2. Making Things Public and Private

The Affective Co-Production of the Political Sphere

What constitutes a public? How does it come into being? How is it related to the private? Who belongs to the public and who does not? And how do different publics distinguish themselves from each other? Questions about the formation and effects of publics have always been a major concern in political theory. In this chapter, we provide a perspective on the role of affective and emotional dynamics for the constitution of public spheres. We propose that affect and emotions are integral parts of the formation, reformation and transformation of publics – an idea that consequently cross-cuts sharp oppositions between public and private.

In his widely recognized work on the constitution of publics, Jürgen Habermas (1989 [1962]) conceptualizes the bourgeois public sphere as a collective medium which operates at the interstices of official political representation and private persons' individual articulations. Habermas does not presuppose a direct opposition between the *oikos* and the *polis* as it is known from Greek political thought (see Arendt 1958: 22-78) but argues that the public emerges out of the private: historically, the bourgeois public sphere comes into being through persons meeting in coffeehouses and salons to engage in rational-critical debate about political issues. As a result of technological progress in printing and the more widespread distribution and circulation of newspapers and books, "the public of the now emerging public sphere of civil society" emerged that "from the outset was a reading public" and "the abstract counterpart of public authority" (Habermas 1989: 23). While public political power had previously been centred and embodied in the person of the monarch, the emergence of the public sphere created a space in which the bourgeoisie could develop an independent understanding of itself and defend its political interests. Habermas is interested in the emergence of the bourgeois public sphere in the 18 th century because he observes an erosion of critical publics in late modernity. His aim is to identify ways of re-conceiving a critical public (in his case in the 1960s) and his theory of communicative action is based on the premise

that an autonomous bourgeois public sphere of the classical kind does no longer exist.

This normative dimension of Habermas' concept of the public sphere has provoked criticism. The feminist philosopher Nancy Fraser, for instance, questioned the implicit exclusion of marginalized perspectives in Habermas' model of the public. Thus, she especially criticizes his ideal of the public sphere as "an arena in which interlocutors would set aside such characteristics as differences in birth and fortune and speak to one another as if they were social and economic peers" (Fraser 1990: 63). For Fraser, such an abstraction is a-political, because the "social inequalities among the interlocutors were not eliminated, but only bracketed" (ibid.). The political would instead emerge in moments when the hegemonic discourse and its suppression of difference are challenged. As soon as one brings the question of social position as well as women's and working-class men's 'private' life into play, it becomes visible that the emergence of several subaltern counterpublics (Fraser 1990: 67) is a characteristic feature of the formation of a political public. According to Fraser, Habermas' ideal has one important limit: there is not one but many public spheres.

The literary scholar Michael Warner (Warner 2002) has built on this criticism from a queer perspective. He shows that public spheres do not only come into being by a common interest or collectively articulated concern but ultimately depend on the performance of social identities, including various forms of embodiment and mediated repertoires of action and interpretation. Thus, Warner moves beyond a mere understanding of a public as discursive arena and considers the basic of affective dynamics and emotional repertoires to the constitution of (queer) publics.

We take this debate on the formation of political publics and the realm of the public sphere in political theory as a starting point for this chapter. If one follows Fraser's idea of counterpublics and Warner's plea for the role of affect and emotions in constructing publics, one can see that there is a tendency to locate emotions and affectivity on the side of subaltern, marginalized or alternative publics. It would seem as if hegemonic publics would not require affect and emotions to maintain themselves. In this chapter we will not follow these distinctions from the outset but refer to materials from our diverse research contexts such as scientific knowledge production, legal processes at court, public discourse on religious feelings, documentary media practices in indigenous communities or theatrical explorations of migration history. We want to discuss more broadly how personal and public concerns interact on an affective level. Moving beyond a mere focus on subaltern counterpublics, we want to question the premise that it is only these marginalized forms of public that rely on the circulation of emotions and are

characterized by a high degree of affectivity. Rather, this chapter highlights that the affective and the rational are co-constitutive for the emergence of intimate and public spheres.

ORDINARY POLITICAL AFFECT IN NEW URBAN 'INDIGENOUS' DOCUMENTARY CINEMA

In Mexico, there is a lively scene of young independent filmmakers who come from communities that, in the Mexican national context, are considered 'indigenous' – a term that refers to descendants of the original inhabitants of the Americas before the arrival of the European colonialists. One of them is María Arias from the rural metropolis San Cristóbal de las Casas in Chiapas. Although she speaks Tsotsil and associates herself with the Tsotsil-Maya and Tseltal-Maya speaking communities of the region, she, like many of her colleagues, is not always comfortable with the label 'indigenous filmmaker', since she feels it to be a racializing, homogenizing and stigmatizing category that is imposed on her from the outside.

Figure 1. Still photo of María Arias' film Tote – Grandfather. The filmmaker María appears herself as a protagonist in her film, here (photo) while having conversations with her grandfather. Image: María Arias.

In many ways, Arias belongs to a new scene of urban filmmakers that was preceded by an earlier local documentary and media activists' movement. It was in the early 90s that indigenous community activists from the rural region around the city began to produce documentary video. During the armed Zapatista revolt of

1994 and later on, those videos played a crucial role in bringing local perspectives in Chiapas to the political fore.[1] The very activists themselves conceptualized video as a political weapon to articulate community demands, to gain visibility, and to denounce structural racism, exploitation, violence and violations of citizen rights of indigenous people (Gledhill 2012). The video-makers referred to themselves as videoastas comunitarios (engl. community filmmakers) and produced with and on behalf of their community and its political organisations (Halkin 2006; Jiménez Pérez/Köhler 2012; Wortham 2013; Leyva Solano/Köhler 2017). It seems that those emotionally charged films were made in order to generate and disseminate political affect (Ahmed 2004). Examples are the films by Mariano Estrada and José Alfredo Jiménez, which portray political marches of indigenous people demonstrating for their citizen rights, or communities massacred by paramilitary pro-governmental groups.

Since about 2010, however, a new generation of young urban university educated independent filmmakers with middle class backgrounds has emerged in San Cristóbal de las Casas. They distinguish themselves from the former classic political media activists, and one would associate their films more with the independent documentary art scene than with the struggles of distinct anti-hegemonic political activists. María Arias' films, for instance, tell first and foremost highly personal and intimate stories. They portray community life and cosmology, traditions, feasts, local medicine and healers, traditional music, and important protagonists of a community. The way these ordinary events are aesthetically presented makes it possible to present highly relevant political perspectives locally and nationally, told through the circumstances of people like María and her family (John 2016). In this way, the filmmakers touch upon feelings and politics of social inclusion and exclusion. Racism and marginalization, as well as the resistance against it, are implicit key motives in many of the local filmmakers' works, although these issues are often embedded in a wider narrative telling an ordinary story. Thus, one can say that these works, while dealing with the ordinary, negotiate affective politics of belonging and indigeneity.

