As we explored different current issues in this module certain things started to come up as way of how we can explain or more embody the theories in a meta-theatrical way in a performance.

What we are trying to do, Mark and myself, is to use the story, a story, to reveal the technique or the issues we engaged with during the past semester.

We started with asking ourselves about our dramaturgical work on the piece. We had a strong vision about what we want to do, to combine our story together, his and mine, bits from different plays and the theory background.

The text (the actual words and the performative text) is constructed with bits taken from, or inspired by, two different plays, two different interviews with theatre makers on their works, an article, the work of a performance artist and the work of a dance theatre artist. All this in order to tell our story or to show the process of making a performative piece. The dramaturgy work that we did is very different from the traditional role of a dramaturg. And by that I mean the role of providing historical and local- current context, editing the original text and asking questions about the aim of the on stage activity and its coherence.

If we define the work of the dramaturg (Avizoor and Ran, n.d) as the art of making the composition of drama, processing the written words to a stage embodiment and apply a set of rules on the performance. In our new kind of dramaturgy there is actually similar lines with the Hamburg’s or Lessing’s dramaturgy. We practiced a theoretical, historical, research work that determined the nature of the written text and the way we are bringing it to stage. The piece is completely theory based and is representing the issues we engaged with throughout the module. The difference between the classical (from Lessing to Brecht) dramaturgy and the post dramatic dramaturgy method that we applied can be explained by Prof Gad Keinar’s suggestion to this term.(Keinar, n.d) Keinar is asking us, the present theatre practitioners in post dramatic era, to rethink about the role of the dramaturg. Keinar defines this new dramaturgy as the one who has complete freedom, chaotic and open. On the other it is responsible to collect the fruits of the creative process’s labour and for it to be organised, coherent performance. I insisted on working “from stage to page” and to start working with basic images that eventually will combine itself to a performative piece. I’m deeply influenced by the work of Pina Bausch, at the Tanztheater Wuppertal. Bausch suicided to translate grand narrative to physical, movement based performances, almost like sign language.

Bojana Bauer (Mark-Ofer, n.d) denies the classical definition of the role of the dramaturg and does not limit it to a `consultant` or the ‘first viewer` or even the connection between the piece and any theoretical base and the audience. Bauer suggest that the role of the dramaturg in postmodern performance art making is to develop or create out of nothing new set of creation tools inherent to every singular, particular, artistic project. Bauer is going even further by saying that the actual job is not to simplify so the initial intension could be clearer but to challenge the artist to find new ways to represent the abstract. For me this the purpose of art in general and the dramaturgical work we did helped us to be the abstract, to say the things the words cannot pronounce. We have found new ways to ` dramaturg` each other’s work in dynamic between us. The way we divided the work between us was that Mark was in charge of translating our ideas to written text, our own or quoted, and I was in charge on elaborating or processing it to a dance theatre based stage text or physical text. Mark created that bridge between the theoretical base to the technique we used to the story we wished to tell and I challenged this text by searching new tools to express it, the story and the theory. This editing craft that we practiced on each other’s work on this project can also be explained by the comparison Monica Gillettte is offering between movie editing and dramaturgy.(Gillette, n.d)

Gillette claims that the dramaturg, as the movie editor, suggest resorting of the material that the artist is working with in order they’ll execute the intention of the artist/director. Our piece is a patch work of different materials that we edited, cut and pasted into this one coherent piece. The editing is been shown on the stage and is used as a material as well. This is how we created a performative text through the rehearsals as a collage of bits of text from different sources, and by doing so we can say that the dramaturgy work was, as a matter of fact, a process of devising.

When I was first introduced to the term ‘’ghosting’’, in a theatrical/performative context during my studies for BA in theatre studies in Tel Aviv University, it was part of the research methods course and was presented to us as a term applied to a certain actor. By that I mean the actor is ghosted or haunted by his last role. For example; John Travolta as Vincent Vega in the movie “Pulp Fiction” (Tarantino, 1994) is haunted by the role of Tony Moreno he played in “Saturday Night Fever” (Badham, 1977) or even the way William Shakespeare used Richard Burbage. Burbage had a name for himself as a very specific kind of actor (a strong looking build with a loud voice, very masculine) and he used to play the star role, the major Shakespearian characters (that can be associated to the term “type casting”).

