

Vanda B. BOŽIĆ\*

University of Zagreb, Zagreb

Dragan Lj. TANČIĆ\*\*

Institute for Serbian Culture Priština – Leposavić

## POLITICS AND THEATER\*\*\*

*Abstract:* The subject of this scientific paper is the indispensable connection between politics and theater, their interdependence in social and political relations. In a given country, without people, or more precisely, without actors who represent them in a theatrical performance, there is no history, no politics, no culture, no theater, and no political events in a certain time, space and territory. Political events from the recent or distant past are often the subject of staged plays. Such theater becomes political theater. Through the performance, the theater can perceive certain subjects, in specific situations, and solve their problems in their own way, as well as critically explain and interpret them, from the aspect of results, effects and consequences. In the paper, the authors indicate the distinction between Aristotle's theater and Brecht's theater, which is manifested in their different function and relationship to the state. Namely, Aristotle's theater supports the existing state order as a divine order, while Brecht destroys the state order through theater. Brecht's theater becomes a political theater, its role is to awaken and change the consciousness of the audience and to convert it in the direction of an ideology, which as such will make its contribution to the state.

*Key words:* politics, political force, state, political theater, theater, Aristotle, Brecht, violence, power.

## POLITICS THROUGH THEATER

Both in the recent as well as in the distant past, theater, has always been a „conglomerate of spiritual compounds“, i.e. a mirror of all social, political and other phenomena and processes, in certain time and in certain places, a mirror of splendor, opulence, entertainment, leisure, misery, an indicator of spirit, virtues, flaws. The history of theater, literature and art is the most beautiful history of the human race.

The subject of research in this scientific paper is politics and theater, or more precisely, the interdependence between these two realities in social and political relations.

---

\* Associate professor, bozic.vanda@gmail.com

\*\* Full professor, dragan\_tancic@yahoo.com

\*\*\* The paper was created within the scientific research work of NIO under the Contract concluded with the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the RS number: 451-03-47/2023-01/200020 dated 02/03/2023.

The first question, in accordance with the defined title of this paper, directs us to determine politics as a concept and as a reality, and then the determinant theater and their specific connections and relationships and interdependence, in social and political relations. In accordance with the above, the question justifiably arises: what does politics as a reality and a concept encompass? Consequently, we will herewith present several characteristic definitions of the term politics.

*Beyme* claims that in ancient times, „...politics is the science of a good and just life and the continuation of ethics... Politics was valued as a ‘royal science’, as the highest of all practical sciences“ (*Beyme* 1974: 20-32).

When defining the term politics, *Burdeau* states that in contemporary social relations the precise boundary between the sphere of politics and other spheres of social life is lost, and in this sense he points out that „With the expansion of its domain, politics becomes depoliticized“ (*Burdeau* 1952: 27).

*Lipset* emphasizes the universal property of politics in overall social relations, and accordingly defines the same in the following way: „Politics in the sense of the struggle for power... extends across the boundaries of organizations; furthermore, conflicts over goals and procedures are, in fact, an integral part of all organizations, were those of the US State Department, the Red Cross, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, or the sales department of a corporation“ (*Lipset* 1959: 101).

When defining the term politics, *Duverger* emphasizes its two essential properties, first, that politics is „...a feminine noun: 1. The science of managing states, wrote *Littre* in 1870. ...the skill and practice of managing human societies, said *Robert* in 1962“; second, that „... the very essence of politics, its true nature and its true meaning is reflected in the fact that it is always and everywhere ambivalent. The image of the god *Janus*, the deity with two faces, is the real representation of the state, it expresses the deepest political reality. The state, that is, generally speaking, organized government in a society, is always and everywhere at the same time a means of domination by some classes over others, a means that the former apply to their advantage, and to the detriment of others, it is also a means by which a certain social order is ensured, a certain integration of everyone in the community for the common good“ (*Duverger* 1966: 7).

