

Enquadramentos, cenas dissensuais e o aparecer antierárquico: ação política e resistência em Judith Butler e Jacques Rancière¹

Frameworks, scenes of dissensus and the anti-hierarchical appearance: political action and resistance in Judith Butler and Jacques Rancière

Ângela Cristina Salgueiro Marques²

Lucas Henrique Nigri Veloso³

Marco Aurélio Máximo Prado⁴

Resumo: O artigo apresenta uma possível articulação entre as abordagens de Jacques Rancière e Judith Butler acerca dos modos de aparecimento político de sujeitos vulneráveis em espaços enunciativos de dissenso e demanda por reconhecimento. Argumentamos que, ainda que por caminhos reflexivos distintos, ambos valorizam as resistências que desestabilizam e questionam as ordens hierárquicas as quais definem regimes normativos reguladores das visibilidades e legibilidades que autorizam e validam as experiências dos sujeitos e suas formas de vida. Aparecer é, ao mesmo tempo, a reconfiguração do sensível e a construção de novos quadros de sentido que permitem novas coordenadas de expressão e reconhecimento das vidas precárias. Isso envolve não só a consideração das vulnerabilidades dos corpos em ação, mas também as fabulações e imaginários que redesenham trajetórias sociohistóricas de sobrevivências e lutas por justiça.

Palavras-Chave: Cena de dissenso, aparecimento, enquadramentos, sobrevivências

1 Este trabalho contou com o apoio da CAPES, do CNPq e da FAPEMIG.

2 Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG). Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil.
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2253-0374> E-mail: angelasalgueiro@gmail.com

3 Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG). Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil.
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9688-7819> E-mail: lucasveloso@gmail.com

4 Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG). Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil.
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3207-7542> E-mail: mamprado@gmail.com

Abstract: *The article presents an attempt to articulate the approaches of Jacques Rancière and Judith Butler concerning the modes of political appearance of vulnerable subjects in enunciative spaces of dissent and demand for recognition. We argue that, although in different reflective ways, both value the resistances that destabilize and question the hierarchical orders that define normative regimes that regulate the visibilities and legibilities that authorize and validate the experiences of the subjects and their ways of life. Appearing is, at the same time, the reconfiguration of the sensible and the construction of new frames of meaning that allow new coordinates of expression and recognition of precarious lives. This involves not only considering the vulnerabilities of bodies in action, but also the fables and imagery that redraw socio-historical trajectories of survivals and struggles for justice.*

Keywords: *Scene of dissent, appearance, frameworks, survivals*

Introduction

This article intends to build a reflection around the aspects and changes of ways apparition of subjects in the public scene, interfering in the coordinates of what could be representable and the forms of utterance. An interference in the social and political operation that define what will be legible and intelligible, establishes resistances that change frames of meaning, rhythms and scales of meaning, enabling other forms of apprehending the visible and its sensitive organization. Jacques Rancière and Judith Butler, even though they had different paths, have developed reflections around the “devices of visibility that regulate the statute of bodies and the type of apprehension and attention they deserve” (RANCIÈRE, 2012, p. 96). Both have been dedicating themselves to promote an ethical approach of the political appearing (*aparaitre*) of bodies, identifying what type of gaze and implication this “appearing” raise along those who observe and interrogate the frameworks that make discourses, gestures, images, bodies visible and readable.

According to Buttler (2011), the framework, taken as a frame that makes vulnerable individuals visible, negatively contributes for intensifying its precariousness and its erasure. Because of that, its reflection on the recognition and the ethics of justice involves problematizing framing in search for cracks which indicate that the frame does not determine in a precise manner what we see, think, recognize and apprehend.

Through different routes, Rancière (2012, 2013, 2019) approaches the argument elaborated by Butler when he defines “appearing” of subjects in the scene of dissensus through an intervention, disturbance and reorganization of perceptive shapes given, to the point of making so that individuals, words and objects can no longer be inserted in the sensitive framework defined by a network of meanings, nor find their place and time anymore in the system of police coordinates where they usually are located.

When observing the devices of visibility that define and impose constraints to the forms how bodies are represented in image, Rancière (2007, 2012, 2019) and Butler (2015) call our attention to the mechanisms of

regulation the statute of bodies represented and the type of attention conceived to them. Frameworks articulates a form of biopolitics or biopolitical government of collective bodies, restraining behaviors, modes of agency and possibilities of action. The framework promotes a type of power that involves the forms of (in)visibility and (i)legibility of subjects and groups, regulating the space and the forms of appearance.