In a way, Mark’s persona, around the place this piece will be performed, can ghost our performance. Mark, and the things he was involved in around the LPAC would be well known to our potential viewers (co-workers and students alike), so we assumed they will come to see Mark as they know him and they’ll expect something they already have seen him doing. Instead of seeing that as a bad thing that can accompanied our performance, we decided to play with it. We aim to create an atmosphere of uncertainty. It’s always liminal between what is true and what is not, what is the actual performative (or the imaginary world) and what is the real life. This is the tool we use to reveal this theoretical base we are leaning on. The performance is consistently going back and forward between setting the scenographic elements and performing it, or acting in the acting area. The time and place are equivalent to the real world but it’s the atmosphere we are creating that transcended the action to “performative mode”. We aimed to use the pri-assumed premises about a performance art piece and the ghosting aspect of it as a raw material, as something to be challenged by, and subvert/undermine it (as Tim Crouch is doing in an oak tree). We are also using that term of ghosting in a different way than the one mentioned above, or the one suggested in class by Dr Kelly Jones, as something that frames the theatrical event and giving it semiotics layers and knowledge). We refer it as an atmosphere or energy field. We charge the room with some kind of artistic presence. We “paint” the scene in particular colours, and we try to keep it under our control to some extent. The piece, is, generally speaking, about memories. We are trying to claim that a person is defined by their accumulation of memories. We are talking about “painting” our memories in different colours and the way we shape, or design, our memories (and by that we’re shaping who we are). If we are in charge of shaping it then we are in charge of what is real and what is not. We are creating new realities in the silent moments, sawing those to the real world and the imaginary one on stage. Mark’s character is trying to to paint a painting that will never exist. We are creating a world with its own conventions on stage and then questioning its realness in Brechtian epic theatre way of thinking. By exposing the mechanism that creates the suspension of disbelief at the same moment we create it. We tried to ask again what the essential parameters are for defining what a performative situation is. Is it still Eric Bentley`s, A preforms B for C? The artist-audience relationship is challenged once again in this this in art we live in. This unmediated, direct encounter is challenged on the background of the rise of the use of technology in our lives. The actual substantive, playable body has a different role in the everyday life and we have all sorts of relationships with people we have never physically met, in the virtual space. We will try to demonstrate it by projecting a pre-recorded version of the piece behind the audience back, where it’s almost haunts them, for the notion of what is real and what’s not. We, ourselves, have different relationships with different technological/virtual embodiments of our own body and persona. Heinrich von Kleist presents the term “marionette theatre” on 1801. (Parry, 1981) Kleist suggest that the mechanical movement (the way the marionette moves) is superior to the organic movement (the way the dancer moves). Kleist engaged with Immanuel Kant’s approach to the notion of truth and determinism and the tension between the inner person`s truth and the outer existence`s truth. Idris Parry writes in his introduction to his translation of Kleist’s essays to English, an offer to sum up Kleist’s premise as a continuation to Descartes “cogito ergo sum”; I think therefore I am aware of myself, therefore a part from my surroundings, but true knowledge must be complete, connected, invisible, so dichotomy of subject and object, self and surrounding, means distance from knowledge consequently, uncertainty and doubt. This is, again part of the constant building and breaking of the “forth wall” convention. The artist is in the imaginary world and in the real world at the same time. We linked that to the Ulay and Marina Abrmovic’s performance *Light/Dark* (1977) , and Abramovic`s *The Artist is Present* (2010). By using Rory Mullarkey`s *Cannibals* text and the abrmovich’s violent movements we are becoming present, claiming our presence in the existence of the here and now.

“Presence.

