

A BRECHTIAN ANALYSIS OF CARYL CHURCHILL'S *MAD FOREST* AND EDWARD
BOND'S *RED, BLACK AND IGNORANT*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

AYŞE YÖNKÜL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
ENGLISH LITERATURE

JANUARY 2013

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŐIK
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Gölge SEFEROĐLU
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĐÇE
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Meral ÇİLELİ	(METU, ELIT)	_____
Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĐÇE	(METU, ELIT)	_____
Prof. Dr. Esin TEZER	(METU, EDS)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all the material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Ayşe YÖNKUL

Signature:

ABSTRACT

A BRECHTIAN ANALYSIS OF CARYL CHURCHILL'S *MAD FOREST* AND EDWARD BOND'S *RED, BLACK AND IGNORANT*

YÖNKUL, Ayşe

M.A., in English Literature

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĞÇE

January 2013, 94 Pages

This thesis is primarily concerned with Caryl Churchill and Edward Bond's attempts to implement Brechtian methods of *Verfremdungseffekt* with the same artistic intent of social change in their plays, *Mad Forest* and *Red, Black and Ignorant*. In order to provoke critical and objective thinking, and action for positive change, both of the playwrights make use of Brechtian *Verfremdungseffekt* techniques of characterization, open-endedness, episodic structure, and audio-visual aids. These techniques let the playwrights present familiar situations, actions and attitudes as if they were unfamiliar so that they could be alienated and evaluated with a critical eye by the audience and the reader. In addition to studying the Brechtian elements in these two plays, this thesis argues that there is a point which drifts Bond's *Red, Black and Ignorant* from Brechtian dramaturgy and Churchill's *Mad Forest*; the point is that *Red, Black and Ignorant* includes non-Brechtian character design aspects and lack of Brechtian audio-visual aids.

Keywords: Brechtian *Verfremdungseffekt*, episodic structure, open-endedness, Brechtian audio-visual aids, Brechtian characterization

ÖZ

CARYL CHURCHILL'İN *MAD FOREST* VE EDWARD BOND'UN *RED, BLACK AND IGNORANT* İSİMLİ OYUNLARININ BRECHTYEN AÇIDAN İNCELENMESİ

YÖNKUL, Ayşe

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĞÇE

Ocak 2013, 94 sayfa

Bu tez Caryl Churchill ve Edward Bond adlı oyun yazarlarının *Mad Forest* ve *Red, Black and Ignorant* adlı oyunlarında, Brecht ile aynı sosyal değişim niyetleriyle Brecht'in *Yabancılaştırma Etkisi* metotlarını, oyunlarında kullanma girişimlerini incelemektedir. Objektif kritik düşünce ve pozitif değişim düşüncelerinin tohumlarını zihinlere yerleştirebilmek için, her iki oyun yazarı da oyunlarında, Brecht'in *Yabancılaştırma Etkisi* tekniği olan karakter dizaynı, açık uçluluk, epizodik yapılanma ve görsel-işitsel öğelerden faydalanmaktadır. Bu teknikler yazarlara tanıdık durum, hareket ve tutumları, alışılmadık gibi göstermeleri konusunda yardımcı olup, izleyici ve okuyucuya bu durumları kritik bir gözle değerlendirme fırsatı sunmaktadır. Ayrıca, bu tez Brechtyen dramaturji ve Churchill'in *Mad Forest* adlı oyunu ile karşılaştırıldığında Bond'un *Red, Black and Ignorant* adlı oyununun Brechtyen olmayan karakter dizaynı içerdiğini ve Brechtyen görsel-işitsel öğelerin de yetersiz olduğunu öne sürmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Brechtyen *Yabancılaştırma Etkisi*, epizodik yapılanma, açık-uçluluk, Brechtyen görsel-işitsel öğeler, Brechtyen karakterizasyon

To my family and my fiancé

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her deepest gratitude to her supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĞÇE for her supportive attitude and constructive criticism throughout the research.

The author would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Meral ÇİLELİ for her suggestions, guidance and precious comments.

The technical assistance of Oktay YAZICI, the head of Foreign Languages Department of Çankırı Karatekin University, is also gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Caryl Churchill and Her Work.....	4
1.2 Edward Bond and His Work.....	7
1.3 The Aim of This Study.....	10
2. BRECHTIAN DISCOURSE AND <i>VERFREMUNGSEFFEKT</i>	15
3. BRECHTIAN ELEMENTS IN <i>MAD FOREST</i> AND <i>RED, BLACK AND IGNORANT</i>	27
3.1 Brechtian Episodic Structure.....	29
3.1.1 Brechtian Episodic Structure in <i>Mad Forest</i>	30
3.1.2 Brechtian Episodic Structure in <i>Red, Black and Ignorant</i>	39
3.2 Brechtian Characterization.....	52
3.2.1 Brechtian Characterization in <i>Mad Forest</i>	52
3.2.2 Brechtian Characterization in <i>Red, Black and Ignorant</i>	57
3.3 Brechtian Audio-Visual Aids.....	61
3.3.1 Brechtian Audio-Visual Aids in <i>Mad Forest</i>	62
3.4 Brechtian Open-Endedness.....	67
3.4.1 Brechtian Open-Endedness in <i>Mad Forest</i>	67
3.4.2 Brechtian Open-Endedness in <i>Red, Black and Ignorant</i>	77
4. NON-BRECHTIAN FEATURES IN <i>RED, BLACK AND IGNORANT</i>	80
4.1 Non-Brechtian Characterization.....	81
4.2 Lack of Audio-Visual Aids.....	85
5. CONCLUSION.....	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	91
APPENDICES	

A. TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU.....	94
---------------------------------	----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the twentieth century, the whole world observed several mass destructions and chaotic scenes which have many long-term effects in several aspects of life such as politics, sciences, economics, cultures, and social lives. Just like all the other areas, literature went through disorder and many theories of it went upside-down owing to its quality of getting affected by the conditions in which it blossoms. Literary world of the Great Britain started to be unsatisfied by the inequalities and the discrepancies of the twentieth century chaotic environment, and it wanted to break with the older patterns which fell short for its aims of social enlightenment. Aristotelian drama techniques started to be insufficient and inappropriate for its aims of awakening and alerting the audience and the reader for a social change; and British drama circles mostly started to be unsatisfied about the way Aristotelian drama drags the audience and the reader into passivity in the service of fate. Unlike Aristotelian drama, modern plays mostly try to activate the audience and the reader so that they can act out about the faulty aspects of the societies. Bill Naismith puts emphasis on the critical quality of the modern plays and audiences of the nation as follows: “Many modern plays invite the audience to judge an action which might not be fully explained on the stage. The structure of the plays provides coherence and meaning, but the perceptiveness of the audience is required to draw relevant conclusions” (xxxiv).

Modern British playwrights expect the audience and the reader get involved in the critical thinking, judging, drawing conclusions and finding solutions for the social problems portrayed on the stage/text. Most of the plays are socially-oriented rather than including individual concerns or psychological developments. Naismith comments on the newer dramaturgy by comparing it to the older notions; he thinks that there has been a shift in the drama theories and theatrical performances and texts. There used to be characters who were fully explained and whose psychological development was the main interest of the plays, while modern dramatists tend to attain the events of the characters a heightened social structure, according to him (xxiii). The modern plays focus more on the social roles of the characters and their positions in the societies so that they can render social thoughts and

actions for the audience/reader in order them to change the societies for better places to live.

One of the main influences behind this functional shift in the dramaturgy circles in the Great Britain is Brechtian Epic Theatre and its arrival in England in 1950s. Alicia Tyler comments on the arrival of the Brechtian discourse as follows: “Since the Berliner Ensemble brought its production of Brecht’s *Mother Courage* to London in 1956, Brecht’s concepts have affected British theatre in diverse ways. Brecht’s ideas have circulated so widely partially because he wrote groundbreaking theatre theory as well as dramatic works” (41). Tyler focuses on the quality of Brecht as a pathfinder of a theory and dramaturgy for the British playwrights and theorists on the way to get functionality on a social basis. Brechtian understanding of drama is one of the major forces behind the social functioning of the British modern drama.

Brechtian Epic theatre tries to activate the audience and the reader for the change in the defects of the society and the world. Aristotelian drama techniques mostly pulls the audience and the reader into passivity because it shows the events and characters as unalterable and predetermined by holy powers while Brechtian Epic theatre revolves around the ideas of free will, responsibility, duality, and action for the change in the society. Hirst comments on Brecht’s own words from his notes to his *Rise and Fall of the City of Mahagonny*, where Brecht compares dramatic works and his Epic plays; Hirst’s comment is as follows:

In the notes to *Mahagonny*, Brecht points out that whereas dramatic theatre thrives on plot which implicates the spectator in a stage situation and wears down his power of action, epic theatre is concerned with narrative, turning the spectator into an observer and arousing his power of action. In dramatic theatre the human being is, taken for granted, is unalterable, whereas in epic he is the object of enquiry and able to alter. (128)

The sharp difference between those two schools of thought is that epic theatre encourages the audiences and the reader about the changeability of the beings and happenings while dramatic theatre most of the time discourages them from social change with the thought *that is what it is* and there is no way to change the happenings and people.

Caryl Churchill and Edward Bond are among the ones who have serious social concern for the societies they live in and the discrepancies of it. They believe in a better future if they can draw attention to the alterability of the events, the people and the world in their plays. Therefore, they have the influence of Brechtian epic theatre in their dramaturgies because of its belief in the potential the people have in them to act for the better. In the commentary of his play, *The Worlds*, Edward Bond argues about the epic theatre’s focus on discriminating between right and wrong as follows: “The new form of

the new drama will be epic... The essence of epic theatre is the way it selects, connects and judges” (108). Edward Bond considers epic theatre as the drama form of the future owing to the theory’s ability to present the topics meaningfully for critical observation.

Caryl Churchill claims that most of the playwrights are affected by Brecht one way or another. In Reinelt’s *After Brecht: British Epic Theatre*, Churchill comments on Brechtian influence on the British playwrights as follows: “I think for writers, directors and actors working in England in the seventies, his [Brecht’s] ideas have been absorbed into the general pool of shared knowledge and attitudes, so that without constantly thinking of Brecht we nevertheless imagine things in a way we might not have without him” (86). Churchill does not disregard Brecht’s influence on the liberation of the ideas in writing and in performance; and Brecht guides the British playwrights on the way of getting newer perspectives in writing and acting, according to Churchill.

This study will focus on the dramatic influence of Brecht on Caryl Churchill’s *Mad Forest* and Edward Bond’s *Red, Black and Ignorant*. It will delve into how Churchill and Bond make use of Brechtian theories and techniques of *Verfremdungseffekt* so that they appeal to the critical thinking and objective reasoning abilities of the audience and the reader in order to be able to motivate and encourage them to change the society for a better future. The reason behind the selection of these two playwrights is that they both care for the social awakening of the societies and an enlightened future of the world; and the reason why their *Mad Forest* and *Red, Black and Ignorant* are chosen for this study is their chaotic settings. According to Brechtian discourse, chaotic and war-like settings are best environments to show how the social responsibility is needed to fix the chaos, as Aston argues: “In the absence of social responsibility comes chaos and global warfare” (119). To get the social responsibility, Brecht suggests using dark and chaotic settings full of social degeneration and evil deeds in the plays. *Mad Forest* presents before, during and after revolutionary activities of 1989 Romanian Revolution when Communist Romania collapsed; the communist leader Nicolae Ceaușescu and his wife Elena Ceaușescu were executed; and a lot of people died or wounded. In the play, the playwright displays the effects of the activities on the people in Romania. Likewise, *Red, Black and Ignorant* narrates the unlived story of an unborn kid who is miscarried due to the nuclear bombings during the pregnancy. The play shows how his life would be if he was born into the world of chaos and wars. In these kinds of settings, both the playwright and audience / reader find many aspects to question due to the gravity of the problems in the environment.

This thesis argues that both *Mad Forest* by Caryl Churchill and *Red, Black and Ignorant* by Edward Bond have Brechtian techniques such as episodic structure, Brechtian

characterization, audio-visual aids and open-endedness; however, what Bond lacks in his *Red, Black and Ignorant* is character design and audio-visual aids in parallel to Brechtian *Verfremdungseffekt*. In other words, while Bond implements episodic structure, open-endedness, and Brechtian characterization – to some extent –, he disregards audio-visual aids of Brechtian discourse and he includes non-Brechtian emphatic characterization which Brecht totally disagrees.

Accordingly, in the first chapter of this study, Churchill and Bond, and their politics, philosophy, their works and their specific works which are significant for the study are introduced briefly; in the second chapter, Brechtian discourse and his *Verfremdungseffekt* are examined thoroughly in relation to Brecht's article "A Short Organum for Theatre" where he explains his theory and methods; in the third chapter, the Brechtian Epic Theatre's effects on Bond's *Red, Black and Ignorant* and Churchill's *Mad Forest* are studied with the examples from the works; and in the fourth chapter, Bond's difference from both Brecht and Churchill are displayed with the examples from the main text of *Red, Black and Ignorant*. The third and the fourth chapters are the parts where the arguments of this thesis are presented.

1.1 Caryl Churchill and Her Work

Caryl Churchill (1938 - ...) is a world-famous British dramatist, one of the major figures of contemporary stage. Her drama gains popularity – criticism and favour at the same time – while she keeps her private life private. She rarely gives interviews, and all these rare interviews are about her dramaturgy; that is, she prefers to be acclaimed by her work. She wrote many of her plays which are mostly premiered in Royal Court, and were directed by many famous directors while she was raising three boys at the same time.

From very early ages of her life, Churchill has been deeply affected by the conditions of the world like abuses of power, oppression of women, and sexual inequality. Churchill, from time to time, is called as being a feminist writer, writer of women or left-wing writer; however what she should be recognized as is *the social critic* in addition to her identity as a dramatist. What she does is to reflect the society as it is with its discrepancies, indifference and inequalities, and to criticize them in her dramaturgy and her articles. As a reply to the critics who try to limit her with the labels of left politics and feminism, Naismith argues in his introduction to Churchill's *Top Girls*: "The variety of her subject matter, the constant experiment with form and her challenge to conventional role models should serve as a warning to those who are keen to appropriate her for a cause or restrict in

any way the scope of her drama” (xxi). Churchill is a playwright who pinpoints the fallacies around her, so it would be to disregard her quality of being a serious critic of any kind of discrepancy if she was labelled as a left-wing activist or a feminist propagandist. She is a social critic and every single conflict would be her subject in her plays.

Churchill constantly plays with the form and content of her plays. Her subject matter could be anything from female to gay issues, from post-colonialism to revolutions. She has a wide array of topics for her plays and articles. Likewise, she experiments with the form of her plays in many combinations. Her long-term director Max Stafford-Clark comments on her dramaturgy with the following words in the introduction to Churchill’s *Serious Money*: “She has an incisiveness, a political astuteness and an ability to analyze, together with a theatrical inventiveness that is always exciting” (xix). She has surprising formations and modifications of literary theories and methods in addition to her mixtures of social subjects.

Churchill wants a society which is purified from all the classifications and limitations. In an interview, which is referred to by Judith Thurman, she describes the nature of her utopic society as follows:

I know quite well what kind of society I would like: decentralized, non-authoritarian, communist, non-sexist – a society in which people can be in touch with their feelings, and in control of their lives. But it always sounds both ridiculous and unattainable when you put it into words. (54)

She is quite sure of what she expects from the society which is fair and equal to all people although she thinks that the society she wishes to live in is unavailable and inaccessible for now; and it may sound really awkward when put into words, as she confesses. However, she does not give up on the alterability of the courses of time and actions, and keeps on struggling changing the public beliefs by urging the audience to think, criticize and change in her performances and in her texts. Thus, in her plays, “by demonstrating how systems of social control operate and link up – the policing of education, punishment, mental health, and so on – Churchill shows how social behaviour is regulated and how, therefore, the power structure of government remains undiminished” (Aston 60). She stylized this critical thinking and attitude in most of her plays because she believes in the questioning of both the present and the possible structures so that the future gets better.

Churchill comments on both the form and content of the playwriting as follows: “Playwrights don’t give answers; they ask questions. We need to find new questions, which may help us answer the old ones or make them unimportant, and this means new subjects and new form” (Churchill, *Ordinary* 446). Through questioning, she wants the audience/reader find answers to previous unanswered questions; and at the same time she

wishes to achieve this by implementing new forms and methods in the plays. In other words, her aim is to find new ways of awakening and enlightening her audience and reader so that they can question the system they are accustomed to from the very beginning.

Brecht's ideas marked an influence on Churchill's texts and performances. Kritzer in her book, *The Plays of Caryl Churchill*, resembles Churchill to Brecht in many ways as follows:

Churchill, like Brecht, eschews the Aristotelian evocation of pity and fear in favour of stimulating new understandings of specific social situations through 'astonishment and wonder'. Churchill's plays make effective use of such Brechtian techniques as distancing the audience from the characters and action to encourage a critical attitude, encapsulating the power relations of a particular situation in the simple action of the social gest, or disrupting the flow of narrative through episodic structure and songs. Most important is a commonality of artistic intent: like Brecht, Churchill seeks to empower audiences against oppression rather than encourage serene acceptance of an apparently inevitable fate. (3)

Kritzer resembles Churchill to Brecht in terms of both artistic intent and the reflection of it to form of the plays. Because of the similarity of their artistic intent, they share the techniques on the way to their aims. Just like Brecht, "Churchill believes in the possibility of change" (Cave 258) at the core and as Innes suggests: "The theatre [of Churchill] itself is affirmed for positive change" (471); thus, she implements Brechtian methods and techniques.

Mad Forest written and performed in 1990, is one of Churchill's acclaimed plays which both posit radical questions and present them in a new style of theatre; in other words, she questions the nature of 1989 revolution of Romania in Brechtian epic theatre method. The play is about the political system, oppression, and social conditions before, during and after the revolution. A few months after the fall of Ceaușescu in December 1989, Churchill took her students of The Central School of Speech and Drama (Kritzer, Sourcebook 108) to Romania and "most of the research [the public interviews about the revolutionary activities] was conducted out on the street, talking to ordinary Romanian people" (qtd in Aston 127).

The play consists of three episodes; two of which (at the beginning and at the end) is about the weddings of two families, the Vladus – a working class family consisting Bogdan, the father, Irina, the mother, Lucia and Florina, the daughters, and Gabriel, the son –, and the Antonescus – a middle class family consisting Mihai, the father, Flavia, the mother, and Radu, the son– under the oppression of Ceaușescu politics, revolutionary and post-revolutionary disorder. As Gray (1993) states, in *Mad Forest* the playwright sets up a mosaic within a tripartite structure: the weddings of two sisters, Lucia and Florina at the

beginning and at the end; and the accounts of the revolution, and the wedding scenes are juxtaposed with the scenes of the revolution. Churchill's perspectives of social, cultural, and political realities of the time row in the same boat in the very well fictionalised world of the play.

1.2 Edward Bond and His Work

Edward Bond (1934- ...) is a British playwright, poet, director and theorist. Apart from being among the best playwrights in the dramaturgy world, he is also a very prolific writer with almost fifty plays. In addition to having much support for his talent and productivity, he received more criticism for his violence on stage and political views from commentators and critics. Many of those critics tried to "relegate his work into a small pigeon-hole in the history of Royal Court Theatre" (Coult 11). It can be claimed that much of his popularity comes from the reactions he had from the critics, and commentators. No one would argue that he is beyond criticism, but he deserves to be acclaimed as talented and passionate, as many other critics and commentators do.

Most of the critics believe that theatrical originality and active imagination are the results of Bond's wish to understand the world we live in and the people we contact with. This wish to reason the world may be the direct result of the tragedies he witnessed throughout his life. When he was sent to Cornwall during the Blitz times – German bombing of the UK during WWII – , he points out in an interview, "I knew that I was being sent away so that I would not be killed by bombs. Not reasonably, I thought that the fact that my parents were staying behind meant that they would be killed" (qtd in Coult 10). These kinds of experiences for a child of his age had most probably led him to become a writer of social criticism.

Bond's childhood memories are mostly about war and the conservative religious beliefs. Born into a lower class family at the very beginnings of the WWII, he experienced a lot of pain and chaos as a child. He moved from one place to another, lived with a family member then with another one. Davis argues that "his early exposure to the violence and terror of war probably shaped his work, while his experience of the evacuation gave him an awareness of social alienation which would characterize his writing" in the introduction of the book he edited (xii). Tony Coult describes Bond's socio-economic class in his own words as follows: "The man who set out at 20 to write a play was, then, a half-educated labourer and clerk from a working-class which had known a good deal of disruption, upheaval and poverty" (13). Bond has experienced a lot of troubles and problems related to

his socio-economic level and the times he was born into. Accordingly, his political and philosophical views which are developed through his own experiences are observed through his plays. He confesses that in an interview, “The reason that I’m interested in politics is that I grew up in a political situation where everything was seen in terms of politics... You were always involved in questions of necessity. Politics was the way one experienced growing up” (qtd in Coult 12). The society in which he was born dragged him into the person he turned out to be as an activist and a playwright who touches on the issues of politics and social discrepancies. As he confesses, it would be wrong to separate his experience from his philosophies.

It is not possible not to criticize Bond because of the wildly performed unvarnished realities of the world but according to Bond, they are the realities that the human beings should not ignore and be indifferent to. However, Bond is an optimist who wants to make the world a better place to live by presenting those aspects of life through his plays and finding solutions to them. He has written a poem to encourage people to do right at any cost; the poem, titled as ‘On Being an Optimist’ published in his *Theatre Poems and Songs* is as follows:

There’s a solution to every problem
The solving of it which would make the world better

But to do one thing right
You may need to do
Four things wrong
Don’t let the four things
Stop the one thing

And though you lived in a time
When for one right thing
A hundred wrong have to be done
Seize the chance
Do the one thing
Or the things that are wrong
Will be one hundred and one. (107)

Bond looks optimistically at the future and believes in the potential of the people to do right. Therefore, in his plays, he encourages people to seize that one chance. The first ring of his better structured society is to let the people think and criticize the actions and behaviours. As Coult argues about him: “by infecting the audience with responsibility for the events and confronting it with its own dark potential, his plays seek to generate antibodies against other more immediate plagues” (37). Bond tries to avoid future darker fallacies of the societies in the present day; and he writes and directs plays accordingly.

Bond desires to activate the minds of the audience/reader about how to take the action to transform the society into a better one. His beliefs about getting changed after watching a performance stems from his own experience of childhood. After he watched his first theatrical production which was Donald Wolfitt's production of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, he was surprised "That other people had seen this play, so how was it that their lives could just go on in the same way?" (Holland 24). After watching or reading a piece of dramaturgy something starts to keep popping in the minds of the ones watching or reading the piece, which is what he thought about the drama and he began writing to solve the puzzle of the world, to understand it. In his dramaturgy, he still desires to urge questions and wants the reader and the audience to find solutions for an improved society on their own now that he believes in changes in people after watching a performance or reading a play.

With this thought in his mind, Bond has written and directed plays which have social function and the focus of alterable qualities of the defective aspects of the society. In an interview with David L. Hirst, Bond makes the following remarks on the topics of acting, directing and audience reactions:

I would like to feel there was some way in which you can dislodge segments of belief that people have so that the whole structure of their ideology is changed. Suppose there's a mosaic and I just move one piece. As a result of that every piece of the mosaic has to readjust itself. You can do that and end up with a different picture. That's a good approach to an audience. You might be knocking out cornerstones. Of course a whole mosaic cannot be changed so easily. But you work at it because mosaics can be changed. This is a difficult experience for an audience and it should be an exciting experience. The audience should actually get a reward at the moment – but later they should get more. It should become a practice of their own life. (Hirst 164-165)

Bond uses the mosaic metaphor to explain his views on the changes that a play should achieve in people. A play should show the alterable nature of the society and the happenings along with that it alters views of those who watch or read it.

In relation his own philosophies about the dramaturgy, Bond believes in the Epic theatre's effectiveness on the people and implements Brechtian methods in his plays. He expresses his admiration for Brecht in his article "On Brecht: A Letter to Peter Holland" in *Theatre Quarterly* journal as follows:

Brecht was an experimenter, an explorer. He did not answer all our questions. The time between his death and the present has given us more experience, more history to draw on. The tragedy of the 20th century drama is that Brecht died before he could complete a last series of plays ... But we have to write the plays he left unwritten. (34)

Bond's remarks show that he wants to follow Brecht's path and his aims of social functionality. His plays beg the comparison with Brecht's in its subject matter and dramatic form, both of which have much in common with the German dramatist's own definition and practice of Epic theatre (Hirst 125). It would be wrong to claim Bond as a deliberate pupil of Brecht but it is obvious that Bond is affected by him in the way that they both challenge the status quo and demand new patterns of thought among the society. Before Bond has access to most of Brecht's plays owing to small number of Brecht's play in translation and Bond's inadequate German knowledge, Bond used to consider Brecht's plays as "naive melodramas" (Bond, *Dialectics* 13). However, his views have changed over the years and he started to call Brecht among the most important writers of his era.

