

The earliest human societies performed drama. They did so because of the three elements of drama and the social responses to them that make us human.

The classical Greeks founded the first city democracy. They created three institutions. The first institution was the legislature to make their democracy's laws. The laws were comprehensive and detailed (they even had stray dog catchers). The second institution was the law court that administered these laws. All citizens were entitled to take part in these two institutions. The juries could contain five hundred or so citizens. These two institutions created the need for the third institution. The makers and administrators of law needed to know why laws are broken, what innocence and guilt are, and to understand the necessary complications and contradictions of law itself. Ultimately justice tries not just offenders against the law, it puts society on trial. The trial of society runs through all civilization and often it is written in blood. This trial is the subject and purpose of all drama. In Aeschylus's *Oresteia* Orestes mother kills his father and Apollo commands Orestes to kill his mother. Orestes asks his friend and foster-brother Pylades if he should kill her. Pylades says he must or what would become of God's word and social cohesion? That is, if he didn't kill her society would fall apart in immoral chaos. Pylades says it's better to be the enemy all men than to be an enemy of God. Orestes kills his mother and goes mad. (In what sense must he have been mad in order to kill her? Can civil obedience be mad?) Later, in a play by Euripides, another God Castor tells Orestes that Apollo made a mistake – but because Apollo is a God Orestes should keep it quiet (this in front of the theatre audience). Greek drama's core subject is war and family and the relation between them. This relation exposes the tensions between self and society, between authority, power and humanness. Greek plays created drama's core subjects and the structures needed to present them. It is why Greek plays are still performed. All later dramas and many of their techniques are derived from Greek drama.

The causes of Athenian democracy's breakdown are complex. Among them is its temptation to imperialism that led to its defeat by Sparta's military dictatorship. Later the Macedonian Greek Alexander tried to conquer the world and give it Greek culture. (Alexander could quote long passages from Greek plays.) It is more difficult to govern a world than a city and when Alexander tried to do it he had to go native. This offended his Greek general staff. There is gossip that they assassinated him. Rome, when it set out to conquer and rule the world, was more ruthless than Alexander had been. Eventually it replaced democracy with dictatorship. Citizens no longer made and administered their laws. It follows that Rome had to destroy Greek drama. Roman versions of Greek plays are neurasthenic shadows. In the place of Greek theatre Rome put the Colosseum circus. Why? If we can't understand the reason why it had to do this we can't understand the structure of history or the problems of modernity and the dangers of postmodernity. Why was it necessary for Rome to replace Greek drama with the arena's blood and violence?

Rome had destroyed democracy and in its place put submission and slavery. Athens' democracy had been imperfect. Athens had its own slaves. Ironically the primitiveness of technology and ironically the complexity of Athenian democracy made slavery useful. Slaves are outside the protection of law. In some societies their owners were free to kill them without question. All authoritarian societies need slaves. That is still true of contemporary societies that are authoritarian with a façade of fake democracy. Fake democracy is protected by the illusions of consumerism. Consumers think that if they have the nous to choose goods in the supermarket they can equally well choose politicians. Goods in the supermarket are bought with money. Authoritarian societies need not only slaves, they need victims. Rome lived on death. In the arena victims were hideously tortured and killed. The arena shows could not provide the insights Greek drama found in family, war and the imperative of morality. Obviously even slaves may have families, the arena's violence could be seen as the spectacle of war, and instead of justice gladiators presented a sort of civic virtue that replaced

morality. But morality is not a civic creation, it is prior to the civic. All the arena's horror was impotent in comparison to Greek drama's moral implacability. That implacability, integrity, was complete not in spite of the tensions in it but because of them. The gap between fact and fiction is not filled by make-believe, and drama is a matter not only of compassion and pathos but logic. Rome wrote the last Greek play. The play was not derived from a community that made and administered its own laws and that by doing so could create drama that revealed the moral meaning of reality. Instead the Roman play was imposed by authority. And ironically, as a warning of history, the slaves and the legally impotent welcomed it more than the formally free citizens. They could even "democratically" vote for death by reversing their thumbs. (After all, without irony to assist it there could be no history.) So Rome wrote the last Greek play. But there was a difference: instead of being fiction it was real. Fiction creates a space for change that Rome did not allow. The last Greek play was the Christian religion.

Authority turned the fiction of Greek drama into the reality of Christianity. It turned drama's fundamental situations inside out. It did this by retelling the story of Oedipus. In Greek drama Oedipus kills his father and begets on his mother his own brothers and sisters. In the Christian rewrite the mother is a virgin who gives birth to the son and the father kills the son with the son's willing compliance. This "reality" is more fictional than fiction but to make propaganda believable it helps to make it unbelievable. (Hitler: "make the lie big.") Then reality engages in profound contradictions. The Christian version probably originated in folk tales. This is seen in a remaining folk pathos of the truth: as the son is being killed he accusingly asks the father why he has forsaken him. The plausibility of this pathos would endure in the human mind. It is a reversal that belongs in the paradox of drama. The reversal, and what it gains and loses, is drama's purpose.

By retelling fiction as truth authority controls the family and the state from within: the supernatural represses self-autonomy. Rome made reality the story of theology. The church supplemented the power of the state and the arena. All ideology is laced with superstition. But to sustain the arrangement Christianity must have its own arena. It is inevitable: without it compared to the state the church would be politically and morally impotent. The church's arena is hell. The tortures of Christian hell are more vicious than those of the state arena and last for ever. The damned have no remission, as Hamlet knew. The arrangement is uncannily precise because (as will become clear) in many ways it comes from the self's own structure. The early Christian father Tertullian said God would reward Christian believers by giving them a ringside seat in the arena of hell to watch for all eternity the torturing of the damned. You may wonder how the blessed would show their approval. They could not clap because their hands would be closed in prayer. (Perhaps their joyous hallelujahs would imitate or mock the victims' howls.) This doubling of arena and hell was inevitable. But there is something even more inevitable (and it is the basis of what I am writing here). Sometimes it is almost out of sight, at other times glaringly obvious. When human autonomy is repressed there is violence. Initially it is the self's violence against itself. But by means of shifting psychological stratagems and political casuistries it is turned into violence against others. It then becomes – the word is appropriate – diabolical. But structurally the devil can never be satisfied. All this is accompanied by the pathos of humanness (as in the abandoned Christ). The dividing line between fiction and reality is here and society is sane only when the dividing line is placed on the stage. Pathos and insatiable cruelty are sides of the same coin. An inevitable consequence of this is martyrdom and a consequence of that is sadism. In early Christianity the rush to be martyred was so great it was feared the supply would run out. The motives for martyrdom are complex -- it is all obscured by pathos, violence and smoke from hell and pyres. One motive of martyrs comes from the contradictions of the self and its attitude to authority. If the martyr is denying his own doubts, suffering may redeem him and he may be spared eternal hell. Or martyrdom may be in itself a further immaculation of the soul, a heavenly insurance policy. These tortures and obsessions were

part of what was known as “the freedom of Christ.” The English Bible calls the faithful God’s servants. A more accurate translation might be God’s slaves.

These notes are about the paradoxes, contradictions and co-operations of pathos and the pathetic, and of pathos and hate. The interrelations are the essence of drama and essential to culture. Ultimately they come from the opposites of nature and consciousness.

For state and Church the executioners and torturers are figures from hell -- for the state practical, for the church metaphysical. Each enhances the other. The heretic may assert his moral autonomy or may be the victim of the cruel burlesque of law and servitude, power and impotence. It is the slippage between the Tragic and Farce. This slippage begins to dominate contemporary politics so that democracy is becoming the martyrdom of postmodernism.

It’s been said that authority governed Rome by means of bread and circuses. Much of the wheat for bread was imported from North Africa, the arena was supplied by misfits, dissidents, criminals and the superfluous, the people on the end of the queue. The Church reinforced civic authority but authority must control all or lives, the bed where we are conceived, born and die and the street on which we live and work -- and so it must control the kitchen. The church had to be at least as well furnished as the state. God already had his own arena in hell but He needed his own kitchen. Pylades warned Orestes to obey God’s orders or society would be ungovernable. It was more dangerous to make God your enemy than to make everyone else your enemy. People can do no worse than make your life unbearable. God can make death unbearable, an eternity spent living death. Judas was Christ’s Pylades. As a conscientious citizen Pylades advised Orestes on the good of society. Of course Judas didn’t advise Jesus, he only facilitated him. The question is, why did God do that to Judas? Drama can’t evade this question. (There was no Euripides to say God made a mistake and if there had been he would have been burnt.) A character’s actions in the plot don’t decide his or her purpose or function. That would be legalism or a reduction to character. Purpose is in the meaning of the whole plot. So why did the all-powerful God do that to Judas? -- and then send him to hell? God seems to betray Judas. The answer lies in the Church’s need to maintain its authority by imitating Rome’s bread and circuses. It did this with the rite of the last supper. It is as if the Meal of Bread and Wine, Flesh and Blood, were human blood and offal served in a kitchen on the arena floor. So why? Judas and Christ must share the meal and even eat from the same bowl. Judas and Christ himself must drink his own blood: that is pathos defined. The last supper (which subsequently can be served at any time of any day) instantiated a political rite that surprisingly initially comes not from psychology but from authority: it turns pathos into hate. It occurs in the labyrinth of subjectivity and is also a structural socio-political constant. It is ultimately why reactionaries believe in themselves. All drama seeks to expose and oppose it, or else it is the theatre of propaganda and entertainment. It follows that Judas betrays Christ with a kiss. Why didn’t he just point? Answer: to tighten its ideological iron-vice authority needs pathos and hate to be as close together as possible. Then it may jiggle and juggle with them to accomplish its strategies. Did Judas kiss Christ’s feet? Hands? Cheek? If authority had the insight -- and in this case the gift -- of cynicism it would have said Judas kissed Christ’s mouth. And for this authority or God (there is no difference between the two at this closeness to the weld of power and reverence, violence and ideology, pathos and hate) paid Judas thirty pieces of silver. Nowadays it is the banker’s bonus, a return on investment. It helps us to understand God if we remember that Himmler, another Judas figure, said he gassed the Jews out of love -- love for his compatriots. The labels on the luggage get swapped during the journey to Golgotha or Auschwitz. The last supper turns wine into blood and bread into flesh. The reformation denied this but in the reformation pathos still turned into hate. The complications in the story of the crucifixion must be disentangled. Always the story returns to the paradoxes in history -- the paradox of drama is that it has no paradoxes.

