

PROJECT : NEW FACES

Intellectual Output n°2: “Why New Faces” videos

"Why New Faces" is the second element of the New Faces Corpus. It consists of a collection of videos issuing from the PreFACES event (17 February 2017, Montpellier).

<i>Panel 1: What is Crisis? Definitions and Theoretical Aspects</i>	2
<i>Panel 2: Crisis: Then and Now</i>	4
<i>Panel 3: Theatre and/in crisis</i>	6
<i>Panel 4: Language Crisis: The War of Tongues</i>	8
<i>Panel 5: Crisis and Authority</i>	11

Languages: English, German, French, Portuguese and Czech



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

PANEL 1: What is Crisis? Definitions and Theoretical Aspects



Click on the picture to watch the video

- Andreas Mahler (Freie Universität Berlin): “What is a crisis? Aspects and criteria”
- Anastasios Brenner (Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, CRISES): “What is a crisis in science?”
- William Genieys (Faculty of Law & Political Sciences, CNRS, CEPEL, Université de Montpellier): “Political science and Political Crises: an Overview”

Summary in English

The first panel addresses some general questions about crisis and crises. It first asks about the nature of crises, whether they exist or whether they are merely felt to exist or whether they are imagined as such and, if so, by and for whom. It then tries to determine some opposite terms to crisis such as ‘order’, ‘stability’ or ‘identity’, and to gauge their usefulness and validity as well as the potential co-presence, and mutual implication, of both the term and its opposites. From a philosophical point of view, the second main point of discussion is, with regard to Thomas Kuhn’s idea of a crisis in science as a ‘paradigm shift’, the temporality of crises, contrasting the idea that the purported ‘revolution’ felt to exist can be seen as coming back to its point of departure but that it can also be interpreted as the introduction of something unheard-of and entirely new. A last point takes into consideration the nature and different stages of political crises and discusses the typical elements and patterns of such phases of disruption. Epistemologically, crises seem to be grounded in a firm belief in rules or some kind of normality, which indicates what ‘should be’, and against which clashes, cataclysms, conflicts look like deviations from that expectation.

Summary in German

In der ersten Diskussionsrunde geht es um allgemeine Fragen der Definition und Beschreibung von Krise und Krisen. Eine erster Fragekreis widmet sich dem Problem der Existenz von Krise, also ob es sie gibt oder ob man lediglich meint, eine zu spüren, oder ob die Krise der Vorstellung entspringt und sich hierüber womöglich immer nur als von jemandem für jemanden gemachte Krise erweist. Daran anschließend geht es um einen möglichen Gegenbegriff zu Krise wie etwa den der 'Ordnung', 'Stabilität' oder auch 'Identität', um dessen jeweiligen Erklärungswert wie zudem um die Frage, ob es zuerst das eine und dann das andere gibt oder ob Begriff und Gegenteil dahingehend als ko-präsent gesehen werden müssen, dass sie sich von Haus aus gegenseitig implizieren. Aus philosophischer Sicht diskutiert ein zweiter Punkt mit Blick auf Thomas Kuhns Konzept vom Paradigmenwandel und der damit verbundenen Vorstellung von wissenschaftlichen Revolutionen den temporalen Aspekt von Krisen, der je nach zyklischer oder linearer Zeitauffassung entweder nach der Krise geklärt zum Selben zurückführt oder aber auf etwas unerhört Neues, Nie-da-Gewesenes verweist. In einem letzten Punkt werden Charakteristika und Phasen politischer Krisen erörtert im Hinblick auf eine mögliche Bestimmbarkeit rekurrenter Elemente und erkennbarer typischer Verlaufsmuster. Aus epistemologischer Sicht erscheinen dabei Krisen als regelgläubig und normalitätsgebunden und zeigen so die Annahme eines So-Seins, gegen die sich Kontroversen, Konflikte, Kataklysmen wie Abweichungen von einer üblicherweise scheinbar voraussetzbaren Erwartung ausnehmen.