1 In 1994 the Zapatista uprising took place in Chiapas. The indigenous Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) took over five important district cities in Chiapas and other smaller towns of the region. After 12 days of fighting peace talks began and the demands of the EZLN were negotiated. The social Zapatista movement and its militant organisation the EZLN are still active, however, since the rebellion of 1994 not actively involved in armed struggles. The Mexican government militarised the region heavily and initiated a so-called low-intensity war (Gledhill 2012) against those communities sympathising with the Zapatista movement (Speed 2007, Leyva Solano 2017).

Another current tendency is to produce films on issues of migration and the new urban indigenous life-worlds in the city. The filmmakers apply "affective media practices" (Kummels/John forthcoming) to intervene in and transform the affective atmosphere of the urban environment and the feelings of indigenous people in the city. At the same time, they also aim to impact the affective relationship that people in the rural communities have with their own cultural difference and its stigmatization in the national context where they are often treated inferior by the Ladino society.[2] Taking the new urban documentary scene in southern Mexico as a case study, we argue that the presentation of affective local atmospheres can open up a public sphere in a deeply political manner by making visible "ordinary affect" (Stewart 2007). Very intimate emotions and even banalities of a day-to-day life can be linked to political ideologies and political regimes of power, inclusion and exclusion.

Several of the urban independent filmmakers have recently produced autobiographic films, such as María Arias, thematising the issue of a manifold and contested belonging: both to an ethnic community and to an urban social sphere. María Arias highlights that she wants to represent indigenous protagonists in an assertive and dignified manner, and that she considers it an important political statement that she produces most of her films in indigenous languages:

> [...] we started to be conscious about what aspects we want to show and which things we do not want to portray. No longer we want to show dirty faces, poor barefoot people, no longer we want to show that, because this image has damaged us, this generated prejudices against us, no? Well, no longer… Now, we want to represent other things, we want to re-appreciate our communities through the 'image', and I believe one can see that in our works, well, at least we are trying to achieve that. (Interview conducted and translated by Thomas John, Mexico 2017.)

Taking into consideration the national context of misrepresentation of ethnic minorities in Mexico (Leyva Solano 2005; López Caballero 2009, 2016; Gleizer/López Caballero 2015), we can consider María Arias's simple and ordinary but dignified and aesthetically appealing images of protagonists belonging to ethnic minorities an affective political statement.

2 The latter are usually called mestizos (Engl. mixed person) in Mexico. The national society defines itself ideologically as "la raza Mexicana" (Engl. the Mexican race) which is constituted by mestizos, meaning people descending from the mix between former European settlers and the pre-Colombian original multi-ethnic population (López Cabellero 2009: 176).

For instance, her work *Tote* (Grandfather) is on the surface a film about her grandfather and his way of life. But at the same time, the film is about the encounter between María and her grandfather, and ultimately about herself and her feelings within the family context and her wider social environment. The film starts with an intro-sequence of María driving a car through the city, leaving the city, and driving at bumpy roads of the countryside, to end up at the farm of her grandfather. This sequence is continuously shot with an over-the-shoulder shot, which evokes a subjective perspective. Meanwhile we hear her speaking in voice-off. She tells us that she does not really feel that she belongs to the city, even though she lived there the longest period of her life. She narrates that she was born in the Tsotsil community Chenalhó and still considers herself as a part of it. However, her parents decided to send her to the city at the age of eleven to live there with her uncles, to be able to visit the school in the city and learn about the way of life of the city, since they thought this is better for her. Her parents did also educate María and her siblings in Spanish, and María learned Tsotsil on the streets and in school from other kids, but not at home with her family:

> I never understood why my parents did not speak Tsotsil with me. Since both of them are Tsotsil and since we grew up in a Tsotsil community, why did they prefer to speak Spanish with me? I'm trying to comprehend, that this was a result from a lot of discrimination which they suffered while learning Spanish themselves. It was an act of love to decide not to speak Tsotsil with us. They did not want us to suffer what they have suffered. They wanted us to learn proper Spanish. They wanted to get us out of the community, so we could grow up in the city. To my own daughters I speak in Tsotsil. In Tsotsil. I think this is the only way we can still feel as a part of the community. If we stop one day to speak Tsotsil, we would be totally alien and strange at that place (quoted and translated from Spanish from the film *Tote – Grandfather*)

María reflects those circumstances critically, while also trying to understand the behaviour of her parents. She mentions further details that help the audience to grasp her subjective perception of a contested belonging: The people of the rural community and even her own relatives would not really consider her a part of the community, since she does not know many things of the community and because she does not behave like a 'proper woman' of the community.

She stayed with her grandfather for ten days, accompanied by her small film-team consisting of a cameraman and a sound recordist. In her film she appears often next to her grandfather in front of the camera. María asks him about his childhood and youth. It turns out that life back then was not easy. He had to work under hard conditions, and he also mentions how he and his family were exposed

to forced labour, and to the violence and arbitrariness of the ladino farmers and big landowners. María explained in a conversation why it is so important for her, against the backdrop of the Mexican national and societal context, to represent protagonists like her grandfather and make their perspectives visible:

> [...] I think that the local [film] production is really important to crush stereotypes, because certainly there are stereotypes about us and the indigenous communities. We know that yet. It is what we have seen in television, in soap operas and films: always it is the 'Indigenous', "the Indio", who does not know how to talk correctly, who doesn't know to… who walks and moves different, who looks different, dresses up different, who is moreover totally dirty. This is the common image of the 'Indigenous', and the indigenous women are in television always something… like for example servants, like this we see them in television, and in films, that is the stereotype! (Interview conducted and translated by Thomas John, Mexico 2017.)

Tote describes the daily routine and the rural life world of María's grandfather. It is slowly edited, with long contemplative shots. We see her grandfather working the cornfields, herding his cows, and María having casual conversations about life, the past, partnership, love, marriage, education, the family, and the daily routine at the farm. She is getting to know her grandfather, who is not dirty, not a servant, but working his land, harvesting, looking after his cows and bulls. In his conversation with María, he explains that he definitely prefers this life and that he would not like to live in the city. He is depicted by María as a counterpart to the stereotype she referred to in the above quotation in which she speaks of her perception of the mass media's representation of the "indio" (engl. Indian).

