『영미연구』
제51집 (2021): 85-110
http://doi.org/10.25093/ibas.2021.51.85

Intermedial Force and Silencing in Stoppard's *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*[*]

Heebon Park
(Chungbuk National University)

[Abstract]

This paper examines Tom Stoppard's 1977 stage play, *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*, which features an onstage orchestra as a representative of Soviet state institutionalization and silencing of dissident expression. This serious yet comic 'play for actors and orchestra' about the abuse of psychiatry against political prisoners presents an experimental aesthetic about political commitment, exemplifying Stoppard's engagement with media combinations and intermedial space. The use of music, education, and psychiatry as tools of propaganda and brainwashing is portrayed by Stoppard on a stage with three acting areas (cell, office, and school), on which the main characters (an insane patient in the mental hospital, a political dissident, and his son) are subjected to ideological maltreatment. Just as the orchestra-within-the-play functions as an actor, the actors often engage in

* This work was supported by Global Research Network program through the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2016S1A2A2912225).

instrument-like dialogues with the orchestra. Individual members of the orchestra are paralleled with the subjects of a restricted society, as Stoppard explores the suppression of human rights. This paper argues that the play contributes to the ongoing debate on punitive psychiatry, the use of intermedial force and the references to silencing creating a synergy effect that enhances the socio-political themes.

Key Words: Tom Stoppard, *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour,* silencing, intermedial force, punitive psychiatry

Ⅰ. Introduction

Tom Stoppard's 1977 stage play, *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*,[1] features media combination and references to political silencing enacted analogically by the onstage orchestra and explicitly by the play's characters. These include "three orthodox pillars of the Soviet state: the Teacher, the Doctor, and the Colonel" (Corballis 107). As Thomas Whitaker notes, the title of the play is "a mnemonic aid used in teaching children the lines in the treble staff" (137). Stoppard expands this association to include a political meaning, as when the Teacher tells a young boy, "if you're a good boy I might find you a better instrument" (20).[2] From this point, the acronym *EGBDF* plays a dual role, "evok[ing] a society based on a rigid notion of harmonious order, its systems of miseducation and injustice, and its attempts to use paternal responsibility as a weapon against conscientious dissent" (Whitaker 137).

Dedicated to the dissidents, Victor Fainberg and Vladimir Bukovsky, *EGBDF* opened at the Festival Hall in July 1977, with co-author Andre Prévin conducting the London Symphony Orchestra. The play then had a number of international stagings,

including performances at the New York Opera House in 1979 and a revival at the Festival Hall in 1987. These high-profile locations indicated the difficulties involved in requiring a full orchestra to share the performing space with the actors. In 2009, some thirty years after its South Bank premier, *EGBDF* was performed at the Olivier Theatre, in London's National Theatre. This theatrical homecoming was critically acclaimed and was revived the following season, indicating a contemporary resonance, as Stoppard mentions:

> Since 1992 political assassination in Russia has become almost commonplace. About fifty journalists have been murdered. In February this year, *The Times* reported, "Roman Nikolaichik, a parliamentary candidate for The Other Russia [party] ... was sent to a psychiatric hospital after police questioned him about his political activities." (Stoppard, "Writing *EGBDF*")

EGBDF features a paranoid triangle-player named Alexander Ivanov (called Ivanov in the script), who conducts an imaginary orchestra in his mind and has been confined in the mental hospital cell which forms one of the three separate acting areas. He shares this cell with another inmate bearing the same name (called Alexander in the script). This Alexander is a political dissident, "a discordant note in a highly orchestrated society" (Stoppard qtd. in Gussow 34). He is also the father of a third Alexander Ivanov, who is referred to as Sacha, a stubborn child who is the representative of "correct morality" (Barry), and refuses to accept the political reasons for his father's imprisonment.

These three players introduce a theme of truth versus Soviet ideology. This theme continues with the three Soviet functionaries who participate in state systems designed to silence freedom, art, and expression. *EGBDF* thus parodies Soviet suppression of free speech, using mental hospitals as prisons and placing dissidents

alongside genuinely mental patients. In this context, the triangle "functions as a discordant element in the grisly order of communism, as well as allowing Stoppard to make some complex wordplay on geometrical configurations" (Barry).

The orchestra takes on the role of "virtuoso actor" (Whitaker 140), in addition to its role as a chorus-like commentator on the unfolding drama of suppression of dissent. It highlights this state-sponsored silencing of dissent - the underlying socio-political theme of the play - through frequent musical metaphors. This psychological silencing is seen to be an effective tool, designed to convince the 'patients' of the mental hospital that, as the Doctor tells Alexander, "Your opinions are your symptoms. Your disease is dissent" (30). In the end, Alexander has the option of acknowledging that his criticism of the state was 'madness,' or starving himself to death and causing his son to lose a father. As the Doctor explains:

> What about your son? He is turning into a delinquent.
> (DOCTOR *plucks the violin EGBDF.*)
> He's a good boy. He deserves a father.
> (DOCTOR *plucks the violin. . .*) (29)

As Terry Hodgson comments, "He has an appalling choice between personal and general responsibility. Those who create such a situation are condemned" (90-91).

