

WHY IS THEATER IN CRISIS?

In an epoch, in which we have lost confidence in Truth and Morality, we have no right to act the same way with regard to Beauty. For, while Truth exposes itself as a haughty and nonhuman daughter of Memory and Intellect, and Morality – as a product of cultural hypocrisy and harmed and repressed pleasure, seeking compensation, Imagination remains the only inherently human of the psychological capabilities. Then, let us not be quick also to destroy its castle that has been handed down from generation to generation – Art, the only ark of refuge that the chased human soul can take shelter in today.

The life of flesh and the blood of cognition meet at the wound of art. It is the only place where these two sheer opponents go to repose themselves and enter into a wonderful, but short-lived union. Because, both Truth and Goodness, have been unfaithful to us: they condemn us to act in the service of what stands higher than us and excels us: Intellect serves the principle of things; Morality – the principle of the haughty, perpetual passionless ideal; whereas, the Indifferent Idea shows mercy to us, humans, only if we give her back the passion that knowledge has deprived it of—and today art alone can restore the passion for cognition, now not so much as a mode of culture, but as the ultimate chance for re-humanization of cognition that is able to choose an existential position.

Only this ideal that appeals to feelings to think and to thinking to feel, so that the imperturbable idealness and the thrilled reality meet in the intercourse of the forces of the beautiful and the logical as a cognizing life and a living cognition, is able to reconcile in its duumvirate the come to be in a deadly enmity rational pathos and irrational impulse, and such is the ideal of art. It alone can restore the intimacy of notions and cause the ecstasy of the restored meaning in life that the Pythagoreans saw in figures, and Plotinus found everywhere in reasoning, to flow out again from figures and symbols.

Therefore, today, theatre has no right to be in crisis, namely because the Humanitarian Ideal is compromised in the latter's intellectual likeness.

Nevertheless, theatre is in crisis. And we'll tell you why: because it has made the mistake to see the human soul in inter-human relationships only, and has satisfied itself to perceive man only in his dialog with another man, forgetting that the human soul has been stolen away from nature and collected from all over the world to be closed and concentrated into one body. In other words, it has forgotten that the human soul is the legitimate emanation of the cosmos, and only after that, secondarily, was appropriated and reduced to human desires. We'll explain this now.

You are watching some play there, whatever it may be, from those that have been written so far, no matter if it is self-affirming or self-destroying. And what does that play show? *The human soul*, you say. No, not the soul, but its faked and reduced appearance;

that play there shows the way people treat one another – how malice, jealousy, envy, failed compassion, lofty pity and open contempt want, but fail to agglomerate in that universal and common feeling they have originated from, called *love*, understood as *appetence* – and would you continue to call these conditions *Human Soul*, and believe that the figure of their grand total is your Ego? No! I, Robot, who has written so many books, do not believe that this is the human soul I have been longing for, and that it is the mother of this godly son, the Ego, the stories about whom I have been holding in reverence.

The human soul is not these elementary and cruel impulses that you exchange among one another and that cut the divine rigidity of your face with foolish smiles and humiliating wails. It is not those animal reflexes trimmed down to pleasure, fear, fury and pain. It is not confined to your body, half an inch under your skin. Neither does it extend in the narrow trivial space from you to the person you love or hate, and far less can it be found on the literary market where you buy your feelings. The human soul exceeds man; it comes from outside the human and goes out beyond it; it comes from where man had not come into being yet; and there it returns – where he won't be any more in this appearance. It spreads outside you and goes to dress the stars; it is in the electron's dance around the atom, in water's frivolity, in the crystal's earnestness, in fire's caprice, in the quarks' trio it is, in the baryons' and the mesons' octet, there, where your thought ends. Your soul is the soul of the objective extra humanitarian world. Your psyche is the psyche of the universe, the way your Ego is the Ego of matter which you have abandoned and from which you have withdrawn in the lee to escape from the storm of your cosmic vocation in one single body, too cosy for oblivion of the infinity you used to be.

Our demand is that: Theatre give up the most superficial layer of the psyche – the interpersonal relationships – and that it come down deeper and change from a theatre relating man to man, into a theatre relating man to being, the body – to the world, and once inside their continuum, to find again the place of the Other one as a transpersonal ontological law.

In other words, the task of the new theater is to convert man to his own two transcendences: his own body and being. Because the Other one is the Hell indeed, but that is why he is exactly the Hell, because he is immanent in me; while my own body is transmundane.