For the greater part of the film María shows her grandfather at work on his farm. We also see María's step grandmother working with him, we see her preparing food on the open fire in the kitchen, and how she shows to the "city girl" how to hand-bake tortilla bread. Cinematographically, María represents her grandfather and the aesthetics of his life world in a very dignified way, and most of its audience would probably agree that it is a nicely shot film with well framed images and a pleasant rhythm of editing.

Figure 2. Still photo of María Arias' film Tote – Grandfather. Image: María Arias.

However, within these ordinary events and conversations represented in the film, a space is opened up for the political negotiation of belonging. This is mostly done through the representation of María's subjective feelings towards her grandfather and her mother, which is shown both in the conversations María has with her family members, as well as by María's voice-over narration. Sharing the personal accounts of family member's biographies, the filmmaker situates the feelings of herself and her family members in the historical and political context of indigenous people in Mexico. In this way, she implicitly points to how structural marginalization, inequality and racism affected their feelings towards their own cultural and ethnic background, such as to one's own language as well as the rural lifestyle and its social practices. María shows how this influenced the way she was brought up by her mother, separated from her community and alienated from people such as her grandfather. She in this way sheds light on how patterns of internalized racism have been evolving within her family biography. María's mother, after having suffered from years of discrimination in the city as an 'Indio woman from the village', looked down somewhat on the 'simple' life of her father and wished something better for her children. She also tells María of the rude and violent upbringing she experienced at the hands of her father. However, in situating her grandfather in the violent, exploitative and abusive historical context of his own youth, María provides a meta-perspective on love, violence and education in her family. The micro-politics of the family are here interwoven with wider historical and political contexts. María is highly aware of that:

The newer generation [of filmmakers] began too, and continued to speak about resistance, well, many of our works speak about a form of resistance. They talk about psycho-historical traumas, that we have in our communities, the racism, the exploitation, these are topics still very present in us, in our works. Even though our works might be very autobiographic, very aesthetic, and very narrative, but they maintain to have this role of denouncing, of resistance and protest, well, even though most of our works do have a rather artistic vision, no? Yet it is an artistic movement, too, and yet our works are at films festivals. (Interview conducted and translated by Thomas John, Mexico 2017)

In her film, however, she does not explain a lot, and terms such as "resistance" or "psycho-historical trauma" are not used. The film is composed to present different fragments of personal accounts in order to trigger affective associations about the people and their affective perceptions of their social environments. María Arias stated that her films are meant to provoke emotional reflections in other people and families who experience similar situations of disaffection between each other and between themselves and their cultural ethnic origin. She also said that she hopes that her film might be a "mirror" for other people, to reflect on themselves and encounter responses on their issues.

What María Arias' work shows is how a new generation of indigenous filmmakers in Mexico are working on the creation and modulation of a political public. To constitute this public, they do not resort to classical genres of political activist filmmaking, but use the affective force of emotionally charged private narratives. We suggest understanding this process of making the private public as an intriguing feature and key component of the affective co-constitution of political publics.

PERFORMING INTIMATE PUBLICS IN KAHVEHANE

Let us now move from Mexico to Berlin, where we can study similar dynamics of the affective co-constitution of the public and the private or the intimate in the context of German-Turkish migration history. One can often find small signs in the window corners of Anatolian coffee houses in Berlin stating: "Access for club members only!" Many of these coffee houses (*kahvehaneler*) have been opened in the aftermath of the recruitment agreement between Germany and Turkey in 1961 when, contrary to lawmakers' expectations, many guest workers did not return to Turkey but gradually moved their lives to Germany. In public debates about the current state of Germany as a migration society, former guest workers and their follow-up generations are still repeatedly framed as not belonging to

Germany, respectively belonging to a parallel society (Yildiz 2013: 10). One could argue that such a hegemonic position is not really contested, but rather supported by signs like the ones found in the windows of Anatolian coffee houses. Drawing a line between inside and outside, between a private, 'inner circle' and a wider public, these signs provoke speculations: What happens behind the doors of Café Gediz, Başkent or Karadeniz?

The theatre parcours *Kahvehane – Turkish Delight, German Fright?* set out to counter those speculations by opening various *kahvehaneler* in the Berlin districts of Kreuzberg and Neukölln to a wider public. Curated by the documentary film maker Martina Priessner and the theatre director Tunçay Kulaoğlu, the project was part of "Dogland", the 2008 opening festival of Ballhaus Naunynstraße, a local theatre in Berlin-Kreuzberg that focuses decidedly on post-migrant issues and engages artists and performers from a variety of ethnic backgrounds, onstage as well as backstage. Conceptualised as a walk through the (former) immigrant districts of Kreuzberg and Neukölln, the theatre audience, divided in small groups, moved through six of twelve participating *kahvehaneler*. Equipped with a map, they were to explore a concrete urban area in which German-Turkish migration history is sedimented and becomes visible – a fact that still tends to be neglected. Thus, *Kahvehane* included the theatre's more or less direct urban environment and set the scene for places usually unknown to the theatre audience by performing artistic works in situ.

This idea ties in with the historical tradition of coffee houses in the Ottoman Empire, where different forms of performance such as readings, puppet shows, recitals by *aşık* (a kind of troubadour or poetry maker) or *karagöz* performances that ridiculed European manners were an elementary part of the coffee house culture (see Kömeçoğlu 2015: 154). The tradition of *kahvehaneler* in Turkey dates back to the 16th century: in addition to the bazaar and the mosque, coffee houses offered a public space of conviviality in which only Muslim men met. As Uğur Kömeçoğlu argues, the *kahvehane* for the first time provided a venue which was neither limited by religious nor by economic duties. The coffeehouse milieu, in which people from different social classes came together, stood for an inclusive social model in which every man could participate according to his personal knowledge and experiences (see Kömeçoğlu 2015: 152). As "schools of knowledge" (*mekteb-I_rfann*), the old *kahvehaneler* "included literary, religious and political activities, but also leisure activities, games (chess, manala and halma), performances, storytelling, puppet shows, music and even the use of drugs" (2015, 153f.). From the government's point of view, however, the coffee houses were observed with skepticism. As semi-public venues, they were

suspected to be places in which political protest could develop and be organized (see Ceylan 2006: 181).

Such readings of the Turkish coffee house echo Habermas' idea of the salon as a birthplace of a bourgeois public. Since the 20th century, coffee houses in Turkey have, similarly to their Western European counterparts, increasingly lost influence as places for political expression and art practice, not least due to the competition from cinema, theatre and opera as art forms on the rise. However, they are still important places for social interaction. In Istanbul, for instance, *kahvehaneler* were founded in large numbers as meeting places for inland migrants who moved from the villages to the cities, and allowed them to keep contact and cultivate traditions.

