Sitting on the Couch: The Conundrum of Spectatorship in Jackie Sibblies Drury's *Fairview*

Damon Krometis

Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism, Volume 37, Number 1, Fall 2022, pp. 67-86 (Article)

Published by The University of Kansas, Department of Theatre and Dance

Sitting on the Couch: The Conundrum of Spectatorship in Jackie Sibblies Drury's *Fairview*

Damon Krometis

Inspired by Simone Browne's concept of "racializing surveillance" Jackie Sibblies Drury's Fairview *challenges what Dorinne Kondo's calls "racial spectatorship": the psychic violence caused by white spectators' hegemonic power within predominantly white theatre spaces. The play invites white spectators on stage to "sit on the couch" and be viewed racially by nonwhite spectators, potentially estranging them from their spectatorial privilege. But this invitation contains an inherent conundrum; white spectators "sitting on the couch" is both central to the play's dramaturgy and its central problem, highlighting white supremacy's residual permanence. The author, a white scholar, describes this moment of invitation in three productions of* Fairview*, and documents his reactions to each, to illuminate the complexities and contradictions of white spectatorship for future consideration.*

Keywords: *Fairview*, *racial spectatorship*, *audience participation*, *antiracist theatre*, *racializing surveillance*

Jackie Sibblies Drury's award-winning *Fairview* is one of several recent plays that challenge the hegemonic power of white spectators within predominantly white theatre spaces.[1]

The play was inspired by Simone Browne's concept of "racializing surveillance"—"enactments of surveillance" that "reify boundaries, borders, and bodies along racial lines," resulting in "discriminatory treatment of those who are negatively racialized by such surveillance."[2] Racializing surveillance in the theatre perpetuates what Dorinne Kondo calls "racial spectatorship," a form of "psychic violence" done to "nonwhite (and progressive white) spectators" that prevents their "happy interpellation into hegemonic representation."[3] *Fairview* attempts to upset these processes by specifically inviting white spectators onstage to "sit on the couch" of the set and be viewed by nonwhite spectators, estranging them from their spectatorial privilege.[4]

I am a white scholar and director interested in how moments of spectatorial participation might critique racial power structures. I came to *Fairview* to learn

Damon Krometis is an Assistant Professor of Theatre at the Community College of Baltimore County. As a scholar, he explores the intersections of theatre for social change, witnessing studies, critical whiteness theory, audience participation, and directing. His writings have been published by *Theatre Topics* and the HowlRound Theatre Commons. He has taught classes in acting, directing, interactive theatre, adaptation, and script analysis at CCBC, Emerson College, Northwestern University, and Roxbury Community College. He holds an MFA in Directing from Northwestern University.

how to be a better ally and do the work of antiracism. "The racial contract of the American stage," Tavia Nyong'o says, requires Black artists to perform "historical memory for predominately white audiences who might prefer to continue forgetting."[5] To break this contract, white artists like myself must do the work of self-examination and help strip the residue of privilege from predominately white theatres. What could I learn from Drury's play about the ways I negatively view and judge Black bodies onstage, problematizing them and enacting what Faedra Chatard Carpenter calls "racial scripts?"[6] How might these lessons help me challenge the racial power structures of the predominately white spaces I occupy?

I witnessed three separate productions of *Fairview* throughout 2019. Upon my first encounter with the play in June, I felt energized. I spent the following days thinking about how my past writings on race had unwittingly perpetuated racial scripts, and how my spectatorial positioning pervaded my logic. By my last encounter in November, as I indeed "sat on the couch" of the set, I wondered what I was trying to prove.

Fairview exemplifies a paradox in exposing the role of spectatorship in theatre's perpetuation of racial ideologies.[7] The play critiques what Dorinne Kondo calls "affective violence," a form of structural violence prevalent in the theatre that "can relentlessly drain" Black spectators of "energy, spirit, and the will to live."[8] It does so by asking white spectators to stand onstage and have their whiteness viewed as strange. This moment of invitation is transgressive, exposing how spectatorship is coded by white people as a racially privileged act.[9] Keisha, the character who invites the white spectators onstage, furthers this power reversal by speaking specifically to the nonwhite spectators present.[10] Yet Drury admits this play cannot function without white spectators.[11] Carpenter points out that the play's dramaturgical turn is designed for white viewers and "not for those that live its commentary" on racializing surveillance.[12] By participating, and in a sense being cast as characters in this world, white spectators are still centered in an event meant to critique their power. If racial ideologies can be "reinforced or undermined through both theatrical and metatheatrical means,"[13] then *Fairview*'s moment of invitation has just such contradictory potential. It provides an opportunity to deconstruct white spectatorship so that it exposes, rather than reinforces racism. But while *Fairview* seeks to advance this antiracist cause, it simultaneously highlights racism's residual permanence. My "sitting on the couch" was central to the play's dramaturgy, and its central problem.

In what follows, I attempt to unpack my experiences with three different productions of *Fairview*. I specifically dissect the moment of invitation into this racial role reversal to explore how different castings of white spectators open new questions about race and spectatorship. I place my observations in conversation with other critiques of the play and critical whiteness studies to examine the rigidity of white racial ideologies.[14] In doing so, I hope to shed light on the complexities and contradictions of white spectatorship for future consideration.

Before I proceed, I must position myself within this admittedly fraught topic. I wish to, as D. Soyini Madison counsels, "take ethical responsibility for [my] own subjectivity and political perspective" and be "accountable for its consequences and effects."[15] I identify as a white, heterosexual, cisgender male, from the mid-Atlantic. I freely admit I have blind spots concerning racial framings; Carrie J. Preston has dissected such framings in my *Howlround* article on *An Octoroon*.[16] Also, there is currently less Black scholarship on this play than there are reviews and commentaries by white authors like myself.[17] By writing this article, I recognize I add to that power imbalance and potentially "center [my] learning process and interests in ways that are detrimental to others."[18] I nevertheless decided to write this article for two reasons.

First, I believe there is much I (and other white artists) can learn from Black artists like Drury if I wish to truly create antiracist theatre. Kondo shows that many white artists who critique white hegemony do so in problematic and power-evasive ways.[19] By engaging with Drury's potent challenge to my assumptions of power in the theatre, I aim to confront rather than avoid my blind spots and do the work of self-examination. I hope other scholars can learn from my experience and thus better challenge white supremacist culture. Second, having seen the first three major productions of *Fairview*, I apply a decidedly different lens than past scholars. My focus on the moment of invitation allows me to draw new connections across existing critiques of the play, potentially revealing new aspects of white spectatorship. My goal is to illuminate the residual permanence of white supremacy so that scholars and artists might find better ways to counter it.

