

4-20-2011

Fragmented Liveness / Mediated Moments

Kristen R. Lovell

Trinity University, klovell@trinity.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/speechdrama_honors



Part of the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lovell, Kristen R., "Fragmented Liveness / Mediated Moments" (2011). *Speech & Drama Honors Theses*. 5.
http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/speechdrama_honors/5

This Thesis open access is brought to you for free and open access by the Speech and Drama Department at Digital Commons @ Trinity. It has been accepted for inclusion in Speech & Drama Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Trinity. For more information, please contact jcostanz@trinity.edu.

FRAGMENTED LIVENESS / MEDIATED MOMENTS

KRISTEN R. LOVELL

A DEPARTMENT HONORS THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH AND DRAMMA AT TRINITY UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION WITH
DEPARTMENTAL HONORS

DATE: APRIL 20, 20011

Kyle Gillette, THESIS ADVISOR

Andrew Hansen, DEPARTMENT CHAIR

ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS,
CURRICULUM AND STUDENT ISSUES

[] This thesis is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which allows some noncommercial copying and distribution of the thesis, given proper attribution. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 559 Nathan Abbott Way, Stanford, California 94305, USA.

Thesis Committee

Dr. Kyle Gillette
Thesis Advisor, Drama Department

Dr. Roberto Prestigiacomo
Drama Department

Dr. Patrick Keating
Communication Department
Film Studies Department, Chair

Fragmented Liveness / Mediated Moments

Kristen R. Lovell

Why would you make live work in an age of mass communications? Why work in **MORE** or LESS the only field which still insists on PRESENCE? For artists interested in “the contemporary” this area of live performance seems like a bit of *backwater*. Do you have something against mass-reproduction? Do you work from some *quaint* notion about immediacy and *real* presence?

I don't know.

Answer the question.

(Forced Entertainment, 1996 - emphasis is mine)¹



I. INTRODUCTION

VIRTUAL CULTURE, PERCEPTION, and PERFORMANCE

There is a light. There is an object. There is an eye. There is vision. There is a focus. **There is perception.** And in this simple way, we see. Light is received by the eye, allowing external stimuli to enter the nervous system. The retina extracts the data and sends a mere fraction of that information into the visual cortex. Then, the human mind makes inferences based on the information received. Volumes have been written on the phenomenon of ocular perception, and although the physical process of reception and extraction may not alter over time, it has become apparent that the contemporary human—overriding the Age of Mechanical Reproduction² and soaring through the Age of Information—is seeing in a new light; or rather, in a new space: an endless and constantly archiving, virtual space.

If perception is altered, everything else is also altered, for an individual's reality is composed of the fabric of perception. So it follows that **performance**, a place for optical and aural stimulation, is also altered by shifts in the manner in which the world is perceived. In this essay I will explore this shift. Using close readings of theatrical performances and their texts, I will look at the ways in which humans and mediated reproductions interact on the stage, and the ways in which audiences may respond—perhaps glimpsing a tear in their fabric of reality: the Real.³ From these fragments of liveness and mediated moments, I recognize that mediated interaction has and will impact the theatre, and we need not think of all mechanical reproduction as a contamination of art.

II. THE EYE AS THE DJ

or -Into a Hypermediated Discourse-

In 21st century culture, nearly every element of the daily life of the consuming class is mediated—or has the option to become mediated—creating an environment of *hypermediatization*.⁴ Even the media is mediated. Videos are no longer confined to tapes, or even DVDs—they stream through sources such as Netflix, Hulu, and Megavideo—and those sources can be found through sites like SideReel, which provide links to the media requested. Television is no longer confined to a box with antennas; it can be viewed from a variety of devices, from smart phone to laptop to iPad. The viewed drifts further and further away from the source in a cycle of citation and hyperlinks, and each dilution and subsequent mediation is another performance of a reality that frames the perceived.

Mediation occurs through an apparatus. According to Walter Benjamin, the audience perceives reality through the constructed framework of machinery, and that framework⁵ not only “intrudes into reality” but also “performs our perception of it.”⁶ John Berger draws upon Benjamin in *Ways of Seeing* when he states:

When the camera reproduces a painting, it destroys the uniqueness of the image. As a result it's meaning changes. Or, more exactly, its meaning multiplies and fragments into many meanings.⁷

This idea of fragmentation ties into the postmodernist strategy of bricolage and the aesthetic of pastiche, for the option of reproduction creates the opportunity for deconstruction and reconstruction.⁸



(Fig 1) Rauschenberg, *Retroactive I*

For example, the image of John F. Kennedy in Rauschenberg's *Retroactive I* [Fig 1] is a reproduction of the original photo which has been abstracted from its context, but still holds fragments of the original meaning. Combined with other clippings from newspapers and magazines, Rauschenberg creates a collage using his multi-media to comment on a media-saturated culture embarking on the television era. We continue to live in a world of constant collage, a society whose hand firmly grips the remote, a culture of quotes and references: the modern sensibility is dedicated to constant ocular and aural stimulation.

Take, for example, the modern means of travel: the automobile, which is as familiar to many humans as their own feet. Within a car, the occupant has many ocular stimulants. There is the rearview mirror, the left and right side mirrors, and the front windshield: all of which act as lenses, glass through which the world is seen, and frames. A driver scans the road, shifting the

eyes to the mirrors and back to the front as if choreographed. Muscle memory insures multiple perspectives. The eyes edit. The brain can cognitively comprehend several stimulants simultaneously, and the climate of modern society positions the audience member to expect and appreciate a constantly shifting gaze.

Furthermore, our age of information-overload is hallmarked by an insatiable desire to sustain a constant mediated connection. The options for phones sold without data plans at cellular kiosks are slim and continue to dwindle. Users can now opt to be active participants in numerous global communities from any location serving their particular network. Applications such as Four Square, Words with Friends, and Angry Birds provide users with a continuous option for mobilized stimulation and connectivity. The past never disappears; it is catalogued in the virtual space of gigabytes and terabytes. Past actions and interactions are catalogued automatically and saved on an indefinite timeline.

Facebook and CNN give the constancy of a continual 24-hour news reel; story after story appears and disappears, but never truly vanishes. It remains recorded in the news feed, or in the video archives of CNN's website. This news craved culture is a symptom and a perpetuation of the desire to be constantly stimulated. To be in contact with the world but not actually touch the *liveness*, to see without being seen, to occupy the position of voyeur. Yet, the apparent transparency that social networks like Facebook provide puts the user in a subject position as well as in an observational one. The observational position allows users to enjoy consuming performed the personalities of fellow users.

I use the word 'perform' here in the sense of Walter Benjamin: that the apparatus, here social media and the internet, 'performs our perception' of the viewed.⁹ Not only does the apparatus itself perform, but so too does the user who takes on the character of his or her avatar,

username, or otherwise virtual being. The words online are not coming directly from the communicator to the listener, between the communicators there is the filter of the apparatus. Additionally, the computer or Smartphone is itself a technological performer.¹⁰ Therefore, an online interaction consists of many layers of performance.

In a social media interaction, the subject position provides platforms from which an individual may represent her identity from hundreds to as many as millions of friends or followers. For instance, call to mind the 2008 United States Presidential Election which was greatly influenced by the millions of people in the form of grass roots organizations that were able to mobilize because they were able to communicate on a viral platform. Status updates and Tweets are powerful and they are performances of the user's identity. For an example, let us look to Kanye West.

Kanye West hit Twitter in February 2011 to send a message to his followers: "An abortion can cost a ballin' nigga up to 50gs maybe a 100. Gold diggin' bitches be getting pregnant on purpose."¹¹ Lilly Allen, rising to fame herself from a cult Myspace following, responded "Never has a tweet put me in such a bad mood."¹² Twitter, in this case, is not only allowing West and Allen to perform to a vast internet audience of re-tweets and blog re-posts, but is also in part performing our perceptions of the mediated exchange. Because the interaction is on Twitter, it has a different reality than if the exchange occurred on a street corner. Instead of two humans interacting one on one, West and Allen are performing through the framework of website to millions of followers, and those followers have the option to re-perform the same exchange through their own personal Twittter accounts, blogs, and other social media outlets. In essence: Twitter, the apparatus, is performing West and Allen's representations of themselves.

The histories of the modern tech savvy human are being composed on blogs and in social networks at the cost of privacy and interpersonal communication. The American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers notes that 81 percent of its 1,600-member group have used or faced evidence extracted from social-networking sites like Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, YouTube, and LinkedIn over the last five years.¹³ Facebook is the unrivaled favorite—The Academy’s president-elect Linda Lea Viken states, “Sixty-six percent of the lawyers surveyed cited Facebook foibles as the source of online evidence.”¹⁴

The angry Tweet does not dissipate even after the emotion is soothed and the user is calmed--the virtual echo remains. Abandoned Xanga accounts of angsty pre-teens now in their twenties litter the web, the words and pictures unchanged by the progress of time and the improvement of personality. Facebook profiles of the deceased remain visible and transform into live mediated memorials.

Internet archives do not easily vanish: they sustain, they are re-posted, they are re-tweeted, they are cited, and end up misquoted on Wikipedia. Peggy Phelan argues that “performance cannot be saved, recorded, documented, or otherwise participate in the circulation of representations *of* representations.”¹⁵ She continues, defining performance as becoming “itself through disappearance.”¹⁶ Performance, which “implicates the real through the presence of living bodies,” is ontologically nonreproductive.¹⁷ In this way, Phelan moves away from Benjamin’s notion of the apparatus itself performing, for if Twitter can perform then it must vanish, and there is no true vanishing on the World Wide Web. Alternatively, although the documented quotation may not vanish, the time code will move on, incrementally and forever becoming the past. Even so, this may be a stretch, for Phelan states that if something is to”

participate in the circulation of representations *of* representations...it becomes something other than performance.”¹⁸

Jon McKenzie in his book *Perform or Else* argues that performance is not constricted to humans, nor is does it demand a live body. He notes that in today’s world, performance “can refer to experimental art, productivity in the workplace, and the functionality of technological systems.”¹⁹ In reference to the Internet Age, he states,

The emergence of this hypermediating media affects all cultures and technologies, for the digitalization of discourses and practices enable them to be recorded, edited and played back in new and uncanny ways. Highly localized ensembles of words and gestures can now be broken apart, recombined, and hyperlinked to different ensembles in ways unlike anything in the past, at speeds incredible from all perspectives except those of the future.²⁰

To McKenzie, hypermediation opens the door for performance on a faster and more diverse level. The Greek prefix ‘hyper-’ means ‘over,’ or ‘excess’—exceeding the normal or the standard, cognate of the Latin prefix ‘super-’.²¹ Extreme mediization creates an extreme in the performances available to a user at any given moment—those who engage in mediated culture are exposed to a world of hyper-performance.

