

Scientific Elements for Theater Research

למרטין אשתי
זיכרון אחרון
משותפות בחיים
ובתיאטרון

1. Background

When attempting to position art, in dealing with the philosophy of art in relation to religion and science, it is necessary first to position man. What is his level of complexity or non-complexity? Let us say, as in a mathematical equation, that collective theater equals man. What is the "collective" within man? Man is unable to walk, behave, grow or think if his systems do not work in complete and continuous cooperation with one another with an overall coordination of every part of his being between individual organic impulses and the larger system of information. The cybernetic system – in which individuals move, is the cyborg. Our bodies are an integration of parts and without this integration, man ceases to function. Simply stated the heart works for the whole body pumping blood to every extremity, to every minute cell in our bodies. The brain thinks for the whole body. The skeletal, muscular and nervous systems strive towards the ideal of the smooth functioning of the whole. This harmonic order enables inter-active relations between systems within a correct and healthy flow, without which man grows ill and dies. Relating to people as cyborgs emphasizes the relation between every part of the system, every individual and every organ, and the larger whole.

Man, or this collective, may be defined in diverse ways: as a brain efficiently operating other systems, as a nervous system or heart or an endless number of parts. But, in principle, we can make use of an internal triangle that simplifies our acts of definition

Key words: art ,religion, science (adam)

and allows both spiritual and physical meaning at the same time. Man is brain, heart and body; thought, love and the need to rule. In this direction, there are three central parts and they teach us, first of all, the place of theater in this cybernetic system of man.

The brain is intended for the activity of thought, the heart for matters of feeling and the need for action. From another viewpoint, the brain represents science or philosophy, the heart represents religion and morality and the will is the element that both propels towards and is propelled to creativity. Art is thus on a parallel with the active sides of man, to action and implementation. When we look at theater, we should see it as a body incorporating all the other arts for in the theater we can find music, dance, sculpture, drawing, architecture, poetry and even cinema and television.

We all know of the competition between theater and the arts of cinema and television and can almost hear their champions say: "Cinema is of course the art that encompasses all arts, for everything can be captured on film, including theater." In taking its stand against cinema, theater must attain a very fine perception above and beyond the straightforward question of whether a film can be screened as part of theater or, when cinema films theater is it already not theater but filmed theater? The real perception is actually made in the human area, in the human touch that exists between actor and audience. In principle, as creative people, we need to place the strongest accent on this special relationship that develops with the audience, in the close contact between one human and another. This is the basis of theater, this cybernetic feedback loop between living creatures on stage and living creatures in the audience. Information passes back and forth in a relatively closed loop. Therefore, theater includes all those arts that have special human contact, and it is uniquely cybernetic when it interactively participates in the feedback loop of theater, with actors "programmed" by a script, and within the structured technical (even robotic) space of a theater. We thus see that players and audience are already cyborgs, and that all theaters have always been cyborg theaters.

We all know, however, that there is theater in which, for example, stage setting exists. Not all theater has stage settings and it is not essential, but lighting is essential even if

only sunlight. Does stage setting require the human touch? Perhaps one day it will be produced by machines and sophisticated robots, without any human touch. And is not stage setting, in essence, the art of painting? And is not the same true for television and cinema? The screening of television movies on the theater stage is an accepted event nowadays. And here we need to ask: is there any art at all that is unable to exist in theater? For we have agreed that theater includes all arts, whether they include the human touch or not.

In discussing the relationship between science and art, a complex question arises. If it is indeed true that theater has the ability to encompass all the other arts and carry them out in subordination, could we not find psychology, history, geography and all the social sciences in theater? It is possible to take this thought even further and say that social scientists could take part in the erection of their well-made structures, each in his own field, and could find professional producers and playwrights who would know how to integrate scientific and theatrical material into a creative, practical system. This is part of our premise in wanting to design and test a cyborg Theater.