According to Rauf Ceylan, these foundations can be interpreted as the result of a similar process of migration. Thus, Ceylan emphasizes in particular the role of *kahvehaneler* as places of belonging in Germany: pushed to the margins of society and hardly represented in the cityscape, let alone in public life, the coffee houses offered meeting places for social exchange (see Ceylan 2006: 190). Nowadays, people with migratory backgrounds from different generations still meet there on a daily basis to foster social relationships and to maintain cultural traditions (Kleilein 2013: 403). Thus, *kahvehaneler* are not only an integral part of the history of public life in Anatolia, they also historically link Turkey and Germany (respectively Europe). However, this transcultural and historical dimension of the *kahvehane* hardly plays any role in public discourse on migration and integration in Germany.

"Turks forbidden!" – such bans, hung on the doors of German pubs, were common practice in the 1960s and are an example of how Turkish guest workers were denied access to the social life of the cities. Such an exclusionary gesture stands for a quite common attitude towards Turkish guest workers at that time. Guest workers were, as the name suggests, mainly regarded as guests, only briefly present and soon to be gone.[3] Against this background, the founding of Anatolian coffee houses in Germany not only sustains a connection to the homeland or represents a gesture of belonging; it is also a reaction to concrete social exclusions based on ethnicity. "Access for club members only!" vs. "Turks forbidden" – both signs indicate certain practices of demarcation and prejudgement that are, as we have seen so far, entangled in many ways. Therefore, an approach towards the topic of *kahvehaneler* in Germany should consider both their transcultural historicity as well as their differing assessments within German migration society.

3 Rainer Werner Fassbinder's film *Fear Eat Soul Up* (*Angst essen Seele auf*, 1974) to a huge extent takes place in a pub. It is one of the first prominent movies dealing with the everyday discrimination of guest workers.

Such an approach is, more or less, the route that the theatre parcours *Kahvehane – Turkish Delight, German Fright?* takes. It explores the conflictual borderland between the supposedly delightful private migrant spaces and their fearful hegemonic perception by a performative exploration tour across Anatolian coffeehouses in Berlin. To illustrate the entanglements and contradictions between personal migrant experiences and different forms of publics in a bit more depth, let us consider Michael Ronen's audio play-installation "Selo's Gastarbeiter" as an example. It was set up at a table in Café "Gediz. Selo'Nun Yeri" (Flughafenstraße 15, Berlin-Neukölln) while the day-to-day business continued. When the small group of people arrived, an intermediary took them to a round table in the middle of the *kahvehane*, prepared with a deck of cards and a pair of headphones for each participant. The card game, however, showed pictures of people, places or Turkish national symbols instead of the usual suits. Once the participants sat down, they were served tea and asked to put on their headphones. Acoustically shielded from the rest of the hustle and bustle in the coffeehouse, a male voice introduces them to the (only partially) virtual setting of visiting Café Gediz:

> Your name is Ibrahim, 38 years. You've lived in Germany for 10 years. After a big fight with your wife, you came here today. If only someone could distract you! Take a deep breath. Now open your eyes. To your left is your good friend Emre, to your right young Hakan, opposite to you your unemployed friend Ahmet. (See Winter 2012)

Calling the participants into the 'roles' of former migrant workers for the duration of the performance, "Selo's Gastarbeiter" conveys parts of the life stories of Ibrahim, Emre, Hakan and Ahmet, who after various workstations now run coffeehouses in Berlin or visit them regularly as guests. The participants listen to their personal narratives via headphones and follow the instructions given to them, so that one "suddenly converses in Turkish, lets oneself be yelled at or hits the table in [inflicted, the authors] anger with one's hand" (Winter 2012). The audio play not only requires the participants to re-enact a significant part of their daily business in the *kahvehane*, but also to relate to the lives of Ibrahim, Emre, Hakan and Ahmet. For instance, they are requested to put those cards on the table which are connected with 'their' memories of illness or unemployment, but also with happy moments; they are questioned about 'their' childhood memories of Gediz, the place in Turkey the coffeehouse is named after: Do you remember the sun over there, the smell of goats hanging in the air, or the barking of dogs in the streets? Yet, none of the listeners can possibly have those memories, because it is not their life stories being told. Rather, the listeners are placed in a different life story, which they in turn can only imagine on the basis of their own subjective

experiences. This increased distance, which has to be permanently negotiated within the framework of the radio play, makes the similarities, but also the differences, all the more apparent.

From an outside perspective, the participants on the one hand re-enact the common behaviour of coffee house guests by playing cards and drinking tea. On the other hand, as members of the majority society, their presence at least irritates the everyday arrangement of Café Gediz. Within the framework of the radio play, the listeners are familiarized with the personal stories of former guest workers and thus gain an intimate insight into a chapter of German history that is otherwise probably rather closed to them. Even if the distances on both sides cannot, or even shall not be reduced, "Selo's Gastarbeiter" contributes to a better, historically grounded understanding of the coffee houses and their guests.

Following this paradigmatic example, the theatre walk "Kahvehane" can be described as a performance of intimate publics, as Lauren Berlant (2008) has outlined. This term obviously echoes the famous political distinction between private and public in modernity which Berlant conceptualizes not as opposite, but as deeply intertwined and mutually dependent. Rooted in feminist and queer theory (see Bargetz/Sauer 2010) and based on the idea of counterpublics, Berlant's approach radically questions the need of bracketing the self within the public domain, which is usually referred to as collective and rationally grounded. Based on the conviction that "publics presume intimacy" (Berlant 2008: vii), she aims at rethinking the public sphere precisely through dimensions of affective embodiment and intimate social relations and vice versa. A public sphere is always based on intimate and personal investments, just as every form of public sphere influences one's own intimate experiences.

The *kahvehane* itself can be understood as a sphere of intimate publics, located at the margins of German majority society, only open to 'club members' and offering a place of exchange between peers and like-minded people. However, the valuation of Western European salons and the devaluation of Turkish coffee houses seems hardly supported by their historically similar role in the formation of Bourgeois publics, which, on the one hand, leads to a hasty condemnation of the coffee houses. On the other hand, the course curated by Martina Priessner and Tuncay Kulaoglu also immanently criticizes the seclusion of the coffee houses. By allowing works of different artistic genres to take place there and thus opening up the venues to a broader public, they tie in with the tradition of the *kahvehaneler* as places of political discussion and artistic production.