Think about the way in which you view the internet. At any given moment, how many tabs do you have open? Are you also connected through email? Facebook? Skype? How many conversations are you simultaneously conducting? In the age of dial-up the idea of tabs, multiple windows, and simultaneous applications was not a possibility. We are extreme consumers of performance. Now, we receive and enter information at rapid rates, switching from view to view, consuming media in fast fragments, making inferences from the media we choose to

perceive similar to the way we make inferences from the fractions of the world of which our retinas inform our nervous system.

We consume information and simultaneously edit what we consume. The fast paced editing of our media consumption leads to new and innovative manners of thinking. Our perceptions are, in essence, a remix of the realities that surround us—and now we have technologies which allot the common user to edit and remix media consumption to mirror the condition of the modern media consumer.

This is an age of remix websites like Owen Gallager's *Total ReCut*,²² of YouTube mash-up sensations like DJ Topcat and Kutiman, of derivative works composed of samples made possible by the "Read/Write"²³ culture of the internet. Open source code acts as a springboard for innovation and reinvention. Sampling allows for new music to be crafted from fragments of the pre-composed. Kutiman, considered the DJ Shadow of YouTube,²⁴ takes videos posted by YouTube users and mixes them to create complex musical compositions. In reference to the video "My Favorite Color," one YouTube user commented that Kutiman took "simple talents and put them together to create a new level of music."²⁵ YouTube sensation Nick Bertke, better known as Pogo, creates innovative musical completions composed of sound and video samples from feature films such as *Alice in Wonderland*, *Mary Poppins*, and *Up*. Through YouTube, Pogo has shared his music with over eleven million people worldwide.²⁶ Similarly, the electronic musician Dan Deacon's first track on the album *Spiderman of the Rings* is entirely composed from a sample of Woody the Woodpecker's iconic laugh. The iconic is reinvented. These artists break the pre-composed into fragments, much like the post-modern contemporaries of Rosenberg, but these millennial artists are aided by the technological improvements of the internet age.

Producers such as Diplo, mash artists like GirlTalk, and remixes persistently featuring Lil' Wayne's spitting flow fill the ears of youth with quotes and regenerations of songs brought into a new light, forming fresh connections and associations. The original is distorted and captured by an additional apparatus; the original meaning "becomes transmittable" (Berger 24). The technological culture manifests, reinvents, and realizes the postmodern pastiche and the concept of bricoleur discourse.²⁷

Information rapidly bombards the viewer, but the eye edits masses of mass media down to a manageable size to perceive and inference. The eye edits faster because today's information travels faster and in greater quantities. The eye acts like a visual DJ, selecting data, abstracting contexts, and making connections to memories and previously stored information. Each person's ability and preference is expressed in how she edits the information, and is influenced by the medium through which she views the information. Layers of mediated realities create a veil around the Real. The Real, however can only be expressed in terms of the realities that surround us, for the Real is exposed by ripping the fabric of reality. Moments of epiphany and trauma constitute a ripping in the fabric of reality—when perceptions of the preconceived world crumble. The fragmentation of realities may create places through which the Real can be reached, and an increase in fragmented and reconstructed materials may be a starting place for exploration.

In this age of transmission, the "putative ability [of theatre] to create community (if not communion) among its participants, including performers and spectators," is put into question.²⁸ Philip Auslander asks, if nothing is unique, where is the stage—invariably temporary, existing "only in the moment"?²⁹

Peggy Phelan, paraphrasing Derrida, asserts that “Theatre continually marks the perpetual disappearance of its own enactment.”³⁰ As previously mentioned, Phelan holds live performance to be in direct opposition to mediated production: “Performance honors the idea that a limited number of people in a specific time/space frame can have an experience of value which leaves no visible trace afterward,”³¹ Philip Auslander holds that theorists and academics like Phelan and Molderings “valorize the live over the mediated”³². Although he admits that our current economy culture marginalizes the live while privileging the mediated, he disagrees with the Phelan school’s belief that “once live performance succumbs to mediatization, it loses its ontological integrity.”³³ Ontologically, performance resists reproduction—to Phelan performance is itself in that it exists only in one moment at one time, then disappears. Phelan holds that it is live performance's incapability to participate in the economy of repetition that “gives performance art its distinctive oppositional edge.”³⁴ Auslander responds: “I would like to suggest in passing that in the context of a mediatized, repetitive economy, using the technology of reproduction in ways that defy that economy may be a more significantly oppositional gesture than asserting the value of the live.”³⁵

Patrice Pavis, in *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, concludes “that theatre cannot be ‘protected’ from any media and that the ‘art in the era of technical reproduction’ cannot escape the socioeconomic-technological domination which determines its aesthetic dimension.”³⁶ Auslander agrees: “live performance cannot be shown to be independent of, immune from contamination by, and ontologically different from mediated forms.”³⁷ Although Pavis’s vocabulary seems derogatory (as Auslander also notices), the conclusion is one of innovation: “The time has passed for artistic protectionism, and the time has arrived for experiments with different possibilities.”³⁸

Although Phelan and Auslander seem to be in direct theoretical opposition, there is something to be extracted from either side. From Phelan, the importance of live bodies in attaining the Real is pertinent. Simply, the live body matters on an ontological and quantum³⁹ level. But this does not mean that the reproduced lacks the aura of the real—fragmented, yes, and each fragment carries with it a different significance and that significance is differentiated each time it is viewed. Furthermore, Marshall McLuhan states:

Media, by altering the environment, evoke in us unique ratios of sense perceptions. The extension of any one sense alters the way we think and act—the way we perceive the world⁴⁰

The user's perception is framed by his or her constantly changing position in the world. Each moment changes the user's perception of the following. Each recorded representation triggers an emotional, physical, or even simply a semiotic response from the viewer. Auslander, perhaps misreading Phelan or perhaps responding negatively to her determined language, advises the use of "the technology of reproduction in ways that defy that economy" which Phelan rejects.⁴¹

Whether performance is or performance isn't is not the question.

I will continue by examining theatrical pieces which occur at a collision of the live and the mediated—creating a glimpse of the Real—through trauma or epiphany—a tearing of the realities which we perceive.

III. MEDIA on the STAGE in ACTION

Peter Sellars states, “theatre as an art form is traditionally twenty to fifty years behind painting, music, dance, and the novel.” He continues: “The Wooster Group is up-to-date.”⁴² David Savran notes that The Wooster Group’s work is constituted by “a kaleidoscopic interplay of forms, perspectives and voices.”⁴³ The Wooster Group’s 2007 production of *Hamlet* combined the liveness of company actors with the famous 1964 recorded Broadway production of Richard Burton’s portrayal of Hamlet. The program note accompanying the fall 2007 Public Theater production provided basic information about The Wooster Group’s experiment: the recording was “filmed in live performance with seventeen cameras and shown for only two days in movie theaters across the country in a simultaneous performance of ‘Theatrofilm’ via ‘the miracle of Electronovision.’”⁴⁴ According to the note, the production

attempts to reverse the process, reconstructing a hypothetical theatre piece from the fragmentary evidence of the edited film, like an archeologist inferring a temple from a collection of ruins. Channeling the ghost of the legendary 1964 performance, we descend into a kind of madness, intentionally replacing our own spirit with the spirit of another.⁴⁵

Through both reconstructing and reinventing the past performance, The Wooster Group’s *Hamlet* “places mimetic live performances before the grainy, wall-filling screen version,” and performs the dynamic of pastiche, setting the reality of Scott Sheppard against the echo of Richard Burton’s legacy.⁴⁶

A hydraulic stage contraption jolts the actors from position to position so that they may mimic the camera angles. Although Brantley, of *The New York Times*, described the effect as “often stilted, antiquated and downright satiric,” he did note “this production met the criterion I bring to any new production of Shakespeare: that it makes me hear familiar language through virgin ears.”⁴⁷ The way in which The Wooster Group performed *Hamlet* (film projections, live camera angles, mechanical set, costumes which hint at rehearsal clothes) sparked new thought. Through the utilization of media, something fresh was produced.

What is fresh here is not the merely use of media on the stage, but the fact that the media played a major character in the dramatic action. Burton’s iconic portrayal of Hamlet was a ghost looming over Sheppard, as Hamlet’s father’s ghost looms over Hamlet. Yet, just as the media influenced the actors on the stage, so too did The Wooster Group influence the media. The Wooster Group digitally altered the meter of the Broadway recording to match the original meter of the Shakespeare, showing that they were not merely reenacting the past, but reworking it through their production.

Audiences who had been previously exposed to Burton’s performance would come to the 2007 production with preconceived notions and associations which can be triggered by the media. In this way, The Wooster Group utilizes the Burton production’s aura by fragmenting it and reattributing the energy into their own production. Consequently, if an audience member was to view the original production after observing The Wooster Group’s interpretation, they would come to the Burton version with a different context than if they were to view it with virgin eyes. The Wooster Group seems to embrace the constant contextualization and re-contextualization of a media-saturated society. This acceptance of ‘contamination’ gives The Wooster Group an edge and brings a decisive edge to their production of *Hamlet*.