In the mid-1980s, Bond started to write the trilogy of *The War Plays*. Motivated by the threats of the last years of Cold War and the political reflections in the UK and in the continent, Bond planned to write on the nuclear activities, as Bond explains in the commentary on the trilogy (Bond, *Plays* 247). *The War Plays* lets him achieve this aim. The trilogy included *Red, Black and Ignorant*; *The Tin Can People*; and *Great Peace*.

In his *Red, Black and Ignorant*, which is one of the two relevant plays of this thesis, he asks questions to the audience/reader for them to find the answers and solutions on their own. The questions of it are crucial and the answers and solutions to them need utmost care and internalization. In the play, the main character is named *Monster* and at the end the audience asks *Who is the real monster?*. As explained at the very beginning of the play, monster is an unborn baby boy who is miscarried by his mother owing to the bombings of a war which is not named any time throughout the play except for the Bond's own commentary. Throughout nine different scenes, the monster's life is explained from birth till his death as if he was born. The play is not a kind of summary of a human life; instead the scenes explain the crucial events happening in the monster's life like the snapshots of a camera.

1.3 The Aim of This Study

As the children of the same era, Bertolt Brecht, Edward Bond and Caryl Churchill share/shared almost the same experiences of political, social and cultural life of twentieth century. It is not important that Brecht is German or Bond and Churchill are British because the events they experienced are not national but universal. Namely, among the experience they shared there seems to be the effects World War I and World War II which are the widest destructive happenings in the history of the humanity.

David L. Hirst, the drama lecturer in Birmingham University, argues that “The task for the responsible dramatist has never been more difficult and demanding than it is at present. The theatrical artist finds himself working in a political and cultural vacuum” (2). He might be right about his argument of British modern drama because owing to the changing time and its effects on social environment, economic and political conditions, Aristotle’s well-made play gave way to “absurdist drama, epic narrative and the Theatre of Cruelty” (Hirst 3). Owing to the mass changes in the twentieth century, Aristotelian well-made play system started to fall short of conveying the twentieth century needs of the playwrights. This helped the literary circles break with the old kind of literary theories; in terms of dramaturgy, a break with the Aristotelian kind of well-made play notion.

Nevertheless, although the Hirst believes that the times change and the notions of the literary streams in drama disconnect with the older theories and methods, he claims that “the influence of such original writers as Beckett, Artaud and Brecht was short-lived in Britain” (3) and older methods started to be implemented again after the trial of these original writers. Hirst relates Brecht’s short life in Britain to his plays’ quality of being the propagandas for Marxism and thinks that Marxism finds no habitat in Britain. Marxism may or may not have found enough place to develop and rise in Britain; however, the association between Brecht and short-lived Marxism in Britain does not make Brecht short-lived too. On the contrary, as observable in the modern plays, Brechtian discourse has long-term influence on the British Drama after the WWII.

Unlike Hirst’s thoughts on Brechtian short-life in Britain, Goetschius, who is a social worker and research consultant for the London Council of Social Service, thinks that because of the social changes following WWII, class structures of upper working class, lower middle class and some groups of middle and upper class started to shake, and they wanted to break with the pre-war patterns in social and political ways. In his article “The Royal Court in its Social Context”, he furthers his comment with the following words: “All of these elements had in common the need to clear away part of the middle class way of life and to make the necessary psychological place within which to establish their new identity. This involved questioning the old identity and the social paraphernalia which surrounded it” (33). These shakes in the social structures led to the shifts in the form and content of the dramatic performances and texts; namely, there appeared to be the employment of the original theories. This time was when Brechtian theory and methods gained popularity in England. When people started to question the society and the social structures they were bored with, Brecht’s and similar drama theories of critical thinking took their positions on the stage.

Hirst, who seals Brecht off the British literary circles of the present times, presents Brechtian qualities of Edward Bond as if they're non-Brechtian. His ideas on Bond are as follows: "In his plays; he constantly turned to crucial periods in the history of the world, to examine the social, ethical and political roots of the present situations in order to alter them in the future. His concern with both the responsibility of the artist and his relationship to his time informs in all Bondian plays" (4-5). Although Hirst tries to disconnect Brecht from the British drama of the twentieth century due to its closeness with Marxist ideas, the features of the Bondian drama which he talks about are quite similar to the Brechtian discourse of alterability of the society through the plays. Just like Brecht, Bond is concerned with dramatic form and its relation to social and historical context. Both are interested in the past and present so that the future is advanced and altered for the better.

Likewise, Simon Trussler ignores Brechtian effect on Churchill and attains Brechtian qualities of Churchill to her being a woman writer. Churchill is thought to be a feminist writer or at least a follower of a feminine aesthetics in her plays and articles although in her texts, she mostly notes that she is not driven by the possibility of the feminine qualities. Her views on the issue are as follows:

I remember before I wrote *Top Girls* thinking about women barristers – and how they were in a minority and had to imitate men to succeed – and I was thinking of them as different from me. And then I thought, 'wait a minute, my whole concept of what plays might be is from plays written by men ...' And I remember long before that thinking of the 'maleness' of the traditional structure of plays, with conflict and building in a certain way to a climax. But it is not something I think about very often. (qtd in Naismith xxii)

Trussler comments on Churchill's views in a way that the 'feminine' quality of her writing may simply have to do with dialectic replacing conflict and open-endedness being preferred to climax (in Naismith xxii). Trussler attributes Churchill's reasoning and her open-endedness to her being a female individual; however, these qualities are existent in Brechtian dramaturgy and they take her closer to Brechtian theory and methods.

Coult acknowledges Brechtian influence on the British drama through Bond. Coult believes that Bond is a follower of Brechtian theories and methods, and furthers his argument as follows:

What is Bond? A philosopher or a propagandist? A theatre technician or a literary artist? The truth is of course, that he is a playwright, like Brecht, who combines all these skills. Like Brecht, he turns his hand to many different forms and like Brecht his writing can be complex to express the difficulty of an issue or simple to express urgency. (24)

Bond's plays are about change and how the change is deadly important for the future of the society. Bond resembles Brecht in many ways about being a playwright. Even the dialogues

in their plays are alike. For example, Even's last words in *The Sea* by Bond is "Remember, I've told you these things so you won't despair. But you must still change the world" while in Brecht's *The Measures Taken* is "Sink into the mine / Embrace the butcher / But change the world" (Coult 52). The content of their plays resemble each other because they both want to change the society and the world for them to be better to live, just like many modern playwrights do.

One time in a TV show about Brecht, Bond explained his attachment to Brecht with the following words: "The good thing about Brecht was that he was a liberator, in the sense that he restored to writers the whole world. You didn't have to write about little things any more. The important things could be written about" (in Coult 96). Bond considers Brecht as the guide of the drama circles owing to Brecht's being free to talk about any important subject and social condition which needs to be fixed.

Bond and Churchill are alike the philosopher in *Messingkauf Dialogues* of Brecht, where he presents his theories through the philosopher. A speech of the philosopher is as follows:

You see, I've got another passion besides curiosity. That's disputatiousness. I like carefully weighing the pros and cons of everything I see and putting my own oar in. There's a certain pleasurable doubt in me. I finger people's acts and utterances just like a poor man fingering his loose change, and turn them over ten times. And I don't think you people here leave me elbow room for this doubt of me; that's what it is. (18)

Like Brecht's philosopher, Bond and Churchill presents the possible aspects of the events and people so that the reader and the audience have their own judgments and own solutions to those aspects.

Bill Naismith quotes a speech of Bond in his introduction to Churchill's *Top Girls*; namely by mentioning about Bond in Churchill's play, Naismith associates them in one way which is to be revealed with the following quotation. Bond has the confidence of writing socially functional plays and explains this with his following words: "I don't set out to be a social writer, I just set out to write good plays, but I say that with the confidence that comes from knowing they will have social function" (xxi). Bond is contented with the social functions of his plays although he does not claim to set out to be a socially-oriented playwright. Naismith resembles Churchill and Bond in terms of being socially functioning in their plays by quoting Bond in his introduction to Churchill's play.

Churchill and Bond could be considered as being among the successors of Brechtian discourse and dramaturgy because in their plays and articles, they are observed to be affected by Brecht as a dramaturg and a theorist. However, this argument has rarely been proved or disproved, which is one of the reasons why this study chooses to examine these

specific playwrights and their interest in Brechtian methods and theories. This study aims to explore Brechtian elements, which are characterization, episodic structure, open-endedness, and audio-visual effects in Caryl Churchill's *Mad Forest*, and Edward Bond's *Red, Black and Ignorant*. Nevertheless, there is another point of argument in this thesis, which is that there are two aspects which differ *Red, Black and Ignorant* from *Mad Forest* and Brecht's dramaturgy. Those two aspects are non-Brechtian characterization and lack of audio-visual aids in *Red, Black and Ignorant*. For non-Brechtian characterization, the thesis puts forward the main character of Bond's play, the Monster, and his emphatic character traits. These emphatic traits of the character make him close to the ones watching or reading the play and there happens to be an emotional block before their critical thinking. The frequency of audio-visual aids also is not as Brecht desires it to be. Briefly, apart from its episodic structure, Brechtian aspects of characterization, open-endedness, *Red, Black and Ignorant* by Edward Bond has non-Brechtian characterization and lack of audio visual aids while Caryl Churchill's *Mad Forest* has episodic structure, Brechtian characterization, open-endedness and audio visual aids all.

According to Brecht, unstable, changing conditions or the people are best portrayed in "the large-scale events or ones where the outside world is abruptly changed as in wars and revolutions" (Brecht, *Organum* 195). In those circumstances, the whole situation, pre or post events and due processes are set before the eyes of the audience/reader in the short-time of the play. In this way, an audience, for example, can read or hear "a woman speaking and imagine her speaking differently, let us say, in a few week's time, or other women speaking differently at that moment but in another place" (Brecht, *Organum* 195). In a short matter of time, alterability and changing feature of the notions are described before the eyes of the audiences and before the mind eye of the readers if those circumstances are chosen as content of the play. Brecht believes that if in such short matters of time everything could be changed for the worse, and then they can change for the better too. Alterability is what Brecht is concerned mostly because he wants to emphasize that things can be changed for the wishes of the society who needs the change bitterly. That's why, this thesis chooses *Mad Forest* and *Red, Black and Ignorant*; for their quality of displaying the different phases of chaotic situations.

CHAPTER 2

BRECHTIAN DISCOURSE AND *VERFREMUNGSEFFEKT*

Brecht (1898-1956) pioneered a very well-known theatrical movement, Epic Theatre. This school of thought presents the problems and troubles in the societies to the audience and the reader in a way which is alienating the familiar; then expects them to find solutions for those problems without being blocked by the emotional tides. Epic theatre aims to open the minds of the audience, and on the stage/in the text, its methods let the ones reading or watching the epic theatre plays resolve the problems that are experienced in real life through the presentation of familiar problematic topics in an unfamiliar way.

According to Kritzer, “Theories of theatre and drama generally acknowledge the primacy of Aristotle. The Aristotelian ideal is one of the structural and stylistic unities based on a narrative plot that builds progressively to a climax and resolution, presenting an instructive example of character development. It is one which has pervaded drama throughout its history” (2). However, there is the need for a social change among the playwrights of contemporary times who are discomforted by the current orders/disorders, and there is the wish to find a way to enlighten their audiences and readers, which they could achieve through Brechtian Epic theatre. This theory and its methods offer fragmentation instead of a linear wholeness; poly-voiced conversations instead of favouring one; wishes for social change instead of psychological development of a single being; and a constant contradiction instead of a short-term resolution.

By purging emotions, Aristotelian drama relieves the sensation of the spectator while watching a dramatic production. Aristotle’s theatrical productions wish that the audience/the reader “who the tale told will thrill with horror and melt to pity at what takes place” (Dukore 43). The Aristotelian theory of catharsis, or purging of the emotions by self-identification (empathy) with those of the actor, was an essential part of the hypnotic, anti-critical theatre, it means “carrying the audience with one”, “losing oneself in the play” (Brecht, *Organum* 172). Aristotelian leads the audience/reader to be “swept away by the story, characters, the actors who represent [...] them on the stage, and/or the naturalistic

devices with which that stage set[s] out to make their representation truly life-like” as Willett puts in his *Brecht in Context Comparative Approaches* (235).

However, Brechtian dramaturgy theory and methods addresses to the senses and humour of the audience or the reader. Brecht aims to awaken the reasoning process and as a result activate the action in the social lives of the audience or the reader; it tries not to hypnotize or disable them. Brecht considers emotions as the hindrance to the social points in the play and the audience as the hypnotized mass under the illusion of the catharsis. His theatre and his texts are tools for expression of ideas, broadening the horizons of the audiences and the readers, and as a result a reshaping of the world for a better universe. He aims to transform the drama into a social functionality. Brecht himself compared and contrasted dramatic and naturalistic theatre theories and methods to his Epic theatre ones in a schematized form in his notes to *Mahagonny* as follows:

Dramatic Form of Theatre / Epic Form of Theatre

- plot / narrative
- implicates the spectator in a stage situation / turns the spectator into an observer
- wears down his power of action / arouses his power of action
- the human being is taken for granted / the human being is the object of inquiry
- he is unalterable / he is alterable and able to alter
- eyes on the finish / eyes on the course
- one scene makes another growth / each scene for itself, montage. (qtd in Willet, *Eight Aspects* 170)

In the chart, he gives clues about both the method implications and artistic intents of Epic theatre of his own. His artistic intent is to show the spectator that there is the potential to alter and to be altered inside people and there are several techniques such as montage scenes to handle this aim.

Unlike disabling schools of thoughts, Brechtian approach tries to break with the notion in which the people take the world for granted and do not even try to question the society or the life they live. With this aim, Brecht presents the world in an unfamiliar way so that they start to be critical and objective about it. As Martin Esslin puts it:

Brecht, the rationalist, demanded a theatre of critical thoughtfulness, an Epic Theatre. [...] Brecht regarded a theatre of illusion and identification as downright obscene, and identification with characters on the stage appeared equally indecent to him. Such an audience, Brecht argues, may indeed leave the theatre purged by its vicarious emotions. But it will have remained uninstructed and unimproved. The audience in his view should not be made to feel emotions; it should be made to think. (in Lauer 2003)

Brecht demands inquisitive audience and not ones whose critical judgmental abilities are thrown away with the emotional tides of the dramatic works; therefore, as a precaution he avoids emotional temperaments in his plays. Basically, as Arriogo Subiotto confirms:

Certainly, Brecht castigated the established bourgeois theatre in the 1920s for encouraging the spectator to leave his reasoning powers with his hat and coat in the cloakroom and enter the darkened auditorium simply to engage in a trance-like orgy of feeling, as if he were drugged. [...] Brecht had far more active designs on the spectator: he wanted him to use his critical faculties in assessing what was being enacted, [...] thus Brecht sought in the first instance to inculcate in the spectator the attitude of the observing historian who, however excited he may be by them, can stand back from the passions of personalities, register events and evidence, and come to a reasoned conclusion about a situation. (199-200)

Brecht's ideal audience/reader is moved away from the drugged states of emotional illusions. He creates an awakening atmosphere for them not to be blocked by the tides of feelings.

Brecht's being non-dramatic and non-naturalist as a dramatist is at the base for his theories. He strictly clashes with the disabling dramaturgies. In "Short Organum", Brecht dedicates a paragraph to the passive and hypnotised state of the ones watching the plays, which is created by non-epic, dramatic plays, which he is sharply against as follows:

We see somewhat motionless figures in a peculiar condition: they [the audience] seem strenuously to be tensing all their muscles, except where these are flabby and exhausted. They scarcely communicate with each other; their relations are those of a lot of sleepers, though of such as dream restlessly because, as is popularly said of those who have nightmares, they are lying on their backs. True, their eyes are open, but they stare rather than see, just as they listen rather than hear. They look at the stage as if in a trance: an expression which comes from the Middle Ages, the days of witches and priests. Seeing and hearing are activities, and can be pleasant ones, but these people seem relieved of activity and like men to whom something is being done. This detached state, where they seem to be given over vague but profound sensations, grows deeper the better the work of the actors, and so we, as we do not approve of this situation, should like them to be as bad as possible. (Organum 187)

This situation may sometimes be demandable as Brecht suggests; however, Brechtian methods prefer a long-term awakening to this kind of temporary emotional temperament. He desires not to address the emotions; he wants to make his audience/reader process their minds and senses to see the reality in the real world which is to be performed on the stage. Brecht argues that dramatic and naturalistic plays consist of such a slight and wretched stuff that it is made of "a few pieces of cardboard, a little miming, a bit of text" (Organum 187) with so little reflection of the reality; and it is incomprehensible to Brecht that such unqualified material rather than the reality itself can move the audience so easily.

Brecht calls his theory and practice procedures as *praxis*, and he uses *Verfremdungseffekt* to achieve the aim of presenting the realities and letting the audience and the reader find solutions objectively in an unfamiliar setting. For English translation of *Verfremdungseffekt*, *estrangement*, or *alienation* can be used to explain the lexicon. However, neither of the versions is able to express what the *Verfremdungseffekt* means exactly. *Estrangement* is more usable than the latter because *alienation* has some other socio-economic connotations; nevertheless using the original version will be more of use as in the case of specific terms, as Elizabeth Wright claims in her *Postmodern Brecht* (38). Therefore, not to drift apart from the original, this thesis mostly prefers to use *Verfremdungseffekt* or *V-effekt*. Willett explains the shortness of the translation for the term in his book, *Theatre of Bertolt Brecht: A Study from Eight Aspects* as follows:

Verfremdungseffekt in fact is not simply the breaking of illusion (though that is one means to the end); and it does not mean 'alienating' the spectator in the sense of making him hostile to the play. It is a matter of detachment, of reorientation: exactly what Shelley meant when he wrote that poetry 'makes familiar objects to be as if they were not familiar', or Schopenhauer when he claimed that art must show "common objects of experience in a light that is at once clear and unfamiliar". The value of this conception for Brecht was that it offered a new way of judging and explaining those means of achieving critical detachment which he had hitherto called 'epic'. (177)

As Willett explains above, Brechtian *Verfremdungseffekt* has nothing to do with making the audience and the reader hostile to the play and its content; on the contrary, it is to do with making the audience get closer to the society they live in and making them have a word to say about the inequalities and deficiencies of it.

The methods of Brecht were mostly favoured posthumously as in the case of many great artists. His lifetime and the era till the second half of the twentieth century were full of either severe criticism or extreme partisanship both in Germany and in the countries which had access to Brecht's plays and articles. He has been among the most discussed figures of the time since his first production. Even the most passionate follower of Brecht, Heiner Müller stated that "Using Brecht without being critical of him is a form of betrayal" (qtd in Thomson and Sacks 279). Heiner Müller who is thought to be among the Brechtian partisans is critical about the ways Brecht thought wrote, which means that even Brecht cannot go without criticism.

Brecht was mostly criticized as being a cultural Marxist icon; and his plays were thought to be as the discourse of the Marxist ideology. Most probably his plays and his theatrical theories were affected by his political and social views; nevertheless, this is not the concern of this thesis. Apart from the criticism he got in relation to his political views, if we look at the artistic perspective, it can be said that he had valuable contribution to the

world of dramaturgy. In his plays, he aims at breaking with the traditional thinking and behaving habits of the audience and he desires to reshape them radically with the help of his famous *V-effekt*. His main contribution to the theatre is not about being political or anti-capitalistic; instead it is to be noted that his Epic/dialectic theatre ideology basing on the *V-effekt* had brought a new perspective to the modern and contemporary drama (Wright, Postmodern 10).

In this thesis, “A Short Organum for the Theatre” (*Kleines Organon für das Theatre*) penned by Brecht himself in 1948 will be used as a guide to Brechtian theories and methods. This article of Brecht is published in Willett’s *Brecht on Theatre*. The script is one of the main sources of Brechtian Epic Theatre in addition to very few others. According to Willett, it would not be an exaggeration to claim that after failing the completion of *Der Messingkauf*, “the Short Organum” became and remained Brecht’s most important theoretical work (Aesthetics, 205). Following the argument of this unwearied commentator of Brecht’s theories and methods, this study will be using this article to prove and disprove the implications of Brechtian implementations.

In “A Short Organum for the Theatre” Brecht argues that theatre should aim two outcomes which are to entertain and to motivate the audience to alter the society for a better environment to live in. He aims to achieve these outcomes by adapting the content according to the needs of the era and by conveying the content through alienation and entertainment methods of his Epic Drama.

While amusing, Brecht wants to shake the reader and the audience up to make them believe the world and the society are not predetermined and unalterable. Brecht argues in the article that “as for the products of our own time, it [Brechtian Epic Theatre] held that their [dramatic and naturalistic works’] lack of any worthwhile content was a sign of decadence: it [Brechtian Epic Theatre] accused these entertainment emporiums having degenerated into branches of the bourgeois narcotics business” (Organum 179). Because of the hypnotising feature of non-epic drama, and its non-realistic content, and its being in the service of the amusement of the higher social levels of the society, Brecht detests it, and wishes to change the course of that kind of dramaturgy by creating his own.

Brecht describes his view of theatre as follows: “Theatre consists in this: in making live representations of reported or invented happenings between human beings and doing so with a view to entertainment” (Organum 180). By sticking to the reality and real content, he desires to amuse his non-bourgeois audience/reader. Older kind of characterization like gods, or any kind of non-realistic content which are to be used as the realities of life is non-consistent in Brechtian theatre. He uses these kinds of non-realistic content and

characterization to amuse and alienate his audience and reader to think and criticize, instead of presenting them as the realities of life. Brecht considers amusement as “the noblest function that we have found for the theatre” (Organum 180). He believes that “nothing needs less justification than pleasure” (Organum 181); in other words, Brecht suggests that theatre can awaken the ones watching or reading the plays to have judgments of their own and it can shed light on the faulty aspects of the society while it is amusing its audience and the reader.

Brecht claims that, following Aristotle, ancients demanded of tragedy as nothing higher or lower than a business which should entertain the courtiers. However, he believes that different times has different kinds of theatre and every sort of society needs to be entertained differently; for example, a queen or a king should be entertained with eloquent language and court content, which is quite different from that of a working or middle class. As long as every group is amused according to its own needs and conditions, it will fit perfectly, according to Brecht. To adapt this comment to today’s modern scientific era, it could be said that there is the majority of a working class which is incredibly high in percentage, so they should be entertained with the modern topics and modern scientific techniques.

Brecht was a careful observer of the era and society in which he lived and he described his theories of the evolution of technology and its effects on men as follows:

It was as if mankind for the first time now began a conscious and coordinated effort to make the planet that was its home fit to live on. Many of the earth’s components, such as coal, water, oil, now became treasures. Steam was made to shift vehicles; a few small sparks and the twitching of frogs’ legs revealed a natural force which produced light, carried sounds across continents, etc. In all directions man looked about himself with a new vision, to see how he could adapt to his convenience familiar but as yet unexploited objects. His surroundings changed increasingly from decade to decade, then from year to year, then almost from day to day. I who am writing this write it on a machine which at the time of my birth was unknown. I travel in the new vehicles with a rapidity that my grandfather could not imagine; in those days nothing moved so fast. And I rise in the air: a thing that my father was unable to do. With my father I already spoke across the width of a continent, but it was together with my son that I first saw the moving pictures of the explosion at Hiroshima. (Organum 184)

Brecht stresses out the vast alterations men experienced during past few decades. To him, the new technologies and experiments made all these important changes of our surroundings possible. He himself experienced things that his grandfather and his father could not even imagine. With the invention and discovery of the new things, new eras and new perspectives began and they opened the ways for the exploration of the newer ones thanks to the curiosity of the men. That’s why, he criticizes the playwrights who still follow

the older kinds of theatrical methods. According to him, now that times has changed so sharply, the dramatists should keep the pace and write plays for their own eras regarding the newer content.

Later in the article, Brecht furthers this sarcastic Hiroshima example by adding, “It cannot be said that their [effects of the technology and inventions] spirit determines everything that we do” (Organum 184). Brecht’s discomfort with the negative effects of the technology and its implementations could be seen by a naked-eye. He is able to see those effects especially the ones which affect the working class. Most of his life, he thought that the real owners of the technology and its benefits are the producers of them, namely the workers. However, the advantages of the inventions or the discoveries hardly reach to the working class because the ones who dominate and exploit both the technology and those people have the potential and access to use them, namely the bourgeois, who does not allow the technology operate in the lower levels of the society where darkness reigns. The more the working class produces, the more the bourgeois gets richer so the gap between rich and poor grows bigger and bigger. Those class distinctions affected Brecht deeply and he wanted to get rid of them. Brecht’s words on this ever-growing gap between the poor and the rich are as follows: “The gigantic joint undertaking on which they are engaged seems more and more to split them into two groups; increases in production lead to increases in misery; only a minority gain from the exploitation of nature, and they only do so because they exploit men” (Organum 184).