\*

The balance between state and Church, pathos and violence, was as efficient as that of a well-run masochist salon. It organised society to maintain itself and to develop its use of nature. Human society is a theatre and a workshop. Philosophy was complicit and the only stage needed was the scaffold. If the spectators' faces had been glass masks they could with one look have known their society and their role in it. God had written the script and so it was complete and without error. But those who till and harvest the earth must ask questions because they labour not for obedience but to store up pelf for future security. Their whole life is a question. It was not that God's text was wrong about decay and death (His knowledge of such things was necessarily as intimate as that of the labourers) but he was wrong about the working of the world he was credited with having created. The sun did not move round the earth and it was not a question of taking a short walk on water but of sailing oceans from port to port. When Galileo was shown the torture instruments to encourage him to stop saying the earth moved round the sun he acquiesced but whispered " 'E pur si muove." Human society had moved and the Church could not stop it.

The renaissance reformed understanding of the world. Copernicus, Tyco Brahe, Galileo discovered that nature was a machine, a technology. Nature (natural-nature, throughout these notes) is one of the two great orders that make up human reality. The other is consciousness. Objective nature is independent of us. If we weren't here it or its ashes or mud would remain. We know nature because it and its effects are in our heads. Natural forces such as sun, flood, earth quakes, the power of our machines, and their shaping pressures on our personal, social, political relations, are forces that create the objective relations in our heads that are part of our subjective reality. It follows that we can't know ourselves as thoroughly as we might know nature. Through scientific experiments we can know what is hidden in nature (up to the quantum boundary perhaps). But given that we are in part only an assemblage from nature we can't completely know ourselves. Nature does not perform experiments on nature but were it not for human morality all subjective life in the natural universe would be an endlessly repeated experiment. We walk on a tightrope over a canyon equipped with teeth – it is a political lesson we need to learn if we are to survive. The nearest we can come to know ourselves is in drama and without drama we cannot be human.

Why had God made nature a machine as if He had worked just as a workman does? And as nature was a machine what were humans? People began to understand themselves differently. The eyes in the people painted by Giotto look at God as if they were looking into the eyes of eternity. The eyes of people painted in the 16<sup>th</sup> century look at the clock. The question of human autonomy was raised in a new way and with it the question of whose blood would authority need to spill. The two orders of nature and consciousness are totally different but their inextricable interrelation forms human reality. The renaissance's natural discoveries made the reformation inevitable. The reformation could not have preceded the renaissance – that is an instance of the objectivity law that gives our reality its structure and that results in human creativity. Our creativity is forced on us even as we stumble along in our own shadows. It follows that our creativity is not based on free-wheeling, random imagination. Creativity is logical, it moves logically – but it is not rational and so it is also logical that it rescinds itself into reaction, chaos or rigid discipline. It is then that human autonomy is repressed and blood is spilt. The logic of human creativity is most clearly seen in drama because there the two orders of nature and consciousness are shown together and their mirror-action seen. Drama is creativity about creativity.

Descartes considered the new understanding of the world and said the human body was a natural machine. He also said that so were animal bodies. Animals had no feelings or emotions. They couldn't be happy or in pain. In animals those things had only a surface resemblance to their sensate fullness in humans. Truth required a canine hell. Hideous experiments were performed on dogs to probe the canine machine. Descartes said the difference between animals and humans was that God

put a soul into humans but not into animals. The soul was sensate because humans needed to know there was a God and the consequences, the cost, of knowing it. (It would be impious to reflect that this gave God employment -- unless you had the reflection on behalf of the tortured dogs.) What connection is there between these canine experiments, the Roman arena and hell? The connection is the denial of human moral autonomy, that instead we are created by a supernatural reality that is beyond our world and to which we are irremissibly answerable. Given this it would be grotesque to say that animals had souls but were denied the fullness of human beings. So Descartes held that animals are machines and therefore insensate. This raises the question of what a human being is and of course why only human (or supernatural) beings can ask the question. And why when the state or the self-repress human autonomy must blood be shed? What is the human tragedy? The reason is not an accident of politics but the cohesion of politics. We need to understand ourselves and society differently. We need to understand the evolution of reality and of the psychology of consciousness. Our understanding is still based in the nineteenth century

The cause of the renaissance-reformation was new knowledge and in the practices based on that knowledge. The human world was becoming a workshop. We had to be organised to work in different ways, and how we live must be based on how we work. The grip of state control had to change to allow people greater freedom but also to control – and in fact corrupt -- their freedom. This leads back to Oedipus, the revolutionary who must be controlled. The first pathos of Jesus is that he submitted but said he was forsaken. It was a brilliant psychological human insight. Apparently It meant that by means of pathos he could be eternally installed in the supernatural. What I shall now describe may show no more than how imagination suffuses human reality. Nevertheless, when nature and human consciousness are combined more closely (as in the renaissance-reformation) then what is imagined becomes operative fact so that then the fiction works as truth. The fiction is made real, almost as if consciousness had lost its research-function and we were cyphers in a nature emptied of living humans and their autonomy. This malleability is the cost of consciousness -- the shadow sometimes leads the object that throws it.

The English king Henry VIII usurped the pope's authority and became head of the Church of England and guardian of the faith (the latter is on English coins, as if in the Eucharist the wafer bore a trademark). This made it necessary to retell the Oedipus story because the story's structure is also the structure of authority and ideology. It is not that the state imitates Oedipus or repeats his history but that the social relations of power and subjects are the same in both and this establishes integrated social practice and expectation. Greek prescience discovered that normality was abnormal. The seeming origin of the pathos when the father, apparently only for the time being, forsook Jesus on the cross, is also the pathos of Oedipus when he blinded himself. But the pathos is more profound and disruptive than these two things. It is as if it is pathos itself that creates facts that are beyond the scrutiny of facts. But really (so far only for the time being) authority can direct imagination for its own purposes and make the most intimate and personal the most generalised, public and obscure or even corrupt. The Church, especially its mystics, held that God was in all things. So God was in the arms of the cross on which Christ hung. God held Christ in his arms when he was crucified. If that is not so then then the crucifixion has no sacred purpose. Instead you would have to call Judas out of hell to explain himself. The volatility of the relationship between nature and consciousness becomes alarmingly clear. The problem is that if authority owns nature its ideology will distort imagination. The connection of this to drama is obvious.

In the Tudor politico-bureaucratic version the pathos is shifted to authority's victims. King Henry is father of his country. But for the story to hold in such a way as to have political gravity he must have a virgin bride. To find her he has six wives. One died while married, one survived him, he divorced two and he beheaded two. One of the beheaded he accused of incest with her brother. In the French revolution authority needed the same Oedipal dynamic. At her trial Marie Antoinette was accused of

incest with her son. Henry died without achieving a virgin bride. His son Edward was a sickly conformist Hamlet. He died young. Before that he commissioned a new Common Prayer book. It is a user's-guide to the changed social order. For state and society to have control of the reformation's industrial technology a new sort of human being was needed. As with the Greeks this required, as it always must, a new drama, a new practical recreation of what a human being is, so that change is not chaotic or merely opportunistic but is integrated into social work and morality. It was a way of hiding truth in its own complexities. In the Roman revolution drama split into the violence of the arena and church hell. God needed hell and not the stage. It would have detracted from his authority. That is why the church opposed drama, as authority usually did until the time of modern finance. A substitute for drama would be found in a new Bible (especially the New Testament). But at first the Tudors could not risk it. A new Bible would have been too radical for the early reformation. That required the political revolution that would come later. When it did, a new consciousness would make the new Bible possible and politically necessary. Then it would be as if authority inserted new grain into an old tree. (Such a solution was too subtle for the Russian revolution and it dealt with the problem by shedding blood in the Great Terror.) In the meantime the new prayer book of user instructions would do. What the state needed was renaissance working man, but it also needed to maintain his submission to authority. For the time being a new drama would strengthen authority and create a new pathos and with it a new safe interpretation of human autonomy. The golden age was an age of brass. The Oedipus story was retold. The Virgin Queen made it possible. With her Shakespeare created the new theatre. Queen Elisabeth and Shakespeare copulated in a mechanics' workshop and the offspring were plays. Shakespeare was preeminent among the horde of new playwrights the renaissance stimulated into being. The efflorescence of Tudor and Jacobean drama came from the need for a new way of speaking humanness that the Second Crisis made urgent. And a limited new way of thinking was even able to slip through the new way of speaking. Drama's reformed language was metrical so that it still related to the governing supernatural but it came down to earth among the mechanicals. From a labourer with a spade royal Hamlet takes a lesson on human beings as machines -- though in the ambiguity of the changing times it's unclear whether as machines themselves or their raw material or waste products. It is a startling echo of Descartes' dogs -- humans are dogs with souls. Authority takes it all as a useful gift and the cultured chuckle and take it as a compliment to their farsightedness. Really it's Shakespeare's honest awareness of limits of human success. Towards the end of his writing life Shakespeare wrote three tragedies: Hamlet the son, Lear the father and Macbeth and the contested political power in the changed world. The three tragedies struggle with the problem of organising and ordering the new society. Shakespeare's structural role is to make the enlightenment practical and to give the new workers ideas and language they can use on the workshop floor. His language is an amalgam of the classical (the outer boundary of justification necessary to authority even before Christianity) and the argot of the workshop and home. It is a piercing language of regret and hope. But Shakespeare will not solve the problem of how to be human in the new society. It is still the problem of our humanness.