PANEL 2: Crisis: Then and Now



Click on the picture to watch the video

- Paola Spinozzi (Università degli Studi di Ferrara): “Prismatic Views of Crisis in Thomas More’s Utopia”
- Luc Borot (Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, IRCL): “Political Crises in the Mid-1650s: Balance of Property in James Harrington’s Oceana”
- Andrew Hiscock (Bangor University/ IRCL, Marie Curie Grant): “The Crises of Faith and Allegiance: Early Modern and Modern”

Summary in English

Andrew Hiscock’s presentation concentrated upon Pre-Reformation England. Taking as its focus primarily the second half of the fifteenth century and the first half of Henry VIII’s reign, discussion focused upon cultures of Catholic worship across the Tudor realm and the ways in which religious leadership in terms of political, artistic and spiritual achievement might be identified in the years leading up to the monarchy’s break with Rome. Particular emphasis was given to the vibrant community of humanists in the British kingdoms, the ongoing role of religious critique amongst late medieval and early Tudor writers and the growing sense of foreboding which accompanied the circulation of Luther’s assertions on the island. While dissecting England and criticizing European colonialism fuelled by discoveries of new worlds, he imagines an island with towns designed according to Renaissance urban planning.

Paola Spinozzi examined Thomas More’s *libellus aureus* as a powerful critique of England under Henry VIII, expressed through direct references to contemporary history in the first book and by means of comparison with the ideal commonwealth in the second. Crisis is addressed from diverse, even contrasting perspectives encompassing private property and communism, despotism and autarchy, euthanasia and suicide. Over the centuries utopian and anti-utopian writers have speculated on rational perfectibility. In the twentieth and twenty-

first century a new concept of “critical utopia” has retained the speculative approach to reality through estrangement stemming from More’s Utopia and expanded on the notion of pluralism and relativism. Looking back towards classical antiquity, rooted in the Renaissance and projected towards future history, oscillating between Englishness and universalism, More shaped early modern thought and anticipates future enquiries into crisis.

Luc Borot focused on crises in the mid-1650s and James Harrington’s Commonwealth of Oceana, published in 1656. It was an age of quick and deep political revolution, conjuring up deeply rooted values in the political culture of the British Isles, and obliterating other, equally deeply held principles in that political culture. This revolution, as all others, was intrinsically divisive. Nationally, confessionally, ideologically, and sociologically. Harrington was a committed republican and followed all ancient, medieval and early modern republicans in his hatred of one-man rule, oligarchy and above all, corruption. He tried both to identify why the revolution was happening and how to prevent its excessive duration by assigning constitutional means to pacify religious, social and constitutional dissent.

PANEL 3: Theatre and/in crisis



Click on the picture to watch the video

- Florence March (Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, IRCL)
- Janice Valls-Russell (CNRS, IRCL)
- Recorded interview of Irina Brook (Théâtre National de Nice)

Summary in English

This panel on "Theatre and/in Crisis" purposes to establish a dialogue between researchers in performance studies and artist Irina Brook, so as to broach both theoretical and practical issues, and combine a variety of points of view.

Florence March first proposes a theoretical frame to consider the way theatre articulates crisis. There seems to be no theatre without crisis, as if crisis was inherent to theatre. According to Jean Vilar, the founder of the Avignon festival in the aftermath of WWII, "as long as theatre goes through crises, it means it is well alive". Is crisis a norm when it comes to theatre? Florence March argues that theatre articulates crisis at structural and contentual levels. As a matter of fact, theatre is about taking risks, shifting points of view, decentering people in the audience, and creating debates. It is precisely because theatre invites us to take a step aside and to allow ourselves to be decentred that theatre is crucially important in times of crisis.

Irina Brook, a stage director and the head of the National Theatre in Nice on the French Riviera, grounds her reflection on theatre and crisis upon her Shakespearean experience in Nice. In 2015 she launched the first international festival entirely dedicated to Shakespeare in France, *Shake-Nice!* – a festival of popular theatre aiming to bridge the gaps in a socially very contrasted city, which was also sorely affected by terrorist acts in 2016.

Eventually, Janice Valls-Russell rounds off the panel by focusing on a series of case studies, examining how theatre can be a means to respond to crisis in different contexts. She discusses several projects that introduce students of secondary schools to Renaissance theatre through practice.

Summary in French

Ce panel sur "Théâtre et/en crise" vise à faire dialoguer des chercheurs et une artiste, Irina Brook, pour mettre en résonance théorie et pratique théâtrales et combiner différents points de vue complémentaires.

Florence March propose un cadre théorique afin d'interroger les interactions entre théâtre et crise. Il semble qu'il n'y ait pas de théâtre sans crise, comme si la crise était inhérente au théâtre, voire garante de celui-ci. Selon Jean Vilar, fondateur du Festival d'Avignon au lendemain de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, "tant que le théâtre est en crise, c'est qu'il se porte bien". La crise est-elle une norme dès lors qu'il s'agit de théâtre ? Florence March suggère à travers différentes pistes de réflexion que la crise informe le théâtre sur le plan structurel comme du contenu. Le théâtre encourage la prise de risque, déplace les points de vue, décentre les spectateurs et initie des débats. C'est précisément parce qu'il nous invite à faire un pas de côté et à nous décentrer qu'il est essentiel en temps de crise.

