

Peggy Phelan (PP): I think this transition is based on a combination of factors. In the United States at least, there was an economic incentive for rethinking Theatre Studies. As Joe Roach points out, theatre departments in the US – and it's probably the same in the UK, although I'm not sure if it's to the same degree and at the exact same time – in the 1950s made extensive investments in the physical plants of their universities. Many universities have multi-million dollar theatre complexes and therefore, very few universities are interested in getting rid of Theatre Studies. Richard Schechner [1995] did propose that theatre departments go out of business and become performance studies departments in an essay in *TDR*. His proposal received a lot of attention, and provoked a certain kind of healthy anxiety I think. But I don't think programmes in Theatre Studies are disappearing. And having just joined a drama department, I hope it is also clear that I don't think theatre departments should close shop. I do think there will be more effort to fuse the best of theatre and performance studies in the future.

Performance has become a central lens for understanding events as disparate as the war in Iraq and Madonna's newest video. We have entered a realm of all-performance-all-the-time. This is not to say that 'the real' has disappeared, but it is to acknowledge that it is impossible to recognize 'the real' without a concept of performance in view. I think that the recognition of the centrality of performance to contemporary life and thought reflects some shifts in the academic scene, but these shifts are themselves responses to a more pervasive performance world-view.

JVC: Your co-edited collection *The Ends of Performance* was in fact explicitly both a celebration and a critique of the institutionalization of Performance Studies. As a recently emergent field of study, what can Performance Studies tell Visual Studies – keeping in mind that, at least as far as I am concerned, there is an obvious distinction between Visual Studies or Visual Cultural Studies as an academic area of inquiry and the visual cultures that are made and made use of, that take place out there in the world, the visual cultures in which we've been engaging critically for years in numerous ways long before Visual Studies came along?

PP: It's an extraordinarily complex question! First you're asking me to speak analogically: how is Performance Studies like or distinct from Visual Studies? And then you're also asking me to talk about a larger question with which I think both Performance Studies and Visual Studies have to contend, and that's Cultural Studies. These are distinct questions. I want to begin by just reflecting upon the CAA meeting in Philadelphia in 2001. Laurie Beth Clark and Nick Mirzoeff organized a discussion on Visual Studies in relation to Art History. I was asked to speak about Performance Studies as a model for Visual Studies. And I found myself in the session being more cautious than I had anticipated. Everything seemed to be available for the newly emerging discipline. There has been an extensive critique of Performance Studies along these lines – 'if everything is performance ... how do you define what it is?' – and my response to this question is always: 'well, if everything is language, why do we have English Departments!' [laughs] Nonetheless, there has to be a way to talk about the border between what is performance and what is not. I am completely behind the discipline of Visual Studies and I think it can enliven and enrich Art History. But as one begins the complex game of institutionalizing a field it is important to delimit your study or

else the field can become too amorphous. I think the example of Cultural Studies is useful to bear in mind. Institutionally, it is now very vulnerable. As you know, the programme was disbanded in Birmingham, and it is under attack in the US as well. The main argument against Cultural Studies is that it lacks disciplinary specificity. Some see it as a little bit of this and a little bit of that; it has a sort of 'jack of all trades, master of none' problem.

I think Performance Studies had a healthy anxiety about that problem, and while perhaps the field was beginning to fetishize the question of liveness, the question nonetheless did help to consolidate the field and to give it some kind of border. And I think similar questions will be important for Visual Studies as well: what constitutes the border between the visible and the invisible? How does our blindness to the opacity of the not-seen frame our experience of the visual?

JVC: Would you speak a bit more about your essay in *Unmarked*, 'The Ontology of Performance' [1993]? What do you think is at stake in your emphasis on performance as an art of disappearance?