Namely because of his inconceivability, so far theater has been satisfied to conceive the Other One, transferring the appetence for one's own body into an appetence for the other's, and thus distorting the primordial ontological opposition. This makes clear the future theater's vocation, once the hitherto existing one has been materializing only the appetence for the other's body: it still has to demonstrate the other aspect of the alternative "one's own darkness or an alien's clarity" – the appetence for, the entering into and the

penetration of one's own flesh. Because the question "Which flesh is hiding the secret about me? – the Other one's or my own?", is answered by that theater, which in order to highlight the drama of the body, blacks out the comedy of the soul. This is the point at which the truth about flesh can only be born out of the murder of the Lie about the soul. The soul, in which everyone, when looking for the Ego, has been finding only and exclusively the Other one. Then he, who is willing to find the Ego, should give up for ever looking for it in the soul that the Other One has been supposed to give him to become allied to him. Here is this point, without whose clarified help our presentation remains obscure: the Soul is exile of the Ego and homeland of the Other one. The body is exile of the Other one and homeland of the Ego. The body is the openness; the Soul is the hiddenness. Man begins to hide himself when he becomes spiritual. This means that the mask is the substance of the cultural. Move away the mask and you'll reach nature. That mask is the language and the universal symbolic systems that enter the flesh in order to embroider it and turn it from animal into human. Therefore, humaneness comes into the flesh from outside. Hence, he, who is willing to free himself from his appearance, risks freeing himself from his humaneness. Humaneness is the universal symbolic. Whereas, in the universal symbolic, the Otherness has ensconced itself. As such, it carries the universal, and never the personal. However, that impersonal is exactly the soul.

Because, for the soul to be born, the universal must penetrate the flesh, and that universal carries the foreignness, which is why the soul that the pure forms of the symbolic systems come to form in us, is the substance of foreignness. Therefore, he who relies on the soul will remain forever alien to himself. This is why, a theater that wants to self-constitute itself mainly on the interpersonal relationships, strengthens in the individual the realm of the anonymous as the total otherness. Let us then wish for ourselves a theatre that will transcend the soul as the only possible way to transcend the otherness. By renouncing the soul as an alienating constitutiveness, all it can do is constitute itself on the flesh.

Then this will be a theater that transcends the human reality devalued in terms of ideals, thus transcending also the Absurdity implied in that reality, and putting an end to the theater of the absurd.

However, should we give up constituting theater on the soul that we denounced as a substance of ostensibility and chose the flesh as a fundamental theaterizing constituent due to its innocence, then inevitably the ideal of such theater will be authenticity. But at this point, having outstripped itself, reasoning is stopped by its own momentary trickery: avoiding ostensibility and arriving to authenticity, didn't we miss the theatrical as well? Sacrificing foreignness for the ideal of authenticity, didn't we also sacrifice the very play that absolutely needs the otherness for its reincarnation? If the theatrical follows from the duality, and if the latter compulsorily involves pretence, and alongside it, deceptiveness as

an apodictic property of the soul, giving up the idea to establish theater on the soul because of its nonauthenticity, don't we also surrender theater itself? Isn't theatricality that pursues authenticity killing itself? Isn't a reality originating from pretence deluding itself that the genuine can come into being through duplicity? And if not this, but the law of theatricality is a self-delusion, shall we, contrary to the rules of logic, claim that the genuine can be phenomenolized only in the deceptive and compulsorily as deceptive? Then deceptiveness is the only truth in which reality deidealizes itself in order to become real, the paradoxical dialectics of the theatrical says. Then the Real is imaginary in life and needs an act to bring about its disimagination freeing it from the imaginary so that it can return to itself and become Real, whereas that act of disimagination is the theatrical. That is, the Real is real only in the theater, outside which the ideas make it imaginary, subjecting it to ostensibilization.

Then we, who want to constitute the theater both on the authenticity of the flesh and the deidealization of deceptiveness, ask: Is a theater that wants to free itself from the mask of the soul, and therefore from the make-up of ideals when only this, fallen out of grace soul, is able to give it the duality of the mask, without which mask it wouldn't be theater, feasible? If the theatrical is imported only by the otherness, how can a theater be self-constituted so as to demonstrate authenticity given that authenticity forbids the theatrical?

However, does the theatrical really exclude authenticity? is the major problem, on whose solution the legitimation of the authentic theater we wish for depends.

And our answer is; the theatrical does not exclude the authentic. The authentic can appear in the theatrical provided that the traditional delusion about the limits of the theatrical is unveiled before that. The authentic includes only the horizon of the cognition, while the theatrical adds to that horizon in itself also the horizon of the existence that slipping away from cognition. However, this specification of the ontological volume of the notions is not sufficient, and for the achievement of our purpose we need to settle one historical dispute. A dispute that will lead us to the thousand-year-old hostility of the logical and the fictional, to their aspirations after the parentage of lie: Is there an autonomously existing lie with regard to theatricalization or is any deceptiveness a result of playing the reality? Does the theatrical give birth to lie or does lie, as a logically primordial semanticity give its duality to the psychical, thus giving birth to it as theatricality?— To which our answer is: It is possible to theaterize only truths. Only their theaterization gives birth to lies as their distorted doubles. However, the fact that the new theatre will surrender the mask of the soul does not at all mean that it will lose the mask. Hence, it follows that a reduction of the lie by the theatrical does not reduce the theatrical itself. The theatrical remains after the lie is removed from it and what remains is exactly the truth. Therefore, now we can define the theatrical: the theatrical unfolds exactly in the