2. Drama in the use of the Natural Sciences

Within the framework of the Faculty for the Teaching of Science and Technology at the Technion during the years 1989-1992, a class researched the 'Improvement of Teaching Methods through Drama', an interesting attempt to teach different areas of science with tools derived from the dramatic arts. Here, of course, we are talking about a phase beyond the development of the teacher's dramatic personality. Many educators around the world, not only in the field of science, accept the vital connection between teaching and drama as a valid and contribution to the development of the teacher's dramatic personality. A wide-spread and well-developed literature has been devoted to the subject. Here we refer to a later phase in which school students, in order to understand the subject matter being taught, will be able to grasp the tools of identification, role

playing and the study of characters in a different way. The difference arises from the aim to perfect knowledge in different areas, except that in a particular case the characters might be molecules or viruses and nerve cells. In this case we are talking about cooperation between the inexact theatrical tool, and the exact, scientific laws and axioms. The uniqueness of this research lies in the idea of including other internal organs, over and above the brain in the learning process. When man moves in space, he uses his body. When he penetrates objects with his thoughts, he uses his feelings of identity and observes them from within. In this way, the student cooperates fully with his teachers and brings his personality, his emotions and feelings into the learning process. This research at the Technion assumes that such involvement will increase the student's ability to absorb theoretical material.

It is not only at the Technion that we find cooperation between science and art. The Italian producer, Eugenio Barba, who achieved fame in Denmark and enjoyed the support of the Danish government, established a school called ISTA, The International School of Theater Anthropology. This school includes biologists, psychologists, psycholinguists, specialists in semiotics, in the history and anthropology of the theater and of course theater professionals from different cultures and traditions from around the world¹. The Polish producer, Jerzy Grotovski says in his article, 'Pragmatic Laws': "Barba has formulated three essential principles in the field of work we call performer's techniques and their rules are: (a) Physical Balance, (b) The principle of conflicting directions of impulses in movement and (c) the process of action brought to its extremes by the presenter which can be implemented and tested from a viewpoint of energy in space or from the viewpoint of energy in time."² In his article, 'Meyerhold: The Grotesque: That Is Biomechanics', Eugenio Barba cites Meyerhold's words from 1922: 'If we observe a skilled worker in action, we notice the following in his movements: (1)

-
1. Eugenio Barba and Nicola Savarese: *The Secret Art of the Performer: A Dictionary of Theater Anthropology* . London and New York: Routledge, 1991.
 2. Barba and Savarese, 236.

an absence of superfluous unproductive movement; (2) rhythm; (3) the correct positioning of the body's center of gravity (4) stability... The fundamental deficiency of the modern actor is his absolute ignorance of the laws of biomechanics.'³

3. Theater as a natural, not only artificial tool

Avraham Shalev, a bio-technologist from the Weizman Institute, in his article entitled 'Purim all Year', presents another interesting point: "The essence of disguise and masquerade in nature is not always clear,' he writes, 'but on the whole it is efficient and successful and has been in existence for as long as evolution."⁴ In this article he strengthens the assumption that the disguise of self and masquerading as natural theatrical tools are not passing things in the life of nature, but are, in fact, inseparable from nature's very being.

Man, in spite of his being a cultured animal, is also an artificial one in many ways, a cyborg linked to a natural vast machine. As an inseparable part of nature, man can grasp these natural tools: "Masquerading is not a new human invention and is not necessarily linked to Purim. It is an ancient phenomenon and well-rooted in nature."⁵ The writer accepts the fact that identification, mimicry and entry into the world of impersonation creates a situation of adopting its characteristics and making use of them. For example, the idea of utilizing the advantages of another animal by imitating its shape, colors, smell, voice or behavior was adopted and used as a natural choice. This phenomenon, called masquerading or mimicry, was well-researched by the end of the last century and still holds our interest in the present time.

3. Ibid 156. Also see Jean-Marie Pradier: "Eléments d'une physiologie de la séduction", in "L'oeil, L'oreille, "Le cerveau". Paris (1989).

