

## 2. THE JOURNEY BEGINS

### Drama and self-Awareness

*As the child was old enough to be confirmed on The Day of The Innocents, the old woman took her to an old crippled shoemaker to have a special pair of shoes made for the occasion. In the shoemaker's case there stood a pair of red shoes made of finest leather that were finer than fine; they practically glowed. So even though red shoes were scandalous for church, the child, who chose only with her hungry heart, picked the red shoes. The old lady's eyesight was so poor she could not see the color of the shoes and so paid for them. The old shoemaker winked at the child and wrapped the shoes up.*

*The next day, the church members were agog over the shoes on the child's feet. The red shoes shone like burnished apples, like hearts, like red-washed plums. Everyone stared; even the icons on the wall, even the statues stared disapprovingly at her shoes. But she loved the shoes all the more. So when the pontiff intoned, the choir hummed, the organ pumped, the child thought nothing more beautiful than her red shoes.*

*By the end of the day the old woman had been informed about her ward's red shoes. "Never, never wear those red shoes again!" the old woman threatened. The next Sunday, the child couldn't help but choose the red shoes over the black ones, and she and the old woman walked to church as usual.*

- Women Who Run With the Wolves (Estes, 1992: 216-219)

This chapter focuses on the initial aspect of creating distance between an individual and her value system, to provide the space for her to interrogate it critically and compare it to other value systems. This first step involves creating a cerebral distance between the individual and her own actions. She needs to learn to step back from herself intellectually and observe herself in action. This will create self-awareness: the awareness of one's belief system and how it motivates one's actions<sup>1</sup>. Section 2.1 deals with the theory and practice of Augusto Boal (1979, 1992, 1995) and section 2.2 with that of Robert Landy (1993, 1994, 1996).

Both Boal and Landy provide theories to explain how drama is capable of creating an intellectual distance. Both theories are informed by a particular understanding of the relationship between drama and everyday life. In order to develop our own understanding of the relationship between the two, each section will describe the relationship from the point of view of the particular practitioner. Thereafter, each section will investigate how the practitioner views the self and discuss this in relation to the secondary frames of character and fictional context.

The third part of the discussion, in each case, will deal with the concepts and methods each practitioner has developed in order to utilise the relationship between everyday life and drama for creating self-awareness. In 2.1, the focus is Boal's concept of the spect-actor as a potential first step in creating distance between *self-as-subject* - the one who observes - and *self-as-object* - the one who acts - as described above (p.21-22). In 2.2, the focus is Landy's concepts of role and distancing as the keys to understanding one's own actions in the context of one's life story.

Lastly, each section will provide a critical analysis of the practitioner's ideas in the context of the endeavour to devise a practical programme for values clarification in a multicultural classroom in South Africa.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is this journey, that starts with stepping back from oneself and becoming self-aware, that Sophie embarks upon in the excerpt from the beginning of the book *Sophie's World* inserted at the juncture between sections 1.1 and 1.2 of this chapter – a pattern that iterates throughout the discussion

## **2.1 Augusto Boal**

### **2.1.1 Introduction**

Boal develops his idea of the spect-actor and the distance between self-as-subject (spectator) and self-as-object (actor) as critique on the traditional physical distance between audience and performers in conventional theatre. In *Theatre of the Oppressed* (1979), Boal criticises Aristotle because in his poetics the spectator lives vicariously through the character (actor) allowing him to act on her behalf. This renders the spectator passive and powerless to change her circumstances. Aristotle's tragedy coerces the audience into accepting the status quo by purging them of the weaknesses that causes people to deviate from accepted social norms. This purging happens through catharsis as the audience identifies with the character in the story through empathy.

The audience, therefore, remains passive while the character on stage undergoes change. Boal is strongly opposed to this. If the physical separation between character and spectator can be overcome then the spectator may be empowered to change her society rather than to relinquish power to it.

Boal finds the root of the disempowering effect of Aristotle's tragedy in Aristotle's statement that art imitates nature. Boal's understanding of the dichotomous relationship between art (drama in our case) and nature (the everyday lives of the audience members) sheds light on the way in which drama can be used to create a distance between the individual and her system of beliefs so that she may be empowered to criticise and change both her beliefs and the actions flowing from the beliefs. Consequently it is necessary to investigate how Boal understands this relationship before looking at the concept of the spect-actor and how it encompasses the kind of distance the proposed process seeks to accomplish.

### **2.1.2 The Relationship Between Art and Nature: Belief Systems**

Boal (1979: 1) writes that when Aristotle said that art imitates nature he meant that "Art re-creates the creative principle of created things." This 'principle of created things' is that they are constantly evolving towards perfection. Art, therefore, recreates that internal

movement of things toward their perfection. Consequently, in Tragedy, the artist must imitate men “as better than in real life” (Aristotle in Dukore, 1974: 32) and not as they are. When nature fails to evolve toward perfection, the artist has to intervene and correct the failure, bringing nature back on track (Boal, 1979: 8-9).

The perfection that nature strives towards and that art should help accomplish, according to Aristotle, is the attainment of the highest goal, which is the political good: justice. But to find out what is just, Aristotle says one needs to empirically examine the real, existing state of affairs. In Boal’s words: “This leads us to accept as ‘just’ the *already existing* inequalities” (his Italics) (1979: 21).

Aristotle's idea of art, and therefore of theatre, is to intervene when already existing inequalities - and the belief system that promotes these inequalities - are being threatened. Theatre is designed in such a way that it coerces the audience into accepting the status quo and changing back from a fallen state into a ‘good’ citizen relinquishing to the current belief system.

Aristotle’s tragedy accomplishes this coercion through catharsis that is created by empathy. Catharsis is the change that occurs in the audience member when she sinks back into obedience. It is accomplished by a bond of empathy that connects the audience member to the character on stage. Through empathy, the audience identifies with the character’s strengths. Yet, the character possesses one weakness, something that the audience may also identify within themselves.