When discussing the concept of politics, *Slobodan Jovanović* started from *Plato* and *Plato's Academy*, and he highlighted several important determinants: „*Plato's Academy* was of great historical importance. Founded in the fourth century before Christ, it lasted until the sixth century after Christ. Leaving everything else aside, it marks a new moment in the understanding of politics. Politics was understood, first of all, as an experience and a vow of the ancestors that is carried out, not discussed. Then, when it started to be discussed, it was understood as the art of persuasion, the art of personal success in arguments. Only in the Academy is an attempt made to make politics a science that studies the state. From a simple skill that brings an individual success in party struggles, politics becomes an objective truth, which, properly applied, provides the state with a peaceful, happy life. Until *Plato*, politics meant something that corresponded to parliamentary rhetoric and dialectic. *Plato*, on the other hand, understood politics as something that would correspond to state law and sociology“ (*Jovanović* 1935: 83). Furthermore, he states: „The leaders of democracy were therefore required to think for

themselves and to have all kinds of knowledge.“ It seemed to Plato that they actually had no knowledge of anything, but that they had come into habit of speaking about everything. Besides, since in public debates it was the most important for them to win the majority for themselves, they did not say what they considered to be the truth, but what they assumed the majority would like to hear“ (Jovanović 1935: 81). Consequently, according to the above: „Therefore, Plato concludes: whoever wants to be a statesman must not rely on his „inspiration“ or his „lucky star“; he must sit down and learn statesmanship, just as one learns a skill or trade. The analogy with the shepherd is wrong in two ways: neither is there the same intellectual distance between the statesman and the people as there is between the shepherd and the flock, nor is the shepherd obligated to take care of the good of the flock in the same way as the statesman is obliged to provide good for the people“ (Jovanović 1935: 93).

*Ratković* emphasizes the subject of politics as a phenomenon and reality and points out: „If we wanted to extract basic characteristic opinions about the subject of political science from the history of the development of political-scientific thought and current understandings and group them by affinity, then we could classify these opinions into the following three basic groups: politics understood as an activity or skill, politics understood as an area of social reality, and the subject of political science understood as an aspect of the social whole“ (Ratković 1985: 65-68).

*Božić & Tančić* point out that the important provision of politics is that it is „a social and political phenomenon, a social and political activity, a social and political relationship, which has a specific time, historical origin, certain beginning and which develops through various phases and stages, and it must, therefore, be understood as a historical, social and political phenomenon“ (Božić, Tančić 2022: 34).

*Samardžić* believes that politics „... is one of the few human activities, or phenomena, which has an identical name in most of today’s languages. The origin of the word politics lies in ancient Greek. There is an ensemble of ancient Greek words that refer to the community and the life of people in the community, from which all European languages derived their lexical derivatives. First of all it is primarily the root word polis (πολις) – community, city-state, municipality, from which the following words had been derived: politeia (πολιτεία) – public order, constitution, polites (πολιτης) – members of the community, citizens of the city-state, politikos (πολιτικός) – civil, state, politics (πολιτικά) – to denote civil and state authorities“ (Samardžić 1993: 872-884).

In addition to the aforementioned definitions of the universality of politics, we must also highlight several important properties of politics as a specific phenomenon and reality, *through our working definition of politics, which reads*: Politics is a social and political phenomenon and the process of managing the general social, political and other interests of society, based on social and political power - including force - through the formation of various social, political and functional orders and systems and appropriate mechanisms of exerting influence.

This general policy definition of ours is based on the following insights:

- firstly, people are foremost natural, and then social and political beings, who have their own needs of different levels and priorities, and the satisfaction of some needs

is necessary at all levels of social development and these are called existential needs in the scientific fund, as pointed out by *Krech & Crutchfield*: „Man must find food, shelter, security, and satisfy many other needs and aspirations. In order to achieve this, he must solve problems, learn, remember, think, acquire skills...“ (*Krech, Crutchfield 1969: 367*);

