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ABSTRACT: LESSONS FROM AN AFTERMATH


The aftermath is a region that is often associated with disruption, disrepair and trauma. Taking as his departure point his witnessing of the specific aftermath of the September 11th attacks in New York– the author returns to South Africa to locations that are concerned with the aftermath of apartheid and the aftermath of the advent of HIV/AIDS i.e. education and public health. He attempts a method of extracting elements from an aftermath as a form of redemptive critical theory (see Walter Benjamin, Hannah Arendt, Jean L. Cohen and Andrew Arato, Maurizio Passerin D’Entreves) in order to apply a combination of elements into a dialogical method of dramatic practice that might provide opportunities for recovery. This he does through a practice that is based upon participatory research involving participants from a high school and an HIV/AIDS wellness clinic. Over three years, various projects were created in classrooms, in sites on the school-grounds, in the wellness clinic, on a university’s heritage trail and in three urban locations of street, gallery and a neglected apartment building. The methodology that governs the research-projects was framed by a modified case study model (see Robert K. Yin) incorporating three progressive stages of research re-adjusted according to a heuristic principle (see Clark Moustakas) that suggests that the discovery of knowledge might occur from within the realm of the unknown. It is an experiential research process that does not separate the subjective self from the researcher’s pursuit of reflexive knowledge and recovery. Both the author and participants, in order to make and reflect upon the research experience (whose central focus was to record and translate the dramatic practice in question) have used multiple materials. These include journals, video documentation, maps and mapping. Re-reading from these various sources has assisted in the recovery of two significant participants’ voices that have informed the shaping of the written thesis. The thesis has been written as testimony. It incorporates encounters with various crises and various epiphanies experienced within the research. These include: how a narrative of indeterminacy that stems from the locale of an aftermath might provide opportunities for recovery; the engagement with cartography as a way to document and inform the research process and advance it further; the acknowledgement of the self as subject in the research process; how the voice of the participant could assist and sustain the reflexive identity of the researcher; how reproduction can be used to assist the progressive stages of creative practice incorporating application, diffusion and gain; and how change might occur through performing acts of recovery. In the exchange between crisis and epiphany there is a sense of self-revelation, which itself is an allegorical act stimulated by performing recovery. The research therefore has been re-narrated in this thesis to function as part of the system of recovery.
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PREFACE

The Preface is the first and also last thing in a book. It either explains the book’s purpose or else defends it against the attack of critics (Mikhail Lermontov 1966, 19).

It may seem odd that in the work below there is not much in terms of a contextual placing of the field of applied drama and recovery. The embargo on referring to similar kinds of practice was not deliberate. Instead the research deviated from discovering what has already happened to a search for personal regeneration through a subjective-autobiographical perspective in order to prove how searching was also researching. I have discovered how—I myself, Myer Taub—as author and researcher—encountered the challenges of an un-recovered self and recovering identity by making connections with others through drama.

The preface provides a method of navigation for the reader who will read of my concerns about autobiographical reflection in a thesis about applied drama practice. The preface includes instruction on how to read the thesis, its somewhat unconventional apparatus and its accompanying appendices.

Alongside this text is another column of text. This text is called a reflexive frame and forms part of an apparatus that include footnotes, appendices, figures and a set of four DVDs. All these are appendages that are set apart from the main body of text and that reflect various registers and strata of narratives. Though each appendage appears to be separate, there is an interdependency whereby each relates to the other and to the main body of text; urging the reader to cross-reference, to bridge disciplines and furthermore to perform further extractions of information. Further information embedded in another place in the same body of work suggests how these modules of information are a series of interrelated commentaries; commentaries that not only explain further but operate as examples of reflexive text. Reflexivity through critical assessment advances the process of reflection toward becoming an agent of recovery, as the thesis will argue.

The purpose of a multi-modal text is that it encourages the act of reading as a performative act and in doing so positions each of the embedded appendages as agents of recovery.

Therefore to clarify (or to simplify) here are suggestions on how to read these appendages:

This text suggests a way of both seeing and thinking. Later, I define this alternative way of seeing and thinking as a series of thought-images (see p3). This is part of the counter-text operating as a reflexive frame opposite the primary text. This is like an inserted fragment, one that you will see again in various formats, also as images, illustrations and revised arguments placed throughout the thesis. This is about instruction on how to do things. This is the recommendation of doing things differently and of seeing things differently. It is a presentation of innovation. This is the encouragement of different registers on the same page. Captioning and creating different frames whereby the reflexive qualities of this narrative can be enhanced. Reconstructing or repeating narrative through these frames is like the use of flashbacks or cuts forward in a montage of film. You are also invited to watch four DVDs. You can watch the DVD’s at any time: before, during or after your reading of the primary text. Similarly you can turn to my blog: potlatch or return to reflect on the images placed throughout the thesis. There are also several images acquired from visual art that are placed like set pieces throughout my thesis. They serve as stimuli and circumspect markers helping the reader to pause along the terrain so as to consider
- Reflexive frames: As parallel texts, they provide further commentary on the original written text. They were written from a revised–critical perspective. They are to be read with that in mind.

- Footnotes: As additional texts, they provide further information about certain ideas that don’t seem relevant to the key argument of the thesis. But they are relevant and evoke the recovery of knowledge.

- DVDS: These all can be viewed before reading the primary written text, during, or after reading the written text. There are markers that I have placed within the written text that directly refer to the DVDs and therefore provide places where the reader should stop reading and watch an episode from the DVDs. These markers are only suggestive, but they do imply how the cross-referencing between written text and video will amplify the interactive quality of the thesis as a whole.

- Reference to my blog entries should be read as additional reference material.

- Images, illustrations and figures are examples of how images can describe thoughts.

- Appendix: Contains evidence that directly relates to the research described in the primary written text.

This preface provides a way of reading for both reader and writer. In my case as a writer, reading is about revision. I am revising my aforesaid text further by re-reading and thus forming the preface into an approach that will provide a clearer path towards a performative conclusion. In reality, a conclusion cannot do. In the pages ahead, I argue that an aftermath is indeterminate, thus this study and approach as an extrapolation of the aftermath (and of the research) must also remain indeterminate. But that said there are still conclusive outcomes from this research including the position that research is progressive. My research is progressive; because it provides an ongoing questioning of the nature of research.

This thesis is an assemblage of works and ideas that form part of a translation of practice-based research that has involved both public enterprises and private journeys. A central aim is to explore how fragments resulting from an aftermath might be assembled, when using applied drama practice to promote recovery. Such
a practice I have framed as a redemptive critical praxis. It has been presented as a (progressive) text that not only embodies the underpinnings of redemption through transparency and intertextuality but also presents a (central) text whose very rhizomatic nature spawns the other bodies of work that include: i) the invention and implementation of practice, ii) the digital documentation of practice; iii) and how the written reflection of the practice attempts to connect with the work originally made from practice.

To present these interconnections I have submitted the possibility of the multi-text, one that continuously performs readings, readings in one text and then simultaneously in another. Thus there is another commentary alongside this text. A column that might distract the reader with a presentation of multiple discourses but hopefully will also provide an impulse to recover. This presentation in style succeeds in mimicking the strata of aftermath whose pathways are not linear.

Just take your time and read. The only instruction is to waste time while doing so. As Jean Francois Lyotard says: ‘thinking has a single, but irredeemable fault: it is a waste of time’ (1992, 36). As a reader with these texts you are wasting time. You have to think. You have to interact. There is a demand here for an unconventional reading, one that requires a thoroughly multi-modal approach that enacts the multi-modal approach to the research project itself.

I re-approach the data before me, still without complete resolution, but I am confident in suggesting that the creation of alternative models of expression might generate empowerment and even initiate an arbitration of agency in difficult times.

ONE
SECOND MOWING

One can say that disaster times, such as the events of September 11 in the US or the events lived by people in war situations around the world have the power to wipe away everything that one narrowly holds on to—the small measurements devised to keep one’s life on tracks. People who have come out of the disaster speak of ‘waking up’ from sleepwalking and the first thing they realise is that time cannot be bought (Trinh. T. Minh-ha 2005, 76).

AN OVERVIEW

On September 11, 2001, I was living and writing in New York City. I say living and writing because after the events of 9/11, the essence of the one and the schemata of the other broke into fragments. I became what Minh-ha might call a sleepwalker. When I returned to Cape Town, South Africa, to embark on several years of postgraduate studies in drama, I set upon a journey of experimentation that I hoped would challenge the inherited sleep in order to activate a strategy that might promote opportunities for recovery. A search for personal regeneration from this cataclysmic event has meant embarking on an odyssey that has encapsulated drama and narrative and interwoven them into a testimony that is this thesis. The testimony is about self-recovery as much as it is about doing drama in the aftermath. It is a Bildungsroman, of sorts, a narrative that incorporates a journey of self-discovery and a method of doing drama, one in which the author finds himself as the protagonist. My method of doing drama has extended into creating participatory projects within two Cape Town locations: a high school and an HIV/AIDS wellness clinic outside of the theatre; in the everyday world in which people live in the aftermath of apartheid and the aftermath of the advent of HIV/AIDS. Each of the locations and the various projects occurring at these locations were consolidated into a progressive series of case studies. My thesis asks this question: How might a practice of drama and narrative, operating from within aftermath, provide recovery? Explanation of the question occurs in a paradigm that incorporates testimony as it does translation. The question accommodates a system emerging from the research-practice that promotes performing acts of recovery.

Effectively what has been written here is as much about translation as it is about testimony. This is a quest to find an appropriate method and means of translating my research into an accessible written form. Translation in this context is about locating ways to communicate research experience as the manifestation of practice. Hannah Arendt says in The Human Condition (1958):

The whole factual world of human affairs depends for its reality and its continued existence, first, upon the presence of others who have seen and heard and will remember, and, second, on the transformation of the intangible into the tangibility of things (95).

The transformation of experience into the tangible is part of the pursuit of this research. Its purpose is the employment of an appropriate translation of the language of the research, demonstrating how ‘action, speech and thought’ made within the experimentation of the research, might be transformed into an accessible ‘record’ of the research as it ‘documents’ the experiments it experiments upon (ibid.). In turn, translation might also
attempt to provide a means to comprehend the research experience as part of the program towards recovery. In the context of this thesis, translation like testimony is located in the medium of narrative, both have been utilised through the method of drama. The thesis is about a particular kind of dramatic practice. However, the translation of the research itself takes the form of a narrative, a particular kind of storytelling, of testimony.

In this context, making drama and narrative explicit as intersecting concepts is not to issue a statement about drama as content or narrative as form. Rather their relationship is much more complex and interconnected as this thesis shall demonstrate. Their relationship is one of several that include:

- Thought-Images;
- Aftermath and the elements of Fragment, Assemblage and Repository;
- Drama and Testimony;
- Recovery and Non-recovery.

Chapter One, ‘Second Mowing’ also an introduction to the thesis, intends to explore these relationships as recurring and regenerating themes that permeate throughout the work.

Chapter Two, ‘Methodologies at play’ explains how the research was undertaken with several methodologies at play. These two chapters make up Part One also called ‘Second Mowing’ because both themes and methodology integrate the concept of renewal from an aftermath. Part Two is called ‘School’ and comprises of Chapters Three and Four. They describe the research undertaken at the first location of the high school, and the subsequent projects that occurred there. Part Three is called ‘Clinic’ and comprises of three chapters. Chapters Five and Six describe the research undertaken at the second location of the wellness clinic, and its subsequent projects whereas Chapter Seven explains how a system emerging from the final projects incorporates a way of doing drama in an aftermath that proposes opportunities for recovery.

**THOUGHT-IMAGES**

In the first week of September 2001, I was spending time at the New York Public Library, grappling with Walter Benjamin’s idiom, *Denkbilder* (thought-images); while reading Sigrid Weigel’s writing about the framing of image and thought in *Body-and Image-Space* (1996). I intended to use Benjamin’s idiom as a strategy for stimulating visual ideograms as part of a program that would activate dramatic action corresponding to urban narratives. I had identified this idiom as a method that would intend to reveal how expressions of thought made intuitively from images will become tangible when reproduced through a cognitive and physical activation of the thought-image. This is the comprehension of what already seems visible, ‘the image understood as dialectic at a standstill is transformed into writing…’ (Weigel 1996, 52). It is also a meditative practice for thinking in images and deriving thought from images, suggesting how thought and image stimulate each other and assist in solving problems. For ideas can be constructed into images and images can operate as ideas.¹

¹ Weigel helps to explain the difference between image and thought-images through these two observations, this is in relation to Benjamin:

¹¹ ‘Image as likeness, similitude, or resemblance (1996, 23).
In the aftermath of 9/11 along with its sleepwalking affect, I lost both Weigel’s text and the conscious pursuit of Denkbilder. I eventually recovered these through the culmination of my research. Hence the implication recovering from within the ruin, and therefore in the compilation of the thesis is my keenness for using footnotes stimulating the reader to unearth fragments of additional thoughts and ideas, stimulating the explored theme of interactivity.

As much as Benjamin has influenced the construction of theory around thought-images, he has also influenced the basic methodology of redeeming fragments from the ruin. Benjamin belongs to more than one school of critical thought, much to his credit various schools, located in both modern and postmodern traditions, lay claim to his thinking. One such school is redemptive criticism. Redemptive criticism is a term I encountered in Jean L. Cohen and Andrew Arato’s *Civil Society and Political Theory* where they write in a chapter on Hannah Arendt and the normative critique:

Thus, like Walter Benjamin, Arendt consciously practices a form of redemptive criticism that, for the sake of a possible future, attempts to save some valued aspects of the past from perceived disintegration of tradition, including the tradition of modernity (1992, 178).

Benjamin recurs in the translations of the thoughts and images I have placed in my thesis, governed by the concept of ‘the translation of the language of things into that of words’ (Weigel 1996, 51). Often I have used images from visual arts to provide examples or even direction in my reading and composition of theory. This is not a thesis of the visual arts; instead I am trying to undergo an interdisciplinary approach to theory, an approach that assumes the position of multi-informed thought over autocratic theory.

Part of the problem is the postmodern condition with its schizophrenia of theory. It is no longer simple to declare a framework and then comment on it as total theory with authenticity. Theories inform theory. Practice also informs theory as much as theory informs practice. However, theory attempts to enclose practice whereas practice can pierce through theory. In the dialogue between theorists Gilles Deleuze and Michel Foucault, Deleuze suggests that theory will detour becoming a wall that practice might puncture. This consideration serves to highlight multiplicity and how it can have a generative effect on the research. When practice punctures theory, it causes further pollination of multiple theories. It is worth quoting at length:

> Possibly, we’re in a process of experiencing a new relationship between theory and practice. At one time, practice was considered an application of theory, a consequence; at other times, it had an opposite sense and it was thought to inspire theory, to be indispensable for the creation of future theoretical forms. In any event, their relationship was understood in terms of the process of totalisation. For us however the question is seen in a different light. The relationships between theory and practice are more partial and fragmentary. On one side, a theory is always local and related to a limited field, and it is applied in another sphere, more or less distant from it. The relationship, which holds in the application of theory, is never one of resemblance. Moreover, from the moment a theory moves into its proper domain, it begins to encounter obstacles and blockages which require its relay by another type of discourse (it is through this other discourse that it eventually passes to a different domain). Practice is a set of relays from

---

\[^{1}\] The combination between thought and images provides ‘a double sense: as images in relation to which his thoughts and theoretical reflections unfold, and also as images whose representations are translated into figures of thought…’ (1996, 51).
one theoretical point to another, and theory is a relay from one practice to another. No theory can develop without eventually encountering a wall, and practice is necessary for piercing this wall (1977, 206).

Multiple theories generating out of the operation of practice means the emerging system can sustain itself as a network as practice continues to puncture theory. I shall argue later how drama is a rhizomatic system. This illustrates how the research framework is a synthesis of multiple theories and generative practices, suggesting not only mediation towards multiplicity but towards an infinite form. I am hesitant to endorse multiple practices. Practice might cause multiplicity (multiple theory and multiple methodology) but in the context of this research, drama is the central practice employed as the central action even though it is a system in itself that is suggestively rhizomatic.

Despite the diversity of theory there is still a common thread located in Cohen and Arato’s formulation, one that suggests recognition of the indeterminate in the present through the synthesis of thought and image in order to comprehend fragments of the past. The best and most suitable example of this is from Benjamin’s own thoughts on an image drawn by Paul Klee in 1920 and purchased by Benjamin in 1921.²

Fig. 1.1. Angelus Novus. 1920. (Israel Museum, Jerusalem).

Benjamin, inspired by the sole image in Klee’s ink and chalk drawing of a flattened, geometric angel whose wings and digits curl backward, writes:

An angel looking as though he is about to move away from something he is fixedly contemplating. His eyes are staring, his mouth is open, his wings are spread. This is how one pictures the angel of history. His face is turned towards the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls

² Benjamin bequeathed the Angelus Novus to Gershom Scholem, Kabbala scholar and friend. On Scholem’s death, the Israel Museum in Jerusalem bought the drawing from Scholem’s wife, Fania in 1987 as part of their collection. Presently it is stored in the museum’s print and fine art collection. I had the opportunity to see the drawing when the museum’s print department retrieved it from its archive at my request but I had barely an hour to study it. (April 15 2008). The image is arresting simple but deceptively so, appearing at first like an etching, it demands that the viewer makes a closer observation in order to take in its wash of colored chalks, earthy tones and geometric symbols that are the surface of the angel. The angel is drawn with an erotic sense of disrepair; it has a handsome face with broken teeth and curling hair appearing like fragile, biblical scrolls. After the short viewing, the curators carefully took the drawing away back to the basement, echoing this fragility.
it in front of his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise; it has got caught in his wings with such violence that the angel can no longer close them. The storm irresistibly propels him into the future to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. This storm is what we call progress (1968b, 257–258).

The single image of Klee’s angel at first might suggest simplicity but Benjamin illuminates Klee’s image with profundity, urging the viewer to delve further to discover how Klee’s angel is an assemblage of geometric fragments evoking an aerial map of puzzles and codes. This labyrinthine view of Klee’s angel mirrors and completes Benjamin’s detritus like a landscape of one single catastrophe. Benjamin’s thoughts on the image illuminate the image providing further visibility of thought and of image.

Fig. 1.2. Detail of Angelus Novus (Israel Museum, Jerusalem).

At even closer inspection, Klee has hung a small key around his angel’s neck. This key suggestively might help to unlock the enigmas associated with the angel. Benjamin’s own challenge to probe deeply is a method connected to redemptive criticism, a method Arendt likens to ‘a pearl diver who descends to the bottom of the sea, not to excavate the bottom and bring it to light but to pry loose the rich and strange’ (1968, 51).

The method of the excavation of fragments lies in the synthesis between thought and image and in the undertaking of an unknown path in doing so.³ It occurs in Arendt’s description of Benjamin’s ‘delving’ like thinking in ‘the depth of the sea’ that will bring to light ‘thought fragments’ (1968, 51). Klee says ‘Art does not render the visible but makes visible’ (Muchawsky-Schnapper 1990, 56). Making visible from the unknown is a tenet of this thesis that I shall argue can occur when assisted by the coordination of thought and image. It is a line of thinking pursued as part of a heuristic process and part as translating research. Benjamin has said this of translation: ‘Just as the manifestations of life are intimately connected with the phenomenon of life without

³ This redemptive method is how Maurizio Passerin D’Entreves describes his observations of Arendt, who finds similarities between Benjamin and Martin Heidegger’s thinking-between ‘destructive hermeneutics’ and ‘a digging quality’, ‘where in order to recover original meaning of our categories we had to do violence to the philosophical tradition in which they were embedded. Here fragments ‘could be saved and lifted through “deadly impact” of new thought’ (1994, 32–33). The act of redemption is to redeem fragments through alternative thought that breaks off from tradition. This is a movement described by Passerin D’Entreves as one where ‘we must move within the gap without any secure sense of direction without any help of any established principle’ (29).
being of importance to it, a translation issues from the original-not so much from its life as from its afterlife’ (1968a, 71). From Klee’s image, *Angelus Novus*, Benjamin issues a thesis pictured as ‘the angel of history’ (1968b, 257). Benjamin’s translation is active; it inhabits and informs the image, as its afterlife from which there is resonance. Thought has multiplied an image into images.

Benjamin’s translation of Klee’s angel also resonates with a catastrophic event such as 9/11. An event that had disrupted my own personal pursuit of a particular kind of narrative, one that I hoped would utilise thought and image in a relationship corresponding between practicing drama and making narrative. The struggle in the aftermath of 9/11 lies in the acceptance of the absence of things and the interdeterminate. Like Benjamin’s allegory of Klee’s angel, the absent skyscrapers remain entrapped within their own debris, growing ‘skyward’ (Benjamin 1968b, 257–258). The collapse of the Twin Towers has joined Benjamin’s illumination of history. Gershom Scholem’s reading of Benjamin’s ‘angel of history’ indicates how ‘Benjamin’s meaning includes the Kabbalistic concept of *tikkun*, the messianic restoration and repair which mends and restores the original breaking of things, and of history as well, after they have been smashed and corrupted by the breaking of the vessels’ (1977, 233). This spirit of repair indicates the wish to ‘make whole what has been smashed’ (Benjamin 1968b, 255) when one encounters or experiences fragments in the aftermath.

In the aftermath of 9/11 I had thought that the investigation of the *Denkbilder* had dissipated. However, I now suspect that the use of visual referencing and diagrammatic presentation in the thesis represents the recovery of the lost device of the thought-images as a way of translating the research itself into an accessible mode of language. There are thought-images placed throughout the thesis. Many of these are images from art while others are diagrammatic and visual examples derived from the participatory projects that I, with other participants, worked to create from the case studies. All these thought-images are interlocutors as much as they are fragments. The position of an interlocutor in narrative suggests an interruptive informality as a way of guiding meaning that might be lost in the formal and traditional presentation of language.

Thought-images in the thesis have been translated into models, maps and equations and thoughts have been translated from images. These are cognitive as they attempt to link thought to image as a means towards a translation of the practice of drama made within the research.

---

4 A note for the reader to consider when reading the thought-images: i.) Scrutiny: how to closely observe the image. This is motivated post Benjamin; ii.) Ambiguity: how the image is ambiguous because of the various categories of perception (Dirk J Van Den Berg 2004); and iii.) ‘*Punctum*’ in which, Roland Barthes (1993) asserts how an image in a photograph has the impetus to unsettle an apparent focus beyond its frame. Reading the image can be instinctive and interpretative in fielding the thought-images in the context of this thesis. It is not meant to encode or commodify beyond the frame of reference, which is to guide and translate the research assisting the testimony here as evidence and documentation of the work made.
I took this image with my analogue camera soon after the attack on the first tower of the World Trade Centre. In the distance, there is what looks like a faint plume of smoke. The smoke was the dust that soon veiled the city. Then there was absence from silence. Even in the silence the effect of silence was gone. This is the starting point of a method that is an attempt to bear witness. It has taken me six years to recover this photograph from the 9/11 aftermath, think about it and scan it, reproducing it as a (digital) thought-image.

Bearing witness is the attempt of the self to position itself subjectively on a plane of agency, instead of merely being the object of the event. This shift of the self suggests a commitment to one’s own observation about one’s experience (As indicated above in fig. 1.3.). The personal testimony of the aftermath of 9/11 is important because it is the starting point on an empirical plane; even if it is merely a premise towards possible conclusiveness. Personal testimony does imply the beginning of the autonomy of the self. It is a personal narrative that assumes a position of self-reflexivity as my own journey detours from witness to researcher and thereafter to analyst of the research itself.

AFTERMATH

Aftermath is an uneasy term for an uneasy, yet regenerative terrain. Increasingly it reverberates with catastrophe although it is not something strictly negative. It is a consequence after an initial cataclysm and a result that procures change. The Oxford English Dictionary defines aftermath as a noun meaning: the consequences of an unpleasant event. Its origin is from dialect: math translated as mowing. This particular origin suggests a meaning that draws from agriculture, suggesting not only regeneration after harvesting but also gleaning from the regeneration like a second mowing. A second mowing can occur when there is a positive effect from within an aftermath, like re-engaging with the ruin in order to produce catharsis, healing, and possibly recovery.

To a certain extent I am paraphrasing Susan Brison here who writes in her book, Violence and the Remaking of the Self: ‘Working through, or remastering, traumatic memory (in the case of human inflicted trauma) involves a shift from being the object or medium of someone else’s (the perpetrator’s) speech (or other expressive behavior) to being the subject of one’s own’ (2002, 68).

Richard Schechner, in his contemporary study of performance, says: ‘The continuing life of a performance is its aftermath’ (2002, 211). His argument is a desire for a corporeality of performance long after its completion. The performance extends as an event operating as re-experience of the event as and within aftermath. Because aftermath might be so ‘open ended’, any kind of re-experience of a performance manifests itself as Schechner suggests in a multiplicity of reconstructions, doing so with immediacy, memory, replay, word of mouth, from the archive, by management of spin, precedence and even myth (211–213). The paradigm of performance within aftermath might also be an allegorical proposition promoting re-engagement with different kinds of experience located within aftermath as lessons to be learnt. These are not prescriptive lessons (like an itemised list of how to learn or heal from aftermath) but are experiential responses gained through re-engagement with the consequence of the original experience (like redeeming fragments from the ruin).

**Fragment**

Fragment is a noun and verb, meaning respectively: a part broken off or to break. Its origins are Latin, from *fragmentum*–from *franger*: to break. Fragment is the thing I found in the aftermath. It was a broken thing. A disrupted object. It was both dead and alive, perhaps something that Jacques Derrida would call a zombie or an ‘undecidable’ (see Derrida; cited Collins and Mayblin 1996,48). The fragment has a Lazarus effect. It has witnessed the dead and is still living but not alive. This implies that even though fragments are damaged or broken, when they are depicted as interrupted entities–they still have the potential of a life force. Various disciplines, including applied theatre, archeology, art discourse and narrative therapy, study fragments. In the following section, I refer to various theories about the fragment made across disciplines. In every reference there is a sense that despite its brokenness the fragment still contains a source of life and the possibility of a continued narrative.

In his own practice of applied theatre James Thompson frequently uses the term ‘action fragment’ (2003, 154–156). According to Thompson: ‘Acting and performing are the deliberate construction of action from gestural, vocal and physical chunks taken from your own and others’ experience’ (156). Thompson explains how in his process ‘each group must start by finding fragments of their own actions of which they can remember the root or history’ (154). His practice does not concentrate on fragments from aftermath but locates the fragment in more generalised terms: made in relation to the body, relating to the minute actions made by the body and embodied as mnemonic marks on the body. This process signifies the fragment, how the fragment resists dormancy and can be reactivated and even remade along with other forms such as performative action.

Whether the fragments can evolve into planned allegorical systems or iconic synecdoche is still up for interpretation because some say there is always agitation in their make-up. Judith Herman explains in *Trauma and Recovery* that ‘traumatic symptoms have a tendency to become disconnected from their source and take

---


8. Fragments have agitation in their makeup because their life force is interrupted. There is a combination of a yearning for life, a sense of un-fulfillment and a celebration of what once was whole. These are permutations that instigate agitation. Art theorist, Linda
on a life of their own’ (1992, 34). She describes how this tendency is a ‘kind of fragmentation whereby trauma tears apart a complete system of self-protection that normally functions in an integrated fashion and is central to the historic observations on post-traumatic stress disorder’ (35). The forms of post-traumatic narratives are fragmented as much as they have content filled with disconnected fragments (Apfelbaum 2002; Feirstein 2003). This means that the structure of post-traumatic narrative is broken as much as the content of the narrative itself is broken.

Elizabeth Harris, who investigates the romantic phenomenon of the planned fragment in European literature and landscape of the late eighteenth century, suggests that although the fragment is broken from the larger whole: ‘it is not necessarily opposed to some existing or imagined whole’ (1994, 8). Fragments in this case might not only suggest mourning for the whole but also embody an allegory for mourning itself. In other words, the fragment embodies its previous existence as part of the whole and simultaneously transmits a longing for the whole, thereby becoming a symbol of loss and longing, of and for the whole.

In post-9/11 studies there are attempts to uncover meaning from the fragment. Margaret R. Yocom in her analysis of the fragments found at the spontaneous memorial made at the site where the Pentagon was attacked observes how: ‘The fragmented mementoes at the memorial pressed visitors to experience presence and absence in conversation with another’ (2006, 83). This juxtaposition signifies the access fragments have to the infinite, what Yocom herself considers by referring to Edmond Jabès who muses: ‘Only in fragments can we read immeasurable totality’ (1993, 42).

According to Caroline Kitsch who studied 20 media cases occurring immediately after 9/11, there are three distinct phases dramatised through the enactment of ritual and ceremony and then legitimised through acts of mourning. These belong to ‘transition rituals’: and they are ‘separation, transformation (or liminality) and aggregation’ (2003, 215).

All I could see was all the fire and smoke and bits of building and paper floating around like confetti; ‘Then the smoke cloud swallowed us all. We could barely breathe. I had ashes in my mouth’ (U. S. News & World Report, 2001, p. 46; cited by Kitsch 2003, 217).

The ‘bits of building’ and paper-like ‘confetti’ are the fragments in the testimony used by Kitsch to describe the transitional phases of separation. The first person singular narrative in the testimony becomes inclusive of the first person plural: ‘All I could see’ suddenly turns into ‘We could hardly breathe’ then back to ‘I had ashes in my mouth’ indicating the phases of transformation and aggregation.

---

Nochlin implies that the fragment in the aftermath of the French Revolution was celebrated as an example of the overthrown past. ‘The fragment, for the Revolution and its artists rather than symbolising nostalgia for the past, enacts the deliberate destruction of the past or at least the pulverization of what were perceived to be its repressive traditions’ (1994, 8). These permutations enabled a visual and literary rhetoric of modernism; of solemnising the amputee, prizing collections of remnants from vandalised statues and displaying an iconography of beheadings and destruction. But Nochlin also agrees that the “issue of relationship” [in regards to fragments] “gets posed, sometimes in new and paradoxical ways”’ (Yocom 2006, 82; citing Nochlin 1994, 43).
This image taken a few days after 9/11 is a transitional image. Kitsch’s three phases are all present here. This young man has his patriotic armband tied around and transforming his right elbow and his back is turned to the camera. He faces a collage of the missing. His is a symbolic act of aggregation, but it is the paper fragments that suggest, not only the phase of separation but also, transformation into vulnerability like the missing themselves. Yocom sees fragments and ‘the terrain of loss that results from them’ as ‘the wellspring of art, the bloody ground from which art gives birth to itself’ (2006, 82-83).

Fragmentation is the immediate condition in the wake of separation. Its effect produces long lasting disconnected forms. Fragments in an aftermath can take on any form, plastic or abstract but all remain disconnected. Interaction with a fragment can induce transformation of the fragment; the fragment becomes an object of the interaction and hence it mutates.

Fragments can become objects of empathy. When placed together they assemble spontaneous shrines that occur in an aftermath.
Kitsch describes objects occurring in shrines like ‘candles, flowers, flag pins, and poems and drawings taped to park fences’ (2003, 215). The objects at the shrines have a fluid narrative in that they still signal a sense of disconnection in their juxtaposition, joined and isolated simultaneously expressing what they might and have become. Yocom describes the dialogue evoked by fragments – as that between ‘absence and presence, the finite and the infinite’ (2006, 82).

Fig. 1.6. An active fragment activated within an interactive treasure hunt.

The fragment in the image above was made later in a project called (in)Heritage in Cape Town, September 2006. The project arose out of the second case study. The porcelain fragment made by ceramicist Lisa Firer was one in a series of commissioned porcelain fragments. Hidden as treasure, the fragments completed part of an interactive treasure hunt corresponding with a series of performances at each heritage site along the Heritage Trail of the University of Cape Town campus. Persons working with visual or performance art utilised each of the heritage sites by initiating individual happenings in an attempt to dismantle the monument. Maps of the university’s original architecture were stamped on to the porcelain fragments. The symbolism is multilayered but what is even more significant is how the fragment as a conceptual form mutated from the original event. The event became progressive. It inspired interactivity, collaboration, exchange, and a transformation of narrative. Throughout this process, the fragment changed. Once recovered it became something else, a new object with new value.9 Yocom refers to Lippard who ‘focuses on the fragment’s role in creating a new whole:

---

9 Lewis Hyde’s historical commentary claims that the process of ritualised fragmentation signifies an accrual of value. Hyde describes the ceremonial destruction of copper reified in ritual by the Tsimshian tribe of North America. During the Tsimshian ‘feast of the dead’, which honours a dead chief and his heir, ‘a masked dancer would come forward and instruct the new chief to break it into pieces and give the pieces to his guests’ (2006, 32–33). The giving of the fragments as gifts adds value to the disembodiment of the whole, suggesting how the transaction might lead to a form of restitution of the dead and the lost. The Kwakiutl tribes, as Lewis reports in citing Frantz Boaz’s historical accounts, also break the copper and throw the fragments out into the sea. Often the fragments were not lost but ‘were saved and continued to circulate’ (33). If someone succeeded in gathering up the parts of dismembered copper, Boaz reports that these were ‘riveted together and the copper attained an increased value’ (ibid.). Assembling the fragments is not only an acknowledgment of the value of the fragment but also of the spirit of life for, as Lewis suggests, ‘the spirit of the gift increases because the body of the gift is consumed’ (34).
“Fragmentation need not connote explosion, disintegration. It is also a component of networks, stratification, the interweaving of many dissimilar threads, and de-emphasis on imposed meaning in favor of multiple interpretations’’(2006, 83).

ASSEMBLAGE

Giles Delueze and Felix Guattari describe the term assemblage as territory that ‘is made of decoded fragments of all kinds’ (1987, 555), but the territory is more than what it holds and what surrounds it and it is more than ‘mere “behavior”’ (ibid.). Originally the term is derived from the discipline of archeology. The Penguin Dictionary of Archeology refers to:

A group of objects of different types found in close association with each other. Where assemblage is frequently repeated and covers a full range of human activity, it is described as culture; when it is repeated but limited in its content, e.g. flint tools only, an industry (Bray and Trump 1970).

Mike Pearson and Michael Shanks in Theatre / Archaeology suggest: ‘A series of modes and methods of affiliation are common to both archaeological and performative assemblage’ (2001, 55). Thus their pointing to a similarity in the practice of performance and archeology, from the excavation of fragments to the composition / orchestration / arrangement of the fragments as an act of assemblage indicates how assemblage is a heterogeneous social practice. Any activity that engages or performs engagement with fragments is assemblage what Thompson might call ‘the creative reworking of fragments of action’ (2003, 156).

When a fragment is represented in juxtaposition with another, metamorphosis of the fragments occurs. The act of assemblage by working with the fragment indicates restitution and redemption. Active re-engagement with the fragments makes it possible to assemble the fragments and therefore associates restitution with increasing the value of the fragment. Once composed, the fragments take on the form of a new body. How the assembled body is represented will often inspire problems of difference or even strangeness. The act of assembling suggests that the assembled body is not the same as before, therefore making it impossible to ignore the rhetorical concerns of curators Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel, about generating new meaning (more than what the meaning currently is–as Deleuze and Guattari suggest) through recreation.

This problem of composition is not only theoretical but also artistic: Through which devices and visual tricks, through which original media with which metaphors, in which language can you produce the simultaneous presence of those assembled and of the bizarre new entity that is generated out of their assembling? (2005, 160)

Assemblage similarly is like a mode of translation since it is the putting together of things from dislocated meanings. The assemblage will restore meaning even if it is not as it was before.
Benjamin says:

Fragments of a vessel which are glued together must match one another in the smallest details, although they need not to be like one another. In the same way a translation, instead of resembling the meaning of the original, must lovingly and in detail incorporate the meaning of the original's mode of signification, thus making the original and the translation recognizable as fragments of a greater language, just as fragments are part of a vessel (1968a, 78).

Assemblage enables the fragments to stem into new, regenerative, imaginative, and ultimately constructive social (playing) spaces. The assemblage of fragments, their interaction, transforms fragments into narratives. Both the reconstructed form of the narrative as well as the content of the narrative can reflect on the cataclysmic event and the experience before the aftermath.

Fig. 1.7. The porcelain fragment recovered as an object of value.

REPOSITORY

Traditionally repositories are containers that hold the recreated body of assembled fragments for safekeeping. What distinguishes a repository from a non-repository is that a non-repository will be unable to store things. Examples of repositories include: cabinets of curiosity, voodoo altars, landscapes of history, salvage sculpture, box-art, beading, testimony, family trees, journals, bodies, maps, communities, curricula, classrooms and cities. (see note 10). Repositories are more than just vessels or structures; they are a way towards sustaining the process of restoration, restitution, and redemption that has begun with the act of assemblage. Not all repositories are restorative, restitutive or redemptive because not all repositories are positive and the qualities of repositories rely on subjective experience.

In Kitsch’s third transitional phase of aggregation there is a loose association of the collected parts. Parts are held together because the collective aim is to promote a renewed system of beliefs, ‘renewal of faith in social values and a commitment to get on with life as a group’ (2003, 215). It might seem that an actual
repository assists in sustaining the collective embrace of fragments. Often this embrace is fluid and symbolic suggesting an imagined solidarity of things that is more abstract than actual. When the repository was utilised during the case studies it was usually experienced as made up of more fluid and abstract relationships of things rather than fixed or actual ones. I am suggesting a less simplistic definition of the repository. It is a vessel that is more than a container, something that is more metaphorical, thus the possibility of replicating an experiential repository – emotionally / internally and through memory. Imaginative repositories still appear to have real restitutive functions. Saphira Linden reflects upon this in her paper, ‘Aiko: Drama Therapy in the Recovery Process of a Japanese/Korean–American Woman’ (1997), which addresses aspects of recovery in relation to a specific drama therapy workshop. In the workshop, several participants imagined ‘a positive container in which more difficult relations can be addressed’ (195); it is with this container–like repository that the participants were able to recover painful memories along with a process of memory, song, and meditations from Zen Buddhism.

In fact, in my earlier Masters investigation, I first utilised the repository as a dramatic structure that could guide the assemblage of literary fragments into creating a play text. The key concept here was that the play texts acting as repositories could accommodate both listener and storyteller alike taking them to realigned sites consisting of fragmented events where alternate histories could be told through a dramatic sequence of manipulated narrative.10

Similarly fragment, assemblage, and repository when structured together transform into three stages that indicate a sequence of interrelationships. These I have extracted as three symbolic elements connoted as $f$, $a$ and $r$ and compressed them into an imaginary equation in order to assist understanding narratives from and in an aftermath.

---

10 My earlier investigation was informed by the work of historians, Kirsten Harstrup and Alessandro Portelli who have both calculated in their own right that recounting one’s own version of the past suggests the creation of one’s own mythology as an alternate version of history. They both call this method and place: *Uchronia* (see Harstrup 1992, 113; Portelli 1991, 99). The discovery of such a variable meant assembling fragments into a repository so that one can transcend to an alternate landscape of history. The present investigation differs in that it poses a question about recovering meaningful narratives from fragmented landscapes that have been traversed through by participatory research made outside specific literary conventions of creating dramatic text.
I inserted the imaginary equation, fragment plus assemblage equals repository, \((f+a=r)\) at the first location of the high school. The original intent of the equation was that it would act as a dialogical code in order to create a practical, tangible, user-friendly apparatus similar to Paulo Freire’s dialogical strategy for education, as stated by Denis Goulet in his introduction to Freire’s *Education for Critical Consciousness* (1990):
Associate an entire population to the task of codifying total reality into symbols, which can generate critical consciousness and empower them to alter their relations with nature and social forces (9).

The imaginary equation \((f+a=r)\) worked not only to guide but also stimulated participants to understand and work with the elements that I had identified as active in the locale of the aftermath. It became the foundation for the participatory projects engineered at the high school.

It was drama as practice that provided the platform for experimenting with \((f+a=r)\), revealing the imaginary equation’s potential for stimulating narrative while simultaneously exposing the equation’s idiosyncrasies.

DRAMA

Journal entry # 9 Friday 26 May 2006

Walking across the city, spot a headline that says something about a fraudulent doctor… start to feel uneasy about my quest. There is still doubt and no form. I arrive early maybe I am anxious. Yoga is going on upstairs. So Nonhla and I talk. (Nonhla is the gatekeeper). She asks, ‘What is drama really?’ Meaning, I imagine, she is asking what is drama? I explain using the yoga upstairs as an example that drama is an animal like a mouse that is watching the cat copy the man doing Yoga but the mouse doesn’t run away only laughs at the cat and then does the same. I think about this explanation, feeling guilty I have borrowed it from someone else (Mieke Bal the narratologist). I think about words, codes, being too clever and getting lost. I go upstairs. I try to be simple. Let’s act as animals for the next hour, animals that can tell stories about other animals. (Simple?)

The above journal entry, written during my work at the wellness clinic forms part of my field notes made since the start of my research.11 This extract raises several themes in the employed multidisciplinary approach, including:

- Urban exploration: ‘walking across the city’;
- The crises experienced within researcher as self: ‘doubt and no form’;
- Labyrinthine detours and incubations: ‘being too clever and getting lost’;
- The application of narratology: ‘the mouse that is watching the cat copy the man’;
- The question of dramatic practice: ‘what is drama really?’

It is this last question about drama located within my own dramatic practice that suggests that drama is a particularly challenging mode in determining how to transcribe and analyse my intuitive tacit knowledge of it. Making meaning from drama places my investigation within the context of dramatic practice. Drama means action. And more extensively as Arendt suggests:

The specific revelatory quality of action and speech, the implicit manifestation of the agent and speaker, is so indissolubly tied to the living flux of acting and speaking that it can be represented and ‘reified’ only through repetition, the imitation or mimesis, which according to Aristotle prevails in all arts but is actually appropriate only to the drama, whose very name

11 My most recent journal entries, made in response to the drama meetings at the wellness clinic, have been posted on my blog site: potlatch@uct.blog.ac.za.
(from the Greek verb *dran*-to act) indicates that play-acting actually is an imitation of acting. But the imitative element lies not only in the art of the actor, but as Aristotle rightly claims, in the making and writing of the play, at least to the extent that drama comes fully to life only when it is enacted in the theater (1958, 187).

Drama does not necessarily only have to come alive, as Arendt argues, in the enclosed place of theatre, nor is it only the imitation of acting. Rather drama can also be the live imitation of action occurring anywhere beyond the enclosure of the theatre. To consider enactment beyond the enclosure, I want to point out Helen Nicholson, who in her book *Applied Drama: The Gift of Theatre* (2005), proposes how applied drama includes ‘forms of dramatic activity that primarily exist outside conventional mainstream theatre institutions, and which are specifically intended to benefit individuals, communities and societies’ (Nicholson 2005, 2). Nicholson expands upon her definition by mentioning James Thompson, who practices with the terminology of ‘Applied Theatre’, which he defines as ‘the practice of theatre where it is least expected’ (Thompson 2003, 15). Both terms, as in drama / theatre are often used alongside each other and interchangeably when the word ‘applied’ becomes their prefix. This is because the fields of ‘Applied Drama’ and Applied Theatre’ are relatively new and are also hybrid and interdisciplinary (see Nicholson 2005, 2–3). In my own practice, I was at first more comfortable with the term ‘Applied Drama’ because it suggests ‘activity’ rather than ‘place’. My notion of activity means – beginning and then making – drama projects that are fluid and inclusive. I abstract dramatic practice from the place of theatre and reconnect this abstraction by applying it onto other fields of practice. Later, on reflection, I realised that the application of drama is an interchangeable practice as it is progressive, and the practice can move from applied drama to applied theatre to applied performance. At first there is dramatic activity and when placed or contextualised – within a setting – it becomes theatricalised emplacement. The emplaced activity might also perform by putting forward an idea. In my case the written thesis has become an application of performance, meaning how the text itself performs a rendition of recovery.

‘Applied Drama’ like ‘Applied Theatre’ is often used as an umbrella term for an assortment of interventionist drama practice including the areas of:

drama as social and cultural ritual; community-based performance; performance and place-making; Theatre of the Oppressed; theatre in prisons and probation; Drama and Theatre in Education; heritage interpretation and museum theatre; refugee theatre; theatres of war and reconciliation (Online: Kerrie Schaef, 2007).

Assortments like the one above do not help in providing a context for applied drama; instead the clutter of practices suggests an equivocal collection of various terminologies and hierarchies.12 What is the common umbrella-like-surface that links each of the various drama practices? Is it intent for transformation? Or is it

---

12 This problem with the prefix ‘applied’ is that it presents alongside it a terminology that might be indefinable. I reflect upon this as ‘an application of definition’, posted as an entry on the Drama For Life website. (2008). It was perplexity I experienced while attending the Africa Research Conference in Applied Drama and Theatre, in November 2008, presented by the University of the Witwatersrand, Wits School of the Arts and its Drama for Life Programme. In my opinion, there was an increasing and intermittent demand for definitions throughout the conference. And these demands (often unsaid) occurred at almost every address, panel or presentation; definitions did not come announced at this conference and yet on the floor there was growing concern about them. Furthermore, I now suggest in absorbing the strata of my sketch (post conference) that the challenge is a protean application of definition: ‘Making drama so as to change the shape of pre-determined things in order to benefit others, (so as not do harm) and in doing so–make theatre where its least expected.’ (see Taub: Online 2008).
about therapeutic change? I do recognise that in drama–therapy, as practiced by the South African Association of Drama Therapists (SAAD: see www.dramatherapy.co.za), and in the answers provided to questions I posed to two South African drama therapists, Heather Schiff and Paula Kingwill (whose answers I have contextualised later in this chapter on pp.35;39) as well as in the observations I have made from the work of Phil Jones, there is a specific application of drama practice that is linked to a therapeutic intention. But my own application of drama practice was not sanctioned by Jones’s therapeutic standards that include ‘the exploration of areas problematic to clients followed by closure’ (Phil Jones 1996, 7). Because in my practice there was an exploration of areas problematic to the practitioner and there was never closure. Rather my practice was more similar to Nicholson’s view that ‘practitioners act out of altruism as well as self-interest’ (cited in Kristine Leahey 2006, 196). The position of the self, allegorical and recovered in my own practice, might provoke as well as unsettle the binding of altruism connecting each of the applied drama varieties. But the concern of self in relation to the other (as subject and participant) suggests how the various applications of dramatic practice are linked by interrogating how the self operates alongside the other, for the practice of drama is about interrelationships.

On a blog called teachingapplieddrama (see Palatine workshop 2008), where there are more questions posted than answers, there is however one clear statement that indicates how applied drama practice is an interdisciplinary activity that ‘explores a process of public and private dialogue which exists as the membrane of “society and self” and seems, therefore, inevitably political’ (Online: 2007). What is political is that the practice occurs outside of an institutional framework of theatre. In my case the relationship between self and society was discovered internally, metaphysically, aided with an extraction from the Avant-garde Japanese theatre director, Terayama Shuji’s manifesto, ‘The Labyrinth and the Dead Sea: My Theatre’ (2005):

Theatres are neither buildings nor facilities. They are ideological ‘places’ in which dramatic encounters are created. Any place can become a theatre, and any theatre is merely part of the scenery of everyday life until a drama is created there (287).

Shuji urges embracing the ‘concepts of theatres as aspects of inner reality’ and ‘to organise the power of the imagination in order to transform all places into theatres – (ibid.).

The relationship between performing in a public space and creating autonomous also more private like activities (like performing acts of recovery within the public space) has developed from working with a method of making and experimenting with drama from and within places that are not theatres and participating with volunteers who are not professional actors and therefore making theatre where it is least expected. It starts with doing drama in the non-theatrical locations of a high school and a wellness clinic. What occurs is the application of drama within an aftermath that is significant to these locations. The amplification of this kind of practice then

13 Dramatic encounter in the non-theatrical place is considered a ‘distortion’ of the conventional theatrical place (Weigel 1996, 46). Weigel refers to Foucault’s concept of ‘drama staged in an unlocated theatre’ (45). Unlocated theatre presents a concept that is not fixed by place. It stages (dramatic) confrontations and (dramatic) problems in unlocated places in order to interrogate traditions of place and history.
advances by performing acts of recovery in public spaces, which takes into consideration several political and metaphysical concerns. These include Setha M. Low’s assessment of the contemporary effectiveness of public space operating post-9/11. Low’s assessment is one I have utilised in a model with an appropriated term called ‘the rights of publicness’ (2002, 165). This template assisted my understanding of the effectiveness of eventually making projects in public places. Criteria of analysis include i.) Access: the right to remain; ii) Freedom of action: to carry on activities; iii.) Claim: the ability to take over the space and its resources; iv.) Change: to change the environment and; v.) Ownership: an ability to self reflect and analyse. Low’s model also relates to Arendt’s concerns of ‘the loss the world, by which Arendt means the restriction and elimination of the public sphere’ (Passerin D’Entreves 1994, 28).

In the eventual aftermath of the above applications, what remains is the translation of the activities of my scheme of drama narrated through testimony. In order to understand this scheme of drama I feel compelled to further unravel the dramatic system that I have applied to my work.

Drama is ‘multi-medial’ (O’Toole 1992, 7). This term, to paraphrase some of O’Toole’s own ‘Processes of Drama’, means that the contexts in which drama presents itself are invariably complex and never exactly reproducible. Drama operates in at least two or more contextual frames simultaneously, each of which has its own sign systems and its own cultural and ideological referents. O’Toole asserts that there are four contextual frames: the fictional context, the real context, the context of the medium and the context of the setting (1992, 51–52). These frames appear to be concentric in shape. The frames occur in order to assist understanding the drama event that is applied through each of the separate frames. There are layers of signifiers in each of the frames that are also ‘interdependent’ (see Gay Morris 2002, 294) to each other. These signifying layers generate behavioral codes considered as physical, movement, linguistics and cognition. Thus attempting to codify all the signifiers in such ‘“multi-medial” texts is a task akin to counting sand’ (7–8).

These models have been adapted from Paul Baran’s computer network diagrams (1964). Baran formulated that distributed networks are less vulnerable to attack then centralised network structures. His network diagrams are also known in cyber terminology as ‘network topologies’ (Martin Dodge 2007).

See Sue Davis, ‘Contexts, codes and online communications’ (Online: 2009) for a useful summary of O’Toole’s ‘Contexts of Drama’.
Drama is a system comparable to the multidimensional model of the rhizome. I have originally derived this framework from Deleuze and Guattari’s terminology because it resembles drama’s multi-medial nature. It is a framework that informs the overall composition of this research and the written thesis. There is a synthesis here between the points of multi-connections located in a rhizome and the created interactions of the dynamics of drama. Both are heterogeneous; both are not ‘necessarily linguistic’ (Taylor and Winquist 2001, 343–346).

Both evoke ‘multiplicity’ (ibid.); both can instigate further evolution and generate different kinds of reception; both can be reproduced and contextualized in alternative types of multi-texts like cartography.

What is not suitable to this kind of study are the specifics of the enclosure, the fixed place and onstage, because the case studies occur in non-theatrical locations. Can a traditional site of theatre be described as rhizomatic? The rhizome is not a place necessarily meant for the stage, to be bound or ‘limited’ (ibid., 343–346). If the conventional theatrical site generates activities beyond its own enclosure then the answer might seem to be yes. Drama, on the other hand, is a collective exchange happening anywhere. Drama is not bound by its own historicity because etymologically drama is about action. Yet, drama is complex because it can employ both the enclosed circle of the collective and the decentered (rhizomatic) machinations of its practice; or alternatively it employs both text and action. From these juxtapositions agitation occurs: the agitation that is action, central to both drama and narrative.

To determine what the practice of drama is, as it makes meaning from aftermath, is also a narrative in itself that informs a testimony of experience and a translation of experimentation. Robin Nelson describes ‘a multi-vocal approach to a dialogic process’ of practice as research in his ‘dynamic model’ of exchange and cross referencing (2006, 113). Nelson has cross-referring processes rendered from testimony, data, and evidence that might assist in producing insight and ‘making the tacit more explicit’ (ibid.). I would like to suggest that Nelson’s processes are also narratives that surround, integrate with, and inform my own central dynamic of drama. In the context of my own research, drama practice is both research and primary evidence. The testimony is the translation of this practice, which in this case includes the thought-images and a selected collection of DVDs attached to the thesis as secondary text and evidence. This does not mean that this kind of evidence will resolve or conclude my own testimony. This becomes clearer when I identify why the irresolution of recovery is an important concept within my thesis. This secondary text or evidence is part of the ‘technical archive’ (Derrida and Steigler 2001, 94). What is recorded corroborates the testimony. Derrida suggests evidence does not replace

16 Although the definition is originally derived from Deleuze and Guattari in A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (1987), I would like to cite another entry from The Encyclopedia of Post Modernism in order to explain the term rhizome: A rhizome like crabgrass grows horizontally by sending out runners that establish new plants which then send out their own runners and so on, eventually forming a discontinuous surface without depth (and thus without a controlling subject) or center (and thus free of limiting structure) (Taylor and Winquist 2001, 345–346). The rhizome and its structure are about eventuality and freedom and, in this case, the shaping of interconnecting lines without a beginning or an end that makes its characteristics useful. Taylor and Winquist refer to six characteristics and they are: connection, heterogeneity, multiplicity, signifying rupture, cartography and decalcomania (ibid.). All of these characteristics have become particularly useful in helping to adjust and later analyze case studies made in the research. The model or framework of research has moved from a hierarchical model of enquiry towards the rhizome, a territory that is generative and multidimensional. It is also interesting to take note of Gavin Jantjies who writes that ‘a South African notion of itself as one nation with many cultures could be described as rhizomatic diversity’ (Jantjies 2000, forward). I concur with Jantjies that embracing heterogeneity is part of the post-apartheid condition.
testimony but instead supplements the case of its telling and, also in this case, assists the generative effect in the production of testimony as a process. This argument is best presented by Derrida and Bernard Steigler in dialogue, in which Derrida delivers the example of the Rodney King Case where the law decided that the video documentation of the beating of Rodney King was strictly evidence made only to supplement the live oral and official testimony of the witness who had recorded the event.\footnote{The Rodney King Case occurred when an African American taxi driver was beaten by Los Angeles police officers. They were then put on trial for misconduct and all except one were acquitted. The jury’s decision was influenced because the video evidence had been misconstrued. The outcome of the court case set off the 1992 Los Angeles riots and its aftermath. Derrida observed how: the law did not consider this video to be a testimony, in the strict and traditional sense of the term. It was an exhibit to be interpreted, but the testimony could only be that of the cameraman, this young man who had the camera and who came out to the witness stand, saying aloud after he had stated his name and speaking without representative, in the first person: ‘I swear to tell the truth’ [(2001, 92); cited Nelson 2006, 112].}

Evidence is the result of the practice made within the research, therefore it is in a position to be analysed. Going back to Nelson’s model – where evidence can be supplemented by a process of analysis that results in data – there is the consideration of the cross referencing of data, which implies further analysis or ‘other evidence’ (2006, 111). Nelson does affirm that all these modes inform each other as ‘interrelated processes [which are] also dynamic’ (115). Similarly, I would like to suggest that in my particular kind of testimony there is also evidence. The thought-images that form part of the intrinsic documentation of the participatory projects operate to provide some of the corroboration. Evidence in this context is not used to measure anything, but sustains the narrative of testimony itself which is a generative record that produces meaning. The key is the translation of dramatic activities into an accessible form that in this context incorporates the narrative form of testimony.