In the contemporary times, theatre should adapt itself to the continuous changes of social structures and technologic developments. Brecht contradicts with the idea of following the old rules of theatre which was fit for those times and amused its own audience and reader. It is wrong to believe that the world stands still and its course of events and actions do not change. It can still be believed that “Narrative is the soul of the drama” as Brecht believes it to be (Organum 183), but narrative methods should renew themselves not to stay behind the era. Brecht detests the way contemporary drama works follows the old notions and he explains this view as follows: “We are more and more disturbed to see how crudely and carelessly men’s life together is represented, and that not only in old works but also in contemporary ones constructed according to the old recipes. Our whole way of appreciation is starting to get out of date” (Organum 183). Newer versions of dramaturgy can have little to borrow from old recipes because the tastes, pleasures, perspectives have changed; and newer content and methods have arisen to be appreciated. “We and our forebears have a different relationship to what is being shown” as points out Brecht (Organum 183).

Thus, Brecht asks; in the experience of all these changes, “What ought our representations of men’s life together to look like? What is that productive attitude in the face of nature and of society which we children of scientific age would like to take up pleasurably in our theatre?” (Organum 185). Later, he answers in his article: “The bare wish, if nothing else, to evolve an art fit for the times must drive our theatre of the scientific age straight out into the suburbs, where it can stand as it wide open, at the disposal of those who live hard and produce much, so that they can be fruitfully entertained there with their greatest problems” (Organum 186). Suburban people who work a lot and earn less are the real owners of the scientific age, without whose work-force, the bourgeois would not get richer and find someone and something to dominate and exploit; that’s why, the workers should be the ones entertained fruitfully for the positive change of the society and the environment.

Brecht’s theatre should be as close as possible to the reality in content because theatre has minutely represented notions, so mental adaptation processes may be harder to get, if the content stay aloof to the reality of the ones watching or reading it. Brecht explains this in his own words as follows: “The theatre has to become geared into reality if it is to be in a position to turn out effective representations of reality, and to be allowed to do so” (Organum 186). Here, Brecht stresses out the word *effective* for his artistic intents. That’s why, his theatre should be as close as possible to the real life events, and people so that it appeals to world of the ones watching the performance or reading the script on the page.

Pure education or instruction or mass messages through art or theatre are thought to be bothering for the audience and the reader who are to be entertained at the same time. However, “it is still free to find enjoyment in teaching and inquiring” according to Brecht (Organum 186). Theatre constructs its useful representations to affect the society so that they can construct a better society in return. Therefore, the ones who are effective in the process of production should be affected by the wisest and most passionate ones – Brecht has the artists and playwright in mind –. He suggests that the wise people entertain the less wiser ones by educating and entertaining them at the same time. He thinks that “They must be entertained with the wisdom that comes from the solution of the problems, with the anger that is a practical expression of sympathy with the underdog, with the respect due to those who respect humanity or rather whatever is kind to humanity: in short, with whatever delights those who are producing something” (Organum 186). Playwright, in addition to entertaining the workers, should be guiding the minds of the reader/audience so that they

can think and act to change the situations instead of being programmed for production by the rulers. That's why, the workers should be entertained properly and guided as well.

The stage is so coherent in itself in older theatres that the contradictions of the real life seem non-existent to the already hypnotized audience. This consistent representation of a dream-like world is somehow beneficial to the working class according to Brecht because they can dream about a contradiction free world only in their dreams. Brecht explains this in his own words as follows: "The one important point for the spectator in these houses is that they should be able to swap a contradictory world for a consistent one, one that they scarcely know for one of which they can only dream" (Organum 188). Brecht tries to point out that in older versions of drama, imaginary worlds and systems are displayed to the eye and the audience can only satisfy their dream of balanced worlds through those plays. The thing is that Brecht detests the way imaginary worlds are shown and the people watching or reading are hypnotized more and more. Till the Epic theatre, Brecht points out, these kinds of theatres were favoured but now it should change because those sorts of theatres transform the children of scientific era into "a cowed, credulous, hypnotized mass" (Organum 188).

Brecht blames the priests and witches who rendered magical beliefs for leading the ordinary citizen into the beliefs of predetermination and destiny. Because of these thoughts, the people were doomed to passivity and trance as he claims. However, he calls for attention and tries to encourage the readers for action with the following words: "Let us march ahead" (Organum 189) and fight for the rights of the deserving working class. Brecht fights for not only theatrical reform but also a social reform as an ultimate aim. He calls for an uprising for alteration, evacuating the predetermination.

Avoidance of non-human powers is one of the methods of *Verfremdungseffekt*. The events should be displayed in such a way that mystical powers be set aside; and everything should be created and maintained by men, and "will in due course be altered by them" (Organum 190). If the actions are touched by Gods' hands, then predetermination and unalterable notion will come to existence; as a result this will lead to passivity in the audience. "Before one thing and another there hangs a curtain: Let us draw it up" (Organum 189), encourages Brecht to dislocate any kind of limitation both literally and metaphorically. In his plays, Brecht dislocates even the curtain between the stage and the audience. This is both a symbolic removal of limitations of predetermining vision and an alienation method to show the audience that what is on the stage is just a re-enactment of what is in real life. He wants his audience see the preparations on the stage and be not moved by the story.

As a suggestion of epic theatre theory, Brecht points out to a mistake of non-Brechtian drama, which is that while adapting different social structures of past periods into today's modern times, other dramatists show them as if it was there all along the human history by stripping out special-features of the mentioned times although the times are left behind. In this way, human mind starts to believe that people or the society never changes; things are unalterable and they will always be permanent. Brecht prefers to reflect those plays with "their distinguishing marks and keep their impermanence always before our eyes, so that our own period can be seen impermanent too" (Organum 190). Brecht's greatest interest about dramaturgy is that it should never make the impression that any condition of any period remains there permanently and his methods serve for this interest.

Brecht declares that his kind of *V-Effekt* is different from any of those belonging to other people. According to him, his methods "are only designed to free socially-conditioned phenomena from that stamp of familiarity which protects them against our grasp today" (Organum 192). Brecht avoids any notion or object which hinders critical thinking and clear processing and believes to create the objective criticizing aura by alienating the familiar, known versions. However, sometimes it seems inevitable to change what has long been unaltered because people get used to what they see before their eyes in the society. Therefore, here comes the question: how could alteration be possible now that men think that what they are experiencing is the only way a person can experience? Getting used to something and thinking through only one perspective are the main hindlers behind healthy mental processes. In addition to these two, there is one more obstacle which is that most people try not to stand against what the majority supports because he/she may be expelled from that society. Namely, getting used to the things around, thinking inside the box and the fear of being cast out of the society are the major factors blocking critical thinking.

Brecht's acting methods are adamant at unnaturalness on the stage. He believes that labelling the actions as natural means fixing them to one kind; in that way, the different alternatives of those behaviours are unacceptable. Not a single individual according to Brecht, resembles one another in every way, so alternatives and differences will perfectly fit into Epic theatre. Accordingly, the actor should convey the meaning that the actor's choices are personal, chosen among many others, no need to show them as internationally accepted natural and ordinary ones. Brecht, at the background of his theories and methods, assumes that "Society cannot share a common communication system" (Organum 196). To prove this claim he puts forward the clashing socio-economic and political classes of all times such as left wings vs. right wings or the rich vs. the poor. Thus, he focuses on the fluctuations in the society, and also fluctuations of thoughts. Instead of fixing a character or

an attitude on the stage, he stuffs his characters with alternative thoughts and behaviours. The actor's aim is to show that he just chooses among many other choices; Brecht calls this method, *Not-But*. This could be explained in this way; a person does not choose to act in one way but it may be acceptable by some other people. There are alternatives and everyone can choose among them. Another technique about unnaturalness in acting is non-emotional acting style of the Epic theatre. Actors should not lose themselves not to drag the audience in a trance. The verdict "He didn't act Lear, he was Lear" (Organum 193) is what Brecht totally against.

Another thing which Brecht feels discomfort about non-Brechtian theatre is that of "letting the dominant character, the star, come to the front by getting all the other actors to work for him: he makes his character terrible or wise by forcing his partners to make theirs terrified or attentive" (Organum 197). In this way, one character, his thoughts and his emotions are deeply described so it gets easier for the audience to identify himself with the character. Brecht does not approve of this. Even if the character design have to center around the main character, Brecht has a suggestion to make qualified the acting for the actors. The suggestion for the actor is to watch their character which they act out on the stage objectively and to grasp each other character's perspective, the actors should swap their roles during rehearsals. In that way, they can see other characters' social standpoints and develop each other's Brechtian acting style.

One more suggestion for the actors is about paying attention to social gests of the characters. Brecht describes the term as follows: "the realm of attitudes adopted by the characters towards one another is what we call the realm of gest. Physical attitude, tone of voice, and facial expressions are all determined by a social gest" (Organum 198). Brecht believes that we live in social complexities, so from praying in private to cursing in public, each single behaviour of ours is determined by that sociality and it is highly complicated and contradictory. Therefore, "they cannot be rendered by any single word and the actor must take care that in giving his image the necessary emphasis he does not lose anything, but emphasizes the entire complex" (Organum 198). The suggestion is that, the actor should solve the social and individual puzzles of the character thoroughly so that he should not miss any crucial detail while acting on the stage. He could master the character through mastering the story first, admits Brecht by these following words, "It is only after walking all round the entire episode that he can, as it were a single leap, seize and fix his character, complete with all its individual features" (Organum 198). As Brechtian methods of narration add meanings and purposes to every single detail and character on the stage, he wishes the actor not to miss any of those crucial touches. Only through this way, a

character, his contradictions and inconsistencies could be presented to the audience and his appreciation.

Structural technique of the *V-effekt* theory is the episodic structure, as Brecht explains with the following words: “the individual episodes have to be knotted together in such a way that the knots are easily noticed. The episodes must not succeed one another indistinguishably but must give us a chance to interpose our judgement” (Organum 201). For the service of *V-effekt*, episodic form is very effective so that the audience/reader is not carried vaguely as if by a fast moving river. The audience/reader should be able to grasp every social gest and content in itself. Being moved means that emotions are active and senses leave their place to emotional temperament. That’s why, the episodes are knotted loosely for the audience not to be moved and create his own judgment in every episode.

Also, every episode has its own title to guide the audience/reader accordingly. He comments on the content of the titles as follows: “The titles must include the social point, saying at the same time something about the kind of portrayal wanted, i.e. should copy the tone of a chronicle or a ballad or a newspaper or a morality” (Organum 201). As told before, every single detail and touch on the stage has its own messages and functions, so if a playwright wants to be successful about Brechtian dramaturgy, s/he should create episodes and give them titles of their own.

“The exposition of the story and its communications by suitable means of alienation constitute the main business of the theatre” (Organum 202), claims Brecht about the nature of his dramatic works. Story and the way it is delivered and alienated are the main constituents of Brechtian dramaturgy. Alienation could be managed through various ways like clothing, choreographies, dancing, music, songs, titles, episodes, lighting, half-curtains, open-ends, or characterization. These also add to the entertainment aims of the theatre. Brecht calls this as invitation of *sister arts of the drama* (Organum 204). He aims not to create an integration of them but he claims that “they lead to mutual alienation” (Organum 204) by addressing to the senses and humour of the audience.

To sum up, both content and the way it is delivered are the main concerns of Brechtian dramaturgy for the aims of entertaining and alienating the audience. Brecht wants his audience and his reader to be entertained and alienated so that they can be rendered to criticize and change the society in accordance with both his content and his alienation methods. Therefore, there is the fidelity of simulation Fredrick Jameson makes. He resembles Brechtian artistic procedures to Cicero’s famous triad – to move, to teach, to delight –. He thinks that Brecht’s theory and methods are like Cicero’s procedures; they, both, move the crowds, teach them and delight them at the same time.

CHAPTER 3

BRECHTIAN ELEMENTS IN *MAD FOREST* AND *RED, BLACK AND IGNORANT*

Abrams claims that Brecht's "aim is to evoke a critical distance and attitude in the spectators, in order to arouse them to take action against, rather than simply to accept, the state of society and behaviour represented on the stage" (5). In relation to his aim Brecht implements several methods like episodic structure, alienated characterization, open-endedness, and multimedia. Through these techniques of alienating the familiar, he plans to achieve his aim of earning the critical eye of the audience and the reader. In Brechtian dramaturgy, methods and techniques revolve around the philosophy of *the presentation of realistic content in an unrealistic way so that alienation and objective criticism are achieved*, which lies at the heart of the *Verfremdungseffekt*.

The content of the plays is totally what a human being could observe around him such as family relations, love, education, childhood, war, fight, revolution and etc. However, the way it is presented on the stage or in the text is unrealistically designed to achieve the alienation goals. Firstly, the structure of the story line is constantly broken by the ends of the episodes in order to break the flow and let the audience have a pause and think about the content of that episode; in order to break the illusion of the stage performance and remind the audience that what is on the stage is all illusionary unlike the life; and in order to cut the emotional bond between the happenings on the stage and the audience/reader. This kind of a structure is called *episodic structure* or *montage scene*. In this technique, every episode is self-contained with its own content and topics. Secondly, the character design is also in the service of *Verfremdungseffekt* and is meticulously achieved for the relevant aims. Among the techniques of the design, surreal characterization – gods, ghosts, vampires, speaking animals etc – is the most commonly used one. The aim of this method in terms of characterization is to make the audience and the reader aloof to the personality and emotions of the characters to avoid the identification and to draw attention to their social roles and deeds. Thirdly, audio-visuals or *sister arts*, as Brecht calls them, are included in the plays in order to break the flow of emotionality. These audio-visuals may be dance, song, music and etc. At the moments of emotional depth on the

stage, these sister arts help the scene interrupt those moments in order not to let the spectators or the readers get lost in the trance created by the emotions. At the end, open-endedness is a very commonly used *V-effekt* technique that serves successfully for the intentions of the Brechtian dramaturgy. This technique lets the audience and the reader observe several perspectives on the stage or in the text, and make up their own ends and solutions for the problems presented.

Both Bond and Churchill's worldly perspectives and philosophies resemble Bertolt Brecht's and so does their dramaturgies in relation to their common artistic intents. In other words, following Brecht in artistic senses, Bond and Churchill make use of his techniques. Just like Brecht, they desire to reflect the chaotic snapshots of the humanity in their drama, and as a result, aim to strike the audience; for them to think, judge and change the society for the best intentions. Therefore, their drama could be considered to be affected by Brechtian methods and theories with all implementations of Brecht's *V-Effekt*.

In his play, *Red, Black and Ignorant (RBI* in in-text references), Bond reflects the chaotic world of an unborn kid and his imaginary life. As though he was born, he, named as Monster, lives through a man's life which is full of troubles and misery from his imaginary birth till his imaginary death. The setting is a war-scene; not only the struggles of decent men are resembled to a war scene but also there are several war-like upheavals including bombs, attacks and shootings both at the beginning and at the end of the play. That's why, the kid is miscarried and unborn and he is killed by his soldier son at the end of his imaginary life. The wars are not explained explicitly, but its effects are felt throughout the play indirectly; its effects on ordinary men's lives, their competitive struggles to get employed, their military services, and their basic needs such as finding food to feed on.

Churchill's play, *Mad Forest (MF* in in-text references), is a straight example of portrayal of defective aspects of revolutions. The play deals with 1989 revolution of Romania and takes it as a continuous process – not a momentary one – with its pre-impact, impact and post-impact periods. The play could be treated both as a work of art and a documentary piece with its interview like speeches by the ordinary people of Romania, which are acted out by the actors. The play starts with a wedding and ends with another; in the middle the revolution breaks out. The first wedding prepares the setting for the revolution by explaining pre-impacts through speeches and the second wedding lays bare the results of it. The middle part is formed of experiences of ordinary men and women who lived through the revolution as if in a documentary video.

In *Mad Forest*, Churchill uses the episodic structure, open-endedness, audio-visual aids and Brechtian characterization to present the nature of the revolutions. Likewise, in

Red, Black and Ignorant, Bond uses Brechtian characterization – to some extent –, episodic structure, and open-endedness to narrate the story of the kid. They both think that there are defects in the society and they should be fixed; and their wish to transform the society into an ideal, class-free and war-free one would be through the presentation of faulty aspects of the current structures and streams of the society in their plays; which would be more useful when presented in Brechtian methods of *V-Effekt*. These two arguments – the existence of Brechtian elements in *Mad Forest* and in *Red, Black and Ignorant* – will be the main concern of this chapter of the thesis.

3.1 Brechtian Episodic Structure

Following the episodic structure, montage scene technique of Brechtian Epic theatre, *Red, Black and Ignorant* by Edward Bond consists of nine successive and independent episodes in one play. Likewise, *Mad Forest* by Caryl Churchill has three episodes of both dependent and independent quality. The episodes of both plays could not only be read as plays of their own but also they are connected to each other chronologically to form a main play. Bond and Churchill achieve this structure for the specific reasons which are closely related to Brechtian *V-Effekt*. Brecht wishes to let the audience and the reader grasp their own meanings and judge every part in its own perspectives. At the end of every part, the audience and the reader should think as if he/she has watched a play and should get as many messages as possible so that he can criticize the society as much as possible.

Brecht does not wish to follow smoothly shaped plot structure in order not to include the audience and the reader in the flow of emotional upheaval as well. He wants to break the illusion of the stage performance or the text at the end of every episode. According to Willett, instead of following the cohesively structured methods, Brecht wished elements of the production to be separated obviously. In this way, instead of getting absorbed in the performance and its plot, the spectator is provided with a chance to criticize human behaviours and attitudes from a social perspective (Aesthetics, 86). Brecht does not wish to let the audience and the reader lose themselves in the linear plotting, he wants to cut every part from each other so that the emotional bonds are cut off. In his commentary on his play *Mahagonny*, he tries to figure out the difference between the dramatic work and epic work in terms of structure there; he claims that dramatic theatre forces the spectator's eyes on the finish since the scenes build from one to the next in a process of growth,

whereas in epic theatre the audience have their eyes on the course where each scene works for itself and encapsulated in a process of montage (Hirst 128).

Tyler argues about Brecht's non-linear structure technique and its comparison to Aristotelian linear structure notion as follows:

By organizing the dramatic narrative in an episodic instead of linear fashion, Brecht intended the play's form to contribute to the audience's awareness. Brecht was very critical of the extreme emotionalism within Aristotelian based theatre. By avoiding catharsis at the end of a production, Brecht hoped to motivate the audience to action. (qtd in Willet, *Aesthetics* 86)

Churchill and Bond's refusal of linear moment-to-moment narrative is a kind of manifestation of their Brechtian implementation. Applying this crucial method of Brecht's, Bond and Churchill prove to be successful implementers of his *V-Effekt* theory. They do not follow a strictly woven plotting system which disables the judgmental cognition of the minds of the audience and the reader while trying to guess what is next in the story. Instead, they both prefer to awaken them and activate their minds just like what Brecht does in his episodic structure technique.

3.1.1 Brechtian Episodic Structure in *Mad Forest*

Caryl Churchill's *Mad Forest* is about the effects of revolution on ordinary people and their lives in general terms. If to speak specifically, it is about the before, during and post periods of 1989 Romanian Revolution which is carried out by the military forces to take Ceaușescu down. However, while reading or watching the play, it is better to consider it as a critical play of all political revolutionary activities because Churchill does not focus on it as a specific or a special revolution. Instead, she questions the nature of the revolution with its reasons and results all at once.

The play has three main episodes with many scenes inside them. These episodes are following each other chronologically. The first one of them explains the pre-revolution, Ceaușescu periods of Romania. The second one presents the revolution times through the eyes of the Romanian citizens with their own words. And the final, the third episode lays bare the facts of the post-revolutionary times. All the three parts stand as if they could be acted out or read on their own as different plays because they all have their own individual meanings and questions to be answered. Brechtian followers achieve this structure on purpose. Aston summarizes the episodic structure and associate the structure with Brechtian discourse with a few words which are as follows: "The Brechtian style of *Mad Forest* is

structurally encoded in the three-part montage of scenes, captioned with titles announced in Romanian and English” (78).

As Brecht suggests, the episodes should be separated from each other so that the theatrical illusion is broken; as a result, the audience and the reader would not be moved by the plot and the content. The most important thing in Brechtian Epic Theatre is to show the reader and the audience that what is going on the stage is all illusion of the reality, and they should see the points but they should not be carried along the emotional temperaments. Brecht does not want them to lose themselves in the process of emotional upheavals but involve in the critical thinking about the happenings and the speeches.

In the light of all these aims of episodic structure, this part presents the content of every episode in order to display their self-contained nature; and presents the moments when the episodes end to show their quality of getting cut at the moments of high emotionality with the intention of avoiding emotional involvement.

The first episode is named as *I. Lucia's Wedding* and the wedding preparations are simultaneously presented with the pre-revolution processes. The reader and the audience could get the information, which is Ceaușescu still reigns and the revolution has not happened yet, from Flavia's teachings to her students at the school. As a state school teacher she has to teach things in favour of the ruling group and she does so. She talks about the history of Romania and introduces the lesson as follows: “Today we are going to learn about a life dedicated to the happiness of the people and noble ideas of socialism” (*MF* 16). She calls Ceaușescu's ideas as noble and his life as dedicated to people's happiness and she uses magnifying words for Ceaușescu and his personality like “this great son of the nation” (*MF* 16), and “the great personality of Comrade Nicolae Ceaușescu” (*MF* 16). In places where chaos and political upheavals reign, the people are pressured by the ruling groups so that they cannot do anything against them. Therefore, the ruling groups form secret information webs and these webs report people who rebel. Keeping this in mind, Flavia teaches what she has to teach whether she supports or not. Another proof of Ceaușescu regime's presence in the first episode is the poem in praise of Elena Ceaușescu, the first lady at the very beginning of the play, which is written only in the stage directions; namely, the poem is not read on the stage or written in the text (*MF* 13).

Patriotism is one of the words which are pronounced many times in the episode but interestingly nobody explains the concept and nobody knows which group serves for it, either Ceaușescu or the activists against him. Fear of being caught up while pronouncing something against the ruling regime, and people stay away from the ones who act in an unpatriotic way and their relatives although what is patriotism is not defined thoroughly.

For example, Lucia is getting married to an American man, Wayne, and everybody around her is indirectly labelled as unpatriotic for this. A securitate, which is the name given to the secret security officers, tries to humiliate Bogdan as not being a patriot and blames him for “encouraging his daughter to marry an American” and he considers this action as “the waste of the resources that could have benefited a young woman with a sense of duty” (*MF* 19). Likewise, his brother, Gabriel, is forced to join the army so that he could show that he is a patriot. The army officers use the following sentences to persuade him which are retold by the brother as follows: “We thought you might not understand patriotism because your sister and this and this, but if you’re a patriot you’ll want to help us” (*MF* 23). Another negative effect of Lucia’s choice is on her sister, Florina. Florina’s lover, Radu is from Antonescu family and they do not want to have their son be close to an unpatriotic family’s daughter: “There are plenty of other girls, Radu”, Flavia, Radu’s mother tries to convince him with these words. Lucia’s so-called unpatriotic action affects her family negatively in many ways from profession to relationships.

Speech ban is another topic which haunts the first episode. People are afraid to talk against any of the groups not to be caught up by the ruling group or the activists. Therefore, they speak in whispers or they turn on music whenever they would like to mention about politics. For example, while Irina, Lucia’s mother, is trying to convince Bogdan about Lucia’s marriage, she turns on the music and talks in whisper in spite of the music (*MF* 13). They do not know what to talk, where to talk and who to talk. There is the distrust ruling the conversations. The priest in the church supports this claim with his conversation with angel:

Someone says something, you say something, you’re called to a police station, that happened to my brother. So it’s not safe to go out to people and when you can’t go out sometimes you find you can’t go in, I’m afraid to go inside myself, perhaps there’s nothing there, I just keep still. But I can talk to you, no one’s ever known an angel work for the Securitate. (*MF* 21)

The priest wants to emphasize that if people do not pronounce their thoughts out loud, they start to be empty inside; namely, the less people hold on to their thoughts, the less they feel whole inside themselves. In those times, because of the speech bans people look for someone whom they can trust and reveal their ideas so that they do not feel empty.

In addition to music or whispers, people in the play find other ways of exchanging their thoughts. One of them is writing. Upon Lucia’s wish to abort her child, she finds a doctor and while accepting her money and wish note; the doctor pretends to be thinking in favour of Ceaușescu’s orders with the following words; “There is no abortion in Romania. I am shocked that you even think of it. I am appalled that you dare suggest I might commit

this crime” (MF 19). Doctor’s words tell what he is expected to pronounce but in written words, he accepts the abortion.