A particularly striking effect of the physical and metaphoric use of the orchestra-within-the-play in *EGBDF* is that it creates an intermedial space, in which "the boundaries soften − and we are in-between and within a mixture of spaces, media and realities" (Chapple and Kattenbelt 12). In fact, *EGBDF* can be identified and interpreted as a work that demonstrates the essence of "intermediality," defined as "a powerful and potentially radical force, which operates in-between performer and audience; in-between theatre, performance and other media; and in-between realities"

(Chapple and Kattenbelt 12).

This paper explores how *EGBDF* employs such intermedial force to effectively dramatize Soviet state institutionalization and oppressive silencing of madness and dissident expression. It is argued that the play contributes to the ongoing debate on punitive psychiatry, and that the intermedial theatrical devices create a synergy effect that supports and enhances the play's socio-political themes.

II. Stoppardian Intermedial Force

Intermediality, which involves "the presence of other media within theatre productions" (Chapple and Kattenbelt 11), is a significant feature of Stoppard's oeuvre. It includes the use of paintings to contextualize the action in *After Magritte* (1970) and *Arcadia* (1993), as well as his theatrical use of popular songs and classical music to reinforce the political and social content of his plays. Intertextual borrowings from performance arts—for instance, music hall performances and acrobatics (*Jumpers*, 1972) or cabaret music accompanying Cecily's lecture on the history of Russian Revolution (Act 2 of *Travesties*, 1974) - contribute to Stoppard's plays by creating further layers of meaning. The use of pop music from the 1950s to the 1970s in *The Real Thing* (1982) and songs from 1968 to 1989 in *Rock'n'Roll* (2006), not only supplements the stage action through the lyrics, but evokes the atmosphere of their age. Music has a less literal function in a radio play *Artist Descending a Staircase* (1972), in which an LP of silence and a recording of the artist, Donner, falling down stairs, highlight, as Hodgson puts it, "the ambiguities of sound recording and the illusions it creates in the minds of two old men" (72). A similar metaphor is used in *Arcadia*, where an out-of-tune piano and melodies heard

in the next room are referred to as paralleling the invisible variables known as ‘noise’ which interfere with scientific investigation.

EGBDF takes Stoppard’s use of intermediality in a further direction, in that its music does not attempt to evoke a given time frame through pre-existing songs and music, but was written for, and is part of, the play. The sub-title, ‘A Play for Actors and Orchestra,’ and the prescription on the Character-list page of the playtext: “*Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* is a work consisting of words and music, and is incomplete without the score composed by its co-author André Previn” (13), indicate that the musical score is indispensable. *EGBDF* thus benefits from applying the notion that “All media products can be investigated from a synchronic perspective, in terms of combination and integration” (Elleström 115).

Stoppard’s ideas “about a millionaire triangle-player with his own orchestra, . . . making the orchestra a mere delusion of the millionaire’s brain” (Stoppard, “Introduction” 6) suggest that his initial response to Previn’s suggestion conformed to the perception of his theatre as “a theatre that thinks: it is always a mixture of wonderful wit and fascinating ideas” (Elisabeth Angel-Perez qtd. in Stoppard, “A Conversation with Tom Stoppard” 1). It was the artistic and intellectual challenge of writing for an onstage orchestra that stimulated Stoppard, rather than any social or political objectives: “The idea . . . appealed as much as anything to my incipient megalomanie. I think I just love the idea of having a hundred musicians in a play” (qtd. in Hodgson 89). However, his introduction the following year to the world of the Russian dissidents, Victor Fainberg and Vladimir Bukovsky, gave Stoppard a new impetus for “the whimsical edifice that was about to collapse” (Stoppard, “Introduction” 6). He then transformed the play into a literal and metaphorical exploration of a crucial human rights issue. As Hermione Lee explains:

> Stoppard now knew that the play was not going to be about a crazed millionaire, but about political prisoners in a 'mental hospital'. It would draw directly on the testimonies he had been reading. He also knew it would have a ten-year-old boy in it. (Lee 323)

EGBDF would be, in Hodgson's words, "an aesthetic with a political concern" (88), applying Stoppard's engagement with media combination to the plight of Russian dissidents and the political abuse of psychiatry.

