

Investigation of the performance indicators in foreman's performance method

*Muhammad Fazel Moghimi **

Graduated in drama directing from the Faculty of Art and Architecture of Tehran Azad University

Lecturer in the field of drama directing, Faculty of Art and Architecture, Shiraz Azad University, Iran

**Corresponding Author*

Hamid Reza Afshar

Faculty member and associate professor of Tehran University of Arts, Tehran, Iran

Ismail Shafi'ei

Faculty member and associate professor of Tehran University of Arts, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

The well-rooted theatrical art has been formed about and has been the focal representation point of the mankind's material and spiritual issues and concerns since long ago and, perhaps specifically and nearly in a well-organized manner, since the ancient Greece up to the present time. The present study aims at the investigation of the Performance indicators in Foreman's performance method. Foreman's works can be to a large extent ascribed to the postmodern period and, due to the same reason, it can be possibly stated that the Performance indicators and indices are expressive of the postmodern performance properties, as well. It is worth mentioning that his performance methods and theater have been definitely devised in respect to certain concerns and necessities stemming from the society and the peripheral conditions and, generally, Foreman's life. The present study has used a descriptive-analytical method for information gathering; subjects like Foreman and creation of pleasure, Foreman and object denial and Foreman's performance method have been evaluated from semiotic perspectives. It can be expressed that Foreman has succeeded in new facilities for producing and performing drama through discarding the general plots and by using the complicated, imaginary and weird material objects; in the end, he has been able to design specific performance techniques for designing and implementing the theatrical plays based on his own specific styles.

Keywords: theatrical performance, Foreman's method of performance, object denial

Introduction

Richard Foreman, the prominent American director and theoretician, founded the ontological-hysteric theater in 1988. He was one of the 1960s' pioneering artists having bonds with John Cage, Merck Cunningham and Wester Theater Group's attitudes. During the years between 1979 and 1985, a division of Foreman's theater was established in Paris and financially sponsored by France's government. His institution in East Village in Saint Mark's church, New York, exhibits Foreman's novel plots as well as some plays most often for sixteen weeks during winters. Foreman has directed works like opera, classical plays and contemporary works in the whole world.

Foreman's writing style and method in drama is creation of discontinuous conversations and separate segments that connect the individuality of the play lines to the individuality of the performer during the rehearsal. His writings ignore and violate the narrative and personal frameworks and, instead, create a rotation of psychological and verbal energy that enables the recombination of the various patterns. In this viewpoint, discourse is transformed into an aspect of scenography. Foreman's theater is an artistic example enjoying a theatrical collection in line with a perfect design. In this position, Foreman can be associated with artists like Tadeusz Kantor, Edward Gordon Craig and Robert Wilson. These artists, as well, have employed discourse as an element at the service of scenography.

In the end, it can be stated about Foreman that his recent works have become more introverted and even gained more perceivability. Being full of contemplations over the evanescence and frustrations originating from the awareness about the impossibility of perceiving what is needed to be conceived, these works are also strangely replete with envy and disappointment; they should be viewed as works by the artist who has stepped into his creative life's sophistication stage. During the late 1990, Foreman states the followings about his work: "I think sadness and feeling of sorrow (perceived in my works) are increasingly reflective of the problems and challenges for endeavoring to accomplish my programs; in the past, I thought as a young man that they are exciting" (Alizadeh, 2009, pp.188-192). The present study aims at the investigation of the performance indicators in Foreman's method of performance.

Study's Theoretical Foundation

Foreman's Performance Method in an Analytical Approach

Richard Foreman's work is the focal point of the considerable bond between various kinds of investigations about the nature of universe and different types of its perception that have been manifested from within the formal dramatic structures and scene-based activities. They also contain elements from Vaudeville, film strip, Grand Guignol, programs in the dance comedic cabaret, expressionist films, carnivals (in both Bakhtinian sense of the word and literal sense meaning a recreation center) and probably a little based on the Meyerholdian elements. Although most of his plays have been published, reading of them apart from the work's performance ground deprives the readers from a vital part thereof and the explication of the performances disregarding the text or the so-called the work's fundamental theory, as well, runs the risk of understating the events. These works are generally theatrical segments presented in whole (Alizadeh, 2008, p.182).

