

**14TH ANNUAL IRISH THEATRE INSTITUTE
NETWORKING CONFERENCE,
PROJECT ARTS CENTRE, DUBLIN
10.30AM -11.30AM OCTOBER 4TH, 2007.
SESSION 1 ~ ANNE BOGART
THE ROLE OF THE ARTIST ON THE WORLD STAGE.**

Session 1

The Role of the Artist on the World Stage

Keynote Speaker: Anne Bogart – Artistic Director, SITI Company, New York

SIOBHÁN BOURKE (PRODUCER, IRISH THEATRE INSTITUTE): We are in the very fortunate position to have our keynote speaker, Anne Bogart, with us this morning. Anne is co-founder and Artistic Director of the SITI Theatre Company in New York City. SITI is one of the leading world companies of ensemble theatre. They have two productions on in the festival and both will be on here in the Project.

Anne will speak on the subject 'The Role of the Artist on the World Stage'.

ANNE BOGART: Thank you very much, and for those who just flew in thank you for getting up this morning. Thank you also to the Irish Theatre Institute for all the tables and options I have here. The Irish Theatre Institute actually sent me a lovely letter with about sixteen questions they wished for me to address. I'm going to talk for probably about forty minutes and open it up for twenty minutes for questions.

Selfishly, I tried to incorporate the questions from the Irish Theatre Institute into things that I thought might be useful to discuss. Primarily they were interested in the notion of the company and ensemble, which we'll continue discussing in the panel discussion. I'm going to start on a fairly personal note and then try to get a little more theoretical.

I think every one of us needs a model in life. Somebody who they look up to. For me that person has been for about thirty years Ariane Mnouchkine from Théâtre du Soleil in Paris. I have to say that for years I went to her ten-hour shows. She's a generation older than I am. The intelligence, the force of vision, the persistence, the diligence, the art, the beauty. Those things really got to me. I would fly anywhere, usually Paris, to see what she was doing. I'd usually find her in the middle of her ten-hour productions, she and her company. I would find her and I would grab her hand and say, *thank you so much*. What I didn't say and what I really meant was thank you for years of inspiration; thank you for being the person who, when I lose courage I think of you and I can go on; thank you for being the person who is doing something in the world that I can aim my little boat towards.

Then in, I think, 1986 I spent too much money on a plane trip to Berlin and found out why, because when I got there her company was finishing productions of the three Shakespeare plays. It was completely sold out, and I realised I'm in Berlin to see these shows. They had no tickets so I pretended like I was helping sell books with the booksellers and snuck in and got a great

seat. Wept through the entire *Twelfth Night*. Just the glory, the physicality, the humanness of this international company. I was very fortunate afterwards to be invited to a party which was out in this fabulous chateau place where the company was having a reception for the closing of the Shakespeare plays. I went out and this exotic international theatre company was dancing away in one of those big fabulous rooms, and in another smaller room there was Ariane Mnouchkine sitting very quietly in a chair next to a fireplace. I thought, I have come to Berlin to ask her a question. I didn't know what the question was but I'm here, this is why I'm here. It took me about twenty minutes to get the courage to actually go in the room. I was scared. I'd start to walk in and then retreat. Finally I got up the courage and I found myself sitting on my knees at her feet. She was very sweet. She said what do you do? I said I'm a theatre director. Then the question came, the reason I was there. I was speaking in French, my face was red, and I said, what about this company thing? She looked sternly at me and said, well, what are you going to do without a company? I mean, don't get me wrong, it makes you miserable, people leave, it's hard, but what are you going to do without one?

In that moment I actually had an epiphany, if you could call it such a fancy word. The things that happen without thinking. I realised that every great production I'd seen without exception in my entire life, in theatre or in dance, was always done by a company. The kind of substance that changes you. So I thought, ok, this is what I'm going to do. I'm going to form a company. I don't know how you start a company, but I believe that when you believe in something you start to speak about it and find words for it. So I did. Whenever I did an interview or talked to anybody they'd say, Anne what do you want? And I'd say, a company.

I got my first company in 1989/90. I was made the Artistic Director of Trinity Repertory Company in Providence, Rhode Island. Ironically, the same place I'd first seen a play when I was fifteen, because I'm a Rhode Islander. I was made the second Artistic Director following Adrian Hall. I was fired after a year. You could debate the issues over whether it was fired or not. Anyway. What I learned from that fabulous and horrible year is that you can't inherit somebody else's company. This was a company that had been nurtured by Adrian Hall. Fabulous actors. But you can't.

