13

THEATRE-HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PATTERNS IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH 1950–1990

Transnational and institutional perspectives[1]

Christopher B. Balme

This chapter proposes broad outlines of a theatre-historiographical approach to the Global South in full consciousness of the hubris involved in sketching out categories that apply potentially to more than 100 nation-states (between 1950 and 1990 the number increased from 60 to 159, with many of the new members belonging to the Global South according to gross domestic product). It draws on historiographic practices developed by the relatively new disciplines of global history and transnational history and applies these methods of writing history to theatre in the post-1945 period. For the most part, the arts have been ignored by global historians, and perhaps for good reason. They would appear to lie outside or at best on the margins of the parameters of the major themes that concern global historians: the emergence and decline of empires, migration, the spread of and rivalry between capitalist and socialist economic models, histories of commodities, currents of internationalism (e.g. the labour movement or women's rights), and modernisation, to name only the most intensively researched. This chapter proposes that theatre was indeed imbricated in some of these global processes and can be usefully studied from such perspectives.

   The term *Global South* is marginally better than its predecessors and competitors to designate those nations that belong to the "Third," "developing," and "post-colonial" world. Arif Dirlik traces the term's origins to the 1970s when it was coined to "describe societies that seemed to face difficulties in achieving the economic and political goals of either capitalist or socialist modernity" (2007, 13). The positioning outside the two main political blocs is crucial because as a term it emerged after the end of the Cold War, largely untinged by the criticism levelled at the "Third World," its main predecessor, via the latter's adoption by the radical left. The Global South finally attained currency through the United Nations (UN) initiative "Forging a Global South" (2003) from whence spawned research centres and academic journals. The journal *Global South*, founded in 2007 and devoted to literature and culture, defines its subject as

> those parts of the world that have experienced the most political, social, and economic
> upheaval and have suffered the brunt of the greatest challenges facing the world under

globalisation: poverty, displacement and diaspora, environmental degradation, human and civil rights abuses, war, hunger, and disease.

Global South 2019

Thus, it has less to do with a division marked by the equator than with continuing inequalities across the globe. One obvious criticism is that significant populations of the Global South live north of the equator and that there is movement between the two categories, as certain countries have shifted economically from South to North in recent decades, or even contain elements of North and South within their own borders. The first challenge for the theatre historian is that the term itself has had little to no theatre-historiographical purchase, but then neither have the alternatives, with the exception perhaps of post-colonial. From a disciplinary perspective the Global South appears to be the preserve of development studies, global heath, human rights, gender, migration, and ecology.

It is in the nature of globalisation that it does not make clean divisions between North and South, but on the contrary often straddles them. An additional complicating factor is the fact that over this period millions of people from the Global South moved to the North (and continue to do so) through migration, forming diasporic communities. The first of these movements took place in the 1950s and 1960s, driven by decolonisation and labour shortages in the North. The second began after the end of the Cold War, is ongoing, and lies outside the temporal framework of this chapter. Rather than asking what the *differentia specifica* of theatre history are in this broad sweep, this chapter explores how theatre history intersects and interacts with issues that historians, economists, and anthropologists have identified for the Global South. In other words, this treatment is more about Structural Adjustment Programmes, the informal sector, and the Cold War than about specific dramatists or directors, and less about prominent theatrical artists than about philanthropic gatekeepers and epistemic communities. This means that theatre historiography needs to shift its focus from interpreting individual artistic achievements to elucidating institutional structures and networks.

Defining theatre in the Global South

A focus on the Global South places more definitional strain on the term "theatre" than in the Global North. Theatre is deployed here mainly in an institutional sense to encompass all those manifestations of performance that evince a set of clearly defined conventions regulating performer–spectator interactions, whatever the degree of regularity and predictability. To borrow terms from Farley P. Richmond, Darius Swann, and Phillip Zarrilli in *Indian Theatre* (1990), these may be classical, ritual, devotional, folk-popular, dance-drama, or modern. Leaving aside the potential overlap between the terms (especially ritual/devotional), we can see in them an indication of the range of possible manifestations of theatrical expression that historiographical treatment would potentially need to engage. The actual focus is somewhat narrower than these possible manifestations might suggest.

Since the perspective is transnational and institutional, this privileges how what could be broadly termed Western forms took root in the Global South and how these institutional processes were often combined with indigenous performance practices. I ask which broader transnational forces and developments had impact on one or some of these manifestations. If we understand a transnational perspective as referring to multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation-states (Vertovec 2009), then the frame of

reference for theatre tends to be Western-dominated, notwithstanding the broad definition enumerated above. The reasons for this are manifold and include neo-colonial legacies in the areas of education but also active ideological and financial encouragement from both the newly founded states and philanthropic organisations in order to foster such activities. This Western focus needs to account for the significant reactions against these forms across the Global South. One could also argue that, like nationalism, which took hold across the post-colonial world because of its "modular" structure, theatre was a "cultural artefact" that was "capable of being transplanted, with varying degrees of self-consciousness, to a great variety of social terrains" (Anderson 1991 [1983], 4). The modular components of theatre — such as acting, dramatic texts, dance, music, and flexible architectural forms — kept changing over this period as modernist thinking in the West subjected theatre to a continual process of experimentation, interrogation, and reassembly of its component parts. Even in a rejected Western notion of theatre there remained a capacity for selection and (like nationalism) adaptation to and hybridisation with autochthonous performance forms.

An institutional approach to theatre historiography also requires some explanation, if only because the notoriously difficult concept of "institution" metamorphoses as it moves through different disciplines. Anthropology, economics, sociology, and law, to name only the dominant disciplines, have differing understandings of the term. I follow a broadly neo-institutional approach: this means differentiation between the levels of institution and organisation. The former refers to abstract rules and frameworks, which are manifested in individual organisations, whereby the two levels are linked together by reciprocal relationships. Following Douglass North's famous definition, we can say that institutions define "the rules of the game" and constitute "the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction" (1990, 3), whereas organisations are the players, "groups of individuals bound by some common purpose to achieve objectives" (5). Theatre scholars tend to concern themselves with the level of organisation — specific artists, theatres, and theatre companies — because it is here that theatre is made and becomes visible. Less visible is the institutional level, which in most cases involves some form of exogenous support, whether through a ministry of culture or state-funded universities, or through private funding, such as transnationally operating private philanthropy. All these instances create rules and constraints that are highly mutable. It is in the interaction between the institutional and the organisational level that structures accessible to theatre historiographical analysis emerge.

The rise of a theatrical epistemic community

The first institutional rather than organisational shift can be seen in the emergence of a theatrical epistemic community in the immediate post-1945 years. This was a time when the world was full of optimism about the potential of theatre to bring about good for humankind. The period lasted roughly from 1950 to 1975, when organisations such as the International Theatre Institute (ITI), the International Association of Theatre Critics (IATC), and the International Federation for Theatre Research (IFTR) were founded under the aegis of UNESCO, the cultural and educational wing of the UN. Artists and scholars collaborated and regarded one another as working towards the same goal: establishing and improving the overall standards of theatre understood as an art form. This combination of artists, administrators, critics, and scholars organised in associations spanning the globe made up what transnational historians term an "epistemic community" (Haas 1992). Although formulated in the context of international politics, the concept was adopted by historians to describe processes already observable

in the nineteenth century. Epistemic communities are closely linked with expertise, as Emily Rosenberg notes in reference to the emergence of international professional associations:

> Nature might be engineered for human benefit; the social sphere might be reordered to eliminate gross injustice; epidemic disease might be eradicated. The new professionals, who energetically worked to build transnational epistemic communities, generally embraced the idea that global revolutionary progress could be guided by the authority of their expertise.
>
> *2012, 919*

Transnational epistemic communities mainly originated in the Global North, yet recent research shows a high degree of interaction between global and local realisations: they tend to be mutually constituent rather than oppositional realms. In Rosenberg's formulation, circuits of expertise did not necessarily act in a top-down fashion; rather, "transnational circuit builders interacted with each other from many different geographic and social positions" (2012, 958). Because the contexts of interaction were highly diverse, knowledge was "co-produced" in a variety of locales that resulted in highly specific realisations oscillating between "broad commonalities and localized variations" (959).