The bond of empathy performs its purging function in two ways. Firstly, when the character ends up in a catastrophe as a result of his weakness, the audience fears that the same would happen to them if they continue to harbour the same weakness. Their fear consequently purges them from their weakness. Secondly, as a result of the bond of empathy, the audience gives expression to their vice, or weakness, living vicariously in identification with the character. In doing so they rid themselves of it.

Boal concludes:

Theatre is change and not simple presentation of what exists: it is becoming and not being. (1979: 28)

If theatre does not represent how things are, but how they should be, it follows that theatre reflects the belief system of those who create it. In this sense, all theatre is politicised. Can theatre then be used to expose those same belief systems? Boal believes it can and he builds on the ideas of Bertolt Brecht to show how this may be accomplished. However, he also criticises Brecht for not going far enough, especially with regards to the relationship between audience member and actor, self and character (Boal, 1979: 113).

### **2.1.3 Relationship of ‘Self’ to Dramatic Character and Context: Playing Oneself**

For Brecht, theatre exposes the belief systems of the characters because “the character *is not an absolute subject with a free will*, but the object of economic or social forces to which he responds and in virtue of which he acts” (his Italics) (Boal, 1979: 92). Therefore, who the character is and how he reacts, continuously betray the social forces he was brought up within, they expose the belief system that he subscribes to (1979: 92-99). This is also true of an audience member. Boal professes the same Marxist understanding of self as being socially determined. It will be shown that his shift from South America to Europe caused a change in the application of his theory and consequently exposes a discrepancy in his theory arising from this understanding of self.

For Brecht, theatre should not allow the spectator simply to live vicariously through the character. Rather it should create a sufficient distance between character and spectator so that the spectator may be critical of the belief system, which motivates the character’s actions. This moment of insight for the spectator is how Brecht understands catharsis (Brecht, 1957: 74-75).

Although Boal applauds Brecht for wanting to use theatre to bring about change by allowing the audience member to think for herself, he says that Brecht’s poetics still render the spectator passive and without power to act, as did Aristotle’s.

Boal’s *Theatre of the Oppressed* endeavours to overcome this:

...the *poetics of the oppressed* focuses on the action itself: the spectator delegates no power to the character (or actor) either to act or to think in his place; on the contrary, he himself assumes the protagonic role, changes the dramatic action, tries out solutions, discusses plans for change—in short, trains himself for real action. (his Italics) (1979: 121)

In overcoming the physical distance between spectator and actor, Boal proposes another kind of distance. This is not a physical distance, but the distance between the actor as subject, and the actor as object. The spectator herself becomes both the subject, thinking and reflecting upon the actions on stage and the object of reflection, the one who is performing those same actions. This change in the understanding of distance also causes a merging between everyday life and fiction. The characters created in Boal's work and the contexts within which they act are not fictional at all, they are representations of the participants themselves and events from their own lives. There are some exceptions to this, when characters are created not to represent actual people, but to symbolise certain belief systems. So, for instance, a policeman is chosen to represent the rule of law. However, the focus here is on the participant and her learning about her own behaviour by playing herself in familiar circumstances.

## **2.1.4 Key Concepts and Methodology: The Spect-Actor**

### *2.1.4.1 Theatre of the Oppressed*

The term *spect-actor* is chosen by Boal to refer to the person who both acts (object) and who watches herself in action (subject). When one is able to see oneself in action and understand the thoughts or beliefs that motivate that action, one can also evaluate and change the action. For Boal it is not enough merely to see and criticise, as it is for Brecht. He wants to empower the spectator to enter into the action and change it. In this sense theatre for Boal is a 'rehearsal for revolution' (1979: 121).

There are two clear stages in this process as indicated by the term *spect-actor*. Firstly, there is the moment of spectating, of looking in on the action from outside and being able to criticise it. Secondly, there is the moment of stepping in and changing the action according to that evaluation. Boal has designed various techniques that will enable people to act out events using the medium of theatre to communicate how they perceive their environment, circumstances and their role within it. All these techniques try to facilitate both the stages of seeing and evaluating the action and then stepping in to change it.

In order for the spect-actor to see herself in action and evaluate it, it is necessary for the action and the belief system behind the action to become externalised. Boal, like Brecht, believes that when people are asked to act out events from their own lives, their systems of belief become clear in their representation.

In *Image Theatre* one participant uses others' bodies, 'sculpting' with them a group of statues to express how she views a certain problem and how she thinks it may be solved. Another participant may suggest a completely different solution to the same problem arranging the bodies in a completely different way. This is because "the different patterns of action represent not chance occurrence but the sincere, visual expression of the ideology and psychology of the participants" (1979: 137). What is interesting here, says Boal, is that each variation not only expresses individual ideology but also collective systems of belief, "The image synthesises the individual connotation and the collective denotation" (1979: 138).

In another one of his techniques called *Breaking of Repression*, Boal writes that "the process to be realised, during the actual performance or afterward during the discussion, is one that ascends from the *phenomenon* toward the *law*; from the action presented in the plot toward the social laws that govern those actions" (his italics) (1979: 150). In this technique one of the participants chooses an event from her life where she had experienced repression, she chooses all the characters that are present and then the event is acted out. Although the event happened to one person in particular, it is important that it becomes clear to everyone how the event is a reflection of the value system of society. When this happens, it is possible to criticise the value system and one's own subservience to it. It is at this moment where individual action leads to collective belief system, that the distance between actor as subject and actor as object is created. Once participants were able to move from the particular interpretation of a belief system to the general rules of that system, it is possible to enter into the action and change the character's behaviour. This is only possible because "Man-the-spectator is the creator of Man-the-character" (1979: 134).

