Shifting Strengths

*The Cyborg Theater of Cathy Weis*

JENNIFER PARKER-STARBUCK

“I used to have a body,” says the glowing face-within-a-television-monitor in front of a small audience at Dixon Place in NY. Just prior to this, audience members have been instructed to move “her” from out in the audience to where she can see: “Be careful, don’t drop me,” and “ouch, that pinched,” “over there, more to the left,” she directs, in a soft southern drawl. “He’s beautiful” she sighs, of performer Scott Heron, who is trying in frustration to complete his dance. Heron finally storms off, leaving the embodied television center stage where “she” happily begins her story, “I used to have a body. Once, I was a dancer. I could run and jump and kick my legs high like the best of them.”

—Cathy Weis, *Monitor Lizards* ¹

The live face in the monitor is New York–based dancer-choreographer Cathy Weis, who proceeds to physically enter the space and interact with her prerecorded self in her piece “Dummy,” one-third of the 1999 *Monitor Lizards*. Weis’s interrogations of the intersections between the body and technology exemplify what I call *cyborg theater*, technologically integrated performance that explores representations of the live body in conjunction with the mediatized image on stage. Cyborg theater uses technology not purely as a frame or aesthetic scenic backdrop for projected images, but as a mutually dependent component of a greater complex of social, political, and theatrical systems existing between the live and the technological.² For Weis, who has been diagnosed with multiple sclerosis, technology intersects with her body in performance, allowing for a freedom of movement no longer possible with her body alone. Her work reconfigures conceptions of the “dis/abled”³ body in contemporary “posthuman” society.

As used by N. Katherine Hayles, the term *posthuman* defines an expansive
condition that forces a reconceptualization of the notion of what it means to be human. Posthuman is not literally “after human”; instead, as Hayles explains, “it signals instead the end of a certain conception of the human, a conception that may have applied, at best, to that fraction of humanity who had the wealth, power, and leisure to conceptualize themselves as autonomous beings exercising their will through individual agency and choice.” The word human is embedded with constructions of what Rosemarie Garland Thomson calls the “normate . . . the constructed identity of those who, by way of the bodily configurations and cultural capital they assume, can step into a position of authority and wield the power it grants them.” In this essay I specifically engage cyborgian fusions between humans and machines within posthumanism as a means of escaping the normative/abnormal binary of current political thought regarding disability. Cathy Weis’s body could be considered disabled, or abject—excluded from traditional privileging of the able-bodied, yet, through her technological performance strategies, her body disrupts “ableist” notions of what is considered “disabled.” I explore Weis’s cyborg convergences as an exploration of an alternate bodily presence on stage.

The cyborg—or “cybernetic organism”—is understood mainly through human-technological hybrids long featured in science fiction and metaphorized by social scientist Donna Haraway as “boundary creatures.” Haraway claims that the cyborg has the potential to “transform the despised metaphors of both organic and technological vision to foreground specific positioning, multiple mediation, partial perspective, and therefore a possible allegory for antiracist, feminist, scientific, and political knowledge.” However, as Peter Hitchcock writes in response to Haraway’s idea of the cyborg as a political ontology, “it is irony that saves the formulation from crude technological determinism.” For Hitchcock, and I think rightly so, the cyborg also functions as a “symptom,” and he reads Haraway’s manifesto also to propose the cyborg “as a heuristic device: it is a way to learn about the forms of politics possible at the end of the twentieth century.” However, as Hitchcock also points out, the cyborg’s boundary blurring, while allowing for metaphoric potentials, cannot be separated from its historical links to capital and to social and economic control. The questions of who controls the technology and in what context it is used are the factors that differentiate between negative examples of cyborg creations and the more metaphoric model Cathy Weis creates on stage. Weis refuses to let her body fully disappear behind the technology she uses, and instead controls the ways in which her physical presence extends into the live space.