The biopolitical use of collective bodies work in the production of frameworks that refuse precariousness, valuing emancipation and autonomy, preserving, at the same time, control over the possibilities of being and existing in society. Frameworks set a way of neoliberal governmentality that structures the eventual field of appearing and action of subjects. According to Judith Butler (2015, p. 14), frameworks (or interpretative frames) “do not determine unilaterally the conditions of appearing (in the sense of a performative apparition about a public scene) of subjects and events. However, its goal is to demarcate the sphere of apparition”. Therefore, becoming visible in a communicative scene of dissensus involves not only the choice of frameworks of shared meaning and values – through which individuals will be identified, known and named – but also the instauration of a conflictive relationship of searching for recognition, legitimacy and autonomy. Being visible, in this case, articulates the existence of a public image to an inter subjective and reciprocal process of utterance, of speaking and listening, accommodation and strangeness.

Our intention, in this text, is to explore the invention of the controversial scene of “appearance” and interlocution, in which is inscribed the gesture, the word and the body of the speaking subject, and in which this subject is constituted in a performative, poetic and argumentative manner, through the connection and disconnection among the multiple names and forms of “presentation of self” that define them. We come from the idea that, both for Butler and for Rancière, “appearing” is not only acquiring visibility, but involves altering the way subjects are perceived and recognized by the others, what demands a dislocation of gaze, a different form of imagining otherness and considering forms of

life that appear in front of us. In the terms of perspectives presented here, appearing means to alter the ways of disposition of bodies, temporalities, spatialities and textualities, in other words, the gesture of reorganizing the field in which the experience itself is lived.

Defining schemes of appearing and the apprehension of precarious lives

When we add the contemporary productions of Judith Butler (2004, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018), we verify that one of the pillars that base her sociological, political and ethical theory is the proposition that embodied human existence is necessarily, even if not sufficiently, conditioned by precariousness. This notion is based by the author through the attestation that the condition of preservation and potentialization of any existence considered as life is conditioned, since the beginning by relations of material, symbolic and affectionate dependence of other beings beyond an individual or himself. In other words, even if we experience multiple dimensions of existing in an individual manner, individuality or singularity is precarious and opaque by finding itself always supported by relations that exceed a self. In this sense, the notion of precariousness puts in foreground the rationality that necessarily conditions our existence as social beings.

Precariousness, as a notion that seek to comprise a necessary ontological dimension of humanity, cannot be thought out, according to the author, as a purified essence or a quality detached from the social and political conditions that cross, obstruct or foster the preservation and development of human lives. This situation is revealed in an especially problematic manner when we attest that, especially in our western everyday life, deficiencies, absences or negations of relations and social structures of existential support, often aren't even "apprehended" as invariably necessary for the preservation and fomentation of a few populations, groups or individuals. Due to that reason, the asymmetrical distribution of precariousness produces, to Butler, asymmetrical ways of

precarity which calls us with urgency to question the pretended foundations and social conditions that are produced, reiterated or intensified by that; an issue of moral, ethical and political nature par excellence.

When questioning about the socio-political crossings that modulate differentially the precarity, Butler proposes that these are an effect of a processual social reiteration of certain “frames of intelligibility” and “norms of recognizability” which allow and prioritize the preservation and promotion of some lives and forms of existence, while legitimating or naturalizing violence and death of others, these that often are not even considered worthy of grief. Such frames selectively sculpt the experience of subjects, in a way that

“We cannot easily recognize life outside of the frameworks in which it is presented, and these frameworks are not only structuring the way which we come to know and identify life but constitute conditions that support that same life” (BUTLER, 2015, p. 44).

For Butler (2004, 2011, 2015), the frameworks would help us distinguish the lives we can appreciate and value from the ones that wouldn't be deserving of being considered. The terms, categories, conventions and general rules that operate in devices of framework shape and transform, for instance, a living being from a subject prone of being recognized through a specific form of apprehension, in other words, a form of knowledge associated to feeling and perceiving, without using concepts. It is about knowing how these norms operate to make certain subjects recognizable people and making others decisively harder to recognize. The problem, according to Butler (2015, p. 20) “is not only knowing more people in existing norms, but rather considering how the existing norms attribute recognition in a different manner”. It is possible to say that there is an approximation between Rancière's perspective and Butler's approach when we talk about searching another sensitive order that allow us to fight against the ranking and subjection. Both topicalize form as a type of control which defines and marks what and who could be audible, visible and readable:

The silent interpretative scheme which distinguishes worthy lives from the unworthy of consideration works fundamentally through the senses, differentiating the screams we can hear from the ones we can't, the visions we can see from the ones we can't, (...) which means that a fight must happen against the forces that seek to regulate the commotion and affectation of different forms. (BUTLER, 2015, p. 83).