The Western theatre gives hegemonic power to white spectators. Whites have long been overrepresented in Western theatre venues. According to a recent survey by the National Endowment for the Arts, about 80.4 percent of American attendees of nonmusical plays identify as white.[20] British audiences likewise vastly overrepresent whites as a percentage of population.[21] This overrepresentation helps create what Brandi Wilkins Catanese calls "the fiction of [western] theater as monoracial," even though it presents racial difference in order to contain it.[22] As a result, Dorinne Kondo asserts that most dramatic criticism reads performance "from a generalized spectatorial position that remains undertheorized."[23] The white spectator is positioned as the default. This assumption of whiteness allows detrimental racial ideologies—racial frameworks that justify the racially dominant status quo—to procreate via various means.[24]

One such mean is through affect. Colin Patrick Ashley and Michelle Billies have shown how affect theory has likewise treated whiteness as universal.[25] Kondo refers to this whitewashed affective thinking as racial affect. She suggests that racial affect "represents a power-laden zone where subjects, feeling, and structural violence intertwine."[26] By "enliven[ing] some and diminish[ing] others," racial affect makes and remakes racial power structures.[27] It creates a space in which white spectators see stories that mirror their experiences and provide "self-

confirmation" and simultaneously "invisibilize the minoritarian subject." Racial affect doesn't allow majority white audiences to see what Black individuals see.[28] Instead, white audiences see characterizations of Black people that are "reflections of white desires and anxieties distorted by theatrical mirrors."[29] And since, according to Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, whites derive pleasure from this type of racial domination, viewing such performances activate positive feelings in white spectators.[30]

Kondo likewise theorizes racial spectatorship, in which "nonwhite (and progressive white) spectators can be assaulted by psychic violence," while white spectators "can be confirmed in their superiority."[31] Depictions of Black people onstage in front of a primarily white audience can thus bolster false narratives that promote white supremacy. Since theatre is based in storytelling and its ability to "lie in the realm of the given," Bonilla-Silva suggests it can "help [spectators] make sense of the world but in ways that reinforce the status quo, serving particular interests without appearing to do so."[32] Even careful, nuanced performances of Black characters can be misread in this racist framework. Carpenter shares such an incident in Baltimore Center Stage's production of *The Whipping Man*, when a spectator labeled the character of John as lazy, despite the production's attempts to reject this stereotype.[33] Any outrage felt by the racialized spectator to such racist propagations "can be labelled 'too emotional,' making them 'feel crazy' in the moment."[34]

Simone Browne further complicates the role of the spectator when she theorizes racializing surveillance. She terms *racializing surveillance* "a technology of social control where surveillance practices, policies, and performances concern the production of norms pertaining to race and exercise a 'power to define what is in or out of place.'"[35] When white spectators view bodies, they code those bodies by race and determine correct behavior. Racializing surveillance perpetuates Joe Feagin's white racial frame: "An overarching white worldview" based in hegemonic racial ideologies and which promotes "racialized inclinations to discriminate."[36] Through this framing, Maurice O. Wallace suggests Black characters must fit within "a rigid and limited grid of representational possibilities."[37] These stereotypes, says E. Patrick Johnson, both maintain whiteness as a master trope and ensure Black individuals are seen as second-class citizens.[38]

Additionally, Browne suggests that "where public spaces are shaped for and by whiteness, some acts in public are abnormalized" and "coded for disciplinary measures."[39] When whites view Black bodies in theatre spaces, they negatively racialize those bodies and seek to discipline any Black presence that doesn't fit existing racial scripts. This is so deeply encoded that Nicole Fleetwood contends that the visual field is always punitive of Black bodies.[40] She observes how in cultural productions like theatre, white spectators assume they "see the same thing when viewing that which is coded as Black," and that Black lived experience can be "knowable."[41] Through racializing surveillance, Black life is stripped of

nuance and individuality yet constantly observed and controlled. Harvey Young suggests the Black body is imprisoned by the white gaze through its "compulsory visibility."[42]

Thus, rather than any spectatorial objectivity, there is a cultural context to how all spectators view bodies onstage.[43] Lisa Lowe terms this context the "economy of affirmation and forgetting that characterizes liberal humanist understanding."[44] To Lowe, the entire white, Western notion of freedom, exemplified in domestic life, is founded on an ignored history of violence and oppression against People of Color.[45] George Lipsitz likewise focuses on domestic life through the white spatial imaginary, which portrays the "prosperous suburban home as the privileged moral geography of the nation" and advocates a wide range of racialized policies that protect it.[46] Bonilla-Silva explains that these processes manifest as "white common sense," wherein whites do not actively support white supremacy, but rather "subscribe to substantial portions of it in a casual, uncritical fashion."[47] When white spectators encounter racist depictions of Black people onstage, they greet them uncritically and thus fail to challenge what they see. Even when Black artists protest these depictions, they face challenges in thwarting the uniquity of the white supremacist imaginary and generating meaningful conversations about structural racism.

The result of this racially charged form of spectatorship is what Kondo calls affective violence—a form of public feeling in which nonwhite spectators feel erased, excluded, and stereotyped by the racial scripts presented onstage. White theatre viewers become comfortable surveilling Black people and coding them in familiar and violent stereotypes. They diminish and punish attempts to break with these stereotypes. And since spectatorship is so often seen as a universal position, it assumes an automatic whiteness that ignores any forms of dissent to this coding.[48] Those that are harmed by these onstage depictions are left to bang their heads against the wall in frustration.

Kondo shares one example of affective violence when she saw Bruce Norris's *Clybourne Park*, another Pulitzer Prize–winning play about race. The play dramatizes events at 406 Clybourne, the house sold to Lena Younger in Loraine Hansberry's *A Raisin in the Sun*. The play juxtaposes two attempts to prevent the sale of the house: by the Clybourne Park Improvement Association in 1959, who fear the Youngers will destroy the neighborhood's white hegemony; and by Lena's grandniece in 2009, who fears gentrification of her now predominantly Black community. The play is preoccupied with its white characters' racial anxieties "about what to say, how to interact, how to avoid the charge of racism."[49] Its "power-evasive discourses" and racially problematic humor marginalizes the Black perspectives within Hansberry's original story. Kondo and her Black companion, Dr. Shana Redmond, professor of musicology and African American studies at UCLA, grew increasingly appalled at the production. But the majority white audience vigorously laughed and applauded. She wondered, "Am I/ are

we, the only ones who see? Why is the audience laughing?"[50] Whether from discomfort or recognition, white spectators' laughter was a "source of bonding" that tied them together and excluded others.[51] The experience was "crazy-making" because it suggested it was "her fault that she [was] excluded from the laughter and enjoyment."[52]

This system of affective violence is self-perpetuating; it sticks to us. Marvin Carlson explains, "The expectations an audience brings to a new reception experience are the residue of memory of previous such experiences."[53] Dani Snyder-Young explains how white spectators specifically develop a residual memory of comfort and belonging within theatre spaces.[54] Lowe points out that such residue never disappears, but "persists and endures, even if less legible within the obfuscations of a new dominant" paradigm.[55] Even when spectators start to become aware of their own racial framings and try to separate from them, this residue clings to white viewing experiences. White comfort too often wins out, even if that comfort takes a new form. Meanwhile, the affective violence done to the Black spectators continues.

