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Kent State University School of Theatre and Dance chose to produce Arthur Miller’s *The Crucible* as the first production of the 2011 Fall Semester. This production was produced in the Wright-Curtis Theatre. Directed by Mark Monday, the play proved to provide unique challenges to be shared by the collaborative efforts of the design team. I chose this production as my thesis project. Working along with Carly Shiner as the lighting designer, Lisa Wilson as the costume designer, and Mark Monday as the director, I prepared for an exciting journey.

*The Crucible* is engaging to its audience regardless of time or location. As an audience, we often look for the play’s relevancy to our society. Arthur Miller wrote the play during the Congressional “witch hunts” for Communism in the 1950s. Today’s audience may read the “witch hunts” as government and political intrusions against an individual’s rights. Instead of looking for solutions to protect ourselves from repeating the same mistakes, we look to blame and punish those whom the government deems responsible. This process never stops. We continue to repeat the mistakes history has taught us.

Arthur Miller explores many themes in *The Crucible*: the individual versus the state, hysteria, intolerance, personal reputation, and courage to defy tyranny—even if the cost is death. It is within the latter that John Proctor finds his courage when he says, ”I am free to speak my heart, I think!” In a time when a man’s word was all that stood between him and the destruction of his family, this story is of John Proctor’s triumph, regardless of the personal cost. As the scenic designer, my goal was to help the audience
visualize the environment and draw their focus into the moment being performed on stage. I wanted to reflect the characters’ struggles and the journey they made to achieve their salvation.

The scenery stylized the confined environmental and psychological circumstances of the characters while emphasizing a fractured social order. The action of the play was forced downstage towards the audience in this intimate thrust theatre by a fence-like upstage wall that effectively confined the environment. A centralized cross-shaped platform was cracked to represent the fractured social order, forcing the characters to be careful within their environment. In order to complete the design, a cross-shaped structure hanging above the central playing area closed the architecture for these interior scenes and signified the character’s journey within the play from their confined and fractured environment to their salvation. The four interior settings were very simple, with scene shifts being accomplished with furniture and lighting changes. To allow the lighting designer to have more color control and contrast in her design the painted wood grain was done with reds, oranges, blues, and browns. The costumes provided the last needed hint of period and color to this production.
CONCEPTUAL STATEMENT AND DESIGN CHALLENGES

In the first conversation I had with the director of this production regarding the scenic design, one key idea was emphasized: entanglement. Director Mark Monday wanted to create a space where the audience and performers became entangled in the web of the story. He elaborated on this idea during the first official design meeting. Monday described the story as one with distinct atmospheres. These atmospheres included fear, ambition, frustration, jealously, perverted pride, and the power of authority. It is authority that entangles the other atmospheres into a spider’s web. The web was described as one of the state—which in 1692, was governed by the church—to trap the individual. Another important quality Monday emphasized was the simplicity of Puritan life as exemplified in the characters’ minimal possessions, and in the simple, yet elegant language Miller writes for them in the play. Monday also expressed his interest in using projections to reinforce these metaphors in the visual presentation of the scenery.

As the design process moved forward, we determined that we would simplify the use of projections to one source and one surface. The projection surface would be the downstage portion of the stage floor. Monday wanted to use the crucifixion of Jesus as one of the key projection images. This provided me with the challenge of incorporating iconic religious symbols into the framework of the design structure without overpowering the role of the actors in revealing the story.

I started to synthesize these discussions with the director by focusing on the following main ideas: the characters are confined (or metaphorically fenced) within their environment and their consciousness by their belief system, they are searching for their
salvation and will only find it when they are able to escape their own confinements. In order to achieve this I needed to create a stage space that limited the movement of the actors and pushed both the performers and the audience’s focus near the downstage edge of the playing space. It also required me to enclose this space to limit its visual size. Finally, it was necessary to further enclose the space and cage the actors with a roof-like structure, in order to visually restrict the audience’s focus.