- secondly, in addition to the abovementioned existential needs, with the development of society as a whole, other cultural and civilizational needs also develop, which people realize in community with other people, and in this context people develop various kinds of activities and perform certain actions that achieve certain results, effects and consequences: „Hierarchy of needs - five levels: 1) physiological needs; 2) security needs; 3) needs for belonging and love, identification; 3) needs for respect, reputation, success, self-esteem; 4) needs for personality actualization“ (*Mihailović, Ristić 2009: 240-244*); people also realize their needs, interests and goals through their behavior, as *Veber* points out“ ..... 1. goal-rational: when one acts in accordance with the expectations of the objects of the external world and other people thus using expectations as „conditions“ or as „means“ for achieving one’s own goals that are rationally pursued; 2. value - rational: when one consciously believes in the - ethical, aesthetic, religious or any other - absolute value of a certain behavior, because it is such, regardless of success; 3: affective, especially emotional, when acting in accordance with current effects and mental state; 5: traditional: when acting in accordance with established habits“ (*Veber 1976: 16-17*); by sharing different contents and forms, different relationships and connections are actually established, different positions, results, effects and consequences (expected, unexpected, intended, unintended) and opportunities are realized and various influences are suffered;

- thirdly, human work in any community (regardless of the socio-political and economic formation) necessarily implies specific connections and relationships and positions of people, which also means necessary organization, leading to differentiation and stratification within communities; consequently, there is a need for managers, leaders, executors, and that’s how politics emerges as a phenomenon and a reality, which manages the interests of human communities, both within them and towards other communities and the natural environment;

- fourth, this general model is maintained even today in modern conditions, therefore we can take a precise position, i.e. that society, politics, state, economy, law and other phenomena as specific social phenomena and processes, arose in some or more precisely, certain natural, social, political, cultural and other conditions, which generally, as necessary and sufficient, cause and condition developmental social and other historical processes, as pointed out by *Tančić*: „Historical and political phenomena always occur and are realized in certain conditions.....Necessary conditions are conditions without which historical and political phenomena could neither arise nor be realized. Sufficient conditions are those conditions that ensure the constitution and realization of the phenomenon as self-contained, temporally and spatially connected. Other conditions are actually conditions of presence, conditioned by the factors of a favorable-unfavorable situation, but they appear after the necessary and sufficient conditions“ (*Tančić 2009: 177*).

## POLITICS AS A SUBJECT OF THEATER, POLITICAL THEATER

Politics and political phenomena, political events and other phenomena and processes are the subject of political science, history, literature, theater and other sciences and scientific disciplines, i.e. they are the subject of people with all their characteristics, either as individuals or as members of smaller or larger groups, collectivities, communities and human creations in totality and detail and their development. This means that there is no history, no politics, no culture, no theater in general, no political theater, no political event without people as social and political beings in a certain time, space and on a certain territory.

In this context, many political, cultural and other phenomena and political events from the recent or distant past were often the subject of theater, political theater. Thus, for example in Athens, in the 5th century BC, the political theater reached a high degree of conformity with the Greek polis, as pointed out by *Božić*: „The center of theater art in the 5th century BC is the largest and most powerful Greek polis - Athens. It is a period when the theater experiences a significant literary flourishing, but also a full affirmation through identification with the polis, which was marked by the three greatest Greek tragedians: Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides“ (*Božić* 2022: 382). As examples, we can cite various social and political phenomena and events, starting with the Roman Republic (period of slavery), Gaius Julius Caesar, Cleopatra, Homer, the Iliad, the Trojan War, the Cretan-Mycenaean civilization, the Persian Wars, Spartacus' uprising, the Crusades, the First and the Second World War.

It is generally known that the application of force, violence and political violence is, generally speaking, a common, important method and tool of politics, both in internal and external political relations; this was often the subject of theatrical performances of theater, that is, political theater. *Albert Camus* explained it very nicely in his book *Caligula* using the example of the atomic bomb in World War II: „The world is what it is, and that means almost nothing.“ This is what everyone has known since yesterday, thanks to the great concert that the radio, press and news agencies started on the occasion of the atomic bomb. Indeed, in the midst of the crowd, we learn that any city of average importance can be obliterated by a bomb the size of a football. The American, English and French press bombard us with elegant discussions of the future, the past, the inventors, the prices, the pacifist appeal and the war consequences, the political consequences, even the independent character of the atomic bomb.