Soon after that the Japanese director Tadashi Suzuki, also a generation ahead of me, also somebody I admire a great deal, actually said, would you like to start a company with me? I said, what do you mean? He said, a place which is sort of a fellowship of theatre artists from around the world but based in the United States. Now, I knew that he had a place in Toga Mura which is up in the mountains, a long journey from anywhere, and had started an international theatre festival, and I understood he wanted to do something similar in the United States. But frankly, to tell you the truth, all I was doing was thinking: Japanese money. I also didn't really believe him. Leon, who is sitting up there, was in the room when this was introduced as an idea. You can correct my bad memory Leon.

Of course I agreed and we did start a company, and it started as a friendship between Japanese artists and American artists. In this initial meeting Suzuki said, I'm going to help you for the first four years, but after that you're going to be on your own because I'm going to have other things to do. Right Leon? He did say that. Leon was translating at the time actually. Exactly what he said

happened. For the first four years we did start in Japan and would continue every summer in Saratoga Springs.

You want to hear an ironic story? Suzuki's company was called the Suzuki Company of Toga or also called the SCOT Company. When he introduced this idea to me he said, why don't you choose a place in the United States? I understood it shouldn't be in New York City where I lived, because it's about being away from New York. I said, Saratoga Springs would be great. He actually went with Leon and the business manager up to Saratoga Springs and met with the Mayor of Saratoga Springs. It's a beautiful town with healing springs and horse races and the Philharmonic, three hours north of New York. He met with the head of the Arts Council and the Mayor. When I talked with him next he said, yes Saratoga is a good idea. I said, oh, ok. He said, do you know what Saratoga means in Japanese? It means the new or fresh Toga. So he said it's easy to raise money; I just say Sara Toga and people start dishing out.

The reason I'm telling you all this is because it didn't take long for me to realise that he was not a fairy godmother. Or fairy godfather. This was a truly remarkable event. The company, which was a group of actors and now designers and administrators, the first decision they made, and it was the acting company, they said what does it mean to be a company member? They all lived in New York so Saratoga quickly became and is our summer residence. New York City is where we live. Their first decision was, what does it mean to be a company member, and they said it means we train together. We train in Suzuki training and Viewpoints training, which became sort of the baseline upon which we function. The other day I was having lunch with the fabulous Irishman Jocelyn Clark, who many of you know. I said, it's amazing. We're doing two shows here in Dublin and next week we're doing a third show at BAM. I don't know how we're holding together through this and also having a great time. He said, oh, it's the training. That's why you're doing it. I think he's right. In other words what holds us together is this initial decision.

Now, I'm getting into the issues of 'the role of the artist on the world stage' because I think the idea of company is actually creating a model society. What we actually are exchanging between audience and actors is the possibility of a way of being. I'm not going to drop this, so hang on. Go with me on this.

In 1922/23 the Moscow Art Theatre came to the United States for the first time. They brought with them old plays that they'd actually made in 1909 or something. Chekhov, Gorky. They performed in New York and around the United States, and they essentially knocked out all these young people who came to see it. They couldn't believe what they were seeing. These were young kids whose names were like Harold Klerman and Lee Strasberg and Stella Adler etc. As you probably know, they were so excited that these kids demanded that the Russians leave behind somebody to teach this method that they were doing. Which, and it's a long story I'm not going into now, became misunderstood and abused. And ruined the American approach to acting. That's another story I'm not going into now.

Why I'm saying this is, actually in discussion with my muse up there, Leon, I understood suddenly that actually it wasn't the method they were excited by. They had basically never seen people be this way together on stage. The melodrama, the declamatory acting approach to theatre was very, very hierarchical. A very hierarchical way of being. These young theatre people

were knocked out by the society that they saw on stage. What the Moscow Art Theatre was doing at that time was proposing another way of being together.

To me, theatre is the only artform - and film sometimes comes in here but for reasons we can go into later – whose subject *is* society. In other words, the question is can we get along? Can we get along in this room? Can we get along in this play? The issues are social ones. So I realised that the theatre proposes not only in the context of a play, can we get along. It proposes ways that human beings might be in the world.