The theatrical epistemic community can be defined as an international alliance of artists, scholars, bureaucrats, and philanthropists who shared an understanding of theatre as a discrete artistic and cultural form as opposed to its commercial variant. They saw in it potential for nation-building, and its rise can be dated to the late 1940s. However, the origins of the post-1945 theatrical epistemic community lie in theatrical modernism: the international, multi-sited movement whose foundational belief is the idea that theatre can be an art form and hence of high cultural value and not just a commercial enterprise. It is the ideology that most readers of this chapter were likely educated in and to which we owe our institutions' existence. An important corollary of the ideology was the need for professionalisation, which meant in turn training in an institutional context comparable to music and the fine arts, which in many new nations were often the first areas of artistic activity to be provided with state-funded training facilities.

Although it is seldom made explicit, the community shared the conviction that theatre, thus understood, was only achievable through some kind of external economic support, preferably from the state but if need be also philanthropy, which replaced older forms of patronage. Artistic autonomy was predicated on public or private funding. The economic foundations and prerequisites for theatre as an art form to flourish required that it be liberated from the vicissitudes of commercial success. The idea of public funding for the arts, especially the performing arts, was a global one that inevitably had its adherents in the Global South but found much less purchase there than in the North. In many new nations combatting poverty and "underdevelopment" in its many forms had a higher priority than funding what were imported institutional forms of dubious legitimacy.

Modernisation and dependency

A second institutional shift that had direct effects on the emergence of Western-style theatre in the Global South can be linked to the ideology of modernisation, which gained dominance in the late 1950s and 1960s through a unique combination of academic research, policy-generating think tanks (such as the MIT-based Center for International Studies), and proximity to political power. Publications such as Walt Rostow's *Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist*

Manifesto (1960), with its famous five stages progressing from traditional societies to "mass consumption," or Paul Rosenstein-Rodan's concept of the "big push for development" (1957) achieved influence well beyond academic circles. Their aim was to formulate a powerful alternative to the Communist ideas and support that had gained considerable traction with non-aligned nations. The US-based initiatives were also partially influenced by older colonialist policies as practised by the major colonial powers such as the United Kingdom and France. As deputy and later national security advisor in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, Rostow was well-positioned to implement these policies. However, modernisation was by no means the preserve of the West but had its rival in the notion of accelerated modernisation promulgated and demonstrated by the Soviet Union. Economically and politically poles apart, both shared a similar set of objectives when it came to applying their respective economic and political ideologies to the Global South.

Although under-researched in this regard, theatre had its place in modernisation thinking in both East and West. On the one hand, it was seen in terms of its representative function as a localised cultural form manifested in plans for "national theatres," which could be adapted to new claims to nationhood. On the other hand, there were internationalist attempts to "move" it around the globe, coordinated by networks such as ITI or the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, which organised festivals to showcase new dramatists and "decolonised" theatrical cultures, and which established branch offices to coordinate the exchanges. In both cases we can speak of a global phenomenon, inasmuch as theatre practice was increasingly seen as a necessary part of an emerging nation's cultural infrastructure and the new international organisations and initiatives provided the networks to facilitate showcasing abroad in cultural spaces replete with prestige and symbolic capital. It can be assumed that the ideology of modernisation, which mobilised huge resources, also had a cultural wing, which has only recently begun to be investigated (Gilman 2003; Engerman et al. 2003).

Closely allied to modernisation theory was the school of "developmentalism," which sought to categorise and describe problems of Third World development in sociological categories. Exponents included the sociologist Edward Shils and (the early work of) the anthropologist Clifford Geertz, manifested most clearly in their jointly edited collection *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Africa and Asia* (1963). Despite growing critique from left and right of its problematic teleological implications, which has been renewed in recent years through globalisation debates, the term *development* became institutionalised and found its way into countless international organisations and initiatives aimed at supporting the Global South, from the many development banks to Theatre for Development (TfD).

The counter-movement to modernisation known as dependency theory was promulgated by many economists, political scientists, intellectuals, and artists from the former colonies (Smith 1985; Berger 2003). Dependency theory argues that rather than simply following the path or stages of growth advocated by modernisation exponents, Third World (the term current at the time) countries needed to free themselves from entanglement in the structures of world capital established in the nineteenth century. Building on earlier Marxist analyses of imperialist exploitation of the Third World, historians like Walter Rodney argued that modern underdevelopment was a direct result of Western, capitalist-driven neo-imperialism that reinforced the division between centre and periphery (1972). Rather than imitating and adopting Western institutions, developing countries needed to rediscover (pre-)existing Indigenous forms and reinvigorate these for the contemporary world. As with their opponents, however, their frame of reference often remained the nation-state so that the cultural theory emanating from this work tended to situate within the new, colonially derived nationalist coordinates: thus, discussions of "Nigerian" and "Indian" theatre proliferated, whereas studies of Yoruba or Marathi performance

tended either to be relegated to performance ethnography or to take on a synecdochal function where Yoruba stood in for Nigeria and Kathakali for India. Calls by writers, directors, and artists to decolonise the mind and theatre (Ngũgĩ 1986) can be seen as the artistic wing of dependency theory with its critique of colonial structures and a search for reinvigoration of forms in syncretic recombination. In the dependency school can be placed also, if sometimes *avant la lettre*, the various pan-African or pan-Asian initiatives, which had chequered ideological careers, oscillating between regionalist, nationalist, and internationalist discourses.

The aporia of modernisation and developmentalist initiatives predicated on five-year plans designed by visiting experts soon became evident. Already in 1962, the young Nigerian dramatist Wole Soyinka, full of anticipation, visited the newly opened Ugandan National Theatre only to discover, in his words, "that there was no theatre, there was nothing beyond a precious, attractive building in the town centre … it was disconcerting to find a miniature replica of a British provincial theatre" (cited in Balme 1999, 227). In a prescient phrase, the later Nobel Prize laureate for literature described a theatre that was nothing more than a building, and an ill-suited one at that. For the new generation of post-colonial dramatists and theatre-makers, a carbon copy of a European architectural structure did not equate with how they envisioned theatre. What the edifice in Uganda (and its many replicas in other post-colonial states) did illustrate, however, is that the creation of theatre could not be achieved by architectural means alone or simply by the writing and staging of Indigenous plays, but that it hinged on complex cultural and political processes of also creating a public sphere to sustain such institutions. After 1945, purpose-built national theatres were erected in Uganda, Kenya, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Somalia (this last was built in 1967 in a majority Muslim country by Chinese engineers on Mao Tse Tung's orders). Whereas Uganda's national theatre was conceived under colonial administration, the others were part of post-independence cultural policies. The most spectacular of these buildings is Nigeria's National Arts Theatre, which opened in Lagos in 1976 in time for the Second World Black and African Festival of Arts and Culture (FESTAC). It was constructed by Bulgarian companies as its design is based on the Palace of Culture and Sports in Varna, Bulgaria. Seating 5,000 in its main hall and also hosting two cinemas, it represents perhaps the apogee of national-theatre-as-building on the African continent. In South Africa the apartheid regime turned to the German model of state-subsidised municipal theatres in the 1960s and established five Performing Arts Councils (PACs) to replace the defunct National Theatre Organisation. These venues permitted full-time employment and integrated drama, ballet, music, and opera. At the same time, they were beset by controversy and regarded by non-white people as bastions of the apartheid regime. In India, the National Centre for the Performing Arts (NCPA) was founded in Mumbai (then Bombay) in 1969 but did not open until 1985. It gradually expanded over the years to include five different performance spaces ranging from opera and symphonic music to experimental theatre. Funding came from both Indian (Tata Industries) and American philanthropic sources (Ford Foundation).

