

‘Doing Housework Doing Laundry’: Spectacularization of Labor in *Caroline, or Change*

By Hansol Oh

Abstract

In this article, I investigate the spectacularization of labor in Tony Kushner and Jeanine Tesori’s musical *Caroline, or Change* (2003). Drawing from the transformative power of spectacle, I contend that overlaying the actor’s theatrical labor and the character’s theatricalized work makes the otherwise hidden issues of labor hyper visible and tangible. I discuss how the musical defines the title character through her work as a maid and illuminates the socioeconomic forces that shape her work. In addition, I analyze the anthropomorphized electronic appliances that work alongside the title character. The deliberate juxtaposition of a black maid’s domestic labor with electronic appliances embodied by live actors, positions labor at the center of the spectacle. By foregrounding work both in narrative and spectacularizing it on stage, the musical ultimately subverts the ‘mammy’ stereotype that naturalizes and conceals issues of inequality and exploitation. Also, when the character’s and the actor’s work bleed into each other, marginalized characters are empowered through the spectacular theatrical labor of performers, transforming their work into an object of appreciation and celebration. Hence the musical’s spectacularization of labor reveals theatre as a productive site, where the increasingly privatized and naturalized neoliberal redefinition of work can be publicized and challenged.

In her book, *The Problem With Work*, feminist scholar Kathi Weeks posits that the current capitalist system, which continuously naturalizes and normalizes waged work, leaves little room to question the organization of work. ‘The social role of waged work’, Weeks writes, ‘has been so naturalized as to seem necessary and inevitable, something that might be tinkered with but never escaped. [...] Th[e] effort to make work, at once public and political is, then, one way to counter the forces that would naturalize, privatize, individualize, ontologize, and also, thereby, depoliticize it’ (7). This engagement with the ‘effort to make work more public and political’ has become more pressing and urgent in what is

variously referred to as the 'new' economy, the 'post-Fordist' economy, or, in its latest manifestation, the 'gig' economy—where creativity, innovation, and risks are repackaged to mask the precarious position of workers and promoted as a revamped, appealing lifestyle option.

In the context of increasingly precarious working conditions, an examination of how work and working characters are represented, negotiated, and critiqued on stage renders theatre a productive site for enacting issues of labor. Attending to the work, and its spectacle, presses the audience to recognize theatre as a space where 'one group of people spend leisure time sitting in the dark to watch others spend their working time under lights pretending to be other people' (Ridout 6). It also invites the audience to observe the different layers of work that take place in front of them. With *Caroline, or Change* (2003), Tony Kushner and Jeanine Tesori bring the private, domestic workplace of the title character into the public sphere: the theatrical stage (a private sphere within a public sphere). They expose the forces that naturalize, privatize, and individualize issues of work, inequality, and opportunity, thus urging the audience to examine how the socio-economic structure of the 1960s American South shapes Caroline's work and life. Drawing from renewed attention to the transformative power of spectacle, I contend that, by overlaying the actor's theatrical labor of performance and the character's theatricalized work on stage, the musical makes the otherwise hidden issues of labor hyper visible and tangible.

After four years of development, Kushner and Tesori's *Caroline, or Change* premiered off Broadway at the Public Theater in 2003 under the direction of George C. Wolfe and then transferred to Broadway's Eugene O'Neill Theatre, playing for 136 performances.¹ Partly inspired by the author's childhood memories,² the musical is set in November

1 My analysis of the staging is based on the recording of a 2004 Broadway production, presented at the Eugene O'Neill Theatre, that I accessed at the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts.

2 The musical contains the most autobiographical elements compared to his other works. For instance, Kushner grew up in Lake Charles, Louisiana and was about the same age as Noah Gellman's character in 1963. Other characters

and December 1963 and dramatizes the changes that, small and large, take place in the lives of Caroline, a Black maid, and her liberal Jewish employers, the Gellmans, right around the time of Kennedy's assassination and the start of the Civil Rights Movement.