TESTIMONY

Testimony narrates the experience produced through the experiments with drama practice. The narrative of my thesis wrestles with testimony, but is also itself a testimony. I agree with Paul Ricoeur when he classifies testimony, along with its ‘multiple uses’, as that which ‘reappears at the end of the epistemological inquiry at the level of the representation of the past through narrative, rhetorical devices and images’ (2004, 161–164). What Ricoeur means by this is that the field of testimony can be extended and measured along epistemological lines. This classification of testimony might provide an entry point into the study of how testimony is performed and furthermore activate the study of testimony according to dramaturgical conventions.\footnote{David William Cohen and E. S Atieno Odihambo, in their reading of African trials and commissions, prompt the development of the epistemological field within testimony, by observing: ‘The very inchoateness of speech, testimony, examination, recording, translation, transcription, reading, listening, and interpretation (will provide) a multiplex and unsettled architecture of knowledge in construction’ (2004, 260). These items, speech–testimony–examination–recording–translation–transcription–reading–listening–interpretation when performed articulate dramaturgical perspective. Similarly, deliberations on theatre and testimony have occurred in a more conventional manner. In Eichmann in Jerusalem (1963), Arendt argue how the theatrical, in the context of the Eichmann trial, was a field of focus that was concentrated as a specific, expedient frame constructed onto the narrative of the trial itself (9). Susan Sontag identifies a generalized theatrical narrative structure in a courtroom trial–‘And as a trial is preeminently a theatrical form, the theater is a courtroom’ (1966, 126). More recently, Catherine Cole extends the parameters of this enquiry into the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission, suggesting that: ‘The TRC hearings embraced the theatricality and innate performativity that Arendt rejected in the Eichman trial’ (2007, 175).}
Where my idea of testimony differs from Ricoeur’s mandate is that the research narrative is not just a written text that is regulated to the archive at ‘the moment of the entry into writing’ (166); rather the testimony continues to perform even after it is written. My idea of testimony is closer to the concept of ‘testimonio’ outlined by John Beverly (2000, 555). For Beverly testimonio constitutes: An informal written document with which the witness experiments and records and threads:

a novella-length narrative, produced in the form of a printed text, told in the first person narrative, who is also the real protagonist or witness of the events; she or he recounts… Its unit of narration is usually a ‘life’ or a significant life experience (2000, 555).

According to Beverly, whose study largely bases itself on the testimonial discourse of Latin America, the recount begins as a unit of narrative, which embodied in the first person, initiates the emerging larger narrative. As a testimonio, my thesis comprises of first person narrative, describing a heuristic awareness arrived at through an application of case study methodology. My visual interlocutors comprising of journal entries, diagrams, reflexive frames, DVDs and visual references are placed within this testimony. They are evidence as much as they are a substratum of the testimony that assists in recovering and reflecting the original idea of thought-images guiding the structural argument of the thesis; hence evoking the redemption of fragments from the terrain of aftermath.

Fig. 1.12. Extract from a learner’s journal describing the drama teacher on trial.

A transcript of this learner’s journal entry reads as follows:
‘Mr. Taub and the Truth Commission. Today Mr. Taub went on trial! I felt really sorry because people just stood up and through (sic) insults about what he does wrong. Mr. Taub I think you are brilliant, your teaching has taught me so much and I think the problem lies in our class. They don’t respect each other! I hate confrontations and when I’m in drama that’s all that happens! Thanx so much for everything you really have taught me how to love the theatre as (sic) respect it. You really have bought culture and drama alive in C.B.H.S I think they were 2 harsh on you, but lets see what happens when they take the stand themselves.!!.’ The transcript of the learner’s own testimonies have been placed in the appendices as Appendix 5. It is an example of transcriptions of the TRC held in the Grade 11 class. Both the journal entry and the TRC transcripts, as forms of documentation, are examples of early experimental work during my research. These examples point to my attempts to try to locate specific local models so as to help learners comprehend the phenomenon of aftermath. They also demonstrate the early difficulties that were encountered in the process of documentation.

Beverly also describes testimonio as an account that normally occurs in the context of repression, poverty, marginality, exploitation, or simply survival. These are implicated and imitated in the act of narration itself, and imitate urgency, an ‘emergency narration’ (ibid.). They occur throughout a testimonio as a repeated series of interlocutive and conversational markers that are both
colloquial and rhythmical. In my case, the *testimonio* occurred because of the repressed emotions that resulted in the anger I personally released during the first case study. The interlocutors in my *testimonio* stall the urgent rhythm of telling but simultaneously heighten the urgency effect creating a result that is labyrinthine, a ‘snail-like discourse (*discurso encracolado*) that keeps turning on itself and in the process invokes the complicity of the reader through the medium of her counterpart in the text as a direct interlocutor’ (*ibid.*). The reader’s desire to know is affected through the stalling of complete disclosure. At the centre of the *testimonio* is the subaltern voice representative of voices other than the hegemonic voice of the author. The subaltern voice corresponds to the first voice through perforation of the hegemonic enclosure. The subaltern voice plays *Echo* to the author’s *Narcissus*—not primarily speaking, but speaking through me.

The intention is to reconfigure the orthodox requirements of testimony made in the context of judicial practice in order to lessen the effect of distance, thereby providing for an egalitarian solidarity enhancing the accessibility of the recount—in its various forms—as an account for all. One kind of reconfiguration that occurs in the text is through the use of the thought-images because they interrupt the dominance of one kind of narrative. Instead they offer trajectories connecting, linking and leaving the arterial narrative. Another reconfiguration is the emergence of the participants’ voices that operate in the text on multidimensional levels: signifying voices that reciprocate the research by providing points of entry in order to understand the researcher’s own voice as a reflexive one (*see* Steir 1991, 175–177). The inserted reflexive frames that provide revised and critical commentaries alongside the main body of text also advance the reflexive voice of the researcher and interrupt the narrative by drawing the reader’s attention away from the main body of the text, inviting momentary diversions. An invitation to watch the DVDs is another reconfiguration amplified by the decision of the reader when to watch them: before reading the thesis text or at the completion of reading or in between: switching back and forth between written word and video image.

My *testimonio* as a thesis starts with the witnessing of the event 9/11. It develops when parallels are drawn between 9/11 and teaching a drama curriculum based upon South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) during the early stages of the first case study. The connections I have made between 9/11, South Africa’s apartheid history and the HIV/AIDS pandemic begin with this comparative context: an exploratory study between 9/11 and the TRC. Both the territories of 9/11 and the aftermath of apartheid invite a comparative as well as flowering analysis. While South Africa’s monolithic apartheid system was dismantled into fragments, it did not explode on impact like the World Trade Centre. However, both evoke the metaphor

19 Narcissus rejects the nymph Echo, who heartbroken, dissipates into an echo (*see* Ovid, *Metamophoses*).
20 Further reconfigurations occur in the use of multiple theories, footnotes, DVDs and the appendix. Their use interrupts the autocracy of theory, stimulates scrutiny, cross-referencing and alternate accounts; linking one model to another.
21 Andre Brink reminds us of ‘the spectrum of possibilities now opening up to the writer in post-apartheid South Africa: These silent places invite exploration, almost a condition for future flowering’ (1998, 30). Flowering patterns seem to forecast the botanical model of the rhizome. These can occur when a significant geopolitical shift either dismantles or shatters prevailing narrative structures. ‘A rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines’ (*Deleuze and Guattari* 1987, 9). A condition of the aftermath highlights the compositional dynamic within the study of this kind of narrative, by exposing a stratum of generative topographies: good and bad. The composition of narrative accommodates: the *peripeteia*, making meaning, and in my case mimics seismic patterns determined by the effect of an aftermath.
of the fragment and its effect. Assembling fragments from the negative experience can dismantle the negative experience that caused the fragmentation to occur in the first place. Testimony is the repository of such a method of assembling and dismantling. The TRC contributed to the dismantling of apartheid. In the ruin of apartheid there are still negatives that have not disappeared and that resurface as repressive and traumatic reassembled systems like shame and disease.

The connections between narratives from an aftermath occur by identifying narratives that emerge as ‘disaster narratives’ whose intent it is to ‘settle those who have experienced the unsettling of their worlds, to make sense of that which seems most senseless’ (Kevin Rozario 2005, 33). Rozario continues that if disasters ‘need narratives to become meaningful, narratives also, in a sense, depend on disasters’ (ibid.). He refers to what Aristotle called the peripeteia, ‘the turning point or reversal that moves the story forward’ (ibid.), and has the characteristic of disaster or crisis. As my research unfolds, I give testimony to a series of crises that are significant as they are turning points in the development of my research.

My testimonio begins as an account of both teacher and researcher told in the first person narrative, attempting to experiment with teaching testimony through drama in a high school as part of my research about drama in relation to aftermath. When the role of the teacher is implicated in sustaining the roles of victim and perpetrator in the classroom, it suggests an urgent need to recover the self. It continues through a descriptive account of my research at the wellness clinic where operations in the practice were transformed through a series of crises and epiphanies. The testimonio continues even after the projects are complete through the reflective process of writing, analysing, selecting, and translating the research experience into research outcome.

Testimony, as a narrative of the self, is re-engaged through the interrogation of the self in order to recover the self. I have placed the intersubjectivity of the self into the research-text through reflection, reading, writing and rewriting, occurring as confession and testimonial.

Deborah Posel says that in ‘the aftermath of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), post-apartheid South Africa contains the rudiments of a confessing society’ (2006, 8). Posel explains: ‘In the aftermath of apartheid, therefore, all were damaged; there could be no position of absolute moral purity or innocence’ (ibid.). I suggest that confession could occur in a similar manner to the methods of redemptive criticism; where the self’s exposition of truth is like delving for fragments in the depths of the unknown, ‘but not in order to resuscitate it the way it was…’ (Arendt 1968, 51). For the process of shame, like the process of Arendt’s sea-like crystallisation, has mutated the fragment. These new forms might not be ‘relevant to our present’ as Passerin D’ Entreves observes (1994, 31); but this does not matter; because the altered, crystallised forms will endure into something ‘rich and strange’ (Arendt, 1968, 51). Posel points to the idea of ‘redemptive confession’ as a performance of post-apartheid citizenship, that is as controversial as it is performative (2006, 8). The performative discourse highlights controversy around ‘what gets said and what remains unsaid; who speaks
Truth has emerged from the depths; fragmented, altered and redeemed. This is why this kind of testimonial discourse operating in the pedagogy of the confessional can mediate the idiosyncrasy of truth. Similarly, Deleuze answers this idiosyncrasy with: ‘It is always a multiplicity even within the person who speaks and acts. All of us are “groupsucles”’ (1977, 206). The ‘groupsucle’ as an alternative Deleuzian term is an instrument utilised as a way of accommodating alternative representations of the subject applied through the conduit of the self as much as the self is a composite of relational experiences, histories and even archetypes; this in turn affirms multiplicity. Phillip Auslander says: ‘Deleuze and Guattari require us to look at the interconnections, the points where the notion of individuality and essence break down’ (2008, 85).

South African, Drama therapist Heather Schiff, co-founder of the Bonfire Theatre Company (see note 26), when asked to give examples about how the self is recovered in her own drama-therapeutic practice, pointed out that often the drama therapist:

conveys to the survivor of trauma that she has other roles in her repertoire other than ‘victim’. The hope is that through rehearsing a variety of roles they begin to form part of the internal resources available to the client (Online: Schiff 2009).

Reclaiming the self through an exchange of interconnections is about composing a narrative of the self, made with others, or to, paraphrase Steier, the stories of ourselves are told through the voices of others (1991, 177). Interconnections like these are evident in the testimony of my research.

Questions about truth are complex and overtly philosophical but in relation to testimony, as observed by Emmanuel Levinas in his ‘Truth of Disclosure and Truth and Testimony’ (1972) where ‘true’ is suggestively a synonym for the real; and also when truth is presented (or transmitted) as something that is original, it assumes indifference in the presentation of its being (1996, 98). Levinas also suggests how the critique of testimony is necessary ‘to draw out truth…’ (100).
The projects made at each location, from each case study are not just outcomes of research, they, like testimony, are the very process of the research simultaneously. In my own aftermath, a shape of narrative assembles fragments and is assembled from fragments in order to prompt recovery. Recovery does not happen alone, even in its most intimate forms there is still a dialogic process operating as retrieval. The repository-like term ‘groupsucle’ validates how multiplicity might support recovery. In Part Two, I refer to Bourriaud’s ‘islets of Utopia’ (Bourriaud 2002b) as part of a converging system of interstices that might challenge the dominant system composed of conventional traditions in research. Similarly, in this context, small acts of change might also multiply and converge into broader social change. Assembling fragments from an aftermath proposes the possibility that things do change.

My testimony begins by revealing how I tried to come to terms with being a first-hand witness to the aftermath of 9/11. The testimony detours into a confessional as a teacher and researcher then changes through my attempts to recover meaning from within the aftermath of apartheid and then by working in the field of HIV/AIDS. Despite these detours, the intent remains the same: to locate recovery for the self as well as for others. Testimony becomes part of an allegory for social change through disclosing an experience of the recovery of the self.
Social change within the context of drama is not to be understood only in the terms of Brechtian dramaturgy, the activism of Augusto Boal or drama therapeutic intention but instead with alternate conventions like allegorical intervention. Allegory as a strategy of intervention, before it was even realised, first occurred in the research projects and integrated the paradox of recovery within a system that stimulated recovery as much as it is masqueraded as concealment. The allegorical convention became my own when it was experimented on within the case studies and practiced as something hidden that could be disclosed – revealed as such so as to become an intervention practiced as part of the system towards recovery. It is the concept of recovery that motivates how change of the self implies a mediation of the self passing through assumptive norms, assisted by self-reflection and reflexivity, or in other words a self-awareness (or even self-consciousness) which indicates a process towards recovery and therefore also a process towards potential change.

Change is determined by the autonomy of the self, making conscious choices that are also reflective of the self. Change occurs also through an intention to promote the rehabilitation of the self. Change is prompted by acts of recovery. This implies the paradoxical and ambiguous state of recovery; on the one hand, recovery is change and on the other hand, recovery constitutes an action that might lead to change. Hence, recovery is a result that arrives at the end of a process, yet recovery is also an active ongoing process that suggests uncertainty.

Recovery means returning from misfortune, trouble, illness and error. Its value as an opportune state also lies in its early French and Latin root recur/se, meaning restore, which evokes both the possibility and action of restoration. The philosophical implications of recovery go far beyond recovering what one was; it also lies in the social and historical implications of loss. Recovery implies there is something to recover. It also implies something is lost. Since states of being cannot be the same as they once were, every attempt at recovery is an experience that prompts some kind of recall of the event, this might be a difficult place to return to and to mediate from as an act for recovery. The act of assembling suggests an opportunity for recovery. Here too the assembled fragment will not be identical to the original body lost or disrupted.

---

23 Brecht, particularly through his methods of Verfremdungseffekt, gestus and dissemination of Marxist doctrine, believed what occurred in dramatic narrative between the telling and listening, between actor and audience could promote an activism in society and effectively change the world. Boal, applies social change as something made through the interaction of improvisational methods directly instigated between player and people. This stimulates an awareness of the self through the telling of the other. Both are terribly important but they do not evoke what matters here; that is recovery of the self. What I refer to later is an alternate method derived from Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett that she calls ‘Theatre of Secrecy’ (1998, 225) where the process of hiding and revealing constitutes a dynamic of allegory inciting the possible modes of interactivity and recovery.

24 The perplexity that I associate with recovery is like Jean-Francois Lyotard’s notion of the ‘search for dissent’ (1984, 66; cited by Sim 1996, 43) accommodated by ‘Paralogy’, which involves ‘the search for, and cultivation of instabilities and paradoxes…’ (Sim, ibid). To some degree this is what the system emerging out of this research becomes: a system emerging out of catastrophe that is fluid, rhizomatic and not fixed–cultivated by paradox.

Judith Herman, in *Trauma and Recovery* (1992) helps to frame recovery. She presents several stages of recovery including: i) Establishing safety: safety here means the necessity for creating a safe place for recovery to occur; ii) Reconstructing the story: how the value of narrative accrues through recovering the event from its aftermath; iii) Restoring the connection between survivors and community: this suggests that once recovery is in place connections within the community can be repaired.

Each of Herman’s stages is not set on a linear plane. Recovery occurs in complex and multiple manners; where stages in the process of recovery crisscross. Herman says:

> No single course of recovery follows these stages through a straightforward linear sequence. Oscillating and dialectical in nature, the traumatic syndromes defy any attempt to impose such simple-minded order (155).

Susan Brison agrees with this labyrinthine, almost non-structure to recovery. She describes her recovery as a survivor of rape neither as ‘linear’ nor without a ‘discernible pattern’ (2002, 111). She suggests that this is due to the emotional aspects of trauma that are difficult to comprehend initially. Cognitive rebuilding takes on a different sense of time and rhythmical structure of repair from linear recovery.

> Recovery no longer seems to consist of picking up the pieces of a shattered self (or fractured narrative.) It’s facing the fact that there was never a coherent self (or story) to begin with. No wonder I can’t seem to manage to put myself together again. I’d have to put myself, as the old gag goes, ‘together for the first time’ (116).

She concludes ‘just as there is such a thing as irreparable damage there might be such a thing as irreversible repair’ (*ibid*.). For Brison recovery is illusory. A new state will differ from its predecessor. However, the process and intention to recover remains important. She suggests that even though recovery will not mean a return to the original state, the reassertion of the self is equally important as the attempt at recovery. This occurs when there is a change from being the object of someone else’s perpetration to becoming the subject of one’s own narrative.

> And yet trauma survivors often eventually find ways to reconstruct themselves and carry on with reconfigured lives. Working through or remastering, traumatic memory (in the case of human inflicted trauma) involves a shift from being the object or medium of someone else’s (the perpetrator’s) speech (or other expressive behavior) to being the subject of one’s own (68).

The shift from the object of another to the subject of the self directs the recovery and assists the self through a process of subjective rehabilitation, reclaiming the self for the self and thereby asserting the subjective self. This does raise methodological questions about how the self-itself becomes a subject of the practice within research.

> I have noticed when drama-therapy uses the notion of recovery, it is to first enhance a therapeutic process among the clients / subjects and not of the practitioners themselves. I asked Paula Kingwill, South African drama therapist and co-founder of the playback theatre group, Bonfire Theatre Company, to contextualise the relationship between recovery and her own method.26

---

26 Bonfire Theatre Company, founded by Schiff and Kingwill and Lesley Bester and Kyle Hudson in Cape Town in 2005, in Kingwill’s own words it ‘uses stories to bridge and heal divides between and within communities in South Africa’ (see online: www.dramaforlife.co.za, Munyardazi Chatiboko, 2008). The experience, Bonfire Theatre Company creates is ‘an interactive and improvised theatre experience. Traditional barriers between audience and performers as well as between audience members are broken down’ (see online: www.bonfiretheatre.co.za).
I would like to quote her answer at length:

In the work I have done, I have found that recovery usually means discovery of the self often for the first time. In most of my experiences, those that are struggling to recover from trauma, depression, etc, use the process of recovery as a process of self-recovery. There was not an original healthy self that can be re-found instead a self that responded to life’s (often overwhelming) challenges with a series of helpful defenses that protected them from the world and recovery is about understanding those defenses and making conscious choices about their use. It is also about understanding and uncovering our internal sources and so discovering who we are without our defenses (Online: Kingwill, 2009).

From my own examples–identifying self-recovery occurred from the place of the subjective self (meaning my own experience of recovery) and then progressed toward being relational – when recovery developed as synthesis between participant and practitioner, both parties addressing and realizing the need for recovery. But this process began with the practitioner identifying the problem first. I am also suggesting here that along with Michel Foucault’s terms, there is an ethics of the self, meaning self-care that will also induce the care for others. (see Martin 1988; Foucault 1994; Fassin 2007).

I also want to refer to the practical implications of working with communities attempting to recover in a post-apartheid context through the case studies of a high school and the wellness clinic. In particular, regarding the wellness clinic, modern health practice suggests a complexity about working with recovery where one can manage HIV/AIDS but never recover.

Edwin Cameron describes AIDS in several stages. The last stage suggests how ‘the catastrophic effects of HIV infection in its late stages can be prevented and even reversed by administrating antiretroviral drugs that bring the activity of the virus that causes AIDS to a halt within the human body’ (2005, 93). Does Cameron mean recovery or a truce? The answer to the question is problematic. HIV/AIDS is not a disease that accommodates the possibility of recovery. However, in the context of creative renewal the disease cannot deny the validity of symbolic growth and symbolic recovery.

In the context of 9/11 it has become difficult to recover public space because there is an increasing lack of access, freedom, claim and ownership of the communal public site (see Low 2002, 165). On the other hand the issue of the access of space has a longer history in South Africa than 9/11. In this context recovery is not only related to the self but to the history of places. Angela Davis says:

We have to take into consideration the ghosts that still haunt us today. Repressive institutions often have very long memories regardless of what the individuals who are their agents know or don’t know. The memory of those institutions is inscribed in its practices and its regimes (2007, 11).

But society might be in a process of becoming partial to the witnessing of the traumatic event as just another daily cataclysm. Any attempt to restore the self in relation to the event is to re-enact the event – sometimes only for the sake of re-enactment, rather than to promote change and healing. However, to extract from the event is
not necessarily to restore the event but to provide opportunities towards recovery by assembling fragments from the event itself. An alternative reading of the event extends and identifies elements from the event in order to promote re-narration and recovery.

Themes of recovery include recovery of things that are lost. There is the recovery of ground, re-emerging as regenerated and renewed in the aftermath like a second mowing. I am testifying to my own recovery from the trauma of 9/11. There are perspectives about social recovery from apartheid. Symbolic recovery considered in the context of HIV/AIDS. Recovering of what has happened in the research through a process of translation. One objective (or even lesson to be learnt) through the multivariate conditions of recovery is how to tell (or recover) all these stories rather than just retelling the event as a single story.²⁷

NARRATIVE OR HOW TELL THESE STORIES.

‘Drama is in itself narrative art, of course, and theatre-making is a good place to explore and represent narratives of selfhood, culture and community’ (Nicholson 2005, 63). Nicholson’s view is a starting point to realize the intrinsic link between drama and narrative as interrelated art forms that embody the active engagement of stories told through exploration, representation and re-representation. Nicholson refers to Benjamin’s essay: ‘The Storyteller’ in order to amplify the case made for the ‘use of experiences of life to offer practical wisdom, finding narratives and metaphors that make connections between life as it is and life as it might be’ (64).

In this essay, Benjamin warned of the demise of storytelling. He believed that the devaluation of experience made it unlikely that any new stories might occur. The devaluation of experience is ‘a concomitant that has quite gradually removed narrative from the realm of living speech and at the same time is making it possible to see a new beauty in what is vanishing’ (1968d, 87). From this viewpoint narrative is driven by experience. Reingard Nethersole in his paper ‘Benjamin’s Storyteller through African eyes: rallying the experience of the “ordinary” in late modernity’ (1998), argues that ‘the importance of experience as being both an enabling condition and an effect of narration’ (1) perseveres within the concept of storytelling.

I recognize from the above how, in my own study, drama makes experience as much as experience informs drama how to tell of experience. The proposal, therefore, is that the narrating of the experiences is empowered through the embrace and exchange of its own multivariate possibilities. I am somewhat abusing Richard Kearney here, but my own strategy is framed in manipulating his proposal that narrative is ‘the

²⁷ Ruth Leys suggests: ‘The teller must not only know how [to narrate the event] but must also know how to associate the happening with the other events of his life’ (2000, 111). Eric Fischl contemplates something similar when he recounts how his bronze sculpture Tumbling Woman created as a response to 9/11 was removed from its exhibition in Manhattan after ‘bomb threats were received’ (2006, 195). Fischl mentions the phrase: ‘Too soon to be seen’ that was used by authorities when the ‘piece was being draped and taken away’ (ibid.). In this detour, Fischl explores another narrative inclusive in promoting narrative itself. Because the sculpture provokes anxiety, it is covered up, “draped” away from scrutiny. However, in re-narrating the smothering, the act itself is recovered, even if it is only a superimposition upon the action and reaction, rather than restoring the original intent of the act itself. In doing so, the artist learns a lesson of how to still tell the story. Fischl says: ‘we need to learn how to tell the story. September 11 is more than a gravesite; it is a narrative. It is The Narrative for us now’ (ibid.). Therefore what connects Leys to Fischl is the storyteller’s agentic perspective of the other intersecting events in order to tell one’s story.
intersubjective model of discourse’ whose intent it is to tell a story (2002, 5). The self along these lines, intends to tell a story and in the telling of the story interrelates with other voices and therefore acknowledges a collaboration of narratives integrated or even consolidated within the self.

This research has activated a series of collaborative participatory projects, events that have engaged the elements extracted from events such as 9/11 and interpreted them as a grand narrative in order to condition experiences as new progressive re-events that empower alternative narratives made from the everyday. Alternative narratives include those composed from digital video documentation, records made in journals and cartography into performance. These methods stem from the collaborative reading and writing made in the recording and dissemination of the research projects. These can simultaneously correspond to exchanges across cultures. In a South African context, this might mean producing mutual exchanges of experience between the isiXhosa speaking participants at the wellness clinic and the English speaking researcher.

Fig. 1.14. Watching a DVD made together: a mutual exchange of experience.

As I approach what can only be an assessment of my activities since 9/11, I am aware that the work continues. Because of its rhizomatic nature, the deliberation is generative. This means an acceptance of irresolution, like the circumstance of trauma itself that ‘is never final; recovery is never complete’ (Herman 1992, 346). Once the project work began, it was recorded digitally on video. As the work progressed, it was shown back to the participants as part of a reproductive process. The aim here was to create a variation of re-enactment through extraction and adaption modified into a reproductive cycle. These processes meant that participants could extract an understanding from the work already made and then assemble their fragments of understanding into reproduced forms of meaning. This process was continuously filmed as if grafting one layer of extrapolation on top of another layer of meaning. Part of this process informed the making of four sets of DVDs that accompany this text. These DVDs also suggest a different composite of the narrative laid out in the primary text: serving as evidence and as celebration of the work produced. The DVDs start chronologically with DISC 1, which contains the digital record of the first (f+a=r) project at the high school and thereafter DISC 2, which continues the outcomes of this project and then the preliminary projects at the wellness clinic. DISC 3 and 4 highlight more specialised projects and testimonies that resulted from the work at the wellness clinic. One can watch these DVDs with an understanding of this chronology but also as an attempt to recognise and recover and reconstruct the many voices of participants, the settings, colors and sounds—the multiple forms and materials—the subaltern voices—that embody and co-exist alongside the primary research narrative. To reflect upon these is to understand the human dilemmas that researchers might engage with in their practical case studies of the research process. The DVD also provides an alternate assemblage of documentation, showing as well as recreating activity and territory. I want to reiterate my suggestion about how to watch these DVDs. There are a variety of ways: before you continue reading the rest of the written text; randomly; at specific points that are indicated within the text; or when you have completing reading the written text. My only recommendation is to understand the specific function of cross-referencing that has been used as a device that will activate, reveal and perform a simulation of recovery.
These strategies do not aim to resolve through re-enactment. In this context re-enacting means acting out the moment prior to the aftermath. Rather there is an attempt to resolve meaning for the self by interrelating with others in the present. There is also an attempt to locate an external membrane that will recover all the multivariate narratives.

Herman describes broken meaning when the ‘inner schemata’ have been shattered by trauma and only might achieve some sense of resolution when new or alternative schemata are imagined or developed (Herman citing Horowitz 1992, 211). Reinternalising the disrupted self has engineered part of the discovery of an external schema that will recover the broken self and assist towards recovering meaning. This means relocating parts of one’s self once dislocated through disruption. It occurs through connecting the various kinds of narratives that are activated as they are made through the research.

New theories have developed as much as they have mutated and transformed into further proposals. Herman writes: ‘in the aftermath of an experience of overwhelming danger, the two contradictory responses of intrusion and constriction establish an oscillating rhythm’ (47). Contradictory forces have colluded and converged into imaginative spaces, both moral and alternative–here in these interstices they might find safety, exchanging and collaborating. Victim and perpetrator, the self and the subject, participants and observer, analysis in the clinic and agency in the classroom, teacher and students, patriarchy and monuments, assembling and dismantling, auto-ethnographer and autobiographer, are all relationships that interact in the interstice. This is a space that proposes making a safe state of play, balanced between collaboration and mediation, in order to find a way out of these confusing times. The point is to declare the differences and then work collaboratively to accomplish a process of exchange, not only through the limitations of re-enactment but in reimagining and forming other possibilities of transference. To maintain a progressive reordering of narrative is to suggest a continuity of the fragment. I am not wounded instead the wounded are us. The assembled fragments made together are from a collective currency of exchange and collaboration.

The lessons in the end are described and prescribed by the self, both foolishly and qualitatively. The position of the fool and researcher correlates to Gianni Bosio’s view of an inverted intellectual’s pursuit of research, which evokes a position that is ‘reversed or upside down’ (Portelli 1991, 42). The inverted position indicates characteristics of an intellectual ‘who could give up the privilege of being a depository of culture and accept the possibility of recognising and receiving cultural messages from the proletarian world’, furthermore, ‘the upside down intellectual will not only teach but also learn; in the field situation, upside down researchers do not study informants but learn from them, and allow themselves to be studied in return’ (ibid.). These lessons from the aftermath are the lessons not taught but learnt from producing drama projects with participants who are dealing with the aftermath of apartheid or with HIV and AIDS. Thus, the thread from the original outset of an aftermath experienced in a post-9/11 environment is unwound on an even larger terrain. However, the aftermath framework of the produced text still embodies the indeterminate form of aftermath itself. This might be represented as a labyrinth of assembled fragments, embellished with Bruno Latour’s descriptive account of the
pathways of *metis*: ‘indirect, devious, mediated, interconnected and vascularised’ (1999, 174). Once experienced the trajectories of research will advance and its activities will generate even further pathways. Latour suggests techniques of navigating the labyrinth: ‘In the myth of Daedalus, all things deviate from the straight line’ (*ibid.*). Here the straight line begins with one context, the witnessing of one aftermath, and deviates into the experience of another.

Fig. 1.15. Visual equation (thought-image) on a map made by a participant at the clinic.

In this thesis, the ‘I’ as ‘self’ has been placed within the narrative as protagonist of event and translator of experience. I am aware of the implications of the ethical position of the self, particularly in relation to the responsibility towards truth, accountability and representation, both toward the self and the subject. I shall illustrate in the following chapter how there are several distinctive methodological mechanisms at play within the research, but it is heuristics that settles the uncertainties and the multiplicities occurring in the paradigm of my thesis, of testimony and translation.
In this chapter I describe how I employed a basic heuristic methodology while creating an imaginary equation \((f+a=r)\) that I inserted, along with applied drama practice, within a series of progressive case study projects occurring at sites of non-theatrical locations. It is in the case studies that I experienced various challenges, detours, crises and epiphanies resulting in the integration of maps and mapping within the research as a method of translating a methodology around practice. Corresponding to these activities was the position of the self that framed, as much as it instigated, the various crises and epiphanies experienced during the research.

I would like to begin with this presentation of a chart, one that I made as I began to construct how I would go about doing what I intended to do in my research practice. This chart is a thought-image stimulating my sense of where the work might take me; giving me bearings—a possible destination as I journeyed across the yet unknown terrain of research. The chart is significant because like a map it outlines the route I undertook, and it identifies various locations or stages along the way that assisted my understanding of my research practice. Each of these stages has been outlined progressively, in a chronological order, but can also be read parallel to each other because as each stage has influenced the research they have also informed each other and furthermore there is a cyclical nature to the chart that suggests something of the ongoing processual nature of the work at hand. The chart itself points to how maps become a significant tool in the research; not only as documents made from within the research but also as a way to assist in navigating the journey of the research.

In *The Task of the Translator* Benjamin asks: ‘Is a translation meant for readers who do not understand the original?’ (1968a, 69). In the introduction, I made a case for how the testimony of the research is also a translation of the research experience. This is a process of translation that embodies both the original form of intent and the form made through the consequence of action. Thus, ‘a translation issues from the original—not so much from its life as from its afterlife’ (*ibid.*). In the translation itself, as Benjamin implies, there is the renewal of something once living, ‘for the original undergoes a change’ (*ibid.*, 73). The chart of fig. 2.1 is a map—a translated form highlighting points of origin and paths of process. The chart also illustrates how mapping as a...
methodology might be able to endorse the variety of methodologies as points of discovered knowledge within the wider embrace of heuristic research. Simultaneously, the map translates the conduct of the methodologies rendering them comprehensible.

I would like to point out the star-like sign in the upper left hand corner of the chart. This refers to the experience of bearing witness to the fragment in the aftermath. The research begins with identifying fragments as phenomena from the aftermath. This identification when contextualised along with Benjamin’s redemptive methodology is similar to what Arendt describes as ‘tearing fragments out of their context and arranging them afresh in such a way that they illustrated one another and were able to prove their raison d’etre in a free floating state as it were’ (1968, 47). What was different in my case was that the fragments themselves were not merely montages, instead the fragments were handled and rearticulated according to the participatory methods of dramatic practice, physicalised in such a way that the fragments could be practised upon, activated and re-narrated. Working with fragments in such a manner informed a method of redeeming fragments from the present as much as from the past. The redemptive movement, as Passerin D’ Entreves describes it is how ‘we must move within the gap without any secure sense of direction without any help of established principle’ (1994, 29). This is significant in associating my initial abstraction of fragments with an emerging heuristic principle.

HEURISTIC MODEL

The heuristic model proposed by Clark Moustakas (1990) is a correlative methodology, one that is able to take into account previous manifestations of research, generating both receptive and oppositional dialogue. Although there are various methodologies at play within the research as a whole, it is heuristics in particular that finally seems to compose them into an overall methodology.

What is central to Moustakas’s approach is the acknowledgement of the ‘internal search’, which not only initiates the research but is also located at the core of the research. The internal search encompasses the self. The self began the heuristic process of inquiry. I asked a question without necessarily having a system or algorithm to substantiate the method of investigation. The intent here was on discovery: within that, there is a process of self-growth spurred on by discovery; there is also a process of ‘self-inquiry and dialogue with others aimed at finding the underlying meanings of important human experience’ (15).

Moustakas insists that the heuristic process requires ‘a return to the self, a recognition of self awareness and the valuing of one’s own experience’ (13). This insistence provided support in the search for an ethics of self, while I simultaneously pursued a collaborative model of ethics, expressed in situations that involve the interaction with others.

Heuristics as a methodology has been informed by the reflexive method as much as the emerging reflexivity of the researcher is supported by heuristic research. Frederick Steier suggests:

28 I would also like to consider this definition of heuristics as the ‘art of discovery’: the search for the solution but with an ‘inherent uncertainty’; because there are no algorithms or no formulas for a solution (Groner et al. 1983, 1; Dorner 1983, 89).
Reflexivity, or turning back on to a self, is a way in which circularity and self-reference appear in inquiry, as we contextually recognize the various mutual relationships in which our knowing activities are embedded (1991, 163).

In recognising the position and dynamic of the self within the research, I became aware of how the self becomes a conduit for the various experiences encountered in the research through a process of heuristic self discovery or—what Moustakas calls the core of heuristic research—‘the internal search’ (1990, 9). Even though Moustakas suggests that the premise of heuristics is the presence of the self within the researcher, growing and understanding the phenomenon and the subject as it is realised, the research itself still requires: ‘rigorous definition, careful collection of data and a thorough and disciplined analysis’ (Moustakas 1990, 14 citing Willard B. Frick 1990, 79). This deflects any possible criticism that would suggest that heuristics is only experiential and avoids qualitative methodologies. Nevertheless at the heart of the heuristic method is a process ‘guided by a conception that knowledge grows out of direct human experience and can be discovered and explicated through self-enquiry’ (1990, 17).

In synthesising the overall collective of methodologies, I have specifically utilised and adapted several principles from Moustakas’s heuristic approach in order to demonstrate how heurism was able to correspond and negotiate with the various other methodologies at play within my research. They include: i) Dialogue of the self; ii) Differences to phenomenology; iii) Immersion in the research question; iv) Creative synthesis; v) Illumination of the research process; vi) Validation of symbolic growth in both participant and researcher. These are not the only concepts and phases of Moustakas’s heuristic research, there are several others; but those that I have extrapolated engage and delineate a methodology that is specific to my research.

**DIALOGUE OF THE SELF**

Moustakas says: ‘In heuristic research the investigator must have had a direct, personal encounter with the phenomenon being investigated. There must have been actual autobiographical connections’ (1990, 14). Steier in reflexive research also describes the value of permitting tensions from the researcher’s personal life to inform the research process (1991, 180). According to both these perspectives throughout my own research process, I continued to reflect on my personal experiences of 9/11 and used autobiographical memory as a way to engage with and resolve various challenges. This suggests how the self and the phenomenon in question are able to openly communicate (and even facilitate disclosure) with each other, which in turn might prompt and generate what Dee Heddon refers to as ‘an expressive-collaborative model’ (citing Margaret Walker 2007a, 9; 1998, 69). This particular model is one of collaboration and places at its centre ‘the practice of negotiation between people in deciding appropriate ethical behaviour’ (Heddon; *ibid.*). In my own process any kind of collaborative model that utilises an expression of negotiation must acknowledge the contribution of the self as it negotiates with its subject, and this might mean that there is a degree of inequality in the negotiation towards collaboration. The self was the position from which the research was compiled, analysed, and importantly in
this context, instigated. Moustakas says: ‘One’s own self-discoveries, awareness and understandings are the initial steps of the process’ (1990, 16). The emphasis on the self has led to a series of crises in the research. At first it seemed like the self had certain expectations, which were sometimes not met. This was because the ‘I’ as the self had been placed within my own research as occupying multiple roles: witness, investigator, researcher, project coordinator, facilitator, teacher, transcriber/decoder and author of creative synthesis. And I was growing increasingly aware of the implications of the ethical position of the self, particularly in relation to the responsibility towards truth, accountability and representation, both towards self and towards others.

Heddon raises the ethical challenges of the self within the field of autobiographical performance suggesting that:

The self is always relational. It is not only a historical and cultural construct but is imbued with, and indeed is inseparable from others. Such inseparability does not only refer to the psychoanalytic understanding of the self as being dependent, structurally, on the other, but rather points also to more material connections between subjects. Our actions and experiences are never isolated; our stories are intertwined (2007a, 1).

Although the positioning and predicament of the self in relation to an appropriate model of ethics is necessarily interpolative, it is not necessarily prescriptive. Heddon suggests that in telling stories of the self, stories of others are made, thus her suggestion is for the self to be responsible to this dynamic. Heddon prompts ‘self reflection on the part of those who create autobiographical performance in order that they at least know what it is they potentially do, to others, every time they tell their “own” story’ (Ibid.). Even though my own research is not specifically located within the context of autobiographical performance, there is still the correlation of the self, in relation to both the self, and to its histories, and to the other, and also in relation to Heddon’s concerns about truth, accountability and representation.

Heddon argues that while truth, accountability and representation are embedded fixtures within the dominant discourse on ethics (as are utilitarianism and libertarianism), they do not necessarily fix the self into a position of autonomy. Firstly, these three fixtures imply that there is the responsibility of the self in and towards representing the other. Secondly, they indicate how the self must make accountable decisions on an editorial process in the creation of cohabiting narratives. In addition, they acknowledge the practice between the self and the other in the validating of authenticity through the construction or reconstruction of the enquiry. However, it is the question of the self’s autonomy that might usurp these perceptions of stability. Heddon maintains how the ‘self is a historical, cultural and social construct, experienced as multiple, shifting and relational’ (6). Furthermore, the self is located within a context to relative situations: ‘each situation is located within a matrix of determining conditions, and that each of these conditions makes a decision more or less likely to be

29 When in conversation with Heddon (Stellenbosch, July 2007), I was reminded of the prompting of ‘self reflection’; as a dramatist, my early dramatic narratives where built around autobiographical experiences, particularly around my family members including my parents and siblings (Southern Born, Artscape, 2000). In addition, in earlier drafts of the dissertation, my primary supervisor expressed concern about my writing style, suggesting that I try to write less like a playwright. How to separate the self while objectively attempting to recover the self has remained an ongoing dilemma, both in ethics and in style.
ethical’ (8). This concept of undecided situations, or what Heddon refers to as Diane Elam’s ‘domain of the undecided’ urges us to look for rules that may do justice to the case of research rather than applying pre-existing rules (ibid.). This is a domain that evokes spontaneity and flexibility so that ‘a decision has to be made each and every time’ (ibid.). This spontaneous decision-making can be made by the flexibility of the self when expressing and practicing ethical appropriateness, made in active collaboration with others. Forming flexibility for oneself resonates with Foucault’s construction of ‘Technologies of the Self’ (1988b, 16–49).

Foucault’s study on the art of self-examination became an important reference point as I proceeded to dialogue with myself throughout the research. I incorporated several of his principles some of which are located in the practice of ‘self-writing’ which in turn guided the development of journal notation and assisted in the written embodiment of the confessional. Here disclosure meant the disclosing of one’s self in order ‘to know one’s self’ in order to exercise ‘the care of the self’ (1988b, 19). Didier Fassin citing Foucault, refers to the idea of the care of the self: ‘the care of the self is also the care for others’ (2007, 263). In other words to paraphrase Foucault, ‘taking care of oneself in order to help every member of the group’ (1988b, 21).

I want to conclude this section with a statement concerning ethics, expressing how the role of the self affected my own ethical practice, as notions of the self were central to the ethical practice undertaken within my research.

In 2006, The Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Cape Town (UCT) introduced a guidebook to assist researchers in defining the ethics of research on human subjects. The guidebook stresses ‘the importance and relevance of the well defined and properly supported codes, protocols and standards to govern the ethics of research on human subjects’ (4). Thereafter, the guidebook refers to several codes of conduct and policies with which the research must accord, including UCT's Codes of Research involving Human Subjects (2006).

This code of research promotes a standard of conduct and procedure that embraces a position of sensitivity, openness and clarity in the framework and methodology governing research. My own research began in 2004, before the publication of the guidebook, but it still strives for the position made explicit by UCT’s Research Ethics Committee. Although my research does not entirely depend on the testimonies of human subjects themselves, it does recognise the centrality of the exchange and reciprocity in regards to engaging and creating projects that involve human subjects. Originally, the conduct undertaken in the research involved a sensitivity and openness in regard to the engagement of projects undertaken at a high school in 2004–2005. Here the methods involved voluntary meetings between parents, teachers, learners, ground staff.

30 For ‘we must judge where we are, in our pragmatic context, and no transcendental alibi will save us’ (Elam 1994, 108). In the field of applied drama, where my own research is practised – a field that Heddon describes as a ‘usefully, unpredictable, unrepeatable, live process’ (2007b, 214) pragmatic, intuitive, on the spot exchanges between self and subject become necessary as opposed to more academic mediation.

31 Both Heddon and Elam have derived the notion of ‘undecidability’ from Derrida who Heddon cites: ‘if we knew what to do, if I knew in terms of knowledge what I have to do before the decision, then the decision would not be a decision’ (1999, 66; 2007a, 8–9). Despite the ambiguity there is a sense that one does take responsibility for one’s own actions and also responsibility in embarking into the unknown. Furthermore, the notion in regards to ethics suggests ‘an ongoing responsibility’ to the making of decisions rather than to the system that might govern the decision itself (Mummery, 2005).
and the facilitator-researcher. Records of these meetings, like digital documentation and journal writing and the dissemination of the digital records, occurred through projecting them back to their constituencies, at their assemblies and meetings. This dissertation refers to the digital work and the several self-reflective writings accessed from the project journals. All of this information was made by participants who gave their consent from an informed position; voluntarily handing over their own made documentation to me at the end of the process. The development of each successive project made throughout the three years of research has modified this form of consent. A provisional code of conduct was forged in the early stages of the research process. It drew from various sources: a recent UCT Drama Departmental memorandum, drafted by Gay Morris as a policy framework for a code of ethics and an article by Bill McDonnell entitled ‘The politics of historiography—towards an ethics of representation’ (2005); and the National Association of Drama Therapist’s code of Ethical Principles (2007); and UCT’s Codes of Research involving Human Subjects. The code declared the following:

- All research occurs with intent of accuracy, transparency, respect, responsibility and awareness.
- To work towards a mutual guarantee that all research participants are the subjects not the objects of research.
- To conduct all research in a manner whereby participants feel that they are collectively contributing to the field of study, and that the research made is with them and not on them.
- To inform all research participants of the purpose, nature and outcome of the study.
- The relationship between researcher and participant will value the collective contribution to the process as well as the individual author’s contribution to the text.
- The objective of the research is to translate experience in reciprocal terms. To achieve this both researcher and participant need to undertake all activities in good faith.
- No participant will be subject to unnecessary, physical or emotional harm or exposed to unnecessary risks.
- Dialogue will be encouraged to generate more open, dialogic narratives.

This ethical code in relation to the consent form has always been a provisional one because of the ongoing questions around literacy and the translation of informed consent. Additional surveys were made at all of these sites, both at the school and at the clinic. They occurred with the assistance of the administrative staff members at each of these sites. During the second case study at the wellness clinic, it became increasingly important to be aware of ethical procedures when undertaking the research. As in the original stages of the research at the school, similar procedures of basic recording and journal making were evident. In Part Three this is described in detail where I write about the implications of working in an environment that urged the researcher to be alert to the factors of disclosure, status in one’s community and the sensitivities that are inherent in working with human subjects that face the conditions of HIV, stigmatisation, poverty and illiteracy. At the clinic, it became a concern within the practice that none of the group’s participants signed anything they did not understand. There was an attempt to translate the consent form into isiXhosa, which is the mother tongue of the clinic participants.
This proved problematic with conflict over the use of particular words rather than others and my own terrible mispronunciation of the participants’ mother tongue. Therefore an alternative, exploratory option was put into place whereby at each meeting, words and phrases that were deemed necessary in order to realise informed consent were talked about and practiced in the participants’ mother tongue, thus teaching the researcher their meaning and pronunciation. Then there was also the production of maps that have become a meaningful and collaborative model in creating a mutual sense of understanding, simultaneously gathering data while gathering consent.

Another example of transactional consent is the journal. Journals were given out to each of the participants during the course of each case study. They are mutually tacit contracts in which the participants make their own observations during the course of each project. Participants had the option to return their journals to the researcher at the end of the project in order to be analysed and transcribed to extract data and patterning. It was determined during the course of the last project that a consent form had to be placed in the foreleaf of the journals that were handed out. This consent form acknowledged and indicated how work made by the participant in the journal and any other recorded activity of the participant (in particular video and photography) during the course of the project could be used by the researcher for research material. There was also an ongoing report–back process at the wellness clinic where the members could disseminate and analyse the digital work made during the course of each of the research projects undertaken.

Heddon states that, ‘(e)thical practice is not only located in the finished “product” but also in the process’ (2007a, 10). Here, too, I am suggesting not only that the aforementioned practices are mutable, but also that the accumulative methodological processes, concretised by a programme of a heuristic method inherent within the research, seem to satisfy the flexible relationship between self and subject in settling both the ethical complexities and the several generative methodologies at play.

I want to acknowledge several similarities with the ethical considerations in Wendy Ann Butchart’s unpublished dissertation for a Masters of Science in Nursing at the University of Cape Town (2005). Butchart in her dissertation entitled ‘Exploring the challenges of Facilitating Participatory Action Research with people living with HIV/AIDS’, indicates how after undertaking research with a group of five, black, Xhosa-speaking, HIV-positive people living in Masiphumelele, an informal settlement near Cape Town, there were the following challenges: i) Crossing language and cultural barriers; ii) The context of poverty; iii) Miscommunication and misunderstandings; iv) Questions around power; v) Questioning incentives in order to attract people to participate in the research; vi) Accuracy; and vii) Lack of awareness of individual rights.
DIFFERENCES TO PHENOMENOLOGY

Unlike phenomenological studies in which the researcher need not have had the experience, the heuristic researcher has undergone the experience in a vital, intense, and full way—if not the experience as such, then a comparable or equivalent difference (Moustakas 1990, 14).

This next section is not meant to outline a comparison between phenomenology and heuristic research. Instead, I am using the concept of differentiation between these two methodologies in order to demonstrate how the heuristic method was able to identify the differences and the similarities between the various other methodologies operating within my research and then form a synthesis between them.

Phenomenology, as I understand it, is the comprehension of events and objects as phenomena. It was one of the methodologies at play in the research that was not practised with orthodoxy. I could not merely describe the phenomena I observed through conscious abstraction.

I needed a direct experience of the phenomena and this occurred by creating projects as research activities. Clarke Moustakas provides this maxim of phenomenology as “‘The things themselves.” In a broad sense, that which appears provides the impetus for experience and for generating new knowledge’ (1994, 26). Phenomenology seemed suitable to contextualise my aftermath experience therefore providing a way to analyse the experience of bearing witness in the 9/11 aftermath; by identifying elements from the aftermath and reducing the aftermath-elements into a research question in order to advance the proposed research activity. Although direct intervention with the phenomena is not strictly phenomenological it significantly dictates how the bracket, and therefore the bracketing of fragment plus assemblage equals repository into an imaginary equation, was a way to engage in the proposed experiential investigation.

Erving Goffman cites Edmund Husserl: ‘I may accept it only after it has been placed in the bracket’ (1975, 252), to suggest how bracketing is not only a phenomenological device but also a dramaturgical convention, as Goffman observes:

The standard example is the set of devices that has come to be employed in Western dramaturgy: at the beginning, the lights dim, the bell rings, and the curtain rises; at the other end, the curtain falls and the lights go on (ibid.).

Brackets allow activity and expression to take place in a particular frame simultaneously framing the research expectations into experimentation. The bracketed activity promotes suspension from disbelief and provides concentration. An epoché as a phenomenological construct brackets either side of the activity producing a focused interrogation of the activity inside the bracket. It does this through regulating a sense of safety and provides a framework for experimentation and creativity for both researcher and participants. However, the experimentation in the safe-space inside the bracket is not entirely divorced from that which lies beyond the bracket. It will affect the action on the outside of the bracket through the perforation of the bracket-enclosure;
therefore promoting a series of generative actions. Jameson has a similar experience when associating phenomenology with Brecht’s estrangement techniques. The dramaturgical necessitates how action through emplaced distance can suggest informed meaning and promote activism.\(^{33}\)

In aligning this back to a heuristic approach in my research there was an initial question of ‘what if I do this?’ activated by bracketing a proposition derived from a method of redemptive criticism into the realm of the unknown. Furthermore, a second question emerged at the unknown juncture occurring at theoretical distance (phenomenology) which also was a hunch (heuristic) translating an uncertain hypothesis that ‘if I do this—might that also happen?’ alluding to a discovery of knowledge which had personal and social significance. The phenomenological reduction from an aftermath initiated a series of questions not only about experience but also of drama itself.\(^{34}\)

I discovered that the phenomenological influence of constructing the bracket also related to Freire’s ‘dialogical codes’ (1990) and Roland Barthes’ ‘text reduction’ (1977b, 193).\(^{35}\) These concepts endorsed the activation of the imaginary equation, which I called \((f+a=r)\). The equation utilised a propositional formula, through an interpretative standpoint, along with a reductive method made from phenomenology further assisted by an ethnomethodological process. By this ethnomethodological process, I am drawing from Jameson’s observation about ethnomethodology ‘whose guiding principle lies in the explanation of what people say about what they do—in other words, about the inherent and verbal knowledge their gestures and actions carry with them, and how they explain these to themselves and to others’ (1998, 83). Observing how participants practice: act and interact and construct narrative as a result of connecting with the imaginary equation, included my own reflection about the participants’ practice as a source of knowledge for the purposes of research.

The equation was not an algorithm nor was it a system; rather it was a conceptual catalyst for discovering knowledge and unsettling conventions like traditional linear narratives and drama activity always located in purpose-built theatre spaces. The equation empowered the research to be self-conscious, critical, and participatory. It was a research stance that I have also labeled ‘feminist’ seeking to unearth and sometimes unsettle, disrupting with an intention to transform, engaging with its participants while remaining distinct from its informants (Fine 1992, 220).\(^{36}\)

---

\(^{33}\) Jameson certifies Brecht’s association with phenomenology partly because of its influence over Verfremdungseffekt. Here experience is not only analysed through the act of distancing but reframed, rewritten and reactivated as dramatrical affect into political opportunism (1998, 80–83). This means the effect of dramatitical distance can be translated and imported into a political strategy.

\(^{34}\) I am using a modification of experience taken from Nadir El-Bizri’s definition of experience:

As a general term, experience designates the acquisition of some form of knowledge by way of practice or observation. It may also have an experimental sense in being a mode of provoking certain phenomena and observing their comportment, hence the rise of a method of empiricism that relies on experience rather than on pure theory. Experience, as an actual and lived observation, or as a practical acquaintance with certain phenomena that results in knowing, may also designate an event that is lived by someone or that affects a certain individual who undergoes a particular attestation or happening (2004, 50).

\(^{35}\) Barthes explains this strategy as ‘a term which expresses nicely the ideology of the summary: on the one side the thought object of the message, element of knowledge, transitive or critical force; on the other style, ornament, province of luxury and leisure and thus futility’ (1977, 193).

\(^{36}\) In defining this position, I have taken into consideration the writing of two active feminist researchers Michelle Fine (1992) and Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999).
The equation was applied to two particular non-theatrical locations and activated participation by generating a series of devised and collaborative drama projects with groups of participants. Participation does also suggest here the influence of ‘Action Research’ as Thompson describes it, ‘a process that is ‘participatory and respectful of the complex learning that is used in the everyday life of the group’ (2003, 170). As action research suggests there were attempts by myself to initiate collaboration between participants and practitioner as a core function of the research so as to incorporate multiple voices, an ethos of reciprocity and opportunities for agency (see Will Weigler 2009, 2–6). Importance lay in the making of activity and the emplacement of action through the application of drama. Thompson considers that what is central to his applied method is action itself:

Perhaps we should abandon behaviourism. We should be interested in action not behaviour. Behaviour implies that humans create their world from inside out. I believe the world is created within each different situation that arises. Action is understandable as adapting between people not emanating from within. Theatre can’t just change behaviour (2001,4).

This process of applying the equation alongside dramatic practice was still governed by a sense of experimentation and the unknown. The participants from these locations created projects that stimulated and advanced the development of the proposition of the equation \((f+a=r)\) and the equation began to mutate into an alternate system. The application of all the above methodological variables of research occurred through three distinct case studies: exploratory, descriptive and explanatory. These case studies consolidated the heuristic process into a comparative design that intended to produce reciprocal benefits for researcher and participants.

IMMERSION IN THE RESEARCH (CASE STUDY METHODOLOGY)

My immersion within the research methodology included the pursuit of a concretising strategy; which serves to fix but also was a Deleuzian-like proposal in terms of the ‘Philosophy of Concrete’. Concretising the rhizome aims to counter and fix the impending confusion in the traffic of text. The diverse methodologies, even though they were driven by a heuristic principle, still needed a frame to provide comprehension that would enable further pollination. I modified a frame appropriated from the considerations of Robert. K. Yin in his two textbooks: *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2003a) and *Applications of Case Study Research* (2003b). The subsequent model of case study methodology modified from Yin’s suggestion meant the creation of three distinct case-study forms that were (2003b, 5):

i) Exploratory: ‘determining feasibility of the desired research procedures’;

ii) Descriptive: ‘a complete description of the phenomenon in question’;

iii) Explanatory: ‘explaining how events happened’.