Such projects represent an intersection of developmental and modernisation discourses, homogeneous institutional frameworks and heterogeneous organisational realisations. They are very much, in Foucault's terminology, heterotopias: those "other spaces" outside the normalised spatial semantics of a given culture (1986). The theatrical equivalent of the hydroelectric dam and ocular proof of progress in the cultural arena, such buildings and their chequered histories demonstrate literal "concrete" examples of modernisation and developmentalist cultural policy.

Since the theatrical epistemic community focused initially mainly on the "modern" Western version of theatre, it too was challenged by dependency theory. One manifestation was significant interest in the folk and traditional forms. Their fostering and in some cases reinvention can be found in certain parts of the Global South and usually as part of state policy. In India, the

Sangeet Natak Akademi (SNA) was established in 1953 in New Delhi to foster the performing arts, especially the traditions of dance, music, and drama.[2] It established, in turn, the National School of Drama in 1959, the Manipur College of Dance, and the Kathak Kendra, devoted to classical Indian dance. The remit was less on imitating Western forms than on bringing India's rich performance traditions into a totalising institutional framework in the sense of grouping them together under one conceptual idea and making the traditions the subject of academic research. Although the search for "classical" traditions pre-dates World War II, it was initially the work of loosely organised private persons and groups. With the establishment of the SNA, these initiatives were given the stamp of state approval. Not only was a building erected and equipped, the learned journal *Sangeet Natak* established, and a library and archive founded, but conferences were convened and research stipends apportioned. In terms of scale and sustained state support, the SNA was perhaps unique in the Global South, yet its implicit and fundamental questioning of the Western model of theatre was broadly shared.

Parallel to the adoption of Western forms, there also emerged a sustained scholarly and artistic interest in paratheatrical phenomena: rituals and performances that were almost theatre, but not quite. Local theatre scholars turned increasingly towards existing performance cultures, often labelled "traditional," in order to find theatre in ritual and ceremony. In Nigeria, for example, the years immediately following independence saw a period of intensive preoccupation on the part of scholars and dramatists with their own indigenous performance traditions. This writing and research often linked ethnography with Theatre Studies and formed the basis for both an artistic practice of syncretic theatre (Balme 1999) and a theatre-historiographical tradition that was heavily Afrocentric. On closer inspection it becomes clear that the consciousness of and sensibility for a new type of theatre (history) that was not just an imitation of Western literary models was conditioned primarily by this interest in the theatricality of African, or more precisely, Yoruba culture. Exemplary in this connection was Joel Adedeji's research into *alárinjó*, the masked performers associated with *egungun* festivals, which sought to establish structural equivalences between these practices and Western theatre (Adedeji 1966, 1972).

Perhaps the most famous product of this endeavour was less historiographical than mytho-poetical, namely Wole Soyinka's famous essay "The Fourth Stage" (1969). Although not written in the idiom of an academic essay, it is clearly the result of substantial research into Yoruba culture, which was conducted with the aid of a Rockefeller scholarship in the early 1960s. Its intention is to be an aesthetic manifesto, not unlike Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy* to which it owes its idiom. Soyinka undertakes a personal reading of Yoruba mythology for his own mythopoetic and dramaturgical purposes. The intricate exegesis of Yoruba creation myths that Soyinka provides is certainly not ethnographical in intent. Rather, the essay can be situated in the tradition of discourse prevalent in the 1960s in which traditional African performance forms were reinterpreted and located in a paradigm with structural parallels to European writings on the origin of theatre in ritual: either Greek or Christian. Such research found an outlet in journals such as *Nigeria Magazine* and *Odù: University of Ife Journal of African Studies*, and in the literary magazine *Black Orpheus*. All three journals published important articles on traditional Yoruba performance during the 1960s, and all three received CIA funding indirectly through the various front organisations operated by the Council for Cultural Freedom (Benson 1986). This mostly unwitting connivance with the forces of liberal democracy or American imperialism (depending on one's perspective) led, when it was revealed, to a backlash against the Afrocentric version of the theatrical epistemic community. A scathing critique is articulated by Biodun Jeyifo, who directs a Marxist-inflected discourse analysis on this considerable body of writing, which he terms a "reinvention of African tradition" (1990 [1984]). Jeyifo provides not just a succinct summary of trends in Nigerian Theatre Studies discourse but also a rare example

of genuine historiographical critique that attempts to categorise a body of theatre historical research from the Global South.

Models and mirrors: Pan-national performing arts festivals

The institutional form that most effectively established transnational connections within the Global South was the performing arts festival. This began with the independence celebrations of individual nations and grew in size, complexity, and ambition between the mid-1960s and late 1970s. Celebrations of independence were a ceremonial performance genre *sui generis*. Ceremonies are a particularly complex form of performative "public events," which conform to a number of anthropological principles and, according to Don Handelman, function as "models and mirrors" of the societies that stage them (1982). Social and cultural practices are not just mimetically imitated but are also refashioned to present an idealised model of the society in question. The ceremonies accompanying the inauguration of the new post-colonial states fulfilled in exemplary fashion the model and mirror functions. Marking the transition from colonial tutelage to post-colonial independence, they were fashioned in such a way as to reflect the ethnic composition of the nation (mirror) and also to point forward to a new future (model).

Decidedly nationalist in focus, independence ceremonies were designed to mark the birth of new nation-states; those that were part of new federations had a kind of transnational orientation as well. The idea of federating smaller colonial polities into robust nation-states had been dreamt up in the British Colonial Office and by the end of the 1950s gained considerable support among local cultural elites. The plethora of peoples that made up Nigeria, for example, was federalist in spirit and constitution. Its independence in 1960 was marked by festivities that constituted one of the most expensive gatherings in the history of independence in a genre not characterised by thrift. An unofficial offering to Nigeria's independence was Wole Soyinka's highly allegorical and prescient *Dances in the Forest*, which is constructed on the pattern of a Yoruba New Year festival (Gibbs 1986, 66). Although not specifically written for the independence celebrations it was performed during them and articulates, albeit in highly coded form, Soyinka's pessimistic view of the new political culture where one regime of oppression is replaced by another.

Independence celebrations also marked the inauguration of the short-lived West Indian Federation (1958–62), which was opened by a play *Drums and Colours* by the young St Lucian poet and dramatist Derek Walcott. Specifically commissioned for the celebrations and premiered on 25 April 1958, *Drums and Colours* was a cultural-political project in the most literal sense of the word. Commissioned by the Extramural Department of the University College of the West Indies, and therefore most emphatically a programmatic measure designed by intellectuals, its artistic team represented geographically and biographically the idea of federation with contributors from several different islands. Walcott's task was difficult. His mandate was to write an epic depicting the chequered history of the Caribbean and, at the same time, implicitly delineate a future for the new nation. Unlike *Dances in the Forest*, it is explicitly historical in its themes and even historiographical in its revisionist re-evaluation of the Caribbean's hybrid heritage. It shares with Soyinka's play the use of a festival framework, in this case carnival. It also marked an intervention in a political debate with federalists opposing nationalists. As Walcott himself states in a foreword to the play, the selected heroes stand for particular phases and experiences of West Indian history, not primarily as an exploration of their individual biographies but rather as "emblematic images from Caribbean history" (Walcott 2002, 7). In this sense the play is a

contribution to an ongoing political and historiographical debate over colonialism and West Indian history, albeit employing the devices of dramatic language and theatrical representation.