Authority needs its subjects' new industrial dexterity but also demands their social submission. It represses their human autonomy. In all the great crises of human reality there is a political-social cat-and-mouse game in which the two (authority and human autonomy) repeatedly change their roles as they struggle to enter a new world. It would have been blasphemous to invent a new hell. God had got the world wrong but to protect superstition and sacerdotal authority He had to be right about the supernatural world. And anyway it is not convenient to have a blood-arena in every town. Tragically the need for a new sadistic blood-letting came not just from the state, it came also from the workers' self-repression of their own human autonomy, just as it had for the arena's spectators. It was also far more efficient and persuasive if the new sadism arose "naturally" out of the causes of the social unrest that it was used to restrain. Then it would have the double utility of restricting and permitting. The new victims were witches. Sexuality can't be removed from social structure, dogma

and commerce. It survives even in the sexual segregation of Religious Houses. The witch-craze was as useful as having an arena in every town and at the west door of every church. It was as instrumental as the Roman arena and the Church's hell had been. The implausibility of the Virgin Mother was easily fablized into the licentious witch. It captured the sense of decay that accompanied the reformation's renovations. The witches were already impregnated with their culture's superstitions so many of the guiltless were tortured into believing their own guilt and telling a gospel of lies. The witch-graze obsessed the whole European reformation. The witch-hunters were ruthless. There is nothing so devilish the godly will not do in the name of God. In one day on the square of a small German town a hundred witches were burnt alive. At the end of the day the buildings surrounding the square were covered in human fat.

When Elisabeth died King James inherited her power. The change in government could threaten instability. And there was a further problem, a problem of state. James was homosexual. This complicated the question of the Virgin Queen. He solved the problem by becoming an ardent witch-hunter and staring in witch-torturing sessions. The social changes had been stabilized and it was time for the new Bible. The Roman Bible was discarded (retaining it would have required a totally new religion with massive social instability) but a new indigenous translation would do. Earlier Henry VIII had dabbled with the idea but his efforts had not caught on in the spectacular way the King James Bible did. Necessarily the new bible's language echoed the capacious consciousness of the new drama's language created pre-eminently by Shakespeare. In practice it was as if the working men gave God lessons in how to speak. When this had been done it was necessary to close the theatres. Drama's innovatory passion and its versatility of the subjective – the contiguity of the objective and the subjective -- threaten to unsettle authority as much as performing the arena's atrocities in the Globe would have done. The increasing changes in methods and ways of working required new forms of organisation and ownership not new penetrative subtleties of human insight. Authority broadened itself to include a burgeoning capitalist class subaltern to aristocracy. The English civil war started in the lifetimes of Shakespeare's surviving children. Cromwell beheaded James' son Charles. He said he would have cut off the king's head with the crown on it. That sounds like a line from a play Shakespeare didn't write but that lurks concealed and fudged in the plays he did write. It is the adamant ruthless force of a new age.

Shakespeare's three last tragedies hollowed out the labyrinth of civilization's Second Crisis. They demonstrate drama's double function of the social and the human. They derive from the drama of the First (Greek) Crisis and anticipate the function of the drama needed in our own Third Crisis. To understand the development of the three crises we have to understand the logic of drama and how drama is the logic of humanness. Shakespeare's last three tragedies ask the questions of Greek drama – humanness and power. To that bare structure are added contemporary references and complications that over time accumulate from changes in the relation between nature and consciousness. *Hamlet* is the son's play. Hamlet's father has been murdered. His ghost tells Hamlet to murder his murderer, Claudius. On the way Hamlet kills six – you could say eight – people. This is not mere clumsiness. All the killings come from the Oedipal dynamic and all the victims are fragments from the first Oedipus play. Hamlet kills Laertes Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. He kills old Polonius and then gleefully drags the body off stage as bodies were dragged out of the arena. He stresses the Oedipal satisfaction of this by doing it in front of his mother in her bedroom. She and Ophelia are Jocasta-figures of the Whore and Virgin. He flirts with both and brings about their deaths. In all these death you could say Hamlet is practicing killing his father. But murder is more hallucinatory than that. Hamlet repeatedly and everywhere kills his father to make death ultimate -- but it remains evasive. The patricides, matricides, filicides fade into each other. Murder is incest and death hammers itself home as if it were nails in its own coffin. In the end old Hamlet kills young Hamlet. The something rotten that Hamlet sniffs in Denmark is his own Oedipal obsession. In Shakespeare there is no redemption (as for the aged Oedipus at Colonus) because Shakespeare

needs and strains after a solution directly to do with government and administration not self. His problem is political not spiritual. It was already the problem in his histories and "biographical" plays. When Hamlet's motive is understood it is clear why in his play he relentlessly and obsessively over-repeats the three deaths in Oedipus. It is also clear that it shows his society's self-ignorance. If you compare Ophelia with Antigone you realise how trapped and conformist Shakespeare remained. His search is relentless because he intimates our modern problem but doesn't understand it. In Hamlet the refraction of death through diverse figures is not a reflection of Freud's death instinct. It is accurately political because the Oedipus impulse runs through the whole of society's structure, institutions and power. It means for us, as it did for Shakespeare, that the order of consciousness is seeking in perverse reaction to reduce itself to the order of nature but remain conscious. This obsession becomes a lawful social obligation. The whole of humanity is ashamed of itself.

*Lear* is the father's play. It is about chaos and so more fatal than the son's play. The Oedipus family are trapped in Lear's society. The chaos is everywhere, it is more Oedipal than Oedipus. Elementary distinctions are broken. The whole ocean-play is a whirlpool. The Virgin Queen is present by her absence: she is Hamlet. He is also Cordelia. Cordelia's sisters are witch-whores. Hamlet is the legitimate and illegitimate sons. In his own play Hamlet feigns madness in his attempt to feign sanity. But in this more crucial because more directly political play Lear's madness is real. That's also why there are no ghosts in his play. The ghost's passion for vengeance is released directly into the family. In Macbeth's play no Macbeth offspring is seen because the play is about the vengeance in institutions. Personal vengeance is diverted to the murder of young Malcolm, and it still occurs in a mother's bedroom. Hamlet is the only child in his own play because family vengeance and institutional vengeance are combined in the one person of the father-king. In Lear's play the Fool is not mad. He has no power and carries no responsibility and so is not an avenger and may instead be knowing and wisely shrewd -- he lives in the gap between quotation marks. It is evidence of a shallow production when the Fool is hanged on stage, it misses the point of the fool (that he lives in an empty grave) and makes pathos sterile -- Shakespeare's entanglement in complexity can't be so easily resolved, he is on a minute inspection of the chaos of state. The fool's death off stage is Shakespeare's greatest image of nihilism, it seems to happen in the audience. At the end a dying man nursing a corpse learns that the whole world -- nature and consciousness -- is mad. When the mad see the joke they stop laughing.

In *Macbeth* the Oedipal characters are displaced from the foreground because after the panic of Lear the play is more sullen and desperate. It's as if Shakespeare wrote it with his pen in his fist or clenched between his teeth. The Oedipal characters seem to run away from each other in panic. It is directly political, its subject is modern power. Hamlet tries to avoid power's obligation to act. Lear irresponsibly gives power away. Macbeth steals power. The son kills the father-king and the father-king kills the son (young Macduff -- the deaths are again refracted). Macbeth-Hamlet usurps the father's power and becomes a tyrant. He can't create a sane society. While power and the human imperative are divided the problem is unsolvable. Witches from the contemporary witch-craze rule reality. The brave new world is shipwrecked -- the First Witch tells the story of a shipwreck and the Roman voting-thumb. She tells it just out of Macbeth's hearing. This plotting seems malicious but it is true to the play's situation. Shakespeare needs to return to shipwreck in *The Tempest*. The spell-book is drowned, the new map of the solid earth melts into water. For Macbeth consciousness is a prisoner creeping day by day in a prison yard. He hires murderers to protect his tyranny. For much of Macbeth's struggle Lady Macbeth is out of the play. She is the fourth witch, a murderess fantasising murdering her children in an image as ruthlessly exposing as Hamlet's patricide in his mother's bedroom -- but it is more vulnerable. *Macbeth* is Lady Macbeth's play The play is the world of Jocasta and Medea. At the end Lady Macbeth reappears with a jolt and the problem of pathos uncovers itself. A doctor from the modern world is with her -- not witches and spells -- because her world is ours and Shakespeare is struggling to find the future. Holding a candle she walks backward from our

time into her play and goes to the horizon to stare into our world. Hamlet dare not commit suicide, Lady Macbeth does. She is Shakespeare's most modern character. Macbeth has become a cypher seeking moral credence. He cannot solve but cannot evade the problem of reconciling nature and consciousness. At the end nature appears: Birnam Wood walks up to the gate of Macbeth's castle as a living spectre parodying humankind.

The three tragedies end lamely. Hamlet sneered at Fortinbras but he is the new order. Lear finds that reality is mad but the Lords come on to reassure us, over Lear's corpse holding another corpse, not to worry, they know how to govern and all's well that ends badly. Malcolm says the same – but there is the uncanny gap when he is absent from the Oedipal murder of his son Macduff. It has to be reported to him as if he had turned his back on himself. We pay for that absence.

Shakespeare knew the problem was fatally serious for his audience. It was one reason why it obsessed him. He called his son Hamnet and he died young. Someone as alert as Shakespeare to the shadows thrown by words and the trickery of events would read Hamlet as his own play. It was said he died drunk in a ditch. He could not solve his problem, it is the problem of drama.

