

3 The Glass Cage

3.1 Descriptive *Poietic* Analysis: *The Glass Cage*

3.1.1 Pre-Production: *The Glass Cage*

Production Phase:	<i>Pre-Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Writing</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Appropriative; Pre-Determinate</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech</i>

Ian Brown first submitted *The Glass Cage* on Michael Russell's behalf to Executive Producer, David Britton of ABC Radio Drama in 1996 following a public playreading, which was taped. The script and tape were not entered into the script assessment system. Britton's contract was not renewed at the end of 1996 as ABC Radio Drama staff and broadcast programme outputs were cut, and he consequently left the ABC.

Ian submitted the script again in 1997, this time for the Ian Reed Foundation radio drama prize [IRP/97/46], which was auspiced by the ABC.

A pilot recording exists of this text, a copy of which was sent to ABC Radio Drama a good while ago now. Apart from a call from the department to assure us they were making a decision on the script and apologising for the delay, we are yet to hear of its fate. (Ian Brown, cover letter to Ian Reed Radio Drama Prize 19/9/97)

It was rejected for the prize by David Chandler ex-EP of Radio Drama in his capacity as external script-assessor for the Radio Drama production unit. Chandler did however recommend that the new EP of Radio Drama, Richard Buckham, and feature-makers Jane Ulman and Nick Franklin, "should have a look at it as either an "illustrated" doco or companion piece to [a] doco." Nothing came of this recommendation either.

I met Ian at the 1998 Australian National Playwrights Conference where I directed a rehearsed reading of *The Anatomy Lesson of Dr Ruysch* by Hilary Bell, which I had commissioned for ABC Radio Drama. I presented a radio drama playwrighting workshop at the conference where I spoke of not being so focussed on professional writing, by which I meant the competent but bloodless writing I had often encountered that smacked of writers looking for their next ‘gig’ rather than pursuing their passion. Rather, I was listening out for the “genuine authorial voice” one with something to say. Also, I was aware of ‘workshop syndrome’ where, responding to critical feedback, writers would polish the rough edges (distinctive characteristics) and the singularity of their works out of existence in the pursuit of a dramatic shape that would conform to an aggregated taste. Hearing my views on the matter encouraged Ian to approach me immediately afterwards with *The Glass Cage*, which he thought, “might be the sort of thing I was looking for.”¹

Ian was correct in his summation, as became clear when he described the script’s provenance, and was confirmed when I had an opportunity to read it closely. Ian recounted Michael’s situation and the beginnings of the script once more when I solicited additional detail for the preparation of on-air presentation copy², and also as background to its 2000 Prix Italia Radio Drama entry.

¹ First Broadcast: Airplay 13/06/99. Re-broadcast 17/09/00. Radio Fiction Finalist at the Prix Italia 2000 at Bologna-Rimini. Production team: Michael Russell, Playwright [assisted by Ian Brown]; David Field, Actor; Andrei Shabunov, Sound Engineer; Christopher Williams, Producer/Director.

² Broadcast Presentation Copy for *The Glass Cage*:

Michael Russell was born in 1976. At eighteen months of age, he was placed in care, and has been a “client” ever since. Michael is “profoundly autistic”, with no power of speech, and was deemed ineducable.

Some behavioural difficulties – specifically, “smearing” or painting with his own excrement: an act with both expressive and political motivations – led to the discovery that Michael could both comprehend and communicate. He was by then seventeen years old.

These days Michael communicates chiefly by tapping out words on a photocopy of a keyboard. With the assistance of his therapist, Michael began writing about his experiences in what was later to become today’s play: *The Glass Cage*.

Michael is “profoundly autistic”, with no power of speech, and some behavioural difficulties. [...] Michael is a resident of the Sandgate Centre [and was] deemed uneducable. One of Michael’s “behavioural problems” was “smearing” – or painting – his own excrement on any wall he could find. It was this particular “problem” – an act with both expressive and political motivations – which lead to the discovery that Michael could communicate. He was 17 years old. It had been assumed that he was linguistically incapable, but several speech therapists later, Michael was conversing with his carers via “Facilitated Communication” (FC). [...]

Michael expertly types his words onto a photocopy of a keyboard, seemingly without even looking at it. [...] Fortunately, therapist Alice Owen [...] offered to take Michael into her poetry appreciation programme. [...] Michael wrote a series of poems which he later self-published. [...] He continued to write creatively and in 1995 he applied to join a writing programme with Access Arts, an organisation devoted to disabilities and the arts. Michael’s writing process, especially in the early days was very slow and laborious, and he dropped out of the program after having produced eight pages of what was the first draft of what he called “a play for voices”. Alice Owen convinced Playlab [...] to take over what remained of Michael’s contribution to the Access Arts Writing Programme. He was eventually teamed with Ian Brown, who facilitated the re-drafting of the text, now titled *The Glass Cage*. (Ian Brown, undated Fax)

In my view, Michael’s piece was precisely the kind of work that a public broadcaster should support: giving voice to the ‘voiceless’. I requested that a contract be issued for *The Glass Cage* immediately upon my return from the Australian National Playwrights Conference, and Ian was contacted with an offer a couple of weeks later.

The development of the play was facilitated by Ian Brown of Brisbane’s Playlab. When Ian asked Michael why he never used the first person pronoun in his writing, Michael replied, “Because I haven’t felt like an ‘I’ for a very long time.”

The Glass Cage is written in six vocal parts – the voices in Michael’s head – and is performed entirely by David Field.

The sound engineer, composers Luigi Nono and Dmitri Shostakovich and the producer/director were credited after the play had aired in the back announcement.

Michael Russell subtitles *The Glass Cage* a “play for voices” and the title page includes the epigraph “BECAUSE I HAVEN’T FELT LIKE AN ‘I’ FOR A VERY LONG TIME”. This suggested to me concerns of personal identity; the integrity of the *ego*; and the experience of subjectivity. The play is written in six voices all of which are aspects of Michael himself: the ‘voices in his head’, as it were. They are: “Michael 1- the voice of despair: evil and vicious – ‘a depressing bastard’; Michael 2 – the voice of hope: nice, and sweet and hopeful; [‘Ghouls of mine’ – M.R.]” then “The Despairing”; “the Poo Person – soft like velvet, female with sultry undertones”; “A Judge”; and “Fairy Godmother (see also Production: Performing).

The structure of the piece is deceptively simple with a basic narrative divided into six scenes. In Scene 1 “Prelude to Escape”, Michael describes having a bad day. Only his writing maintains his sanity. He is tortured by a boredom that feeds a smouldering rage. Those of his carers that do in fact care seem unable to help him. Scene 2 “Poo-Painting a Plan...” is the longest in the play. Michael describes his experience of smearing his own excrement – at one time his only outlet for self-expression. His actions horrify his carers, which destroys any sense of pleasure he is able to derive from them. He is left feeling entirely misunderstood. “The Despairing” and “Fairy Godmother” resemble Good and Evil Angels in their struggle to drag Michael down or buoy him up. Michael feels trapped as his attempts at escape are short-lived. In the short Scene 3 – “The Smell of Freedom”, Michael sees an opportunity to break out. This is in part an allusion to being taught to read and write as a result of attention staff paid him in response to his smearing behaviour.

Michael 1:

Just when it all seems so useless and tragic, your need is met and someone unlocks your cage and sets you free. They come and give you a life of hope and joy and words and meaning.

At the end of the scene Michael's suicidal thoughts are paired with a protest that his "poo" is not an object of disgust. The scene concludes with "A moved sequence with music and vocal repetition that culminates in the escape".

In Scene 4 – "On the Run" Michael's voices conflict hope and despair, aspiration and self-loathing. There is a tension here between the excitement of 'breaking out' and the dead weight of his sense of his own inadequacy to survive in the outside world. Finally he is reconciled to the idea that his attempt at independence is premature. He resolves to go back into care consoled with the knowledge of the progress that he has made. Michael appears to be driven to give up by hunger, and by the fear that he will be apprehended by the Law. This suggests that Michael may perhaps have felt compelled or at least tempted to steal food to survive outside of care. In either case, in "Scene 5 – On Trial", Michael describes his return to care as an imprisonment, a punishment for a crime he does not recall committing, and his feelings of persecution, martyred, "Saint-like", to the mental health system. The concluding scene, "Back at the Ranch", is a powerful accusation against the system of care as he experiences it, and those who stand by and do nothing to change it. He is left feeling diminished: "they refuse to allow you to be a human being". The boredom is torture. His suffering serves no purpose and has no meaning: "I am a metaphor for pain and suffering who opens your own wounds".

I identified a number of potential cuts to the written script according to dramaturgical criteria that I judged would improve its spoken delivery. These amounted to three speeches and four other phrases. Broadly speaking these presented as somewhat clumsy or obvious (and therefore redundant) in the writing: "in fact" (Michael 1: 1st speech, Scene 1) spoiled the rhythm of the speech; "it is extremely interesting that" (Michael 2: 1st speech, Scene 1) is redundant; "because they show their concern and can't do anything for him" (Michael 1: 3rd speech, Scene 1) resorts to explaining; as does "It is only an idea you have – only a fragile little idea that keeps you going and gives you

hope. It means so much to hear other people telling you you can do things and encouraging you to go on when all seems lost” (Michael 1, end of Scene 2); “instead of narrowness” (Michael 2: beginning Scene 4) spoils the rhythm set up in the two previous phrases; “So that I am unable to function at anything more than an animal level and can’t see any way out or any hope” (Michael 2: 3rd speech, Scene 4) and “and not doubted” (Michael 2: 4th speech, Scene 4) both resort to explanation. Later on, in the production phase, working on the performance with actor David Field (see Production: Performing below), he easily persuaded me that he could give a convincing performance of pretty much all of the passages I considered doubtful in their writing, and agreed to cutting just two of the phrases: “instead of narrowness” and “and not doubted”.