Selo's Gastarbeiter can also be described in Berlant's terms: Through the exchange of personal experiences, anecdotes and objects within the Sonosphere (Pinto 2014: 38f.) of the audio play, this performance establishes an affective

network between the coffee house guests. Although the audio play, as well as the theatre walk as a whole, brings together people from different social and ethnic backgrounds, it does not simply constitute a community of spectators that watch others; rather, the audio play virtually and actually initiates a change of positions that blurs the boundaries between the conceptions of the intimate and the public. Because it doubles the actual intimate public of Café Gediz and transfers it into the virtual intimate public of the audio-play, *Selo's Gastarbeiter* allows for multiple disruptions to occur. Herein, the theatre audience appears as a third element that appropriates the unfamiliar personal narratives while interrupting the everyday routine of Café Gediz. It is this performative interruption that blends the theatrical and the migratory intimate publics and politicizes both through the affective co-production of dissociative relations between theatregoers and coffeehouse guests. In multiplying the relationships between the usual intimate public of Anatolian coffeehouses in Berlin and the theatre public of Ballhaus Naunynstraße, the theatre walk Kahvehane re-politicized these places through mediating between marginal and recognized forms of intimacy and publicity.

The case of independent filmmakers in Mexico as well as the case of the theatre walk "Kahvehane" through Anatolian coffee houses in Berlin make manifest how the mobilization of affect and emotions plays a crucial role in establishing and reshaping publics – at least on the micro-level. While this could still be interpreted as supporting the thesis that affect and emotions mainly play a role in the formation of marginal counterpublics, we would like to argue that highly visible and mediatized discursive publics are also deeply structured by affective and emotional dynamics. Discussions on religious politics in Europe can serve as an example.

Law and Affective Order: Politics of Secular Affect

The public controversies following the terrorist attacks on the journalists of the political magazine Charlie Hebdo in Paris showed how difficult it is to decide what exactly religious and moral injury entail. How can we decide whose injury (or, the violation of rights and freedoms) deserves recognition and protection, and whose must be left out? Such decisions appear as negotiations between legal norms. Secular liberal law is designed as a set of rights within a nation state for every single citizen. As such, secular law constantly shapes and defines the contours of norms, such as "public order, health and morals" in the European Convention on Human rights (ECHR). In this way, secular law comes to determine what counts as sayable

or unsayable, as performable or un-performable. In so doing, it also simultaneously redraws the boarders of private and public or religious and secular as intrinsically interdependent categories, or as Agrama put it, as "two hands mutually drawing each other into existence" (2012: 1).

A rich literature has already addressed Muslims' religious feelings and how to prevent their offense and injuries. Instead of concentrating on the private feelings of Muslim subjectivities, we assess the role of public sentiments as (secular) affect in order to understand how the law makes and unmakes restrictions of Muslim practices in Europe. As such we are in conversation with recent inquiries into the existence and construction of secular bodies, affect and emotions (Mahmood 2009; Fadil 2009; Hirshkind 2012; Amir-Moazami 2016; Scheer et al. 2019) on the one hand, and into the feminist and phenomenological branches of affect theory (Ahmed 2004; Berlant 2011) on the other. Law is not neutral towards or independent of feelings towards certain human and non-human bodies that are produced in public space through practice and discourse. To illustrate how affect can destabilize legal regulations, one can point to the example of two Islamic controversies in Germany and in France: circumcision and burkini bans. Such controversies serve as a "privileged methodological tool for studying the discord that simultaneously confronts and binds the different actors together" (Göle 2013: 8). Both bans were quickly revoked, but the affect and emotions generated through and with those controversies about Muslim bodies and practices are still in effect. These rapid legal changes expose the paradoxes inherent to liberal freedom of religion, of consciousness and of expression, as they pertain to public order and sentiments – all key concepts in the justifications of the bans.

A good case in point was the controversy over ritual male circumcision in Cologne, Germany, in 2012. A regional criminal court decided a case in which it saw an exercise of religiously motivated circumcision ["*religiös motivierte Beschneidung*"] as amounting to a criminal offence due to unlawful infringement of bodily integrity ("*Körperverletzung*"), according to §213 of the German Criminal Code (StGB). After a four-year-old Muslim boy faced complications due to his circumcision, state prosecutors in Cologne filed a criminal charge against the physician who had performed the circumcision, for causing bodily injury. This decision was then discussed at length by various actors, not only in Germany but also in Turkey and Israel, as part of public concern over the rights of Muslims and Jews in Germany. Talk shows were organized to discuss the pros and cons of child circumcision, bringing together doctors, psychologists, lawyers, rabbis, pious and secular Muslim public figures – either as defenders or opponents of the decision. In those discussions, defenders of the ban frequently called on religious actors to think rationally and not emotionally about the issue. Yet when religious actors were

invited into these discussions – usually as the only opponents of the ban present there – talk show hosts would typically ask them to talk about their feelings, experiences, and immediate reactions to the decision. In her convincing article on the circumcision debate, Shirin Amir-Moazami has demonstrated how secular actors discursively use "self-differentiation as a mode of unmarking the secular through the gaze on the marked body of the other"; namely, of the religious body (2016: 166).

While the circumcision debate focused on bodily practices in relation to young males, the burkini ban in France was concerned with the female body, usually of adult age. In July 2016, the far-right mayor of Cannes issued a municipal decree temporarily banning the use of the burkini, a bathing suit that covers large parts of the body, mostly worn by Muslim women on the beach. The decree categorized the burkini as being "of a nature that creates risks of disturbing the public order (crowding, skirmishes, etc.)".[4] The mayor justified his decision by invoking the state of exception measures in France, drawing parallels between the terrorist attacks that took place in Nice two weeks prior, in which 86 people were killed. The mayor classified the Islamic garment as a political symbol and a provocation. This decision was reproduced in around 30 municipalities, by conservative and socialist mayors alike.

The bans on circumcision in Germany as well as on the burkini in France rapidly became a national and international affair, involving the highest politicians in both states and stimulating comments on the ban's legitimacy among world media outlets. Manuel Valls, then prime minister of France, pronounced his sympathy and support for the mayors of Cannes and other municipalities – at the same time emphasizing that he would not support a nationwide application of this law. The German chancellor Angela Merkel was also involved in the circumcision debate. Contrary to Valls, however, she positioned herself against the ban. Secularism as a fundamental value of both states (*Säkularismus* in Germany and *laïcité* in France) was placed at the core of polemical debates. Two prominent intellectuals in both countries reacted to the discussion: Jürgen Habermas and Jean Baubérot criticised the ban, highlighting the necessity of dialogue and public discussion.