I'm going to digress a bit, and I hope you'll bear with me. I'm working on a play about the brain which will be called *Who Do You Think You Are?* It's the next SITI Company play. I've been studying the brain and there's a fairly new discovery in neuroscience which many of you might have heard about already, called *mirror neurons*. This is really going to relate to the role of the artist on the world stage, don't worry. I'm going to come back to it. Mirror neurons are a fairly recent discovery, in the last ten years or less. Neuro scientists and cognitive scientists have taken a huge interest in it. Essentially it was found originally in monkeys. It's the cliché 'Monkey See, Monkey Do'. They found that if a monkey is watching another monkey do something like eating a banana that the monkey who's watching has neuronal activities, synaptical activities that are exactly parallel to the monkey that's doing. The monkey is actually exercising the same muscles and the same synaptical patterns that the monkey's doing.

Of course you know where I'm going next on this. It turns out that, yes, human being also have mirror neurons. Which starts to get really interesting when it comes to the notion of the stage and the audience. In other words, what is the audience doing? Which is why I differentiated it from film so much. What is the audience doing in the theatre – it might be, what is the audience restraining themselves from doing? Meaning that an actor is proposing a way of being. Two actors are proposing a way of being together. A group of people is proposing a model society. It's a scary thing to say an actor is proposing a model human being.

Please bear with me on this too; this is a very important distinction. It doesn't mean that the play is all about model human beings. It means the person playing the villain is a model human being. What an actor needs to play a role or somebody who's full of hubris or having problems is not to actually be a problematic person, but to be a person who is at the height of their capacity of being a human being. To be at the height of the level of spontaneity. To be willing to go with something, to drop other things. Their neuronal activity is happening at top speed. As an audience you are in the same room with a group of people or a human being who is functioning at the top of their capacity, both as an individual and in their responsiveness and responsibility to one another.

It starts to get interesting to me in terms of what are we doing. Going back to the initial meeting with Ariane Mnouchkine when she said what are you going to do without a company. A company is a way to practice a social interaction, social morals, ethics, behaviour. The SITI Company is fifteen years old. There are many reasons why we still enjoy being together. One is that everybody respects each other, basically. You have worked really hard; you have earned my respect and also I listen to you. There's nothing more inspiring as a director

or as an audience member than to be in the presence of people who actually listen to each other and change because of the other person.

In organising this talk today I organised six points. We're on the first which is: *start with necessity*. In other words, in the conversation with Ariane Mnouchkine, the necessity of a company for me was very, very important. Number two, and I'll return to it, is: *pay attention*. I'm going to return to this. Number three is: *incorporate the other*. Number four is: *speak clearly*. Number five is: *cultivate presence*. Number six is: *alter time*. I'll try to go through each one.

In terms of paying attention, which is the basic ingredient in the theatre, and in the context of what we are actually speaking about right now, and for those who are in the room and for the reason you're in the room, one of the things you attend to is context. Right now we are in the context of a festival, in the context of a conference, and this affects the way we listen and the way we attend to things.

To be brutally honest, I have to say that international touring is painful. Deeply painful and often embarrassing. It has to do with context and how attention is brought to the contextual situation. I'm going to give you a really fabulous example – some of you I know have heard this before. I think it's the most beautiful example of contextual misunderstanding. This has a great deal to do with international touring.

I think in the early 1990s I read an article in the New York Times about a production of *Hair* that was done in Sarajevo. It was during the worst war-torn moments of Sarajevo and this production of *Hair* was a huge hit. It happened in the basement of a bombed out building. It was sold out every night. People would make their way, taking their lives into their own hands, across the city that was being bombed from the outside and going to see this production of *Hair*. A musical from the 1960s from America. What did that mean? The New York Times sent a reviewer over since it was such a phenomenon. They described the production and said it was very moving, especially when they get to the song 'Let the sunshine in, let the sunshine in'. People lost it. Clearly, in the context of a war-torn Sarajevo the play *Hair* meant so much. At the end of this little article I was reading the journalist said, it's so popular that several commercial producers from New York are thinking of bringing this production intact to Broadway. Now, you can imagine how embarrassing that would be, when I say international touring is embarrassing. It would have been seen as terribly fragile, I imagine. Thank god it never happened. It wouldn't have made any sense in a pre-9/11 New York. It might make sense in a 2002 New York. Are you with me?

So this issue of context is the one that we live with every day. What does it mean to do this thing here, now, in the lens through which it is being seen? The lens – certainly in Ireland – of a very literary culture that has a very particular history. What does it mean to bring these semiotic experiences to an audience?

One thing in my number two is *pay attention*. Pay attention to what? Pay attention to context. It's difficult and very tender to move meaningful things, which is why I think that the big hits of many festivals actually don't have language. I'm not going there.