The participant's entering into the action to change it is most pronounced in *Forum Theatre*. Actors play out a scene proposed by members of the audience. It is important that the scene brings the protagonist to, what Boal calls, a *Chinese crisis* (Baxter, 2003). This climax is characterised by the elements of both danger and opportunity for the protagonist. In the first version, he does not seize the opportunity and the story ends in tragedy. During a second presentation of the scene any audience member who wants to change the course of events, may step in and take the place of the protagonist. The entry of participants is encouraged and facilitated by a *Joker* who challenges the participants to take action. After some attempts at changing the protagonist's fate, participants may replace any other character in the drama. By replacing the actors, the participant rehearses her solution to the problem within the context of the fictional representation. The actors in the story are to resist her efforts in order to keep it realistic and not allow 'magical' solutions. Boal writes that even though the situation is fictional, the experience of the participant when she acts out her solution is concrete (1979: 141). Being a concrete experience, it can help the participant discover the workability, or not, of her solution. On the other hand, however, because it is a simulation, the participant is always left with a sense of incompleteness that can only be fulfilled once that rehearsed solution is carried out in real action (1979: 142).

As he moved from Brazil to become an exile in Europe, Boal has shifted his focus from the liberation of the masses to the liberation of the individual. This shift in focus was prompted by the kinds of oppression that he found in Europe compared to the kinds of oppression he was familiar with in Brazil. In South America the oppression was caused by racism, sexism, abuse of power and authority by clergymen and the police, low wages, and unbearable work conditions. The main cause of death there was hunger. In Western Europe the main problems were loneliness, an inability to communicate, and purposelessness. The main cause of death was suicide and drug overdose (Boal, 1995: 7). In South Africa we are in the unique situation where Western and African values and ways of life appear side by side and both groups of problems are identifiable in our schools (Van Zyl Slabbert et al, 1994: 55). Boal's own reinterpretation of his work in Brazil and particularly of the concept of spect-actor may be useful in finding ways to

apply his ideas to the South African context. His shift in focus is mapped out in his work *The Rainbow of Desire: The Boal Method of Theatre and Therapy* (1995).

#### 2.1.4.2 *The Rainbow of Desire*

The phrase ‘rainbow of desire’ refers to the concretisation of the desires and warring emotions within the individual. In most of the Rainbow of Desire techniques, images, or forum theatre sessions are created where the characters are made up of the internal voices or desires of the individual. These desires expose the value system of the individual since the things people value are also the things they desire. Where Boal focussed on external forms of oppression, or the ‘cops in the street’, in *Theatre of the Oppressed*, he now focuses on internalised oppression, the ‘cops in the head’ of the participant. For these internal desires to be concretised and the value system therefore exposed, the distance between self-as-subject and self-as-object is paramount.

Theatre — or theatricality — is this capacity, this human property which allows man to observe himself in action, in activity. The self-knowledge thus acquired allows him to be the subject (the one who observes) of another subject (the one who acts). It allows him to imagine variations of his action, to study alternatives. (1995: 13)

This confirms what has already been said that, for Boal, theatre enables a person to see herself from the outside and so doing allows her to critique her action and change it. However he then adds another dimension to this distance between self-as-subject (spectator) and self-as-object (actor): “that distance which separates space and divides time, the distance from ‘I am’ to ‘I can be’” (1995: 13). It is the distance between the self in the present and imagined self of the future.

Although Boal talked about trying out alternatives of how one’s actions could change in *Theatre of the Oppressed*, he now emphasises the aspect of imagination more strongly. One has to be able to *imagine* oneself acting differently before one can actually act differently. He adds that it is necessary for this distance between self and imagined self, to be symbolised, and this symbolisation is possible by virtue of theatre. This is why theatre should not just belong to those who choose it as a profession, but to all humans who want to imagine themselves changing.

By the same token, the theatre space or *aesthetic space*, does not only refer to places where formal productions are being performed, but any space, which

...has as its primary function the creation of a *separation*, a *division* between the space of the actor — the one who *acts* — and the space of the spectator — the one who *observes* (his italics) (1995: 17).

He argues further that neither spectators, nor a physical platform is necessary for theatre to occur:

The 'theatre' (or 'platform', at its simplest, or 'aesthetic space', at its purest) serves as a means of separating actor from spectator; the one who acts from the one who observes. Actor and spectator can be two different people; they can also *coincide in the same person* (his italics) (1995: 19).

This moment of separation between actor and spectator, when it happens within the same person and when it enables that person to imagine a change of action, is what Boal now understands as the moment of catharsis. This separation is referred to as the dichotomising power of the aesthetic space (1995: 24-26). The Rainbow of Desire techniques are all designed to facilitate this separation of self-as-subject and self-as-object by the concretisation of hidden desires and by placing them in dialogue with each other. When a person can see her desires in action, she can gain insight into herself and the internalised oppressive beliefs that motivate her action. Then she may also start to imagine how it would be if she changed her beliefs and actions. When the spect-actor is purged of inaction, when she is dynamised in this way to take action, she has experienced catharsis (1995: 72).

While his move from Brazil to Europe has helped him to refine his concept of spect-actor and its relevance for change through theatre as medium, it has also caused his own beliefs to be more concretely expressed and their shortcomings to be exposed.

### **2.1.5 Critical Analysis**

When applying Boal's ideas to the multicultural secondary school classroom in South Africa, we find them useful only up to a point. Boal's analysis of the aesthetic space as a place where all the different internalised belief systems ('cops in the head') can be identified, may be useful to identify the different demands of groups within a

multicultural context, on the individual. His emphasis on allowing the spectator to enter into the action in order that she may be empowered to have an impact on the course of action is also important. However, there are some difficulties that arise firstly, from the nature of the South African context. This context is complex and has specific characteristics that problematise the uncritical application of Boal's methods. Secondly, as Davis and O'Sullivan argue (2000), Boal's methods (especially his adaptations for Europe) do not really aid the individual in taking action to change her belief systems, but rather to adapt to them or turn the same oppression back onto those who were enforcing it in the first place. The reason for this is that, Boal's theory does not provide an objective standpoint from which to judge the 'cops in the head' of the individual. These criticisms will now be viewed separately.

South Africa is considered to be a third world country, comparable to Brazil, rather than a first world one like European countries. Therefore Boal's work in *Theatre of the Oppressed* is considered first. In the programme that is being developed here, both the moments of viewing for evaluation and then stepping in to rehearse alternative actions, as suggested by the concept of *spect-actor*, are important. However, it is necessary to reinterpret some of Boal's principles for the particular context of a multicultural group of learners in South Africa.