PP: I was trying to make clear that the ephemeral, indeed the mortal, is absolutely fundamental to the experience of embodiment, to the *facticity* of human history itself. Although the essay has prompted a lot of criticism, I still stand by most of it. I was trying to move the field away from a constant preoccupation with the content of performance, a descriptive fixation on what performance enacted, and toward a consideration of performance as that which disappears. I thought this aspect of performance allowed us to answer some important philosophical and political questions about loss, history and death – questions that I thought performance art had done much to pose. I wanted the field to engage more directly with questions around historiography, psychoanalysis, trauma and, therefore, ethics. I think this interdisciplinary work has been very good for the field.

JVC: Picking up on this matter of disappearing, in *Unmarked* you say that you are if not against then you are certainly suspicious of a politics of visibility – a politics which seeks empowerment through visibility and exposure. 'Visibility is a trap', you say, following Jacques Lacan's invocation in *Four Fundamental Concepts* [1981]: 'In this matter of the visible, everything is a trap.' In effect, you say you're against economies of vision as surveillance, as voyeurism, and as colonialism's fetishistic will to possession [Phelan, 1993: 6–7]. Instead you propose a possibility of being or becoming 'unmarked', an 'active vanishing' that 'refus[es] ... the pay-off of visibility' (p. 6). In your book you attend to questions of the need to move from matters of visibility to invisibility, disappearance, de-materialization. You ask: what does it take to 'value the immaterial'? Could you speak a little more about the background to this critique of visibility and this critique's concomitant call for a need to attend to the process of disappearance?

PP: *Unmarked* was written in the very late 1980s and early 90s. In that period in New York (and elsewhere) the Left was absolutely obsessed with identity politics and visibility politics. The idea was that if you could give the disenfranchised access to representation, these groups could secure political power. I was suspicious of this for the feminist Lacanian reasons that you mentioned before, and also because I knew that this was part of what capitalism does so well – acquire new

audiences! If one could increase the range of representation's demographic addresses, capitalism could add more markets to its expanding stage.

Unmarked was read, quite correctly, as a psychoanalytic text. But it was also about the way in which capital works: I was interested in finding ways to resist the relentless acquisitive drive of capitalism. Much of the energy and inspiration of performance art in the 1970s derived from an attempt to dissolve the materiality of the art object, and to create, in the moment of performance, something of value that did not have an object. This might be described as a quest for an intersubjective experience. I wanted to return to that impulse because I thought it was a brilliant critique of commodity culture, and very radical. By the time I was writing, however, that impulse had been overtaken by the usual capitalist worldview in the United States, and especially in New York, where the galleries, and museum culture more generally, had become so dominant. In places like Eastern Europe or Brazil, of course, the history of performance art played out quite differently.

When I was writing *Unmarked*, however, I was trying to think about resistance to commodity culture. As the performance artists of the 70s made clear, one mode of resistance is to think about things that don't consolidate into objects that can be sold. I was interested in the *immaterial* allure of performance as one possible way to imagine new economies of value. One of the reasons why capitalism is so damn successful is that it understands we have an implicit system of value, discernment and end-judgement. I was trying to propose an economy of intersubjectivity, if you will, or an economy – now this has become a problematic term, but at the time it wasn't so bad – an economy of cultural capital independent of object commodification. And this was what that stream of the argument was about. But it hasn't really been taken up. The response to *Unmarked* has been much more about the technology of the ideal performance archive and the nature of disappearance.

JVC: In *Unmarked* you say that 'performance's only life is in the present' (p. 146). This is a statement about the problem of mediation (of film, video, photography) between liveness and the experience of performance, and the memory of that fact, against the ability of recordable medias to document and reproduce performance, a statement about the undocumentable event of performance, and thus its ontology. You say that recorded or documentary footage, photographs of performances, and so on are distinct from performances themselves and are in a sense transformed visual acts in and of themselves that don't even bear an indexical link to the performance proper. We might say that they are in fact their own discrete works of art. Could you say some more about this proposition, with which I wholly agree, and also if you think the internet and its 'real-time' relays offer an addendum to this argument.