Stoppard is not alone in the use of music in his plays. For example, an earlier British dramatist, J. B. Priestley (1894-1984) also combined music and drama in plays such as *In Music at Night* (1938), in which a violin concerto provides the background for the actors to reveal their innermost selves. However, the music, "although dictating the shape and changing moods of the piece, was played off-stage and faded out in several key scenes" (Kalson 562). Priestley also experimented with a 'platform piece' called *Dragon's Mouth* (1952), in which he and his collaborator Jacquetta Hawkes performed in recital and lecture halls. Albert Kalson suggests that Stoppard extended Priestley's "neglected experimental forms" in *EGBDF*, writing "a play for the concert stage which has about it the committed spirit of the urgent public meeting" (562). Nevertheless, it should be noted that while the music in *EGBDF* was inspired by Stoppard's text, it was Previn who realized Stoppard's stage directions and added his own musical commentary. As Whitaker points out, Previn's orchestra, as a symptom of Ivanov's lunacy and as a participator in the action,

> delights the audience with its mimed passages, its various responses to its lunatic conductor, and its parody of the Doctor's movements; it plays a threatening nightmare when Alexander sleeps and a bit of Tschaikovsky's '1812 Overture' when he confronts Ivanov over Tolstoy's *War and Peace*; it suggests through pastiche of Prokoviev and Shostakovitch the controlling Soviet ethos;

> and it becomes the percussion band in which Sacha bangs away without regard for the written notes. (Whitaker 140-41)

Stoppard's contribution to the music in the play is limited to the striking of the triangle and the Doctor's use of the violin. The triangle plays a controlling role in the action right from the opening scene, when the performance of a "*band of young children . . . goes wrong because there is a subversive triangle in it. The triangle is struck randomly and then rapidly, until finally it is the only instrument to be heard. And then the triangle stops*" (18). This symbolic use of the triangle as an instrument of dissent, destroying the harmony and the functioning of the institutionalised orchestra, reappears almost immediately: "*The orchestra continues with percussion element for perhaps ten seconds and then is sabotaged by a triangle beaten rapidly, until the triangle is the only sound heard*" (20). This repetition is an instance of doubling, symbolizing Alexander's resistance to his detention and the twisted logic behind it.

Such doubling occurs throughout the play with characters and music. Ivanov and Alexander are an obvious double, being dual occupants of the cell, and sharing family names and psychiatric treatment. The fact that they have different reasons for being in the Hospital reveals an encoded level of contradiction symbolic of the subversion of language and intent inherent in the use of psychiatry for political purposes. Musical doubling occurs in the frequent use of duet-like dialogues, which adds a libretto-like aspect to the text, alluding to the intermedial nature of the work. It is also apparent in the two orchestras—one an imagined orchestra in the head of an authentically insane inmate (Ivanov), and the other a 'real' onstage orchestra, symbolic of the state, and attempting, in the person of the Doctor, to persuade the sane dissident (Alexander) to confess to being mad. Further doubling occurs when Alexander's son, Sacha, doubles Ivanov by playing the triangle in the school band.

The appearance of Sacha also introduces the instances of tripling that occur in the play. Sacha is the third Ivanov and plays a triangle whose three sides and angles mirror the threefold character groupings, Ivanov/Alexander/Sacha, and Teacher/Doctor/Colonel. Further tripling can be seen in the stage layout, which consits of "Three separate acting areas" (15): the cell, the office, and the school.

Doubling takes on linguistic, geometrical, and musical allusions when a verbal duet is performed between the Teacher and Sacha, with Sacha's Euclidian axioms standing for reality, and the Teacher's ideological pronouncements attempting to subvert their veracity through proximal and subliminal association:

> TEACHER: The asylum is for malcontents who don't know what they're doing.
> SACHA: 'A line has length but no breadth.'
> TEACHER: They know what they're doing but they don't know it's anti-social.
> SACHA: 'A straight line is the shortest distance between two points.'
> TEACHER: They know it's anti-social but they're fanatics.
> SACHA: 'A circle is the path of a point moving equidistant to a given point.'
> TEACHER: They're sick.
> SACHA: 'A polygon is a plane bounded by straight lines.'
> TEACHER: And it's not a prison, it's a hospital.
> SACHA: 'A triangle is the polygon bounded by the fewest possible sides.'
> TEACHER: Good. Perfect. Copy neatly ten times, and if you're a good boy I might find you a better instrument. (19-20)

The Teacher's efforts are ironically, if unintentionally, realized in another duet, between Sacha and Ivanov:

IVANOV: Everyone is equal to the triangle. That is the first axiom of Euclid, the Greek musician.
SACHA: Yes, sir.
. . .
IVANOV: A trombone is the longest distance between two points!
SACHA: You're not the doctor.
IVANOV: A string has length but no point.
SACHA: (*Cries*) Papa!
. . .
IVANOV: (Shouts) A line *must be drawn!* (34).