These three components of Yin’s enclose the variations made through the heuristic pursuit in relation to the other methodologies at play.

37 Jean-Clet Martin’s ‘Deleuze’s Philosophy of Concrete’ defends the relationship between the rhizome and the concrete (1999, 242–249). For even though the concrete fixes, it also expresses a ‘composition, a botanical concretion, a rhizome of forces, a thicket of singularities that, acting as plants, do not so much as filiate as pullulate’ (*ibid.*). Exposing the strata in concrete as rhizomatic, could be compared to slicing a tree in half and exposing its life rings (known as dendochronology).
A framework built on Yin’s applications was determined by a question aimed at what was ‘the choice of object’ studied and practiced at each location as part of the case study methodology (Yin citing Stake 1994, 236-247; 2003a, 18). In this context, the questions were concerned with what the designs of research might be, as much as they were about the choice of object for the research. The self in relation to the applied drama practice and the participants of the research in relation to the same practice were both the research subjects. Modifying these choices was an ongoing development occurring at each case study stage— as multiple stages that in turn provoked questions about why the research was necessary, and how practiced models, as designs might be reproduced.

In a summation of Applications of Case Study Research, I suggest that Yin’s method affirms the methodology of case study research within my own project-based research:

The method is appropriate when investigators either desire or are forced by circumstance (a) to define research topics broadly and not narrowly, (b) to cover contextual or complex multivariate conditions and not just isolated variables, and (c) to rely on multiple and not singular sources of evidence (2003b, xi).

The case studies assisted in framing the projects that were initiated at each location throughout the research. The activities of the projects’ research synchronised with Yin’s preliminary factors, meaning the first projects were more exploratory and the later projects were more descriptive. But overall the projects were framed within Yin’s general factors of case study methodology: they were broad and covered complex conditions that were not only multivariate but were also multidisciplinary and relied on multiple sources of evidence from audio-visual data to experimentation with maps and mapping and exercising self-reflexivity. What was even more appropriate in regards to appropriating Yin’s framing was
how each of the projects emulated Yin’s three different stages, thus generating and shedding the work through a series of multiple case studies that encompassed: exploratory, descriptive and explanatory stages. I need to paraphrase Yin in his description of each of the case studies in order to explain further how I have applied his methodology to my own more project-based work.

An exploratory case study aims at defining preliminary questions. This occurred during the preliminary research at the first site of the high school. Here the hypothesis was proposed, its elements experimented with and tested, its outcomes analysed and the intent and questions modified. The descriptive case study presents a more focused description of the phenomenon in its context. This occurred at the second site of the wellness clinic where the hypothesis was adjusted to be replicated and validated through, firstly the descriptions obtained from the projects made at the previous location of the high school and, secondly in relation to the observations made at the clinic. Finally, explanatory projects framed by an explanatory case study were formulated as a result of the analysis of the relationships studied in the context of the phenomena occurring in the earlier study models, determining what was to be done as an outcome; not necessarily as resolution but as explanation. The explanatory model generated the projects: *(in)Heritage* (2006) and *(in)Junction* (2007). Although the explanatory model communicates an ongoing process, it indicates where specific projects stop for the purpose of this explanation with an outcome that suggests ways of doing drama in an aftermath that provide opportunities for recovery.

**Fig. 2.3.** Model that activates Yin’s Case Study Model.
CREATIVE SYNTHESIS

Moustakas suggests in relation to his principle of ‘creative synthesis’ that the overall presentation of the research is like a return to ‘lyric poetry, autobiogaphy and biography’ (1990, 10). Furthermore, he declares how he himself engages ‘in an immersion process, open and receptive to the nature of discovery, welcoming, alternating rhythms of concentrated focus and inventive distraction’ (ibid.). Similarly, Stringer, who when citing Norman Denzin affiliates himself to another researcher with an interpretative viewpoint, declares that ‘writing research may be envisaged as texts waiting to be staged’ (1999, 109). This confirms how creative synthesis in research is made possible through an alternative exploration and application of methodological practice. Although I suspect Denzin is not be taken literally, his sentiments still affirm the development of alternative modes of translation of my research such as maps and mapping, thought-images and how the voice of the self might be reaffirmed through a narrated testimony. The creative synthesis in my research was progressive and overlapping and did not only occur as Moustakas suggests in the ‘final phase of the heuristic research’ (1990, 31).

Maps and mapping were distinct methods that emerged during the research, creatively synthesising (but also challenging) ‘components and core themes’ (ibid., 32), into an alternate research narrative. It is important at this point to make the distinction between maps and mapping. Mapping is the process of exploring a projection of an experience of knowledge whereas maps hold expressions of the mapping process. In this context, the map is an alternative text produced through experience and observation that following Deleuze and Guattari ‘constructs the unconscious’ (1987, 12; first cited by Pile and Thrift 1995,1).

Tim Ingold in ‘Maps, wayfinding and navigation’ (2000) raises the complexities of working with such documents resisting an assumed simplicity that is often associated with inscribing an experience (as an outcome of knowledge) onto a piece of paper. Ingold prescribes varied complex and paradoxical functions onto assumed cartographic principles of map, mapping, map making, way finding and navigation. These include the different ways that environments are spatially perceived and represented both internally and externally; meaning there can be internal maps just as there are geographical maps. This is based on Ingold’s premise that ‘places do not have locations but histories’ (119). This kind of perspective challenges the synthetic emergence of maps and mapping within the research process as something simplistic because it presents alternative ways to interpret what has been made and experienced as knowledge was gained. The more cartography ‘aims to furnish a precise and comprehensive representation of reality, the less true to life this representation appears’ (ibid., 242).

I have attempted to provide a simplified modification of Ingold’s terminology as follows:

i) Maps: A representation of things in space that is independent of any particular point of view (224).
ii) Mapping: An activity of knowing carried out along paths of travel unfolding over time (220).
iii) Map-making: Where the performative gesture becomes the inscriptive practice (231).
iv) Way finding: Discovering ones own movement through the world by imbuing a sense of history, story and memory on places (239).
v) Navigation: To plot a course from one location to another (219).

A view echoed by Miles Harvey who says: ‘A map provides no answers. It only suggests where to look: discover this, reexamine that, put one thing in relation to another, orient yourself, begin here…’ (2002, 38).
However the maps that were made and the mapping that was practiced simultaneously assisted a process of reflection by arriving at a means of translation that could compliment the research as something generative at the same time as providing something tangible, comprehensible and meaningful for all.

In the research, exchange was an outcome occurring through the practice of making maps. The making of maps emerged as a result of participatory research activities that were engaged in translating the language of the research, making it accessible to all who participated. In this case, experience was not only reproduced on to maps but was encouraged to continue through acts of mapping practiced and read within the projects. Therefore the experience continued to develop throughout the research process by means of reciprocity and exchange.

Fig. 2.4. Maps are studied to be made.

Figs. 2.5–2.6. Cartography as method and methodology.

Mapping fixed much of the pluralistic processes occurring in the practical research activities. In particular, this happened during the second case study at the wellness clinic. Maps were made to bridge linguistic barriers. Maps became a cost-effective medium to record experiences, indicate stages of research and reproduce events in order for the participants and researcher to reflect upon and analyse.
Cartographers like John Pickles (2004) use terms, like ‘embodied social relations’, ‘accretion’, ‘reworking’ and ‘bricolage’ to suggest how the repository of the map is constructed and rewritten. But it is Pickles’s ‘building on and with the ruins’ that resonates. It suggests that there is a life force from within the ruins (87). It reveals an alternate dimension to the map, appearing as a palimpsest on the original ruin. The redemption of the fragment from the ruin and later the assembling of the fragment onto the map are conceptual methods my research is eager to uphold. They also indicate how the method of research is remapped on to this text, not only as bricolage, but also as a map of multiformed narrative—a text inclusive of drama and testimony, thought and image. Mapping informed a methodology around practice. Once mapping became a methodological practice it assisted in translating experience by applying a process of cartography on to reflection and reproduced performance. The practice of mapping is a decisive result in the research. The collaboration between narrative analysis and an observation of dramatic forms has constructed a method of abstraction and reproduction, through which maps have been created and performed, stimulating a term I like to call cartographies of performance.40

Cartographies of performance were an important outcome from the practice of research occurring in the case studies. During the descriptive stage of the case study, mapping did not only reveal the first crisis but the first conscious process to resolve a crisis, for the practice of mapping as a practical device detoured and deviated from the original application of \((f^2+a=r)\). This led to a series of crises. These crises led to a series of epiphanies. Both crises and epiphanies are processes made explicit through the heuristic model.

ILLUMINATION OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS (CRISES AND EPIPHANIES)

Throughout the research, results arose that were not entirely satisfactory or that left me, as the researcher, feeling frustrated and even constricted. To describe these results as failures would be out of place. Rather the results led to crises. Crises were keys to producing epiphanies and thereby developing the research. Each crisis informed me that the research had reached a limit. Several of these crises grew into an impending compound of crises.

Fig. 2.7. Epiphany model indicating crisis and stages of epiphany.
Moustakas’s position is that research is a process of self-discovery for both the researcher and participant involved in the research. If this is so then the moment of epiphany becomes central to the methodological practices undertaken and developed in the research. Discovery matters as much as the systems themselves that are produced to corroborate the evidence.

Ernest T. Stringer, in describing the epiphany as an element within action research, says: ‘Epiphanic events are moments of crisis or triumph–turning point moments that have the potential to be transformational’ (1999, 174). Epiphanies not only represent a fundamental point of discovery within the research but also, when interrogated alongside the moments of illumination as they occur, can provide comprehension about the components within the research process, which up to the point of illumination have been incomprehensible. Stringer suggests that an interrogation of the moment of epiphany should be based upon a review of the epiphany itself, of key people who contributed towards the epiphany, of the moment of crisis and the distinctive features that define the epiphany. All the aforementioned elements suggested by Stringer should be categorised in a ‘framework of headings’ to extend the person’s story so ‘that the reader can understand (a) the nature of the crisis and (b) the way that crisis sits in the person’s everyday life’ (ibid.). By understanding the operation of the crisis, both in terms of its nature and in terms of how a person behaves, the crisis might be utilised towards an epiphany. What is clear in framing these key epiphanies along Stringer’s model of categories and headings is that earlier epiphanies inform and influence later ones. The element of the detour is persistent throughout each progression of the epiphanies maintaining how epiphanies continue to occur and detour in later phases of informed experience. There is also continuity amongst these key epiphanies, highlighted in particular by the last epiphany, which seems to embrace and similarly transform the original epiphany. Epiphanies do not contain the crisis but emerge from the crisis, detouring from a process of incubation.

Moustakas describes how the incubation process occurs in his third phase of heuristic research: ‘Incubation is the process in which the researcher retreats from the intense, concentrated focus of the question’ (Moustakas 1990, 28). Incubation implies a movement away from the object in question towards a detour. This usually occurs when the research has reached a limit and therefore there is a crisis. The detour provided might prompt questions in an alternative but enclosed space. In the progression from crisis to incubation – there is an epiphany, a moment of illumination. Illumination, Moustakas suggests, occurs after incubation when there is a ‘breakthrough into conscious awareness of qualities and clustering qualities into themes inherent in the question’ (ibid.). It was illumination that repositioned the research activity into an emerging system that assumed that interactivity composed of drama and narrative could translate an aftermath through performing an act of recovery. The proposed system was both a consolidation and an unravelling of what had occurred previously in the research. Activating this system within the last two research projects of (in)Heritage and (in)Junction indicated part of the validation of symbolic growth within the research process.

Alongside Stringer’s ‘key people’ I would also like to add key events as crucial elements in contributing towards the epiphanies.
VALIDATION OF SYMBOLIC GROWTH IN BOTH PARTICIPANT AND RESEARCHER

Validation in the context of heuristic research is based upon an experiential outcome: 'The question of validity is one of meaning' (Moustakas 1990, 32). Meaning as knowledge gained – is a subjective outcome for both participant and researcher. With regard to the participants who were involved in the research projects at the various locations, I have recovered several of their voices by rereading the documents they have made, in particular their journals and their maps, in order to evaluate their sense of growth during the research projects. The recovery of these voices has revealed my reflexivity–a necessary part of my own research process that has validated a sense of my own symbolic growth.

A judgement of validity is made as Moustakas suggests by the ‘primary researcher who is the only person in the investigation who has undergone the heuristic formulation of the question’–through all the phases of exploration, challenges, detours, crises, illuminations and explication (1990, 32). This does signal that the research journey undertaken is essentially my own and that I am the protagonist. Discovery of knowledge and recovery of the self has occurred through an exchange and collaboration with others and it has informed an emerging system of recovery.

I would like to refer to a term, which perhaps describes best, the essence of my meaning here. It is derived from Thomas Homer-Dixon who writes in his book *The Upside of Down: Catastrophe, Creativity and the Renewal of Civilization* (2006) that ‘an occurrence of renewal through breakdown’ is *catagenis*: ‘a word that combines the prefix *cata*, which means “down” in ancient Greek with the root *genesis*, which means “birth”’ (22). This, in Homer-Dixon’s context means, ‘the birth of something new, unexpected and potentially good, in the aftermath of catastrophe’ (*ibid*). In his view *catagenis* is ‘the everyday reinvention of the future’ (*ibid*). In my view the reinvention of the future or creative renewal coexists with redeeming fragments from the ruin (like a second mowing). I find this useful in demonstrating my own sense of symbolic growth through the original activation of the research itself and recognising that there is validation not only in an emerging system but also in unravelling a system’s history. Homer-Dixon defines this characteristic as ‘path dependent’ meaning that a system’s history is important because it ‘profoundly shapes what the system becomes…’ (2006, 27). The primary text is a record of the system’s history; but the system is also multi-modalular and the multi-modal approach is embedded within the text; thus re-activating the system when its history is read.

The system is allegorical. Through doing drama and translating this process into a narrative there is also an embodiment of self-redemption. An attempt to heal or recover the self is at first not consciously disclosed. Being not apparent at first, makes the redemption of the self an allegorical act. Once the act of self-repair is revealed, it affirms the testimony of the research as a solvable part of this allegory of recovery. In Arendt’s words: ‘an allegory always proceeds from an abstract notion and then invents something palpable to represent it at will. The allegory must be explained before it becomes meaningful, a solution must be found to the riddle it presents…’ (1968, 13). The solution and the explanation of the solution appear in the descriptions ahead.
Figs. 2.8–2.9. Explanations at the clinic.
PART TWO: SCHOOL

INTRODUCTION

This rather extensive section attempts to consolidate both the early and the intermediate exploratory projects undertaken at the first location of Camps Bay High School, Cape Town, between 2004 and 2005. First, I shall discuss the early exploratory projects that I launched:

i.) Exploring and adapting elements of the imaginary equation \((f+a=r)\) in the context of devising two plays about the aftermath with two successive drama classes of grade ten learners.

ii.) Using the concept of the repository whilst teaching drama in the classroom.

These projects reflect some of the early crises experienced. Although they were not consciously experienced as crises they still reflect distress and challenge – hence Chapter Three is called ‘Ubu Drama and Distressed Kings’.42

I will then describe a more defined project in the fourth chapter called ‘Dramatic Equation’. Here, I integrated the imaginary equation \((f+a=r)\) into an interactive-narrative project involving parents, ground-staff, teachers and learners as voluntary participants. It developed in juxtaposition and in response to the earlier exploratory projects.

In writing-up or recording these exploratory projects as case studies I will use the style of first person narrative; thus consolidating the position of the self and self-reflexivity within the role of recording one’s own research. Particularly in this kind of praxis where the role of researcher is included within the case studies, by examining how researchers participate within the study, ‘we can also develop an awareness of how reflexivity becomes a useful way for us to understand what others are doing’ (Steier 1991, 3).

My position as researcher not only links to how auto-ethnography informs the authorship of research but also interrogates what it means to be a teacher in post-apartheid South Africa. This choice is also influenced by what Denzin calls ‘the need for forms of reporting that are more clearly able to represent people’s lived experience’ (cited in Stringer 1999, 109). Denzin also calls for ‘writing that experiments with genre, voice, and narrative style, so that “official” reports may take on the appearance of writing more usually associated with fiction and poetry’ (ibid.). Denzin develops this argument by suggesting that ‘such writing may be envisaged as texts waiting to be staged’ (ibid.). I value this point of view not only because the focus in the thesis is on drama but also because the research produces secondary texts, like plays and digital documentation that stemmed from the projects generating out of the case studies and their locations.

42 The phrase ‘distressed kings’ is from Jean Duvignaud who describes a particular conundrum in theatre-making, that of active collective participation as opposed to the sociological manifestations of isolation in the individual as artist (1965, 7–25). This symbolic expression of an exchange is a conundrum fraught with tension. It portrays the ‘isolated representative figure’ of the king (ibid.). However, in reality, I was teaching drama at a high school, an opportunity that presented multiple ways of exploring theory and practice but simultaneously caused as much distress as it did discovery.
In his essay ‘The Author as Producer’ (1970), Benjamin claims that the writer has a ‘single demand, the demand of reflecting, of thinking about his position in the process of production’ (7). Reflection provides the possibility of producing work within the phases of research—not only as text but also as secondary text. Reflection, as I will begin to demonstrate, contributes to the transformation of research from producing research into research production. The difference lies between producing research, which is the process and which is quite fluid, and the product of research, which might be more finite. Reflecting upon one’s research provides further agency for the researcher but might remain simply meditative. Agency advances when the reflective mode becomes reflexive. Reflexivity activates the reflective act by making it more critical and explicit. Gillie Bolton, when describing her looking glass model (a model I later use in the intermediary project at the high school) describes reflective ‘as the situations’ we find ourselves in, whereas reflexive is ‘the self’ we find there. (2001, 30).

I want to use Benjamin’s reference to Brecht’s ‘functional transformation’ (1970, 4), as an example to indicate how research outcomes change as the reflection advances towards reflexivity. When reflection becomes reflexivity the apparatus of the research changes or perhaps the way the apparatus is applied changes. In either case, this brings about changes in effect. I shall demonstrate how this occurs in the transition from project to project in this exploratory stage (and even in the later stages of the research). My own research apparatus i.e. the imaginary equation is transformed from remaking curriculum within the institution to becoming an autonomous agent subverting narratives within the institution. The apparatus changes as it provokes change. Both the function and the application of the research apparatus transformed as it elicited change; the results were changes occurring in the apparatus, in the way that it was applied and the changes it brought about within the institution.

Further elaboration on Benjamin’s example of Brecht’s ‘functional transformation’ or Umfunktionierung illustrates how it is not simply about revealing how the apparatus of production changes but it is also about changing the apparatus to the maximum extent… '(1970, 4). Doing so takes ‘place at the point in time at which certain works should no longer so much relate to individual experiences (have the character of the work) but rather should be aimed at the utilisation (transformation) of certain institutes or institutions’ (ibid.).
THREE
UBU DRAMA AND DISTRESSED KINGS

Fig. 3.1. Notice board outside high school advertising two out of three projects.

School was never a pleasant place for me. I grew up in South Africa during a time when educational practice formed the bedrock of the apartheid monolith. Although the last period of my secondary education occurred at a private school outside the government’s official policy, I still felt helpless in a continuum of dominant, oppressive, ideological practices including religion, politics, discipline, sport and gender. Of course, I was growing up in South Africa in the eighties and this was to be expected.44 Some years later in the climate of post-apartheid South Africa, after graduating with a Masters in Theatre and Performance with the possibility of a doctorate in drama, I was invited to seek employment at a high school with the primary aim of doing research and teaching drama. I was excited to observe and examine how oppressive apartheid practices might have been dismantled and what fragments remained in the aftermath of this dismantling. What I found was a repression that, if not entirely in the same form as in the past, was still inherent in the school in some way or other. Not only did the teachers and the administration maintain traditional values but the learners also too often resisted unconventional methods and alternative modes of practice. Violence also persisted. It was inherent not only in the relationship of learners to each other and to themselves but also in the relationship of teachers to learners. More sinister was identifying the hidden violence within education and the inherent aggression located within myself, both repositories for aftermaths that contained unresolved fragments.

44 Similarly Mark Fleishman writes how English improvisation expert, Keith Johnstone argues that the school system inhibits ‘the ability to react spontaneously and therefore to play’ and this was also experienced in Fleishman’s own South African context where: ‘Both previous white Christian National Education and black Bantu education refuse all spontaneous and creative thought in favor of the ideas of some higher authority: parents, teachers, the Government, God’ (1991, 78).
The school where I taught reached across multiple race and class sectors of South African and Cape Town society because a proportion of learners came from areas other than the immediate locale of Camps Bay, arriving from Cape Town’s CBD, Sea Point, Hout Bay, Mandela Park, Khayelitsha, Langa and Guguletu. The school is a feeder school, meaning it relies on the traffic of learners from areas other than the local community, which cannot provide the school with a sufficient student body. In contrast, the local community is mostly made up of the upper-middle class, who send their children to fancier, private schools further away, and foreign visitors who arrive to live in the suburb during their northern climate’s winter. Students who come from the suburb itself are often the children of domestic servants working in the houses of the upper-middle class South Africans and the foreign visitors. During my period of teaching and research, the difficulties encountered were not of identity but lack of discipline and apathy.

The traditional image of a Camps Bay High School learner is associated with surfing and being laid-back because of the seaside suburb where the school is located. The public transport students, who are bussed in from the feeding areas, seem less prone and more ambivalent towards this reputation. They arrive with a very different image to the students who are driven in cars by their parents. They travel from the townships, leaving early in the morning. They bond daily as a collective, not always harmoniously, on the long trip into town. Often they are restless and even tired by the time they reach midmorning classes. I presented some of these themes in a short playlet called ‘Miss Freshette’ that formed part of the larger, first aftermath play I devised at the high school called ‘Bophumtwalo’ (2004).

Fig. 3.2. A scene from ‘Miss Freshette’.

This short memory play showed three learners, one of whom was a ghost, locked in the old drama costume room as part of detention. It was successful with the learners who responded enthusiastically to its themes of punishment, abandonment and the consequences of violence. The idea for the play arose from an incident that
happened at Sinako Secondary School in Makhaza, Khayelitsha. According to the Argus Newspaper: ‘Two high school pupils were injured when police opened fire on teenagers rioting at a Khayelitsha school over the cancellation of its “Miss Freshette” beauty pageant’ (Magazi 2002). Themes from this school aftermath are synonymous with the aftermath of apartheid including: displacement, poverty, distrust of authority and a ‘school pass rate of 32 percent’ (ibid.). These themes found their way into the larger play of ‘Bophumtwalo’.

Fig. 3.3. ‘Bophumtwalo’ on the school floor.

‘BOPHUMTWALO’

This Sesotho phrase means ‘Pack Up and Leave’ and is a song used in Junction Avenue Theatre Company’s play Sophiatown (1986).45 The devised school play took the form of a collection of fragments from South African plays, poems and texts and original writing like ‘Miss Freshette’ to thread a dramatic collage of the history of South Africa’s Group Areas Act.46

The fragments of text hinged together by choral work and ensemble performance, evoked a sense of dispersal and movement. In the devising of this collage of texts, one particular grade ten learner, a young (adolescent) woman, was brave enough to play the character of a male gangster called Mingus from Sophiatown (see fig. 3.3), an example of how the devising of the original play text raised questions around gender and identity. By the end of the project, the learners were eager to raise questions about their own gender roles and sexual orientation raising further questions about what it means to be different in school today.

45 Sophiatown (published Purkey 1993) was workshopped by the Junction Avenue Theatre Company and premiered at the Market Theatre. The play uses historical artifact to assemble a sympathetic study of one family and their friends who have to deal with the forced removal from and destruction of, the racially mixed neighborhood of Sophiatown in 1950.

46 This infamous Act engineered the forced removal and dispersion that occurred in the apartheid era in South Africa during which about four million black South Africans were forcibly removed from their homes. Sean Field observes that between 1913 and 1983, it is estimated that at least 3,9 million people were forcibly removed in South Africa (Field 2001, 4). Elaine Unterhalter, notes that the true figure of forced removals and displacement may even double this (1987, 3).
‘Bophumtwalo’ is an aftermath play: a bricolage of many texts, partly the collaboration of an ensemble of students who performed, studied, directed, acted, designed, stage-managed and wrote in their first taste of unconventional theatre. They performed on the floor of the hall as it was my intention to dismantle what I saw as the hierarchical and politicised structure of the school hall with its raised school stage. The stage was metaphorically dismantled and turned into something else: a décor or backdrop of panoramic ruin while disused school debris lay out on the hall floor. This scattered debris was itself political because the audience themselves had to interact with this symbolic detritus by finding their way through the detritus in order to sit and watch the play.

Ramifications like these introduced a debate amongst the learners around conventional and unconventional methods of representation in performance. Many of the learners resisted at first the idea of performing on the hall floor and only wanted to perform on stage. In these learners’ voices I encountered both alternative and conventional issues that were less obvious than the ones I believed to exist in the aftermath of apartheid. At first, I neglected these voices of dissent through my own unpreparedness, improvising practice through exploratory methods that were not yet developed but seemed to be spontaneous. I relied on my own tacit knowledge and my extraction of old-second hand curriculum study guides left behind by previous drama teachers. In retrospect, the learner’s voices grew more ferocious, wanting to be heard as I the teacher became angry. Thus in reflecting on this early part of my research, I must ‘come clean’ about how projects, curriculum and texts were created but at the expense of the participants’ voices who were involved in the creation of these projects (Fine 1998b, 278).

47 Bricolage, in this context is meant as making a montage from readily available sources. It becomes significant in the aftermath because its primary function is to consolidate available pre-existing forms into a collaged remade form. It originates from French meaning ‘tinkering about’ and ‘doing odd jobs’. It is not necessarily the work of the handy man and has been utilised in the visual arts through collage, in postmodern theory, in improvisational theatre and positioned by Claude Levi-Strauss in The Savage Mind who locates it having a function of creating form by making ‘do with “whatever is at hand”’...’ (1966 17). Thus, learners were required to make and stage a text with materials that were immediately available to them.

48 Here I am using Michelle Fine’s analytical phrase ‘coming clean at the hyphen’ (1998b, 278) as a way to interrogate my own methods in writing this research so as not to provide just assumptions but rather to instigate a critical perspective. This phrase contributes to understanding what gets left out in-between making and observing, writing and reflecting, these absences are often located in a process of self-censorship and silencing in order to establish an authoritarian voice. Thus a form of hermeneutics occurs in order to understand one’s own voice more clearly when establishing discourse.
TEACHER IN TROUBLE

As my teaching continued, I grew angrier. I never intended to get angry. On reflection, I can acknowledge the pressure, the stress, my carelessness, the lack of discipline and the mutual lack of respect that I experienced while teaching, but in the end, I lost my ‘cool’ far too often. On more than one occasion, I used profanities while teaching. There is no justification for it. None of this was professional or ethical. I turned into an abusive teacher. I realised I had to acknowledge my failure to one specific class, the grade ten drama class who had so enthusiastically experienced the devising of ‘Bophumtwalo’. Since then, they had grown in size and stature to an uncontrollable and ill-disciplined grade eleven class.

This particular (grade ten now grade eleven) class had become so enamoured with my methods but also dismissive of them, characteristics of an immature love affair. They were also at the receiving end of my outbursts. Sometimes I was able to navigate this condition successfully but at other times it was awful and the ‘vase’ would break. Ingrid de Kok quotes Derek Walcott who says:

Break a vase, and the love that reassembles the fragments is stronger than that love which took its symmetry for granted when it was whole. The glue that fits the pieces is the sealing of the original shape. It is such love that reassembles our African and Asiatic fragments, the cracked heirlooms whose restoration shows its white scars (1998, 62).

De Kok qualifies Walcott’s metaphor of assemblage by adding that the gluing together may be the key function of art and cultural education in the time of social change, but ‘it involves seeing and feeling the fragmented, mutilating shards, before the white scar can be celebrated’ (ibid.). This implies seeing and feeling my own mutilating shards. Fragments being broken can be as dangerous as the mutilating condition that broke them. Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela describes how ‘The “dangerous living” in this constant repetition of violence has been associated with individuals who have not confronted or successfully integrated their trauma’ (2003, 157). My own aggression experienced while teaching indicated how unresolved fragments can incite aggression and can continue to hinder development. Thus, the perpetration of violence continues as the traumatic experience manifests. Whilst teaching I realised that I needed to recover the self through acknowledging the fragmented, mutilated shards as much as my work suggested locating a route towards recovery.
‘Don’t show your anger to the learners’ was the only advice I received in the staffroom when I began to teach. When I forgot, it felt just like dropping a ‘vase’. I accrued strategies from my own research in order to maintain some kind of order in the classroom and within myself, while simultaneously teaching and researching, which I thought might dismantle the oppressive element of anger. One of these strategies was to introduce the repository as a teaching tool in the classroom.

UBU DRAMA

The particular class of grade eleven learners were completely unwilling to try another Mr. Taub experiment: the introduction of the repository. There was more chance of a rebellion than a repository. I remember how one student called it a suppository! I introduced two *Ubu* texts into the curriculum of theatre history and provided practical examples of the repository: in puppetry, the making of journals and testimony. These texts were Alfred Jarry’s *Ubu Roi* (1896); and a contemporary South African text authored by The Handspring Puppet Company who along with Jane Taylor adapted Jarry’s original text into *Ubu and the Truth Commission* (1998).

Initially I thought that by teaching *Ubu*, the largeness of the word UBU, in essence its prodigious absurdity would disrupt the enclosure of all things traditional whilst installing the imagination of the dramatic. I assumed there would be an adolescent fascination with its violent and profane language as well as identification with a text originally created as a schoolboy prank. I had hoped that I could instill an understanding of comparative analysis by promoting the study of a contemporary South African text alongside Jarry’s original. In both texts, there is an embodiment of themes. These include corruption, inversion, and violence. They occur within the text through forms of characterisation, stock types, genre and gestus. In class, I became an embodiment of these themes. I became the distressed and angry Pa Ubu bullying for kingship, then the foolish Pa Ubu, a clumsy and appropriating trickster, and then Pa Ubu asking for amnesty. It becomes apparent that these three Ubu forms are similar to the archetypes that I have appropriated and embodied through-
Before I asked for amnesty things only got worse. The method of comparative analysis sowed seeds of further discord. ‘Why must we do BOTH!’, the learners would often complain and resist.

Because of the continuing isolation, conflict and duality in the classroom I was clearly distressed. I needed a platform for reconciliation. A tactic of reconciliation, between learner and teacher through practically applying a dramatic example of the South African Truth Commission allowed for some respite. The drama class held a trial. I had one of my teaching assistants present himself as my defense lawyer. Each student had a few minutes of time to present testimonies about the deteriorating situation in the classroom. The result was significant because everyone understood the value of testimony by hearing each voice in the class make their own record of testimony. The students saw the practicality of having a truth commission in their class first hand. It was live theatre assembled with elements from Augusto Boal’s Forum Theatre and television’s Jerry Springer functioning like the Greek Chorus.\(^5\) There was a practical understanding of a positive collective mechanism of reconciliation. The learners’ response to this exercise formed part of their testimonies written into their own journals.

Fig. 3.5. Letter to the drama teacher now repaired.

The journal became the significant repository for the intended curriculum. The learners could keep their theory notes, decorate them, find areas of connections with other fields and research and expand their scenarios into film/theatre analysis or décor and design or gossip or simply reflect. The stuff of drama and testimony expanded into their journals. These are their personal records reflecting both the political and the personal. When fragments occur in an assembled form; both the event before fragmentation and the method of assembling fragments reveal a narrative. The configurations of these assembled forms allow for the metaphorical shaping of narrative. In other words, fragments assembled in a repository indicate narratives. An example of this is a page from the journal of one grade eleven learner (see fig. 3.5). Here are assembled pieces of a torn up letter, written out my written research; how my distressed king eventually transforms into the trickster in the second case study and thereafter a third archetype arises through a complex manner of analysis and interpretation in the concluding projects. This final archetype transfigures into a Benjamin like allegorist and collector who has allegorized amnesty in a testimony of recollection.

\(^5\) Testimony became a repository for a montage of these dramatic elements: the drama class acting as a Greek chorus debated while performing their testimonies and by vocalising their dissent. As Boal’s Forum Theatre indicates, there was the intention to resolve many of the problems experienced through demonstrating testimony (see definitions of Boal’s Forum Theatre: Babbage 2004, 45; Cohen-Cruz and Schutzman 2006, 4). See Appendix 5 for examples of transcriptions for TRC held in Grade 11 Class.
by her mother to excuse her from being involved in a drama project. She cites nervousness as the reason not to participate but the learner later finds the courage to tear up the letter and assemble its fragments in her drama journal to represent her ultimately enthusiastic, involvement in the project.

Forms, in which the assembled fragments occur, act as repositories for the fragments. What the repositories do is enable a multi-narrative. The multi-narrative contains the narrative of the original fragmentation as well as the narratives that reflect the intersection between fragment and assemblage. The narrative of the container itself becomes the glue that holds the now fixed, broken object.

To embrace the journey from fragment through assemblage to repository is to re-energize and articulate debate about how to restore narrative from the aftermath of traumatic events through drama. Furthermore, to reconcile the difficult and the contested in sites where the potential for trauma exists is perhaps the challenge of extracting lessons from the aftermath; as things learnt from the aftermath rather than lessons as structured models of teaching drama.

Gavin Bolton refers to Plato who in disregarding drama in education as ‘prolonged indulgence’ still wrote ‘let your children’s lessons take the form of play’ (Bolton 2007, 45–46; citing Plato The Republic). This implies that play founded on instinct and spontaneity is a lesson that when recalled can indicate a useful consequence made from play.

EARLY ANALYSIS
An analysis of this early project suggests how these improvised and experimental projects could exist in relation to the institution of the school and could inform the workings of the researcher and the institution in which the researcher was working. Repositories became a useful vehicle for this kind of analysis. For instance, if one were to investigate the structure of the voodoo altar as a repository, one might look at the structural roots of colonialism, African and Caribbean history, memory, post-colonial and postmodern identity. The voodoo altar does not only contain these things but does determine assemblage and enable what it ends up containing. Deconstructing the repository might lead us to the roots or even routes of further analysis and understanding. Similarly an investigation into the institution I was working in revealed it to be a hyper-repository of educational curriculum and ideology. Its form is made of the sediment from multiple aftershocks.

Educator and sociologist Roland Meighan (1986) describes the term ‘porridge words’, first identified by Edward de Bono (1972), as words ‘that can be stirred around to stimulate further ideas and further connections because of the lack of precision’ (67). Aftermath is a porridge word. It has no precision. It follows a rupture. One simply does not know what might occur after this. Part of the early enquiry was not only about how to locate aftermath in education but also to determine how education itself is a repository for many aftershocks.

Through teaching and investigating education, I also realised my own anger. Subsequently I was drawn to Alan Sekula’s opinion that the ‘school and media are inherently discursive institutions, sites within discourse that become a locus of symbolic force, of symbolic violence’ (2003, 241). South African schools have their
symbols of violence. The Soweto student uprising is a violent and progressively potent symbol of South Africa’s liberation. In its aftermath, while I was teaching at the school, I encountered a simple reminder of actual school-related violence that went beyond symbols hidden in curricula, teaching methods and the school environment. A Cape Times headline pinned to a staffroom board pointed to this:

‘25% of Cape Schools unsafe’ meaning:

A staggering 220 out of 850 schools in the Western Cape’s safe schools program have been labelled ‘high risk’ and ‘extremely high risk’ meaning an average of 2000 pupils are likely to be exposed daily to gunfire and other violence (Kassiem 2005).

Often there were days that the staircase that spiralled up past my drama classroom seemed to be out of control with activity, bustle and the undercurrent threat of bullying. A survey at the school indicated how violence in the form of bullying was apparent. Of the grade eight learners questioned, 78% experienced bullying at school. In the same survey an anonymous grade eight learner says: ‘It is unfair the way teachers treats us special (sic) the head of grade’ (From school survey conducted, 2004). Was violence part of the school’s hidden curriculum? Did this hidden violence have an influence on my own aggression?

VIOLENCE AND THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM

Planned curriculum coexists with the hidden curriculum. Meighan defines the hidden curriculum as ‘all other things learnt during schooling in addition to the official curriculum’ (1986, 65). Schools have a traceable residue. This residue might be located as an identity traced back to the community and the local environment, but it also might be a history of the institution-one that is often hidden. There is considerable ambiguity in the idea of the hidden. Meighan says:

The reason for a learning to be hidden presents one problem. Is it hidden intentionally to manipulate and persuade? Is it hidden because nobody notices or recognises it? Is it hidden because it has been forgotten or neglected? Is it hidden because the originator has left? (66).

Is the hidden what Sekula points to when he says schools are inherently sites of discursive violence? (2003, 241). I was well aware that I too might be implicated in this hidden curriculum in the school but I could also learn to resist it. Exploring elements of my imaginary equation suitably negotiated such a polemic; incorporating tactics of both collusion and subversion as seen in the second devised grade ten play that followed ‘Bophumtwalo’. This play was called ‘The Wave That Disappeared’ (2005).

My objective here was to devise a drama with learners that engaged with both their concerns and mine, and that was not simply a didactic exposure of an aftermath. My initial concern was how my dramatic equation would operate in relation to my concern of violence in schools. The concern was derived not only from earlier observations and personal experience but also from the survey where the learners questioned had experienced bullying at school. The devised play suggested that standing up for oneself and group support seemed likely ways to deter this phenomenon.
Fig. 3.6. Chorus performs the opening of play along the vista of mountain and sea.

Flow, the laid-back surfer girl who is the protagonist in the play, disappears while surfing on a wave. With the wave, she lands in the Shipyard, an imaginary place that accumulates all things lost. Here, Flow meets the Lost Children who teach her the value of memory. She then is able to stand up to the arch-bully, Captain Dredge, tyrannical ruler of the Shipyard. I suggested the creation of Captain Dredge when realizing that adults bully too, even some teachers.

One particular planned school tour to Thailand corresponded with the Boxing Day tsunami of 2004 that decimated the coastline and populace of South East Asia. Miraculously, the tour had not left South Africa when the tsunami broke. I began to wonder how the school as a community, linked culturally and geographically to the ocean could empathize with a natural disaster and its aftermath that is about the ocean.

Already this particular grade ten drama class was grappling with the history play text, using the text as a way of extracting and collecting historical artefacts to stimulate further discussion and creativity, similar to the process of the earlier devised play, ‘Bophumtwalo’. This time they compared the text of *Sophiatown* alongside the text of *The Diary of Anne Frank*. Both of these plays are part of the drama curriculum and studied as history plays. This included a method of unearthing historical evidence from both dramatic texts and assembling the evidence as fragment, into an inventory of categories. I indicated to the class that when studying the play text they were to take on roles of investigators looking for historical clues and problems within the text. The class would assemble these clues, once found, into an inventory. This inventory was arranged into categories made up from the learners’ own suggestions corresponding to a table of emotion, place and object.

---

51 This well made play, dramatised by Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett in 1956, constitutes an example of memory and confessional as elements of realist drama and was inspired by Anne Frank’s actual diary of life in Nazi occupied Netherlands.
Another practical exercise that was actually an expedition, laid down the foundation for the play. During one double period, I led the class down to the nearby beach, only minutes away on foot. Here I instructed the class to analyse their environment by identifying, collecting and then, much later, mimicking its surrounding sounds, smells and objects. There was to be no discussion, rather they would collect then interact with each other only through their assembled artefacts of sound, action and object. The beach is full of detritus, of the thrown away and thrown up. Dried up seaweed, empty bottles and shells became building blocks. The class placed the detritus into a fragment box and the fragment box provided stimulus for developing the location of the play: ‘The Shipyard’ where all things that are lost, land up.

The Nemos who are a lost girl rock band who sing to Captain Dredge while he waits for his favourite book.

‘Storms and tsunamis and things that break, We want to see a big earthquake! Little tornadoes and things that smash, we’d like to feel a hurricane lash! Sadness and tears and things that cry, Captain Dredge is our reason why! Heartache and pain is good for despair, Come on, Captain, pull up a chair. He’s our saviour, with bad behaviour, These are a few of our favourite things. He rules the shipyard with big iron fists…’

(From ‘The Wave That Disappeared.’)

Amanda Stuart Fisher’s ‘The Playwright in Residence: A Community’s Storyteller’ (2004) presents many of the challenges faced in the interactions between the individual storyteller/playwright and a particular community, actively collaborating in creating a story. She stresses that the playwright is in residence, meaning not a member of the community but rather a visitor, a conjurer who is invited to play a temporary shamanistic role in order to transform the community’s lived experience into a story that is meaningful and owned by those who create it (137). This is not always the case. In the case of the second devised aftermath The wave disappeared in the winter of 2003, after a local shipyard company called Murueta S.A. dredged the Guernica estuary at the mouth of the Oka River, ruining what turned out to be a very important sandbar. The dredging changed the flow of the river so drastically that the coastal seawater just blubbered and swayed where it used to rear up into a speeding curl. It was a catastrophe, not just for surfers but also for tourism in Mundaka -- not to mention the local hip clothing shops that had thrived in the area’s bustling surf culture. (Sören Meschede, Der Spiegel Online: 2006).

The genesis for the play was taken from a news report not too dissimilar to this one in Der Speigel, reporting on the phenomenon of the wave that disappeared in Mundaka, Spain. The news report was discussed in the drama class and out of this discussion ideas were generated about what it meant for a wave to disappear and why it did disappear. I initiated the idea and I drew its focus up to a point. The learners’ own concerns were implicitly revealed in the way that they engaged with belonging to a school that was located so near to the sea. Learners began to collate their feelings and ideas about the wave disappearing in their journals. They were instructed to create an archive of ideas that was structured in a table-like format with these headings: objects, memories, places, people. Various exercises were created to stimulate making a narrative about the wave disappearing using the archive table as a guide. One of the most influential exercises included the previously mentioned expedition down to the local beach. Activities of this kind took place for a month in their allocated drama class. After this, I took their journals away to write the play text using their journals for inspiration, particularly their archive-tables. The play was performed publicly over a period of two nights in the school cafeteria and ran concurrently alongside the public performance of the intermediary project of (f+a=r) as a way to stimulate comparison between these two performance events. Like Bophumtwalo the play text and questions alongside it were used in the final drama exams of these particular learners. The image below is the set of the original play; boxes and fishing nets combined with other detritus filled the school cafeteria creating the milieu of the shipyard.
text, I was still part of the community. The students recognized me as their teacher and this presented difficulties for me to objectively stand outside the classroom in order to look in. I became aware how my role was like Duvignaud’s archetype of a ‘distressed’ king who is both isolated but in a position to lead. (see N42). This is an archetype that has a specialized role in collaborating in social drama. The conflict and subsequent distress arises by virtue of the awareness of a split in life. This description of myself as a distressed king was weaned from hours and hours of enthusiastically studying and writing, collaborating and initiating, teaching and researching, a figure of authority and dissemination, here isolated and there engaged in embracing the collective. Perhaps these dialectics are necessary when maintaining a facilitatory role that engages in creating drama within the collective whilst simultaneously maintaining distance. Gavin Bolton in his overview of a European history of drama in education concludes that a ‘right degree of distancing’ in teaching drama in the classroom might provide a way towards ‘true substance’ (2007, 58). This position provides a kind of retrospective clarity on the archetype of the distressed king that I embodied in this process. This contradiction of being part of the community and being distant from the community provides an inescapable tension that this kind of archetype might sustain and extend with ‘the right degree of distancing’ in order to create collectively (Bolton 2007, 58).

Bolton talks about the archetypes of the shaman and the clown when he gives his overview of a ‘History of Drama Education’ signifying how these two archetypes ‘both stand for a virtual reality, the very essence of the imagined’ (51). I, too, had assumed an archetype with an imagined identity. When I performed with it, it provided me with the ability to play and improvise within the collective in order to create collectively but helped me to maintain distance. In my case the archetype also occurred through passively resisting the variables of violence, a fragmented self and hidden curriculum. It was this position that enabled me as a playwright in residence (along with the roles of researcher and teacher) to receive and shape the narrative of the many experiences told.

All through the collaborative process, in making ‘The Wave That Disappeared’, the learners’ observations were placed into their drama journals, embodied as text, collage or visual responses. Halfway through the process I made several significant decisions in realising the strong position I held within the group. I tried to remain an outsider so that the learners could define their activities on their own. I also realised that out of all the narrative-building projects that were occurring in the school, this project, as a collaborative devised text was the only one that might represent some of the traditional Aristotelian notions of dramatic narrative. This tradition includes linearity of plot and narrative structure, unity of time and place and forms of resolution. The learners themselves requested this structuring of traditional logic. Guided by this, I took the learners’ journals away to shape the text thus negating my objective of distance. Three days later, I had written the second aftermath play, ‘The Wave That Disappeared’, and employed another adult director to facilitate the directing of the play. The final play as performed by this group of grade ten learners occurred in the school’s cafeteria. The audience, mostly made up of the school’s community, sat in the round of the recreated ‘Shipyard’ and watched attentively as the learners performed in a panoramic action around them. This play embodied a compromise
of unconventional presentation with a linear narrative displaying themes of bullying, memory and individual identity. Once again as an aftermath play like ‘Miss Freshette’, the learners involved responded enthusiastically to both its form and to playing its content.

Fig. 3.7. Captain Dredge sits amongst his detritus in the school cafeteria.

A play in the school cafeteria is like an interstice. The interstice dispels permanence. It avoids obvious dramatic sites like the drama classroom or the stage in the school hall in favour of non-obvious sites for drama. This disrupts the institutional architecture and the rules of space and its usage. By resisting the conventional, it promotes methods of unsettling the hidden curriculum perceived as negative for the school community and provides playful ways to deal with serious themes of the aftermath. At the same time my own theoretical processes, themselves contingent and temporary, are experimented with so that the research process becomes more conscious and complex as the practice develops. In this way, the methodology shifts from a more exploratory phase to an intermediate phase of development in producing a play text like ‘The Wave That Disappeared’ that subsequently became a reproducible product staged in another environment as indicated by the excerpt below. This is not meant to negate the importance of the process and to separate it from the product but it does point to the increasing development of the methodology such that it is able to produce work capable of standing separate from the process of creation.

About the play, I have to say for me is a really emotional breakdown. I cry everytime we practice/rehearse. The kids are from all over Alexandra Township and only a few come from outside (Tembisa and Lombardy). You can actually see the joy in their eyes when they do the play and how eager they are… And we were struggling a bit about the costumes (making them) but 2 guys from the church volunteered to make them for us.

(Excerpt of a letter written by Thembi, a grade eleven learner from Northcliff High and director of ‘The Wave That Disappeared’ for her church drama group, the Ikemeleng Scripture Union in Alexandra Township, Johannesburg).

52 Bourriaud whose theories start to operate with greater effect in the intermediate school project recalls Karl Marx when defining the term interstice. In Marxist terms it had a trading function that alluded to the dominant economic context. In Bourriaud’s terms it ‘is a space in human relation which fits more or less harmoniously and openly in the overall system but suggests other trading possibilities than those in effect within this system’ (1998, 16).
CONCLUDING THE EARLY PROJECTS

In the early projects of this experimental phase working with fragment, assemblage and their equation developed as if it was a playful yet allegorical code that was used only in my drama classes whilst simultaneously devising plays and classroom interventions. But I soon realised the need to create a practical, user-friendly guide for the school and its learners in order to explain aftermath and its elements of fragment, assemblage and repository. I began to explicitly articulate this when the intermediary (f+ar=r) project began (see Appendix 6 for examples of information forms about the (f+a=r) project).

No matter how comfortably the equation fitted into a reductive composition it also needed to embrace ways of decoding and encoding action and to provide critical thought. This only became evident in the next project when the equation left the enclosure of the teaching classroom and was applied in a voluntary project. There were two questions that arose during the early projects and were developed further in the subsequent project as discussed in the next chapter. These questions include:

- Could alternative experimental designs that develop narrative strategy co-exist alongside teaching traditional drama curriculum in the classroom?
- In the location of the school were there other places that could be exposed as performable interstices?

These questions were broad as they were naïve. They however provided a framework and a means of testing the relationship of the equation on drama and narrative as a strategy for change in the non-theatrical location (in this case the school), although the theatrical location still persisted as convention within the drama classroom and within the drama curriculum. The early work on the equation somehow managed not only to produce narrative as play text but also encouraged alternate curriculum development and began to position itself as a subversive force that mediated and encouraged critical action and thought within the school community.

The early projects provided the first challenges to my self in encouraging me to interrogate my anger and initiate my own journey of self-recovery. Importantly the early projects also exposed the pressure that teachers experience in everyday teaching. Bolton cites Larry O’Farrell, who as President of the ‘International Drama in Education Association’, writes how the use of drama helps ‘children and young people to express their feelings of pain, loss, sorrow and anger to declare their will to live and their hope for the future’ (cited in 2007, 57). From this Bolton suggests that such ‘expression in drama is encouraging and idealistic’ (ibid.). I would concur especially when facilitation, as in my case, also needed a point of expression. My own objectives were not just about teaching drama in the classroom, neither was I using drama as an impetus towards self-repair, but somehow the practice became an intersection of these and several other things, which at this point in the research seemed unclear. There was a lot of making the most of what was readily available in order to experiment rather than to validate the experiment.
Drama and education practitioner Shifra Schonmann, reminds us of the danger of doing drama with young people (in her case Israeli and Arab youth): ‘Real life can sometimes burn through any dramatisation causing its frameworks to collapse’ (cited in Bolton 2007, 58). There was a real danger in all of the above-mentioned projects that my own inherent aggression intersecting with the hidden violence would burn through the framework of what I intended to explore. This danger was circumvented by a position of distance supported both by a phenomenological distancing incorporating the variables of the imaginary equation in question and the distancing assumed by the archetype of the distressed king. If there is an evaluation of the work in retrospect, it was not to be provided through an assessment of the learners’ activities, because at this experimental stage I could not comprehend how to form such an evaluation. Rather there is an assessment of my own role and the work that was created with and for the learners. During this exploratory stage an assessment is necessary in order to distil the outcomes towards a more descriptive framework. I have made categories of an evaluation modified by Schonmann from the work of May Field Belenky, et al. in *Women’s Ways of Knowing* (1986).

I suggest from this modification that unlike Schonmann’s original intention which is to evaluate learners’ experiences in drama, similar categories can be used to evaluate the work of teachers themselves thus extending a Paolo Freire-like paradigm of alternate terms in education, of ‘teacher-student and student-teachers’ (1971, 67). The modification here includes:

i) A delineation of process through a description of aims;
ii) Discovering the unknown within the instruction;
iii) The value of intuition and play;
iv) An arrangement of instruction and research as respectively collaborative and solitary;
v) The relationship of the self versus the concern for others;
vi) How are the goals (of production) perceived?

All of these factors occurred as challenges experienced within these early projects and recurred in other forms throughout my research. Arguing for this kind of evaluation also means emphasising bricolage whilst working and reflecting with what resources are readily available to the teacher and in this case researcher.

‘Teachers as bricoleurs in resisting mandated curriculum’ is how Eileen Honan defines the position teachers take when conducting ‘complex adjusting, work, in order to make sense of the changes that continually impact on their situations’ (2006, 79–93). This chapter is a bricolage, of making do with what fragments are left from this exploratory phase, mostly existing as reflections that might enable an understanding of the evolution of how a practice of drama and narrative might from within aftermath provide recovery. Reflection encourages

Schonmann (2004) suggests that often ethical responses to doing things right rely on instinct rather than an appropriate model of procedure. She emphasises the use of mental-images, defined as ‘a representation of an image, which emerges from a defined perception of an entity’ (1). If utilised correctly [these] can generate positive outcomes through the mediation of doing and knowing. Her methodology is similar in essence to Benjamin’s *Denkbilder* because while thinking of the image in the mind, the imagination stimulates a generation of image activated through the body and in space thereby rearticulating the original thought image. Schonmann asserts that ‘The drama teacher should be aware of the power of mental-images to destroy or to build, their ability to cure or wound’ (6).

Schonmann describes the work of Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule as the development of a ‘number of coding categories to capture the ways in which women construe experience of themselves as developing beings (see Belenky et al. 1986, Appendix B, 237–238), [and that] it is possible to suggest a framework of guiding dialectical principles for all levels of education’ (2007, 418).
teachers to become engaged as ‘reflective researchers’ and thus become active participants in their own practices, recognising the complex nature of teachers’ work and working with intertwining theory and practice into praxis (81). It also repositions teachers as professionals who begin to accept and value change, and who are ‘always looking for better, newer things’ (94).

I went beyond being merely a teacher and a generator of new text. I was a researcher who adapted my research as I wanted to encourage change as a process towards constructing new kinds of collaboration in the high school. Subsequently in the next project, many of my earlier concerns fell away because both the process and production of research were done differently, more descriptively and I was ready to shift gear and to attempt a new project that was even more complex.
FOUR
DRAMATIC EQUATION

Fig. 4.1. \((f+a=r)\) written on board in a maths classroom.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE INTERMEDIARY PROJECT

At the end of the last chapter I indicated how I reconciled myself as a researcher working in the location of a high school. I had consolidated aspects of my research apparatus, the imaginary equation, from making projects in response to the institution towards transforming the research apparatus and advancing the research process in the production of a project autonomous to the institution. The project became an interactive narrative project, known as \((f+a=r)\). I launched the project at the location of Camps Bay High School in August 2005. Fourteen voluntary participants including eight learners, three teachers, two parents and one ground-staff member utilised the equation: fragment plus assemblage equals repository \((f+a=r)\), along with methods of drama practice and narrative building to actively create their own interpretive version of dramatic-narrative. This occurred through a process of storytelling, games, discussion, journal writing, and video assemblage. In this process, the participants disregarded traditional text in favour of forming a drama project that was more exploratory. The participants were ready to experiment with a site-specific performance that consisted of fragments of narrative performed and exchanged at various sites around the school grounds. I have submitted the video documentation of this project, both its meetings and its subsequent performance within the appendix as a secondary text.

In this section, I shall: i) outline the preliminary stages of this project; ii) give an overview of the contribution of video to the project; iii) use the journal reflections of one participant to describe the meetings held over the course of the project; iv) assess the contribution of the video documentation as the power of scrutiny; v) describe the interactive narrative performance that occurred during the project as performing

It is at this point that I recommend watching the video documentation made from this project; see DVD \((f+a=r)\): Appendix 1; 2.
secrecy; vi) reflect upon one last journal entry as a means of analysis and vii) then point to what was learnt from this project in a postscript where I shall include an assessment of the project linking it to the next location and section: the clinic.

PRELIMINARY STAGES

My intention with the \((f+a=r)\) project was clear and straightforward: to assemble a group of voluntary participants from all sectors of the school’s constituency. At the meetings, each volunteer would bring a personal fragment. These fragments would have to represent something physically or symbolically broken from the volunteers’ lives. I had hoped the act of bringing a single fragment would be the start of a narrative-building drama project, facilitated by the interplay between the elements of the equation (fragment, assemblage and repository) that would become a tactile exchange of embodied knowledge and gained experience amongst the participants.

I wanted to involve all members of the school’s constituency. I had hoped that the project would attract learners, teachers, parents and ground-staff. The meetings would depend on voluntary participation: no one would be forced or encouraged to join; there just had to be genuine interest and commitment to attending the meetings. The meetings themselves would extend beyond the formal confines of the school, meaning meetings might not necessarily happen in school hours or in demarcated, obvious school places. I did not want to limit the development of the project to be solely based on my own intentions and relied very much on what the group, once assembled, wanted.