PP: That's a really good question. A couple of things: I was not saying, although I've heard people say I *was* saying, that we must not have photographs, videos or sound documentation of performances. I'm quite happy to have those! I teach and I use them all the time. I'm not against technology. But I think when one is showing a video one is showing a video; one is not, as it were, having the performance be re-performed. Video is a different medium and it pursues a different aesthetic. So I do stand by that part of the argument.

If I can paraphrase myself reasonably successfully, 'performance betrays its

ontology to the degree to which it participates in the economy of reproduction.' That's not exactly it, but it's close. This word 'betrays' has been a bit of a problem. I think I was read as a high priest saying 'we must not have betrayal!' I understand that we live with betrayals of all kinds. I was trying to point out what distinguishes performance, ontologically, from the photographic and recording arts. Performance's ephemeral nature, I was arguing, is absolutely powerful and can serve as a rejoinder to the 'preserve everything', 'purchase everything' mentality so central to the art world and to late capitalism more broadly.

Phil Auslander has written a book called *Liveness* [1999], in which he disagrees with most of my argument.² Fair enough. But he misreads my essay in significant ways. He likes to say he doesn't *believe* in the unconscious and I think he thinks this relieves him of the obligation to contend with the psychoanalytic dimension of my argument. I can accept that, although I am not sure it is a legitimate mode of argument. At one point he says that I don't seem to notice that Angelika Festa's performances are performances with technology in them. Of course I notice it, and I spent a long time talking about what's on those monitors because I was not in any way trying to say that live performance cannot have video, audio, or technology. I was trying to notice where performance's political power lies. It has to do with this critique of the commodity. So that was what that was all about, and I am not so stupid [laughs] as to think live performance eschews technology. Performance is a technology. Medieval theatre was a technology. It was not the new technology, not, say, electronic technology, but it was technology: a plank and two boards, the definition of theatre. That's a technology!

Now we have streaming video, web casts, all sorts of media capable of recording and circulating live events. They can give us something that closely resembles the live event but they nonetheless remain something other than live performance. But these are very useful and very interesting tools and I am not against their use at all.

But in terms of the ontological question, it's simply not the same thing. For me, live performance remains an interesting art form because it contains the possibility of both the actor and the spectator becoming transformed during the event's unfolding. Of course, people can have significant and meaningful experiences of spectatorship watching film or streaming video and so on. But these experiences are less interesting to me because the spectator's response cannot alter the pre-recorded or remotely transmitted performance, and in this fundamental sense, these representations are indifferent to the response of the other. In live performance, the potential for the event to be transformed by those participating in it makes it more exciting to me – this is precisely where the 'liveness' of live performance matters. Of course, a lot of live performance does not approach this potential at all, and of course many spectators and many actors are incapable of being open to it anyway. But this potential, this seductive promise of possibility of mutual transformation is extraordinarily important because this is the point where the aesthetic joins the ethical.

Embodiment, trauma, death, mourning

JVC: Towards the end of *Unmarked*, you write that 'performance art usually occurs

in the suspension between the 'real' physical matter of 'the performing body' and the psychic experience of what it is to be embodied' (p. 167). Add to that Elin Diamond's compliment on the dust-jacket of *Unmarked* that your book is a 'moving study on the ethics of the visible', my question is this: Is the point between these two things – between the real physical matter of the performing body and the psychic experience of what it is to be embodied – the point where Performance Studies, or perhaps performance itself, finds an ethics of the *visible*?

PP: Oh, that's nice! I wouldn't have thought so, but tell me what you mean? Certainly that might be where it finds an ethics, yes, but why would it have to be visible?

JVC: Well, it wouldn't have to be visible at all – especially given the tremendous critique you direct at the visible, as we've already discussed, and the efforts you go to delineate the contours of the invisible, or the process of disappearing, of disappearance. But as a book that seems to be incredibly engaged with the difficulties of understanding the nature of visibility, and looking for ways in which the de-materialization of vision might be able to make certain kinds of possibilities available, if one is seriously taking as a starting point this particular axis, this point of convergence of the real physical matter of the performing body and the psychic experience of what it is to be embodied, it may well be that some kind of ethics of *visibility* can emerge too?