4. Avraham Shalev: "Purim all Year" in *Ha'aretz* 9/3/1990.

5. Shalev, "Purim all Year".

Creatures survive in nature through mimicry and identification, but for different reasons. "The phenomenon of impersonation is common in both the animal and plant kingdoms. Even viruses are capable of a type of impersonation by adopting the protein-like coating of the host cell or of another virus. This action enables the virus to evade identification by the immune system of the host and/or to more quickly penetrate the cells it has targeted for attack. The definition of the phenomenon of impersonation, differs from chance resemblance in that it stresses the benefits that the impersonator gains by masquerading: the linkage of the impersonator and the impersonated to the same geographical area, to the same predators or to the same sources of existence".⁶ Neither is the phenomenon of impersonation limited to the sense of sight as it may include misrepresentation of any or of all the senses. Shalev describes instances of masquerading in nature that have developed into character. The wild Ophry's flower, for example, has adopted a 'costume' that attracts the male bee. The aroma of the Ophry's secretions resemble those of the sex hormones of the queen bee. The male bee, whose sole purpose is the impregnation of the queen bee, sees her hindparts in front of him when he sees this flower. The temptation is tremendous and the male bee prepares to carry out his holy task. He settles on the phantom queen, sensing her velvety touch and her characteristic motion that bear an incredible resemblance to the movements of the highly desirable queen bee. This is exploitation of another kind, for the impersonator needs a dupe for its impregnation. In another instance, the butterfly's need for masquerading is so ingrained that one finds cross-masquerading between different types, virtually signaling = "masquerade in my image and I'll masquerade in yours". Double and even triple masquerades apparently increase the female's chances of survival for the male, by maintaining his original colors, highlights his female partner's costume. In this case, masquerading is a tool of survival. Shalev also describes mammal, reptile, fish, bird and plant examples. The eel, which is a fish, gains from its resemblance to a dangerous water snake and the Indian cuckoo does a marvelous impersonation of the

6. Shalev, "Purim all Year".

threatening hawk. In these cases, impersonation serves as a tool of aggression and intimidation.

Researchers have found that impersonation and masquerading are vital tools in nature and we can take the next step forward: to better understand material, we should grasp the tools that nature has given us. In other words, it is not sufficient to study the laws of nature, it is preferable to actually experience them ourselves, with our bodies and our spiritual elements. As early as the time of Aristotle, learning was achieved by mimicry, but mimicry is only a stage after which follows experiencing on and within ourselves. In short, the use of masquerade, mimicry and impersonation for study purposes has existed for a long time.

4. According to Aristotle, the enjoyment of mimicry is an instinctive impulse that also exists in nature.

In another article, Menahem Brinker writes: 'that in contrast to Plato, who sees beauty in the first approach of the idea of beautiful, and as such as a type of entry point into the cognitive experience (or a spiritual one, according to another meaning) of the perfection of the world, Aristotle acknowledges the autonomy of the beautiful'.⁷ Aristotle has another two points to teach that have already been mentioned: beauty from our point of view, as a tool and independent component in the theatrical system and pleasure as an instinctive component, arising from the beautiful in harmonic form and from the beautiful in mimicry (mainly in the theater). "He speaks of two impulses existing in man, the impulse to find pleasure in harmonic forms and the impulse to enjoy the perfect impersonation as original and independent impulses". The point about masquerading that is particularly pertinent to our purpose is the relative statement between these two impulses and between the impulse for growth, for it is here in fact that the eternalness of

