

## Caroline Wake and Emma Willis

### Performance, Politics, and Non-Participation

I would prefer not to. —Bartleby, the Scrivener (1853)

Like Bartleby, the legal clerk who famously decides that he would prefer not to, this issue of *Performance Paradigm* investigates the politics and performance of non-participation. The figure of Herman Melville's Bartleby appears everywhere in political theory and philosophy: in Gilles Deleuze's "Bartleby, ou la formule" (1989); in Giorgio Agamben's companion piece (1993; published in English 1999); in Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's *Empire* (2000); and in Slavoj Žižek's *The Parallax View* (2010). In performance, his spirit manifests in Noor Afshan Mirza and Brad Butler's project *Museum of Non-Participation* (2007) as well as in Mette Edvardsen's *Time has fallen asleep in the afternoon sunshine* (2010), wherein a single performer recites Melville's story to a single audience member for half an hour. In performance scholarship, Bartleby recently appeared in Daniel Sack's *After Live: Possibility, Potentiality and the Future of Performance* (2015). Perhaps we hear him in phrases such as "don't do it on my account" and catchphrases like "computer says no." We might even see him, his slogan printed on a bag or a t-shirt. What are we to make of the fact that more than 160 years after Bartleby first appeared, both pizza ads and productivity coaches proclaim: "No is the new yes" (Huffington Post 2012; Kellaway 2017; Schwartz 2012)? And what is the difference between the "no" and the "non" when it comes to participation? One can choose not to participate (refuse) or one may be excluded from participation, which is altogether different. Is to refuse important in and of itself or should it build towards action; is it, in fact, more a type of action—a striking against—than non-participation? If so, then what can be said about the inaction of non-participation, for it surely produces significant effects?

*Participation* and performance have been well theorised by Jen Harvie (2013), Josephine Machon (2013), and Adam Alston (2016), among others. The emphasis in this issue on non-participation—withdrawals, refusals, boycotts, strikes, and even the occasional sulk in the corner—is intended to extend that work. As has been argued, many participatory performances rely on a mode of compulsory conviviality that eventually becomes coercive. In Helen Iball's memorable phrase, spectators generally want to "give good audience" so that the artist's work may "work" (Heddon, Iball and Zerihan 2012, 124). Except when they don't. Sometimes audiences don't feel like swallowing the strawberry (124) or tipping the bucket of icy water over the performer (Cairns 2012, 366). Or, having done so, they feel

remorse not only at their actions but at doing the artist's bidding so easily (366). On other occasions, audiences *do* want to participate but find themselves excluded because an artist has not factored in different regimes of the senses and their associated accessibility needs. On still other occasions, artists and audiences have conscientious objections—to structures, to sponsors, to subject matter—in which case they might boycott the event (Warsza 2017). In these instances, the artist never arrives at the scene of the performance and this becomes, in turn, the artwork. Indeed, the artist boycott of the Biennale of Sydney in 2016 even attracted its own "review" with the *Sydney Morning Herald* declaring it "a bold, confronting series of interconnected performance works ... *Biennale Shitfight* is a remorseless, disturbing and often absurdist exploration of art, politics and commercialism" (Crabb 2016).

Lest we fetishise non-participation, it is worth noting that its politics can be ambivalent. Think, for example, of the parents who decline to vaccinate their children, the politicians who abstain from contentious votes, and the countries that refuse to participate in the global effort to reduce carbon emissions. As Sianne Ngai asks: "Is Bartleby's unyielding passivity ... radical or reactionary? Should we read his inertness as part of a volitional strategy that anticipates styles of nonviolent political activism to come, or merely as a sign of what we now call depression?" (2005, 1). The reference to depression is interesting: if depression is a sort of ontological paralysis, then what are the systemic causes that produce it? And how is refusal a means of resisting the "efficacy," for want of a better word, of these causes? Rather than pathologising individuals perhaps we should focus on the collective strategies of non-, semi- and subversive participation, including sabotage, the "go-slow," the "work to rule," marching, occupying, blockading, striking, and refusing to pay debt, rent or taxes. In 1957, political economists writing about industrial plants defined the "go-slow"—also called the "slowdown"—as a "form of on-the-job activity in which workers, while appearing to be engaged in their usual routines, deliberately limit their output in order to exert pressure upon management to make some desired change" (Hammett, Seidman and London 1957, 126). In their conclusion, they speculate that "with the growth of union bureaucracy—the divergence of interests of union leaders and union members and the failure of communication between them—there are likely to be cases in which workers, finding the machinery too slow or the officers too unsympathetic, resort to the slowdown as a quick remedy for the conditions in the plant that they find burdensome" (134). Sixty years later, academics find themselves arguing for "slow scholarship" (Hartman and Darab 2012; Mountz et. al. 2015) and, in the case of the University and College Union in the United Kingdom this year, voting against the deal made by their union bosses and employers (Busby 2018).