Firstly, when dealing with a group of learners where there are representatives of various cultures present, it is not so easy to move from the individual interpretation of a value to the collective system of beliefs that teach that value. The 'collective' that supports this value may not be represented by the rest of the class. It may become too personal for that participant to expose her culture's values to evaluation, she may even be moved to defend them, rather than interrogate them. This may be especially true of adolescents (the target group of the proposed programme), who, on account of their developmental phase, may find it difficult to create a distance between their own actions and their emotional responses to the action as is suggested by Renée Emunah (1994). She proposes the employment of distancing techniques when using drama methodologies with this age group (1994: 42). The cultural composition of the multicultural class is too

complex<sup>2</sup> and the age of the target group makes it even more difficult to let participants play themselves in familiar context, as Boal suggests. Greater distance is needed. Such an experience of cultural conflict and a reiteration of the need for more effective distancing techniques are explored in an article by Bryan Edmiston (2002) *Playing in the Dark with Flickering Lights Using Drama to Explore Sociocultural Conflict*. He had written the article after an experience in Northern Ireland where the division between Protestant and Catholic systems of belief were too close to home for participants to explore in a drama he had attempted to set up based on a news article of the day. He found that such conflicts are easier to deal with in completely fictional situations as in another class he had designed around the story of the three little pigs and the wolf. This drama explored the relationship between pigs and wolves rather than between particular socio-cultural groupings of people. It proved more engaging and more effective in bringing about understanding and change for the learners.

This thesis proposes the creation of completely fictional characters in fictional situations as a further means of distancing. To evaluate what that fictional character is doing, may be easier and more productive for the target group, as Edmiston had experienced. Nonetheless, it is important to remember that the character has to be under the complete control of the participant, in order to ensure that the physical distance between spectator and actor is not reinstated. It may therefore be potentially useful to look specifically at Boal's process for the creation of Forum Theatre by actors. In this kind of theatre the protagonist is created so that spect-actors could identify with him, and he is represented within a situation that is familiar but not identical to an actual occurrence. To make him identifiable, Boal insists that the protagonist's ideology must be clear, his actions must communicate this ideology and he must make errors in dealing with the situation that participants will find familiar (1992: 17). The next chapter deals with the complete fictionalisation of the character and his context to facilitate learning.

---

<sup>2</sup> This is not to suggest that there are not classes, or whole school populations, that are more homogeneous in the sense that learners have similar combinations of influences from their contexts. This would be the case if learners were all from the same community and same race or same gender. Yet, the study seeks to be applicable in heterogeneous multi-cultural contexts of all varieties and therefore chooses to focus on more complex target groups. I do propose, however, that the methodology developed here be tested with other kinds of groups as well to test its validity across the board.

A second reinterpretation that is needed in Boal's work in *Theatre of the Oppressed* is connected to the concept of oppression. It is not as simple anymore as saying that it is the masses oppressed by a minority elite government, as was the case in the South American context in which Boal was writing and in South Africa under the apartheid government (James, 2001: 5). It has become more complex than that as discussed in the Introduction to this thesis. The enemy is not clear.<sup>3</sup> In South African schools the oppression wears more faces than that of political oppression and poverty. I ran a workshop in 2001 with a group of 32 secondary school students of a multicultural government school on the problems they face. The workshop formed part of an educational theatre programme unrelated to the current investigation that focussed on helping learners identify the things that they could label as 'enemies' or 'predators' in their lives. The main tool for externalising these 'oppressors' was Image Theatre and the following sources of such oppression were identified: peer pressure, sexual and physical abuse, pressure from parents and teachers to perform coupled with the looming problem of unemployment, pressure from media and friends to be physically attractive and rich coupled with the problem of widespread poverty, opposite sex relationships complicated by HIV/AIDS. Each individual has a unique combination of these pressures and each individual needs to be empowered to deal with her combination in a responsible manner. The first step in this process is for her to learn to step away from the value system that guides the way she is accustomed to dealing with problems and making choices. Thereafter she may be able to compare her value system to those of the groups that are exerting pressure on her and come to a decision about how to act. The belief system enshrined in the constitution is but one of these points of comparison, or frames that bring about perspective. Others may include the values that are communicated through Hollywood films, or those

<sup>3</sup> The study does not ignore the fact that a vast majority of South Africans live in a developing world scenario where the 'cops in the street' may seem easier to identify. Our history demands that we recognise social conditions in defining how we are in the world as well as the choices we make or are empowered to make about our own values. Still, as mentioned earlier, my own interest and emphasis is on the internal landscape, or 'cops in the head', of the individual, rather than on the external one where the 'cops in the street' are rampant. This is partly because I focus on the multi-cultural aspect of the target groups and partly because of an ever present scepticism about the simplicity even of external forms of oppression. As I will argue shortly, I doubt our accessibility to the objective reality where such oppressors can be found. It all translates back to our own interpretations which are governed by the 'cops in our heads.'

underlying television advertisements, or the values of particular religious groups, parents or other figures of authority. The application of Boal's theory therefore is problematic because of the complexities: firstly, in the composition of a multicultural class and secondly, of the forms of oppression represented in the class.

It may be argued that Boal's own reinterpretation of his work in *The Rainbow of Desire* may solve the problem, since he has shifted his focus to empower the individual in identifying her personal combination of oppressive systems. However, there are some fundamental problems with Boal's concept of the *self* that obstructs the application of his reinterpretation.

In their article *Boal and the Shifting Sands* (2000: 288-297), Davis and O'Sullivan argue that Boal has never really believed that theatre could mobilise a group to induce social change that his work was never grounded enough in Marxist theory to allow it to empower an entire social group for action that would bring about social change. From the start, even in *Theatre of the Oppressed*, they maintain that he was an idealist who worked with people's thoughts about their experiences and their interpretations and did not take into account the power of the oppression that existed in objective reality. He saw the self not as a construct of economic and social forces, as did Brecht, but as an absolute subject with a free will.