The German playwright and director Bertolt Brecht theorizes that *Verfremdungseffekt*, “the technique of defamiliarizing...as to enable the spectator to see or hear it afresh,” challenges the mimetic property of acting that semioticians call iconicity, “or the conventional resemblance between the performer’s body and the object, or character, to which it refers.”⁴⁸ Applying Brecht’s *Verfremdungseffekt* to The Wooster Group’s *Hamlet*, we see the strangeness of convention-breaking producing a unique entity from an aged text. The film on stage is a form of alienation, yet it is also surprisingly normal. The eyes may dart easily, taking in the varied images, stimulated in the same fashion as day-to-day experiences, as the spectator is accustomed to a bombardment of stimuli. Yet, for some audience members, perhaps not accustomed to an ocular bombardment of such magnitude, the effect was jarring and disorienting. Combined with the noise of the hydraulics, there was an element of discomfort, causing a distancing on the part of the audience.

The Wooster Group embraces and emphasizes echoes of the past, the ferocity of Burton’s unforgettable role as Hamlet, and from that point of departure, creates uniqueness. By recognizing the societal paradigm of collage, The Wooster Group integrates media artifacts to not only produce new interpretations of artistic text, but create a collision of live and mediated performance.

III (b). WAGNER’S LEGACY and HISTORICIZING *innovation* on STAGE, a subchapter of ‘MEDIA on the STAGE in ACTION’

The text of theatre is not merely the script. Simon McBurney from the performance group Complicite states on *A Disappearing Number*: “Any theatre language that you use should be equally important as another bit of theatre language, so that if you have a strong text then the light should be as strongly apart of that text as for example the sound should be of whatever it is that you see.”⁴⁹ Complicite, a contemporary of The Wooster Group, is “always changing and moving forward to incorporate new stimuli, the principles of the work have remained close to the original impulses: seeking what is most alive, integrating text, music, image and action to create surprising, disruptive theatre.”⁵⁰ McBurney’s statement is in itself an echo and definition of nineteenth-century theory: Richard Wagner’s notion of *gesamtkunstwerk*.

Wagner’s nineteenth-century ideal of theatre embracing *gesamtkunstwerk*, a synthesis of art forms,⁵¹ is seen throughout some of the most innovative scripts of the twentieth century age: Beckett’s *Krapp’s Last Tape* makes prolific use of the playback of recorded sound, Marsha Norman’s *Night Mother* utilizes the hyper-reality of a real-time clock onstage, and John Guare’s *Six Degrees of Separation* unfolds around a two-sided Cézanne painting. The near apex of *gesamtkunstwerk* can be seen in the innovation and collaboration of Phillip Glass and Robert Wilson.⁵² According to Elizabeth LeCompte, director of The Wooster Group, Wilson’s work has an “almost Wagnerian relationship to the world” (Savran, 1988, p.4).

Brecht attempted to undermine the cohesiveness of Wagner with his theory of *Verfremdungseffekt*, but modern artists seem to have been able to reconcile the twoby upholding

Wagner's integration of art forms and utilizing them in innovative ways that may distance the audience from the dramatic action. The integration of mechanically reproduced sounds and images synthesizes in a Wagnerian sense yet has the potential for Brechtian alienation. Brecht himself utilized documentary footage on his stage, but he was focused on politicizing the drama rather than creating aesthetic choices. The marriage of different forms on stage, in particular the innovations of mechanized reproduction with liveness, can create alienation while enjoying a synthesis.

Technological innovation has long had a place on the stage: for example, Boucicault's *The Octoroon* (1859) predicted the Polaroid before the camera had even been solidly established. Indeed, obsession with photographic realism began long before the establishment of Realism in the 1870s when the playwright Henrik Ibsen abandoned verse, the writer Emile Zola returned the theatre to a laboratory, and the director Andre Antoine filled his stage with the furniture of reality.⁵³

Dennis Diderot is attributed as conceiving the first concept of the fourth wall (the ideological construct of Realism) in 1758: "Regardless of whether you are writing or acting, think no more about the audience than if it did not exist. Imagine a wall across the stage, dividing you from the audience, and act precisely as if the curtain had not risen."⁵⁴ Diderot advocated a rebellion from the neoclassical habit of separating comedy from tragedy—as habit, he says, "holds us captive."⁵⁵ In dissenting from neoclassicism, he suggested innovations in staging, "for drama would move an audience profoundly only if it created an illusion of reality."⁵⁶

The 'illusion of reality' Diderot suggests is seen by film scholar Nicholas Vardac to have culminated in the motion picture: "the motion picture finally made its appearance in response to the insistent social pressure for a greater pictorial realism in the theatre."⁵⁷ Vardac attributes the

“scenic absurdity” of the melodrama—the ice scene, for instance, in *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1858)—for “the breakdown of conventional staging methods.”⁵⁸ Vardac concludes:

The cinema, by doing so much better the selfsame things which had been the aim and objective of the popular nineteenth-century theatre, became the most widely patronized and effective art force in the world, the prime source of entertainment, as well as one of the most powerful propaganda weapon[s] ever in the hands of man.⁵⁹

In this way, Vardac asserts that cinema has an effect, or in the words of Sean Cubitt, “cinema does something, and what it does matters.”⁶⁰ Scholars and practitioners recognized the power of cinema as a process of representation even before its artistic possibilities were brought into the forefront of cultural imagination. All over the world, perception was beginning to become altered and influenced by the cinematic apparatus. At the same time as Vardac’s writings, Soviet filmmakers were inventing montage theory.

At the beginning of Sergi Eisenstein’s “A Dialectic Approach to Film Form,” he quotes playwright Goethe: “In nature we never see anything isolated, but everything in connection with something else which is before it, beside it, under it and over it.”⁶¹ Eisenstein, building from theatre, defines synthesis as “arising from the opposition between thesis and antithesis.”⁶² Applied to editing, audiences make meaning from images based upon their order of appearance, forming correlations, “a collision of independent shots.”⁶³ Placing two photographed still images of a moving object “next to each other” results in “the appearance of movement. Is this accurate? Pictorially—and phraseologically, yes.”⁶⁴ Yet, Eisenstein holds that mechanically this statement is false: “In fact, each sequential element is perceived not *next* to the other, but on *top* of the other.”⁶⁵

By superimposing mediated theatre upon stage performance, a new form of montage is created, from which audience interpretation is more varied and diverse. Peter Sellars notes,

There are many ways to react to the Wooster Group. You can become absorbed in the arcane and minutiae that eventually recombine to form the densely layered textures...and because there is so much detail, too much certainly to be taken in during a single performance, each viewer's response to the work is quite different.

66

Combining mediated theatre with stage performance addresses the dichotomies of both. A theatre audience and cinema audience is similar: both are situated in a darkened space, and by the customs of Realism, they expect to see without being seen. A key difference: when the fourth wall is broken, a theatre audience is confronted with a real set of eyes staring back at it. When Giulietta Masina smiles into the lens in the last frames of Federico Fellini's film *Le notti di Cabiria* (1957), the audience may feel as if she is looking at them, but Giulietta in truth sees only the lens and behind it, Fellini. When The Stepdaughter in Luigi Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author* (1921) begs the audience to believe her side of the story, she meets their gaze, they are no longer in any sense the unseen, and they are invariably a part of the action. Brecht advises the artist to abandon the idea of the fourth wall so that "the audience can no longer have the illusion of being the unseen spectator at an event which is really taking place."⁶⁷

A society composed of the postmodern aesthetic and principle of pastiche cannot simply be approached on a linear field. In an age of multiple screens, endless distraction, and the limitlessness of accessible knowledge, an audience is never merely the observer of one frame of perception. The situation of the stage is impacted by not only the *Verfremdungseffekt* of Brecht, but also the experience of the audience member—the individual positioning of the human observer.

In the next sections, I will examine two theatrical texts which explore the collision of the live and mediated representation.

The past went that-a-way. When faced with a totally new situation, we tend always to attach ourselves to the **objects, to the flavor** of the most recent past. We look at the present through a rear-view mirror. We march **backwards** into the future. Suburbia lives imaginatively in Bonanza-land.

--Marshal McLuhan, *The Medium is the Massage*

(emphasis is mine)

*Like so many lonely people he tends to have
an emotional rapport with
material objects.*

- Samuel Beckett, on the last page of his Production Notebook for *Das letzte Band (Krapp's Last Tape)* at the Schiller-Theatre Werkstatt, Berlin (Beckett, ed. Knoelson 248)

IV. THE TAPE MAKES THE LAST OF KRAPP: A Close Reading on the Interaction of Human and Machine in *Krapp's Last Tape*, with an Eye Toward Epiphany

The construct of *Krapp's Last Tape* explores one man's interaction with his mediated past self. The character of Krapp interacts with the machine of a tape recorder and the tactile objects of tape spools in a desperate addiction, attempting to grasp the past and deny transience. The interaction of man and machine can be likened to a twenty something re-reading her pre-teen Xanga posts, an internet time capsule preserved---with the same tendencies to skip over posts just as Krapp fast forwards through bits of his pre-recorded tapes. Beckett's Krapp is set in a time previous to internet interaction, but it is still situated within a mediated culture. In the 1950s, when *Krapp's Last Tape* was conceived, television programs such as *I Love Lucy* and *Leave it to Beaver*, as well as audiotapes had become American household commodities. Beckett's Krapp may exist in an indefinite future (perhaps post apocalyptic), but the audience would most assuredly be situated within a culture dealing with the onset of a media saturation.

The setting of *Krapp's Last Tape* is simplistic at first glance—a table, a man, a tape recorder—yet, the relationship between man and machine in Beckett's one act is a complex milieu of mediated memory and renegotiated identity. Krapp sits alone with his tape recorder, cardboard boxes full of spools—his memories are encapsulated within polyester type plastic film, magnetically recorded, and infused with the essence of prior performance. Unable to retrieve the memories without the aid of his machine, Krapp is reliant, addicted to the player's capabilities for technological recall. In *Krapp's Last Tape*, the past events are performed by

Krapp's initial memory and retelling of the event, the recorded medium of that memory, and Krapp's subsequent replaying of that recording.