What I do understand in terms of paying attention is what a play does and when it is effective, such as the Bosnian *Hair*. It came through understanding one of the etymologies of the word *catharsis*. We say a play creates catharsis. You think of catharsis in the Greek, Aristotelian sense as this overwhelming feeling that you get, but you can look at the word etymologically as 'shedding light in dark places'. As in cathode ray. Shedding light in dark places. If the usefulness of a production is in its ability to shed light in dark places, one asks in terms of attending to context, what are the dark places of our lives right now? And can we tenderly shine a light in that area? It gets a little scary, and that's when you bring your showbiz, entertainment sensibility in to join with a very serious analysis of whatever you're shining the light on.

I was very deeply affected being a New Yorker, by being in New York on 9/11. What I found most helpful was a quote by Leonard Bernstein who said 'A artist's response to violence is to make the music more intense'. He actually said 'A musician's response to violence is to make the music more intense'. I found that really helpful because the tendency in a violent era is to pull back, correct? Is to shrink the intensity. But that as a way of thinking I found really helpful, particularly in a climate or in a context which changed so drastically. At least in terms of living in a country where patriotism took the place of uncertainty. In that horrible time right after 9/11 people were really shaken up and what replaced it for many people was a notion of patriotism which then is translated into certainty, rather than uncertainty. Certainty, I believe, if it is taken to the extreme always leads to violence. Always. So coming back to the notion of being an artist on the world stage, in a way our job is to be uncertain; is actually to disentangle from the very understandable sweep towards certainty which is a way towards violence.

The last thing I'd say under the rubric of *pay attention* is – I run the graduate directing programme at Columbia University and we don't have a design programme so we have classes with NYU designers, graduate designers. The directors at Columbia and the designers at NYU get together and they do model boxes of shows and we look at them. It's a great class. At any rate, John Conklin who is a wonderful American designer who teaches in the class kept yelling at the design students, particularly the scenic designers, and he would say, why are you standing mid-distance from the model? You can't see anything from there. Get really close up or get really far away. What are you going to see from mid-distance? And I thought, actually that's really interesting in terms of being an artist in the world right now. We tend to get ambushed by mid-distance. I mean mid-distance in a sense is CNN and Sky News. It's kind of a buzz. What you actually have to do is go too close or move far enough away that you start to be able, in the imbalance to start to sense something and get some sense of truth.

The third topic is about incorporating the other. I think, it's not an original thought, but the history of art is the history of inclusion. If you look at the history of art it starts being about the Gods – this is overly general – and then the royals and then you bring in the aristocrats and then you bring in the common people. As you look at art move through time it incorporates more and more of what we do not know. I certainly believe in the idea of whatever one is doing is incorporating something that is out of control. Certainly, international touring is out of control in the way I was talking about before. It's contextually out of one's control. You're sort of knocked sideways.

But I'm thinking about maybe something that you have experienced in museums that really drives me crazy, which is taking photos with a cell phone of paintings. Do you know what that is? It drives me crazy when people do that. I had to wonder why I get so angry when I see people taking cell phone photos of paintings. What that means is that you're treating the thing as an object you've bought or that you then own. You've made it smaller than you. You don't approach the painting from yourself; you approach it as a product, as something that you are actually consuming. This issue brings up notions to me of chivalry, the original meaning of chivalry, which is to make the other person dangerous. It's interesting to me that acts of chivalry, acts of distance, acts of formality are ways of saying you are powerful and different and I am giving you space.

The question is how to make the other dangerous, how to allow it to be dangerous. How to, in a practical sense as a director, how to allow an actor I've worked with for fifteen years to continue to be dangerous to me and to surprise me, instead of saying, I know this person. I've got them in a box. It's an issue also of perspective and attitude. Of changing the way we approach one another and changing the quality of our space between us. Back to the notion of taking photos with a cell phone. I think it's endemic – at least in American theatre, I don't know about elsewhere – that there's also a sense because it's so expensive, in the United States at least, people come in saying, it's mine and if I don't like it I'm leaving. There's a sense of ownership which is terrifying. I think it's a disease that's spreading. It's very dangerous in the theatre. As opposed to approaching the theatre from both sides as a mystery. Which brings up a whole other issue of attitude. I'm going to keep moving.

I'm quoting Tadashi Suzuki, and it was the reason for us beginning a company together, he said international cultural exchange is impossible; therefore we must try. Under the rubric of *incorporating the other*, I agree with him from the depths of my being. To attempt the impossible it means that something might happen. To attempt the possible means that nothing will happen. We are in the business of, hopefully, making events, and events are usually a little bit out of our control.