I was struck by Michael’s evocative setting for *The Glass Cage*, which includes the phrase: “A hole in the fabric of time and space”. From my dramaturgical reading of the script, in spatial terms the several voices Michael hears/imagines co-exist (multiple) in the one mental space, but at the same time each speaks from its own place (a pre-condition for a distinct identity). Consequently, I would have to overlay multiple spatial acoustics. For these to register, the sound design could not afford to be too dense. The solution to this concern lay for me in building a sound design on the voice (see ‘Post-Production: Composing’). In temporal terms, Michael as represented in *The Glass Cage* lives in a condition of stasis, repetition, activity without consequence. This suggested a frequent use of repetition of phrases – verbal and musical - (already inscribed to some extent in the script); and the rupture of the temporal flow: chorus-like interludes, interjections, ‘irruptions of the real’, and ostinati.

I was struck too by the phrase, “Voices from silence” at the beginning of the play. For me, the music of the piece had to arise out of the thoughts represented as forming in Michael’s head.

*

Production Phase: *Pre-Production*
 Creative Practice: *Composing*
 Creative Strategy: *Indeterminate; Appropriative; Pre-determinate*
 Sonic Material: *Speech; Music*

I was conscious in producing *The Glass Cage* that I was not so much 'interpreting a script' as creating a 'listening experience' for the audience. As befitted a work of experimental dramaturgy, I was interested in exploring the potential for sound design in *The Glass Cage*. It's radiophonic potential for me lay chiefly in the 'musicalization' of speech. I decided to make arrangements of speech which would involve a musical approach through the use of orchestration, rhythm, counterpoint, repetition, and radiophonic (or electro-acoustic) treatment. The sound design would also involve and explore the simultaneous layering of spaces that would be inscribed in multi-tracked vocal recordings. I determined that in post-production I would make creative use of sampling, and 'time-stretching' digital signal processing so as to 'elasticize' the sound of the voice, and to effect the deconstruction of passages of appropriated music.

Michael's epigraph for the play (see Pre-Production: Writing above) was prompted by a question from Ian as to why Michael did not tend to use the first person pronoun (he uses almost exclusively in the voice of Michael 2). If Michael experienced the "I" as *other*, then this for me mandated dramaturgically a paratactic manoeuver that was the key to the musicalization of the speech. I decided to record a wide variety of enunciations of the word "I" to be edited in place of the originals in the post-production process. These would function similarly to large interval transposition of motifs in pointillism or *Klangfarbenmelodien*. I also considered mapping these to a sampler so that they might be played (and transposed) from a keyboard.

I selected certain phrases for repetition, taking my cue from three production notes in the original script: one calling for “a moved sequence with music and vocal repetition that culminates in the escape”; another for the word “Twit” to be “Repeated as necessary”; and a third, “repeat: you only cost us money”. I imagined these phrases could function independently as ostinati or as ‘shout choruses’ supporting other vocal lines. I identified all these phrases in the margins of my production script in preparation for recording. In the first scene, I identified three occurrences of the phrase from Michael 2’s second speech “and food and toilets”. The first occurrence is repeated once. I planned to have the performer repeat the phrase rapidly for an extended period and then to fade it under the continuing speech in post-production. I would then repeat this device on the third occurrence of “and food and toilets” within the same speech. Later in the same speech, I would use this device again repeating the phrase “and how many times”. At the end of Scene 1, I would treat the phrase “cares and cares” and “hates and hates” in the same fashion.

In Scene 2, I marked the phrases from The Despairing’s first speech, “crazy”, “and mad”, “and bad”, “and stupid” for repetition in performance. This speech concludes with an anaphora built on “and your” to emphasize Michael’s litany of faults. Michael 1’s “round and around and around . . .”; Fairy Godmother’s “and on and on . . .” were to be treated similarly. I selected from Scene 3 The Fairy Godmother, “They don’t believe me”; Michael 2 (as per Michael’s production note) “You only cost us money”; and the Poo Person, “it’s only my poo”. From Scene 4, Michael 2’s first speech, I noted another instance of anaphora incorporating “It’s a feeling”, so I marked the opening part of the phrase for repetitive delivery. Michael 2’s next speech features a fourfold repetition of the word “hate” would I thought could be extended further. Michael 1’s “Twit. Twit. Twit” is intended to be “Repeated as necessary”. “You can go back” appears three times in two of Fairy Godmother’s speeches. Fairy Godmother also repeats “I will be there” three times. These phrases, too, could be extended through repetition. Likewise the phrase “Food, food,

food” that appears in one of Michael 2’s speeches. In the Michael 1 speech that follows I marked the phrase, “Go on. Go on. Give it up” in my production script with the intention repeating it. In Scene 5 – On trial, Michael often uses repetition: “guilty, guilty, guilty. You, You, You. Guilty, Guilty, Guilty” (Judge); “Twit, twit, twit” and “Ha Ha Ha!” (Michael 1); “Awful. Awful. Awful. Pain. Pain. Pain.” (The Despairing). Michael in this scene employs anaphora a third time: “no reprieve/no pardon/no joy/no hope” (Judge).

Michael includes two sequences that make extensive use of alliteration and assonance to form a musical patterning. Firstly, The Despairing addresses the listener with “It only seems that you are crazy and mad/ and bad and sad and Vlad.” Then later, Michael 1 describes the tedium of his everyday existence:

It makes your life seem endless and
 kooky and cookie and rocky and gnocchi –
 Gooky and drooky and grookie and sookie
 Soopy and froopy and loopy and gloopy
 droogie and froogie and looby and drooby
 ghoooullie and cruelly and snooly and schmoolie -

Having decided to cast one performer to voice six roles, I faced the challenge of working with that performer to differentiate between them. In and of itself this choice determined the work as *radiophonic*: it is impossible to stage effectively in this way. The form of radiophonic orchestration relies on the actor’s vocal range and characterisation based on the speeches; on the use of signal processing such as reverb; and on the use of the variations in acoustic characteristics of the recording studio (see Production: Performing & Recording. In post-production I incorporated montage technique (Poo Person), and the ‘abuse’ of sound production technology (The Despairing) to augment my emerging orchestration (see Post-Production: Recording).

Of the six voices in *The Glass Cage*, I decided to pre-determine the rhythm for the Fairy Godmother speeches. I heard this voice in my mind's ear performed in a childish 'sing-song' voice giving it a pollyanna-ish feel. I notated a potential rhythmic stress pattern on a 'post-it note' on the cover of my production script, intending to work on it with the performer in rehearsal. The notated stress pattern is: long/short/short/ - long/short/short/ - long/short/ - long/short ($6/8 + 3/8 + 3/8$). I equated this with the feel of a nursery rhyme similar to a $3/4$ waltz. I also noted the potential for the use of the sound of a child's music box under the Fairy Godmother speeches. I recorded all the Fairy Godmother speeches in two sung takes and in a high-pitched but spoken version also.

I intended to create a sound design that was sparse, unsettling, spiky and rendered in intense bursts to intersperse and break up the speech; to create a sound world that was, in a word: fractured. I also wanted to cue the listener that this work is experimental in form by appropriating recordings of avant-garde music or by appropriating passages of music for unconventional use in musical and radiophonic experiment. An important dimension to the sound design is predicated on Michael's setting of the work in no space (a utopic space). There is no inscription of diegetic space in this 'play for voices'. The listener is enlisted in the task of creating Michael's world in his or her own mind. *The Glass Cage* is a play in which the acoustic subject is decentred together with the fracturing of Michael's scripted persona into six autonomous voices. Consequently, the sound design is relieved of the burden of constructing such a diegetic space sonically. *The Glass Cage* in my production makes no use of recorded sound effects (nor are any specified in the script).

I first came across the Shostakovich string quartets at the 1986 Adelaide Festival where The Shostakovich Quartet presented all fifteen in a stunning series of performances. The *Allegretto Furioso* in the 10th String Quartet was electrifying and by the end of the final movement the audience was moved to

stand on their chairs cheering and applauding: the experience stayed with me ever since. I speculated that this movement might bring the kind of intensity I was seeking for the scene “On the Run”. Paul Griffiths describes the movement as “shocking” and “a ferocious march in E minor” (2012); while Alan George writes of it as “a sadistic creature” “which must be one of the fiercest of a particularly aggressive species of scherzo movements” (1994). I was also seeking 20th century electroacoustic or avant-garde instrumental works that could complement The Shostakovich Quartet sonically. The Shostakovich would be suitable for the escape scene, but I needed something with which to create an extensive but fractured soundscape.

I had become aware of Luigi Nono as a composer while reading up on the RAI radiophonic studios in Milan. A search of the ABC record library for any electro-acoustic works out of Milan yielded almost incidentally a copy of Nono’s string quartet *Framente-Stille, an Diotima*. I was drawn to the sound of this work in part for its use of Schönbergian *klangfarbenmelodie* and its deconstruction of Beethoven’s Op. 132. This work could easily have fulfilled the role of underscoring the Ulrike Meinhof speeches in *My Poor Room* (Case Study 2) taken by Xenakis. The fragmentary form of the work seemed in keeping with Michael’s representation of his fractured personality. According to Håvard Enge (2011),

In this period, Nono also began experimenting with the perception of musical space by employing live electronics. Rather than openly provoking the audience to outward political action, the works of Nono’s third and last phase seem to be directed *inwards*: toward a renewal of listening, perception and reflection. Feeling much closer to the thinking of John Cage than he had done 20 years earlier, he now frequently spoke of – and composed with – *silence*. But the details of his music were just as far from chance procedures and aesthetic indifference as they had been. In his pupil Helmut Lachenmann’s words, “the silence into which Nono’s late works lead us is a *fortissimo* of agitated perception.”