Caroline, the stoic heroine presented as ever resistant to change, opens the musical announcing 'Nothing ever happens underground in Louisiana' (Kushner 11). As one commentator put it, the musical 'eschewed Broadway spectacle, sacrificing these tools of the musical for depth of character and theme' (Fisher 85). Considering its subject matter, which explores economic and race relations just before the Civil Rights Movement in the segregated South, it is perhaps not surprising that the musical lacks a dazzling chorus line, flamboyant costumes, or jaw-dropping set changes, which are typically associated with a Broadway spectacle today. These features of spectacle, perhaps best exemplified in *Wicked*—which competed alongside *Caroline, or Change* for the Tony Award for best musical and won—are not found in *Caroline, or Change*. However, through their innovative dramaturgical construction, Kushner and Tesori push the boundaries of the form and, as I argue, do spectacularize the central theme of the musical: work.

In writing about the musical's transformative power, musical theatre scholar Scott McMillin observes that musical numbers allow for 'double characterization', through which the characters' 'musical versions enlarge them into lyrical power' (McMillin 21). In other words, the music is not simply integrated into the book to reveal the character's psychological depth but also elevates the character to another dimension through performance, to the point of disintegration. Millie Taylor, similarly problematizing the notion of integration in musical theatre, writes:

although the performer may maintain a realistic
psychological development from one moment to

draw inspiration from Kushner's childhood, for example the family employed a Black maid, Maudie Lee Davis, to whom Kushner dedicated the libretto. But other details differ in significant ways, clearly a making the show a fictionalized account of what happened in his childhood.

the next, the act of singing and the intrusion of the orchestra alter the mode of representation. The audience may still accept the performance as realistic within the genre, but the vocal technique, the beauty of the voice, the harmonious interaction with the orchestra, and, in some cases, the simultaneous delivery by several performers all allow the mechanics of the performance to be revealed. (Taylor 116)

In performance, a musical's very dramaturgical construction is not just revealed through disjunction and disunification of theatrical elements, but, rather, musicals thrive on powerful performances that expose their artifice. McMillin identifies a musical's political potential in 'the crackle of difference' (2). The genre's roots in satiric popular entertainment and self-aware aesthetic suggest the genre's 'potential for resisting structures of wealth and power' that allows room for constant reinvention and transformation (McMillin 29). *Caroline, or Change* engages with this political potential through its innovative dramaturgy by amplifying the gap between the characters' and the actors' work and revealing 'the mechanics of the performance' (Taylor 116). Psychological realism, on the other hand, in its effort to create a faithful illusion of the outside world onstage, calls for the theatrical artifice to disappear; the actor should disappear into the role to become a seamless whole with the character. However, musical theatre's dramaturgy opens up gaps for the theatrical labor of actors to become palpable in the crack between the dramatic narrative and the performance. *Caroline, or Change*, in particular, makes this disjunction felt through what I refer to as 'spectacularization of labor' by overlaying the characters' work and the actor's work and sheds light on the different layers of work.

Both Baz Kershaw and Amy Hughes' observations in regard to spectacle are pertinent to my focus on spectacularized labor, in that placing work and working characters as the focal point in a theatrical performance thrusts the work of the character and the performer into the spotlight, as well as the historical and social forces that shape them. Historicizing the anti-spectacular bias in the fields of theatre history and criticism, Kershaw argues that, in today's performative

society, spectacle gains a new critical potency because of its power to create an excess reaction in people (Kershaw 592). In a similar vein, unpacking how melodramatic performances served nineteenth century American society's social reform, Amy Hughes proposes 'spectacle as methodology' and argues that spectacle has the 'potential to destabilize, complicate, or sustain sedimented ideological beliefs' (Hughes 4). As I will demonstrate in this article, spectacle in *Caroline, or Change* does not function as a decorative element to the visual aesthetic but serves a dramaturgical purpose. By bringing work and working characters into visual and kinesthetic focus, the musical subverts the 'mammy' stereotype, renders hidden labor hyper visible, and empowers marginalized subjects through the theatrical labor of its performers.

