

**Using one of the plays we have examined in class as your main point of reference, discuss how such a text serves to stage and bring attention to the specific socio-political events that it draws its material from. You must refer to two more plays that we have not examined in class and which deal with the same or similar topic to illustrate your points and construct a convincing argument.**

*Rhinoceros* by Eugene Ionesco, *A Number* by Caryl Churchill and *The Ugly One* by Marius von Mayenburg are three plays of the recent and contemporary period which share similar themes and arguably compliment one another when it comes to the discussion of their socio-political events. This exploration of the themes which link the three plays will begin with a discussion of individuality, homogenisation and mass ideology, not only within the texts but within wider society, and whether conformity is destructive to the individual, and vice versa, or whether individuality is emphasised when one is part of a mass. The second part of this discussion will approach narcissism within society and the plays, and its impact upon fascism, and ideas of beauty, such as whether individuality and appearances can ever be truly separated.

### **Individuality, Homogenisation and Mass Ideology**

*A Number*, *Rhinoceros*, and *The Ugly One*, particularly the latter two, bring to the stage the idea of ‘conforming to socially normal behaviour’<sup>1</sup> which allows one to signify that ‘one is a member of this [their] society.’<sup>2</sup> This theme generates several questions about the nature of a ‘society’, for example: can a society exist without conformity? If one stands apart from the masses, are they still considered to be part of a community, or exempt from it? What, if anything, is considered to be socially “normal”? Some of these ideas are also approached by *A Number*, and it is my intention to explore in detail these social themes which bring these three contemporary plays together, beginning with grouping, and mass identity.

Sigmund Freud has much to say on the nature of mass psychology. Whilst this is not identical to the study of mass ideologies, it shares many similar philosophies, which can be observed within the chosen plays. Though Freud did not originally base his studies on fascism, but rather on the Church and the army, his work will be explored in it’s relation to fascism because of its ‘irrational’<sup>3</sup> nature, and it’s objective aims which ‘contradict the material interest of great numbers of those whom they [fascists] try to embrace’<sup>4</sup>, which is observed in the political commentary of *Rhinoceros*. Freud did study a society’s ‘willingness to yield unquestioningly to powerful, outside collective agencies’<sup>5</sup> and felt that the western world – that is to say, the western world as it stood in the aftermath of the Second World War – bore witness to ‘the decline of the individual and his subsequent weakness’<sup>6</sup>. Not only this, but he argues that the individual is not only weakening but the idea of becoming a member of the masses is literally satisfying. He writes of the ‘actual or vicarious gratifications individuals obtain from surrendering to a mass’<sup>7</sup>. It is evident that Freud believes in the strength of a collective as an overpowering alien entity that one must ‘surrender’ or ‘yield’ to, to become a part of, but once this sacrifice has been made the subject receives gratification for their efforts and ceases to desire their individuality.

This phenomenon can first be observed in Ionesco’s play. ‘So our friend Boef’s turned into a rhinoceros. (*Laughs.*) He’s having us on – it’s just fancy dress’<sup>8</sup> proclaims Jean, in seeming disbelief at the idea that a person could become anything

other than what they are. By the end of the scene 'he's a rhinoceros! he's a rhinoceros!'<sup>9</sup> after deciding, in a complete change of character, that human moral values pale in significance compared to the natural order. This could easily represent that his regular moral values are no longer important to him due to the new ideology, whatever it may be, that he has adopted. The speed with which Jean's character changes within the play is alarming, and his uncertain behaviour is reminiscent of submission to fascism. Yet, his insistence on 'rebuild[ing] our life's foundations'<sup>10</sup> seems not the ramblings of a man unhappy with this drastic life change.

Equally, though in a significantly different way, a transition from one ideal to another occurs in *The Ugly One* by von Mayenburg. Upon realising he is ugly (a topic which will be discussed in greater detail later on) Lette, who, due to his looks, has been rejected from doing a work presentation on a product he designed, submits to reconstructive cosmetic surgery. Heavily influenced by the people now in love with his face, Lette is informed that his work 'performance has drastically deteriorated'<sup>11</sup> and is then fired. He is then reluctant to keep up with his new looks (his new ideology) but pressure from those around him, especially his assistant who shares the same face, encourages him to bear it, 'now that we're [he's] rich and beautiful'<sup>12</sup>.