Although on the whole political attempts to forge federations and various kinds of supra-national structures had failed by the mid-1960s, the pan-spirit lived on in the cultural realm. The most significant events were the three pan-African art and performance festivals held in Senegal in 1966, Algeria in 1969, and Lagos in 1977. If political alliances were untenable, then culture, especially performance culture, could at least demonstrate transcultural interconnec-tions. The succession of high-profile festivals that provided showcases for artists and companies from emerging countries can be seen as an institutional answer to the continuing dominance of neo-colonial structures. Beginning in the 1950s with the programmatically international Théâtre des Nations in Paris under the aegis of UNESCO and ITI there followed a succession of international theatre and arts festivals such as the Commonwealth Arts festivals, and theatre was widely represented at various Expos and even at the 1972 Munich Olympic Games.

The festival form could be easily adapted and grafted onto existing cultural practices in the Global South without the problem of neo-colonial mimicry that often beset theatre in the former colonies: "theatre" that was almost, but not quite. The series of interlinked pan-African arts festivals that took place in the 1960s and 1970s were often referred to as the "African Olympiads": the World Festival of Negro Arts (Dakar 1966), the first Pan-African Cultural Festival (Algiers 1969), and FESTAC (Lagos 1977). They provided arguably the most important international showcase for the performing arts on the African continent and beyond in the 1960s and 1970s, particularly in Francophone Africa. Because of their global reach and multi-faceted organisational structure, they demonstrate the efficacy of post-colonial cultural networks involving both statist cultural diplomacy and oppositional investment by the writers and artists associated with pan-Africanist movements, including those hailing from the United States and Caribbean.

For approximately a decade, these festivals built up and represented "network power" of a kind we associate today with globalisation. David Singh Grewal defines network power as the conjoining of two ideas: first, that coordinating standards

> can lead to the progressive elimination of the alternatives over which otherwise free choice can effectively be exercised (and secondly) certain versions of local practices, routines, and symbols are … catapulted onto a global stage and offered as a means by which we can gain access to one another.
>
> *2008, 4*

Festivals demonstrate network power in action as highly diverse cultures and countries rec-ognised the relevance of the form and its efficacy for various pan-nationalist cultural projects. Festivals have the tendency to fan a bright flame and then burn down very quickly so the question needs to be asked how the *événementiel* nature of festivals and long-term institutional sustainability of the performing arts in Africa could be reconciled.

Although interlinked, each of the three festivals had a recognisable emphasis. As the name indicates, the Festival Mondial des Arts Negres (FESMAN, World Festival of Negro Arts) held in Dakar from 1 to 24 April 1966 was conceived as a showcase for *négritude*, a concept associ-ated with the Senegalese president and host, Léopold Senghor. It involved the fine as well as the performing arts. The former had received substantial institutional support from Senghor with the foundation of an Académie des Beaux-Arts on Parisian lines but with African content. The network power can be seen in the conjoining of three main sponsors: UNESCO, the gov-ernment of Senegal, and the American Society of African Culture (an international agency, a

national government, and a private, US-based association of artists, writers, and scholars, funded, unbeknown to most of its regular members, by the CIA) (Wilford 2008, 213–14). The festival opened with Wole Soyinka's *Kongi's Harvest*, a satirical treatment of new autocratic African leaders' development initiatives.

The Pan-African Cultural Festival (PANAF) held in Algiers from 20 July to 1 August 1969 was a more explicitly political gathering. It provided a forum for Third World political activism, especially the Black Panther movement, and explored African–Asian connections in the spirit of the 1955 Bandung conference of non-aligned nations. It also extended its focus to include cinema as a cell for art committed to the Third World. The fact that its main sponsor and organiser was the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), which had avowed pan-Africanist aims, provided a much more explicitly political framework than FESMAN, which was modelled on earlier Black writers' and artists' congresses in Paris (1956) and Rome (1959). Continuities can be seen on the level of delegates, some of whom, such as the Senegalese filmmaker Ousmane Sembene, attended both.

The Second World Black and African Festival of Arts and Culture (FESTAC), which took place in Lagos from 15 January to 12 February 1977, was, in the words of Anthony Apter, a "cultural fantasia" fuelled by the oil boom (2008, 2). A decade after the high-minded concept of FESMAN and the Black Power activism of PANAF, FESTAC used spectacular opulence to rework the same set of performative components in another political and ideological framework. As well as receiving direct support from a Nigerian state awash with petrodollars, the festival was sponsored by the OAU and the newly founded Economic Organisation of West African States (ECOWAS). The geographical range was extended yet further and even included a delegation/dance troupe from Papua New Guinea, "thus remaking the local within a modern framework of regional, national, and global 'communities'" (Apter 2008, 3). By extending the geocultural borders, the festival replaced the pan-African focus of the earlier two iterations with a less focused but more all-embracing global commodification of performance.

Such pan-African events both expanded and challenged the theatrical epistemic community through new cultural forms and generic understandings. For example, the predominance of dance demonstrated the problematic nature of "dramatic" or "spoken" theatre devoid of music and dance as a model outside the West. The festivals also revealed the complex economic and ideological involvement of both statist and non-statist actors, since they required elaborate structures of funding combining public funds, philanthropy, and private donors, and these in turn had implications for the artists selected for involvement.

All three festivals had resonances of ethnographic shows and colonial ceremony in the way traditional culture was showcased, although their institutional framework was radically different from these other models. Not only did they take place on African soil for a predominantly African audience, but they progressively freed themselves from European economic dependence. Many Western states, especially the former colonial powers, funded FESMAN, whereas PANAF and FESTAC had little to no direct financial assistance outside Africa. In terms of modelling and mirroring, all three festivals sought to formulate a pan-African future by harnessing the shifting enthusiasms of *négritude*, Black Power, and newly found economic wealth. The festival as a model enthuses through sheer exuberance, while mirroring the shifting geopolitical and institutional frameworks that enable it.

Philanthropy and the cultural Cold War

All three pan-African festivals reflect Cold War tensions. There seems little doubt that projects to develop theatrical institutions in a Cold War context were vigorously promoted on several

levels. US involvement was both direct and indirect. Direct funding of theatre was channelled mainly through philanthropic organisations of global reach such as the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations, which supported theatre with varying degrees of vigour. Such bodies were also involved in what is known as the Cultural Cold War, the policy to harness culture in the battle for hearts and minds, often discussed under the rubrics of "soft power" (Nye 2004) and "cultural diplomacy" (Prevots 1998; Gould-Davies 2003). The Cultural Cold War refers in particular to the activities of the CIA, which channelled funding for arts and culture through various front organisations such as the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) and assorted foundations (Saunders 1999; Caute 2003; Wilford 2008). Mainly active in Western Europe, the CCF and its affiliated organisations also developed activities in decolonised countries, especially Nigeria, India, and the Philippines (Benson 1986). Nevertheless, Western philanthropy was granted on a decreasing scale between 1966 and 1977.

On the other side of the Iron Curtain, the Soviets also actively supported theatrical development. The Cairo Opera Ballet Company, a resident company in the Cairo Opera House, was developed during the 1960s under the tutelage of members of the Bolshoi Ballet. A ballet academy was founded in Cairo at the request of the Egyptian minister of Cultural Affairs, and young Egyptian dancers were sent to Moscow for study. In an unusual confluence of tanks and tutus, the company was established in the backwash of Soviet military aid to Egypt. Public performances began in 1966, and the close collaboration continued until 1973 when Anwar Sadat expelled all Soviet advisors from Egypt, including the ballet masters from Moscow, under his new Western-oriented policy. Thereafter, the ballet company continued to operate under state patronage.