State propaganda becomes illogical ranting when transformed by Ivanov, and the subversive triangle is abetted by goemetrical truths that defy educational brainwashing, as Alexander tells Sacha: "Don't neglect your geometry" (35).

III. Punitive Psychiatry: Context

Stoppard garnered a reputation early on in his writing career, particularly in early works such as *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* (1967), *The Real Inspector Hound* (1968), and *After Magritte* (1970), as "a formidable brainbox with a capacity for jokes" (Billington) and an intellectual who was indifferent "to contemporary social issues" (Barry). Statements such as, "I burn with no causes. I cannot say that I write with any social objectives" (Stoppard, "Something to Declare" 47) fueled criticism from left-wing British writers of the 1970s. They felt that Stoppard was sidestepping an important role of the playwright—to raise public awareness regarding current political and social matters of concern. However, as Norman Barry points out, Stoppard was reluctant to air his political views and his involvement with Czech

dissidents, until "two important plays in 1977—*Professional Foul* (written for TV) and *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* (with music by André Previn)—firmly established him as an anti-communistic and pro-West writer" (Barry).

Lee observes that Stoppard was profoundly shocked when Soviet forces invaded Czechoslovakia on 21 August 1968, though he had not previously identified with the people of his country of birth. In fact he only learned in 1975 that a group protesting in Red Square, Moscow, in 1968, had been arrested, and that one of these men, Victor Fainberg, "was beaten up, 'pronounced insane' at his trial and sent to a 'psychiatric prison,' or 'prison-hospital'" (Lee 320). This awakening came to fruition in *EGBDF*. Stoppard became a member of the Committee Against Psychiatric Abuse, and then visited Moscow and Leningrad in 1977 with the assistant director of Amnesty International. Posing as tourists, they visited the homes of dissidents, heard of house searches, hunger strikes, and forced detention, and talked with the wives of imprisoned scientists. Stoppard was also taken "to the Leningrad Mental Hospital where Fainberg's fellow detainee, Volodya Boris, was being held" (Lee 324). *EGBDF* and *Professional Foul* resulted from this journey, though much of the former play-with-orchestra had already been written.

Barry sees Stoppard as "more politically acute than Pinter and Miller," stating that *EGBDF* and *Professional Foul,* along with *Jumpers*, reveal "a deep commitment to morality. . . . Above all there is a confident exposure of the dehumanizing aspects of Marxism and its relativistic anti-ethics" (Barry). However, as Stoppard, a self-confessed "conservative in politics, literature, education and theatre" (qtd. in Bull 151) notes, the inclusion of political content in his oeuvre did not happen overnight:

> There was no sudden conversion on the road to Damascus. I know human rights have been around for a long time and I have always been concerned with the daily horrors that I read in the newspapers . . . For some time I had been

> involved with Amnesty International. (qtd. in Hodgson 89)

Hodgson suggests that Stoppard's association with the social activist Ed Berman,[3] may have contributed to the "change in tone and emphasis of Stoppard's work during the mid-seventies" (88). However, the genesis of *EGBDF* indicates a lengthy gestation. As Lee reports, Stoppard was invited by Amnesy International in 1975 to write a television play for 'Prisoners of Conscience Year' 1977. When he visited the Amnesty office to read up on Fainberg and his fellow dissidents, he learned for the first time about the Soviet authorities' use of psychiatric treatment as a punishment and Fainberg's incarceration in the Leningrad Special Prison hospital. He also learned of "the use of drugs, of force, of isolation, and the cat-and-mouse games played by the authorities" (Lee 321), and the requirement that political prisoners renounce their beliefs, agree that they are mad, and thank the doctors. Stoppard duly included such requirements in the play in the words of the Doctor:

> Incidently, when you go before the Commission try not to make any remark which might confuse them. . . . The sort of thing I'd stick to is 'Yes', if they ask you whether you agree you were mad; 'No', if they ask you whether you intend to persist in your slanders; 'Definitely', if they ask you whether your treatment has been satisfactory, and 'Sorry', if they ask you how you feel about it all. (28)

As Lee points out, "The effect on Stoppard of these materials was to make him feel 'criminally insular and over-privileged', . . . He at once linked what was happening in Soviet Russia to the situation in Czechoslovakia. . . . This became his cause" (322). Stoppard's "deep and uncompromising view of the morality of freedom" (Barry) became evident in this pursuit, espousing precepts of human liberty and

equality, and a belief in fundamental individual values independent of collectivism, nationalism, ideology, or religion:

> However inflexible our set of beliefs, . . . however authentic their existence may be, the truth is that they owe their existence to individual acts between individuals, which themselves are derived from an individual's intuitive sense of what is right and wrong. (Stoppard qtd. in Delaney 144)