Foreman's theater is generally influenced by many things and affairs the most important of which is ontology.

In his first ontological-hysteric declaration in 1972, Foreman announced that "now, there is only one theatrical issue and that is how a performance should be exhibited on a scene so that the audience can experience the danger of art not as an engagement or adventure or excitement and not even as something threatening the audience's vulnerable personality domains but as a decision-making risk it might be exposed to upon confrontation with the artwork. Here, the artwork is proposed as a fight between the posited subject (or process) and the audience. The old concept of drama (until Grotowsky, Brook and Chaikin) equaled the danger of situation rotation in such a way that the audience is entangled in a sort of emotional bound" (Alizadeh, 2008, p.158).

Foreman has also been impressed by Jack Smith and the modern American cinema, especially his film "the flaming creatures" (1962). It is a film that "is intensively influenced by the public culture and considerably influences the forms of theatrical performance after itself through a sort of eclecticism" (Alizadeh, 2008, p.165).

Foreman himself has asserted that “the initial and self-wanted quality of this film and its non-paying of attention to the work’s technical paint and enamel which is in vivid contrast to the technical complexities of the commercial films has exerted a subtle relieving effect on him as an artist in the area of theater” (Alizadeh, 2008, p.166).

He also has been impressed in his first works by filmmakers like Jonas Mekas and June Rainer as well as by poets and non-theater individuals (Niki, 2010, p.57). Foreman’s works have also been influenced by minimalism in some respects such as paying attention to richness, complexity, density and emphasis on the external structure.

In a declaration, Foreman rejected what he called the discourse’s stupidity and carefully coordinated activities in works like the *midsummer night’s dream* by Peter Brook (1971). Instead, he was looking for discarding configuration for achieving a shape or another thing as seen in the works by artists like Frank Stella and Donald Judd who appeared in the middle of 1960s as heralds of reaction to the abstract expressionism.

For advancing his works and narrating his intended themes and, in general, navigating the audience towards his desired destination, he applied diverse and special facilities and methods. Due to the same reason, he was looking for the achievement of certain goals. Foreman wanted to pause the process of the work’s observation and challenge the onlookers’ presumptions. He states that “personality, sympathy and narration are all constraints imposed on taste in such a way that it can take a familiar, comfortable and confiding form to itself for the audience ... but I want a theater capable of disappointing our habited view style thereby to release the taste from the objects that are always associated in our culture thereto. Of course, it has to be reminded that he did not intend to guide the audience towards a given ideological perspective. Unlike Brecht who once had impressed Foreman, the latter did not have a political agenda and did not guide the spectators towards a social action. However, in the process of the spectator’s perception mechanism certain evolutions undoubtedly occur in their style of approaching the world and Foreman’s theater can be in this regard considered as political. Foreman realized his writing process as an assault on the common patterns of understanding and perception.

Foreman compares this process with a sort of psychological analysis wherein the problem is resolved by means of the re-proposition and re-expression thereof. “My dramas and plays are demanding an art that concentrates on the change in the perceptual environment in the framework of which we can observe objects and issues. I even avoid the analysis of this problem and its objects by applying terms that have been formed by means of our society’s intensified perspectives.

Foreman’s declaration known as declaration no.3 (1975) is substantially a reaction to the Heidegger’s existence and time. Heidegger states in this work that there is a pre-structure latent in concept of understanding that directs human’s rendering by means of some presumptions and beliefs.

The duty of art is assisting the understanding ... by the assistance of creating a territory and this is congruent with what is in the base. It is an experience that is not the experience itself. Here, the thing that is in the base of experience cannot be experienced. Experience is not the method of achieving this issue. The thing that is in the base on the experience includes the regulations (processes) of perception and the other regulations shaping the world.

Like minimalist artists, Foreman’s goal is re-concentrating the process of watching on the structure of the event itself and process of creation for giving rise to things he calls “reflection mechanisms”.

