Introduction

"To make a novel out of a city, to represent the streets and the various districts as dramatis personae, each one with a character in conflict with every other; to give life to human figures and situations as if they were spontaneous growths from the cobblestones of the streets […] to work in such a way that at every changing moment the true protagonist was the living city, its biological continuity, the monster that was Paris—this is what Balzac felt impelled to do when he began to write Ferragus." ~ Italo Calvino, The City as Protagonist in Balzac.

Our being is not separate from our situatedness. Our location, the way we anchor ourselves, the way we interact with ourselves, the way we interact with others, constitutes our identity. Our identity is always already influenced by our *habitus*. This *habitus* helps in identity formation and meaning generation. Hence are asked the questions so vital to our identity – when and where? Since our spatiality is always already a part of our being, we have made places out of spaces; just as we have made watches out of time. Tuan says, "Place is a term which signifies a territorial space – it can be seen and physically inhabited. It is open to architectural and land planning (as in town planning) and is, therefore, a concept having a very concrete reality. The term "space" on the other hand, signifies an abstract concept which is basically discursive in nature. It is associated with how people of different cultures divide up their world, assign values to its parts, and measure them, according to their biological needs and social relations. "Space" thus, in discursive terms, is "humanly constructed space" and the human being, by his mere presence, "imposes a schema on space" This is how the city, by virtue of human action, becomes "space," and not just "place" signifying a latitudinal and longitudinal point of intersection" (Tuan 34). In the course of the thesis I shall consider this 'where' co-ordinate of our identity. Where do we live? We live either in cities or in towns or in villages. The question is what makes a town different from a city? A village different from a town? More importantly, are all cities alike? It is quite clear that New York is not London, that London is not Delhi, that Paris is not Berlin. Then why this tendency to homogenize the heterogeneous space of the city? What is it then, that makes a city? Is it its buildings, roads, shopping malls, hospitals that make a city? Or is it the people who live in it? The vital question to be asked is, does a city define a set of social, cultural practices that go on in it

or is it itself defined by it? Our lives as citizens are shaped by our responses to several issues. How do we cultivate positive, cohesive societies which value diversity and also promote the same? Should the concept of beauty guide our urban planning and architecture? How do we achieve fairness in our cities? Such issues are of vital importance when one thinks of life in a city, but in most public policy debates they have always ended up staying as unexamined assumptions.

In this thesis I attempt to study the city in relation to theatre. Chicago School member, Robert Park, was of the opinion that the city could not be defined only on the basis of its physical or institutional forms. He called the city "a state of mind", "The city is a state of mind, a body of customs and traditions, and of organized attitudes and sentiments that inhere in this tradition. The city is not, in other words, merely a physical mechanism and an artificial construction. It is involved in the vital processes of the people who compose it; it is a product of nature and particularly of human nature." (Harvie 2)

It is because of the ambiguous yet interesting questions that the city has left unanswered that it has been an area of study for philosophers down the ages. Several prominent thinkers have referred to the city in their search for a base of moral ethics and democratic philosophy. Others also extended place and environment ideologies to specifically concentrate on the city, integrating cultural, sociopolitical, and ecological issues. Present intellectual studies on human existence and the construction of identity also give much importance to the city. Proponents of globalization also see the "global city" gradually as a modern locus for both sociopolitical and economic issues. Socrates initiated the birth of Western philosophy in the city. With the switch over from the remote village to the ancient *polis* of Athens, thinkers like Socrates posed questions about the very nature of this new society and lifestyle mechanism and so founded by it. "For Socrates, the unexamined life- a life without philosophy – was not worth living. And the life of philosophy was nurtured within the walls of the city" (Meagher 3). Henri Lefebvre states that in "Classical philosophy from Plato to Hegel, the city was much more than a secondary theme, an object among others. The links between philosophical thought and urban life appear clearly upon reflection, although they need to be made explicit" (Lefevbre 86). In his *Republic*, in a conversation between Socrates and other Athenian men, Plato establishes a city "in speech"; for him justice of the individual in the context of the city is important. The