The premises, judgements, disagreements, values, affective predispositions, etc. which allow social actors to recognize and understand the facts and perceptions reveal how the framing is set as a central organizing idea in processes of unveiling and discursive construction of a political problem and the subjects articulated by those. However, the framework is not capable of fully contain what it transmits and, because of that, it ruptures every time it tries to give a definitive organization to its content (BUTLER, 2015). In this process of continuous rupture, the terms through which subjects are named and known are produced, dislocated, questioned and altered. It is about, according to Butler, knowing how the operations of appearance work that make certain subjects and groups recognizable and valuable, while others are clearly removed from respect and consideration.

It is important to point out that, even though precariousness and vulnerabilities are differentially and asymmetrically distributed in a certain social context, therefore marking lives as worthy or not of existence, preservation and potentialization, the author's reflection intends to surpass the historic opposition to which these notions were associated with others, such as agency, creativity, insurgency and political resistance. According to her, when vulnerable and precarized subjects are apprehended from the production of a space of appearance outlined by its political action, reveal a resistant power of putting in question an unfair social normativity (VELOSO, 2018).

Therefore, the practical reiterations of "intelligibility schemes" which compose framings and "norms of recognizability" linked to them, do not determine the destiny of a corporeality, identity or a subject in a certain social context, even though it conditions roles, functions, social

actions and modes of existence. Butler finds the power of resistance in the performative reiteration, in redefinitions and dislocations that fracture hegemonic social orders:

The performative is not a single act used by an already established subject, but one of the most powerful and insidious forms in which a subject is called to become a social being through diffused places and is inserted in the social through a set of powerful and diverse interpellations. In this sense, social performative is a crucial part not only of the affirmation of the subject, but also of the consequent political questioning and the reformulation of the subject itself. The performative is not only a ritual practice is one of the most influent rituals in formation and reformulation of subjects. (BUTLER, 2005, p. 256).

In this sense, “performativities” produced by corporealities crossed by vulnerabilities, violence and damages, such as the caused, for instance, by individuals, groups and social movements in their daily interactions or in protests, enable the emergency of an act of objection to injustices that are supposedly updated and naturalized in a given context. “These collective forms of resistance are structured in a very different manner from the idea that a political subject that establishes their agency while subjugating their vulnerability – this is the masculinist ideal which we must continue to be opposed” (BUTLER, 2016, p. 24).

The author gives special emphasis to the need of understanding political “performances” not only through the interaction effects of multiple scales that produce, but also through networks and relationships of alliance or opposition, human, non-human and/or extra-human, which enable or create obstacles so that corporealities discuss the perceptible social field or “space of appearing” (BUTLER, 2018). It is important to point out that this “space of appearing”, despite referring to Hannah Arendt’s argument about the public square, is not considered by the author as a public sphere detached from or taken as given to a posterior surfacing of politics, mainly when we consider that public or private qualities of spaces, times and materialities are already crossed by disputes and/or

negotiations between different social groups more or less vulnerable in relation to one another.

The “appearing” can designate a visible presence, spoken words, but also representation in network and silence. In addition, we have to be able to think in such acts as a plural action, presupposing a plurality of bodies that present their converging purpose of forms that do not require a conformity strict with a singular type of action, or a singular type of claim, and that do not constitute together a singular type of subject. (BUTLER, 2018, p. 157).

The space of appearing involves the understanding of how vulnerable subjects enunciate their demands and, at the same time, their vulnerabilities, exposing bodies that need support, but not in the sense of “eliminating” what the hierarchic order points negatively as “precariousness”. The political appearing in spaces supposedly or potentially public expresses, thus, a “performative contradiction” that not only puts their own social norms at stake, but also the own socially shared meaning of their own vulnerabilities:

There is a plural and performative bodily resistance at work that shows how bodies are being manipulated by social and economic politics that are decimating the means of subsistence. But these bodies, when showing this precariousness, are also resisting to these same powers; they play a form of resistance that presupposes a vulnerability of specific type and are opposed to the precariousness. (BUTLER, 2016, p. 20, our translation).

The spaces or scenes of appearing are effects of the alliances and agencies that are guided by the care and responsibility with the other more vulnerable. According to Butler, subjects and corporealities can, even though in brief and infinitesimal instants, introduce cracks in the social time-space that comprises them, through tensions, dislocations and/or even reconfigurations of labeling, values, social esteems and even the aesthetic of the “normalized” and ‘normalizing” gaze which, in other contexts, are reiterated by the norm.