The main feature of Foreman’s initial works are sleepwalking (of the actors), flat and uniform tone of the dialogues’ articulation in combination with the prerecorded dialogues and assertions by Foreman himself as well as lighting that directly irradiates light into the spectators’ eyes and abrupt and abnormal sounds that bring the audience all of a sudden out of the Hugoean ecstasy created by the work’s tempo. The scene is zigzagged by yarns. These yarns occasionally connected two objects or one of the performers to one of the objects and, in some of the cases, they only divided the scene into two parts. Actors often appeared in weird and ridiculous shapes.

The movements were exaggerated or deformed and nudity, especially of the women (that were usually placed alongside the performers with detailed and complicated clothing), was witnessed often in the works.

The scene's objects and tools were handmade. The scene's depth and indentations were often hidden by a single dark tint and a horrifying sense of a nightmare was created.

The dialogues were self-referential and they seemed nearly childish especially when they were separated from the tangible ground of the performance. Some of the characters [Rueda which was always played by Kate Manheim to whom Foreman later on married; Max which was played by Bob Filsner, the filmmaker and Ben and Sofia] were repeatedly seen in these works. Although these characters lacked any narrative or psychological essence, they could not have an independent life outside the performance framework. The text of these works can be realized as the dynamic conversation between Foreman and himself more than anything else; he questions the beliefs and opinions in them and asserts ideas about what he has previously stated (Alizadeh, 2008, p.185).

It seems that Foreman's work is associated with the works by the artist Joseph Kosuth; if we wish to refrain that Foreman necessarily owes to him. Under the influence of Wittgenstein's discussions about the sameness of the mathematical predicates and their applications as the image of the world, Kosuth has claimed that an artwork is a sort of tautology because it offers the artist's intention; it means that an artwork, as he puts it, is specific to art or a definition of art.

Foreman's plays are full of paradoxes in Kosuth's style and the miniature models of the larger objects are presented on the scene for comparison and similar but different objects are arranged alongside one another therein. The always-present yarns of the scene compel the spectators to make comparisons between the seemingly irrelevant elements. All these issues question our presumptions about the method of perceiving and understanding the world. The smaller specimens of the scene can be usually found in certain situations. These specimens might be found as paintings on the wall or in the form of a model somewhere in such a way that the spectators see a space from different viewpoints and directions and they even pass the time by the visual manipulations and juxtapositions while they are objectively fixed in their places. Meanwhile using face, light, gesture and motion for building the framework of an action, an object or an image, the scene is usually accumulated with the real frameworks, as well, reminding the renaissance paintings and simultaneously segmenting and centralizing the spectators' attention. Foreman was not satisfied with less than the revision of almost all forms of perceptions the most of the spectators could have by means of the whole modern tradition of the western theater.

Unlike Wilson, Foreman fought against rapture and this that the spectators lose their self-consciousness before a performance. All the elements of an ontological-hysteric performance served the returning of the spectators to themselves and force the spectators face the text and the performance and question the perception methods and styles incessantly. His displays replace the postmodern discontinuation and disintegration by meta-narration. These works ceaselessly assert ideas about themselves and the process of their formation and this means the actual postmodern manifestation of sarcasm.

Foreman and Creation of Pleasure

Considering pleasure and pleasure creation as the goal, Foreman states that "pleasure is pleasure; pleasure gets us to the goal with what is the pleasing faith". Next, in an answer to the question that "can we make a more supervised use of the force that has been targeted consciously and is being used purposefully so as to become qualified for an objective example; an example that stimulates the pleasure-creating force?" he states that "of course, we can. This is a duty; the discovery of the quality of supervision, taking control and selection. Here, the objective example that stimulates a pleasing thing also embraces quality, as well. The objective example of granting pleasure is what increasing the amount of our 'saying yes' to a large extent thereby to provide us with an endless capital of the fuel of pleasure" (Delgado, 2009, p.360).