city, for Aristotle, is marked by its ultimate goal of common good which he defines as justice. Pericles especially praised the tolerance of Athens, its ability to accept non-citizens. Aristotle compares the cities to a living entity, a collective structure in which the whole exceeds the sum total of its component parts. The city's shared intention is to establish and encourage *eudaimonia,* better interpreted as "human flourishing." St. Augustine in his musings on the city brings about a combination of Christianity and the classical ideals of ancient Greek philosophy. Guided by Plato's insistence on the value of 'truthful definitions', Augustine claims that Rome may not have been a city at all, as it did not follow Cicero's definitional standards. Augustine believes that Rome was not successful in satisfying Cicero's definition of a republic as a "people's affair" because there was no common consensus on what is right. Augustine believed that the common good that has gone astray on earth could only be re-instated in a heavenly city. While both the Greeks and St. Augustine gave importance to what is good, just and true in the city, the only concern for Machiavelli is power. Machiavelli does not hesitate to exploit the prince's skill (*virtu*) to take absolute control over the city. For him, if a city or its cit(y)zens refuse to fall in place with the prince, then it has to be destroyed, rather than let it destroy his success. Machiavelli mentions two types of cities, the free city where citizens revolt against the prince and live by their own free laws and the city that lives a life that is subservient to its ruler. Machiavelli prefers the second one. St. Thomas More a British contemporary of Machiavelli created *Utopia*. More's ideal representation of humans is as naturally social and supportive beings. He is so totally focused on the need for shared values and ties that he utterly excludes diversity from his community/city. Machiavelli's insistence on individualism and '*realpolitik'* resurface in Thomas Hobbes, who is intrigued by questions of survival. During Hobbes's time the development of the nation-state gains ground and the concept of city as a political entity takes a backseat. The accelerated urbanization that occurred in the nineteenth century as a consequence of the Industrial Revolution brought the city a into the arena of social science research and it ceased to be only a subject of philosophical inquiry. George Simmel and Max Weber raised valuable questions like "What is a City?" and investigated the changing nature of city over time. Meagher says, "In the twentieth century, philosophers who worked on the urban questions largely focused on the rapid growth of the cities and the rise of the mass man, which they saw as a distinguishing characteristic of the modern city. Some like Mumford, returned to Athenian concepts of

community for the antidote to the increasing anonymity of big cities. Others theorized that the growth of negative urban traits was linked to the rise of capitalism and turned to Marx for analysis. In more recent years, we have witnessed yet another shift in philosophy's relationship to the city. Although earlier philosophers focused on issues concerning the nature of the city and concepts of citizenship, more recent writings tend to focus on the built environment and on issues of diversity and economic justice." (Meagher 7)

The present study attempts an understanding of theatre in and around the city, analyze and demonstrate how and why the theatre relates to the urban community and vice versa. The city has become, and continues to be, a significant centre where human civilisation sublimates its joys, crisis and discontent. As such, towns and cities concentrate and reflect on all the main intellectual issues to which thinkers return eternally and these ripples in the city are caught by the mirror of theatre and art. Lewis Mumford, one of the pioneers of the twentieth century urban planners, understood the city as "a theatre of social action": He says, "The city fosters art and is art; the city creates the theatre and is the theatre. It is in the city, the city as theatre, that man's more purposive activities are focused. The physical organization of the city may ... through the deliberate efforts of art, politics, and education, make the drama more richly significant, as a stage-set, well-designed, intensifies and underlines the gestures of the actors and the action of the play" (Mumford 82).

Mumford also says that urban performativity, then, allows citizens to explore – through imagination, memory and longing – new ideas about themselves and their inter-connection with the urban landscape. Theatre forms an integral part of performance studies, holding within itself a vast storehouse of human culture. Also, theatre as an art form best demonstrates life. Theatre catches the ripples of life and reflects them on the stage. Not only does it image reality but also produces new realities by its story-telling, acting and dramaturgy – both on and off the proscenium stage. Jen Harvie says in *Theatre and the City*,

Theatre, likewise, is an ever-changing material, aesthetic and social structure where many people gather to participate – through work and leisure - in complex social activities; it is also usually located in cities. Theatre is therefore in some ways symptomatic of the urban process, demonstrating the structures, social power

dynamics, politics and economics at work more broadly throughout the city. Theatre actually does more than demonstrate urban process, therefore; theatre is a part of urban process, producing urban experience and thereby producing the city itself (Harvie 6).