The preliminary planning before the commencement of the project itself also included: i) preliminary discussion with the headmaster; ii) advertising; iii) an announcement at assembly and iv) a letter given to parents informing them about the project. These kinds of preliminary planning suggest how complicated it was to explain to the school constituency why they should bring a fragment to the \((f+a=r)\) project and why they should volunteer to participate at all.

Presenting so many preliminary components as explanation is an example of inadvertently colluding with my own fears of the institution and its administration. On the surface they were open to the project and allowed it to happen. I did suspect them of fearing anything out of the ordinary or subversive because they continued to ask for further explanation. Although dissimilar to Michelle Fine’s experiences in so far as content was concerned, her research in a public school in New York began too with veiled warnings from the administrative powers to silence her and the ‘imaginations of the adolescents’ (1992, 12). Fine notes a ‘systematic fear of naming’:

\[56\text{ see Appendix 6.}\]
Naming involves those practices that facilitate critical conversation about social and economic arrangements particularly about inequitable distributions of power and resources by which these students and their kin suffer disproportionately. The practices of administration, the relationships between school and community and the forms of pedagogy and curriculum applied were all scarred by fear of naming, provoking the move to silence… (ibid.)

This silence – what she later calls ‘The White Noise’ or ‘Administrative Silencing’ - was also apparent in my case but, in essence, there was a reversal too. Many of my own words and over-explanation provoked a kind of complicit silencing. During the preliminary stages, there was a need to over-articulate my project in order to accommodate an inherent fear I had within the institution of the institution.

i) Preliminary discussion with the headmaster:

The headmaster indicated his excitement at the prospects of the project. He was very keen to involve learners who appeared to be uninterested in any other extra-curricular activities. He felt that this project was an alternative activity that might stir the interest of these learners. From this meeting it was also clear that he was going to be the gatekeeper of the project. He would have certain privileges in granting and restricting access to the project and the mobility of the project. At first, I did not mind this and even told him that his position was like that of a gatekeeper. In anthropological terms, the gatekeeper is ‘a person who can provide a smooth entrance into the site’ (Leedy 2005, 137).

Later on, the headmaster as gatekeeper made certain decisions that sometimes thwarted developments within the project, but at this preliminary meeting he was enthusiastic and keen to develop and include within the early stages of the project an accompanying survey, which I would initiate. This survey would gauge the apathy levels amongst learners at the school. I was interested in launching this survey because I too was interested in what motivated learners to become involved in extra-curricular activities. The survey did not assist the project in the way that the surveys from my earlier exploratory projects helped to prepare the way forward. The survey seemed to collude with the traditional framework of the school, as a subtle way of enforcing participation, which was not the intention of the project because the project was voluntary.

Fig. 4.2. Poster now modified with \((f + gay = r)\)
ii) Advertising:
I placed posters around the school building. The posters were simple, white, A3 in size and had only the bold, black lettering of the equation \((f+a=r)\) written in the centre. I wanted them to be oblique in order to incite the curiosity of the school. The posters went up two weeks before the project was formally explained in assembly. I placed the posters on various school walls, in corridors, outside classrooms, and in entrances to toilets. Their intended effect was achieved. During the weeks leading up to the project, teachers were assailed with questions from learners concerning the meaning of the posters. At that point, no one could really give any answers. The strategy of secrecy here was not only alluring but also provocative; provoking the school into being curious and interested in the forthcoming project. The secret itself expressed itself as an incomplete knowledge of the equation, like a type of communication, which ‘universalized curiosity and exchange’ (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998, 253). This incomplete knowledge demonstrated my own uncertainty about what form the project might embody. Demonstrating this obliqueness stimulated a universalised curiosity amongst the school’s constituency, which in turn promoted a relational exchange of questioning and dialogue. Secrecy was a productive strategy so that given bits of information, the receivers assembled them how they chose to and communicated new unintended meanings to others. Sometimes these unintended meanings were not as positive as I would have liked them to be as was illustrated when one of the posters of the project was defaced (see fig.4.2). I found this alongside the prefect’s room, so perhaps the defacement had more to do with reacting to a fellow learner’s authority than to the project itself. The imposition of secrecy does however provoke new secrets and new acts of social encounter; themes of the project that intended to promote alternative kinds of social interaction. At the same time the posters were also projections of the codification strategies pointed to by Freire who suggests that: ‘These representations function as challenges, as coded situation-problems containing elements to be decoded by the groups with collaboration of the coordinator’ (1990, 51). The decodification of the posters occurred through an exchange of dialogue with the project’s participants reporting to the school’s constituents. This progressed as soon as the project was underway.

iii) Announcement at assembly:
Two weeks after putting up the posters, I made an announcement at school assembly (this was still some weeks before the project began). These assemblies were traditional, formalised gatherings that occurred twice a week. During the assembly teachers would usually sit on stage while the learners would sit on the hall floor, reinforcing the hierarchical power structures. In the previous chapter, I indicated my suspicion of such hierarchical arrangements. I described, how in one devised play, I attempted to rearticulate the structural hierarchies of the school hall by rearranging

57 There are connections to what Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett describes as ‘the theater of secrecy’ (1998, 225). Here ‘hiding and showing’ are ‘mutually constitutive and seem to create ‘ little dramas [which] ‘structure our perception and attention. They create channels and pathways for transmission. They regulate the rhythm, pace, range and distribution of value’ (ibid.). Later in the meetings, this became embodied through the playing of the children’s game ‘broken telephone’ also known as ‘Chinese whispers’. In both the school and clinic project, this became a popular exercise. One participant would whisper a secret passed around the group as a whisper, invariably mutating as it is passed from one participant to another. This exercise indicates how performing phrases of language as secrets might lead to a fragmentation that must then be assembled through the listening and the telling.
the performance configuration, off the raised stage and on to the flat floor. Now, as I stood on the stage looking down on the learners, I had become complicit in the conventional power structure of the school. What stopped me from standing on the floor when I spoke or at the back of the hall for that matter, was that at the time I thought I must placate the institutional powers so that the project did not appear to be threatening in order to operate harmoniously within the conventional power structures. The only way I could explain the implementation of the project was by announcing it from on high, reinforcing in the process the operations of power. Later on if I were to resist the power structure in any way I felt I would have to manipulate the assembly for the project’s needs on the project’s terms. I had to use the assemblies as a useful place to inform the school of what might be occurring in the \((f+a=r)\) project meetings but also as an important site of reproduction so essential to the project.

Reproduction in the context of the project means successive production stages or processes applied onto each other progressively and continuously; a process of recycling that also reflects a process of assemblage. Furthermore reproduction assists the advance of reflexivity. The final image in the \((f+a=r)\) DVD, of a hall filled with learners watching a \((f+a=r)\) video episode in the assembly, demonstrates the operation of reproduction through this reflexive digital frame.

Fig. 4.3. \((f+a=r)\) as a video episode shown at weekly assembly.

---

58 In his essay, ‘The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction’, Benjamin validates reproduction as both process and an advance for the interpretative arts. He writes: ‘In principle a work of art has always been reproducible’ (1968c, 218). In the context of reproducing forms, he notes a progression from practice to diffusion on to gain. This means practice diffuses a particular kind of produced practice. Comparatively in my context, there is the use of case study methodology as a form of progression. What is different is I am certain that reproduction can be present ‘in time and space’ (220) unlike Benjamin who ascertains that reproduction is ‘lacking in one element: its presence in time and space, its unique existence at the place where it happens to be’ (ibid.). My argument is supported by Benjamin’s own contradiction concerning the rereading of reproduction, meaning: ‘And in permitting the reproduction to meet the beholder or listener in his own particular situation, [as in time and space] it reactivates the object reproduced’ (221). Examples of this occur in my own rereading of a participant’s journal and furthermore in the note below which articulates how reproduction engineers a form which is very much present in time and space through its extension of these very qualities.

59 This image is to be compared to sitting between two mirrors. It can be extended using the framing device of the *mise-en-abyme*; originating from a ‘French expression used in heraldry to describe a small shield within a large shield’ re articulated by Diane Elam (1994) in feminist theory and critique used to pluralise the relationship between object and subject as ‘fluid and changeable’ (cited in Gorton 1999). Although the term reproduction is adapted from Bourriaud in terms of the manipulation and recycling of material that is ‘no longer primary’ (2002a, 13), the reproductive function does appropriate the reflexive frame by suggesting endless recycling and repeating towards infinity. Similarly according to Barbara Myerhoff and Jay Ruby the reflexive frame occurs when mirrors double creating ‘the endless regress of possibilities….’ (1995, 309).
iv) Parent’s evening:
Parents’ evening was the last stage of the preliminary phase. The quarterly parents meeting happened to occur just before the first meeting of the project. I hoped parents would show an interest in participating. I thought it suitable to distribute a newsletter informing parents about the project. The newsletter followed a similar format to the announcement made at the school’s assembly. When the project began, only two parents decided to participate, one of whom was already a teacher at the school.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF VIDEO
Before I begin to describe the meetings themselves I want to stress the importance of video to the work, both as an archival document and as a process of reflection and reproduction; how reproducing and assembling video narrative was an important device. Each of the project’s meetings were recorded on videotape in real time and later edited into smaller segments. In this way, the narrative (of what occurred at the meetings of the project) was reproduced. One of the strongest influences on the project was my collaboration with video artist Ed Young. He worked alongside me on the (f+a=r) project, filming on digital camera then editing the weekly meetings together with me, reproducing them as DVD episodes. The edited DVD documentation of these meetings is also entitled (f+a=r). The contribution of video to the research also indicated the increasing contribution of other disciplines besides drama, thus advancing the trans-disciplinary approach to the research as a whole.

Fig. 4.4. Ed reflected in the mirror filming (f+a=r).
Young brought to the work his (then) intense fascination with Nicholas Bourriaud’s descriptions of processes of production in art, particularly from Bourriaud’s book *Postproduction* (2002a).^60^

In my collaboration with Young, processing and reproduction occurred through the remaking of raw material found in the digital documentation. The raw material was the real time footage of the project’s meetings. Through the editing process, the digital footage was reproduced into secondary and tertiary material.

Bourriaud explains

As a set of activities linked to the service industry and recycling, postproduction belongs to the tertiary sector as opposed to the industrial or agricultural sector, i.e. the production of raw materials (2002a, 13).

Reproduction is an intersection occurring continuously between the various sectors in production, between raw material and the secondary and tertiary sectors. In my project, edited segments or secondary narratives were presented back to the participants who had informed the original raw material. These meetings and subsequent viewings were also filmed and then reproduced, as were the episodes that were screened to the entire school at assembly (these were also filmed and reproduced). These later processes formed part of the tertiary process or narratives and included an ongoing dissemination by producing further reproduction.

Throughout the process of video documentation, Young and I grappled with Bourriaud’s theories. We became obsessed with notions about truth and non-truth. It became clear that we had no control over exposing a truthful narrative about the project’s meetings. What stopped this from happening was our uncertainty about the representation of truth once we began editing these

---

^60^ Bourriaud has made an impact on contemporary art theory and activity since the publication of *Relational Aesthetics* (1998) in which he discloses an interest in: ‘The possibility of a relational art (an art taking as its theoretical horizon the realm of human interac-
tions and its social context rather than the assertion of independent and private symbolic space)...’ (14). *Postproduction* (2002a) he claims is not a ‘sequel’ to his earlier book except that they are linked to ‘an analysis of today’s arts in relation to social changes whether technological, economical, or sociological – while the former deals with collective sensibility Postproduction analyses a set of modes of production...’(8). What I was able to extract from his publications and link to my own projects were questions about reproducible forms produced and synthesized through social collaboration involving interaction, participation and exchange.
filmed meetings. How could we identify truth as non-truth and non-truth as truth within the editing process? Was this important? One way to highlight our suspicions with regard to the discrepancy of truth was to demonstrate an altercation with the edited narrative. We eradicated representing normative time frames. We distorted sound and image. These kinds of digital subversions could be described as an experiment of incongruity. Researchers, Alvesson and Skoldberg, describe this as ‘The experimenter (who) behaves in a deviant mode in relation to some rule or expectation, in order to reveal the implicit rule structure by an estrangement effect’ (2000, 42). This experiment with digital subversion rearranged certain conventional rules about linear narrative structure and objectivity that in turn revealed certain things about our own subversive processes in the making and re-making of these filmed episodes and the questions they provoked. We suggested that the answers to these questions might lie in effecting estrangement and enhancing distortion in order to demonstrate our suspicion of the implied objectivity of edited filmed narratives.

As the project proceeded, it became useful for the participants to reflect on the narrative they had already expressed in order to move forward in the process. Participants learnt to adapt previously recorded narratives by reflecting on them and then transforming them by changing previously recorded action in order to reproduce existing narratives and advance the practice of reproduction. Reproduction like assemblage suggests that even if there is an intention to reproduce again in the same way, there will be a transformative change signaled by the imitation of the original and thereafter the extension of the original. The copying act would generate new meaning. Advancing reproduction into a structure of pedagogic reflection meant the task was not necessarily only to interrogate and thus subvert existing rules structured around truth; but also meant reproducing the digital narrative by returning to previously made records in order to reflect and learn from them. A model of pedagogic reflection in the context of reproduction points back to Benjamin’s assertions about Brecht’s ‘functional transformation’ (see p67–68); how an apparatus of production (in this case reproduction) transforms itself as it transmits change in effecting production. The modes of production change as they also change things. Utilising the digital process in this way was an important innovation for the project as a whole and continued throughout the other projects as both a process of pedagogic reproduction, and archival resource.

THE MEETINGS
My descriptions of the project meetings will rely on the journal entries of one of the participants. The reproduced journal entries are an accurate representation of the actual journals (any inaccuracies are the participant’s own). An analysis of these journal entries will provide a way to reflect on these meetings, which in turn will provide a comparative commentary on the process of the project and products of the project, i.e. journals and video.

The voluntary participants who attended the meetings are separated into two primary categories: learner-participants and parent-participants.
• **Learner participants:** There were five consistent participants in this category but the number inconsistently wavered from eight to twelve. Sub-categories that take into account South Africa’s particular social–political context include:
  
  • Gender: male or female; with a standard ratio of two girls to three boys (2:3).
  
  • Junior (meaning grades eight or nine) or senior (meaning grades ten, eleven or matric): what is important here is how the senior’s interest dwindled towards performance time whilst the consistent attendants were all junior students.
  
  • Race: out of the five junior learners, who attended consistently one was white and four were black thus a standard racial categorization of 1:4.

• **Adult participants:** There were three sub-categories here defined as:
  
  • Teacher parent-participant. (Also male/white)
  
  • Teacher-participant. (Also female/coloured)
  
  • Mother parent-participant. (Also female/white)
  
  • Ground-staff participant. (Also female/coloured)

I gave journals to all of the participants at the first meeting of the project; explaining to all how the journals would store their personal reflections on the meetings and the project’s process. At the end of the project, participants could volunteer to return the journals to me as part of the contract of informed consent. I had hoped that the journals made available to me would be useful in understanding the participants’ integration of process and comprehension of the project. Most of the participants were not consistent in their reflective writing. The presence of video documentation challenged this process of reflective writing. I also suspect I did not do enough in order to prepare the participants to appreciate or understand the value of journal writing. At the end of the project, I only received five journals. The learner-participants submitted four of these and the mother-parent-participant submitted one.

Alexandra Sutherland argues in, ‘Writing and Performing Change: the use of writing journals to promote reflexivity in a Drama Studies Curriculum’ (2007):

that all dramatic arts processes are at some stage unknown and chaotic, and that by generating spaces and sites, such as journals, to identify what we did in these moments, we are engaging in what theorist Donald Schön calls a reflective conversation of reflecting *in* and *on* action (119). Sutherland also refers to this kind of reflective engagement as ‘the revision of experience’ (115). The term ‘revision of experience’ sustains the reflexive method as a narrative that takes into account the subjectivity of the researcher and how this affects both the project and its written account. The term ‘revision of experience’ benefits the researcher in understanding the experience ‘as a site for learning rather than a failed creative action’ (*ibid.*).

61 Gillie Bolton (2001) cites Best (1996) who stresses the value of the journal ‘as a process of integration’ for containment and therapeutic space: it is a safe place to put experiences and emotions, however bad these might be. These can then be reviewed more safely at a later date: the material will have remained on the same page in the interval, but the writer will have moved on and be able to reassess the situation, their feelings and thoughts about it. She also calls it a *play space*: ‘space to explore and confirm’ (167).
This is important because the project was experimental and by nature I was often too self-conscious of the possibility of failure. The term ‘revision of experience’ provides a sensibility when revisiting project work in order to understand and appreciate its value no matter what its immediate effects were.

By analysing the entries made by the mother parent-participant called Lauren, I will revisit the project and focus on trying to understand the nature of the project subject to Lauren’s observations. Doing so contributes to identifying and integrating the ‘reflexive identities and abilities’ (ibid., 111), of myself as researcher in making research projects, documenting and translating the research practice and validating the paradigm of testimony by consolidating the ‘confessional practices that may be seen to constitute a generic identity: practitioner as confessor’ (Bleakley 2000, 13). What does happen is a kind of comparative dialogue between Lauren’s journal entries and my recollection of the same events.

I want to concentrate on Lauren’s journal entries because they are consistent. They correspond to Sutherland’s criteria of forming a narrative analysis from journal writing i.e. ‘a reading of narrative involving theme, plot, characters, metaphor, action and outcome’ (2007, 111–112). Lauren’s journal entries form a narrative because they give an account of how the project proceeded. Her journal is a record of almost every meeting. Her observations form a narrative that corresponds to an aim of the project that promotes an internal search in order to discover from the unknown as part of the heuristic method. The analysis of Lauren’s journal might also determine a growing self-awareness of the participant’s own identity. It will give a voice to a participant whose contribution evokes consistency on the page; importantly it is her own voice, her writing that will lead the analysis, not framed by my own intention to analyse. Lauren’s consistent voice also suggests that the project’s complexities might have silenced the learner’s voices in the project.

Fig. 4.5  In the first meeting a learner participant brings a broken pencil.

62 Bleakley in ‘Writing with Invisible Ink: narrative, confessionalism and reflective practice’ (2000) points out that reflexive practice will reflect qualities that appear to be like ‘personal-confessional, with its introspective gaze and anecdotal, value-laden expression (13). This kind of observation assists a hunch that what occurs (thus is learnt) in my writing of the written thesis is a confessional shape subscribing to Bleakley’s terminology of critical reflexivity. The shape progresses throughout the thesis and I shall return to accommodate it as reflexive in my concluding chapter.
The First Meeting: 08/01/2005

Lauren’s only observation of the first meeting is:

As the east is from
the west

Lauren’s journal is a dark blue A5 Moleskine notebook, which I gave her, as well as the other participants, at the first meeting as part of the transaction of consent. Her observations of the project’s meeting fill 28 pages of the 80-page notebook. Her observations from the first meeting make up just one line or one phrase on the first page. It appears to be like a code indicating the obliqueness of the first meeting or like an interrupted thought-fragment.

My own recollection is that I planned little for the first meeting. I did not even know what to expect. The initial number of participants was bigger than expected. At this first meeting, there were eight learners, two parents, two teachers (one who was also a parent) and one ground-staff member. We discussed where and when we should meet. The group in unison agreed they were happy to meet at the time of the school’s second break on a Monday in my classroom (The second breaks at the school lasted forty minutes.) I was not happy about this. I explained the need to operate outside the school’s formalised time as a different space but no one wanted to volunteer a different time, and in unison again said how this time was the most convenient. I did not object again. We then formed a circle and played broken telephone. I used this as an example of how even language can fragment. The exercise seemed popular and everyone enjoyed the mutual performance of whispering, the interruptions and the sense of secrecy.

We then sat around in a circle to discuss a T.S. Eliot quote from Robert Sokolwski’s Introduction to Phenomenology (2000): ‘We pick up fragments to shore against the ruin’ (5). I was hoping to generate discussion about fragments, why it is necessary to articulate what our own personal fragments are in relation to the experience of things being broken. I introduced a fragment box. A box decorated with collage. I said this would be our initial repository of the group’s brought fragments, where we could store the fragments. Everyone then had a turn to talk about their fragments. The first fragments that were introduced were a broken pencil and a torn football (see fig.4.6). These fragments were introduced by two learner-participants. The mother parent-participant (Lauren) brought a broken carrier bag, which she continued to tear in front of the group. We started to run out of time, so I asked participants to bring their fragments back to the next meeting and (quickly) introduced the importance of the journal. Everyone then had a few minutes to write in his or her journal. It was at this point that the first important crisis entered the project even if I did not recognise it then. It is important to

Sokolwski in using this phrase from T.S. Eliot’s The Wasteland (1940) demonstrates how ‘the technological expansion of images and words’ forms detritus of superficial experience (2000, 4–5). This in turn leads to a dangerous condition of non-experience. Sokolwski’s fear might be the apparent problem in this project where there was an overload of experience through different mediums. My challenge was to find cohesion of these experiences through an exploratory distillation of each of the mediums (perhaps not through the central action of relational drama but rather through an appropriate form of reflection).
single this out because this crisis of literacy was to be repeated later in the clinic. The ground-staff participant came up to me, said she did not how to write, and asked what she should do. I did not know how to answer her. I told her to hold on to her journal and said we would find a solution. In the end the only solution I came up with was the direct testimony to the camera including her own. Her testimony is central to episode three on the DVD \( f + a = r \). I suggest watching this chapter in order to witness her testimony. It was only later at the clinic that I discovered the solution of mapping to counter the problem with literacy.

I asked the mother parent-participant (Lauren) to stay behind to talk about her feelings on the first meeting. I hoped to do this with each of the participants throughout the project. Although Lauren’s journal entries are the most consistent, her first written observation is brief and fragmented. This first entry also occurs on the day when she reveals her feelings to the video camera. Her feelings on video are more direct and heartfelt than her obscure journal entry.

Does this signify the tensions between different modes of documentation in the project; how with increasing use of video there was reliance on speaking rather than on writing even if it was often, as in the case of video, passive reflexivity? In this context passive reflexivity means addressing the camera with a reflexive stance but also implying passivity because an external investigator has initiated the address to camera. Bleakley values writing over speech, because it is ‘not to be limited by the spontaneity and immediacy of expression and then presents a more complex option for exploration of ideas and feelings, and a safe option, through which privacy is valued’ (2000, 13). In the context of the \( f + a = r \) project, Bleakley’s sentiments are valid but they do not represent the reality of the project’s outcome. Video actively engaged the transformative process of reproduction and was embraced by almost all the participants whereas journals were sidelined and their potential of accumulative expression remained limited and unexplored. Lauren’s journal is the exception and not the rule. In reading Lauren’s journal, the space of exploring feelings and ideas increases indicating her own sense of safety in the project’s meetings. The value of the subject writing the journal for the researcher lies in the researcher being able to reread the subject’s journal hence applying a process of reproduction on to the analytical process; for in revisiting the body of reflection, new forms are produced on top of pre-existing forms. This might indicate a direction towards translation but also assists the researcher’s own reflexivity.

This moment can be cross-referenced by watching the end of episode one—the first meeting on the DVD \( f + a = r \).
The Second Meeting: 08/15/2005

Lauren’s observations of this meeting take up two pages of her notebook. They are notably different from her first entry. The entries are written in two different coloured pens and one pencil. They indicate her first impressions and then go over these reflections again adding in new thoughts with different colours. This demonstrates how her journal is like a palimpsest, an intricate form that is also utilised as metaphor and mode of reproduction in this and in the later projects.

In order to contextualise Lauren’s second entry, I need to give some background to the second meeting. In the second meeting I introduced a game called ‘Di Moss’s Game’, which I had extracted from *Reflective practice: writing and professional development* (Bolton 2001). The game is designed to help practitioners appreciate the value of being reflective and reflexive about actions, thoughts and feelings. As Sutherland observes there is ‘general tendency’…‘to use terms like reflection and reflexivity interchangeably’ (2007, 112). In my own terms, reflection is meditative thought considering what has occurred before whereas reflexivity is a corresponding action of reflection, it is both critical and ambiguous; it considers implications and the presence of subjectivity. According to Myerhoff and Ruby reflective is ‘thinking about ourselves, showing ourselves to ourselves without the requirement of explicit awareness of the implications of our display’ (1995, 309).

The game that helped to advance comparisons between reflection and reflexivity requires six eggs in a box with a number painted on each; plastic floor covering; a small hammer; writing materials; and a watch:

1. Place eggs in the centre of the group circle.
2. Explain that one egg has been hard-boiled.
3. Ask the group to study the eggs without touching, and decide individually which has been boiled – without conferring.
4. Each group member has to spend five minutes writing the number of their chosen egg, and why they chose it.
5. Make a performance of putting down a plastic sheet and producing a hammer.
6. Make the individuals ill at ease by saying you are to choose someone at random to test out their choice – what a mess if their choice is wrong.
7. Ask group members to write how they feel about being offered the hammer and its possible consequences.
8. Confess that no one is to hammer an egg, and none of the eggs are boiled. Their first paragraph is an example of being reflexively reflective about actions and thoughts, the second about feelings (Bolton 2001, 72–73).

---

65 Watch the game of broken telephone played in the classroom in episode one and two on the DVD (f+a=r) and then compare it later to the game of broken telephone that was played in the clinic: see DVD 2, clinic, first meeting.
Lauren’s observations start rather quickly, written in pencil:

No. 2 because its lost its’ sheen its pale.
I love hard boiled eggs-
2=b
b=boiled
The egg stuff will run into all the other
eggs and they’ll all stick to each other!
The egg will be fragmented
That’s if its not hardboiled
(in different ink) Duh Lauren! Still don’t get quite get it

Emotional thoughts when Henry (Parent-teacher-participant) said he had written about my life experience or death experience… He is a very deep and strong man who I trust and look up to. And my heart hurt for him when he said he suffered from psoriasis. My mom went through this too and it’s awful. Its’ amazing/weird that he felt so strongly about my past that he had to write about it to deal with it. And (learner-participant) Gavin’s testimony about going to church and praying for forgiveness. (different pen) Excellent equation Mr. Taub. This project has brought us together in fragmented ways! I enjoyed the name game, realised what a bad memory I have with regards to names! The egg breaking exercise was brilliant. Mr. Taub you are very gifted very sussed +were born to do what you do. Thank you. Pity Shirley wasn’t there today. She said she was coming. She’s a mama of note to so many young people. I picked No.2 egg. Hee hee. See page 1.

The purpose of the game here was to initiate an understanding of reflection and reflexivity. Lauren confirms as indicated in her entry that she does not understand the game although she does think it is brilliant. However, as is apparent in her entry, she reflects as much as her own narrative advances towards some kind of reflexivity. She expresses feelings, addresses the reader directly whom I suspect she imagines is me, and importantly advances the fragmentation theme, highlights mood and ascribes qualities of characterisation on to the meeting’s participants. She also correctly observes that the ground-staff participant is absent even though ‘she said she was coming’. This points to a difficult incident whereby the headmaster as gatekeeper exerted his influence on the project, motivated by the ground staff-participant’s obligations to fulfil other responsibilities during the allotted time of the second meeting, and prevented her from attending the meeting. The participant resolved this conflict by negotiating alone with the headmaster to attend the rest of the meetings, which subsequently she did. What is absent from Lauren’s entry is her lack of reflection about the group watching the DVD of the previously recorded meeting. This is interesting because Lauren’s speech concludes this first video segment. Does her omission signal her own doubts about video, something that resurfaces later on in the project?
Fig. 4.7. Watching a reproduced version of an earlier meeting on DVD.

The Third Meeting: 08/22/2005

Lauren’s observations:

Wish I was there. But I’m not, I’m here. I’m so sad. I’m happy some place inside but overall sad.

Lauren did not attend this meeting and she refers to it with this brief entry. It indicates her commitment to the group and it shows how Lauren has begun to generate experiences from the meetings into a wider range of feelings and moods. What is also apparent in her journal is that she dates the day after the third meeting quite emphatically. This date is inscribed alongside a map I had asked the participants to make after the third meeting. I asked them to think about either a good space or a bad space that they wanted to identify somewhere in the school and to map the location of this place in their journals. Lauren is the only participant who has made a map in her journal. It is obvious that Lauren has kept up to date with the third meeting even without being there thus demonstrating her commitment to the meetings. In retrospect, Lauren’s absence from the third meeting did mean she lost out on experiencing an

Watching themselves in the mirror became a central drama exercise in the (f+a=r) project. The exercise was introduced in the third meeting and filmed as such. The group focused on watching themselves as a group in the mirror and was instructed to observe if there were any differences to their appearances in the mirror. The video segment reveals their intense concentration. Then the group split up into pairs and told each other stories as if they were watching themselves in the mirror and then re-enacted their partners’ stories. This exercise demonstrated the first time that the participants had got up off their feet and physically moved into doing drama. The project rarely had the group ‘do drama’ but instead drama enabled the interconnection with the other elements adapted from across disciplines like narrative building, digital reproduction, place and space dynamics and mathematics. It was as if drama instigated not only the opportunity to watch themselves but provided the participants with a wider vocabulary to see themselves as well; therefore adopting a reflexive praxis from the original reflective stance.
exercise important in understanding and perceiving image. This is evident from Lauren’s journal where there is no direct reference to the use of reproducing video images in the project’s meetings. Her own reflection suggests a silence informing a mistrust of the video image.

The exercise I introduced at the third meeting was about feeling safe while reflecting upon individual and collective images. I brought a mirror exercise to the meeting where participants would look at each other as a group in a large mirror. Here they would concentrate in silence observing each other, making mental notes of each other’s appearance and observing any differences between looking in the mirror and not. As Benjamin describes feeling ‘estrangement’…‘before one’s own image in the mirror’ not only makes, in his terms, the reflected image ‘separate’ and ‘transportable’ (1968c, 230) but also approachable and absorbable. I wanted the participants to imagine what would happen if they stepped through the mirror to another world. The intention of developing the idea of reflexivity through stepping into alternative spaces that might provide them with a sense of safety in order to tell their personal stories to others about their fragments. They would also hear these stories being repeated by others thus prescribing a sense of distance on to them. Splitting up into pairs, the participants told each other a story or a poem that described something that had broken in their lives. Each had to face the other. They stepped into each other’s space as if entering into a mirror to retell the stories they had exchanged and heard from each other. The alternate space in the mirror turns out to be the alternate person in the group who retells another’s story as if it was their own. I had originally extrapolated and also modified this exercise from Bolton’s ‘looking-glass model’ (2001). This model encourages participants to:

- be as reflexively aware as possible of their own social, political and psychological position, as well as their own environment. In this dynamic state, things will appear strange, back to front, and to operate in unusual ways: they should do so (31).

I still maintain that this is a useful exercise to develop along the lines of drama activating reflexivity—through observation, focus and critical reflection. It is unfortunate that a participant like Lauren whom I suspect seemed the most adept at expressing her reflexivity was not there to develop it further.

---

Bolton describes how her students call the ‘through the looking-glass model making the ordinary extraordinary’ and ‘it is a very strange seemingness or extraordinariness which will enable students to formulate their own questions about the situations in which they find themselves in (reflective), and the self they find there (reflexive)’, and she continues to describe how this model has no ‘comfortable beginning, middle and end to the process’ and has three foundations: certain uncertainty, serious playfulness and unquestioning questioning (2001, 30–33).
The Fourth Meeting: 09/01/2005

In Lauren’s journal is her hand drawn map. It indicates the school building and the recycling centre with a stick figure labelled ‘me’ outside the recycling centre. Shining rays emanate from the recycling centre. There is only one circular route marked by arrows moving along the school’s building and leading to the recycling centre. The map has the following inscription:

Ok this is my spot. This is my place. I love this place. You light a cigarette. Sometimes you bring a flask of coffee. (Pushing the door to open it) They haven’t fixed the door yet. Just bash it open with your hip. I know it seems nothing to you but once you start working here, you will understand. People’s lives end up here. The remnants and the fragments of their lives. I suppose and also its very rewarding, you take home a lovely carrier bag, you find a lovely book or you find a surfing magazine for someone-there-always find something for someone….

At the time of the project, Lauren worked as a volunteer at the recycling centre recycling all the detritus that was deposited by the school’s community. I asked the group if we could follow her map and by doing so, we left the classroom and walked across the school all holding hands as if joined together like links in a chain. When we arrived at the recycling centre, Lauren described its importance to the group. The following commentary is transcribed from the \((f+a=r)\) DVD:

\[\text{see DVD } (f+a=r) \text{ Appendix 1 (Fourth Meeting).}\]
One of the learner-participants found amongst the rubbish a pillbox similar to the pills that had caused his father to have a fatal heart attack. The whole group, aware of the significance, grew silent. The recycling centre became a locus of expression; of a father’s death, of Lauren’s love for recycling; and also of reproduction and regeneration, all proving to be aftermath motifs. I asked the group if they would meet at the recycling centre the following week and if they would hold hands to walk back to the classroom. They did not seem to mind. Once back at the classroom I interviewed on video three of the learner participants who were generally quieter and less confident than the rest of the learners during the weekly meetings. Their answers to my questions around fragment, repository and assemblage were informed and clear, as if their excursion to the recycling centre had helped them understand these elements.

Lauren’s entry from this meeting continues. She refers to the excursion but also indicates feeling vulnerable. This I suspect is her doubt about being reproduced on video, particularly since she was aware that her own children would have also watched the first video segment along with the rest of the school that morning at assembly (at that morning assembly the first edited DVD episode of \(f+a=r\) had been shown to the school). Lauren, from this journal entry, indicates feeling a sense of danger of doing something different outside the traditional expectations of the school. She links feeling vulnerable to being different, an outsider but acknowledges how her own children accept her ‘being part of this group’. Lauren does maintain that her children still need ‘strength’ and ‘personality’ to assist them in accepting her doing something different and in being exposed through video in doing it too. Her lack of critique here exposes the point in the project where Lauren as participant has suppressed her own reflexivity through what I suggest is an implicit fear of the project’s reproductive processes that seem strange and different. I want to add that Lauren was not only writing with the DVD shown to the school in mind, but also with me reading what she writes in mind. This complicates the issue of her as a self-reflective participant.

The following figures (4.9–4.12) encourage the reader to watch the DVD \(f+a=r\), and in particular to reflect upon the fourth and fifth meetings of the project.
Fig. 4.9. The recycling centre.

Fig. 4.10. The pill box.

Fig. 4.11. The coven.
Lauren’s observations:

Phew Henry (parent-teacher-participant) is so informed, tolerant, patient, deeply intellectual and perceptive. This place he took us was so depressing + it seems a cry to be heard by the discovered occupants. Thank goodness, they were found. The ground staff participant said they were not from the school. Anyway, the postscript he wrote in memory of Ryan who wrote ‘The Listeners’ is to me brilliant. He has since given me a copy for my journal. Thanks Henry. And funny too (not ha-ha) but strange, beautiful was the place that Matt (learner-participant) took us to and spoke about how he takes his negative thoughts and throws them out to sea and they get dissolved. Washed away by each wave and how majestic that place is—at the top of the stairs which leads to the main school entrance. He said he wants to put the schools name up on in lights and big for nite so everyone can see he was so happy to be there to share his positive space with us and amazing that Miss (teacher-participant) said she was also a happy for here—she cleared her mind after classes and the beauty of it is all made by her also realise the meaning of so much that our problems are so small and insignificant compared to this. “helo Horizonte”=beautiful horizon…”

The site, where the parent teacher-participant who is identified by Lauren as Henry took the group, shaped the future route of the project as much as the recycling centre did. Henry took us underneath the concrete vaults of the school by opening some sealed up doors, then he pointed up towards the ceiling in the direction of his bad/ negative place. Here in the blurred, musty, light amongst a tower of old furniture and forgotten sets from school musicals was a platform on a balcony, built into the foundation rock. He said that this platform had been the site of a satanic coven. The group heard his version of what had been found there including symbols (pentagrams, 666’s and swastikas), a disused fire-place and a cat’s skull, and how he had been involved in uncovering it. There was a real sense of awe and horror from all of us as he led us to this site and told us his version of its history.68 He also said that there was a direct pathway to the coven platform from my classroom through a barred up door against one of the classroom walls. We left the space. Henry was besieged with many questions from the learner-participants. It seemed the group did not even give any thought to the implication of his revealing this, of what was until then a school secret and myth, barred up and forgotten. There were questions about the

68 ‘Satanic signs at a leading school’ are the headlines of an article appearing in The Argus (October 29 1992) describing how ‘Satanic articles have been found in a store under a classroom at a leading Cape Town school’ (Schooner 1992, 9). The article continues to describe how ‘Police visited Camps Bay School last night and said afterwards that they were convinced it was genuine and not a school boy prank’ (ibid.).
Satanists who had practiced there, what awful things had they done and what had happened to them. The parent-teacher-participant seemed to answer all the questions with the ease of a raconteur. I felt unsettled and asked if there were any other places anyone wanted to show the group. There was a long silence; no one wanted to move away from the doors that Henry had just opened. Then a learner-participant said he wanted to lead us to a positive place on the front steps of the school where he explained he watched waves take away his bad energy and he hoped they would return with good energy. We all stood on these front steps, looked out to sea and watched the waves crash along the shore.69

There would be no more videoing of the group activities. Because of a prior work engagement, Ed had to terminate his videoing of the project. I announced that in the following week, the group would need to discuss how they would assemble all of these experiences into a public performance of some kind. The absence of the video camera did not have any immediate effect because the group had a new priority, the planning of their public performance. If it did have longer-term effects than I was not aware of these and by the time the project’s performance was in place there was a new camera-person onboard, Dan Halter. In order to remain true to the processes of the equation itself nothing generated by the equation could be disposed of, so as to ‘remix available forms and make use of data... from the stockpiles of data’ (Bourriaud, 2002a, 17).70 This included a consolidation of everyone’s contribution in the project: a mandate from the relational aspect of the project promoting participation and exchange.

Lauren, in her journal writes down some of her own ideas for this part of the project:

```
None of us are whole. We are all fragmented. But when we assemble these fragments, we find there is somewhere we can place them in a repository- at our feet, humbly… that is the equation F+A=R. Come with us in this moment drum, guitar (song) from all of us….
```

Lauren then fills her journal with fragments of planning, scraps of other things and ideas until she gives one last long assessment of how the project has shaped her perceptions. I will refer to this entry later. For now I want to suggest how her return to using fragmented phrases is similar to the first entry of her journal. It indicates a shift of gear back into coded introspection away from an expressive self-awareness. Lauren’s longer journal entries demonstrate the project’s potential in informing reflexivity of the self and of others. I suspect that her pattern of retreating into introspection resulted from a fear of how the video images of her own face on a screen, might be viewed in assembly. Lauren never directly expresses this in her journals. I suspect it is the case only by rereading her entries and marking her silences about the DVDs. This evaluation is not only

---

69 see DVD (f+a=r) Appendix 1 (Fifth Meeting).
70 Here I am paraphrasing Bourriaud who says:
Artists today program forms more than they compose them, rather than transfigure a raw element (blank canvas, clay etc…), they remix available forms and make use of data. In a universe of products for sale, preexisting forms, signals already emitted, buildings already constructed, paths marked out by their predecessors, artists no longer consider the artistic field (and here one could add television, cinema or literature) a museum containing works that must be cited or ‘surpassed’ as the modernist ideology of originality would have it, but so many storehouses filled with tools that should be used, stockpiles of data to manipulate and present (2002a, 17).
reflective it is also interventionist assisting an ethical route in my own research practice as a responsibility towards subjects. ‘Any “intersubjective relation” proceeds by way of the form of the face, which symbolises the responsibility we have toward others…’ (Bourriaud, 1998, 23). Faces of the participants were reproduced on to a large screen in the school hall during assemblies. The participants gave their consent to this, however, their reproduction was not merely an expression of the meetings they also became objects of scrutiny.

THE POWER OF SCRUTINY

Before I describe the public performance that culminated from the meetings I want to first address the power of scrutiny as a concept that is an essential part of the methodology and a strategy of dismantling power structures in the institution. A central focus of hierarchy in the school was the relationship in the hall between learners, seated on the floor, and teachers, seated on chairs on the stage. I had persuaded the headmaster to show the \((f+a=r)\) DVD episodes during the Monday assemblies. This decision was taken after consultation with the group. I thought that screening the meetings in a large forum could assist the reproductive process and involve the wider school constituency. Learners from the group went up onto stage and contextualised the screening of the meetings to the school.

During their screening of these episodes the focus of the assemblies had shifted. There was no one on the stage, except once during the first screening of episode one where both the gatekeeper and his deputies remained on stage, their heads crooked at an angle to watch the screen. For the rest of the school, on all five occasions when the sequences were shown, everyone’s focus seemed to be on the screen. The power of scrutiny had shifted. The teachers were not scrutinising the pupils and the pupils were not scrutinising the teachers, both parties were now regarding the participants as objects of scrutiny. But because the narratives of the DVDs were so unconventional, it was the narrative and the opaque meaning embedded in the narratives that demanded the most scrutiny. Instead of watching the presentation of normative and accepted forms of power and behaviour,

Watch the end of the fourth episode of the DVD \((f+a=r)\). You will notice three of the learner participants who are being interviewed. They appear in split screen and talk about their experiences of walking across the school while holding hands. They are also asked to define fragment, assemblage and repository. It is the learner that appears in the left screen that demonstrates how the participants extracted from and acted upon previously recorded practices and reflections. This was a learner whose commitment to the project grew because he was able to watch the video recordings of his somewhat lackadaisical actions in the previous meetings and then act upon these previous recorded actions. I am almost certain that when the DVDs were shown at assembly he scrutinised his peers scrutinising his actions and then he acted upon these in order to improve on them. By the fourth episode, his ability to demonstrate his feelings about the elements and activities in the project is both articulate and precise, thus a clear transformation from his previous practices.

In Narrative Counseling in Schools, John Winslade and Gerald Monk refer to Foucault’s ‘gaze’ and suggest: As children go through school they often develop an intense consciousness of how they appear to others. This is a product of such scrutiny. In fact, schools often have highly sophisticated systems of measuring the worth of a person and letting him or her know what kind of person he or she is: for example: texts, exams, report cards, references, and filing and recording systems. Worries about the effects of such systems are not just individual foibles that can be dismissed by encouragements ‘to be ourselves’ or ‘to think more rationally’. The gaze includes the hidden scale of judgment against which we measure ourselves when we entertain such worries. The gaze, and our response to it, becomes implicated in many of the problems of our lives (1999, 24). This refers back to Lauren’s concerns about acceptance from her children who along with the school would scrutinise the video episodes and therefore are implicated in judging the projects on their own terms modified by the social construction of Foucault’s ‘gaze’.
the weekly meetings were exposed as presentations of alternative discussions, exchanges and images. The DVD sequences consolidated the episodic narratives that had been occurring in the weekly meetings into a relational act. Discussions took place across the school as to what the video episodes shown during assembly actually meant. These were both formal and informal, in class and out of class. The learners instigated these relational acts. Bourriaud defines relational aesthetics as ‘Aesthetic theory consisting in judging artworks on the basis of the inter-human relations which they represent, produce or prompt’ (1998, 112). The DVDs primed and prompted further acts of interrelations, even in the context of scrutiny. The meetings were edited into video sequences that shifted their narrative so that there was a derangement of the expected order of narrative. This demonstrated that what was occurring in the meetings was not identical to what was being shown in the assemblies. Operating against the conventional scrutiny that occurred during the assemblies meant resisting expectations of the ordering of narrative—a kind of acceptance that the episodes being shown and watched would be acceptable and normative. Resistance to this expectation increased the perplexity, confusion and curiosity amongst the viewers. This became dramatic. Everyone was made to ask questions about the questions that the participants and I were asking each other in the meetings. The relational nature of the project increased because there were interactions and exchanges about the project that extended beyond the confines of closed-door meetings.

The narratives reproduced on video were absorbed within the larger narrative of the assembled school watching the DVD episodes in turn generating further narratives that were reproductions of the narratives made in the group. A cycle of reproducing narratives began. There was never an attempt to cohere the narrative in order to manufacture an acceptable understanding of what was really happening. There was only a general sense of uncertainty, playfulness and progressive questioning. The assemblages of the DVD indicated how the process of the imaginary equation could subvert conditions and conventions of the institution and at the same time subvert the process of the participants by not highlighting any participant’s individual story or intention by bringing it into the foreground. As such, while the uncovering of the Satanist coven underneath the school might have become the focal point of the project, it did not. It remained elusive within the focus—one of the many narrative fragments – unless the viewers themselves personally extracted this particular fragment of the narrative. None of the participants mention the coven in their own journals, except for one brief euphemism from Lauren who writes:

—a dark ‘cavern’ in school

Bourriaud reflects on the possibility of contradictions through the construction of a particular kind of narrative:

Human society is structured by narratives, immaterial scenarios, which are more or less claimed as such and are translated by lifestyles, relationships to work or leisure, institutions and ideologies (2002a, 45).
Lauren’s interpretation of the coven as ‘a dark “cavern”’ suggests her complicity with a societal narrative that might represent authoritarian norms along with a Camps Bay lifestyle. In this way the cavern as euphemism for coven did not seem as threatening to her. Bourriaud suggests society is structured by a particular kind of narrative of ‘projected scenarios’, which might have different demands than to truth itself – ‘We live within these narratives’ (2002a, 45). In the project, there were a collection of inherent fragments of truth; these had been muted by a fear of being scrutinised, which in turn I attempted to show resistance to, by providing puzzlement.

The levels of reproduction continued as the tertiary narratives began to reproduce themselves through circulation. This occurred through a pedagogic process and simultaneously through a process of assembled scrutiny during school assemblies. It became important for the participants to reflect on their work through watching, extracting and observing the scrutiny in order to move forward in the process. The participants began to learn to adapt conditions within the group and in the school by extracting and acting upon previously recorded practices and reflections. They began to learn from and reproduce what they had already made and negotiate beyond the power of scrutiny (see the accompanying reflexive frames for examples of these).

The equation \( f + a = r \) had exhilarated its own code through exchange and reproduction, unearthing fragments that were once hidden. I did not want to guide the project to any predetermined conclusion but let the generation of narrative speak for itself. Information became both a public and private exchange and the project’s participants continued to recover and reassemble fragments that accounted for their symbolic knowledge of what they were experiencing; hence the sudden accumulative, re-emergence of fragmentary writing in Lauren’s journal. Another tangible example includes the learner’s discovery of the pillbox and his ability to identify this as a fragment from personal history and then to connect and assemble it as a fragment within the project. Narratives like these continued turning themselves into a public performance.

Fig. 4.13. Entrance from drama classroom to coven.
PERFORMING SECRECY

Since many of the analyses used in sociology are derived from theatre, it is perhaps surprising how little attention is given to analyzing the set in which dramas take place (Meighan 1986, 78).

The physical site of a school furnishes a concept like ‘Hidden Curriculum’ where concealed ideology is not only built into the physical school architecture but also in the traces of a layering of history. My own drama classroom, known as room 42, was down at the end of a very long and depressing corridor at the back of the hall. Teaching was the only excuse to enter this neglected place.

The classroom had a dreadful, musty smell that prevailed no matter what incense was waved about the room or which window was opened. Lights sometimes went off. You could say the classroom was haunted.

The analogy of haunting is fraught with difficulties since it is a concept derived from superstition, with very low probabilities of factual existence. The more systematic and scrupulous studies of ghosts have placed themselves rather firmly in the area of illusion, suggestion and delusion, and only a small minority of cases investigated so far have failed to yield a natural, though often bizarre, set of circumstances. However, having acknowledged this, the analogy has some value in illustrating the hidden curriculum (Meighan 1986, 70).

Once the coven was revealed by one of the participants, the barred up door, situated against one of the side–walls of my classroom, was opened and the passage into the vaults of the school was cleared. It became important for the group to explore this space.

I felt a lot like an archaeologist or ‘Indiana Jones’, with candle in hand, several learner participants behind me, exploring the traces of graffiti and peering into eerie nooks and crannies.

In the penultimate meeting of the project, a discussion took place between participants as to how the narratives of the meetings were to be performed. Bolton’s ‘Through the Looking Glass model’, which had been modified and used in the meetings to initiate narratives by separating the self from its image, became useful in assisting the reflexive nature of the project.72 The secret doorway was a metaphor for the secret curriculum. The two public performances, each lasting approximately 50 minutes, occurred as a result of the (f+a=r) meetings and they were subsequently edited into a 7 minute video segment, placed onto Disc 2 as (f+a=r) 1 (performance). When you watch this episode you will notice how it begins with Henry in his mathematics classroom where the public audience would first gather. Henry was filmed before the performance, in preparation, writing onto his teaching board several iconic equations from the history of mathematics including our own fragment plus assemblage equals repository. In this first piece, he disproves the imaginary equation by using semantics from Latin and arguing that in Latin it would be more appropriate to use the word componare, meaning fragments are built up rather than assembled which in his Latin terminology means ‘people are called together’. Henry does not take into account that people could be fragments or even fragmented and therefore can be metaphorically assembled. It indicates a lack of understanding on his behalf of one of the central themes of the project that humanity is fragmented. According to Henry this is not appropriate; thus (f+a=r) on his own terms becomes (F+C=R). It is an allegorical moment with Henry as participant suggesting his own difficulties with the project by writing on the board, in Latin and translating from the Latin: ‘between me and you there was a river difficult in the crossing’. After the title sequence, the coven is then shown highlighted by a torch that I myself beam onto the site. In this sequence, my voice-over is both rushed and lacks direct information. This indicates how uncertain I felt about this site. The next scene returns to Henry’s classroom, which is then shown as the first meeting place for the public audience. A television monitor is shown here. It demonstrates how at each site there were television monitors that showed one of the episodes from the (f+a=r) meetings. An example of my instructions is also revealed as it was heard. This speech was broadcast over the school intercom system into Henry’s classroom. My speech was to provide instruction and indicate how aware
I was of my own presence in the project. I was obviously uncomfortable about this, not sure how to resolve the role of the self in relation to creating collaborative work with others. In this case I was trying to find ways to suitably remove my own ego and therefore had gone into hiding. My speech also indicates the genesis for ideas forming around a treasure hunt format with the recovery of clues and a sense of interactivity. These were not properly realised during this project but later, during the projects at the clinic, they took on a central role. The recycling centre is shown as the next scene. Here Lauren is revealed welcoming and managing public visitors into this site. The scene ends with a close-up of her writing in chalk on the walls: 'There is another way'. It indicates how important this site became to the project, as place where material and human fragments could gather and assemble, thus a counter to Henry’s site of the coven and his argument that assemblage was not necessarily the appropriate term to place within the imaginary equation. The entire video segment ends with a close-up of the final (f+a=r) episode. Images from this episode are magnified into a pixilated form, suggesting both reproductive and reflexive qualities that this project discovered and subsequently embodied. This sequence ends rather abruptly and demonstrates the lack of conclusive outcomes arising out of this particular intermediary project.

The debate about deciding how and what to utilise in performing the evidence of the group’s meetings was an organic process. There was also consensus on utilising the DVDs in juxtaposition to all the good and bad places discovered through the process. As a group we decided on a route that the public might follow and agreed that the learner-participants like tour guides should guide the public along this route. Six distinct places or stations.

For instance, the pictures on the wall next to the fire seemed to be alive (Carroll 1969, 122–123).

Fig. 4.14. DVD episodes playing on loop in classrooms.
were identified: the drama classroom, the mathematics classroom belonging to the parent-teacher-participant, the hall, the coven, the kitchen and the recycling centre. The adult participants would monitor each of the chosen sites, performing various tasks like handing out reading material, reading from the journals or just talking to the audience about the project. Each place would have a television set and would show on a loop, one of the five episodes of each of the meetings i.e. five episodes of five meetings. The route would engage the audience in retrieving their own fragments from the exercise without providing a coherent picture for them; they would assemble their own narrative. At the same time, the learner-participants would take the audience on their own personal routes, walking across the school, stopping at each station to watch, retrieve or interact.

‘Theatre of Secrecy’ (Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998, 225) had an evocative function in the performance. It began as a device in the meetings that suggested a dual process of hiding and revealing personal fragments. It manifested itself within the public performance by displaying various ways to conceal as well as ways to reveal. Hiding and showing occurred in the multiple narratives at play, in the derangement of linearity and also in the choices that the spectators made, as to which guides they chose to follow and the routes that the guides chose to take. These choices affected what secrets were revealed or further concealed. There was no written text, as in a formal script that the participants followed. The participants disclosed information about the history of the project depending on their own personal willingness to reveal. The variations of what was disclosed and concealed activated a variety of interactions between participant and spectator. Interactive pathways of information were created across the school grounds. These performed like channels of discoverable secrets. Secrecy became a productive strategy. It was first used in the workshops illustrated by the game of broken telephone, it manifested itself in the secret of the Satanic site disclosed by one of the participants, and then it was performed by evoking the layers of hidden history of the school and articulating the bits of information given to spectators by the participants leading them across the school. The receivers assembled these secrets and decoded them depending on how they chose to use the information given to them.

This journey across the school by the learner-participants would be a personal remapping of the established everyday school routes through a process of recovering school territory. This raises the issue of agency within the project. Agency here is determined by the interaction between the individual and social structures when the individual can ‘act independently of structural constraints’ (Abercrombie et al. 2006, 9). Participants were able to determine the method of revealing the sites of the school on their own terms and in relation to their own narratives that they had created through the meetings. Each participant had his or her own meaning inscribed on to each site chosen. The maths classroom had a different effect on teacher, learner, parent, cleaning staff, and each had a different value attached to it. All the participants were still able to collaborate effectively in animating how these sites would operate.

74 Meighan describes the layers of meaning in a school building:

The school building presents different experiences to each of the groups of the people involved. To an educational administrator it is a building of a certain size, for a defined set of pupils, and having a detailed schedule of furnishings. To a pupil it is a place where a large part of one’s life is spent, other children are encountered, and teachers experienced. To teachers the school building’s primarily a selection of rooms, perhaps inadequately equipped and serviced. To parents it may be predominantly the assembly hall where their child
The fact that some of the participants would be walking across the school with an audience meant that the
participants as tour guides would be making their own journeys and stopping at the stations on the way, further
suggesting that the participant’s agency was informed not only by the structure of the project but by their
own experiences. Agency here implies an action, in contrast to what Meighan refers to as ‘environmental
competence’ citing Steele (1973) who defines this as:

(a) a person’s ability to be aware of the surrounding environment and its impact on him; and (b) his ability to use or change his settings to help him achieve his goals without inappropriately destroying the setting or reducing his sense of effectiveness or that of the people around him
(1986, 86)

Achieving an agency of environmental competence is to go beyond an individual action of identifying
fragments. Individual action will include assembling the fragments through narrative whereas environmental
competence extends this narrative into locating places in the environment to tell these stories. If there is a
question about this process, it concerns how the group takes on the responsibility of implementing these
processes through a collective action rather than through an individual action of agency.