In line with the achievement of this goal, Foreman believes in a high value for configuration and he has the following words for demonstrating its significance: "let's accept that the sunset is usually pleasing and watching a corpse does not create any pleasure in us. If we place the corpse inside a proper corpse, it has to be stated that we are pleased by the whole configuration of which the corpse is a part. The duty of art is finding what has not yet gifted us with pleasure and, then, inserting it in a composition that eventually leads to pleasure. Configuration does not need to include the expected feelings or engage in its own or an artwork's definition. Configuration might be a ground for embedding and placing a specific matter. In most

of the today's arts, the configuration of the background is inherited from the art of sunset. This question might be raised in theater as an art always lagging behind the time that what do we have for adding to the configuration that has not yet become valueless as well as other questions of the like. Many pose such questions in theater and act like this. The reason for the theater's long-lastingness and exceptionality lies in here. The theater's problems are begun when the audience not interested in art solely seeks amusement meaning that the spectators enjoy things in theater that they have previously found pleasing and their reactions to the appending of new matters they called pleasing up to now would be predominantly negative because such spectators have been trained for the perception of the objects but not perceiving the configuration. When you watch a theater, you look at the things following your routine patterns and not at the plots, background and configuration (Delgado, 2009, p.361).

Pointing to the wrong habits of the spectators and their irrational wants, he adds that "most of the audience and critics demand amazement. These are signs of their disease and blindness for they want to remain in their childhood. Most of the spectators demand an understandable and recognizable content; they are willing to reduce the experience of an artwork to a special gestalt so as to snatch a thing from the theater and take it in their own possession; it is as if they are earning money or obtaining properties through theater; a profit that is earned by long-term investment in experience. The experiencing of the art should not add anything to the same case.

Image accumulation renders the weight heavier and limits the vivid panorama of the horizon. The experiencing of the art should more than anything else deal with the elimination of those things and, by curbing the human beings, it tries to make the aspects of reality fall into an artificial sleep. It is better for this art to deal through the exhibition of the qualities and how-s to the declaring of this point that how reality is always an absolute and positive issue and its response directed at negative backgrounds. Such a demonstration allows us to relate cross-sections of this vividly polar continuation with a really existent reality; of course, not by means of the social issues but through interaction in the heart of the encountered objects, deepening the life and peaking it. The important point is that we permit ourselves inside the art's experiential domain to overthrow the childish-vulgar wishes that are habitually roaring at us in the entire course of life; that is a vulgar state of perception that prevents the existence of a paradox in the center of a stabilized example.

Pointing to the importance and, even occasionally, the preference of form to content, Foreman states that "form is not a xylem in art for content rather it is a scale for producing a supplementary movement in a posterior stage when there is a subject. The retrogression towards a previous stage is made and rendered feasible by form. It is the public thoughts about content or a pretext subject that regulates the process of rotation. The primary subject is the process that the text is like me; it grows like me; it expands, falls down, slips on a thing, improves and it displays itself the way it wants; the structure is this not the temporal structure but the momentary structure; there is no time.

Therefore, every movement is expressive of what confronting with the paradoxes and enmities of the displays in the other levels and not just an individual controversy. That causes a dramatic enmity and distinctness of an objective example. In the creation of a drama, the author intends to construct an important example which has been never existing (Delgado, 2009, p.354).

Foreman and Object Denial

The process of the modern object denial that was seen in the previous decades, saying in 1950s, in the paintings by Rosenberg and Jasper Jones (Kay, 2010, p.41) and other artists (painters and others) is well evident in Foreman's works and performance method and the works by these artists distanced maximally away from the theatricality and object of death towards transformation to a theatrical (dramatical) event the emphasis of which was directed more than the subject towards the formation of the event and establishment of relationship with the spectator.

Although the systematic multiplication of Foreman's productions and his self-awareness point to the processes of seeing that are engaged with the denial of the object's hallucination, it ironically preserves its own entrapment. In contrast to John Cage's works, Foreman has specifically but, of course, in a vaster spectrum of the deviations in art, drama and dance that have applied chance in configuration and

performance, pursues what he realizes as a path that evades both the conventional dramatic plots and haphazard processes. Foreman relates the efforts for making the meaning give up through chance-based operations to another sort of the nature's specification and figures out that his solution is not escaping such deviations but a sort of informing about them. In his first declaration, he lists three substantial distortions:

- 1) Logics: as it is in realism; the same thing rejected by us because the mind previously knows the next move and it is not accordingly sensitive thereto;
- 2) Chance, randomness and voluntariness; the same thing that we reject because every selection has been determined in a very short time that it can be similarly predicted such as the part that is produced stochastically, randomly etc.
- 3) New possibility; a skillful appending between the logics and randomness that keeps the mind sensitive so that it avoids rapid integration into the intellectual system. Always choose this one!