Apart from being afraid to talk about politics, people are afraid to hear politics too. How much they hear makes them closer to the activist propagandas. While Radu is loudly whispering “Down with Ceaușescu” in the shopping queue (MF 17), “*The woman in front of him starts to look around, then pretends she hasn’t heard. The man behind pretends he hasn’t heard and casually steps slightly away from Radu*” (MF 17). People are afraid to be mixed up in political situations because ruling groups intimidate people so that they cannot hold beliefs and ideas against them. They would like to be seen as in harmony with them.

Another one of the first episode’s main concerns is the social criticism of the people who do not stand against something or have no ideas of their own and move in a flock. The leaders encourage or intimidate the ones who hold no beliefs or no courage to stand against and then they form large groups of people. The result is certainly for the benefit of those leaders and is certainly at the flock’s cost. This happening is criticized in the play through many conversations of the characters. One of the best examples is the conversation between Flavia and her dead grandmother who used to be imaginary best friend of Flavia. Whenever Flavia feels empty or upset, she starts to talk to her dead grandmother who is really outspoken about criticising Flavia. One time she criticizes her with the following words:

You’re pretending it isn’t your life. You think it’s going to happen some other time. When you’re dead you’ll realise you were alive now. When I was your age the war was starting. I welcomed the Nazis because I thought they’d protect us from the Russians and I welcomed the Communists because I thought they’d protect us from the Germans. I had no principles. My husband was killed. But at least I knew that was what happened to me. There were things I did. I did them. Or sometimes I did nothing. It was me doing nothing. (MF 26)

In this conversation the playwright wants to focus on the fact that people with no principles is harmed at the end both physically and psychologically. They lose their lives, their beloved ones, or feel empty inside because fighting for something makes people stronger at least in their inner lives. The grandmother warns Flavia about this empty feeling and wants her to do something to hold on to something whether it is wrong or right. She does not want her granddaughter move with the flock, unlike herself.

Another example of striking criticism about the sitting back and watching is included in the conversation between the priest and the angel. The priest is worried about being in the shadows about the revolutionary activities and the angel tries to comfort him by saying: “There’s no question of taking a stand, it’s not the job of the church” (MF 22).

The angel is actually trying to say what the priest expects the angel to say. Not comforted by this, he goes on pretending to get worried about the revolution and angel answers once more: “I try to keep clear of the political side. You should do the same” (MF 22) but he still appears not to be persuaded and starts attacking the angel with the words: “I don’t trust you any more” (MF 22). Bored of trying to comfort, angel starts to push him with the following words:

That’s a pity. Who else can you trust?

Pause

Would you rather feel ashamed?

Pause

Or are you going to take some kind of action, surely not?

Silence. (MF 22)

The priest is not expecting an answer which pushes his button about being inactive and ignorant, and he gets appalled by the Angel’s reaction. Therefore, he withdraws and wants to turn back to the times when he is comforted as follows: “Comfort me” (MF 22). Like many people, the priest is inactive and he wants to make up excuses for this lack of motion. Surely, as the angel utters, he will not take a stand; all he wants is to be comforted so he will be able to go on living motionless, that’s all. Here is the playwright’s criticism of those kinds of people who neither take a stand nor feel sorry about it through the dialogues between her dead grandmother and Flavia, the priest and the angel.

This episode is self-contained with its meanings and criticism. If someone wants to perform a play about the inactive and ignorant people; and people’s fear of being caught up because they talk against something; and patriotism, he or she can use this episode as a reference or he or she can direct this episode as a play itself. As Brecht suggests, the episode has the qualities of being acted out as a play in itself with its own meanings and topics, which shows the *Mad Forest’s* episodic structure. Apart from this feature of the episode, it is also cut at a moment of high emotionality, at Lucia’s wedding. These kinds of moments create pity and joy among people. However, by interrupting the scene at that moment by the closure, the playwright achieves breaking the illusion of the scene and the inclusion of the emotions. In other words, the playwright not only implements self-contained form but also achieves to keep the audience and the reader away from getting blocked by the emotions.

The second episode, *II. December*, runs around the Romanian people who speak in English with their own accents. In this episode people “*behave as if the others are not there and each is the only one telling what happened*” (MF 29), as the stage direction leads. This episode presents the experiences of Romanian citizens of the revolution. That year, on December 21, there happen the shootings between the activists and Ceaușescu army and

many people die. On December 22, there are celebrations and cleanings of the blood on the streets; and in the evening Ceaușescu is captured by the army, and the General of Ceaușescu regime commits suicide at night, while the shootings keep on. On December 25, Ceaușescus are tried and shot to death by the army (*MF* 6). People from several social roles explain their thoughts and feelings about those happenings. Instead of narrating the time of revolution and another subject simultaneously, unlike what the playwright does in the first and third episodes, she uses direct narratives of the people. Their joy, courage, discouragement, fear and confusion are told from the mouths of the Romanian people. First, they mostly feel discouraged, and are afraid on the first day and then come courage, and joy on the following days. However, there is the confusion in their minds about not knowing the details both at the beginning and at the end, along with the sorrow in their hearts about the blood they have seen on the streets.

At the very beginning, the people feel discouraged and are afraid in their hearts. The Painter claims that “There was plenty of people but no courage” (*MF* 29) on December, 20. People gather around the state buildings and they still fear of action and talk; and they cannot be sure of what to do. Therefore, they remain silent until somebody gives a shot for the start. Their lack of courage stems from the fact that they have no knowledge of what is going to happen. Their fear and lack of hope is written all over their faces as Student 1 argues with the following words: “I see a friend and at first I don’t know him, his face changed, and when he looks at me I know my face is changed also” (*MF* 31). Another fearful comment comes from Student 2, which is, “My mother, sister and I all slept in the same room that night because we were scared” (*MF* 34). Ordinary people get scared in their houses because they hear the shootings and see the blood on the streets; and even they do not know the reasons behind those actions.

During the fall of Ceaușescu, on December 22, people start to get courageous and joyful about the happenings. Translator explains his feelings about the evening of that day as: “I heard people saying ‘Down with Ceaușescu’ for the first time. It was a wonderful feeling to say those words, Jos Ceaușescu” (*MF* 36). The first time, people could stand against the ruling regime which is turned out to be the falling regime with these words. Translator goes on with more joyous words expressing his and the people’s happiness: “Everyone was hugging and kissing each other, you were kissing a chap you’d never seen before” (*MF* 37). They feel the happiness of the fall of the Ceaușescu regime.

Apart from all the feelings that stand out as lack of courage and hopelessness before the fall and as happiness and courage after the fall of Ceaușescu, there is the sorrow and confusion of what to do, when to do, what to talk, and what is going to happen. This is

one of the serious problems the play as a whole wants to present, like this episode does; the problem is the confusion and sorrow that a revolution creates on the consciousness of the ordinary men. And owing to the confusion and sorrow of being pressured, people join the flocks of people who do not know anything. Just to feel safer and happier people follow the others and at the end there may be chaotic results. “But in a crowd you disappear and feel stronger” (*MF* 37) as Girl Student expresses her thoughts about the activities of the crowds.

Even the soldier of the state is unaware of the happenings, his following words before the revolution reveal that: “We wait something, we don’t know what. We don’t know Ceaușescu speak, we don’t know what happen in Bucharest” (*MF* 32). Ordinary men mostly follow a flock owing to the fact that they, on their own, do not know what is actually going on and hope to find answers in crowds and join them. This happens before or after the revolution. Right after the revolution Student 2 observes the army taking sides with the civilians; that army was shooting the civilians just one night ago. Student 2 expresses this: “I saw people climbing on army vehicles, I thought they’d taken them from the soldiers, then I realised the soldiers were driving and I heard people shouting, ‘The army is with us.’ Then I started to cry and I shouted too, ‘The army is with us’” (*MF* 37). There is a big clash between one night and the other, which could be called duplicity, and the people do not even dare to question it.

The playwright criticizes how people could be joyous, upset, excited, murderous or fearful in the flocks of other people. This is the herd mentality of ignorant people. They do not question the world they live in; even if they question, they give the right to answer their questions to the others who pretend to be the leaders of the group. And there comes the personal wishes of the leading people who exploit the others. As a result, there happens to be the chaotic environment of wars, revolutions or fights.

This episode’s content is the feelings – lack of courage, courage, hope, hopelessness, sorrow and confusion – of the people who have gone through the revolution. The most moving of them in the play are the representation of the sorrow and confusion. That’s why, the playwright cuts the episode right after the painter’s expression of his emptiness of the soul and sorrow, which are as follows: “Painting doesn’t mean just describing, it’s a state of spirit. I didn’t want to paint for a long time” (43). The episode is self-contained with all its expressions of the experiences and feelings, and it is cut at a moment of an emotional talk to let the audience and the reader think about the content and not get lost in the emotional temperament. Therefore, it could be said that in this chapter too, Churchill complies with the Brechtian episodic structure model.

The third episode of the play, *III. Florina's Wedding*, is the last one and tries to give information about the post-revolutionary times. This episode questions selfish thoughts of both ruling and ruled people; post-revolutionary changes; ignorance of people and herd psychology. The episode starts with the conversation of the vampire and the dog. This conversation is crucial for the play as a whole by explaining how selfish thoughts can lead to corruption of the souls. The vampire symbolizes the blood sucker selfish leaders and the dog symbolizes the hungry citizen who is ready to be manipulated. The hungry citizen could do everything ordered by the selfish leaders thanks to his empty stomach and empty soul. The vampire introduces himself to the dog and explains his reasons to come to Romania with these words: "I came here for revolution, I could smell it a long way off" (*MF* 44-45). The chaos and confusion in the country call the blood sucker people into the country and they exploit the people and their resources. This situation could be both the reason and the result of the upheavals in a society. These kinds of exploiting people blend into the crowds and drive them to act according to their selfish wishes. At the end, who is exploited turns out to be those crowds. This is what the vampire admits with his own words: "Nobody knew who was doing the killing, I could come up behind a man in a crowd" (*MF* 45).

This situation is not full percent the fault of the blood sucker; the hungry citizen gives the way to be manipulated in the exchange of being fed, just like the dog expresses: "Don't throw stones at me, I hate it when they throw stones, I hate being kicked, please please I'd be a good dog, I'd bite your enemies. Don't hurt me" (*MF* 45). The dog follows his primary needs to be fed, to find a shelter, and not to be kicked out. In exchange of these, he could do anything the feeder desires of him. The dog claims to bite the vampire's enemies, but he does not question whether the vampire's enemies has done anything to harm the dog; this is out of question for him, he is ready to do anything the vampire orders. There starts the corruption of everything such as ethics or humanity.

The blood sucking continues till the last sip of the hungry dog. This is the case for the humanity too; the exploiting people do not stop until they could take every bit of humanity inside the people and every single piece of valuable material they have. Rodica, Gabriel's wife has a nightmare of such a situation in which she feels to be Elena Ceaușescu. The soldiers, the exploiting ones in the nightmare, promise to save Rodica – Elena – from being executed by the army in the exchange of her belongings. The nightmare is as follows:

Soldier 1: Have you enough money to pay for the helicopter?

She gives them money from her hat. They pocket each thing she gives them and hold out their hands for more till she has nothing left on her hat. She gives them the hat. They hold out their hands for more.

Soldier 1: Give us your hands.

Her hands disappear under her cloak.

Soldier 2: Give us your feet.

Her feet disappear under her cloak and she sinks down till she is kneeling.

Soldier 1: There's no helicopter. You'll have to run. (MF 56)

The exploitation continues till she has nothing left and she gets nothing promised at the end. This is the nature of the upheavals; none of the citizens win anything, there are just the provokers who win everything and leave the bloody scene as if they've done nothing. The vampire supports this claim with his words of: "All that happens is you begin to want blood, you try to put it off, you're bored with killing, but you can't sit quiet, you can't settle to anything, your limbs ache, your head burns, you have to keep moving faster and faster, that eases the pain, seeking. And finding. Ah" (MF 46). When a person tastes the unfair profit, he or she starts to be greedier and this does not end any time because human greed is never satisfied.

Another criticism is about the post-revolutionary changes, or so-called changes. The question of the episode is whether the faulty aspects could change through a revolution which happens over night. A social sin is avoided only by the wish of the large conscious majorities; in opposition, this revolution is carried out by the public unconsciously as obviously seen through the previous examples. The social defect which is exemplified in the episode is bribery. Bogdan brings a bottle of whisky for the doctor who treats his son, Gabriel; and Irina considers it a "little present for the doctor so he's gentle with you[Gabriel]" (MF 48). However, Gabriel tries to dissuade them from giving bribe with the words: "That was before. Not now" (MF 47). Gabriel believes that this kind of action remains buried in the past while according to Irina "They can't change things so quickly" (MF 47), and to his father "You do something for somebody, he does something for you. Won't change that" (MF 47). The playwright presents two different thoughts about whether the revolution changes things or not; revolution solves the problems or not. Through Radu's words, the audience and the reader may have another time to think about this problem in the episode, he claims "We have got to have another revolution" (MF 82).

Although the social wounds need time to heal, the flocks do not need that much time to change sides. In the first episode, the Antonescus are trying to dissuade their son from marrying the Vladus' daughter because she has an unpatriotic sister. Now, in the third episode they want Radu to marry Florina because this time she has a brother who is a patriotic hero. Mihai Antonescu expresses his feelings about the past reluctance of them with the following words: "We're so glad the young people no longer have a misunderstanding. We have to put the past behind us and go forward on a new basis" (MF 49). A marriage to an American by Lucia is enough for the Antonescus to cast out the

Vladus and an action of joining the army is again enough for them to save the family from being labelled as unpatriotic. The thoughts of the Antonescus and their actions of changing routes so quickly are presented to the critical mind of the audience and the reader.

The nature of the revolutions is the main topic of the play which is ready to be thought about by the readers and the audiences. After the revolution, Gabriel is wounded and he lies in a hospital bed. There appears a mental patient in his room and he asks several questions about the revolution such as the results and reasons of it, but the people in the room, Gabriel, Lucia and Florina, ignore him as he is a mental patient. However, the questions are qualified enough to be asked and answered by sane people about the nature of the revolution. Here lies the criticism of the ignorance of the people who do not have the courage to question the status quo.

Churchill in this episode deals with the topics like post-revolutionary changes, selfish thoughts of exploiters and exploited, ignorance of people and herd psychology. Namely, the episode has its own content and topics to meet the needs of a self-contained episodic structure, and also it ends at a moment of extreme feelings which may keep the audience and the reader away from thinking and criticising the content. The episode ends at the wedding scene, just like the first episode, but this time Florina and Radu's wedding.

In all the episodes, the playwright sticks to the rules of Brechtian episodic montage scene structure with their self-contained form and interruptions at the deeply emotional scenes. Therefore, it could be alleged that Churchill implements Brechtian episodic structure successfully in her play, *Mad Forest*.

3.1.2 Brechtian Episodic Structure in *Red, Black and Ignorant*

The aforementioned nine episodes of *Red, Black and Ignorant* have their own meanings and topics in themselves. They are all like independent plays of their own and also they relate to each other for the succession of the Monster's life. The episodes narrate the chronological story of the life of the unborn kid, the Monster, from his birth to death. The episodes are like snapshots of a camera catching the crucial points of a war; they are the catastrophic moments of a human's psychology. Namely, they are the snapshots of an ordinary individual's tragedy throughout his educational, love, marriage, and parental life.

In addition to having content of its own to be considered as a play, those episodes are either cut at the moments of high emotionality to break the emotional flow and move away any kind of hindrance caused by the emotionality, or cut at the times of moral tirades

to give the audience and the reader enough time to think and criticize before the start of the next episode.

One – Introduction: The first episode of the play is named as *One – Introduction*. In this episode, the Monster, the reasons behind his being unborn, the world's being chaotic and unsafe place, and the experiences of war times are introduced to the audience and the reader. The birth and the baby's welcoming ceremony are described in a poetic way as follows: "No exiled hero could turn to a land more welcoming / No president be received into office with such preparation / No victor be greeted with so much joy" (*RBI 3*). Although the delivery of the baby is presented as the most joyful and greatest activity happening to the mankind, there is a hidden meaning behind it which is whether we can supply the babies with happy, chaos-free lives or not. We build our children streets, apartments; we market their food, fold their clothes, and protect them from sicknesses. These are materialistic, basic needs of the kids and their physical health. Nevertheless, we cannot provide them happy, mentally-healthy and peaceful lives. There is the irony; humankind cannot create a psychologically healthy environment for their newly born owing to their continuous fights, hurts, and kills.

Monster's mother tells the experiences of the survivors of the preceding wars with the following words: "The world became a place of toys / A huge red ball inflated in the sky / Houses shook as dolls' houses shake when they're carried by children" (*RBI 14*). At the times of wars and instability, the world turns out to be places in the hands of a bunch of childish people and their actions. It comes to be a situation of dicing on the lives of ordinary people who have no power, no money or right to speak out the discrepancies. The metaphoric use of the play house and the unconscious actions of the children fits perfectly to the explanation of the unreasonable actions of the adults which should have been mature and reasonable in fact. The mother focuses on the fact that she has not seen or experienced such wars but these happen in the world even if every single person does not directly experience these.

However, the mother believes that the baby in her womb senses the fear and loathing among people, and consequently it desires to be unborn and left to be dead. The mother tries to explain what the baby was going through in her when the baby was miscarried, as follows: "That morning the child had moved in my womb as if it wanted to run away from the world" (*RBI 4*) and she adds, "The flesh burst open and threw him into the furnace of my burning house" (*RBI 4*). The burning house metaphor is used to describe the fires of the world which is full of hatred and blood. The house is resembled to the world.

Although the mother has not experienced a real war herself, it seems from the way she tells about war-like settings that the Monster has gone through one himself: “The last breaths whistled from dead mouths / And as the flesh burned from faces the skull whistled” (*RBI 5*). The mother hears about wars from her ancestors, and her kid would go through one if he was not miscarried. Even if she does not experience one, her parents and her kid see a war. That she does not experience a war does not mean that the fights and wars are over.

This first episode has the quality of being an introduction to the rest of the play, as the Monster foretells: “Now we will show scenes from the life I didn’t live” (*RBI 5*). The episode has its own topics and meanings for the audience and the reader to think and act as Brecht suggests in his theories. The main topic of the episode is the unhealthy and unsafe environments that the older generations create for the younger ones due to their immature actions. The episode is a play within itself with its topic and criticism. Also, the episode is cut at a moment of deep criticism of the unborn kid. He renders thought with the following words: “If what happens seems such that human beings would not allow it to happen / You haven’t read the history of your times” (5). The Monster talks about sorrowful and tragic ignorance of the humanity and it is where the scene is interrupted by a closure. The audience and the reader are allowed to take a moment to think about the criticism.

Two - Learning: This episode is dedicated to what the kids learn at school and their educational lives. The Monster is spat at by a boy who is trying to woo a girl to go on a date after school. The boy spits casually not deliberately at the Monster and he tears a page from his book – which is illegal – to wipe the phlegm. However, what is important for the psychology of the main character is that the boy ignores him and behaves disrespectfully after the accident; not he is spat at or not. Upon this, Monster gets very upset about the way he is treated, and while sitting in the washroom, he pronounces his thoughts and feelings to himself and to the audience and the reader with the words:

I spent my life putting together the bits of a jigsaw
It was complete and I looked at the picture
But then a friend kicked the table
The pieces of jigsaw flew into the air like startled pigeons
And settled down again into the picture
But the picture is different
A bullet has passed from side to side of my brain. (*RBI 8*)

Because of his friend’s cruel and disrespectful behaviour, his life turns upside down. The lives of people are never the same again after the hurtful incidents. These kinds of actions are never easily forgotten and it gets harder for the victim to trust anyone again.

This is one of the things he learns at school instead of learning ethics, science, math or literature; he learns to be spat at and be treated in an ignorant way. Another striking

lesson comes right after the teacher's realisation of the spitting incident. First, she wants the Monster to be gone nearby the spitting kid and tell him that:

It is against school rules to spit in the school buildings or the school
playground
Spitting is unhygienic and loutish
Furthermore it may lead to unforeseeable circumstances
By this spit you might have forfeited my friendship. (*RBI 9*)

This is a very pleasurable suggestion and a reasonable lecture by a teacher who wants to teach not to spit at the others and in the school. The striking aspect of the incident is what the teacher adds to her suggestion next. She wants the Monster spit at the boy after he tells her words although the Monster tries to defend his friend's behaviour as unintended.

However, as the teacher orders him, Monster should obey and he does so with a few adjustments. After he spits at the boy, they start fighting and rolling over and over on the ground. He learns how to be spat at and be ignored and also how to take revenge, which he explains in his own words to the audience and the reader at the end of the episode: "I had not yet learned to hate / That knowledge is gained in higher schools / So far I knew only the basis of hate and fear" (*RBI 10*). The children at that age should be learning how to share, respect and love the others. Instead, the Monster learns basically how to hate and fear, which is the ironic aspect of the education system. The critical topic of this episode is what the kids learn at school instead of what they should learn. Also, it is cut right after the moment of Monster's ironic and critical talk, which could be considered as cohesive in terms of Brechtian episodic structure technique of *V-effekt*.

Three – Love: In this episode, the Monster is hurt and wounded by a professional accident, which could be understood from his bandages and his words like: "My blood stinks: pods on factory floors: acid / My bandages burn with acid" (*RBI 11*). Most probably, there happened to be an accident with some acid inclusion in the factory where he works. This accident emphasizes the unhealthy working conditions of the unqualified workers who become useless after several professional accidents due to the harm given to their both physical and mental health. The Monster has one of those accidents.

Another suggestion for emphasis in this part is the way a woman's love for Monster's physical beauty. The audience's and the reader's attention is drawn to the way the woman considers him only as a sex object not a man who has the heart and the soul. She only cares about his chests, arms and eyes, which is understood with the following words of her:

His legs are as subtle as trees bending in spring wind on hills over the city
His chest is as broad as fields
In his arms is the fullness of autumn

And his eyes are as sharp as frost to see the approach of the enemy. (*RBI 11*)

Obviously, the playwright wants the audience and the reader question the quality of the love of the woman. The title is *Love* but the quality of woman's love shows it as the desire for the physical attractions. Thus what he finds out about love is just physical sexuality not the personality.

This episode criticizes unsafe working conditions of the unqualified workers; and human kind's love for physical beauty, not the personal qualities. Actually, if these two topics are combined, there appears to be a deeper topic, which is now that we mostly live in a world of love for physical beauty, what if the individuals lose their physical beauty and physical health by the professional accidents? In this episode there are crucial points to be thought thoroughly. As obviously seen, the episode has its own topics and meanings to be considered as self-contained. And also, it is broken at a moment of high emotionality when "the Monster goes out he cries like a child" (*RBI 12*) after he realizes the woman's love for his physical attraction which is damaged by the acid. Brechtian suggestions for episodic structure technique are successfully achieved.

Four – Eating: This episode's main concern is about how the Monster and his wife argue on trivial issues. It is the meal time at home. The wife tries to prepare the meal and the Monster looks for his book that he borrowed from the library but he cannot find. While the wife argues that he has forgotten it in the bus and the cover of the book is green, the Monster thinks that he has not forgotten in the bus and the cover is blue. Over subjects with little importance, they start arguing and hurting each other both physically and mentally. The Monster tears the bread apart and throws the pieces onto the floor and orders his wife "Eat your meal off the floor and lick it clean" (*RBI 14*). He forces her to eat on the floor. How a book can cause such a rage is the main theme of the criticism in this episode.

After getting calmer, the Monster, aside, starts criticising himself and getting upset for the way he behaves. He admits and pronounces poetically: "At every turn, we break the oath we make when we are born to human reason / Even in hell to walk with decorum / With each little rage we tear pages from the dictionary" (*RBI 15*). He accepts the fact that their fight is over nothing serious, and for nothing they hurt each other deeply, which is against the human reason. He ends the episode with the message for the reader and the audience:

As nature doesn't define what shall make us angry
We define ourselves by the things we allow to make us angry
If we choose these wrongly or are wrongly taught we are blind with rage even
when we're most calm. (*RBI 16*)

He argues here that the things at which the humans get mad are all their choices and decisions or they're taught so. Even if both happen to be true – either they choose or they are taught – they get hurt and they hurt every time; and they are to be blamed in either case. Therefore, the episode raises the criticism of at what the human beings get angry, and hurt others.

The episode has its own topics to be counted as a play in itself for the standards of episodic structure technique of *V-effekt*. And also, it is cut after an ethical talk of Monster to let the reader and the audience have time to think before the next episode's topics, which is in coherence with Brechtian dramaturgy.