7. Menahem Brinker. "A History of Beauty in the West". *Thoughts* 59 (1990): 8-12 IBM, Israel.

theatrical impulse and the inner need for its existence lies".⁸ These two impulses are as instinctive as the need to grow, to move, to develop and in their joining, are the source of all the beautiful arts. And it is here that matters come to a common point. At the beginning of the article we spoke of man as a complete entity, in whom all roles, all arts, all sciences and religions lie. Here Aristotle teaches us, via Brinker's prism, that the impulses to find pleasure from harmony and from perfect impersonation are eternal impulses like growth and in their union is the source of all the beautiful arts. Therefore, when we say that theater is man, we have gone no further than Aristotle. Such theater embraces all the arts and sciences within it. 'However, in Aristotle's opinion, satisfaction from the harmonic form or from successful impersonation exists in science no less than in art,' says Brinker. As such, tragedy is also beautiful when it causes the awakening of the fear and compassion that lead to catharsis. And the horse is beautiful when it is powerful. Every beautiful thing is beautiful within its own kind and the impression it makes is made with the intellectual action of comparison and judgment in regard to the beautiful and its results. According to Aristotle, the connection is made between the aesthetic and the cognitive experience.⁹

In this article, Brinker presents a summary of the ideas of diverse philosophers, including Baumgarten, a student of the Leibnitz school of thought. He sees in the beautiful arts (in the 18th Century) an instrument to improve the consciousness of truth. His purpose is to perfect the concept of the senses and teach man to see and hear in minutest detail. By attaining such perfection, man can place a greater number of problems before the logical-mathematical methodology of the consciousness of the world and so be aware of the different ways that objects (the subjects of the concept) combine within the oneness, the order and the harmony of the world. The sensually beautiful according to Baumgarten, is no more than a symbol of logical-mathematical relations, and this is the source of its pleasure when under observation. Wolf, who

8. Ouriel Zohar: "The Theatre is a Living Being". *Studio 20* (1991): 28-29.

9. Brinker, 9.

studied directly under Leibnitz, said that the pleasure in listening to music arises from the pleasure of subconsciously carrying out arithmetic calculations of multiplication, addition, subtraction and division. A mathematical understanding of the world triggers higher capabilities than those utilized to listen to music and music's value lies in that it prepares and stimulates us to deal with the mathematical understanding of the world. The sensual aspect of the true, non-mathematical musical note does not exist at all. Baumgarten and Wolf loved art but did not acknowledge it in the way that modern awareness acknowledges it. They were propelled to enjoyment from harmony, in its configured structure, that includes maximum unity and multiplicity at one and the same time, and from these forms the cosmos is represented in the subconscious.

In the first third of the 19th century, says Brinker, when romantic ideas were prominent in society, the creation of art appeared to be an independent source of achieving wisdom as compared to substance. What the brain is unable to understand in its faithfulness to the fragmenting of reality into components (thus distorting it) is achieved through the artist's intuition. We arrive at unity in nature, the character of man, situations and views, not with the aid of scientific-analytical investigation, but via artistic imagination, empathy and emotion. This is the background to the lines of John Keats: "Truth is beauty, beauty truth" that upsets the whole rational tradition of western culture and raises the artist not only above the common man, but also above the scientist and the philosopher.¹⁰

Today we understand art, in no small way thanks to romanticism. The creation of art is an organic whole. Its function is an expression and not merely an imitation. The concept of style in art is a result of traditions and of creative diversions from these traditions. Above all, the originality of the artist is a virtue demanded of his creative work. All of these concepts are the contributions of romanticism to our thought on the beautiful and on art.

10. John Keats. "Ode on a Grecian Urn." In Oscar Williams ed. *Immortal Poems of the English Language*. (New York: Pocket Books, 1952) 326.