Foreman underlines that "I think some kinds of object overthrowing wherein there is solely a need for incorrect persuasion are more suitable. But the thing that is very interesting for me is the overthrowing to the maximum possible self-conscious overthrowing of an artwork ... I would like to build it inside an object ... in such a way that the real creation of my work be a possible being coming to existence with an overthrowing process".

By acting through what can be conjectured as a distraction from the possible perspectives or associations, Foreman often offers simultaneous and non-mergeable focal points for breaking every concept of concentration. More than presenting paradoxical events in a simple form, he offers a collage of paradoxical principles that have been connected together through a single structure or pattern.

Many of the elements introduced by Foreman work based on the spectators' predictions and they even imply some events that they will be followed by in future but every element is placed in such a way that it seems as if it is neutralizing another element in such a manner that the various predictions are deployed against one another.

Foreman's work can be perceived as an effort for accommodating the elements stimulating echoes from amongst the predictions or facilities created in the drama and the projected text serving the distraction of the attentions from the perception of a particular set of predictions. This is not just about the disintegration of the program that goes on rather it largely incorporates signs of an actor's personality, feeling, plot and meaning that are distressed and disordered at the time of emergence by means of casting and offering method.

Foreman's Performance Method from the Perspective of Semiotics

1) Framework Systems

In the application of the material framework systems, Richard Foreman has acted variably. For example, although his works were still being performed in the storehouses and/or other small places with capacities rarely exceeding one hundred persons, it was with the arrival of mid-1970s that his works were performed for consecutive months on performance halls the tickets of which had been presold (Alizadeh, 2008, p.157). In regard of the controlling of the mental, historical and social framework's system (advertisement, preperformance time, post-performance time and so forth) acts differently in respect to the various performances of his enlightened theater.

2) Spectatorship System

In application of spectatorship system, Foreman never seeks getting the spectators' sense of sympathy accompanied his works and fought against ecstasy of them as well as against their loss of their self-awareness before the performance. All the elements of an ontological-hysteric performance act in line with referring the spectators to themselves; the spectators are coerced to face the text and the performance and incessantly question the perception styles and methods (Alizadeh, 2008, p.191).

In regard of his relationship with his spectators, Foreman states that "in my mind, the effect of my plays on the spectators is something more like surfing on the waves. While surfing on the wave of emotions and condensed and compressed feelings and affections based on which the plays' foundations have been

designed, the spectator reach equilibrium in the peak of the occasionally hasty events (Whitmore, 2007, p.96).

3) Action System

In order to achieve his theatrical goals, Foreman applies the various elements of acting in special and different forms.

For instance, in order to avoid the deviating power of the actors' faces, some directors, including Richard Foreman and Robert Wilson, often use non-actors and their roles are assigned to individuals who have had no formal education about acting, sound or motion and have never had any acting experience (Whitmore, 2007, p.125). In this regard, Foreman states that "to me, the interesting thing *inter alia* was the selection of individuals from the real life (non-actors) and placing them on the scene and providing them with the possibility of courageously influencing the professional theater spectators by their own real personality.

Foreman was often accused of treating his actors as puppets very much like Craig's super-puppets; however, the rich and outstanding acting by Manheim was specifically powerful and able and associated with the great expressionist directors (Alizadeh, 2008, p.185).

It can be stated that Foreman pursued a special goal in this use of the non-actors; part of the idea flowing in such a doing was breaking the ordinary and habited expectations' horizon of the spectators and forcing them to experience a performance free of euphonious voices, delicate and magnificent motions and, all in all, glorious characters. The spectators are asked to think about the role as well as about the words voiced by the amateurs and sit to watch individuals that might be physically not beautiful and even appearing a little ugly on the scene and, in sum, watch and project images of their own selves as actors and, in case that the horizon of their expectations happens not to prevent the non-actors' acceptance, they can get closer to the performance and feel their own existence in it otherwise they would reject the play as something almost non-credible and essentially unfavorable (Whitmore, 2007, p.126). Richard Foreman also expands the expressional facilities in various methods; a group of directors like Richard Foreman corroborate the actors' words and speaking by the assistance of electronic instruments so as to make them gain a quality beyond reality (Whitmore, 2007, p.118).

