Jane Turner

Acts of Creative Vandalism? Plane Performance Deconstruct the Canon

In this article Jane Turner explores the trilogy of works titled *Re-placing Texts*, together with *Epilogue*, devised and performed by the innovative group Plane Performance, now in its tenth year. The trilogy – *Three Degrees of Frost*, *SET* and *Round-about* – are rewritings of Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*, David Lean's film *Brief Encounter*, and Rogers and Hammerstein's film musical, *Carousel*. The article examines the strategies adopted by the company as acts of 'creative vandalism', both in terms of current understandings of theatre practice and in terms of their treatment of the original texts. Jane Turner argues that the dramatic texts have become ossified by cultural usage and that the radical stance taken by the company allows for a counter-cultural position to re-emerge. The author is a Principal Lecturer in Contemporary Arts at Manchester Metropolitan University. She has recently published work on Eugenio Barba and applied theatre practice.

But maybe we only ever learn from the past by radically reworking it (*the one duty we owe to history, said Wilde, is to rewrite it*).

(Dollimore, 1986).

THIS quotation, from Jonathan Dollimore's essay 'Creative Vandalism', is commenting on theatre that, as Susan Bennett states, takes up a deliberately antagonistic relationship to its source text(s) 'as well as to the operations under which the source is generally produced and/or received' (1996, p. 1).

Focusing primarily on Plane Performance's *Re-placing Texts* trilogy of work – *Three Degrees of Frost* (2000), *SET* (2001), and *Round-about* (2004) – this article examines the extent to which the three productions might be considered acts of 'creative vandalism'. The primary texts used by the company for the trilogy are the play *The Cherry Orchard*, the film *Brief Encounter*, and the musical *Carousel*. The argument being put forward here is that all three primary texts have become ossified by popular cultural usage and that the process of radical antagonism perpetrated by Plane Performance, though it might appear to purists to be vandalism, has in fact unfixed the texts and allowed a counter-cultural position to re-emerge.

The antagonism practised by the company towards the selected texts is actualized in their deconstructive play with both form and content. They treat established notions of theatricality with a suspicion that places their work on a border between performance and theatre. However, their evident fascination with dramatic text and the competencies of theatre, both of which are exposed and radically rewritten by the company, suggests a paradoxical position between theatre and performance. Plane Performance's work, as illustrated by the trilogy, might be best understood as postdramatic theatre. As Hans-Thies Lehmann states,

> *Post*dramatic theatre, again and most definitely, does *not* mean a theatre that exists 'beyond' drama, without any relation to it. It should rather be understood as the unfolding and blossoming of a potential of disintegration, dismantling, and deconstruction within drama itself. (2006, p. 44)

The process of deconstruction engaged in by both the making and the interpretation of the performance texts will be examined here, and in so doing I shall draw on Bakhtin's notion of the dialogic, the intention being to consider the rewriting strategies being used that both enable the spectator to reconsider the canonical status of the dramatic texts while also inviting us to reconsider the relationship between theatre and performance.

 © CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS DOI: 10.1017/S0266464X07000115

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Trilogy

A brief résumé of the three performance texts under discussion here follows.

THREE DEGREES OF FROST was the first part of the *Re-placing Texts* trilogy and raised questions concerning performance and theatricality. For example, the performance explored questions such as why Chekhov's play *The Cherry Orchard* holds such a high status in the British theatrical canon and how a young group of English performers might make sense of the play in the here and now.

The performance was staged in four acts that, although edited, closely followed Chekhov's play in terms of narrative and dialogue (as translated by Frayn, 1972). However, it was in the performance style and context that the performance questions were explored. The performance space was defined by four transparent pillars and rows of fairy-lights marking the edge of a floor space covered in a layer of rock salt that crunched underfoot and glittered against the stage lights.

The company of six performers played out their attempt at staging *The Cherry Orchard* in eighty minutes in functional everyday clothing of their time; props were indicated and the script was clearly evident in the space and apprehensively relied on by the performers, as though the words written were the key to solving this performance puzzle.