There were functional as well as aesthetic challenges posed by placing this design in Wright-Curtis Theatre. First, I needed to devise a unit set that could incorporate four different interior locales. Second, to reinforce the concept visually, the structure needed to allow the performers’ movements to illustrate a metaphorical tangled web of action and language. The third challenge was to create a design that simulates the elemental textures and aesthetics of the time period while remaining within a budget that does not allow for actual rough, heavy, dimensional lumber. Fourth, I needed to design a floor that could work as a rough wooden structure and yet function well as a projection surface. Finally, I needed to find a balance between historical Salem, Massachusetts of 1692 and the artistic visual metaphor important to the overall production concept.
THE DESIGN PROCESS

Research

The Penguin Classics version of Arthur Miller’s *The Crucible* gives several descriptions of characters and an interpretation of historical events from Arthur Miller’s view. These, along with Christopher Bigsby’s introduction provide insight into the world of the play and the audience of 1953. This play is often compared to the Congressional trials on Communism. The events and characters of the play are not all historically accurate. For the purposes of this project, I will use the history as it is presented in Miller’s play. We know that seventeenth century Massachusetts was a very harsh physical environment. This daily hardship combined with a strict Puritan religion would have, and did, cause fear and anxiety. Their very survival was dependent on their unwavering faith in God and their total loyalty to each other and the Church.

John Proctor describes the church as a clapboard-meeting house in Act 2 when he is talking to John Hale. He says, “I think, sometimes, the man dreams of cathedrals, not clapboard meetin’ houses.” The research of the interior scenes, including a clapboard meeting house, began with searching for images of Puritan homes from the 1690s (Figures 1 – 4). Puritan life, as we call it today, was simple. There was very little decoration within the home. The major source of building materials was hand cut and carved wood and stone. The Puritans focused their lives on work and faith in order to survive. My research made it clear that the scenery needed to have the look of wood with no decoration on the surfaces. The set needed to visually reflect the harsh physical environment as well as the restrictive, heavy psychological stresses on the characters.
The combination of both visible and psychological elements helped to form an enclosed space cut off from its surrounding environment.

The rough wooden surfaces of the clapboard buildings in my research reminded me of my Grandfather’s old barn. As a result, I began looking at both interior and exterior images of wood-sided barns (Figures 6-7). I liked the idea of leaving gaps between the planks of the walls that are sometimes seen in these barns. From the beginning of our collaboration we had discussed the idea of raising the floor to allow for light to shine between the floorboards. This slatted board effect was considered for the walls of the scenery as well. The idea reminded me of the image of fortified walls surrounding military forts in that time period. This image of a stockade plays into the relationship between the Puritans and their environment, as well as the relationship between the characters and their accusers.

While researching barn structures, I came across some images of barn rafters (Figures 6-7). This led me to the idea of using a rafter-like structure hanging over the stage to visually press down on the characters and cap the space. This structure later transformed into the form of a cross, a major symbol for the production.

First Response

Once I had the general texture and shape of the walls and floor established, I began to work on a rough ground plan. Then I went directly into a rough model, developing a few general shapes of levels and walls. I knew at the start of this project the scenic budget for this production would not allow for large scene changes. I also knew
that the director and I wanted a unit set so that the action of the play would be able to continue as smoothly as possible without losing the audience’s focus.

One early idea was to use several rolling units that could play in the space together as a single unit, or apart to help define the space. These units, however, would then require a staircase if they were to have any height, doors on one side for entrances, and would need to be placed upstage toward the mezzanine level in order to allow for the downstage space necessary to allow the units to move and rotate as envisioned. Although interesting, this solution proved unacceptable for a number of reasons. It was too square, clunky, and placed the action too far away from the audience. So I went back to the beginning. I looked at my notes to see how to simplify by reviewing what was most important to the director and for the action of the play.