Collective agency would mean understanding the group’s collective action, what its purpose is and
whose ends and interests are being served. Collective agency as a collective responsibility can be successful
when the group initiates and implements action together and understands why they are acting in this way. The
learner-participants implemented a sense of collective agency cohering the multiple narratives through their
guided tours. This did not always occur. There was never conscious resistance but rather too much blurring of
the several components of the project and not enough focusing of the multiple layers. For instance, the
focalisation of the DVDs worked as a strong focus through the reproduction processes in the meetings but got
lost in the performance. The blurring between the layers did not help the design of the project. It seemed easier
for the adult participants performing in each site to present clarity. Again, this did not always occur because their
fixed place promoted a self-consciousness of performing rather than just telling and being. Lauren who
remained in the recycling centre appeared very much at ease in welcoming the public into her domain. She
explained her relationship to the centre and the project and handed out chalk after she herself wrote on the
recycling wall:

There is another way

is performing or singing on a platform along with other children. To caretakers and cleaners it is often a place of problems how to keep
things clean, of pipes that burst, of floors to polish, windows to repair and fittings to maintain (1986, 79).
The ambiguity in this phrase is evident and suggests the contradictory tensions that permeated through this exchange of stories, methods and theories. Lauren negotiated her space with a television set showing a video segment of meeting four-episode four. Often she would ignore the television and the playing of the looped DVD and she would draw the audience’s attention away by pointing towards her reproduction of her chalk phrase on the recycling wall.

The project was the testing ground for a series of ideas encompassed by and excavated through the imaginary equation \( f + a = r \). My own process of reflecting on the project has revealed the hermeneutics of the research. I have tried to interpret Lauren’s journals. I am able to validate the project through the retelling and revisiting of this experience. Lauren’s last journal entry openly expresses how beneficial this process was to her and to her position within the recycling centre.

![Fig. 4.15. Rewriting on the recycling wall.](image)

The volunteers in F+A=R are so deep and (introspective in their responses) and yet so open and dynamic in their ideas and opinions and feelings. I never thought they’d be so open, so mature and aware. The physical building itself has colour, history, dark and light, sad and happy places not only for pupils past and present, but also for teachers, parents cleaning staff. It has changed my narrow, tiny perception of drama in that I can be all encompassing even perennial in a sense, can blend into any situation, place, any people and candid camera… in a serious sense - has opened my general perceptions of so much, especially a person’s life. I never realised the immensity of my own fragmented life, never mind others. I always feel so complicated so alone in my weirdness, my problems, faults, drives and comprehensions. Yes in other aspects of me personally I am confident and never shy really, strange it is and another coincidence that somewhere in my head I yearned for an outlet = non-threatening and deep + interesting= just me and others= expressing + I and them have come this FAR!

Helen Nicholson has ‘expressed some scepticism about claims that drama always transforms beliefs and attitudes for the better’ (2005, 82). She bases this understanding on how there will always be ‘other social narratives and alternative perceptions of power’ within the drama workshops and that to gauge social effects is difficult if expected immediately \( (ibid.) \). There is enough stuff expressed by Lauren, experienced when revisiting her journal, that warrants trying to ignore the complexity in Nicholson’s scepticism. What Lauren clearly expresses is a closer understanding of seeing the world differently and how there are alternative ways to express
this in order to make alternate meanings meaningful. However there are silences and an absence of critique in her journal. These I have interpreted as silent crises. Returning to reflect upon Lauren’s journal has incorporated reproduction as a process that has assisted in consolidating my own reflexive practices affiliated to my research project by critically interrogating my own role within the project. It is from this position that I am more certain of the knowledge gained.

Demonstrating gained knowledge does not only occur through an itemised summation of the value of the work gained thus far, but through knowledge applied in the subsequent location of the clinic. Nonetheless, in the postscript below, I attempt to consolidate certain aspects that I have discovered or recognised from this project. These are meditative points of value that transform into knowledge gained.

**POSTSCRIPT FROM ANTONIN ARTAUD**

In his essay, ‘Production and metaphysics’ in *The Theatre and its Double* (1970), Artaud delivers his perspectives on Van Leyden’s medieval Flemish painting, *Lot and his Daughters* (1521). Artaud is adamant that the painting articulates a potent language to which theatre should aspire, the symmetry of transgression and a centring of secrecy. Van Leyden’s landscape of Sodom is fantastical. Plunging towers and gateways transforming into shadowy caves form an alternative world of catastrophe. In the foreground are Lot and his daughters in a state of transgressive repose suggesting not only incest but also comfort in the midst of despair. The centre of the visual spectacle however is neither the background of chaos nor the foreground of transgression but rather the middle ground containing a red tent with its red curtains slightly parted, revealing nothing but the veiled possibilities of secrecy. Here secrecy is performative, implying the clandestine. What lies behind the red curtains and in the red tent suggests there is something more, something other that guides possibilities for further drama. Similarly, what was revealed, unsaid, and cryptic in the school project is a kind of theatre of secrecy. This theatre of secrecy suggests transgression and hidden layers of veiled violence. The theatre of secrecy, in this context, when placed in an alternative landscape collectively created by its participants can produce a project of relational value through drama and narrative (storytelling, mapping and digital film). Therefore I am able to assume a genre for the \( f + a = r \) project as a theatre of secrecy. There is more to consider. In my reading of Artaud I suggest the value of secrecy lies in performing the clandestine and in recovering possibilities from the unknown. In doing so, the act itself becomes allegorical.
Fig. 4.16. Lot and His Daughters (Louvre, Paris).

Benjamin asserts: ‘Artistic production begins with ceremonial objects destined to serve in a cult’ (1968c, 224). He then assumes what matters is the existence of the object and not what is on view (ibid.). The hidden is an instrument of magic promoting artistic objects’ connections to the spiritual world, unknown and dangerous. Benjamin does suggest that art in a public exhibition might shift the magic of art to mere mechanics (1968c, 225). In order to retain the magic in reproduction is to constantly re-read its processes in order to reactivate the ‘object reproduced’ (Benjamin, 1968c, 221). Re-reading transforms the text, from fixed, into fluid. Re-reading might also occur when revisiting the research through the eyes of others. It is in the re-reading that my reflexivity as an example of symbolic growth is more certain. Moustakas says:

>The heuristic researcher returns again and again to the data to check the depictions of the experience to determine whether the qualities or constituents that have been derived from the data embrace the necessary and sufficient meanings (1990, 33).

I want to return to Artaud’s essay ‘Production and Metaphysics’, an essay from his Theatre and its Double, (1970) where he claims that Von Leyden’s representation of Lot and his daughters forms part of a social idea that becomes a product because the very idea of the sexual act manifests into an act of transgression whereas everything else emanating from the scene including the parted red tent is metaphysical. (Artaud 1970, 23-26). If you watch the video segment (DVD 2, chapter three) called interstice, you will see me being filmed as I walk and talk: leaving the high school and moving onto the clinic. The video segment begins with a close-up of me asking the camera: ‘Should I begin again?’ Beginning again, remaking or remapping has been a task that I have invested and reinvested in, in the making of the overall text. It is as if the rewriting and the re-reading may enact and even activate the transdisciplinary approaches embedded both in the method of research and the multi-modal format of the text. In other words, in this process there is also the act of recovery. This particular video segment does demonstrate the challenges of the self–of Myer Taub–of my ideas, feelings, fears; more than perhaps about a specific research question. However, it also demonstrates the challenges of the self when applying it as role within a research process. It is as Artaud surmised that everything else after product is metaphysical. And it is this forming of a multi-modal approach that is re-affirmed as a narrative within a multi-modal text that also echoes Artaud’s desire for a narrative of theatre composed of everything filling the stage. ‘Everything that can be shown and materially expressed on stage, intended first of all to appeal to the senses, instead of being addressed primarily to the mind like spoken language.’ (1970, 27). Even though Artaud wanted to move away from the spoken text so as to develop other forms of communicative arts, my spoken monologue in this segment is twenty-five minutes long and it appears to construct the time it normally took me to walk to the clinic each week. Also my language disappears immersing itself into the soundtrack of the city. Hence, the video segments begin to reveal the other less spoken languages discovered from the research and are reaffirmed within the reflexive frames of the text as part of everything else that is both experienced and re-experienced in this kind of research method that at first might seem difficult to stage. It is as if the multi-modal approach meets the demands made when drama re-enacts narrative as a device on stage: for one of the rules of theatre is to make narrative one of those things that cannot occur in action but in re-enactment (see Racine’s introduction to his Britannicus).
A critique emerges from re-reading that demonstrates how I have assumed various archetypal attributes to help me understand and relate to the research and its subjects as the research unfolds. Assuming an archetype has meant accommodating the dramatic variables I have unearthed as my research has progressed. These archetypes include the previously distressed king who in making projects in response to a school unearthed his own inherent anger. The anger has sublimated into the active researcher, a role a lot less distant from being a ‘distressed king’ but a lot more complex as the most recent project suggests. As researcher I am actively making my practice research by being both reflective and reflexive and thereafter being challenged by the discourses that are being discovered along the way. What or who was the archetypal figure in this \((f+a=r)\) project? I have turned to Benjamin for clues from his description of the magician and surgeon: ‘The magician heals a sick person by laying on of hands; the surgeon cuts into the patient’s body’ (1968c, 233). The element of magic, shamanism, exposing a cult and the attempt to make another did surface in the project but more as themes than as role, just as much as cutting up the narrative did, like a surgeon not so much to heal but to subvert or provide reconfigured incongruities. My role in the project was also similar to Foucault’s ‘parrhesiast’ who in Bleakley’s terms ‘purposefully seeks to challenge habitual patterns of thought and action especially in situations of “danger”; as in pointing out the unworthiness of established and normative practices that are unethical, hypocritical, unreflexive, congealing or sloppy’ (2000, 12). Challenging normal conventions suggests the action of the fool who inverts standards in order to expose and critique. I am the upside down researcher who has invented a neologism, an imaginary equation. It is the upside down researcher who might be able to incorporate the characteristics from the above-mentioned archetypes. This role of the fool I continue to explore and even embody in the next location of the clinic.

Inventing an imaginary equation had value. It helped in experimenting with drama and its development at the high school. It had initiated a project, two original plays, an alternative curriculum and questions around the subversive use of dialogic codes. It was incorporated into my research, which I have identified as a subversive activity that unsettled, challenged and contested social and educational formations. The latter is not as negative as it seems, intending only to produce unconventional methods in order to inspire forms of critical thinking and creativity among its participants. But the equation in its original form came under more and more pressure as the research developed.

There was a certain kind of closure to the equation and its projects in the school and this came with an administrative silencing of them. Soon after I left the school, one of the first things that happened was the barring up of the secret doors and passageway underneath the vaults of the school that had been unearthed by the \((f+a=r)\) project. There was to be no discussion on how to creatively transform the site. The cult returned to the coven through this silencing and became further sediment in the repository of the hidden curriculum. I felt this was a misinterpretation of what I had intended to do— to open up possibilities, to reveal what is hidden, translating this creatively into alternative forms of narrative.
The repository might have enclosed the work as something fixed; instead it represented something that was symbolically fluid. I needed to find a way to highlight this ephemeral quality in the work. I discovered the way through the idea of the interstice; the small gap or break in something continuous that could also be dimensional on its own terms. ‘The interstice’, says Nicholas Bourriaud, ‘presents the possibility of functioning differently:

In a world increasingly homogenized and subject to a single law. It is important to support spaces which try other things especially as there is not today a united global discourse presenting an alternative to the system (2002b).

At this juncture how the imaginary equation \((f+a=r)\) might transcend the institution through temporary practice and initiate social change was a central concern in the research. There were opportunities or gaps within the generally homogeneous institution in which the project could insert itself. I created interstices that briefly generated a sense of agency amongst the participants, including myself. The sustainability of agency cannot be measured immediately. Sometimes the decisions within the experimentation of the interstice were not always correct or positive. I can be certain of this by revisiting Lauren’s journals and translating her entries through my own reflection. Even so, the project ‘can leave networks between people, creating new minute linked action fragments that can compete, constrict or lie above hurtful marks from the past’ (Thompson 2003, 62). The outcomes were experiential, as indicated by my last journal entry of this phase, which concluded my research at the school. It describes a sense of incompleteness, frustration at this stage of the research process. On the other hand it also indicates how the meaning can be extrapolated through experience.

I have to write something about repositories in relation to the experiences I have had at the school over the past year. Repositories if I remember correctly are realised when the shards have been physically handled by the assemblers alike. Somehow the physical handling of the fragment makes the fragment the handler’s own. This occurs because the handling makes a shape and in the assembling, the storytellers, the listeners, the handlers, and in this case the participants all begin to appropriate shards of stories that they themselves might not have really lived but are still able to tell. Imagination must be recognised as enriching assemblage, constructing the repository. While grappling with all of this, I wake up on the 24\textsuperscript{th} of November 2005 at 6h30 am to catch the school bus to put in the last of learner’s marks, which I still owe to the school. These results are disappointing, not alarmingly so. They reflect a détente. The experimental grade eleven class, who were an over large class and difficult, with a stubborn, argumentative nature produces a fifty percent average. There are no obvious distinctions. And two dreadful failures. Whereas the grade ten drama class has one alarming failure and three terribly bright distinctions. And I wish to say: ‘I am the failure. The teacher. Self appointed head of department. Now researching an imaginary equation! Locked in a terrible clash of personality and institution!’ And I wish to say; ‘Would I have no failures rather than a distinction. All this I wish to say. Instead I write this. And I continue to reflect on my failures. All of them. As if this exercise has become an engagement in pseudo rages of sharp intellect and show-business. I have always known that. But where are the academics in all of this? Where is the meaning? Perhaps in my investigation of social change? But where is the social change? Everywhere? All through this research into the configurations of the aftermath there has been the question of social change. How do we measure it? What does it indicate? Has it been worthwhile? Halfway through my research I question whether it is still possible and where shall it take me? I am curious and so I move on. The Rosenberg Scale does indicate that with any insertion in a research activity there is social change, measured and indicated through the scale of self-esteem. The digital camera indicated not only a change of behaviour in myself as the only consistent social actor in the exercise but in the participants themselves. So I wait to catch the bus with all of this interplay of interconnectedness, and at the bus stop are two learners: one black female and one white male, both sixteen; who are revising their biology notes for today’s exam. They are relaxed as most of
In assessing the projects at the high school I recognise an evolving hybridisation of complex processes incorporating mediums and genres, of narrative, drama, digital film, performance and reflexive representations, informing a shape (rhizomatic) from the manifestation of many ideas, allowing for a progression of transformation of my own dramatic practice towards ‘intermediality’ (Chapple and Kattenbelt 2005, 11). But even so this terminology does feel completely appropriate; because the research advanced, as knowledge was acquired and experience gained, into the realm of a new set of unknowns at the second location of the clinic.

What did occur after the location of the high school was a realisation of how some of the knowing might be achieved. This knowledge was made possible only after experimenting, asking, struggling and reaching for unknown vectors in the project, like contemplating what is inside Artaud’s red tent or like Benjamin’s surgeon cutting through an application of heurism. The known occurred through producing narrative from interaction and reproduction. The knowing occurs through reading and rereading the narrative found in reflective forms like journals and DVDs. Nicholson cites Ellsworth (1992) who describes the ‘negotiation of different forms of knowledge as “a pedagogy of the unknowable ” because it is never fully possible to know the full experience of others’ (2005, 55). Working under very different circumstances from location to location, the fragments of the knowing remain forming into what Bourriaud calls when multiplying the interstice, ‘islets of Utopia’ (2002b).

This metaphorical reference imagines the interstice as small islands of Utopia that either are apart from the system or form a dam around the reigning system. The more we multiply these points of systemic divergence, the more we multiply the possibility of another dialogue emerging. One islet in my research narrative is Lauren’s voice. Her narrative is part of what Bleakley describes as ‘loyal narratives, or “little stories”’ (2000, 12). When they penetrate the dominant research voice, there is an aftermath where the dominant research voice will ‘proliferate, as a return to a kind of tribal storying…” (ibid.). A collective form of storytelling

---

Chapple and Kattenbelt define intermediality as the incorporation within theatre practice of other forms of technology specifically digital technology (2005, 11).
like bricolage made from various sources and voices. The researcher learns from the subject how to do research and to translate the research into a written form as dialogue. The research becomes heterogeneous dialogue: reflexive dialogue, dialogue between researcher and participant, dialogue with the self, dialogue between the known and the unknown.

Often my practice is embodied and instinctive as it reflects the stratified essence of tacit knowledge accumulated and practiced over years of study and experience. What my own research has gained (in knowledge) from this project is the recognition of the actions of exchange occurring in research and collaboration with subjects or participants. These help me to understand not only ‘when I know’ but ‘how can I know when I know’. This helps to consolidate the reflexive part of the research process. Determining the design of the research product is also subject to my research. As my research advances, I am concerned about the design, a preferred answer to my research question, that I assume will eventually be a template of interactivity (that can be reproduced and replicated) made collaboratively between drama and narrative in order to promote opportunities of recovery. These are the considerations ahead, suspended partly known and partly unknown, produced as distillation from the first set of projects made at the high school and reproduced in the second set of projects made at the wellness clinic, which presented very different circumstances, new themes and new challenges.
PART THREE: CLINIC

I am Mandisa Pindela. I am 37 years old. I am the mother of three children. I am staying in Khayelitsha at Site B in BM Section. My hobbies are playing and listening to the younger people who have the good careers. I also like activities (September 11, 2006).

This is Mandisa Pindela’s first entry from her journal. The entries contain her reflections of participating in the (in)Heritage project in September 2006. They are not written in her mother tongue of isiXhosa but in English. The project was the penultimate project generated from my work at the HIV/AIDS wellness clinic. Mandisa was a regular participant, both of the fortnightly drama meetings that I facilitated at the clinic, and a volunteer in nearly all the clinic’s projects except when she was too ill to attend. Her voice like Lauren’s voice, in the last school project, appears to be the most consistent amongst the group of participants from the wellness clinic who made observations in journals and in maps.

Mandisa’s journal: a brown A5 exercise book (I stopped handing out expensive Moleskine notebooks soon after the school project forsaking unnecessary expenses), has 15 entries. Each entry reflects the progression of the research and the development of Mandisa’s knowledge of this particular project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We go to UCT and there we saw the heritage of UCT. The statue made of skull carrying a stick, which means the ‘life and death’ (September 14, 2006).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingmar Bergman and the question of death. Man of the skull is called grim reaper because he is working hard (death) (September 29, 2006).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandisa’s small evocative entries demonstrate her acute ability to observe, listen and form new knowledge that began to occupy her during the course of this project. Besides her journals, Mandisa appears in other forms of documentation: video and maps. She appears in video: through interviews recorded actively talking about the maps she has made and filmed as a Polite Force tour guide taking people on tours on the University of Cape Town’s Heritage Trail. It is the maps that illustrate how participants like Mandisa in making new forms of documentation in low-tech ways can also help to generate projects formed from unconventional text. Maps assisted in strengthening the agency of the participants for making their own reflective documents that also transcended barriers of language. The mapping processes were intriguing, fruitful and validated my assumptions about alternative modes of communication. Cartography (as a collective term for maps and mapping) became a repository in a broad sense for finding one’s way and for containing the discoveries made along the way.

It will take almost two chapters in this section for Mandisa’s voice to re-emerge. This is because Mandisa’s voice, in a reflexive context, re-emerges only when the repositories containing her own reflections are properly put in place by way of analysis, when there is a consolidation of ethical concerns, and when my

---

76 see Appendix 3 and 4.
research practice advances by way of distilling video, journals, and maps as modes of documentation and reflection. I shall return to an analysis of Mandisa’s voice not necessarily to evaluate her role in the projects but to provide further access towards understanding my own processes. Similarly, my analysis of Lauren’s voice in the previous school project advanced my own reflexivity while translating my research practice. Although both Lauren and Mandisa are mothers with children, they come from entirely different circumstances. Mandisa is indigent, black and HIV-positive while Lauren is white, middle class and her status undisclosed. Yet, both express a desire for knowledge and experiences of new things and new possibilities. Lauren and Mandisa express an appreciation of their involvement in my research projects perhaps because these projects were outlets for their own personal aftermaths; projects that did not hinder their exploration of the world around them, but instead encouraged them to sustain their own sense of curiosity.

This section itself is dense. It is a record of several stages of research occurring at an HIV/AIDS wellness clinic operating from the MonkeyBiz beading collective in the Bo-Kaap, Cape Town from December 2005 to December 2007. It follows the development of several projects created with participants like Mandisa who are members of the wellness clinic. This entire section curves into completely different territory than what was discovered in the previous case study. Here alternative methods arise in response to methods used in the previous location; new methods that evolve into new forms of practice. In particular, the dramatic equation dissipates into new methods that facilitate narrative and drama practice operating across cultural and linguistic barriers. I shall attempt to frame what I took into the location of the clinic from the previous location of the school and consider what I left behind.

Chapter Five, called ‘Dramatic Beading’ begins with an introduction to the wellness clinic in relation to the practice of drama and beading. This serves as a synthesis to new encounters
with new and old theories, which in turn project certain aims and challenges. The chapter continues with a description of the first project created at the clinic: a short play created for World Aids Day 2005. This description includes an evaluation of digital reproduction in the context of the clinic and a chronology of the first meetings up until the creation of the first play. These records I present along with my own journal entries. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the challenges I encountered at this stage of the research at the clinic, that in turn produced a proposition around allegory that points to new archetypal forms in assisting the role of the researcher in his research projects.

Chapter Six extends this allegorical proposition along with themes of the playwright Henrik Ibsen and the possibility of poor research (in the sense of Grotowski’s ‘Poor Theatre’), hence its title: ‘Poor Ibsen’. This chapter also concentrates on the manifestation of cartography as a complex method that emerged during this stage of the study, and its comparison to the other modes of recording and reflection: video and journals. Developments from this stage lead to the origin of two projects: (in)Heritage September 2006 and its descendent (in)Junction, occurring twice during April and December 2007. I shall describe these two projects along with explanations extracted from Mandisa’s observations located in her maps, her journals and video documentation in Chapter Seven called ‘Remapping the Catastrophe’. In this last chapter, I shall continue to articulate the intent within my research, to design a model that is able to replicate interactivity and promote recovery through a particular practice of drama and narrative. I shall conclude that such a design is possible when it is able to be reflexive about its own assumptions. This position is narrated through the testimony of the self, consolidating how the self accommodates itself (along with its projects and participants) as subject within the research.
THE WELLNESS CLINIC

The MonkeyBiz wellness clinic operates with various degrees of collective politics occurring alongside a politic of contemporary health practice. On the surface, the clinic operates like an informal network but in reality there is a tacit efficiency functioning like a political machine that provides skills training and HIV/AIDS support for low-income HIV-positive women. The wellness clinic started in 2003 and it caters for 70 women who supply the collective with beading work. Their first language is isiXhosa, ages are between 20 and 40 years and the majority reside in Khayelitsha Township. The clinic offers them beadwork training, HIV/AIDS counselling, yoga-therapy, drama, choral training, homeopathic HIV/AIDS treatment, a light meal, and basic nutrition instruction in a safe and confidential environment. All who attend the clinic supply the non-profit factory/shop with their labour, the fruits of which operate the clinic. Therefore there is an ethos of assertiveness in ‘self-financing of the poor themselves…’ indicating ‘a practical objective at best to make poverty useful by fixing it to the apparatus of production, at worst to lighten as much as possible the burden it imposes on the rest of society’ (Foucault 1984, 276).

77 There is one man who attends the clinic, even as an exception, he has been a consistent participant in both the drama meetings and projects.
78 A snap question asking where they reside indicated that 73% live in Khayalitsha and 24% live in Samora Settlement close-by. The small percentages of 2% and 1% were located in Phillipi and Udono settlements respectively.
Foucault’s points (mentioned above) stem from assertions that he makes about the interdependence of individual and collective approaches to healthcare provision or the lack thereof, in his analysis ‘The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century’ (1984), which is an important essay in the context of the wellness clinic for several reasons. I say this because at first glance there is nothing in common between Foucault’s analysis of the problems in the organization of eighteenth century European public health and a wellness clinic operating in Cape Town, South Africa in the twenty-first century. But on closer inspection, Foucault’s analysis contextualises the objectives of an organization like the wellness clinic, in relation to sustaining the health of the individual as a means ‘to raise the health of the social body as a whole’ (275). Foucault suggests that the collective organization of health is designed to maintain control of the individual in order to ‘maintain the imperatives of labor to the needs of production’ (277). The collective practice of the MonkeyBiz wellness clinic working outside of the state apparatus as a non-profit ‘charitable foundation’ (275) doesn’t necessarily contradict this. What does occur in the MonkeyBiz wellness clinic points to relationships of interdependence between the mechanisms of the individual and the politics of the collective in order to sustain health. It exists in the interrelationship between the informal structures of the clinic and the formal expectations of commerce. This is evident in the practice of the beading. Here the individual might initiate a beadwork alone but relies on the collective for the nurturing of the maker of the object in question. Nurturing by the collective includes providing advice, positive critique and impetus. The collective who share the beadwork experienced in a communal space such as the clinic, accommodates these exchanges. The interrelationship between collective and individual practices is also evident through a series of multiple-sided processes described by Foucault that precipitate:

- a collective practice endowed by magical-religious institutions with its social character,
- the extension of a network of personnel offering qualified medical attention, the growth of individual and family demand for health care, individual examination, diagnosis therapy and voluntary, communal techniques of assistance, which are exercised within the framework of lay and religious organizations devoted to a number of ends; distribution of food and clothing; care of abandoned children, projects of elementary education and moral proselytism and provisions of workshops and workrooms (1984, 273–275).

These features of an eighteenth century collective politics of public healthcare also operate in contemporary ways in the MonkeyBiz wellness clinic. Features that are framed within the civic organization and transformation of the ‘politics of health’ (274), are also inclusive of the individual’s wants and needs. In my analysis of the activities at the clinic, it is neither the singular imperative of the factory/shop/clinic’s voluntary staff nor the demands of commercial management nor the demands of those in need alone but a collective imperative, that of ‘(t)he imperative of health: the duty of each and the objective of all’ (277), that also forms part of Foucault’s concerns around ethics of the self or care of the self.79

79 Foucault’s ‘ethics of the self’ forms part of his greater ‘technology of the self’. The context of his study includes relating ‘specific techniques that human beings use to understand themselves’ (1994, 224). Exercises or techniques incorporate a practice of improvement ‘by which men not only set themselves rules of conduct, but also seek to transform themselves, to change themselves in their singular being and to make their life into an oeuvre that carries certain stylistic criteria’ (1987, 10–11).
Foucault’s emergence in my research is about trying to understand how he problematises systems. This also provides further self-awareness as a researcher working within systems like health or education whilst trying to design my own system. This points to a synthesis between emerging and previously considered theories, i.e. between Benjamin’s *Denkbilder* and Foucault’s ‘archeology’, ‘genealogy’ and ‘the care of the self’ (1988a, 43). Didier Fassin suggests, in his account of experiences and politics of AIDS in South Africa, *When Bodies Remember*, that “the care of the self” is also a care for others: in short an ethics (2007 263). This imperative founded upon Foucault’s ‘ethics of the self’ seems to thread its way, seen and unseen, through the dynamics and demands of both disease and work, the severe destructiveness of the HIV epidemic and the collective’s desire to work together mostly in the assembling agency of beading.

**THE POLITICS OF BEADING AND THE PROBLEM OF LANGUAGE**

Beading is a significant historical amalgamation of indigenous African traditional craft and commercial European artefact. Fragments from different cultural codes (of ritual, gender, wealth, spirituality, expression and custom) transcend barriers of language and ethnicity when assembled along new lines. Multicoloured shards of bartered Venetian glass are assembled and juxtaposed with African cowry shells and leather thongs.

---

80 It is not as if Foucault’s discourse has not been evident in previous chapters. It has occurred in understanding the gaze in the (*Φ*α=τ) project and I would suggest it surfaces on the periphery in regards to schools as a whole in his work *Discipline and Punish* (1979). However this is not a leitmotif about the clash of theory but rather suggests the emerging series of crises that begin to occur in the research that a critical thinker like Benjamin could not necessarily resolve. Foucault also ratifies the self as subject within the research (see Martin 1988, 4).

81 How and what figure do I use to indicate the severity? It has been reported that: ‘In South Africa alone, by the end of 2003 around five million adults were living with HIV. That figure is growing. Everyday another 1700 people are estimated to become infected with the virus’ (Abdool et al. 2005, 37). Also, to paraphrase a citation from *The Dictionary of Sociology* indicating the urgency of the epidemic in sub-Saharan Africa, there are 29.4 million people infected with HIV/AIDS, 15 million have died from AIDS (80% of total AIDS related deaths) and 3.5 million were infected in 2002, but only 60,000 are receiving any anti-retroviral therapy (ARV). AIDS raises a major question about the role of social and economical factors in explanation of illnesses. Education (especially of women) is a necessary foundation of other forms of development, social and economic. It also raises questions about the role of the social sciences in relation to health care. In South Africa, 20% of pregnant women are infected with HIV, and South Africa’s Treatment Action Campaign claims that there are 4.7 million sufferers and 600 deaths per day (2006, 12). According to the *Mail and Guardian’s* HIV Barometer, on May 14 2008 there were 2 478 812 AIDS related deaths in South Africa (May 16 2008).
Beading has become an important source of income for the indigent women at the wellness clinic, their beading also sustains the running costs of the wellness clinic and beading is an important form of self-expression translating traditional craft and transcending language and cultural barriers.

The erosive nature of HIV/AIDS, the destructive impact it has on the socio-economic environment in which it is prevalent, intensifies whatever cultural barriers might exist when attempting work in such an environment. In particular, the implications of literacy barriers concerned me at the beginning of the drama process. How would I begin to articulate a description of the equation, both imaginary and dramatic, that I wanted to develop and collectively explore in our meetings? What would be our mutual point of access? We did not share the same vocabulary, experience or condition. Would the potential strategies of text reduction or the reproductive processes of pedagogy, effectively used in the previous location of the high school be sufficient? Could these even be relayed or understood?

What links the politics of health care and the cultural politics of beading, to the challenges of working in a context of HIV/AIDS in the field of applied drama, is finding a way to transcend language barriers. These crises and strategies of mediation determine a redirection of the challenges ahead. As of yet I am offering no solution. Helen Nicholson raises questions about dramatic literacy and differentiated knowledge in applied drama practice (2005, 51). She argues for locating a process of exchange based on differentiated knowledge; locating in the Friesian sense: word-action, recognising Wittgenstein’s famous maxim (the limits of my language are the limits of my world), and understanding how drama practice is a form of literacy ‘where you can feel and read through the body, aurally, visually and kinaesthetically’ (2005, 51–56).

Such alternative forms of literacy can happen instantaneously through play, where the body reads, responds and is read instinctively through a set of unconscious directives operating from within group practice. The unconscious directive might also occur in dialogue. Dialogue is a process of translation. It is an exchange of expression and reception. Dialogue is about differentiation towards making stories. Similarly beading and drama, as in this case, are therapeutic possibilities of exchange and suggest an investigation into a medium that points to alternative modes of translating expression, beyond the barriers of literacy. Both beading and drama can communicate beyond linguistic constraints. In this case, both express an alternative dialogue and juxtaposition of variant forms of dialogue. One bead assembled alongside another points to the threading of narrative. Beading is a solitary craft embraced by a collective. The collective come together to bead together. In observing the operations of the beading collective, they all seem to innately understand another set of unconscious directives that operate from the body and can produce an aesthetic craft that is expressively therapeutic; as it is commodified, as it provides subsistence. Similarly, a solitary action in drama can be assembled together with other actions and reactions made by the collective. Drama and beading are

82 I am assuming the position articulated by Walter Fisher’s ‘Narrative Paradigm’ where all human exchange can be considered as forms of storytelling.
both produced from the body, both engage with a fragment that is assembled, and in this case, both meet in an aftermath of HIV/AIDS. Here too drama joins Foucault’s imperatives located within the interdependence of the individual and the collective in the larger framework of politics and health.

Foucault’s position as Bouriaud suggests is ‘the possibility of functioning differently’ (2002b), in order to challenge the continuum of conventional thought and systems of power. It is along this line of thinking that Sigrid Weigel claims Foucault has ‘a considerable closeness to Benjamin’s way of thinking…’ (1996, 30). She provides, amongst numerous examples, Benjamin’s phrase a ‘leap towards a wholly new form of thought’ as a way of linking these two purveyors of theory (38). However, their dialogic closeness suggests their contrasts.

Thus far, Benjamin has provided my research with a thematic means in assisting an application of fragment, redemption from the ruin, translation and reproduction in my practice located in the locale of the aftermath. Importantly I have used his Denkbilder not only to support my use of visual examples as a way of translating my practice but also as a process of expressing thought through the activation of image. Perhaps it is this process that might transcend the barriers of language. This assumption I will only return to after the manifestation of maps and mapping takes shape within my research. However, my own thought processes’ emerging proximity to Foucault’s and to the immediate linguistic barrier exposed in the clinic, means that another line of thinking might be necessary; one that seeks out the form of the problem itself.

This chapter I have called ‘Dramatic Beading’ because it describes the correlation between beading and my particular drama practice in the context of the wellness clinic. By placing the clinic into a specific context of public health I could not ignore the operation of the individual in the context of the wellness clinic itself because it is as much the actions of the collective as it is the emerging voice of the individual that reflect the shape of my research processes in the clinic. I have tried to link the interdependence of the individual and the collective in public health along with the cultural politics of beading to the application of drama in the field of HIV/AIDS. I realise I have somewhat complicated this link through intersecting my own theoretical aims, the obvious emergence of Foucault’s discourse in contrast to Benjamin’s own.

My research in its overall context values the multiplicity of theories and how intuitive intersections (as they often are) can illuminate the problem as much as they simultaneously sublimate transformation within research as the practice of the research transforms. My aims were to apply forms and methods identified from the location of the school into the drama meetings at the clinic. The descriptions in this chapter are preliminary descriptions as my work at the clinic continued for two years and there was an evolution of practice, altered by crises experienced in the location of the clinic.

Sigrid Weigel contextualizes the concepts ‘of the archaeological with reference to the forms of the problematisations themselves, and (the) genealogical in terms of the “formation [of the problematisations] out of the practices and the modifications of the latter”’ (1996, 31). In more simple terms ‘archeology’ is a method for Foucault ‘because of the idea of uncovering layers of civilization’ (Fillingham 1993, 97), whereas he conceived genealogy ‘as a series of infinitely proliferating branches’ (102). The genealogical model with its many branches of knowledge that are simultaneously being stripped away suggests similarity with the rhizome.
In the previous location of the high school, I had perceived drama as an interstice operating in a traditional space. In the location of the clinic, drama operated within an already existing alternate space. Through drama I continued to experiment even against the expectations of this alternate space. These expectations included the problem of language. I worked in the clinic attempting to use beading as a motif to explain by example how my particular drama practice could operate beyond this challenge. However, the interstice problematised the actual practice within the interstice. Because in hindsight, it took the previous location of the school to establish the option of an interstice as an alternate space to experiment within whereas it took the location of the clinic to try to understand what were the alternate operations that could occur and work within an alternate space.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CLINIC WORK

At the end of 2005, the administrators at MonkeyBiz asked me to facilitate an hourly drama workshop to occur at the MonkeyBiz wellness clinic on every second Friday. I agreed to run these workshops as long as I could continue my research while conducting the workshops. In these workshops there were about 60 women who participated in various elements of dramatic practice that included role-playing, games, singing, storytelling, choral and ensemble work.\(^84\) At the beginning of the workshops, the dramatic equation \((f+a=r)\) was introduced through the re-enactment and translation of the experience of fragment. From this work a short, five minute play emerged, performed on World AIDS Day (December 1, 2005).

In 2006, I decided to arrange the drama workshops into two groups hoping that they would eventually converge. The Friday workshops continued as before incorporating methods that were discovered in more intense week-long voluntary workshops for a smaller group of participants. The smaller workshops ran on a more intense, weekly basis at various scheduled times during 2006 and 2007. They attracted a smaller group of voluntary participants who arrived every day for a week because they wanted to do drama.\(^85\)

---

\(^84\) This number was often inconsistent due to the nature of the clinic, in the context of socio-economic conditions and the everyday health of its members.

\(^85\) It was this expression of ‘wanting to do drama’ that was commonly and persistently used throughout the workshops by the clinics members. ‘But what does doing drama mean?’ I would ask back. The reply more often than not would be just a shrug and smile, repeating ‘drama’ suggesting that I knew and the term alone provided an answer to its own question.
These small more intensive workshops operated like a nucleus in relation to the larger group meetings; incorporating reporting to the larger group and dissemination of explored practices. The process of reproduction was explored through a manageable and practical articulation, back and forth, between the larger and smaller processes. It was in the nucleus that generative projects were devised. The nucleus generated: i) Exploratory work around fragment and text; ii) The development of cognitive mapping exercises that became useful tools of reflection and in creating alternative types of text and documentation, and iii) Performances of guided tours of the maps made and read.

On one hand, I suspect that the extensive number of generative projects originating from the smaller group or nucleus was because of the ongoing recovery of my own creative self and because of an increased understanding and application of alternative modes of translation. But on the other hand, i) the group was smaller; ii) the attendance was more consistent and regular; and iii) the work was conducted in an intensive way, rather than one hour every second week.
On both these accounts the smaller group succeeded in generating new material that included alternative processes of mapping as a vehicle for facilitating instruction, reflection on work, analysis and further reproduction. In the same way that the video work from the previous location released pedagogic processes of reproduction, so did this alternative form of cartography create pedagogic processes and variations of reproduction that I call cartography of performance, further defined in Chapter Six. The work evolved in a similar pattern to the first location of the high school, beginning with short devised plays and then further along, realising routes of unconventional performances in public spaces, performing acts of recovery. When I started at the wellness clinic I met only the larger group operating within a descriptive framework, extracting methods developed from the first location of the school and applying them into the second location of the clinic. This began on the first day with video work, opening with my own dialogue to the video camera as I left one part of the city and walked towards the wellness clinic.

**DIALOGUE AND DIGITAL REPRODUCTION**

The method of digital documentation introduced through recording the meetings of the \((f+a=r)\) project at the high school influenced the outcome of the project’s narrative and the pedagogic implications of working with reproduction. I thought it would be useful to begin the second stage of the research this way.

The first recording was of me, walking and talking to the camera through the city thus recording my self-joining one interstice with another.\(^{86}\) I asked the videographer, Daniel Halter, to join me for coffee with his camera at a local coffee shop on Kloof Street on the morning before the first planned meeting at the clinic. Halter had replaced Ed Young in recording the projects because of Young’s other commitments.\(^{87}\)

Halter, whose own salvage-like work portrays assemblages of re-stitched political maps and a bricolage of localised (meaning made local) music videos, can also be described as being coloured by his own personal anguish about the current political state of his homeland, Zimbabwe. He has an almost opposite vision to the anarchic, yet yearning for the holistic, Young. Halter has a rigid vision around assemblage, located in his detailed approach to collage. Although both examples of video footage display a process of collective assemblage, there are differences. Young’s contribution indicates how the mutual agreement to collaborate can promote incongruity; the boundaries between fiction and reality are blurred and thus narrative becomes subverted. In contrast, Halter’s contribution suggests how the subversive already exists in the current state of chaos.\(^{88}\)

\(^{86}\) see DVD \((f+a=r)\): Appendix 2 (Chapter 3).

\(^{87}\) Both video artists have also contributed to the collective engineering of the framework of my research, since my collaboration with various artists extended in the last projects beyond video documentation. Halter and Young laid the groundwork for these forms of collaborations and networks.

\(^{88}\) Surfacing on the periphery of this debate is an interesting observation made by digital filmmaker, Thi Minh-ha Trinh: The recorded image has been used primarily as raw material for further composting. Reality has become ‘elastic’. The digital format, which is much more capricious and compressible, hence more flexible and versatile than analog, is not only offering a bridge between film and video; it is also displacing boundaries, fixed boundaries set up between film, animation or computer games for example (2005, 56).
In the first instance, Halter filmed me in discussion with the camera, reflecting on the projects at the high school as I walked through the city to the location of the clinic. I spoke about my theories on walking through the city, wondering/wandering about Benjamin and Bourriaud, their theories about the interstice and the city and what their theories meant to my work as a whole.  

When we approached the wellness clinic the personal reflection as dialogue ended and documenting the project began. This segment of my dialogue with the digital camera was not edited. The subsequent meetings at the clinic have also taken on a form where there is less interference with linear documentation. Rather, while the record of my walk through the city is a reproduction of real place and time, the record of the meeting in the clinic is a reproduction of truncated real place and time.

The recording of the first phase of the meeting aimed to provide material for the pedagogical process by allowing the participants themselves to watch each of the recordings of the weekly meetings so as to retrieve and assemble previous action. Later, cognitive mapping replaced the video work as method of reproduction.

PRELIMINARY MEETINGS AT THE CLINIC

In this section, I will describe each of the meetings with the help of my own journal entries as well as providing theoretical reflection on the meetings. These journal entries are primary and generative, in other words they are interpretative, in order to generate further investigation. These entries are less formal in style, punctuation and grammar because that is how they appear in their original form. I shall concentrate on these entries as examples of my personal subjective voice as an alternative narrative opposed to my formalised academic tone. I will also provide theoretical reflections on each of the entries. At this stage, the participant’s individual voices are less obvious, appearing as an ensemble voice through collectively learning ‘how to do drama’ in these preliminary Friday meetings.

What was obvious in the first stages of the meetings was that the only way of recording group reflections was through digital video and not, as had been explored in this first project, through an accumulation of digital film and journal writing. The participants in this case were reluctant – even resistant – to write anything down. I suspect this was due to their being self-conscious about their literacy proficiency. Instead they were happy to be filmed during the process, as they were used to television crews coming into the clinic to interview them and to record their beading and singing. The filming, although useful in a pedagogic process of recording and then motivating the participants to retrieve, mimic and reproduce action from the previously recorded material, was not completely satisfactory. It lacked both a sufficient sense of engagement and a

In particular, it is Benjamin’s musing about the active role of the *flâneur* in activating critical thought by walking through the site of the city. Benjamin believes that if one becomes lost then one can reorganise and assemble the fragment of losing oneself constantly in new and creative ways (see note 94 on the connection between the fool and the *flâneur*). Benjamin’s method is described by Steven Pile: a method of mapping the city—by walking the streets, by losing one’s self in the city as of losing one’s self in a forest. Giving yourself up to the city, he believed, was about more than immersing yourself in the city, It was also about being able to pay attention to the fragments of city life. From each fragment, Benjamin traces out an association. As with dream-analysis, each association leads to further thoughts other fragments. In some ways, however, Benjamin’s method is as much like archeology as it is dream interpretation. He recommended careful digging through the layers of dust that cover the fragment (2005, 137).
collaborative process of producing data and the exchange of group narrative. I did not dwell on this, rather relying in this first instance on a digital record of our activities. Only later in the process did I realise that we would need to develop an alternative method of reflection.

What was significant was that the participants could watch the recording of the weekly meetings and draw from the DVD the actions they wanted to repeat. These actions were filmed again so the process of reproducing fragments of action was recycled through the medium of digital video.\(^\text{90}\) Once again I suggest watching the video record of these first meetings on DVD 2 in the chapter called *clinic*.

**CHRONOLOGY OF THE FIRST FIVE MEETINGS**

![First day, first meeting.](image)

My journal entry: November 4, 2005. What an energised day! Already woke up less anxious. I think the school project offered many complexities of issues that in the end became worrying and realised that in the end they stalled the project, now there are other complexities but they seem to be more personal and not so institutionalised. I met Dan (filming the video) and he filmed me as we walked to the clinic as I walked and talked and posed many questions along the way, a variety of things came my way… We arrived at the Clinic-Shop-Factory and met the second gatekeeper, Nomhla who cautiously led us into the shop, turning to me she said, ‘I wanted you to come to teach us drama’ and then led us upstairs where the women had begun singing incredibly, they were all beading and they looked up… then silence… Nomhla introduced me in Xhosa as ‘Boetie Myer’ and together we formed a circle. Not everyone was receptive, so I chose one participant who was still winding some thread on a small reel. I asked the group to look at her action and then to copy what she was doing and said by looking at the action of another and copying it we can start to understand drama and everyone agreed and then we played broken telephone and spoke about putting things together. The phrase was… Broken… Now I cannot remember what it is in Xhosa but will try to retrieve it… Qapukha… We also played a clapping game: using sound and movement and that’s where we left it.

\(^{90}\) The process of returning the filmed material to the filmed participants was pioneered by ethnographic filmmakers Robert Flaherty and Jean Roach. Roach took the procedure of returning to the informants much further than Flaherty by not only taking his films back to his subjects for comment but actively involving them in the creation of narratives, and later as ‘co-creators of improvised films’ (Loizos 1993, 13).
Theoretical reflection:

Understanding the concepts of drama and the equation \((f + a = r)\) was first realised primarily through observation: extracting a fragment of action, imitating the fragment of action and reproducing it as collective action. Game playing inspired a sense of performativity. The game, ‘Broken Telephone’ has been discussed in an earlier chapter but demands further analysis. Steven Pinker observes:

(In) the game known as broken telephone (or Chinese whispers) a child whispers a phrase into the ear of a second child, who whispers it into the ear of a third child, and so on…. Distortions accumulate, and when the last child announces the phrase it is comically different form the original. The game works because each child does not merely degrade the phrase, which would culminate in a mumble, but re-analyses it, making a best guess about the words the preceding child had in mind (1999, 52).

Barbara Kirschblatt-Gimblett has suggested in her definition of the ‘theatre of secrecy’ that secrets are performatve (1998, 255). Here the game initiates the performing of secrets. Broken telephone becomes a process of recycling words or phrases into performance. The chosen word or phrase is reproduced into a performance of secrecy that produces an exchange of listening, recording and retelling. The collective action of relaying a secret message that needs to be heard by the entire group enhances the idea of assemblage and the collective sculpting of ensemble performance. It also points to the way in which the original is transformed through the performance. Another version of the game involves listening to a fragment of sound produced by the single motion of the clapping of hands, and then passing that clapping sound to the next person in the group, that enhances qualities of listening and giving. These are important techniques in encouraging and enhancing collective participation.

Fig. 5.6. Hands are up and waved about at the start of a drama exercise.
Theoretical reflection:
Physical fragments, action fragments and sound fragments are all important indexes of locating an understanding of the process. From these objects, real, imagined, articulated, made and felt, narratives are exchanged and stories told and recreated into performances. The fragment is revealed in the group, the group themselves interpret the fragment and reproduce it through imitation and action. Dialogue and spontaneous improvisations from these fragments lead to a collective making of a story.

Using the qualities and variations developed from sound itself has become an element of the process. Here was a group of participants who would sing as a group when they beaded or prayed. Their singing would often occur when they were alone and not engaged in any particular activity offered by the clinic. Their singing occurred between activities or first thing on Friday mornings during the prayer service. Their songs were a process of collective energising and gathering. As beautiful and important as the songs were, I did not want to lead them in song or even ask them to sing, I did not have the confidence to do this because I cannot sing. Their
singing needed to occur as instinctively as it did collectively.\textsuperscript{91} What was important from my perspective was to understand how the fragments of sound that were practiced and initiated within the drama activities were symbols in themselves and could become a medium for narratives to be exchanged, transcending cultural and literacy barriers. I hoped the sounds of song would run counter to the original focus of ‘Western philosophical traditions, of the eye and its gaze…’ (Stoller 1996, 168). My own fascination with words, literacy and games thus needed to include the important dimension of sound.\textsuperscript{92}

Fig. 5.8. Broken Necklace.

Fig. 5.9. Me playing the Fool (The monkey).

\textsuperscript{91} Allesandro Portelli in his ‘Typology of Industrial Folk Song’ (1991, 161–192) draws comparisons between folk song and urban song and indicates how both are still ‘non-hegemonic’. They are often related but the industrial folk song occurs from the inside and therefore its differences to the rural form are caused by intense contact and conflict. It is also important to mention how, in some cases, songs in factories were encouraged by management in order to prevent women workers from talking to each other and to prohibit the eating of the picked product. This is not the case in the clinic but does indicate there is a further need to analyse the assemblage of these organic songs particularly in relation to meaning and as a form of communication.

\textsuperscript{92} Stoller (1996) motivates for the understanding of the tones of things, to spatialise musicality and understand the dimensions of sounds. He cites Zuckerkandl in order to infer ‘that the meaning of a sound “lies not in what it points to, but in the pointing itself”’ (168–169). Considering the sound to be dynamic symbols provides entry into a world of intangibles and with this in mind ‘we can better appreciate the intangible and can cross thresholds into the deep recesses of people’s experiences’ (ibid.).
Theoretical reflection:

This third meeting was an important one because of two events. The first was the active contribution by one of the participants. By bringing a physical fragment of her broken necklace to the meeting she engaged the collective in assembling a story. I explained by using the beading of beads on a necklace as an example, how a story is made and the group understood how a dramatic story is assembled with units of dramatic action.

Secondly, the efficiency in creating this short play occurred because the methods of activating a fragment were effective. This effectiveness on my part I suspect was a lot more complex. I relied on the intervention of the archetypal behaviour of the fool to transgress boundaries in order to move things along.

I realised that part of my transgression of boundaries, through encouraging playfully, energising or moving participants (even the sick and the tired) was an unconscious enactment of playing the fool. This intervention is a development in playing out traditional archetypes from the distressed king in the first location of the school to the fool in the second location of the clinic. As I became more conscious of the fool, I wondered how to utilise it in research and practice. Jung maintains the fool is ‘a collective personification’ meaning ‘is the product of an aggregation of individuals and is welcomed by each individual as something known to him which would not be the case if it were just an individual outgrowth’ (1986, 142). With this perspective in mind, perhaps the group anticipated me playing the fool as much as they encouraged it to happen.

93 Jung’s classification of the archetype is determined by forces outside the self along with similar types—more shadowy permutations of the former, both affecting the unconscious. Both these forces are usually associated with stock figures drawn from history, literature, myth and fairytale affecting patterns of behavior: ‘The collective figure gradually breaks up under the impact of civilization, leaving traces in the folklore which are difficult to recognize’ (1986, 142). These figures are reconfigured through behavioral associations.
Foucault suggests that the madman, the simpleton or the fool is the ‘guardian of truth’ because he reminds ‘each man of his truth’ (1967, 14). The fool reverts, transgresses and disrupts boundaries in order to reveal hidden truths but also attempts to initiate performance. William Willeford refers to the terms, the ‘philobat’ and the ‘ocnophil’ (1969, 27). The fool as the ‘philobat’ will seek out safe places to journey to and the activities on the journey to that place is what ‘enables him to make this journey’ (*ibid.*). This can be applied to my research where earlier experimentation within the process enabled the ongoing journey of the research itself. Whilst with the term ‘ocnophil’ there are the dynamics of subversion in relation to the use of the object to which the fool is necessarily close. The proximity to the object allows for interrogation, which in turn invites subversion. The movement from activity-exchange to critical interrogation can occur within research when it is practiced and similarly can occur within the researcher as reflexive action response: ‘Since he is both, he is neither; he expresses, relieves and ridicules the anxieties of others in the face of objective reality’ (Willeford 1969, 27).

The researcher as fool inverts not only the object of research but the role of researcher in the research itself. As Portelli states:

> the upside down intellectual will not only teach but also learn; in the field situation, upside down researchers do not study informants but learn from them, and allow themselves to be studied in return’ (1991, 42).

It is along these lines, when considering the effect of reversing ordered conditions that Jung suggests ‘that the wounded healer is the agent of healing, and the sufferer takes away suffering’ (1972, 136). The reversal of roles includes the wounded teacher taught by his students and then later healed by HIV-positive women who are themselves suffering. Benjamin highlights the seriousness of playing with the archetype of both fool and king particularly in the way I understand it, in the context of the aftermaths of health and education.94 ‘When the stage is empty, fool and king will no longer count for anything’ (1977, 126). Benjamin who makes his observation from an epigram above an engraving depicting an empty stage articulates his allegoric and idiomatic poignancy at times of a catastrophe.

---

94 Very little has been written by Benjamin about the fool or about Benjamin and the archetype of the fool but I would like to suggest that what he makes of the *flâneur* who inverts direction and narratives of a city is somewhat similar to the fool because both have ‘reflexive foundation’ enabling them to shift across demarcated boundaries (*see* Taubman 2006).
My journal entry: November 25, 2005.
Practicing the small fragments of action and assembling them into a whole as a short play/skit have become important. We begin today with a warm up, massaging each other’s bodies in a circle, rubbing each other’s bodies in awkward places so participants laugh and jump at being uncomfortable. We play broken telephone and then rehearse as practicing repetition of the fragment of actions. We don’t even have time to watch the video documentation from last week instead we practice what we can remember again and again as a pattern forming a performance. We develop the idea of testimony at the end of the scene where everyone drops the large suitcase they have been carrying on their shoulders or backs and each participant, one after another, enters into the circle and discloses something about themselves. Every participant without any urging from myself chooses to say they are HIV-positive.

Theoretical reflection:
When disclosing a verbal artefact as important as one’s HIV status there are enormous resonances in the spheres of ethics, stigma, performance, narration and testimony. I must make it clear that this action of disclosure came from the participants. All through this first stage of the project, I did not directly confront the collective status of the group. The impetus had been around assembling fragments of action, stories and sounds inspired by recalling an experience of a broken necklace. The position of the group as participants was now altered by their own need to unpack this important fragment of information. They had initiated an agency for themselves of what was important to tell. The disclosure seemed an imagined removal of the condition from the body through utterance; by purging the body of the fragment sending it back into the ruin and the need to authenticate the condition through the experience of individual disclosure in the repository of the collective. It is interesting to compare the role of secrets in the process. Originally, in the game of broken telephone, the secrets were
whispered and conjured up a performativity of dialogical intimacy from one person to another; now, the imagined secrets were openly disclosed and instigated an intimacy from one person to everyone. Here collective solidarity is reinforced through disclosure and supported the occurrence of the disclosure.

The development of the ‘witness’ is modified, as indicated by Dori Laub (cited by Diana Taylor 2003, 205). This means that there is a progressive relay of processes informing the role of witness. In the context of the example made at the clinic the modified stages of bearing witness include: internal witnessing and then self-consciously witnessing oneself from the outside and on to witnessing each other through observation; acknowledging and engaging with both the ‘I’ and the ‘You’. This process exposes the variation in the fragmentation of the witness when bearing witness. Both individual and collective become repositories supporting the assembled disclosure of the fragment.

I became aware that the documentation on DVD added a different dimension to the process. I became somewhat suspicious of the message it had begun to generate. On the DVD, the testimony becomes the central focus of this particular meeting. In the experience, the action of performance activated testimony and not the other way round. This meant that testimony was secondary to performance. I also become aware that through the first stage of this process some of the participants were eager to perform for the camera and less eager to perform for each other as a collective without it. This also occurred the other way round where some of the participants became more self-conscious once the camera was in the room.

The first phase of this project is over. It has culminated in a performance of the group’s work on World Aids Day. The performance lasted not longer than five minutes. It was performed on the factory floor for everyone who is involved in the running of the beading factory/shop/clinic. The performance space was very small and we had not yet practiced in it due to time constraints. Besides for hesitant start it began with no problems. It was the first time these participants have performed for anyone let alone a large group. It involved telling the story of the broken necklace through a series of interlinked vignettes around city life, observed, recreated and practiced and performed. At the end of the piece each member walked into the circle and introduced themselves, telling each and everyone something. Each participant said their name and then disclosed their status as being HIV positive with confidence and ease. They then packed up their imaginary objects that were carried in an imaginary bag and began a procession singing a song they had sung in the weekly meetings called: ‘I shall die no more’. There was a long silence in the meeting hall. The song itself seems to be a poignant anthem for the twenty-first century. It is wonderful to see people come together to pass this moment together with assembled stories and then to exchange these with others.