In view of this burgeoning political awareness, it was serendipitous that Stoppard's commitment to human rights in East Europe segued with Previn's suggestion in 1974 to write a play that included an orchestra. In the end, *EGBDF* "used an imaginary orchestra in the mind of a Russian dissident imprisoned in a psychiatric hospital" (qtd. in "'He Packed about Six Lives and Careers into One'"). The play was in rehearsal by the summer of 1977, when Bukovsky, having been freed from prison in Russia, attended one of Trevor Nunn's rehearsals. His presence, however, was overwhelming for Ian McKellen, who was speaking Bukovsky's words, and he "faltered in mid-speech, and found it hard to go on" (Lee 326). Not only had Stoppard confounded his critics by writing a political play, but his words, reworking and integrating those of survivors of Soviet punitive psychiatry, were sufficient to cause even the most experienced of actors, such as McKellen, to pause.

Robert van Voren explains that the issue of 'punitive psychiatry,' an important subject of debate for the psychiatric community, "became prominent in the 1970s and 1980s due to the systematic political abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union, where approximately one-third of the political prisoners were locked up in psychiatric hospitals" (33). While similar instances were reported in certain Eastern European countries in the period from the 1960s to 1986, Theresa Smith and Thomas Oleszczuk point out that "the distinctive characteristic of the Soviet case is the

unprecedented *number* of political hospitalizations, resulting from the scale and conspicuousness of the Soviet dissident movement" (4).

Such treatment would appear to be a clearcut case of political silencing initiated by the Soviet secret service (the KGB) and practiced by medical professionals. However, as van Voren points out, "Socialist ideology is focused on the establishment of the ideal society, where all are equal and all will be happy" (33). According to this ideology, anyone expressing dissenting opinions must therefore be insane. This approach offered a logical explanation for many psychiatrists, who "could not explain . . . why somebody would be willing to give up his career, family, and happiness for an idea or conviction that was so different from what most people believed or forced themselves to believe" (34). Nevertheless, doctors such as the one protrayed in *EGBDF* were fully aware that they were participating in political silencing, "generally understood as the active practice of removing particular subjects' voices either through direct or indirect means" (Cooke and Dingli 2).

IV. Silencing and Madness

While Sarah Dauncey stresses the importance of silencing as "signalling the existence of oppressed groups" (29), Thomas Cooke and Sophia Dingli allude to the "multiple meanings and functions of political silence – all of which intersect at the nexus of power and agency" (1). A position article from the Global Initiative on Psychiatry also refers to the political abuse of psychiatry as "the misuse of psychiatric diagnosis, treatment and detention for the purposes of obstructing the fundamental human rights of certain individuals and groups in a given society" (Davidoff, Roache and van Voren 7).

Although the main plot of *EGBDF* focuses on the misuse of psychiatric diagnosis on Alexander, a significant subplot of 'cultural silences' appears at the beginning of the play, when the orchestra engages in its normal routine of tuning up:

> *The tuning-up continues normally but after a minute or two the musicians lapse into miming the tuning-up. Thus we have silence while the orchestra goes through the motions of tuning.* IVANOV *stands up, with his triangle and rod. The orchestra becomes immobile. Silence.* IVANOV *strikes his triangle, once. The orchestra starts miming a performance.* (15)

At this point, the audience is introduced to the madman Ivanov, who is taking part in a performance that is playing in his own head, as the sane Alexander watches - "*a man watching another man occasionally hitting a triangle*" (15). By silencing the 'real' orchestra, and transferring his attention to the one in his imagination, Ivanov has effectively immobilized the musical representative of state oppression in favour of his own internalized harmony.

This forefronting of madness at the opening of the play serves a number of purposes. It not only introduces the mental institution and its legitimately committed inmate, but also hints, in the juxtaposition of the two cellmates, that Alexander is indeed (according to the ideals of the Soviet 'ideal society') medically insane, and that his internment for psychiatric re-education is justified. Furthermore, the fact that both Ivanov and Alexander are subject to the Doctor's treatment signals Michel Foucault's construction of an archaeology of the silence of madness: "In our era, the experience of madness remains silent in the composure of a knowledge which, knowing too much about madness, forgets it" (xii). From this perspective, Ivanov is more than a conventionally 'mad' companion to Alexander, and represents the other side of the coin of cultural silencing. As Dauncey observes:

> Foucault argues that the modem age's establishment of a psychiatric discourse that categorizes madness as 'mental illness' results in the termination of communication with the mad. . . . Madness is removed to the perimeters of culture by the institution of the asylum. The classification and treatment of the mad in the asylum was based upon a 'silently organized' system, with the intention of aiding the mad to recognize their own non-reason. (Dauncey 83)

Thus, "the mad remain an unrecoverable silence, whose elision can only be pointed to" (Dauncey 83). Nevertheless, Foucault suggests that the mad might communiate with the non-mad through art, as he cites mentally challenged artists whose works have become part of the public imagination: "the world that thought to measure and justify madness through psychology must justify itself before madness, since in its struggles and agonies it measures itself by the excess of the works like those of Nietzsche, of Van Gogh, of Artaud" (Foucault 289). In this sense, we might see Ivanov as trying to communicate through his triangle and his imaginary orchestra, and being silenced by the Doctor.