Beckett meticulously lays out Krapp's interaction with his environment in his copious stage directions. From the way Krapp "fumbles" with his keys to the way he consumes and "strokes [the] banana," Krapp's relationship to his "den" is intimate and specific.⁶⁸ Although Beckett gives great importance to these "encounters" with food, beverage, and envelope, Beckett gives Krapp no words to express their importance⁶⁹—to that we look to the machine, the tapes.⁷⁰

The "relish"⁷¹ with which Krapp enunciates "Spooooo!," anal complex aside⁷², is referent to the integrality of the tape recorder/player within Krapp's otherwise simplistic domain. Krapp responds to the numbers written on the tapes "with surprise," he chides the tapes, "the little rascal!..the little scoundrel!"⁷³—he treats the tapes themselves with invested attention; the tapes are "addressed as if they were recalcitrant children."⁷⁴ On page 79 of Beckett's Production Notebook for *Das letzte Band (Krapp's Last Tape)* at the Schiller-Theatre Werkstatt, Berlin, Beckett writes that the "smiles, looks, reproaches, caresses, taps, exclamations (Du...! [You...!]) etc." are tendencies "of a solitary person to enjoy affective relationships with objects."⁷⁵ The tapes and the recorder are prized objects, held above all others: touched, spoken to, and related with far more intimately than the other objects, even the notorious bananas.

The spools, after all, are the constancy in Krapp's life: the creation and replaying of the tapes is a ritual for the lonely man; the tapes serve as a stand-in for the lack of interpersonal communication in Krapp's life. Every year for at least forty-five years⁷⁶ Krapp has habitually devoted time on his birthday to recount and relate the events of the year for his personal archives. A once "positive, purposeful form of stocktaking," the recording and listening to the "tape-

recorder [has] now become a mechanical habit, a birthday treat and a ritual action in the old man's barren life."⁷⁷

The archives are hollow shells, a skeleton of memory, a reproduction of a recollection. Krapp's tape recorder is a "memory machine," "the mechanical equivalent of Proust's vases."⁷⁸ The tapes "represent the only form of contact that Krapp can achieve in a depleted, almost totally isolated existence," an existence he once sought out when he was the arrogant voice on the other end of the tape, but now dreads as he sits listening, lacking mental and physical dexterity.⁷⁹

Krapp salivates over his archives, he is

addicted to them because they offer the possibility to relive things, to 'be again.'

Once is never enough. [His] desire—to exhaust and ruin the archives by repeated intoxication (described as something of the order of the carnal, of the animal)—is to 'devour' what there is left to relive.⁸⁰

This clinging to the past, this addiction is Krapp's demise. It is why Krapp is not saved in the end of the play. He neglects to address his epiphany by clinging to the being of his former self. He refuses to accept the recontextualization of a fluid life, instead he consumes the mediated form of his former self with the relish of a carnivore, languishing in the taste of the past while his live form deteriorates before the audience.

According to Derrida, a singular work contains two gestures: the archiving and recording ("to write so as to put into play or to keep the singularity of a date" or instance) and the critique ("to question, analyze, transform," a reflection on the general in the singular).⁸¹ Krapp's critique is a renegotiation of the past; in fact, Beckett notes Krapp has a "tendency to become what is on the tape."⁸² Krapp pauses the tape, rewinds the tape, fast-forwards the tape, switches the tape off, interrupts the tape, changes reels, and records a new tape—his last tape. Krapp does not let

the tape play out, he cannot let the tape play out, for his memory itself is fragmented; Krapp “hears nothing anymore” after the words “and from side to side.”⁸³

Yet even more puzzling than Krapp’s repetition of the love scene on the boat, is his omission of the product of his epiphany at the end of the jetty. Each time the recording of Krapp’s former self speaks of his revelation “on the end of the jetty,” Krapp “switches off impatiently” and fast forwards the tape in order to relive his intimacy with the girl on the lake.⁸⁴ With this back and forth action, Beckett considers the tape-recorder Krapp’s “masturbatory agent.”⁸⁵ Krapp seeks masturbation, not recollection. Even so, the instance on the jetty attracts attention.

Krapp’s epiphany is reminiscent of Beckett’s own large, relatively sudden turning-point in his artistic career, but

in so far as there was an autobiographical source for the vision, Beckett wanted it made clear that the location of the event was a quite different one. In 1987 he told James Knowlson: “Krapp's vision was on the pier at Dun Laoghaire; mine was in my mother's room. Make that clear once and for all”⁸⁶

Although Beckett separates his experience from Krapp’s by location, there remains a life changing moment of realization. In a discussion of how literary epiphanies can deepen the understanding of the autobiographical narratives of “quantum changers,” Martin Bidney asserts: “It is only a rare epiphany that is so reassuring and enduring as to signify a quantum leap to the one who feels it and describes it.”⁸⁷ Looking at Bidney’s examples of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, Beckett’s epiphany seems to fit Bidney’s criteria of vividness, intensity, and mystery for that of a “quantum changer.”⁸⁸ Indeed, the mysterious omission of the event in the text of *Krapp’s Last Tape* points to the vanishing of memory when the real intrudes upon reality⁸⁹. Bidney notes that

Quantum change does not just occur in the aftermath of an epiphany, but can also “involve a strong feeling of remorse and may sometimes bring strongly negative revelations, particularly after trauma.”⁹⁰ Trauma implies that there is a blockage in the signification process—“trauma is *real* insofar as it remains unsymbolizable.”⁹¹

Epiphany, like trauma is a point where the individual who experiences the event is forced to reevaluate the fabric of their world—the matrix constructed from domestication and observation. The point of epiphany or trauma is a tear in that fabric, and because the fabric is made up of dialectics, words, and images of the world’s symbolic ‘reality,’ the point of departure can never successfully be described. The moment can never successfully be understood within the symbolic world’s lexicon because the moment is not of the world, it interrupts the symbolic world. As Peggy Phelan notes, “within the physical universe, the real of the quantum is established through a negotiation with the limitations of the representational possibilities of measuring time and space,” but through the dialectics of Freud and Lacan, “the Real [is] forever impossible to realize (to make real) within the frame of the Symbolic” (Phelan 3). Epiphany, trauma, as well as performance constitute “missed events.”⁹²

By fast-forwarding the tape past the recollection of his epiphany, Krapp is rejecting the notion that words can describe his epiphany. The moment is not necessarily unbearable or uninteresting to Krapp; the fast-forwarding seems to be Tourette-like automation. Krapp must get past this part, for one reason or another, and “curses louder” when he momentarily fails (Beckett 21). The vision on the jetty once seemed significant enough to record, but now there is a “gulf between a past experience that seemed to offer a key to possible fulfillment and a present of failure, emptiness, and meaninglessness” (Knowlson and Pilling 82-83).

Krapp's rewinding of the tape presents the second and third recorded 'performances' of the love scene in a constantly shifting framework. Just as audiences are constantly repositioning and reevaluating world views in relation to the continual transgression of events, so too does the replaying of the same tape present different results. The difference between the first and the third playing of the section (besides differences in length) is that the third performance is informed by the previous two presentations of the recorded material. "Since Krapp first winds the tape so far forward that we only hear the end of the episode," the context to combat the association that the couple achieved harmony from a "purely physical union," is not represented.⁹³ Yet, when Krapp winds the tape back and replays the recording the second time, the sex is downplayed by an "unashamedly lyrical" and sentimental passage.⁹⁴ The third time the passage is played, it is after Krapp has thrown away his newly recorded reel—an indication that he not only wants to forget his "vision" but he also no longer wishes to exist in the present.

Throwing the present aside, Krapp returns to box three, spool five and the intimacy he once shared. His slurring miserable speech of the present is replaced once again with lyrical beauty—a singular moment lived by a man Krapp once knew as himself. This time, the tape plays all the way to the end, echoing: "Perhaps my best years are gone. When there was a chance of happiness. But I wouldn't want them back. Not with this fire in me now. No, I wouldn't want them back."⁹⁵ The words, stating that the best had come and gone thirty years previous to the present, close the play on a decidedly depressing note: the Krapp on the tape, full of hope, fire and passion for his craft juxtaposed with the Krapp in front of the audience, dismal in his weakness, failed and alone. The Krapp preserved through the apparatus of the tape recorder is twice removed, as younger Krapp recounts to the recorder a memory of previous events. Thus the event itself is performed by both the apparatus and the memory in the retelling.

This fissure between real and represented underlines the depression of the closing—the hope of the past so far removed from the present, that despondence is inevitable.

The decidedness of the title, *Krapp's Last Tape*, “suggests clearly enough that death is somewhere close at hand.”⁹⁶ Yet, the ‘Last Tape’ ends in the trash. Perhaps this signifies that Krapp does not wish people, himself or otherwise, to remember him in his current state. He rejects himself, what he has become, and longs for the past. By throwing out his present, he effectively stops living. With the reinstating of box three, spool five, Krapp metaphorically dies. Instead of reaching a heaven or a semblance of happiness, however, Krapp clings to a rejection of the transient nature of the world. According to Buddhist philosophy “transience is the root of our suffering.”⁹⁷ Krapp embraces suffering with his constant need to record, replay, and relive his past self. Throughout the *Krapp's Last Tape*, Krapp demonstrates a thirst for Aggregates,⁹⁸ for worldly attachments: his distasteful consumption of bananas, his constant interruptions of drink which progresses to outright drunkenness, and his tendency toward masturbation and sexual cravings—Krapp is the anti-Zen.