Five – Selling: In this part, schooling and marketing are criticised in the same bowl. Monster and his wife have a baby of one year old. A man of Register of Births detects that they have a baby which is at an age to learn to speak and he comes to fetch him in the exchange of money. He comes to Monster's home after having researched on the family and the baby about whether the baby is healthy or not; what his origins are; and how much his parents' price was while being sold to the State. Therefore, the buyer determines a price on behalf of the state who buys the kids when they come to an age to speak and act for the profit of the State. The buyer presents no reasonable or functional excuses for buying the baby like growing the baby to have good education or to serve as a soldier; he presents nothing which could be counted as a reason for separating them. He just utters: "Training must begin early to have full effect" (*RBI* 17). The training here is about training the baby not to rebel against the State and not to criticize it. Actually, the aim is to separate the baby from the environment where he or she can learn how to judge the discrepancies and act accordingly. The buyer supports this argument and explains it in his own words:

The good citizen is satisfied more by serving than being served

Monster: That's what you'll train him to think?

Buyer: Certainly.

And then he won't object will he?

His opinions will be formed even before he knows the subjects on which he holds them

Could life be more trouble free? (*RBI* 18-19)

The buyer's real objectives are revealed; he wants the baby to be trained as an individual who constantly serves the State and holds no thoughts against it. Namely, the buyer will hand in the baby to the State so that they should train him as an individual who is not a threat to it.

Another thing about this episode is the way it presents the marketing issues. The buyer treats the baby as a sellable good, and he bargains on it; as a consequence, he degrades human life. He has some lectures on economics and marketing ignoring the

feelings of the family who are going to get separated from their one year old baby. He bargains on the baby with the words:

There are always more of you coming on to the market so the prices are set by the buyers
If the price is too high we don't take
There are many types of incineratory devices for disposing of unsellable goods which if left lying about would create a health hazard
Take the twenty years
The economic situation is bad and the prices will fall. (RBI 18)

In addition to be treated as a good which can be sold in exchange of money, the baby cannot be sold at a price which is set by his parents. The prices, as emphasized above, are set by the buyers; and if the seller claims a price more than the buyer claims to pay, the good turns out to be unsellable and it is to be disposed of. Namely, the seller has to conform to the prices set by the buyers. This is not understandable even for non-human goods; and when it comes to human life, it should be heavily criticized and objected as Bond does in this part.

The state or the buyer does not care about the worth, either physically or mentally, of human life. This even gets deeper after the baby is sold by the parents and bought by the buyer; the baby appears on the stage and he is made of newspaper sheets – for alienation and will be dealt with later on in this thesis, under the Brechtian characterization heading – and instead of caring for the emotions or thoughts of the sad parents; the buyer is lost in reading the newspaper headings and ignores the others because he has already achieved his goal which was to buy the baby at a desired price. The wife and the Monster utter emotional sentences about the baby but the buyer disregards them. This scene and the words of the family are as follows:

Wife: His smile is worth three years. The prime minister would tell the chauffeur to stop so that my son could be photographed standing on the curb and smiling into the official limousine.
The buyer takes the baby from the wife and reads from the print on its face.
(RBI 19)

The buyer shows no care for the parents or the baby; he does his job and reads the newspapers.

This episode's main interest is the schooling for the State's profit and marketing for the desires of the rich people who have the right to set the prices. Also the ignorance of the rich people about the poor people's feelings and conditions are presented and criticized. In addition to meeting the standard of being a self-contained episode, it has the quality of being cut at a moment of high tension and moral talk. Monster's aside talk is as follows:

They are so greedy they stuff food into their anus

People starve and the guts of the granaries burst
In the fish farms piles of rotting fish rise from the middle of the black lakes
under piles of screaming gulls
But I who never tasted milk tell of the time when the eater and the food are
consumed by one fire. (*RBI 20*)

The monster criticizes the people's greed and waste of human life and resources. With this talk the episode is closed and the audience and the reader are allowed to think critically on the topic.

Six – Work: This episode is about competing, getting employed and ignoring humane values on the way of getting a job; and also unemployment psychology. The son, after being trained by the State, comes back to his home and looks for a job which is not provided by the State. The setting where he looks for a job is described by the son at the very beginning of the part with the following words:

Son: A woman walked in the centre of the decaying city
A wall of a derelict warehouse fell into the street and a concrete beam from the
wall pinioned her to the pavement
Woman: Help me
Son: Everyday there are cries for help in this part of the city
No one answers them
Often the person who cries is a decoy
Even when they aren't people say they have only themselves to blame for
coming to this savage place. (*RBI 21*)

The woman is trapped under a beam, which is an ordinary happening for that part of the city because it is a hazardous and decaying place. However, the people who have to earn a living have to try every chance to get a job even it is in such a place because they may not have any others.

From the distance, the son recognizes the woman as a friend and goes to her and the son pretends to try to lift the beam and actually he tries not to help her to crawl out. The reason behind this is revealed by the woman:

Why are you on this street?
You're going to the factory
Yesterday I told you there was a job vacant
You're going to ask for it
You want my leg to be crushed so that you get the job. (*RBI 22*)

The woman judges the son, and the son justifies her claims with the following words: "I look anxiously along the empty street afraid someone will come" (*RBI 23*). Employment issues turn people into competing robots who do not care about the humane ethics. Not only does he not want to help her, but also he is afraid to see someone who will come and help her throughout the way. The son who is raised by the State is not given a job, is not

properly educated by it to get a qualified job; what's more he is not taught about morals and how to act humanely.

The son wants to get the job even at the expense of incapacitation of a woman who is a friend. Luckily for the woman and unluckily for the son, Monster hears the woman crying for help and comes to save her, but the son tries to dissuade him. However, the Monster is not dissuaded and saves her. To justify his actions, he pronounces: "The world isn't just / Justice is made by people" (*RBI 25*). He calls his son's unhelpful attitude as "Monstrous" (*RBI 23*) although he himself is named as the Monster. The Monster with his insult and his name create the irony and wants the audience and the reader think on it.

However, Bond, in addition to focusing on the Monster's humane action and the son's monstrous one, does not ignore the condition of the son who lives through the psychology of an unemployed man. The son explains his aspect and claims himself to be a second class citizen with these words:

You could call my father good and me evil
No – the pittance paid to the workless ensures that all seek work
The government rules by creating two classes of citizens
I am second class: I have no work
I cannot afford to behave as if I were the first class. (*RBI 25*)

He feels that the State pushes him hard to get a job to be an individual and on the way to get employed, everything cruel or inhumane could be committed, accordingly.

The part leads the audience and the reader to take the competitions of unemployed people for jobs and the psychology of them into consideration. Also Bond wants to draw attention to the setting in which people start to be good or evil. In other words, he does not blame or does not want the reader or the audience to blame just the son. He regards the background and the setting too; namely the society the son lives in. Monster justifies this claim: "In bad times it should be human to do good / But in bad times good cannot be done" (*RBI 25*). People should do good, which is a universal code for humanity; however, how a human being can be good if he himself is in a bad condition is what the playwright raises here. Namely, he also calls attention to the society who should prepare the background for the all kinds of people to do good.

Bond takes competitions for employment, unemployment psychology, and the effects of the environment and the conditions on doing good as the topics in this episode. The episode has got the qualities of a self-contained one in Brechtian episodic structure terminology. Also the episode is cut at a moment of moral speech and high emotionality the unemployed son and his relationship with his father creates. In other words, the episode

meets the requirements of the Brechtian episodic structure technique with its self-contained nature and its closure at a strategic moment.

Seven – The Army: This is the part dealing with the army service of the son; the way he is motivated for the army; and the bloody face of the wars. At the beginning of the episode, the son cheerfully puts on his military uniform – his bullet proof jacket and combat helmet – and his rifle while singing the following motivating army song, taught him by the army:

I am the army
My legs are made of tanks
My arms are made of guns
My trunk is made of nukes
My head is made of bombs
I am the army

And he goes on with the second part of the song:

I am the army
My breath is toxic gas
My eyes are radar beams
My pulse is ticker-tape
When I speak a siren screams
I am the army. (*RBI 27*)

These songs emphasize the fact the minds and the hearts of the soldiers are dehumanized and programmed for killing and these kinds of songs mostly serve to motivate them for their objective which is to kill. Dehumanization of people is very chaotic for the future of the mankind because it determines what the future will be.

In addition to the songs which are to motivate the soldiers, there are also songs which describe the bloody scenes of the wars, and Bond prefers to push hard the brains of the audience and the reader by using one of those mentioned songs in *Red, Black and Ignorant* which is as follows:

When a soldier heaves a grenade what does he see: a body explode like a bottle on a wall
When a soldier slits a belly what does he see: guts spill like clothes from a suitcase
When a soldier fires a bullet what does he see: blood spurt like water from a hosepipe
That is the soldier's reward for his skills: the pleasure of seeing the way he kills. (*RBI 27-28*)

Through metaphors, Bond forms the image of the war in the minds of the reader and the audience. Motivated and encouraged for killing, the soldiers are not ashamed of killing someone because they are taught that killing is normal and that is what they should achieve; and as a result, they create those scenes pictured above through words. Bond in this episode

criticizes the way the soldiers behave and their willingness to kill; and he wants the audience and the reader to criticize them too.

This episode is about the army service and bloody aspects of it. It is self-contained in itself with the specific topic it presents. Also, the episode is cut right after the army song of the son which motivates the soldiers to consider themselves as gods. This may create extreme anger among the readers and audiences so the episode is interrupted at such a crucial point not to let them moved by the feelings the scene arouses.

Eight – No one can willingly give up the name of human: This part is dedicated to the war times and chaotic results of the war. There is a famine throughout the whole country, and violence and blood is everywhere. Everybody lives in misery both physically and psychologically. The Monster introduces the part with the explanation of the public's fear of death as follows:

It could have been destroyed as easily as if it had been a little apple and a giant stood up in space and devoured it in one bite
People walked on tiptoe in the street as if they feared the vibration of their steps would set off the rockets
They stopped moving the furniture in their houses: the movement might show up on radar screen and bring destruction on them and their neighbours
Security was so great all were suspected
Even as they lay their silos the rockets destroyed societies they were said to protect. (*RBI 28-29*)

It could be claimed that ordinary people are one of the most affected groups in a time of radical change like a war because they have no right to protect themselves and no right to decide on vital actions of the managing groups. They just sit in their houses and wait to die while getting more and more afraid each day. Through metaphors again, the playwright wants to describe the paralysis the ordinary man lives through; only the rulers have the position to decide and mostly the rulers are unaware of what is going on among the ruled people.

The Monster and the son constantly argue in this episode. The Monster takes the side of morals and doing good, while the son supports the army and its deeds and the mother supports the son. The son chooses to behave in favour of the army because he has no education, or qualification to do something else. He has to choose the army to some extent because of his unemployment situation. He expresses his thoughts like this: "I like the army / When you're a soldier all your problems are solved by training / Kill or be killed / No apologies or explanations" (*RBI 30*). He believes that now that he cannot find a job through civilian life, he joins the army and his unemployment problems are solved through military training. As mentioned earlier in this thesis, the son feels useless and he claims to be cast out by the society. Through military service, he feels useful. Also, the pressure of

killings on the consciousness of the soldiers is blown away through the motivating attitude of the army. They believe if they do not kill, they will be killed; therefore, it is their natural right to kill without any justifications.

Upon seeing this dehumanized killing psychology, the Monster accuses his son with the words of being a beast and behaving accordingly: “He sits there in human clothes and speaks our language” (*RBI* 31). These kind of inhumane actions or thoughts do not fit the Monster and he is strongly against them when they are outspoken.

Because of the famine, the soldiers are ordered to go to their own streets and kill someone to save food for the rest. The choice about who they would kill belongs to them; the only aim is to save food. Therefore, the son comes home and there are two families left alive in the street. Owing to her mother’s encouragements, the son goes to the other family’s house. The couple living there are such old people that the son cannot kill them. However, he comes home and shoots the Monster to death.

The Monster speaks the final words of him in this part although he is dead – which is for *V-Effekt* again and will be dealt with under Brechtian characterization part – leaving the audience and the reader in thoughts. His words are as follows: “We know ourself (sic.) and say: I cannot give up the name of human / If we define it wrongly we die / If we define it and teach it rightly we shall live / The first playwrights said know yourself” (*RBI* 38). In parallel to the title of the episode, the Monster ends it with these words. He calls for attention to the definition of being human and humane actions. If we act bearing the name of the human and teach our children how to be human, we continue to live as humans, or else newer generations start to behave inhumanely. He also draws attention to the education of the young generations; he does not blame the son for his bloody actions; however, he puts the blame on the older generations and education systems for not teaching them how to act in a rightful way.

This episode’s main topic is dehumanizing nature of the wars and the society’s fault in those situations. The episode is actually a play within a play with its own ground content. Along with the self-contained form, its closure at a strategic point where Monster has critical comments on the content of the episode serves for Brechtian episodic structure technique.

Nine – Funeral: The final episode presents the funeral of the Monster. The Monster, his wife, the son and the other characters appear on the stage all together. Some of the family members express their final thoughts. The wife speaks out her words in the following way:

You who live in barbarous times

Under rulers with redness on their hands blackness in their hearts and
ignorance in their minds
Everything before your time was the childhood of the humankind
With the new weapons that age passed. (*RBI* 39)

With the development of the technology, massive weapons which could kill or paralyze thousands of people in one moment arose and the violence and the wars got widespread and intensified. The wife calls these times the maturity of the humankind, and the past times as the childhood of the human history. In childhood, it is hard to harm the environment in large-scales, but in maturity, there is little limitation; Bond resembles the eras to the life-span of a person.

The wife's words are crucial for the play. The play, which describes the modern wars and the helplessness of the ordinary man who is caught in the setting, is named as *Red, Black and Ignorant* and the wife explains the meanings. Red is the blood in the hands of the cruel people; black is the ruthlessness in their hearts; and the ignorance is their indifference to human life.

The Monster, to his son, while throwing his own ashes to the ground, tells about his views on freedom and democracy, and at the same time he guides the critical minds of the reader and the audience to think with the following words:

You killed us for freedom
Democracy isn't the right to vote but freedom to know and the knowledge
based on knowing
Your democracy is the way truth is suppressed and freedom hustled away to
prison
What is the freedom you gave me?
Two fists of ash
Where is the freedom in that?. (*RBI* 49-50)

Leaving the audience and the reader in thoughts again, the Monster questions the current democracies and judging with these final words of him. By judging his son and accusing him of killing his own father for nothing, he actually needles the actions under the name of the democracy. He believes democracy is not only to vote, it is to think, to act, and to judge as to one's own wishes and desires.

This episode picks up cruelty of humankind as a subject and it is cut at an emotional moment of Monster's throwing his own ashes on the ground. Namely, the episode is a self-contained one, just like the other eight episodes, and is closed at an emotional moment, which is in coherence with Brechtian episodic structure technique.

The struggles and miserable conditions of mankind is told and presented through an unborn individual. The audience and the reader observe the life of ordinary man through nine episodes belonging to different times of an un-lived life. The way they are separated

from each other serves for Brechtian *V-Effekt*. They're chronologically succeeding each other but could also be considered as plays within a main play. Thanks to this kind of structure, the reader and the audience are alienated by being cut out of the moment-to-moment happenings which creates emotional processes, and have time to think about the all topics before the succeeding one appears on the stage.

3.2 Brechtian Characterization

For Brechtian Epic Theatre, characterization is among the few elements which should be paid rigorous attention. At any cost, the audience and the reader should be stood away from the character in order to hinder the emotional identification between the two, and their attention should be drawn to the character's sociality. Any mechanism about character design directing their critical thinking into the reasoning processes of the play should be applied because according to Brecht, disabling the emotions and enabling the critical thinking are mostly achieved by the characterization. Among the technique of this thought, there is surreal casting, naming the characters in relation to their social roles and professions, and letting one actor play several roles on the stage etc.

Churchill uses general characterization such as the translator, the soldier, or the boy; she does not use a main character throughout the play, and she lets many of minor characters appear on the stage; and she uses surreal casting such as dogs, and vampires. Bond uses a surreal name for his main character; makes use of general characterization such as the boy, the girl, the son, the wife, or the buyer; he uses an unborn miscarried kid as the main character; and he lets a newspaper baby appear on the stage.

3.2.1 Brechtian Characterization in *Mad Forest*

Firstly, in the second episode, where the playwright chooses to give documentary details about the due events of the revolution, she prefers to call the characters by their social roles and professions like painter, bulldozer driver, flower seller, girl student, boy student, painter or waiter and so on. The people who go through the revolution and narrate their stories are non-individualized through the use of their social roles. The playwright treats them as everyman, and hides their individuality. What is left in the mind of the audience and the reader after watching or reading the episode is what they have gone through instead of their personalities. These socially-named characters are crucial for the

play because at the points of extreme tension and though subjects, they appear on the stage in order to avoid the risk of blocking those points with emotional bonds.

The painter, for instance, unearths his witnessing a tragic death through the following words: “A man was shot in the throat in front of me” (*MF* 41). This moment is critical for the expression of the cruel aspects of humanity, and it should not be blocked by any hindrances. The moment should convey its depth thoroughly, and through character alienation, it could be achieved. Therefore, the playwright uses a non-individualized character design in order to convey the general terror during the shootings.

One of the other general characters is the patient who is crucial for the play. Churchill does not take the risk of conveying the nature of the revolution through an individually revealed character because that kind of a character such as the members of the Antonescus or the Vladus have the potential to get identified by the audience and the reader due to their several revelations of personality throughout the play. However, the patient appears only in the hospital room scene, but he is able to ask the most important and daring question of the revolution or so-called revolution. He is able to ask the fundamental question which is: “Did we have a revolution or a putsch?” (50), and he can question the shootings as: “And for whose benefit? And by whose orders?” (50). Although the other characters – Gabriel, Florina and Lucia – ignore him and his key questions, he is able to question and criticize the nature of the revolution anyway. He does not have the risk of being identified by the readers and the audiences.

Secondly, non-human casting is used to serve for V-effekt. Among the non-human characters there are an angel, a dog and a vampire which talk to the humans like the way humans do, and wander among them. Interestingly, these creatures talk more courageously than the humans do and they can talk about the subjects which humans avoid of uttering. Churchill purposefully chooses them to talk daringly about those subjects so that she could appeal to the audience and the reader by breaking the empathy bonds between the characters and the ones watching or reading the play. If she allowed a human being utter those words, there would be a risk of being not understood owing to the block created by the emotional bond between the human character and the audience/the reader.

The angel in the first episode is the voice of the social criticism of the religion and the church which do not get involved in the social problems. Originally, religion is a kind of coordinator of the social and individual lives of people. However, unfortunately, church avoids fixing the problems of mass tragedies. Here the angel stirs the minds of the audience and the reader by posing a sentence on the situation. The conversation between the priest and the angel is as follows:

Priest: I am free inside, I can fly about in that blue, that is what the church can give people, they can fly about inside in that blue.

Angel: So when the Romanian church writes a letter to the other Christian churches apologising for not taking a stand / against –

Priest: Don't talk about it. I'd just managed to forget.

Angel: Don't be ashamed. There was no need for them to write the letter because there's no question of taking a stand, it's not the job of the church / to.
(MF 21-22)

Priest is against the Romanian Church's letter of apology for not taking a stand. However, he seems to be worried about holding no views on the current upheaval in the country. There is a clash of thoughts inside the priest. Here is the criticism; the church and its members prefer to stay cool and ignorant about social tragedies and they pretend to be sorry for their inactive position. The angel renders criticism about the church and its social roles which may not be criticized through the human characters. This is a direct way of questioning the informally prohibited questions by a non-human being, which the playwright deliberately installs in order to focus the attention of the audience and the readers to the topic.

Churchill uses the dog and the vampire in the same context to present a metaphor of the relationship between the human exploiters and hungry fit-for-treason human being. The scene is introduced by the stage directions as: "*Night, outside. A shrine. A Dog is lying asleep. A man approaches. He whistles. The Dog looks up. The man whistles. The Dog gets up and approaches, undecided between eagerness and fear. The man is a Vampire*" (MF 44). If human being is out in the middle of the night and gets shelter in a shrine, he/she could be considered as a person who is most probably in need of food and harbour. He/she is both afraid of any kind of future harm done to himself/herself and curious about what is to come, maybe food and shelter. Apart from being homeless and hungry, the dog proves to be a fit-for-treason creature by his wish to turn into a vampire who does not need to be taken care of. Upon the vampire's question, "You want me to make you into a vampire? A vampire dog?" (MF 46), the dog says yes willingly because it has already prepared the background for the question to be asked. Mostly, this would create pity, anger, and identification if a human being is used instead of the needy betrayer dog while the dog keeps the emotional distance between the character and the reader/audience.

On the other hand, the vampire is out at night looking for someone to impose and compel so that it can claim to be the owner of the compelled being and exploit him till he sucks the last drop of his blood. The vampire explains the way he wanders for blood with the following words: "All that happens is you begin to want blood, you try to put it off, you're bored with killing, but you can't sit quiet, you can't settle to anything, your limbs

ache, your head burns, you have to keep moving faster and faster, that eases the pain, seeking. And finding. Ah” (*MF* 46). He confesses that blood sucking makes him more and more addicted and it starts to affect both the physical and psychological being. Apart from the cruel side of the vampire, he is a solitary being who looks for a creature to talk to as he claims. He utters: “And then it’s over and you wander round looking for someone to talk to. That’s all. Every night. Over and over” (*MF* 46). He is lonely the whole night; he can feed on people, kill people but he cannot make friends with them. Here is the tragic clash of being a blood sucker as he conveys. If Churchill preferred to explain this lonely evil without the vampire metaphor, there would arise anger and mercy among the audience and the reader at the same time and these two emotions would block the reasoning processes of them. By using this dog and vampire metaphor for needy traitors and the solitary exploiters in the society, she gets rid of the identification and being moved along the emotional flow of the events.

Just like non-human casting, posthumous characters serve for exact same reason, not to be identified with by emotionally blocked audience and the reader. These kinds of surreal characters appeal to the critical thinking of them because none of the audience and the reader would like to personalize a dead person’s speeches and actions; therefore, he/she can look through an objective eye. Again just like the non-human casting, posthumous characters also can judge the events from an external perspective and can judge critically. The posthumous characters are the dead grandmother of Flavia and a ghost appearing upon a fight between Florina and Radu.

The dead grandmother of Flavia appears to her on moments of stress for Flavia. In the first episode, she comes to advice on the way Flavia wastes her life. Flavia is a woman of middle ages who takes no stand for the crucial aspects in her life. She is a teacher and she teaches whatever is given to her; her following words display that: “Let them give me a new book, I’ll teach that” (*MF* 65). She holds no beliefs and admits that she can teach every ruler as a noble being and his/her reign as the most beneficial one. The grandmother comes to warn her about her lack of ideas of her own. The dead grandmother introduces her entrance to the stage as follows: “Flavia, your life will soon be over. You’re nearly as old as I was when you were a little girl. You thought I was old then but you don’t think you’re old” (*MF* 25). These sentences are there to reveal Flavia’s being wasteful about her own life. The outside characters like the dead grandmother can talk directly and guide both the characters and the ones watching or reading the play to ask the right questions about people’s lives and how they can change for the better without the risk of getting connected

to neither of them emotionally thanks to her being a non-living being, which is perfectly fit for Brechtian *V-Effekt*.

The ghost in the third episode appears right after Radu and Flavia quarrel about each other's attitude to political events. They are about to get married in a few days but somehow they have clashes about the way each other live and hold beliefs. Florina is angry at Radu about his being unemployed and wander around as a hooligan of politics while Radu is uncomfortable about the way she does not respect his beliefs and they tear apart throughout the scene. Upon this, a ghost of a young man comes to tell the following words:

I'm dead and I never got married. So I've come to find somebody. I was always looking at you when I was ill. But you loved Radu then. I won't talk like he does. I died, that's all I want to know about it. Please love me. It's lonely when you're dead. I have to go down a secret road. Come with me. It's simple. (*MF* 73)

Florina is a nurse at a hospital and during the revolution she has nursed many patients. The ghost is one of them who died for revolution. The ghost reveals he has never gotten married and due to revolution he will never be able to. He has never tasted of being married to a woman and being called as husband, although the couple who are about to get married in a little time quarrel about political views and hurt each other. Here, the ghost is the voice of all the people who fight and die for politics unconsciously and whose rights to be happy are blocked. His appearance right after the quarrel between is a kind of criticism for the lovers' hurtful attitudes to each other for politics. The ghost reminds her that they hurt each other unnecessarily. Here the situation is so sorrowful that Churchill does not want it to seem pathetic and in order to make the audience /reader focus on the words of him, she uses a ghost instead of a live human being. Or else, they would pity him in a maximized level, which would hamper the aims of *V-Effekt*.

Another alienating character design technique is the variety of the characters used in the play. Throughout the play, thirty-seven different characters appear on stage and in the text (*MF* 8-9). The Vladu family has ten members; the Antonescu family has four members; and there are twenty-three more people apart from the families. Also, there are people in queues and as wedding guests. Thanks to this variety, all the characters are non-detailed and avoid identification. The more the characters' personality and individuality are revealed, the more the risk of being identified by the ones reading or watching the play is.