Reliance on the Soviets implied an orientation towards their state-funded models. We find theatre academies being established on the GITIS model (the Russian Institute of Theatre Arts), which combines theatre training and academic research. For example, the Higher Institute of Dramatic Arts in Damascus was set up in 1977 on the Russian model by the Syrian director Fawaz Al-Sabjer, who studied theatre in Moscow in the 1970s and 1980s. No reliable figures exist documenting the extent of traffic, however there was a small but steady stream of students from the Global South who studied at GITIS or in East Berlin, Bucharest, Belgrade, and Budapest. On the Eastern side of the Iron Curtain, the foundational principles of the theatrical epistemic community — theatre as an art form — were held high and generously supported by the state, conditions that did not always hold in the students' home countries.

From an institutional perspective, it is probable that during the 1960s the Rockefeller Foundation provided the most significant support to theatre artists and organisations in the Global South. The theatrical recipient of the greatest Rockefeller largesse outside the United States was University of Ibadan School of Drama and its faculty, which between 1959 and 1969 received grants totalling $423,202.[3] In this period, the Foundation's own funding goals coincided with US foreign policy, which under the modernisation imperative and commitment to comprehensive planning had identified Nigeria as the African country with greatest potential for development outside South Africa. It was also crucial to keep Nigeria in the Western camp as its neighbours such as Ghana were openly flirting with the Soviets.

Figure 13.1 shows the distribution of Rockefeller theatre-related funding in the Global South. Outside Nigeria, the grants were much smaller but still represent a consistent policy of institutional support. Whether in Ghana, Tanzania, Jamaica, Trinidad, or the Philippines this shows a concerted strategy to support arts-based theatre. Funds were allocated in support of the Ghana Drama Studio directed by Efua Sutherland, Derek Walcott's Trinidad Theatre Workshop, the University of Bahia to support a theatre school, the Catholic University of Chile to fund a transportable tent theatre, the Indonesian National Theatre Academy, the Philippines Normal

Figure 13.1 Project funding of the Rockefeller Foundation, according to countries 1945–85. From the Rockefeller Foundation annual reports.

College in Manila to support a drama programme, the Department of Drama in the National Conservatory of Ankara in Turkey for teaching materials, and the Uganda National Cultural Centre Trust for an experimental training programme at the National Theatre. Across the world, the Rockefeller Foundation (and in other countries, such as India, the Ford Foundation [Gandhi 2002]) funded theatre activities that were not just artistically focused but sometimes unequivocally experimental. Apart from personal stipends, which were mainly used to assist faculty and artists to visit the United States or other countries, most funding went to support infrastructure. Some money went to sending experts from abroad to these countries, but most was invested in the people on the ground. Robert W. July, Rockefeller's field officer for Africa, was more go-between than expert, but as such he had considerable influence (July 1987). Expertise could be imported by bringing in people with special training, but it could also be actively fostered by enabling "key individuals" to form networks with others of high potential and thus contribute to the development process.[4] This was the age when it was believed that expertise was the crux to development, and this held true not just for the construction of hydroelectric dams but also for theatrical infrastructure that required concomitant investment in skills and knowledge.

Actors and

If we look at recent theatre history, both North and South, from a global perspective, three names stand out: Konstantin Stanislavsky, Bertolt Brecht, and Augusto Boal. Of these, the impact of Stanislavsky's acting pedagogy in the Global South is perhaps the most surprising. In post-revolutionary China the diffusion of his teachings began in the early 1950s when the Soviet Union sent "experts" in his method to China to assist in establishing an acting school on Stanislavskian principles at the newly established Central Academy of Drama in

Beijing and at the Shanghai Theatre Academy. A key figure was the acting teacher Boris Kulnev, who conducted extensive workshops with Chinese actors and directed "model" productions. Stanislavsky's pedagogy persists there to this day, despite geopolitical ruptures and the Cultural Revolution, as Holy Writ in Chinese theatre academies. It also spread through South America and to parts of Africa. Wherever the modernist theatrical episteme was being taught — mainly in universities — the method was sure to follow. Jonathan Pitches asks whether this was a "system for all nations" (2017). Perhaps not all, but certainly for many from Nigeria to Bangladesh and from Cuba to Tunisia. Stanislavsky was a foundation stone of the theatrical epistemic community, a prerequisite for delivering the realistic dramas that were being written, and later for the films and television dramas to be broadcast. Whether the work progressed from outside in or from inside out, emotional memories were ransacked across the globe, sometimes with the help of Soviet pedagogues and sometimes through self-help workshops organised by someone who had been "abroad."

"Brecht in the World" — or in Asia, Africa, or India — features prominently as a title of many conferences (Fuegi and Tatlow 1989) and proceedings that, in hindsight, document a remarkable receptivity not just towards a dramatist but also towards a system of conceiving and delivering theatre that was overtly political. His impact on the Global South was enacted less through state-run drama schools and universities than with the help of outside experts. Some, like the East German (GDR) Fritz Bennewitz, came to India and the Philippines directly via the GDR branch of ITI (Esleven, Rohmer, and John 2016); others, like his colleague the academic Joachim Fiebach, worked for extended periods at universities in Nigeria and Tanzania. Sometimes funding was provided by the West German Goethe-Institut, a parastatal organisation that by the early 1970s had overcome its suspicion of the Marxist author and saw him as a way to disseminate German culture abroad. By the 1970s, Stanislavsky and Brecht were theatrical brands in both the North and the South.

This decade also saw the emergence and triumph of the Brazilian Augusto Boal. His essay collection *Theatre of the Oppressed*, first published in Spanish in 1974 while Boal was exiled in Argentina (English, French, Italian, and German translations followed by the end of the decade), gave rise to the eponymous theatre movement.[5] Boal came from the Global South. His techniques — a mixture of Stanislavsky, Brecht, and J. L. Moreno's psychodrama, with a philosophical-pedagogical underpinning from his compatriot Paolo Freire — caught on in both hemispheres. In the North through his numerous workshops, and in the South through the rapid absorption of his teachings into Theatre for Development (TfD), the Theatre of the Oppressed also became a global brand with an international organisation that linked together various groups in a powerful network.

The historiography of post-colonial theatre has tended to underplay the importance of these three names with the exception, perhaps, of Brecht. Boal's influence was registered somewhat later. A triangulation of three key books on post-colonial theatre published in the mid-1990s produces two other names: Wole Soyinka and Derek Walcott (Gilbert and Tompkins 1996; Crow and Banfield 1996; Balme 1999). Soyinka and Walcott stand for different tendencies, yet they are united by attempts to syncretise Indigenous performance cultures and European dramaturgy: Soyinka for the mythical and performance traditions of the Yoruba, and Walcott for his interest in carnival and a sustained attempt to create a viable theatrical infrastructure in the Caribbean. Each figure represents a different aspect of the institutional challenges faced by theatre-makers in the Global South. Each attempted a different strategy to forge robust organisational structures for his theatrical activities. As a playwright, Soyinka worked mainly in the framework of the university as in Nigeria there existed no professional theatre to stage the kind of English-language drama that he and his colleagues were writing. The professional concert

party theatres of West Africa performed in Indigenous languages and were not amenable to such elitist writing (Barber, Collins, and Richard 1997). Although Soyinka founded and managed semi-professional groups on and off, these were mostly short-run affairs.

Derek Walcott, on the other hand, devoted himself between 1959 and 1974 to building up a professional, ensemble-based theatre in the Caribbean, the Trinidad Theatre Workshop (King 1995). This is an example of a failed national theatre project that, while achieving in its best phases remarkable productions and international acclaim, never obtained anything more than frugal and grudging state support (Balme 2014). Where the state of Trinidad and Tobago failed to provide funding, American philanthropy stepped in; the Rockefeller Foundation provided substantial support throughout the 1960s. The Caribbean state was much more interested in investing in carnival, with its huge touristic potential, than in a high-minded West Indian version of the Berliner Ensemble.