Truth, and it should not go beyond its limits if it does not want to be replaced by the lie. So it is clear why the theatrical is at the same time distinguishable from the lie, distinct from the truth and indistinguishable from the truth. It is indiscernible from the truth for the logical superiority and becomes distinguishable from it in the logical inferiority. So far as we do not leave the level of the logical duality as is the characteristics of the logical superior, and judge about the theatrical from the position of the lie, it remains indiscernible from the truth which is the substratum of the inferior. Only when we change the position, and from the position of the logical superior, whose substratum is the lie, move inside the position of the logical inferior which imports us into the truth, are we able to discern the theatrical from the genuine.

But then, what is the *differentia specifica* of the theatrical, if it is not deceptiveness, and by far more not the genuine, although it is not discernible therefrom? We answer: *Differentia specifica* of the theatrical is the simultaneous identification with two truths by ignoring the lie. Or it also can be said that it is ambigological. In order to have theatricality it is enough to defend equally strongly and fervently two mutually exclusive truths without dominating any of them. Because, if one of them is dominated, the other will move immediately from the logical inferior to the logical superior and will be represented as a lie. Therefore, exactly art, and theater in particular, renders lie impossible as a lie, restoring its logical legitimacy of a banned and chased (pushed out) truth.

And having proved that the theatrical is able to give birth to the mask outside the soul, and to derealize the reality outside lie, we can conclude that theatre has adequate grounds for self-constituting based on flesh.

We proceeded from our accusation against the existing theatre whom we accused of ontological negligence: in the game of being against logics it puts down its stake on a substituted playing card: the soul. We condemned it on the grounds that having been fulfilling its potential through the interpersonal relationships it had substituted the conflict of man with being for a conflict between man and man; and had forced us to be at war with the narcissistic heart instead of fighting matter.

We have put the blame* on the dogma of inter-human beauty that obscures the brilliance of the world in order to illuminate its narcissistic illusions for worldwide oneness and cosmic privilegedness. This shame will be with us until the beautiful gift of thought focuses its charm on the hearts' stalking one another. The helpless anger within us will keep growing from the view of the decreased mundane excitement to the supremacy complex or the masochistic acceptance of subjugation. We know that man will continue to waste the invaluable energy of illumination for monstrous purposes and that nemesis will always come upon him as upon a fool: he will die in laughter because he didn't venture on living as a tragic figure. Which I why we threatened the existing theatre that the dissolution

of the human individual into the choicelessness of the readymade unified psyche society offers it, brings about the disappearance of individuality, since the soul today, as the bearer of the anonymous universality is an agent of impersonality. And having warned that the theatre of the soul only strengthens the leveling and reinforces the hegemony of impersonality over the individual through the totalitarizing social identifications, we opposed to it the ideal of the theatre of flesh that presently is the only one able to guarantee human dramatics uniqueness, and to protect it against the threat of ultimate dissolution into the universal pseudo drama of the readymade myths. And since we have given up on the personal in our soul, now we have to show how it regenerates from the soul.

The personal will emerge merely as an effect¹ of the interaction of the body and the universal. Because the flesh faces the alternative: to either allow to be remodeled by the universal through which it mingles in the universal or to try in its own turn to give the universal its own bodily uniqueness. The Ego appears only where the bodily manages to reconfigure the universal in accordance with itself and thus to make it unique. When the body of a physicist comes across the universal theory of physics, a conflict arises between those two: If the physicist's body succeeds in modifying the theory of physics rendering unto it the configuration of his bodily uniqueness, he becomes an Einstein or a Schrödinger. And if the universality of the theory wins strategically the contest, the bodily vision becomes unified with the universal paradigm and the triumph of the intellectual truce resulting from the termination of the contests, marks the disappearance of the physicist as a body. He has received for soul the soul of the theory of physics, and with that – the impersonal. The soul of the theory of physics has come back to life from the death of his body.

Thus the individual's walk of life is the risk of the choice between the rational universality and the bodily uniqueness. Such choice presupposes their intercommunication. However, in this communication the Personal cannot rely on a union, but on a conflict only. As a union, such communication is subjection of the flesh to the universal which gives rise to impersonality. As a conflict, such communication is survival of the unique standing its ground in its fight against the rational universality. The duration of the conflict spans throughout the continuation of the personal. It vanishes always when the universal alone or the bodily alone triumphs. The victory of the universal is anonymization of the body, whereas the victory of the bodily is degrading to the animal.