The cyborg as metaphor has also been criticized for not accounting for actual bodies. Susan Bordo is astute in her caution of its whimsicality: “The spirit of epistemological jouissance suggested by the images of cyborg, Trick-
ster, the metaphors of dance, and so forth obscures the located, limited, inescapably partial, and always personally invested nature of human ‘story-making.’” Additionally, cyborgian couplings proposed to eliminate differences can suggest troubling and complicated prospects, as Jennifer González points out in her discussion of the term e-race-safe. It is important to consider by and for whom the boundaries are blurred, and I agree with González’s assertion:

The image of the cyborg has historically recurred at moments of radical social and cultural change... Imaginary representations of cyborgs take over when traditional bodies fail. In other words, when the current ontological model of human being does not fit a new paradigm, a hybrid model of existence is required to encompass a new, complex and contradictory lived experience.

If this “hybrid model of existence” falls within the province of the posthuman, then instead of representing a cold disembodiment, the cyborg can emerge as a site to explore productive encounters (at least theoretical ones) between humans and machines. This is the space in which Weis works.

The cyborg, though it continues to reside largely in science fiction scenarios, film, and cartoons, is well applied in Weis’s work, producing an expansive model of a diverse society in which there is no “norm.” As Lennard Davis has said, “The application of the idea of a norm to the human body creates the idea of deviance or a ‘deviant’ body.” Certainly the body itself, flesh and weight, must be made manifest beyond metaphor, but perhaps, through an integration of the flesh with technology, an attempt can be made to “reverse the hegemony of the normal and to institute alternative ways of thinking about the abnormal.” To destabilize the problematic binary of able/disabled that Davis’s reversal reinforces, I introduce the cyborg theater as a third possibility. When difference is embraced with as much acceptance as new technologies, the cyborg will have outlived its usefulness. For the moment, however, the cyborg can stand in as a site of resistance to illuminate the strengths of difference.

One site for the possibility of resistance is performance. In the work of Cathy Weis, the live claims technology as its “present absence.” Weis’s version of cyborg theater interrogates increasing absences. For example, in her piece A String of Lies, which she created shortly after her diagnosis with MS, she projected a juxtaposition of her upper body onto the moving legs of dancer Jennifer Miller, which allowed her to “finally do a ballet piece again.” Though professing a lack of awareness of the implications at the time, she later realized that the impaired mobility of her legs need not stop her from dancing—she simply dis/placed her body into the frame of video
to create a new way to continue working. Weis never lets her body (or those bodies she choreographs) disappear completely behind her innovative uses of technology; instead technology merges with the live figure, projecting fractured, composite, and humorous images of this union. By creating a mosaic of bodies and body parts, Weis refigures traditional ways of seeing bodies, especially those Western society is trained (not) to see in/ by medi- atized representation.\textsuperscript{16} Her work subtly comments on the media’s obsession with an impossible ideal—a body too perfect, too thin, too fit to encompass the many actual varieties. Her work seems to seek a means of resistance to the hegemony of the supposed norm, and opens spaces for bodies that, although quite present, are either overlooked or oppressed to the point of invisibility.

Cathy Weis has been creating multimedia performance for the past fifteen years. She began her career as a teenage soloist with the Louisville Ballet and went on to Bennington College as a modern dance major. She has toured as a member of a bluegrass band, done street theater in San Francisco, and was once a self-proclaimed “disco queen.” Weis began working with video in the 1970s after spending a period working with other mediums, such as stained glass, while recovering from a foot injury. After returning to dance and suffering recurring injuries, she was diagnosed in 1989 with MS, a disease that has progressively diminished the strength of her right side. Rather than give up dancing, Weis turned to a combination of video and performance in order to develop new sites for her own dance work. She does not see her work with technology as response to MS; it was an interest she had developed prior to her diagnosis. However, she does credit it as a way back into performance. Although she will freely discuss having MS, she pauses at the word \textit{disability}. As she explains, “Over the years I’ve begun to feel that every time that word comes up, it has an attitude—‘disability.’” It is a weak and victimized position. People who have had to really deal with physical problems and challenges understand that it is a shifting of strengths.” To try to relate to the able-bodied, she uses the example of age:
As you get older, everybody loses things, and everybody understands the word loss. . . . For people with physical disabilities the changes happen either more quickly or more dramatically. . . . So I understand why that's a category, "disability," but there's something about the word. . . . You have to really make a lot of choices and priorities and take a lot of responsibility for your life, and there are strengths that happen. Disability only looks at what you are losing, and not how you shift the balance for yourself. It only looks at what you've lost.17