We will summarize everything in one sentence: mechanical civilization has just reached the last pillar of savagery. We shall have to, in the near or distant future, choose between collective suicide or the judicious use of technical achievements“ (*Camus* 1945: 8). *Camus* also condemned the Soviet military intervention in Budapest, as well as other political activities that were the result of political force and political power in international and domestic relations, in his time, during the forties and fifties of the last century. Certain analogies, just like in the time of *Camus*, are still present on the international scene, such as, according to some authors, special military intervention, or according to others, Russia's aggression against Ukraine, the relationship of the USA, the EU, NATO towards Russia and the possibility of using nuclear weapons during

the year 2023 or the question of the justification of the use of artificial intelligence and unknowns that can be human work, and in general everything depends on political will, force and power.

Artificial intelligence, according to some authors, represents a conglomeration of traditional science, physiology and psychology, all with the aim of producing a machine that, according to human standards, could be defined as an „intelligent machine” (Božić, Tančić 2023: 108).

This means that the power of politics, political power, includes the use of force as a means of achieving political and other goals. The application of force, political force, both in internal and external politics, no matter how much it appeared as a counterpart to the politics of peace, was always very current, both in political life and in the theater in general, and especially in the political theater.

The example of this is also *Dragoslav Mihailović's* political drama „Kad su cvetale tikve“, in which the author emphasized the model of political or state violence on the example of Goli otok, which was actually not talked about for a long time (*taboo topic*). The theme of Goli otok, essentially a political drama, was forbidden in the National Theater in Belgrade and other theaters; it became an „enemy of the state“ because it was considered that plays could initiate various gatherings and even demonstrations. In the aforementioned political drama, the theme of Goli otok, i.e. the relationship between politics and political theater is a blatant example of the demystification of political violence and political power in order to preserve the given absolute political power. In this example, there is an indisputable conflict between the holders of political power and cultural and artistic creativity. In political theaters, regarding the use of violence, political violence, political force, plays about wars, rebellions (the use of violence, force to destroy the political and social system), military interventions, assassinations, diversions, kidnappings, robberies and other forms were often performed. Events at the time of Inform biro, Goli Otok, were for Dragoslav Mihailović an inspiration and an instrument for presenting the problems and consequences of that time and for re-examining political decisions from that period.

## DATA SOURCES

In the presentation of these different social and political phenomena and events in the scientific fundus, theaters, political theaters, theatrical performances, authors often started from different historical sources, facts, data, information and interpretations, on the basis of which different views were formed, regarding both recent and distant path. In the scientific fundus of social sciences and humanities, there is no general agreement when defining historical sources, which leads to different understandings, interpretations and representations, both in political sciences, philology, art and other sciences and scientific disciplines, regarding generally the theater or the political theater as a *specificum*.

Thus, for example, when a play is performed in a theater about a social or political phenomenon or event, it is undeniable that the inspiration for a play lies in, e.g. the position of the slaves in the Roman Republic and their uprisings, such as the Spartacus

uprising in the seventies BC or the position of the working class in Germany or Great Britain during the 19th century, where the inspiration had its starting point in certain historical source. The question arises, when, for example, a play talks about slaves in the Roman Republic, whether the message of the play is that the slaves at that time were powerless in relation to the slave owners, whether their powerlessness showed the power of the slave owners and fatalism in the sense that slaves were always disenfranchised and that this was passed down into their collective consciousness for generations and that it became their mindset. By analogy, the following question arises as well: can a similar relationship be applied in modern times, the era of globalism, capitalism? Or, for example the political event that took place in 1983, when 241 American marines were killed in Beirut by a wagon bomb of great destructive power, which influenced the political ruling structure of the USA (the period when Ronald Reagan was the president of the USA) to end the presence of American forces in the shortest possible time Lebanon. What could be the messages to the audience based on the events that happened in 1983 in Beirut: to justify or not to justify the presence of the USA in Beirut and with what arguments for one or another claim and the like, what are the consequences, effects?