Butler's "space of appearing" takes into account the exposure of individual and collective bodies, revealing her relational constitution dependent of alliances that can be established "among people that live together with that purpose, it doesn't matter where they are, which means that as with any action happens in a localized place, it also establishes a space that belongs to the alliance itself" (BUTLER, 2018, p. 73).

When mobilizing the notion of "space of appearing" proposed by Hannah Arendt (2009), Butler can affirm that the "appearing" in the (supposedly) public scene is the condition necessary for democratic politics and the emergence of existences that affirm that are alive and worthy of living, objecting their supposed invisibility and unworthiness of grief. Notwithstanding, it is important to emphasize that spaces or "scenes of appearing" of affecting and being affected, of a mediation of appearing that promotes an exposition and dispossession of self from the other, either by a gesture, scenic performance or collective protest:

[...] we appear to someone and that our appearing has to be registered by the senses, not only our own, but somebody else's. If we appear, we must be seen, which means our body must be seen, and our vocalized sound must be heard: the body must enter in the visual and audible field... Appearing is not a necessarily morphological moment when the body takes a risk of showing up not only to speak and to act, but also to suffer and move, to engage other bodies, to negotiate an environment someone depends on, to establish a social organization with the goal of satisfying needs. (BUTLER, 2018, p. 175).

If Judith Butler goes beyond Hannah Arendt (2009) when she says that a "public sphere" is not a space you simply enter, as an "Agora" that waits that a people or citizen to speak up and express themselves, speak or express themselves through the reciprocal justification so that they can be seen and heard, it is necessary to think still about the material, symbolic and affective supports so that the subjects have the condition to "appear" in other contexts beyond those who tend to reiterate their forgetfulness, alienation and exclusion.

Therefore, there is no way to promote apparition without questioning the asymmetrical forms of power that delimit the sphere of the visible. That does not mean to dismiss the logics of management, governmentality and control that come from institutions and their strategic rationalities. However, it implies recognizing that there are moments in which norms can be broken, adapted or replaced by others. In Rancière's words, subversion disestablishes and interpellates the order of the police qualifying them, making them less police-like, even though it continues to be management (PRADO, 2019).

We point out that Butler and Rancière are interested in the ruptures that can be made in the system of visibility, in other words, in how it is possible to subvert the dominant order and seek moments in which other possibilities of appearing of subjects may emerge, even if temporary. They characterize the subversion as an aesthetic and performative process through the appropriation and torsion of forms of doing, making and being. While Butler emphasizes the appropriation of new forms of being through the inexact repetition of norms, Rancière emphasizes the appropriation of times and spaces through dis-identification and subjectivation. And both highlight that politics can't be transformed in management, it must be reinvented, without the unquestioned use of the moral grammar that ranks subjects and their bodies and allows conflict to find places of expression in the public world.

In Butler's terms, the political act needs to reveal itself as a certain mode of life produced as a possible reality through its action within the norm, but an action that reiterates it and recreates it at the same time. In Rancière's terms, the political act must reveal the mechanisms of constitution of a certain truth, which evidence the contingency of any hierarchic order. According to him, the subject is always positioned between identities, between forms of police and political regulation, searching a reconfiguration of the field of their experience and their condition of enunciation, "especially in certain contexts where the so-called dissonant noises are in the borders of these forms of governance

that act through the manufacturing of identity locations” (PRADO, 2019, p. 209).

The dis-identification is a process that joins and separates identities, showing how they are already coated, already named in the breast of hierarchies through social technologies of management of time and space. Therefore, it is a process that allows that subjects escape evaluative and bio legitimator discourses that prescribe and determine their existence and expectation of change. Resisting identity fixation is to distance oneself from a condition of prepared recognition. To Rancière, as we will see next, disidentification is a process of subjectivation in which are questioned and re-disposed the codes, times and spaces that defined and made an individual or group intelligible until then. It is an affirmation of an alternative rationality that can assure re-existences and survivals.

The dissensus scene and the political insurgence of “*apparâitre*”

The concept of “appearance” in Rancière (2018b, 2019) is not restricted to something superficial or to the way someone or something manifests publicly. Appearing (*apparâitre*) is an aesthetic and political gesture that promotes another form of structuring the “thinkable”, involving the alteration of a regimen of perception, of reading and listening through which diverse elements are juxtaposed and get in friction in a way of allowing a dislocation of our position in relation to the way we apprehend, perceive and respond the demands of the other and the events of the world.

Appearing is an aesthetic experience of rupture with a pre-figured order which programs our perception and our reason to cater in a consensual way to these appeals. Therefore, “appearing” is a practice that resets visibility and intelligibility which mediate our interactions with otherness. This gesture is insurgent, because it defies the hierarchy that links the gaze and the listening to devices of control and predictability.