As stated earlier, the thesis attempts to map the lived experience of the city through theatre, in this case city theatre in India roughly around the 1970s to the present. But the question automatically arises, why city? The answer to this is the age we live in. Whether by chance or choice we live in an Urban Age which is experiencing a rapid transformation from rural to urban. In 1968, the world faced a kind of Urban riot, and almost as a spontaneous reaction to this, academics shifted their focus to social issues in these towns and cities. Although an overlooked area for a long time, several universities started programs in Urban Studies. At present several educational institutions and universities also include urban outreach centers which link academics and members of the urban community. Such outreach projects are clearly indicative of a scholarly engagement with cities and the need for community participation. In India too, the post-independence adoption of a mixed economy has ensured this trend of urbanization. Despite having a large rural population, there is a huge inflow of people into the cities of Mumbai, Delhi, Kolkata and Bangalore. The population of urban areas in India is rising at a rapid rate. Already grappling with issues of colonial hangover and religio-ethnic diversity, this spate of urbanization and industrialization makes urban India a volatile battleground for survival. The present day theatre feeding on such issues portrays an urban landscape which accentuates the isolation of individuals rather than promoting a sense of community. Hence, the focus given to the city and its theatre and the multiplicity of meanings it generates.

The present dissertation will explore the relationship of theatre in India (in regional languages and translation from the 1970s to the present) with the city. It will investigate into the "reality/realities" of these cities that make them muse-worthy in the course of four chapters which have been organised chronologically, thematically and dramaturgically at once. Each chapter seeks to offer critical insights into a particular phase of city-theatre in India and establish its right to claim as a separate (sub)genre. It will take up select plays of GirishKarnad, Habib Tanvir and Vijay Tendulkar in chapter1 which interrogates the city's

link to folk performance and the emergence of the new dramatic form of urban-folk. Moving forward the chapter 2 demonstrates the theatrical and performative dimensions of cities most easily recognizable in plays and other designated performance events including street-theatre, the agit-prop theatres associated with rallies and demonstrations, festivals, site-specific works and theatre's social role as seen in the street theatre movement that flourished in the hands of Safdar Hashmi, Badal Sircar and Utpal Dutta. Chapter 3 focuses on the Indian English playwrights who chose English as the medium of their plays and the city as the centre of their drama. This list includes the likes of Mahesh Dattani, Abhishek Majumdar and Ramu Ramanathnan who bring the city to life through their plays. These plays may be studied as conscious explorations into the relationship between the city and the contemporary theatre in India. These plays have been read as potent texts that capture the urban milieu through an exploration of spaces that have indelible footprints on the city. Chapter 4 deals specifically with women's experience of the city and how women playwrights represent the city though their work.

The city chosen for this project is "essentially" the Indian city. India is a strange mix of traditional cultures and modernity. It is an older civilization and a comparatively younger nation-state. Unlike the growth of western civilization, as discussed earlier, historically centered around or largely co-incident with the development of cities like Rome and Greece, present day Indian cities are mostly post-independence products of urbanization brought in by industrialization and globalization. Therefore to define the Indian city in parlance with western traditions of the 'polis' would be grossly inappropriate. Unlike the western city which becomes a 'salad-bowl'[1] for people of different walks of life, the Indian city with its vast religious, economic and socio-political diversity forms a kind of mosaic rather than a uniform community. The Indian city is where the "imagined communities"[2] live as immigrant communities[3]. A large number of people

---

[1] A salad bowl or tossed salad is a metaphor for the way a multicultural society can integrate different cultures while maintaining their separate identities.

[2] Concept defined by Benedict Anderson in his book of the same name.

migrating from the villages to the city in search of jobs or otherwise form a huge internal diaspora within itself. This produces a sort of hybridity where the migrant is unable to shed the regional baggage and this in turn results in the opacity and fragmented nature of the city. Despite being in a so-called homogenous space, they are heterogeneous. They struggle within themselves as they amalgamate, not assimilate in the city. Theatre being a cultural product informed by the historical, political, social conditions of a time is not only representative of these realities but also formative of the nature of such cities.