Despite Weis's initial discomfort with the terminology, she does not let her "disability" disappear behind the images she creates. Her body is quite visible in her performance, and her project is to work with movement on all types of bodies. "Technology with imagination is a way of expanding voices so other people can listen to them. . . . It is important to break boundaries so things don't stay the way they are."18

In a Village Voice article titled "The Virtual Dancer," about the 1998 piece Gravity Twins, Deborah Jowitt comments, "Weis, the supposed spectator, is the actual choreographer in charge; yet her dancers are controlling her disembodied image . . . others 'dance' her."19 Weis often elects to integrate her disability, rather than making it a focal point of her work. This absence, however, is no erasure. Her work speaks for itself; the presence of MS ghosts her work as she investigates alternate ways of envisioning bodies on stage. Weis's use of technology asks questions and seeks to find answers about her own changing body. In "Dummy" she emerges from backstage, introducing her "self" as opposed to her "head," who stays "focused on choreographed skills." "I know it is not easy without a body," the corporeal Weis says gently as she brings out a similarly dressed, two-foot-tall foam puppet body that attaches nicely to the monitor head. Weis's use of humor and movement transform the frightening Frankenstein tale into a powerful metaphor of visibility and presence, a cyborgian story to live with. Weis's newly formed cyber-alter ego seems to seek a friend when it remarks that "some people have a problem with sentient media . . . [It was] only a matter of time before we started interacting back." These are prescient words amid a societal debate over cloning and genetic engineering.20 Although the puppet's head is Weis's mediatized own, and we are aware that the control and creation is also Weis's, she/it begins to take on a life of her/its own. The live Weis and her doppelgänger manikin do a little duet dance number, exchange witty repartee, and the piece is over. The cyborg in this performance is both a literal and a metaphoric manifestation, interrogating what it means to have a body, and what it means to have a body that does not entirely do what it is told.

Weis's cyborgian performance rehearses a new paradigm of bodily practices that makes visible—in an attempt to make understandable—the dif-
ferring strengths bodies can possess. "All movement is interesting—it's how you deal with it. On crutches, in a wheelchair, or wearing a brace, this movement is as interesting as a ballet dancer's if it has its own voice." In her attempt to make a larger variety of movement visible, Weis seeks out performers with strengths she wants to explore, regardless of race, gender, or ability. The differences from her own body are important to represent a heterogeneous space within which to work. In addition, there are many ideas she visualizes as a choreographer but cannot enact. Here too she depends upon technologies—video and drawings—to give her dancers ways to see what she wants.

Her awareness of the distance between choreography, writing, dancing, and dancing is similar to the dancer with the broken hip in Peggy Phelan’s "Immobile Legs": "As my feet tapped away under my chair and my fingers typed on the keys, I began to feel that the lack of direction in my feet might be cured by the mapping my fingers were making on the keyboard. I was transferring the hesitation in my feet to the plotting of my calmer hands." Both Weis and this dancer desire to use technology as a means of "mapping" something no longer doable with their own bodies. Weis credits her interest in video as having given her the strength to emerge from the trauma of the diagnosis. Phelan’s dancer goes on, "I lost the rhythm of my own limbs' utterance. Computing was an attempt to put that loss in my hands and head, to transfer the grief in my feet that formed the root of my own illness." Like Weis’s movements, which are in need their own voice, Phelan’s dancer also searched for this resonance. It is through shifting their strengths from "pure" corporeality to the complex dance between embodiment and technology that both of these dancers are able to dance through trauma.