SET explores the filmic conventions used to construct both the 'real' and the sentimental in *Brief Encounter*. The performers invite the audience to engage imaginatively with the world of the film. The mechanisms for constructing a sense of the 'real' are made evident and evidently demonstrated by the performers throughout the performance. For example, a record player is conspicuous to the left of the performance space and is operated by a member of the company, who plays a recording of Rachmaninov's Piano Concerto No. 2 alongside various sections of the performance.

Across the back of the performance space is a metal screen which throws out a dark and distorted reflection of the action and seated audience. Performers move theatrical lights into place to reconstruct particular filmic moments in what appears to the spectator to be stark black and white. These reconstructed filmic moments usually derive from intimate moments where a character is caught in close-up by the camera.

Other scenes are played out that depict a profusion of characters, voices, and places demonstrating the impossibility of theatrical reconstruction but foregrounding the creative and imaginative engagement that such a theatrical gap is able to offer the spectator. *SET* luxuriated in a nostalgic romance of a time when love was thwarted by social convention and depicted as an unacceptable indulgence amongst the middle classes. On one level the spectator is engaged with a pastiche of the period, but on another level the performance engages us with a satiric parody on the absurdities of English class behaviour.

ROUND-ABOUT takes us into the strange world of the Hollywood musical, in this case *Carousel*. For this, the third in the trilogy of works gathered under the title *Re-placing Texts*, other texts are pulled in, most explicitly Aldous Huxley's *The Art of Seeing* (1943). Whereas in the previous parts of the trilogy the performances explore and interrogate political assumptions surrounding the performing of a text, this performance opens up a social politics inherent in, but effaced by, the form of the film musical.

The process of deconstructing the film text surfaces a narrative that exposes rather than condones violence towards women. In *Roundabout* the spectator's viewing position is radically shifted from an end-on relationship to a narrow, intimate traverse, where the performers frequently need to apologize for getting in the way of and stepping on the toes of the spectators.

The performance space is covered with mirror tiles, described as a huge shattered mirror ball, and has a projection screen at one end, where we see a mediated image of a young woman walking on a beach. What is being looked at, what is being perceived and by whom, are all questions which surface in this satire of *Carousel*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Right:
Luke Dixon, Anna Wilson, and Mike Farrimond in *SET*, 2001.

Opposite page: from *Epilogue*, 2005.



A final performance conceived performatively to reflect on the trilogy is appropriately titled *Epilogue* (2005). This embodied summation of the previous three performances operates as a recollection and re-situation of the texts by the performers. The staging, here with the audience seated on four sides, is intimate and suggests that the spectator is literally creating a physical framework and boundary for the performance. In addition, the performers indicate through their gestures that, in order to recollect, they are reliant on the spectator for actual physical support.

Playing with Text

All three parts of the trilogy – *Three Degrees of Frost*, *SET* and *Round-about* – are structural, as well as interpretive deconstructions, exploring textual, theatrical, and filmic processes. The texts are all derived from what had already been written, and each already had a material shape in the world and in the consciousness of many of the spectators. In fighting the tyranny of the iconic dramatic texts, the performers sought to subvert not only (what had essentially become) escapist dramatic (literary) texts but also the illusory nature of theatre, by initially demonstrating an 'incomprehension' of what it is to 'act'. However, while the group thus sought to eliminate the illusion of performance, they also aimed to represent as 'truthfully' as possible the performance texts.

The impact of the performers' presence was especially evident in *Round-about* and *Epilogue* due to the intimate proximity of the performers to the spectators. In both instances the performers were literally on top of the toes of the spectators or grasping out to hold their hands. The challenge for the performers was to show that presence is effective while also highlighting pretence as ineffective. This was achieved in part by the performers' desire to be immersed in 'being-conscious-of-process' (Pontbriand, quoted in Wallis and Shepherd, 2004, p. 232).