In a wider sense, it would be possible to affirm that Rancière is interested in thinking about a repositioning of bodies, in how to produce

dislocations and cracks in the naturalized ways of apprehension and explanation of events, in how to invent “a way of interrupting the machine of explaining things” (RANCIÈRE, 2018b, p. 17). According to Rancière, the type of operation that can change the “distribution of the visible and thinkable” (RANCIÈRE, 2019, p. 50) is to set the scene.

The scene can be defined as a creation of a possibility of enunciation of subjects that go beyond fixed places and times by the consensual hierarchic order (policial order⁵). In other words, in a scene of dissensus, it is possible to perceive how it is possible how, in reiteration of norms and codes of control and conduct, there is the potentiality of following historic processes and the attempts of producing moments of dislocation of the sensitive regime that defines legibilities and intelligibilities unequally destined to subjects that question a social identity imposed to them. To go beyond social identities and previously defined scripts outline a conflict that can promote opportunities to “invent a scene in which spoken words become audible, objects become visible and individuals become recognized” (RANCIÈRE, 2020, p. 124).

I think that the issue of scene is also very strongly linked to the issue of appearance, to the fact that appearance is not the contrary to reality, but the scene of manifestation. Theatricality is the construction of another universe of appearances: the fact that making appear what wasn't or making appear in a different from what appeared under a certain mode of visibility and intelligibility. Theatricality is strongly linked to that, knowing that everything is played in presentation of what it appears (theatricality from insurrection) (2018b, p. 17).

The scene promotes, thus, other possibilities of arrangements and articulations among temporalities and spatialities in a way of altering the dynamics of appearing of subjects and events, reorganizing the field of visible and excluding it from a consensual representative order. According to Rancière (2019, p. 48), what is important in this scene is the fact that

5 “I defined police as a form of sharing sensitive, characterized by the imaginary adequacy of locations, roles and forms of being, by the absence of vacancies and supplements. (...). Police, to me, does not define an institution of power, but a principle of sharing the sensitive within which strategies and techniques of power can be defined.” (RANCIÈRE, 2010, p.78).

it builds a visibility and an “appearance” through attempts of framing, assembling and distributing experiences and their registers questioning the historic and social form taken by these arrangements, tensioned between the cut and the construction or weaving of a “common”. The situation made present through the scene produces a type of cut or discontinuation which shows the arbitrariness or the violence of the current sharing of sensitive and the possibility of difference. However, this cut is not a result of an instantaneous interruption, detached from social-historic processes of fight and conflict: “We are not dealing with the radical discontinuity that makes what was impossible yesterday possible tomorrow” (RANCIÈRE, 2018b, p. 31). The scene puts in evidence a singularity and connects the interruption of the policial order to wider processes that generally are made illegible through mechanisms of separation between everyday life of subjects and the unreachable of a impenetrable totality represented by the neoliberal governmentality. But it is important to remember that the scene of dissensus is not necessarily related to this specific form of policial sharing of the sensitive, just like there are different policial regimes, different types of scene are mounted to evidence specific hierarchic arrangement;

The notion of scene comprises two ideas: the one of a cut and the one with a certain architecture of what is given. (...) The issue is: what is given to perceive? What location the individuals have that are given to see in this architecture? (RANCIÈRE, 2019, p. 49).

As we will see later on, it is this idea of “architecture of what is given” that allows an approximation between Rancière’s and Butler’s perspectives: the scene promotes alterations in the frameworks that structure the architecture of the visible. These alterations are a product, simultaneously, of the emergence of processes of political subjectivation and the work of reflection of those who dedicate themselves to the operation of setting a scene through the approximation of documents, images, words, historic registrations that bring up the political and historic movement of insurgency. The experienced scene, produced and unfolded by the operation of subjectivation exist as a singularity that may or may not be redirected in the work of setting.

Certain subjects that are not considered create a common controversial scene where they put in discussion the objective status of what is given and impose an exam and discussion of these things that weren't visible or considered before. (RANCIÈRE, 2010, p. 125).

When explaining how the scene compose the method of equality, Rancière (2018b) reinforces that their epistemological role consists in refusing a causal logic of explanation that privileges the search for something hiding under appearances. The scene allows that is at stake in the singularity chosen to be contemplated, it associates the setting of events that are located in a discontinuous temporality, from the choice of a certain form of rationality: "I thin that in the thickness of a singular event we can read the set of bonds that define a political, artistic or theoretical singularity" (RANCIÈRE, 2018b, p. 22).