In the third piece of Monitor Lizards, "Fly Me to the Moon," Weis’s integration of technology and the body directly addresses themes of bodily absence and presence. In this piece, an evocative technological foray aided by a narrative of love, loss, and the human body, Weis physically manipulates the camera, creating expansive depths within the small space around her. She enters pulling a camera on a cart, her body fixed in the eye of a camera, an effect that cascades her image back and forth endlessly. The flat wall suddenly seems to open up as the images reach backward as far as the eye can see. The melancholy mood of the piece is aided by grainy video, haunting sounds, and a sparse, compelling text. Dancer Scott Heron enters and speaks about Weis’s character as he stands at a microphone: "Helen has left me and gone back to 1930." This thematic absence is contradicted by an extreme close-up of Weis’s face directly behind him as he alternates between speaking and breaking into a twisted, contorted dance that resonates with a sense of pain and nostalgia. Heron’s "able" body communi-
cates loss through his movements, while the conceptually absent character Weis plays is made most present through the close-up projections, creating a complicated juxtaposition of the ideas of absence and presence. Weis also physically wheels the camera around on stage, controlling what is being captured and where it is projected. Her technological manipulations grant her an agency necessary for the disabled body on stage, an agency that resonates in Thomson’s writing:

I intend to counter the accepted notions of physical disability as an absolute, inferior state and a personal misfortune. Instead, I show that disability is a representation, a cultural interpretation of physical transformation or configuration, and a comparison of bodies that structures social relations and institutions. Disability, then, is the attribution of corporeal deviance—not so much a property of bodies as a product of cultural rules about what bodies should be or do.24

Weis’s configurations of the body and technology propose alternate subjectivities—ones that do not attempt to be understood as the equivalent of able-bodied norms, but instead pose a challenge—to expand our cultural understandings of the body. Weis’s slippage between the present and past allows us to imagine a future less marked by “cultural rules” about what bodies should be or do. Through her choreography Weis reinscribes both her character and her own physical body with empowering constructions of presence.

Performing Bodies in the Age of Global Technologies

Weis’s Live Internet Performance Structure (LIPS) is a new direction in performance that allows culturally ideologically resistant work to emerge through the intersection and integration of the live and the technological on stage. LIPS may best be understood through the literal image of the acronym—two separate entities making up a whole: two simultaneous performance events linked and made one through a live Internet feed. Presently, a LIPS performance is based upon two groups of artists working from different sites but with the same technical “language”—the setup, mixer, screen, and monitors. Each performance space typically has several layers: a live audience watching live performers who “partner” remote performers, who are also performing live in their space across the world. The remote performers are projected into the other space onto a large screen. The ability to restore physicality to those out of reach is what attracted Weis to this work. The appropriation and development of the Internet as a performance tool (from its original development for militaristic purposes),
serves to replace the global within local bodies in a performance site, while at the same time serving as what Jon McKenzie might call a "minor history"—functioning as a challenge to technological fetishism, globalized capitalism, and cultural imperialism.25

Weis sees these projects as long-distance connections—she has collaborated with performers in Prague, Budapest, and Macedonia. The performers in each space are choreographed to interrelate within the performance Weis designs, which varies in its narrative and improvisational content. The work has a fluidity based on the instability of the Internet link as well as the act of live bodies performing with projected ones. Additionally, live bodies are often projected onto the images of remote bodies, creating a third performance frame. Both sides are witnessed by audiences in the live spaces, but much of the mixing of images in one space is not seen by the audience in the other. The frames created by the screens give an awareness of dislocation and distance, especially as they reference ways of relating to television or film, but the live body in the mix and the ways the frames are used to bring global communities together create an expanded stage rich with connections. By using the Internet as a performance tool, Weis attempts a reengagement with the body made absent through technology—perhaps as a reaction to her own slowly declining body—by actively reinserting these virtual global bodies into a local space, by not letting them slip out of sight. The audiences become points of contact, witnesses to a piece of the performance rather than objective reporters of it as a whole. Weis maintains documentation through video of both sides, but no "whole" can ever be constructed from these dislocations. Weis's own bodily trauma permeates her work. The work I have described represents a progression in Weis's "writing trauma." Dominick LaCapra differentiates between the idea of writing about trauma, which he thinks of as an act of historiography, and the more intangible "writing trauma":