Theater, primarily political theater, through plays, can perceive some problems or situations, in some time and in some space, for some subjects; it may try to critically explain, solve, interpret them, from the aspect of results, effects and consequences. How? By confronting words on stage, where e.g. some political violence is happening. Again, we take *Goli Otok* as an example, where some subjects experienced violence as a specific trauma, and the mere confrontation of the audience with the violence on *Goli Otok* was intended to cause empathy in the audience as well as collective purification of the collective consciousness. In this context, a key question arises: To whom does the theater or political theater address, who are the recipients. The answer to that question could be given through the following statement: „We must tell the truth about the barbarism in our country in order to create the possibility for action... We must say that to those who suffer the most in those relations, who are most interested; this includes their change and it includes workers and those we can make their allies“ (Brecht 1966: 9-34).

In relation to the understanding of political, historical and other sources, there are different scientific and theoretical approaches in the scientific and artistic fundus. Thus, *Joachim* understands them in the following way: „... we call all texts, objects or facts from which knowledge about the past can be gained“ as sources (Gross 1976: 243). *Topolski* divides sources into „direct and indirect, addressed and unaddressed, written and unwritten“ (Gross 1976: 275). *Lukić* states that for „... the period from the 9th to the 4th century BC there are not enough preserved historical and legal-historical sources and monuments; even what is preserved is in fragments. However, from the 4th century until the loss of independence, and even for the later period, a lot of material has been preserved. Among historical sources, the works of Greek historians: Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophenes, Plutarch and a number of others should be highlighted. The works of Greek philosophers: Plato and Aristotle and others, which contain many important data for the history of the state and law, have also been preserved.

The same applies to the speeches of some Greek politicians, Demosthenes, Isocrates and others. The data of the aforementioned historians and philosophers are mostly reliable if they refer to the period in which they lived or to the recent past, although there is there a biased and non-objective presentation as well. However, sources from the past should be used with great caution, as they are partly inauthentic. Literary works can also serve as a source of knowledge about the life of the Greek people, but to a much lesser extent they can be used to study the history of the state and law. Few legal monuments have been preserved. The legendary laws of Lycurgus in Sparta and the laws of Draco in Athens are mentioned. The most important preserved legal monuments are the following: the collection of laws of the Greek state Gortin, so called. The „Law of Gortyn“ and the laws of Solon, which played a major role in the democratization of the Athenian state. A certain number of other legal texts and a large number of contracts in their entirety or in sections have also been preserved“ (Lukić 1977: 47- 48).

In the theater play about Zoran Đinđić, the assassination of Đinđić is the starting point, the main theme, with different sources; consequently auxiliary themes are conceptualized as well which are more comprehensive in Serbian political society, before the murder itself, in which the reasons for that event are sought to be exposed, why did it happen? The character of Zoran Đinđić was presented as a specific phenomenon by the director Oliver Frljić in the theater play, because the political public of Serbia had two diametrically opposed viewpoints about Đinđić. Thus, Frljić points out that: „In Serbian society, there are two paradigms about Đinđić: spitting, which denies anything he did [...]. The other side is the one that works on his glorification, the uncritical creation of a cult of his personality. In my work, I tried to bypass both paradigms and I tried to speak in a stage language that I think is adequate for that: the play Zoran Đinđić starts from the assassination of the prime minister, but indirectly tries to talk about Serbia today and the various assumptions that society is bearing“ (Trebješanin 2012: 7). This theater play reminds us of Brecht's conception and concept of politics, namely that the goal is not only to explain but also to change reality, that theater is both a method and a means of political struggle: „The goal of such a play, as well as of his earlier author's projects, is to encourage thinking, to face reality, their own and collective responsibility, and from that change something first in themselves, and then in the community, as far as it is in their power, and all these are elements of Brecht's theoretical discourse“ (Sibinović 2015: 75 - 91). Similar to Brecht's approach is also Lehmann's claim which states that: „The theater becomes political no longer through the direct thematization of the political, but through the implicit content of its way of presentation“ (Lehmann 2004: 334).

#### THEATER IN THE FUNCTION OF POLITICS (OF THE STATE)

*Teatar – pozorište – kazalište – gledalište* (lat. *theatrum* < grč. *θέατρον*: auditorium), on the one hand means an institution where plays are performed / held that belong to the stage and performing arts, while on the other hand, it represents a stage or a place, the scene of certain actions, events, which we call a theatrical performance, as a final product. Theater signifies the place where the state resides.