“A *fortissimo* of agitated perception” describes very well the writing in *The Glass Cage*. Nono’s experiments with sound colours voiced simultaneously in

combinations of instruments playing with varied dynamics, durations, articulations, and extended playing techniques, engages the audience in close listening to its emerging timbres:

The listener is not overwhelmed by information, but has the opportunity to reflect upon each sound or constellation of sounds. Lachenmann argues that the silences invite the listeners to discover themselves:

It is not just the composed score of the *Diotima* quartet which puts across this music's message: it is the perception of its reflection in our inner selves, across the space of silence and also remembrance, reflection, self-discovery as opened up by the fermata. (Ibid.)

Incorporating elements of Nono's work into *The Glass Cage* would help draw the listener into a mode of spatial perception that denies the listener any point of audition outside the work, and so immerses – submerges – the listener in Michael Russell's world, even as he or she experiences (and so produces) it.

*

Production Phase:	<i>Pre-Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Performing</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Pre-determinate</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech</i>

In my dramaturgical analysis of *The Glass Cage* I noted the presentational mode of address inscribed in the script. Michael Russell did not develop a scenic space in which the listener could observe the actions and behaviour of dramatic characters at a remove. Instead he collapses any distance between performer and listener. The listener does not occupy an "audioposition" (Sterne 2015), or 'point of audition' (Chion 1994) outside of the work. Michaels 1 and 2 directly address the listener in a form of monologic narration. Of the two, Michael 2 tends to assume a more intimate mode of address. The voice of Fairy Godmother generally speaks to Michael, except in

one ‘aside’ to the listener delivered in Michael’s implicit presence: the Fairy Godmother talks about Michael in the third person to the listener, as it were ‘in front of him’.

Somehow our belief
 gives him a strength
 to go on and on and on
 in spite of the setbacks and
 barriers and obstacles and
 his own stupid body which
 tortures him
 ceaselessly and
 gives him no rest
 or respite or let up or
 hope of change and progress.

Conversely, The Poo Person addresses the listener, except for one occasion when he addresses Michael with “Sweetie, don’t worry. It will be alright.” The Despairing addresses Michael throughout, including what serves as almost a curse: “Awful. Awful. Awful. Pain. Pain. Pain.” but could equally be a cry for help addressed to the listener. The voice A Judge solely addresses Michael, however by the time we hear him, we are already deeply complicit in the production of Michael’s world. Our identification with Michael complete, we, too, stand accused and sentenced, addressed as “You”.

I made the decision to include the titles, epigraph, and closing of the play as performance text in ‘the authorial voice’, identifying Michael Russell as both dramatic persona(e) and author, portrayed by an actor. I reasoned that working with a single performer to play all six voices would help embody the idea of a divided personality: recognisably the same person but at the same time voiced in its multiple aspects. Besides, I recognised that this approach would be inherently *radiophonic* since it would be effectively impossible to realize on stage, and would require the technical resources of the sound studio.

When I first saw David Field perform it was in the role of the Bosun in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* in Neil Armfield's production at Belvoir Street Theatre. I was struck by Field's silent concentration such that he repeatedly drew my attention away from other members of the cast playing the scene. I had to reassure myself that he was not deliberately pulling focus and found myself in awe of his ability to command the stage by his concentrated and focussed presence alone. I subsequently cast David in the premier production of *Low* by Daniel Keene at Belvoir St Theatre, and in the radio plays *Baby* by Billy Marshall-Stoneking and *All Souls* also by Daniel Keene. For *The Glass Cage*, I needed an actor emotionally brave and mature enough to go to some dark places. I had confidence in David's power to command an audience's attention, and in his range and creative imagination to find six different voices for the one divided personality inscribed in *The Glass Cage* script.

*

Production Phase:	<i>Pre-Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Recording</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Pre-determinate; Indeterminate, Appropriative</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech, Music</i>

I started work on *The Glass Cage* convinced of its radiophonic potential; that is, its scope for sound design and engaging the aural imagination. I decided to signify to the audience my production's experimental aspirations through the appropriation of an avant-garde string quartet performing a sparse *klangfarbenmelodie*, and a fiercely expressive movement from a more conventional but deeply passionate string quartet performance. In my 'reading' of the script, there was no call for the use of sound effects, as I was not intending to create a *diegetic* space. This I believed would heighten the musicality of the production. *The Glass Cage* takes place (if at all) in a *non-*

existent space, within a texture of vocal presences, articulating aspects of a decentred and fragmented persona.

I did not consider using a range of microphones to assist in the development of the six vocal personae that comprise Michael's – identity is not the word – perhaps, 'self-talk'. I presumed that any variation in timbre generated by this means could be as easily achieved by audio signal processing after the event. Besides I was keen to hear what the performer David Field could achieve by his own technique in this regard. This desire extended to wanting to hear David 'play' the studio acoustics as an extension of his own voice (see Production: Performing), treating the studio (and not just the microphone) as an instrument for performing.

The range of modes of address identified above (Pre-Production: Performing) and developed in performance (see below Production: Performing), called for differentiations in the level of intimacy and distance inscribed in the recorded speech. This necessitated the conscious construction of multiple spaces for the various voices to 'inhabit', and which would inscribe their sonic imprints (or 'grain') on those voices as recorded. This approach would both draw attention to the use of the recorded voice to produce sonic space, and implicate the listener in the production of that space: producing a point of listening within the work while producing the space of the work in the act of attentive listening.

This production of the space of the work would be complicated by a rupturing of the temporal flow of the work (see Post-Production: Recording). I have already indicated that I intended to cut into the flow of speeches by Michael 1 which used the first person pronoun 'I', and to substitute alternate takes producing a defamiliarization, presenting the 'I' as *other*. In pre-production, I also considered using other pronouns that referred to Michael voiced by Michael2: 'he', 'him', 'himself', 'me', and 'my'. I considered that these all (along with 'I') could be 'performed' by a computer text-reader, but decided the

machine-like connotations would be undesirable. Besides, I counted seventy-eight instances of these personal pronouns, which, treated in this way I considered, would threaten the coherence of the performance. I therefore limited any particular treatment of pronouns to that of 'I'. To this end, I planned to record David Field recording many variations of the word 'I'.

In thinking this approach through, I came up with the idea of 'morphing' the spoken 'I' into the sound of a violin. I auditioned a few recordings of solo violin, before concluding that I could just as easily work with samples of stringed instruments from the Nono quartet. This allowed me to develop a more dynamic sonic development to trace the course of Michael's self-estrangement through *The Glass Cage*. The gradual musicalization of the first person pronoun and its transformation into musical notes, also changed the relationship between the soundscape collaged from samples from Nono to Michael's personae. His world would now be perceived as populated by musical expressions of his fragmented persona. Those notes being sonic residual traces of a decaying presence of an 'I'.

3.1.2 Production: *The Glass Cage*

Production Phase:	<i>Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Writing</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Pre-Determinate; Indeterminate</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech</i>

I worked with actor David Field on the script on the day of recording. Once I had briefed him on my production concept (in addition to any notes sent with a copy of the script in advance), I identified for him those phrases from the script that were marked for repetition and improvisation. My plan was to record the complete speeches attributed to each voice separately, and then pickup the phrases designated for a particular approach in performance. That is, any extra speech elements would be recorded at the conclusion of a

‘straight’ reading of the related speech. The exception to this was with the recording of the instances of ‘I’ which I planned to record after the conclusion of all the Michael 2 speeches, for editing into the speeches in post-production. Recording out of script sequence allowed for the continuity in acoustic set-up including microphone placement, and assisted the performer in maintaining consistency in each vocal characterisation (six in total) and to secure a differentiation between them. Overall, I hoped to capture a more conventional reading of the script along with variations in articulation and intonation, which would allow me to work with the relative tension between verbal coherence and paratactical features in post-production. I viewed this as a process of generating sonic speech materials.

When I came to explain my proposed cuts to the script, David was moved to defend many of the lines so marked. It was a matter of professional pride as a performer that he was convinced he could make these phrases ‘work’. These phrases also include “This food obsession...it drives me to do awful things that jeopardise my very life”, which is a note by Michael Russell in his second last Michael 2 speech from Scene 4. A simple demonstration by David was enough to convince me in all but two instances (see Pre-Production: Writing above). David relayed to me that in his experience directors tended to resort somewhat too readily to cuts in production prior to rehearsal. This has two consequences: the script becomes ‘smoothed out’ in the manner described above (Pre-Production: Writing), making it seem bland; and the actor is denied the challenge of working with difficult text, leaving him or her with the sense that they are not trusted by the director. Of course, under the regime in which we worked (public broadcasting), I was entitled simply to insist on these cuts, but that would not have served ‘the work’, only the maintenance of my power/status as Producer, which was not my concern here. This exchange was not about demarcation or territoriality or even a concern with losing any amount of lines of speech. Here David was asserting the quality and efficacy of his creative practice as a performer in the context of an interaction with a creative practitioner engaged in the creative practice of

Writing (dramaturgy). Indeed, this was not the first time we had consciously negotiated the interaction between our respective roles. While working together on *Low* at Belvoir Street Theatre, I had embarked on an experimental approach in my directing incorporating aspects of Mike Leigh's improvisational technique (with whom I had studied at AFTRS) and Charles Mairowitz's take on rehearsal techniques derived from Artaud's Theatre of Cruelty during the LAMDA experiments, before David made a representation on his own and fellow actor Rosemary Harris's behalf that their needs as actors were not being met by this particular rehearsal process (Mairowitz was confronted by the same tensions in practice). They were concerned that they would simply run out of time in rehearsal to develop a complex characterisation and to embody the *mise-en-scène* required. Simply put, my more experimental approach had created anxiety in two result-oriented professional actors. I refocused my rehearsal plan overnight to a more conventional and pragmatic one and the play went on to critical success. Since my role as a director in relation to the actors is to assist them in achieving their best as performers, I had no hesitation in modifying my approach to rehearsal as it involved no compromise of my directorial aspirations for that particular production. One of the advantages of working in radiophonic production for me was the alleviation of anxiety for the actor of opening night nerves. Since the completed performance is always deferred until the production is mixed and the actors typically long gone, the actors do not assume a responsibility for it in the same way as for a theatrical production.