A city is a conglomeration of strangers who perform their lives in the city. The city is a stage that produces identities and is in turn produced by them. The thesis adopts performance studies as a tool to examine the ways in which the drama of living unfolds itself in the cities. The citizens are participants as well as audience of urban drama. Hence it becomes important to refract the city not only though the lens of performance but through the referent of performativity. Performative theatre practices encourage increased audience participation and compel them to question their own performance in everyday urban life. The performative critical approach empowers the citizens and gives them a sort of agency to question the normative and hegemonic social, political practices of the society. It also reinforces the fact that the staged drama is after all a reflection of the drama of their life. Urban theorists such as Henri Lefebvre, Edward Soja, Victor Turner have all reinforced this view in their works. Victor Turner talks of 'social drama'. He believes that dramas exist because of the conflict that is inherent in societies. As Turner says,

> The manifest social drama feeds into the *latent* realm of stage drama; its characteristic form in
> a given culture, at a given time and place, unconsciously or perhaps pre-consciously,
> influence not only the form but also the content of the stage drama of which it is the active or
> "magic" mirror. The stage drama, when it is meant to do more than entertain-though
> entertainment is always one of its vital aims-is a meta commentary, explicit or implicit,
> witting or unwitting, on the major social dramas of its social context (wars, revolutions,

---

[3] The word immigrant here refers largely to Indian citizens who migrate from the villages to the cities or small towns to bigger metropolitan cities in search of jobs and other sources of employment.

scandals, institutional changes). Not only that, but its message and rhetoric feedback into the *latent* processual structure of the social drama and partly accounts for its ready ritualization. Life itself now becomes a mirror held up to art, and the living now *perform* their lives, for the protagonists of a social drama, 'a drama of living (Turner 20).

Henri Lefebvre, the radical French sociologist talks of the citizens 'right to the city', of their ability to change themselves by changing the city. Performance orientated theatres, such as street theatres, urban artist's march, have this aim in view when they perform in the cities. In a nutshell, the narratives of theatre are those that define their relation to the places they live in. Theatre brings out the hopes, desires, disappointments and attitudes of the audience and in doing so often blurs the distinctions between the aesthetic and non-aesthetic realm. Therefore, a perception of theatre in the city can help us to appreciate the social experience in it. Nicholas Why brow writes in *Performance and the Contemporary City*, "the body has not been replaced at all but *re-placed*, wandering en masse into the space of the city (not for the first time of course), performing *in situ,* a relational body or switching station that acts within and is acted upon by its urban surroundings. Thus bodies can be said to both *produce* and *be produced* by the city. And while cities obviously contain bodies, bodies also contain cities" (Whybrow 3).

The performance traditions in India trace back to the epics and *puranas* as well as traditions of oral story-telling and regional folk-narratives. However, with the coming of the British large theatre Halls were built in the colonial city of Kolkata, which catered to the urban educated middle-class. These colonial mediations made theatre more and more city-centric and ironically enough, colonial methods were largely used to materialize the anti-colonial cultural narrative in India. The partnership between the city and the theatre reached new heights when theatre – and particularly English theatre – became the vehicle through which the native's induction into the cultural modes of the West was accomplished. The location for such assimilation became the city, whose geographical realities facilitated the spread of colonial culture. Throughout the nineteenth century, the colonial authorities did not pursue repressive tactics surrounding the dissemination of English theatre throughout India. They refrained from using oppressive contraptions such as the laws or force that compel citizens to behave in compliance with societal norms; they rather thought it

convenient to culturally hegemonies the urban elite. They selected ideology as a means to fulfill this propaganda. Throughout colonial India, the hegemonic practice of English theatre, based on Western concepts of realism appeared perfectly natural. The city was the focus of such activity. Throughout the early nineteenth century there was a period when theatre-going became commercialized in India, with theatre being a luxury for use by a single segment in society including the learned elite. Theatre progressed into a consumer goods from a community event associated with annual harvests and religious occasions. The British established the conceptual model of theatre as "dramatic literature" in India and brought in the textualisation of drama as opposed to the native indigenous traditions. Erin B. Mee says: "Modern theatre came to be defined in terms of plot-driven plays that stemmed from a single author. It was expected to have human characters, conversational dialogue, behavior that was psychologically motivated, events that were causally linked, and realistic settings that allowed spectators to believe in the present-tense reality of the action onstage and to identify with the characters, eliminating anything that would shatter the illusion of the fictional world of the play" (Mee 2).

This urban turn in Indian theatre became more and more evident in post-independence India. Efforts at nation building largely paralleled the development of the Nehruvian megapolises of Delhi, Bombay Madras and Calcutta. Around the same time efforts were also directed at the institutionalization of culture, and theatre formed an important part of this institutionalization. Major milestones were the formation of the Sangeet Natak Academy (1952) and the National School of Drama (1959) which organized several seminars and conferences aimed at finding a single idiom for Indian Theatre. But, given the plurality and multifaceted nature of India any such efforts were only frustrated. Various genres and sub-genres of theatre emerged during this time, largely mirroring contextual realities.