PP: That's terrific. You should write that book! I was not thinking of that. But yes I follow your point. I was trying to delineate a possible ethics of the *invisible*, but your idea is very rich and perhaps more positive. I wanted to talk about the failure to see oneself fully. This failure is optical, psychoanalytical, and ethical. The wager of the book was to see if we could use this failure as a way to re-think what we mean by power, what we mean by representation, what we mean when we imagine our encounters with the other. I was suggesting that this central failure, instead of being constantly repressed by culture, might be something we could acknowledge and even embrace. If this were possible, I thought perhaps a different ethics, a richer encounter between self and other might become actual and actual-izable.

JVC: Following up on these ethical matters, in *Mourning Sex: Performing Public Memories* [1997] you claim that 'it may well be that the theatre and performance respond to a psychic need to rehearse for loss, and especially for death' (p. 3). Would you tell us some more about the confluence of theatre, performance, and death?

PP: Well, I started to take this question of disappearance really seriously! [laughs] Ultimate disappearance, as far as we know, is death, right? I became very interested in the ways in which theatre seemed to be obsessed with death. Currently I am writing a book about Andy Warhol and Ronald Reagan. They both were shot, they both were close to death and they both lived. Warhol said he heard himself pronounced dead and, characteristically, he says he heard this twice. For 18 years after, he said he didn't know if his existence took place on the side of life or death. Similarly, the announcement of Reagan's Alzheimer's disease in 1994 raises important questions about the assumptions we make about 'life' and 'consciousness' or 'subjectivity.' Is Reagan still Reagan if he does not know who he

is? Is he alive in the sense that he is himself? Do we need to understand more clearly how life both needs and does not need consciousness in order to render a body a sense of liveness? Both Reagan and Warhol had explicitly pronounced theatrical worldviews and I am interested in how this worldview was challenged and either enhanced or rejected by these biographical and biological events. But to be brief, yes it is fair to say that the seeds of my new book, *Death Rehearsals* [forthcoming], were planted in that paragraph of *Mourning Sex*.

JVC: Does *Death Rehearsals* have anything to do with your time at The Open Society Institute's Project on Death in America from 1997–9? As far as I can grasp what the Society does, it aims to 'understand and transform attitudes about dying and bereavement through research in the humanities and the arts, as well as to foster innovations in care, education and public policy'. How did you get involved, what did you do there, and what, as we say in this horribly bureaucratic age, was the 'outcome' of your time there?

PP: The 'outcome' is still to come! Yes, it's the forthcoming book, *Death Rehearsals: The Performances of Andy Warhol and Ronald Reagan*. The Open Society generously funded my work, enabling me to spend time reading in The Archives Study Center at The Andy Warhol Museum in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and in the Ronald Reagan Presidential Museum and Library in Simi Valley, California. My time in the Reagan archive was a mind-blowing experience on every level, but you'll have to wait for the book to read why. The Project on Death in America is now defunct, but it helped attract scholarly and pragmatic attention to issues of dying and death. Their work on palliative care has been especially successful and has helped increase the medical world's sensitivity to pain management.

JVC: As a practitioner, and an academic, and a creative critical writer, and as a performance writer, I was wondering if you'd say a little more about a project you worked on with the English Performance Studies academic, Adrian Heathfield, who is based at University of Warwick, entitled *Blood Math*, a performance piece via email on love, loss, memory, the body, the act of giving, employing philosophical, psychoanalytical, and anthropological models of gift giving as a way of beginning a particular kind of exchange. In a similar vein, another of your projects is an imaginary dialogue with Jacques Derrida entitled 'P.S.' in which you write as 'P.S.', a pseudonym and/or acronym of/for Plato/Socrates and/or Performance Studies. You also contrast the P.S. with the P.P. punning both on your own initials and Freud's *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*! [laughs] Would you speak about the multi-faceted nature of your commitment to performance?