> It is a common observation that theatre enacts a circulation between the presence of the actor and the absence of the person represented, and the absence of the actor under the role. And this can be a fetish of presence.
>
> (Wallis and Shepherd, 2004, p. 235)

In all three parts of the trilogy, the performers are resisting acting but are representing and not merely presenting. The moments, although unintentional, of physical interaction

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the spectators reaffirm the presence of the performer and draw the spectator into the illusion of the fictional world while physically reminding them of the actual world of the there and then. The notion of illusion is a distraction, and the performers use this distraction as an act of performance itself, to expose the relationships between each other and as a challenge in terms of how they deal with the performance moment by moment.

While on the one hand the performers consciously demonstrate the characters that they choose or have been chosen to represent, they also aim to imbue their performance with a complex, though allusive, psychology that belongs to them and not the character, in order to point to the frailty of character representation in live contemporary theatre. For the spectator, it is the gap that is opened up in representation that is alluring here, the gap between the self-conscious self of the performers and the object that they seek to present.

The task of the performer to maintain a sense of being 'authentic' in the moment of performance is arguably always elusive, unless the performer is caught off-guard or out of control of her/his self by the spectator, for instance in a state of what is referred to by Geertz (1975) as 'deep play' and by Barthes (1993) as 'the punctum'; as consciously to reconstruct the authentic can only lead to a state of inauthenticity.

When a performance is scored, the process of textualizing the material removes the self and, under the continual gaze of the spectator, the performer is challenged to work against the pre-formed text, which requires her to stop imitating herself. Thus, although the performer uses real actions, the present moment of the performance is arguably always an illusion of the real.



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Antagonizing the Text

The work of Plane Performance is noted in the English translation of Hans-Thies Lehmann's *Postdramatic Theatre* (2006, p. 13), which also includes a very useful overview of the theatrical landscape in Britain from Karen Jürs-Munby. Lehmann's discussion offers a critique on current and emergent performance strategies in theatre, and argues that, while the common threads which draw post-dramatic theatre together is the rejection of dramatic text, it also collectively identifies that post-dramatic theatre has a political sensibility because it 'introduces chaos and novelty into the ordered, ordering perception' (2006, p. 179).

The theatre performances here have not rejected narrative text, since a different dramatic text operates as a catalyst for each part of the *Re-placing Texts* trilogy, and it is through performance intervention that the performers have introduced chaos and disruption that require the spectator, especially if they are familiar with the dramatic texts, to question and reconsider the status of the texts' signification and reflection of socio-political values.

This process of defamiliarizing the familiar offers a response to Lehmann's call for a 'politics of perception in the theatre', which would include a 'transgression of taboos'. In this instance the taboo is the process of deconstructing such iconic dramatic texts as constitute the trilogy, to question their cultural status, and, as Lehmann suggests, to 'create playful situations in which affects are released and played out' (2006, p. 186). 'Affects', as understood here, refers to the stylistic conventions and dramatic characters that the company attempt but 'fail' to imitate. The process of 'playing out' the situations does not, as already stated, discredit the status of the dramatic text but does allow the spectator to see beyond the layers of unspoken, culturally based assumptions that have built up over time.

The dramatic texts have accrued a humanistic tragic position where the culpability and frustration that constitutes people's lives invite an audience empathetically to accept, on the one hand, that we are all impotent to take positive action, but that, on the other hand, we must carry on regardless, stoically intent on making the best of 'things'. The Plane performers confront this culture of defeatism by demonstrating their incomprehension of the texts and failing realistically to represent the words and gestures inherited from other people and other times. They thus question those values that have become mythologized and romanticized by the present culture.

The dramatic texts have already been marked by history, and the texts all bear the traces of their previous users, some of whom are certainly as iconic as the texts they appeared in, and some arguably defined by the iconicity of the dramatic texts – for instance, Celia Johnson and Trevor Howard in *Brief Encounter*. The performers charged with the task of delivering the words translated from another place, time, and person play out their struggle to reconstruct the language in its social, historical context, choosing rather to contest its position as prime arbiter of the dramatic narrative and deflect the spectator's attention away from the historical text and towards the strategies that they are employing to foreground and clear away the previous layers of historical markings.