Freud concentrated on Oedipus's personal problem. It was the problem of the bourgeois 19<sup>th</sup> century. It thought it had filed away the problem in a definitive evolutionary text. But the real problem is the logic of human reality. Oedipal structure shapes society and is even the dynamic of its economic and technological power. But we are Oedipal "forms" not through our personal subjective drives but through our objective social situation and its relation to nature. The Oedipal problem is the relationship between nature and consciousness. That makes us the drama species. Brecht and Stanislavski in different ways got the problem wrong. Stanislavski can be accommodated on Broadway. Brecht received the Stalin prize and wrote the theatre of the Gulag death camps.

Shakespeare could never have solved our problem because he dealt with it in terms of individuals. His characters are in positions of power -- otherwise in an undemocratic society his plots would have been ludicrous, shopkeepers are not authorities on the universe and the spade is not a map of the soul. The cards are shuffled historically: the king is father, the son is the worker, and because she was denied political power the woman is fate. Of course this distorts the situation. The three functions interact. They are co-operation, repression and control. To understand the meaning of any piece of art or code of law you need to understand the society in which it was created. Of course Shakespeare knew that his plays were about society, but once he had established the Tudor-Jacobean language he was trapped in the philosophy of its words which defined meaning in a specific way. When the revolution came he was dead and so we lost half the future.

The enlightenment followed the reformation. It was distorted by the supernatural and even by fanaticism's reaction to the enlightenment's rationality. Soon the enlightenment was dominated by technology. Over time the workers who used the new technology based their lives on its practicality. Ownership remained a barrier (as it had been for earlier slaves) but owners became increasingly dependent on users. Hegel saw the change but understood reality ideologically as an immanent world Geist. All Ideology is superstition. Over time the users organised themselves for their own protection and advantage. A trade union should be an army fighting for the good of its own soldiers not of its leaders Both father and son are involved in the strife of manufacture and trade. Morality loses the place it had in Greek drama. In the enlightenment the son should have inherited the father's role but he doesn't because (to put it in terms of the Oedipus drama) the father has begun to commit adultery with money, turning his back on obligation to the human family. Profit becomes a perverse eroticism (structure can't escape from its foundations.) The family war became a war between families and then a war for markets in the family of nations. The market is the Oedipal marriage bed, Oedipal anxiety and its sublimation into heightened-lust is transferred into the

consumption of things. The father hires the son to work as procurer in his adultery with money. The business firm and the self become one. The worker's role is culturally but not morally sanitised by making democracy the firm of "X and son." Ironically the son is required to fight his father's rivals. The situation is anticipated in the Bible story of the other son, the prodigal. The prodigal is the spendthrift parasite on the worker son. In telling the story of his return to the father's welcome Jesus anticipates his own pathos on the cross (but he is not the prodigal). The prodigal's brother is slaughtered in the trenches and on the battlefields of colonial wars and two world wars. Pylades has pushed truth over the edge. It is an extraordinarily vicious twist of the basic structure that creates morality. Technology's usurpation of the enlightenment led to the world wars (it is startling to think how novel a world war is!). The Second World War led to social welfare and the emancipation of the worker sons – fleetingly the sons of reality. If they had developed their emancipation then the combination of enlightenment and technology could have moved closer to solving the human problem and creating a sane society. Finally the relation between consciousness and nature would be human and we would no longer misuse death by shedding blood. But the development was stopped by Capitalism and a version of communism based on Stalin's abuse of Darwin. Stalin turned the ultimate form of materialism into a Hegelian idealism. He saw emancipation not as a form of drama but as a form of the evolutionary survival of the fittest. It might as well have been based on the model of Christ's second coming. It was the attempt to bring materialism down to earth as spiritualism but the real structural relations remained stubbornly the same. The victims were not slaughtered in the arena but worked to death in the death camps. Stalin's camps were another hell. Hamlet no longer gazes at a skull as at a crystal-ball but wanders round the Gulag collecting bones as fortune teller's tokens. Lenin created Stalin. Not long after purging the 1917 provisional government of all representatives except his Bolsheviks colleagues Lenin was talking of the value of public executions. It is the spectacle of the arena and the language of Dostoyevsky's Inquisitor. Capitalism's grotesque version of Stalinism is the "human naked ape". Our understanding of evolution is still Victorian and we must change it.

It wasn't inevitable that if the workers had been spared all this they would have create the enlightenment community. Capitalism had replaced the enlightenment with hyper-technology. Hyper-technology is a form of nature that when joined to Capitalism has the freak unreality of a dream guiding sleep-walkers. It is as if reality had caught a disease or what the Greeks thought of as the impurity that comes from moral trespass. It might still be a sickness unto death. Hyper-technology doesn't automatically create the sane society but promises only endless consumption of milk-and-honey (or milk-and-money). A greedy child licks the plate, the modern consumer eats the plate, the cutlery, the table, the . . . It is the market society's fairy story. It comes from the father's adultery with money and at this extreme of human reality nature itself becomes a cannibal consuming the living and the dead. Instead of the arena and hell being other places used to control society a new heaven is created that is hell on earth. It is repression by seduction. This follows necessarily in the structure of human reality: nature, consciousness and Oedipal conflict. The roles in the basic structure are reversed – Capitalism (nature) becomes God and the supermarket (consciousness) the arena. Nothing can pretend to be sacred anymore or in the species that runs death camps even human. The relation between nature and consciousness can't be endlessly manipulated and the consequences evaded.

What is the role of woman trapped in this male world? What does fate do? Technology's mindless repetitions contaminate the working of imagination and clog it with nouveau rust. The modern Oedipal woman was the Witch. Thatcher is the witches' revenge. She took off the brakes that restrained Capitalism. She was supported by her victims, as often witches are. Because taking off the brakes combined culture and technology it was her materialist-spell. What followed is another consequence of the two orders of consciousness and nature. It seems uncanny but the relations in the basic structure are the logic of reality. Thatcherism twisted the tragic structures that guided the

slow creation of humanness into the structures of farce. The structures stay the same but in farce judgement is removed. You understand the tragic because it understands you. You don't have to understand a joke, you have to get the point. Thatcher put pathos up for sale and the price was thirty pieces of silver. It is the price tag of Capitalism.

\*

There are two things to understand. First, the two orders of nature and consciousness and the system of evolution. Second, Leibnitz's question why is there anything rather than nothing? It is necessary to understand evolution because the two orders of nature and consciousness seem to reflect each other. But they are different and we must describe the difference in detail or be trapped in ideology. Human beings are unique. To understand their uniqueness we need to explore ideas and areas of knowledge not commonly associated with drama. If we don't do this we can't understand ourselves or foresee our future. And we certainly can't understand drama or be able to go on making it -- it is the uniqueness that makes us the drama species.

I explain these things in detail also to correct some of the misunderstandings of things I've previously written. A lot of anthropology begins from observing and experimenting with the objective outer being and then inferring from that what happens in the subjective inner being. I write from the point of view of drama. A dramatist has to get inside his characters to understand them and what they do. I begin by introspecting the inner subjective self and how it knows and relates to itself and to the outer objective world. If you don't know how a mind relates to itself you can't know how it relates to others. I have been criticised as being a Manicheist. The opposite is true. As an explanation it makes nonsense of all I write. In the two orders of nature and consciousness there is no place for Maniche. Manicheism is an ideology and patently this criticism of me is based on the critic's own ideology. I've also been admonished that we are social beings and that our socialisation begins at birth. Of course -- but the question is exactly why and how we become socialised. One critic writes as if when the baby pops out into the world the parents say "oh you're a boy we'll call you Bobby and you'll grow up to be a policeman" -- or "Dave and you'll become a drama teacher." People who misunderstand me in this way go on to show that they misunderstand drama and don't know what it is or does. They are misled by their own ideology. Sometimes the misunderstanding is crude and irresponsible and intellectually endangers students. It's tempting to think of the prosaicness, banality, of some drama teaching.

Evolution and its connection to humans could be explained by using any advanced animal. I choose the cheetah (*Acinonyx jubatus*). It hunts deer. It cannot know it hunts deer because it has no concepts. The cheetah is sensate but cannot make ideas out of sensation. It cannot know it is hunting a deer even when it hunts it. It is not even responding or reacting to a stimulus in the way we would understand that. It is like a rock falling from a cliff when it is dislodged by the fall of another rock. The cheetah is hungry but it does not know it is hungry. It cannot know that eating assuages hunger. To us this seems strange. The cheetah cannot form a pattern of ideas and so it cannot have any idea. You cannot have an idea of one unless you have an idea of two. (It is relevant that it is here that the actor's mind stands on the floor his brain.) In pre-humans reason could not function at this level of nature. The chase and devouring are automatic and mechanical. One part of the cheetah-and-deer situation activates the other. The cheetah might be devouring its own shadow. The deer does not fear the cheetah that is chasing it any more than an Olympic runner runs to escape from his competitors. For the cheetah being alive is no more than being equipped to be dead. Understanding this differently is anthropomorphism. (This is also a limitation of artificial intelligence, it can never know that its instructions are correct. If it did it could choose to disobey them.) We have to understand this extremity if we are to understand human consciousness and the complications of our lives. The cheetah is a territory but it is not a site. Events happen on a site.