David and I worked through the script seated at the table. David reading, me giving feedback. We paid close attention to the phrasing of the speeches as Michael Russell's punctuation is somewhat idiosyncratic. We marked sense pauses and breath pauses, and the relative importance between multiple clauses. We spent considerable time around the table working on the rhythmic phrasing of *Fairy Godmother* which required practice and some revisions on my part as the approach evolved (see Pre-Production: Composing), and on 'placing the voice' for each of the six voices in the script

(see Production: Performing). I requested that David voice the titles in the script, but reserved judgement on whether to use these recordings until post-production.

*

Production Phase:	<i>Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Composing</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Pre-Determinate; Indeterminate</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech</i>

I deferred further work on appropriated music recordings until the post-production phase. Composing during studio recording centred on the orchestration of voices on the actor David Field, and the working up of sung speech through the pre-determined rhythmic patterns and improvised (i.e. indeterminate) pitches.

I thought of Michael 1 as a pessimistic and generally negative voice of self-criticism. Michael Russell describes him as “the voice of despair: evil and vicious – ‘a depressing bastard’”. This is the voice that constantly runs Michael down. He addresses Michael in the third person, harrying him at close quarters. The voice should convey an attitude of contempt and self-loathing, frequently employing sarcasm to wound or to establish distance. I heard it in a lower register. Michael 2 speaks for Michael in the first person – the only voice to do so. So I looked for a more intimate approach to voicing it. This would be close-miked, softer in tone, and lighter in register. In Michael’s words: “the voice of hope: nice, sweet and hopeful. This voice is self-reflexive and shares Michael’s innermost thoughts. It establishes a confidence with the listener which turns at the end of the piece into the vehicle for accusation. Addressing the listener as “You” in a close perspective, leaves the listener nowhere to hide, no distance into which he or she may escape. Michael

refers to Michael 1 & 2 as “ghouls of mine” giving a sense of a haunting presence: unwanted, ever-present, inescapable.

‘The Despairing’ gives voice to the madness of despair. This too was to be performed in a lower vocal register. I marked this voice for radiophonic treatment, to make ‘insane sounds’ with it. I intended to generate an effect resembling tape ‘wow’ or a warped LP by slowing the playback speed of the voice manually. The anticipated effect would be a sonic analogy between the falling pitches of the vari-speeded audio, and the emotional ‘downer’ of depression. What I also discovered was that the process of replaying at greater than normal speed (especially when accelerating) is able to suggest a ‘manic’ quality in the voice. In practice, I developed this technique in rather more complex ways (see Post-Production: Recording). The Poo Person “-soft like velvet, female with sultry undertones” presents Michael at his most vulnerable. It is a fragile voice, high in vocal register and miked at a comfortable (conversational) distance. The Poo Person speaks to the listener on Michael’s behalf, except on the occasion he speaks to Michael to reassure and comfort him.

A Judge and Fairy Godmother can be thought of as a pair in opposition. One condemns Michael, the other is a “creature of light and joy” – a source of hope. I approached A Judge as something dark, ferocious and monstrous, using David’s lowest vocal register. I considered resorting to some pitch-shifting to effect this, but I was aware of the limitations of that technique from my experience working on ‘A Radio Faust’ to create the voice of Lucifer.³ The performer David Field would carry the greatest share of the responsibility for realizing the orchestration I was developing. As indicated above (Pre-Production: Composing), I heard Fairy Godmother in a ‘sing-song’ voice reminiscent of nursery rhymes. David would perform this in a falsetto. The

³ Having already treated John Gaden’s voice as the Evil Angel, pitch-shifting it lower, I left myself nowhere to go acoustically with the voice of Lucifer played by Tony Llewelyn-Jones, whom I wanted to have an even lower voice.

originally devised stress scheme (above) was reworked in the recording studio with an alternate rhythmic stress pattern that scanned better in performance. Of the Fairy Godmother's speeches, I notated the following in my production script with the (alternate) rhythmic stress pattern (long stress italicized) below:

We are *on-ly* a *small* voice
a-against the harsh *chor-us*
 but we *make* your world
bear-ab-le and give you *hope*.
 We *on-ly* *help* a little bit
but
 a *lit-tle* is *bet-ter*
 than *noth-ing*.

*

You *can* go back...*you* can go back...you can *go* back!

*

You *can* go back and I will *be* there. I *will* be there. I will be *there*.

*

Let's *go* back and *try* again. *They* nearly *got* us that *time*, but this *time* we'll' stay *one*
 jump *a-head* of them. *Slow-ly*, *slow-ly*, *catchee mon-key*.

*

We *will* keep *try-ing*. Don't give *up*. It will *be* alright *one* day.

I left the pitches open for the performer to improvise. All of Fairy Godmother's speeches were both sung (two takes) and spoken in a falsetto register.

*

Production Phase:	<i>Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Performing</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Predeterminate; Indeterminate</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech</i>

I began work with David Field on his performance sitting around the table working on the script to ensure in the first instance that its meaning and intention were clear. David had had a copy of the script for a few weeks. In keeping with my preferred directorial practice, I invited sound engineer Andreij Shabunov to join us for the first read-through and preliminary discussion. During work on Michael 2's speech on page 14 of our scripts, David and I agreed that using 'very' in the phrase "very habitual" was tautological, and we cut it from his performance. Michael's punctuation did not serve the performer well and so we spent time marking up the script for performance as we went through it. We then moved to start shaping the orchestration of the various voices David would need to produce in performance.

After a brief discussion about the approach to each voice (see Production: Composing above) with particular attention paid to placing the voice in specific registers, it became obvious that not much more could be achieved around the table, since I was keen to couple the voice to the studio acoustics to achieve the desired vocal orchestration. I heard the studio acoustic as an integral part of the performance and identity and identity of each voice. Firstly though, I took David through the rhythmic patterns I had created for each of the sung Fairy Godmother speeches. It was immediately apparent that not all these rhythms sat well with a natural scansion, producing an awkward effect. I developed alternative solutions as necessary and we marked them in our scripts after a brief rehearsal (see Production: Composing above). I decided that, where I had identified phrases for repetition as an effect (see Pre-Production: Composing), I would record those phrases separately after the main speeches. Each voice would be performed out of script sequence to allow for continuity of acoustic and microphone placement.

After some discussion with Andreij Shabunov (see Production: Recording below) I placed David's microphone in the "dead room" for its very dry acoustic that would lend an intimate feel. I directed David to perform *sotto voce* very close to the microphone, to create the impression of 'overhearing' Michael 2's thoughts. I asked David to read all the text for Michael 2 with a normal emphasis on the word "I". I intended to edit in variations on this word in post-production, and I aimed to capture the overall phrasing of the sentences as 'normal', since that would provide the appropriate context for the interpolated word, and so enhance the sense of rupture in the statement. I asked David to record numerous variations of the word "I" for use with a sampler perhaps, or for their interpolation into the speeches of Michael 2 using a Digital Audio Workstation. I did the same for the word "me" though I later discarded these during post-production.

I also recorded The Poo Person in the dead room. For this voice, I directed David to aim for a more 'feminine' voice, light in register, and as Michael Russell describes it "sultry" and "velvety". I also wanted David to find a vulnerability and tenderness for this voice, and to perform against the strongly inscribed rhythms in the speeches: to perform *rubato*, as it were. While still close and intimate, David as The Poo Person did not work so close to the microphone when compared with the voice of Michael 2.

For the recording of the Michael 1 voice, I moved David over to the air-lock between the main studio floor and the studio storeroom. This small narrow space had just enough room to squeeze in actor and microphone. The large wooden door and the concrete floor determined the immediate room acoustic. David worked at a distance from the microphone. I was looking for a performance that was angry and cynical in tone. We discovered that the air-lock door emitted a slowly undulating moaning tone when slightly ajar and decided to make a 'wild' recording of this so it could perhaps be laid under one of the voices in post-production (in particular I was thinking of A Judge).

The door was fully closed for the vocal recording of Michael 1. I asked David to record separately the words “he”, “him”, and “his” for possible interpolation into the Michael 1 speeches in post-production. The Michael 1 voice addresses the listener and refers to Michael Russell in the third person. This creates an uncomfortable feeling for the listener as a witness to Michael 1’s carping and hectoring. Michael 1 is the only voice to show an awareness of the other voices, especially Fairy Godmother whom he mocks sarcastically.

I felt I had gravitated to the most sonically interesting part of the studio. For *The Despairing*, I moved David into the storeroom itself facing toward the airlock where Andreij positioned the microphone. David’s voice took on a hint of the storeroom acoustic but recorded quite close. I asked David to give me a somewhat extravagant performance, directed outwardly to an audience. I wanted *The Despairing* to come across as histrionic and self-dramatizing. I moved David closer still for a separate take of the anaphora at the end of *The Despairing*’s second speech in scene two, with its play on “and your’ as a repetitive figure. This gave me a drier recording of these phrases to allow for signal processing such as downward pitch-shifting in post-production.

With the vocal performance for *A Judge*, I moved David further into the large storeroom and placed the microphone at a considerable distance. In this way, the recording picked up a good deal of the concrete box’s acoustic. I asked David to summon a rage in which he shouted condemnation at Michael. He delivered a ferocious sense of loathing. I recorded some of *A Judge*’s repetitions separately to allow for signal processing and arrangement in post-production.

I recorded Fairy Godmother speeches out on the main studio (carpeted) floor. David recorded all the speeches in *falsetto*, before recording those speeches as sung. His delivery strayed from the prescribed rhythms somewhat but still carried the character and purpose of the Fairy Godmother. David improvised the pitches so he would not have to learn a complete song, and even more so

that he would give the impression less that this was a performance and than that this was Fairy Godmother's common way of 'speaking'. Fairy Godmother was taken close to the microphone and performed softly, to the point that David's voice took on a vulnerable edge. I noted the idea (not in the end pursued) that I could underlay Fairy Godmother with the sounds of a music box in post-production.