Since white spectators' tastes and racial assumptions—what Bonilla-Silva calls white habitus[56]—is so hard to change, it is no wonder the white gaze holds such undue power. Frantz Fanon states that the Black man "must be Black in relation to the white man."[57] White people continually justify their dominance through "negative differentiation," in which they consume "denigrating racial stereotypes" of Black people that confirm their feelings of white racial superiority.[58] But the white gaze is also dual-edged. It simultaneously represents the punitive, limiting gaze that many scholars theorize, and what Fanon calls a "liberating gaze" that can restore a "lightness of being" to Black people by potentially removing the tag of "Other" from them.[59]

To counter these frameworks, the hidden machinations of white spectatorship—including racializing surveillance, racial affect, and affective violence—must be laid bare. If Blackness is defined in relation to whiteness, then Carpenter sees a potential solution. She posits that antiracist theatre can employ "dramaturgical strategies to make whiteness 'strange,' thereby revealing it as a social, political, and economic construct."[60] In formulating what could be seen as "strange," Carpenter turns to Catanese and her notion of racial transgression.[61] Accepting racism as the "sacred truth" that unconsciously binds the Western world, Catanese offers racial transgression as the tool to properly mark racial privilege. Racial transgression "exposes the limits placed upon racial discourse in order to violate them and force the possibility of progressive action."[62] Catanese specifically examines how casting Black actors in certain roles opens space for racial transgression. If these concepts are applied to theatre spectators, can theatre expose the racial framings that undergird spectatorship? *Fairview* aims to do just this by focusing on racializing surveillance and making white spectators seem strange.

Drury directly cites Browne and racializing surveillance as influencing *Fair-*

view.[63] In the printed version of *Fairview*, Drury quotes a famous line from Fanon: "'Dirty [n-word]!' or simply 'Look! A Negro!'" In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon details the trauma he felt when a white child called out his Blackness in a public setting.[64] Fleetwood refers to this anecdote as the Fanonian Moment, a "primal scene in which the Black subject comes into self-knowing through the traumatic recognition of another's eyes."[65] This traumatic recognition is at the heart of Drury's dramaturgy: "This [moment], reversed, is the play, in a way."[66] Her reversal refers to both the play's structure and white spectators' affective journey.

Act 1 "appears to be a comedic family drama"[67] involving the Frasiers, a well-to-do Black family in a suburban home, as Beverly frantically races against the clock to prepare Grandma Frasier's birthday dinner. Her husband Dayton lollygags with the silverware, her sister Jasmine berates her, and her daughter Keisha seeks permission to take a gap year before college. The action challenges the notion of the white spatial imaginary, placing a Black family in the suburban home. The Frasiers lead relatively mundane lives full of low-stakes challenges. Jasmine even compares their lives to a "movie" telling "real stories about real people."[68] Paul J. Edwards commented that act 1 "harkens to Black family sitcoms" that "were important forms of representation for various communities" so often negatively racialized on predominately white TV shows and other forms of media.[69]

But Jasmine also suggests the Frasiers's experiences are interchangeable. Their "movie" could equally be about adopting children after a relative's death or adopting a dog and getting it to dance.[70] Her multiple plotlines exemplify Fleetwood's contention that Black art is "subsumed" into "overdetermined narratives" and suggests Black experience can be commodified and stripped down to absurd tropes.[71] Keisha seems to recognize the danger of this when she mentions that "something is keeping me from what I could be"—an unseen force that seems to think it knows and can control her.[72]

Act 2 "watches Act One;"[73] the events repeat in pantomime like a television on mute. Meanwhile, four disembodied white characters are heard debating the question, "If you could be any race, what would you be?"[74] Their conversation hits on a variety of racist tropes. One woman, Suze, waxes nostalgic about her relationship with her Black nursemaid, Mabel,[75] unwittingly painting her as a Mammy stereotype, the "public face that whites expect Black women to assume for them."[76] They eventually comment on the Frasiers, whom they are watching. They exoticize their Blackness by ogling their dancing, praising Grandma Frasier's "glamor," and extolling Jasmine's sass.[77]

Come act 3, these white voices materialize and invade the Frasier house, performing the roles of named but unseen Black characters as Fleetwood's "denigrating racial stereotypes."[78] They then violently reshape the narrative to their whims, arbitrarily deciding that Keisha is pregnant, Dayton has put the family in debt, and Beverly is addicted to drugs.[79] These actions reify the Black bodies onstage, forcing the Frasiers into the limited representational possibilities presupposed by

Wallace. The white invaders' antics devolve into a food fight that "gives way to violence that feels more consequential."[80] This journey follows a common arc that Soyica Diggs Colbert catalogues wherein "quotidian and 'minor' forms of racism cultivate extreme and explicit manifestations of racial violence," but where "the connection goes unnoticed in a context of color blindness."[81]

Then abruptly, Keisha confronts the invaders. She forces Suze, who claims an affinity with Keisha, to name her whiteness.[82] Yearning to know what life would be like without white voyeurs controlling her, she wonders, "If I could ask the folks who call themselves white to come up here, do you think they would?"[83] At this point, "Keisha steps through the fourth wall" and invites white viewers to come stand onstage and be observed.[84] Once this act is complete, she turns her attention to the nonwhite spectators, stating, "I have been trying to talk to you. This whole time."[85] She looks for an original story to tell that is unburdened by white racial framing. She lands on one in which everyone present could look at the people around them and assess their struggles. She imagines:

> They took it all in.
> And in their estimation
> they found all of it,
> their view over all of it,
> the sum of it all,
> to be fair.[86]

The play's finale expands the conversation beyond representation to make racializing surveillance —and with it, racial spectatorship—seem strange. By quoting and reversing Fanon, Drury acknowledges that the white characters in the play go from exoticizing the Frasiers ("Look! A Negro!") to violently dehumanizing them ("Dirty [n-word]!"). But also, she presages the reversal of surveillance through sousveillance, a type of gaze that is "an active inversion of the power relations that surveillance entails."[87] It allows the powerless to watch the watcher and is epitomized by the swath of cell-phone videos capturing police violence against Black people.[88] By asking white spectators to stand onstage and be watched, Drury creates such an opportunity, allowing for a potential "Look! A White Person!" moment to ensue.