Ground is not an event because it is not the site of itself. Only humans have sites. An animal that knew what it did but remained an animal would be in a vast contradiction in which it knew its life as a constant death. It would be as if it were in a site that had no territory because it could not act on what it knew. Because it had no autonomy it would be in hell. It would live perpetually in the arena, but mere existence is not as cruel as human beings. (Ironically heaven is a site without a territory.) The cheetah does not know it bears or succours young. For it there is no different meaning between giving birth and killing. The cheetah is not in Medea's site. And for the cheetah cub it is enough if its parent doesn't hunt it. The living die but not the dead because the grave is uninhabited territory without an event. Evolution is a machine with no purpose. The survival of the fittest is a known tautology. Evolution constantly advances or lessens the cheetah's means of existing in a territory. Through repetition the brain becomes more acute, and the animal better able to survive in its territory. "Acuteness" is the decisive point. The increasingly acute brain is structured in the cheetah's neuronal system. The huge evolutionary advance is that the cheetah's young is born with its parent's acute brain. It is as if the territory of the parent's brain became the site of the offspring's brain. The change is incremental over eons. Meaning enters into reality

This genetically "acuteness-to-territory" in all physical and sensory attributes of being increases over time to evolve pre-human hominids. We must understand this increasing acuteness and the changes it brings in the animal if we are to understand ourselves. Instead of acting as before in its territory (for example the territory of "cheetah-and-deer") the brain begins to act on itself. It relates to itself. That is, the brain becomes a site. It becomes the site of its own territory. But this development is still only the increased acuteness beginning to act on itself. The acute brain attains the knowledge of being with pre-human hominids of its own kind, its species. But it acquires only the awareness of their territories. It would be as if a human repeated something out of habit without noticing he did. It does not acquire their sites because they have none – that comes only with culture, community, when the self gives other brains their sites. This first stage is not the beginning of empathy or sympathy and certainly not of pathos. (Pathos is possible only in cultures, it has an horizon that is both intimate and far distant because it combines the self with others. It is reasoning not sentiment and that is why it may be corrupted.) At this first stage it's no more than as if the cheetah's brain becomes its own cheetah-and-deer. Then the cheetah's brain territory includes the other cheetahs' brain territories: their territories are included in its own brain territory. But territories have no horizon so the acutely-brained cheetah is not yet in a site. Only sites have horizons. To repeat, the cheetah's pre-human brain that is its own territory will not contain other cheetahs in itself but only their brain territories, the new acuteness of their brains – but the accumulated brain territories neither expand nor refine one another. It is no more than the inter-relating of the new neuronal acuteness of the same species' own-territories and that is why as yet there is no site. Interpretation must be parsimonious and not anticipate the change that turns pre-human into human, otherwise we miss the decisive frontier and are confused and even ideologically corrupt: Hitler had a pet dog and of course called it Blondie as if his convictions haunted him. As it is, it might have been a disaster when the cheetah's acute brain became a site. All structural changes are fraught. Why doesn't a new "acute-brain-being" relate to the others in its species as if it was the cheetah and they were deer to be hunted and devoured? The answer is that cheetahs are not Oedipal. They have instincts but not culture. The cheetah and not even the later acute-brained pre-human hominid are not as knowing and lost, as confused, as human beings – such things come with intelligence. Self-knowledge – being a self – comes from knowledge of the being of others, that they are selves. Others are the site of the self's humanness. The argument for drama is that only it can save us from inhumanness, from war and the cannibalism of selves.

Over time species genetically pass to their young their own accumulating brain acuteness and the physical changes it causes. A new-born cheetah's genes contains the sum of its progenitors' life experiences, many of them from an ancient past. Cheetahs with shared acuter brain neuronal structure may begin to hunt deer jointly, even though at first their brains are themselves still only

territories and not yet sites. The new relationship will be an early consequence of the cheetahs' proximity -- the cheetahs will be in a relationship but will not contest over the dead deer but devour it. (Many of the behaviours that are regarded as a relapse into our animal past are a result of our intellectual sophistication). Later the contesting of booty may develop in the chase before the catch -- in the myriad multi-dimensional situations that result in the creation of culture. The doorway in the boundary between territory and site is built incrementally. At first the situation is still outside the hunters as if the game were played by the board and not the pieces on it. Animals do not become human through encounter with things, we become (as I shall explain) human through our encounter with nothingness -- we are more than just cleverer animals. Over time the interconnections of the cheetahs' territories will change and may be complex and even specialised but not as the result of reason, of understanding the rules. Cheetahs will have become more efficient machines. The group may even be tactically structured (as in present-day herds) but there is still no apposition between the board game and the counters on it. The moves are made by the board. A hurdle has been crossed -- but our analysis must still be parsimonious. Only humans have a site and morality makes their site the whole of reality. We need to make clear the responsibility of being human. A worm must live as a worm, a monkey must behave as a monkey, but nature does not determine human beings. Animals are not Descartes' mechanical puppets. They are a territory without a site. They are not human but are sensate, but sensation is not sense. As long as humans kill animals to eat, or hunt, molest and kill them for sport, humans will kill each other because they will not yet be human-humans.

To recap, animal species evolve into hominoids. The young of advanced, complex, pre-human hominoids inherit their parents' acute brain. In time there is a startling consequence: the hominoids give birth to the humans. How is this? The parents existed as territories and their acute brains were appropriate to their hominoid life. Over eons of time the acuteness of their brain increases to an extreme. At birth the new young (the neonates) genetically inherit their parents' acute brain. The line of hominoids gives birth to humans. The human neonate's brain has no territory and can have none. It cannot mentally be part of or aware of, for instance, its parents' hunt. What, instead, is it aware of? It is acute but has no territory. This makes it a mind because its acuteness is aware of its situation. The situation is a site. It is then that pathos may be painted on cave walls. It is essential to put yourself in the neonate's place. For its reality is nothingness replete within itself. That is, the neonate (the new born young) is human. It's not known how long the neonate's first state lasts -- minutes, days, longer? Would seconds be enough? It is like the singularity, the flash of time, that physicists find at the start of the cosmos. That singularity creates matter and everything develops from it. The development of matter is inherent in matter itself. (Matter remains a territory and is not a site). But what happens in the neonate is unique: what it finds is the search. We are the searching species. Our search is not a hunt -- the search creates the self. The development of **consciousness is** not inherent in itself. This is the difference between a mind and a clod of earth. These are the two orders of consciousness and nature. The neonate is in the nothingness of Leibnitz's question. The neonate's state is interior to the neonate and so the drama point is not what it is but what it is like and no one can enter into another's consciousness. But it is certain there must be such a neonatal state and we know, abstractly, what it is. The cosmos has no consciousness, it is matter, natural-nature. But the new born human neonate has the conscious of the acute brain. It creates its own consciousness in nothingness. What it is conscious of is its self. In this it creates itself. There must be a self to be conscious of nothingness. The state of the neonate's self has to be imagined. It might even be that in the singularity of the cosmos and the singularity of the human self there is a structure that repeats, swings into being, to bring into being the being of whatever is or may be, a repetition that is the being of reality itself -- as in an image of an empty rocking chair that on occasion swings into movement and rocks. I don't speculate about that, my question is about politics, drama, pathos and human suffering and perhaps in the events I've described human consciousness is after all no great thing but it is all we have.

Leibniz wanted to solve Hume's puzzle of how, why, effect follows cause. How anything happens. That can only be a part of the more basic question of how there is anything that something can happen to or with. Leibniz's answer was the monad. Every human mind was a monad hermetically shut into itself -- imagine an object that has content but no surface. There was no actual contact between humans. They have no shared reality. God alone knew the connection of cause and effect and how and why there is anything and anything happens. All that knowledge was outside the monad. Each monad was totally and for ever isolated from all other monads. Every human monad saw the world from its own point of view. Only God knew the whole of reality and in each monad he put that reality from that monad's own point of view. One monad saw someone leaving through the door and another monad saw someone entering it -- it was the same event. God arranged that each monad's point-of-view would image the total reality that only He knew. Leibniz said the monad has no window on the world. Imagine a completed jigsaw. Each contiguous piece fits into the completed puzzle but the picture is on the back where only God sees it. Obviously there were boxes-within-boxes because each monad would imagine what went on in the other monads' subjectivity but if you could open their boxes you would find they are empty. A monad could never have contact with another monad because it would be outside its monad. Only God was really real. God is subjectivity. He is the knowledge of eternity. The only site. Humans -- like cheetahs -- were territories. It is as if somewhere there is an infinite store of events, things, time, that are poured into the box of each monad. It is a drama on the stage of God. That is only an explanatory image but it is remarkably like the stage and drama we ourselves create and it is remarkable that (in enactment) our drama can create the reality of nature and morality Leibniz thought only God could create. Leibniz's God is outside his drama but we are in ours. Leibniz understood things inside out.

The human neonate monad is acute and for it there is nothing outside itself. It's acute brain is conscious but only of its self and the plenum of nothingness. Nothingness is the neonate's territory and in it the neonate creates its "self." This makes the monad a site. The site is the self. The neonate inherits its consciousness but it creates its self when its only biography is the trauma of birth and the phenomena of nothingness. Its reality would be scattered pieces of jigsaw whirling in a picture-less world. Remembering this is recalling the forgotten origin of human sympathy -- it is pathos made visual. It also shows why pathos may become terror. Seeing reality as scattered jigsaw pieces is similar to the way adults see a play (the bits are unreal but real) but by seeing it through their social world and self-understanding they give meaning to even the incidental bits. The means of doing this are originally given us by our neonatal self and that makes the means innate in us. But what the neonate sees is nothingness. It is easier to find this in our imagination than it is to understand it -- but to be human we need to understand it. It is not a bridge from the cheetah to us. Through the neonate monad nothingness breaks into reality and consciousness. The break is total. The neonate child is in nothingness. Nothingness is not even a territory but because the child is conscious nothingness is to it an event in its site. It follows that for the neonate child nothingness and consciousness are the same event and together they are a site. That makes the child the site of itself. It is its self-conscious mind, later with all the intricacies of its further learning. That is the definition of human. Leibniz wrongly thought there was a separate supernatural world of God. There could be no God outside the monad because the monad is the total of reality. The human neonate is in the position in which Leibniz put God. This is the origin of morality. Morality makes us human. The human neonate creates itself and morality in a single act of creation. This is the origin of human consciousness and so the logic of imagination and the logic of reality are one. Later, external reality cannot change or modify this because the logic is the consequence of the neonate's creation of morality. It puts us on a perilous tight-rope: it is why tragedy and farce have the same structure. It gives us our human autonomy and moral responsibility, sealed into our body, blood and brain. For the new-born neonate child there are only two things: consciousness and nothingness, and nothingness is everything beyond the conscious self. As morality is founded in nothingness it cannot

be lost or abandoned during the human life that created it. That makes morality an innate imperative. Moral responsibility and the self are one. The self can cease to be moral only by destroying itself in one of the ways of doing this that society offers and may demand. Young people's pitiful self-harm has become a symptom of the immorality of Capitalism. They perform on themselves the rites of the arena.