In conclusion, the only thing Krapp is devoted to is a machine, a material, an object of the physical world—he rejects himself in favor of the mechanized reproduction of his former self, even as he calls that past self a “stupid bastard.”⁹⁹ Through Krapp's obsession with his tape-player, he skews his past and destroys his future. By neglecting to live in the present and embrace the transient, Krapp is doomed to suffering. Krapp's dependant relationship with the tape-player is his unraveling, for the reproduction of a memory can never serve as anything substantial. The represented can never equal the real. Krapp is reduced to a life without meaning, “motionless staring before him,” as “the tape runs on in silence.”¹⁰⁰ Although Krapp (and Beckett) crossed some sort of quantum threshold, it ironically did not succeed in saving him

or releasing him from suffering. The mere existence of an epiphany is not enough to ‘save,’ for in the present there is no apex, there is no plateau—one must continue to grow, reevaluate, reconfigure, and recontextualize the world as it is perceived. An epiphany cannot serve as a peak; it must function as a launch pad.

Krapp consumed the spools in order to relive the past, not deconstruct it to form something new. His dramatic action was a cycle of clinging, a thirst that could not be sated because time does not move in reverse. Krapp clung to the time of the past instead of accepting its transience. Beckett’s Krapp does not form something transient that neglects the context of the original, he savors the untouchable original. The recorder echoes the original like the Wooster Group’s echoing of Burton, but in Krapp there is no attempt at recontextualization. True, Krapp manipulates the text of his past by fast forwarding and rewinding, but he does nothing to alienate it from its pre-composed contextualization and bring it into the sphere of liveness. Instead, he brings himself into the sphere of the mechanized, becoming almost one with the machine, and inevitably extinguishes his liveness in favor of his memories trapped within the mechanized.

Conversely, Christine Kozlov’s installation, *Information: No Theory* (1970), utilized a tape recorder in order to get at the transient nature of existence. The installation, praised by Auslander, “consisted of a tape recorder equipped with a tape loop, whose control was fixed in the ‘record’ mode.”¹⁰¹ Therefore, new information continuously replaced existing information on the tape in a cycle of temporary existence and continual disappearance. The artist noted: it was “proof of the existence of the information [did] not in fact exist.”¹⁰² Here, Auslander argues, “the functions of reproduction, storage, and distribution that animate the network of repetition” were undermined by using “the very technology that brought that network into being.

In this context, reproduction without representation may be more radical than representation without reproduction.”¹⁰³

Perhaps a warning against mediated culture, Krapp loses the real in order to languish in the representational. Beckett’s Krapp represents a failure, but as Krapp fails to accept transience, the audience sees through Krapp a fleeting life—transience is made apparent by Krapp’s desolate life. In Krapp’s death, there is a hope for the life outside his dully lit room—there is hope when the house lights rise.

The family circle has widened. The
worldpool of information fathered by
electric media—movies, Telstar, flight—
far surpasses any possible influence
mom and dad can now bring to bear.
Character no longer is shaped by only
two earnest, fumbling experts. Now all
the world's a sage.

--Marshall McLuhan, *The Medium is the Message*

V. A WORK IN FRAGMENTS: a Close Reading of the Use of Television in Scene 4 of Heiner Müller's *Hamletmachine*

Heiner Müller's *Hamletmachine* is a postmodernist play loosely based on Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. As The Wooster Group uses Burton's *Hamlet* as a place for departure, Müller takes the characters and the emotions from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and philosophizes them within the sphere of a fragmented post-war society suffering from both American media saturation and a government funded reinvention of history. The characters are porous, taking on multiple interpretations of themselves, and the text is a conglomeration of borrowed phrases and fractured images.

The introduction of televisions on stage in scene 4 of Heiner Müller's *Hamletmachine* is an exemplification of Brecht's *Verfremdungseffekt*¹⁰⁴; the televisions have been alienated from their original settings in several ways: they are without audio, they compete with live action, they are not the objects of the observer's gaze, they are displaced from the privacy of the home, and there are three channels simultaneously transmitted. Yet, unlike Brecht, Müller does not infuse his displaced icons with a clear ideological message. No, Müller fuses Brecht with Artaud, and reaches audiences repulsed by Brecht's "preachiness" by providing a forum to evaluate rather than a definitive evaluation; Müller "did not deliver meanings, but propose questions."¹⁰⁵ Performance gives a space for the rethinking and reworking of past and pre-formed ideas, behaviors, and enactments. Television is a pillar of transmission, and by deconstructing the icon of television on the stage, Müller brings the communion and discourse of performance to a form

utilized for the renegotiation of history, the purposeful reeducation of a population, and the promotion of homogenized mass consumption.

Scene 4, *Pest in Buda/Battle for Greenland*, is “Space 2, as destroyed by Ophelia”—a place defined by female action, which will serve as a place for male observation. Hamlet begins by speaking of cold, of winter, and the Russian Civil War.¹⁰⁶ His language is a composition of borrowed phrases, fragmented into a verse without discernible beat or structure, and it is interrupted by an unmasking: “He takes off makeup-and costume.”¹⁰⁷ When Hamlet dons the guise of a woman in scene 3, “I want to be a woman,” he traded his status as observer for that of subject—he leaves his status as man and becomes the female, the objectified.¹⁰⁸

Hamlet’s return to his masculine position as surveyor in scene 4 is exemplified by his speech, which resembles the dialectics of a radio or courtroom reporter. Hamlet begins by subjectively narrating the action in relationship to the singularity of himself,¹⁰⁹ “behind me,” yet he expresses that he is “not interested anymore” in his drama.¹¹⁰ He is now decidedly the observer, the viewer—an inactive surveyor and conveyor of action, but there is a split. This abstraction underlines Müller’s writing, “influenced as much by Nietzsche and Foucault as by Artaud,” from a sense that the “contemporary ‘subject’ was diseased.”¹¹¹

The disease is not just the character’s apparent state of schizophrenia and the split between East and West; it occurs in the physical body. Hamlet wishes for death, Ophelia strips down to a bare nakedness—all which signify a significant traumatic rapture. Post-war Germany is ripe with PTSD, and the body politic responds with censorship and a methodic reworking of historic events. Denial and bargaining dominate the political sphere as the character of Hamlet retreats into despondence.

Even when The Actor Playing Hamlet begins to use the subjective “I” within the action of his narration, he is not doing—he merely speaks of action. As Hamlet returns to his masculinity, he simultaneously forsakes his character’s identity, as he becomes The Actor Playing Hamlet (henceforth, to be referred to as Actor-Hamlet), and he speaks, “I am not Hamlet. I don’t take part anymore. My thoughts suck the blood out of images. My drama doesn’t happen anymore. Behind me the set is put up...”¹¹²

The observer, radio-like quality of Actor-Hamlet’s narration is contrasted by the entrance of the televisions, as the set is literally “put up,” and “stagehands place a refrigerator and three TV-sets on the stage.”¹¹³ Actor-Hamlet’s sentences following the entrance of the televisions begin with nouns other than himself and separate from his previous identity as Hamlet—“the set,” “his name,” the monument,” “the stone”—even when he refers to “my drama,” the noun possesses its own modal verb, as if Hamlet or Actor-Hamlet’s identity is unnecessary to the continuation of the dramatic action of *Hamlet*. He is telling an aural story separate from himself, the action on stage, and the images transmitted on the televisions.

His sentences, although evocative, describe images of action without commentary. Yet, the dialectics of television has an integral component of commentary, for the images are thought to speak for themselves; the images tell the action. Instead, the audience views “three TV-channels without sound”—the stage is composed of images without commentary, of the description of action without commentary, of sound dialogue that does not describe or shed light on the images transmitted. The stage is permeated with semiotic discontinuity. Actor-Hamlet’s spoken imagery is in direct competition with pictorial image. The audience is asked to imagine Actor-Hamlet’s words in action, but is ocularly stimulated by three separate channels transmitting un-coded signs—the stage begs to be signified.

An overload of stimulation inquires: Where should the audience direct their gaze?

Although Actor-Hamlet professes that he is aware of his own position in the theatricality, the action of the stagehands goes “unnoticed by the actor playing Hamlet.”¹¹⁴ He does not see the televisions. Once the set of the TV-set has been set, however, the actor’s words “The set is a monument,” seem to underline the “unnoticed” action that has just been performed.¹¹⁵ Actor-Hamlet is in the foreground, not watching the images, not gazing at the televisions. A television’s purpose is to be viewed, but here, the actor does not look at it. He is silhouetted by the electricity. By abstracting Actor-Hamlet’s gaze from the televisions, Müller enforces that the words and the images are separate. One does not affect the other. The televisions will continue to transmit their images regardless of the words that Actor-Hamlet speaks, and Actor-Hamlet would continue his monologue without the televisions’ presence. The reality of the televised reproduction of image is separate from Actor-Hamlet’s reality—in fact, the discontinuity questions the legitimacy of the pictorial reproduction. If the images on the televisions are not relevant to the stage action, how does that change their relevance within the domicile?

Television images placed on the stage expose those images, abstracted from the comfort of the domicile, as images: not necessarily truth. With mechanical reproduction comes the guise of truth, of reality, but this is not always the case. Behind a lens is a practitioner, a framer, and behind a program package there is an editor—and editing creates meaning.

During the twenty years from 1954 to 1974 the West German television market became progressively saturated, and television eventually and “effectually created an all-inclusive national audience.”¹¹⁶ By the end of the expansion process, “there were over eighteen million TV subscribers in the Federal Republic, and only 5 percent of the population did not have access

to a television in their own homes.”¹¹⁷ The prevalence of television in the West German home was a reflection of the extended leisure time made possible by, in combination with other social developments, “the mobilization of society through the automobile and the reduction of average working hours.”¹¹⁸ The television became the number one family activity. In a survey of Germans conducted in 1977, the response “often watch television together” was the most applicable answer for “things you often do with other members of the family.”¹¹⁹ The response was consistent across all economic and social classes, surpassing the runner up—“Frequently play games”—by a rough average of 30 percent.¹²⁰ The prevalence of the television in the home “gave rise to new family rituals.”¹²¹

Peter Brook, in his discussion of Holy Theatre in his text *The Empty Space*, notes that ritual is paramount to the production of applicable theatre, and it is only when ritual is at “our own level that we become qualified to deal in it”¹²²—he references pop music as a level to which we have access. In the late 1970s, Heiner Müller was increasingly aware that theatre artists like Peter Brook as well as Peter Weiss, Edward Bond, and Jerzy Grotowski “had earned international recognition by fusing Brecht and Artaud in original syntheses.”¹²³ Whether or not he was directly influenced by Brook’s words, Müller’s placement of televisions on the stage brings the familial ritual of television viewership within the interpretative and re-evaluative schema of the proscenium. In the home, families no longer were expected to speak, to each other or look at each other—they could spend time together by not relating to each other as individuals, but by relating to the same box, by fixating their gaze in the same direction, by experiencing images—processing prescribed text rather than engaging in acts of creation or dialogue. Although audiences of a theatrical work do not engage, the alienation of the television

requires dialogue. The reattribution of the private television box into the public theatre space reevaluates the dissonance between transmission and communion.