Second Response

From the beginning of our collaboration, director Mark Monday expressed his interest in using projections in this production. He specifically wanted to use the image of the crucifixion of Jesus. Since the steep rake of seats in the Wright-Curtis Theatre provides a high viewpoint for the audience, the floor becomes the largest background surface in the theatre (as prominent as the back wall) and a very important visual element in the production. We determined that placing the image of the crucifixion of Jesus on the floor would allow the characters to, literally, walk on their religious beliefs. This concept led me to dissect the floor space on two planes creating what amounted to a large cross on the floor. I used this cross as a starting point and treated it as a raised platform
in the shape of a cross. I could then project the image on the platform, which became the
defining element of the landscape. The space downstage of the cross platform would be
raised only enough to place lighting instruments underneath. The spaces upstage of the
cross platform would be higher, and could be used as playing space for various scenes.
The cross platform was placed at an angle not symmetrical to the centerline. I did not
want to balance the stage with this platform. The entrances would be placed at the three
points of the cross platform that were upstage of the last audience rows. The walls would
run between the entrances and help to divide and close off the unused portion of the
stage. A black curtain would be hung from the catwalk in front of the mezzanine and
follow the shape of the mezzanine level. The projection surfaces would be on the cross
platform and downstage section of the floor. I used AutoCAD to produce a more precise
ground plan and built a new white model on top of it (Figure 8).

I met with the director and showed him the white model of this configuration. He
liked the large cross platform on the floor and the general layout of the ground plan. We
discussed making the upstage levels smaller. He felt that they were too large and too far
upstage. He wanted me to try to really push the walls further toward the audience. One
solution was to lower the height of the levels and eliminate some of the steps. We
considered the idea of having shafts of light coming through the slats below the
platforms. But the time and cost of materials would, by my estimates, not allow us to
achieve the desired effect. I was also inquiring about using rough cut lumber as the main
building material and surface for the scenery. I knew this material would consume a
large portion of the allotted budget, so we decided to cut the lower platform level to
reduce the cost of the supporting structure. We then asked for the rough lumber to be the
priority for the finished aesthetics. I also used this meeting to examine the idea of using a hanging structure to help close and define the space. I did not want a full ceiling piece. I was, instead, looking for more of a sculptural open structure to possibly represent the rafters of the space. Monday liked this idea and we discussed having it mimic the position of the cross platform on the floor and use it to introduce a visual spider’s web into the space.

Third Response

My next task was to make the revisions the director and I had discussed. By removing the downstage level and placing that area directly on the stage floor, the cross platform became sixteen inches above the stage floor instead of the previous thirty-two inches. I removed the next level of steps completely so that there was only one step up from the cross platform to the upper levels making their height twenty-four inches instead of forty-eight inches. The removal and lowering of the levels then allowed me to make the cross platform slightly smaller and move it further downstage (Figures 8 and 9). The next step involved making the upstage levels smaller. While this sounds easy, dealing with the sightlines around the entrances made this task a little more difficult and extremely important. By joining several walls at odd angles that peaked at twelve feet from the stage floor, which created the atmosphere of an enclosed fence. I made sure all the audience members could see the actors when they came on and off the stage (Figure 9).

I positioned three crates along the downstage edge of the stage to hold many of
the hand props. I also wanted to use them as masking for footlights. In my conversations with the lighting designer, Carly Shiner, we saw several opportunities where the shadowy look of foot lighting could add to the characters’ dialogue. This lighting effect would add a feeling of confinement to the dark interior spaces such as the Proctor house and the jail. I believe the shadows produced by the foot lighting revealed a colder mood in these scenes. And since I had removed the possibility of placing lights under the platforms, the footlights became more important to balance the shadows and textures contributing to the visual focus of the audience and psychological environment of the characters.