But surely even at its absolute beginning the child has parents and minders and there are the "geography" and "geometry" of its room and the movement in it – all that is not nothingness! But as the monad is the total of reality it knows them – knows all things -- as part of its self. There is no external. It is conscious but exterior and interior are the same reality. For its nature doesn't yet exist. There is only consciousness. Later this provides a gap which imagination occupies and in which artists may "re-create" reality. We have to imagine the neonate mind and not think of new born babies as miniature adults. We understand the neonate only when we put ourselves in its place. (As I am writing about drama I add that this is the way an actor puts himself in his part.) The gap between monadic reality and its contradiction by adult reality (both synaptically imprinted in one brain) is the site of imagination. Imagination seeks logic and the consequence is the logical structure of even the wildest imagination. Even in what is clearly pseudo-reality imagination seeks logic, even in imagining what it half knows is fake it seeks the logical world beyond it. In nature a thing cannot both be and not be, but that duality is at the core of conventional human reality just as it is of madness – the only singularity is morality.

There is another complication that has far-reaching consequences. It's what ideology wrongly understands as the infant's original sin or even as the existence of a separate force of evil in perpetual strife with a force of good. If that were so human reality would be split in two and creativity would be a sort of defence. The point is consciousness. To say something is innate in consciousness is a form of Platonism that probably makes geometry prior to geography. The crucial point is that in the monad's conscious act geography and geometry become one and the self is there in the consciousness. Being conscious of what is not the self creates the self and its self-awareness. But we must still be parsimonious if we are to understand the monad and the relationship of consciousness and morality that is our reality. Being conscious is like unravelling the history of nothingness. Doing this gives us the responsibility of freedom. In the monad's consciousness the first events are pleasure and pain. They are part of monad reality itself and so in and for the monad reality itself is in pleasure and pain, reality feels pleasure and pain. As the monad self is the total of things, experiencing pleasure and pain is more than just, say, the creation of pathos. It is a diagrammatic awareness of the necessity of cause and effect. As the monad is the total of reality it is not just in pleasure and pain but is itself pleasure and pain and so humanness is real, is realism. The monad would choose pleasure over pain. Choosing pain is a corruption of the later socialized self. This raises a question. It is the first question to be asked in our or some other universe. It is the first question all humans ask, already as neonates. The question is "why?" The cheetah's only question is "what." That question is limited to territory and the answer is the earth under your feet. "Why" is a question that asks for meaning and turns territory into site. It is the human question. That something is good or bad doesn't tell us that we should or should not do it. "Should" itself is subject to why. Because of that pathos may turn to hate and the inquisitor condemn Jesus. This makes us political. Dostoevsky said that sometimes two and two are not four. He mistook what for why. It is the error of all ideology and it turns postmodernism into bigotry. No manipulation or casuistry can turn what into why. But the neonate knows that finally why is also what because morality is made by humans and not humans by morality. Hitler forgot this and the consequence is that he can't count the dead in the gas chamber or even see them as he stumbles over them. As the monad's consciousness is the total of reality so reality may be in pain. For the monad pain would be evil and is where morality begins, it makes morality responsibility for the world and seemingly for reality. This is morality's categorical imperative. As the mind can't abandon reality and the

imperative, so the imperative is the categorical imperative of humanness. If later as adults we could abandoned the imperative we would cease to be human. But not even Hitler can cease to be human and locked in the imperative. The human who seeks to abandon the imperative lives in torment. The tormented find peace only by becoming sadists. Their freedom is captivity. Freud mistakenly thought life instinctively sought death because death gave the peace of nothingness. He understood nothingness and its relation to death reductively. When human autonomy and its responsibility for morality and life are destroyed, blood is shed and there is no peace. We need to understand the relation of this to politics and drama. For the monad pain and nothingness are of cosmic disturbances. It is as if all the chaos and violence of society and nature are crammed into the small child's head so that nature is cruel and bewildering. It is Hesiod's war of giants. The small child cannot speak but wails and points. It is the agony of Lear Hamlet Macbeth Antigone Medea Hecuba who speak for all the living, the wrong and wronged and even the evil, because a play speaks for everyone in it and in its audience. And there is a deeper and more fraught complication: evil is pain and as the monad is the whole of reality, and knows pain as the being and act of evil, then the monad in pain asks itself do I do evil, am I its cause? This is the second question asked in the universe. Pain is a what but the question is asked by morality and implies why and the question itself shows that evil is not stamped in matter but comes from nothingness. It is how the monad creates morality, so that human beings are not a what but a why. That is why we must create drama. Drama's subject is justice and our moral survival depends on the state of our drama. See it simply: if someone sets out to do evil morality tugs at him and if he pushes it away then he is alone in the space he has created. It is the void in which the sadist lives.

The obvious question is that If we are the moral species why do we behave badly and why is history a tangled of injustice and violence? Why when authority denies our human autonomy and moral responsibility must blood be spilt? If we could unravel this enigma we would understand our and society's problems. We live in corrupt societies and to survive in them we learn to be corrupt. The problem's complexity and intractability is seen most clearly in people who are evil not because they don't know what is evil but because they think it is good to do what is not good -- that it is morally good to do evil. But evil is a territory not a site, no matter how complex the philosophy of, say, Fascism may be. Because of the monad morality is inherent in the self's situation and so is a constant presence in human reality. Often the reactionary, the evil, can't describe even events in which they were part. They get the geometry and geography wrong of a tea-table and a continent. Evil is not sui generis but a perverted form of morality. Because morality is inherent in the monad it is innate in the self as part of reality. If the self chooses to act immorally it contradicts itself and so is its own enemy. This is the violence of reaction. All immorality is reaction. The reactionary's innate moral self seeks satisfaction and peace by punishing its own immoral self. At first the reactionary is paranoid about himself and subsequently about others, the victims. The reactionary's vindictiveness is insatiable because his self-contradiction has no resolution. He hunts for more victims but all the time he is hunting for himself. The unsatisfied pathos of his self-pity inflames his hatred of others. His public outer-self blusters or menaces but his private inner-self is frail and trembling with constant fatigue and strident and contorted rage. He wants to stamp on his own head with both feet. To punish himself sufficiently he would have to kill himself and then he wouldn't know he'd punished himself and so his enemies would triumph. He's denied even the solitude of suicide. His victories are abject defeats. The political reactionary is dangerous because he can never be satisfied. In every pile of corpses always someone is missing. In most societies reaction is ugly and relentless but smallminded and petty and the reactionary's unhappiness can be satisfied only by his victim's misery. When whole societies are reactionary there is also an added economic incentive, ready and waiting contrived by reaction itself and its politics. When Rome denied its citizens' human autonomy it spilt blood in the arena. Reaction is still modernity's danger. It stretches from the pettiness of addictive shoplifting to the commandant of Auschwitz tossing children into the gas chamber over the heads of their parents. In liberal democracies people don't need to wait for authority to repress their autonomy, they have the vote and can use it to repress it themselves. The two orders of nature

and consciousness are chaotically entangled in ideology. The problem is how to describe reality but that is exactly what the reactionary can't do. Ideology's entanglements are always logical. You can't alter the image in the distorting mirror by changing your expression, you have to change the mirror. Could we ever see the two orders of nature and consciousness for what they are, could we ever untangle economics and psychology? In the first and second crises (of classical Greece and reformation Europe) a new drama was created out of the crises. Drama could do this because in the crisis it still had the sinew to recreate itself from the crisis. Drama could still do this now at least well enough to enable us to survive our Third Crisis.

\*

What is the logic of reality and drama and how are they the same? This can be shown in a simple way by using the first five letters of the alphabet.

A	anchor
B	boat
C	sea
D	drowning
E	existence

A is the basic human being, body and brain. B is the beings personal life situation but already as a social being. C is the social, political, economic, technological natural world in which AB exist. D is any disaster in ABC. E is the survival of disasters. No letter can exist on its own. Each letter is distinct from but connected to all the others. An event in one letter must have consequences in all the other letters. A consequence is another event. The letters form the basic primary structure of the order of nature. It is a territory of territories. The relationships between the letters are the logic of reality. Consciousness and morality are a secondary structure outside the primary structure. They relate to ABCDE and so share the same logic of reality. Consciousness and morality intervene in the primary structure and so they and ABCDE are in a collective third structure of reciprocations. The given nature of morality and consciousness is that they jointly seek to impose themselves on the total structure. Functioning in this way they are the moral-consciousness that creates from itself, instantiates, imagination. In this relationship imagination and reality share the same logic and this creates the singularity of drama in which the logic of drama is the logic of reality. To repeat, the juncture of the rest of the structure with moral-consciousness is the source of imagination. Imagination is inseparably bound to ABCDE and drama must observe its structure. Because of the primary structure's material rigidity it is as if in the total structure, of which we are conscious, we are closest to ourselves when we are outside ourselves, as if for example when we put on our clothes we put them in the shop window. Habitual familiarity makes us unaware of this duality and the subjective evidence for it is concealed in the practicality of daily living. Nevertheless the duality is of great significance in drama. It gives it the free space for creativity. The relations in the whole structure and its relation to imagination are the logic of human reality. This means that drama can enact reality and create what I later call "Macbeth's gap" and make the "invisible object" visible. It brings into sight the objects, movements and human behaviour of the total structure. The connection of drama to the monad world is obvious.