PP: In *Mourning Sex* I was experimenting with what has come to be called performative writing. It's a way of bringing back to critical theory a certain *affective* emotional force. I was very interested in that. I was also concerned by a persistent separation between critical imagination and creative imagination: I wanted to foster a way of writing that would enable me to respond more completely, more emotionally I suppose, to art. And so it seemed logical, as a next step, to become a writer of performance. I first wrote 'Eat Crow' which was performed in 1997. It was originally written as a radio play. I was invited to the International Women Playwrights' Festival in Galway, Ireland in 1997, and I worked with the actress,

musician, and scholar Lucia Sander on it. We performed it there and it was a fantastic experience for me. It inspired me to take my artistic ambitions more seriously.

I had been giving a lot of talks over the years, and after a while, I began to compose these talks as letters to the audience. As it happened, Adrian [Heathfield] heard a lot of them. I think he heard the first three or four. I became obsessed with the letter as a form. I was very interested in a direct address that I thought criticism was in danger of losing. Of course I was deeply influenced, if not obsessed, by Derrida's important book *La Carte Postale* (1987). Eventually I wrote two letters to Derrida that took up his book, and more particularly my meditation on his meditation on the P and the S central to his argument. For him, the P and the S stand for Plato and Socrates, the image on the post card around which he structures his book. These two figures also originate the textual structure of Western philosophy, hence their fascination for Derrida. I was interested in the P and the S as a way of thinking about Performance Studies, and we both were interested in the notion of PS as postscript, as that which exceeds the 'first' text and continues the text beyond its frame, including the frame of life. One of these two letter performances was published on the internet in a special issue of *Tympanum*, honouring Derrida's 70th birthday.³

When Adrian and I composed *Blood Math*, it was very much designed to be a kind of poor theatre piece – we used only music and slides. Most of my letter performances involved music and slides, and I know Adrian had often used video and slides in his talks. Even though my friends tell me to use PowerPoint and so on, I like the archaic nature of the slide projector; I even enjoy the stress of getting all the images in the trays properly. And there is nothing like music to create a mood and state of mind. Adrian and I began composing letters, almost all on email I believe, that would become the basic text for the performance. The text is about letters in the sense of epistolary correspondence and letters as in the alphabet. The performance plays a simple trick with letters that I won't reveal here! We performed it first in Chicago at the Goat Island Summer School, and then again at the Performance Studies international (PSi) conference in Arizona. The third and final performance took place at the London International Festival of Theatre (LIFT). The text, without the slides or music, was published in the journal *Cultural Studies*.⁴ Having now done these performances (and a few others), I have learned I prefer to let others perform my work. I am quite self-conscious and stiff, and when I am working with another person, I feel this awful burden and responsibility. I don't want to wreck the thing on their account. When I write my own texts and perform them myself, it seems to matter much less. If they are flops, I know I will survive and that I will try again.

JVC: In the JD project you've just mentioned, you say 'Love, like writing, endures'. Could you say something more about the role that love plays in your thinking?

PP: I think that the older I get, the more I believe love endures. I think that when you're young, you have this idea that *you* are immortal and love is finite. And as you get older, you begin to develop a sense that *you* are mortal and *love* is infinite. I had been reading Derrida since 1981, and in the course of that 20-year long

relationship my feelings about his work of course changed. But the practice of reading his writing endured. I wanted to address that element of love when I wrote to him on his 70th birthday. I was trying to write a love letter to someone not my lover but without whom my own love life would be less – what? – less well written! I'm kidding in a way, but I am interested in the ways in which writing and loving have always been entwined for me. The labour of critical attention I offer to the work of the other is a mode of love. A willingness to go out to the work of the other and respond to it with work of one's own is fundamental to critical writing. In this response, one writes, but one also loves. So love, like writing, endures.