The need to develop a theatre that moved away from British models and at the same time reflected the contemporary realties of the day, concretized in the 'theatre of the roots'[4] movement. It combined " specific traditional Indian performance practices with Western theatrical conventions to create modern plays for urban audiences " (Mee 26). In certain cases, this theatrical mode also used material from village

---

[4] Term coined by Suresh Awashthi to denote the trend of actively using traditional genres in contemporary theatrical productions.

life and presented it to city audiences which made the reception context of this material very different from a village. Director M.K.Raina wrote, "we are not going back to tradition, as some of us claim, we are in the process of creating, thinking new sensibilities, and therefore new forms. Perhaps the fusion of some of the traditional forms and contemporary struggles may give birth to vital new forms, representative of contemporary Indian reality" (Raina 29). Moving beyond binaries, this theatre in its very essence questioned the "the colonial cultural divide between high/English/urban/modern/theatre and what was characterized as low/Indian/rural/traditional/ performance" (Mee 4). This type of theatre we can call urban-folk drama, for it incorporated folk traditions and visual practices into its corpus, but the message it sought to convey was contemporary, portraying the *angst* of the urban generation. The folk traditions served the purpose of taking theatre to the level of spectacle and hence conveying the message more effectively. Writers such as Habib Tanvir, Girish Karnad and Vijay Tendulkar are instrumental in analysing this phase of city-theatre in India.

The 1970's was a time of upheaval for several reasons. The adoption of mixed economic policy, the rapid spate of industrialization which drew in large number of people from villages to the cities, the Naxalite Movement, the Autonomous Women's movement, refugee influx from Bangladesh, and several wars brought in drastic changes to the social, economic and political order. Such changes readily caught the attention of playwrights of the naturalist-realist mode who did not hesitate to make theatre a weapon of protest against social and economic exploitation and inequities. The unrest of the 1970s, the People's Revolution with strong Marxist inclinations, produced among other things, a theatre of protest in the urban and semi-urban areas of the country. Urban, educated intellectuals such as Badal Sircar, Safdar Hashmi and Utpal Dutt spearheaded this movement. This theatre broke several conventions. Keeping up to its revolutionary name, it moved out of the proscenium, into the streets, *nukkads*, factories, slums, temple-courtyards, railway platforms etc in its attempt to reach out to the public at large. In most cases this audience comprised factory workers, unemployed youth, labourers who had migrated to the city in search of jobs. But life in the city had not been very kind. Marvin Carlson said in *Places of Performance,* "places of performance generate social and cultural meanings of their own which in turn help to structure the meaning of the entire theatrical experience" (Carlson 2).In a nutshell, street theatre had this aim in view when it moved to these alternative venues and out to the streets of the city.

Since the 1980s onwards a group of young, dynamic, city-bred playwrights have enlivened the urban stage by portraying new cityscapes and by using English as their medium of playwriting. Bold, new and fresh in its approach, theme and dramaturgy, this theatre smells of the city. Dealing with contextual realities, contemporary Indian English theatre is concerned with city-dwellers who are busy negotiating their lives in the city and facing new challenges every day. The rate of social development in India has not been able to keep up with the rate of mechanical urbanization, leading to huge gap between the rich and the poor. Urban India has become a place where the dictum 'survival of the fittest' applies aptly. It has become a mad race for capturing a 'rightful place' in the city claimed mostly by wrongful means. Violence, suicide, murder, communal strife, rape, abuse have become tools of subjugating the marginalized sections of the city. The same power politics runs internally within urban households for getting a larger share of the limited amenities and resources the members possess. Indian English theatre today has become a site of reenactment of the complicated dynamics of city-life. Mahesh Dattani, Abhishek Majumdar, Ramu Ramanathan portray these urban conflicts using an English which is assertive, urban and hybrid. Dattani himself says that there are enough issues and challenges in urban Indian society and these automatically form the content of his work. Theatre groups such as Rage Theatre and MAD (Mad About Drama) are performing plays which are a depiction of the populace of the metropolitan cities in their confusions and conflicts both within and without. The discourses that are produced as the characters speak to each other and to the audience are essentially the discourses that run in the cities.