So as demonstrated, the two plays project and draw attention to Freud's thoughts on mass mentality, but such projections inevitably create more queries. Though the individual receives joy from being part of a larger whole, is the society they form a joyous entity in and of itself? Arguably, no. The society formed in Ionesco's text is one of brute force and lawlessness, where individuals have become indistinguishable from one another at an alarming rate and avoiding 'rhinocertitis'<sup>13</sup> is a literal fight against a stampede. Becoming a rhinoceros is, of course, not a genuine life concern, but Ionesco used this as a metaphor for submitting to fascist propaganda and joining mass movements. The play, written in 1959, was the playwright's method of exploring his own ideas of political activity without risk of accusation from the authorities. Though within the play, shortly before turning, the herd seems desirable ('People look like that – cheerful – feeling good about themselves. They don't look insane'<sup>14</sup>) there is little to suggest a world ruled by beasts is anything more than dangerous.

On the subject of a mass mind being dangerous to greater society, and the indistinguishableness of individuals, let us briefly revisit *The Ugly One*. Though the surgery which creates the 'masterpiece'<sup>15</sup> face does little physical damage to society (unlike a herd of rhinoceroses), the face itself becomes idealised by others, and soon leads to adultery, exclusion from the workplace due to ugliness, and self mutilation. Von Mayenburg puts in the script, to then be staged, the notion that such acts derail western society's notions of monogamy, equality and self preservation. The concept of beauty and the nature of narcissism shall be explored later, but any new ideal which challenges the foundations of a culture is surely to be seen as *threatening* to that culture, or, if not threatening, then the formation of foundations for an entirely new culture.

It has been said that *Rhinocéros* represents Ionesco's feelings before he left Romania in 1938, when more and more of his acquaintances adhered to the fascist movement of the Iron Guard.<sup>16</sup>

If *Rhinoceros* truly represents Ionesco's feelings towards the Iron Guard (represented on stage as giant, roaring beasts), who amongst many fascist crimes were involved in Hitler's holocaust, then it becomes apparent that we are meant to sympathise with the character Béranger, last seen insisting he will remain human. Yet it must be noted the other characters are not unintelligent, or even bestial in nature. Freud would lead us to believe that the desire to act against their regular nature is brought on because 'in a group the individual is brought under conditions which allow him to throw off the repressions of his unconscious instincts.'<sup>17</sup> Taking this, for a moment, as the truth, there is an assumption that beneath each of our civilised exteriors lurks a dormant desire to 'go with the flow.'<sup>18</sup>

However, I propose that the plays do not necessarily dictate that it is innate uncivilised desires which cause mob mentalities, for a second theory is observable. It has been said that 'fascism and the entire technique of fascist demagogues are authoritarian'<sup>19</sup> yet within *Rhinoceros* and *The Ugly One*, the authority itself is silent and unseen, unless we consider the first rhinoceros to be an authoritarian figure. The absence of an obvious dictator within the plays, who persuade each character to change their form or face, leaves the nature of the demagogue down to the audience's interpretation. What is made more obvious, especially within Ionesco's work, is the outcome of collaborating with fascist ideals. It is the 'irrational emotional aggressiveness purposely promoted by our would-be Hitlers'<sup>20</sup>. The accuracy of this statement is too obvious to disregard when one considers the '*trumpetings mixed up with garbled words like "I'm so angry," "bastard!" etc.*'<sup>21</sup> of rhinoceroses.

Jean, one of the first to change form, is presented from the first scene as an eloquent, rational individual with an acute awareness of what is socially acceptable ('The superior person is the one who fulfils his duty.'<sup>22</sup>) It is with this in mind, alongside Béranger's work colleagues, that it becomes apparent Ionesco's play 'does justice to the simple fact that those who become submerged in masses are not primitive men but display primitive attitudes contradictory to their normal rational behaviour.'<sup>23</sup>

Le Bon describes the masses as being 'largely de-individualised, irrational, easily influenced, and prone to violent action'<sup>24</sup> and this description can be seen not only through the actions of the rhinoceroses in Ionesco's work ('we see the steps of the staircase collapse'<sup>25</sup>) but in reasonably recent newspapers and constantly on television. As recently as September 2009, community secretary John Denham in a recorded interview likened a fascist group to 'the right wing groups demonstrating in British-Muslim communities... trying to provoke violence with their protests'<sup>26</sup> and stated that 'provocation can lead to community division.'<sup>27</sup> This kind of mob mentality was actually used politically to enforce anti-Semitism during the Second World War, with provocation from the Nazi Party to outcast the Jewish people. 'Le Bon had noticed that the irrational crowd 'goes directly to extremes.'<sup>28</sup> Despite Ionesco writing his play in 1959, its themes are just as relevant to politics and society today.