The act of white spectatorial participation is key to critiquing the white gaze. "Audience participatory performance," says Gareth White, "has among its building blocks—its media—the agency of the participant, and their point of view within the work."[89] *Fairview* manipulates both building blocks. First, the invitation to come onstage grants white spectators a new form of agency—the choice whether to move or to remain in their seats. Edwards disliked this choice, as it "offered nothing for People of Color to show their active participation."[90] But

this segregation seems designed to manipulate white spectators' perspectives within the event. Gareth White explains this idea through the concept of "keyed frames." In moments of spectatorial participation, spectators' actions "may resemble serious forms of behavior, but they are being played 'in a different key,'" which allows spectators to view those actions in a new light.[91] By allowing only white spectators to move and offering "nothing" to the nonwhite "Others" present, Drury makes white racial spectatorship seem "strange." With such a clear power imbalance made visible, white spectators are called upon to dissect their dominance within the theatre space. Then, by having Keisha directly address the People of Color in the audience rather than the white viewers who chose to move, Drury allows white spectators to feel what it is like to be decentered in the theatre. Drury states, "I thought it could be cathartic to create a space in which some audience members [whites] make themselves uncomfortable in order to try to make People of Color feel more comfortable."[92] This act is transgressive, seeking the progressive action Catanese describes.

But what is changed by this transgression? Can the residue of so much racial framing be stripped away once it is made strange? Jacques Rancière has shown that any production creates a "third thing" between artist and spectator—an experience devoid of clear ownership and not necessarily the artist's intent.[93] As such, unpacking the effects of racial affect, racial spectatorship, and racializing surveillance is a complex work that one production can never solve. And if it is not solved, does the residual habitus of white dominance take hold in some new way? How might attending multiple productions of *Fairview* open the discourse further and provide additional opportunities to theorize the role of race in spectatorship?

I witnessed three separate productions of *Fairview* throughout 2019: The revival of Soho Rep's world-premiere production, directed by Sarah Benson and choreographed by Raja Feather Kelly at the Polonsky Shakespeare Center in Brooklyn in June; a production at the Woolly Mammoth Theatre in Washington, DC, in September, directed by Stevie Walker-Webb; and the London premiere at the Young Vic, directed by Nadia Latif, in November. In each instance, I experienced my whiteness as strange in new ways, revealing new aspects of racial affect, racial spectatorship, and racializing surveillance. Since Keisha shared the physical space with spectators, how she addressed white spectators most explicitly cast whites in the play and denoted their connection to structural racism. I will therefore focus on Keisha's nonverbal choices during the invitation in the three productions.

Soho Rep developed *Fairview* for several years before presenting a sold-out run in their ninety-nine-seat space in 2018. In an interview with me, director Sarah Benson (who is white) explained how the creative team considered various experiences to give white spectators at the finale, including taking them out of the theatre or into an unseen part of the Frasiers's house. However, Drury and Ben-

son's team decided the finale should be "the strongest experience it could be for the People of Color in the audience and not for white people." The artists planned to "have the white people experience the hyper-visibility that People of Color are subjected to all the time" while refusing to manage their emotions.[94]

Several aspects of MaYaa Boateng's portrayal of Keisha during the Brooklyn revival demonstrated this intent. When the violent food fight concluded, reviewer Shane Breaux noted that "Boateng's voice shift[ed] to a different register from character and performance to actor and self," making it unclear if character, actor, or even playwright was speaking.[95] This amalgam of all three women recalls what Harvey Young terms *critical memory*: "The act of reflecting upon and sharing recollections of embodied Black experience." Critical memory is a key part of Black performance, for it "allows the Black body to be singular (Black) and variable at the same time."[96] Boateng's amalgamation showed the maddening reach of racializing surveillance on both the stage and the streets—whichever woman she was, Boateng had still felt the negative effects of surveillance. When she turned to the audience, her ambiguous subject position only intensified. The night I attended, I was one of the first white spectators to come onstage when she said, "Would it help if I told [white people] that the show is ending?"[97]

This line shook me personally, for it highlighted Bonilla-Silva's assertion that "all whites, whether consciously or not, participate in various ways in maintaining racial order" and "derive a degree of satisfaction from enforcing racial boundaries."[98] Countless cases document how whites seek to socially control Black people in public spaces. For example, on April 12, 2018, two Black men were arrested in a Philadelphia Starbucks for loitering while they awaited a third business partner for a meeting. By some reports, Starbucks employees called the police within two minutes of their arrival.[99] Boateng's mention that the show was ending was a reminder that the white gaze polices time just as much as space. Here, the sense of racial transgression started to take hold for me. While Boateng said it in a plain, matter-of-fact way, I did not know if she, Keisha, or Drury was speaking to me at that moment. I suddenly felt rushed (an unfamiliar feeling inside an auditorium). I was reminded of my morning walk to a former job at a nonprofit in Harlem, and how my gaze fell warily, even harshly, on the young Black men who seemed to "linger" on 125th Street. I wondered about the more subtle ways I have policed others/"Others" in my daily life.

White spectators may be unused to racial discomfort like what I started to feel and will often deploy tactics to escape it. Snyder-Young points out that "audience members at antiracist theatrical events can displace racism as elsewhere, positioning themselves as enlightened good white people in contrast to the imagined other bad, racist white people."[100] This is especially the case when participation is involved. Preston worries that plays that use participation to comment on race might "unintentionally reinforce racist tendencies in some [spectators]. And when audiences believe they are too savvy to allow that to happen, the plays might (equally

unintentionally) reinforce a liberal audience's belief that it is 'beyond' the racist logic of its culture."[101] By participating in *Fairview*'s role reversal, white spectators might feel they have proven they could not possibly be racist, and therefore distance themselves from any negative feelings the play elicits.

I admit I was tempted to feel this way. During act 2, the house lights rose slightly so viewers could search for the disembodied voices emanating from the crowd. Salamishah Tillet noticed "a lot of" white spectators "stopped laughing, got really quiet, and saw themselves in that conversation."[102] Suddenly visible, I felt a tacit challenge from the production: would I silently accept what the white characters said, or express my disdain for it? By participating in the finale, I felt I could present myself as an ally and deny that I shared the guilt of racializing surveillance with these white characters. But when I arrived onstage, I saw that Boateng's eyes stayed fixed on the auditorium, and particularly on the nonwhite spectators who remained in their seats. Her lack of attention toward me and the other white participants made me realize I wanted her to validate me as a "good white person." I thought then of Preston's concern and my personal sense of superiority deflated. Standing onstage and "performing" as an antiracist did not make me "beyond" the play's critique. Instead, true antiracism required a "serious commitment" from me. My presence onstage was merely a "performative rehearsal" for "life beyond the theatre" where I could "get out of the damn way" and thus prove myself ready to make space and listen.[103]

The Soho Rep production ultimately served as my baseline for the subsequent productions I witnessed. I spent the following days thinking about how much I'd wanted Boateng's validation and the work that I had ahead to be a true ally. I was eager to rethink my own racial framing and revisit some of my writings. I reread Preston's critique of my *Howlround* article and began rethinking a play I'd been writing about civil unrest. But my desire to act quickly faded. Seeing two other productions of *Fairview* in the next six months revealed my naïveté about how much I had grown from one night of theatre.