5. Collective Theater

Collective theater cannot be one-sided as it incorporates both the rational and the irrational. It might appear one-sided if left to the inherent extremes of its polarity. But from the moment that it includes both a contradiction and its complete antithesis, it brings all philosophical concepts closer together. In this way we certainly gain proximity to the unified, romantic concept of beautiful, intuitive art that carries within it a truth that is unattainable by scientists or philosophers, according to Brinker. But modern collective theater cannot live by romantic ideas alone. Students of the Leibnitz school of thought claimed the opposite; art perfects the brain and intelligence in favor of a creativity that contains unity and multiplicity at the same time in order to understand the cosmos. Hegel took this idea even further, for in his eyes a philosophical system (his own, of course) that incorporates all the right principles for the understanding of arts and science, has nothing more to teach man. Like many of his other prophecies, his prophecy of the death of art did not realize itself. Here again we encounter the eternal conflict between science and art that has found expression over hundreds of years. This struggle led to the victory of science, which rebuked art, although it was often religion that rebuked both its two predecessors. The struggle between art, religion and science is a reflection of the awful struggles that raged and continue to rage within man himself. Science, from Leibnitz's viewpoint, ignored the sensual, creative qualities of art, which may well mean the ignoring of the very existence of art in this context. On the other hand, the statement of romanticism that the artist is bearer of truth and that in his intuition is above and beyond scientific and philosophical knowledge is also a disregard of the central course of science. Collective theater needs to make order out of this confusion. To organize things correctly does not mean the destruction of drama for here the danger may indeed lie in the never-ending search for an all-inclusive, solution, the subordination of the one art that is man.

Art is creative activity and the impulse to action. If we were to tie man to the symbol of the heart, to its inner feelings of warmth and love, we find that the whole essence of religion is found in the heart of man. Science seeks its own ways to research, analyze, clarify and enlighten processes that take place in nature and in the universe between human beings. We must go back and say that in nature, as in man, these three elements live together and make for a complete unity. Here a contradiction is formed because we are referring to two kinds of man: one who is trapped in a constant inner struggle between the three elements and the ideal one, for whom we seek for collective theater and who attempts to create the harmonic unity of the three elements.

Today too, we find that different activities are taking place in man as a result of these three elements. The brain evaluates and analyzes. At times the heart does not give its approval, sometimes liking, sometimes disliking the brain's decisions. Conflict exists between the brain and the heart, but we can see that the will cannot be carried out unless there is some form of consensus between the brain and the heart. As soon as there is conflict between the two, a problem arises and the will is unable to operate.

6. The Stanislavski Method

Theater does not work without the eternal struggle taking place between two or three of the elements or sub-elements that we have mentioned. No play has gone on stage that does not include a struggle of one type or another. The heart feels something, the brain denies it and then the will and the body lose direction. Whoever tries to live according to his heart must bear the criticism of his brain and enters a difficult phase that might even lead to suicide. Conflict is a major element in drama. Konstantin Stanislavski, the Russian director, built his system on the work of the actor, upon himself, according to this threefold concept.¹¹ Man is in effect a collective of three components that have to

11. Konstantin Stanislavski: *Actors prepare and build a character*. London: Methuen, 1980.

function in coordination, otherwise the actor will not be able to play the role he has taken upon himself. His body will not move and the material running around in his brain will not arrive in a sufficiently precise form for his body to know how to act properly. He has to pass through his personal prism as knowledge cannot be based on the mind and on analysis alone. Stanislavski, as a producer and thinker who had great influence particularly over western theater, (Meyerhold is his direct pupil and his biomechanical theater is a continuation of a certain line of his system) wrote: "Mind means intellect, will and feeling in a reciprocal relationship". When his students had completed two years of work he would say to them: "Everything you have learned in two years lies confused in your minds. It will not be easy to gather it all one by one and to fit all the elements analyzed and released with our emotions. Therefore, all that we have found is simplicity, man's most natural condition..."¹²

The human condition that Stanislavski refers to is based on 'the psycho-physiological process whose source lies in our original nature' and this can be defined, according to Franco Ruffini as 'organic body-brain.' Ruffini defines the Stanislavski Method in his article of the same name in Eugenio Barba's anthropological dictionary.¹³ According to this definition, the body-mind is organic when the body fulfills the brain's requests in a way that is not 'overfull', 'irresponsible' or without continuation. But, when: 'the body only fulfills the requests received from the brain' or when 'the body fulfills all the requests received from the brain' and when 'in response to all the brain's requests, and only to these requests, the body adapts itself to them, and seeks to fulfill them ; an organic mind-body is to be found in a body that does not carry out useless activity, that does not prevent essential activity and that does not react by internal contradiction or in an anti-productive way.'