The change in mood and approach is also evident in the disciplines of theatre and performance studies. In 2001, the fields were contemplating the performative imperative, as captured in the title of Jon McKenzie's book *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance* (2001). Eleven years later, this imperative had been extended to include audience members who now had to, in Rachel Fensham's witty rewriting of McKenzie, "participate or else" (2012). Six years after that, however, the authors in this issue find themselves asking: "What might the 'or else' involve?" To put it another way, the articles

in this issue begin to assemble a taxonomy of non-participation for theatre and performance studies. In this sense, we join the fields of anthropology (see McGranahan 2016; Simpson 2016; Sobo 2016; Weiss 2016), media studies (Casemajor et. al. 2015), and peace studies (Mac Ginty 2012), in attempting to rethink our theories and vocabularies of participation, inclusion, resistance, and refusal. To do so, scholars in this issue draw on a wide range ideas and authors. From political theory, for instance, Nien Cheng borrows Sherry Arnstein's famous "ladder of citizen participation," which has eight rungs grouped into three levels: "non-participation" at the bottom; "degrees of tokenism" in the middle; "degrees of citizen power" at the top (1969). From the visual arts, Frazer Ward adapts another tripartite taxonomy of "ostentatious inaction," "communicative inaction," and "radical inaction" (Koch 2011). Lindsay Goss also draws on the visual arts via the recent volume *Assuming Boycott: Resistance, Agency, and Cultural Production*, which "takes a critical detour from the pro/con axis of debates surrounding cultural boycotts" and instead proposes that "boycotts are often beginnings and not ends ... generat[ing] challenging and productive discussions rather than shutting down dialogue" (Estefan 2017, 15).<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere, both Cheng and Warren draw on literary and affect studies, with the former invoking Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's *Touching Feeling* (2002) and the latter citing Ngai's *Ugly Feelings*, a book that not only begins with *Bartleby* but turns him into an adjective with Ngai writing of "a politics of a Bartlebyean sort," a "Bartlebyean aesthetic," and "Bartlebyean feelings" (2005, 9, 20).

Lindsay Goss opens the issue, addressing the boycott of the 1976 Shiraz-Persepolis Arts Festival in Iran, asking what happens when performance *doesn't happen*. That is, she explores the political dimensions of withholding performance, specifically considering the relationship between "the activity of making a performance and the activity of *not* making a performance." Beginning from the point that theatre's political character lies not so much in its content as it does in the fact and context of its production, she explains how boycotts, paradoxically, function as participatory political events. The refusal to stage theatre at the Shiraz Festival was, she argues, not so much a negation or erasure of the performance event as it redirected attention towards the normally unarticulated political implications of such staging. As she writes: "The cultural boycott [...] takes seriously the ways in which the theatrical event [...] can illustrate and contest existing distributions of power. This is so because, importantly, the cultural boycott does not demand, merely, that something not happen; rather it proposes that a not-happening *happen*" (23). Thus, the disavowal of one kind of participation allows the latent political dimension of "non-participation" to come to the fore.

While non-participation may be effectively framed as an act of political refusal or defiance (whether grand or subtle), the full scope of constraints on participation in any given event needs to be taken into account. That is, as suggested earlier, non-participation is a choice for some and a decision already made for others. Goss makes this point very apparent in her political dissection of the Shiraz boycott, pointing out the conflict between the privileges and freedoms afforded to star participants (such as Merce Cunningham, Peter Brook and Robert Wilson) in previous festivals, and the constraints brought to bear on Iranian artists (and indeed the Iranian citizenry) generally. The right to participate, and the

right to refuse to participate, mean very different things for those on the inside and outside. Indeed, as Ward points out of Cady Noland's status as art world "dropout," one needs to have already accumulated cultural capital in that world in order to effectively stage one's withdrawal from it. Nonetheless, as Ward demonstrates, Noland's refusal to participate in the art world by way of not only relinquishing recognizable art-making practices, but furthermore devoting her energies to variously legally contesting her own authorship of certain works throws a spanner in the works of the art market. This is not insignificant given Noland's renown: the sale of her work *Oozewald* (1989) in 2011, for example, set a record for the most expensive work by a living woman artist at the time (and as we went to press, we received news a major retrospective). Significantly, Ward argues that such "spanner throwing" constitutes a performance and indeed art practice in its own right. Noland might thus be considered a non-participatory combatant, supplementing her refusal to participate in the machinations of the art market with fulsome participation in the legal arena.