Originating in the early nineteenth century, the mammy stereotype is typically associated with the image of a faithful servant, presenting an enslaved Black woman as a devoted loving caretaker of a white family (McElya 4). The mammy is often portrayed as an overweight, motherly figure of advanced age whose physical attributes make her appear asexual, 'an unsuitable sexual partner for White men' (Collins 84). Such characterization has historically served to hide Black women's sexual objectification and to 'legitimate relations between Black women and White men as maternal and nurturing, not sexual' (McElya 8). Painted as a loyal and nurturing caregiver for a white family, the mammy narratives leave her role as a mother and caregiver in her Black family unexamined in favor of portraying her as good-humored and content to serve the master's family wholeheartedly. Such delineation deliberately misrepresents Black women's affective and physical labor on the job as a spontaneous and natural act of love and simultaneously obscures and romanticizes the coercive and exploitative nature of the work they performed in white households. This stereotype has had a lasting impact on Black womanhood and functions as a 'controlling image', significantly limiting the ways in which Black women are perceived and treated (Collins 72).

In the musical, *Caroline* is first and foremost defined by her work and her economic needs. As a maid for the Gellmans, she

'cook[s] and clean[s] and mind[s] th[e] boy, / doing housework doing laundry' for a weekly salary of thirty dollars (Kushner 17). Working as an underpaid maid and raising four children has made Caroline exhausted, and she is constantly characterized as angry and unhappy. The radio introduces her, '[a]ll day long you wear a frown. / Dressed in white and feelin' low, / ... Doin' laundry, full of woe' (Kushner 12). Noah and Rose Gellman make similar observations. Caroline is always angry and never smiles (Kushner 14, 50). Caroline's profoundly sad role subverts the centuries-old 'mammy' stereotype by showing 'her distaste for the job' (Thomas 205). In addition to her visible dissatisfaction with her job, Caroline's refusal to perform affective labor clearly frames her activities in the Gellmans' household as wage work. For example, she does not reciprocate Noah's affection for her and turns down his request to wish him good night saying, '[t]hat not my job' (Kushner 45). Additionally, Caroline distances herself from Rose's friendly gestures, which underscore her understanding of their relationship, not as friends, but as employer and employee.

In addition to revising the mammy stereotype, the musical demands that we recognize the socioeconomic forces that shape Caroline's work. We view her work and subjection not as individual traits but as the products of socioeconomic conventions. Although we see Caroline as chronically sad and exhausted, Dotty, a fellow maid and a friend who has known Caroline for many years, attests to a different Caroline. When Caroline blames Dotty for her changes, Dotty refutes the claim by singing:

Once you was quick,
and once you was bright;
now it seem you come to some confusion,
you losin courage, you losin light,
lost your old shine, lost Caroline. (Kushner 33)

Additionally, Emmie, Caroline's daughter, asks her mother if she remembers fun, implying a past when Caroline was capable of dreaming and laughing (Kushner 42). Caroline never expected to be working as

a maid for twenty-two years when she first started. In much the same way as Emmie is vocal about her wants and desires, Caroline too was once an aspiring young woman. She thought she'd 'be / better off than this!' (Kushner 17), and that she'd be 'someplace cooler, someplace high, / someplace where there's something dry [...] / doing something finer' (Kushner 18).

Yet, the musical number 'Ironing' reveals that her subjection is a product of wage relations shaped by the Segregationist South. Caroline and her husband struggled because there was 'no work for Negro men' (Kushner 71). Even when there was an opportunity, her husband could not secure employment because white workers dominated the labor union (*ibid.*). His prolonged unemployment status meant Caroline was the breadwinner for her family of six, which eventually led to the couple's separation. Although Dotty suggests Caroline can choose to make a change in her life, the backstory clearly illustrates the insurmountable systemic racism and inequality that lay in Caroline's way—and which has trapped Caroline in her job as a maid for more than two decades. Years of working as an underpaid domestic worker have hardened Caroline and put her in a vulnerable position. When Rose implements a new household rule to discipline Noah about money, she tells Caroline to take whatever loose change the boy leaves in his pants for laundry. What starts as a benign finance lesson for Noah spirals into humiliation for Caroline. She snaps at Rose that she 'ain't some ragpick / ain't some jackdaw', but, at the same time, she worries about losing her job. The Washing Machine and the Radio vocalize her concerns and desperation simultaneously:

THE WASHING MACHINE

Please please boss lady boss
Lady New York lady don't don't
fire me fire me can't do without
do without do without money!