I'm going to go to rubric number four, which is *speak clearly*. Now, I'm speaking as an American. I think the most radical act that an American can do is to finish a sentence. I think there are political reasons why people don't finish sentences, because if you don't finish a sentence you're basically ineffective. You hear 'and she was all, and I was like, and he was like, whatever'. Where does that go? It's a disease. I think being able to find words to describe something that you are just beginning to envision gives power to the thing that you're envisioning. And gives other people a way to respond to it. I believe in words, from the depths of my soul.

The board chairman of my company Jaan Whitehead wrote a very incendiary article saying that artists don't describe themselves well enough. She said, we say things like 'not-for-profit', or 'non-profit'. Which is basically like going up to somebody and saying, hi, I'm not. She also says things like, and this is going to devour Europe I'm afraid but, it's dangerous to use the words 'unearned income'. Since when is unearned income unearned? Unearned income is fundraising, correct? It's the biggest earned revenue. But to say our unearned income is this, and our earned income is this, what she's suggesting is that you're essentially giving up before you begin. I took her thinking a little bit farther and I started thinking about the way people name their theatre

companies. There's an awful lot of theatre companies that decide they're called 'On A String' or 'No Matter'. I don't know what. There's a company in Brooklyn that began and they named themselves the National Theatre of the United States of America. They're in this tiny little hole. I'm here to say I support that company. I will send them a cheque.

The notion is essentially that speaking is part of the creative act of making what you're making. The ability to describe something, whether it's to a foundation or to the person sitting next to you, it's actually the creative act. It's not like you wait until you get into the rehearsal room. You actually, through words, start creating the event of a thing.

I'm going to go to five. I seem to be quoting Tadashi Suzuki a lot. Maybe it's because Leon's sitting up there. Number five is *cultivate presence*. Suzuki said that his problem, talking to me about the American theatre, is that it's weak. You could blow and it would fall over. He said, I thought rather misogynistically, I don't care what you think about my theatre but you can't blow it over. It has strength. Not misogynistically. Chauvinistically. But there's something true in what he's suggesting. I will say that the approach to acting, at least in the United States, has become very, very weak. I think there's a lot of rolling on the floor. I think the reason why SITI Company's training programmes are so full and always with a long waiting list, is because actors want to be asked to raise the bar. The bar is set very low. There are historical and political reasons about why one sets the bar low.

Sometimes I think that the best acting training is to just do the most difficult thing you can find to do, and do it every day. Something that you just makes you look like poop. That you actually have to deal with you own weakness and find the inner strength and the inner presence. Thinking of Mr. James Joyce from across the river, he calls it improper and proper art. Improper being kinetic art and proper being static art. Kinetic art moves you. Static art stops you. Kinetic art is like pornography. It moves you, sexually. It's improper. Advertising art moves you. It's improper. Static art stops you in your tracks. You can't quite get by it. It does not create desire as does pornography or advertising. You do not desire to eat Cezanne's apples, but you are stopped by the appleness of Cezanne's apples. You're stopped in your tracks.

Because I have to stop myself, I'd just like to say what I'm trying to do in the theatre is to create presences and a society that creates a tension and a physicality between the audience and the stage that suggests a different way of being, that suggests a different way of interacting with one another. That handles the play with clarity. That the play speaks through people who are working at the top of their ability, and interacting with one another in ways that can only be developed over time. Hence going back to Ariane Mnouchkine's notion of a company.

Number six is *alter time*. Because I think of the internet, and because of the way time is moving faster, the most radical thing we can do in the theatre is to change the time signature of an event. Particularly in my country. It used to be about what would young directors do with MTV? Do you try to go faster than MTV? Is that what you do? I saw a young woman director do an extraordinary adaptation of a Borges play. She was a young director. She slowed everything down. I thought that was so fabulous. It was fun, everybody was happy in the performance. It was beautiful. But the first thing you have to do in this particular culture we live in is to be sensitive to the fact that the time signature that we're

on is very, very fast. Our job is to actually radically alter the experience of time, which is a huge issue. I don't really have time to go into it, but that's the quick encapsulation.

SPEAKER 1 (DAVID PARNELL, ARTISTIC DIRECTOR, GÚNA NUA THEATRE): Thank you. That was a lovely speech. If you wouldn't mind me asking you, how long does it take you to make a piece of work?