Things of the heart: enjoy your symptom, embrace your trauma

JVC: I sensed that it might be fun to draw out some implicit themes, concerns, and guiding impulses that I've discerned in your thought and writings over the years, and that we could play out a game of word association in a make-believe analytic situation? As the analyst, obviously, [laughs] I'll throw a word at you, and all you have to do is tell me the first thing that comes into your head. OK?

PP: OK.

JVC: Community?

PP: I just moved to San Francisco and I don't yet have a community! Community is crucial. One of the things about living in New York I now see was how spoiled I was. I took for granted my intellectual, emotional and political community. In California, everybody drives cars – there is not that sense of spontaneous meeting in the street. I hope in time I will find an everyday community, but for now it is dismaying to miss it so much. Communities aren't always based on physical proximity of course. Some of the people I feel closest to don't live in the United States. Again, as you get older, you see the same people can be committed to a common project. It's very important. When you have this guy, George Bush in the White House, it becomes even more important to find a way to be sane and dissent. And sometimes you do have to do it in public, and get arrested. Sometimes you simply have to act. Having a community makes that a lot more fun, a lot more feasible, than it might otherwise be.

JVC: Eroticism?

PP: I'm for it! [laughs] Eroticism and seduction, I think they go hand in hand. There's a certain kind of banal eroticism of the ubiquitous image of the good-looking, buff body that I'm happy to turn away from. I love Roland Barthes' essay *Camera Lucida*, where he speaks of the *punctum* in the image, which is really the space of the erotic – always traumatic. And I'm in favour of embracing the trauma. Enjoy your symptom, as Slavoj Žižek advises. [laughs] We need eroticism to keep us sane. And seduction, of course. Women's version of seduction – not Baudrillard's.

JVC: Time?

PP: It's passing away. I'm really interested in the present. I say that as someone

who lives in the United States and is incredibly embarrassed by the a-historicism of my native land. But I feel that that's a lost object for me, it's too late for me to become an historian! Beckett has this wonderful bit in *Godot* where Didi asks: 'Do you remember?' and Gogo says: 'I'm not an historian!' As I get older, I keep saying: 'I'm not an historian!' I think that we've either become obsessed with the future, which is what culture is always saying: 'It's going to get better ...' or 'buy this and you will be ...' and so on. That's the imperative. Performers such as Stelarc and Orlan concern themselves with the future by radically revising the present surface of skin. Very important work for sure. And of course, many people as they get older fall in love with the past. But I really think we have to find a way to be present in and to the present. This is much harder than it appears to be.

JVC: Intensity?

PP: I'm often told that I'm affectless, which I find very interesting. I feel myself to be intensely emotional, but I appear to be laid back, calm, and that gets read as affectless. But I'm pretty intense, and I'm interested in the intensity of others. I like extreme things, extreme art, intense emotions.

JVC: Hesitation?

PP: Very useful. A discipline. I used to be extremely impetuous, but as I get older, I am becoming a fan of hesitation. It is useful because it allows you a moment to think. But it can be paralyzing. So you have to say 'perhaps', and then do something. I think a lot of intellectuals get caught in the 'perhaps', and can't decide. I often suffer from this. Hesitation is a kind of humility that's worth practising. It's a discipline, but it's dangerous. Better not to fall in love with hesitation, but good to entertain it.

JVC: Tenderness?

PP: There is a huge emphasis in contemporary culture on passion and hectic-ness towards desire. As I get older – god, I sound like I'm 90! – I feel gallons of tenderness toward my students and toward children in general. It's amazing. Tenderness is really beautiful and I want more of it – both to give it more and also to receive it more. And to trust it a little more, because especially with this war, we're in this unbelievably violent time, and I think the capacity for tenderness is especially worth cultivating now.

JVC: Redemption?