Re-exploring the quotation by Theodor Adorno indicating contradictory 'primitive attitudes', it highlights that individuals do not always elect to become members of a collective of their own volition, for their mob behaviour goes against their usual mannerisms, and it is here that *A Number* can also be observed as a demonstration of Adorno's theory. Bernard 2 finds himself unwillingly the member of a group who

‘happen to have identical be identical identical genetic.’<sup>29</sup> The father, having cloned his original son, is unaware that the scientist he visited created multiple versions of Bernard, and the father even named the first clone after his original son, forcing the question: ‘does it make it worse?’<sup>30</sup> Bernard 2 is an example of an individual unknowingly subjugated, a forced member of a collection of identical, indistinguishable people, whose authority figure saw fit, even, to give him an identical name to his predecessor.

Douglas Kellner wrote *Jean Baudrillard From Marxism to Postmodernism and Beyond*, focusing on the thoughts and theories of the French cultural theorist whose name featured in the books title. He wrote:

Cloning, Baudrillard suggests, makes possible an extension and multiplication of the body, which transforms the very nature of the body, sexuality, and human being itself.<sup>31</sup>

Jean Baudrillard, a figurehead in postmodernism, taught that ‘neither child, nor twin, nor narcissistic reflection, the clone is the materialisation of the double by genetic means.’<sup>32</sup> The clone is an entity which is exactly like you, and yet, not the same person. The clone allows us to discuss the repercussions of unnatural symmetry in society – should there be more than one, of one person? If everybody looks the same, are they the same person, and is this destructive to society? Though *A Number* is most obviously associated with this idea, *The Ugly One* pertains to the outcome of several people using the same face, and the human characters within *Rhinoceros* eventually became unable to tell which type of rhinos they were surrounded by, and ultimately all except Bérenger became something they were not originally, and all look the same.

Of course, *A Number* was published in the same year that Dr Severino Antinori announced that the first human baby clone would be born, according to BBC News, and so Churchill is giving us a brief glimpse into her suspicions of the future that human duplication (namely, suicide, and abandonment) and the loss of one of the contributing factors of individuality – unique genetics. Bernard, Bernard 2, and Michael Black are individuals who share identical genetics, yet did not share identical upbringing. Understandably, then, the play also mirrors a popular political debate – whether nature or nurture is responsible for mental and emotional development. *A Number* answers with a call of ‘nurture’, for the three identical individuals were precisely that – individual, ‘not the same person’<sup>33</sup> – but the father’s difficulty telling them apart (‘Do I look like?’ ‘Yes of course.’<sup>34</sup>) throws barriers in the way of any individuals idea of self. There is little use in being an individual, if nobody can tell you apart from another.

As previously explored, actions within *The Ugly One* are suggestive of the undoing of western society’s foundations, and similarly, the morbid outcomes of *A Number* – one father, alone, one dead son and one absent son – indicate similar disasters. All three plays draw attention to the risks of loss of individuality to society, to both its social constructs and its literal physical well being. However, if loss of individuality is to be seen as disastrous, how would one explain individuality? This is approached within the plays. The members of contemporary masses are raised in a ‘liberal, competitive and individualistic society, and conditioned to maintain themselves as independent, self-sustaining units’<sup>35</sup> whilst simultaneously, they are informed that ‘consumption of

commodities signifies happiness, well-being, affluence, success, prestige, eroticism, modernity and so on'<sup>36</sup>. If 'consumption of commodities' were to be taken at less of a literal value in terms of the plays and taken instead as 'taking what is being offered', the decision to transform into a rhinoceros could be seen as the path to happiness and modernity, and the new faces purchased in *The Ugly One* require far less personal interpretation to see that the faces cause initial well-being and affluence. But 'in his early works, Baudrillard generally takes a critical Marxian posture toward the consumer society, suggesting that consumption constitutes a total homogenization and organisation of everyday life.'<sup>37</sup> It is this homogenisation which is the important, for as long as an individual is willing to take from a society what that society has to offer – are they truly an individual, or an unknowing participant of a collective? They have distinguished themselves not through their own attributes, but by what it is they want to have, that society has, which they do not.