Certainly, the power to think up an idea and try it out is the ruling principle of Boal's theatre. There is no explicit reference to the social or material objective reality. (2000: 292)

This idealist approach renders the theory impotent as regards practical reality, in their opinion. It causes a utopian impression of the solution and therefore does not empower the individual to change her social circumstances, but rather to adapt to them, or worse, turn the oppression back on the oppressor.

This argument is similar to the one made earlier about the oppressor not having a clear face. If there is no clear enemy, there may also be no clear source of wisdom to overcome the enemy. Where does one find an objective stance from which to judge the perspective of the individual story? If the cops are all in the head, who is to say that the 'new insight' gained from the workshop does not turn into one more cop? The only way

Boal is able to overcome this, according to Davis and O'Sullivan, is to construe an absolute subject that can view the situation from a metaphysical point of view. However, according to Marxist theory, such an objective point of view is problematic since the individual's choices and beliefs are always influenced by the oppressive social and economic forces of objective reality. Davis and O'Sullivan argue that if this is so then what stops the individual from simply turning the oppression back on the one exerting it in the first place? They cite an example from a workshop by Boal they have attended in Brisbane 1995, where the person felt oppressed by his siblings because he was forced to look after his elderly mother. The forum reverted to finding ways to "avoid having your needy mother dumped on you" (2000: 288), while it should have questioned the value system behind the unwillingness of children to care for their elderly parents. By leaving the values unchallenged the 'oppressed' son is now free to turn the same kind of oppression back onto his siblings and by so doing, exert some oppression of a different kind on his mother who is the one truly needing the care in the first place.

Boal seems to confirm his own theory of theatre exposing the belief system of the one practising it. His theatre practice reveals some of his own beliefs about the self that is in opposition to his expressed Marxist perspective.

From a post-structuralist point of view, one can agree with Davis and O'Sullivan that Boal was more concerned with internalised oppression, the 'cops in the heads' of the participants, even in *Theatre of the Oppressed*. However, one could not agree with them that this would have been different had Boal taken into account the objective reality of oppression. Post-structuralist thinking doubts our accessibility to such an objective reality. Our only access to it is through interpretation (Berry, 2000). One should rather say that Boal does not take into account and create dialogue with other interpretations of the same reality that may relativise or shed a different light on the first interpretation. He focuses only on the participant's interpretation, especially in his later work. He does create dialogue around the issue among the participants present to create a 'collective denotation' (Boal, 1979: 138) but he always insists that people who are to participate in one person's images are to feel a certain 'identification', 'recognition' or 'resonance' with the material presented (Boal, 1995: 68-69). So doing no new insight or alternate

interpretation is presented that could challenge the original.

What the current research wants to achieve is to create dialogue between the individual's interpretation of events and other interpretations. More specifically it wants to find a way of creating dialogue between the belief system that forges the individual's interpretation and other belief systems that may offer a different interpretation of the same event, such as the one suggested by the constitution and the bill of rights. It will do so by using the frame of dramatic character creation as a reference point for the discovery of how belief systems motivate actions.

This dialogue between belief systems is very necessary in the South African context where a diversity of cultures and beliefs are represented in one classroom. Dialogue is one way of overcoming the problems caused by the complexities of the South African context. Augusto Boal's theory is useful for the first step toward dialogue: stepping back from your own position in order to understand it better. However, it does not assist us further with the process of comparison, evaluation and change of behaviour.

A thinker who does take into account the dialogue between different interpretations is Robert Landy. He presents a different framework, another vantage point from which to view one's situation in order to get a clearer picture of the belief systems functioning within it. His work will be the focus of the next section.

As soon as Sophie had closed the gate behind her she opened the envelope. It contained only a slip of paper no bigger than the envelope. It read:

*Who are you?*

Nothing else, only the three words, written by hand, and followed by a large question mark....

*Who are you?*

She had no idea. She was Sophie Amundsen, of course, but who was that? She had not really figured that out—yet.

What if she had been given a different name? Anne Knutsen, for instance. Would she then have *been* someone else?...

She jumped up and went into the bathroom with the strange letter in her hand. She stood in front of the mirror and stared into her own eyes.

"I am Sophie Amundsen," she said.

The girl in the mirror did not react with as much as a twitch. Whatever Sophie did, she did exactly the same. Sophie tried to beat her reflection to it with a lightning movement but the other girl was just as fast.

"Who are you?" Sophie asked.

She received no response to this either, but felt a momentary confusion as to whether it was she or her reflection who had asked the question.

Sophie pressed her index finger to the nose in the mirror and said, "You are me."

As she got no answer to this, she turned the sentence around and said, "I am you..."

Wasn't it odd that she didn't know who she was? And wasn't it unreasonable that she hadn't been allowed to have any say in what she would look like? Her looks had just been dumped on her. She could choose her own friends, but she certainly hadn't chosen herself. She had not even chosen to be a human being.

- *Sophie's World* (Gaarder, 1994)

## **2.2 Robert Landy**

### **2.2.1 Introduction**

Robert Landy's role model provides the individual with a means: firstly, to identify the perspective from which she is viewing a certain situation; and secondly, to find alternative, often conflicting perspectives, from which to understand it. Bringing the two ambivalent perspectives into balance with one another is the goal of his drama therapy.

The two primary sources for Landy's theory on role are theatre and sociology. For him theatre is the main source of therapy since role is the connection between stage and every day life. On the other hand, the social sciences have informed his understanding of role as socially determined (1994: 102). Landy builds on the ideas developed in the social sciences during the 1930s when role became a metaphor applied to psychological and social analysis and the notion of world as stage had achieved scientific status in the field of human sciences (Landy, 1993: 19). However, theatre for Landy is not merely a metaphor for understanding human life, theatre and role in particular is "the primary frame of reference for an analysis of social life" (1993: 26).