The furniture used in the production played a key role in defining the four different locations. These locations included: a small bedroom in the home of Reverend Samuel Paris, the common room of John Proctor’s house, the vestry of the Salem meeting house, and a cell in the Salem jail. We needed four benches, which would also be used as beds; a table, four chairs, a trunk, a stool, and a couple of crates. The actors would place these items during the scene changes. Adding a few hand props to the scenes would add just enough reality to the space for the audience to accept the newly defined location.

The hanging structure took its shape from the architecture I had created in the space. I began with a large cross shape that hung directly over the one on the floor. I reviewed my research and added in long pieces stretching from the center of the hanging cross down toward the peaks in the walls. I also added a few pieces that went downstage. In order to get a web effect, I added a few pieces that connected the ones that reached toward the peaks in the walls. These mimicked the pattern found in many spider webs (Figure 11).

The projections were my next focus. I began looking at images relating to several
of the biblical references used in the play. In Act 1 we hear the words “going up to Jesus”\(^2\) being sung in a psalm just before Betty screams out. In Act 3 John Proctor refers to the angel Raphael as he attempts to comfort Mary Warren and get her to tell the truth.\(^3\) In Act 4 Reverend Parris speaks “Excellency – a dagger” when he talks with Judge Danforth about a threat made against him.\(^4\) These images and ideas were where my research into the projections would begin, but I wanted to have more input from the director before I went much further.

I had another meeting with director Mark Monday. He was very pleased with the revisions I had made and loved the addition of the hanging cross structure. Further, he felt the hanging structure was enough of a symbolic marker that we no longer needed projections. Monday was delighted with the way the downstage crates tied down the corners of the performance space. He expressed how this was a great way to put a separation between the stage and the audience. The entrances were in strong visual locations and the new size of the levels made them usable staging areas for all scenes. By defining the space with the walls and use of the black curtain I was able to close off the unnecessary stage space. This provided Monday with the intimate setting he was looking for. Our new topics color and texture. I was looking to remain in a natural color palette with contrasting wood tones to help define the significance of the cross on the floor and separate the floor from the walls. I also shared these ideas with the rest of the design team and production staff. I left the new white model (Figure 9) with Monday for the summer. It included the furniture pieces so that he would be able to work on some of the blocking before rehearsals began in the fall.
During the summer, Monday contacted me with a new idea. He asked if we could crack or break the cross on the floor as a way to show how corrupt and broken the characters’ world was and that he wanted the cross hanging overhead to represent the salvation the characters are seeking. These ideas created an interesting interpretation to the symbolism we were going to construct. I felt that the broken cross platform marked how some of the characters were using their religion for personal gain. This visual metaphor now reflected the journey the characters needed to make in order to find true salvation.

I tried several variations of breaks in the cross platform before finding one that I liked enough to share with Monday. I did not just want to paint a black crack on the floor. I wanted something the actors would need to look out for, as the characters were looking out for their safety in a dangerous environment ruled by what appeared to be a corrupt governing body. I finally decided on a crack that went through the middle of the cross platform, breaking it into three pieces. Each piece would have a 2 inch height difference from the other. This difference in height would give the crack more visual impact and make the actors be even more careful when crossing it. In designing the crack in the floor, I decided it should cause the cross platform to shift slightly in two directions. This would change the shape of the upstage platforms, making them slightly smaller. Once I was satisfied with the broken cross platform and the new slight differences in the ground plan, I sent it to the director. He expressed to me that it was exactly what he was looking for.
PROBLEMS AND EXECUTION OF THE DESIGN

Budget

During the summer I had to make a decision that I had foreseen from the beginning of this process. I received word from our technical director, Martin Simonson, that we were $1000 over our allotted $3500 scenery budget. I did not want to make drastic changes to the design, especially since the director had already approved the design and I felt it worked extremely well to achieve our goals. The biggest expense on the set budget was the rough-cut lumber I had specified. I contacted some of my design colleagues to see if they knew of a good solution. After looking at several ideas, based on time and labor, I decided that we could achieve the desired look I wanted with painted lauan.