Foreman corroborates most of the voices and sounds inside and outside the scene so as to be able to extensively expand the range of the sounds' highness and lowness for human voices; to do so, he installs a oscillator in the scene and showily and vividly sets the degree of the sound displayer in a high intensity in such a way that it can be viewed in the entire course of the play by the spectators so as to provide them with this opportunity to not only hear the changes in the sounds' volume and size but also see them with their own eyes. This way, Foreman directs the audience's attention to the sounds' nonverbal aspect and the dramatic discourse as a signifier implying itself.

In many of his works, Foreman intends to make the spectators note the language itself in a state of purity; he does not want to compel his actors impose hefty vocal implications on the literary meanings of the written text. The pivotality is with the discourse not with the essential capability of the sophisticated actor's voice. This is another clear proof to Foreman's nearly permanent use of microphone on the scene so that the actors can be easily heard when speaking on the scene with their own ordinary voices and sounds. The projection method prescribes (necessitates) more tinting and increased emphasis (Whitmore, 2007, p.140).

Like many of the postmodern directors, Foreman, as well, employs the gesture (states and motions) as one of the primary specifications of his own performance style. For showing the play "fall of the hause usher", Richard Foreman succeeds in creating a (neatly processed) postmodern gothic performance style (Whitmore, 2007, p.171).

Richard Foreman has made a lot of efforts for overthrowing the traditional expectations' horizon and metamorphosing the spectators' attitudes. He takes advantage of the weird and unpredictable gestures and motions as primary means of creating metamorphosis in the perceptual attitudes of the audience and guiding them towards a new perceptual status.

As for the use of motions, Richard Foreman resists the (regulations of the) traditional scene's poetical technique. He seriously avoids using one of the most important movements in theater, i.e. inclined movements. Foreman states that "I usually warn the actors that I do not at all agree with the performing of

diagonal movements in the diameter of the scene. If they are supposed to reach from the right end of the scene to the front left thereof, they should do it, instead of simple movement in the diagonal of the scene, by direct movement towards the front and downside of the scene and, then, rotation towards the right side". He demands so for creating a meaningful network of the simple perpendicular relations with the intention of achieving motion transparency such as the versatile movements made by a chess player.

In regard of makeup, Richard Foreman was thinking about the creation of a destroyed and abandoned environment when directing the play "Witesk". In order to induce such a situation, he configured a world the residents of which were walking dead; a set of the characters were stupid with red bulging eyes and white horrifying faces and present everywhere (Whitmore, 2007, p.194). In this regard, Foreman's works were in such a way that the actors frequently used weird and ridiculous forms and shapes.

4) Visual System

Foreman is amongst the postmodern directors who have found the visual signs' system of theater as the most determinative theatrical signifiers and stating that "we intend to extend most of the performance's visual aspects to the amount that they become the most original elements influencing the spectators" (Whitmore, 2007, p.2000). As for the use of space, Richard Foreman demanded a gym for the building of the mind. He states that "the play setting is an environment for doing research on a text and a gym for a physical, spiritual and psychological exercise; a rehearsal room, a factory, a laboratory and a drill room. If the *mise en scène* fails to submit to all these, the whole body of theater will be rendered non-credible (Whitmore, 2007, p.2010).

By emphasizing on some elements in his performances, Foreman pursues a specific goal. In practice, he encourages the eyes of each spectator to wander about and go on a sightseeing in the entire *mise en scène*. He states that "I am willing to imagine that the spectators have eyes on the whole scene in the entire instants of the performance; so, I try to create an image on the scene wherein every segment of the play can play a part. I may carefully coordinate the smallest details apart from what is apparently in the focal point of the scene because I would like to preserve the attentions to the combined whole of the entire play's vista" (Whitmore, 2007, p.230).