> Now look, *there is no orchestra*. We cannot make progress until we agree that there is no orchestra. . . . I am a doctor. You are a patient. If I tell you you do not have an orchestra, it follows that you do not have an orchestra. If you tell me you have an orchestra, it follows that you do not have an orchestra. (21)

The role of the Doctor here is to objectify madness through the imposition of reason, exemplifying the view that "[m]adness exists as a category by virtue of its silence; to speak of it is to reconceptualize it in reason's terms" (Dauncey 85). He is finally successful in this when Ivanov's orchestra is invalidated, leaving him with an uneasy silence: "I have no orchestra! (*Silence.*) . . . I have never *had* an orchestra! (*Silence.*)

. . . I do not want an orchestra! (*Silence*.)" (32).

Where the intention with Ivanov was to force a madman into the realm of reason, the Doctor's wish when practicing this objectification on Alexander is to persuade a man of reason that he is mad:

> DOCTOR: . . . The idea that all the people locked up in mental hospitals are sane while the people walking about outside are all mad is merely a literary conceit, put about by people who should be locked up. . . . For example, you are here because you have delusions, that sane people are put in mental hospitals.
> ALEXANDER: But *I am* in a mental hospital.
> DOCTOR: That's what I said. (27)

However, Alexander (speaking for Bukovsky) explains, "My madness consisted of writing to various people about a friend of mine who is in prison" (28). In one of the longest monologues in the play, he details his incarceration in a gaol-like cell, with male nurses who were convicted criminals and wore KGB uniforms under their coats. In this setting, "punishment and medical treatment are intimately related" (29), and he was given "injections of aminazin, sulfazin, triftazin, haloperidol and insulin, which caused swellings, cramps, headaches, trembling, fever and the loss of various abilities including the ability to read, write, sleep, sit, stand, and button my trousers" (29). However, he successfully resists 'chemical silencing' and decides to embrace the final silence of death − an elision of conformity:

> Then I went on hunger strike. And when they saw I intended to die they lost their nerve. And now you think I'm going to crawl out of here, thanking them for curing me of my delusions? Oh no. They lost. And they will have to see that it is so. (29)

This willingness to make the final sacrifice for his beliefs produces a dilemma for the Doctor, since "I'm not allowed to let him go till he admits he's cured. [. . .] He'd rather die than admit he's cured? This is madness, and it's not allowed!" (36). The officially impossible admission of Alexander's sanity and the fear of giving him a martyr's death is finally resolved by the Colonel, who states, "There's absolutely nothing wrong with these men. Get them out of here" (37).

It appears that the institutional silencing of madness and dissent has been rebuffed, as the organ music of the exiting Colonel leads to the orchestral music of the finale: "*The* TEACHER *moves into the orchestra. The* Doctor *moves to the violins taking his instrument and joining in*. IVANOV *takes his triangle and joins the percussion and beats the triangle*" (37). This congratulatory rather than suppresive role for the orchestra suggests hope and resolution, as Sacha sings, "Papa, don't be crazy! Everything can be all right!" (37), recalling his earlier phrase, "Everything is going to be all right" (25). This evokes the phrase that came to Stoppard as a child in the Mount Hermon school in Darjeeling: "it suddenly came upon me that *everything was all right*, and would always be all right" (qtd. in Lee 22).

However, as Kalson points out, the play's conclusion "is more disturbing than optimistic" (562). Ivanov and Alexander remain on the stage, hinting that the Colonel's unlikely capitulation could be another psychiatric ploy, and that they are still in the mental hospital. Ivanov is now playing in the 'real' orchestra, symbolizing his return to sanity, but is this organ of the state really congratulating the inmates on their release? For Kalson, questions remain; the improbable resolution "is complicated by the relativism between insanity and the rational mind, for the audience begins to question the reality of the happy ending" (562). Finally, Sacha's words do not welcome his father's release, but urge him to reject his official status of insanity. As he sings two pages earlier, everything *can* be all right if his father admits his

'madness': "Papa, don't be rigid! / Be brave and tell them lies!" (35).

V. Conclusion

Stoppard's antiphonal world-view typically juxtaposes the dualities of art and science, and absolute and relative values, as "convergences of different threads" in his "carpet-making" (qtd. in Hayman 4) playmaking style, interweaving contrasting or opposing perspectives, as if "two trains arrive on the same line without colliding" (qtd. in Guppy 40). In the case of *EGBDF*, the clash between morality and political ideology forms a philosophical duality expressed both textually and musically.