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Devising and performing a very short play, very quickly in five meetings, and then performing it was a very fast yet satisfying process. It indicated some of the functions of the imaginary equation ($f + a = r$).
I suspect that the reason why the game of broken telephone became so popular at the clinic was that it adapted the role of witnessing as an intimate act of exchange between two parties. The game suggests that sharing secrets is an empowering act similar to giving testimony as a witness. Even though giving testimony could possibly be disempowering as my journal entry at the end of this frame will suggest. This is why I suspect disclosing one’s status became an ambiguous issue even within a site like the wellness clinic. For even though it is a site of collective support for women with HIV, disclosure here meant a paradox: on one hand it meant a reinforcement of their condition and thereafter the fear of shame and stigma; on the other hand it meant an imagined removal of the disease through play. In the game the secret played the part of the intermediary in this paradox, a secret that was still a disclosure and a witnessing. The secret was empowering and less threatening than a general and repeated disclosure to the entire group. And then later on during the project the following incident occurred as indicated by these journal entries (2008), which I now insert as an example of this paradox of both witnessing and disclosure in this site of collective support.

February 24

Today I arrived to hear a very animated discussion in the upstairs clinic. I walked up the stairs to see the members, behind desks, caught between intensely beading and involved in a heated discussion, even argument in Xhosa. No one took notice of my arrival and their focus was only on the debate that was ensuing. ‘What’s going on?’ I asked. No one could answer me until one member carrying up a bowel of apples for everyone to snack on, turned to me and told me: that in the group, as it turns out, there is one member attending the activities of the clinic who is not HIV positive and instead has only arthritis. The debate was whether to reject her from the group because of her status. Poor M who is an active member, particularly in the drama activities, was not seated but stood uncomfortable and silent, waiting on her fate as member after member argued for her dismissal. Suddenly there was silence. No one it seemed wanted or cared to do any drama. What to do? I spoke. I said how important it was for everyone to talk about the issues and find a solution but that it was important to realize how they should reflect on their own fears of rejection because of stigmatization and that wasn’t this space about acceptance rather than rejection? For the first time in my attending the sessions no one understood me. Then one member shouted out how their safety and protection from the outside world was important. They all shared something in common and what would happen if M went back to their communities and revealed things about the group and threatened their safety. Fear, the situation seemed poignantly ironic something I could not hope to translate and yet I had hoped that the creation of a performance in this project would give the participants a sense of what it would mean to create a narrative from fragments. This process promoted and increased levels of self-esteem and agency amongst those who were involved. They witnessed fragments from their own lives unfold into narrative and furthermore reproduced these narratives from watching and extracting from the digital documentation.

There were complexities. This fieldwork involves participants who are not only HIV-positive but are located within a particular social and cultural context.

HIV is stigmatised primarily because it is sexually transmitted. This brings into question the role of gender in managing the epidemic. The plight of African women has received much attention. In much of Africa women are considered second-class citizens with limited ability to influence decisions about sexuality and accessing health care (Wilson and Fairall 2005, 489).

The women at the clinic live with a life threatening disease. They also face the challenges of oppression because of their gender, indigence and stigma. They support themselves through beading. These conditions presented challenges to the ongoing practice and research in this case study. Could my work on this project relieve any of the oppressive manifestations associated with the multiple conditions of disease, meagre earnings and social stigma? An important question that might only be answered later on as the research progressed.

In the early work on the project I had realised how watching the recorded work helped the participants to reproduce narratives of action that had occurred previously. Participants were at ease in recreating narratives quickly from this process. More significantly, it seemed that watching one’s own action from a distance composed in another medium, and thereafter extracting from this in order to reproduce an alternative narrative might, ease the stigma of oneself. Producing narrative through the formula \((f+a=r)\) engineered a process of dismantling stigma or the debilitating effects of stigma; participants seemed willing of their own volition to articulate their status publicly. What was significant was
how the mechanism of reproduction involved a synergy of dual processes: assembling and dismantling. What had been deemed oppressive and assembled for scrutiny could be dismantled through reproduction. I began to realise how reproduction might be a form for translation. What arose out of witnessing the real collapse of the World Trade Centre could extend to a translation of broken systems.

Earlier in the thesis I used Benjamin’s ‘Angel of History’ as a thought-image to guide and instruct the arrangement around my questioning, that is to delve deeper. I now began to understand that Benjamin’s angel could be reproduced and utilised in the context of HIV/AIDS alongside the already developing coordinates of \((f^2a=r)\).

This insight arose through reading Patti Lather and Chris Smithies’ observations of women who have been diagnosed with HIV/AIDS in *Troubling the Angels* (1997). They have utilised Benjamin’s ‘Angel of History’ suggesting that to allegorise is to intervene and simultaneously position and understand moments of crises that fragment the personal.

There is a movement towards some way of being that is both and neither secular and holy, irony and hope, out of the ruins of the secular which distresses the angel who has been salvaged from the ruins of the sacred (117).

In the context of the clinic, whilst using the allegory, there is the presupposition that its creators who are fragmented cannot be directly harmed by the work they create. Instead what they make ‘is a moment towards some way of being that is both but neither’ (*ibid.*); and recovery is accomplished through the extrapolation of concealed meaning; this is how allegory intervenes.

Benjamin’s ‘Angel of History’ reveals the fragment; concealed and wrought in the ruins. His angel is also a fragment, extracted from an image reproduced as a metaphor and further emplaced as an argument for alternative and dissenting methods that resist conventional practice in order to provoke serious engagement and scrutiny, articulating the possibility of an inverted movement towards a different kind of future.

---

95 Lather and Smithies like to cite Benjamin’s concept of the unacceptable in history as ‘permanent emergency’ and compare this to the emergency of AIDS (2007, 114). It is in this context that the allegory intervenes because in a modification of Benjamin’s own citation of philologist Friederich Cruezer: the allegory is ‘a general concept, or an idea which is different from itself (but) the concept has descended into our physical world and we see it itself directly in the image’ (Benjamin 1977, 165).
Benjamin’s ‘Angel of History’, when used in the context of HIV/AIDS as it is present in Hilary Mantle’s reading of Didier Fassin’s *When Bodies Remember* (2007), suggests a phenomenological observation of the epidemic, how one: ‘hears overhead the creaking wings of Benjamin’s Angel of History, surely no longer surprised at the corpses piling up at his feet as he flies backwards towards the future’ (2007, 9).

Mantel points to stigma or rather shame as an emotion that connects the TRC to HIV/AIDS in the aftermath of apartheid:

Reconciliation is a project poised between remembering and forgetting, and the problem (or so it seems to me) is that in the case of South Africa, memory, personal or collective, is often accompanied by crippling shame; whether you have been victim or victimizer—or cannot agree which role you occupy—you are ashamed to have lived under apartheid, to be the relic of such a system. Shame is what makes forgetting most urgent, and also what makes it impossible. And the virus has arrived to intensify stigma; South Africa, for so long a political untouchable, so far off the moral map, is ravaged by a disease which from its inception has been identified with sexual shame (7).

The ongoing research at the wellness clinic was significant in understanding this transition from one shame to another; a decisive moment that was not arrived at through observation of the participant’s shame but of my own. Shame at being merely a sleepwalker post-9/11 meant a journey towards recovery while utilising only an imaginary equation. Shame meant not having the appropriate language to evoke sufficient understanding with regards to the conditions within the clinic. Shame meant anger experienced at the high school. Shame reflected as a ‘healthy’ white man amongst ‘diseased’ black women. How was I to recover from my own shame? The women in the clinic could not recover from HIV/AIDS but they could recover from stigma and shame, and were ready to disclose their status openly on camera and perform the dismantling of shame to each other. Herman says recovery can never be resolved but much in the same breath says it can be achieved.

The investigative journey has turned almost full circle. My witnessing of the destruction of the World Trade Centre and the harnessing of Benjamin’s ‘Angel of History’ which originally helped to define the condition of fragmentation in aftermath; has enabled me to insist on applying allegory as a goal assisting the formula of recovery. An allegory derived from the ruin implies recovering a lesson from an aftermath. The members of the wellness clinic accomplish recovery in the context of teaching how recovery can never be fully resolved. Hence to quote Jung, ‘the sufferer takes away suffering’ (1986, 136). However unlike Benjamin’s angel who seems trapped in the ruin, we might challenge the fixed outcome by aspiring to learn to live with wings that are spread and no longer closed.

---

96 To anticipate an attempt at recovering from the damage brought about by shame might be like making a step towards trying to unravel the difficulties of recovery. In this context it is about inducing an ease in those who see themselves as shamed, through applying public performance as a vehicle of dramatic practice; considering and resisting how the ‘logic of shame is [also] a scene of exposure’ (Ruth Leys 2007, 126).

97 It is a mere coincidence that Mandisa dates her first journal entry as September 11, 2006. Its significance might not be so apparent until I point out that this journey began five years before on September 11, 2001.
INTRODUCTION

It is now apparent (to me) that in my research, I have searched for symbols in order to guide my practice and have applied images in order to assist the translation of the practice as part of the research. I have appropriated, modified and assembled these as idioms, metaphors, archetypes and allegories as my enquiry demanded and my work advanced. ‘Poor Ibsen’ is the title of this chapter because it refers to two more figures that emerged as I continued to work at the wellness clinic. Playwright Henrik Ibsen and theatre innovator Jerzy Grotowski are both catalyst figures but they can be no less alike. They are from different centuries of European drama. Ibsen’s realist ideology was a catalyst for social consciousness on stage that despite being pretty radical for his time still demanded what we would today consider traditional accoutrements and conventions whereas Grotowski rejected the fourth wall embellishments in order to frame his mandate of ‘Poor Theatre’, which embraced the centrality of the body and voice of the actor. These two figures symbolically formed two bookends at this stage of my research. They are also ‘serious’ authoritarian archetypes that usurped my ‘playing the fool’ by allegorizing a sense of crisis that began to emerge during this phase of practice. The chapter will describe the crises as they unfolded and also consolidate the advance of maps and mapping. I shall demonstrate how

---

Fig. 6.1. Details of map produced by a participant.

---

Holman in *A Literary Handbook* (1978) makes this useful distinction: ‘If we consider an image to have a concrete referent in the objective world and to function as image when it powerfully evokes that referent, then a symbol is like an image in doing the same thing but different from it in going beyond the evoking of the objective referent by making the referent suggest to the reader and audience a meaning beyond itself; in other words, a symbol is an image that evokes an objective, concrete reality and has that reality suggest another level of meaning’ (1978, 519). In that case, the use of *Denkbilder* implies how the generation of meanings represented in the narratives made between thought and image make the image less concrete. Weigel writes of ‘a double sense… images in relation to which his (Benjamin) thoughts and theoretical reflections unfold, and also as images whose representations are translated into figures of thought…’ (1996, 51). Furthermore there is the assumption that within the reflexive mirroring or the bending back that could also occur in an idiomatic relationship—the one becomes the other: the image becomes symbolic, the word becomes the image, and the ruin evokes a lesson.
cartography, as a process of work, created an avenue of reflection that challenged and substituted for digital and text documentation and reproduction; hence the proposal not only of poor research i.e. low-tech, low-maintenance documentation and reproduction but how maps are also an alternative form of text that is key to an expression beyond linguistic barriers.

In this chapter I will also refer to and analyse several maps made by Mandisa who participated in most of the projects at the clinic as an example of her emerging voice as well as an example of an overall emerging creative and analytical process. I have arrived at an analytical methodology from various sources in order to translate these maps into meaning (see Downs 1977; de Certeau 1984; Ingold 2000; Rye 2003; Subotovsky 2004; Pickles 2004). I have also engaged in a comparative study of the digital and journal testimonies of participants talking about the maps they have made and a synthesis of several theoretical concepts in order to assist in the auditing of these maps. I have also woven Mandisa’s maps into this chapter in order to sustain the reflexive role of the researcher that occurs within the heuristic process by operating with the assumption affirming ‘that we tell our stories through others’ (Steier 1991, 3). I conclude with a summary of the series of crises and epiphanies that initiated the later explanatory projects generated from the clinic work. These projects help to define a system that practices recovery. The system itself is also allegorical because it is also a testimony to self-recovery. It is an allegory shaped from Ibsen that first refers to the crises and begins this chapter.

IBSEN

During the early years of his career as a playwright, Ibsen went into voluntary exile in Rome where he kept a live scorpion bottled in a jar. Ibsen’s observations about the bottled scorpion serve as anecdote and metaphor for a playwright whose central theme is one of social consciousness: ‘From time to time the brute would ail; then I would throw in a piece of ripe fruit, on which it would cast itself in a rage and eject its poison; then it was well again’ (Darrach 1971). In observing the bottled scorpion, Ibsen noticed how purgation might inspire wellness in the artist. The scorpion’s ailment is alleviated through the scorpion’s ejection of its own poison. The artist’s ailment is alleviated through the recognition of another suffering and by observing the subsequent cessation of suffering through purgation. The artist by throwing the piece of fruit into the jar is also the catalyst of the purgation.

This highlights the problem with my being clearly self-conscious within my own practice at the clinic whilst simultaneously recognising the potential of the participants to alleviate their ‘poison’. At the wellness clinic, there is a very real condition of ‘poison’, which is both stigmatised and immutable. When dramatic activity instigates catharsis as a form of release, it might only be recognised as therapeutic by the researcher

99 Caroline Rye in ‘Incorporating Practice: A multi-viewpoint approach to performance documentation’ (2003) suggests that, in the end, ‘a Faustian pact’ might be necessary between image based data and digital technology whereby the quality of information counteracts the difficult relationship the document may have with its live event” (116). I also claim that interaction between different modes of information is necessary. An interdependent relationship can exist between different forms of documentation assisting and informing each other of their abilities to translate research practice and its effects. I made comparisons from tables of audited items drawn from various sources of analysis (Downs 1977; de Certeau 1984; Rye 2003; Subotovsky 2004; Pickles 2004), and these informed my analysis.
and not by the participants. What could catalyse an expressive purgation of this condition that did not demean the participant by simply throwing fruit into the jar? I suspected that I might be that fruit in the jar; simply by attending the clinic I was a catalyst for some of the participants’ own processes of recognition. I was the outsider and obviously different. Being self-conscious of this, I resisted the archetype of the fool and turned to figures that were far more serious. I searched for a reciprocal connection between the recognition of suffering and the release from suffering. I began to suspect that this was the act of recovering fragments during the process of recognition. Recognition needed to occur through an accessible and translatable form that did not negate my own sense of purpose and at the same time did not devalue the voice of the participant: ‘the subjectivity of others’ (Fassin 2007, 264).\(^{100}\) Could the participants recognise the value of catharsis? There was value in expressing one’s condition— as indicated in the previous chapter— but could this be effectively translated into catharsis? This routine of questioning started during the second stage of work at the clinic in 2006. It heralded the difficult challenges I was about to encounter— later identified as crises that in turn generate epiphanies. But as I began, I thought I was able to sort through what was working and what was not, modifying and rectifying the dynamics not only of the methodology of the imaginary equation \((f + a = r)\) but also in relation to working within the differences of language and culture.

I realised that I could harness allegory as a device to extend and extrapolate latent meaning through fragmented metaphors like Benjamin’s ‘Angel of History’ and Ibsen’s scorpion.\(^{101}\) This could assist my work with an additional proponent for heuristic causality. An attempt to recover from the ruin has informed this inquiry as an allegory of self-discovery and recovery towards redemption of the self. Allegorising suggests a movement towards redemption by salvaging something of value from aftermath, thus extending the fragment towards translatability as Benjamin suggests; but also beyond that by reproducing the fragment as a generative form that incorporates intervention because it is interactive.

I believed this would help to define the condition of fragmentation in the field of this particular aftermath; of ‘an epidemic enmeshed with the politics of race and sex and death’ (Cameron 2005, 75). It therefore seemed appropriate to extract allegory as a fragment from a playwright like Ibsen whose own themes deal with stigma, guilt, shame, contamination, infection, and the tactical liberation from these oppressive forces.\(^{102}\)

---

\(^{100}\) Fassin quotes Wittgenstein: ‘I am the only one to know if I really suffer; another person will merely suspect it’ (2007, 264). Fassin is referring to ‘this outer limit that anthropologists can operate— that is, not only by imposing their own thoughts as they analyse the words of their subjects which have become their object of study but by also making their subject’s voices audible and clarifying the significance they attribute to their actions and words’ (ibid.). I suspect that the formation of activity and analysis that needs to accommodate both voices is like an interdependency of private and public. Interdependence is a recurrent theme of Foucault who suggests that investigating the technology of the self might begin by one’s own means ‘or with the help of others…’ (Martin 1988, 4).

\(^{101}\) Benjamin indicates in *The Origin of German Tragic Drama* (1977) that the meaning of allegory extends beyond that of ‘a conventional relationship between an illustrative image and its abstract meaning’ (162). Reading into Benjamin’s explanation, I would like to suggest (particularly in the context of my research) that allegory is an expression embodying exchange between the concealment of meaning and the active recovery of meaning. Allegory intervenes through this kind of dialectic. It does so with a characteristic that Benjamin suggests is violent because it is progressive, dramatic, dynamic, fluid, ambiguous and ‘has multiplicity of meaning’ (165–177). ‘Allegorical intrusion could therefore be described as a harsh disturbance of the peace and a disruption of law and order in the arts’ (177).

\(^{102}\) *Enemy of the People* (1882): Contamination; *Ghosts* (1881): Infection; *A Doll’s House* (1879): Gender oppression.
I was also able to intervene, by extending the use of allegory and simultaneously positioning myself at the heart of the crises with ‘cultural weapons’ so to speak, to try to empathise with moments of crisis that fragment the personal. There was a lot more at stake here: the pivotal question of how to create opportunities for recovery and routes of purgation towards wellness. I had also hoped that the experimentation at the clinic would not become like Ibsen’s scorpion in the bottle. In the first, experimental (exploratory) case study, at the high school, the researcher and participants were often enclosed, bottled and trapped in a flux of manipulative intervention.

In the wellness clinic, the methodology progressed towards a descriptive model as modified from Yin’s case study methodology. In this case, the researcher might still be pursuing experiments in a laboratory but both the researcher and the participants discover a mutual and more descriptive narrative through an occurrence of ‘informal manipulation’ (Yin 2003a, 8). This means that researcher and the participant begin to manipulate events. This occurs because the participation and self-observation (awareness) of the researcher and of the participant increases therefore both parties feel more empowered to act. In the wellness clinic, both the participants and I were progressing towards finding a mutual language of accessibility. It was not only about applying my method of drama to promote recovery. There was also an exploration into a method of instruction and of mutual understanding. This culminated in the exercises using maps and mapping. But reaching this point in the research did not occur through direct manipulation on my part, it arose because methods were constantly being revived and reproduced. According to Yin ‘informal manipulation’ will not occur when the evidence relies only on previous (historical) reportage or when behaviour is manipulated ‘(d)irectly, precisely and systematically’ (ibid.). However, the overlapping of methods: the repeating and revising of methods (from exploratory to descriptive case studies) and the explaining why things occurred the way they did, refers to what Yin describes as “‘quasi-experimental situations”’ (ibid.). My research, by its very circumstance and nature, would always be experimental as it attempted to present a description of the experiential phenomena in question (Yin 2003b, 5) through a series of iterations. It was this repetitive process of distillation that I hoped might produce or in fact reproduce a system from the research as practice. Every week the same exercise was re-invoked and repeated as if this process of iteration would yield a mutual outcome for the participants and myself.

I shall now concentrate on describing two significant workshops occurring at the clinic during April and July 2006, where I could continue to replicate my experimentation.

103 Cultural weapon was an ironic term that emerged during the resistance era of South Africa, contextually located in the performing and visual arts it includes protest theatre and theatre of resistance. It was an ironic term appropriated from Inkatha justifying their supporters brandishing knobkerries and assegais as ‘the right to carry cultural weapons’ during protest marches (Powel III 1994). Subvertting this meant suggesting that culture as a weapon could resist apartheid. Therefore if, as Archbishop Desmond Tutu suggests (cited by Mantel 2007, 7) ‘Aids is the new Apartheid’ then perhaps contemporary South African cultural weapons could be allegorical, disrupting denial and shame.

104 Although this becomes clearer in Chapter Seven where I conclude with an explanation of the produced and reproduced system, I want to claim that practice in this context is this revision of method formed from the research. Through the ‘repetitive or experimental activity’, there occurs the development of a ‘repertoire of expectations, images and techniques’ (Schön 1983, 60) merging into a system that suggests research to be inventive as it encourages intervention as Steier implies (1991, 179).
In order to extend the idea of allegorical strategy, I decided to extract a particular fragment of text from *A Doll’s House*.

**Mrs. Linde.** I don’t suppose you recognize me.

**Nora.** No, I’m afraid – Yes, wait a minute – surely -! *(Exclaims)* Why, Christine! Is it really you?

**Mrs. Linde.** Yes, it’s me.

**Nora.** Christine! And I didn’t recognize you! But how could I -? *(More quietly)* How you have changed, Christine! *(Ibsen 1985, 29).*

I taught *A Doll’s House* at the high school for two years. I remembered one particularly resonant scene between Nora and her friend, Mrs. Linde or Christine. The scene occurs early on in the play when Christine visits her old childhood friend, Nora. In the scene Ibsen explores issues of illness, secrecy and stigmatisation. At first Nora does not recognize her old friend because Christine has changed physically as a result of age and possibly illness.

While Nora is trapped in her ‘Dolls’ House’, Christine achieves autonomy by locating an antithesis within herself. She is restless but also wants to settle down. She arrives in the first act wearing ‘travelling clothes’ *(Ibsen 1985, 28).* A stranger in a familiar landscape, she is both ‘shy’ and ‘hesitant’ but also certain of herself *(ibid.)*. When first introduced, she is confident in her greeting but is not recognised by Nora, her childhood friend. Ibsen provides a series of ellipses in the text to assist Nora in uncovering who this stranger really is but she also needs to question her recognition: ‘Why, Christine! Is that really you?’ Christine answers it is her, ‘me’, articulating the certain uncertainty *(29).* Towards the end of the extract, through an intimate confessional, Christine reveals she is a widow and has no children; in fact, she has nothing: ‘Not even a feeling of loss or sorrow’ *(30).*
Ibsen created a play filled with marginalised identities that strive for coexistence and in doing so challenged boundaries of gender and social identity. Boundaries that were once immutable become ambiguous; what appears fixed is now open to adaptation and thus is allegorical. This potential ambiguity has encouraged revisions of the play-text not only by the playwright himself but also by contemporary intercultural interpreters. In *Women’s Intercultural Performance*, Julie Holledge and Joanne Tompkins assert ‘that adaptations are ideal intercultural texts because they mix (at least) two cultural periods, and in some cases two theatrical worlds’ (2000, 18). The intersection of culture and text functions ‘as an interpretive mechanism’ (42).

This is a mechanism that provides a trajectory of interpretative narratives that have internal and external stimuli that include intercultural methods of adaptation, mapping and the rhizome.

Pickles refers to Deleuze and Guattari calling the rhizome, an argument of ‘the multiplying, rhizomatic logics of “and…and…and…” that multiplies interpretations and readings, providing more tools, more languages and more assemblages to help us in thinking about the various kinds of work maps do’ (cited in Pickles 2004, 19). What Pickles is suggesting from this redefinition of the conventional term is that the map is more than the flattened document of representational image and symbol. It encompasses a more fluid dimension that is able to represent spatial regions as much as embody a generative reflective process. I had hoped that a fragment of text could be similarly activated as a root (route) that is then multiplied as a rhizome through the mechanism of interpretation. In other words, the mutation of a ‘verbal artefact or text’ into an alternative dimensional form while still remaining faithful in some way to the original whole, appearing like a generative synecdoche (Holledge and Tompkins 2000, 19).

I introduced Ibsen’s fragment of text into the April workshops at the wellness clinic to experiment with an example of a well crafted, obviously Western, dramatic form and as a response to the group’s desire ‘to do drama’. This could simultaneously allow for the application of a rhizomatic process that may have provided a means to explore allegorical extensions within practice. This included an investigation into mapping as a reflective method (but not yet as a reproductive method) that prompted further investigation into how the \((f+a=r)\) equation could disrupt and subvert forms of narrative as much as it could initiate and even multiply them. What occurred in this process was the fragmentation of the literary fragment, creating a constellation of possibility.

During this process, I introduced an actress into the workshop who had recently graduated from the University of Cape Town. My reason for introducing the actress who spoke isiXhosa was to facilitate the process of physical and literal translation by working beyond the barriers of language that I had found particularly challenging. I had worked with her previously and found her compassionate and unassuming. Of course, the introduction of the actress had the potential to disrupt the process, to mitigate against agency and to make the participants from the clinic self-conscious. But she was immediately welcomed by the group and continued to visit the group in both the smaller and larger sessions.
The initial analysis of the abstracted text fragment suggested themes that the participants could both interpret and understand without it merely existing as a Western preoccupation. Working with the text began with explaining the play’s content and the context of the scene. Those who could read English were given the scene to read whereas the rest of the group were asked to improvise from themes and words extracted and translated from the scene. There was a convergence of the two groups resulting in a hybrid text, created by translating Ibsen.

Everyone, at first, seemed pleased to play all the parts, both as a chorus and then as new characters, derived from the original scene. Playing the scene again and again in multiple ways and experimenting with its form and interpretation produced two outcomes: the creation of a physical space called ‘Christine’s Room’, and a new context for the drama. The space the group created was a space between spaces, an interstice that was safe. ‘Christine’s Room’ also evoked a sense of Christine, Nora’s friend, left behind and marginalised; a struggling and unfortunate widow. It was an intimate space that represented something of everyone’s room. The new context had Nora, having left her husband behind in Cape Town, waiting for Christine in Christine’s room in a township. The group placed the room of Christine above a shebeen. There was poignancy in creating and playing this collaboratively and there was a firm, proposed (re)creation of Christine by one of the participants and of Nora by the young actress working within the group.

The position of the actress became difficult. The participant playing Christine grew attached to her, asking for her telephone number, and the actress began to feel uncomfortable. She felt boundaries had been crossed and it became an important issue that was questioned considerably during the second half of the smaller workshops and even later on. However, she remained a kind of privileged visitor to the process and was committed to the ongoing projects at the wellness clinic. On the other hand, the participant who played Christine left the wellness clinic altogether, determined to find new support independent of the clinic structures, both in regards to beading and general checkups. In some ways she simply disappeared but, on hearing that the workshops continued later in the year, signalled she would return to participate in another workshop. However when she returned she seemed unfocused and did not stay long. Her encounter with the actress did unsettle her and I suspect the inability to make a ‘real’ friend meant she would abandon the support of the collective as well.

DIGITAL CRISIS

A digital record of the participant who played Christine has her standing in front of a map she made during the April workshop. She uses her fingers to directly point to emblems made on her map. The camera first frames her face. She is both excited and nervous, indicated by her rush of speech and a sudden break in speech when she discloses her status.

105 see DVD ‘Cartographies of Performance’ Appendix 4 (Chapter 1).
This is Tuesday’s map. It’s about how you feel, about me…how I feel…about my… (pause)…HIV. How we talk about HIV and the stress. This is my group. (Pointing to a row of figures on the map, whose faces all have down-turned mouths indicating they are sad.) We make a circle. (She points her finger down to a muddy circle, coloured in brown hues of crayon.) We share our feelings. (Pointing to the circle again) HIV. In Part two we make a nice story about Nora who is looking for Christine. She is lost in the village. People doesn’t know who she is but they meet for two days and talk about lots of things because they are friends…

This interview was recorded on the last day of the workshop as part of a reflective process. Analysis of this digital fragment illustrates the problem with participants from the clinic reflecting on video. At first when applying video documentation as a form of pedagogic reproductive processes, as in the previous location of the high school, it had an immediate validating effect. Participants watched themselves doing drama on video. They then extracted recognisable dramatic forms; these forms were practiced and reproduced into making their own dramatic narratives.

However over time, working with video in the clinic heightened the self-consciousness of the group performing in front of the camera. Participants began to behave differently when the camera was there and when it was not. This is evident in the self-consciousness of the participant who although willing to be interviewed, begins by saying: ‘It’s about how you feel, about me…’ Indicating a concern of how others might feel about her linked to how she feels about herself and her HIV status.

There were members of the clinic who participated in the drama meetings who were reluctant to do anything when the camera was not there but who readily performed when the camera was turned on. The video camera became an event in itself, an initiator of fake performance.

An analysis of this particular video entry also points to how more acute reflective tools were necessary to provide my own analysis with skills to assist in my intuitive reading of the transcriptions. Thus to read the documentation intuitively might have pre-empted this particular participant’s need to cross boundaries as well as exposing her fear of others and her lack of commitment to the clinic. However, on a more positive note, reading her video transcript has also illuminated the effectiveness of importing the dramatic equation into the location of the clinic where language did present problems.
The dramatic equation \( f+a=r \) had been translated and remade (adapted) by the participant with her own terminology of representation and imagery. On the map as indicated is a stick figure with an inverted smile holding a child. This figure is followed by an equals sign, and followed in sequence by a virus and an AIDS ribbon. The stick figure is the participant (a single mother) who is fragmented. The equation has mutated into \( f=\text{HIV/AIDS} \). To reach this interpretation, map and DVD informed each other, a synthesis best articulated by Pickles who cites Olson’s analysis of ‘what does the finger and the eye point to?’ (2004, 4). Coordination of the two mediums includes reading (as in listening and watching) the oral explanation of the participant recorded on video and studying the drawing made on her map for further validation of the gesture by the participant in pointing to her equation.\(^{106}\) Her gesture of pointing rather than tracing indicates the polemic of several types of territories coexisting on a single map. What is apparent from this gesturing is how the informant reveals the demands made on her as she negotiates her way through crisis and fragmentation as in the apparent fragmentation of territory and activity drawn on the map.

\(^{106}\) Making meaning from the participant’s recorded interview while referring to the map she has made is about video supplementing the testimony that has made as a map. This relates to Derrida who demonstrates how video corroborates oral testimony (see note17).
The participant has used symbols, particularly the circle as a way of suggesting separateness, disease but that also might suggest togetherness as feeling and community. The participant used her map as a way of transcribing her own mnemonic interpretation of the dramatic narrative created in the workshops.

This example exposes the ethical argument about how to represent the internal world of the participant. The participant has been made explicit in the DVD documentation. She has a face and is not just a map. Faces must be considered with ethical consideration in reference to Emmanuel Levinas’ notions of the ‘face’ (Levinas 1986; Butler, 2004). This edited DVD document gives not only a face to the informant but also a voice and a body that speaks a certain language and gesture. Her face has been captured in a particular way, in a particular frame and within editing constraints of time and aesthetics. Butler suggests in reading Levinas: ‘Someone or something else speaks when the face is likened to a certain kind of speech; it is a speech that does not come from a mouth or if it does, has no ultimate origin or meaning there’ (2006, 133). Therefore exposing the vulnerable position of the face on camera exposes not only the vulnerability of the subject in question but also the vulnerability of the researcher as well. ‘To expose myself to the vulnerability of the face is to put my ontological right to existence into question’ (Levinas 1986; Butler 2004).

In reviewing this video transcript I have also taken into consideration Schön’s deliberations on ‘reflecting in action’ and ‘reflecting on action’ (1983, 278–279). An analysis made from video transcripts meant reflecting on the action that was made rather than reflecting in action, which indicates an immediate reflective response to the action made in the situation. The advantage for both researcher and participant reflecting in action would mean additional assistance in intuitively inventing solutions as problems were encountered (Schön 1983, 182). The difference between these two reflective terms, in the context of the challenges I faced at the clinic, indicates the difference between what was recorded on the map and what was recorded on video. I began to suspect that maps might be a more immediate way to reflect in action rather than on the action.

I wanted to know how to record accurately without the camera and simultaneously find a method of accurate reproduction and recovery. How could both researcher and participants work in a process with their bodies in action and reflect in action with just pencils and blank pieces of A4 paper? How could this interplay become an alternative to digital reproduction? How could I lose the digital but still keep the valuable discovery of reproduction?

POOR RESEARCH (Preliminary planning before July workshop 2006)

Jerzy Grotowski cautioned against labelling experiments as scientific in his classification of theatre, even though his ‘Theatre Laboratory’ suggests a contradiction, for a laboratory is also a place for working with things that are scientific (1968, 27). This is not a critique of Grotowski’s method nor does it do justice to his

---

107 Levinas’ notion of the ‘face’ has been taken from Judith Butler’s citation of it. She says that ‘the notion (of the face) explains how it is that others make moral claims upon us, address moral demands to us, ones that we do not ask for, ones that we are not free to refuse’ (2004, 131). The portrayal of the face does not necessarily diffuse the containment of the other nor does it provide agency for the other. Nonetheless, the ‘approach to the face is the basic mode of responsibility’ (ibid.). In the case of DVD documentation, there is a need to follow this approach with a similar consideration, in the filming, editing and analysis.
legacy, nonetheless I am motivated by how his ‘Poor Theatre’ dictates values that embody the essential, the bare minimum, not excess, not rich.\textsuperscript{108} Disinvesting in the dispensable means investing only in what is necessary. The essence of the problem is also its centrality. Exactitude of focus might problematise only the problem and not the perforating issues. In this context I was not only searching for a solution that would accommodate an immediate method of reflection in action and assist the research itself in directing the focus of my argument in a landscape filled with possibilities, but the pragmatic intent was also to clear away unnecessary ornamentation. Excess in this context meant anything that might hinder the focus of what was being made by the participant and researcher at the time of questioning. In his doctrine, Grotowski asks what is indispensable. I have appropriated the term ‘Poor’ because this is about the essential application of research, made in order for both participant and researcher to reflect in action.

The reflective exercises created through journal writing or the application of digital documentation are mediums that do not facilitate measurement or produce evidence in and of themselves, but rather in how they are read as tools that render evidence and make measurement possible. Maps on the other hand might mean a total research document; decoding a question by encoding its answer through the representation of image in relation to space on a piece of paper, which in turn collectively activates the practice in the research; for the map can be immediately displayed and interpreted by the participants. The maps are collectively fragmented and reproduced into generative exercises, which in turn are reflected upon on maps. A piece of paper and a pen is all that is needed for the collective experience to be complete. I am not implying that the meaning will then be fixed. As these mapping processes suggest, meanings were reproduced and were generative as participants and researchers moved through them and around them.

Maps and mapping (described together as cartography) as an alternative poor research proposition to digital documentation did not just suddenly occur. Towards the end of the group’s meetings at the high school I had asked the group to identify the good and bad places within the school and to map these on a piece of paper or in their journals. This led to the idea of guiding an audience to these places during the performance. In particular, Lauren’s map was an important element of the design in the last project at the high school. At the performance, audiences were given maps of the school, which were redrawn and rerouted by the participant-guides. In redrawing the official map of the school, the participants were provided with an agency of translation. During the April workshop at the clinic, while developing Christine’s Room, maps were used only as a reflective tool. Maps became a way to map participant’s responses to the activities in which they were engaged. This led to the development of new language tools: not only as ‘a symbol system for mapping the world as it is, but as a performative means for coordinating activities’ (Steier 1991, 5), to assist in understanding each other. It was during the second smaller workshop at the clinic in July 2006 that I began to advance cartography as a distinct practice and as a form of reproduction.

\textsuperscript{108} Grotowski’s discourse in his ‘Towards a Poor Theatre’ (1968) is acute in its descriptions: ‘the core of theatre art’, a ‘ripening’, ‘a complete stripping down’, ‘eradication of blocks’ and ‘concrete concepts crystallised’ etc. (15–25). His language functions like sacred technology concentrating on the production of the ‘requisite state of mind’ of the actor (17).
Before I begin to describe the July 2006 workshop, I think it is important to reiterate the distinctions I made earlier in the process between maps and mapping. Mapping is the process delineating expression and reflection from which maps are made. Maps are the outcome of this part of the process; alternative texts produced through mapping. The maps that were made accommodated all kinds of representation, meaning they were not limited to accommodating pictorial representation or images or even to ‘furnish an objective record of the disposition in space’ (Ingold 2000, 235). Maps documented experience. The process did not end with the maps but continued with mapping and even remapping. This process itself saw to it that mapping was extending beyond the workshops at the clinic. Mapping also comprised of the auditing of the map. The process of auditing comprised of studying the marks made on the map as signs, landmarks or codes and making an inventory of them. Furthermore, reviewing this auditing process raised questions about the non-indexical qualities of these items based upon the proposition ‘that their truth conditions are not bound to the place where they are made’ (Ingold 2000, 223). This becomes important because it is about reading symbolic narratives from the map that might transcend barriers of literacy.

Mapping the body as a therapy is discussed by Anya Subotsky, in a paper for the University of Cape Town’s Centre for Social Science Research called ‘Mapping Bodies: Corporeal Erasure and representation in AIDS-related stigma’ (2004). Subotsky explains how: ‘Means of resisting and eroding this erasure (of disease) are explored through the representation of bodily images and life narratives in the form of body maps. Body mapping (used to address each cycle of stigma in turn) as both a therapeutic and advocacy tool…’ (2).

The process of enabling people living with HIV/AIDS to transcribe their experiences and inner feelings through a biological topography, rerecording themselves in the drawn maps of bodies on life-sized pieces of paper might provide strategies for resistance to stigmatisation, concealment and anxiety. Here, to paraphrase Subotsky, the reconstruction of one’s body embodied as something else, as an object of art, might negate the stigma of representing the body as ill and decaying. The reconstructed map of the body embodies an inner topography of experience, tracing painful stories of concealed identity. A new identity emerges, resurfacing from the internal and biological body. This body reveals alternative narrative trajectories tracing the disease and making the invisible visual. The process becomes one of intervention and resistance against socially constructed forms of identity by the self and the other, transforming them into a discourse that is about the personal finding imaginary yet aesthetically real solutions to the ‘the silences imposed on HIV positive bodies’ (11).

Subotsky outlines the new body as resurrected and reclaimed, though not necessarily recovered:

Body maps resurrect and reclaim this visibility. As many layered self-portraits they make manifest the ways in which our life stories inscribe themselves on our bodies, leaving their traces in scars, laugh-lines, stitches or wrinkles. Shifting between depictions of the body’s visible surface and imaginings of its hidden depths, they map internal organs, rashes on the skin, unborn children, experiences and memories of violence, love or loss; the virus blossoming in the bloodstream (9).
I had hoped to explore this system of body mapping in the first smaller workshops. On the first day of these workshops, the group as a whole resisted the idea of body maps with the defiant and generalised reason that they had done them before with an art therapist who had visited the clinic. The participants were unwilling to try it again. I had to find a compromise or a solution and so I asked them to map their everyday instead. This compromise cleared the way, allowing the introduction of mapping. These maps encoded experiences, recovered, talked about and represented in the workshops and later recoded as dramatic activity. Reproduction of the everyday maps occurred as participants were asked to map not only their everyday, their daily journeys to the workshops, but the workshops themselves. These everyday maps became the repositories of reflection and re-experiences. Moreover, when these maps were revisited, items from the maps were extracted and reproduced into units of dramatic narrative, which in turn were also maps. I found in this way that cartography was able to sustain the reproductive processes I had previously discovered in the digital work.

I also want to refer to Ingold’s use of two terms: ‘a complex process metaphor’ and ‘a complex structure metaphor’ (2000, 220), in relationship to a review of cartography as it was applied in the research. The latter term means a descriptive ‘mechanism of replication’ of the environment before there is physical interaction with the environment (ibid.). A cognitive structuring relates to thinking about the image as a thought-image before there is physical interaction. The former term is experiential, heuristic and assumes that by interacting with the environment, solutions will be provided through finding one’s way. When cartography became embodied within the research and the translation of its practice, it displaced the complex structured metaphor of the imaginary equation but embraced its qualities of fragment, assemblage and repository and utilised these qualities in response (and here I am paraphrasing Ingold; 220) to the ongoing perceptual monitoring of finding one’s way through the research surroundings. Alternatively, these terms can be applied and understood in relation to my introduction of body mapping (earlier on in the mapping process) which the participants resisted. They were resisting a complex process metaphor in favour of a complex structured metaphor, of thinking of their everyday rather than ‘an immersion of the actor-perceiver within a given environmental context’ (220), in this case their bodies. But even with these examples the distinctions are not exactly clear. Because even though the participants were resisting a complex process metaphor it was exactly what I was asking them to do, particularly as cartography advanced into territories of the unknown for both of us. Cartography did not present simple fixed solutions instead it contributed multiple, interchangeable and complex processes—to already complex circumstances.
Figs. 6.5–6.8. Making maps.

Fig. 6.9 Map becomes play.
MANDISA’S MAPS

I now want to continue my description of the July 2006 workshop with a focus on cartography by including several maps made by Mandisa (it is her maps that demonstrate the development of the mapping process and provide an opportunity for her voice to be heard). In order to contextualise the development I shall also rely on my own journal entries that correspond to the maps Mandisa made. This informing correspondence is like a conversation that refers to the interdependence and interplay that I think is necessary between two or more modes of information (see note 99) and it also continues to advance the reflexive quality of my written research that I want to endorse.

What also occurs when re-reading Mandisa’s map is the conversation between different analytical modes. There are the maps made, then there are my journals entries that I refer to and which in turn refer to the activities that inspired the reflections on the maps, and then there are the formalised analytical tables produced from an analytical distillation of all participants’ maps. I suspect that this rereading is a process of reproduction: items made from one analytical process in conversation with another producing further analysis.109

Fig. 6.10. Mandisa’s first map.

109 Steier talks about the ‘interplay of the conversation’ in research as a process of ‘learning to see in new ways’ (citing Bamberger and Schön): examples of conversations between researcher and participant, participant and participant, participant and objects and conversations between information materials. ‘What marks all of these is the recognition that these multiple conversations are in effect, multiple realities, no one being the real conversation’ (1991, 6). I would suspect that it is the researcher’s own self that holds all the conversations together.
Reflecting on Mandisa’s first map:

Mandisa made her first map when she began to attend the smaller drama group meetings in July 2006. This particular workshop occurred during the last week in July. It was the second of such meetings operating like a nucleus in relation to the larger group meetings. It was during this July workshop that cartography as a reflective process for the participants at the clinic began to take shape. What had occurred during the previous workshop-session in April was the exploration of adapting a fragment of text into a devised play and reflecting on this process through mapping, whereas during the subsequent July session the devised play was reproduced from the maps produced in the workshop.

Mandisa’s first map suggests ambiguity about the document of the map itself and illustrates the difficulty in defining what exactly the document is that is being made. On first observation I would suggest that Mandisa’s map is just a picture with text. Even further: a counterpart to image and thought or what Benjamin might call an emblematic inscription of thought alongside an image, ‘a key to the realm of hidden knowledge’ (1977, 184). The participant is unsure of what kind of record to make in this document.

On the other hand, it is a map because it is an accessible document that reflects a record of experience and knowledge. This reflective delineation of image and text lies flattened onto paper. The document is accessible to the participant who is able to immediately transcribe her experiences and inner feelings stimulated by an activity. It becomes accessible to the researcher because the document has been made immediately in his presence. This immediacy suggests accessibility towards translation.

What is most apparent in Mandisa’s first map is text-thought and picture-image. The text refers to the play that was being devised in the workshop but also Mandisa’s reflecting upon her own feelings about being a mother to her children. There is an underlying sense of optimism here about her predicament and an obvious
need for an outlet of expression. The boiling pot is not only a source of nourishment but also suggestively
the ‘inexpressible seeking expression’110 (although one cannot ignore the possibility of the pot boiling over as
imminent disaster). Does this point to the participant learning how to recognise internal thoughts and feelings
and to develop modes of expression for these thoughts and feelings?

Mapping could effectively translate several of Weigel’s observations about Benjamin’s _Denkbilder:_
i) Actualising of the theory of ‘thinking and acting in images’ (1996, 4); ii) developing ‘a concept of action in
which, as thoughts become em-bodied _in actu_—(there is) the interpenetration of body-and image-space’ (4);
and iii) ‘where subjects themselves embody their ideas _in actu_, image-space conjoins with body-space’ (10).
Eventually these concepts did become processes in the workshop. The map at first was a document of thought
and image. The document advanced when the activities around maps and mapping became more dimensional
through actions like: participant’s orally explaining the maps that they made, participants performing the
map though reproducing fragments from the maps and translating them into dramatic action, and participants
investigating how their maps related to geographical and urban maps, related to routes on these ‘authentic’ maps
working alongside the participants’ bodies in space.

110 Benjamin citing Creuzer: ‘What is dominant here is the inexpressible which in seeking expression, will ultimately burst the too
fragile earthly vessel of earthly form by the infinite power of its being’ (1977, 164).
Reflecting on Mandisa’s second map:

It is apparent from the second map that Mandisa is still struggling to substitute images for words. She writes a description of the narrative of the play we are about to devise. Once again, there is inscription, describing activity. Below the written paragraph is a simplified chart, which in essence is the map. This map is composed of progressive units of activities. It is a route to a story representing dramatic narrative. The image of

The state of this map demonstrates how the maps were used in the workshop; they were not treated delicately but worked on, passed around, exchanged and reproduced as action. The marks made on the maps during their handling were traces of the workshops. See Mandisa’s own description of this her second map and her third map on DVD (f+a=r) Appendix 3 (Chapter 1).
the pot has been replaced by a series of images that make up a map. Regeneration is hinted at, for in the play, as Mandisa describes, Luvuyo throws away his pills and these turn into a tree; although on the map it is a flower that emerges from the pills with an inscription attached: ‘decorating’. This could imply that decorating, as in beautifying, is like the growth of a flower.\footnote{Here the flower is similar to the rhizome with its quality of regenerative perseverance. Life has always seemed to me like a plant that lives on its rhizome. Its true life is invisible, hidden in the rhizome. The part that appears above ground lasts only a single summer. Then it withers away—an ephemeral apparition. When we think of the unending growth and decay of life and civilizations, we cannot escape the impression of absolute nullity. Yet I have never lost a sense of something that lives and endures underneath the eternal flux. What we see is the blossom, which passes. The rhizome remains (Jung 1967, 7).}

**Fig. 6.12** Mandisa’s third map.

My journal entry: July 26 2006.

On the following day, we recreate an exercise mentioned by Nicholson in *Applied Drama: the Gift of Theatre*. It is an exercise about the broken hearts that are placed on the map and these are markers on the map for what each person thinks is important as we create more and more maps. I ask the group to extract symbols from the map and we see common things like trees, hospitals, benches, buses, balls, stoves, ovens, pots, spazas and support centres and it’s strange one person in the group suggests that the fragments on the maps are like pieces of an orange. We start to talk about childhood and childhood songs but we need a longer time for this as the day draws to a close. We run through the play so it can be filmed and then we draw some summary maps around people’s favourite activities. It’s nearly the end of the week so the group embody musical instruments marching in song to celebrate the week’s work.

Reflecting on Mandisa’s third map:

This map is the most conventional map made by Mandisa thus far. It illustrates a route through Cape Town from Monkeybiz wellness clinic to the ‘Hungry Lion’ (fast food establishment). The landmarks have been coded with red stickers, fragments, and Mandisa’s broken heart. The red stickers give the map an empathic quality. The map depicts horizontal representations like stick figures, it also has aerial qualities: boxes and demarcated routes that conventional maps often embody.
As referred to in my journal entry this game of broken hearts originated from a game Nicholson describes when she observes the charity Action Aid using a technique called ‘Reflect’—‘to encourage adult literacy in the developing world’ (2005, 42). Her response to the game, which in its original context was explored amongst a group of refugees, indicates that there is a symbolic charting of experience (ibid.). On Mandisa’s map, there is also a charting movement beyond the placed fragments indicated by the route she makes on her map that depicts both fragments and journey.

De Certeau describes the map as a ‘totalising stage on which elements of diverse origin are brought together to form the tableau of a “state” of geographical knowledge’ (1984, 121). Mandisa’s second map is a repository, containing the collated data of an immediate reflexive experience. Multiplicity infers ambiguity in the narrative recorded on the map. Perhaps that is why previously there was resistance to the body maps: the everyday maps reflected (superficially) how the participants were living whereas the body maps exposed how they were dying. The everyday maps were about free determinism; holding stories that sometimes disclosed and sometimes concealed the virus.¹¹³

Throughout the week’s workshop participants had studied city maps of Cape Town in order to replicate the structure in their own maps. Participants began to draw their routes from township to city and across the city to the clinic on these maps. Maps made were also explained orally to other participants. Participants also reproduced maps from other participants’ maps. When maps were explained and read, their value was extended through extraction and reproduction. This was the exchange of maps on the ground. What is evident in the maps made is that they are both horizontal and aerial representations.

*Wandersmänner* is a term utilised by de Certeau to describe the everyday elementary practice of walkers on the ground ‘whose bodies follow the thicks and thins of an urban “text” they write without being able to read it’ (1984, 93). Una Chaudhuri, replying to a question about theatre and tragedy in the context of 9/11, says: ‘Classical tragedy offered a “God’s eye view” of human suffering, whereas modern tragedy offers instead a “bird’s eye view”, contingent, unstable, flighty’ (2002, 97). She suggests that both classical and modern tragedy assure us views from above: the height of heavenly temples and skyscrapers provide both god-like and bird-like perspectives enabling the planning of possible routes. But now that the emblematic Western structure has fallen and the view from above is lost, the only view is from the ground, amongst the rubble. Chaudhuri’s ironic revelation colludes with de Certeau’s reading of grounded narrative. Has 9/11 led to the grounding of optically driven narrative? There are other towers, as there is more access to the Global Positioning System, but the tragic event has emphasised a distinct movement away from the sky to the ground. Disaster shifts narrative preoccupation into making more everyday stories. It has informed the maps people make internally and externally in their everyday journeys. As a walker plans the route on the ground and walks on ground level, the fragments of the city become embedded as markers on a mental and physical map. A map

¹¹³The etymological origin of the map is derived from *mappa* meaning ‘tablecloth, napkin or sheet’ and *mundi* meaning ‘of this world’. Therefore, the sheet of the world does suggest a document that reveals as much as it conceals (see OED). It might be only in action that revelation becomes apparent.
made while traversing space on ground level has no single controlling perspective. It discovers the detail of space from moment to moment. It has no control; it is continually surprised by what it discovers. Whereas an aerial map implies a single perspective, with a panoptic view, it is the panoptic view that consolidates the viewing narrative represented as an aerial summation on a map. The aerial maps that were always at first cognitive before the experience of embarkation, are not lost; they are reconfigured into the walking maps made from the ground.

The assumption about the grounding of optically driven narrative also relates to an assumption that Ingold’s complex process metaphor has replaced its complex structure counterpart, for there is less pre-planned content. This is not necessarily so, both metaphors like the views of the environment are part of a larger process of knowing: ‘every “somewhere” is not a location in space but a position on a path of a movement, one of the matrix of paths comprising the region as a whole’ (Ingold 2000, 227). There is an intersection between information that is thought about and experience as knowledge ‘in the passage from place to place, and in histories of movement and changing horizons along the way’ (ibid.). Walking the map is the physicalising of knowledge of a region; the walking and recording happen as simultaneous experiences.

The maps made in the workshop were often at first summations of broad themes and generalized experiences. Many of the everyday maps made by participants in the clinic had an aerial composition synthesised with flattened horizontal perspectives. Often the shapes and lines composed had a distant dimension as if the narratives of the participants, even though grounded as Wandersmänner, had aerial perspectives about everyday tragedy. Is there something instinctive about aerial composition as the innate knowledge of regions or does aerial composition dictate simple composition because distance reflects simplicity?114

When I reflect on my own experiences of walking, as a walker, a flâneur with purpose, it is clear to me how walking the map is evident in my work, translating as both research and experience.115 I have walked different routes, sometimes a similar trail, to each and every bi-weekly session at the wellness clinic over two and half years. This is all recorded in journal form and in digital documentation; my experiences of cutting across a city. Walking across the city’s quarters and neighbourhoods was mental preparation and provided focus before spending time at the clinic. It was also a process of understanding how the dimension of mapping can be a physical one. I extended my own embodiment of walking the city into the workshops by introducing walking exercises to certain locations in the city from the clinic, asking participants to reflect these walking experiences

114 Is aerial composition what Benjamin would call a ‘wish image’ (Buck-Morss 1989, 114)? Pickles who cites Benjamin’s ‘wish image’ is also referring to Benjamin’s ‘Angel of History’ as a map of a particular vision of history that exemplifies Benjamin’s attempt to counter ‘the futurist myth of historical progress’, which Pickles records along with ‘the visual giddiness of elevation and the ability to survey the earth beneath…’ (2004, 140). In Benjamin’s view the ruin is at the Angel’s feet, therefore undoubtedly trapped on the ground. When viewing Klee’s Angel it is as if the Angel is beneath us composed as an aerial map; hence an allegory of wishing for transcendence on to another dimensional plane.

115 Pile, in Real Cities, says: ‘For many, walking is the pre-eminent spatial practice for the city’. He cites the writing of Ian Sinclair who he says signifies walking ‘significant not just as a means of experiencing the city and of assessing the mood of the city, but also making the deliberately imaginative—even mythical or magical—connections between the different parts of the city’ (2005, 4).
on to maps. In retrospect these exercises related to Ingold’s point that ‘knowledge is regional: it is to be cultivated by moving along paths that lead around, towards or away from places, from or to places elsewhere’ (2000, 229).

Fig. 6.13. Mandisa’s fourth map.

My journal entry: Friday 4 August.
The workshops end resulting in the formation of a strong core group. The larger drama workshops begin again. One method that is carried through from the workshops is my writing down everyone’s names on to stickers. This is a success everyone likes to be acknowledged. We also create a game of sounds that I have derived from Grotowski. We create a game of sounds where one person blows the sounds across the room to another creating lines and trajectories of sound. This is a map of crisscrossing sound, crisscrossing the room, both visually and orally. The smaller group then performs the play they have worked on in the workshops. The beauty of this play is that everyone, even the audience, can participate and admonish the man who watches television for not taking his pills. Participants from the larger group suddenly get up and interact naturally by admonishing the man for throwing away his pills and the smaller group who are acting in the play love this. They are performing to an audience who is interacting with them. This is a success!
Reflecting on Mandisa’s fourth map:
Mandisa’s fourth map consolidates elements from her previous maps above. It is reflective, conclusive and takes on the diagrammatic conventions of maps influenced from the previous day’s activities. It summarises the play as a dramatic narrative with each unit enlarged with detail: pictures, objects and inscription. It also has two inscriptions, which although they are not clear on the reproduced map above, are still important to point out. One points to her earlier referencing of regeneration: ‘that is growing into a tree and this is something beautiful’ and the other says: ‘we are videorized’ suggesting awareness and acceptance of other forms of recording methods. I am also aware how the term indicates not only video but could also allude to invasion perpetrated from an outside force like a virus.

The mapping processes were intriguing, fruitful and validated my assumptions about alternative modes of communication. The maps made indicated where the participants and I were at various moments in the research process. Links were made between the internal world of participants and their markings on paper and between the evolving process and the markings on paper. Cartography was indispensable and became a predominant mode and medium in every subsequent project.

Mandisa voluntarily continued making maps in the next project demonstrating her own reflective processes, an emerging knowledge and an increasing need for expression. When I asked Mandisa in a group discussion why she was drawing maps, she replied.

They are maps because it was what we have done so now we have to write it down. The routes we have taken, the things we have done so that’s why we call them maps. It is the things we have seen. (Excerpt in DVD 4 Chapter 1)

Mandisa seems to grasp both method and form, indicated by her use of particular words: ‘routes’ and ‘the things we have done and seen’. This is an indication of an active advancement in understanding and of an agency in regards to this method of mapping.

