

Examining the signature as a familiar ,ritual' that was briefly mentioned, the argument becomes clearer. The signature on a document answers the question of the author, and therefore enables authorization. Further, the signature clearly distinguishes the original document from its copy. From the official side there are further performatives (stamps, seals, bills) with a similar purpose. They are designed so as to be hard to mimic and thus serve as the institutional signature. We might not notice those gestures anymore, because they have become such an ubiquitous routine of daily life (Lee 1980: 2-5).

There is obviously two distinct performative spheres in bureaucratic procedures: encounters between clients and officials on the one side, and the handling of the cases within the administration behind closed curtains on the other (Hull 2012: 113). Weber referred to this inner-administrative area, which is trying to keep its knowledge, its most powerful resource, secret as an administration of „secret sessions“. Since on the other side, clients have no access to that secretive area, they as well turn to performatives in order to ensure their case is being properly understood and worked on, as Hull has described for his study of Islamabad (Hull 2012: 119). Clients' performance can also be witnessed in the long queues outside of government buildings that start growing long before offices even open. The administered often find themselves stupefied by the whole process, or as Graeber puts it: “Contrary to popular belief, bureaucracies do not create stupidity. They are ways of managing situations that are already inherently stupid because they are, ultimately, based on the arbitrariness of force” (Graeber 2004: 73). Aradhana Sharma and Akhil Gupta (2006: 12) draw a direct connection from this ,proceduralism' to state control: „routine, repetitive practices of rule following—and its violation are central to “how the state comes to be imagined, en-