Presentation of opposing moral realities is a feature of Stoppard's work, though as Mel Gussow notes, he likes to present every side of an issue: "I write plays because writing dialogue is the only respectable way of contradicting yourself" (qtd. in Gussow 3). The genesis of *EGBDF* from a witty diversion to a political statement against punitive psychiatry thus diverges to some extent from Stoppard's norm, in that he takes an active stance against the abuses of a totalitarian society.

> I don't lose any sleep if a policeman in Durham beats somebody up, because I know it's an exceptional case . . . What worries me is not the bourgeois exception but the totalitarian norm. (qtd. in Demastes 42)

Other plays such as *Professional Foul* examine "the recurring tension in modern societies between politics and personal freedom" (Delaney 144) and illustrate "[t]he echo of mass state-directed culture as against the efforts of the lone artist" (Bull 143). However, it should be noted that the theatre for Stoppard is not a place in which the audience should receive a history lesson or a seminar. Rather, a play

should be ‘self-sufficient’ regardless of whether the audience members possess any background knowledge of the events or characters. For Stoppard, the function of his plays is to make learning and knowing enjoyable at all levels, his multi-layered text providing affordances for every level of awareness.

EGBDF presents the perversion of reason, illuminating “the social lunacy that turns music (or language, or psychiatry, or geometry, or the Gospel) into a tyranny from which a conscientious man can only dissent” (Whitaker 143). This silencing of madness and dissent is described through intermedial force, culminating in a co-authored festival of music, acting, and socio-political awareness. As the 2009 National Theatre revivial of the play indicates, the underlying theme of the play is far from outdated. Van Voren points out that “the issue of political abuse of psychiatry in the People’s Republic of China is again high on the agenda” in the twenty-first century, and that “[t]he abuses there seem to be even more extensive than in the Soviet Union in the 1970s and 1980s” (34). Stoppard’s play therefore continues to voice warnings and admonitions for current generations.

EGBDF is not solely a political play. In addition to containing important messages for domestic and international audiences, it is also a well-crafted play. The work explores, as Michael Billington states about Stoppard’s plays in general, “the mystery of existence, the anguish of the human heart and the strange fact that it is our apprehension of death that gives joy and intensity to life” (Billington). Stoppard’s engagement with the silencing of free speech in Russia and Eastern Europe is expressed through the theatrical use of an onstage orchestra, voicing the fate of someone who was “not a man to be broken or silenced” (Stoppard, “Introduction” 7). In this way, Stoppard’s play continues to contribute to the ongoing debate concerning human rights and the punitive use of psychiatry.

Notes

1) This play is hereafter referred to as *EGBDF*.

2) Further citations from *EGBDF* are given as page numbers only.

3) Berman founded the Almost Free Theatre in Soho in London's West End in 1971. Stoppard wrote a number of his one act plays for Berman's theatres.

Works Cited

Barry, Norman. "Freedom and Morality in the Plays of Tom Stoppard." *Foundation for Economic Education*, 1 August 1999, https://fee.org/articles/freedom–and-morality-in-the-plays-of-tom-stoppard/.

Billington, Michael. "The Real Thing." *The Guardian*, 7 August 2002, https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2002/aug/07/theatre.artsfeatures.

Bull, John. "Tom Stoppard and Politics." *The Cambridge Companion to Tom Stoppard*, edited by Katherine E. Kelly, Cambridge UP, 2001, pp. 136-53.

Chapple, Freda, and Chiel Kattenbelt. "Key Issues in Intermediality in Theatre and Performance." *Intermediality in Theatre and Performance*, edited by Freda Chapple and Chiel Kattenbelt, Rodopi, 2006, pp. 11-25.

Cooke, Thomas N., and Sophia Dingli. "Political Silence, An Introduction." *Political Silence: Meanings, Functions and Ambiguity*, edited by Sophia Dingli and Thomas N. Cooke. Routledge, 2019, pp. 1-19.

Corballis, Richard. *Stoppard: The Mystery and the Clockwork*. Methuen, 1984.

Dauncey, Sarah. "The Uses of Silence: A Twentieth-Century Preoccupation in the Light of Fictional Examples, 1900-1950." Diss. U of Warwick, 2003. http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/4054/1/WRAP_THESIS_Dauncey_2003.pdf.

Davidoff, Viktor, Madeline Roache, and Robert van Voren. "Psychiatry as a Tool of Coercion in Post-Soviet Countries, 2012-2017." *Human Rights in Mental Health*. Federation Global Initiative on Psychiatry, April 2017, https://www.gip-global.org/files/pol–abuse-eng-april-2017-full.pdf.