Irina Brook, metteur en scène et directrice du Théâtre National de Nice, fonde sa réflexion sur théâtre et crise sur son expérience de Shakespeare à Nice. En 2015 elle a lancé le premier festival international exclusivement consacré à Shakespeare en France, Shake-Nice!, festival de théâtre populaire qui vise, entre autres, à construire des ponts dans cette ville socialement très contrastée, et durement touchée par un attentat terroriste en 2016.

Janice Valls-Russell clôture le panel par une série d'études de cas qui donnent à voir comment le théâtre peut être une réponse à différents contextes et situations critiques. Elle présente ainsi plusieurs projets menés dans des établissements d'enseignement secondaire, en France et à l'étranger, autour de la pratique du théâtre à partir de corpus dramatiques de la Renaissance.

PANEL 4: Language Crisis: The War of Tongues



Click on the picture to watch the video

- Rui Carvalho-Homem (Universidade do Porto): “Clashing Voices: invective, derision, laughter”
- Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin (Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, IRCL): Insult, trauma and linguistic vulnerability: a few Shakespearean examples”
Claire Cornillon (Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3, Praxiling and Association Auxilia) “Language and distance learning for inmates: the example of the Association Auxilia”

Summary in English

This panel contributed to the menu of discursive challenges offered by the PreFaces event by interrogating the ways in which language has been / is used for human interaction under *critical* conditions. Indeed, New Faces aims to address the early modern past in order to come to terms with crises in our late modern present – and this panel pondered the particular question: how can verbal practices, and especially instances of verbal interaction found in early modern texts, enhance our ability to confront crisis today?

In light of the broad New Faces rationale and of the suggestiveness of such a question, the panel considered a starkly diverse range of uses of language – from outright conflict to forms of mediation and welfare.

Thus, Rui Carvalho Homem launched the session by highlighting the extent to which the present-day diagnosis of crisis, which has become a major discursive commonplace in advanced societies, derives much of its persuasiveness from the new digital media, with their round-the-clock operation often geared towards verbal aggression; and he proceeded to connect this with representations of intractable individuality in early modern city comedies, manifested in the characters’ inability to listen to the voices of others, as the urban space,

fashioned for cohabitation and circulation, becomes rather the setting for a denial of transit and commonality. Nathalie Vienne-Guerin then offered a reading of 'Insult, trauma and linguistic vulnerability' in Shakespeare, and considered the crucial importance of 'effect' and 'context' in determining the conditions under which certain uses of language indeed operate as insults – arguing, therefore, that 'pragmatic' rather than 'systematic' considerations are decisive for an understanding of how language may foster crisis. The final paper was given by Claire Cornillon, who offered an account of the work of an association (*Auxilia*) that has been helping develop the verbal skills of groups of citizens affected by a very specific set of *critical* conditions – those that are proper to a prison environment; her account emphasised opportunities for mediation and enablement that arise from an enhancement of verbal capacities, often through means that are all the more striking because they involve 'low-' rather than 'hi-tech' resources.

Summary in Portuguese

Este painel contribuiu para a gama de desafios discursivos propostos pelo simpósio PreFaces através de uma questionação dos modos como a linguagem foi / é usada para a interacção humana em circunstâncias críticas. Com efeito, o programa New Faces interpela o passado proto-moderno para melhor se confrontar com cenários de crise no presente tardo-moderno – e este painel ponderou uma questão específica: como podem as práticas verbais, e em particular certas instâncias de interacção verbal em textos proto-modernos, ajudar a desenvolver a nossa capacidade para enfrentarmos crises no nosso tempo?

À luz dos nexos gerais definidores do programa New Faces e da sugestividade da referida questão, o painel teve em conta um conjunto enfaticamente diverso de usos da linguagem – desde o conflito aberto a formas de mediação e a exemplos de políticas sociais.