David's performance made use of his extensive vocal range in various ways, and also worked with the different acoustics in the studio to heighten the differentiation of the vocal performances between each 'voice': a considerable artistic feat.

*

Production Phase:	<i>Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Recording</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Indeterminate</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech</i>

Andreij Shabunov⁴ was the sound engineer for *The Glass Cage*. Andreij joined actor David Field and me for a read-through of the script and discussions on performance and the recording schedule. Andreij had had a copy of the script for some time. Each voice performed by David (six in total) required a different microphone placement. I made notes of my preferences on 'post-it' notes which I attached to my production script. We had one day

⁴ Andreij Shabunov was born in St Petersburg, Russia. He started his audio career as a sound technician at the Documentary Film Studio in Moscow. He later moved to the field of music recording, working for a long period for the Symphony Orchestra of Cinematography in Moscow as a sound engineer. He then worked as a sound engineer and sound designer for The Video Film Studio in Moscow, making sound tracks for videos, musicals, documentaries, dramas and concerts. He also recorded and mixed music for many Russian pop and rock groups including Kino, DDT and Alicia. In 1996 he began working for the Australian Broadcasting Corporation's Radio Arts department. As a sound engineer in the department he has recorded and mixed radio programs, including features, documentaries and drama. [From the ABC Radio Drama 2000 Prix Italia entry script, p.4]

scheduled for recording. I set aside the previous day in the studio for my sound engineer to set up for recording and for us to have time to discuss our approach to recording each project. Andreij preferred to work with a Sennheiser MKH40 microphone with a pop-filter for close vocal performance. We worked as usual in the Drama Studio 256 (ABC Ultimo) (for more on this see the *Granados Case Study*).

I was interested in exploring the available acoustic responses to the voice that could be excited by working in different parts of the studio. I wanted to use the studio as an *instrument*. While I had always used various parts of the studio to simulate realistically motivated spatial acoustics in radio drama, using the various available studio acoustics on the Drama Studio as an aspect of composing the voice represented a new departure for me (see Production: Composing). Previously I had relied on signal processing of the voice in post-production to achieve a simulated acoustic. As I explained my intended approach to Andreij, he protested that he would not be able to offer me the usual level of control available through the method of recording in a dry acoustic and deferring decisions concerning a designed acoustic until post-production.⁵ We would be committed to whatever acoustic imprinted itself on the voice recording which would also inhibit the success signal processing of the voice in post-production. I insisted that I wanted to make a break from our usual previous practice, and that I noted his concerns and would assume responsibility for any creative constraints this approach might impose. When I had convinced Andreij I had given this different approach serious consideration and was aware of its creative implications for flexibility as well as its possibilities, he relented with a warning that I would have to commit to whatever acoustic we could find.

⁵ Andreij argued in favour of maintaining flexibility in vocal treatments in post-production. Paradoxically, I felt this approach was leading to a sameness of vocal sound and constraint in the creative use of the studio across my recent productions (only working with Andrei the previous eighteen months).

We worked through the script recording out of script order. This allowed us to ensure that all the speeches pertaining to each voice were recorded in the same studio acoustic. I was conscious that the six voices each with their own acoustic would necessitate the layering of multiple studio acoustics in the work. I thought this would best help create the utopia (no place) that constitutes Michael's world. Voices speak from elsewhere to an unstable point of convergence where the listener's 'point of audition' situates him or her to overhear them all. David worked without headphones except for the voice of Michael 2 in the dead room. Several of the voices required separate takes of phrases to be used repetitively. This would allow for the repetitions to continue under the remains of the associated speech, to be arranged in post-production

In contrast with the recordings set up in the dead room and on the main studio floor (Michael 2, The Poo Person, Fairy Godmother), I struggled to achieve a balance between the direct vocal and the acoustic response of the 'room' when it came to the voices of The Despairing, A Judge, and Michael 1 recorded near the studio storeroom, until Andreij rigged a pair of headphones for me so I could monitor the changes while fine-tuning the microphone placement and actor positioning. Having found the desired balance for each voice, I was able to revert to the studio control room for the recording proper. Much like the head arrangements in jazz performance, I made decisions about the deployment of recording and performance technique in the moment in the studio, in response to and informed by the script read-through and discussion with David and also in discussion with the sound engineer, Andreij.

All studio takes⁶ were recorded to DAT recorder at 44.1 KHz sample rate and in 16-bits, via an SSL 400E/G console.

*

⁶ None of the studio takes have survived. The DAT tapes were most likely recycled.

3.1.3 Post-Production: *The Glass Cage*

Production Phase:	<i>Post-Production</i>
Creative Writing:	<i>Writing</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Pre-determinate; Indeterminate; Appropriative</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech; Music</i>

The studio recordings of David Field's performance were loaded onto a multitrack editor (see Post-Production: Recording). Since the recordings were made out of script sequence, the first task was to assemble the takes in script order and to evaluate which were the best takes of each of the speeches, discarding the others. Some speeches were to be layered using multiple takes. This assembly was only roughly edited in the first instance as the rhythms of performance and syntactical form of the work were still being developed. The editing of separately recorded phrases and sequences of speech into the speeches proper would alter the contour of the vocal performances. So too, would the audio signal processing of recorded speech and the interpolation of appropriated music. Each voice was assigned its own track to allow for the layering of voices and vocal effects.

Perhaps the major sound-writing idea I worked with in Post-Production was representing the progressive disintegration of Michael's ego and identity by 'morphing' the word "I" into splinters of sound. These splinters of sound would consist of samples of stringed instruments appropriated from the Luigi Nono recording of *Fragmente-Stille, an Diotima*. In preparation for this transformation, I had recorded numerous variations (especially in pitch) on the word "I" performed by David in the same set-up as for Michael 2 (see 'Production: Recording'). I then auditioned each of these variations, and used the best of them once each only to replace every instance of the word "I" in the speeches of Michael 2. I realised that such a pronounced effect had best be kept focussed in its usage or its impact would be diluted. So I decided against employing any of the other words I had intended to record separately for use in this way: "me" for Michael 2 and "he", "him" and "himself" for

Michael 1. There was in fact one use of the word “I” in Michael 1 in the scene ‘On Trial’ but I edited this out of David’s performance for the sake of consistency and dramaturgical coherence. While this technique of replacing “I” in Michael 2 with a separately recorded version had a defamiliarizing effect, with extravagant pitching creating a sense of discord and an ‘irruption of the real’, the resulting impression was somewhat static: ‘Michael’ may well have not seemed himself, but there was as yet no sense of the progressive degeneration of an integrated personality – such as remained, anyway. Strangeness of pitch interrupting the projected contour of the speech alone was not going to convey this. I attempted a solution to this problem by extending the musicalization of speech, which could be developed by using signal processing, and by a simultaneous double displacement, progressively replacing the estranged “I” with musical notes produced by stringed instruments.

Where repetition of phrases had been called for in the script, and also where the script leant itself to this device, I had recorded multiple iterations of a phrase which could be layered under subsequent ‘dry’ speech. While I did use some of the performed repetitions, I also created repetitions radiophonically using slow filtered delays with high levels of feedback in the signal path chained with large scale reverbs. I created vocal effects tracks for each processed voice so that dry (unprocessed) and wet (processed) vocal signals could be mixed dynamically. The use of heavy and lengthy processing necessitated retarding subsequent speeches to accommodate vocal effects, or fading them under incoming speeches. Since many voices were subjected to signal processing this means that in post-production I introduced by default a layering of vocal effects associated with outgoing and incoming speeches.

The treatment of space is important in *The Glass Cage*. Each voice should express a unique identity in part inscribed in the recording by the acoustic from which it appears to emerge. This acoustic is not only determined by the

natural studio acoustic, but also by the fabrication of unreal spaces generated by the signal processing of the voice. By working with one performer to generate all six voices, they are each related by the timbre or 'grain' of David's own voice. In a way not feasible on stage, all of the voices in *The Glass Cage* can be perceived as produced by the same body, yet with each expressing a different 'character' or *persona*. In post-production I worked on extending the differentiation of these voices through the use of signal processing to inscribe the spatial acoustic unique to each voice (see Post-Production: Recording). Incorporating these radiophonic effects into the mix altered the rhythm of the performed speech thereby extending the musicalization of speech overall. In editing the vocal tracks voices often overlapped top-and-tail, especially as effects slowly decayed. I determined the spacing between speeches by ensuring that the timing of these edits conformed to good dramatic rhythm between the leading or dominant (usually dry) voices.

The various modes of address by the six voices of 'Michael' - some addressing the listener, some 'Michael', with some switching addressees - fail to construct collectively a point of audition outside of the work whence the listener can observe the action of the play objectively. There is no attempt made to construct a soundstage utilizing stereo reproduction to create audio *perspective*. This collapsing of any dramaturgical distance implicates the listener as a witness complicit in the attacks *on* Michael, and as the target of accusations of the listener made *by* Michael. The listener is temporarily incarcerated in Michael's world, *experiencing* that world while simultaneously *producing* it in his or her own creative imagination.

*

Production Phase:	<i>Post-Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Composing</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Appropriative; Indeterminate</i>

Sonic Material: *Music; Speech*

Working with the musicalization of speech in *The Glass Cage* necessarily blurs the distinction between writing and composing. The arranging of multiple recordings of the same speeches, some of which were sung, other processed electronically or both involved making creative decisions informed by a musical sensibility. The speeches are in part *composed*. The arrangements for the voices were not predetermined but developed through experimentation in post-production. I will treat the technical aspects in 'Post-Production: Recording', but it should be understood that the process of shaping *The Glass Cage* in post-production involved working simultaneously with the creative practices of writing, composing, and recording on the performing processes inscribed using sound studio technology.