This can be better explained by inspecting Michael's attempts to explain his individuality. The main point is that it is perhaps impossible to assert oneself as an individual without first admitting that one is part of a larger collective.

Salter: Maybe you could tell me a little  
Michael: about myself  
Salter: if you don't mind  
Michael: no of course, it's where to, you already  
know I'm a teacher, mathematics, you know I'm  
married, three children did I tell you that  
...  
Salter: tell me something about yourself that's really  
specific to you, something really important  
Michael: what sort of?  
Salter: anything  
Michael: it's hard to  
Salter: yes.<sup>38</sup>

His initial answer to Salter's request is to speak not of his own achievements per say, but his place in wider society as a teacher, and to speak of other people, his family, not himself. Michael struggles to think of anything to say about himself which would make him seem unique, because without admitting to wider culture, we cannot indicate our own place in the world. It is here that we may consider that, contrary to the considered dangers of conformity on the individual, and the loss of self, the individual may actually thrive within a mass – the mass may give the individual a basis from which they can define themselves as a singular person (by comparing themselves to others). It may be that people are never truly individual, for each belongs to a society, and so will describe themselves in terms of that society's constructs, and their bonds to other people. It would explain the perceived eagerness to fit into social 'categories', dependant upon your musical or fashion interests, sexuality, faith and political leanings. It would also explain, even if only partially, another reason for mob brutality.

Perhaps it is not entirely due to Le Bon's observations of herd mentality, and perhaps Freud's theories on fascist authoritarianism and submission play only one part. It could be that people, in life and within the plays, primarily *Rhinoceros*, go to

unexpected extremes, simply to profess pride in their opinions and political leanings, as individuals.

### **Narcissism, and Ideas of Beauty**

In terms of bringing to the stage social and political events, one quotation from *Rhinoceros* brings attention to itself, and that is Daisy's proclamation of 'they're beautiful'<sup>39</sup> when looking at the stampede. In a society which idealises 'rigidly conformist notions of physical perfection'<sup>40</sup>, selling cosmetics and displaying models boasting frequently unnatural and often unhealthy figures, beauty is a term loaded with meaning.

'The essential role of narcissism in regard to the identifications which are at play in the formation of fascist groups is recognised in Freud's theory of idealization.'<sup>41</sup> Put simply, whatever it is that we are in love with, we love because we idealise it and wanted that for our own egos. By loving this external entity, we hope to satisfy our own innate narcissism. A group (or mass, collective, society, etcetera) forms because each member of it has unanimously replaced the ideals they want for themselves with an object (within our plays, this would be a rhinoceros, or a face) on which they place these ideals, and because each member idealises the same object, in turn each individual comes to idealise the other individuals, too. 'What he [the individual] projects before him as his ideal is the substitute for the lost narcissism of his childhood in which he [the individual] was his own ideal,'<sup>42</sup> and so, the follower is attracted to it, and seeks to achieve this object's perceived perfection for himself. The object that the narcissism transference is placed onto becomes known as an 'ideal ego.' 'This ideal ego is now the target of the self love which was enjoyed in childhood by the actual ego. The subject's narcissism makes its appearance displaced on to this new ideal ego which... finds itself possessed of every perfection that is of value.'<sup>43</sup> It is in this way that narcissism plays its part in the creation of fascist groups, such as the Iron Guard on which *Rhinoceros* is based.