Despite the ambition to construct the secular as a neutral concept free of emotions, both the circumcision ban and the burkini ban were frequently justified through dominant feelings of love and fear. The self-proclaimed "non-religious Jewish doctor" Gil Yaron, for instance, wrote in an article on the circumcision rituals' reasoning, written as a response to her sister who desired to go against tradition by not allowing her son to be circumcised: "If my Jewish education leads

4 … De nature à créer des risques de troubles à l'ordre public (attroupements, échauffourées, etc.)

to a point that my son asks me one day as a mature and convinced Jew to get him finally circumcised, I will then fulfill his wish with love, pride and pain. But not before."[5] Yaron suggests that he can only exercise his duty as a father through sensing love, with pride and pain, when faced with his son's mature decision of becoming a convinced Jew, which can only come after a certain age. A parent's love and respect for the child's bodily integrity, and for the genuine willingness of the child, emerged as commonly raised secular arguments during the debate. This example shows how feelings of love, pride and pain play a crucial role, in both "religious" secular reasoning.

The burkini ban mainly revolved around public sentiments other than pride, love and pain. In an interview, Jean Baubérot took for granted that the people are allowed to be shocked to see women wearing a burkini at beaches, but that this feeling was not a good enough reason to ban it.[6] On the other hand, the experts of laïcité and Islam in France argued that such affective reactions "are motivated by the feelings of fear that arose after the attacks".[7] Much of the media debate was dominated by how the burkini scares and provokes people as a political symbol.

The ordinary emotional registers of the secular – love and desire for the bodily integrity of autonomous liberal subjects as well as contempt and fear of Islam – dominated the debate in both countries. These emotional registers, however, became destabilized when discursive elements were introduced in the debate that belonged to other liberal orders, namely Jewish and Women's emancipation. One can argue that both bans were rapidly overturned because emotions of shame became stronger and more dominant than the initial anti-Muslim inclinations.

In Germany, the possible prohibition of circumcision rapidly started to revolve almost exclusively around Jewish practices. Although it had been a Muslim circumcision that was at the centre of the Cologne court case, banning male circumcision was related to a dormant anti-Semitism within Germany as well as to the Shoah. This reference to the historically coded affective registers of the genocide, newly emerging through the ban of Jewish practices, drastically changed the discursive landscape. Angela Merkel said that Germany was ridiculing itself as a

5 „Wenn meine Erziehung zum Judentum dazu führt, dass mein Sohn eines Tages als mündiger, überzeugter Jude von seinem Vater fordert, ihn endlich zu beschneiden, dann werde ich seinen Wunsch erfüllen, mit Liebe, Stolz und Schmerz. Aber nicht früher." Gil Yaron, "Unsere seltsame Tradition", FAZ, 21.07.2012.

6 Sabrina Champenois, "Burkini: On peut être choqué sans pour autant interdire", Libération, 16.08.2016.

7 "Ces réactions sont motivées par le sentiment de peur surgi après les attentats", Burkini: La France cherche à rendre l'Islam invisible, ARTE Info, 18.08.16, https://info.arte.tv/fr/burkini-la-france-cherche-rendre-lislam-invisible.

"comedy nation" ["*Komikernation*"] and that she did not want Germany to be the only nation where Jews cannot live their tradition.[8]

In France, the discursive landscape markedly altered with the emergence of an iconic image showing three armed policemen standing at the beach in Nice forcing a woman in a modest garment to remove her clothing. In the mainstream and social media those images began to be compared to the images of a police officer issuing a ticket to a woman because of her bikini at the beach in Italy in 1957. Through references to women's suffrage and feminism, the controversy gained legitimacy as an issue of women's rights while partially freeing itself of the grammar of terrorism, political symbolism and provocation. In the burkini affair, shame began to play a prominent role in the affective vocabulary. "They want to take her clothes off. But they are removing their uniforms! The police of shame" was a comment by the president of CCIF (Collective against Islamophobia) Marwan Muhammed that found support within the anti-racist feminist milieus.[9]

The anti-Muslim legal regulations in those contexts were rapidly revoked because they became discursively related to affective registers of extremely unpleasant historical experiences. Through this discursive shift, anti-Muslim legal bans came to be associated with the "Jewish Question" in Germany and with the "Woman Question" in France. The making and unmaking of legal rules of religious practice depend on how discursive alliances and associations are created and sustained. The common medial and scholarly focus on the religious feelings of Muslims is only one half of the story. One should not ignore that the secular, as a discursive formation, is affectively grounded. It is critical to note the hierarchies that differently shape the way religious and secular affect gain legitimacy. To avoid making these hierarchies invisible, one must make this affective grounding of the secular visible, and avoid depicting emotions only in the religious singular body.

In considering how affect and emotions discursively constitute the public sphere, it is important to note that they are not confined to specific arenas of public debate, such as religion. We argue that, on the contrary, affect and emotions play a role in constituting any kind of political public and any kind of discursive position within it – even if in different modulations. This includes, as we would like to demonstrate next, politicizing academia.

8 "Merkel –Wir machen uns zur Komikernation", die Welt, 16.07.2012.

9 "Ils veulent lui retirer ses vêtements. Mais qu'ils retirent leurs uniformes! La police de la honte", Indignation après le contrôle d'une estivante ôtant sa tunique sur une plage de Nice, Europe1, 24.08.2016.

THE AFFECTIVE CO-PRODUCTION OF SCIENTIFIC OBJECTIVITY IN THE POLITICAL SPHERE

"You, Ladies and Gentlemen, are defending reason against the brutalisation of our public debates!"[10] With these words, German President Frank-Walter Steinmeier addressed scientists during his speech at the National Academy of Sciences in Halle in February of 2018. Two sets of expectations become manifest in this sentence: On the one hand, the diagnosis that current public debates have become rougher in tone, marked by outrage on all sides and characterised by mutual insults. On the other hand, the hope that with the power of better argument scientists are able to compete with this phenomenon in a level-headed and reasonable fashion. These two sets of expectations are based on a dichotomy of affectivity and reason: While brutalisation is driven by affect and emotions, reason is characterised by objectiveness and distance to emotion. This dichotomy is assigned a distinct value: affect-driven brutalisation is considered negative and must be avoided while reason is considered positive and must be promoted. This raises two questions: First, is it really the case that affectivity and reason are mutually exclusive? Second, how can or should scientists do justice to this kind of expectation?

Contrary to the described expectations and the widespread academic self-image according to which affect and emotions have no place in science – beyond the possibility of becoming the object of research – matters turn out to be much more complicated. While it is claimed that affective and emotional dynamics in research must be prevented, disciplined or even neutralised, many if not all scientists would agree that scientific practices are by no means free of emotions and affect. Enthusiasm for one's object of research, curiosity for and excitement about new insights, and affective engagement in disputes are all considered academic virtues. Most scientists would concede that they are afraid of being embarrassed for mistakes in argumentation or happy about the recognition of their work by peers. Affect and emotions possess a different relevance in various sectors or stages of scientific practice and consequently come into view in different ways: While possibly being extremely significant and utilisable as an epistemological resource in data collection processes or in the context of data analysis processes, they are largely hidden for the purposes of publication, and in part even explicitly written out of publications in obedience with the demand for factualness and objectivity, despite the fact that internal scientific negotiations are characterised by affect and emotions as well.