Stanislavski's conclusions arise from his knowledge of human psychology. Man functions on occasion according to feeling, at times according to the will without

12. Stanislavski, Actors prepare and build a character.

13. Barba & Savarese, The Secret Art of the Performer: A Dictionary of Theater Anthropology.

evaluating the action in the brain, which may occasionally lead to feelings of dissatisfaction and disappointment. This means that man needs to be sufficiently mature to understand that a number of impulsive actions, in spite of their being instructions from the brain, might lead to unacceptable results. If he does not learn this experience, he places himself in a trap. This is what happened in the theater group, 'The Left Bank' started by a group of young people in Tel Aviv in 1991. These beginners had thoughts of living and creating together, somewhat resembling the well-known scheme of Julian Beck and Judith Malina in their 'Living Theater'. In the beginning, this is a very special experience, different from anything experienced in the regular, traditional process of creativity. There is a uniqueness to a group that is formed for group theatrical work, but mistakes probably arise from inexperience and a lack of knowledge of the basic system of modern theater that Stanislavski established.

In Judaism the possibility of "doing and listening" exists in artistic meaning in that one takes religious duties upon oneself as a result of a belief in the existence of God, and one has one's whole life to learn from one's mistakes and from books. There are great artists in the theater who are capable of doing before analyzing such as Peter Brook, who is a theatrical and cinematic director with a high level of control over his personality and his complexity. He has deeply analyzed himself and has, to his credit, great knowledge and rich experience in psychology and theater, and in other areas linked to this profession. But at the moment we are neither dealing with the side of religious belief in man nor with people of the caliber of Peter Brook who was certainly also influenced by Stanislavski and his students.¹⁴ We are attempting to stress that theatrical truth can serve us well for other needs.

-
14. Peter Brook. "L'Espace vide", écrits sur le théâtre." (Paris: Le Seuil, 1977).
Also see: Georges Banu. "Brook" *Les voies de la création théâtrales 13* (Paris: CNRS, 1985).
Peter Brook. "The Shifting Point." *Theatre, Film, Opera 1946-1987* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987).
Ouriel Zohar. *Rencontres avec Peter Brook*. Édition (Tel-Aviv: Zohar, 1990).
Peter Brook: "Le diable c'est l'ennui", – Edition (Dijon: Actes Sud -papiers, 1991).
Yoshi Oida: "L'acteur flottant", Ed. *Le temps du théâtre*, Actes Sud (1992).

In Stanislavski's opinion, the actor's body must adapt all the brain's requests especially to itself, those that have a constructive rather than a destructive purpose. In day to day life this is not necessary: the brain makes realistic demands of the body. On the other hand, when unrealistic demands are made on the stage they must be changed into realistic ones. This is the meaning of the Russian word "perezhivanie" which is defined as "return to life". From Stanislavski's point of view, the aim is to train the actor's brain to prepare requests that will awaken it, so that the body will not act except in coordination. The difficult and essential factor in this method is that the actor does not only need to prepare logical reactions that have motivation and feelings compatible with the subject matter, but that the subject matter has to occur as if it is a realistic request. The actor has to believe in the thing that he has created. For it is only when the actor himself truly believes that the audience will be able to believe.