In regard of the use of decor, he applies a unique style. Except for some of his rare experiences such as the performance he has exhibited for the play "Witesk", he avoids empty spaces. He states that "I have repeatedly thought of decor- and object-free performances on scenes; of an empty theatrical setting without the heaviness of the pressure of a physically pompous and complicated performance. But I happen to notice later on that such a nudity does not allow me to reveal the semantic layers of the text (with which I am mostly concerned)". Foreman's physical theater has been designed for assisting metamorphosis (of the spectator's experience); he cannot achieve his goals through the empty spaces (Whitmore, 2007, p.240).

When Richard Foreman wants his spectators to experience a sense of self-alienation, he builds a large glass wall between them and the actors and uses it as a method for reminding this point that play is something for seeing and watching not for engaging and getting united therewith (Whitmore, 2007, p.245).

As for the use of clothing, Foreman utilizes his own specific properties but one of the most distinct indices of his work in this regard is the use of bareness. In most of the works, the women's nakedness is observed but they are usually placed alongside other actors with detailed and complicated clothing (Alizadeh, 2008, p.185).

Richard Foreman's continuous search for the creation of visual incongruences and psychological tensions in his works provide him with the ability of placing the unbridled and disordered scenes and disintegrated and invading verbal texts alongside the simplest clothing, i.e. nakedness. He states that "I wanted to create a gap in the spectator's awareness between the detesting reality of the nudeness and the non-carnal strangeness of what is flowing in language and provide spectators with a possibility of experiencing and perceiving struggle flowing between the wishes in their consciousness based on the duality inside them.

As for the use of light, Foreman also has a unique style and method. In his works, Foreman is fluctuating and dubious from the no use of lighting and special effects to the use of lighting for the creation of a personal

style, creation of a special sense and state and creation of a diversity of view levels and, more importantly, creation of the integrated and coordinated visual combinations.

When using light, Foreman creates combinations that are implicative and, at the same time, strengthen his intended and insane aesthetics. In his works, light grants both general illuminance and architectural structure to the scene and plays a role in the creation of the sense and mood of the scene's sensory reality. In the course of the progress and evolution of his theatrical style, Foreman finds out that lighting (though he completely ignored it in his initial works) adds another aspect to his multidimensional performance; in fact, lighting is currently acting like a unifying factor in his *mise en scène*.

Foreman is amongst the directors inclined towards the use of the white and gray lights. He is also amongst the directors who have found out that the use of fire in its various manifestations, to wit camp fire, torch, candles and even a burning umbrella, on the scene adds a sense of naturalism, visual discontinuity and dotting or mysteriousness to the scene (Whitmore, 2007, p.287). In regard of the use of color, Foreman has an approach nearly opposite to his use of light and, avoiding any sort of messiness, distress and chaos, he is interested in and applies monochromes.

5) Auditory Systems

It can be probably stated that Foreman utilizes auditory systems as the most primary signifier in his performances and this same special and notable application of the auditory system is amongst the most outstanding factors of his works. Foreman uses sound as the controlling and guiding element of the performance; he transforms sound and silent to the dominant and main elements of the performance (Whitmore, 2007, p.305). Foreman makes a good use of technological progress for producing music and turns it into the integral and always-present element of his performances.

In recording, editing and regulating sound and music for his performances, Richard Foreman acts carefully and fussily. He gathers all the actors in one place and records all the dialogues within one to two meetings and, then, reminds that "it takes nearly one week to finish the edition of this tape; afterwards, we can begin the work". During the edition week, he adds sounds and music to the tape so as to finally achieve a perfect audio text. He explains that "when we begin the practice, it really seems that I have a partitor (text) at hand; this is really similar to the designing of dance motions. It is as if the play has been arranged in the form of an audio text" (Whitmore, 2007, p.317).

In regard of the use of music, Foreman adds: "in all of my plays, including my classical performances and contemporary dramas that I have not myself written, music has been flowing in the whole time in the text's background. If I am supposed to work with a composer, it would never strike my mind to begin the practice before the completion of the music because the performance is ought to be mine".

Foreman explains that "I was interested in the use of a sort of music that could be replaced for the scene's emotional quality; music was completely in opposition to the dominant sensory setting of the scene. I wanted to achieve a scene completely different from what I desired" (Whitmore, 2007, p.330).