The work of building a scene is shared between experiences of political subjectivation and thoughts that evidence the political agency of social and intellectual actors that wish to evidence a "poetic of knowledge", altering the coordinates of the field in which experiences unfold. Such poetics comprehend the method of scene as conjunction, while ethical and aesthetic gesture of putting bodies, gestures, gazes, words and meanings together in a way of producing a fiction that reveals a form of rationality that cannot be explained by what is "out of scene", but by the disposition and setting of elements that compose them.

Fiction in the sense that the scene that I build, I invent. Even if I come from a text, I reinvent it as text of a character that observes a book or watches a show. I invent it with verifiable elements, but there is always a moment of *mise en scène*. In general, it is the same thing I did in Night of the Proletariat, where there is, at the same time, a huge mass of files and scenes that are, in fact, conjectural. I offer them as they were told, or I tell them again under the form of a probability. There is always a game from the possibilities in which the event offers, as data, to build a scene, a form of enunciation, a space of the viewer. (RANCIÈRE, 2018b, p. 125).

Therefore, we emphasize how the notion of scene is linked to the creative work, creating fables and resistant to the fictional narrative,

because it promotes a multitude of worlds and forms of experimentation that are not our own, and, because of that, allow us to think, tell the world and reflect about it in another perspective. Fiction allows “other ways of identifying events and actors and other forms of articulating them to build common world and stories. (RANCIÈRE, 2017, p. 13).

The setting allows the approximation of heterogeneous temporalities, spatialities, corporealities and languages, whose tension and shock can falter the incoherences of representations and the way they usually bring, at the same time, conflicts and their peaceful solutions.

The scene is what exposes the most different ways one thing can be perceived: it is always, to me, the moment in which things can falter, be shaken or reversed. (...) There is subjectivation, to me, when there is a reset of coordinates of a field of experience. That is what’s at stake in the scene. (2018b, p. 31)

The rationality of fiction derives from differences and ruptures that produce in the breast of a supposedly homogeneous continuum led by the causal and hierarchic order of organizing and inhabiting time (CALDERÓN, 2020). The scene allows, therefore, the fictional ordination of a singularity through which can reveal “what was indexed under the register of one possible reality, presenting to this ordinary and already consensual real a de-hierarchization and another possibility of showing up” (RANCIÈRE, 2019, p. 55). The scene and its setting produce moments of *rêverie* (*daydream*):

Moments that explode, dynamite the continuous time, the time of winners: allowing the opening of another time, a common time, born in the breaches operated in the first: not a time of dream that would make the suffered time fall into oblivion or project a heaven to come, but a time that is presented in another manner, giving a different weight to such instant, connecting it to an Other articulating other instants (RANCIÈRE, 2018c, p. 36).

Just like Butler, we see that Rancière is concerned with the way antagonic bodies and enunciations appear on the scene, because they define

it “as conjunction, as operation of putting bodies, perspectives, words, gestures and meanings” (2018a, p. 29). Appearing has an emancipatory dimension, because it involves another way of thinking a distribution and organization of bodies and capacities, modifying a field of experience and building a common alternative world in relation to the one which the identity positions, expectations and temporalities were already signed and distributed. Altering the conditions of appearing is also fracturing the device that controls which bodies and which appearances are worthy of being considered legitimate to the detriment of appearances perceived as abject and despicable.

Final considerations

In our point of view, a first possible approximation between Butler and Rancière’s approach about the conditions of political appearing of subjects about a scene of conflict is related to the way they define such conditions, pointing out deep asymmetries in the ways of apprehension and intelligibility, making the processes of recognition and minimization of injustices harder. Both bet in the importance of altering schemes of legibility and intelligibility of the world so that we can imagine and effectively build a common non-hierarchic order, that recognizes the dignity of existences.

Derived from this first approximation, a second interface between Butler’s reflection (2016, 2017, 2018) and Rancière is found in the political power of “spaces of appearing” of bodies, their experiences and forms of life, taking into special consideration the support networks, agencies, alliances and performativities that constitute and introduce difference in their interactions and social struggles.

We believe that Butler and Rancière bet in the appearing as an operation of resistance which alters legibilities and intelligibilities. Butler’s subversive gesture gives focus to the presence of a corporeality that invents a different response to the one expected or foreseen. In Rancière, the modification of coordinates of experience which inscribe bodies in time and space begins when a vulnerable body gets to access the

“unmeasured moment” (RANCIÈRE, 2017, p. 155), in other words, the “moment of shaking that is conserved between nothing and everything, that gets in this border in which lives are falling into nothingness rise” and are taken from the infraworld of time of reproduction and hierarchy. In our point of view, the political gesture narrated by Butler in the construction of alliances open a deviant time and space hiatus, revealing vulnerable subjects that create, many times in the midst of an atrocious suffering, “another way of inhabiting time, another way of sustaining a moving body and spirit”. (RANCIÈRE, 2018c, p. 34).