Walter Benjamin's famous essay "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit"¹²⁴ "appeared in the *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*¹²⁵ several months after the Reich Broadcasting Company announced 'the world's first regular television service.'¹²⁶ The "near simultaneity" of the new mass medium and the publication (and resulting popularity) of Benjamin's critique, demonstrates the awareness of changing perception in German culture. John Berger prefaces his first essay, a reconfiguration of Benjamin's original, in his text *Ways of Seeing* with the notion: "Seeing comes before words. The child looks and recognizes before it can speak."¹²⁷ Berger's essay collection, published first in 1972, signified a renewal of the original critique of the way the machinery of technological reproduction performs our perception of the object viewed. *Hamletmachine*, published in 1977, echoes Berger's sentiments, as the televisions on the stage are actually performers. In this way, the televisions are essentially physical manifestations of the notion that the apparatus 'performs' our perceptions of reality. Indeed, the televisions, the machines, seem to have more of an identity than that of Actor-Hamlet, whose status as a subject is a continual fragmentation. The machines, however, are static in their transmission. They are singular in their frame. They position the viewer decidedly.

Berger's notion of the child's development is also performed by the absence of audio on the television sets. The child looks and sees the images and is educated by them. Before words, the images speak. The power of television for education is paramount. Television executives, through the production of "patriarchal television," defined the "population's educational needs, and among many other items this agenda included *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*."¹²⁸ Much of the televised air time in post-war Germany was dedicated to historical programming: "between 1963

and 1993 the ZDF¹²⁹ aired over 1,200 programs that dealt with the Nazi past and postwar legacy” and “during the 1960s and early 1970s, the ZDF offered an average of sixteen hundred prime-time minutes of historical programming per year.”¹³⁰ Yet, this programming was decidedly biased and perpetuated the dominant government enforced ideology. Before the 1984 introduction of commercial channels, the government controlled all televised content and television was exclusively public.¹³¹ From 1963 to 1971, television “was made and consumed by contemporaries of Nazism... they were engaged with representations of the past to help them cope with the postwar political and moral status quo.”¹³² To reiterate Vardac: the cinematic lens is “one of the most powerful propaganda weapon[s] ever in the hands of man.”¹³³

While the programming during this time period defiantly reserved an anti-Nazi stance, it also “employed a range of strategies designed to strengthen the audience’s loyalty to the new state and lift the moral burden of Nazism from its shoulders.”¹³⁴ The network’s coverage of history renegotiated and “the conservative resisters of Hitler into democratic proto-West Germans” yet neglected to mention the existence of the Communist resistance movement.¹³⁵ Despite the prevalence of historic programming, the hours and funding allotted to the production and viewing of the material, the station consistently dedicated a meager 1 percent to 1.5 percent of its programming “to educating and informing its viewers” about the problems in Germany’s past, instead “the early shows of the ZDF displayed a disturbing tendency to revisit and mourn military defeats during the war and omit the army’s involvement in Nazi crimes.”¹³⁶ In a 1978 interview, Müller refers to *Hamletmaschine* as “an important endpoint to his career—

From *The Scab* to *Hamletmaschine* everything is one story, a slow process of reduction. With my last play *Hamletmaschine* that’s come to an end. No substance for dialogue exists anymore because there is no more history.¹³⁷

The televisions on the stage may be a reduction of the lack of actual history in historical programming in Germany. The pastiche nature of Müller's work relies on the reattribution of existing artifacts, pieces of old history, reworked. Not 'new' history, but a conglomeration.

The televisions on the stage in *Hamletmachine* display three channels. West Germany, as well as East Germany, possessed two stations for the majority of the 20th century. Public television fostered "cultural homogenization by alleviating social and regional differences," as well as familiarizing "West Germans with democratic decision-making processes."¹³⁸ Between 1964 and 1969, the ADR¹³⁹ launched "five independent regional channels," but they lacked "significant impact on national programming."¹⁴⁰ The placement of three channels on the stage is significant, it points to the emergence of the *Die Dritten*, or *The Third Networks*.

The three channels also may signify that broadcasts from the west could be received in most of East Germany, that the borders were not closed to televised transmission¹⁴¹. Images from the west spilled into the east, displaying a mass consumerism unavailable to East Germany: "Hail Coca Cola."¹⁴² Consumer groups underwent a period of expansion in the 1970s, and American products saturated the marketplace. East Germany, cut off from the 'protection' of the United States, did not have access to the product itself, but through television, they had access to the performance of the product, the reproduced image of the product. Actor-Hamlet goes back and forth referencing West Germany, "Give us our daily murder," and East Germany, "Of the lies which are believed."¹⁴³ This contrast and conglomeration underlines the East-West dialectic. They are talking to each other. The West's television talks to the Eastern audience. In East Germany, western consumer products were represented, but not manifested to the public. The East could see the products, but not acquire them or consume them—they could just see what they were missing.

By the presence of three televisions on the stage, Müller also proposes the existence of differing viewpoints. When an individual views the television in the comfort of the home, he/she is transmitted one image, one view. On the stage, there are three televisions, and there exists a variety of available transmissions. Furthermore, the ‘transmission’ aspect of these images is in conflict with the space of the theatre: there is no audio importance given to the images, and the images are upstaged by the Actor-Hamlet’s monologue. The audience, not given a definitive point to fixate their gaze, must make the choice to view one thing or another. This choice is not allotted to the homogenized audience member in the home; that television audience is given limited choice and is seen (at this point in history) within effects based theory. On the stage, the effect of the image cannot be determined because the audience has an increased choice in where they fix their gaze. Müller, in his fraught relationship with his own country’s government, may be suggesting that the transmissions of the public television are fraudulent.

Before the “TV screens go black,” Actor-Hamlet references Warhol saying, “I want to be a machine.”¹⁴⁴ By referencing Warhol, Müller is again snipping clippings from the fabrics of the pre-composed, and what is more post-modern than Andrew Warhol, who delights in the object and its representation? A female identity is not enough, a character identity is not enough, a male identity is not enough—Actor-Hamlet now longs to be a machine. Neither subject nor object, Actor-Hamlet looks enviously at the construct of the frame. “No pain no thoughts” occur within the machine, only the basic mechanisms of functionality, “Arms for grabbing Legs for walking.”¹⁴⁵ Actor-Hamlet wants to be the television, he wants to be the refrigerator, he wants to be static in his typical-of-Hamlet inaction. Yet, the machines effectually do more action than the Actor-Hamlet. The only action Actor-Hamlet performs within his monologue is the (repeated) tearing of the picture of the author, thought to be a moment of crisis in Müller’s

career; the rest is the description of action.¹⁴⁶ Conversely, the refrigerator buzzes, the televisions play channels, and then the televisions “go black” and “blood oozes from the refrigeration.”¹⁴⁷ In the end, the machines too are fraudulent—they are not what they seem, they are further alienated by their abilities to act and not merely be acted upon. The machines perform literally in addition to the televisions framing performance through the construct of mechanical reproduction.

Hamletmachine situates the audience in a place where semiotic relationships do not follow clear paths: signs no longer travel on clear circuits toward signifiers—there is a haze between “words and meanings, texts and performances, actors and audiences.”¹⁴⁸ The fragments do not necessarily add up to anything whole, the text is full of meaning, but it must be interpreted on an individual scale, on a philosophical scale.¹⁴⁹ *Hamletmachine* is an intertextualized performance, a script at the crossroads of precedent and present—the explanation cannot be prescribed, as it singular in its reliance upon the audience’s prior knowledge of citation and experiences with the bricoleur parts. Robert Wilson stated in a dialogue with Fred Newman:

When I first met Heiner Müller, even though people had always talked about him as being a political playwright, I said to him, ‘Heiner, I don’t see your work as political. I think that it is philosophical, but not necessarily political.’ When I directed *Hamletmachine* at New York University with students, it was very difficult for them to understand anything about the Hungarian Revolution; they didn’t know what it was. Heiner always said the reason he liked the production and the American kids doing it was the space it gave to the intellectualism. If his body of work is going to be looked at 500 years from now, it won’t be looked at as a political voice, but as a philosophical voice.¹⁵⁰

The philosophy of *Hamletmachine* is an evisceration of identity and history, a resignification of the past and a recontextualization of thought. Just as television renegotiates German history, *Hamletmachine* renegotiates theatre's capacity to present text with its erratic use of speech prefixes, deliberate confusion of line and stage direction, and nearly non-performable transcriptions.¹⁵¹ The use of televisions on stage significantly contribute to Heiner Müller's pastiche aesthetic as well as point to and deconstruct a significant German mass medium. Literature is deconstructed, popular culture is deconstructed, history is deconstruction, and with the deconstruction and reattribution of television, it is known: nothing is safe from Heiner Müller, the engineer of conglomeration.

By deconstructing his own history and the cultural and social paradigms of his environment, Müller was able to touch on something more. He created a rip in the fabric of the pre-composed and exposed the guise of mechanical reproduction. By bringing the pre-recorded images onto the stage, Müller framed the media—he in effect hyper-represented the images on the television sets, bringing into question the whole construct of framing and the definite truthiness or verisimilitude of the photographic image. Müller confronted the trauma of misrepresentation with the deconstruction of representation itself.



People are not disturbed by things, but by the view they take of them.