THE RECIPROCATORS
Steier calls those who participate with him in his research: ‘reciprocators, for it is only by their hearing me and answering me that a ‘me’ can emerge as an I who does research’ (1991, 175). Throughout the research, the observations of self and others have occurred in three mutually reciprocal repositories: digital video (or DVD), maps and journals. All three have provided a means to reflect back on the practice produced and recorded. They have informed each other as media, assisting each other in their own development and as transmissions of accessibility. They embody valuable research information as much as they make research and produce information. The participants in each project have transferred on to them the means of making observations.
and the documents themselves embody transactions of informed consent. In the rewriting and the writing of the thesis itself, I have become aware of a further conversation, between Lauren, Mandisa and myself. I have tried to expose this interplay through weaving their made documents and their voices into the text.

What has occurred, as Steier suggests, is that Lauren and Mandisa’s voices have become reciprocators. They revealed to me a necessary part of my own researcher’s voice. By returning to Lauren and Mandisa’s voice in order to try and understand why they heard and answered me in the ways that they have, is to try and recover a sense of their process and my own. Discovering the ‘reflexive dialogue’ as Steier describes it is to construct or even reconstruct the possibility of new types of narratives emerging. This includes the interplay between drama and narrative, which I have often referred to as dramatic narrative, the narratives made by cartography, the narratives that occur when there is re-engagement towards recovery, the narratives that incorporate an interplay of reflexivity and referencing of the self and the other. These examples I hope can support my argument about changing existing systems into preferred ones.

Furthermore my argument that change might be evident in a system of interactivity that promotes recovery is illustrated in the presentation of this thesis, which enacts recovery. Ahead, there is also Chapter Seven that describes two projects produced from my work at the clinic that also demonstrate this assumption that interactivity promotes recovery. Before this is possible, I need to reflect on several crises that emerged before these projects took place. It really began when cartography was taken back into the larger group at the clinic. Many of the participants from the larger group simply left the room as soon as mapping began–resisting this mode of practice and aggravating the crises of difference and of instruction.

Steier says:

Paradoxically, seeing research as translation allows that, as we reflexively understand our research to be about ourselves, we open up greater (rather than fewer) degrees for the voices of others. It allows us to begin to question where our own categories do not fit, and where we have created ‘false notes’ out of good music (1991, 177).

Questions will always continue to occur throughout research but in this case doubt began to surface. I became anxious not only about the process and the product but the role of the producer in this exchange–me. I became worried that I had got lost in the determination to recover and to produce examples of recovery, furthermore I got lost in the translation of this intent. Recovery remained a challenging concept because the deliberation thus far has been that recovery is indeterminate and never complete. However the action of recovery itself as a performative mode emerged as an important function: to extrapolate from the unknown and to redeem from the ruin emerged from a process of self-revelation whilst the self was submerged in a series of crises including a crisis of translation. I was aware as described by Steier that:

116 I mean here a system in Steier’s terms: one that emerges in a hermeneutic merging in the investigative process, and includes the researcher and his or her modeling processes (making research autobiographical) co-constructing the system in conversation with others’ (1991, 179). Furthermore, a system on Benjamin’s terms that changes the apparatus of production as itself changes (1970, 4). Alongside these is my own invented system that translates an aftermath through a performative route of recovery.
We can move from “what gets lost in translation” to allowing ourselves to get lost in translation, to understanding what is, as Geertz (1983) notes, found (by us) in translation (1991, 182). Therefore getting lost also meant a detour towards knowledge.

POSTSCRIPT FROM A LABYRINTH

Fig. 6.14. Dossa Dossi’s ‘A Portrait of an Anonymous Man’ (Philadelphia Museum of Art).

A sullen man sits framed in a close up in portraiture. In the foreground, to his right, is a single pear and, to his left, his finger points downward on to a feint labyrinth chalked on the desk in front of him. Dossa Dossi painted this scene, a set piece, in the early part of the sixteenth century. Dossi, a lesser-known Renaissance painter often depicts themes of romance and mythology in his paintings. However, in this particular painting, there are few clues as to what are its distinctive themes. The subject’s identity is not clear. He is known simply as the ‘gentleman’ and considered anonymous by contemporary critics. What is central to an interpretation is the labyrinth, a cryptic emblem in its own right.

The labyrinth is a small, chalky-white etching in the right hand corner of the painting. Its position in the portrait prompts perplexity. Is the labyrinth beyond the gentleman’s concern, meaning that he has surpassed its internment, or is he in fact still caught within it, contemplating his own ensnared turmoil and confusion therefore causing his fixed melancholy.

Hermann Kern says that the gentleman’s left-hand index finger points directly not only to the labyrinth but also to the gentleman’s circumstance.
It is evident that the labyrinth recalls an unpleasant experience, for the sitter is pointing to it with his left, ‘sinister’ hand and is purposely looking away from it with a melancholy expression and a vacant unfocused look in his eyes. He is turning not to see something else, but, rather, to avert his eyes from the labyrinth (2000, 203).

Kern continues that the positioning of the finger directly above the centre of the labyrinth signifies how ‘the man claims he is still in the middle of it, that the labyrinthine task is a burden he continues to bear’ (204). It is not misfortune that continues to torment the gentleman’s predicament; instead it is a contemplation about transference. Kern points out that this labyrinth is ‘a ten-circuit church labyrinth’ (203). Church labyrinths were introduced when the Holy Land became inaccessible for pilgrimage and substitutes were found:

For those too old or too ill to undertake a long pilgrimage, the church labyrinth provided a manageable alternative – penitents could trace the labyrinth on their knees or with a finger if it was on a wall or pillar as at Lucca Cathedral’ (Grove Dictionary of Art 2000, 584–585).

The labyrinth was like an imaginary pathway to an imagined ‘Chemin de Jerusalem’ that, as an imagined pathway to salvation, promoted a ritualized performance of transference–action that became ‘synonymous with Christ’s passion’ (ibid.).

This act of transferring an imaginary route onto and through the body was a form of re-enactment and reimagining. This was not necessarily an entrapment but provided alternative routes towards an unreachable territory. The unreachable made accessible through cartography and its performance.¹¹⁷

Interpretation of Dossi’s painting points to my proposal of reaching the unreachable as an allegorical variable. In other words constructing a hidden place or becoming lost in the re-imagining of an aftermath and then retrieving oneself or what had been hidden in order to assist in the explication of redemption and renewal from the ruin. The painting also refers back to the potent, complex image of the participant from the clinic, who is portrayed

¹¹⁷ As Ingold suggests citing Wood (1993): ‘The map, like the written word, is not, in the first place, the transcription of anything but rather an inscription. Thus mapping gives way to mapmaking at the point, not where mental imagery yields an external expression, but where the performative gesture becomes an inscriptive practice’ (Wood 1993, 53; 2000, 231).
with several of her fingers pointing down on to a map, the map that she explains she has made. This image therefore has both an allegorical and ethical significance contributing to the impending series of crises that I experienced within my research.

Throughout the research I have posed a succession of questions, some of which I am yet to answer. There have been a number of results that have not been entirely satisfactory or which have left me, as the researcher, feeling frustrated and even constricted. I would not necessarily describe these as failures but as a series of crises informing me of limits reached. I have alluded to the dilemma of the impending compound of crises. The categories of crises include (in no particular order):

i) Questions around the value of creating reproducible dramatic text in favour of alternative narratives discovered within the cases studies;

ii) Enabling situations of recovery in obvious conditions of non-recovery;

iii) Limitations of language within cross-cultural research;

iv) Vulnerability of both the self and the subject when participating in the practice of the research;

v) Questions around continuity of participation specifically in regards to the health of subjects in the second case study;

vi) Commitment of the participants and incentives provided by the research;

vii) Informed consensual practices;

viii) Exchanges of collaborative research;

ix) Ethical framing of the documentation in regard to Levinas’s concept of ‘faces’ within the ownership and reading of documents made;

x) Complexities around narrative framing in the editing process;

xi) ‘Anxieties of dis-integrity’ (Fine 1998b, 147);


I would like to concentrate on the last two examples in order to explain how these crises were limitations in the research. Firstly, Fine refers to the ‘anxieties of dis-integrity’ as states of anxiety projected by the researcher on to the subject of research itself (Fine 1998b, 147). This occurs because of the unconscious anxiety instilled and created by the researcher’s own anxieties about the subject’s apparent condition. Fine calls these the ‘existential and aesthetic anxieties’ of the non-disabled researcher (ibid.). She cites Hahn’s research around the works of the non-disabled researcher working in the field of the disabled, that reveals more about the ‘researcher’s own terror of disability than… the persons with disabilities about whom they have presumably written’ (ibid.). The point of this crisis within my own research was that I too might have unconsciously created and projected my own anxieties and fear of HIV and AIDS on to the women whose own bodies and predicament were an example of my anxieties, which were in danger of becoming reinforced. This predicament presents yet another crisis. The attempt to embrace the other within myself and to acknowledge that I, as a white, Jewish, gay, HIV-negative male, with a specific vocabulary, also wanted to attempt to heal and repel what was the other (of gender-
disease-race) located within the subject–black, Xhosa, Christian, HIV-positive, indigent women and therefore possibly ‘dangerous’. Fine doesn’t offer tangible solutions to this crisis except perhaps to ‘come clean’ about the contradictory stances, politics, perspectives and histories we import to our work’ (148). I needed to acknowledge the differences that were apparent, perhaps not attempt to bridge the divide as much as to articulate the gap. To stabilise this crisis might only sustain the polarisation and anxieties but, at the same time, there was a subtle conflict inherent in the research and it was necessary to avoid promoting it. Elam says: ‘There are differences, they arise, always more of them’ (1994, 84). Gobodo-Madikizela asks this question:

Does continuing to define myself as a person from a “historically disadvantaged background and my white counter-parts as coming from “historically privileged” background help to move the agenda of institutional transformation? I doubt it (2005).118

Steier makes the observation that research particularly when seeking out the conversation of differences can be like bridge building. ‘In translating from conversation to conversation, a researcher becomes a pontificator…’ (1991, 176). Perhaps in recovering my own research from its crises I needed to seek out a system that could build bridges between differences but would be as fluid and encompassing as the research itself. Nonetheless, taking to heart what really matters about the work: the product of research or the subject of the research further compounded crises: It is Latour’s concern that within what he calls a ‘program of action’ (that I might call research) one might only reach a phase of the ‘intermediary’ and never reach a phase of ‘mediation’ (Latour 1998, 178). By this he actually means things might never appear to be conclusive. If this is so, a series of steps that anticipate reaching a specific goal within the research, only occur within the intermediary phase but these never really settle, instead they will alter, deviate or change the anticipated goal. Sometimes the programme is interrupted as with a crisis. While moving from the exploratory stage into a descriptive stage, I was left wondering if the research had really advanced knowledge or even become informative, explainable beyond my own assumptions. Limitations in the earlier stage limited mediation towards the explanatory stage.

This is where Moustakas’s incubation process comes in to play–from his third phase of heuristic research: ‘Incubation is the process in which the researcher retreats from the intense, concentrated focus of the question’ (Moustakas 1990, 28). The phase of incubation is like being lost in the labyrinth and, like the unknown gentleman, it is not necessarily an unfortunate predicament but one that might lead towards a process of illumination. Moustakas explains how:

Illumination opens the door to a new awareness, a modification of an old understanding, a synthesis of fragmented knowledge, or a discovery of something that has been present for some time yet beyond immediate awareness (30).

---

118 Gobodo-Madizikela suggests an integration of the moral imagination into difficult, polarised situations and it is the position of the moral imagination as a concept that I return to in Chapter Seven.
Illumination can occur through a series of epiphanies. Epiphanies are stages of being which encompass the progression of moving from crisis to epiphany towards eventual illumination. Illumination eventually consolidates the epiphanies that might occur in varied progressive stages. In the case of my own research, the process of progression from crises led to incubation and thereafter on to an epiphany and then much later an illumination leading to a transformation of my research.

Epiphanies represented points of discovery as the research proceeded. Stringer suggests that an interrogation of the epiphanic moments is necessary to grasp an understanding of the challenges faced within the research (1999, 174). I began to chart several key epiphanies along the lines of Stringer’s suggestion in order to understand where the research was, how it transformed and how it might produce an illuminating system. The key epiphanies were:

- Dramatic narrative that stems from the locale of an aftermath might provide opportunities for recovery.
- Acknowledgement of the self as subject in the research process.
- How the voice of the participant could assist and sustain the reflexive identity of the researcher.
- Reproduction as a progressive stage of practices incorporating application, diffusion and gain.
- Cartography as an alternative mode of text incorporating reflection and reproduction.
- Change might occur through performing acts of recovery.

What was clear in framing these key epiphanies along Stringer’s model was that earlier epiphanies informed the later ones. There was a sense of continuity in the research, problems highlighted in particular by an epiphany about the reflexive self seemed to embrace, rein in and transform the original research question, which arose from the event of 9/11. Prompted by this I began to probe my perceptions about the 9/11 aftermath once again. Two years after 9/11, my father passed away. His death at the time did not equal the loss I experienced during 9/11. I neglected a process of mourning and lost a sense of my own legacy. At the same time I began to realise how much the role of my own self-recovery had become an object of the research in question. As my own self-reflexivity advanced within the intermediary phase, as a process of self-projection, I could not ignore the danger of it interrupting the process of mediation between the recovery of the self and the participant’s own process of recovery in my research.

Steven Pile and Nigel Thrift in ‘Mapping The Subject’ (1995) describe the danger of reflexivity as ‘to use the self/other relationship comes perilously close to narcissism and solipsism’ (16). This is a danger that might promote a kind of slippage away from the intended object of pursuit. It is a crisis, which they describe as ‘largely (but not only) a crisis’ linked to that of ‘the white, western, heterosexual male self’ (17). Stephanie Hammer suggests, in Schiller’s Wound (2001), citing Julia Kristeva, that ‘people subjected to traumas may often be narcissists–withdrawn, resentful people secretly obsessed with grandiose self-images entailing enormous power and global fame’ (2001, 16). I am not suggesting here that in this research I am seeking out Kristeva’s concerns regarding power and fame nor that my research is, to paraphrase Pile and Thrift, a ‘takeover bid’ by
the self (1995, 17). What is certain is that 9/11 sidelined the more personal familial loss. I suspect intimate narratives were replaced by narcissism, self-involvement replacing symbolic acts of mourning, negating engagement for fear of weakness and reinforcement of loss. I am also aware of Charles Derber’s concerns about ‘wilding’, meaning self-centred behaviour that harms others (Cited by Sawyer 2005, 1). But at the same time my experience of reflexivity was able to provide a sense of self-revelation.

Through this sense of self-revelation, which itself is an allegorical act stimulated by an act of recovery, the research has been re-narrated into functioning as part of the system of recovery. I had returned to question how my own anger is complicit in how I interact in the everyday and how research illuminated my own system of repression. At the same time, I did not want the recovery of the self to negate the recovery of others. I had hoped that I could find a way to locate the self as I bent my own narrative of searching backwards in order to assist my own research recovery. It was in the incubation phase while processing the series of other crises that I had a strong epiphany and located a fragment that I recovered from autobiographical memory.

While I was growing up in Johannesburg, when my father was free from work on weekends, he would take my siblings and I on treasure hunts across the streets of the inner city of Johannesburg. There we would have to answer riddles pertaining to clues around specific icons and emblems attached to the historical buildings still existing in central Johannesburg. If we could identify, recover and answer clues in my father’s trail of ad hoc history, we were awarded prizes, usually sweets. From that moment I wanted to know how I could assemble this fragment into my present research: perhaps dramatise a treasure trail so that both participants and myself could rewrite the maps that we were writing and reading while recovering fragments from an aftermath.

It was an epiphany – an autobiographical fragment – as Benjamin might suggest, that I was ‘to seize hold of memory as it flashes up to a moment of danger’ (1968b, 255). The epiphanic fragment illuminated how I could reposition and reconstruct my research with others towards being part of an active system that assumes that interactivity, composed of drama and narrative, can translate an aftermath through performing a route of recovery.

The proposed system is a consolidation as well as an illumination of what might be made (and become) from the research. The system is what is practiced. The system is a complex body of things including a repository of knowledge that can activate and replicate itself as a template of interactivity. The system is an argument for changing existing systems into preferred ones. Benjamin in his study of the Baroque in The Origin of German Tragic Drama (1928), observed how the Baroque, as a system, was preoccupied with the preservation of the ruin in landscape. He suggests, by quoting metaphysical poet Karl Borinski, that it is not only the fragment but the survival of fragment that becomes important:

The broken pediment, the crumbling columns are supposed to bear witness to the miracle that the sacred edifice has withstood even the most elemental forces of destruction, lightning and earthquake (1977, 178).
My proposed system advances from this proposal to include within its own complexity the fragment and its survival but also the redemption of fragment as a process towards recovery. In the following chapter I shall explain the proposed system further through a delineation of two later projects that advance my study towards explanation. I want to add that as projects they have been made with an extensive amount of work and as such the projects and their generative effects demand several chapters of explication. This is not possible. I also initiated these projects, modelling myself as producer or curator. I did not make all the works in these projects instead they were generated through collaboration with a diverse range of visual artists and theatre makers. Therefore I cannot call all the work in these projects my own. The projects themselves did incorporate a system that produced a network of other work made by other people. This extended the framework of my research outcomes rather than standardising them. But what is necessary is how the forthcoming projects complement and react to the earlier projects as a synthesis of progressive mutations of the research into the system that I want to define. The descriptive details of these projects have been made into an additional document and included as Appendix 8 in order to refer to and highlight the originality of the projects as performance events.
SEVEN

CONCLUSION OR REMAPPING THE CATASTROPHE

Fig. 7.1. A porcelain fragment stamped with the original architect’s plan of Cape Town University in the (in)Heritage project.

Fig. 7.2. Mandisa in the (in)Junction project (December) framed in the moment of recovery by offering beetroot as medicine to the statue of Louis Botha on his horse.

Fig. 7.3. Dismantling the monument in Limbo the collaborative site specific performance for the Infecting City Festival, Cape Town 2009. (Geza, et al.)

EXPLANATION

Since 2001 I have been researching methods of doing drama and these have extended into creating collaborative projects within several Cape Town locations outside of the theatre, in the everyday world in which people live in the aftermath of apartheid and the aftermath of the advent of HIV/AIDS. At a particular point in my research I asked this question: How might a practice of drama and narrative, operating from within an aftermath, provide recovery? From this an imaginary equation (f+a=r) emerged, one I utilised in order to initiate drama projects within two locations: the high school and wellness clinic. The original hypothesis of the equation
was challenged by various circumstances in these locations. Nonetheless, the equation remained an original facilitative mechanism towards creating drama projects in the otherwise difficult terrain of aftermath. The equation did not disappear as much as mutate into a less prescriptive method of creating drama still using the variables of fragment, assemblage, and repository. This formula reappeared (surreptitiously) within the practice of cartography and reproduction.

The central question of the research remains ever present within the practice of the research but now accommodates a system that emerged from within the research-practice, a system that promotes performing acts of recovery as a practice of drama and narrative. These acts of recovery (as I will explain in this section) are performed as allegorical interventions by incorporating multiple-modes of live interpretation, including dance, performance art, text, visual and conceptual art into a narrative of interactivity while simultaneously using maps as a way to further generate and document the practice as research.119 Interactivity develops by engaging voluntary participants (collaborating in the projects) and public participants (as in an audience and as readers) to recover fragments as a way to stimulate acting upon recovery. Recovery is an outcome of this research occurring in theme – in method and – in medium. The concept of allegorical intervention extends the focus of recovery in establishing an interdependent relationship between concealment and disclosure. This relationship as exchange encourages cross-referencing, repetition, re-reading, remapping as devices within a text that enacts recovery. This relationship permeates through the operations of projects and within the recovery of the self, and through the translation of the practice presented in this thesis as a recovered configuration; an embodiment of testimony.

It was within the evolution of the emerging system, through making collaborative drama projects, that I experienced various crises and epiphanies that included the integration of cartography within the research as a method of translating a methodology around practice. Corresponding to these activities was the relational self, a subjective position that framed, as much as it instigated, the various crises and epiphanies experienced during my research. This meant that I reflected on and used my own personal histories, including the intersection of heritage with autobiographical memory, as a way to engage with and resolve the various challenges that I experienced.

The drama projects occurred on various levels, as a drama-teaching program and a series of workshops, culminating in particular (for the sake of this explanatory chapter) into two performance events. These two performance events occurred in two different locations away from the clinic although the projects themselves were generated from the clinic whilst still working with its participants. The two performance events took place along the University of Cape Town’s (UCT’s) Heritage Trail and along an urban trail in the city of Cape Town. I hoped that the two projects, (in)Heritage (2006) and (in)Junction (2007), would promote a template of interactivity. Explanation of the above-mentioned projects occurs in several ways. The first way is through

119 I would like to think that the term ‘live interpretation’ can mean more than the interpretation of history and historical sites through live ‘storytelling in a new incarnation’ (Online: pastpleasures). In the sense in which I understand it, ‘live interpretation’ is an interpretative act involving one or more of the live creative arts forms, across creative arts disciplines, and activated primarily in museums and in the field of heritage more broadly (see Manchester University’s Performance, Learning and Heritage project for a wider range of definitions: http://www.plh.manchester.ac.uk/research).
the relational self, recovered though retelling this research-story. The second way, is through the use of thought-images, Benjamin’s Denkbilder, a term I thought I forsook when I left Sigrid Weigel’s book Body-and Image-Space on a reading desk of the New York Public Library during my immediate experience of 9/11. The book has no direct connections to 9/11 except that I will always associate it with my own experiences of the catastrophic event and its aftermath. Throughout the research and the translation of its practice I have been able to return to the book again and reinvest its theory into my own practice by relying on ‘the insight that memory and action find articulation in images, that ideas are structured as images, and what is at stake is therefore a praxis that can operate with images’ (996, 10). The images I have reproduced in this text are used to explain further: how and why I thought my practice occurred the way it did. A third way is through the use of the descriptive text that is inserted as Appendix 8. The final way is through the participants’ journeys. I have relied on two witnesses because there is a synergy between Lauren and Mandisa as two South African women and mothers whose curiosity about the world around them has sustained their commitment to the research projects. I have been able to validate their own experiential growth within the process by recovering their voices from the documents they have made. In re-reading their voices I have been given another perspective from which to look back at my own work, more aware of the reflexive quality in my research. By assuming this as a quality, according to Myerhoff and Ruby: ‘We may achieve a greater originality and responsibility than before, a deeper understanding at once of ourselves and our subjects’ (1995, 307).

Mandisa in particular illustrates the making of new forms of documentation in low-tech ways that helped to generate projects formed from alternative text; an example of her symbolic growth in knowledge. Mandisa’s almost certain non-recovery from a life-threatening disease presents the central paradox in this theme of recovery. Maps assisted in strengthening the agency of the

(in)Heritage used the heritage trail at the University of Cape Town as its starting point. The project incorporated the live interpretation of the various heritage landmarks on this trail by various conceptual, visual, dance and performance artists located in Cape Town. Participants from the drama workshops at the wellness clinic acted as guides assuming the role of Christian Nerf’s Polite Force along this trail. Their guiding entailed recounting their own interpretations of the heritage landmarks and making sure the public kept to the correct paths along the heritage trail. Another level of interactivity was the element of the treasure hunt: using clues, a treasure map and hiding a box of porcelain fragments in a post box as the hidden treasure. Please watch the video references to this work. They are available on Disc 4 of the DVDs. In a chapter called cartography (on Disc 4) a group discussion is filmed during the training of the tour guides; and the significance of maps is suggested. There is also the (in)Heritage chapter on the same DVD which shows the training of the Polite Force on the university campus. It uses the song in the background that the training group chose to sing, both during their training and in their welcoming of the audience on the day of the public event. The song is called: ‘somebody is calling my name’. It is a popular song at the clinic and I suggest it is also an allegory of both mortality and recognition.

(in)Junction began as a comparative study to (in)Heritage, asking the question: could a similar format be replicated in an urban environment? Once again, several conceptual, visual, dance and performance artists located in Cape Town were asked to create work in a specific urban environment. This time however the monkeybiz drama group held a week long workshop around mapping in a local gallery. The workshop culminated in a performance and became the central element of the project. The treasure hunt theme was repeated in this environment. The Polite Force acted as guides taking the public along the urban treasure trail. I
adapted a personal heirloom into a modified mayoral necklace that became the treasure. The project recurred again after its original inception providing a generative possibility to the work. Please refer to Disc 3 of the DVDs, for there are two clear examples of the project. The chapter city shows the mapping workshop in the gallery and consolidates a lot of the practical methods in relation to mapping and drama. And the chapter called treasure hunt shows the journey of the winning team who found the hidden treasure.

In the two projects (in)Heritage and (in)Junction I asked the question: how could performance dismantle the monument and then assemble its fragments into an alternate repository? This occurred most poignantly in the second (in)junction with Mandisa feeding beetroot to the statue of Louis Botha on his horse situated on the corner of Parliament and Roeland Streets in Cape Town were the project took place. I will refer to this concept of dismantling of the monument again in the next reflexive frame.

I refer to this fragment from Mandisa’s journal in order to demonstrate my own ongoing concerns about inconclusiveness while working with recovery. I still ask myself why the transcription did not read: ‘we learn as we make’ or ‘we learn what we recover’. Recovery is a result that arrives at the end of a process, yet recovery is also an active ongoing process that suggests uncertainty. This paradoxical state unsettles and seems indeterminate. I am even tempted to place the probability of recovery in Derrida’s domain of ‘undecidabilty’, for there is no certainty, ‘playing all ways’, taking no sides, ‘it cannot be fixed down’ (Collins and Mayblin 1996, 48). On the other hand, this entry (of Mandisa’s) does indicate how recovery was practised, and how the research activated thought-images as a recovered process and a process of recovery, as an application of observing –seeing the world differently.

Nonetheless, by the end of (in)Heritage there was a sense that participants did not want to transcribe their own internal fragmentation as much as they were keen to learn and reproduce from the external world in order to validate their sense of belonging. During the second (in)Junction in December, Mandisa had stopped voluntary mapping altogether, and only made maps when they were part of the exercises. It seemed that now that she had to play the part of tour guide there was no need to reflect voluntarily on her own. I observed changes in her concentration and energy (not her commitment). I suspect this had to with Mandisa’s physical health, fluctuating and unstable; her HIV compounded by the prevalence of tuberculosis in her body.

Crises continued to arise because of the very medium and circumstances in which I have involved my work. I concur with Heddon who says:

Since applied drama is usefully an unpredictable, unrepeatable live process that takes place in and across time and space and between people, the autobiographical account that recognises itself as a similarly creative endeavour might not be an inappropriate tool to aid assessment (2007b, 214).
It is a perspective that when assembled along with the factors of disease, stigma, poverty and language barriers will depend on the facilitator who, when doing drama under these predicaments, will negotiate the crises through an assessment of the self as part of the strategy of renewal. And if assessment is necessary then the stories of the facilitators themselves, ‘reflecting on their practices as they attempt to assess them’ (Heddon, 2007b, 214) might occur through constructing an alternate narrative with:

A taking of the multiplicity of materials that adhere to the applied drama event (including memories, anecdotes, collected data, journals, photographs and videos), and the structuring of these into another event (in this case a translation also, from the live into the written), for another time and place (Ibid.).

Therefore this thesis text embodies the event and its history, it is a text that is ‘path dependent’ (Homer-Dixon 2006, 27) for it unravels its history and consolidates its composites into a multi-modal format. The text becomes reflexive according to Myerhoff and Ruby when there is a self-conscious consolidation and interconnection between ‘process, producer and product’ and in becoming reflexive it reveals itself to an audience: ‘so that it can understand both the process employed and the resultant product and that the revelation itself is purposive, intentional, and not merely narcissistic or accidentally revealing’ (1995, 311). The text in this chapter and in fact throughout my thesis intends to consolidate, reflect and be reflexive, so as to explain and in doing so adopts a particular medium of explanation: multiple confessions of the self as an indicator of the emerging reflexivity of the renewed self; a further example of how creativity can salvage fragments from an aftermath.

This concluding chapter first picks up from a question I had asked (at the end of the last chapter); whether a fragment from my own autobiography could inform an interactive treasure trail so that participants and researcher could rewrite the maps they were reading and mapping while recovering fragments from an aftermath? In recovering my own research from its crises, I needed to seek out a system that could build bridges between differences but be fluid enough to reflect on the differences expressed. This particular crisis of the self led me to a process of incubation, to a point of self enclosure–away from the project, embarking on several short yet significant journeys that included attending a particular lecture that illuminated the significance of the moral imagination.

THE MORAL IMAGINATION

In 2005, The University of Cape Town held a lecture series during September (which in South Africa is known as Heritage month), specifically honouring Heritage Day, which is September 24.121 I attended the last lecture in the series, in which Professor Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela described trauma as an inherited legacy of

120 Myerhoff and Ruby have borrowed the terms producer, process and product from Johannes Fabian (1971) taken from a ‘communications viewpoint’ and can be understood to signify similarly: creator, channel and consumption (1995, 310–311).

121 This statement issued in September 1996, by the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, marking a public holiday, now known as Heritage Day, defines its origin and purpose: ‘The day is one of our newly created public holidays and its significance rests in recognizing aspects of South African culture which are both tangible and difficult to pin down: creative expression, our historical inheritance, language, the food we eat as well as the land in which we live…. Within a broader social and political context, the day’s events are a powerful agent for promulgating a South African identity, fostering reconciliation and promoting the notion that variety is a national asset as opposed to igniting conflict. Heritage is defined as ‘that which we inherit: the sum total of wildlife and scenic parks,'
contemporary South African society. She also identified South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) as a positive symbol of heritage. She explained its effect by using the concept of the moral imagination. Citing peace activist and academic Paul Lederach, Gobodo-Madikizela describes the moral imagination as an ability or ‘capacity to imagine ourselves in a web of relations that includes our enemies; the ability to sustain a paradoxical curiosity that embraces the complexity of venturing into uncharted territory’ (Gobodo-Madikizela 2005). In this context, the imagination is utilised as a meditative form that redeems conflict through a creative process. This might mean negotiating a heuristic practice for all parties concerned, what Hannah Arendt describes as, when using a quality from Walter Benjamin’s redemptive-like thinking; ‘to pry the rich and the strange’ from ‘the bottom of the sea’ (1968, 51).

I left the lecture hall engaging with the possibility of the moral imagination as a way to perforate my enclosed self then suddenly picked up a heritage map that was lying amongst a pile of maps left on a table outside the hall. The map outlined the University of Cape Town’s recently inaugurated heritage trail comprising 18 sites on the campus. I remembered my late father whose legacy lay in creating treasure hunts for my siblings and I to discover and extract clues from historical buildings located in the city centre of Johannesburg. Delving into my fragmented memory, I extracted a proposal for creating a mutually beneficial project for both the participants of the clinic and myself; accommodating an exploration of cartography and its translation into performance. It meant I could transfer my focus away from the crises I was facing onto a new subject. It also meant diving into a territory of heritage that was equally unknown for both the participants of the clinic and I, to explore and develop collectively. Here in the unknown, both the participants and researcher could remap the maps that they were already mapping, while recovering fragments from a collective aftermath of heritage itself.

Fig. 7.3. Diving into the unknown.

sites of scientific or historical importance, national monuments, historic buildings, works of art, literature and music, oral traditions and museum collections together with their documentation’ (South African Government 2005).
HERITAGE AND THE TRADITION OF CATASTROPHE

What are phenomena rescued from? Not only, and not in the main, from the discredit and neglect into which they have fallen, but from the catastrophe represented very often by a certain strain in their dissemination, their ‘enshrinement as heritage’. They are saved through their exhibition of the fissure within them. –There is a tradition that is catastrophe (Benjamin 1999, 473).

According to Benjamin, catastrophe means ‘to have missed an opportunity’ (1999, 474). This deliberation is not only an example of Benjamin’s melancholic perspicuity but points to the problem with heritage and the monuments that continue to enshrine and exhibit apartheid legacy within the South African post-apartheid landscape. We have missed an opportunity in so far as we have failed to recontextualize these monuments. The AIDS epidemic in South Africa is a catastrophe because it is a disease associated with shame that has become a pandemic and we have missed an opportunity in taking so long to confront it.

My research has pursued a particular investigation within the tradition of catastrophe by asking questions about redemption and creative renewal in an aftermath. Questions like these illustrate how the term aftermath, although uneasy as it reverberates with catastrophe, is also a potentially regenerative terrain. I had hoped that my pursuit of creative strategies of renewal along with methods of drama practice could be focused on the designated sites of heritage on the university campus, and that these could serve as catalysts for experimenting with methods of intervention within the traditions of catastrophe. The heritage map and the heritage sites are controversial when aligned to monuments of malevolent legacy, particularly in a post-apartheid context. Could the site and the map be used in order to unsettle the fixed heritage monument, in other words to dismantle the monument? In this context, the heritage map might be able to be remapped as a palimpsest, made from multiple sources, whilst the heritage site could operate

As my research progressed embracing the challenges of engaging reflexively with/of/about the self as an object of the research; it became clear that my contextual placing of others who do similar kind of work had not occurred.

Whose work that seemed similar could I also refer to? My research was not therapeutic drama. My research was not site specific. But in fact, in some way it was both of these things. This was no oversight. I had denied this contextual part of the investigation because of crises and self–enclosure, and these seemed to weaken my study. On the other hand the self-enclosure revealed and heightened the value of self-reflexive inquiry. During the revision of my text, perhaps at the point of perforation of the enclosure, I recognised the concept of dismantling the monument by performing an act of recovery in the collaborative piece called *Limbo*, created for the Infecting the City Festival, 2009. In Cape Town’s Church Square a group of people who were moving as if dancing, had a rope wrapped around the base of the statue of Jan Hofmeyer (Cape politician and statesmen) and then struggled as if to pull the statue down. This was an act that was similar to the tearing down of statues in Russia and Iraq during regime changes there. This metaphorical dismantling in Church Square did not last long. One by one the group of people dissipated from their dismantling, eventually leaving the ropes to their own devices; as if in limbo. Consequences, which were in effect liminal, of both the aftermaths of slavery (once centred on this square) and the xenophobic violence that occurred across South Africa in 2008 (also the theme of the festival) had merged into the same continuum, leaving everything else, performers, objects, sound and audience scattered on their boundaries.

I watched the performances again and again over the several days of the festival. Sometimes I happened to be part of the audience and on other days, I was a walker-by who happened to cross the square on my way to work on my thesis in my nearby studio. My repeated incursion with *Limbo* also softened my attitude to it; as if its daily occurrence succeeded to dismantle my own enclosure. Thus I began to embrace the potential to discover what else out there remains to be discovered.
as a site for dialogue with and between various modes of live interpretation that stimulate interactivity and 
intervention. The fixed heritage monument might metaphorically change shape into an altered repository 
containing fragments made from a metaphorical dismantling.\textsuperscript{122}

\textbf{Fig. 7.4.} Vandalised heritage board signalling parts of the university’s heritage trail.\textsuperscript{123}

\textit{(in)HERITAGE}

Benjamin’s ‘heritage as a catastrophe’ is a phrase I had in mind whilst observing some of the reactions and 
responses to the University of Cape Town inaugurating its heritage trail with heritage boards at each site on the 
trail. \textit{Varsity}, the student newspaper, describes some of the reactions:

The installation of the new heritage sign-tour has caused an outcry among students and staff at 
UCT. This was most noticeable outside Jameson Hall where the phrase ‘racist mass murderer’ 
was written in red across the board. Other acts of vandalism have occurred across campus. The 
Sod Turning Slab Heritage Board was removed and rested against the War Memorial (Reddy 
2005).

Enshrining historical phenomena at the University of Cape Town proved to be difficult terrain since it comprised 
heritage’ is interesting because its does not simply besmear heritage as something connected to a villainous past 
but exposes the gaps or fissures that Benjamin illustrates; these are like rival trajectories in history, challenging 
traditional historical interpretation with alternate forms.

\textsuperscript{122} I would like to paraphrase artist Horst Hoheisel, not only in the context of his submission for a German national memorial 
for murdered European Jews which proposed to ‘blow up the Brandenburger Tor, grind its stone into dust, sprinkle the remains over its 
former site, and cover the entire memorial area with granite plates’—but also his suggestion that passers-by searching for the memorial 
must first find it in their own heads (Young 2000, 90). By this he is implying that engagement with contested heritage means an interactive 
internalised engagement consisting of a metaphysical and interpretive dismantling of the fixed, through manipulating provocatively 
what is not. This might encourage passers-by to search for more redemptive alternatives: submerged truths recovered from an aftermath 
by stimulating internal engagement with the self and the necessary surrounding forms.

\textsuperscript{123} Photograph by Simon Back (\textit{Varsity} 2005).
The university land was once occupied by Khoisan pastoralists, then home to Dutch and British colonists and their slaves and then Cecil John Rhodes bestowed this same land and made the foundations of the university (and its heritage trail) possible (*Monday Paper* (24)22, 2005). An earlier survey undertaken at the university in 1999 made it clear in its findings:

That in students’ experiences ‘whiteness’ still largely characterises the institutional culture. Many students felt the colonial values of UCT were still entrenched in the symbols around campus such as the names of buildings, and that this made a mockery of calling UCT an ‘African’ university (Steyn and Van Zyl 2001, abstract).

There are also the words of another respondent: ‘that anyone looking at the map of the campus, could be excused if they presumed that the university was situated in Europe or North America’ (Steyn and Van Zyl 2001, 28).

Various members of the university’s heritage committee when reacting to the vandalised heritage boards, declared how they appreciated the ‘expressive feelings’ (Reddy 2005). Yet the committee did not offer alternative tangible solutions that would correspond with the concerns of those surveyed in the earlier context or with the ‘expressive feelings’ of the vandals in the latter; perhaps they had missed an opportunity for engagement.

**OBJECTIVES AND IMPLEMENTATION**

I wanted to use the university’s heritage trail as a catalyst for my experimentation with the catastrophic tradition. My original planning had several objectives that once implemented could be consolidated into an overall framework (thereafter system) occurring as *(in)Heritage*. The first objective was to recreate the map. The map as a conceptual document became the stimulus for an alternate text emerging from the original heritage map. It realised an alternate, treasure map, which in turn activated a narrative of a performance route along a heritage trail. The map became the repository of interactivity because it stimulated interrogation and contained knowledge.

The tour was another objective. I incorporated a programme of training within the drama workshops at the clinic; to get participants from the clinic to lead the public on a tour according to the map that had been re-created. This training programme consolidated previously explored practices of studying and performing maps along with learning about the particular university heritage map and prompting strategies for talking to the public audience about their experiences in learning from this project.

Adekeye Adebajo’s article in the *Mail and Guardian* ‘A most unsavory rehabilitation’ (2006) refers to attempts to rehabilitate the legacy of Rhodes through the association of his name with the Mandela Rhodes Foundation. This prompted debate in the same newspaper, including this letter from Helena Sheehan, Dublin who writes ‘During my visits to the University of Cape Town I confronted every day the statue of Rhodes at the entrance to the upper campus and it always caused me to halt and wonder why it was still there and what should be done. I have a proposal. Leave it there, but build around it a portrayal of all classes and races of the Cape Colony of his time, a representation of all the toil, theft and repression over which he presided. And to the rest contextualize them too, or else topple them and send them to the museum of imperialism’ (2006).
My last planning objective was to curate ten heritage sites as performance interventions along the heritage trail. These interventions were placed along an alternative route along the trail according to a realistic measurement of time that it would take for participants as spectators to complete. Artists working in the medium of live interpretation were invited to submit proposals for interventions or translations that dismantled the heritage monument. The detail of these interventions is described in Appendix 8.

MAP

There were in fact three maps, operating in turn as official and treasure and subterranean.

Fig. 7.5. The heritage map.

Fig. 7.6. Treasure map.
The official map was the heritage map, created by the university’s heritage committee. It was colourful, formal and instructive, providing the necessary information to do with historical facts. The informal map was a treasure map, redrawing the original. The treasure map provided the route for the live interpretations and in doing so it became the official map of the (in)Heritage event. The treasure map was light blue, fluid yet simple; embedded with clues and encouraging play. Its final appearance revealed a Kabbalistic pattern of empty circles linked in a tetracyclic formation. The circles were to be filled in with assembled numbers gathered by the audience who, when prompted by clues, became treasure hunters. Underneath the surface of this map were traces of J.M. Solomon’s original architectural blueprint plans for the campus of the University of Cape Town (1917). Like a palimpsest, there was the sediment of another map lying underneath the layers of a reproduced map, pointing to another hidden history. The subterranean map was Solomon’s original architectural plans. Excavating Solomon’s blueprints from the university’s archives revealed not only the basic design for the treasure map but pointed to other archetypal figures including that of the collector. Here I was the collector, an assembler of fragments, of people, theories, histories, voices, experiences and events. A Benjamin-like collector, described by Eleni Varopoulou as the ‘physiognomist of the world of objects [who] succeeds in organising his magic encyclopaedia, and in setting up an entire network consisting of interdependencies and interrelationships between them’ (1997, 167). In doing so the collector, as Varopoulou suggests, becomes the allegorist wanting ‘the invisible hidden aspects of things, their symbolic character to be revealed to him’ (168). The interconnections are linked together on an internal map of sorts with an intention of revealing a destination towards knowledge.

A description used by Harvey, appropriated from Shakespeare, is a ‘mapperist, an ecstatic contemplator of things cartographic’ (2002, xii). I have become a mapperist by adopting cartography into my work. However, unlike Harvey, my maps, informed by Ingold, are made ‘as we go, from place to place’ (2000, 229) and embody traversed

J.M. Solomon became an important symbolic figure for this process. The project recovered facts about his tragic yet notable life as the university’s architect revealing how his prodigious life was cut short by suicide. The project also retraced his map and life onto both site and map through performance and recovery, by returning to a moment in his own history and encouraging spectators to read from his obituary given out by a performer who was playing his wife (who in reality was also an actress).

‘They call this bed-work, mappery, closet of war’ (William Shakespeare Troilus and Cressida, act 1, sc 3, l20).
regions of accumulated knowledge. They are not ‘temptations’ towards treasure although I do agree with Harvey that perhaps the buried treasure ‘lies not only in the earth but deep in our collective unconscious’ (2002, 27–28).

The buried treasure of (in)Heritage was a collection of broken shards of porcelain hidden in a post box at a post office called ‘Rhodes Gift’ located on the heritage trail. Maps of the university’s original architecture and fragments of verse were stamped on to the porcelain fragments. Like Artangel’s Treasure Hunt in London’s King Cross called The Pleasure of Treasure (2002), interactivity meant an engagement along the heritage trail and ‘the hunt itself was part of the treasure’ (Battista et al. 2005, 431).127

Acts of recovery operated not only along lines of interpretation but also by actively engaging with the sites, encouraging the audience to extract and recover clues that further prompted critical engagement: ‘To answer the clues, treasure hunters have to use their hands, eyes and imagination’ (Ibid., 444).128 In order to do this, the heritage trail mutated into a game of hide-and-seek with the presentation of puzzles and clues inscribed into the performances. The treasure map urged interaction by encouraging the assembling of fragments: the living, the numbered and the artefact. It introduced subversion into the official narrative by urging the players of the game, both performer and spectator, to imaginatively replace and dismantle established narratives enshrined and exhibited as legacy.

Fig. 7.8. My own training map indicating the welcoming song.

127 ‘The Pleasure of Treasure was a treasure hunt through London’s King Cross and was devised in response to Richard Wentworth’s exhibition, An area of outstanding unnatural beauty (2002). The Pleasure of Treasure sought to take people round the area with a view to exploring its histories and oddities. It utilised a double-sided treasure map that compelled people to walk along a route locating and identifying historical details, performing certain simple instructions like listening and recovering objects from the landscape that had no real value except as “being fragments of the past that persist in the present’” (Battista et al. 2005, 439).

128 Acts of recovery include: recognition, simulated acts of acting out recovery and practice as maintenance.
Fig. 7.9. Training at the clinic.

Fig. 7.10. First day of training on campus.

Fig. 7.11. *Polite Force* in training.
TOUR

Nine participants from the drama group at the wellness clinic, including Mandisa, volunteered to become tour guides as part of the (in)Heritage activities. Their training is documented in the DVD ‘Cartography of Performance’, in a section called ‘in heritage’. During an intense training session, six weeks before the event itself, they consolidated their earlier mapping practices from previous drama meetings. This process developed from reproducing the map as a performative text into utilising the map as a representational plane of shared experience and producer of knowledge.

The earlier sense of crisis had detoured; both researcher and participants were mutually observing how their own practices could be acted out on another more traditional map. Participants were able to determine methods of revealing sites on their own terms and in relation to their own narratives created through previous meetings.

This excerpt is taken from Mandisa’s journal and reveals her interpretation of what she learnt. The training developed through various degrees of understanding, sometimes simplified, sometimes complex in their simplification as the entry above indicates. This pedagogic process of instruction also meant the participants went to the public library to do research and to actively work at interpreting each heritage site, exploring the locations and dimensions of the heritage landmarks, thus extending their own literacy and experience of the world around them. A correspondence occurred between seeing what was on the map and then acting it out, making it a collective experience of finding one’s way.

\[129\] See DVD ‘Cartography of Performance’ Appendix 4 (Chapter 3).
One further element added to the training was that of uniform or costume. I believe that the choice that was made was uniform although in Mandisa’s journal she indicates:

We wear costumes (Polite force).

This was a provocative choice on my behalf. It was not only motivated by a desire to create an aesthetic identity for the tour guides as a collective but also to suggest a complex and ironic liminality in between the degrees of inherited legacy. The participants at the clinic have inherited one of the most severe legacies of apartheid, obviously located in their class and status as HIV-positive indigent craft workers. They were now re-narrating as well as de-territorializing some of the historical antecedents of this legacy.

‘Heritage has become the new HIV’ (Lorraine Khoury citing Clive van den Berg 2006). This is a provocation that combines catastrophe enshrined in both disease and historical legacy but also indicates how these themes are played out and embraced as novelty. I utilised Christian Nerf’s playful motif of the Polite Force as an idea to work within this operation of provocation, aesthetic subversion and collective identity. Nerf has developed an identity, which has subverted the official South African police uniform, substituting polite for police and at the same time enforcing the playfulness of the pun and its social agenda of politeness as an exchange of force. The uniformed costume reinforced an identity for the participants as a playful and helpful regiment. The uniform also increased the sense of empowerment for the group when training for the tour and then when narrating the map. The participants themselves had embarked on a tour of instruction in order to take others on tour. From her journal, in writing about a discussion session held about this process, Mandisa described part of the process as:

Making forms and performance documents.

Interpreting Mandisa’s insight particularly of ‘performance documents’ could mean two important corresponding things: how performance is a document that activates the inscribing of memories on to the body and in space; and/or how maps were made as performance documents, which in the end is what they were.

130 These words, spoken by Clive van den Berg at The Visual Arts Network of South Africa (VANSA) conference, were cited by Lorraine Khoury, one of the speakers at (in)Heritage seminar held alongside the tour and is from her paper ‘For Time and Memorial: re-evaluating the role of the memorial in South African Visual Culture’ providing an example of the crossroads of heritage complicated by the commemoration thereof as ‘pure spectacle’ and ‘theatre’ (2006).

131 Polite Force; ‘began as a subversive public performance, speaking back to the legacy politics always already in play in the “New South Africa”. [Nerf] took riot gear uniforms (complete with shields and helmets) from during the Apartheid era, and modified them to read “polite”, rather than “police”, asking his actors to carry bags, help people cross the street, light cigarettes, and compliment the outfits and hairdos of onlookers. The project began on September 11, 2002, also speaking directly to the politics of the post-9/11 world, and therefore garnering interest beyond South African borders’ (Green 2004).
TOWARDS A CONCLUSION.

Correspondence between (in)Heritage and the later (in)Junction projects suggests a proposal of recovery from aftermaths in sites that are as historical as they are everyday. Although it is somewhat difficult in this context to capture the experience of the events themselves, I hope that their description in the section above, the DVDs, accompanying reflexive frames and Appendix 8 will present these projects as examples of generative models stemming out of a programme made from live interpretation that stimulates opportunities for recovery. Both projects advanced the assumptions made by my research. The projects and their interconnecting framework (of models and templates) enable them to recur as systems in similar forms with participation from diverse sectors of society who might assist in redeeming the catastrophe of having missed the opportunity in the historic and in the everyday.

Myerhoff and Ruby describe the challenges that reflexivity presents when turning ‘back to contemplate ourselves just as we may be beginning to realise that we have no clear idea of what we are doing’ (1995, 307). This suggests something of my own return to reflect upon the projects, anxious of having missed opportunities in creating the projects and in exposing their process. Retracing my steps is like ‘advancing backwards’ (Derrida 1988, 130), remapping in order to resolve my own uncertainties. In particular this relates to my relationship to Mandisa as a participant, where it has become almost difficult to provide anything else except the assumption of symbolic growth in knowledge, in a participant whose almost certain non-recovery presents the central paradox in this theme of recovery. I return to her journal and her maps again.
and again, determined to look for any further clues—motivated by returning again ‘and again to the data to check the depictions of the experience’ (Moustakas 1990, 33). There are two entries that have become significant at this point of reflection. In her last entry in her journal, Mandisa says this about (in)Heritage:

At the end I, Mandisa told the audience how do we feel about the project of Myer. My son was given time to tell us about heritage (what is heritage?). And then we go for the closure and then were given our envelopes carrying our money.

The significance here relates to Mandisa, who by referring to herself, validating the project also affirms her own contribution and place in the project. Her assessment is not complete but it is assumed that her own independence and agency is affirmed through her understanding that she as ‘I, Mandisa’ (and her son) have a role to play in validating both the project and myself. This is important. Secondly, the entry refers to the challenges of indigence and the questions it raises about attracting indigent participants to research projects. Although Mandisa’s participation was voluntary, she like all the other participants received remuneration for transport and tea. Money is important as a production necessity. Mandisa states this as such, hinting at its incentive for participation. These conditions are complex but perhaps the challenge is not to over emphasise the value of money as an incentive but rather to take into account the desperation that is associated with poverty and the real needs that there are and that there might be in working in such circumstances. Thus the crises continue and looking for more resolution, I study the surface of Mandisa’s journal, its front and back covers. On its back cover is a telephone number written in blue ink:

(021) 6901037 Jooster ward 1

This is the telephone number for the women’s clinic at Jooster Hospital in Mitchell’s Plain, whose treatment includes providing quarantine and refuge for women who are HIV-positive and have tuberculosis. Mandisa sought treatment in the clinic soon after (in)Heritage ended and she remained at Jooster Clinic and then at Brooklyn Chest Hospital for almost a year. When she was discharged she participated in the second (in) Junction. Presently as I write this, there is only uncertainty. She is noticeably absent from the wellness clinic and when I asked recently where she was, the women became silent and said ‘Mandisa has problems at home’.

There is no immediate answer to my questions about Mandisa; I expect my questions will only continue.

Questioning (value–recovery–efficacy) transports my research further along; questions that embody a crisis of conscience join the crises of the self. Here I am able to emplace an interrogation onto the self, mediated by a heuristic model of research empowered by the account of epiphanic phases. But the illumination also bends my research back, turning on itself as if operating in a reflexive way. In doing so the research also advances forward. The self has mediated a creative collaboration with its crises as subjects. This was a process that accommodated practitioner, participant and phenomena. The collaboration informed on the recovery of the self and how performing recovery, as a conceptual act, had the capacity to expose crises and transform crises into attributes. For example: out of the digital crises, cartography emerged and out of the cartographic crises, (in)
Heritage and (in)Junction emerged. The narration up to this point has been the testimony and translation of this process. To replicate this operation in another context is the distillation and reproduction of what has already been made into further generative activities.\footnote{When I re-wrote this section: and also this footnote (and also as alternative narrative on my blog) I had embarked on a new project called ‘Miss Nothing’ involving the women from MonkeyBiz Clinic and Iziko Museums of Cape Town, a collaborative project that intends to reveal the hidden voices of domestic servants in an eighteenth century museum home called Koopmans De Wet House. Importantly in this context Mandisa was one of the actors in the project, she returned to the clinic on hearing about the project (motivated by doing drama) and she was chosen to be involved in the project by the women themselves because in their words, Mandisa is ‘prepared and can take direction’ (Ammended September, 2008).}

POSTSCRIPT FROM THE RHIZOME

Fig. 7.14. HIV (Henry the Fourth, Dan Halter, Cape Town)

I want to consider one last portrait of an anonymous man; this time it was Dan Halter who placed his work on the wall of the interior gallery of the AVA as part of the gallery’s contemporary critic’s selection exhibition, August 2007, Cape Town. The portrait is called HIV (HENRY THE FOURTH) and is a beaded re-representation of English King Henry IV. The painter of the original is anonymous as is the sitter, who is certainly not the king. It is synonymous with medieval polygamy, but also with H.I.V or ‘Henry the Fourth’ as a current colloquialism used in Zimbabwe to explain the present crisis of HIV, amongst other catastrophes there.\footnote{Henry the Fourth (Henry IV) is ‘coded slang’ (the artist’s own words) for HIV in Zimbabwe. It appears in Alexandra Fuller’s book Scribbling the Cat (2004): ‘you find a decent gondie, you train them, and then the poor bastard gets Henry the Fourth and dies. Now how do you explain this?’ (124).} The irony is framed in gilded wood and delicate beadwork covering the original copy of the man known as HIV. The work intertwines naïve simplicity represented by the beadwork with a sophisticated playfulness of bartered language and symbolism. The work is a witticism. The drawing is like a color by numbers painting that has been originally pillaged or ‘googled’ from ‘Google Image’ by Halter and instead of paint filling its spaces and surfaces, there are beads. The glistening beadwork creates a surface of fissure on the original surface, already made contradictory as recycled tabular rasa. Beaders and provocateur together made the choices of colour and placements. This is an example of an intended collaborative exchange between Halter and several women working as a beading collective upstairs in the Monkeybiz wellness clinic. It also serves as an example of the
relationships made in the research extending further out from both self and subject as a rhizomatic network between other collaborators creating other exchanges of collaboration.\textsuperscript{134} And furthermore the example assists a consideration of how aesthetics contributes to an earlier deliberation of mine – on what coheres the multivariate narratives of the research, produced through this particular applied drama practice. i.e. what is the membrane? (see pp.24–25)

Halter’s filming of the digital documentation of all the project work at the clinic provided him with an insight into the operation of the beading work made at the clinic. This insight is also ironic, because it is a misunderstanding. For these beaders are women who belong to another group within the broader collective who call themselves ‘Name Tag Art’. Halter had originally intended to work with the women he had filmed during the clinic’s projects (here the irony is the women themselves who are objectified as HIV–positive women beading a portrait colloquialized as HIV) but his request was misconstrued. And there was also miscommunication on behalf of MonkeyBiz.\textsuperscript{135} So in the end he was working with a collective who he had only filmed while they beaded in the shadows.