Theatre for the people

Walcott's interest in carnival and other vernacular performance forms is representative of wider developments within politically committed theatre in the Global South. These had theatre-historiographical consequences. His colleague and rival Errol Hill abandoned playwriting and became a historian of Caribbean theatre and carnival, which he declared to be a "mandate for a national theatre" (1972), a position Walcott never shared. Folk or popular theatre became a point of orientation and contention within the broader theatrical epistemic community, both North and South. There was broad-based criticism or even rejection of urban forms that were associated with the Western proscenium stage. While commercialism represented artistic compromise within elite circles, from another perspective it signalled sustainability and above all freedom from state or philanthropic support that was not forthcoming or that came with too many perceived strings attached.

Across the colonial and post-colonial periods there existed in several regions of the Global South commercially oriented, usually travelling, theatre companies that syncretised Western proscenium-style theatre with a variety of pre-colonial performance and musical forms. In India the post-1945 period saw the end of the Parsi theatre, the hugely successful travelling troupes issuing from Bombay that performed in Gujarati, Hindi, and Urdu. In contrast to forms such as *jātra* in Bengal, *bhavāi* in the west, and *nautanki* in the north of India, which could claim a shared pre-colonial *ancienneté*, Parsi theatre was clearly a product of the colonial period and fell into both artistic and scholarly disrepute. The identification of *jātra*, *bhavāi*, and *nautanki* as "folk" or "popular" led to a reassessment between the 1960s and 1980s within new scholarly paradigms heavily influenced by materialist approaches. Even so, in 1990 Darius Swann claimed that "until recent decades these forms were largely ignored by serious scholars," owing to an almost exclusive focus on traditional forms, although Swann noted a recent re-evaluation (Richmond et al. 1990, 239). It could be argued that their "refunctioning" (to use a Brechtian term) within the politically committed theatre of "India's leading Marxist playwright" Utpal Dutt (Dharwadker 2005, 114) and antiestablishment playwright Badal Sircar had a knock-on effect among theatre scholars (Sircar 1978; Chaturvedi 2010).

On the African continent, particularly in West Africa, popular theatre forms emerged in the contiguous region extending across Ghana, Togo, and the Western Yoruba-speaking region of Nigeria, where they are known variously as concert party, folk opera, or travelling theatre. The emergence of these linguistically separate but highly isomorphic forms has been attributed to four factors: the economic boom of the 1950s, urbanisation, education, and nationalism (Barber

et al. 1997, 4). To this list could be added the influence of the Christian church and the musical forms and training fostered by it. In all manifestations, music provided by a live band played a central role. At the core was usually a moral tale reflecting the vicissitudes of urban life delivered in dialogue form. The action was usually leavened by comic monologues and sketches. The suc- cess was undoubted. In the heyday of the 1960s more than fifty troupes were active in Ghana, and in Nigeria the number was estimated to be over 100.

While West African travelling theatre was not political in its inception — its origins lay in an eclectic mix of school concerts, British musical hall, silent films, and church cantatas — it was co-opted for political purposes. In Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah's Convention People's Party actively established concert parties to support the government (Barber et al. 1997, 23). In Nigeria in the 1960s and 1970s, rival political factions competed to press particular theatre groups into service for their respective causes (Jeyifo 1985, 110). Although these groups belonged to the infor- mal economy (Barber et al. 1997, 53), there were attempts, albeit short-lived, to organise and even unionise the sector, especially in Ghana, where in 1960 a Ghana National Entertainment Association was formed with high-flown aims, including the encouragement of the "teach- ing of play acting in schools" (Barber et al. 1997, 17). It was probably modelled on the Union of South African Artists, which was founded in 1952 to foster black musicians; it provided a training ground for countless Black artists, including Gibson Kente, who went on to found the Township musical theatre. Union Artists produced his first two musicals (Coplan 1985, 207–8).

In Nigeria, the fusion between theatre scholarship, artistic production, and eventually theatre historiography began very early. In 1963, the same year that the School of Drama was estab- lished at the University of Ibadan, Kola Ogunmola, the leader of a concert party, was granted a six-month attachment (courtesy of the Rockefeller Foundation) that culminated in the famous production of Amos Tutuola's *The Palm-Wine Drinkard*. The first theatre-historiographical account of Yoruba concert parties is Ebun Clark's study of Herbert Ogunde, who pioneered the commercial form in the 1940s (Clark 1979). The undoubted appeal of travelling theatre to the "masses" produced an admiring assessment in Biodun Jeyifo's materialist account (1984). While Yoruba concert parties have ceased to exist as a theatrical form (Barber et al. 1997), hav- ing metamorphosed into video and television production, Ghanaian troupes continue to work in a variety of media. These transformations lie outside the scope of this chapter, yet from its inception the form was characterised by a protean nature that lends itself to historiographical study (Cole 2001).

During the 1970s, a different kind of popular theatre began to emerge, one that espoused political radicalism and had few aspirations towards commercial success. Theatre-makers like Utpal Dutt and the Indian People's Theatre Association (IPTA), founded in 1943, had already pointed the way in Bengal. As a widespread interconnected movement, radical popular theatre of the 1970s and 1980s had different institutional frameworks and goals. A highly influential model of popular, grassroots-based theatre was initiated in 1967 with the establishment of the Philippines Educational Theatre Association (PETA). A direct response to the implementation of martial law in 1966, PETA primarily used the vernacular Tagalog and existing performance forms such as the local version of *zarzuela* and even Passion plays to criticise not just the govern- ment but also American imperialism and persistent feudal structures. PETA was both a produc- tion house and a training institution. Although it frequently fell afoul of the authorities, PETA also attained a remarkable international impact through its tours, sponsored by a Dutch NGO, and managed to set up partner organisations in South Asia. Its fundamental principle was net- working on a community level by partnering with churches, schools, and other theatre groups throughout the country. By the end of the 1980s it coordinated five regional sub-divisions, all of which received funding from abroad (van Erven 1992, 65). Its self-declared vision of using

theatre as a tool for education, social change, and development also made it very compatible with funding agendas of foreign non-governmental associations, church organisations, and even UNESCO, despite its initial political radicalism. Versions of PETA's approach were established in South Korea, India (especially Kerala), Pakistan, Thailand, and Indonesia.

Structural adjustment and theatre for

PETA's journey from radical liberation to broad-based advocacy of theatre for educational and developmental purposes represents a major shift in theatrical practice throughout the Global South in the 1980s. The importation and diffusion of so-called serious (or art-based) theatre was mainly contingent on state funding (relatively rare in the Global South), whether directly through state institutions such as the Sangeet Akademi or indirectly through higher education. When, therefore, the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) implemented by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank began to bite, the effect in the Global South was palpable. SAPs were the result of factors affecting economies in the North during the 1970s: the oil crisis that spiked prices but depressed supply, stagflation, the debt crisis, and rising interest rates, which meant that by the 1980s old loans became almost unserviceable. In order to obtain new loans, Global South countries had to submit to strict economic management, often overseen by the IMF and/or World Bank. Primarily a feature of the 1980s, SAPs continued after the end of the Cold War and indeed until the present, although under different names and policies. They had many effects, most of them negative, including growth of the informal sector (a term coined by anthropologist Keith Hart [1973]), which, according to International Labour Organization figures, can account for up to 80 per cent of employment.[6]

The most significant effect of SAPs in the area of theatre, especially in Africa, was to severely curtail whatever state funding had been available, including to the universities. The theatrical corollary of the SAPs was Theatre for Development (TfD), originally a loose assortment of practices that went by other names, including community or popular theatre. TfD originated in southern Africa and then spread quickly to Nigeria and other parts of West Africa as university-based theatre-makers realised that Ibsen, Shakespeare, Brecht, and even Indigenous dramatists were not addressing communities' needs. The first generation of TfD proponents such as David Kerr, Christopher Kamlongera, and Zakes Mda were all involved in adult education, and this perspective had a significant influence on their approach to theatre. In its early iterations, TfD had pronounced left-wing inclinations: Soviet agitprop and guerrilla theatre were often invoked, including in Soyinka's brief flirtation with this form (Jeyifo 1985). Looking back on a practice of the 1980s, Kamlongera imagined TfD as "theatre practice for the masses" (1989, 223), while Zakes Mda defined it primarily as a form of "communication" (1993). They frequently invoked Freire's notion of "conscientization," which was implemented using Boalian techniques described in *Theatre of the Oppressed* (Boal 1985 [1979]).