The compositional aspect of shaping the speeches in *The Glass Cage* involved determining a suitable arrangements and radiophonic treatments of the voices. Michael 1's voice is presented as heavy, depressing, lingering by drenching this voice in an appropriate reverberation effect. Michael 2 is practically the only voice to use the first person pronoun and consequently is the voice we most closely identify with the playwright. So I left Michael 2 'dry' in comparison to the other voices. It is also the closest in microphone perspective. However, drawing on the epigraph for the play - "because I haven't felt like an "I" for a very long time" – I substituted for the word "I" in David Field's performance of Michael 2's speeches, separately recorded instances of the word "I" which had been pitched so as to stand out as *defamiliarized*. I carefully auditioned the repertoire of "I"s performed by David before selecting the most suitable candidates. I then treated all but the very first instances radiophonically using a particular feature of the Fairlight MFX3 control surface and playback system which allowed me to elongate and reverse the reproduction of David's voice articulating the word "I". These processed instances were then treated with reverb becoming progressively 'wetter' to suggest that Michael 2 was becoming increasingly alienated from

For the Fairy Godmother, I combined a dry spoken falsetto vocal with sung voices. A sung voice leads the spoken voice for each speech and continues briefly after the end of the spoken vocal. One sung voice appears left, the other right. They are of different performances. They overlap with the second voice following on the other's tail. The lead sung voice alternates between left and right. Occasionally I have added individual sung phrases left and right as a chorus or a restatement of a spoken and musical phrase. The effect is of a multiply-voiced persona with up to five simultaneous voices in play, almost in a round. The spoken voice is delivered at a faster tempo than the sung renditions.

I sourced two recordings from which to develop the sound design in conjunction with the musicalization of the speech elements (see Pre-Production: Composing). I had already identified the *Allegretto Furioso* from Shostakovich's 10th String Quartet as a promising underscoring of the scene 'On the Run'. I auditioned The Brodsky Quartet's recording of the Shostakovich cycle of string quartets from the ABC sound library but I failed to recognise the passionate intensity I remembered from The Shostakovich Quartet's rendition. I remained disappointed until I found a copy of The Shostakovich Quartet's Olympia release in the classical music section of a Sydney music retailer. I asked sound engineer Andreij Shabunov whether he could account for the relative difference between the two ensembles, as he had recorded classical music in Moscow for state television and radio - possibly in the same studios where the Shostakovich's recordings were made (Moscow Radio Broadcasting House). For Andreij, the difference lay in the close-miked sound of the Olympia release assisting the intensity of performances. There may be something to this as I was very close to the front of the audience when I heard them in person in their 1986 Adelaide concerts.

The repetitive phrasing in the most intense passages of the *Allegretto Furioso* lean themselves to looping. I identified seven musical phrases to loop in the Fairlight MFX3 which I used under this scene. The last of which coincides with the first really grotesque distortion of the processed "I" from Michael 2 as Michael comes to understand that his escape bid is over. The idea behind looping these phrases was to create a feeling of stasis in motion, as a kind of analogue to the sensation of running on the spot: lots of frustrated activity but no forward momentum. The escape bid is ultimately futile and failure its inevitable. The Shostakovich loops only recur under Michael 2 speeches. They cycle as many times as required to underpin the Michael 2 speeches in Scene 4 'On the Run' and the end edit is masked by sending the tail into a large reverb effect. The first loop occurs under the Michael 2 speech beginning "It's a feeling of hopefulness and abandonment". The spoken phrase "It's a feeling" is also repeated under the following Michael 1 speech sounding like a rebellion or protest. The second Shostakovich loop begins under Michael 2 "I only know the words for hate hate hate hate". The entry of the third Shostakovich loop is delayed as the first phrase by Michael 2 doubles last phrase of the previous speech by Michael1, beginning instead on "I am only in space of intelligence sometimes." The fourth loop begins with "It is foolish of me to trust that I will be believed". In this and the next Michael 2 speech, the word "I" is untreated for the only time in the play suggesting Michael becomes more 'himself' when free of the institution. Before the next Shostakovich loop I layer Fairy Godmother (sung only) under Michael 1. The fifth Shostakovich loop follows under Michael 2's "It's too hard out here" speech. Before the next Michael 2 speech, Fairy Godmother (sung voice only) is layered under the first part of Michael 1 as if his sarcastic description of Fairy Godmother drives her away. The sixth Shostakovich loop appears under Michael 2's speech beginning "The fridges are calling too loudly". Fairy Godmother once again sings under a Michael 1 speech, before resuming the spoken/sung arrangements in a standalone speech. The Fairy Godmother gives voice to the positive aspects of returning to care, while Michael 1 condemns Michael as a failure.

While the Shostakovich loops served to give expression to Michael 2's frustrated desire for freedom and escape attempt, I also needed suitable sounds on which to create the sound design that would feature the transformation of Michael 2's "I" into a musical expression – the voice having lost its identity as subject. I was looking for something with a contemporary experimental sound but with the orchestration of a string quartet to relate to the sonority of the Shostakovich Quartet. I settled on the 1986 recording of Luigi Nono's *Fragmente—Stille, an Diotima* performed by the LaSalle Quartet. The large spatial acoustic inscribed in this recording as well as the angularity and spaciousness in the composition lent itself very much to my conception for *The Glass Cage*. This demanding work certainly does have the contemporary experimental feel I was seeking. I worked through the recording selecting (appropriating) phrases that were "speech-like" in phrasing, that were actually or potentially expressive of emotional intensity and psychological alienation. I also selected some sustained phrases that could underscore speeches. The various unison combinations of violins, viola and cello provided ample sonic variation. I developed the instrumental aspect of the sound design for *The Glass Cage* from this recording. Significantly, I opted only to use this music in association with the voice of Michael 2, either punctuating his phrases or underscoring in the first two scenes and in the last Michael speech which ends the play. Every other voice apart from The Poo Person is already complex sonically, and their speeches layered and "musicalized" to a considerable extent. The Poo Person is deliberately left quite 'exposed'. Since, I also used Nono phrases to substitute for Michael 2's "I" towards the end of the play (from the end of the scene 'On Trial'), this suggests that these phrases can be interpreted as the vocalized splinters of Michael's fracturing ego that have already flaked off. The Shostakovich string quartet is also associated with Michael 2. The tying of musical sonic materials to Michael 2 speeches further reinforces that voice as the one with which the listener is principally encouraged to identify.

*

Production Phase:	<i>Post-Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Performing</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Indeterminate; Appropriative</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech; Music</i>

While I had worked closely with David Field on finding a voice for each of Michael's personae, I re-shaped his performances considerably in post-production. This was not in any way a corrective process, remedying deficiencies in the original performances or 'fixing it in the mix'. Rather, I sought to use the sound studio technology creatively in order to extend the possibilities for performance: "actually constructing a piece in the studio" using the studio as 'a composition tool' (Brian Eno in Cox & Warner, 2006 127). I will describe the techniques involved in doing so in more detail under the section Post-Production: Recording.

The recordings of David's performances of Michael 2 were assembled using a series of improvised "I"s, that were treated with signal processing techniques to vary the tempo and direction at which they were to reproduce the voice, and to place them in a different space to the main body of the speech (reverb). During Michael 2's bid for freedom he is briefly able to articulate the word "I" as he asserts his subjecthood. Towards the end of the play David's performance of the word "I" is replaced by musical phrases from Nono. This approach was intended to present a disintegration of the person, which becomes progressively alienated from itself by using sound technology to creatively disrupt the pro-microphonic performance. Michael 1 was treated with a very long modulated reverb that sustained almost indefinitely under the succeeding 'dry' voice, giving Michael 1 a haunting otherworldly character: a dark despairing voice that never recedes totally.

For *The Despairing* I developed a 'voice' from four layers of performance. I used two different takes; re-recorded them from a variable playback source both forwards and backwards. The speeding up and slowing down of David's performances of these speeches are unsettling. The listener perceives the human voice as if through altered perception that might be associated with the uncanny or in this instance with forms of mental disorder. This sense is further reinforced by the sound of those original performances re-processed with variable speed backwards playback. Single words and phrases emerge from the dense vocal texture through the incorporation of repetition and redundancy in the arrangements. Andreij Shabunov used equalization to strip away the lower frequencies from David's voice for *The Poo Person*. David had already placed his voice in its higher register. The *Poo Person* voice sounds feminine, somewhat hesitant or unsure and gentle. I used the editing of beginning consonants and the words at the opening of phrases into fast repetitive sequences, to give *The Poo Person* an electronically-produced 'stutter'. This gave the voice an enhanced quality of vulnerability which has clearly been produced synthetically and so keys the listener yet again into the frame of speech-based composition.

The *A Judge* voice was written with repetitions of key words such as "You" and "Guilty". In post-production I extended these repetitions by using delay effects. This allowed me to layer the repeats under the continuing 'dry' speech. As a consequence David began to sound like the voice of doom. *Fairy Godmother* combined spoken and sung performances except during the scene 'On the Run', where I also layered just the sung voices under Michael 1. The sung voices lead the spoken and alternate phrases left and right of the stereo image. In successive speeches the lead sung voice appears alternately left and right. The spoken voice follows and ends before the sung voices. The improvised sung voices emphasize the optimistic nature of this persona. The voice is performed falsetto and shares similarities with the *Poo Person*, although is not as closely miked. The sung voices layered under

Michael 1's speech in which he mocks Fairy Godmother ("Only your good fairy knows that and she isn't telling") seem to wither under the derision.

David performed the play and scene titles in his 'own voice', out of character, though I did include a humorous rendition of the title "Back at the Ranch" which echoes the title like a manic "voice in the head". The editing in post-production of David Field's performances into script order combined with the respective arrangement and radiophonic treatment of his voice(s) significantly alter the way in which the listener receives them perceptually, sonically and dramatically.