10 Kathrin Zinkant: "Listen to the scientists", Süddeutsche Zeitung, dated 15 February 2018.

It is, however, remarkable that for the purpose of publicly transferring knowledge and the public presentation of science, emotions are included yet again: Science is not only supposed to inform – it must also stir up interest, be exciting, activating, touching and even enthralling. The following excerpt from the introduction of a current US-American scientific journal serves as an illustration of this observation: It is, however, remarkable that for the purpose of publicly transferring knowledge and the public presentation of science, emotions are included yet again: Science is not only supposed to inform – it must also stir up interest, be exciting, activating, touching and even enthralling. The following excerpt from the introduction of a current US-American scientific journal serves as an illustration of this observation:

The stories of science are told many ways, in many places. Scientists share the ups and downs of the research process over raucous conference cocktails and long hours on the road, across lab benches and conference call lines, and around campfires after long days in the field. These stories underlie every scientific paper yet rarely appear alongside the tables and graphs. To read the often dull, sometimes tedious reports that fill the scientific record, you'd never know that science is a human endeavor, like any other, shaped by tragedy, comedy, and (mis)adventures. In this issue of PLOS Biology, we highlight the deeply human side of research in a new collection, 'Conservation Stories from the Front Lines.' These narratives present peer-reviewed and robust science but also include the muddy boots and bloody knees, ravaging mosquitoes, crushing disappointment, and occasional euphoria their authors experienced. We deliberately sought stories of triumphs and tragedies, successes and failures, and invited a diverse group of scientists to submit contributions written in their own voices. Rather than cling to a standard structure, we asked authors to choose their own format to best present their ideas, experiences, results, and conclusions in a style that is compelling, concise, and accessible.[11]

This quote demonstrates that affect and emotions are a significant part of the scientific production of knowledge. Scientists share stories of the ups and downs of their research with each other privately, but generally do not include them in their fact-based publications. The objective of this journal issue is to change all this: "we aim to make the human side of scientific research visible". To this end, "the muddy boots and bloody knees, ravaging mosquitoes, crushing disappointment, and occasional euphoria" will be accompanying the robust results of research, including the individual voices of single researchers telling of the disappointments,

11 Editorial of Special Issue "Conservation Stories from the Front Lines Collection" of PLOS Biology Journal. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2005226. Published: February 5, 2018.

elations, triumphs and tragedies which are fundamental to scientific research. This clearly shows: Reason and affectivity are not automatically mutually exclusive.

However, does the subjective-affective experiential dimension of scientific research not undermine science's general claim to objectivity, one might wonder. To this, the editorial of the special issue responds:

> Scientists are increasingly recognizing the need to find new ways to effectively engage with a diversity of audiences. Here, we've revisited the historical version of scientific communication by turning peer-reviewed papers into evidence-based, scientific stories. We don't know where this experiment will go—perhaps it will end with this single collection. But conceivably, it could catalyze further experiments with peer-reviewed scientific narratives. We hope it does. As we grapple with emerging crises wrought by a changing climate and plummeting biodiversity, we'll need to explore every possible avenue for sharing the best available science with audiences far beyond the academy.

It becomes evident that it is particularly important for publishers to search for new ways of addressing different and non-scientific audiences. The extent of social problems, in this case climate change and reduction of biodiversity, appears so great to them that scientists should use any opportunity to effectively address as wide a public audience as possible. At this point, at the latest, science turns political: when it impacts society in order to create changes.

Since scientific knowledge plays an important role for all kinds of public opinion formation processes, it is frequently furnished with the claim of critical potential and represents the attempt to modify practice. In this sense, all knowledge transfer and scientific communication can be considered political. The goal is to inform, enlighten, create consciousness or mobilise in order to initiate social change. The fact that scientists today are supposed to actively dedicate themselves to the objective of making their research accessible to a wider public is an explicitly stated social and scientific-political expectation. To that extent, not only the requirements of the scientific profession are changing, but there are also institutionalisation processes for the formation of appropriate communication forms.

The task of scientific communication is to present highly complex, factually objectified contexts which rarely exhibit clarity, in a short and concise, generally comprehensible manner in order to create interest. A frequently recommended (and disputed) procedure for scientific communication is to tell touching, powerful and transformative stories which create resonance, establish connections and make it possible for people to relate to the narration. For this purpose, the editorial of the special issue suggest that affect and emotions (as became evident in the first quote) should not be seen as an addition to the 'hard facts'; rather, they form an

essential part of scientific knowledge production. They are no (longer) hidden in the example, but instead actively utilised to affect people, legitimise research, anchor it more in the everyday lives of people and thereby increase the probability of social change.

This example shows that making science political is an endeavour that is at its core connected to the endeavour of making science affective for publics. The power of affect and emotions, it seems, is to open up contained and compartmentalized expert publics to a more general public. This project of creating such a discursive opening is achieved by deploying affect and emotions. Politicizing a non-political discourse means not least making it affective.

THE POLITICAL TRIAL AND THE REGULATION OF AFFECT

The divide between law and politics can serve as another case study to carve out what we mean by the affective constitution of the political public. Many would agree that the law is about impassionate judgment. Justitia is blind, and that means that she is not swayed by emotion. While some see this as an ideal the law must aspire to, others criticize the law exactly for its neglect of emotion. A strand of research called law-and-emotion scholarship has emerged to investigate the relationship between law and emotions, united by the project to debunk legal ideologies of the un-emotional law (Bandes 2001). The law, so the law-and-emotion scholars, is deeply embedded in affective and emotional dynamics. Instead of striving to cast affect and emotions out of legal proceedings, these dynamics should be systematically investigated.

Such investigations into the role of emotion in the law are an integral part of an affective societies approach to the humanities and social sciences as we are proposing it. However, when we interrogate the law about its role in the politics of affective societies, a more basic question emerges that goes beyond finding emotion in legal proceedings. How can the law itself, and its public proceedings, be seen as devices to affectively modulate the political?

Law and politics are often seen as opposites, or at least as opposing ends of a spectrum. Politics is dominated by power and interests, driven by passionate argument, and tends to implement the practical. The law is dominated by rules and regulations, driven by dispassionate judgment, and tends to strive for the ideal. Most theoretical thinking on the political is oriented towards this divide between law and politics, but with different emphases.