THE RADIO

Talk like that, talk like that,
you won't be a maid no more

(Kushner 77)

As much as she resists performing affective labor for the Gellmans, she battles against herself to keep her job and disciplines herself to meet

their expectations.

The musical is noteworthy in that it makes 'work' a central theme by foregrounding Caroline's work visually and kinaesthetically. When Caroline is first introduced to the audience the stage directions break down her work process step by step, '[s]he's doing the laundry, sorting the clothes [...] Caroline opens the lid of the Washing Machine, and begins to load it with clothes [...] Caroline switches the Washing Machine on' (Kushner 11–12). The stage directions suggest that Caroline performs the domestic labor in a realistic manner as she would in a dramatic play. However, the sung-through form of the musical demands that Caroline's work of washing, ironing, folding laundry, and cooking is constantly overlaid with her singing. In other words, her represented work of doing laundry is not separated from the work of performance as in a book musical, where a realistic book scene is followed or interrupted by a musical number in which the actor breaks into a song and dances. Caroline's act of washing and ironing are presented simultaneously as the performer's singing. In this way, although within the dramatic narrative, the work takes place in the basement of a private household, in the theatricalized setting, the stage doubles as a workplace for both the character and the actor, publicizing both layers of work—Caroline's work in the basement and the actor's singing performance on stage.

One of the most striking and ingenious choices of the musical is the anthropomorphized appliances. Caroline works in solitude but is accompanied by 'a brand-new Nineteen-Sixty-Three / seven-cycle wash machine' (Kushner 11) and a dryer that sing along with her. Some commentators saw their presence as a product of a playful and theatrical imagination. Ben Brantley attributes the dramaturgical choice to Kushner's recent collaboration on *Brundibar* with Maurice Sendek, a renowned children's book author and illustrator (Brantley). Similarly, Fisher writes that 'these oddly whimsical anthropomorphic creatures, perhaps imagined as a result of Kushner's affection for children's literature (among his earliest works are children's plays) and the fact that one of his central characters is a child' (Fisher 101). I

argue, however, that the anthropomorphized characters add more than theatrical delight to the show and directly contribute to the spectacularization of labor.

In the off-Broadway premiere and original Broadway production, Capathia Jenkins played the Washing Machine and Chuck Cooper played the Dryer. Each actor stood on a platform slightly higher than their actual appliance, clearly visible and recognizable as live human actors. Both actors' physical presence not only made their charismatic performances stand out but made the basement on the stage appear cramped as Caroline describes it. The anthropomorphized appliances comment on Caroline's life, sometimes give a voice to the unspoken thoughts of the taciturn and stoic title character and sing about their own work. The Washing Machine sings in onomatopoeia, 'hum hum hum hum / round and round I agitates / while them what does the clothes awaits, / they contemplate and speculates, / in the peace my one-horsepower / lectric motor's hum creates' (Kushner 13) and '[w]ashin finish! Sweet and wet! / And cool! / My daily task is done!' (Kushner 15). The Dryer then takes over and sings, metaphorically referring to the work as physically and emotionally draining: '[t]ime's come to perspire! / Turn on the electric dryer! Sucking moisture out the air, / melt the hairspray in your hair! / Turn it on, turn on despair!' (Kushner 15–16). On both a narrative and performative level, the appliances assist Caroline in her work. As scholar Joanna Mansbridge observes, the appliances, cast with Black actors, 'visually recall the history of African American labor and possession of Black bodies as objects of labor' (Mansbridge 4). However, in performance, the appliances also harmonize with her. The music of Caroline and the singing appliances is grounded in the legacy of slavery, drawing inspiration from field holler, work songs, and spirituals ('Production' 00:16:20—00:16:41). Caroline, in particular, sings in a throaty, gravelly voice that communicates pain and struggle and the domestic appliances sing in Black musical idioms, such as blues, spirituals, and Motown, delineating the domestic labor as racialized. Musically, this historicizes and constructs Caroline's underpaid and exploited work as a continuing legacy of slavery. The

overlapping physical demands of both signifying (acting and singing) and signified (domestic work) forms of labor render both forms more palpable. Additionally, the routine of privatized and individualized domestic work is transformed into an object of aesthetic appreciation and located within the larger social and historical context of work.