One final technique of Brechtian characterization is non-idealization of the lovers. Traditionally, the lovers are idealized in literary works and the other issues in the works are shadowed by them. This kind of shadow would clash with what Churchill and Brecht wants to achieve in their plays. They try to stay away from any kind of emotional block and wish

to appeal to the objective minds of the audiences and the readers. In *Mad Forest*, Caryl Churchill does not shadow the revolutionary activities by the love stories of Lucia and Wayne or Lucia and Ianoş or Radu and Florina. On the contrary, the lovers are not idealized. For example, Lucia gets Ianoş's baby aborted (*MF* 19) and marries Wayne (*MF* 28); and right after the revolution she leaves Wayne and turns back home, then Lucia proposes Ianoş, "Shall I stay here and marry you?" (*MF* 59). Lucia's love seems not to be ever-green for Wayne or Ianoş. Therefore, neither the reader nor the audience gets moved by those actions of the lovers; instead they would question the quality of them and the revolutionary activities at the same time.

Radu and Florina's love story is as shallowly-presented as the Lucia and her lovers' ones. In the first episode, they are almost over by the actions their families commit and the views they hold; and they even do not resist the break up. In the third episode, they reunite and they are about to marry but there are almost no scenes which presents how much they love each other. One time they quarrel about each other's daily activities; Florina works at the hospital and Radu attends political activities. Florina is uncomfortable about his being political and earning no money while Radu is against the way Florina is inactive about politics. The way they quarrel is as follows:

Florina. So what have you done today? Sat in the square and talked?
Radu. I know you are tired.
Florina. I like being tired, I like working, I don't like listening to you talk.
Radu. People are talking about a hunger strike.
Florina. Fine, those of you who weren't killed can kill yourselves. (*MF* 72)

As the play presents, the way they treat each other is not a legendary and unproblematic one. The playwright has other aims than presenting a fabulous love story and legendary lovers; what she tries to achieve is an awakening play which maximizes the level of critical thinking among the audiences and the readers. Moved by the emotional scenes and not be able to think critically is what both Brecht and Churchill are against.

Churchill makes use of non-human and posthumous characters, generally naming, non-detailed characterization and non-idealized lovers to stay emotionally away, critically close to the audience and the reader. It can be said that she is successful about sticking to Brechtian characterization for *V-Effekt*.

3.2.2 Brechtian Characterization in *Red, Black and Ignorant*

First, the name of the main character is the Monster. Bond deliberately chose a non-human name for the character not to let the reader and the audience identify themselves

with him. What the Monster goes through is totally what a human being is likely to go through in his / her life. Therefore, the name is purposefully chosen to prevent them from putting themselves into the Monster's shoes at least to some extent. Bond does not desire to leave the audience and the reader caught up in the plot of the Monster's life because in that case people would not think critically about their own lives. What he wants to create is emotional alienation and rational involvement in the processes.

Naming him as the Monster would not allow the audience and the reader to identify themselves with him because nobody would like to be resembled to a being named as Monster even if he is a human being. Monster is not a sympathetic word unlike flower, baby or pet names which an audience or a reader would like to be called as. The Monster speaks and behaves like a human being who is addressing to the mental reasoning of the audience and the reader but his name is Monster which is used to keep the emotional involvement. At the beginning of the play, the Monster utters some words about the nature of being a human in the following way: "Alone of creatures we know that we pass between life and death / And wish to teach each new mind to be as profound as a crystal ocean through which we may see the ocean bed and from shore to shore" (*RBI* 3). He considers himself as being a member of the humanity and uses the pronoun *we* together with the other human beings. Also, it can be claimed that these words hardly belong to a man without wisdom. He has the wisdom as obviously seen although he has the name of a non-human creature. Therefore, the person who is watching the performance or reading the text does not resemble himself or herself to the creature; instead, s/he pay attention to the words and the content which requires not the emotional processes but the critical thinking and reasoning of the mind.

Another example for the alienating characterization about Monster is laid bare to the audience and the reader when the Monster calls his son's actions as "Monstrous" (*RBI* 23) in the sixth episode named as *Work*. Here, the son does not help the needy woman who is stuck under a concrete beam and she has the possibility of getting crippled life-long. The son who is named as a human being does not help the woman while the Monster who is named as a non-human creature not only helps her but also degrades the son to a non-human being. This scene leads both the audience and the reader to the critical thinking of humane and inhumane actions of the human beings and blocks the way of emotional involvement by naming the character as the Monster who behaves humanely. The one who is supposed to act in a humane way does not meet the expectations and act monstrously whereas the other who is supposed to act as a monster does not behave monstrously. This keeps the emotional distance.

Second, the Monster, in addition to his non-human name, is an unborn being that senses the misery in the world and wants to run away from it, as his mother who miscarries the Monster claims. The Monster introduces himself at the beginning as: “Now we will show scenes from the life I did not live” (RBI 5), and attends his own funeral with his own ashes in his hand. Namely, he is both an outsider, the narrator of his own imaginary birth and death; and an insider who lives through the imaginary life. This moves away the audience and the reader’s emotional involvement in the play; in contrast, they can use their critical abilities because they would not identify themselves with an imaginary non-human being. They can objectively judge and criticize him for his deeds and behaviours. He himself warns them not to put themselves into his shoes but to observe his experiences and criticize both the Monster and themselves and as a result change the society accordingly.

Stage directions in the eighth episode show that he has been shot to death by his son, which could be a guide for the reader. The directions are as follows: “*The son shoots the Monster. The Monster dies immediately: he drops his bread*” (RBI 48). His being dead is crucial for the alienation; therefore the playwright does not let anybody miss the point and emphasizes through the wife’s words too, which are: “He’s dead / You’re mad / He’s come to kill us all” (RBI 48). As it is obvious to the naked eye, Bond wants both the reader and the audience focus on the fact that he has been killed. However, he is afraid that his death’s being a very tragic one would create the pittance and let the cognition stay away from the deed; therefore, he immediately presents the funeral which is attended by the Monster himself with his own ashes.

At the end of the last episode, he makes his closure speech although he has already been dead before the last episode, which is as follows:

You killed us for freedom
Democracy isn’t the right to vote but freedom to know and the knowledge
based on knowing
Your democracy is the way truth is suppressed and freedom hustled away to
prison
What is the freedom you gave me?
Two fists of ash
Where is the freedom in that? (RBI 49-50)

He emphasizes the fact that he has been killed, but he can still speak; this serves for the character design of Brechtian *V-Effekt* technique. He calls for attention to the speech, he does not let the audience and the reader pity him for his tragic murder by his son. He comes to the stage all alive and asks his questions. He stays away from the personal identification – which would be impossible when it is about a dead man – but tries to involve mental processes into the play. What Brecht wants to achieve is already there in the play.

Third, the characters, apart from the Monster, are named with their social roles, and their genders. In other words, they are not specified with human names to prevent personal identification. For example, the kids in the school are named as the boy, the girl; and Monster's wife's name as the wife, his son's as the son. Giving them specific names would be to specify them and as a result that would be easier for the audience and the reader to identify themselves with. Here Bond, by generalizing the characters, tries to focus on the sociality and the characters' social roles instead of their individuality and personal traits or concerns.

For instance, in the second episode, named *Learning*, the teacher orders the Monster to go to the boy who spits at the Monster's jacket and tell him the moral aspects of the action. The teacher's speech is totally social and is about the teacher's social role. She is presented in the context of her sociality and her profession; not her individual life or personal traits. Accordingly, she is named as the teacher. Bond does not want the audience and the reader to criticize only this teacher, but all the other teachers who behave this way.

Another example is in the third episode which is named as *Love*. A woman, not named specifically as Mary or Elizabeth, expresses her thoughts about the Monster's physical beauty. The Monster is presented only physically here, which is not expected from a proper decent relationship. People are expected to like each other's personal beauties when they're in a relationship. Here what is criticized is the way the woman considers the Monster only as an object of her sexual desires; and by giving her a general name, again all the womankind is criticized, not just this woman.

The buyer in the fifth episode is another relevant example for the socially naming technique which Bond implements. The buyer is man of the State which buys every single baby when they are old enough to speak and learn. The buyer symbolizes the whole trade and selling activities in the whole world. He defends his selling strategies upon seeing that the Monster wants to increase the price of the baby in an ignorant way; he only takes care of his own side in the trade; and he wants to buy the baby with a reasonable price. Let alone his objectives to take a human being in the exchange of money without any explanation, it is wrong of all the buyers or sellers bargain on something without any respect to the other's feelings, troubles or efforts on the good. The buyer here is the general example of the competitive economic system of the markets in the world. On behalf of every single competitive buyer and seller he is named generally and criticized in the play.

Another characterization technique which Bond makes use of is the presentation of the baby as it is made of newspaper sheets to avoid any sympathy with it. It is a generally known fact that the babies soften most of the people and may block any critical thinking;

therefore, Bond does not let a living baby appear on the stage to avoid pity or emotional upheavals. In the stage directions, he made it clear for the future performances as follows: “*The Monster’s wife brings on a child made of newspaper papier maché and wrapped in newspaper sheets*” (RBI 19). The newspaper baby is not optional for the part; instead, it is a clear-cut direction for the purposes of Brechtian Epic theatre.

To sum up, following in the footsteps of Brecht, Edward Bond implements many characterization techniques to alienate the audience and the reader from sympathizing with the characters and to avoid their judgmental abilities. Using general names like the boy, the girl, the buyer, or the wife; using an unborn miscarried boy as the main character; naming the main character as the Monster which is non-human; and showing a baby which is made of newspaper sheets are the characterization techniques which Bond implements in his play *Red, Black and Ignorant* so that he could achieve Brechtian *V-Effekt* and alienate the reader and the audience from emotional involvement.

3.3 Brechtian Audio-Visual Aids

Under this title, this thesis explains the use of audio-visual aids and *sister arts* as Brecht calls them in the dramaturgy. The sister arts of drama, as previously argued in the thesis, are music, dance and songs for both entertainment and alienation concerns. As for the audio-visual aids, presentation or announcement of episode titles could be counted.

Brecht in his dramaturgy paid attention to the use of songs, music and dance. In addition to his role as a playwright, he composed music and wrote songs for his plays. These arts play a big role in *V-Effekt* for the audience and the reader not to be caught up in emotional upheavals and cut from them through these intervals. Chiari (1971) argues that Brecht intentionally interrupts the dramatic action at critical moments with songs to prevent the suspense and climax which can lead to emotional involvement, and to underline an important point or a message in the play. The songs and music, which are in the service of breaking the continuity, in its further sense serve to counteract the emotional exhaustion and passive mood that could be the result of the gloomy and dark plots. Brecht and his composer friends worked in an interrelated way to give meaning to Brechtian Epic Theatre in this enlightenment sense.

Following Brecht’s theories and methods, the playwrights who are affected by him, have used many kinds of arts in their plays. Churchill and Bond, who are mostly affected by Brecht in their dramaturgy, implemented those functional aids too. However, there is an exception about Edward Bond’s *Red, Black and Ignorant*. While Churchill makes use of

several arts such as dancing, music, songs, and the title presentations in her play *Mad Forest*, Edward Bond falls behind her about the use of those aids. There is only one song, which is about the army in the seventh episode, throughout the play and there are no dances, music or title announcements; in *Red, Black and Ignorant*. In other words, while Churchill sticks to Brechtian methods in *Mad Forest*, Bond keeps low of the use of visual or audio aids for Brechtian purposes. That's why, Churchill's audio-visual aids will be dealt with in this chapter, whereas Bond's lack of use will be explained in the chapter four of this thesis.

3.3.1 Brechtian Audio-Visual Aids in *Mad Forest*

In terms of audio-visuality, Churchill could be considered as very careful about sticking to Brechtian theory and methods. As Brecht suggests, she uses many sister arts and audio-visual aids. Many times in the play, people dance, there are pieces of music and songs and every title is presented and announced carefully. Brecht believes that what is in the play is the reflection of the real world so the audience/reader should be reminded of that constantly so that they are not moved by the flow of the events and emotional temperaments. Brecht believes that unbroken story line and the emotional adaptation can absorb the audience and the reader so there should be breaks in the flow of both story line and emotions. These breaks could be maintained through the use of several other arts like songs, dances, and music and title presentations. Churchill uses those aids at the moments of emotional tension and moving story flow in order to serve for both *V-Effekt* and entertainment. Churchill in this play uses music, dance, songs, poems, re-enactment of a real event, and title presentations in order to be able to deal with the issue of breaking the flow and to remind that it is an illusion. Otherwise, the audience/reader would be moved by the emotionality as if they were going through the happenings on the stage or in the text.

At the beginning of the play, the stage direction orders that "Each scene is announced by one of the company reading from a phrasebook as if an English tourist, first in Romanian, then in English, and again in Romanian" (*MF* 13). A title is announced three times by being not contended with one time saying. Every single announcement deepens the alienation. By believing that one time reading may slip away from the cognition of the reader and the audience, and that three times of announcement gives enough time to the thought, she prefers three times of saying. In the play there are three episodes and twenty-five scenes in total, which means there are seventy-five announcements in one play, which

seems quite enough for breaking the stage illusion and reminding the audience and the reader the play's being illusionary.

The music has two functions in the play, one is contextual and the other is Brechtian. The people in the first episode turn on the music not to be heard by any political people and the army, which is contextual. Another function is about sticking to Brechtian purposes. Throughout the first scene, nothing is heard, but the actions are visible to the audience on the stage and through the directions to the mind of the reader. The stage directions narrate that:

Music continues. Bogdan and Irina Vladu sit in silence, smoking Romanian cigarettes. Bogdan turns up the music on the radio very loud. He sits looking at Irina. Irina puts her head close to Bogdan's and talks quickly and quietly, to convince him. He argues back, she insists, he gets angry. We can't hear anything they say. (MF 13)

The point is to convey the speech ban issue. It is not about what they speak to each other, or what they argue about. They cannot express their feelings freely and music is the conveyer of this context. This is the music's contextual function. What is about being Brechtian is that music breaks the illusion; it is very loud and people's mind is awakened at the very beginning of the play; the music leads the audience's mind to get cleared and refreshed. Churchill starts the play with this scene and obviously she does not want to risk any point to be missed so she uses a very loud music to achieve her aim.

Another piece of music is heard right after Lucia's wedding to the American boy, Wayne. Weddings are happy moments which create relief and comfort in people but neither Brecht nor Churchill wants their audience to be moved by the emotional flow of this incident. Therefore, Churchill let a piece of music be heard after this emotional scene. Priest puts the crown on Lucia's head with the words: "The handmaid of God Lucia is crowned for the servant of God Wayne, in the name of father, and of the son, and of the holy spirit" (MF 28). If there would not be a wedding ceremony seen on the stage or read in the text like this, there would not be an emotional situation but these words and the ceremony on stage can drag the audience into an emotional flow of happiness. Therefore, the music is there to prevent this situation.

Just like Lucia's wedding, in Florina's wedding music can be heard. However, unlike many wedding ceremonies, the music is not heard all along the ceremony. It is existent right after the fight scene. The fight is about racism at the core; Gabriel does not want a Hungarian man to be close to his sister, Lucia, then he starts a fight by pushing Ianoş, who pushes Gabriel back and then Bogdan gets involved in the fight. He swears: "Leave my son alone. Hungarian bastard. And don't come near my daughter" (MF 84). The

reader and the audience can smell the racism here. What initiates the real fight is Ianoş's reply, which is: "I'm already fucking your daughter, you stupid peasant" (MF 84). Ianoş rejects being victimized in the quarrel and rows back with the above words, humiliating Bogdan's socio-cultural position and his daughter. Then the fight commences:

*Bogdan hits Ianoş.
Radu restrains Bogdan.
Lucia attacks Bogdan.
Bogdan hits Radu.
Mihai pushes Bogdan.
Bogdan hits Mihai.
Flavia attacks Bogdan.
Ianoş pushes Gabriel.
Irina protects Gabriel.
Gabriel hits Ianoş.
Radu attacks Bogdan.
Mihai restrains Radu.
Radu attacks Mihai.
Florina attacks Radu.
Gabriel hits out indiscriminately with his crutch and accidentally knocks Bogdan to the floor. (MF 84)*

This kind of a fight which has a lack of purpose and which involves a bunch of drunk people may create a variety of emotions among the audiences and the reader. A bride attacks her bridegroom, a son knocks his father to the floor, a bridegroom attacks his father-in-law, or a daughter attacks her father. These actions may create anger, fun, or sadness or happiness in people. In order to avoid of such kind of emotional states, the playwright cuts the scene and lets the music begin for awakening purposes with Flavia's words: "This is a wedding. We're forgetting our programme. It's time for dancing" (MF 84). Upon this, as stage directions reveal, "*They pick themselves up, see if they are all right. Music - the lambada. Gradually couples form and begin to dance*" (MF 84). The playwright avoids dragging the audience and the reader into an emotional state of passive critical mind and she lets music be heard, dance be seen.

Singing songs through the play is one of the sister arts that Brecht pays attention to for his discourse and *Verfremdungseffekt*. Songs serve both for contextual functions and Brechtian *V-Effekt*. The songs are not randomly chosen, they have purposes for the general theme of revolution. The play does not show the execution scene of Nicolae and Elena Ceauşescu in the Second episode where it could be more documentary-like but in the third episode it is re-enacted through several ways, one of which is Rodica's nightmare. Rodica, Gabriel's wife, has the nightmare in which she is Elena Ceauşescu in post-revolutionary times. There are two soldiers who claim to be helping her in exchange of her belongings. But in the end they take every piece from her until she is left with a matchbox and her cloak

and the soldiers leave without helping her to escape. The matchbox seems to be a jukebox and whenever she opens it, it chants “Ole ole ole ole” (MF 56). Here, the scene symbolizes how Elena Ceaușescu is cheated by the people around her who seem to be her and her husband’s advocates, and the song is there to block the emotional reactions of the audience and the reader. This is a scene which could arouse pity and commiseration among people and Churchill, just like Brecht, could not take the risk of showing the scene as an emotional one, so she uses a song. The song is both functional by being a politically encouraging song which can be used to move the crowds, and is there to serve for Brechtian discourse by being an alienating and entertaining factor.

Another song is chanted just before the characters act out the execution scene all together to cheer Gabriel up. When the people bring him to the apartment, they see that the lift is broken and Gabriel needs to be carried along the stairways. This needy position may make him upset and discouraged so they sing a song to distract him and then they act out the execution. The cheerful song is as follows sung by all:

The lift’s broken.
How do we get Gaby up the stairs?
We’ll have the party here.
Rodica’s waiting in the flat.
We shouldn’t have stayed so long at the Berlin.
We can carry him up.
We need a drink first.
Let’s do it here.
Do it, I’ve never seen it.
Yes, Radu, to celebrate Gaby coming home. (MF 69)

After the realisation of the lift’s being out of order, the characters find a solution to divert Gabriel’s attention from being upset about his situation, to make him feel like a hero, in the execution of Ceaușescu. The song is there to introduce the scene and to temporise for the preparation of the scene. Apart from being contextually functional, the song is also for Brechtian *V-Effekt* and his discourse. Brecht’s discourse orders to be distracting in emotional scenes. Gabriel’s being crippled may move the audience and reader into feelings of pity and sadness, but the cheerful song and the execution scene prevent them from getting involved in emotional temperaments.

The other song is sung by the peasant aunt of Florina while she is getting married. Florina is getting married and there seems to be a happy moment for the play; and to balance the feelings, the aunt sings a ritual chant to show the sad face of the marriages and being a wife and a mother:

Little bride, little bride,
You’re laughing, we’ve cried.
Now a man’s come to choose you

We're sad because we lose you.
Makes you proud to be a wife
But it's not an easy life.
Your husband isn't like a brother
Your mother-in-law's not like a mother.
More fun running free and wild
Than staying home to mind a child. (*MF* 76)

Previous song interrupts a sad moment to balance the emotions by being cheerful while this one cuts a happy moment with a bitter song of Aunt's. Thanks to this technique, the extreme feelings are kept low to hamper getting lost in those feelings and to activate the critical thinking.

Re-enactment of the execution is another alienating and entertaining audio-visual aid. The characters in the play act out a short trial and execution scene of Elena and Nikolae Ceaușescu. This entertains both the characters and the ones reading or watching it. The scene is there to motivate Gabriel about his being a war veteran and to show him that he is not wounded abortively and thanks to him and others like him, Ceaușescus are down. The scene is to cheer Gabriel because they realize that the lift is broken and Gabriel should be carried up the stairway so they both sing a song and act out the piece. In the piece, Radu and Florina are the Ceaușescus, and the others are there to judge and execute them (*MF* 69-70-71). The scene serves to balance the emotional extremity. Gabriel's being crippled and the execution of any human are bitter conditions. If the execution was not acted out right after the realization of Gabriel's condition, the audience and the reader would drown in the sorrow for a veteran who is crippled life-long. On the other hand, if the execution was acted out on its own not right after a situation which is indirectly caused by the Ceaușescus, the audience and the reader might drown in sorrow for a couple who is murdered by an arrogant crowd. Both cases could arouse pity and mercy among the audiences and the readers; however, the playwright wisely integrates them into each other and presents to the critical mind of the ones watching or reading the play.

In terms of the integration of the audio-visuals, Churchill's play resembles Brechtian plays. She prefers to appeal to the critical thinking and exclude the extremely emotional scenes for the sake of pushing the audience and the reader for thought and action for a better society which is not depending on the rules of the rulers and blind ruled. In his plays, Brecht wants to awaken the crowds who are used to adapting to every situation without questioning and judging; he wishes to see people holding beliefs and ideas who can act accordingly. Likewise, Churchill stirs the societies with her plays by not imposing thoughts on them, but by presenting every aspect and letting them choose and change themselves accordingly. Audio-visual aids serve for this objective of Churchill's and

balance the emotional moments with reasoning of the minds. With the help of these aids, she highlights the crucial points and let the audiences and the readers realize every single point with an open-mind.

3.4 Brechtian Open-Endedness

One of the main features of the Brechtian Epic theatre is the way it questions its subjects and people instead of deciding on a verdict directly. This style questions and criticizes the subjects regarding every single perspective. The style does not serve for certain ideologies because it does not give direct messages; it lays bare the facts and figures from several aspects and wants its reader or the audience to think critically on the data and to render a verdict themselves. This quality frees the minds of them by letting them think and answer on their own instead of imposing the playwrights' thoughts on them.

Both *Red, Black and Ignorant* and *Mad Forest* end in questions in mind and in text too. Instead of imposing their own thoughts on the reader and the audience, Bond and Churchill let them have their own ideas and judgments for the happenings through questioning them, which is what Brechtian *V-Effekt* requires. Leaving the ends open and letting the others tie up them with their own thoughts fit for what Brecht desires to have.

3.4.1 Brechtian Open-Endedness in *Mad Forest*

Churchill employs this technique to challenge her audience and the reader so that they could come up with their own solution for social change. Kritzer comments on Churchill's implementation of this Brechtian technique with the following words:

Churchill's plays typically conclude with the central question resolutely left unanswered. This open-ended format, evidence of a continually evolving engagement with Brechtian dramaturgy, challenges and invigorates audiences to think about answers rather than simply identifying with or against an idea generated by playwright. (14)

Kritzer associates Churchill's implementation of open-endedness with an evolution of Brechtian effect on Churchill in terms of artistic intent of social functionality.

In *Mad Forest*, there is a main topic and several other minor ones throughout the episodes, and they all end in questions waiting to be answered by the audience and the reader. The presentation of the revolution is a theatrical success which Churchill achieves to dramatize the questions and uncertainties which the Romanians need to express (Aston

79). Aston believes that the play asks the questions that the Romanians should ask themselves and each other about the revolution and the nature of it.

The first episode, *Lucia's Wedding*, sets the background for the 1989 revolution of Romania. In this setting, the episode questions many issues. First, through Lucia's marriage to an American, the episode asks what patriotism is. Throughout the whole episode, people around Lucia suffer by this issue and they are subjected to some kind of discrimination. Lucia's father is questioned by a Securitate about how he can let his daughter marry an American and the first question of the security officer is "Do you love your country?" (MF 17). A person who loves his/her country cannot marry people from other nationalities according to the Securitate, who is the officer of the State. Lucia's brother is challenged to prove his patriotism by joining the army forces. When they first come to Gabriel, they ask "What is patriotism?" (MF 23). The State's officers believe that both Bogdan and Gabriel may not have a clue about patriotism because they let their sister and daughter marry an American. Also, Florina is casted out by her boyfriend's family owing to Lucia's marriage to a non-Romanian man. According to Radu's mother, the whole family is responsible for Lucia's unpatriotic behaviour and they should all be casted out from the society. These kinds of attitudes against the Vladu family, Lucia's family, pave the way for critical thoughts about patriotism, what it is, and what it is not. Here patriotism is open to debate instead of being out of question.