Whatever the moniker, TfD had its origins in the mid-1970s and came to full fruition in the 1980s when it slowly shed its radical origins and often forged alliances with various forms of governmental, international, and later non-governmental development programmes. It is symptomatic that Kamlongera's major study was funded and published by the German Foundation for International Development (DSE), a parastatal organisation of the West German government (Kamlongera 1989). Through a symbiotic connection with the academy and theatre practice, a whole generation of theatre students were trained to go into communities, carry out theatrical projects ranging from building latrines to popularising the use of fertiliser, and come back and write up the results. Even the Yoruba Travelling Theatre was harnessed for TfD

purposes when the Family Planning Council of Nigeria had "Kola Ogunmola create a play on family planning titled *My Brother's Children* which was filmed and used by the Council in their campaigns around Nigeria" (Jeyifo 1985, 110).

Research literature on TfD is considerable, produced mainly by its practitioners in the form of case studies of self-led projects and instruction manuals. Largely ahistorical, and highly communication-oriented in keeping with the instrumental goals of TfD, research to date has only intermittently engaged with the movement's own foundational narratives, as in Kees Epskamp's brief overview (2006). While the ideological and practical influence of Freire and Boal is clear, what is less well understood is how a particular conjunction of international organisations and expert networks led to the de-radicalisation and remarkably rapid diffusion of this set of practices. With hindsight, we can recognise that the originally highly politicised commitment to conscientisation and empowerment joined forces at some point with the imperatives and prerogatives of international development aid. Scholars advocating and studying political theatre in post-colonial countries recognised the problematic aspect of an approach to theatre beholden exclusively to developmental agendas. In his study of liberation theatre in Asia, Eugène van Erven observed the potentially detrimental effects brought on by this conjunction of interests:

> In the final analysis, the influence of Western development agencies can therefore be just as detrimental as government subsidies were to radical people's theatre in the West. Sooner or later, the artists become economically dependent on them and when the external financial incentives disappear, as eventually they all must, their commitment, and subsequently their activity, dies.
>
> *1992, 232*

TfD represents an alliance of politically committed, Boalian-inspired theatre with educational and developmental agendas, whereby the former gradually ceded to the latter. TfD quickly came to dominate theatrical activity in the Global South, especially on the African continent. became almost the only way for trained theatre graduates to make a living. The AIDS epidemic the 1980s was perhaps the single biggest factor contributing to its success, and it proved to be highly successful (particularly in East Africa) as a means to quite literally reach the masses. While TfD w and continues to be used for conscientisation about sanitation and ecology, its ability to negotiate the intimate sphere of human sexuality — the main avenue of HIV infection in Africa — via theatre and drama proved highly effective. As governments were forced by SAPs to concentrate their meagre resources and focus on debt repayment, non-governmental organiza- tions and philanthrop (both secular and religious) stepped in to fill the gap through increased TfD funding and its associated endeavours.

Theatre in the Global South as global history

This chapter combines theatre-historical information with historiographical reflection. The approach draws on the neo-institutional differentiation between broad ideological frameworks (institutions) and specific realisations of these frameworks (organisations). Although hitherto the discipline of global and transnational history has shown very little interest in cultural, let alone artistic, questions, it is apparent that theatre can provide rich material for the concerns of global history. Institutional frames that were formative for theatre in the period 1945–89 had a significant influence on broader trends in countries of the Global South, most of which were involved

in processes of decolonisation and nation-building. Both the Western theatre model that was embraced by American philanthropy and East European solidarity initiatives pertain. At the same time, the newly independent countries recognised the theatricality of their autochthonous performance traditions. This led to a significant body of historiographical inquiry that excavated and reframed these traditions and practices within a new understanding of theatre, which expanded on and revised the Western model. Perhaps most significant was the need to expand a text-based understanding of theatre to include a more inclusive concept of performance. The imposition of the Western theatrical model on the Global South had far-reaching effects on both Western theatre practices and theatre historiography, which had to accommodate new concepts and an understanding of the medium. Part of the attraction of Western theatre was its "modular" composition that could be adapted to a wide variety of terrains, for it was not dependent on a specific language or cultural matrix. Even its architectural form was highly flexible and adaptable, to the point of being able to entirely dispense with any fixed structure.

A key institutional framework is the rise of what has been termed here a "theatrical epistemic community" consisting of experts who were almost by definition international in composition. Such a community emerged around proponents of modernist theatre who advocated that the medium was both culturally edifying — and hence worthy of state support — and internationalist in outlook. On the basis of these claims organisations such ITI, IFTR, IATC, and later the International Organisation of Scenographers, Theatre Architects and Technicians (OISTAT) were founded. Not only were they internationalist in outlook and composition, but they emphatically sought to bridge Cold War ideological divides. Linking the various acronyms was a shared assumption that because theatre was an art form, it transcended politics. All these organisations were active in the Global South.

The establishment of an epistemic community is a symptom of modernisation. The shift from modernism to modernisation signalled more, however, than just a change of suffix. The ideology of modernisation that dominated both capitalist and socialist thinking in the 1950s and 1960s, although mainly political and economic in orientation, could also accommodate the artistic movement of modernism, which therefore was integrated into plans to build national theatres, the necessary corollary to new nation-states as the epitome of political modernisation. Equally global was dependency theory, or the backlash against such imposed, uniform ideologies. The theatrical version of dependency theory manifested itself in calls to rediscover and reinvigorate autochthonous performance forms, although these were often incompatible with nation-state frameworks and could often only function through metonymic processes where culturally specific idioms had to stand in the for the nation. Metonymy as modelling is evident also in the pan-national performing arts festivals of the 1960s and 1970s, especially on the African continent but also in Western Europe. While the unit of representation was the nation-state, the underlying ideology was transnational or even global. The broad rubric of pan-Africanism could encompass both the relatively apolitical *négritude* movement (Dakar 1966) and the decidedly political Black Power activism that manifested in Algiers in 1969.

Looming over all the processes outlined in this chapter was the Cold War, the most significant geopolitical phenomenon between 1945 and 1989. Its cultural dimension, known as the Cultural Cold War, directly affects the topic through the willingness of both the US government and American philanthropy to support theatre and the arts throughout the Global South. This implied accepting a Western understanding of theatre, a policy that was modified or even discontinued by the 1970s when Western largesse was withdrawn and harsh SAPs came into being. Western theatre was replaced by localised and often politicised popular theatre forms that emphasised community engagement over national policy. These, in turn, metamorphosed into largely apolitical TfD initiatives that were compatible with non-governmental and government

funding alike. As the Cold War came to an end, short-term theatre projects with clearly defined instrumental ends were much more amenable to SAPs than were calls for artistic autonomy, with their implied reliance on state support.