Strategies such as semaphore and reading the dialogue from the script are used in the performance of *A Cherry Orchard* in Plane Performance's production of *Three Degrees of Frost* in their attempt to deterritorialize the texts (to paraphrase Féral, 1997). In addition, this point is particularly emphasized at the close of the performance, when one of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Opposite page: Luke Dixon and Niki Woods in *Three Degrees of Frost*, 2000. Above: from *Round-about*, 2004.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press

performers reads Firs's final speech in very broken Russian as a (literally marked) scratchy recording that purports to be Firs's speech is heard (it is in fact an old Russian-language tape). The spectators are left at the end with just the sounds of a Russian voice slowly fading out.

The Dialogic

Bakhtin's notion of dialogism can be usefully applied here as a methodology for reading the performances, in this instance not only by the spectator as reader but also by the theatre-makers. Dialogism allows the critic to mark out particular performance and compositional strategies apparent in the playing out of the performance in front of spectators. Dialogism is a concept of text that is, according to Holquist, always in a state of production, where there is no single point of normalizing stasis (1990, p. 141).

Although the key concepts of dialogism, the chronotope and heteroglossia, are usually applied to the process of reading a literary text, dialogism, as Holquist says, 'resists being confined to any exclusively "literary" application' (1990, p. 107). Thus, each part of the trilogy is, in Bakhtin's terms, a heteroglossic event where time and space are not specifically demarcated and the company's act of re-reading these theatrical and filmic texts can be described as a dialogue between the performers here and now and the texts there and then.

The dialogue in this instance appears tentative, since the interaction of words, gestures, and values from the historical texts, as 'uttered' by the performers, offers both the impossibility and a necessity to exchange a connectedness. Holquist quotes Bakhtin as saying, with reference to the chronotope, that, 'when a man is in art, he is not in life' (1990, p. 111); however, it is the dialogue between these two different registers and the lived experience of the two phenomena that allows the spectator to engage in a review of the narrative unit, or chronotope. Again, Holquist usefully evaluates Bakhtin's use of the term chronotope by stating that the concept needs to be treated 'bifocally':

> One must be careful to discriminate between its use as a lens for close-up work and its ability to serve as an optic for seeing at a distance.
>
> (1990, p. 113)

Round-about, the third part of the trilogy, includes an intertextual reference to Aldous Huxley's *The Art of Seeing*. Specific extracts from Huxley are quoted in the performance and the performers urge the spectators to change their gaze, engage in exercises to help their eyes 'see better'. The title of Huxley's text itself blurs the distinction between art and life and its use in the performance asks the spectator to discriminate between what we are seeing 'close-up' and what we view from a distance, whether that be literally in the performance space or historically in relation to the deconstructed text of *Carousel*.

The chronotope, according to Holquist, invites spectators to evaluate each re-articulation of the narrative, in relation to both intertextual and historical contexts (1990, p. 118). The apparent incoherence caused by the diverse levels of discourse does not make the new text unreadable: on the contrary, the ruptures indicate the cultural and spatial gaps papered over by a gloss of nostalgic familiarity. The distortion of texts in the *Re-placing Texts* trilogy is an 'appropriation of [the texts'] repeatable features', foregrounding the idea that each text has a 'particular meaning in a specific time' (Holquist, 1990, p. 118). However, Bakhtin's intention is not, as noted earlier, to fix the status and reading of a text but to acknowledge its time/space relations to the social and historical conditions at every point of its existence; therefore the distortion of the texts is a process of unfixing in order that the political and social relationships can be changed.