Geographer Nancy Duncan reminds us, "Social relations, including, importantly, gender relations, are constructed and negotiated spatially and are embedded in the spatial organization of places" (Duncan 5). After all its claims of development and progress, one thing that the so called liberated space of the city has not been able to avoid is gender bias. Women from across disciplines, caste and class have been subjected to some kind of discrimination and gender bias. What differs is the nature and degree of discrimination; the attitude remains the same – men have 'mind', women have 'body'. Women's experience of the city is rather different from men's. It is then obvious that their literature will also be different. Anne Lambright and Elizabeth Guerrero write in the introduction to their book *Unfolding the City*, "women's experience of the city, as expressed particularly through literature, is unique and revealing, as women writers propose new

mappings of urban space; contemplate the rapid transformation of the modern city; interpret caste, ethnic and class dynamics; and explore their own place in the city" (Lambright and Guerra xiii). The work of women playwrights (from 1970s to the present) and how women have responded and reacted to the urban milieu will also come within the scope of the thesis. Ashis Sengupta says in his book, *Mapping South Asia Through Contemporary Theatre*, "Playwriting and directing remained a male privilege until the emergence during the 1970s of the autonomous women's movement (mainly around issues of dowry, rape, and bride burning), largely spearheaded by urban, middle-class, educated women). In recent times the focus has shifted from the previous concerns of 'women's welfare' to the 'women's empowerment' and the question of individual autonomy" (Sengupta 22). Women now do not need men to be their mouthpiece. They have taken it upon themselves to have a *voice* of their own and speak out to the world through their plays. In many cases they have not been able to find exact solutions to their problems, but they have at least registered a protest. Women playwrights have come out with issues such as domestic violence, rape, sexual abuse, female sexuality, and the problems being a working woman and a homemaker simultaneously. The innovation has been not only in terms of theme but also dramaturgy. Women directors have worked without traditional scripts, actors have acted *impromptu* on stage, used single actors, and portrayed the female body as a metaphor for their fragmented life. Playwrights such as Neelam Mansingh Chowdhury , Anuradha Kapoor, Manjula Padmanabhan, Poile Sengupta, Mallika Thaneja, Annie Zaidi have signaled this welcome change through their work. To add on to these are a host of ambitious young performers such as Maya Krishna Rao, Jyoti Dogra or Amruta Mapuskar who, rather than using preconceived scripts, perform on stage using motion, gestures and improvised texts.

Writing in the 1930s, Lewis Mumford interpreted the city as a "theatre of collective action". Within confines of the contemporary post-industrial urbanization, where theatricality and performativity are core generators of "experience economies", Mumford's ideas retain its relevance. When shaping reform, city policy-makers become constantly attuned to such dramatic conceptions as the "urban scene" and "urban drama". This study, by employing interpretive approaches facilitated by Performance Studies, offers an account of some of the forms in which theatre and performance happen in cities. This addresses some of the ramifications of urban performativity, suggesting that successful urban communities include

performative ethics, "whereby citizens become spectators and co-performers of urban drama". It has rightly been said that, "Performing the city, therefore, demands an ethics of performance, a measure by which to foster and value partnerships between the polis and its people. In order for the performative to be embedded and activated beyond the formal theatre building, the citizenry needs access to shared civic space. Performing the city becomes an assertion then of the political values of access, participation and cultural democracy" (Makhem 158). The thesis thus proposes to focus on the multiplicity of meanings generated by the city and performed in Indian theatre from the 1970s to the present. As Desmond Harding says, "In linguistic terms, urban fiction thus represents a hospitable field of play, a paradigm of *difference,* of linguistic free play, defying unity, wholeness and authority invested in a unified subject" (Harding 9). My focus in the course of the work will be to engage with theatre in its urban context and analyze its themes, material and dramaturgy – with its interface with the cit(y)zens Nevertheless, the city's theatre comes alive by individuals' collective actions, generating signs and meanings, in conversation and conflict with each other, watching and being watched, narrating tales, enacting the rituals of drama. By doing so, people are actively involved in a theatre of collective change as co-performers as well as viewers. In order for this theatre to operate effectively in reality instead of being reduced to the level of a fictitious allegory, the city government must accept the performance in its entirety, including the dramas of violation and antagonism that empower social discourses, and allow the existence of harmonious diversities.