A abrir a sessão, Rui Carvalho Homem salientou como o diagnóstico de crise do nosso tempo, que se tornou um lugar-comum discursivo em sociedades avançadas, vai buscar muita da sua força persuasiva aos novos media digitais, cujo funcionamento incessante se apresenta tantas vezes dirigido para a agressão verbal; e articulou este estado de coisas com representações de irreduzibilidade individual em “comédias de cidade” proto-modernas, em particular através da incapacidade revelada pelas personagens para escutar as vozes de outros, à medida que o espaço urbano, criado para a coabitação e a circulação, se torna antes o lugar de uma negação dos trânsitos e de um sentido de comunidade. Nathalie Vienne-Guerin propôs em seguida uma leitura do “insulto, do trauma e da vulnerabilidade linguística” em Shakespeare, tendo

em conta a importância crucial do “efeito” e do “contexto” na determinação das condições em que certos usos da linguagem funcionam como insultos – e argumentando, portanto, que considerações “pragmáticas”, mais do que “sistemáticas”, são decisivas para um entendimento do modo como a linguagem pode fomentar a crise. A intervenção final foi de Claire Cornillon, que ofereceu um relato do trabalho de uma associação (Auxilia) que tem ajudado a desenvolver as competências verbais de grupos de cidadãos afectados por um quadro muito específico de condições críticas – as que são próprias do ambiente prisional; o seu relato salientou as oportunidades de mediação e capacitação que nascem da melhoria de capacidades verbais, por vezes através de recursos que surpreendem por serem de “baixa”, que não de “alta” tecnologia.

PANEL 5: Crisis and Authority



Click on the picture to watch the video

- Martin Procházka (Charles University, Prague): “Crisis of divine kingship and its consequences for modern nationalism”
- Nathalie Rivère de Carles (Université de Toulouse Jean Jaurès, CAS): “Colliding authorities: Shakespearean views on the contemporary crisis of the diplomatic voice”
- Marc Smyrl (Université de Montpellier, CEPEL): ““Sad stories of the death of kings’: the loss of authority and its consequences from Richard II to David Cameron”

Summary in English

The panel first discussed (in Martin Procházka’s paper, using the material from Shakespeare’s first historical tetralogy) the crisis of divine kingship towards the close of the middle ages (the demand of popular consensus and the influence of monetary economy) and its consequences for modern nationalism based on the imagining of communities in the “transverse, cross-time temporal simultaneity” (Benedict Anderson). The substitution for the divine authority is that of “nature” and its derivatives (language, organic unity, race, etc.), all used in modern nationalist ideologies. Nathalie Rivère de Carles’ paper focused on the issue of an autonomous diplomatic voice as counterweight to early modern rulers’ tyrannical authority (using Jean Hotman’s play *The Ambassador*, 1603, and Shakespeare’s *Henry V* and *The Winter’s Tale*). It showed the persistence of the tension between the diplomatic and political authority in contemporary political crises (Brexit, Trump administration’s reorientation of US diplomacy) and the new communicational options to be considered in these conflicts. Finally, Marc Smyrl outlined the problem of the loss of authority using both Shakespeare’s *Richard II* and the example of the recent downfall of David Cameron. His paper showed that authority is prior to power and that its loss is irretrievable. What is at risk is not the career of individual leaders but the legitimacy of the offices they hold. The ensuing discussion dealt with the sources and

exercise of authority in contemporary politics and everyday life, confronting rhetorical and structural aspects of modern authority.

Summary in Czech

Panel se nejprve zaměřil - v příspěvku Martina Procházky, vycházejícího ze Shakespearovy první historické tetralogie - na krizi božského práva králů na konci středověku (potřeba panovníků dosáhnout konsensu o jejich právu na trůn a vliv peněžního hospodářství) a důsledky této krize pro moderní nacionalismus, založený na „transverzální simultaneitě společenského času“ (Benedict Anderson). Božskou autoritu posléze nahrazuje autorita „přírody“ a od ní odvozených pojmů (jazyk, organická jednota, rasa), kterých hojně využívají moderní nacionalistické ideologie. Příspěvek Nathalie Rivère de Carles se pak zaměřil na problematiku autonomie názorů diplomatů, jež byly často protiváhou absolutisticky chápané autority raně novověkých vládců. Vycházel přitom ze hry Jeana Hotmana *The Ambassador* (Vyslanec, 1603), ze Shakespearova *Jindřicha V.* a z jeho *Zimní pohádky*. Nakonec nastínil Marc Smyrl problém ztráty autority. Vycházel přitom z *Richarda II.*, ale zároveň uvedl příklad nedávného pádu Davida Camerona. Tento příspěvek ukázal, že autorita je důležitější než moc, že ji předchází a její ztráta je nenahraditelná. Neznamená ohrožení kariéry, ale legitimacy funkcí, které politici zastávají. Následující diskuse se zabývala zdroji a uplatňováním autority v současné politice i běžném životě a srovnávala rétorické a strukturální stránky moderní autority.

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.