Color

The colors in the scenery started as natural contrasting tones of wood. I put together a color model (Figure 10) made from different species of wood veneer. The floor was in various brown, yellow, and ochre tones. The cross platform, hanging structure, and furniture were a dark brown shade, similar to black walnut. The walls were similar to the overall floor, but darker and redder. These colors worked well together. They had a nice contrast from one another and were neutral enough not to become a specific focus on stage. I presented this color palette on the first design meeting of the Fall semester. We discovered that my color scheme would need to be adjusted. For
budget and labor reasons, the costume designer Lisa Wilson, needed to choose many of her costumes from stock and rental sources. Many of her choices were in the same warm earth tone color pallet as the scenery and there was not enough color contrast to keep the costumes from blending into the floor. We agreed that it would be easier to adjust the paint treatment on the set than to find completely new costume sources. As a result, I kept the same general ideas, but added oranges, blues, reds, browns, and black as wood grain colors (Figures 25 – 27). This not only proved successful with the costumes, but it also gave the lighting designer more of a color range in creating her design.

Lighting Around Scenery

We discovered that there were concerns in how to access specific lighting positions with the hanging structure in its current location. After some discussion, we decided to remove parts of the structure, reposition and change other parts in an attempt to allow the lift to pass closer to, or through the structure. Unfortunately, the missing pieces of the structure took away from the web-like look. But this was a sacrifice worth making if it meant keeping the larger portion of the structure.

The lighting department also expressed concerns about the height of the walls along the upstage edge of the set. Their height prevented a backlight system from being able to cover the area in front of the walls. I was asked if I could lower the back walls. This was one instance where I felt I should not compromise. The wall height was 12 feet from the floor at their highest point. The platforms in front of the walls were 24 inches high. Lowering the walls would make them seem architecturally incorrect, especially
since the steep rake of the audience created a high viewpoint of the scenery. I expressed my concerns to both the lighting designer and the director regarding this issue. I believe they decided they could achieve their goal with a steep side light system. Therefore, I did not need to change the height of the walls.

Hanging Large Scenic Pieces

The next design problem was how to design the hanging cross structure so it could be rigged over the stage. The technical director felt that the design needed to be changed somehow so that this structure could be put together more easily. I approached this problem first by attempting to create a cross structure that could be put together in pieces, and would fit through the shop door. This proved insufficient, so I tried to break up the structure so that it became three separate hanging pieces (Figure 12). This idea became even more complex then the initial one. It was not until my third attempt, that we narrowed the problem down to making the entire structure small enough so that it could be built upside down in the theatre and flipped when they went to rig it. The solution was simple. I took a little off each of the four ends (Figure 13).

The End of the Journey

After all the building and painting, we had created a very stylized setting that incorporated both realistic elements and the metaphoric symbols needed to display our design concept, which had developed into a journey toward salvation. The unit set was
transformed into the four different locations with the director’s staging, lighting, and use of props.
The scenic design for Kent State University’s production of The Crucible played only a small part in the overall success of the project. This production required the collaboration of the whole design team. I do not feel that any design element shined brighter than the others. Together we were able to show both the beauty and ugly grit of the story. The scenery contributed to the way the actors moved and foreshadowed the journey the characters would make. They shared their struggle within the broken confines of their environment and illuminated the path they chose to gain their salvation. The broken cross upon the floor combined with the whole cross hanging above them, were the major symbols provided by the scenery. Combined with director Mark Monday’s staging, the characters told their story.

This production helped me realize the importance of finding a true meaning in the scenery I place on stage. The impact of a visual image that becomes incorporated into the story cannot be of more importance to the design team. Finding the right image was, in a way, my own journey toward a greater goal. My approach to this design was different than my designs in the past. I took a much more proactive role in finding a way to put the assortment of descriptions provided by the playwright and director Mark Monday, together. By using models, and revising them as the process went along, I was able to clearly communicate with the director and achieve a product that I was truly pleased with. The scenery represented both the production team’s concept and the environment of historical Salem. The enclosed space helped to focus the action for the audience and maintained that intimate feeling throughout the entire performance. I felt
that the director and I were able to communicate our ideas clearly to one another and this made the process seem quick and easy. I allowed myself enough time to process the information I was given and as a result, the addition of the crack in the floor came to light.