I will address the Young Vic production next, even though I saw it last. I do so because I feel it falls in the middle of a spectrum of invitations between the Soho Rep production and the Wooly Mammoth production, which I will address last. While I felt the Soho Rep production was indeed uninterested in my emotions, I thought the Young Vic production very much was concerned with my feelings.

When the time came for Donna Banya (Keisha) to address the audience, she jumped off the stage and into the house. When she dropped from the stage, Banya simultaneously dropped her American accent, resuming her British lilt. This act accomplished two things. First, it collapsed the space between the imagined America of *Fairview* and the real world of the British audience. The British scholar Michael Pearce (who is white) "felt slightly removed from identifying with/being identified as the white racists" due to "the characters' American accents."[104] His sense of geographical distance from the play exemplifies the illusion that white

theatre patrons are displaced from racism, and that "bad, racist white people" are located "in a geographic region they consider less enlightened."[105] Banya's transformation countered this assumption and brought focus to director Nadia Latif's goal of dismantling the affective violence seen on British stages: "If [Britons] continue to focus on racial violence as being the only form of racism that gains conversational or media mileage, then we will never begin to unpick the serious systemic racism that permeates every corner of the UK."[106] Speaking as a Black British woman *and* as a fictional American one, Banya's vocal shift suggested racism functioned similarly in the United States and Great Britain.

Additionally, Banya's shift mitigated the common racial response wherein white people view racial Others as threats.[107] White habitus teaches white people "how to fear bodies seen as different, dangerous, and inferior" and "derive emotional well-being from racial dominance."[108] Banya's first line after jumping off the stage was "Hi, white people." Suddenly outside the fourth wall, with a new accent, this line came across to me as humorous and disarming. Her joke acknowledged the audience's overwhelming whiteness but also minimized her supposed threat potential.[109]

Perhaps this was out of concern for participation. Gareth White points out that any invitation to spectators to participate in a play carries some amount of risk. To encourage participation, artists must mitigate this risk.[110] Civic practitioner Michael Rohd suggests that the implicit and explicit messages in a production should remove obstacles to spectators engaging actively as coauthors of a performance.[111] These facilitative practices coax viewers through three phases of engagement: a passive "watching phase," a "choosing phase" in which they agree to participate, and a "doing phase" where participation occurs.[112] When constructing moments of spectator participation, Rohd encourages artists to be facilitators who "welcome [spectators], engage them, and sneak the show up on them."[113] Banya seemed to follow these steps, using this humorous "Hi, white people" to ease white viewers into the "choosing phase" of the event.

To encourage white spectators to choose, Banya and Latif may have considered their racial discomfort. Robin DiAngelo coined the term *white fragility* to refer to a state in which "the smallest amount of racial stress becomes intolerable [for white people]…trigger[ing] a range of defensive responses" that "work to reinstate white racial equilibrium."[114] White fragility permeates discussions of *Fairview*. It has received numerous negative reviews from white journalists, many tinged with such racial grievances.[115] Even positive reviews acknowledge white fragility. Ben Brantley, for instance, dubbed the Soho Rep production's climax a "systematically arranged ambush" and warned white spectators that they would "wind up questioning your basic right to sit there."[116] I wondered, "Was Banya coddling the white spectators to minimize the effects of white fragility and prepare them for the racial discomfort *Fairview* requires?"

If so, her softer, more humorous portrayal serves as example of how much weight is placed on the shoulders of Black performance. Tavia Nyong'o questions if Black performance can "live up to the demand that it repair and make good the hard feelings" that white spectators feel "when forced to confront the traumatic origins of their own enjoyment of, and possessive investment in, whiteness." He laments how contemporary theatre is "saturated with racial minefields that are so often left to Black theater artists alone to navigate."[117] Banya's approach did not challenge this tendency. Naomi Obeng, one of the few Black reviewers of the production, worried it possibly left room for spectators to think they were "beyond" being part of the problem: "[White people are] just standing on a stage, which is Not the hard work or how it feels and i hope nobody comes away feeling great for going up some stairs" [caps in original].[118] Banya's invitation might have accidentally told "the very People of Color whose lived experience and perspective the play represents that the event is not for them – it is for the consumption and benefit of the white audience."[119]

This is not to say this production was not affecting. Indeed, if one goal of the show was for white people to "make space for someone else for a minute,"[120] then Banya particularly exemplified this in a small unscripted moment. Shortly after Banya hopped offstage that night, an older gentleman seated a few rows in front of her began to weep. He appeared to be Black, although I cannot confirm his racial identity. Banya paused ever so briefly to look at the man and nod in recognition. "I see you," that nod said. "I value you."

Kondo speaks of reparative creativity—"the ways artists make, unmake, remake race in their creative processes, in acts of always partial integration and repair"—as a useful tool in remaking the world.[121] Banya applied such reparative creativity in this moment to remake the space into one where this man's emotions could be honored and (potentially) partially repaired. Bonilla-Silva explains how People of Color must control their emotions around white people.[122] By recognizing this man for not controlling his emotions, Banya removed the crazy-making component of racial spectatorship that labels nonwhite spectators as "too emotional." Instead, the man could experience his feelings and the entire theatre "made space." I could not help but marvel at that modest demonstration of empathy. I wondered in that moment whether I could learn more about my racial framings by making that sort of space rather than by standing onstage. Looking back, I understand now that the two activities are not counter to each other. Both unpack white supremacy culture in different ways. Indeed, they point to the myriad avenues through which artists can promote reparative creativity. That is worth further study another day.

In any case, I was soon focused elsewhere. When I came onstage at the Young Vic, I chose to sit on the couch. My choice seemed so overtly casual that I was hyperaware of it. I worried what others onstage thought of me for seeming so

comfortable in my actions in this discomfiting moment. I believe that dread is related to my experience at the Woolly Mammoth production in Washington, DC, two months earlier. Unlike the other productions, I left that production feeling decidedly skeptical about the prospects of ending the affective violence of contemporary white spectatorship. This was due to how the production handled the final moment of the play.

When Keisha, played this time by Chinna Palmer, turned to face the house, Edwards reported she "meekly invited' whites onstage, "promising the play is almost over."[123] Carpenter used the verb *implore* to describe Palmer's action.[124] In my experience, this suggested that asking white spectators to vacate their seats was a social transgression. Then came Keisha's story to the nonwhite spectators, and the final word of the play: *fair*. Boateng and Banya had both delivered this word calmly, perhaps with a sense of aspiration that everyone's experiences could one day be equitably compared. At Woolly Mammoth, however, it was more complicated. In an interview with me, director Stevie Walker-Webb shared the difficulty he and Palmer had interpreting this moment.