This collective shares the space during the week with members of the wellness clinic except when there is a wellness clinic on Fridays. Unlike the wellness clinic members, the members of this collective are not all HIV–positive; although some of them are. Often in the digital film, you see them in the shadows of the digital, in the corners of the frame, just out of reach of the camera’s eye hence decentralised from the vigour of drama activities. Are they a group as faceless as they are Halter’s misunderstanding – who are they? Questions not necessarily placed at Halter’s feet nor at Monkeybiz’s but at my own. Halter’s work has been widely celebrated since art critic Melvin Minnar nominated the work for a critic’s choice award. And Minnar did so for the reasons that the work incites provocation and suggests subversive irony.\textsuperscript{136} In regards to the ethics of collaboration, the question of should I have acted differently is something I ask myself. Should I have familiarised both potential parties with each other before setting them to work together in order to realise the making of a new co-collaboration? I did not help MonkeyBiz understand the impulse of agitation in an artist like Halter whose work unsettles through sophisticated provocation. Nor did I assist Halter with any ethical mediation in order to make sure his original vision was realised but did not compromise either of the potential parties involved. My own insight might have been necessary, an insight made and amended from my own previous case studies, whilst working on similar types of projects where forms of exchange have occurred between two cultural

\textsuperscript{134} There were other examples of this: Ruth Sacks’ \textit{Tea at High Plaza} originally curated during \textit{(in)Heritage} 2006 was later reinstalled during Jay Pather’s \textit{Fresh} at the National Arts Festival, Grahamstown, 2007 as well as Peter Van Heerden’s more recent work \textit{6 Minutes} 2007 named ‘after a statistic that a child is sexually abused every six minutes in South Africa’ and performing simulated rape (Loewe 2007) originating from his \textit{Mechanical Man} also from \textit{(in)Heritage} 2006.

\textsuperscript{135} The cycle of this query still continues. I recently asked both Halter and MonkeyBiz to respond to this section, which deals with the issue at hand. Halter who has been invited to exhibit his art in Havana, left suddenly for Cuba by the time I sent my request to him so did not respond. On the other hand, Shirley Fintz one of the founders of MonkeyBiz replied with this email: ‘My comments are that there was no miscommunication with Monkeybiz. In fact there was rather no communication with Monkeybiz. It was a misunderstanding between Nametag and Dan. Dan should have expressed the need for the project to be undertaken by the women from the HIV clinic. And Nametag should have explained that they were not trained to do this type of beadwork. It feels strange and incorrect that a dialogue exists and Monkeybiz is Completely unaware of it. (until chatting to Dan) I would have been excited to be part of such an interesting work…’ (March 09/09).

\textsuperscript{136} see Sue Williamson on Dan Halter in \textit{Arthrob} (2007).
groups in a South African context whilst using notions of irony and disparity. As indicated by the crises that I described during the previous chapter, this is a predicament of an aftermath. When we become both its readers and its writers – as to make something from it – we continue to learn from its lessons. This is not an indictment of failure but perhaps another lesson, for art aims to contest the fragmentation occurring in reality or rather use it and transform it, as I have argued. Its practice is to recover from what has been broken. Fragments are vulnerable. I have chosen to reflect on this living (fragmented) art piece of Halter’s (who as living and African is unlike the several other classical works I have referenced throughout my thesis) not as a critique, contestation, nor even indictment but to recommend an enquiry into the ethics of the aesthetic and an ethics of narrative as lessons from an aftermath. Aesthetic choices need to have principles as much as narratives do. My reflection here is based upon an understanding of how aesthetics have assisted the design of my research outcomes. An example of this is how the written thesis has been designed in a particular way in order to reveal and activate the layers towards recovery. But before the design can be applied onto the text – the text must yield consistency. Bearing in mind, when aesthetics are applied to cohere the equivocal contexts of the dramaturgical, there is an inherent paradox to aesthetics. On one hand, theirs is a demonstration of flippancy, and on the other, an evocation of discipline. Paul Virilio demonstrates this, when he refers to Karlheinz Stockhausen, who after 9/11 declared: ‘What we have witnessed is the greatest work of art there has ever been!’ (Virilio 2002, 45). In this context, identifying the destruction of the World Trade Centre as spectacle – an artwork to some – made from 9/11 will unsettle the relationship between ethics and aesthetics. Narratives emerging from an aftermath will mimic its characteristics: being as indeterminate, ‘unpredictable’ and ‘controversial’ as the aftermath itself. (see Lawrence J. Vale and Thomas J. Campanella 2005, 239–240).

My deliberation with ethics have found their bearings from Foucault’s maxim that the care of the self is practiced with the care for others, (see Martin 1988; Foucault 1994; Fassin 2007), and similarly the care for others is mediated with a care for the self. This has been realised through advancing my reflexivity as a researcher over the last several years, discovered and even recovered through the voices of others. The discovery is written as a confessional narrative. A confession because in my research as I have revealed thus far methods have been transgressed, there have been mistakes and I am guilty. This confession is not a weakness instead it heightens the need for an interrogation of the self and a revelation of the self. Furthermore, this internal polemic reaches back to its relationship with its subjects whose voices are recovered in the documents they themselves have made. As I cautiously approach a conclusion of my work that is a testimony to the collecting of knowledge and making meaning since 9/11, I am aware that questions based around interrogating an invented system that translates aftermath through performing acts of recovery still continue to arise. Questions continue to arise because the system by its very rhizomatic nature endorses a deliberation that is generative and through my own admission that an aftermath is never final and never complete.

137 I am directed by Bleakely here following: 'stories without principles are blind, or narratives need to be ethically sensitive.'(2000, 23).
My own research journey continues, not only in order to stake a claim to this field of applied drama practice that negotiates its way across disciplines. The journey continues because the ongoing practice advances and sustains the emerging recovery. There is also my ongoing facilitation of ‘doing drama’ at the wellness clinic (see most updated journal entries on potlatch@uctblogs.ac.za). I have also created an exhibited artwork entitled Heisting Beauty situated around the theme of the recovered body and presented as an archival installation at the ‘Spier Contemporary’ (Pather, 2007). In March 2008, I completed a collaborative work with performing students from the Wits School of The Arts and New York University called Skin of Memory, which incorporated a narrative of interactivity accommodating a treasure hunt on the East Campus of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg along with themes of memory and identity. These examples demonstrate how research as it continues, defines itself as progressive and redefines itself, as it remakes itself in the process of revision.

**Fig. 7.15.** Making one’s own documents during *(in)junction.*

**Fig. 7.16.** New maps, new discoveries during Skin of Memory.

**Fig.7.17.** Heisting Beauty, Johannesburg Art Gallery, 2008.

REMAKING ONE’S OWN DOCUMENT (IN CONCLUSION)

This thesis is not complete; it is ongoing. It has inherent uncertainty, it is an alternative mode of translation, it is paradoxical, it is oscillating and it is dialectical. It is the consequence of traumatic syndromes that ‘defy any attempt to impose such simple-minded order’. (Herman 2002, 155). It is also a search for personal regeneration.
It is about self-recovery as much as it is about doing drama in the aftermath. It asks the question: how might a practice of drama and narrative, operating from within the aftermath provide recovery? It is as much about translation as about testimony. It is the quest to find an appropriate method and means for translating the research into an accessible form that can also accommodate the enactment of recovery. The thesis aims to recover the multivariate stories experienced in the research rather than just telling the event as a single story.

This thesis deliberates how the aesthetic choices affecting research relationships might be the membrane covering all multivariate experiences unleashed in the research process. It affirms the development of alternative modes of translating research. It demonstrates how the voice of the self might be reaffirmed through narrated testimony. It is a testimony to the collecting of knowledge and making of experience and meaning since 9/11.

After 9/11, writer Linda Grant observed that:

Something subsequently disintegrated inside of me: my capacity to concentrate on an interior reality that was more important than the external one. I am not sure if my concentration has fully returned (2008, 1).

After 9/11, when I embarked on my research, my internal self attempted to reach out to others by communicating in numbers, models, formulae, maps and thought–images. These were not scientific nor at first even dramatic but when assembled together I called them dramatic equations. My research in the field of applied drama practice has provided a place to experiment and invent ideas as practice. And it is drama that has become the focus of this operation because drama is action; live, energetic, immediate and experiential. Drama has empowered my own narrative by activating experience. In all my research projects, drama was the first reason I was there. It was drama that became the applied medium for experimenting with the various hypotheses.

This thesis was about applying elements from the aftermath into an imaginary equation called \((f+a=r)\). In my research the equation intended to reconnect the personal with the symbolic and to extend this toward making connections with others as part of a process towards recovery. James Thompson says that ‘mathematics can be understood as an abstraction from real objects to a system of symbols. In this case “applied” means to reconnect the symbolic to those objects’ (2003, 18). In my research, the activities made with drama, were comprised of a system of symbols abstracted from objects of an aftermath. These were real geo–political and social conditions as well as more metaphysical and imaginative places and thereafter the abstracted symbols were applied onto each other. They were activated through the various forms of exchange that produced generative action that I considered to be rhizomatic. This network of generative-rhizomatic exchanges still found a way of having a single intent that being the recovery of the self.

This thesis is of the self, a multi-formed narrative, an autobiographical narrative, a narrative of recovery and redemption. It is a narrative about the discovery and therefore the recovery of the self.

Nicholson describes how life:
is not itself, a coherent unity or linear narrative, but a ‘configuration of memories’ and ‘matrices of meanings’ which become stories as experiences are retold, re-created or ordered and interpreted. This acknowledges that the aesthetics of self-production is built on the convergences and interplay of different narratives, and that constructing narratives of selfhood is both an ethical and a creative process (2005, 65).

In his, *The Empty Space*, Peter Brook explains, ‘Theatre = R r a and to arrive at these letters we are forced to draw from an unexpected source’ (1968, 154). This source is not mathematics but language itself and it is the abstraction of three words from language: ‘Repetition, Representation, Assistance, which reflect the problems and the possibilities of the theatre event’ (*ibid*). Brook’s concept of repetition highlights repetitive practice as a dramatic art form. But repetition also constricts the living. He says that in this word there is the essential contradiction in dramatic form: ‘To evolve, something needs to be prepared and the preparation often involves going over the same ground again and again’ (157).

It has been five months since I was certain that there would be no conclusion to this present work. I felt it was unnecessary. A conclusion would be inappropriate, if the in-determinacy of an aftermath was to be evoked in the narrative of this thesis. Five months later, I am revising, remapping and going over the same ground again, in order to consolidate the key ideas of my narrative and realise the value in repetition. Locating the motif of Narcissus has unlocked the value in also recovering his discarded companion Echo, who submerged in the recovery of the self and its reproduction, does emerge to say something. What does Echo say? Or what would I hear in the reflexive moment from an echo? I only recognise now that in this relationship, it is Echo that is the drama as opposed to the enclosed self of Narcissus. For it is Echo, ‘rejected who tries to imitate Narcissus’ cries of despair’ (Guus Houtzager 2003, 104). And it is this ‘imitation’ of despair that evokes the dramatic form. What is evoked and made more certain by this repetition is to begin again, to advance backwards or to unfold the palimpsest back to the place where the self began to break and dissipate. This is when the research progresses beyond its present findings. It generates forward by going backward towards further investigations stimulating further questions and discoveries.

This thesis is reflexive. It is a rhizome; a bricolage; an assemblage; a repository and a creative testimony. This thesis is about revision. My research continues as I do revisions to this particular work. My funding ceases. I vacate my tiny PhD office located in the Drama Department on Hiddingh Campus and I seek refuge in the *Studio 2666*, originally founded by Ed Young, Christian Nerf and Douglas Gimberg. Here in the studio amongst a group of artists working at the margins of their field, I unpack my library of things. I suddenly recall what Benjamin says about unpacking one’s library and seeing books, their dates of publication and their formats as the only examples of ‘exact knowledge’ (1968e, 60). I have the space now to see the last several years of work unfold in front of me. I begin to revise my thesis and plan other projects resulting from the original work presented in this present form. Suddenly I get news that *Studio 2666* is to be demolished, in order
to prepare the way for a new monument to democracy on the site of the studios. In order to avoid the aftermath of this demolition I attempt to reconcile faster. Time is not on my side to let things merely unfold and to revise slowly.

Nonetheless new collaborations are made: co-studio resident Chad Rossouw advises me on the InDesign format which the thesis will incorporate in order to embody the multi-modal presentation that I hope will express the enactment of the research process. Another regular visitor to the studio is a masters student in art discourse at the University of Cape Town, Matthew Partridge, who re-introduces Lyotard and Freud to my range of thinking. What begins as a weekly discussion of theory and ideas, between Partridge and I, helps me to understand further why I have placed an emphasis on the self in my own research and how it developed as such. This brings to the fore the practice of the self in my research, both as I rewrite and as I continue to plan new research projects.

I continue to plan projects with ideas that generate from the work at the MonkeyBiz clinic and in particular hope to revive a workshop of Christine’s Room into a larger project reinvesting the original material into something more sustainable. The aim of the project would be to reveal the interminable spirit of humanity both in regards to survival and life itself. I continue to teach at the clinic and continue to face new frustrations but I have realized that I go to the clinic because the women there teach me things about me. Importantly, the participants themselves have achieved ways to negotiate and narrate their frustrations and fears affected by the catastrophe of HIV/AIDS. This was evident in the recent performance of their play: Ulwamkeleko (to be welcomed) created by the MonekyBiz Drama group themselves and first performed as street theatre in Makhaza in Khayelitsha on World AIDS Day 2008.

I want to lastly submit this journal and blog entry that describes the play happening in Makhaza for it demonstrates the usefulness of subjectivity in the presentation of outcomes and evaluation realised from a method of applied drama practice emanating from my experiences at a HIV/AIDS wellness clinic in Cape Town. This example forms part of the allegorical trajectory that has combined both critical and self reflexive approaches towards ways of doing research and presenting research findings in the field of applied drama practice. It is a trajectory because its narrative contributes to the ongoing debate about subjectivity in academic research, and it is allegorical in that it disguises its tactics of critique. It is the self that hides and shows, reveals and discloses, activating the allegory that simultaneously critiques and appeases the self in its own narrative.
inadequacy and the more important flip side of the insurmountable human spirit, the tenacity like today where spirit shimmers with a mirage like quality through the sandy roads, the sandy foundations, the sandy spazas, the sandy houses and the sandy-sandy shrub. The sand, here is a kind of an appeased color of a detritus smoothie, a combination of everything that is to be found. Outside the new centre, there is a circle of mainly Xhosa women who are in the throes of a combination of dance, pray and song. From within the circle, I spot the women from the drama group and am very warmly greeted. This is their home ground. I suddenly realise the neutral distance of the clinic in town. A tall American fellow is leading the ceremony translated by a nervous Xhosa fellow, who bursts into laughter in overtime, every time he can’t find the right words for translation…

‘We are African,’ says the American. The Xhosa man laughs and translates this into something that makes him laugh even more. It is the American who has a list of the day’s proceedings in his hands. Even from afar, I suspect the women and their play are not on the list. Too add to these worries, S who plays a large role has not arrived. Mandisa says to me that they will find a replacement. I tell her that could be a problem since S has been working on the part for almost four weeks and someone cannot just replace her. She just looks at me and says that S is disappointment. Before she walks off, I tell her that sometimes we have to accept the disappointments. She doesn’t agree with me (I mean who would know better about what qualities as a disappointment than a women who is single-handedly raising children and grandchildren while being HIV and TB positive.) Then Nompucuko (also known as Civilization) walks up to me and says they want to rehearse in a nearby empty container. I feel like they are still asking me permission to do things. I just want them to realise that this is their play and today there are obstacles, which they have to overcome—that they have to overcome in order to do their play. So they find a replacement, N who was working on the play a while back before she disappeared from the clinic. The group now gathered rehearses in the container and are ready perform. ‘Please go tell them, we are ready to do the play.’ ‘Look’, I respond. ‘This is your play. You must organize that, go and tell that tall white man there’, I say, pointing to the American. ‘Tell him you want to do your play.’

(At this point, I realize how ridiculous that is, this is the end, no more mistakes an inner voice says, just get IT right please, well almost, right.)

None of the drama group women are that confident to tell Master of Ceremony-Key Funder that they want to do their play. I have to do that, they still need me. ‘OK. OK I will go and talk to him,’ I say and wander over to him, ‘Hey look, I don’t want to disturb you but I have come as a representative from the MonkeyBiz Drama Group who have created a play called ulwamkeleko, it means to be welcomed, can they do it?’

He looks at me suspiciously but also exhausted.

A long pause. He says: ‘I think that all these people badly want to go into the centre and then perhaps after that they can do their play.’ ‘Sure.’ I say this and nothing else. I knowing his is a bad idea because once the crowd is in the centre, the natural audience will be lost.

The ribbon is cut. The crowd rushes into the newly built centre, to see the impressive shape of the hall, the smart pointillist-like designs painted on one side of the wall and the exhibition of American art on the other (the art was sold in order to raise money to build the centre). I sadly leave the space feeling defeated. The sun beats down on me. I wait. I return to the hall where the drama group women are sitting around with others in a natural square so the crowd has settled. I go back to the American who is now busy with arranging the raffle.

‘Can they do it now?’

‘Um…’

‘Look the crowd has settled and there is a perfect square for an audience.’
My thesis is an assemblage of works and ideas that form part of practice-based research that has involved both public works and private journeys. A central aim was to explore how fragments from an aftermath might be assembled when using applied drama practice to promote recovery. Such a practice I framed as a redemptive critical praxis. Its outcomes have been presented in this form: a progressive text that not only embodies the underpinnings of redemption through transparency and intertextuality, but also a text whose rhizomatic nature encloses and simultaneously generates other bodies of work that include: i) the invention and implementation of practice; ii) the documentation of practice; and iii) how the written reflection of practice attempts to connect the work originally made from practice.

‘Inside?’

‘Yes inside.’

‘No. It’s to hot inside.’

He says, fanning the humid air looking as if he is ready to faint and suddenly he rushes up so as to begin ushering the crowd outside hall. There is potential for pandemonium. I say meekly, ‘I don’t think this is a good, I…’

/ ‘What!’ he growls back, ‘you are advocating the play so let them do it outside.’

‘I’ …snarl back ‘am only the messenger so don’t shoot the messenger!’

And then I see Nompucuko. ‘Here is Nompucuko’, I say, ‘Nompucuko tell this man you want to do your play… Outside!’

Once more defeated, we take this ‘song and dance’ outside; I spot another group of women sitting in the shade. I call the drama group women together and point this crowd out to them. ‘There – this is your audience… do your play for them. They are sitting in the shade and are waiting for something.’ The drama group agrees. I go up to this group and I ask if they want to watch a play and they do. They seem pleased to watch the play. The play begins… The play and the players, perfect – They stand right in among the audience, the women appear brave. They are telling a story that everyone in the audience responds to and recognizes. The crowd gathers including a large group of children who are captivated, until they are at least forty people who are watching the play. All of us are captivated for twelve minutes or so. This is it! The play has been performed outside on the dusty street in Makhaza. It tells the story of a young girl’s battle with her HIV and her struggle to disclose her status to mother. It is told so that it becomes the instrument for discussion and dialogue and some understanding. The merit here is that the women in the play are saying the things everyone else is to afraid to say, even the word, ‘positive’.

The play is over and the women take a bow. There is a loud applause. The drama group is approached with congratulations from the crowd of people who have watched them. And the women are swallowed up in the crowd. The crowd has consumed them. There is a rhizomatic sensation of consumption, me-you-us-everyone-becomes part of the experience. Things are shared and I am satisfied. The women look pleased and satisfied. An obstacle is overcome – there has been a little bit of triumph today in Makhaza.
To present these interconnections I submitted the possibility of a multi-text, one that continuously performs readings: readings in one text and then simultaneously commentaries in another. These interrelated commentaries that perform, writing as exchange and recovery, suggest how the thesis becomes a system. It is a system that presents the subjective self as part of the presentation of research-outcomes and research-evaluation. This thesis is a document that presents alternative ways of self-evaluation. It offers a proposal for further evolution in practice-based research by promoting strategies for subjectivity that simultaneously transcend the internal projection of the self towards accessible and inclusive ways of communication.

Brook cautions the use of his own formula ‘Rra’ in drama: ‘the essence is still lacking because any three words are static; any formula is inevitably an attempt to capture truth all the time. Truth in theatre is always on the move’ (1968, 157). My research is not static, it is inventive and original and on the move. It operates within the making of drama/narrative projects that turn inaction, like numbness, apathy and sleepwalking, into action. What I have hoped to describe thus far is series of discoveries that led to the recovery of a theatre practitioner who learnt to practice, a theorist who excavated autobiography and a creative (mis) mathematician who invented an imaginary equation so as to provide and learn lessons from an aftermath.
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EXAMPLES OF TRANSCRIPTIONS FOR TRC HELD IN GRADE ELEVEN CLASS

Candice

Mr Taub says, "I don’t need to be here." I am offended by this.

Nombulelo

(He) lashes out at us. Lashing out is not the answer. He needs to deal with things maturely and not act like a kid.

Michael

My complaint with Myer is that I feel the class has no consistency. Other times when we laugh, he doesn’t like it and shouts at us. My closing remark – no consistency. It doesn’t benefit us in the opposite way.

Crispin

Discipline – don’t think it’s severe enough. Don’t think it’s consistent. I think that Mr Taub must fit the discipline to the act done.

Linda

You are a good teacher and we know that we like you. We love you and you best drama teacher and you bring aspects that we have never had and you need to discipline. One class.

Melany

I would like Mr Taub that our teacher has teaching methods but at times he is something else and there no consistency. I don’t feel we given enough credit for the things we do when does something good they should be acknowledge.

Murphy

- So many problems
- No basis to class work (random)
- Need to know what to study keep for matric
- No prac work e.g. improv

Tabiso

Confused. Too many different classes. Theory/Acting etc. Never get to finish what we’d started before. Too much.
Liam

Don’t listen to reasons (stop think and listen)

Nicole

Nothing wrong with Mr Taub. No respect for people in class. Blamed for stuff. People can’t shut up for more than 1 minute.

Cillia

Nothing against Mr Taub even though sometimes he throws tantrums and agrees with Nicole. The Black thing has become an excuse. Control ourselves.

Mr Myer Taub

• Teaching is about exchange, listening to us, admits to not listening to us and we not listening to us. Listening leads to reaction.
• This is an experiment class, creating new ideas about dramatic art (wonderful experience).
• Work load – go to Mr Taub about your work and will sort it out.
• The convicted says that though he was meant to be found guilty we were speaking out of guilt.
• All work done is for Matric work.
• His guilt is that he doesn’t listen, it’s about the pupil’s guilt.
• Change – about the workload – he’s sorry.
• Consistency – we as pupils must find consistency among ourselves.
• Guilty – we must admit the guilt to ourselves.

∝ David as lawyer reads closing statement.
Dear Parents

The \((f + a = r)\) project with Myer Taub (Drama Department)

\(F\) = Fragments: things that are broken.

\(A\) = Assemblage: Putting things together.

\(R\) = Repositories: Containers.

This year, 2005, Myer Taub was awarded a Potter Fellowship to begin his Doctorate in dramatic narrative strategies at the University of Cape Town. His first research pilot project will happen during the third term at Camps Bay High. The project is open to learners, parents, teachers and ground staff, in fact anyone who is in someway involved with the site of the school. The actual shape and outcome of the project, whether it will be a performance or an installation or a story-telling project, will be decided by the participants themselves. All the participants need to do is bring a fragment that represents something about themselves or something that they have experienced. Once the project starts, everything will be documented and recorded for research purposes. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact Myer Taub at the Parent’s Evening on Thursday 21st July or during school hours. If you as a parent or learner or teacher would like to participate in the project please nominate a suitable time and date after school hours that you are able to attend. The time and date for meeting will be decided by the majority of the participants.

Please return this information to the school as soon as possible.

Name of Participant/s: .................................................................

Contact number: .................................................................

Suitable day and time for participating in project: .........................................

Thanking you,

Myer Taub

HEAD OF DRAMA
This term when you arrived back at school you probably saw the \((f+a=r)\) poster somewhere in the school grounds and wondered what kind of equation is this? \((f+a=r)\) is an equation. It is used in drama and something called narrative strategies. It is an equation that can perhaps help us understand how to deal with life when things within it change. It might also tell us how when things get broken, putting things back together can help transform the way things are. The elements of the equation are three letters: \(f, a, r\) from the word fragment. Fragment means things that are broken and once part of a greater whole \(A\), from the word assemblage. Assemblage means putting things back together. \(R\), from the word repository. Repository means a container that can hold objects. But what does this all have to do with Camps Bay High? And how can you help to change things using this equation? Before I began my association with this wonderfully diverse school, I was studying at the University of Cape Town. There I began to develop this equation as a guide to making and writing plays. I used the setting of the Aftermath as a way of understanding how this equation could be a formula for making plays. Now you wondering what is the Aftermath and what’s that got to do with me? Imagine how we live, how we make sense of the world around us and you will see we live in a world that is constantly changing with events and experiences that are sometimes good and sometimes bad. One of these experiences happened to me before I came to teach or went to university and that was when I was living in New York City; and one day on September 11\textsuperscript{th} 2001, I experienced, like many other people on that day, seeing the collapse of the World Trade Centre. (The Twin Towers) The experience of seeing one of the tallest buildings in the world, collapse into rubble and ruin, killing many people and sparking off wars in other countries made me consider how there are experiences and events in the world can cause shifts and changes in our very being. These experiences cause fragmentation and we can begin to feel like the broken off pieces that surround us like after an event like 9-11. But after the event, people persevere, sometimes they begin to assemble the broken up objects as memory of the experience. They use this action of assemblage as a way of coping with change or as a way of telling or remembering a story of the event that they have just witnessed. After assembling the fragments, repositories are found, which the assembled fragments are placed inside. The shifting experiences which I call experiences of the Aftermath do not have to be big world events but can happen in your everyday life like motor car accidents, or when your body gets hurt on the playing field, or when you are teased on the playground, broken hearts or the break down in family lives.

But sometimes the fragmentation can be positive. Think of how apartheid was dismantled or how the Berlin Wall collapsed or how anger or stubbornness can be broken by the endurance of good energy. Some of my students know how I have used some of these things that I have spoken about, in the way I teach drama or the way I prepare a play. This year the University of Cape Town has awarded me with a Fellowship called the Potter Fellowship. This has enabled me to start developing a program of exploring whether this equation can work if other people start to use it in relation to the changes in their own lives.

The \((f+a=r)\) project is like an experiment to see if this equation is an effective means in representing the everyday experiences of participants who undergo change and transformation. The participants are those who want to be involved in the project. They will determine the shape and outcome of the project. Anyone who is involved in the school in some way can be a participant. The participants in the project can then develop something from the equation that finally they can show to the public. This might be a dramatic performance or even a dramatic installation. I do not know what the outcome will be, anything might occur from developing this equation. And it is the collective participants themselves who will influence the process and final shape of the project. So what am I asking you to do? If you want to be involved:
- You must think about freeing up at least two hours of your after school time to attend the project.
- You must agree to having everything you say or feel, about the process of the project recorded for the use of research.
- You must be ready to perform if needs be.
- You must be ready to tell your story to the public.
- You must be open to seeing the world around you in a different way.
- You must be ready to work as a group member.
- And at the first meeting you will be asked to bring a fragment that represents some experience from your own life and be ready to tell its story.

So now is the time to invite you as learners, and your parents and your teachers, to be involved in developing the first pilot program using the equation \((f+a=r)\) that could be launched in other communities, other schools and other cities where change and transformation are being realized.

If you would like to speak to me during the course of the day about the project please do.
Dear
Thank you for showing an initial interest in this research project. As you well know I am not sure what the outcome will be but I hope that you get something out the process. Please will sign the attached consent form and attach a passport photograph to it. (If this is going to incur a cost please let me know and I will reimburse you.)
This letter is to welcome you to the project and to assure you that everything that is said or felt in the project will be utilised for research purposes only. We will be presently meeting during the cultural slot on Mondays at 12h20. I hope that this time suits you. Once the project gathers a momentum will find perhaps an alternative or time to meet. I suspect that the performance or final result of the project will happen during the third or forth week of the fourth term but lets see what happens. For the first meeting on Monday 1st of August, (what a good start with the first of August!) we will meet in my classroom at 12h20 and I want each of you to break a fragment to that meeting. Now just to remind you a fragment is something broken from something else. So think of a fragment that represents you or your school your community or your city. And that’s all you have to do for the first meeting besides for signing the consent form. I am also attached the speech I made at assembly so that you can reread and remind yourself about the fundamentals of this project.
Thanking you

Myer Taub

Meeting One: 1/8/05: Bringing a fragment
Dear Parents

The (f+a=r) project with Myer Taub (Drama Department)

F= Fragments: things that are broken.
A= Assemblage: Putting things together.
R=Repositories: Containers.

This year, 2005, Myer Taub was awarded a Potter Fellowship to begin his Doctorate in dramatic narrative strategies at the University of Cape Town. His first research pilot project will happen during the third term at Camps Bay High. The project is open to learners, parents, teachers and ground staff, in fact anyone who is in someway involved with the site of the school. The actual shape and outcome of the project, whether it will be a performance or an installation or a story-telling project, will be decided by the participants themselves. All the participants need to do is bring a fragment that represents something about themselves or something that they have experienced. Once the project starts, everything will be documented and recorded for research purposes. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact Myer Taub at the Parent’s Evening on Thursday 21st July or during school hours. If you as a parent or learner or teacher would like to participate in the project please nominate a suitable time and date after school hours that you are able to attend. The time and date for meeting will be decided by the majority of the participants.

Please return this information to the school as soon as possible.

Name of Participant/s:  

Contact number:  

Suitable day and time for participating in project:  

Thanking you

Myer Taub
MYER TAUB
HEAD OF DRAMA
I, LAUREN COOK, agree that everything I say or do during the (f+a=r) project can be recorded and documented both as text and as audio visual references by the researcher so as to be used for research purposes only. These references might be used in published dissertation.

Signed ____________________________  
Date ___________ and witnessed by ____________________________
I ___________________________, agree that everything I say or do during the (f+a=r) project can be recorded and documented both as text and as audio visual references by the researcher so as to be used for research purposes only. These references might be used in published dissertation.

Signed _______________________

Date ___________ and witnessed by ________________________________
For Myer Taub/ Research Project / Drama department/ University of Cape Town

I, ________________________________, agree that the work I write in this journal and any recorded activity made of myself during the undertaken project can be used by the researcher ________________________________ for research.

Signed:

Date:
Consent Form

My participation in the (f+a=r)^2 project at the Monkey Biz outreach clinic is by informed consent and can be documented by the researcher so as to be used for research purposes only. The documentation and references might be used in a published dissertation. The documentation includes mainly video recordings and cognitive mapping.
In this case, I grant permission to Myer Taub, the researcher, to be incorporated within such documentation.

Name (print) Nqunuyo Ngobozwa
Signature
Date 27/07/2006
Address Block 298, Hleula st, Makuraza 7784
Contact number 078 3340784

Consent Form

My participation in the (f+a=r)^2 project at the Monkey Biz outreach clinic is by informed consent and can be documented by the researcher so as to be used for research purposes only. The documentation and references might be used in a published dissertation. The documentation includes mainly video recordings and cognitive mapping.
In this case, I grant permission to Myer Taub, the researcher, to be incorporated within such documentation.

Name (print) Mandisa Pindela
Signature
Date
Address Block 1559 Site B, Krayeutsi 7784
Contact number 076 1678462
APPENDIX 8

The final projects: (in)Heritage and (in)Junction.

Fig. 8.1. Gregory da Silva (The Eggman) tells a story at the start of the trail.

SITES OF (in)HERITAGE

There were 18 interpretative artists who worked at eleven sites along the heritage trail. The complete list of the artists as well as a summation of their work at the sites is as follows:

Fig. 8.2. Andile Vellam dancing Matsogo.

Andile Vellam and the Remix Dance Company had Andile, a dancer who is deaf, tied to a tree with splattered cloth close to the site of Jackson Hlungwane’s sculpture Kava nga Heti. There he danced Matsogo (Hands of Time) in order to remind the spectator that ‘different times in the same space’ is a translation of cultural heritage.
Werner Marx, choreographer, danced a solo piece called *room* in the Molly Blackburn Hall. The solo piece of concentrated physicality was a representation of the pliable space between performer and audience. This space itself was demarcated by a single red ribbon that formed a circular space for the dance itself.

Leila Anderson, performance artist, played the part of architect J.M. Solomon’s wife who re-imagines his suicide by cutting out his obituaries at the site of a plaque replicating his original drawing (a blueprint) for the Upper Campus buildings.
Bianca Baldi and Elgin Rust, conceptual and visual artists, explored the interactivity of the contemporary portrait by inviting passers-by to have tea on Jameson Steps with a cardboard cut-out of the present University chancellor, Graça Machel.

The *erf* (81) Collective represented by member Andre Laubscher and several people from Cape Town’s homeless community set up a makeshift campsite at Rhodes Statue.

Storytelling at the ‘Legends of the Cape Good Hope Site’.
Busker Gregory da Silva also known as ‘The Egg-man’ (as part of his costume is a crown embellished with an assemblage of eggshells) recounted African folk tales around a fire. This was opposite *erf(81)*’s Andre Laubscher who lay in a hammock reading a book on Hendrik Verwoed.

Fig. 8.10. *erf (81)* member Peter van Heerden, performance artist, simulated raping a woman (performed by Nicola Swanepoel) at the site of *Mechanical Man*.

Fig. 8.11. *High Tea at the Plaza*.

Ruth Sacks, conceptual artist, employed Marika Williams an actress to play the part of a waitress cutting a cake of the world at the Cissy Gool Plaza.
Renée Holleman, conceptual artist, installed hundreds of pink origami bunnies invading the foyer of the Zoology Building close to the site of Neels Coetzee’s sculpture, *The Skull Series*.

Angela Nemov and Micheal Inglis created an emblem of interactivity prompting spectators and passers-by to recover keys from the water at the site of Bruce Arnott’s, *The Oracle*. 
Lisa Firer, ceramicist, took fragments from Ingrid de Kok’s poem *treasury* and inscribed them on porcelain shards. These shards were hidden as buried treasure.

Tanya Barben, librarian of the university’s Rare Books and Special Collections, presented a series of historical and literary anecdotes through an array of the collection’s antiquarian treasure.
I would like to concentrate only on a few artists from the above list who, working in the medium of live interpretation, were able to convey the project’s aim of dismantling the heritage monument through an activation of live interpretation. I shall discuss these examples through the use of Mandisa’s rehearsal timetables written in her journal. Her timetables provide a framework for the project activities that occurred on the day of the public event.

| 20 September 2006                                                                                           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) i] We are arriving at 10h00                                |                                                                 |
| ii] Singing                                                   |                                                                 |
| iii] Opening of the doors                                    |                                                                 |
| 2) 12h30-13h20 Lunch time                                    |                                                                 |
| 13h30 We go to the skull statue, pink rabbits and the whale skeleton |                                                                 |
| Downstairs                                                   |                                                                 |
| 13h40 Cissy Gool Plaza until 14h00 (cake and is the lady who liberated and graduated first) |                                                                 |
| 3) 14h05 Mechanical man. Statue with four arms. There will be a man performing in a glass. We have to look |                                                                 |
| 4) 14h20 We all meet at the place where there is a man dancing under a tree and we watch 10 min and then we cross the road. |                                                                 |
| 5) 14h30-45 Fish Sculpture (3m long which is too long and has no completement. Outside is a badge of faith by Solomon Hlungwani.) |                                                                 |
| 6) 14h45-15hoo Legends: A Man carrying eggs                  |                                                                 |
| 7) 15hoo-15h10 Map - Solomon where the man shoot himself when he gets home and left a toy gun on the map. Guests draw the map and- |                                                                 |
| 8) Stamping of the maps and go to the Oracle where the keys are: |                                                                 |

According to Mandisa’s timetable the first live interpretation occurred at the skull statue, part of Neel Coetzee’s Skull Series. This was not necessarily so, as nearly all the live interpretations were continuous and therefore simultaneous. Also there were two groups of tours that went in two opposite directions re-meeting as Mandisa correctly indicates: ‘at the place where there is a man dancing under the trees’.

Fig. 8.18.  The Pink Bunny Project. (ii)
The site of the Skull is also the entrance to the Zoology Department. Artist Renée Holleman used the cold vacuous interior of the department building to house hundreds of invading pink paper origami bunnies. It was a dialectical moment of playful intervention on behalf of the artist in illustrating a relationship between scientific experimentation and creative production. In the artist’s own words she explains:

_The Pink Bunny Project_ took on the standard jokes about rabbits with a subtle ironic twist, relying equally on the notion of reproducibility and a somewhat quirky brand of humour. Initiated in June 2005 [at a different site,] the project involved teaching members of the public how to make an origami rabbit. While reminiscent of children’s art classes, the practice of folding origami was in itself a very formal and precise activity requiring concentration and care. In such a way it facilitates a personal engagement through a small, simple and ultimately playful exercise. Over time these rabbits have gradually accumulated to form a representative community of the individuals involved. Quietly transforming the foyer of the Zoology building behind Neels Coetzee’s _Skull Series_, the pink bunnies suggest that our heritage is indeed a communal one, to be celebrated not only by its heroic achievements, but in the small, seemingly insignificant actions and gestures that constitute the fabric of our daily lives (Holleman, 2006).

The public were taken by the _Polite Force_ tour guides from the skull sculpture into the interior of the Zoology building where they all had to carefully sidle around the installation of pink bunnies and make their way up to the second floor to see the skeleton of the whale. This was the tour guide’s contribution, wanting to point out the whale’s skeleton to the public. Mandisa explains some of this fascination in her journal:

> There is away inside which will have the pink rabbits on the 30th of September. Inside there is the number ‘0’ where there is the whale skeleton and the whale is a fish that has the heart of a human being and is also a mammal.

Fig. 8.19. Interior of Zoology Building.
Mandisa describes in her journal:

Zaine-Nissa the woman who [was] born in 1897-1963. She graduated in 1932 here in South Africa was the [place] she liberated South Africa. The place is called Cissy Gool Plaza.

At the site of the Cissie Gool Plaza, Artist Ruth Sacks worked with actress Marika Williams who played the part of a waitress. Sacks wanted to have Williams performing as the waitress cutting up a large cake decorated with the map of the world. The public were invited to choose sections of the world that they wanted to eat. Williams while cutting the cake would begin a series of improvised colloquialisms and conversations. The irony in place was an intersection between a young coloured actress playing the part of a ‘coloured’ waitress in the university plaza honouring a coloured activist who is a symbol for women’s rights.\(^1\) The performative exchange raised questions about the assumed conditions of dignity thus challenging a heritage symbol’s presumptive guarantee of women’s rights. Here is an edited section transcribed from Marika’s live performance:

The cake is stealing the spotlight, I am a performer and you tell me to pretend I’m not acting. Well, the competition with the cake is on. Why didn’t you tell me the people have arrived? Welcome everybody, don’t be shy, come closer. May I offer you a piece of the world? You can

\(^1\) Coloured in a South African context is a constructed term of identity associated with people of mixed race, and or also, of slave descendancy. It is an identity that signifies both racial heritage and racist legacy. Therefore it is a term that Nadia Davids (in email correspondence with the author) has described as historical yet also ambiguous and fluid ‘in as much as any other identity is—it is an unstable, racialised category in the same way that “black” and “white” is and should be considered like them, in context of and subject to place and history’ (September 18-22 2008). However, ‘coloured’ is a term that by its very emplacement invites deconstruction. Crain Soudien suggests: ‘What apartheid and the struggle against it had done was to produce what one might regard now as strong “official” and “counter official” identities. In the aftermath of apartheid, both the official and the counter-official have been revealed as constructs which in the language of deconstruction are not unproblematic’ (2001, 114). Therefore the coloured actress playing the part of the ‘coloured activist’ activates multiple constructs, a dialectic of official and counter official and doing so playfully destabilises the construction and naming of terms.
choose any part. No, don’t show me where is situated… May I offer you another part of the world? Oh, England, what a marvellous choice. We don’t have any tea to go with it, but if you turn to your left, you can swallow England down with some champagne’ (Williams 2006).

Fig. 8.21. Simulation of rape in the glass atrium opposite the heritage landmark.

Irony was specially evident in the work of provocative performance artist Peter van Heerden who along with his collective erf(81) simulated an act of rape, occurring in the glass atrium opposite the heritage landmark of Lippy Lipschitz’s sculpture, *Mechanical Man*. Juxtaposed against Lipschitz’s stoical statue was a simulated courtship dance that accelerated into a chase, culminating in violence with the victim being pushed up against the glass by her half naked attacker, his body inscribed with a confusion of words. Their performance intended to unhinge the legacy of patriarchy and to settle the score on behalf of the safety of women. What was pertinent was how the performers marked time as a boundary emphatically marking time itself. Their performed time informed the time the guides and their tour groups took in walking past, stopping to look at the heritage landmark and then literally to turn around and watch an act of rape. The sense of timing between looped performance of simulated rape and the tour was intimate as it was distant. This cut through conventional assumptions about ownership, and power in relation to time and space. Time and space were abused–disrupted and being so, the public space transformed into a private space re-revealed.
Other strategies utilised by artists included theories taken from Nicholas Bourriaud’s *Relational Aesthetics* (1998) and the Situationist’s theory of *detournment* (Debord et al. 1958; cited by Bourriaud 2002, 36). This was evident in the work of Bianca Baldi and Elgin Rust who presented a life sized photograph, cut-out of the university’s Chancellor Graça Machel having tea at a tea-table at the heritage site of Jameson Steps. Passers-by were invited to have tea and had their Polaroid taken alongside the Chancellor. Machel as the university’s first African female Chancellor was remade into a photographic cut-out and represented by the artists in a site that had previously been ordained by white male colonialists and academics. Given that Machel at the time of this intervention had not yet had an official portrait made, the artists had catalysed one, allowing the portrait to become a performative space employing the idiom of correspondence through Polaroid and tea party. Through exchange and navigation, the new milieu was informed by and informed its original setting, also putting into practice the mediation of new rules through the simulation of interactive play.

Mandisa makes no mention of the tea party at Jameson Steps except noting it is the place where the public would have their maps stamped, ‘stamping of the maps and go to the Oracle where the keys are’. She is correct in observing how the project promoted interactivity on various levels. As indicated in Mandisa’s example: the public inscribed marks on their own maps, their maps were also stamped when they had tea with the cut-out of the Chancellor and at the final site of the *Oracle*, keys were recovered from the watery pools with

---

2 *Relational aesthetics is art ‘taking as its theoretical horizon the realm of human interactions and its social context, rather than the assertion of an independent and private symbolic space’* (Bourriaud 1998, 7). This can be articulated as a collective exchange created by the artist that is inclusive of the objects made and used by the artist in relation to what is being made and used by the audience in relation to what is being experienced by both as a process of collectivism and exchange. The theory of *detournment* as illustrated by Bourriaud is when ‘cities, buildings and works were to be considered parts of a backdrop or festive and playful tools. The situationists extolled *la dérive* (or drift) a technique of navigating through urban settings as if they were film sets* (2002, 36).
numbers drawn on them pointing the way to where the porcelain shards were hidden. In all the above-mentioned examples the live interpretative artists working at the heritage sites were simulators who in playing in space and time, were simultaneously remapping a network of catastrophes into alternative forms of inhabitation.

The overall project had an efficacy and reflexivity. It implemented and combined both curatorial and communicative aspects: co-coordinating various modes of live interpretations through the reproduction of the site, the map and the tour, aligning these, along with a more specific narrative of recovery, along the treasure trail itself. It included an exchange of stories by promoting alternative voices and hidden histories in order to re-narrate the narratives of the official route, thus affirming alternate expressions of South African heritage sites.

Fig. 8.23. Recovering keys from the Oracle.

Fig.8.24–8.25. Recovering a shard from Rhodes Gift.

There are a number of other models affirming alternate expressions of South African heritage sites. These include:

i) The Western Province Athletics holding a race on Heritage Day (2007) with a theme of ‘From Township to Township’ (Khan 2007);

ii) The ongoing Sunday Times Heritage Project as explained by Charlotte Bauer, which set up contemporary South African artists’ readings of heritage sites alongside ‘significant action moments and spots’ in South Africa’s history (Bauer 2006). Portraying ‘the heritage memorial as a readable narrative, stitching the fabric of our streets and communities… in order to think about our past in fresh, imaginative ways that would be accessible and interesting to pretty much anyone’ (ibid.).

iii) The objectives that are undertaken by the Hector Pietersen Research Project in highlighting and geo-mapping the various routes taken by students from various schools in Soweto on June 16, 1976 (Farouk 2006).

The shard reads: ‘even if we believe in other magic…’ (de Kok 2006, 128); see fig.1.7.
In order to promote the template’s capacity I proposed an alternate location in order to replicate this model reproducing site, map and tour as practised conventions in a different context. This was implemented in the project called (in) Junction.

*(in)JUNCTION*

Fig. 8.26. Treasure hunt in the inner city.

(in)Junction occurred twice: on the visual arts platform of XCape in April 2007 and on World Aids Day December 2007. In the project, I continued to apply and reapply the emerging interactive system incorporating the repertoire of interpretative artists and the Polite Force tours in order to promote acts of recovery in the form of a treasure hunt. The system advanced the contribution made by participants of the wellness clinic who became both a drama group and tour guides represented in their own right, joining a network of visual artists and performers, theorists, documenters, groupies, families and passers-by. By the time the second (in)Junction had occurred the system was in place, consolidated by its own replication.

Figs. 8.30–8.31. Location of project in urban environment.
The project was based in the urban framework of a street, in the east district of Cape Town, where neglect is sandwiched amongst the flurry of urban renewal. The performances took place in the location of street, gallery, and a derelict apartment block whose residents include new immigrants, refugees, and the indigent, reflecting the urban edginess and realities of everyday aftermaths in South Africa. The project evoked an alternate expression made at the intersection between the everyday and the historical. The project was also allegorical because in assuming that the city is ‘decaying, it suggests an urban condition of illness afflicting the rationality of a city’s history and its inhabitants’ (de Certeau 1984, 95). It also meant performing acts of recovering the fragmentation from the city as an act of redemption.


![Performance in the gallery April 2007](image1)

![Performance in the gallery December 2007](image2)

Fig. 8.34. Performance in the gallery December 2007.
The WhatiftheWorld Project Room situated at 13 Hope St, Cape Town became the central locus for these projects. In April and December the gallery held an ongoing series of performances performed by the wellness clinic’s drama group. Mapping the everyday, abstracted on to a map and recovered into a performance, was the central operation of this process. Once the maps were made in the workshop they were put on to the walls of the gallery as works of art. The workshop process was exposed to the public through the gallery’s glass windows. Often members from the public would wander in off the street to enquire about the workshop and on one occasion during the April event, a local homeless lady, Rachel, even joined in by making maps with the rest of the group.

Figs. 8.35–8.36. Mapping.

During all the performances, in April and December, the audiences chose to either remain outside the gallery to watch the action taking place behind glass or they entered into the gallery to exchange in a different experience of intimacy. The first gallery performance in April was a collaboration made between five participants from the clinic, two professional working actors and my mother. The practice of asking outside people to join in on the clinic projects is something I have continued from earlier projects motivated by extending the Deleuzian term of the ‘groupsuclés’ (1977, 206), endorsing inclusivity and multiplicity. I asked my mother to join the workshop in the gallery in order to sustain the autobiographical theme of the overall work and because the motif of (in) Junction itself was about mothers.
The title of the project was an injunction served to the city of Cape Town warning the city about its claim to the title of ‘mother city’. It is a hypocritical claim to the title of mother as many of the city’s inhabitants live in conditions informed by abuse, neglect and violence.\textsuperscript{6}

The participants from the clinic had full autonomy in deciding who should participate in the April and December projects. It was important that these representative-participants returned to the clinic with the maps that they had made in order to report on their activities in the project.

\textsuperscript{6} A perception informed by Heidi Grunbaum Ralph and Yazir Henri whose phrases: ‘mother city: fractured looking language and invisibility of violence’ and ‘mother city fractured spaces and the violence of oblivion’ suggest that the mother city as Cape Town signals a perpetration of violence by the city in its attempts to decentre the visibility of its inherent and violent history (2003).
During the April event, the imaginary equation \((f^2 + a = r)\) was introduced into the workshop. It was brought up on the first day to initiate a reflexive exercise around placing a broken experience on a map. The mapping process included the explanation of maps made and maps recycled and reinterpreted as stimuli for spontaneous performances. The result of the process was a playlet with minimal verbal text. It physicalised 13 short acts concentrating on different kinds of relationships including those between mothers and children. The play’s spiralling structure can be attributed to the maps being created affected by an atmosphere of spontaneity. Like at the other sites, the performance was filled with cryptograms, alluding to a theatre of secrecy and a treasure hunt.
The second performance in December took on a different structure. In order to develop a sense of focus in the small gallery space, I decided to work with only two participants from the clinic, who along with a choreographer/theatre-making honours student from UCT’s Drama Department, created a short play. The play was devised from all the available maps that had been made at all the previous workshops. These were put up on the gallery wall and the collaborators could extract fragments from them and assemble the fragments into a new play that in the end became threaded with reproduced maps, physical movement, English words, and isiXhosa text. The result was a play called ‘Dear Virus’ and was composed as a long letter by one of the two participants who performed in the piece. This letter was written to confront her virus and to defeat stigma. The play was only four minutes long and was performed as a loop in the gallery situated amongst the maps and the audience.
The *Polite Force* continued to be made up from a group of participants from the clinic. They sustained their training for both events by studying the maps of the local area and the re-made treasure maps where the events took place. They also participated with the actors in mapping workshops. It was my intention that the *Polite Force* would guide the treasure hunt tours to various performance sites on intersecting street corners and on to the several encounters in the apartment block above the gallery. This was not always the case, as the public barely acknowledged the *Polite Force* as guides and embarked on the trail on their own terms. This might have to do with the fact that urban trails are infused with multiple personalised trajectories as opposed to the lateral trail of an institutionalised route.

Fig. 8.43. The *Polite Force* meeting the Police Force.
Mandisa who was so committed to this process during *(in)Heritage* by leading the group both in spirit and observation, was unable to participate in the April *(in)Junction* project because of her failing health. In her absence, no one wanted to replace her and in effect the troupe became leaderless. When her condition had improved she returned to participate in *(in)Junction* in December. During the December training, the tour guides were at first confident and happy. However towards the end of the week’s workshop they chose to go further away from the location without any supervision. It was agreed they would walk alone from Hope St to Long St (a previously explored route) and back in their uniform/costumes. I decided they could go without supervision because it meant more independence for them. When they returned from this expedition, they were visibly upset. They had chosen an alternate route to the agreed route, walking instead to Cape Town Station. At the station they were harassed and verbally abused by commuters because of their *Polite Force* uniform/costume. Clearly they had become less confident and were unhappy. Their identity as *Polite Force* had exposed their differences, and the reactions to them had marginalised them further. We spoke about this incident at the end of rehearsal. I raised the point that they had gone against the agreed terms of the expedition although this was no justification for their mistreatment at the station. This crisis refers back to an earlier point I raised, how crises continue (in different guises) and do not go away. I tried to explain to the tour guides how moments like these could only make us all stronger and more determined. Then the conversation ended. No one wanted to talk. They went home. This particular crisis revealed the participant’s frustration and anger. I had unraveled issues around trust, communication, and dignity. The following entry is taken from the student collaborator-choreographer’s journal. Although I do realise the danger of bringing in a new voice at this juncture I want to use this extract because it reveals how sometimes an immediate resolution to a crisis like this cannot be found.

The journal entry reveals the value in the contribution of an outside participant whose observation and immediate access to language could assist the facilitator of the work who might neglect or overlook apparent (and even non-apparent) crises that might not be made explicit through cartographic exercises. That said these circumstances did not undermine the value I had identified in cartography as a way of creating alternate forms of expression. Crises like these take time to resolve. It was the participants who began to resolve the crisis by returning the next day to rehearsal, resolute in continuing their training towards the upcoming event.

---

7 Like all other participants on the projects the collaborating honours student was asked to keep a journal, one, which she handed to me at the end of the project. The journal is of particular importance because it records all the activities with an insight that is valuable because she has some knowledge of isiXhosa that was spoken by the participants during the December workshops and therefore she had an alternate access to understanding the participants’ process. As with all other previous journal transactions, I only received this journal at the tail end of the project and was unable to reflect on her insights during the process but it still remains an important document as a process of reflection and for future planning.
Figs. 8.44–8.46. *Siren.* (Baldi and Rust)

Fig. 8.47. Handing out cupcakes at the entrance to the apartment building.

Fig. 8.48. Treasure hunters.
At both (in)Junctions there were acts of live interpretation in various urban settings that were signalled as performances. One example is *Siren* created by Bianca Baldi and Elgin Rust. It was a conceptual work which recurred at both performances in April and December. The work was inspired by the account of actress Terry Norton who had been arrested by the Camps Bay police for walking her dog on Camps Bay beach. According to Norton, the local police had assaulted her. Baldi and Rust recorded an interview with Norton about her arrest and then shredded her interview into a soundscape that would seem like a police siren. They attached the sound with an accompanying light piece on to the door of the Hope St Police Barracks as an act of intervention. They recorded fragments of phrases from Norton’s interview recalling her arrest and traced these verbal fragments into the accumulation of dust that covers the Police Barrack’s mirrored windows.

Live interpretations also occurred inside the derelict apartment block of Lynwol Court, 13 Hope St. During both (in) Juctions I had the misfortune of living in a flat in the same apartment block. Lynwol Court was a vessel of health hazards and poor living conditions. At both events, the public gained entry into the apartment block if they had found the right clue, a small Monopoly house. The Monopoly houses were attached to a caretaker’s shack opposite the neighbourhood Catholic Church. In the apartment building there were various encounters ranging from meeting ‘real’ people in their flats (gaining entry with further found clues)

---

8 Norton ‘was arrested and allegedly put in a cell with two men for walking her dog on Camps Bay beach without a leash’ (Samodien 2006).
to eating communal cupcakes. The ‘real people’ included a performance by my mother and my boyfriend in my own flat who re-enacted the parts of a Gypsy/fortune-teller (played by my mother) and her keeper in a rabbit mask. In the later (in)Junction in December my gay, Muslim neighbour invited the public into his flat for refreshments and conversations around stigma. I continued to use self-referential elements like these in the work because their use heightens allegory as a construct in exploring and composing themes around self and collective recovery.

Artist Esti Strijdom in a conceptual work called Meet Your Neighbour baked the communal cupcakes. This work recurred at both (in)Junctions. The cupcakes were made using ingredients given to Strijdom from 19 residents living in the apartment building. Residents were encouraged to contribute baking ingredients to make collective-cupcakes that were handed out, on the performance day, to the audience and residents alike. The cupcakes held clues to the location of the treasure.

The treasure of the hunt itself was an heirloom left to me by my late father: a Masonic necklace with a tassel of keys hanging from its edges and an additional bronze centrepiece for the necklace with the inscription: Cape Town: Jou Ma Se Poes. Looking like an inverted mayoral chain, the prize was a political tactic, using a localised barbarism to subvert the notion of privilege. It signified intervention in the crises of urban life in Cape Town. The mayoral necklace was made into a roving trophy with a condition that its finder and temporary keeper will have to present a live interpretative act at the possibility of the next (in)Junction project thus contributing to encounters along the route, which inspire interactivity and hopefully the generation of a long term project.

Fig. 8.51. Displaying the mayoral necklace as treasure.

---

9 This local Cape expletive is associated with a mother’s genital organs.
Figs. 8.52–8.53. Finding the mayoral necklace *(in)Junction* April.

Figs. 8.54–8.55. Winning the mayoral necklace *(in)Junction* December.
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