The Radio, another anthropomorphized electrical appliance, plays a similar function. Embodied by three female actors in the Broadway production, the Radio's performance and musical style call to mind the Motown girl trio the Supremes and allude to the musical's early 1960s setting. In contrast to Caroline's hoarse and throaty vocals, which evoke pain and suffering, the Radio players sing in sweet and harmonious voices. By drawing from Motown sound, the Radio alludes to the social change its music carries implicitly. However, more significantly, the Radio's performance represents the limited segment of African-American work that was popularly recognized before the Civil Rights movement, as seen in the crossover hits produced by Motown in the mid-20th century. Although the label did not make explicit political statements, Reiland Rabaka notes that their music nevertheless carried messages of change:

It was not only ingenious, but it was also indicative of the desegregationist and integrationist ethos sweeping across African America in the late 1950s and early 1960s. [...] Motown was increasingly given entry into mainstream American popular culture at the exact same time that African Americans were desperately struggling to integrate into mainstream American society. In short, 1960s Motown music was implicitly Civil Rights Movement music without explicitly espousing traditional Civil Rights Movement themes, politics, and slogans. (Rabaka 145)

Read in this context, the Radio's glamorous and dazzling appearance in tight, shiny golden dresses and highly coiffed wigs add not only a spectacular element to the mostly domestic environment of the musical but also the lyrics of the Radio songs provide commentary on both Caroline's situation and the musical's action; however, it is notable

that these numbers are framed as the only diegetic songs. On the narrative level, the music from the radio provides an aural landscape for Caroline's world, but, on the stage, the music is performed live by actors who embody the Radio. Presenting songs from the radio not as disembodied sounds but as part of the live stage performance by the three female actors, the musical recasts them as entertainment workers performing for pay and aligns the actors' work with previous generations of entertainment workers. In light of this observation, I argue that the Radio character makes multiple layers of work on stage tangible, spectacularizing their labor.

Spectacularizing theatrical labor renders invisible labor visible, but it can also empower marginalized characters who perform underappreciated and invisible labor through the laboring performance of the actors. Although the dramatic narrative features Caroline as a marginalized subject who is exhausted from too much work, the physical demands of the live performance contradict the narrative and create a strikingly different result. In her analysis of the 1966 musical *Sweet Charity*, Stacy Wolf notes the transformative power of spectacle in musical theatre. The dramatic narrative portrays the female protagonist as victimized and disempowered by men; however, in live performance, the scene becomes an occasion for a pulsating performance that contradicts the narrative. Noting how musical theatre's use of multiple modes of expression and the demand of live performance can create a powerful, transformative spectacle, Wolf writes:

Interestingly, though, these 'victim' scenes foreground the typical status of Charity's body as active and self-assured, a theatrical embodiment of athletic self-possession. Charity's ostensible weakness, then, is contradicted by the actor's strength in performance, especially in singing and dancing. Her inability to attract and keep a man is contradicted by the appeal of her character to the audience; her awkwardnesses are contradicted by her excellent, strong, and graceful dancing. In this way, *Sweet Charity* repeatedly and insistently enacts a paradox between saying and doing, and, yet, the result is not cynicism: the exuberant

action—the 'doing'—performatively brings feminist possibilities into being. (Wolf 63)

Caroline, or Change does not offer dance numbers that showcase the actors' athleticism, but its sung-through form and the range of vocals demand strong singing voices. Here, the actor's singing performance achieves a similar effect of transforming Caroline into a larger-than-life figure, contradicting the dramatic narrative.