The selfish thoughts of the individuals are questioned through several incidents in this episode, too. Although abortion is illegal according to the State's laws, the doctor accepts performing one on Lucia in exchange of money. The Doctor pretends to be against abortion due to the laws but on paper he writes to Lucia he accepts performing. His words and his actions clash. Doctor, for fear of being heard and caught up, utters the following pep-talk as though he believes in them: "There is no abortion in Romania. I am shocked at you even think of it. I am appalled that you dare suggest I might commit this crime" (MF 19). At the same time with this speech, he accepts the envelope thick with money, as could be understood from the stage directions. It is a social behaviour to obey the rules because rules regulate the social life whether they fit for everyone or not. However, some people prefer to disregard them for their personal profit and this first step leads the way for the next violation of the rules and another and another. The playwright presents this situation and never suggests a solution for that, she wants the audience and the reader find one themselves and put that into action for a better designed society.

People's ignorance and lack of action is another issue criticized and presented to the minds of the reader and the audience for them to decide on a judgment and act

accordingly. Flavia's grandmother, who is dead, appears to Flavia at some specific moments. This time in the episode, she appears for stressing Flavia's ignorance of taking a stand in life. The grandmother through examples from her own life warns Flavia about life's shortness and recommends to hold some beliefs not to regret in the later phases of her life. The grandmother criticizes her granddaughter and by focusing on her ignorance of having ideas of her own, she breeds the audience and the reader's minds for thought on the issue. The answer is not given, the grandmother does not decide on a solution; instead she presents her own case and lets the others find the solution, just like Churchill does.

Another example of social ignorance is the Priest's one. The Priest is visited by an angel who has witnessed several other upheaval times and tries to comfort the priest who is worried about his being inactive in the revolutionary processes. She tries to be calming with the words of "there is no question of taking a stand, it's not the job of the church" (MF 22). Although the angel tries to comfort the grouching of the priest, there is a slight criticism of his and church's avoidance fixing the social problems. The church, or the religion originally, organizes the peace and order in the society but ironically it does not intervene in the times of social disorder. The aspects of the criticism are presented through the priest and the angel but the solution or the judgment is all the audience and the reader's.

One final criticism in the first episode is about the speech ban. Before the revolution, people are intimidated out of stage and on the stage the audience and the reader observe the results. All the people are afraid to talk and be heard so they find several solutions not to be heard if they need to talk. In the first episode, whenever a person wants to talk about politics or the regimes, either music is turned on, or he/she talks in whispers; or he/she does both. For example, in the scene when Gabriel narrates the story of his being summoned to the army to prove his patriotism, his mother, Irina, warns him to be quieter or to stop speaking. The speech is as follows:

Gabriel: Something happened today. / They came to

Irina: Wait

Irina moves to turn on the radio, then remembers it isn't working.

Gabriel: the office yesterday and gave us their usual pep talk and at the end one of them took me aside / and said we'd like to see you

Irina: Wait

Gabriel: tomorrow. So I knew that meant, they were going to ask me / to do something for

Irina: Wait stop, there's no power.

Gabriel: them. I prayed all night I'd be strong enough to say no, I was so afraid I'd persuaded, / I've never been brave. So I went in and they said

Irina: Gaby, stop, be quiet. (MF 23)

When '/' is used, it means that the speaker is interrupted at that exact point (MF 7).

The criticism is to show that Gabriel is interrupted every time he wants to say something important about politics and his being active in politics. The first time he starts to talk about them, Irina wants to turn on the radio, but it is not possible because it is not working. After seeing this, she interrupts Gabriel constantly because there is the risk that they could be heard by some malicious people.

Another important aspect about speech ban is that whenever a person is heard speaking about banned subjects, the people around him/her pretends not to hear him/her not to involve in the legal procedures of being caught. This mostly happens to Radu who generally cannot stand remaining silent in public. For example, when he is in a queue of people for shopping he whispers loudly: "Down with Ceaușescu" (MF 17). What is important in this scene is not how courageous he is or what he utters. The important thing is that the others pretend not to hear him in order not to be swamped with him. As the stage directions order:

The woman in front of him starts to look around, then pretends she hasn't heard. The man behind pretends he hasn't heard and casually steps slightly away from Radu.

Two people towards the head of the queue look around and Radu looks round as if wondering who spoke. They go on queuing. (MF 17)

People are so afraid that they cannot speak, and they do not want to be considered among people who speak, and also people who can utter just a few words pretend not to have said them. Intimidation causes people lose their freedom of thought and speech, and this is one of the things Churchill criticizes in this episode. The playwright does not ask easy questions, she criticizes patriotism, selfish thoughts, people's ignorance and lack of action, and intimidation and speech ban by presenting them to the reader and the audience from several perspectives without solving them on the stage or in the text. Here lies the playwright's aim, which is to let the audience and the reader think about deadly issues and answer them for self understanding. This is the first step of a better transformed society.

December episode, the second episode of the three-episode play, presents the first hand information on the revolution from the mouths of the Romanian people who went through those days of the chaos. This episode questions the nature of the revolution both specifically for this revolution and generally for all the other revolutions by presenting its physical and psychological results on people. The revolutions are meant for people's well-being originally; however, the ordinary people are the most affected party in a revolutionary process and generally in negative terms both physically and psychologically. They are shot to death; they are wounded; they are scared and hopeless. What's more, they do not know about the course and reasons of the events for which they fight. This episode is

dedicated to the effects and results of the revolutions but the solutions to the problems which the revolution causes are not presented on purpose. As Brecht suggests, the events and the people are laid bare to audience and the reader but they are not judged.

The very first thing is the loss of the lives. People are killed in many undesirable ways in times of upheaval and chaos. From the first hand information, the ways in this revolution is revealed. For instance, the painter describes a man's death which occurs before his eyes as follows: "A man was shot in the throat in front of me. Some people could not look but I was staring trying not to forget" (*MF* 41). Maybe the painter would like to paint the scene or he would not like to ignore the men's death and take lessons from the incident, which is not known but the thing is that a man is shot to death through his throat. This is one of the tragic aspects of the revolutions; people kill other people who do not think the same way as them at the expense of some other people.

The doctor in the second episode, tells an anecdote belonging to the revolutionary times. On the December 23:

I went to work. Two boys came in with a young man on a stretcher, which they put down, then one of the fell to the ground and began to scream – he sees the wounded man is his older brother. His friend takes him down the hall to get a tranquiliser, it is very dark and when they come back the friend trips over something, it is the body of the older brother, who is dead waiting for surgery. The younger brother was only 14. He threw himself on the corpse and won't move, he said he wants to die with his brother. (*MF* 41)

Those incidents are the inevitable results of the chaotic times which inflict deep wounds on the consciousness of the people who witness them.

In addition to the dead people, there show up as many wounded people. Again the doctor talks about the cases in the hospital with his following words: "At the hospital no one knew what had happened but there were 14 dead and 19 wounded. There were two kinds of wounds, normal bullet wounds and bullets that explode when they strike something and break bones in little pieces, there is no way of repairing them" (*MF* 35). For the sake of unknown reasons for ordinary men, they die and get crippled maybe for life with those merciless bullets. This may be unbearable for wounded people to live dependent on the others.

Apart from the physical damages given to people, the psychological damages are far too heavy on the individuals. First, they feel the fear of being caught, tortured or killed all through those happenings. On the very first day of the revolution, on 21st of December, the translator introduces himself and the first day as follows:

I work as a translator in a translation agency. On the 21st we were listening to the radio in the office to hear Ceaușescu's speech. It was frightfully predictable People had been brought from factories and institutions on buses

and he wanted their approval for putting down what he called the hooligans in Timișoara. Then suddenly we heard boos and the radio went dead. So we knew something had happened. We were awfully startled. Everyone was shaking. (MF 29)

The ordinary people do not know what is going on in the country but naturally, they get afraid of the chaotic environment. Fear is a natural reaction to the discomfoting situations; they are expecting to hear the Ceaușescu speech but they hear boos and radio goes dead, which sounds like the upcoming chaotic events and so they get startled.

People express their fear in many different ways. Some people scream; some people swear; some people run away or some others defend themselves in a fearful situation. The Student 1 in *December* episode must have gotten very afraid that he sleeps too little and he does not stay away from his weapon. He expresses his thoughts as follows: “On the morning of the 23 I went home and I slept for two hours. I kept the gun with me” (MF 41). This person prefers to keep his gun with him so that he can defend himself in a bloody moment, which shows that he is afraid of someone, and chaotic moments make people fear of many things going on around them.

Some other dark feelings that the revolution brings out is the emptiness and hopelessness. If the people feel empty in a revolutionary process, what is the use of the revolution then? Revolutions are there to make people look at the future with hope again. If not so, what do the revolutions bring to humanity? The painter in the *December* episode reveals his thoughts on the procedure with the following words: “Painting doesn’t mean just describing, it’s a state of spirit. I didn’t want to paint for a long time then” (MF 43). The painter believes that creating a picture does not only mean describing something, but also reflecting one’s mood and feelings. Unfortunately, the revolution kills his spirit and his creativity for a long time till the pain is relieved.

All this physical and psychological pain is for nothing according to the *December* episode. People do not know anything about what they fight for, who they fight for, what they do, or what the future will bring to them. The Doctor of the State does not know anything about what is going on through the country; he just cures the patients, as his job requires. He expresses his being uninformed as follows: “At the hospital no one knew what had happened but there were 14 dead and 19 wounded” (MF 35). Some people start tearing the country apart, and others do not have any information about it. This means the revolution is for some people’s specific purposes; not everyone’s.

Just like the doctor, the soldier does not know the course of events. At the very beginning of the episode, he tells his lack of information as follows: “We wait something, we don’t know what. We don’t know Ceaușescu speak, we don’t know what happen in

Bucharest” (*MF* 32). Even the Soldier, a very active being in the processes of the revolution, does not know anything about what is going on, and what is going to happen.

Student 2 is one of the most clear-minded figures in the second episode. He consciously rejects getting involved in the process because he accepts the truth that they fight for over nothing. He reveals his thoughts with the following words:

People were shouting, ‘Come with us,’ but I thought, ‘It’s a romantic action, it’s useless to go and fight and die.’ I thought I was a coward to be scared. But I thought, ‘I will die like a fool protecting someone I don’t know. How can I stop bullets with my bare hands? It’s the job of the army, I can do nothing, I will just die.’ So I went home. (*MF* 40)

He is one of the few people who can see the hidden facts behind actions while mostly people move in the flow of the romantic action. Fortunately, he could observe the crowds very well and deduces that they fight for something which they do not even know.

By presenting facts of this specific chaotic time, the playwright wants the audience and the reader have a generalization about the nature of the revolution; its physical and psychological effects on people who even do not know what they fight for. She wants them to understand these and have solutions for the related problems on their own. Churchill does not speak in favour of or against the revolutions or upheavals but she lets people think and act accordingly for a better-formed society by presenting the procedures.

The third and last episode of the *Mad Forest* is *III. Florina’s Wedding*. This episode, just like the first episode, revolves around the two families, the Vladus and the Antonescus. However, this time the setting is the post-revolution times. The playwright wants to show the differences or so-called differences between the pre-revolution and post-revolution times by presenting them in the same context which is the wedding. The social defects, selfishness of the individuals, racism, herd psychology, and ignorance of the people are presented to the audience and the reader in this episode too. Therefore, it could be understood that the problems of pre-revolutionary period go on after the revolution. These topics are presented for the critical eye of the audience and the reader without judgmental comment so that they can come up with their own verdicts, which is desired by Brechtian open-endedness technique.

The Doctor’s abortion of the Lucia’s baby through bribery is one of the first episode’s social defects. Same kind of bribery situation is existent in the third episode as well. The former one is about Lucia’s baby whom she wants to abort; at first, the Doctor does not accept giving an abortion to Lucia because it is illegal and he could get caught. However, upon seeing the envelope full of money, he does not care about violation of the law (*MF* 19). In December episode, Bogdan brings a bottle of whisky for the doctor who

treats his son, Gabriel; and Irina considers it a “little present for the doctor” (MF 48) because she believes he’s gentle with treating him. Although Gabriel tries to dissuade them with the words: “That was before. Not now” (MF 47) while Irina chooses to believe “They can’t change things so quickly Gaby” (MF 47) and his father argues “You do something for somebody, he does something for you. Won’t change that” (MF 47). What Churchill wants here is to strain the audience and the reader’s mind so that they could judge whether revolutions are radical solutions to social defects or not. She presents the ordinary men’s mentality which is at the very bottom of the ladder on the way to affect the whole society.

Bribery is the name of the context in which Lucia and the Doctor involves, while the Doctor’s attitude could be counted as selfishness. Doctor does not care about the society but his individual profit. One single mistake affects all humanity and it makes another stride on the way of corruption. In parallel to that, there is an occasion in the third episode, *III. Florina’s Wedding*. The case is between a dog and a vampire. The dog symbolizes the hungry citizen who is ready to commit any kind of crime for self satisfaction and the vampire stands for the blood sucker leader who leeches off of weak people for their own interests. Here both of the parties are after their own benefits. The vampire argues that in a crowd he would suck up the blood of the crowds and “Nobody knew who was doing the killing. I could come up behind a man in a crowd” (MF 45). He claims that he can leak into the groups of people and leech off of them till their last drop of blood and no nobody still knew that he is killing all those people. This is what the exploiters do, disguised as human for self profit. The dog is another being in this relationship who cares for individual benefit. The dog wants to be turned into a blood sucker by the vampire (MF 46). The dog devours the ethics of the society and wants to be among the blood suckers. Maybe he is the first ring of the chain on the way to total corruption of the whole society. For his self benefit, he risks all the society and future societies. The playwright uses the metaphor, not to directly allege the crime but she wants the audience and the reader question and answer on their own. She leaves the end open, verdict is theirs.

In addition to bribery and selfishness, the racism is one of the ever-green topics of both first and third episodes. In the first episode, the whole Vladu family and the people around them labelled them as being unpatriotic owing to their daughter and sister, Lucia’s marriage to an American. The same kind of context is created in the third episode too. This time Lucia wants to have a relationship with a Hungarian man. On a picnic, where Ianoş the Hungarian boy, his adopted brother Toma, and Lucia leave the group for a walk and chat on some personal and political issues and at the end of the scene, Ianoş who is the lover of Lucia, asks her “Would your family let you marry a Hungarian?” (MF 60). He asks this

question because he is not sure about the answer because of the attitudes against him. Lucia's answer is unknown to the ones watching or reading the play because the scene is cut at that moment and left open-ended.

After the re-enactment of the Ceaușescu and his wife's execution in the third episode, "Ianoș hugs Lucia lightly" (*MF* 71). Upon seeing this, Gabriel, although he is a friend of Ianoș, insults him jokingly: "Get your filthy Hungarian hands off her" (*MF* 71). Gabriel argues that he is just joking but the subject is too sensitive to joke about; therefore, there is the possibility of existence of a real insult in the conversation. Another incident about his being Hungarian happens in the last scene of the episode, when the wedding ceremony goes on. After taking too much alcohol, people get really drunk and they get more and more aggressive constantly. Ianoș utters a sentence about Romanian's being under the rule of Turks too long and he believes that makes the Romanians like slaves. Lucia answers, "You think I'm a slave? I'm not your slave" (*MF* 84). Although Ianoș does not behave her as his slave, Lucia resents. Then Gabriel gets involved and pushes Ianoș, who pushes him back. And there comes the protective father of the martyr Gabriel. Bogdan swears to Ianoș with the following words: "Leave my son alone. Hungarian bastard. And don't come near my daughter" (*MF* 84). They start fighting upon the words and everyone gets involved in the fight. There is a prejudice against Ianoș because he is ethnically foreign to them. The playwright presents an unchanging situation to the eye of the audience and the reader and wants them think about it thoroughly and find a solution for a better society.

Another on-going issue is the herd psychology both in the first and in the third episode. As the episode reveals, over-night revolutions do not change the things radically. Herd psychology is one of them and Flavia from the Antonescu family is a good example of the concept. In the first episode, she praises the Ceaușescu regime and him with the words: "Today we are going to learn about a life dedicated to the happiness of the people and noble ideas of socialism" (*MF* 16). She calls his ideas as noble and his life as dedicated to people's happiness and she uses magnifying words for Ceaușescu and his personality like "this great son of the nation" (*MF* 16), and "the great personality of Comrade Nicolae Ceaușescu" (*MF* 16). She builds up a magnified figure of Ceaușescu in the minds of her students because Ceaușescu was the ruler of the time in the first episode. When she comes to the times of post-revolutionary activities, she turns her coat to the new regimes of the new people and tells her husband that "Let them give me a new book, I'll teach that" (*MF* 65). She moves with the flock without ever questioning either the pre-revolutionary rulers or post-revolutionary ones. The playwright aims to show the constant situation of the movement with the flock and flash lights on the minds of the reader and the audience.

One final non-changing issue is the ignorance of the people to the developments in their lives. In the first episode, the criticism is presented through the Grandmother and Flavia conversation, and the priest and the angel conversation. The non-living beings, the grandmother and the angel push hard on the living but non-active beings, Flavia and the priest, so that they criticize themselves about being ignorant and transform accordingly. Meanwhile the audience and the reader question themselves too so that there could be a better society to live. In the December episode, the criticism comes from the mental patient who can judge the things objectively:

Did we have a revolution or a putsch? Who was shooting on the 21st? And who was shooting on the 22nd? Was the army shooting on the 21st or did some shoot and some not shoot or were the Securitate disguised in army uniforms? If the army were shooting, why haven't they been brought to justice? And were they still shooting on the 22nd? Were they now disguised as Securitate? Most important of all, were the terrorists and the army really fighting or were they only pretending to fight? And for whose benefit? And by whose orders? Where did the flags come from? Who put loudhailers in the square? How could they publish a newspaper so soon? Why did no one turn off the power at the TV? Who got Ceaușescu to call everyone together? And is he really dead? How many people dies in Timișoara? And where are the bodies? Who mutilated the bodies? And were they mutilated after they'd been killed specially to provoke a revolution? By whom? For whose benefit? Or was there a drug in the food and water at Timișoara to make people more aggressive? Who poisoned the water in Bucharest?. (MF 50)

He is able to ask these questions while the sane people are not able to criticize the happenings. What's more, they try to stop and silence him by interrupting him. The ordinary man is accused of being ignorant of the things progressing around themselves while both non-living and insane beings can observe all these thoroughly. Churchill displays all these clashes for the mind of the audience and the reader and she purposefully leaves them open-ended to push hard on them to think and make up their own solutions.

The playwright pays attention to the unchanging condition of the social defects, selfishness, racism, herd psychology and ignorance in the first and in the third episodes; and the nature of the revolutions and their physical and psychological effects on the citizens are focused through the text and on the stage so that everyone watching the play or reading the text could have their own judgments. The answers of the critical questions are not provided in the text or on the stage; this is a deliberate action of a Brechtian Epic play which desires to teach the audience and the reader to think and act for a better society. Awaken their lazy minds by pushing hard with questions is a meaningful feature of the Brechtian methods and obviously Churchill likes to conform to the methods and theories of the German playwright and theorist. Paving the way for critical and analytical thinking, instead of giving the answers, is what the Brecht tries to achieve, so does Churchill.

3.4.2 Brechtian Open-Endedness in *Red, Black and Ignorant*

Edward Bond in his play *Red, Black and Ignorant* implements questioning technique of Brechtian dramaturgy. He does not only show how the things work in the ordinary lives and how the people react on them, but he also questions them through his plays with open ends. He does not take sides in the happenings; namely he does not support someone or humiliate the other. He flashes lights on the happenings from the available perspectives and he guides the critical minds of the audience and the reader for them to ask the appropriate questions.

The previous part, Episodic Structure in *Red, Black and Ignorant*, shows that every episode is a play in itself in *Red, Black and Ignorant*; and they have their own sayings and ways of criticising. Every one of them just like the play as a whole, ends in questions either directly or indirectly. The reason behind this is that following Brecht, Bond does not prefer to give messages directly. Instead, he wants people process their minds and think; criticize and judge themselves. That's why, instead of saying something, *Red, Black and Ignorant* questions things by presenting possible aspects of the happenings. Bond in the play is not a lecturer who gives information on something; but he is more like a guide who leads the way for critical thinking. *Red, Black and Ignorant* asks several questions on the lives and deeds of the modern ordinary people. It does not end in classical conclusions which tie up loose ends; instead, it ends in questions without the answers being given.

The second episode, for example, questions the function of the education system. It directly asks what the students learn at school. The Monster is being spat at; the kid who spits at him does not apologize and what's more the teacher orders the Monster to take revenge. The schools and the teachers are expected to be teaching something about the decent life of the individuals. However, obviously, that's not the case for the modern age. This part focuses on this subject and expects the audience and the reader question the current education system so that it can be changed in the later phases. Questioning something is the first step of changing it for the best.

In the case of not being understood very well, the Monster guides the minds with his last words of the part: "I had not yet learned how to hate / That knowledge is gained in higher schools / So far I only knew the basis of hate and fear" (*RBI* 10). He calls attention to the fact that if the rulers or the ruled do not do anything to cure the wound – which is the low quality of the education system – it will get worse and higher grades of students will get lower and lower in the quality. The schools should have a welcoming, lovely environment where how to share, how to love and respect should be taught. The clash

between what the current system is and what it should be paves the way for the criticism of the education system; and teacher and student behaviours, which are crucial for the future of the generations. This part does not give answers, it is open-ended; namely, it poses questions waiting to be answered.

The third episode questions the way people do care about physical beauty far too much than the personal characteristics while flirting. The woman ignores the beauty inside the Monster; she is after his being a sex object. Monster's legs, chest and arms are the things that concern her, not his minds or his heart. This feeds the minds of the reader and the audience to think about the nature of the relationships and the way the couples consider each other. The episode does not judge her or humiliate her; it presents the way she treats him and leaves the judgment and verdict to the others watching or reading the play.

The fourth episode questions the way married people treat each other and how they behave hurtfully even for trivial issues. They abuse the other with words and physical harm is given. The monster and the wife have an argument about the location of a book of Monster's. After getting calmer; Monster confesses: "At every turn we break the oath we make when we're born to human reason / Even in hell to walk with decorum / With each little rage we tear pages from the dictionary" (*RBI* 15). He emphasizes the fact that the humankind does not miss any chance to hurt the others. Every little disagreement turns out to be big fights and ends at odds. Monster's fight with his wife symbolizes the fights of every couple and leads the audience and the reader think about the nature of the fights and their triviality, instead of answering them.

Episode six, as previously mentioned, posits questions on the competition in the professions and dehumanization of the people to get a job. Monster blames his son for not helping the woman who is in pain under the concrete beam with the words: "Someone is calling help / Why'd you stand with your hands at your sides?" (*RBI* 23). This is an actual question; the son does not help her because she is a threat to him on the way to get employed although she is in danger of getting crippled under the beam. The Monster cannot understand the way the son behaves. This direct question is to be answered or this situation is for all humanity who ignores the others who are calling for help. He asks whether his son could call himself a human being by not helping the other who is in need of help.

In the episodes seven and eight, Bond asks several questions about the wars and violence such as how human beings can kill each other and how they can still consider themselves as being human. As mentioned before, the Monster explains the nature of the wars with the following words:

When a soldier heaves a grenade what does he see: a body explode like a
bottle on a wall

When a soldier slits a belly what does he see: guts spill like clothes from a suitcase
When a soldier fires a bullet what does he see: blood spurt like water from a hosepipe
That is the soldier's reward for his skills: the pleasure of seeing the way he kills. (*RBI* 27-28)

This is a way of creating the war image in the minds of the audience and the reader, and as a result they are expected to question the bloody face of wars. Wars, as pictured above, are the actions of complete violence and abuse of power and the human. Inhumane activities are always the subjects of Bondian dramaturgy and in this part, he presents them to the audience and the reader to activate their minds to think and judge. By not giving the answers, Bond lets them have their own ones so he keeps them away from passivity and laziness, as Brecht suggests.

Bond, just like Brecht, does not want to give messages for the society; instead of trying to use them as the servants of his own ideologies, he wants to teach them questioning, criticising and finding solutions for the faulty parts of the society. As a result, he wishes to achieve to a better society whose hunger is for knowledge; not one where people are greedy for money, physical appearance or blood. Bond is a restless playwright who mostly serves for humanism and he cannot stand violence in any scale – international or domestic –. He desires to be helpful about preventing the violent actions. He both tries to help pressure the bloody face of the humanity and awaken all people by activating the potential socially-driven minds to shift the course of status quo.

Accordingly, his play *Red Black and Ignorant* asks the following questions; What is to be a human today? And What is to be a Monster?. He wants these to be defined and through the Monster's words, he pronounces his thoughts: "All that is needed is to define rightly what is to be human / If we define it wrongly we die / If we define it rightly we shall live" (*RBI* 38). He believes that all the misery that the human kind experiences could be prevented only through defining and learning the definition of being a human. Otherwise, people get more blackness in their hearts, more redness in their hands and more ignorance in their minds. Inhumane activities make people monsters and this leads to total corruption of the world through teaching the wrong definition to younger generations.