Butler and Rancière define their public apparition of subjects as a shock that rips bodies and their potentialities of stigmatizing frameworks and causal and deterministic manners of narrative ordination of history. Both question the sensitive rules of apprehension and intelligibility of bodies, building what was programmed to be seen. Appearing comprises, for both, the breach of expectation, the expansion of the enunciative experience, “altering the statute of the visible, the way we look at things and how we move through them” (RANCIÈRE, 2019, p. 51).

The combination between the appropriation of norm in Butler and the dis-identification in Rancière shows us how subversions can derive the appropriation of times and spaces that previously weren't legitimately designated to subjects within the policial order or schemes of biopolitical control: in these appropriations, subjects were dis-identified and/or allow dis-identification with a position that was previously defined in the current hierarchy, modifying the relations traced between elements that locate them in a social order.

Such “new relations” derive from, according to Rancière (2019), the reconstitution of the conceptual network that makes an utterance thinkable and that modifies the conditions of their appearing. The appearing (and the scenic space it calls for) consists in, thus, producing an arrangement, a reframing, a reorganization of perceptive forms given, a re composition of the order that sustains a given narrative, a set that evidences a gap, a space that makes possible to inhabit the “in-between”. The survivals linked to the space of apparition are produced in the

continuous fractures and remodeling of visibilities and intelligibilities, in the construction of alliances between bodies and imaginaries, that are related to the political power that precarious lives have of producing a “performative contradiction” directed towards the agents of governmentality and subjection (VELOSO, 2017).

The scene of appearing is set by excess, by supplement, by what surpasses places and times fixates by the policial order and by biopolitical and necropolitical frameworks. Because of that, not only in protest and large-scale agencies, but this scene is also explicitly understood as a form of experiencing time potentially in any scale and territoriality, in macro and micro events (MARQUES & PRADO, 2018, p. 29); it is the excess that characterizes the “scene of dissensus”, as the emergency of the “without part” and the process of dis-identification (RANCIÈRE, 2012).

When focusing the embodied vulnerabilities that constitute a social action, the scene of apparition in Butler considers the access and restriction to networks of material and symbolic support introduce difference in the own formation and “performativity” of a political action and in what sense these dynamic elements are updated, objected and/or re-appropriated (WOODFORD, 2017). In this sense, mapping how political subjects experience their vulnerabilities, violence and damages can lead us to understand network alliances themselves, and the opposition they form and the effect they produce in the politics performed, for instance, in a collective protest.

Under this aspect, mapping performativities and dis-identifications is also a movement of mapping their own social structures of “intelligibility” and “recognizability” that are updated, reported or uttered as fairer in a certain context. The embodied exposition of self, always crossed by vulnerabilities, have both the possibility of reiterating dominant normative schemes, producing unpredictable and perverse effects, and exposing socially naturalized flaws, violence and injustices (VELOSO, 2017).

Under this bias, Rancière and Butler call us to study political processes in their “becoming”, in other words, de-naturalizing terms such as agency, subject and politics as a priori notions that universally categorize

or explain rationalities, corporealities, agencies, practices and territories that are agonistically related in a fight for justice. Both reveal how survivals relate to the efforts made in moments of collective insurgence, of people in alliance, to rebuild a common form of life. Therefore, at the same time that a scene of appearing is installed in a space-time of rupture, there is

[...] an effort to install a duration of these moments of reconstruction of a common form of life in experiences of production, exchange, circulation of information, transmission of knowledges and the offer of care that weave networks of a solidarity in the conflicts of today, which is also the anticipation of a future form of life, a common form of life free of the hierarchy of time and abilities (RANCIÈRE, 2018c, p. 46-47).

What calls our attention is the fact that Rancière highlights the articulations and bonds of belonging that give origin to experiences rich in multiple lines of escape that allow subjects to constitute and appear as agents of their lives. Like Butler, he points out how affections and bonds weaved through conflict reinforce how subject evidenced everything they do to keep their dignity, their integrity, how they continuously fix the ordinary world, so that they could build conditions of self-preservation being a part of a “common free from the hierarchy of times and abilities”.

This is an important issue, since the way subjects weave together the network of maintenance of life, they will articulate the weave of solidarity, of belongings, the trace of humanity that insists on being disrespected. The articulations produced by insurgences allow life to keep its weave, its shape, at the same time that helps subjects to find a rhythm, a viable style that resists pain, suffering, attack. It is like they were barricades made of vulnerabilities and resistances that, glued together by the affection, work together to make amends and a continuous creation of fables of life that threatens to break every minute.