Each part of the trilogy conforms to a chronologic re-telling of the narrative events in the text. Thus the story of *The Cherry Orchard* is played out with the aid of narration, as is that of *Brief Encounter* and the core narrative of *Carousel*. Running simultaneously to the narratives is a process of deforming them, incorporating distortions, repetitions, and divergences that all combine to distort the relationship between what the spectator experiences and its relationship to everyday life.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The fallacy that each of the three texts purports to represent everyday life is exposed by the performers' evident failure to articulate the literariness (and artificiality) of the dialogue or the high level of technical skill which is needed to perform the songs and dance routines from the musical. Within the film version of *Carousel*, the representations may be of honest working folk, but their ability to dance does not reflect the lives of an ordinary working community.

In a different application of the dialogic notions – of acting, not-acting, theatricality, anti-theatricality – live and mediated performance are not so much set against each other as played off each other; and thus the relationship might again be described as dialogic. The heteroglossic reflects a multitude of voices, perspectives, dynamics, and rhythms, all key performance aspects that Plane Performance play with in their work.

A Strategy of Performing Failure

The final performance appended to the trilogy, *Epilogue* (2005), engages with the performers' recollections of experience and exposes the spectators to the experiences and performance strategies being explored by the company, such as performing the behaviours set out in the texts to see whether they fit, feel comfortable, make any sense to us here and now. Of course they do not. But, to paraphrase Schechner, in order to experiment, to create new cultural stuff, there needs to be a return to traditional values (1991, p. 313). The cultural values initially questioned in the selected texts for the trilogy are uncomfortably traditional and mask a mind-set that now appears to support values and behaviours ideologically at odds with our time and place. In this instance, finding a language that can articulate 'our' time and place is only possible by returning to the texts that we have inherited and, to return to Bennett (1996), take a deliberately antagonistic position in relation to them in order radically to rewrite them.

The language of the displaced self or the dissolved ego is already secondhand. In this instance the performers enact their dilemma by problematizing their 'being' in the text. The disintegration of the dramatic character, a facet of postmodern practice, is literal in the performance of these texts, best illustrated in the first part of the trilogy where the performers appear to use aging copies of the script of *The Cherry Orchard* that they have to struggle to read from. The spectator is required to deal with the seeming incoherence and difficulty that the performers are experiencing in their attempt to represent 'character'. Representation is thus foregrounded as problematic both for the performer and the spectator.

The texts are taken as verbatim from a translation of Chekhov, Lean's film of *Brief Encounter*, and Rogers and Hammerstein's 1956 film version of *Carousel*, but in each instance the words, now placed in the mouths of performers culturally removed in time and space from these texts, appear to be awkward. The enunciation, removed from the stable syntactical structure means very little to these performers who struggle in their attempt to make it meaningful and significant. While the performers indicate (by putting their hands in the air) that they are 'playing' a character, the relationship between performer, actor, role, character, and spoken text is exposed as a contrivance. The process of acting as the representation of someone else, speaking words that are not your own, using gestures and projecting emotions that are not your own, is seen and performed as absurd.

In her discussion of Robert Wilson's theatre, Fischer-Lichte states that, 'speech is deconstructed not only as part of a meaningful dialogue but also as a sign of character' (1997, p. 270). What is different in *Re-placing Texts* is the performers' intention to be meaningful. There is a necessity and urgency in the performers' need to communicate, to play their parts convincingly. They fail but try again. The effect of their disarming commitment to these words and gestures has the effect of allowing the spectator to see the gap between performer, actor, role, and character; and, rather than debunking the fallacy of acting as a contrivance, this aesthetic strategy of performing failure – failure to deliver

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press

speech naturalistically, failure to deliver virtuosic dance sequences, etc. – is not cynical but ironically celebrates that which it deconstructs, as also the complex processes of signification and readability.

Thus, a virtuosic dance sequence ('June is bustin' out all over') is broken down into apparently disconnected and indifferent gestures, but the performers in their attempt to reconstruct the dance routine from the film *Carousel* create a choreography that in its playing out engages the spectator similarly in a sense of the performers' virtuosic ability; making sense and being meaningful become secondary objectives.

