myth, Terzopoulos’s ritual theatre strives for a recreation onstage of the world of the myth through the organization of time, space, and the actor’s body. In chapters 4 and 5, Decreus offers a detailed discussion of how the historical time of myth is organized spatially through Terzopoulos’s Bauhaus-inspired, spare, austere, and geometric forms, and finds its way to the ever-present time of the theatrical event through the vibrating, exalted body of the actor: “At each occasion, it is the universe and its energy that are rebuilt on the stage, not the accidental text, not a physical body just passing by” (104).

The theatre of Terzopoulos has been oftentimes criticized, among Greek critics especially, as too formalist. Decreus’s analysis of the organization of the time-space-body relationship offers a satisfactory response to this criticism by pointing to form as a dynamic, ongoing process in search of the fundamental archetypical relationships of the mythic universe. In so doing, it reminds us of the continued relevance of Terzopoulos’s work, nearly 35 years after the founding of Attis: “Every myth starts as a narrative that can never result in definite and complete answers; [...] it is destined to be part of an everlasting search, to be repeated again and again, and therefore, bound to result into any form, in fact just into FORM, or a form that must always remain unfinished” (81).

—Aktina Stathaki
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One Dyke’s Theater contains the edited texts of 10 plays by Terry Baum (b. 1946), a lesbian playwright and performer, spanning work she created over the course of five decades working in three cities: San Francisco, Amsterdam, and New York. In 1974, Baum arrived in San Francisco from a graduate program at UC Santa Barbara and founded the Lilith Women’s Theater Collective, which has operated intermittently in the years since. Baum has performed her work around the world, and this collection places a selection of her writing alongside commentary by her longtime collaborator, and editor of the volume, Carolyn Myers. Highlights of the collection include Dos Lesbos: A Play By, For and About Perverts (a two-woman coming-out exploration written at Eugene O’Neill’s Tao House and first performed in an Oakland bar in 1981); the delightful misandric monologue Coming-Out Story (from Ego Trip) (1982); One Fool (1985, revisions 1987 and 1988), which Baum performed in Amsterdam, Germany, London, and San Francisco’s Theatre Rhinoceros; and Hick: A Love Story (with Pam Bond, 2014), a dramatization of the relationship between reporter Lorena Hickok and Eleanor Roosevelt, which premiered at San Francisco’s Eureka Theatre in a production directed by Myers and in New York directed by Adele Prandini. Baum’s effervescent and singular voice shines through in all her work, and her early pieces specifically evoke an unguarded and joyful sincerity long absent from solo performance work.


The essays collected in Jacki Apple’s Performance / Media / Art / Culture span 35 years and observe, with fine attention to detail, a multitude of shifts in aesthetic, political, and social attitudes. Apple and her editor Marina LaPalma have arranged the works thematically not chronologically (sections include “The TV Generation,” “History Restaged,” “Politics of Culture,” and “Concerning Nature,” among others) and cover a spectrum of artists working across genres: Laurie Anderson, Meredith Monk, the Wooster Group, Lin Hixson (in an exquisite 1991 retrospective for TDR), Ping Chong, Twyla Tharp, Rachel Rosenthal (to whom the book is dedicated), and many others. The essays Apple and LaPalma selected for this book document the career of a critic who has keenly observed the changing winds of artistic possibility. “Most of the independent art publications I wrote for during that pre-Internet period no longer exist,” Apple writes in her Afterword, “Sadly, neither do their editorial missions” (286). When contrasted across decades, the cumulative effect of these essays on various topics illustrates the
difficult transition from a vision of possibility in the early days of performance art into the late capitalist morass in which we work today. This volume outlines this transition and reminds us of the key works of great artists of the recent past.


“We wanted to underline how performance, and not the written review or academic paper, propels theatre discourse,” the editors write (11). Towards this end, the book collects responses to Krishen’s theatre work and the remembrances of the 2015 conference, dialogues, memoirs of his colleagues’ time with him, and plenteous imagery. Through this disparate collection of writings, the editors compose an image of a singular theatre artist—one who worked as a historian, teacher, and critic, too—whose work addressed issues of colonialism, language, urbanization, and identity. Krishen kept few records during his life, so much of the work compiled here relies on his collaborators’ reconstituted memories. The book never slips into hagiography or detached study, and as such, these editors and their 14 contributors suggest theatrical solutions (criticism, dialogues, annotated performance scripts, complex imagery) that prioritize, as they promise, theatre’s ability to create its own discourse.


Drawn from the April 2016 Berlin conference “On Remnants and Vestiges: Strategies of Remaining in the Performing Arts,” Performing Arts in Transition collects essays from scholars of dance studies, history, drama, film studies, and art history to consider the evolutions of an artwork as it changes media. Beginning with citations of Rebecca Schneider, Philip Auslander, and Amelia Jones early in the project, the editors asked their contributors to question and develop concepts such as “remnants,” “debris,” and “human remains.” This resulting volume—organized into sections on temporality, exhibition, genre transfer, histories, and documentation—highlights a variety of modes of inquiry for reliving and reimagining artistic works. Early chapters by Beatrice von Bismarck and Nicole Haitzinger study the relationship between performance and the museum as apparatus, and chapters by Wolf-Dieter Ernst, Ulrike Hanstein, and Sandra Umathum focus on individual artists or groups (ORLAN, Goat Island, and Ragnar Kjartansson, respectively) and their performance remains. The chapters in this collection suggest numerous methods with which to consider the lasting implications of an artwork, and the necessity and value of such a consideration.


“Speaking of art and nation seems inevitably nineteenth-century-like and passé,” writes Cecilia Rodríguez Lehmann in her chapter “Effigies that Crumble: Profanations of the National Body” in Radical Disobedience. Few do this as well, she thinks, as Caracas-born, Brooklyn-based artist Deborah Castillo, whose performance work of the past decade finds analysis in this open-source digital publication. In their introduction, editors Irina Troconis and Alejandro Castro construct
a comparison between Castillo’s body and that of the nation, identifying parallels between her
tongue—central in much of her performance work—and the tongue used to make language, to
create, to retell, and to dismantle. As the book exists only online, the editors are able to include
videos and gifs along with the texts, published in both English and Spanish. The essays in the
resulting book bring the same level of sustained engagement we might see in a printed work.
The result blurs the distinction between volume and website, and it develops a model for widely
accessible digital scholarship.


Min Tian’s book discusses a handful of Western theatre artists who drew inspiration from their
limited encounters with Asian performance traditions. Chapters on Antonin Artaud and Bertolt
Brecht come as no surprise, then, though they are joined by studies on figures whose encoun-
ters with Asia are less famous, such as Adolphe Appia, Edward Gordon Craig, W.B. Yeats,
Vsevolod Meyerhold, and Sergei Eisenstein. An early chapter on Lugné-Poe and the Théâtre
de l’Œuvre is one of the book’s most striking episodes, and the discussion of Yeats’s relationship
with noh provides a compelling look at (and critique of) his adaptation of Japanese forms. The
chapters do not aggregate; they focus acutely on specific artists and works, and are limited geo-
graphically and temporally (they largely fit in Europe in the first half of the 20th century), yet
they are meticulously detailed and assuredly provocative. In total, the book argues that early-
20th-century investigations of Asian artworks formed a part of a reaction against naturalism in
Western drama, and constituted more of a projection than a reflection of these traditions.

—Charles O’Malley
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