PP: Redemption is more complicated! Redemption has such a theological canopy, it's hard to get out from under that. I do take my theology very seriously, but there is a spiritual overhang that I'm not always willing to engage. I did deal with some of this in my essay on Caravaggio's painting, *The Incredulity of St. Thomas*.⁵ It begins with a meditation on Adorno's wonderful bit about redemption in *Minima Moralia* (1974[1951]). I'm interested in that notion of redemption, the way in which one has to, as it were, think oneself past the dialectic, past the synthesis, into something we could call the after-thought. The P.S. Or the after-death, the sense of survival that sometimes overtakes one unawares. I am interested in this kind of redemption, a consciousness of survival without expectation and without disappointment. I absolutely love Beckett. Beckett had a pervading belief, a pervading theology about

failure. He has illuminated that brilliantly so there is no need to do it again. I'm interested in this other kind of post-Beckettian possibility, a post-theatrical age in a profound sense. The word 'beyond' isn't quite right – it implies a temporal thing, that you move through these things one at a time, but I don't mean it in that way. It's hard to express because our language is itself temporally bound in these ways. But I guess one way to say it is to suggest that there are some things that are conceptually 'after', that touch on, for lack of a better term, a kind of redemption. But it's not redemption in a sense of going to heaven ... It's more a sense of completion without expectation of response. A sense of having survived without needing any more experience to teach you what survival is. Something like this. It's not quite on the side of life, since it is in some fundamental sense 'after' desire, and it's not quite on the side of death because one still possesses consciousness, subjectivity, language, vision, touch, and so on.

JVC: You mean it's more like the 'something' that comes after the 'perhaps' of hesitation?

PP: Yes, perhaps.

Notes

1. This interview took place on Friday 28 March 2003, days into the US/UK war on Iraq, on the eve of a conference – and series of events – co-curated by Adrian Heathfield, and Lois Keidan and Daniel Brine, Director and Associate Director respectively, of the Live Art Development Agency, entitled 'Live Culture: Performance and the Contemporary' at Tate Modern.
2. Auslander (1999) argues, contra Phelan, that in an effort to work against our desire to fetishize 'live' performance we must come to terms with the fact that 'liveness' itself is an effect of mediatization and that it only comes to have meaning during or after the advent of its technologization: 'like liveness itself, the desire for live experiences is a product of mediatization' (p. 55).
3. This internet journal can be found at: <http://www.usc.edu/dept/comp-lit/tympanum/4/khora.html>
4. *Cultural Studies* (2001) 15(2): 241–57.
5. Phelan (1997): 23–43.

References

- Adorno, Theodor (1974 [1951]) *Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life*. London: New Left Books.
- Auslander, Philip (1999) *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques (1987) *The Postcard: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lacan, Jacques (1981[1973]) *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Phelan, Peggy (forthcoming) *Death Rehearsals: The Performances of Andy Warhol and Ronald Reagan*.
- Phelan, Peggy and Jill Lane (1998) *The Ends of Performance*. New York: New York University Press.
- Phelan, Peggy, and Lynda Hart (eds) (1993) *Acting Out: Feminist Performances*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Phelan, Peggy (2001) *Art and Feminism*. London: Phaidon Press.

- Phelan, Peggy (1997) *Mourning Sex: Performing Public Memories*. London: Routledge.
- Phelan, Peggy (2001) *Pipilotti Rist*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Phelan, Peggy (1993) *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. London: Routledge.
- Schechner, Richard (1995) 'Transforming Theatre Departments', *TDR: a journal of performance studies* 39(2): 7–10.

Peggy Phelan is The Ann O'Day Maples Chair in the Arts at Stanford University. She is the author of *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (Routledge, 1993), *Mourning Sex: Performing Public Memories* (Routledge, 1997) and the forthcoming *Death Rehearsals: The Performances of Andy Warhol and Ronald Reagan*.

Marquard Smith is the editor-in-chief of *journal of visual culture* and is busily setting up a Masters programme in Visual and Material Culture in the School of Art & Design History, Faculty of Art, Design & Music, Kingston University, London. He is a co-author of *Stelarc: The Monograph* (forthcoming, The MIT Press).