Notes

1 This chapter was generated with funding received from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 694559 — Developing Theatre).
2 See Rashna Darius Nicholson's contribution to this volume.
3 The figures are based on the amounts published in the annual reports of the Rockefeller Foundation.
4 For the term "key individuals" in connection with Rockefeller funding, see Peter Benson, who uses the phrase to explain why the German advocate of Yoruba culture, Ulli Beier, received a Rockefeller travel grant (1986, 34).
5 For a discussion of the complex translation problems surrounding *Theatre of the Oppressed*, see Jean Graham-Jones in this volume.
6 This is the figure calculated for India. See the International Labour Organization site www.ilo.org/newdelhi/areasofwork/informal-economy/lang--en/index.htm.

Reference

Adedeji, Joel. 1966. "The Alárinjó Theatre: The Study of a Yoruba Theatrical Art from its Earliest Beginnings to the Present Times." PhD diss. University of Ibadan.

———. 1972. "The Origin and Form of the Yoruba Masque Theatre," *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* 12 no. 46: 254–76.

Anderson, Benedict R. 1991 [1983]. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised ed. London: Verso.

Apter, Andrew. 2008. *The Pan-African Nation: Oil and the Spectacle of Culture in Nigeria*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Balme, Christopher B. 1999. *Decolonizing the Stage: Theatrical Syncretism and Post-Colonial Drama*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 2014. "Failed Stages: Postcolonial Public Spheres and the Search for a Caribbean Theatre." In *The Politics of Interweaving Performance Cultures: Beyond Postcolonialism*, edited by Erika Fischer-Lichte, Torsten Jost, and Saska Iris Jain, 239–57. London: Routledge.

Barber, Karin, John Collins, and Alain Ricard. 1997. *West African Popular Theatre*. Oxford: James Currey.

Benson, Peter. 1986. *"Black Orpheus," "Transition," and Modern Cultural Awakening in Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berger, Mark T. 2003. "Decolonisation, Modernisation and Nation-Building: Political Development Theory and the Appeal of Communism in Southeast Asia, 1945–1975." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 34 no. 3: 421–48.

Boal, Augusto. 1985 [1979]. *Theatre of the Oppressed*. Translated by Charles A. McBride and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride. New York: Theatre Communications Group.

Caute, David. 2003. *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy during the Cold War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chaturvedi, Ravi. 2010. "Theatre Research and Publication in India: An Overview of the Post-Independence Period." *Theatre Research International* 35 no. 1: 66–76.

Clark, Ebun. 1979. *Herbert Ogunde: The Making of Nigerian Theatre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cole, Catherine M. 2001. *Ghana's Concert Party Theatre*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Coplan, David B. 1985. *In Township Tonight! South Africa's Black City Music and Theatre*. New York: Longman.

Crow, Brian, and Chris Banfield. 1996. *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dharwadker, Aparna Bhargava. 2005. *Theatres of Independence: Drama, Theory, and Urban Performance in India since 1947*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Dirlik, Arif. 2007. "Global South: Predicament and Promise." *The Global South* 1 no. 1: 12–23.

Engerman, David C., Nils Gilman, Mark H. Haefele, and Michael E. Latham, eds. 2003. *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Epskamp, Kees. 2006. *Theatre for Development: An Introduction to Context, Applications and Training*. London: Zed Books.

Esleven, Jörg, Rolf Rohmer, and David G. John. 2016. *Fritz Bennewitz in India*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1986. "Texts/Contexts: of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* 16 no. 1: 22–7.

Fuegi, John, and Anthony Tatlow, eds. 1989. *Brecht in Asia and Africa*, *Brecht Yearbook 14*. Hong Kong: International Brecht Society.

Gandhi, Leela. 2002. *Arts and Culture: From Heritage to Folklore. The Ford Foundation 1952–2002*. New Delhi: The Ford Foundation.

Geertz, Clifford, and Edward Shils, 1963. *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Asia and Africa*. New York: The Free Press.

Gibbs, James. 1986. *Wole Soyinka*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Gilbert, Helen, and Joanne Tompkins. 1996. *Post-Colonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics*. London: Routledge.

Gilman, Nils. 2003. *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*, *New Studies in American Intellectual and Cultural History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Global South. 2019. http://muse.jhu.edu/journal/391. Accessed 4 January 2020.

Gould-Davies, Nigel. 2003. "The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy." *Diplomatic History* 27 no. 2: 193–214.

Grewal, David Singh. 2008. *Network Power: The Social Dynamics of Globalization*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Haas, Peter M. 1992. "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46 no. 1: 1–35.

Handelman, Don. 1982. *Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hart, Keith. 1973. "Informal Income Opportunities and Urban Employment in Ghana." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 11 no. 3: 61–89.

Hill, Errol. 1972. *The Trinidad Carnival: Mandate for a National Theatre*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

International Labour Organization. www.ilo.org/newdelhi/areasofwork/informal-economy/lang--en/index.htm. Accessed 4 January 2020.

Jeyifo, Biodun. 1984. *The Yoruba Popular Travelling Theatre of Nigeria*. Lagos: Nigeria Magazine Publications.

———. 1985. *The Truthful Lie: Essays in a Sociology of African Drama*. London: New Beacon Books.

———. 1990 [1984]. "The Reinvention of Theatrical Tradition: Critical Discourses on Interculturalism in the African Theatre." In *The Dramatic Touch of Difference: Theatre, Own and Foreign*, edited by Erika Fischer-Lichte, Michael Gissenwehrer, and Josephine Riley, 239–21. Tübingen: G. Narr.

July, Robert W. 1987. *An African Voice: The Role of the Humanities in African Independence*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kamlongera, Christopher. 1989. *Theatre for Development in Africa with Case Studies from Malawi and Zambia*. Bonn: Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung.

King, Bruce. 1995. *Derek Walcott and West Indian Drama: Not Only a Playwright but a Company, the Trinidad Theatre Workshop 1959–1993*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mda, Zakes. 1993. *When People Play People: Development Communication through Theatre*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press; London: Zed Books.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. 1986. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey and Heinemann.

North, Douglass C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance: The Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nye, Joseph S. 2004. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

Pitches, Jonathan. 2017. "A System for all Nations? Stanislavky's Transmission in the World." In *Stanislavsky in the World: The System and its Transformations across Continents*, edited by Jonathan Pitches and Stefan Aquilina, 12–24. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Prevots, Naima. 1998. *Dance for Export: Cultural Diplomacy and the Cold War*, *Studies in Dance History*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press.

Richmond, Farley P., Darius Swann, and Phillip B. Zarrilli, eds. 1990. *Indian Theatre: Traditions of Performance*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Rodney, Walter. 1972. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London and Dar-es-Salaam: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.

Rosenberg, Emily. 2012. "Transnational Currents in a Shrinking World." In *A World Connecting 1870–1945*, edited by Emily S. Rosenberg, 815–989. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rosenstein-Rodan, Paul. 1957. *Notes on the Theory of the "Big Push."* Cambridge, MA: Center for International Studies, MIT.

Rostow, Walt W. 1960. *Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saunders, Frances Stonor. 1999. *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War*. London: Granta.

Sircar, Badal. 1978. *The Third Theatre*. Calcutta: Bardal Sircar.

Smith, Tony. 1985. "Requiem or New Agenda for Third World Studies?" *World Politics* 37 no. 4: 532–61.

Soyinka, Wole. 1969. "The Fourth Stage: Through the Mysteries of Ogun to the Origin of Yoruba Tragedy." In *The Morality of Art: Essays Presented to G. Wilson Knight by his Colleagues and Friends*, edited by D. W. Jefferson, 119–34. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

van Erven, Eugène. 1992. *The Playful Revolution: Theatre and Liberation in Asia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Vertovec, Steven. 2009. *Transnationalism*. London: Routledge.

Walcott, Derek. 2002. *The Haitian Trilogy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Wilford, Hugh. 2008. *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.