The canon of drop-out artists is, as Ward notes, embarrassingly white. It not only ignores the work of artists like Adrian Piper and Tehching Hsieh, it also misses the opportunity to think through the privilege inherent in the gesture of withdrawal and the difference between withdrawing and withholding as political tactics. The third article, by Azadeh Sharifi, picks up on this theme albeit in the German context. Sharifi analyses four different protests from the 1950s, 1980s, late 1990s and the current day, in order to analyse how minorities have employed performance to protest the terms of their political and theatrical representation and participation. She analyses how new activist groups borrow old tactics and in doing so, build new coalitions between minority communities whom the mainstream would otherwise attempt to pit against each other.

Where non-participation is explicit and explicitly political in the case of the boycott of the Shiraz Festival, or the walkout of a German theatre, Nien Yuan Cheng examines the significance of subtle refusals. Taking as case study the nation-wide call for citizens to participate in the Singaporean Government's "Singapore Memory Project," Cheng explains how seemingly a-political gestures of defiance demonstrate the capacity and indeed inclination of some Singaporeans to refuse the "soft authoritarian" participatory imperative. Cheng draws on Sedgwick's concept of "periperformatives" to examine how these ambivalent engagements "skirt around" the edges of the Government project "by refusing to respond appropriately" (74). Her analysis identifies a mismatch between the type of affective and material participation called for by the Government, and the inappropriate participation of her examples. In this context, non-participation is couched within participation in such a way that it disrupts the "scripting" of national memory and personal and collective identity.

In a much less explicitly political context than Cheng, Asher Warren, far from giving "good audience," gives non-compliant, even recalcitrant, audience. Warren's article canvasses a range of live art experiences, over a span of five years, and in doing so assembles a variety of non-participations. There is his late arrival at a performance with a strict lockout policy, which means that he misses it entirely (93); another lockout policy that is oddly addressed to "toiletgoers" as opposed to "theatre-goers"; a walkout by one patron, followed by a verbal

retort from a performer; a walkover, as a performer climbs across the seated audience; and the leg cramps that develop during a durational performance, producing symptoms similar to a long-haul flight except that one is not permitted to walk up and down the aisles of the theatre (93–95). Finally, the article focuses on one particular act of non-participation: Warren’s own refusal to participate in a mediated one-to-one performance that invites him to “undress and confess” (98). Having listened to the “confessions” of several previous participants—earnest to the point of tediousness—and then hearing the slightly coercive tone of the app, Warren feels rather irritated and decides that he would prefer not to.

The refusal that characterises Jesse Eggers’s article is of a different quality. Drawing on the work of feminist scholar Alison Mountz and her collaborators and their advocacy for “slow scholarship” (Mountz et. al. 2015), Eggers focuses on two case studies: Ivana Müller’s *While We Were Holding It Together* (2006) and Kris Verdonck’s *END* (2008). More than ten years old, these objects find themselves at an awkward age: too old to be called current case studies but too recent to need an historical reassessment. Yet it is precisely these conventional temporalities of scholarship that Eggers asks us to consider and contest. Her own belated thoughts are inspired not only by “slow scholarship” but also by the “slow dramaturgy”—to borrow the term of Peter Eckersall and Eddie Paterson (2011)—of the performances themselves. In Müller’s work, slowness manifests through stillness, which of course cannot be maintained as the dancers’ muscles start to fatigue and move involuntarily. In Verdonck’s work, slowness manifests through repetition and circulation not unlike Mother Courage’s circumnavigating of the stage. Eggers insists that slowness is “relentless and uncomfortable as well as generative and creative” (120).

Finally, the affectivity of slowness is sharply contrasted with the figure of the heckler, who Mel Jordan and Lee Campbell theorise as political actant who, via their interruption, makes visible “the invisible boundaries between speaker and listener” (129). Examining the ways in which the heckler refuses to participate appropriately in public discourse, the authors argue that the heckler, in their embodiment of a particularly spirited kind of agonistic intervention, has much to offer to a thinking through of practices of democracy. As they conclude, “The Heckler, together with the Whistleblower and the Philistine provide new ways to consider subaltern publics; heckle, act and be heard!” (138).