*Schechner* believes that theater represents and implies problematic, borderline and dangerous human experiences such as those related to social order, territory, sexuality and aggression (Arvanitakis 1998: 33-60). And the ultimate goal of a theatrical play, as stated by Schechner, is that it should cause a change in the social and psychological order.

*Artaud and Grotowski*, as contemporary theater scholars, point out that „The theater must be considered a counterpart not of direct everyday reality ... but of another archetypal and dangerous reality, ...“ (Artaud 1938: 48.)

We emphasize that even today there is still no single definition of the term theater or even a definition of the term acting as an art, but on the contrary, there is a great theoretical divergence due to the existence of numerous theories and definitions. The purpose of the theater as a cultural institution can be seen through the establishment of signs, consequently, the purpose of the existence and work of the theater can be defined as the creation of certain meanings (Fischer-Lichte: 1979). *Barthes* states that theater is a cybernetic machine that sends a bunch of messages, starting with the very opening of the curtain on the stage, which implies the beginning of the play for both the actors and the audience (Brecht: 1966).

Theater was born from the rituals that were held in honor of the god Dionysus (the Greek god of wine). As a by-product of the worship of his cult, there is a development of drama in Athens. It appears in three forms, as a satirical poem, a tragedy and a comedy. That is the period in which theater experiences a very significant literary flourishing, but also a full affirmation through identification with the polis.

According to *Aristotle*, a tragedy is a type of drama in which characters act and conflict with one another, but the first place in a tragedy is the events and the fable, because they are why there is a tragedy. The plot of a tragedy should contain an imitation of a concrete action related to some terrible and touching events. In order for it to be a believable performance, the actors imitating the faces acting, signify certain characters, characters that should be appropriate, consistent and in some way similar to us (the audience), so that we can identify with them. The third place is reserved for the process of perceiving some phenomena and processes, problems, which is carried out through the senses, as well as through non-sensory means, with the participation of consciousness and thinking (Tančić, Božić 2022: 178), therefore, in third place are the thoughts that are spoken in according to the specific character. The fourth place belongs to diction, speech that is expressed verbally, in words.

The main hero of a tragedy is always a strong moral personality who is the bearer of a dignified idea of the society in which he lives and who wants to realize that idea. However, as is to be expected, he encounters obstacles in life. First of all, he clashes, in a very dramatic way, with the social community because of his lofty and brash character with which he acts in order to realize his ideas and imagination. On the other hand, a stronger force does not let him go forward, and in the end, as an essentially positive personality, he suffers in that unequal conflict with a „stronger“ than himself. In a tragedy, the main hero ultimately, inevitably, tragically dies, precisely because of his brash and violent character, ignorance, delusion, mistake, which leads him to his death.

We wish to emphasize that the main irony of the tragedy is that in the end the protagonist becomes fully aware of his fate, that he brought himself to that state, which

reflects the even greater tragedy of his suffering. The suffering and misfortune of the main character of the tragedy carries with it great drama, which creates an urge in the viewer to start fighting against the injustice in society that was done to their hero. The audience is affected by his death and identifies with his fate, however they become aware that the main character made a fatal mistake.

In the end, catharsis occurs with the audience, namely, the audience is purified and freed from negative emotions and charges. Also, the audience realizes that there is a destiny that a person simply cannot oppose. That destiny is a divine prophecy that serves to establish harmony in the world. Harmony is established by punishing the main tragic hero. It is precisely prophecy that is a constitutive element of tragedy, because the audience leaves the theater convinced that they cannot fight against fate and against the harmony that will inevitably be established in the world.

Tragedy is financed by the state, the state stands behind the tragedy and the harmony that it creates, the state brings its population that has the right to vote as an audience to the theater to watch the tragedy, consequently, the audience consists of all those that come to the theater as those who participate in some way in political life.

Aristotle progressively creates tension; the goal of tragedy is to make the audience horrified and scared by the punishment that befalls the main character because he opposed fate and prophecy, divine harmony with his behavior, while Brecht's audience should be aware of its class position and that the audience should „stand for itself“ and the tension arises from the rational discovery of the strangeness of each situation in particular“ (Selenić 1971: 82).