The performances inscribed in the appropriated music of Shostakovich and Nono were re-shaped in post-production: used as sonic material to construct an expression of thwarted resistance and rebellion (Shostakovich) and the signs of a disintegration of the individual psyche (Nono). I describe these constructions in more detail under 'Post-Production: Composing'.

*

Production Phase:	<i>Post-Production</i>
Creative Practice:	<i>Recording</i>
Creative Strategy:	<i>Indeterminate; Determinate</i>
Sonic Material:	<i>Speech; Music</i>

Working closely with sound engineer Andreij Shabunov, I worked extensively in post-production on the speeches recorded by David Field to further differentiate the representation of Michael's various voices and as part of the development of the sound design for *The Glass Cage*. The studio DAT tape recordings were transferred to a Fairlight MFX3 Digital Audio Workstation (2i8o) outputting to a Studer 961 (12i2o) mixing console in a post-production suite equipped with 15" JBL studio monitors. Each of the six personae was loaded onto separate tracks. Some personae were constricted out of multiple

I found alternatives to using a sampler. I may have been that the Akai 1100 Sampler I had used previously on *Rita's Lullaby* (1997) had been 'retired'; or that Andreij may have considered that it represented too costly a time commitment, or that neither of us were confident enough in its use at the time. It is significant, however, that I noted its potential use, expressing a desire to engage with sampling technology for creative purposes at this time.

A feature of the Fairlight MFX3 control surface, on which Andreij was editing the audio, was a weighted jogwheel control that moved the playback cursor on the screen and which could be combined with a static playback head. The MFX3's static replay head plays a very short loop of audio at the position of the replay head, and is designed to assist editors in locating the desired sounds, much as spooling and rocking analogue tape across tape playback heads had done formerly. The position can be altered using the jogwheel whose speed is varied by altering the resolution of the visual representation of the audio waveform. Given an appropriate resolution it is possible to approximate a normal playback speed, to speed up and slow down playback dynamically (accelerate/decelerate playback) or play at set but non-standard tempos, and to play audio forwards and backwards. I experimented with zooming in and out of the waveform display until I found an appropriate setting to assist with scrolling forward and backward and at varying speeds, so producing manually a variety of radiophonic vocal 'performances'.⁷

In particular I experimented with elongating the enunciation of the word "I", which involved scrubbing in both directions over the word, and which began to take on the form of a synthesized musical tone because of the static head replay function. The takes of various improvised deliveries by actor David Field of the word "I" recorded out of context had been selected for their expressivity, their quality of rupture with the speech into which they were to be

⁷ I was inspired in this creative use of sound studio technology once again by composer/producer Klaus Buhkert, who showed me how he had achieved an effect I was particularly intrigued by: the re-recording of the intermittent playback of audio while scrolling through speech on a DAT recorder.

inserted and for their variations in pitch. These selections were then treated electro-acoustically (or radiophonically) to elongate the word to the point of unrecognizability. This transformed the semantic property of word into a musical one. Each recurrence of the word “I” was individually and electro-acoustically “re-performed” using the static replay head and the jog wheel of the Fairlight MFX3 control surface. These variations had to be re-recorded to a DAT recorder and then loaded into the MFX3 since it could only perform one of either the record or scrub functions at a time. I then went through the Michael 2 track again and replaced later iterations of the word “I” with these processed versions sequenced on another track so they could be sent to a reverb processor separately and the return recorded onto a vocal stereo reverb track.

I was fortunate to have access to an excellent reverberation unit, the Lexicon 480L mounted on a portable trolley, which Andreij brought into our post-production suite and patched into the Studer console via the studio jackfield. I progressively saturated these processed performances mixing them with a reverb (probably a small hall algorithm) blended from the separate reverb signal return track, so that Michael 2’s “I” starts ‘dry’ (first speech only) and then becomes more and more separate spatially from the rest of his speech which is untreated. Towards the end of the play, I placed phrases from the Nono recording (see Post-Production: Composing) performed on stringed instruments, of a similar length to the processed voice, on a separate track, so they could be mixed with the voice and become progressively dominant until the human voice disappears altogether. These phrases from Nono were processed with the same signal processing path as the word “I” to help link them together. The particular features of the Fairlight MFX3 were put to work to create paratactical features of speech and the musicalization of speech. Together with the use of a reverb to create a different spatial acoustic for the word “I”, these processes served to defamiliarize the word “I” for the listener to signify Michael’s alienation from himself and the fractured nature of his personality.

The first perceptible reverb behind Michael 2's "I" occurs halfway through Michael 2's second speech. During the scene 'On the Run' Michael 2's "I"s are dry for two speeches. This signifies a momentarily more integrated personality as Michael experiences his short-lived freedom outside of institutionalized care. Once Michael returns to the institution the treatment of Michael 2's "I" becomes grotesque: severely elongated by scrolling back and forth over very short distances with the jogwheel and static playback head. The trick in performing this techniques is modelled on phrase-sampling technique: one must begin with the head of the phrase, the middle section can be "looped", before the tail of the sample phrase plays out. By moving the jogwheel back and forth in the middle of the articulation of the word "I", it was possible to prolong the word indefinitely. From the end of Scene 5 On Trial, I mix stringed instruments under the word "I" so that "I" begins dominant, but strings overwhelm it by the end of the phrase. I had hoped to achieve the effect of one sound 'morphing' into the other, but did not succeed using this approach. I was convinced that the dynamic blending of the voice and stringed instruments conveyed my intent. By Michael 2's first speech in the final scene, only on the very first instance of "I" do we momentarily hear a trace of the word, then we hear it no longer [22'00"].

At then end of the last scene [26'05"], I used the Nono phrases to provide aggressive interspersions of Michael 2's speech as he lists the features of his anguish:

In fact it is completely senseless;

Mindless

Boring

Dull

Excruciating

Pitiful

Gutless

Desperate

Disgusting

and devoid of all meaning.

The string attacks here are to be understood as expressions of Michael's anguish: the "I" is no longer heard but rather cries for help.

Working on the recorded speeches for Michael1, Andreij 'dialled in' a complex vocal signal process on the Lexicon 480L. This 'reverb' is very diffuse with a high level of regenerative feedback and its tail is heavily modulated with what appears to be a pitch shift or twin delay programme. The effect was programmed by Andreij to combine the use of feedback, cross-channel feedback, separate pitch-shifting delay lines left and right. The effect return was recorded onto a separate stereo track so it could be mixed against the 'dry' vocal. Andreij did not opt to use 'ducking' to dynamically process the effect return in order to 'punch a hole' in the effect enhancing the clarity of the 'dry' vocal. The overall 'voicing' of Michael 1 creates a persona that seems to cling, to hang around, to weigh him down – in Michael Russell's words "a depressing bastard". During the scene 'On the Run' I overlaid Michael 1 and Michael 2 saying the identical phrase: "A fool and a dope and a hopeless mess" as per the script. Interestingly, this is the only time these two voices are identified in together in this way. I understand it as a moment of struggle between the two as Michael wrestles with whether he can survive outside institutional care.

The original studio takes of The Despairing were made in a very live acoustic - that of the studio storeroom. I revisited the technique of using the Fairlight MFX3 control surface jogwheel described above in developing the voicing for The Despairing. Firstly I re-recorded two different takes of The Despairing speech scrolling forward manually. It took some rehearsal, adjustment of scale parameters, and several attempts to perfect this 'performance' technique. I then re-recorded the same two sources scrolling backwards manually. I opted for this approach rather than simply reversing the forward-

scrolled performances to give a greater depth of complexity and performativity. In each instance of re-recording onto a DAT machine, I attempted vary the speed of playback *expressively*. I was interested in the sonic qualities of the vari-speeded and reversed speech, and in using the jogwheel to emphasise certain words or phrases. I felt able to push this process for effect because of the level of repetition and redundancy the layering of vocal tracks afforded. This kind of construction is of course indistinguishable from the process of Composing the sound design or Writing the speeches.

The effect of the vari-speed executed manually using the jogwheel becomes more pronounced and exaggerated as the play continues. By Scene 3 'The Smell of Freedom' the effect is already quite grotesque: "There's food in that fridge". After The Despairing "Awful. Awful. Awful. Pain. Pain. Pain." speech, I have written the word "montage" in my script, indicating that I would develop this as an arrangement in post-production. This was probably written during or in preparation for the post-production phase. I also indicated that this might be played under the previous Michael 1 speech that itself contained the repetitions: "Twit, twit, twit." and "Ha, Ha, Ha!". In the end, I transposed The Despairing voice during the scene 'On Trial' "Awful/Awful/Awful. Pain/Pain/Pain." to after The Poo Person's next speech, so that Michael's despair is understood as a response to his condemnation by A Judge. This speech is layered so that both "Awful" and "Pain" continue to be repeated using a constructed simulation (see comments on 'A Judge' below) of a filtered delay with high levels of regenerative feedback, they are simultaneously treated with variable playback speed via the jogwheel control, this time not producing backwards speech.

During the scene 'Poo Painting: a Plan . . .', I chose to edit the phrase "Your mind" so that it repeats on alternating stereo channels underneath the rest of the speech and so that it continues and in fact swells amplitude in a long decay on the conclusion of the speech. This creates a ping-pong delay effect

just using editing and a large-scale reverb. By shortening the interval between repeats at the end of the speech I simulated the shortening of a delay effect. I took this approaching to this speech as I saw it as an opportunity to key the audience into the frame of *The Glass Cage* as the sonic presentation (i.e. not a representation) of a fractured state of mind. Finally all of The Despairing tracks were sent to the same medium-scale reverb.