Once flesh has defended its personness, now it must defend the hypothesis of its innate theatricality outside of and independently on the soul. And since theatricality as a playing reality is built upon the availability of Duality, Pretence and role-playing, their apriori disposition in the bodily should be proved. Let us trace the two types of argumentation – that of the soul and that of the flesh.

The arguments of the theatre of the soul can be summarized in the claim that without psyche there cannot be Duality, Pretence and Role-playing on which to build up the theatrical. Let us see if it is really so. Whereas, the flesh claims the opposite: that pretence is innately inside her, and that only thanks to its capability of assuming a mask, of playing double and reincarnating the very soul has come into being. In the meantime, when the soul imagines that it has invented the game and the borrowed life, flesh mocks it claiming that were it not for that game and that borrowed life that it had ventured on when it was forced to defend itself against Language, soul would have never been able to come into being. In order to defend its independence, the soul adduces arguments about the ideality of its nature referring to the imaginary life it leads, pointing it out as its substantiality. Yet exactly its imaginary existence uses the flesh as an argument for its ostensibility. Their years-long dispute and the diversity of their argumentations are reduced to the fluctuations in the superiority and priority of their right of private ownership over Pretence. Thus the struggle between materialism and idealism turns into a struggle between the real and the ideal over the primacy or the secondariness of Theatricality. The riddles of matter begin to be interpreted as collisions. The evolution of the universe is seen as drama. The spirit sees its guarantees in the secondariness of Theatricality. The hope of materialism is in its primacy.

We would reduce this, already become comic dispute, to an examination of the genesis of Pretence in the flesh: When did flesh come to know Pretence and why did it venture on duality is to us the answer of the question about the origin of Theatricality that precedes the question about the origin of the Soul. Since the Soul itself was born from the pretence of the flesh, the answer of the question about the origin of Pretence in the flesh is fundamental for the civilization. Thus we actually determine our stand regarding the aforementioned dispute: The origin of Theatricality precedes the origin of the Soul; assuming that the soul itself was born from the pretence of the flesh, whereas that pretence, strictly speaking, is the limits of Theatricality, this implies that Theatricality gives birth to the soul, not vice versa, which actually had to be proven in order to defend the right of the theatre to self-constituting itself on the flesh independently on the soul.

Let us hear the argumentations of the flesh.

a) In the first place, the soul itself is a hypothesis: no one has seen it; we judge about it only by observing its causes and effects. What we call by tradition *soul* is only the effect of the reflection of the mutual play of Language and Body.

b) If that is so, when does soul invent duality? If the soul does not exist, but only the Language and the Body exist, duality should be deduced from their mutual play. Language as super-personal, universal and inanimate, is monolithic within its own self, and would not need such a means of defence as the invention of duality is. It is clear that it is

necessary only to a being that feels itself insecure and dependent on the environment, whereas such a being is the flesh, and which the historical conditions force upon it so it can protect itself against the aggression of the universal symbolics to be replaced by an entity that will have its characteristics, and nevertheless will remain the same, being something else: e. i., an entity that will imitate it. However, that entity must not be a real entity – the historical intention requires that the nature of its existence be imaginary. That is, it must be an imaginary entity. But then, there is no need for it to be another entity, but simply another kind of existence of the primary entity – its imitative existence.

Namely, by inventing its imitative existence, the flesh makes it to the supranatural extraordinary existence of the double, that unparalleled model of being that is within being and at the same time is not.

Having discovered the double, the flesh can already easily give up its real availability to the expansion of the symbols and the labor operations by retiring into its doubled existence. The double that is yet to turn into an *i d e a l l i f e*, and hence into an *i d e a l E g o*, for the time being enters this famous game that logics and evolution will have to lead for millennia without any arrogance, solely in the modest role of a protective screen.

At some sublime historical moment, when the ontological fate of the flesh was hanging in the balance and was threatened with being melted entirely in the configuration of the symbols and the universalizing labor, it ventured on pretended, instead of real existence in order to survive: it has chosen its **SHADOW AS A SYMBOL OF THE PERMISSION TO LEAVE THE EVOLUTIONARY BATTLE** by going out of the gates of the genetic tree with dignity and unnoticeably. No one has noticed when the human flesh left the gladiator arena of being in order to retire in the castle of imitative life, because it has left in its place in evolution its own self. Escaping from the genetic labyrinth, it has saved itself. It has moved to exist in its double – indeed, ideally and imaginarily, but sparing itself the humiliation of instinctive dependence and the horror of perishableness. Indeed, its life in the double that later science will call its ego, closes it for ever in its foreignness and in the life borrowed from the symbols. However, without such moving into the foreignness of imitative existence, the flesh would have not preserved itself as flesh of the human being, who will keep remaining a human being until he remains imaginary.