The main distinction between Aristotle's theater, which is in the function of the state and which supports the existing state order as a divine order, Brecht destroys the state order through the theater, namely, he uses the theater against the state system, which means that Brecht's epic theater has a revolutionary purpose. Brecht believes that the theater should support the class struggle, contribute to the victory of the working class, which needs to become aware, and turn from a class „in itself“ into a class „for itself“ (Božić 2018: 205).

Brecht emphasized the following: „We who endeavour to change human nature, like everything else, must find ways to present man from that side from which he seems to be changeable by social intervention. For this purpose, the actor needs a huge re-orientation, because the art of acting so far is based on the view that man is what he is, and that, to the detriment of society or to his own detriment, he remains so, eternally human, always true to his nature and never different“ (Brecht 1979: 263).

Brecht's role is to make the audience aware of themselves and to change the audience's consciousness. His theater becomes a political theater, since Brecht finds the reason for its existence in the achievement of the goal of converting the audience in the direction of an ideology. As such, the audience should then contribute to the social community. With his theory, Brecht hints at a semiotic approach to theater, given that he emphasizes the rational, not the emotional (Božić 2015: 317).

Wonder (astonishment) is a mode of drawing attention to a specific thing in the play, from something familiar and simple to something unexpected and specific. *The wonder effect or V-effect* (Verfremdungseffekt) is achieved by turning what is familiar

to the audience first into the unknown and estranged, so that it examines its attitude. The audience, after being in wonder, comes to their senses so that they can formulate their attitude and opinion, in order not to become the object of state manipulation. Brecht directly had a great influence on the directors of the political theater (Jevtović: 1997). In fact, he advocated that the audience be presented with a theatrical performance that would present the behavior and life of the people of a society in a critical way. Although Brecht's theater changes the habits of the audience, the question is whether it changes them in effect and to what extent.

#### REFERENCES

- Artvud (1938). Artaud Antonin, *Le Theatre et son double*, Paris: Gallimard, 1938.
- Arvanitaks (1999). Arvanitakis Konstantinos I (1998), *A Theory of Theater: Theater as Theory, Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought* 21, 33-60.
- Beyme (1974). Beyme Klaus Von: *Suvremene političke teorije*, Stvarnost, Zagreb, II izdanje, 1974.
- Božić, Tančić (2023). Božić Vanda, Dragan Tančić: *Primena opštenaučnih metoda u veštačkoj inteligenciji*, Zbornik radova Čovječanstvo pred izazovom vještačke inteligencije, TOM III, Evropski Univerzitet Brčko Distrikt, str. 107-119.
- Božić, Tančić (2022). Božić Vanda, Dragan Tančić: *Krivičnopravni i politikološki aspekti zaštite tajnih podataka i dokumenata*. Institut za srpsku kulturu Priština – Leposavić.
- Božić (2022). Božić Vanda: *Fundamentals of the historical development of theater acting from Ancient Greece and Rome to the modern and avant-garde*, Baština, Priština-Leposavić, sv. 58, p. 381-395.
- Božić (2018). Božić Vanda: *Gluma u dramskom i gluma u postdramskom teatru*, doktorska disertacija, Fakultet dramskih umetnosti u Beogradu.
- Božić (2015). Božić Vanda: *Dramski lik u pozorištu danas*. In: *Zbornik referatov z XII. međunarodne Banskobystrickeje teatrologičke konferencije v cykle DNES A TU, Akadémia umení v Banskej Bystrici* (pp. 313-327).
- Brecht (1966). Brecht Bertolt: *Dijalektika u teatru*, Beograd.
- Brecht (1979). Brecht Bertolt: *Dijalektika u teatru*, Beograd, Nolit.
- Burdeau (1979). Burdeau Georges: *Traite de csience politique*, Tome 4.
- Duverger, Maurice (1966): *Uvod u politiku, Savremena administracija*, Beograd.
- Fischer-Lichte (1979). Fischer-Lichte Erika: *Bedeutung-Probleme einer semiotischen Hermeneutik und Ästhetik*, München.
- Gross (1976). Gross Mirjana: *Historijska znanost, razvoj, oblik i smjerovi*, treće izdanje, Zagreb.
- Jevtović (1997). Jevtović Vladimir: *Uzbudljivo pozorište*, Beograd.
- Jovanović (1935). Jovanović Slobodan: *Iz istorije političkih doktrina*, Sabrana dela Slobodana Jovanovića XV, knjiga prva, Izdavačko i knjižarsko preduzeće Geca Kon A.D. 12, Knez Mihailova ulica 12, Beograd.
- Krech, Crutchfield, Richard (1969). Krech David, Crutchfield, Richard S: *Elementi psihologije*, Naučna knjiga, Beograd.
- Lehmann (2004). Lehmann Hans-Thies: *Postdramsko kazalište*, Zagreb/Beograd, CDU- Centar za dramsku umjetnot, TkHCentar za teoriju i praksu izvođačkih umetnosti.
- Lukić (1977). Lukić Radomir: *Opšta istorija države i prava*, Savremena administracija, Beograd, 1977.
- Mihailović, Ristić (2009). Mihailović Dobrovoje, Ristić Slobodan: *Organizaciono ponašanje*, Neypress, Beograd.
- Novakov Sibinović (2015). Novakov Sibinović Jasna, „Prepoznavanja i interpretacije Brehtovog teorijskog diskursa: komparativna analiza pozorišnih kritika predstave Zoran Đinđić“, *Zbornik Fakulteta dramskih umetnosti br.28*, Beograd, Institut za pozorište, film, radio i televiziju.