There is an English sensibility in Plane Performance's presentation that resonates throughout the trilogy in the performance style and, although this performance strategy may appear at odds with the agenda to reveal an ideology masked by production history but implicit in the dramatic texts, it can be understood in terms of its intention to disturb the spectator's expectation. As Kate Fox suggests, Englishness can be identified in terms of an *Embarrassment Rule*. She says,

> one must perform rituals *badly*. One must appear self-conscious, ill-at-ease, stiff, awkward and above all, embarrassed. . . . Hesitation, dithering and ineptness are, surprising as it may seem, correct behaviour. (2004, p. 41)

The performers frequently appear ill at ease with themselves and their audience. The reserved style of acting, or behaving, is so understated in Plane Performance's practice as to appear to be a radical deconstruction of the phenomenon that is normally recognized and understood in the mainstream of theatre as acting. Their parodic re-articulation of dialogue from Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*, David Lean's film of *Brief Encounter*, and the musical *Carousal* exposes the nostalgia with which these texts have come to be wrapped up. The dramatic texts all retain residual evidence that they were once intent on exposing behaviour that was socially repressive, but time, historical production, and the gloss of period costumes, musical anthem, and black-and-white film have all collectively functioned to eradicate the social political commentary inherent in the texts. The texts have culturally become iconic of theatre, musical, and film, a part of our cultural zoo, and as spectators we have become, in Schechner's word, tourists (1991, p. 310).

Postdramatic Theatre?

In a landscape where many new theatre forms are labelled 'postmodern performance' or 'postdramatic theatre' – terms that delineate texts where the author has been usurped, at least to some extent, by the reader – it is odd that such theatre is often attributed to a director, Robert Wilson being a frequently referenced example. Féral refers to Wilson's theatre work as 'already belonging to performance' (1997, p. 294), although she later states that a feature of performance is that it appears to be 'directorless' (Féral, 1997, p. 298).

Just as Wilson's theatre work can be identified from particular compositional strategies, trademarks if you will, I propose here that the theatre work produced by Plane Performance, under the direction of Neil Mackenzie, also has clearly identifiable stylistic conventions and compositional strategies that, in this instance, critically play with the notion of the traditional status of the dramatic text. As such the *Re-staging Text* trilogy is identifiably the work of a particular author, or auteur.

Following on from this point is the question as to whether the work can be located as theatre or performance practice. Mackenzie, in collaboration with the performers in Plane Performance, deconstructs theatricality and presents performances that operate at the margins of both theatre and performance, while borrowing from both modes. From the outset, the descriptor of the company as a 'performance' rather than a 'theatre' company is beguiling, and the trilogy of performance texts being examined here follows a journey that exemplifies many of the aspects that Féral (1997) identifies in her journey from performance back to theatre. Each of the performances offers a multitude of viewpoints on the narrative-based texts that the company have selected to deconstruct and,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in this sense, the work can be argued to be theatrical.

Féral certainly argues that theatre is defined by an available 'multiplicity of viewpoints and gazes' (1997, p. 297). However, narrative, although integral to the project, is often delivered ironically or as though it is explicitly being quoted. Féral sees this feature as an aspect of performance, and further argues that:

> Performance can therefore be seen as an art form whose primary aim is to undo 'competencies' (which are primarily theatrical). Performance readjusts these competencies and redistributes them in a desystematized arrangement.
>
> (Féral, 1997, p. 298)

As discussed above, a feature of Plane Performance's performance aesthetic is the performance of failure. Each part of the trilogy aims to uncover, or undo, the competencies of the medium being deconstructed, whether these are naturalistic acting, the mechanistic processes used in the construction of cinema, or the virtuosic singing and dancing of the musical. So, while there is a sense that Mackenzie has an antagonistic stance in relation to dramatic theatre, the trilogy inhabits theatre but critically borrows strategies from performance.