Being present, over long stretches of time,

Until presence rises and falls, from

Material to immaterial, from

Form to formless, from instrumental to mental, from

Time to timeless.” (Abramovic, Ulay, 1981)

Abramovich continues by claiming that “the most powerful tool today in performance is the artist herself.” (Abramovic, 2010) That means, as I read it, that the theatre of the future or the postmodern, postdramatic performative situation is going to be methathetrical, metaphysical and would be closer to life itself, would come within the artist, between the loud moments in the silences and pauses, that would be the true “slice of life” or the greater representation of still life or aristo’s mimesis. “…doing nothing that opens the doors to different perceptions” (Abramovic, 2010)

This stillness, as the artistic product can be pinned down to the tradition of “the invisible art”, which started in the Nouveau Realisme movement in France of the 1960’s. According to the movement’s manifesto, the artistic process is aiming towards bringing the actual realist object from the everyday life to the centre and by doing so creating a new meaning of mimesis. It’s referring to the new, post WW2, reality the world faced at that time throw new prisms. At the final dissertation I submitted for my BA I linked that to Antonin Artaud’s writing and claimed that the Nouveau Realisme continues Artaud’s alternative discourse and is paving the way to the postmodern fine and performative art, and to the postdrama. The artists who were part of the movement presented new, in-yer-face approach in order to achieve a real reality experience, naked, neither conventional nor conceptual, throw the artists prism or his own mind. The world, as a whole, is a piece of art that the artist can fish out fragments from, in order to redesign them. (Restany, 1990) We combined that approach with the Shakespearean concept of Teatro Mundi to create a new reality on the stage. It’s a reality between Mark`s reality and mine, between the real and the lie and between us and the other artist’s words and ideas.

Although the movement’s manifesto was written more than 60 years ago , I strongly believe that the art world in general, and the theatre in particular still missing where the arts should go according to it. The members of the movement are declaring in the manifesto the art as they know it today (in France of the 1960`s), is dead. The artist of the present must go outside himself towards new pure reality experience, emancipate himself redeem himself through Artaudian cruelty, to this authentic, more realistic reality experience. If Artaud is neglecting the spoken language and is engaging with the real, raw material of the live theatre, to its different components, then the nouvau realist artist would investigate that using different technics such as assemblage, shooting pictures and many more, highlighting the process and not the final product.

The roots of the idea of the invisible, the void, in fine and performance art are in Yves Klein’s premise of the void. Klien presented in 1957 at Galerie Colette Alendy in Paris, an empty room. According to Klien the room wasn’t empty at all but charged by the artist himself, with the presence of pictorial sensibility in its raw primary stage. Klein continues to develop this idea to air architecture (together with Jean Tinguely) that aimed to create consistent awareness to the space and cure social conventions and abscesses. The same social abscesses Artaud is writing about in *The Theatre and The Plague* (Artaud, 1958). The plague is a metaphor to a social disease and it’s the theatre job to cure it. It’s the physical collapsing of spiritual power flashes that about to end. It’s the bursting force of the theatre. It begins in the physicality of reality dressed up in spiritual form of a persona the actor is acting like and breaks apart in the artistic process in a safe close circle to its very essence. This the aim of our performance. In Jacques Derrida's Reading of Artaud (Derrida, 1978) we can find that the plague is killing, tearing apart the body, as the theatre should, and charge the masses mind. The theatre is reviving the unsolved accidents in the human heart and can be used as a metaphor to the bursting of the disease, inside out.

Klien is writing about the theatre of the void in the newspaper he published (Dimanche), that the void is taking off the covers of those inner conflicts and by doing so he frees them. Klien, as Artaud before him, is letting go the representative space in favour of the event concrete space. It’s not a representation of something but the actual thing itself. The first idea we had for this performance was that we would like to show the process of making this piece, or a performative piece, as we know it. This is the story we want to tell. It’s a meta theatrical story that is using a few different true and made up stories to say the literal thing. We asked to show the artist in its work like Hans Namuth photos of Jackson Pollok.

Oskar Schlemmer and Dona Haraway are continuing this discourse about the body in this technological era even before the great leap of this century.

Schlemmer rejected the human element as the central component of the performance and insisted on the need of the theatre of bringing the latest technological development to centre stage. (Schelmmer 1923) Haraway wrote about the collapsing of the categorization and the borders of the human body in the digital era. The dichotomy between natural and artificial is no longer relevant. (Haraway, 1991) The cyborg Haraway suggested is combining organic and digital systems. The performance is happening in several spaces and times. The audience is experiencing the existence of us here and now and at the also the windows we planted in the performance to another worlds, the google search, the projection of a previous performance and so on.