Marxist theorists of law and state have tended to prioritize the political over the legal and tried to line out how much the legal is determined by political

operations (Paschukanis 1929; Althusser 1970). In this critique, most of these Marxist thinkers have conceded that there is a relative autonomy of the legal sphere, but there is a need to politicize the law and make its political workings visible. Chantal Mouffe's (2000) work on the political is a more recent example for this line of thinking. She criticizes modes of juridifying political questions, not least because it takes the passions out of politics, and she makes a plea for politicizing the legal. The recent critique of the "juridification of politics" by Marxist anthropologists John and Jean Comaroff (2006) are based on a similar thinking.

Liberal theorists of law and state, Rawls (1971) and Habermas (1992) for instance, have, in turn, tended to balance the legal and the political. Their thinking also accepts the relative autonomy of both realms, but they see the law's potential of taming the more disruptive modes of political processes. The 'juridification of politics' is not so much a fighting word, but a necessary strategy to set the ground rules for meaningful deliberation in democratic societies.

Implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, this law-and-politics debate appears as a debate about regulating affect. The way the relationship between law and politics is framed points to the question of how the political sphere should be affectively regulated. What both sides in this debate disagree on is the measure between the affective mode of excited deliberation and calm deliberation. While Marxists tend to be more on the side of excitement, liberals are more on the side of calmness. These leanings tend to correspond with respective preferences for more or less law. Consequently, whether you are on the side of politics or on the side of the law, a mixing of the two modes becomes problematic. The phenomenon of the political trial addresses precisely this problematic mixture. A "political trial" arises when the legal form of the criminal trial has become a political affair. Political trials are highly publicized. Prime examples are large international war crimes proceedings such as the Nuremburg and Tokyo tribunals after World War II, or the trials held before the International Criminal Court. But there are also national criminal trials that are political in this sense, such as the military tribunal against Saddam Hussein after the Iraq War in 2003, the trial against Muhammed Mursi after the military coup following the Arab Spring in 2011, the trial against the neo-Nazi terrorist Anders Breivik in Norway beginning in 2012, the anti-terror trials after the attempted military coup in Turkey in 2016, and many others.

Regardless of whether theorists follow a more Marxian or a more liberal thinking on the relationship between law and politics, both criticize political trials. Hannah Arendt (1963) has most famously criticized the trial against the German Nazi bureaucrat Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem for going far beyond the individual guilt or innocence of one person. Famously, she criticized bringing in witnesses who provided passionate and heart-breaking accounts of the horrors of the Holocaust.

Such an affective mode was obviously not fit for a man who represented "the banality of evil" rather than the monster the Israeli institutions wanted to portray him as.

More recent critiques of International Criminal Court (ICC) proceedings in the African context, such as the one by Kamari Clarke (2006), likewise criticize such political trials – but with a different emphasis. In these trials, according to Clarke's critique, the socio-political structures of violence in Africa are neglected. The legal logic of individual criminal responsibility makes invisible the political dynamics of global inequality that bring about violence in Africa. The ICC as a legal institution is wholly unfit to address these issues, and the "tribunalization of African justice" promotes specific emotional regimes that give preference to legal solutions over political solutions (Clarke 2019).

Recent theory of the political trial has highlighted the performative power of legal proceedings (Ertür 2015). Criminal trials are performative in a double sense. First, they have the form of a theatrical performance, which carries a specific affectivity (cf. Bens 2019). Second, they are performative in the sense of Austinian speech act theory (Austin 1956). That means that in trials, actors not only talk about a social reality as it transpired outside the courtroom, but the use of legal language is in itself a social practice that contributes to the construction of this reality (Derrida 1989; Butler 1997). Legal actors usually try to make invisible this performative dimension of trials. They paint trials as rule-determined events processing social reality as it is rather than as theatrical events having the capacity to change the social world.

This, following Basak Ertür's (2015) claim, is different with political trials. A trial is political to the extent that its performative dimension is openly admitted. Political trials 'put up a show' and have the explicit goal of changing social reality. They are conducted to show the public audience what is acceptable political action and what is criminal conduct. From the perspective of an affective societies approach, Ertür's claim can be modified and extended. What makes trials political is that their capacity to publicly affect is openly admitted. Political trials are, and also shall be, affect-regulation-machines. They shall affectively interfere with collective perceptions of justice and injustice and promote specific sentiments (Bens/Zenker 2019).

The legal actors engaged in conducting political trials seem to be very aware of this dimension of collective affect regulation. During a study of affective and emotional dynamics at the International Criminal Court, conversations with staff showed that the topics of affect and emotions in relation to their work are seen as crucial. On the one hand, the legal actors frequently pointed out that the trial shall 'take out the emotions' and 'focus on the facts'. As such, they see the political

trial as a device that shifts the collective mood into a more calm and balanced mode. But that is by far not its only function. Asked more broadly about the role of affect and emotions for political trials, those involved in conducting these proceedings often found it desirable that the existence of such trials scares potential perpetrators of mass violence. It was also said that the victims of mass violence needed the emotional closure that comes with perpetrators being brought to justice. These opinions reflect, albeit in terms of affect and emotions, long debates in the theory of criminal justice. Deterrence and retaliation, categories deeply inscribed into theories of why crimes are punished, are outlined here in their affective dimension.

Discussions about the role of law in politics, or the role of politics in law, can be read as discussions about the kinds of affective modes that should be desired in the public sphere. The law and its proceedings can then be seen as a device to regulate collective sentiment. The political sphere emerges as an affective arena that can be modulated by introducing legal proceedings into it. The political trial in one central device to attempt such affective regulation. Differentiating what is legal from what is political can then be seen as a strategy of constituting the political sphere as a public of specific affectivity. What this perspective deconstructs is the idea that the public sphere can either be emotional or rational – and that one can pick what one likes better according to one's theoretical preferences. The question is rather: what kind of affective register does one believe should govern the political public. The "if" question transforms into a "how" question.

***

The formation of some kind of public is an integral part of any political process. In this chapter, we have argued that affective and emotional dynamics are of prime importance in the formation of a political public. The affective societies perspective we are proposing is skeptical of the public-private-divide insofar as it is constructed as a divide between an emotional private realm and a rational public realm. Instead, our case studies indicate that it is only through constant boundary crossings that both realms can be constituted in the first place. Political films become public through private stories; Turkish coffee houses become public through intimate familiarization with them; the hallmarks of non-emotional publics (secularism, science, law) all depend, in their constitution and their publicity, on emotional and affective dynamics of production, maintenance and transformation. The making of public and private and the constant boundary-making between them is not a question of allowing or banning emotions, but rather a question of modulating the affective dynamics that pervade all realms of the social.