In this play, Bond wishes to get answers to his questions by the reader and the audience. He shows both humane and inhumane reactions to the events; and he asks questions accordingly and wants the reader and the audience see the difference and answer the questions righteously. He leaves the ends open both in the episodes and in *Red, Black and Ignorant* as a whole, for Brechtian Epic theatre's sake.

CHAPTER 4

NON-BRECHTIAN FEATURES IN *RED, BLACK AND IGNORANT*

In notes to his play, *The Bundle*, Bond explains his views on dramaturgy and the reflection of life in it as follows:

The stage does not go inside the mind as easily as novels and music can, but it can demonstrate social relationships between people more concretely than other arts. All theatre is political – Coward’s as well as Brecht’s – and theatre always emphasizes the social in art. The audience judges in the same complex way that it judges in ordinary life. But it is given this advantage: it may look at things it would normally run from in fear, turn from in embarrassment, prevent in anger, or pass by because they are hidden, either purposefully or innocently. So audiences respond with all the faculties of their consciousness to the things that determine their social and private lives. (xii-xiii)

According to Bond, theatre is the reflection of life; it is even more than a real life because it combines all the aspects of the consciousness of the people in two-hour stage performances. Therefore, theatre is a good device to awaken people against the happenings that they normally turn from, run from, prevent or pass by. The theatre should teach them not to ignore cruelty or discrepancies. That’s why, the theatre should appeal to the questioning mind of the audiences and the reader.

Hirst describes Bond and his theatre as follows: “Bond is essentially a revolutionary. He wants to change the world and he will employ the most effective theatrical media to do so” (25). Hirst argues that for the sake of change in the society, Bond uses any functional method. Bond may use his own revolutionary character design and audio-visual media, but his methods clash with characterization and audio-visuality of Brechtian *Verfremdungseffekt*.

Bond believes in the enlightening quality of the theatre so he writes and directs his plays according to his social aims. At this point, about the social intent and dramatic theory duality, Bond resembles Brecht very much. Both claim to be writing for social functionality and choose their theatrical methods for their specific purposes. It can be claimed that Bond is affected by Brecht both as a social critic and a dramatist. However, in his play *Red, Black and Ignorant*, Bond falls short in implementation of Brechtian characterization and audio-

visual aids although he makes successful use of episodic structure and open-endedness and some of Brechtian characterization aspects.

4.1 Non-Brechtian Characterization

One of the arguments of this thesis is that Edward Bond does not pay critical attention to Brechtian requirements while designing his characters in *Red, Black and Ignorant*. Brecht marks that the characters should avoid empathy so that it could get harder for the audience and the reader to identify themselves with the characters. Although he uses several methods in his play such as naming the characters generally, naming the main character as Monster, or using a newspaper baby on the stage to break the emotional bond between the characters and the ones watching or reading the play; by using a main character throughout the whole play, the reader or the audience feel closer to the character because how much he stays on the agenda and on the stage, that much is disclosed about him, his mental life or emotional life. His emotional depth is revealed throughout the whole play thanks to his being the main character, which is not preferable for *V-effekt* standards for characterization.

Brecht believes that the characters should keep the emotional distance between themselves and the audiences/the readers so that they can see the illusionary quality of what's going on the stage; so that they are not fascinated with the emotional depth of the characters. Brecht wants the reader and the audience can see the meanings behind emotional curtains. He explains this in his *Messingkauf Dialogues* through his philosopher with the following words: "The crux of matter is that true realism has to do more than just make reality recognisable in the theatre. One has to be able to see through it too. One has to be able to see the laws that decide how the processes of life develop. These laws can't be spotted by the camera. Nor can they be spotted if the audience only borrows its heart from one of the characters involved" (27). Brecht strictly states that theatre stages and texts are best ways to convey the pure meanings but there is only one condition which is that the audience and the reader has to be kept aloof from the empathic traits of the characters. Only if there happens personal identification between the characters and the audience/reader, Brechtian enlightenment and critical thinking are avoided. Therefore, the playwright, director and the actor should work in cooperation about this crucial point.

Bond himself argues that his plays present "situations not the characters" (in Hirst 43); however in *Red, Black and Ignorant*, he describes the main character thoroughly in addition to his descriptions of the situations. Throughout the whole play, there is a main

character who is the Monster, so throughout the whole play much detail is revealed about him; that's why the audience and the reader have the possibility of getting close to personality and individuality of the character. In the play, Bond lets the character evolve emotionally in the flow of the play and so the audience and the reader get the hints of the character features in addition to situational implications.

That he is spat at the school and he muses over that; that the woman cares about his physical beauty only and he cries over that; that his wife earns the money for home and he suffers under that; that his baby is taken from him and he is not paid enough in return and his emotions are disregarded by the buyer; that he pities the woman under the beam and saves her in a heroic way; and that he is murdered by his son, all these make him an in-depth character and breaks the walls of *V-Effekt*. The audience and the reader necessarily feel close to the Monster because too much detail about his emotional life, his sufferings, his misery and his unhappiness is revealed on the stage and in the text. Irving Wardle considers episodic structures as in the service of character alienation; his words on the claim is as follows: "It is a model of expressive brevity, each scene, no matter how powerfully charged, cut off as if by a guillotine as the actor steps out of character" (in Aston 56). Aston argues that episodic structure serves for character alienation and cuts off the bond between the character and audience/reader. The argument is acceptable to a significant extent; however, in *Red, Black and Ignorant*, character alienation is not fully achieved due to the existence of the main character although the play is structurally encoded in nine episodes which are strictly cut off from each other.

First, as told in the previous chapter the Monster, when he is a school boy, is spat at the school by an ignorant boy who is trying to woo a girl. After the incident, he Monster pities himself in the second episode with the following words:

I spent my life putting together the bits of a jigsaw
It was complete and I looked at the picture
But then a friend kicked at the table
The pieces of jigsaw flew into the air like startled pigeons and settled down
again
But the picture is different
A bullet has passed from side to side of my brain. (*RBI* 8)

Here the Monster talks about how he is shocked at the spitting incident and his emotional and mental life is destroyed by the boy. He mentions about how he tries hard to put himself together and how he is turned into a mess by others whenever he achieves something. After each destruction, he can never be the same person who stands optimistically. His life gets darker and darker every time. His moody speech and depressive airs lead the audience and

the reader into the same mood of emotions. Critical abilities are lost to some extent in emotional states which may create empathy and pity.

In the third episode, the Monster's physical beauty is what the woman cares about most. Therefore, the Monster is humiliated by her speech and he is not self-confident about his appearance owing to his professional wounds. While the woman talks about his outer appearance, he cries and leaves the stage. The following parts reveal the words of woman and the action of the Monster:

Woman: In bed I notice your warmth
The warmth in your legs is different from the warmth in your neck
The warmth in the back of your neck is different from the warmth in the front
As the Monster goes out he cries like a child. (RBI 12)

The woman is interested in his being as a sexual object and his masculinity; nevertheless, as obviously seen, the Monster does not want to be treated as such and leaves the stage in tears. This outburst of sadness is what an audience and a reader may pity and leave his or her judgmental processes aside. It is mostly true that people cannot help pitying a person who is crying, which means the main character's cries on the stage or in the text does not overlap what Brecht expects from the playwrights or the stage directors.

In the fourth episode which is named as *Eating*, the Monster is degraded by his wife. She is the one who earns the money and a living for the family, and she pronounces this fact to upset the Monster. The Monster is unable to work because of his professional wounds. Namely, he is disabled to work and this is handled by his wife. She emphasizes this fact in the fourth episode with the following words:

I suppose now I cooked your meal you expect me to scrape it off the plate for
you into the pedal bin
You can afford your luxuries because I struggle to pay for the necessities
Buy books if you must read
But it is not fair to waste good food I struggled to buy. *(RBI 14)*

The Monster is not a person who willingly stops working and earning money; owing to a professional accident, he has to stop working. Therefore, it is unfair of his wife to remind him the accident and his disability. This humiliation makes the audience and the reader sympathize with him and according to Brecht when the emotions are involved; the judgmental abilities are suspended for a while. As a result, the meaning of the episode is not conveyed or thought thoroughly.

In the *Selling* episode, the Monster is shown as a person whose baby is taken from him against his will, and at a low price which is against his will too. Not only his baby is taken apart from him, but also he is paid less than he expected or wished. In a society, the motherhood and the fatherhood are two of the holiest roles and they are mostly respected if

they are performed deservedly. Here the Monster and his wife are the victims of the State's unreasonable actions and policies; therefore, the Monster deserves to be relented. As a result, the critical abilities of the reader and the audience are casted out and emotional involvement is processed. Stage directions reveal that after the buyer is gone with the baby, the Monster "turns aside gently and hugs his arms and chest as if they still smarted from the fire" (*RBI* 20). The grief of losing a child is resembled to be smarted from fire and the Monster hugs his own arms as if there is still the baby. Nevertheless, the baby is gone, and the audience and the reader find themselves pitying the poor father.

In the episode six, the son denies helping a woman who is stuck under the concrete beam while the Monster finds his son's refusal of help monstrous. Upon this, the Monster pushes his son aside and he "goes to the bench. He lifts over his head and poses in triumph. His son and the woman look up at him. A heroic snapshot" (*RBI* 25). Here the Monster is presented as a hero and heroes are easy to identify with characters in a play or literary work because deep down many people would like to be courageous and heroic many times. Now that the Monster achieves to be one in this episode, the reader and the audience are meant to be allowed to identify themselves with the Monster.

The woman's words upon this incident are worth to be presented at this point, which are: "I look at the face of the one who helped me / Without thinking we smile at each other / He turns to look at his son and as he smiles his brow creases into a frown" (*RBI* 25). Just like the woman's and the Monster's facial expressions, the audience and the reader smile at the attitude of the Monster and frown at the son's, which means that emotions are not blocked in this happening. Just the opposite, critical abilities are casted out of the way.

Last but not least, funerals are among the saddest aspects of the human life. When a person goes to a funeral even to one which he has no bounds with, the person may get upset and may cry. The murders are even worse than natural cause deaths. Innocent victims of murder scenes are the pitied parts of the crime scenes. In the play, both a funeral and a murder scene presented on the stage and in the text. Monster is slaughtered by his own son. He is the victim of this scene. Monster's being murdered by his own son creates the emotional pressure on the audience and the reader. Killed by his own son conveys such a serious emotional state that even the ones who have nothing to do with parenthood would be carried away from critical thinking. Bond does not avoid presenting such a moody experience on the stage and this means that at this point he clashes with Brechtian theories and methods.

Although he sticks to the Brechtian characterization in some other aspects like naming the main character as Monster, using general names for the characters, using a

newspaper baby, and using an unborn kid to present the human life, Bond does not meet all the standards of character design of Brechtian *V-effekt* by using a main character throughout the play. This kind of a characterization reveals too much about the main character on the stage or in the text; therefore, emotional connection is more easily set up. His name's being Monster, or his being not born at all and his life's being an imaginary one alienate the audience and the reader to some extent but in any case they may not refrain from pitying his murder or humiliation, or his unhappiness. The audience and the reader learn too much about the Monster who is allowed to disclose himself on the stage, and they inevitably put their emotional mechanisms into action and keep their critical and judgmental abilities away from processing the incidents.

4.2 Lack of Audio-Visual Aids

In terms of non-Brechtian elements in *Red, Black and Ignorant* by Edward Bond, the lack of audio-visual aids could be presented in addition to its non-Brechtian characterization. Although Bond makes use of several other Brechtian methods for Epic theatre, he does not pay much attention to the audio-visuals in this play. The strongest manifestation of this claim is the existence of only one song; there are not any other pieces of music or dance or songs; also there are not any title presentations or placards.

When compared to the other methods of Brechtian theory – episodic structure and open-endedness – audio visual aids are less in quantity in *Red, Black and Ignorant* by Bond. This makes *Red, Black and Ignorant* by Edward Bond less Brechtian than *Mad Forest* by Caryl Churchill or many other Epic plays in terms of audio-visual aids. Bond has a very different attitude than Brecht about the use of the music. Here is a Bond's poem which explains his views on the integration of music and songs in the plays:

On music
Music cannot ask questions
It can startle
That is as good as a question

Music cannot give answers
It can persuade
That is as good as the truth
Music is very dangerous

(We are afraid to believe anything
Scepticism is polite
Conviction leads to argument
Truth loses something if told)

At Auschwitz they hanged men to waltzes
In Chile they broke a musician's hands
With the same irony the church
One took away heretic's tongues

So there must be a new music
A music you can't hang men to
A music that stops you breaking musician's hands. (Bond, Songs 78)

Brechtian songs and music are more alienating and they're played to break the illusion of the play on the audience and the reader to break the emotional flow while Bondian music and songs are there to serve for contextual integrity and harmony. Bored and tired of musician's suffering and speech bans, Bond prefers to write songs that do not clash with the other people's benefits directly; instead he achieves this clash indirectly. In his songs, he uses irony and this leads to questioning. The Army Song of the *Red, Black and Ignorant* is an example for this argument. As a result, his songs and music serve for the same reason as the Brechtian ones but Bond and Brecht does not use the same method in their use of music and songs.

As told above, the only audio - visuality is the song in the seventh episode. This song which the son sings is about the dehumanization of the people through military activities. The song is as follows:

I am the army
My legs are made of tanks
My arms are made of guns
My trunk is made of nukes
My head is made of bombs
I am the army

I am the army
My breath is toxic gas
My eyes are radar beams
My pulse is ticker-tape
When I speak a siren screams
I am the army. (*RBI* 27)

This song emphasizes how the people act inhumanely under the military oath. They consider themselves as the robots which are programmed just for killing even without any objective. Soldiers' body parts resemble to the relative killing machines; legs to tanks, arms to guns, trunk to nukes, or heads to bombs. Modern war equipment is imposed on to the minds of the soldiers as if they are integrated to their body.

The song goes on with the psychology of being a soldier and a part of the army. Through this part of the song the soldiers are forced to feel that they are the gods and they should be worshipped. The rest of the song is as follows:

I am the army
My feet are on the earth
My hand is on the moon
My head is out in the space
Don't whine to me in fear
Don't plead for the human race
Don't show me children huddled in dread
I am the army
I shit on the earth from the stratosphere
And wipe my arse on the lists of the dead
Bow down and worship me. (*RBI 28*)

Through this song, the soldiers are fired up to kill people who rebel against them and the state. They are taught that the people should obey them and they even do not have the right to beg for their lives. This one and only song is crucial for the discourse of the play which is about the misery of the human race and what is to come if they do not change the course of events. However, this single song which is there for contextual harmony does not change the fact that Bond did not make much use of arts and aids that contribute to Brechtian methods of Epic Theatre. This one and only song does not make it a Brechtian epic play in terms of audio-visuality.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The functionality of the drama or the aesthetics of it has gone through a lot of changes since the first plays of the British drama history. Till the twentieth century, Aristotle's *Poetics* was the major influence on most of the British plays. However, twentieth century observed many shifts both on the lives of playwrights and their dramaturgies. In the century, Bertolt Brecht was the one who guided the modern British dramatists with his original theory of *Verfremdungseffekt*; and many playwrights were affected by his dramaturgy such as Caryl Churchill and Edward Bond who share the same artistic intent which is to serve for social transformation. To study those two playwrights together is not an arbitrary choice; the way they are concerned with the social mechanisms and their technique about solving the problems of those mechanisms resemble each other; in other words, both their philosophy of artistic work and their dramatic technique are almost the same as each other's.

Churchill and Bond are against the idea that the audience and the reader are the passive observers of the happenings in the plays who go through emotional cleansing by the plot, climax and character identification of the dramatic works. Instead, they prefer critically actuated and alerted minds which have the potential to fix the problems related to the current mechanisms in their lives. In this respect, they implement the *V-effekt* techniques to achieve their aims of leading the audience and the readers into objective criticism, and personal and social solutions.

With regard to their social intents of artistic works, Churchill in her play *Mad Forest* and Bond in his play *Red, Black and Ignorant* shed light on several aspects of social defects which they hope to be realized by the audience and the reader, and to activate them to come up with reasonable and permanent solutions. At the first ring of the chain, there lays the mission of making them aware of the problematic aspects of the society they live in, and think about the dynamics of them. Hence, in contrast to the conventional missions of the playwrights and audience/reader roles in the processes of drama, they apply the

elements of *Verfremdungseffekt* which is the tool for the playwrights to handle their social concerns and goals about their dramaturgies.

At the very heart of *Verfremdungseffekt* there is the unrealistic presentation of realistic content because Brecht suggests that only when familiar topics and problems are presented in an unfamiliar way and without the blockage of the emotions, the awareness and realization could be achieved by the society. This theory affects every detail – plot structure, characterization, audio visuals and etc – in a play, and so that it can succeed fully, it makes use of several techniques such as non-human casting and montage scene.

In *Mad Forest*, Caryl Churchill makes use of many of the methods and techniques of this drama theory to present the tumultuous environment of 1989 Romanian revolution. In order to draw attention to the specific topics of the disorder times of the revolution, she pays critical attention to the design of her play. Firstly, with the aim of avoiding emotional moments, and breaking the illusion and flow of the performance and the text, she sticks to episodic structure technique with her three self-contained episodes which are closed at the moments of extreme feelings like joy, tension or anger. Secondly, following Brechtian characterization, she makes use of the techniques such as surreal casting, non-idealization of the lovers, socially named characters like painter, doctor, boy, and girl, and non-detailed characters. These techniques serve for keeping the characters away from the reader and the audience so that they cannot empathize with the characters and cannot get emotionally blocked. Thirdly, Churchill integrates sister arts such as dance, singing, music into her play with the aim of breaking the emotional flow of the ongoing events and topics. This helps her break into the moments of high emotionality and tension so that they cannot hinder the critical processes of the minds of the audience and the reader. Finally, the playwright applies Brechtian open-endedness technique to make the audiences and the readers think on the presented topics and problems so that they can come up with their own solutions without any intervention.

Red, Black and Ignorant by Edward Bond, likely, includes Brechtian dramaturgy elements in order to lay bare the deficiencies of the current social mechanisms through the life of a miscarried unborn individual. The baby lives through an imaginary life in the play. The topics and problems are likely to be encountered by any individual in life; nevertheless the presentation through an unborn kid makes the familiar topics seem unfamiliar to the minds. Firstly, Bond implements montage scene to cut the continuity and familiarity of the performance or the text. Through nine self-contained episodes, the reader and the audience are presented with several fundamental topics and they are allowed to have a pause and think about the moral aspects of the topics with the closures at the Monster's ethical

comments. Secondly, through open-endedness technique, the playwright achieves to present the critical subjects, and let the audience and the reader think about those subjects and find solutions for them on their own. Here is one of the fundamental objectives of the Brechtian discourse which is to guide the minds on the way to critical thinking and objective judgment. Brechtian open-endedness technique is one of the best tools for this aim. Thirdly, Bond makes use of Brechtian characterization in the play, if not in all aspects of it, to present the familiarity in an unfamiliar way. For example, the main character's name is Monster and he lives through an imaginary life, which is revealed at the beginning of the play. He uses social names for the characters such as boy, wife, son, girl etc in order to focus on the sociality of the instead of their personalities, and in order to avoid identification.

However, unlike Churchill, he does not apply any audio-visual content in the service of Brechtian *Verfremdungseffekt*. Namely, to break the flow of the events and emotions, he does not include any audio-visual element such as dance or music in his play. Another aspect which differs Bond from Churchill and Brecht, the inclusion of empathic character traits of the main character can be presented. The use of the main character which paves the way for too much revelation about the characteristics of the main character is a violation of Brechtian suggestions which aim to break the emotional bond between the characters and audience / reader. In brief, it could be claimed that *Mad Forest* by Caryl Churchill and *Red, Black and Ignorant* by Edward Bond include elements of Brechtian discourse and his *Verfremdungseffekt*; such as characterization, episodic structure and open-endedness; however, the lack of audio-visuality and inclusion of non-Brechtian empathic character traits in *Red, Black and Ignorant* draws the play away from Brechtian dramaturgy.

All in all, this study helps the author and the readers learn about Brechtian dramaturgy theory and its reflections in British practices thoroughly. Showing the alterability aspect of the events, people and behaviours is the functional base of the Brechtian Epic Theatre theory and methods. Likewise, this study wants to present how this aspect could be implemented not only in the plays of Edward Bond and Caryl Churchill, but also in the lives of the people. In other words, the implementations of Brecht's theory in those two British playwrights shed light on the alterability of the society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources

Churchill, C. Mad Forest. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1996.

Bond, E. Plays: 6. London: Eyre Methuen, 1998.

II. Secondary Sources

Abrams, M. H. A Glossary of Literary Terms. Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Pub., 1999.

Aston, E. Caryl Churchill. Glasgow: Northcote House, 2001.

Bond, E. "On Brecht: A Letter to Peter Holland." Theatre Quarterly 30 (1978): 34-35.

----- "Drama and the Dialectics of Violence." Theatre Quarterly 2 (1972): 4-14.

----- "Something of Myself." Ed. David Davis. Edward Bond and the Dramatic Child: Edward Bond's Plays for Young People. London: Trentham Books, 2005.

----- Theatre Poems and Songs. London: Eyre Methuen, 1980.

----- The Bundle. London: Eyre Methuen, 1978.

----- The Worlds. London: Eyre Methuen, 1980.

Brecht, B. "A Short Organum for Theatre." John Willet. Brecht On Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic. London: Eyre Methuen Ltd., 1964: 179-205

----- Messingkauf Dialogues. London: Eyre Methuen, 1965.

Cave, R. A. New British Drama on the London Stage. New York: St Martin's Press Inc., 1988.

Chiari, J. Landmarks of Contemporary Drama. New York: Gordian Press, 1971.

- Churchill, C. "Not Ordinary, Not Safe". The Twentieth Century 168 (1960): 443-451
----- . Serious Money. London: Eyre Methuen, 2002.
- Coult T. The Plays of Edward Bond. London: Eyre Methuen, 1979.
- Davis, D. Edward Bond and the Dramatic Child: Edward Bond's Plays for Young People.
London: Trentham Books, 2005.
- Dukore, B. F, ed. Dramatic Theory and Criticism: Greeks to Gratowski. New York: Holt,
Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.
- Goetschius, G. "The royal Court in its Social Context." English Stage Company. Ten Years
at the Royal Court 1956/66, 1966.
- Gray, F. "Mirrors of Utopia. Caryl Churchill and Joint Stock." Ed. James Acheson. British
and Irish Drama since 1960. London: St. Martin Press, 1993: 47- 59.
- Hirst, D. L. Macmillan Modern Dramatists: Edward Bond. London: Macmillan, 1985.
- Holland, P. "Brecht, Bond, Gaskill and the Practice of Political Theatre." Theatre Quarterly
8 (1978): 24-34.
- Innes, C. Modern British Drama: 1890-1990. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press,
1992.
- Lauer, R. A. "Martin Esslin. Bertolt Brecht: A Choice of Evils. London: Methuen, 1984."
Bertolt Brecht and Epic Theater - A. Robert Lauer's Notes for Span 4184. 29 Oct.
2003. <http://faculty-staff.ou.edu/L/A-Robert.R.Lauer-1/Brecht.html>
- Kritzer, A. H. The Plays of Caryl Churchill. New York: Palgrave, 1991.
- . "Caryl Churchill." British Playwrights 1956-1995: A Research and Production
Sourcebook. Ed. William W. Demastes. Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 1996.
- Naismith, B. Introduction: Top Girls. London: Eyre Methuen, 2005.
- Reinelt, J. After Brecht: British Epic Theatre. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
1996.

Subiotto, A. "Epic Theatre: A Theatre for the Scientific Age." Critical Essays on Bertolt Brecht. Ed. Siegfried Mews. Boston: G.K.Hall & Co., 1989. (197-209).

Thomson, P. & Sacks, G. The Cambridge Companion to Brecht. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Thurman, J. "The Playwright Who Makes You Laugh About Orgasm, Racism, Struggle, Homophobia Woman-Hating, the British Empire, and the Irrepressible Strangeness of the Human Heart." Ms. (May 1982): 53-7.

Tycer, A. Caryl Churchill's Top Girls. London: Continuum, 2008.

Willett, J. Brecht in Context Comparative Approaches. London: Eyre Methuen Ltd., 1998.

----- The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht: A study from eight aspects. London: Eyre Methuen, 1977.

----- Brecht On Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic. London: Eyre Methuen, 1964.

Wright, E. Postmodern Brecht: A Representation. London: Routhledge, 1989.

----- Postmodern Brecht. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi, 1998.

APPENDICES

A. TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı : YÖNKUL

Adı : Ayşe

Bölümü : İngiliz Edebiyatı

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : A BRECHTIAN ANALYSIS OF CARYL CHURCHILL'S *MAD FOREST* AND EDWARD BOND'S *RED, BLACK AND IGNORANT*

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans

Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın.

2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)

3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)

Yazarın imzası

Tarih