Writing trauma would be one of those telling aftereffects in what I termed traumatic and post-traumatic writing. . . . It involves processes of acting out, working over, and to some extent working through in analyzing and "giving voice" to the past—processes of coming to terms with traumatic "experiences," limit events, and their symptomatic effects that achieve articulation in different combinations and hybridized forms.26

For LaCapra, it is never fully possible to write trauma, because trauma itself cannot be localized or pinpointed in a fixed moment.

In January 2001, Weis premiered her program Show Me at the Kitchen in New York City. The first half of the program was made up of three multimedia pieces; the second half was the premiere of "Not So Fast, Kid!" Weis's
Internet collaboration with Phil Marden, based on a story told by Davor Petrovski, and using performers in both New York and Skopje, Macedonia. *Show Me*, as a whole, reflects a shift from Weis’s initial resistance to the signs indicating that her body was changing, to a gradual listening to what these signs were telling her; from her traumatic experience immediately after her diagnosis with MS, to her ability to turn this experience out into the world and redefine the terms of her disability. Weis’s use of a story from another culture addresses her own trauma as reflected through listening to another. Cathy Caruth explains this process:

The inherent departure, within trauma, from the moment of its first occurrence, is also a means of passing out of the isolation imposed by the event: that the history of a trauma, in its inherent belatedness, can only take place through the listening of another. The meaning of the trauma’s address beyond itself concerns, indeed, not only individual isolation but a wider historical isolation that, in our time, is communicated on the level of our cultures.27

Weis projects her work outward into the Skopje community and builds “Not So Fast, Kid!” upon a familial structure. The piece integrates a live “family” in New York, another in Macedonia, also live, and a third family of animated cartoon figures projected on a second screen in the performance space. In her program notes, Weis writes, “This piece is an attempt to connect with another culture. I went to Macedonia and asked artists there what story they would like to tell a New York audience. It could be anything. A fable. A war story. Something from the newspaper. The only rule was it could be no longer than one hundred and fifty words. This is our attempt to tell that story.” The story they picked goes like this:

I took off my shoe for the hundredth time, and checked to see if the little pebble was still there. Yes, it was. Every night, in the silence, my father, waiting for me to fall asleep, made an incantation to the little pebble so it would know how to prick me better. Today I have begun my 7,608th life. My foot grew and tore apart the shoe. The little pebble fell out. From the bridge, I watched it falling into the river, disappearing in the unfeeling waters. In the East began the new day. The wind brought the Dawn and with her came the gypsies. I was thinking what to buy from the bazaar, sandals or moccasins. Finally, I decided it would be best for some time to walk barefoot.28

The story might be a reflection of Weis’s own symptoms—the nagging pain on her right side that grew greater and began to cause her to fall—and her coming to terms with her MS. Weis’s “pebble” cannot fall out, but as she gives voice to her own trauma through her work, the work is strengthened, and as she listens to other voices, she listens more closely to her own. This
story also reflects the politics of the place, freedom, growth, the fall of Communism. Each “family,” the performers in the United States, those in Macedonia, and the projected animations, tells the story differently, and with different nuances. Each family performs on its own, and then the performers are integrated in a cross-cultural, hybridized exchange: Weis dances with “Robert” from Macedonia; another performer dances with an animated character; Ishmael Houston-Jones, the “father” figure in New York, dances with the “mother” figure from Macedonia. The tone of the piece varies from the comical, as animated eyes follow the live performer around the space, to the poignantly beautiful, as Houston-Jones begins to dance a “solo” in the New York space. A camera is fixed upon him, projecting his image onto the screen where the audience views it simultaneously interacting with the mediated image from Macedonia. In front of the screen Houston-Jones is aware of the interactions behind him and how his movement contributes to this complex picture. The images blur together at times, leaving a ghostly sweep of one’s arm across the other’s face, colors and textures blending into a cyborgian promise of crossed boundaries. The performers—live, animated, and remote—all interact with each other, creating densely layered images that represent connections between people and countries.