The crack in the stage floor became more than just a mere symbol in this production. It became a metaphorical lens through which the audience could see which characters were true to their faith. The characters that were seeking personal gain from the trials would cross the crack as if it were not even there. The judges of the trials also seemed oblivious to its existence. Characters such as Rebecca Nurse, who never told a lie, and was always true to her faith, never crossed the crack. Elizabeth Proctor only crossed the crack one time. This was when she lied in court to protect her husband’s name. Reverend John Hale could often be found sitting, kneeling, or standing at the bottom of the broken cross, where he desperately looked for a way to fix the bridge this community had built for their journey toward salvation.

The walls defining the upstage edge of the playing space made it possible to narrow the focus of the action. By cutting off a portion of the space that was not necessary to accommodate the action of the play, I was able to provide a more intimate feeling for the audience and bring them into the story as if they were the jury of the trial. I felt that it was not necessary to fill the unused space with extraneous scenery. The walls were made with vertical gaps between the lauan boards. This allowed light to pass through them and add texture, color, and a shift in mood to various scenes.

The floor was an important design element as it always is within the Wright-Curtis Theatre. My goal with the floor was to use it as a way to boost one of the major
symbols we used for this production (the broken cross), and to design it as an
environmental element to help place the characters within their setting. I believe we
succeeded in both. The wood flooring brought the audience into the realm of an interior
space and the contrast between the colors used in the floor helped to set the importance of
the cross apart from the rest of the floor surface.

In working with the lighting designer, Carly Shiner, the process went well. We
took several opportunities to look at the model and the paint elevations in the light lab as
she chose her colors. This allowed us to see how much variation she would be able to
achieve in her design. It also allowed me to see if I needed to make any alterations to the
scenic color pallet. Her color choices took advantage of the various colors in the painted
wood grain on the scenery. Each location had a different mood and she was able to
establish a shift in mood as the play progressed. The scenes often shifted from a strong
cool tone, broken up by Shiner’s use of texture, to a warm red shift that drew out the
anger and fear that often ended each scene (Figures 28 – 36).

The hanging structure was used as both a symbol of salvation in heaven and as an
element to close in and focus the playing space. The cross portion of the structure was
aligned with the broken cross on the floor. By using it as an architectural element, it
helped to define the space as an interior and helped to surround the characters with a
feeling of both oppressive political forces pushing down upon them and a symbol of hope
that their salvation was within reach.

In the end, the changes I made to the hanging structure proved to be completely
unnecessary. The lighting team decided to place their instruments in locations where
they could be focused from the catwalks in the theatre, rather than use the Genie Lift at
all. Open communication regarding these choices could have prevented much extra work, and the visual appearance of the hanging cross structure would have had a stronger impact within the space. I learned I needed to be more proactive regarding these decisions, especially when working with less experienced student designers. In the end, I think the lighting and scenery complimented each other and worked together successfully as a whole.

The costumes, designed by Lisa Wilson, played well against the scenery. Her choices of period costumes helped to add a true sense of time and reality to the production. None of the actors visually disappeared into the set, and the costume colors played well with both the paint treatment and the lighting. We did have a small technical difficulty. We found it necessary to do a last minute add of a scrim panel in front of the footlights to prevent the costumes from getting snagged on the instruments.