- Ratković (1985). Ratković Radoslav, Osnovi političkih nauka, Institut za političke studije, Beograd.
- Samarđžić (1993). Samarđžić Slobodan: „Politika“, u: (Prir.) Matic, Podunavac: Enciklopedija političke kulture, Savremena administracija, Beograd.
- Selenić (1971). Selenić Slobodan: Dramski pravci XX veka, Umetnička akademija, Beograd.
- Seymour (1959). Seymour Martin Lipset: Political Sociology, objavljeno u zborniku Sociology today, urednici R. K. Merton, L. Broom i L. S. Cottrell, New York.
- Tančić (2009). Tančić Dragan: Istorijski metod u istraživanju političkih pojava, doktorska disertacija, Fakultet političkih nauka u Beogradu, 2009.
- Tančić, Božić (2022). Tančić Dragan, Božić Vanda: Strah u političkim i krivičnopravnim naukama, Tematski zbornik „Strah u naučnom i umetničkom stvaralaštvu“, Leposavić: Institut za srpsku kulturu Priština, 2022. str. 175-186.
- Veber (1976). Veber Max, Privreda i društvo, TOM I, Prosveta, Beograd.
- Trebješanin (2012). Trebješanin Borka, „U potrazi za građanskom hrabrošću“, Intervju s Oliverom Frljićem, Politika, 16.05. 2012.

Ванда Б. БОЖИЋ  
Драган Љ. ТАНЧИЋ

## ПОЛИТИКА И ТЕАТАР

### РЕЗИМЕ

Предмет овог научног рада је неизоставна повезаност политике и театра, њихова међузависност у друштвеним и политичким односима. Без људи у одређеној држави односно без глумаца који их представљају у позоришној представи нема ни историје ни политике, ни културе, ни театра, а нити политичких догађаја у одређеном времену, простору и на одређеној територији. Често су предметом упризорених позоришних представа политички догађаји из ближе или даље прошлости. Такав театар постаје политички театар. Кроз представу театар може да неким субјектима, у конкретно постављеним ситуацијама, уочи и реши њихове проблеме на свој начин, као и да исте критички објасни и интерпретира, са аспекта резултата, ефеката и последица. Аутори у раду указују на дистинкцију између Аристотеловог театра и Брехтовог театра који се очитује у њиховој различитој функцији и односу ка држави. Наиме, Аристотелов театар подржава постојећи државни поредак као један божански поредак, док Брехт посредством театра руши државни поредак. Брехтов театар постаје политички театар, његова је улога да освести и промени свест публике те даје преобрати у правцу једне идеологије, која ће као таква дати свој допринос држави.

*Кључне речи:* политика, политичка сила, држава, политички театар, театар, Аристотел, Брехт, насиље, моћ.