> We kept coming back to, "Is it an indictment? Is it a question? Is it a challenge? Is it a call to action? Is it a keening of the spirit?" I told [Palmer] to make that decision every night. I think that's how we got to peace—how she got to peace. Make that decision every night.[125]

The night I attended, Palmer stood just in front of the apron, addressing the nonwhite spectators before her. Then she turned to the stage, looked at us white participants, her lip quivering, tears sliding down her face, and screamed, "Fair!" That scream commented on how, to quote Walker-Webb, "'Fair' is this carrot that's constantly being dangled" in front of Black people.[126] It reminded me how often (white) spectators, according to Helena Grehan, "leave the space and enjoy a Chardonnay, feeling as if they [had] actually done something by attending."[127] Carpenter confirmed this phenomenon when she heard "the clusters of spontaneous post-show conversations" at "the closest Starbucks and neighboring gelato shop."[128] This Keisha harbored no illusions that white viewers would take any responsibility despite the immense power they were implied to have. Instead, she anticipated the passive empathy of white spectators,[129] and how, "at worst, antiracist theatrical events support oppressive systems of power" by "reinforcing the dominance of affluent, educated whites."[130]

I cannot possibly conclude the other performers of Keisha felt no rage as they delivered this final monologue. But Palmer's more explicit display revealed two paradoxes. First was the paradox of Black rage itself. Bonilla-Silva has catalogued the ways Black women's emotions are denounced and therefore suppressed.[131] Palmer's "meek" invitation suggested she knew showing her emo-

tion in public would normally be coded for discipline. But Black rage is also productive. Colbert suggests Black rage necessarily "returns again and again" as it "combats invisible and routine forms of racism" that lead to extreme racial violence.[132] Audre Lorde claims that Black rage helps Black people "identify who are our allies with whom we may have grave differences, and who are our genuine enemies."[133] The next time I visited Woolly Mammoth, I heard two white viewers reflect on their experience at *Fairview* and claim to have been vilified. I wondered whether Palmer's journey from meekness to rage had done its job and effectively scrutinized "enemies" amongst potential "allies."

The second paradox I noticed was "of seeking validation from structures generating [racial] marginalization, thereby reinforcing that system of recognition."[134] Since *Fairview*'s dramatic turn requires white spectators to be present and participate, it still centers whiteness to some degree. Black critiques of the play repeatedly hit on this fact even while offering praise. Carpenter, who "really liked the play's last moments," found that "the breadth of this play was not meant for [her]" as a Black woman.[135] Tillet "felt like [she] was a 'prop' who suddenly had to perform racial solidarity in [the finale]" and noted that ultimately, "the Black gaze on white people means something different than the white gaze on Black people."[136] Obeng found herself "resisting feeling like [she] need[ed] to congratulate the white people for stepping up. what the actual fuck. where does it come from? this 'well done you'?"[137] Edwards "sat relatively close to the middle of [his] row and when the white audience members went up to the stage, they had to pass [him], a Person of Color. This required [him] to get up and make way for these now active white participants,"[138] reversing Breaux's notion of "getting out of the damn way."

If the play is this frustrating to many Black scholars, perhaps Palmer's rage as Keisha is (partially) directed at *Fairview*'s inherent conundrum. It has garnered top accolades and infiltrated the white spaces it means to critique, but it simultaneously works within that white structure. Walker-Webb says,

> [White] institutions and spaces say this play that talks to white audiences directly is worthy of the highest prize for dramatic literature. Where's the play that's made by Mexican people, Black people, Asian people, Indigenous people? The play that's made by them and for them and is given to them will never be seen and is not even up for consideration by anyone for anything.[139]

While Drury is trying to speak to nonwhite spectators, Walker-Webb illuminates how hard that is to do inside a predominately white space. Is the play a failure? Are its own boundaries too limiting, or are they somehow malleable? Can a production of *Fairview* challenge whiteness without permanently centering it?

Sitting on the couch on the Young Vic set, I wrestled with these paradoxes

and questioned whether my journey had been truly productive. Had I grown as a spectator? Or was the residue of my white privilege emerging in new ways, either by forcing me into navel-gazing or inoculating me from discomfort? Regarding the crying man, had I really held space for him? Or was the crying man just an example of how I was, to quote Edwards, "still able to find Black spectacles" for my entertainment?[140] I had seen this remarkable play performed three times, using three drastically different invitations to move white spectators onstage, eliciting three equally valid and enthralling responses from me. But if whiteness is centered, is racial transgression possible?

I must emphasize the subjective nature of my experiences. They are wrapped up in multiple contexts—geographic, demographic, historical. I have mentioned some variant reactions to *Fairview*, and many more exist. What I found compellingly estranged me from my whiteness might have been seen as commonplace or offensive to others. As the reviews I have quoted attest, the play produces ambivalence in people regardless of race. Racial identity is also extremely complicated and often deceiving, which can lead to misunderstandings about who should come onstage in *Fairview*.

Dramaturgical strategies are also not limited to the ones employed in *Fairview*. Woolly Mammoth followed its production of *Fairview* with the Movement Theatre Company's production of *What to Send up When It Goes Down* by Aleshea Harris. This play ended by dividing Black and non-Black spectators. Non-Black viewers left the theatre and were read a note from Harris. "As a Black woman and writer," she said, "I am uniquely positioned to create a piece of theatre focused on making space for Black people." She then challenged everyone present to "consider what *you* are uniquely positioned to offer."[141] Artistic director Maria Manuela Goyanes intended these two plays to comprise a single experience for Woolly Mammoth patrons, inspiring them to think deeper about their role in systems of oppression.[142] Pairing these plays suggests there are many ways to address the white gaze in white-dominated spaces.

I am grateful to Drury for writing this play and for the lessons it has taught me about my own racial framings and the limits of what theatre can and perhaps cannot accomplish. My journey with *Fairview* has shown me personal growth is incremental but also reversible. This fact leads me to two closing remarks. First, the complexities of racial affect, racializing surveillance, and racial spectatorship persist, and they are worth further study. So too are the various intervention strategies being tested in the work of other antiracist artists like Drury. Scholars like Browne, Carpenter, Catanese, and Fleetwood have laid important foundations, but in the future other scholars can further analyze how acting, directing, dramaturgy, and design each factor into this work.

Second, the work of dismantling the white gaze must be white people's responsibility. This article is one attempt to do that work. I offer it forward not to congratulate or absolve myself, but to outline the challenges ahead. Becoming

better white allies is paradoxical and unfortunately will probably involve some missteps from every white person. Real change is nebulous, as any antiracist action may quickly be subsumed or lose its potency. But I contend that the surest way forward is to continue to challenge the biases and power of white positionality in as many spaces as possible. Like a theatrical performance, this action must be repeated numerous times, always with a critical eye. And unlike a performance, the work doesn't end when the house lights come up.