If the issue has any shortcomings, it is that no scholar here takes up the work done in anthropology, settler-colonial studies, and critical race theory—that is, the subaltern and counter-publics that Jordan and Campbell refer to remain under-discussed. Here we are thinking of the pathbreaking work done by Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson (2014; 2016; 2017) and Michi Saagiig Nishanaaberg theorist Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2001). The latter puts its powerfully when she writes:

In the face of colonialism, non-participation has also proven to be an effective form of resistance. Refusing to participate in co-management agreements, EIAs [Environmental Impact Assessments], treaty negotiations, natural resource management agreements, research projects and the Euro-Canadian educational system are effective ways of resisting the dominance

of Euro-Canadian society, and its assimilative tendencies. By not participating, Aboriginal peoples send the message that the process is unacceptable to them. That the process or framework itself negates power sharing, traditional values, Indigenous knowledge and *meaningful* negotiation by Aboriginal peoples. ... participation does not guarantee that Aboriginal people will be valued, listened to, and afforded the respect we deserve. Resistance is a powerful tool Aboriginal communities have fostered in order to survive the hostilities of the past, and we will continue to resist in order to provide our children with land, traditions and cultures that are meaningful to them. (Simpson 2001, 144)

In Australia, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples also contest settler-colonial processes and terms of participation. For example, in December 2015, the Australian Federal Government and Opposition appointed a 16-member Referendum Council to “talk to Australians about changing [the] Constitution to recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples” (Referendum Council 2018). Led by Alyawarre woman Pat Anderson AO and Cobble Cobble woman Professor Megan Davis, the Council conducted a series of First Nations Regional Dialogues with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander delegates across the country from December 2016 to May 2017. On June 30, 2017, Davis read out the Uluru Statement from the Heart and the Council delivered its Final Report. These made the case not for mere “recognition” but for “the establishment of a First Nations Voice enshrined in the Constitution” and for a Makarrata Commission, so-named for the Yolngu word and concept of Makarrata or “coming together after a struggle” (Referendum Council 2017). The commission would oversee a “process of agreement-making between governments and First Nations and truth-telling about our history.” Incredibly, then Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull greeted this gift with agitation, telling the Council at a meeting the following month: “This was not what was asked for, or expected” (Pearson 2017). Cape York leader and Council Member Noel Pearson writes simply, “The country’s prime minister cannot even hear his own words” (2017).

The same could be said of theatre and performance studies perhaps and it reflects on the disciplines that we have not more fully reckoned with First Nations theories, vocabularies and practices of non-participation. It also points to the fact that we have a long way to go when it comes to who feels able to participate in the discourse itself. Nevertheless, we have made a start here by considering the complex entanglements of the politics of participation and non-participation.

We are hugely grateful to our talented authors, dedicated peer- and book-reviewers as well as to our fellow editor Sandra D’Urso for overseeing a bumper crop of book reviews. Thanks also to former editor Helena Grehan, whose guidance remains invaluable. We hope you enjoy the issue. We look forward to your correspondence too; we are hoping to move to a more dialogical model of publishing, which means that we can include responses to previous issues in forthcoming ones. If you would like to respond to this issue, please email. Of course, if you would prefer not to, we would fully endorse that too.

---

## Notes

1. Though not always, as evidenced by the silence that has greeted Rayya El Zein, Irene Fernández Ramos, George Potter, and Gabriel Varghese's "BDS and Palestinian Theatre Making: A Call for Debate within the Disciplines of Theatre and Performance Studies" (2018).