ANNE BOGART: Because of the US theatre economy we have three weeks plus tech. Now I will add that another feature to having a company is that you open it to an audience after the fourth week and then you work on it for three years. Or with *bobrauchenbergamerica* for example, we opened that in 2001. Pre 9/11. Now it's 2007. That's the up side.

Yes, the economics are terrible. But it's also a great way to take all of the energy and frustration and fury and compress it and find space. A rehearsal needs to feel like you've got all the time in the world. The issue is life is very limited. We forget that. I think of an hourglass. You turn it over and it's a very finite period of time you've got and yet the sand is very light in the way it travels. So our job is to turn it over and we've three weeks, and yet work as if you've got all the time in the world. That is an artform, to slow down time, which goes to the question of changing the time signature. You start by changing the time signature in the rehearsal room. You know the pressure's on. But life is that way too. It's really limited. How are you going to handle that inside of that? The time of a rehearsal is limited. The time of a performance. *Radio Macbeth* is one hour and 25 minutes. Really tight. And yet, inside of that, it's got to feel spacious. Who was it said, you need as much time as you have. If you decide that, then you have a different attitude. It does help to know, ok this is going to open but it's going to have a trajectory.

SPEAKER 2 (WILLIAM GALINSKY, CORK MIDSUMMER FESTIVAL): Because you have a company though, three weeks feels longer than three weeks. I know that if you start with a scratch company, in three weeks you're maybe getting to know each other's names.

ANNE BOGART: No, you still can do it. It's a question of attitude. It really is. It's your attitude towards time and to the human beings with whom you are with. Is that English?

You know there's things called Secretary Directors? That's not a good thing. A Secretary Director is someone who says, ok, by the end of week one I've got act one, by the end of week two I've got act two, by here I'm here. It usually doesn't work. The artistic process is more quantum than that. Meaning that you can spend an inordinate amount of time, an incredibly in-depth, beautiful amount of time on three minutes of a play and the rest of it will fall into place, which is what I mean it's about your attitude. If you say we create the logic of the piece, the aesthetics of the piece, the feel of the piece, the rules. Any time you're creating a play, you're actually creating the world. You're creating an entire system of logic that is unlike anything that one has in daily life. Therefore you can't do that in three weeks by saying, oh my god, I've got to get act one, I've got to get act two. You say, if I can just get these three minutes and really open it up it will create its own system of fractals that the actors then understand in their bodies and you'd be amazed how the rest falls into place. I really think that using time and money as excuses is not good. What do I mean

by not good? Meaning, is not helpful. The issue is your attitude toward what you are doing, which is very important. How you line yourself up.

I love the German word *haltung* or in plural *haltungen*, which is basically attitude. *Gestus*, which is misunderstanding Brecht. Brecht talks of *gestus*, which is essentially the attitude is also posture. In Germany the actors speak of their *haltung* or *haltungen*, because it's a thing that changes, which is an outward directed energy that responds to what's coming back. Attitude, it can be translated as attitude.

I'm going to end with this. I think, what a good actor does, and this also relates to creating and directing a whole thing, is they have a good attitude or good *haltung* or *gestus* as Brecht called it, which has nothing to do with gesture. In cybernetics you think of is as feed-forward and feed-back. Feed-forward is like when you're playing volleyball, it's the feeling of when the ball is coming at you and how you go out to meet it. That's feed-forward. Feed-back is the sensation you receive because of your forward attitude.

So you could say that bad acting is either too much feed-forward or too much feed-back. So an actor who's always [*shouting*] like this all the time. That's a lot of feed-forward. It's not very interesting. An actor who has too much feed back – Strasberg – is like, oh my dog died, I think I feel this and now I'll say the words. Also not interesting. A great actor is somebody who has the courage to go out into the world and then receive back the sensation of that courageous act, in the moment, with an audience. That creates reverberations.

Same thing, when you go into a rehearsal you come in with an attitude like, this is a bust that's only three weeks. You've pre-programmed it. It's in your body. It's like when you go on a date with somebody. You can pre-programme if that's going to be a successful rendezvous or a bust. This person's not worth it, so it won't be worth it. You come with an attitude, a possibility that something can happen. The only thing that's important in a rehearsal is that something happens. It's nobody's job to know what that thing is. You bring a certain attitude into the room of both feed-forward adventurousness and feed-back, the sensation of receiving that. That creates a human experience.

I'm going to end right here. Thank you very much.