Let us explore how Freud's theory of narcissism, and how it contributes to fascism, fits within the plays. The rhinoceroses are 'good and tough'<sup>44</sup> and become a target of people's admiration, much as Lette's face is a 'fixation'<sup>45</sup> for Fanny. The desired objects do not only attract the eyes of those gazing upon them, but they also desire to become like the objects themselves. In *Rhinoceros*, the efforts to become more like the beautiful creatures ends with almost total conformity. Alongside this, Salter's determination in *A Number* to have a second son exactly as 'perfect'<sup>46</sup> as the first leads to a large collection of identical people. For *The Ugly One*, Lette's fascination with his own face ends in a narcissistic, hypnotised finale, in which he falls in love with a duplicate of himself. The transformations of body and face happen as the characters submit to the 'dictates of fashion for... social approval or recognition.'<sup>47</sup>

Theodor Adorno wrote a set of essays on postmodernist culture which were accumulated to form the book *The Culture Industry*, which has been frequently quoted within this discussion. He believes that fascists, through use of propaganda, convince the follower that 'simply through belonging to the in-group, [the follower] is better, higher and purer than those who are excluded.'<sup>48</sup> In *Rhinoceros*, Daisy questions 'why's nobody else look like us?'<sup>49</sup> and realises that she must alter her appearance (and way of thinking) to fit in with the rest of her people. *The Ugly One*,

Lette, literally 'give[s] up your [his] face'<sup>50</sup> to fit in. This is particularly interesting as the stage directions specifically state 'you shouldn't be able to see any changes in the actors' faces after the operation.'<sup>51</sup> Whilst the play has a minimalist feel, with only four actors, limited stage directions and multi-role playing, it can be assumed the lack of change in the actor's faces post-operation is not due to issues with budget.

Arguably, by insisting on no actual change in the actor's features, von Mayenburg was making a statement about our perceptions of beauty, and that it is a matter of perspective. The Oxford English Dictionary describes beauty as 'such combined perfection of form and charm of colouring as affords keen pleasure to the sense of sight'<sup>52</sup> and yet what is pleasurable to the eye of one person may not be so for another, and it is questionable whether "perfection" actually exists. The Curtain Up London Review astutely notes the lack of change in the actor's appearance as a 'clever dichotomy between play and production which serves to highlight the text's themes'<sup>53</sup> such as 'is it possible to divorce ourselves from our looks? Will people always judge by looks? Is surgery to change what we look like a good idea?'<sup>54</sup> These are topical issues with strong social relevance, especially when we consider how normal cosmetic surgery is in today's society, with television programs such as *Nip Tuck* detailing the medical procedures and celebrities spending thousands of pounds on unnecessary alterations.

So, *is* it possible to divorce ourselves from our looks? Within the first part of this essay we explored individual identity and the formation of groups. We return to the subject of individuality here, as appearances are a large part of how individuals of the twenty first century identify themselves. It may be impossible to describe oneself without referring, in part, to appearances. Adorno writes of the 'primitively narcissistic aspect of identification as an act of devouring, of making the beloved object part of oneself'<sup>55</sup>. At the end of *The Ugly One*, Lette and Karlmann, now identical, 'slowly move closer until they are kissing.'<sup>56</sup> This intimate gesture involving the mouth is symbolic of the act of devouring described by Adorno, and is especially narcissistic when one considers that the characters are kissing a duplicate of themselves. Karlmann, amongst others, wanted Lette's face for himself and was willing to submit to surgery to make it part of his own body. Whilst in *Rhinoceros* the characters do not devour the creatures, they do gain the desire to be like those that they admire, for a variety of reasons, and do indeed make the rhinoceroses a part of themselves by metamorphoses.

Ultimately, *Rhinoceros*, *The Ugly One* and *A Number* all stage and approach the impact of conformity and narcissism upon society. I have discussed, amongst other things, the reasons why people conform (such as yielding to power, gratification, peer pressure, or belief that it makes them a better person) and unveiled evidence of such conformity in each text, whether the characters chose to conform or it is thrust upon them. Ironically, even Ionesco himself was conforming to what was expected of him by an external power, for he had to hide his political commentary behind an absurdist play.

By studying the plays alongside the theoretical works of Freud, Baudrillard and Adorno, we have been able to observe the possibly disastrous nature of conformity to the individual, and debate whether individuality is in fact enhanced when one is compared to a large group that they are a member of. Each play theatrically mirrors

the impact of narcissism on political movements and greater society, and the influence of beauty upon perceptions of the self. Our brief inspection of the impact of the production of *The Ugly One* and its subsequent reviews further contextualised the plays, and allowed further awareness of their social and political relevance today.