I treated the A Judge voice with a long delay with a high level of feedback into a large reverb, repeated phrases slowly filtering into obscurity. As each successive phrase is delivered, it works like a palimpsest speaking over but not quite erasing the previous utterance. The long delays decay under the succeeding speeches. I edited the word 'You' from the line "You You You" so that it repeats, conforming to the timing of the original performance. That is I took a single utterance of "You" and repeated it at the same tempo as in the original performance, but extended it under the succeeding part of the speech and continuing under the following Michael 2 speech. The result is the simulation of a slow delay with high levels of feedback, using volume control and filtering to create a gradual decay; but in which the spacing of the echoes conform to David Field's performance tempo.

On the anaphora built on "no" I repeat the "no" successively using a massive filtered delay with high level of feedback so that the word "no" continues long after the speech and ends as if it would form a cry of protest by Michael. Here I use the same treatment I used for "You" in A Judge's first speech. I doubled A Judge's first "no" on a separate track using a different performance (voiced as Michael 2 and so more plaintive) and then spaced successive repeats in accordance with the rhythm set up in the anaphora. This motivates the Poo Person to comfort Michael 2 – the first and only time The Poo Person addresses him. "No" continues to repeat under The Poo Person's speech and finally disappears under The Despairing. I tried shifting The Despairing speech from before the second A Judge speech (script order) to before the A Judge's second speech, but I liked the treatment of "no" continuing under The

Poo Person, and could not accommodate both, so I moved The Despairing to after The Poo Person: “Sweetie, don’t worry” speech. The change strengthens the perceived empathy from The Poo Person, who appears to sense The Despairing’s emotional state before his expression of it in “Awful/Awful/Awful. Pain/Pain/Pain.”.

I kept the voicing of Fairy Godmother dry, layering two sung voices (different takes) under the foregrounded spoken falsetto. This approach may have been suggested by Fairy Godmother’s reference to herself in the third person plural ‘we’. David Field’s falsetto performance feminizes Fairy Godmother’s voice. Andreij enhanced this vocal timbre by using high pass filtering on David’s voice. In track-laying the arrangement of this voicing from three sources, I led with one of the sung voices on one side of the stereo image, introducing the second on the opposite side after the first sung phrase (or word on shorter speeches). As soon as the first sung voice is audible and identifiable to the listener I introduced the spoken vocal which always dominates. Fairy Godmother presents as sympathetic, somewhat overly optimistic, kindly but ineffectual.

I made use of a couple of variations of the voicing outlined for Fairy Godmother above. In Scene 2 ‘Poo Painting a Plan’, due to the fast-paced spoken delivery of the speech for Fairy Godmother beginning “We are only a small voice”, there is not time for the sung version of the second half of the speech in both versions without dragging the tempo of the overall performance. In working this arrangement, I follow the first sung voice “We only” phrase with the second, but then repeat the first before ending the arrangement of this speech. The effect is for the listener to hear “We only” sung repeatedly, which reinforces the idea of Fairy Godmother as ineffectual. The second variation referred to above comes during Scene 3 ‘The Smell of Freedom’. Here two identical speeches of Fairy Godmother “You can go back ... you can go back ... you can go back!” both precede two speeches by Michael 1 – the first telling Michael he cannot make it on his own, the second

mocking Fairy Godmother. Fairy Godmother stops singing when Michael 1 makes sarcastic remarks about her. A third Michael 1 speech has “You can go back and I will be there. I will be there. I will be there” from Fairy Godmother laid under, but this time it is the spoken vocal that leads. This voicing of Fairy Godmother ends halfway through Michael 1’s speech to make way for another Fairy Godmother speech that follows as a standalone speech.

Like the voicing of Fairy Godmother, The Poo Person was treated with a high-pass filter and a short vocal plate reverb algorithm to enhance the ‘feminine’ aspect of David Field’s falsetto delivery. I make use of the repetition of phonemes and phrases for rhythmic effect: another form of the musicalization of speech in *The Glass Cage*, creating a heightened *performativity*. I edited repeated first syllables of words or fragments of phrases on to the beginning to create The Poo Person’s ‘stutter’, working with repeated samples in the audio sequencer rather than a sampler instrument or a ‘Stutter’ algorithm from a signal processor such as the Eventide Harmonizer. Using the audio sequencer, a Fairlight MFX3, allowed greater control over the performance, rhythm, and duration of the constructed ‘stutter’.

I intended for technique to contribute to the voicing of this persona as vulnerable and fragile. I used this technique to create more radical interruptions of the original speech as the play progresses. The voicing of The Poo Person in so far as the ‘stutter’ effect is concerned is represented below with repeated fragments in bold, the hesitations are represented by the spacing of the text:

The Poo Person: It is a bitter pill to swallow you **<ca->** can’t believe the world is so bloody awful. It doesn’t make sense to go on living in this **<tra->** **<tra->** tragedy. It doesn’t make sense to stay in this demented half-world of insanity and **<des->** **<des->** **<des->** despair

*

The Poo Person: You feel so hopeless and alone. It **<f->** **<f->** feels deeper

than a bottomless pit and more awful than a dungeon in hell it feels like your only outlet is **<this>** **<this>** this disgusting habit of unpicking your bottom and smearing its around to see what you're are made of. This doesn't endear you to your carers who can't appreciate the beauty of your **<cre->** **<cre->** **<cre->** creations and only see them as disgusting faeces from a crazed lunatic.

*

The Poo Person: No-one ever asks you what they **<si->** **<si->** signify until one day you very carefully crafted a **<p->** **<p->** play about them and fully explored their sig-nificance and beauty. It seems to you that all the trauma in the world is contained in your shit and you can overcome **<the>** **<the>** the tortures you are subjected to by smearing and feeling the pain and joy of this process. It seems to you that you are exploring your un-conscious with this method and that no-one that understands that **<that>** **<that>** that is what you are doing.

*

The following two speeches were arranged almost like a piece of additive music:

The Poo Person: **<It's only my>** **<p->** **<p->** **<p->** **<p->** **<It's only>** **<m->** **<m->** **<m->** **<m->** **<m->** **<m->** **<m->** **<m->** **<m->** **<my>** **<It->** **<It->** **<It's on->** **<It's only my->** It's only my poo - not a big pile of shit.

*

The Poo Person: **<don't >** **<w->** **<w->** **<w->** **<w>** **<-w>** **<-w>** **<-w>** **<-w>** **<Sweetie,** **don't>** Sweetie **<don->** don't worry. It'll be alright.

There was some post-production of the music appropriated from Shostakovich and Nono. This involved identifying suitable loops from Shostakovich's

Allegretto Furioso of the String Quartet No.10 from which I used seven loops in total. These were built on repetitive passages which are a feature of this movement. I worked from the Olympia recording alone rather than from a score. In each instance they were used to underscore Michael 2 during the scene 'On the Run', one separate looping passage for each speech. The endings of the looped sections were given a fabricated reverb tail using the Lexicon 480L to mask the edit. The spacious composition of Luigi Nono's *Fragmente—Stille, an Diotima* allowed me to use mostly the natural acoustic decay inscribed in the recording. I worked through Michael 2's speeches inserting suitable short string attacks to intersperse phrases, and longer sustained tones to underscore for affect. I identified these in the Deutsche Grammophon recording and not from the score. At the end of the scene 'On Trial', I mixed longer Nono phrases under the radically processed "I" of Michael 2, so that they overwhelmed the tail of the vocal articulation earlier and earlier in the blended voicing so that early in the following scene, the Nono phrases substituted completely the vocal articulation of "I" in Michael 2. At the close of the play, I used Nono phrases once again interspersed between Michael 2 phrases to emphasize each damning adjective in his accusation of the listener for indifference. These musical phrases at least have been re-processed with a largish reverb.

David Field's delivery of the titles for *The Glass Cage* were given in his natural speaking voice. I repeated the final words "End of Play" in mono five times to emphasize the sense of monotony that Michael Russell refers to describing his experience of institutional care, before ending on a dual mono iteration in which left and right are slightly offset temporally as well as panned left and right to create a form of chorusing or flange effect: a final instance of what I think of as creating a 'sonic shock' for the audience in the Brechtian sense.

At a later stage in post-production, while re-auditioning my arrangements so far, I made several notes on the on the back page of my production script. These notes give evidence that the Writing and Composing processes are

evolving continually up until the final mixdown, and that the arrangements and sequencing and mixing of sonic elements are always provisional. I noted that the Nono passages underscoring Michael 2 needed finer editing to tidy up their heads and tails. I noted that the sung voices of Fairy Godmother first speech were competitive under The Despairing, when the spoken vocalization of Fairy Godmother was timed sympathetically (remembering that the sung voice was to lead the voicing of Fairy Godmother). Subsequently I edited the beginning of the Fairy Godmother voicing, dropping the first sung voice so that the spoken voice enters almost immediately after what was originally the second sung voice. This way I was able to close the 'gap' between the Despairing and the first Fairy Godmother speech to develop a more sympathetic rhythm of performance between speeches. I noted that the Nono phrases interspersed between Michael 2's phrases in the scene 'On Trial' were making the scene too busy or dense, so I proposed to "thin out Nono" in this scene or alternatively substitute "more sustained notes". I soon after ticked this last remark to indicate that this would be my preferred course of action.

Inside my script I also proposed to use a "slow pass "I"" in Michael 2's last speech of the scene 'On the Run'. I intended to represent Michael 2 as more integrated psychically by incorporating a 'normal' delivery of the word "I" whilst he is free. However, it is not always clear when Michael 2 is speaking from a space of freedom, and so I decided to interpret Michael 2's last speech as one of recognition and resignation that he should return to care, and so no longer remains 'free'. This required a processing of his articulation of the word "I" to indicate his return to his former self-alienation. There is also the possibility that I heard the need to sonically prepare the breakdown of Michael 2's vocal uttering of the "I" as his personality disintegrates by elongating the "I" so that they take on a less semantic and a more musical aspect in terms of duration and pitch prior to 'morphing' into a musical instrument courtesy of Luigi Nono.