Delaney, Paul, editor. *Tom Stoppard in Conversation*. The U of Michigan P, 2001.

Demastes, William W. *The Cambridge Introduction to Tom Stoppard*. Cambridge UP, 2013.

Elleström, Lars. "Adaptation Within the Field of Media Transformations." *Adaptation Studies: New Challenges, New Directions*, edited by Jørgen Bruhn, Anne Gjelsvik and Eirik Frisvold Hanssen, Bloomsbury, 2013. pp. 113-32.

Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Translated by Richard Howard, Vintage Books, 2006.

Guppy, Shusha. "Tom Stoppard: The Art of Theater VII." *The Paris Review*, vol. 109, Winter 1988, pp. 37-51.

Gussow, Mel. *Conversations with Stoppard*. Grove, 1995.

Hayman, Ronald. *Tom Stoppard*. Heinemann, 1977.

"'He Packed about Six Lives and Careers into One' - Tributes to André Previn." *The Guardian*, 1 March 2019, https://www.theguardian.com/music/2019/mar/01/he-packed-about-six-lives-and-careers-into-one-tributes–to-andre-previn.

Hodgson, Terry. *The Plays of Tom Stoppard for Stage, Radio, TV and Film*. Icon, 2001.

Kalson, Albert E. "*Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* by Tom Stoppard and André Previn." *Educational Theatre Journal*, vol. 29, no. 4, December 1977, pp. 562-63.

Lee, Hermione. *Tom Stoppard: A Life*. Faber and Faber, 2020.

Smith, Theresa C., and Thomas A. Oleszczuk. *No Asylum: State Psychiatric Repression in the Former USSR.* Macmillan, 1996.

Stoppard, Tom. "Something to Declare." *The Sunday Times*, 25 February 1968, p. 47.

_____. *Every Good Boy Deserves Favor and Professional Foul*. Grover, 1978.

_____. Introduction. *Every Good Boy Deserves Favor and Professional Foul*, Grover, 1978, pp. 5–9.

_____. "Writing *EGBDF*." *The National Theatre Programme*, 2009.

_____. "A Conversation with Tom Stoppard." *Sillages critiques,* vol. 13, pp. 1-8, 14

December 2011, http://journals.openedition.org/sillagescritiques/2497.

van Voren, Robert. "Political Abuse of Psychiatry—An Historical Overview." *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2000, pp. 33-35. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbp119.

Whitaker, Thomas R. *Tom Stoppard*. Macmillan, 1983.

국문초록

스토파드의 『착한 아이라면 누구나 호의를 받을 만하다』에 나타난 상호매체적 힘과 침묵시키기

박 희 본
단독 / 충북대학교

본 논문은 톰 스토파드의 1977년 연극 『착한 아이라면 누구나 호의를 받을 만하다』를 중심으로, 구소련 정부가 제도화시킨 반체제 인사들의 표현억압과 침묵시키기가 무대 위 오케스트라를 통해 어떻게 고발되는지를 고찰한다. 정치범으로 투옥된 인물에 대한 정신치료 오용을 다룬 이 진지하면서도 코믹한 '배우와 오케스트라를 위한 연극'은 정치적 신념에 대한 실험적인 미학을 보여주고, 매체 결합과 상호매체적 공간에 관한 스토파드의 극적 관심을 예증한다. 그는 무대 위 (감방, 사무실, 교실) 세 장소를 통해 음악, 교육, 정신치료가 선동과 세뇌의 도구로 사용되는 것을 묘사하며, 이곳에서 주인공들(정신이상 환자, 반체제 인사와 그의 아들)은 이념적 학대를 당한다. 이러한 설정에서 연극 속 오케스트라는 배우 역할을 하며, 배우들 역시 악기처럼 오케스트라와의 대화에 참여한다. 극이 인권 탄압을 탐구하는 과정에서 오케스트라의 개별 단원은 억압된 사회의 시민으로 병치된다. 이 논문은 스토파드의 극이 징벌적 정신치료에 대한 지속적인 논쟁에 기여함을 조명하면서, 상호매체적 힘 그리고 침묵시키기에 대한 언급은 극의 사회적, 정치적 주제를 강화하는 시너지 효과를 창출함을 주장한다.

주제어: 톰 스토파드, 『착한 아이라면 누구나 호의를 받을 만하다』, 침묵시키기, 상호매체적 힘, 징벌적 정신치료

논문접수일: 2021.01.18
심사완료일: 2021.02.09
게재확정일: 2021.02.24

이름: 박희본
소속: 충북대학교 인문대학 영어영문학과 부교수
주소: (우) 28644 충북 청주시 서원구 충대로 1
이메일: hbpark@chungbuk.ac.kr