Notes

1. Other plays include *The White Card* by Claudia Rankine, *What to Send Up When It Goes Down* by Aleshea Harris, *Slave Play* by Jeremy O. Harris, and *An Octoroon* by Branden Jacobs-Jenkins.

2. Simone Browne, *Dark Matters: On the Surveillance of Blackness* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 16. Drury cites Browne in Alexis Soloski, "In This Play about Race, 'People Need to Be Uncomfortable,'" *New York Times*, July 6, 2018.

3. Dorinne Kondo, *Worldmaking: Race, Performance, and the Work of Creativity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018), 36.

4. Jackie Sibblies Drury, *Fairview* (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 2019), 102.

5. Tavia Nyong'o, "So Far Down You Can't See the Light: Afro-Fabulation in Branden Jacobs-Jenkins's An Octoroon," in *Race and Performance after Repetition*, ed. Soyica Diggs Colbert, Douglas A. Jones Jr., and Shane Vogel (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2020), 31.

6. Faedra Chatard Carpenter, "Reading and (Re)Directing 'Racial Scripts' on and beyond the Stage," in *The Routledge Companion to Dramaturgy*, ed. Magda Romanska (London: Routledge, 2014), 145.

7. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. 5th ed. (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018), 36.

8. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 18–21.

9. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 11.

10. Drury, *Fairview*, 103.

11. Liz Appel, "Theater Is Coded as a White Space—Jackie Sibblies Drury Is Changing That," *Vogue*, June 5, 2019.

12. Faedra Chatard Carpenter, "Performance Review: Fairview," *Theatre Journal* 72, no. 3 (2020): 369.

13. Carpenter, "Reading and (Re)Directing 'Racial Scripts,'" 146.

14. For other critiques of the play, see Ben Brantley, "Theater as Sabotage in the Dazzling 'Fairview,'" *New York Times*, June 17, 2018; Shane Breaux, "Seeking a Fairer View: Smashing Theatrical Mirrors in Contemporary Black Drama," *Performing Arts Journal* 125 (2020): 75–87; Carpenter, "Performance Review;" Paul J. Edwards, "Catering to White Audiences: Fairview at Woolly Mammoth," *TDR: The Drama Review* 65, no. 2 (2021); Jesse Green and Salamishah Tillet, "'Fairview': Watching a Play in Black and White," *New York Times*, August 7, 2019; Naomi Obeng, "Review: Fairview at Young Vic," *Exeunt Magazine*, January 27, 2020; and Michael Pearce, "Making Whiteness Visible and Felt in Fairview," *Humanities* 10, no. 81 (2021): 1–16.

15. D. Soyini Madison, *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance*. 3rd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2019), 8.

16. See Carrie J. Preston, "Hissing, Bidding, and Lynching: Participation in Branden Jacobs-Jenkins's An Octoroon and the Melodramatics of American Racism," *TDR: The Drama Review* 62, no. 4 (2018): 73, and Damon Krometis, "The Dissonance of An Octoroon." *HowlRound*, April 17, 2016.

17. See Carpenter, "Performance Review;" Edwards, "Catering to White Audiences"; Green and Tillet, "'Fairview'"; and Obeng, "Fairview at Young Vic."

18. Dani Snyder-Young, *Privileged Spectatorship: Theatrical Interventions in White Supremacy* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2020), 42.

19. See Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 17–22. Her observations focus primarily on Bruce Norris and Tracy Letts. Further study can be devoted to the white artists who might successfully avoid these discourses.

20. National Endowment for the Arts, *A Decade of Arts Engagement: Finding from the Survey of Public Participation in the Arts, 2002–2012*, (Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts, 2015), 12.

21. See Pearce, "Making Whiteness Visible and Felt," 4–5.

22. Brandi Wilkins Catanese, *The Problem of the Color[Blind]: Racial Transgression and the Politics of Black Performance* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014), 14.

23. Kondo, *Worldmaking, 36.*

24. Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists*, 9. Kondo pulls from this concept to speak specifically to theatre as a site of ideological affirmation. See Kondo, *Worldmaking*, *11.*

25. Colin Patrick Ashley and Michelle Billies, "Affect & Race/(Blackness)," *Athenea Digital* 20, no. 2 (2020): 8.

26. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 15.

27. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 11

28. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 19–20.

29. Shane Breaux, "Seeking a Fairer View: Smashing Theatrical Mirrors in Contemporary Black Drama," *Performing Arts Journal* 125 (2020): 76.

30. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, "Feeling Race: Theorizing the Racial Economy of Emotions," *American Sociological Review* 84, no. 1 (2019): 8–9.

31. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 36.

32. Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists*, 96.

33. Carpenter, "Reading and (Re)Directing 'Racial Scripts,'" 149.

34. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 37.

35. Browne, *Dark Matters*, 16. Internal quote comes from John Fiske, "Surveilling the City: Whiteness, the Black Man and Democratic Totalitarianism," *Theory, Culture and Society* 15, no. 2 (1998): 81.

36. Joe Feagin, *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 15.

37. Maurice O. Wallace, *Constructing the Black Masculine: Identity and Ideality in African American Men's Literature and Culture, 1775–1995* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), 135.

38. Johnson, *Appropriating Blackness*, 4.

39. Browne, *Dark Matters*, 17.

40. Nicole R. Fleetwood, *Troubling Vision: Performance, Visuality, and Blackness* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 13.

41. Fleetwood, *Troubling Vision*, 5–6.

42. Harvey Young, *Embodying Black Experience: Stillness, Critical Memory, and the Black Body* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010): 7, 12.

43. Fleetwood, *Troubling Vision*, 16.

44. Lisa Lowe, *Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 39.

45. Lowe, *Intimacies of Four Continents*, 39.

46. George Lipsitz, *How Racism Takes Place* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011), 13.

47. Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists*, 10.

48. In writing this paper, I had to control for my own instinct to assume much of the audience was white. Early drafts of this paper addressed white spectators as we, since I speak from that position. But *we* carried over regularly into race-neutral discussions of the audience, revealing a subtle bias.

49. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 19.

50. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 18.

51. Kondo, *Worldmaking*. 19.

52. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 20.

53. Marvin Carlson, *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre as Memory Machine* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001), 5.

54. Snyder-Young, *Privileged Spectatorship*, 17.

55. Lowe, *Intimacies of Four Continents*, 20.

56. Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists*, 121.

57. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Richard Philcox (New York: Grove Press, 2008), 90.