-Epictetus¹⁵²

VI. AFTERWARDS and Questions for Consideration

We are currently embarking on a new phase of theatrical representation that is being influenced by the hypermediated world in which we find ourselves. Long is the tradition of integrating the mediated with the live, and this tradition will assuredly continue into the future, utilizing technologies which have yet to see the consumer market. I say here, or attempt to say, that there is something there in that interaction. There is something more than aesthetics. There is something which touches at how we are programmed and conditioned to accept mediization as life.

We perceive our lives in a new space, in a virtual space. Of this virtual space, Marshall McLuhan writes “electric circuitry is recreating in us the multi-dimensional space orientation of the ‘primitive.’”¹⁵³ McLuhan asserts that “pre-alphabet people integrate time and space as one”—where Western ideals create a primarily visual space, ‘primitive’ individuals live in a horizonless space defined by aural and olfactory spaces in addition to visual space.¹⁵⁴ The virtual world is one of multiple axes: transcending the x, the y, and the z. Circuitry is seemingly boundless, and information races at incredible speeds. Structures break down and become fluid.

This fluidity allows for an increase in interpretations and experiences. By utilizing the circuitry of technological progress on the stage, we can tap into the unconscious part of the brain (conditioned by the new world of the internet) that can observe and compute information at rapid speeds. This is not necessarily an improvement to theatre—or better or worse for the stage—but it is a direction that theatre can possibly take in order to further the experimentation of colliding the live and the mediated.

Hypermediation will continue to permeate the world around us, and increase in its excess. The negative influences of technology, for instance an addiction to connectivity, have

yet to be established, for this world is just forming. By acknowledging the mediaization, recognizing its influence, and thinking of a text or a post to be a moment in time that passes may save our community from the fate of Krapp. Learning from Müller, we can recognize propaganda power that the television holds, and we can see that our children are educated by realities other than those on the screen. Media is not a contamination to art, but it can infect the individual. Being aware, and exploring the struggles in art is the best way to combat forces which draw the individual further away from the Real.

ENDNOTES

I. INTRODUCTION: VIRTUAL CULTURE, PERCEPTION, and PERFORMANCE:

¹ Phillip Auslander. *Liveness: Performance and Mediated Culture*. (Oxon: Routledge, 2008), 2

² Concept coined by Walter Benjamin

³ “Within Lacanian psychoanalysis, the Real is full Being itself...The Real is forever impossible to realize (to make real) within the framework of the Symbolic” The Symbolic is our perceptions of reality—Layers of science, law ‘realism’—the Symbolic establishes stability.

Peggy Phelan. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. (London; New York: Routledge, 1993),

3

II. THE EYE AS THE DJ or -Into a Hypermediated Discourse-:

⁴ Jon McKenzie. *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance*. (London: Routledge, 2001)

⁵ The concept of “frame” in this section does not attempt to tackle the notion of psychology or politics. Here, “frame” is the *mise en scene* within the ocular perception.

⁶ N. Bolz, and W. Reijen. *Walter Benjamin*. (Humanities Pr.: 1996), 71

⁷ John Berger. *Ways of Seeing*. (New York: Penguin Books, 1977), 19

⁸ Marita Sturken and Lisa Cartwright. *Practices of Looking: an Introduction to Visual Culture*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001). 222, 243

⁹ Bolz, and Reijen. *Walter Benjamin*. 71

¹⁰ McKenzie. *Perform*. 11

¹¹ “Kanye West Offends With Abortion-Themed Tweets.” Last modified February 24, 2011

<http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/kanye-west-offends-abortion-themed-161164>

¹² “Kanye West Abortion Tweet Angers Famous Followers” Last modified February 26, 2011.

<http://blog.kazaa.com/kanye-west-abortion-tweet-angers-famous-followers/>

¹³ Leanne Italie. “Facebook is divorce lawyers' new best friend” Last modified June 28, 2010.

http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/37986320/ns/technology_and_science-tech_and_gadgets/

¹⁴ Italie. “Facebook...”

¹⁵ Phelan. *Unmarked*. 146

¹⁶ Phelan. *Unmarked*. 146

¹⁷ Phelan. *Unmarked*. 148

¹⁸ Phelan. *Unmarked*. 7

¹⁹ McKenzie. *Perform*. Foreword

²⁰ McKenzie. *Perform*. 22

²¹ “Hyper-” Dictionary.com. Accessed April 4, 2011.

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/hyper->

²² “Total Recut” Last accessed April 8, 2011. <http://www.totalrecut.com/>

²³ Term coined by Lawrence Lessig in *Remix* (2008)

²⁴ “Beastie Boys’ message board” Last accessed on April 13, 2011.

<http://bbs.beastieboys.com/showthread.php?t=90455>

²⁵ anu05, comment on “My Favorite Color” Last accessed on April 8, 2011.

http://www.youtube.com/all_comments?v=nIl4LkHYRkg

²⁶ Fagottron. YouTube User Profile. Last accessed on April 8, 2011.

<http://www.youtube.com/user/Fagottron>

²⁷ "The bricoleur, says Levi-Strauss, is someone who uses ‘the means at hand,’ that is, the instruments he finds at his disposition around him, those which are already there, which had not

been especially conceived with an eye to the operation for which they are to be used and to which one tries by trial and error to adapt them, not hesitating to change them whenever it appears necessary, or to try several of them at once, even if their form and their origin are heterogenous – and so forth. There is therefor a critique of language in the form of bricolage, and it has even been said that bricolage is critical language itself...If one calls bricolage the necessity of borrowing one's concepts from the text of a heritage which is more or less coherent or ruined, it must be said that every discourse is bricoleur." Jacques Derrida. *Writing and Difference*.

(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 285

²⁸ Auslander. *Liveness*, 4

²⁹ Auslander. *Liveness*, 4

³⁰ Phelan. *Unmarked*. 15

³¹ Phelan. *Unmarked*. 149

³² Philip Auslander "Ontology vs. History: Making Distinctions Between the Live and the Mediatized". 1999. Last accessed on February 8, 2011.

<http://webcast.gatech.edu/papers/arch/Auslander.html>

³³ Auslander "Ontology"

³⁴ Phelan. *Unmarked*. 148

³⁵ Auslander "Ontology"

³⁶ Patrice Pavis, trans. Loren Kruger. *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*. (London: Routledge, 1992), 134

³⁷ Auslander. *Liveness*. 7

³⁸ Pavis. *Theatre*. 134

³⁹ Phelan references quantum theory throughout her book *Unmarked*.

⁴⁰ Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore. *The Medium is the Massage: an Inventory of Effects*. (New York: Bantam Books, 1957).

⁴¹ Auslander "Ontology"

III. MEDIA on the STAGE in ACTION

⁴² David Savran. *Breaking the Rules: The Wooster Group*. (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1988), xiv

⁴³ Savran. *Breaking the Rules*. 6

⁴⁴ Sarah Werner. "Two Hamlets: Wooster Group and Synthetic Theater," *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 59 no. 3 (2008): 323.

⁴⁵ Werner. "Two Hamlets." 323.

⁴⁶ B. Brantley. "Looks It Not Like the King? Well, More Like Burton," *The New York Times*. Last modified November 1, 2007

<http://theater.nytimes.com/2007/11/01/theater/reviews/01haml.html>

⁴⁷ Brantley. "Looks It Not Like the King?"

⁴⁸ Elen Diamond. *Unmaking Mimesis*. (London: Routledge, 1997), 45

III (b). WAGNER's LEGACY and HISTORICIZING innovation on STAGE, a subchapter of 'MEDIA on the STAGE in ACTION'

⁴⁹ BarbicanLondon (2007) THEATRE: Complicite – A Disappearing Number. [Video] Last modified August 30, 2007. Youtube. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FK3o05UEufA>

⁵⁰ R. Graef. "Overview" Last viewed April 15, 2010. <http://www.complicite.org/about/>

⁵¹ O. Brockett, *History of the Theatre*. 10. (Allyn & Bacon, 2008) 390.

⁵² See, in particular, *Einstein on the Beach* (1976).

⁵³ Brockett. *History*. 343.

⁵⁴ quoted by Brockett *History*. 251

This statement, cited as appearing in Diderot's essay "On Dramatic Poetry" (1758), does not appear in John Gaywoon Linn's translation, nor could an accurate citation be found through the use of internet search engines; however, as many sources continue to attribute Diderot with the concept of the fourth wall (all without viable citations), this essay will begrudgingly uphold this claim despite the disturbing lack of concrete evidence.

⁵⁵ H. Adams, and B. Hathaway. *Dramatic Essays of the Neoclassic Age*. (Ayer Publishing, 1972) 350.

⁵⁶ Brockett. *History*. 238.

⁵⁷ Nicolas Vardac. *Stage to Screen: Theatrical Method from Garrick to Griffith*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949) xxv.

⁵⁸ Vardac. *Stage to Screen*. 5.

⁵⁹ Vardac. *Stage to Screen*. 251

⁶⁰ Sean Cubitt. "The Cinema Effect." (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2004) 1.

⁶¹ Sergi Eisenstein, and J. Leyda. *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*. (Harcourt Inc., 1949) 45.

⁶² Eisenstein. *Film Form*. 45.

⁶³ Eisenstein. *Film Form*. 49.

⁶⁴ Eisenstein. *Film Form*. 49.

⁶⁵ Eisenstein. *Film Form*. 45.

⁶⁶ Savran. *Breaking the Rules*. xv.

⁶⁷ Bertolt Brecht "Alienation Effects in Chinese Acting" in John Willett's *Brecht on Theater*. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1964). 91.

IV. THE TAPE MAKES THE LAST OF KRAPP: A Close Reading on the Interaction of Human and Machine in *Krapp's Last Tape*, with an Eye Toward Epiphany

⁶⁸ Samuel Beckett. *Krapp's Last Tape, and other dramatic pieces*. (New York: Grove Press, 1960) 9-1.