A prime example is when Caroline sings the eleven o'clock number, 'Lot's Wife.' In the Broadway production, Tonya Pinkins appeared on an almost-empty stage to sing about her despair at having to go back to work after a humiliating head-on confrontation with the eight-year-old Noah, which further draws attention to her desperate economic situation. In one critic's words, '[t]he song is an act of psychic demolition' (Lahr), and yet Pinkins' electrifying performance contradicts the song's words and elevates her character to a heroic level, transforming Caroline into a rebellious and assertive figure. Pinkins, who originated the role of Caroline, is a Tony Award winner for *Jelly's Last Jam* and is known for her powerhouse performances. In his otherwise lukewarm review of the production, Ben Brantley highly praises Pinkins's strong performance: 'Ms. Pinkins has never been better than she is here, in an intense, controlled performance [...] Even when confessing her weaknesses to God, she remains formidable. You can see why Noah would idolize her' (Brantley). Critic Adam Feldman, in his rave review, wrote that Pinkins's 'soon-to-be-legendary performance alone would be worth the price of admission' (Feldman). As these critical commentaries attest, the character presented as weak and defeated on the page is transformed into a strong figure on the stage through Pinkins's performance.³

A comparison of the promotional materials for the musical's

3 Pinkins's portrayal of Caroline won her numerous accolades, including a Tony nomination for best performance by a leading actress in 2004 and a Laurence Olivier nomination for Best Actress in a Musical in 2007. She also took home the Obie Award and the Lucille Lortel Award for best actress in a musical. In addition, she won the 2004 Los Angeles Drama Critics Circle Award and the Backstage 'Garland Award' for her performance in *Caroline, or Change*.

two major productions is illustrative of the transformative power of spectacularization and its significance—its Broadway premiere and a Broadway revival production transferred from London’s West End. The original Broadway poster for the musical features an illustration of Caroline, recognizably Tonya Pinkins, during her cigarette break. Dressed in her crisp white uniform and white stockings, Caroline is clutching her right arm with her left hand while holding a cigarette between her fingers. Her profoundly sad facial expression and her slouched shoulders suggest her exhaustion and weariness from a long day of work. Simultaneously, her right hand hanging loosely and the slightly revealed legs—one folded and the other stretched—exude erotic tension. Kushner affirmed the image by observing it is

strangely sexy, there’s something quite sensual about the expression on her face, the lips are slightly parted, her legs are held together in a way that suggests a sensual life, and the dress defines her. There’s something both forbidding and heartbreaking about it, there’s something very robust and erotic. (Kushner and Davis)

By this measure, the poster image creates a powerful counterweight to the stereotypical ‘mammy’ image, subverting the stereotypical image of the grinning, asexual ‘mammy’ (see Thomas). This image was reused for the book cover when the libretto was published and has become most closely associated with the musical. However, this portrait of Caroline remains a literal representation of her, as described in the text.

In contrast, the revival, directed by Michael Longhurst and starring Sharon D. Clarke as the titular character, casts Caroline in a completely different light. The new poster features a photo of Sharon D. Clarke in the middle of a performance. Clarke, who has played the title character since its revival at the Chichester Festival in 2017, followed by a Hampstead Theatre run and a West End run, plans to reprise her Olivier-winning role on Broadway.⁴ The poster features Clarke

⁴ The revival was initially planned to open on Broadway in April, and the show was scheduled to go into previews just the day after the Broadway

standing upright. It is clear she is in the middle of performing 'Lot's Wife' because she is wearing her Sunday dress instead of the white maid's uniform she wears throughout the rest of the performance. Her head is tilted back, with one arm raised in the air; she is singing her heart out. Blue and white stage lighting backlight her, creating a halo-like effect that clearly frames Clarke in a theatrical performance. The image of a powerful diva at a climactic moment in the show depicts unequivocal entertainment, but also captures how Clarke's theatrical labor bleeds into the character, empowering her to ask God to '[t]ear out my heart / strangle my soul / turn me to salt / a pillar of salt / a broken stone' (Kushner 118). While delineating Caroline's character as undefeatable, the image only partially captures the musical's message and the power of spectacularization. On its own, the new promotional material seems to reflect and reiterate the changed attitude toward work since the musical's premier. By stressing the 'show biz' moment of the production, the poster image frames the musical as a glamorous entertainment. Without the transformative power of spectacularization that pries open the gap between the character and actor in the moment of the performance that inform the image, the poster inadvertently collapses the precarious maid with the actor, which, in today's gig economy, is celebrated as flexible and creative. For this reason, the change in the musical's public image points to the urgency and timeliness of investigating labor in theatre, and theatre as a unique and productive site to publicize and interrogate work.