## Works Cited

- Agamben, Giorgio, and Gilles Deleuze. *Bartleby: La formula della crellzione* (Macerata: Quodlibet, 1993).
- Alston, Adam. 2016. *Beyond Immersive Theatre: Aesthetics, Politics and Productive Participation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Arnstein, Sherry. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." *Journal of American Institute of Planners* 35 (4): 216–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- Busby, Eleanor. 2018. "University Strikes to Continue Despite Proposed Deal Between Union Leaders and Employers." *The Independent*. March 13, 2018. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/university-strikes-latest-pensions-dispute-lecturers-ucu-college-union-uuk-a8254031.html>
- Cairns, Jon. 2012. "Ambivalent Intimacies: Performance and Domestic Photography in the Work of Adrian Howells." *Contemporary Theatre Review* 22 (3): 355–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2012.690741>
- Casemajor, Nathalie, Stéphane Couture, Mauricio Delfin, Matthew Goerzen, and Alessandro Delfanti. 2015. "Non-Participation in Digital Media: Toward a Framework of Mediated Political Action." *Media, Culture & Society* 37 (6): 850–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0163443715584098>
- Crabb, Annabel. 2014. "Critics Are Raving About the Biennale's Big Hit." *Sydney Morning Herald*. March 16, 2014. <https://www.smh.com.au/opinion/critics-are-raving-about-biennales-big-hit-20140315-34tm5.html>
- Eckersall, Peter and Eddie Paterson. 2011. "Slow Dramaturgy: Renegotiating Politics and Staging the Everyday." *Australasian Drama Studies* April: 178–192.
- El Zein, Rayya, Irene Fernández Ramos, George Potter, and Gabriel Varghese. 2018. "BDS and Palestinian Theatre Making: A Call for Debate within the Disciplines of Theatre and Performance Studies." *Theatre Survey* 59 (3): 409–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0040557418000327>
- Estefan, Kareem. 2017. "Introduction: Boycotts as Openings." In *Assuming Boycott: Resistance, Agency, and Cultural Production*, edited by Kareem Estefan, Carin Kuoni, and Laura Raicovich, 9–17. New York: OR Books.
- Fensham, Rachel. 2012. "Postdramatic Spectatorship: Perform or Else." *Critical Stages/Scènes Critiques* 7: n. pag. <http://www.critical-stages.org/7/postdramatic-spectatorship-participate-or-else/>
- Hammett, Richard S., Joel Seidman, and Jack London. 1957. "The Slowdown as a Union Tactic." *Journal of Political Economy* 65 (2): 126–34. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1827368>
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hartman, Yvonne, and Sandy Darab. 2012. "A Call for Slow Scholarship: A Case Study on the Intensification of Academic Life and Its Implications for Pedagogy." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 34 (1–2): 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2012.643740>

- Harvie, Jen. 2013. *Fair Play: Art, Performance, and Neoliberalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heddon, Deirdre, Helen Iball, and Rachel Zerihan. 2012. "Come Closer: Confessions of Intimate Spectators in One to One Performance." *Contemporary Theatre Review* 22 (1): 120–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2011.645233>
- Huffington Post. 2012. "'No is the New Yes' Domino's Pizza Ad Offends Some With Apparent Rape Innuendo." *Huffington Post*. July 12, 2012: [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/11/dominos-artisan-pizza-ad-rape-\\_n\\_1665612.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/11/dominos-artisan-pizza-ad-rape-_n_1665612.html)
- LaFrance, Mary. 2013. "The Disappearing Fourth Wall: Law, Ethics, and Experiential Theatre." *Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment and Technology Law* 15 (3): 507–82. <http://www.jetlaw.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/LaFrance.pdf>
- Kellaway, Lucy. 2017. "Why Most Successful People Just Say No." *Financial Times*. June 11, 2017: <https://www.ft.com/content/0a7977ac-4cf5-11e7-919a-1e14ce4af89b?mhq5j=e3>
- Koch, Alexander. 2011. "Out of Practice, Out of the Picture. An Introduction to Leaving the Art World Behind." KOW 8 (General Strike). <https://kow-berlin.com/events/kow-issue-8>
- Machon, Josephine. 2013. *Immersive Theatres: Intimacy and Immediacy in Contemporary Performance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mac Ginty, Roger. 2012. "Between Resistance and Compliance: Nonparticipation and the Liberal Peace." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 6 (2): 167–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17502977.2012.655601>
- McGranahan, Carole. 2016a. "Refusal and the Gift of Citizenship." *Cultural Anthropology* 31 (3): 334–341. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14506/ca31.3.03>
- . 2016b. "Theorizing Refusal: An Introduction." *Cultural Anthropology* 31 (3): 319–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14506/ca31.3.01>
- McKenzie, Jon. 2001. *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance*. London: Routledge.
- Mezzadra, Sandro, and Brett Neilson. 2013. *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mirza, Noor Afshan, and Brad Butler. *Museum of Non-Participation* <http://www.museumofnonparticipation.org/index.php>
- Mountz, Alison, Anne Bonds, Becky Mansfield, Jenna Lloyd, Jennifer Hyndman, Margaret Walton-Roberts, Ranu Basu, Risa Whitson, Roberta Hawkins, Trina Hamilton, and Winifred Curran. 2015. "For Slow Scholarship: Feminist Politics of Resistance through Collective Action in the Neoliberal University." *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 14 (4): 1235–259. <https://www.acme-journal.org/index.php/acme/article/view/1058>
- Ngai, Sianne. 2005. *Ugly Feelings*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pearson, Noel. 2017. "Betrayal." *The Monthly*. December 2017. <https://www.themonthly.com.au/issue/2017/december/1512046800/noel-pearson/betrayal>
- Referendum Council. 2017. *Final Report of the Referendum Council*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. [https://www.referendumcouncil.org.au/sites/default/files/report\\_attachments/Referendum\\_Council\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](https://www.referendumcouncil.org.au/sites/default/files/report_attachments/Referendum_Council_Final_Report.pdf)
- . 2018. "The Council." *Referendum Council*. <https://www.referendumcouncil.org.au/council>
- Sack, Daniel. 2015. *After Live: Possibility, Potentiality and the Future of Performance*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Schwartz, Tony. 2012. "'No' Is the New 'Yes': Four Practices to Reprioritize Your Life." *Harvard Business Review*. January 17, 2012: <https://hbr.org/2012/01/no-is-the-new-yes-four-practic.html>



- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 2002. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Simpson, Audra. 2014. *Mohawkus Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 2016. "Consent's Revenge." *Cultural Anthropology* 31 (3): 326–33.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14506/ca31.3.02>
- . 2017. "The Ruse of Consent and the Anatomy of 'Refusal': Cases from Indigenous North America and Australia." *Postcolonial Studies* 20 (1): 18–33.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13688790.2017.1334283>
- Simpson, Leanne. 2001. "Aboriginal Peoples and Knowledge: Decolonizing Our Processes." *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 21 (1): 137–48.  
[http://www3.brandonu.ca/cjns/21.1/cjnsv21no1\\_pg137-148.pdf](http://www3.brandonu.ca/cjns/21.1/cjnsv21no1_pg137-148.pdf)
- Sobo, Elisa. 2016. "Theorizing (Vaccine) Refusal: Through the Looking Glass." *Cultural Anthropology* 31 (3): 342–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14506/ca31.3.04>
- Warsza, Joanna, ed. 2017. *I Can't Work Like This: A Reader on Recent Boycotts in Contemporary Art*. Sternberg Press.
- Weiss, Erica. 2016. "Refusal as Act, Refusal as Abstention." *Cultural Anthropology* 31 (3): 351–58.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14506/ca31.3.05>
- White, Gareth. 2013. *Audience Participation in Theatre: Aesthetics of the Invitation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Zahara, Alex. 2016a. "Ethnographic Refusal: A How to Guide." *Discard Studies* August 8, 2016.  
<https://discardstudies.com/2016/08/08/ethnographic-refusal-a-how-to-guide/>
- . 2016b. "Refusal as Research Method." *Discard Studies* March 21, 2016.  
<https://discardstudies.com/2016/03/21/refusal-as-research-method-in-discard-studies/>

CAROLINE WAKE is a Senior Lecturer in Theatre and Performance at the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, and Editor of *Performance Paradigm*. Her research interests include the performance and forced migration. Together with Emma Cox, she guest-edited a special issue on "Envisioning Asylum / Engendering Crisis" for *Research in Drama Education* (2018). She is also the editor, with Bryoni Trezise, of *Visions and Revisions: Performance, Memory, Trauma* (2013). Elsewhere her work has appeared in the *International Journal of Performance Arts and Digital Media*, *Theatre Research International*, *New Theatre Quarterly*, and *Modern Drama*.

EMMA WILLIS is a Senior Lecturer in Drama at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, and Deputy Editor of *Performance Paradigm*. Her research interests include: spectatorship and ethics in contemporary performance, the theatre of Aotearoa New Zealand, tourism and memorial culture, metatheatrical dramaturgies, and subjectivity and community in contemporary performance. Publications include, *Theatricality, Dark Tourism and Ethical Spectatorship: Absent Others* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014) and articles in *Theatre Journal*, *Text and Performance Quarterly*, *Australasian Drama Studies* and *Journal of Contemporary Drama in English*.

© 2018 Caroline Wake and Emma Willis



Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).