6) Smelling and Touching Systems

Like in many of the theatrical performances, these systems might be influential in Foreman's performances, as well, but it seems that Foreman has less frequently happened to make a calculated use of them.

Principle of Simultaneity in Performance

In the end, performance needs experienced and astute persons with directorship knowledge so that all the systems can be coherently applied. He himself has the following words in this regard: "the director's duty is making decisions about those aspects of performance that he intends to intervene or not intervene in them; the final product is the result of dialectic interaction between these two choices (the two controlled and uncontrolled part) ... no director can control all the components and elements of the performance.

Conclusion

After the investigation of the books, articles and, in general, various materials about the performance style and performance indicators in Foreman's works, the author believes that this American director has succeeded in the present era and contemporary time to a large extent to expand and apply the performance and play directing indices and indicators in respect to his time, era and society. It can be stated that he has always kept on his creative performance process during the long years of his dealing with the performing of theatrical plays and he has never been solely the follower of the forerunners. Based thereon, the followings can be pointed out amongst Foreman's method of performance:

1. Ignorance of the narrative and personal frameworks in his writings and creation of a process of psychological and verbal energy rotation
2. No emphasis on the text and, instead, simple reading of the dialogues
3. Placing the spectators with conscious and intentional awareness in the course of the actions between the reality and dream
4. Creating gaps between the spectator and the performance
5. Relationships between the body and objects on the scene and use of weird and unfamiliar gestures
6. Absence of general linear designs in Foreman's mind for the performing of the play
7. Flat and uniform tone of the dialogues and ecstatic tempo
8. Accompanying the actors' live voices with the loud speakers' sounds
9. Making the spectators encounter decision-making danger in the artwork hence life
10. Pause in the process of seeing
11. Frustrating the habited view style and releasing of the objects
12. Evolution in the spectators' approach towards the world
13. Attacking the common patterns of understanding and perception
14. Belief in the idea that the thoughts and feelings prevent perception hence non-application of them
15. Looking at theater from the lens of psychology and ontology and use of characters without cognitive psyche
16. Foreman's belief in the idea that the individuals' frustration stem from awareness about what they cannot perceive and do research on
17. Creation of pleasure from a non-beautiful thing by means of novel structures
18. Exhibiting demand networks of the relationships between awareness and the material world with intersecting forces
19. Opposition to the spectators' wants about amazement
20. Belief in the idea that the artist should be seeking for what s/he has never seen not a new monster and a thing that causes amazement
21. Making life tangible
22. Denial of the modern objects and emphasis on the process of the subject-based performance formation
23. Expansion of the expressional facilities by the assistance of electronic instruments and their corroboration for achieving a quality beyond reality
24. Achievement of new motional facilities like the cautious moves made by a chess player
25. Denial of the predetermined motional pattern for inducing an aesthetical issue in opposition thereto
26. Speeding the motions quite contrary to Wilson for getting them maximally closer to the life
27. Taking experiments by the use of the complex sequence of the motion-freeze tableau that produces a disintegrated but uniform motion patterns in the entire performance
28. Method of using diverse and specific rhythm and exaggerated makeup
29. Foreman demands a gym for fostering the mind
30. Cubistic use of space
31. Belief in the combined whole
32. Accumulation of the scene with tools
33. Belief in and emphasis on the spectators' self-alienation
34. Nakedness in clothing
35. Bigotry in the application of the semiotics of the scene of implements
36. Belief in the idea that this world is administrated by objects

37. Light creates combinations in Foreman's works that are implicative and, simultaneously, reinforcing the eclectic and insane aesthetics; the structure granted by light is both architectural and general

References

- [1] Delgado, Myriam and Heritage, Paul, (2010), "directors speak of theater", tr. Yadollah Abbasi, 2nd ed., Tehran, Qatreh
- [2] Alizadeh, Ali Akbar, (2008), "approaches to the theory of performance: articles about the art of performance", 2nd ed., ritual theater, Tehran, Bidgol
- [3] Kay, Nick, (2010), "postmodernism and performance", 3rd ed., tr. Amir Lashkari, Tehran, Qatreh
- [4] Whitmore, John, (2007), "postmodern theater's directorship", tr. Samad Chiniforushan, 1st ed., Tehran, Namayesh