Amelia Jones is observing a new body on the stages these days. The technology is changing the way we are doing the things we do and makes us have prior assumption, how about how we experience others and ourselves.(Jones 2001) The encounter between the actual body of the performer and the audience is becoming multidimetional.

The postmodernist spectator is more involved as Brecht predicted in the 1930`s. the political aspects of the new technologies as a whole is forcing automatically obeying to rules. As that has been done in *An Oak Tree* that a member of the audience is participating but been controls the whole time. As our usage of the concept of the chair. We offer the audience to explore by themselves the limits of their rules and conventions. We are performing, living, watching all at the same time, and so is the audience. By doing that we also challenging the key terms of the performance art discourse; liveness, performativity and embodiment in rephrasing the term “the live show”, Even if it’s only a quote or reconstruction/restoration/reproduction.

If “Everything is a Remix” (Ferguson, 2011) (and for me this is the theatre of the future-an accumulation of quotations) then this is the real fulfilment of the Wagnerian Gesamtkunstwerk. As Yair Garbooz is saying (Ofrat, n.d) everything that I’m doing is contemned with Arman syndrome, everything that I’m creating is retro perspective. I’m collecting everything and when the last and right component arise, it all comes together to this artistic product.

To sum up this essay, I believe that I still have a lot to write about what is the current issues in today’s drama and I would to elaborate the discourse about the body, the author (or its death) and the postdramtic theatre. Also I’d like to link that to my previous works that follow the theme of the void in our existence.

3066 words.

Bibliography:

1. Avizoor l. and Brown R. /”Thinking an Old Practice Anew”/ Maakaf/n.d

http://www.maakaf.co.il/en/previous-issues/dramaturgy/62-editors-note/99-thinking-an-old-practice-anew

1. Keinar G./ “From a Dramaturg Text to the Dramaturg as Text”/Maakaf/ n.d (Hebrew) http://www.maakaf.co.il/עב/previous-issues/8/25-category-3/56-gad-keynar
2. Mark-Ofer N./Interview with Bojana Bauer/Maakaf/n.d (Hebrew) <http://www.maakaf.co.il/עב/previous-issues/8/47-category-5/75-bauer>
3. Gillette M./”Reorganising Anew”/Maakaf/n.d

http://www.maakaf.co.il/en/previous-issues/dramaturgy/64-cross-genres/95-re-organizing-anew

1. Von Kliest H./”On the Marionette Theatre”/1810/ translated by Parry I./ Published in his book- “Hand to Mouth and Other Essays” /Carcanet press/1981.
2. Ulay and Abramovic M./”LIGHT/DARK” / Kunstmarkt,Koln */*1977 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t-j0Ey2O4HU
3. Abramovic M./”The Artist is Present”/MOMA/2010 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O6dF8Gjm-X8
4. Conroy C./”Theatre and the Body”/Plagrave McMillan/2010
5. Derrida, J./ "The Theater of Cruelty and the Closure of Representation"/ Jacques Derrida, Writing and difference/translated by Alan Bass/ Chicago: University of Chicago Press/1978.
6. Restany, P./”60/90: Trente Ans de Nouveau Realism/ Paris: La Différence/1990.(French)
7. Schelmmer O./”Man and Art Figure” /1923/ The Bauhaus Theater: Oskar Schlemmer's Design in motion Concept: <http://www.academia.edu/8329095/The_Bauhaus_Theater_Oskar_Schlemmers_Design_in_motion_Concept>
8. Haraway D./ "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century"/ Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature/Routledge/1991
9. Jones A. / "The body and Technology." /Art Journal /2001/ 20-39.
10. Artaud A./ The Theatre and it`s Double/trnalated by Victo Corti/One World Classics/1964.
11. Ferguson K./ Everything is a Remix/2011 http://everythingisaremix.info/
12. Ofrat G./Blog / n.d (Hebrew) https://gideonofrat.wordpress.com/2010/12/21/%D7%99%D7%90%D7%99%D7%A8-%D7%92%D7%A8%D7%91%D7%95%D7%96-%D7%9E%D7%94-%D7%A0%D7%97%D7%91%D7%90-%D7%91%D7%9E%D7%97%D7%A1%D7%9F/