In an attempt to prove how precisely the actor needs to work on his emotions, his thoughts and his body, Stanislavski creates an analogy between the actor and his diverse tools with musical instruments and the musician's preparations for a concert. Acting is like the search for the minimalistic and most exact musical tone. On the stage, situations are usually more drastic than in life and the actor must widen his expressive range as much as possible without extending it beyond expressive realism, otherwise he will not succeed in his endeavors to build stage reality. Organic body-brain is the second nature that an actor must teach himself to gain from practice and experience. The objective of the system is to ready the actor to play the role that he is required to fulfill on the stage. The organic body-brain is the condition for the meaning of character on the one hand, while character is the condition for the meaning of the role, on the other.

Stanislavski's theater has three stages for working on a role: (1) to build from the organic body-brain. (2) to build the character based on the written text describing the role, and (3) to build from the role, based on the character's human nature. It is important not to forget the existence of examples that show, based on the same text, how thousands of different characters can be presented. There are millions of Hamlets in the

world, (each actor has his own Hamlet) and only some of them have been presented to date on the stage. According to Stanislavski, we find the distinction between the role and the character (nature) if the character is organic body-brain in the given conditions of the written role. On the other hand, it can be said that the played role is the character focused towards the channeled super-objective via the action line. In the case of Hamlet, the distinction is to be found in that Hamlet is the universally known written role, but that to play it, even according to the text itself, every actor will personate a different character. The character exists above and beyond the actions carried out as part of the role. The character is therefore not identical with the role. The character is the condition for the meaning of the role. When an actor loses, or does not find the character (nature), according to Stanislavski, the role loses meaning. If the actor has succeeded in building one character, the role has achieved one meaning. If the character that the actor has built is different, the role's meaning will be different, but it will have meaning. In the same way that the role has no meaning without character, so the character has no meaning without the actor's organic body-brain. If the actor's body-brain is not organic, the character's actions, even if they are compatible with the conditions dictated by the role, will not be actions that match its demands. They will only be mechanical, a result of the implementation of external instructions. Without the organic of body-brain, the character will have no life; it is not a human existence and therefore cannot promise meaning to the role.

The mathematical equations that we found with Stanislavski remind us on the one hand of the concept of the Leibnitz school, in that they stressed the mathematical understanding of the world in order to carry out a higher ability than that for listening to music. From their point of view music prepares and stimulates us to deal with a mathematical understanding of the world. If we take a look at Leibnitz' school from Stanislavski's viewpoint, we find that he would have criticized them for the fact that the sensual aspect of the musical tone itself, the non-mathematical element, did not exist at

all. He would have said to them that their music is mechanical and does not "return to life".

On the other hand romanticism relies on what the mind is unable to understand in its faithfulness to fragmenting reality into its parts, thus distorting it, and placing all belief in the intuition of the artist. Stanislavski would not attack the intuition of his actor-artist, but he would exercise more caution as he believes that the first command or request comes from the brain, not from belief. The brain is responsible for assessing the precise nature of the request in order for the body to carry out precise and organic action. Stanislavski would not object to the premise that the unity of nature, the character of man, situations and scenery are reached via artistic imagination, empathy and emotion, and not through scientific-analytical investigation. However, he would have to balance by means of his threefold system, by means of the organic body-brain, by means of the will-body, the brain and the heart and in the ability to give all man's elements their place on the stage. Stanislavski, in the laboratory that he set up with students around the play *Tartuffe* by Moliere, reached the conclusion, in the opinion of V. Toporkov that the objective of the laboratory was to prepare the actor and give him the means to learn how to prepare himself for all possible theatrical roles in the world while working on one role¹⁵. Art begins when there are no roles, or when there is only one role: 'I' in the given conditions of the play. Scientific theater works along two parallel lines: the objective 'I' and the subjective 'I' and the ability to give them meaning or to remove their meaning in order to create a role. But the purpose of the whole route is to better know man. The actor may enjoy the benefits, (even if he is unaware of the definitions) if he succeeds in carrying out a role on the stage in a live, genuine and convincing way. Is a subjectivity that has used up all its resources truly the beginning of objectivity?

15. V. Toporkov. *Stanislavski in Rehearsal*. (New York: Theater Arts Books, 1979).