Weis is a pioneer with her video and Internet creations. Working against physical and financial odds, she has developed her work with small budgets and amateur equipment. It is a resonant echo of her body; she frames the fragmentations and textures that this technology grants her. Weis’s interests are grounded in bodies, in the moments onstage in the present, but through her use of multimedia she also challenges the ways in which bodies are seen at both a global and a local level. Her work can be seen as a response to McKenzie’s *Perform or Else*, which in conclusion states, “The challenge: not only to recognize that one experiences history from the perspective of the present, but to plug into emergent forces in order to generate untimely perspectives on this very perspective, perspectives that multiply and divide the present, rattling it to and fro.” With determination Weis questions boundaries of the body, technological frames, where the body begins and ends, how technology can augment the body, how to place the audience within technological frames, which frames to use, which bodies?

The cyborg has the potential to fill a space too often vacated by fears of the unknown, whether the fears relate to the loss of the live presence on stage, or are fears of what is societally abject or different. Weis’s cyborg theater palliates an all-too-typical uneasiness of disabled bodies by uniting with technology to create a figure undiminished by the physical or psychological limitations placed on the living flesh. Her own physical limitations become
evident when she, at the close of *Monitor Lizards*, puts a leg brace back on to greet her crowd. Her gradual acceptance of the brace after a period of self-consciousness peaked when she recently danced with it on in a piece by Scott Heron. “I wore this really tight sexy black dress and I had my brace on, I was in your face. . . . It was kind of liberating to do this, to wear something sexy and have this brace on—and it was still sexy!” In *Show Me*, Weis and Heron revived “Fly Me to the Moon” (now called “A Bad Spot Hurts Like Mad”), and Weis wore her brace throughout. This act strengthened the piece and reinforced the themes that seemed implicit in the original version. Weis’s em-brace-ing of this feeling of sexuality empowers her image on stage. Watching her dance this revival, I was taken by the beauty of her movement; her body sweeping through the image-saturated space reconfigured negative tropes of the cyber-subject as bodiless and troubled stereotypical representations of disability. Weis’s physicality converges with technology on the stages she occupies, creating a practical space that might otherwise be unoccupied by artists with disabilities.

*Notes*

1. This epigraph is my description of Weis’s performance. The piece was titled *Lizard Monitors* when it was presented at Dixon Place, New York City, between April 9 and April 24, 1999. Weis has since changed the title to *Monitor Lizards*.


3. Although I will use the general configuration *disability*, I am tempted by Ann Cooper Albright’s coinage *dis/ability*, which she uses to “exaggerate the intellectual precipice implied by this word.” Her discussion of terminology invokes the ideas of many people writing in disability studies, and I will use disability carefully, acknowledging the word choices within the field. See Ann Cooper Albright, *Choreographing Difference: The Body and Identity in Contemporary Dance* (Hanover, N.H.: Wesleyan University Press; University Press of New England, 1997), 58–59.


16. I frame my argument within Western society and on modes of seeing that are promoted in Western media because this is my own personal perspective. This is not to say that the same argument could not be applied from other perspectives, only that I locate myself within a Western tradition.
17. Weis, interview, June 1, 2000.
23. Phelan, Mourning Sex, 68.
25. Jon McKenzie, Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance (New York: Routledge, 2001). Although corporate video conferencing can be read in a similar way, I distinguish between the use within a corporate structure as a means of productivity and the use within a performance structure.
28. Show Me program notes, story by Davor Petrovski.
29. McKenzie, Perform or Else, 255.
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