References

- ARENDDT, H. *A vida do espírito: o pensar, o querer, o julgar*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2009.
- BUTLER, J. *Precarious Life*. London, Verso, 2004.
- BUTLER, J. *Lenguaje, poder e identidad*. Síntesis, Madrid, 2005.
- BUTLER, J. Vida precária. *Contemporânea - Revista de Sociologia da UFSCar*, São Carlos, v.3, n.1, p. 13-33, 2011.
- BUTLER, J. *Quardos de guerra: quando a vida é passível de luto?*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2015.
- BUTLER, J. Rethinking Vulnerability and Resistance. In: BUTLER, J.; GAMBETTI, Z.; SABSAY, L. (Ed.). *Vulnerability in resistance*. Duke University Press, 2016.
- BUTLER, J. When gesture becomes event. In: *Inter Views in Performance Philosophy*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2017. p. 171-191.
- BUTLER, J. *Corpos em Aliança e a política das ruas*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2018.
- CALDERÓN, A. S. Reivindicación de las apariencias en el trabajo de Jacques Rancière. *Daimon. Revista Internacional de Filosofía*, n. 79, p. 21-35, 2020.
- MARQUES, Â.; PRADO, M. A. M. O método da igualdade em Jacques Rancière: entre a política da experiência e a poética do conhecimento. *Revista Mídia e Cotidiano*, v. 12, n. 3, p. 7-32, 2018.
- PANAGIA, Davide. Dissenting words: a conversation with Jacques Rancière. *Diacritics*, v. 30, n.2, p.113-126, 2000.
- PRADO, M. A. M.. Emancipações, subjetivações políticas e a questão democrática. In: COSTA-VAL, A.; GUERRA, A. M.; PRADO, M. A. M.; ROCHA, G. M. *Confins do Político*. Curitiba: CRV, 2019, p. 205-228.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *O desentendimento: política e filosofia*. Tradução Ângela Leite Lopes. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1996.
- RANCIÈRE, J. The method of equality: an answer to some questions. In: ROCKHILL, G.; WATTS, P. (eds.). *Jacques Rancière: History, Politics, Aesthetics*. Duke University Press, 2009. p. 273-288.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *O espectador emancipado*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2010.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *O destino das imagens*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto, 2012.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *Aisthesis: scenes from the aesthetic regime of art*. London: Verso, 2013.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *Les bords de la fiction*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil, 2017.
- RANCIÈRE, J. O desmedido momento. *Serrote*, n. 28, 2018a, p. 77-97.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *La Méthode de la scène*. Paris: Éditions Lignes, 2018b.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *Le temps modernes*. Paris: La Fabrique, 2018c.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *Le travail des images*. Conversations avec Andrea Soto Calderón. Dijon : Les Presses du Réel, 2019.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *The politics of aesthetics: the distribution of the sensible*. London: Continuum, 2004.

VELOSO, L. H. N. Linhas de fuga, agenciamentos e corporeidades: reflexões sobre dimensões infinitesimais da luta antimanicomial de Belo Horizonte. *Idealogando: revista de ciências sociais da UFPE*, n.1, v. 2, p. 34-54, 2017.

VELOSO, L., MARQUES, A. C. S. Vulneráveis ou vítimas? A experiência das redes de luta antimanicomial em Belo Horizonte e a construção relacional de biopotências. *Lumina*, v. 12, n. 2, p.59-78, 2018.

VELOSO, L. “Remédio anti-covardia”: cartografia de vulnerabilidades, comunicação e política na construção e performatividade do dia de luta antimanicomial. 2020. 201 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Comunicação Social) – Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2020.

WOODFORD, C. Subjects of Subversion: Rancière and Butler on the Aesthetics of Politics. In: Street A., Alliot J., Pauker M. (eds) *Inter Views in Performance Philosophy*. Performance Philosophy. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2017, p. 205-218.

On the authors

Ângela Cristina Salgueiro Marques – PhD in Social Communication at UFMG, professor of the Social Communication Department of this institution, working in undergraduate and graduate level.

Lucas Henrique Nigri Veloso – Master’s in Social Communication at PPG-COM/UFMG. PhD student in Political Science at PPGCP/UFMG.

Marco Aurélio Máximo Prado – PhD in Massachusetts University/Amherst. PhD in Social Psychology at Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo. Professor of the Graduate Program in Psychology PPGPSI/UFMG.

In the current article, all authors took active part in the discussion of results; and made the revision and approval of the final version of the work.

Date of submission: 08/11/2020

Date of acceptance: 11/3/2020