Drama can't be directly involved in objective ABCDE because drama is in imagination. Neither can the subjective self directly dominate imagination because imagination is subject to the logic of reality. The self is an intermediary, not just a psychology but a part of total humanity and its power. Drama can intervene in ABCDE only through imagination and imagination would be fiction if we had no moral obligation. Drama's moral obligation is to ABCDE and to itself. Its moral obligation to itself is to create dramas that relate to the elements of ABCDE and to the practical functioning, the means,

that make doing that possible, so that the collective society, culture, mediates between drama, imagination and ABCDE.

A drama text need not include all parts of ABCDE but potentially must have contiguity with and access to all of them. That is drama's ambience. (Probably it's what creates drama styles.) Propaganda is dramatically moribund because it is based on selected axis and problems, is not related to the entire ABCDE and so cannot deploy the logic of reality. Without that logic it reifies whatever is. Propaganda may give an audience new ideas but not new ways of thinking and the old ways distort the new ideas. Propaganda is like a baby born with no umbilical cord. "Theatre *Industry's*" entertainments are not comedies because they too must avoid the logic of reality. Theatre of anecdote is a diversion.

Because of morality's urgency drama concentrates on its society's crises. Theatre (not drama) and a lot of literature are trapped in the sterility of anecdotes and the incidental. The War of the Worlds is a novel derived from the open anxiety and hidden panic caused by modern technology. Its extra-terrestrial invaders are finally defeated by the common cold. They have no resistance to its germs -- hurrah! HG Wells wrote the novel in 1898. Sixteen years later the first world war began. After it ended millions of civilians died of influenza from the germs released by the war. Wells novel did nothing to stop the panic of the pre-war arms race or the war itself. All drama is political and morally must deal with the greatest crises in audiences' lives.

\*

Given time the Enlightenment could have create the sane human society. Instead Enlightenment was replaced by one of its first causes, technology. Technology is part of nature. Nature is a territory and in itself has no purpose. We prosper when we make nature a human tool. Otherwise its territory usurps the human site. The problem is ownership. Instead of being a human tool technology became the tool of Capitalism. Tools in nature are rare, and many of its tools are weapons. Capitalism is a form of evolution and as such is pre-human and in the same order as cheetahs. Capitalism's founders were startlingly honest about this. Adam Smith held that Capitalists can give up being moral because Capitalism itself was moral. If everyone pursues their own advantage it inevitably leads to the well-being of all. This confuses advantage with wellbeing. We should distinguish between a miracle and hocus-pocus. Capitalism reduces the human site to animal territory. Evolution is a system that ruthlessly punishes and exterminates the weak and vulnerable. (Hitler could not logically resolve his problem of the ruthlessness of nature and the "cunningness" of Jews except by saying for philosophical and not moral reasons that Jews are not human.) The tougher and more consistent theory of Capitalism is that individual intended moral acts are immoral and perverse because they interfere in the system's rational-moral operation. This idea makes the whole theory and the system based on it paranoid in the way reactionaries are paranoid. It doesn't understand the human relation of dependence between nature and consciousness and that in a structurally paranoid system pathos becomes hate. But it is a little worse even than that: in its basis Capitalism is a form of euthanasia. It is impolite to point this out, after all the euthanasia is only a little one, but that does not assuage the despair of grief. Strictly a Capitalist should charge the widow weeping for her husband, killed in an industrial accident, for the handkerchief on which she dries her tears. We should speak of things as they are. Reactionaries believe workers do less well economically because they are too idle or disorganised to concentrate everything on their pursuit in the way Capitalists do. They believe workers are anti-social because they work for their own interest and Capitalists are pro-social because they work for the general wellbeing. Culturally this is used to justify the economic weapon of impoverishment. It may no longer always be a matter of sweat but of alienation and nervous debility, but it's when it all operates as a culture that Capitalism becomes a form of euthanasia. The poor die younger than the rich.

As Capitalism is a form of evolution it can't be ahead of itself in the way Capitalists claim it is. Capitalism acts as if there were a reserve of morality that is not part of the human system but that somehow can be incorporated into that system. That is as absurd as saying the cheetah could knit itself a warm coat for winter or that morality can be extracted from rocks in the way gold is. Morality is precisely not a reserve raw material. Morality must constantly be newly made by actions at the heart of the contradictions of nature and consciousness and cannot be made by either on its own. Centuries of human history created our reserve of morality and Capitalism squanders it in the way it squanders natural resources. Capitalism reverts to a pre-human form of existence. That isn't rhetorical invective, it is accurately descriptive. Capitalism is a species separate from and is more ruthless than humanity because it is not clogged up by moral trappings. That is not an accusation, it is Adam Smith's own defence. As Capitalism is an evolution and as such pre-human it must replace humanity with itself. Under Capitalism humanity is a dying species. What does that mean in the modern world? It means as always that one species can replace another only by debilitation or war. And worse, even a pre-human species survives as itself only by blood-letting. Capitalism is a war species. The power of evolution is that it provided some animals with more efficient ways to meet their needs. The absolute ultimate need of human beings is justice without which there is no humanness and it is a need that Capitalism intentionally does not provide. The growing gap between rich and poor has become a disaster on a Biblical scale. Capitalism maintains itself by manufacturing more and more wants. Its cure is a symptom of the disease. It destroys nature and corrupts humanness because meeting artificial and coerced wants doesn't meet the need for justice that makes us human. Early Capitalism stimulated production and relieved people from medieval poverty. Now it burdens them with wasteful ersatz wants and threatens them with a ruined world. It changes why into what and that is the extreme sin no God but only man could contrive. All this is as clear as daylight so why isn't it seen? It's because, in the way I've described, the reactionary, immoral and paranoid can't recognise or describe reality – in them history forgets its lines. The primary function of imagination is the perception of reality but in unjust and corrupt society it does the opposite and hides reality in chronic fantasies. But even in its most extreme fantasies imagination is the working of morality. Humanness would not be creative if creativity were given us by our genes. The Infant monad created its self and morality out of nothingness, not from the weighed-down cornucopia of the capitalist market. Capitalism is a territory in the corrupt site of the arena.

In the place of drama capitalism puts entertainment. Entertainment is a form of consumption. Tragedy in drama is a pivot from which spin whole swathes of human life. The tragic protagonist is faced with our ultimate moral dilemmas that in modern life have become threats to our species existence. The logic of the tragic structure proposes the humanness of life outside the tragic. A drama may be set in a contemporary domestic setting or in a remote time and place and its dilemmas remain real and human. We share in the creativity of the past. Antigone, Medea, Hecuba, Oedipus are our dramas just as the first cultivated wheat, the invention of the wheel and the trans-historical craft of making fire are ours. Perhaps classic dramas are better at defining questions implacably and beyond evasion than they are at answering them. **But** if they ever temporized with politics it was over answers and not questions. Now only we can speak for ourselves. The classics challenge our basic moral self and shared humanity. The neonate is totally alone in its monad but finds in it the being of everyone and does not corrupted itself by plucking shadows from the darkness of nothingness. In the monad there is nowhere to hide from the question why. No authority to deny its autonomy. We are born realists. Drama presents the what and drama protagonists and we respond with why and we must live with that answer. Historical and modern tragic drama confronts the protagonist and the spectator with his or her self-definition. It reaches beyond the self's social compromises and accommodations and returns us to the monad and the events in which you created your self. I have described how the imperative to be human can be hidden in reaction and paranoia. How corruption may use even the structures of morality to deform itself -- it is part of the social cunning of survival. It causes the reactionary's relentless fury. Hitler needs the bodies in the gas chamber so that he may escape from his loneliness by going into it and

sharing their company. A paranoid can't describe reality or even know where he is but history is the ground under our feet. Drama has no formula, it is as complex as its audience. Entertainment uses the structures of tragedy but not its responsibility. It is frightening to realise that Hollywood has not produced one work with the power of Greek drama.

Ideologies imagine a world outside reality as the source of morality. An ideology is a series of what's presented as an answer, as a why. As it isn't a question it can't repeat the infant monad's encounter with nothingness. Its false bravado becomes a place of fear. Authority uses fear to take possession of the self's autonomy. In time it binds the puppet in the strings that it first used to animate it so that at last the paralysed puppet sees its strings and thinks it animates itself. Through practical daily necessity these distortions cascade into the existing social structures so that society seems to substantiate authority's reality. It's why the Roman arena shed blood and why in our time commercial ovens were delivered to Auschwitz. And because the humanness of a living human being can never be abolished dissidents and heretics must be destroyed to protect the paranoid puppets. That has been the history of a century.

Can drama be as powerful as the arena and hell? Out of reality drama creates a place inside reality because it is an "imaginary" of reality. It creates reality without the cost of reality (the actor playing Hamlet doesn't die). Drama has reality's consequential seriousness because the "imaginary" returns the self to the event in which out of uncontaminated nothingness the neonate created its self and morality. If this is not so then humanity has already exceeded itself and the future is the place not of robots but puppets. Finger-puppets on the fists of violence. Drama is the human site, the arena and hell were entertainments. Entertainment still exists -- on news programmes massacres are adjacent to sport reports and Hollywood and they are indiscriminate symptoms of modern life, come from the same source and share the same cash. Entertainment replaces the arena -- it is the solace of modern democracy. Drama is tragic because tragedy responds to the morality of reality but its structures are also those of the comic and farce. To be farcical a situation must be a potential catastrophe. But in farce Antigone changes her mind or her problem shows up as false. Tragedy entails the understanding of why something is tragic. The most destructive of all wars led to the creation of the Theatre of the Absurd. Was absurdity an appropriate judgement of Auschwitz and Hiroshima? Did *Waiting for Godot* recreate waiting for the secret police? The mass of contemporary culture is trivial, most of all when it thinks it is being serious. For it what is tragic is lack of money -- and the joke is that that is true of the whole of contemporary society. The theatre of the Absurd was Capitalism's response to the Second World War. It was fought not for freedom but to save Capitalism. The cost was more Capitalist waste product, the waste-heaps of cities and wasted lives. That doesn't dismiss the sacrifices of "ordinary" people in war, but war is an arena and in that arena blood-shedding was a farce. The sacrifices were made on both sides of the war, for the West's freedom and for Hitlerite slavery. Is dying for Hitler tragedy or farce? It can't be one without being the other. That confusion isn't innate in our species but is the product of our culture. Tragedy and farce have the same structure because they deal with the same problems and the Second World War was the farce of death. We should not parade in false dignity. The bird's-eye view sees what the struggle leads to. The First World War was more destructive than the crusades and colonial wars. The Second World War was more destructive than the First World War. The Third World War will be more destructive than all earlier wars and crusades put together. The holocaust was the greatest crime in history. Not to have fought against it would have been a greater crime. Ideology has vast power and who is free to describe reality? And the danger is, reality takes no sides.