Though some of the questions raised throughout this discussion on the nature of individuality may never have a definitive answer, all three playwrights have succeeded in bringing their thoughts on mass ideologies, the self, narcissism, beauty and homogenisation to an audience in an interesting and unique manner. Whether the plays reflect events of the past, the events taking place during the time of writing, or they paint a bleak picture of the future, each has remained relevant, and will continue to do so, challenging audiences with their social commentaries indefinitely.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kellner, Douglas, *Jean Baudrillard: From Marxism to Postmodernism and Beyond*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1989, p.15

<sup>2</sup> Kellner, Douglas, p.15

<sup>3</sup> Adorno, Theodor, *The Culture Industry*, London: Routledge, 1991, p.129

<sup>4</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.129

<sup>5</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.116

<sup>6</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.116

<sup>7</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.117

<sup>8</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, *Rhinoceros*, trans. Martin Crimp, London: Faber and Faber, 2007, p.91

<sup>9</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.96

<sup>10</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.94

<sup>11</sup> Von Mayenburg, Marius, *The Ugly One*, London: Methuen Drama, 2007, p.49

<sup>12</sup> Von Mayenburg, Marius, p.61

<sup>13</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.105

<sup>14</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.141

<sup>15</sup> Von Mayenburg, Marius, p.24

<sup>16</sup> Esslin, Martin, *The Theatre of the Absurd*, Great Britain: Pelican Books, 1968, p.178

<sup>17</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.117

<sup>18</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.123

<sup>19</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.119

<sup>20</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.114

<sup>21</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.96-97

<sup>22</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.11

<sup>23</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.117

<sup>24</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.116

<sup>25</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.66

<sup>26</sup> *BBC Today: Take Fascist Threat Seriously*, Available Online:

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/today/hi/today/newsid\\_8252000/8252057.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/today/hi/today/newsid_8252000/8252057.stm) Accessed: 21/12/2010

<sup>27</sup> *BBC Today: Take Fascist Threat Seriously*, Available Online:

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/today/hi/today/newsid\\_8252000/8252057.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/today/hi/today/newsid_8252000/8252057.stm) Accessed: 21/12/2010

<sup>28</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.123

<sup>29</sup> Churchill, Caryl, *A Number*, London: Nick Hern Books, 2002, p.12

<sup>30</sup> Churchill, Caryl, p.21

<sup>31</sup> Kellner, Douglas, p.101

<sup>32</sup> Baudrillard, Jean, *Simulacra and Simulation*, trans. Sheila Faria Glaser, USA: University of Michigan Press, 1994, p.97

<sup>33</sup> Churchill, Caryl, p.39

<sup>34</sup> Churchill, Caryl, p.54

<sup>35</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.116

<sup>36</sup> Kellner, Douglas, p.14

<sup>37</sup> Kellner, Douglas, p.13

<sup>38</sup> Churchill, Caryl, p.55-56

<sup>39</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.143



- <sup>40</sup> Billington, Michael, *Upstairs Downstairs: The Ugly One Review*, Available Online: <http://www.royalcourttheatre.com/whats-on/upstairs-downstairs-the-ugly-one> Accessed: 13/12/2010
- <sup>41</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.121
- <sup>42</sup> Freud, Sigmund, 'On Narcissism', *Literary Theory: An Anthology*, ed. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998, p.151
- <sup>43</sup> Freud, Sigmund, p.151
- <sup>44</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.90
- <sup>45</sup> Von Mayenburg, Marius, p.39
- <sup>46</sup> Churchill, Caryl, p.21
- <sup>47</sup> Kellner, Douglas, p.97
- <sup>48</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.125
- <sup>49</sup> Ionesco, Eugene, p.141
- <sup>50</sup> Von Mayenburg, Marius, p.14
- <sup>51</sup> Von Mayenburg, Marius, p.2
- <sup>52</sup> *Oxford English Dictionary*, Available Online: <http://www.oed.com/> Accessed: 21/12/2010
- <sup>53</sup> Loveridge, Lizzie, *The Ugly One Re-Opens*, Available Online: <http://www.curtainup.com/uglyonelond.html> Accessed: 19/12/2010
- <sup>54</sup> Loveridge, Lizzie, *The Ugly One Re-Opens*, Available Online: <http://www.curtainup.com/uglyonelond.html> Accessed: 19/12/2010
- <sup>55</sup> Adorno, Theodor, p.120
- <sup>56</sup> Von Mayenburg, Marius, p.61