Looking back on the design, I realize that I would only change one element. I would make the surface of the painted wood appear more rough and jagged. This production made me realize that doing more with less can be the difference between great art and mediocre theatre. We were, I think, very successful in creating a stylized environment that pulled at the audience and made them think, “why?” We were successful in creating a beautiful piece that contributed to the story told by the characters. But the lauan, after being painted, looked too refined. While I am sure that the Puritans were great craftsmen, I would convey more about how harsh their environment really was. Not by adding more scenery, but by subtracting from the beauty of what I designed.
Notes


APPENDIX A

CONCEPT STATEMENT FROM THE DIRECTOR
Why is this play one of the most produced in America? Indeed it is Arthur Miller’s most produced work. Perhaps one reason lies in one definition—crucible—"A severe test." During the period of the play Puritans lived a theocratic life. The church dominated. Individualism was discouraged. Life was severe and rigid yet people were free to advance as long as it was under the guise of the church or God’s will. The problem—to too few people having a direct link to God’s direction, putting the balance of power into the hands of the few.

Arthur Miller had been interested in the Salem witch trials before the on-slaught, which sprang from the House Un-American Activities Committee. He first encountered the story while a student at the University of Michigan. Miller did not clearly see a dramatic devise for the play, however, until the hearings of the Committee commenced in Washington, D.C. It was then the playwright found parallels between Salem and current events. When faced with the “severe test” of naming names before the Committee many of Miller’s colleagues and friends succumbed to the pressure and revealed those whom they believed to be communists—especially those in the entertainment industry. Miller, summoned to the proceedings, named no one. To not name names was a death sentence to many careers—just as not naming names or confessing was a death sentence to nineteen men and women (and two dogs) in Salem, MA in 1692. Unfortunately, the dogs had no means of confessing and were not spared like many of their human counterparts. To remain silent is often the most difficult choice.

*The Crucible,* it has been argued, is a play about the “seductive nature of power.”
I certainly do not disagree with that argument. I would add it is also a play about the power of salvation—be it an individual victory or belief in a higher power. You’ll see in the play that those who wield the power have their own individual motives in making their decisions. John Proctor also has an individual motive and that is his own salvation.

So— we come back around to the individual versus the state, or in this case, the church. Regardless, the parallels are clear. And, one more point...it is not that the democracy we enjoy is easy. Personally, I get extremely frustrated in the excruciatingly slow process that democracy demands. Thankfully, all Americans are like John Proctor in this—”I am free to speak my heart, I think!” And, there is much salvation in that.

Director Mark Monday
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CONCEPT RESEARCH
Figure 1. Concept Collage 1

Figure 2. Concept Collage 2
Figure 5. Concept Collage 5

Figure 6. Concept Collage 6
Figure 7. Concept Collage 7
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MODEL PHOTOGRAPHS
Figure 8. First White Model

Figure 9. Second White Model
Figure 10. Final Color Model
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THE HANGING CROSS STRUCTURE
Figure 11. Plan View of the Hanging Cross Structure (Version 1)

Figure 12. Plan View of the Hanging Cross Structure (Version 2)
Figure 13. Plan View of the Hanging Cross Structure (Version 3)
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COMPLETE SET OF DRAFTING
Figure 14. Ground Plan (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 15. Sections (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 16. Platform Breakdown (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 17. Flooring Layout (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 18. Walls A-G (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 19. Walls H-M (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 20. Hanging Structure (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 21. Hanging Structure (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 22. Railings (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 23. Crates and Furniture (Drawing not to scale)
Figure 24. Furniture Plot (Drawing not to scale)
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PAINT ELEVATIONS
Figure 25. Paint Elevation of the Upstage Walls
Figure 26. Paint Elevation of the Floor
Figure 27. Paint Elevation of the Floor Cross and Hanging Structure
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SELECTED PRODUCTION PHOTOGRAPHS
Figure 28. Bare Stage

Figure 29. Hanging Structure
Figure 30. Act 1

Figure 31. Act 2
Figure 32. End of Act 2

Figure 33. Act 3
Figure 34. Act 3

Figure 35. Act 4
Figure 36. End of Act 4
REFERENCES