Drama is our only means of disentangling and understanding the problem. The difficulty is that "The Institution of Theatre" is now too weak and inadequate to understand it and too busy to try. Capitalism's recreation institutions are theatre, sport, spectacle and entertainment. Drama is a privileged form of understanding because of its monad origin -- it is the means, the form of understanding, into which the problem can be fitted. The infant monad is the stage on which the

drama of the human crisis is first played. Later drama re-enacts the crisis in the audiences' world. How can society, community and individual be bridged so that drama is public and its effect shared? Is there still a way? Drama is the triple-brain. The triple-brain is made of the audience's brains (each member of it) and the player's brains (all of them), and the third brain is the wooden stage itself. The three brains are one. Every member of the audience and every player was once the monad in which the brain creates the human self. Drama returns the self to its primal monad human state and the one act in which it creates self and morality. That is, drama recreates our reality, our entry into reality. Why is the third brain the stage and not the play? The play is transitory but drama endures. Nothing, for example no Freudian insight, can change the meaning of Hamlet or Antigone. Their meaning is bound into itself, into the means of meaning. The Greeks created the stage as the public space on which to recreate individual human reality. The triple-brain may present all the situations, dilemmas and paradoxes that a human being may be in and be human. The triple-brain is the human individual site of the community. Unfortunately this does not mean that drama is free from ideology – drama's purpose is to confront it. I read a book in which an Oxbridge don wrote that he found Antigone to be a "tiresome gall." (I've already mentioned the prosaicness, the banality, of some drama teaching.) Drama as part of culture expresses politics and so is vulnerable to reaction but drama contests reaction -- and in its logic, there is the power of the human imperative.

Capitalism's use of entertainment -- comedy, melodrama and reductive documentary – to destroy the stage is a triple-lobotomy. It might seem it would be impossible to recreate the stage that has been lost, to reopen the Institution that has been closed. But when actors in a drama share human responsibility with the audience, are with them in the triple brain, drama recreates itself. Then instead of acting there is enactment and the reality in the triple brain is shared. It is the nearest the self can get to seeing itself. In enactment the self discloses itself in the life of other people. In contrast to this, the strident effects and mannered sentimentality of entertainment-theatre dominate the audience and have the stun-effects that are in all hypnotism.

The performance of a society's theatre becomes the performance of its institutions, law and politics. All of them belong in the same structure. Clearly this is so in modern politics. The politics of the past were as serious as civilization's great dramatic tragedies. The apparent surface moves of politics are still much the same (or administration would not be possible) but the use and meaning of political structure has utterly changed. When the tragic is removed from tragedy, the outlawed tragic stalks the streets and on them there is violence and sentimentality instead of reason and pathos. I write about the crucifixion because it is a prototype of human consciousness. God and Christ were father and son in one. Then legally and exegetically the crucifixion would have been suicide, a pointless rite. There had to be an outsider, someone apart, to make the crucifixion a social act with meaning and the ground of morality. If this isn't so, Judas's role is redundant, an otiose melodrama. If God and Christ are one the crucifixion is a conspiracy of power and Judas is the victim. Judas is God's tool, as much a victim as Christ but he "knows not what he does." Judas is a figure of farce in the tragedy of the crucifixion. The farcical figure is a clown. The clown acts mechanically as if he had tumbled back from humanness into nature. He has a white face, a mask that shows no emotion or intention. By the crucifixion God created a moral form but not humanness. Pathos not reason makes us human. Reason can be the skill of Nazi butchers. As yet there was no pathos – but it was about to happen: Judas hanged himself. Someone born of a virgin would be half-territory-half-site, a pre-Christian magus walking on water. That is not an allowable solution to the problem of Oedipus. It is not known if Judas saw the crucifixion but it is certain that he died alone twisting on a rope, a human rag swinging in the wind. Judas suffered and he must be seen as the Son of Man and Woman. Pathos is sorrow at the pain and suffering of the innocent and the guilty. The brilliance of Charley Chaplin is that he was a clown but had pathos. He took care to emphasise his reasoned technique, the open meticulous way he rehearsed and achieved his effects. Chaplain was not a mechanism. He didn't conceal his purpose in secrets and his candid openness made reason act as pathos. He had a Hitler moustache – a prop from farce – but turned it into pathos by his use of reason. Chaplin's face is an

icon. Because farce has no reason it isn't human. Reason would require farce to explain itself and it has no explanation. Could the arena stage the tragedy of the crucifixion? Suppose one day in the arena a son killed his real father, as in Oedipus? Or a father killed his real son, as in the crucifixion? These would be killings not murders, ironically much as the cheetah kills, but in the arena even money is not a reason but an excuse for killing. In all murders there is a reason however confused and it follows that if humans last then one day they will understand themselves. In a sane society guilt would be an aesthetic quality. The father-son killings in the arena would be entertainments, cash-stunts. Each would create a void in which reality imitated imagination. They would be as fake as TV reality-shows, farces not tragedies. The tragedy would be the society outside the arena. Capitalism is a farce with the consequences of tragedy. You don't need the promise of resurrection and the threat of hell when you have reason and pathos because with them you already have understanding. It's easy to see that the crucifix is like the plot of a drama -- and the purpose of drama is to remove the ideology from the story. I called it the logic of drama. There is no God, the story of the crucifixion was created by the tectonic shifts in the great masses of human beings.

It is essential to farce that it has no reason. To achieve its ends modern administration depends on rational efficiency but modern politics itself has done away with reason. Without reason there is no pathos, understanding or humanness. Donald Trump does not make treaties and pacts with his opponents. He makes deals. Deals can't rationalise the complicated mass politics of administration and diplomacy. This is not a linguistic foible. Deals squeeze out human reason. Farce is afraid of truth and addicted to danger. Both are characteristics of Trump. He is a paranoid reactionary clown with the art of making clumsiness look like a skill. The clown in the farce that destroys the means of judging him. The prototype of the postmodern politicians who will follow him. But why, how is all this so? The answer has already been given. Why? – to make money. How? – Capitalism has ceased to create humanness . It has reverted to nature and with that we lose rational-judgement and pathos. The causes of The Thirds Crisis are profound and come from the basic structure of our species, the relation between nature and consciousness. We are becoming the paranoid reactionaries who can't see the reality around them. We dodge and contrive and society becomes increasingly irrational. We no longer live in a democracy or even try to create one. Our politics -- our society -- are a farce and all farces must end in disaster.

When we abandon the last of our human responsibility the "gun lobby" will become the "bomb lobby" and we will shroud the earth in nuclear dust. Unlike Lear we haven't seen the cruel joke so we go on laughing. We will not die crying, not even decently laughing at ourselves but giggling and guffawing like children making mud pies in a cemetery. That is the grandeur of our times. It is the logic of drama – and that is the logic of reality.

Hitler won, he always did.

\*

Leibnitz's question is why is there anything rather than nothing. Because we ask the question we can give it meaning but we shall never be able to answer it. It is what without why. Newton thought that time and space were separate entities in which we put things in the way we put a cup on a saucer. But there is only space-time. Space bends and the speed of time changes depending on where you are in space. If space did not bend the cup would fall off the saucer. Things are not as they may seem. But the infant human is right about humanness and morality. It creates them out of nothingness. Theatre is corrupt because we live in ideologies. Drama can't be corrupted because the infant monad created it before there were ideologies. We are in civilization's Third Crisis. If we fail to create a new drama out of our crisis we will lose the power to take care of civilization and of each other.

These notes are not about drama techniques and not really about particular plays. I use those only to illustrate the nature of drama itself. Imagination may lose itself in our busy lives and we have to learn how to find its images in ourselves. I wrote these notes to describe how to find them. If we don't understand the nature of imagination and drama we can make only theatre. To make drama we must understand the purpose of imagination. The "Institution of Theatre" has become a fortress of reaction. Yet our playwrights, especially the young, could, could, could create drama that would revolutionise not just society but the human condition. Elsewhere I described a drama device I called the invisible object. I explained how enactment (but not acting) can make it visible. One evening years ago when I was hardly more than a boy I walked through the debris of bombed London streets to a theatre to see Donald Wolfit as Macbeth. Macbeth saw in the air before him the knife that would lead him to the king he was to murder. Of course there was no knife. It was an image in Macbeth's head. It was Shakespeare's profound dramatic insight -- the object embodied the motive as it does in all human culture. Macbeth reached out at arm's length to clutch it. The forward weight of his body opened a gap between the ground and his heel -- the actor had put the invisible object in the triple-brain. In cinema the knife would be visible dripping gore and the audience would lick its lips. But the invisible object was the gap between the actor's heel and the ground. The actor had enacted reality.

Of itself drama can't make society human but without drama there can be no human society.

\*\*\*