To accept Landy's emphasis on role as the central concept for successful therapy, it is important to understand how he sees the relationship between everyday life and theatre and between self and role.

### **2.2.2 Relationship Between Art and Nature: Dramatic Paradox**

Landy agrees with the post-modern view that addresses diversity and multiculturalism, recognising that our sense or interpretation of reality is subjective and context dependent (1994: 102). The only access we have to reality is through interpretation and more specifically through dramatic paradox. Interpretation is the product of paradox, of living in two realities at the same time: that of everyday life and that of the imagination, that of actor and that of role. He writes:

...dramatic paradox (is) a notion that well establishes the connection between the world and the stage, and leads to an understanding of the healing potential of drama. (Landy, 1993: 11)

Dramatic paradox in theatre is characterised by the actor who is simultaneously herself and someone else. The actor and the character/role are both separate and merged, and the “non-fictional reality of the actor coexists with the fictional reality of the role” (1993: 11). Referring to Hamlet, Landy writes: “The paradox of drama is to be *and* not to be, simultaneously” (1993: 12). ‘Being’ is the part of the actor that is in role, carrying out the action in the moment, ‘not being’ is the part that is de-rolled, inactive, reflecting upon the action from outside.

This paradox is reminiscent of Boal’s idea of the *spect-actor* as one who acts and reflects upon her action from outside. However, for Landy the moments of acting and watching are not separate, but simultaneous. It also is not just characteristic of actors in the context of theatre, it is true of any human being in everyday existence who needs to make choices and reflect upon their consequences. Drama and theatre, by virtue of the dramatic paradox can become a means of survival, of gaining understanding and control of reality. In this sense everyday life is essentially dramatic in character.

Landy makes an analysis of the origins of role, in order to illustrate how theatre and role have always been one of the most important tools used by humans to gain understanding and control of their lives. In ancient traditional cultures the shaman would take on the role of Rain to ensure a good planting season, or the role of Death to ensure a safe journey for the dead into the unknown (1993: 16). In the religious rituals of Judaism and Christianity, dramatic symbolisation is used to strengthen the faith by representing images or stories from the past. In performing the ritual the role of god-like figure is assumed to ensure transcendence and to assert control (1993: 17). The dramatic play of children also serves as a means of making sense of the world and of learning to control certain aspects of it through symbolic play. In the same way improvisational drama is a form of dramatic play for adults serving the same purpose (1993: 17-18).

Sue Jennings takes the idea of dramatic play as a means of survival and as proof that everyday life is essentially dramatic in character, even further. The idea of the *imagined other*, of playing a role, is present from early childhood as illustrated, for instance, by a child acting out her fears as monsters. Thereafter, since the time of playing doctor-doctor to the time, as adults, we imagine what it would be like to be married, or to

have a certain occupation, drama shapes the way we see ourselves. We frame our personal histories and relate episodes from our lives as though they were part of a play. (1998: 49-67)<sup>4</sup>

Landy makes another important point in his analysis of the origin of role:

...throughout the history of theatre, from the early rituals of traditional cultures through contemporary postmodern performances, certain repeated role types have tended to prevail. (1993: 15)

Landy talks of a 'cast of characters' (1993: 15) found in play scripts from the earliest times to recent days. People categorise one another in terms of types in order to limit the other and so understand him better. It is the same inclination that makes us limit our life experiences by framing them as episodes in a story. From hundreds of play scripts Landy has compiled a taxonomy of roles, 84 in total, categorised in terms of type, quality, function and style. His cast of characters appear not only in theatre but also in every day life, by virtue of our interaction with life through drama. Theatre has become a repository of the roles we use in everyday life.

If everyday life is essentially dramatic in character, role becomes the most important tool of survival. By taking on roles, people gain knowledge and power over everyday life. Such a limited repertoire of roles provides a catalogue of different strategies for survival. Finding the most appropriate role for the situation is one of the main goals of drama therapy as Landy understands it.

However, it is not as simple as it sounds. There is a complication: role ambivalence. Landy writes that because dramatic paradox lies at the heart of role, even the most extreme commitment to a particular role is characterised by ambivalence.

...the human condition—that of having awareness and the propensity for generating roles—makes us cowards and heroes all at once. (1993: 13)

Because role ambivalence "is the natural order of things" (1993: 13), the aim of drama therapy is not to help the client pick a role as a survival strategy for a particular

---

<sup>4</sup> On punctuation: the fact that the reference to the resource here is placed *outside* the full stop indicates that it applies to the entire paragraph, as in the case of blocked quotations. Until now a reference that appeared at the end of a paragraph was placed *inside* the full stop because it referred only to the last sentence of that paragraph.

circumstance, but to help her see the conflicting roles within her situation and to help her negotiate a balance among the roles. It follows that the more roles one is able to play and balance, the greater one's chance of success in overcoming the difficulties one is faced with. Behind this understanding of role ambivalence lies a very particular view of the self as being multiple rather than centred on a core. There is also a very particular understanding of the relationship between self, role, dramatic character creation and story.

### **2.2.3 Relationship of 'Self' to Dramatic Character and Context: Role-Play**

In *Persona and Performance* (1993) Landy builds on the idea of world as stage and people as characters. If the dramatic paradox of living in two worlds at once is the connection between theatre and real life, role is the connection between self and dramatic characters. Landy describes his understanding of self in terms of two movements. Firstly, he identifies a movement away from understanding self in terms of a core identity towards an understanding of the self as many-sided. Secondly, there is a movement away from viewing the self as purely socially determined toward understanding it in terms of the creative action of role-playing within a context.

Landy, like many others, challenges the concept of a core self that contains the essence of being and that can be known. According to this concept of self, therapy would entail accessing the true self in order to expose false 'masks' and 'social roles' that come in conflict with it (1993: 19). Since the 1930s these ideas have been challenged by social scientists such as G.H. Mead (1934) and William James (1950) who start defining the self in terms of compartments such as the 'I' and the 'me'. Self becomes a social construct based on how we are seen by other people. A key theorist in this regard is Ervin Goffman, whose book *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), describes how we create our identities by choosing roles relative to the audience to which we present ourselves.