By placing Caroline's work at the center of the stage, *Caroline, or Change* subverts the stereotype of 'mammy' and underscores the Black maid's work as a product of an exploitative capitalist system in the Segregationist South in the 1960s. Through the spectacularization of work, showcasing Caroline and her electronic appliances, the musical

shutdown was announced to contain the spread of COVID-19. In late March, Roundabout Theatre Company's artistic director and CEO Todd Haimel announced that the show's opening was postponed until fall 2020, but it has since been rescheduled for spring 2021. It is reported that Sharon D. Clarke will stay with the production.

transforms the repetitive, mundane drudgery into an object of public appreciation. The musical's place within the capitalist system and the economy of commercial theatre risks glorifying and romanticizing work, rebranding it as a palatable commodity. Yet the musical reveals theatre as a productive site to theorize about the politics of work, in that individualizing discourse around work can be challenged in public spaces, and layers of work that are increasingly becoming naturalized and invisible in the post-Fordist economy are being brought into sharp focus. Therefore, the spectacularization of work in *Caroline or Change* demonstrates that publicizing the individualizing and normalizing forces of work on stage is, indeed, a political project.

Works Cited

- Brantley, Ben. 'Outsiders Bond in a South of Roiling Change'. *New York Times*, 1 December 2003. <<https://www.nytimes.com/2003/12/01/theater/theater-review-outsiders-bond-in-a-south-of-roiling-change.html>>. Accessed 19 August 2020.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. 2nd edition. Routledge, 2014.
- Feldman, Adam. 'Change is Good'. *Time Out*, May 2004, <https://www.timeout.com/newyork/theater/change-is-good>. Accessed 22 August 2020.
- Fisher, James. *Understanding Tony Kushner*. University of South Carolina Press, 2008.
- Hughes, Amy. *Spectacles of Reform: Theater and Activism in Nineteenth-Century America*. University of Michigan Press, 2012.
- Kershaw, Baz. 'Curiosity or Contempt: On Spectacle, the Human, and Activism.' *Theatre Journal* 55.4 (2003): 591–611.
- Kushner, Tony. *Caroline, or Change*. Theatre Communications Group, 2004.
- Kushner, Tony and Paul Davis. Interview with Judith Kampfner, 'The Theater Art of Paul Davis'. *WNYC*, 29 Jul. 2004 <<https://www.wnyc.org/story/85012-the-theater-art-of-paul-davis/>> Accessed 22 August 2020.
- Lahr, John. 'Underwater Blues: History and Heartbreak in 'Caroline, or Change'', *The New Yorker* 79.38 (2003): 122–124. Accessed 25 May 2020.

- McElya, Micki. *Clinging to Mammy: The Faithful Slave in Twentieth-Century America*. Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Mansbridge, Joanna. "'Take Caroline Away": Catastrophe, Change, and the Tragic Agency of Nonperformance in Tony Kushner's *Caroline, or Change*'. *The Journal of American Drama and Theatre*, 31.2 (2019): 1–21.
- McMillin, Scott. *The Musical as Drama*. Princeton University Press, 2006.
- 'Production: *'Caroline, or Change.'* YouTube, uploaded by American Theatre Wing, 8 October 2013, <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TyxZFF7zjRE>> Accessed 19 August 2020.
- Rabaka, Reiland. *Civil Rights Music: The Soundtracks of the Civil Rights Movement*. Lexington Books, 2016.
- Ridout, Nicholas. *Stage Fright, Animals, and Other Theatrical Problems*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Taylor, Millie. *Musical Theatre, Realism and Entertainment*. Routledge, 2012.
- Thomas, Aaron C. 'Engaging an Icon: *Caroline, or Change* and the Politics of Representation.' *Studies in Musical Theatre* 4.2 (2010): 199–210.
- Weeks, Kathi. *The Problem With Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*. Duke University Press, 2011.
- Wolf, Stacy. *Changed for Good: A Feminist History of the Broadway Musical*. Oxford University Press, 2011.