58. Fleetwood, *Troubling Vision*, 13. Fleetwood borrows "negative differentiation" from Irit Rogoff, "Other's Others." In *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*, ed. Teresa Brennan and Martin Jay (New York: Routledge, 1996), 187–202, and is influenced by Elizabeth Cowie, "Woman as Sign," *M/F* 1 (1978): 49–64.

59. Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, 89–90.
60. Faedra Chatard Carpenter, *Coloring Whiteness: Acts of Critique in Black Performance* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014), 3.
61. Carpenter, *Coloring Whiteness*, 7.
62. Catanese, *Problem of the Color[Blind]*, 21.
63. Soloski, "In This Play about Race."
64. Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, 89.
65. Fleetwood, *Troubling Vision*, 22–23.
66. Drury, *Fairview*, 6.
67. Drury, *Fairview*, 5.
68. Drury, *Fairview*, 23.
69. Edwards, "Catering to White Audiences," 177.
70. Drury, *Fairview*, 22.
71. Fleetwood, *Troubling Vision*, 14–15.
72. Drury, *Fairview*, 27.
73. Drury, *Fairview*, 5.
74. Drury, *Fairview*, 45.
75. Drury, *Fairview*, 51.
76. Patricia Turner, *Ceramic Uncles and Celluloid Mammies: Black Images and Their Influences on Culture* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1994), 73. Simone Browne connects the Mammy stereotype to social control. See Browne, *Dark Matters*, 57–58.
77. Drury, *Fairview*, 58, 66.
78. Fleetwood, *Troubling Vision*, 13.
79. Drury, *Fairview*, 90-1.
80. Drury, *Fairview*, 98.
81. Soyica Diggs Colbert, "Black Rage: On Cultivating Black National Belonging," *Theatre Survey* 57, no 3 (2016): 338.
82. Drury, *Fairview*, 101.
83. Drury, *Fairview*, 101.
84. Drury, *Fairview*, 102.
85. Drury, *Fairview*, 103.
86. Drury, *Fairview*, 106.
87. Browne gets this concept from Steve Mann, "Veilance and Reciprocal Transparency: Surveillance versus Sousveillance, AR Glass, Lifelogging and Wearable Computing" (presentation, 2013 International IEEE International Symposium on Technology and Society (ISTAS): Social Implications of Wearable Computing and Augmediated Reality in Everyday Life, Toronto, ON, June 27-29, 2013): i-xii.
88. The instances of this are numerable but include Darnella Frazier's video capturing the death of George Floyd on May 25, 2020, Diamond Lavish Reynold's video of boyfriend Philando Castile dying beside her on July 6, 2016, and Stop the Killing Inc.'s capturing of Alton Sterling's death on July 5, 2016.
89. Gareth White, *Audience Participation in Theatre: Aesthetics of the Invitation* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 26.
90. Edwards, "Catering to White Audiences," 176.
91. White, *Audience Participation in Theatre*, 36. White gets the concept of "keyed frames" from Erving Goffman, *Frame Analysis* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1986).
92. Appel, "Theater Is Coded as a White Space."
93. Jacques Rancière, *The Emancipated Spectator*, trans. Gregory Elliott. (New York: Verso, 2011), 15.
94. Sarah Benson, "Interview with Sarah Benson," August 28, 2019, audio, 19:25.
95. Breaux, "Seeking a Fairer View," 85.
96. Young, *Embodying Black Experience*, 18–20.
97. Drury, *Fairview*, 102.
98. Bonilla-Silva, "Feeling Race," 10.
99. Hayley Miller, "Black Men Arrested at Starbucks Said They Were There for 2 Minutes before 911 Call," Huffington Post, April 19, 2018, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/black-men-speak-out-starbucks-arrest_n_5ad8809fe4b0e4d0715dc393.
100. Snyder-Young, *Privileged Spectatorship*, 22. Shannon Sullivan coins the term *good White people* in *Good White People: The Problem with Middle-Class White Anti-Racism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2014).

101. Preston, "Hissing, Bidding, and Lynching," 78.
102. Green and Tillet, "'Fairview.'"
103. Breaux, "Seeking a Fairer View," 85.
104. Pearce, "Making Whiteness Visible and Felt," 7.
105. Snyder-Young, *Privileged Spectatorship*, 22.
106. *Fairview Program* (London: Young Vic, 2019), 7.
107. George Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*, 20th anniversary ed. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2018), xxvii.
108. Bonilla-Silva, "Feeling Race," 7.
109. Pearce, "Making Whiteness Visible and Felt," 4-5.
110. White, *Audience Participation in Theatre*, 78.
111. Michael Rohd, "Artist Notebook: Civic Participation," *Theater* 43, no. 3 (2013): 30.
112. Rebecca Novick, "Intrinsic Impact: Interview with Michael Rohd," *HowlRound*, March 8, 2012, https://howlround.com/interview-michael-rohd.
113. Rohd, "Artist Notebook," 31.
114. DiAngelo, *White Fragility*, 2.
115. Pearce, "Making Whiteness Visible and Felt," 10–11.
116. Brantley, "Theater as Sabotage."
117. Nyong'o, "So Far Down You Can't See the Light," 30–31.
118. Obeng, "Fairview at Young Vic"; capitalization of *Not* in original.
119. Snyder-Young, *Privileged Spectatorship*, 44.
120. Drury, *Fairview*, 103.
121. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 5, 210.
122. Bonilla-Silva, "Feeling Race," 10.
123. Edwards, "Catering to White Audiences," 175.
124. Carpenter, "Performance Review," 368.
125. Stevie Walker-Webb, "Interview with Stevie Walker-Webb," March 24, 2022, audio, 14:51.
126. Walker-Webb, "Interview with Stevie Walker-Webb," 14:30.
127. Helena Grehan, *Performance, Ethics and Spectatorship in a Global Age* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009), 6.
128. Carpenter, "Performance Review," 369.
129. Bonilla-Silva, "Feeling Race," 16.
130. Snyder-Young, *Privileged Spectatorship*, 20.
131. Bonilla-Silva, "Feeling Race," 6, 10.
132. Colbert, "Black Rage," 338.
133. Audre Lorde, "The Uses of Anger: Women Responding to Racism," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (1981): 7–10.
134. Kondo, *Worldmaking*, 37.
135. Carpenter, "Performance Review," 369.
136. Green and Tillet, "'Fairview.'"
137. Obeng, "Fairview at Young Vic."
138. Edwards, "Catering to White Audiences," 176.
139. Walker-Webb, "Interview with Stevie Walker-Webb," 26:24.
140. Edwards, "Catering to White Audiences," 178.
141. Aleshea Harris, *What to Send up When If Goes Down* (New York: Samuel French, 2019), 63–64; emphasis in original.
142. Maria Manuela Goyanes, "Interview with Maria Manuela Goyanes," July 21, 2020, audio.