Such an understanding of the self implies contradictions and splits within the person. Landy agrees with this many-sided picture of the self in contrast with the idea of a core self. However, he goes further by saying that, in order to deal with these splits and ambiguities, there arises

...a need for *stories* (my italics) that support the multitude of splits confronted each day on personal and political levels...These stories need to be peopled not with a self, but with roles that respond to the many ambiguities of being. (1993: 22)

For Landy, a change in the understanding of self leads to a change in how the self is contextualised through stories. Role becomes a way in which people can think about and play out different parts in their life stories. This is because the term *role* addresses the paradoxical and dramatic nature of everyday life.

Where role was merely a 'serviceable metaphor' or a 'social artefact' subsidiary to the more inclusive concept of *self* for Mead and others, Landy sees it as a concept in its own right (1993: 23). Influenced by the ideas of Jacob L. Moreno (1960) and Theodore Sarbin (1954), Landy extends his ideas to include the context within which role is played out. A person is not merely passively responding to social circumstances, she interacts with them actively (1993: 24). There exists an interactive relationship between person and context.

For Landy human beings have three functions within their context. Firstly, they are *role recipients* who receive certain roles based on biological and genetic make up. Secondly, they are *role takers* as they take roles based on how they are viewed by others. Lastly, they are *role-players* who act out their own identity within the context of social circumstances. Human beings are therefore both creations, determined by biological and social factors, and creators of their own identities (1994: 101).

Although there is no core self, the self is not random, aimless and disconnected. Rather, the "human personality is a system of interrelated roles which provide a sense of order and purpose" (1994: 101). Furthermore, the dramatic paradox as embodied within the concept of role, allows a person to see herself in role, even to see herself in ambivalent roles, and therefore to be an active creator of new roles, able also to adapt old ones to new circumstances.

If one needs a concept of centrality or core, I would like to offer that of impersonation. At the center of the person is the ability, the potential to take on other persona. (1996: 116)

Role, therefore, represents the most indivisible part of the human personality. It represents a part, rather than a whole. Yet, it performs a knowable purpose within the context of the life story. Role is, therefore not an entity, a new kind of core, rather it is a relationship between someone and a particular context.

*Story* as the context of the role becomes a second important dramatic frame through which to understand everyday life.

As people take on and play out roles based in the events that make up their lives, they frame stories about themselves in role, which provide an understanding and give meaning to their existence. (Landy, 1993: 26)

Life, then, is a network of stories and people are the characters that invent their own life narratives. The way they do that is through role-play.

Framing the context in terms of a story and understanding the purpose of a particular role can help someone understand themselves. The role is smaller and more conceivable than the entire network of roles that a self is made of. The story is smaller and more conceivable than the entire life of an individual because a story is a section of that life told from the perspective of one of the roles constituting the self. Story and role, become the primary dramatic media for understanding self (Landy, 1996: 99).

In playing a role and telling a story the client in drama therapy enters the imaginative, fictional reality for the purpose of commenting or reflecting upon the everyday reality. (1996: 99)

Role and story serves not only as framing tools for the complexity of this network of roles, in addition it enables a person to gain distance from the complexity of her experiences in order to bring about reflection and therefore transformation and a change of behaviour. This transformation comes as the repertory of roles expands and becomes more integrated. A healthy self is one with a large repertory of roles and high degree of integration between these roles.

## **2.2.4 Key Concepts and Methodology: Role and Distancing**

### **2.2.4.1 Role**

For Landy *role* is the container of all the thoughts and feelings one has about oneself and others in one's social and imaginary worlds, seen from a particular perspective. The

story, told from the perspective of the particular role, is the verbal or gestural text that expresses the role. When someone therefore tells a particular story, fictional or otherwise, the role, or chosen perspective, is exposed to others (1996: 99). This happens through role taking and role-playing. *Role taking* is the mental process of assuming the role. *Role-playing* is the physical behaviour that flows from the chosen role.

Role taking is a complex dramatic process that occurs when someone internalises the qualities of a role. The individual sees herself as some one else. She is subject and object at the same time. This 'someone else', this role, can be based on an actual role model, for example a parent, or a fictional role model, for example an imaginary image of a hero. Role taking can happen through imitation, identification, projection or transformation (Landy, 1994: 107-110).

*Imitation* happens when, for instance a baby imitates the movements and sounds of significant others. *Identification* happens on a deeper level when a child not only imitates the mother's movements, but also takes on her feelings and values. *Projection* occurs when one imagines another to be like oneself as in puppet play or doll play.

*Transference*, according to Landy, is when a person views an actual role in terms of a symbolic one. So, one may view one's friend (actual) as a mother (symbolic), or one's pupil as son. Other writers have referred to the same process as 'transformation' (Jones, 1996: 47; Schechner, 1988: 110). Transference, or transformation, causes people to symbolically recreate reality in terms of their subjective worldview. Transference is an "imaginative act of transforming individuals into archetypes" (Landy, 1994: 109). It is of great importance to the drama therapist since the client uses transference to give symbolic shape to past experiences and feelings. This can only happen, however, when the role is externalised through role-play.

If role taking is an internal, mental process, role-playing is the external enactment of that role. The relationship between taking on the role and playing it out, is reciprocal. In role-playing the person embodies the role, or persona, externally, but at the same time the person projects internal qualities of herself onto the role. In the embodiment of the role, the internal feelings and values of a person are exposed. This is extremely important for the therapist and client, because:

If I can know my actual and fictional role models, then I can have a good idea what I value and who I am. (Landy, 1994: 115)

The taxonomy of roles as a source for all the different roles people play out can be used to help identify the different personae that are taken on and played out and so present the opportunity to draw the parameters of the roles in the system that makes up the self. For easy access the taxonomy is categorised in terms of role type, quality, function and style.