Heiner Muller's description of his own postdramatic work as an 'explosion of memory in a withered dramatic structure' (in Lehmann, 2006, p. 27) is an apposite description of the *Re-placing Texts* trilogy, and would thus position the work as postdramatic. The epilogue to the trilogy invokes the performers' memories of the dramatic texts whose collective memories they had attempted to explode; as with these texts, the performers needed to move away from theatre better to understand and reinvent a theatre practice for themselves.

An Explosion of Memory

The trilogy is a critical reaction to works that have been awarded canonical status and are recognized as having 'timeless' relevance. But *The Cherry Orchard* has become stultified, a museum piece that is occasionally framed, or disguised, in performance by some sort of 'contemporary relevance'; *Brief Encounter* evokes a nostalgia in audiences, although what is nostalgically being sought for is uncertain; and *Carousel* is better known now because 'You'll Never Walk Alone' has become the anthem of Liverpool Football Club. It is because of the antagonistic strategies employed by the company that these texts can be revitalized and granted some kind of authentic existence.

Jameson suggests that postmodern art has nothing left but to imitate dead styles and to make art about itself, which, he argues, is an acknowledgment of our failure. If this is the case, then it would follow that the trilogy does indeed represent our failure to make art (Jameson, in Foster, 1985, p. 115). However, the trilogy, and especially *Epilogue*, do disturb our memories and reveal a different perspective on the deconstructed texts, on our sense of the past, and on our sense of ourselves in the here and now. By violating the dramatic text, Plane Performance invite us to see and experience theatre differently. As spectators we witness and condone the company's acts of creative vandalism. Along with the performers, we can transgress the boundaries of expected behaviour in the theatre by overcoming the spectator's 'dis-ease' with physical contact and social interaction and, in so doing, see theatre and these dramatic texts differently.

The *Re-placing Texts* trilogy can be viewed as a kind of autopsy of theatrical performance by a new generation of theatre-makers, who acknowledge the past but are intent on making 'new stuff' from an outmoded organism. In addition, the company demonstrates that dramatic text, despite having withered, can be burst open, to paraphrase Lehmann (2006, p. 27). The trilogy is a radical disturbance of the dramatic form of each text that results in a re-emergence of a counter-cultural politics, inscribed in the texts but ossified over the years.

References

Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida* (London: Vantage, 1993).
Susan Bennett, *Performing Nostalgia* (London: Routledge, 1996).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Anton Chekhov, *The Cherry Orchard*, trans. Michael Frayn (London: Methuen, 1972).
Jonathan Dollimore, 'Creative Vandalism', essay published in the Royal Court Theatre programme for Howard Barker's *Women Beware Women* (1986).
Josette Féral, 'Performance and Theatricality: the Subject Demystified', in *Mimesis, Masochism, and Mime*, ed. Timothy Murray (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997).
Erica Fischer-Lichte, *The Show and the Gaze of Theatre* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1997).
Hal Foster, ed., *Postmodern Culture* (London: Pluto Press, 1985).
Kate Fox, *Watching the English* (London: Hodder, 2004).
Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (London: Hutchinson, 1975).
Michael Holquist, *Bakhtin and His World* (London: Routledge, 1990).
Aldous Huxley, *The Art of Seeing* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1943).
Fredric Jameson, 'Postmodernism and Consumer Society', in *Postmodern Culture*, ed. Hal Foster (London: Pluto Press, 1983).
Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*, trans. Karen Jürs-Munby (London: Routledge, 2006).
Richard Schechner, 'Intercultural Themes', in *Interculturalism and Performance*, ed. Bonnie Marranca and Gautum Dasgupta (New York: PAJ Publishing, 1991), p. 308–17.
Mick Wallis and Simon Shepherd, *Drama/Theatre/Performance* (London; New York, Routledge, 2004).

Filmography

Brief Encounter (1945). Written by Noël Coward. Directed by David Lean. Produced by Noël Coward. Distributed by Pinewood Films Ltd.
Carousel (1956). Music and lyrics by Rogers and Hammerstein. Directed by Henry King. Produced by Henry Ephron. Distributed by Twentieth Century Fox.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000115 Published online by Cambridge University Press