⁶⁹ In *Regiebuch* pp.10-14 in a lengthier description of Krapp's actions, Krapp takes out his watch and "grunts incomprehensible sounds" as he peers at it. Later, he "makes a little tasting noise with his lips" as well as rummages for his banana in the drawer "with a quiet murmuring". Information found in *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett vol. 3: Krapp's Last Tape* edited by James Knowlson (pp. 14 -15) Although these grunts and sighs are aural, they remain non-verbal.

⁷⁰ Beckett. *Krapp's Last Tape*. 23

⁷¹ On page 69 of Beckett's Production Notebook (p.185 in *The Theatrical Notebooks*) Beckett writes: "savour the word"

⁷² See chapter 4, "Some Kind of Anal Complex," in Phil Baker's *Beckett and the Mythology of Psychoanalysis*

⁷³ Beckett. *Krapp's Last Tape*. 12

⁷⁴ James Knowlson, James, and John Pilling. *Frescoes of the Skull: The Later Prose and Drama of Samuel Beckett*. 1 Evergreen ed. (New York: Grove Press 1979) 83.

⁷⁵ Samuel Beckett, and James Knowlson. *Krapp's Last Tape: With a Revised Text*. 1st ed. Vol. 3. (New York: Grove Press, 1992) 205.

⁷⁶ On page 3 of Beckett's Production Notebook (p.53 in *The Theatrical Notebooks*) Beckett writes: "Since there is a reference in the text to box 9 (Mein Gott!) [good God!] and to 5 reels of

tape in each box, on the table there must be at least $9 \times 5 = 45$ recordings = birthdays = years.

So, when he began making these recordings, he must have been at most $69 - 45 = 24$ years of age (Box 1, spool 1)”

⁷⁷ Knowlson and Pilling. *Frescoes of the Skull*. 82.

⁷⁸ Ackerley, Chris, and S. E. Gontarski. *The Grove Companion to Samuel Beckett: A Reader's Guide to His Works, Life, and Thought*. 1st ed. (New York: Grove Press, 2004) 338.

“**vase**: a recurrent image of memory. In Proust (15), the individual is the seat of “a constant process of decantation,” from the vessel containing fluid of future time, “sluggish, pale monochrome,” so that the containing fluid of past time, “agitated and multicoloured by the phenomena of its hours”In Krapp’s Last Tape the vases become spools, images of yesterday captured on celluloid, another paradise lost.” (Ackerley and Gontarski 604)

⁷⁹ Knowlson and Pilling. *Frescoes of the Skull*. 83.

⁸⁰ Asja Szafraniec. *Beckett, Derrida, and the Event of Literature*. (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007) 33.

⁸¹ Szafraniec *the Event of Literature*. 31.

⁸² Beckett and Knowlson. *Krapp's Last Tape: With a Revised Text*. 181.

⁸³ Beckett and Knowlson. *Krapp's Last Tape: With a Revised Text*. 148.

This “unhearing” is demonstrated by Krapp not reacting as he has been during the previous pauses in the tape, he “sits quite motionless, no longer hearing the words on the tape” (269).

⁸⁴ Beckett. *Krapp's Last Tape*. 21

⁸⁵ Beckett and Knowlson. *Krapp's Last Tape: With a Revised Text*. 181.

⁸⁶ Paul Lawley. “‘The Rapture of Vertigo’ Beckett's Turning-Point.” *The Modern Language Review* 95.1 (2000) 29

⁸⁷ Martin Bidney. "Epiphany in autobiography: The quantum changes of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 60.5 (2004): 471-480. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 15 Dec. 2010. 472.

⁸⁸ Bidney. "Epiphany." 471

V. A WORK IN FRAGMENTS: a Close Reading of the Use of Television in Scene 4 of Heiner Müller's *Hamletmachine*

⁹⁰ Bidney. "Epiphany." 477.

⁹¹ Sean Homer. Jacques Lacan. (New York: Routledge, 2005) 84.

⁹² Need citation

⁹³ Beckett and Knowlson. *Krapp's Last Tape: With a Revised Text*. 88.

⁹⁴ Beckett and Knowlson. *Krapp's Last Tape: With a Revised Text*. 89.

⁹⁵ Beckett. *Krapp's Last Tape*. 28

⁹⁶ Beckett and Knowlson. *Krapp's Last Tape: With a Revised Text*. 82.

⁹⁷ Paul Foster. *Beckett and Zen: A Study of Dilemma in the Novels of Samuel Beckett*. (London: Wisdom, 1988). 113.

⁹⁸ For these purposes, a component of the mind-body unit, including consciousness, organ sensations etc Foster. *Beckett and Zen*. 112.

⁹⁹ Beckett and Knowlson. *Krapp's Last Tape: With a Revised Text*. 28.

¹⁰⁰ Beckett. *Krapp's Last Tape*. 28

¹⁰¹ Auslander "Ontology"

¹⁰² Auslander "Ontology"

¹⁰³ Auslander "Ontology"

¹⁰⁴ Müller, heir to the Berliner ensemble and said to be Brecht's legacy, famously said that it was heresy to use Brecht without criticizing him.

¹⁰⁵ J. Kalb. *The Theatre of Heiner Müller*. (1998). (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998) 106. Brian Walsh. "The Rest is Violence: Muller Contra Shakespeare." (PAJ: Performing Arts Journal 23.3, 2001): 24. Web. Last viewed December 6, 2010. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3246331>

¹⁰⁶ Heiner Müller. Carl Weber ed. *Hamletmachine and other texts for the stage*. (Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1984) 304.

¹⁰⁷ Müller. *Hamletmachine*. 304.

¹⁰⁸ Müller. *Hamletmachine*. 303.

¹⁰⁹ Perhaps reminiscent of Merleau-Ponty not only putting the self at the center of the perceived world, but also attributing the self with conceiving the perceived world...

¹¹⁰ Müller. *Hamletmachine*. 304.

¹¹¹ Kalb. *The Theatre of Heiner Müller*. 106

¹¹² Müller. *Hamletmachine*. 304.

¹¹³ Müller. *Hamletmachine*. 304.

¹¹⁴ Müller. *Hamletmachine*. 304.

¹¹⁵ Müller. *Hamletmachine*. 304.

¹¹⁶ W. Kansteiner. *In Pursuit of German Memory: History, Television, and Politics After Auschwitz*. (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2006) 134.

¹¹⁷ Kansteiner. *In Pursuit of German Memory*. 134.

¹¹⁸ Kansteiner. *In Pursuit of German Memory*. 134.

-
- ¹¹⁹ E. Noelle-Neumann, & Institut für Demoskopie. *The Germans--Public Opinion Polls, 1967-1980*. (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1881) 25.
- ¹²⁰ Noelle-Neumann. *The Germans*. 25.
- ¹²¹ Kansteiner. *In Pursuit of German Memory*. 134.
- ¹²² Quoted from website reproduction, <http://owendaly.com/jeff/grotowsm.htm>.
- ¹²³ Kalb. *The Theatre of Heiner Müller*. 106
- ¹²⁴ “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction”
- ¹²⁵ A German periodical of the Frankfurt School
- ¹²⁶ Murray and Wickham. *Framing the Past: The Historiography of German Cinema and Television*. (1992). (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992). 167.
- ¹²⁷ John Berger. *Ways of Seeing*. (New York: Penguin Books, 1977), 7.
- ¹²⁸ W. Kansteiner. “Entertaining Catastrophe: The Reinvention of the Holocaust in the Television of the Federal Republic of Germany.” *New German Critique* 90 (2003): 4. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 13 Dec. 2010.
- ¹²⁹ Zweites Deutsches Fernsehen (English: "Second German Television")
- ¹³⁰ Kansteiner. *In Pursuit of German Memory*. 136-137.
- ¹³¹ Kansteiner. *In Pursuit of German Memory*. 134.
- ¹³² Kansteiner. “Entertaining Catastrophe.” 132.
- ¹³³ Vardac. *Stage to Screen*. 251.
- ¹³⁴ Kansteiner. “Entertaining Catastrophe.” 139.
- ¹³⁵ Kansteiner. “Entertaining Catastrophe.” 139.
- ¹³⁶ Kansteiner. “Entertaining Catastrophe.” 136, 139.
- ¹³⁷ Kalb. *The Theatre of Heiner Müller*. 107

¹³⁸ Kansteiner. *In Pursuit of German Memory*. 134.

¹³⁹ The first West German TV station: Arbeitsgemeinschaft der öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunkanstalten der Bundesrepublik Deutschland – "Consortium of public-law broadcasting institutions of the Federal Republic of Germany"

¹⁴⁰ Kansteiner. *In Pursuit of German Memory*. 370.

¹⁴¹ Needs a better source, found at:

http://www.germanculture.com.ua/library/facts/bl_radio_tv.htm

¹⁴² Müller. *Hamletmaschine*. 306.

¹⁴³ Müller. *Hamletmaschine*. 306.

¹⁴⁴ Müller. *Hamletmaschine*. 307; Kalb states that it is a reference to Warhol: Kalb. *The Theatre of Heiner Müller*. 107

¹⁴⁵ Müller. *Hamletmaschine*. 307.

¹⁴⁶ Kalb. *The Theatre of Heiner Müller*. 107

¹⁴⁷ Müller. *Hamletmaschine*. 307.

¹⁴⁸ Walsh. "The Rest is Violence: Muller Contra Shakespeare." 24

¹⁴⁹ E. MacDonald. *Theater at the Margins: Text and the Post-structured Stage*. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1993) 20.

¹⁵⁰ Robert Wilson, Fred Newman, and Richard Schechner. "Robert Wilson and Fred Newman A Dialogue on Politics and Therapy, Stillness and Vaudville." *TDR: The Drama Review* 47.3 (2003): 118. Web. Last accessed December 6, 2010.

¹⁵¹ Walsh. "The Rest is Violence: Muller Contra Shakespeare." 25

VI. AFTERWARDS and Questions for Consideration

¹⁵² McLuhan. *The Medium*.

¹⁵³ McLuhan. *The Medium*.

¹⁵⁴ McLuhan. *The Medium*.