*Role type* refers to a meaningful form that contains related role qualities (1994: 103). A client named Anne identified with Hansel in a workshop where the story of Hansel and Gretel was used as a starting point for therapy. So doing she identified with the role of hero. (Landy, 1993: 111-137)

By *role quality*, Landy means the distinguishing attributes of the role. Some role qualities within a type are contradictory and then demand the creation of a subtype. So for instance, the role type 'Lover' has as sub-type 'Narcissist' (1994: 103-104). The qualities of the hero may be used to help the client Anne to understand herself better: protector, rescuer, creative problem-solver. It can be further explored by looking at qualities of subtypes such as anti-hero, or pilgrim. (1996: 128-131)

Each role is taken on and played out with a specific *function* or purpose in mind. Every role can serve its player in a certain way: victims relinquish control, mothers nurture, revolutionaries rebel against the established order etc (1994: 104). The role of Hansel served the client by helping her to deal with her alcoholic father. She used the role to help her protect the other members of her family against him. (1993: 112-113)

Finally, each role is played out in a particular manner or *style*. The style of a role is determined by its closeness or separation from reality. The more distant the role from reality e.g. using puppets or masks, the less it is played with emotional intensity; the closer to reality, e.g. realistic role-play, the more emotional it becomes. Style becomes a tool in the hand of the therapist to help the client gain distance from painful situations, or to face their emotional intensity, depending on the specific need of the client. (1994: 104-105)

Using the taxonomy, the therapist can follow an eight step process where the role, and therefore some of the beliefs and values of the client, is externalised, concretised and

reflected upon so that transformation can take place. Note that the steps do not necessarily follow one after the other, they may overlap and interweave with one another.

Step one is the *invocation of the role*. Because any one role only embodies some of the beliefs a person has about life, it is important that the chosen role embodies beliefs that are conflicting and need resolution. According to Landy the unconscious knows where the person's needs lie and through spontaneous play and the identification with certain characters in stories, the necessary role arises instinctively. (1993: 46-47)

The second step is the *naming of the role*. This helps to draw the boundaries of the role and separate it from the rest of the role system. It also encourages the participant to fictionalise the role and take the first step into the paradox of the dramatic process: simultaneously being oneself and not being oneself. (1993: 47-48)

The more finite and clearly the parameters of the role are drawn, the more the client is able to explore its infinite possibilities. Exploring the possibilities is the next step in the process called the playing out or *working through of the role*. This is done through various forms of enactment, like improvised dramas in groups, or in-role story telling by individuals. Working through, says Landy, always occurs in role and "is most successful when clients are able to fully accept the fictional reality of the drama" (1993: 49). Further insight is gained as the role is *explored in terms of its internal qualities*, or the qualities of sub-types (step four). This is most often how internal contradictions or ambivalence is discovered. So a nurturing mother may find within herself a manipulator. (1993: 50-51)

The next couple of steps are about connecting the fictional role to everyday life. Step five is *reflecting on the role*. By initially limiting the reflection to the role-play, the participant retains a safe distance and she is able to talk about her role without having to confront herself directly (1993: 51). Thereafter the discussion moves *to relating the role to everyday life* (step six). Where the previous step focused on discussing the qualities, function and style of the role/s, this step asks how those same qualities, functions and styles play themselves out in the life of the client. It is also important to discuss how the role differs from the way the client behaves since the personality is always much larger and more complex than a single role. (1993: 52-53)

The last two steps lead to consolidation. Step seven involves the *integration of the explored roles to create a functional role system*. That is, to bring the ambivalent roles into balance so that one role or a handful of roles, do not overpower the system. Landy admits that it is hard to assess exactly how and when this happens, but it comes through understanding the relationship between ambivalent roles and making peace with both the positive and negative aspects of a role (1993: 54). The last step is that of *social modelling*. For the client to break the pattern of dysfunctional behaviour, she needs to act out the changed behaviour by modelling qualities of other roles that have been liberated.

An alcoholic is always an alcoholic, but the power of that one role can be diminished as other, less dependent ones, such as the helper, the elder, and the orthodox believer; are developed and modelled. (Landy 1993: 56)

Throughout the process of role-taking, role-playing and reflection, the concept of distance between player and role is of significance.

#### 2.2.4.2 *Distancing*

*Distancing* is the separation between thought and feeling. It is an important separation, because in order for an individual to be critical about her system of beliefs, she needs to remove herself from the intense emotions associated with those beliefs. Landy's theory on distancing focuses attention on an important issue that has not yet been identified and was not addressed by Boal directly either. There is an intense emotional component to the role one chooses to take on and the beliefs represented by that role. This emotional connection complicates the process of stepping back from and criticising those beliefs and the underlying values.

Landy identifies various degrees of distancing on a continuum between over distancing and under distancing. In everyday life an *over distanced* person is one who is analytical and rational, always needing to create rigid boundaries between themselves and others. An *under distanced* person is one who seeks both physical and emotional closeness, who empathises easily with others, seeing themselves reflected in their behaviour (1994: 112).

The continuum not only describes a person's relationship to actual others, but also to the 'other' as represented by the roles one takes on and plays out. In these terms an

over distanced person is one who is not only disconnected from others outside, but also from herself. She is rigid and over controlled with a very limited repertory of roles in her system, which she plays with little flexibility. Over distance is a state of repression, where a person blocks herself from experiencing emotion. She may remember past emotional experiences, but does not allow herself to feel anything. (1994: 113)

The under distanced person, on the other hand, is one who has little emotional control, is vulnerable and needy. Her repertory of roles is too expansive and roles merge into each other with little distinction. Under distance is characterised by a continual return of repressed feelings. Such a person is often overwhelmed by painful experiences and lives in a state of anxiety. (1994: 113)

Midway between over distance and under distance, one finds *aesthetic distance*. Here catharsis takes place because painful memories can both be remembered and relived, but with a sufficient balance between present and past, actual experience and fictional enactment. At aesthetic distance one is able to play the role of the object, who relives the past; and the subject, who reflects on the past, *at the same time*. One is able to be an over distanced observer and an under distanced enactor simultaneously. It is experiencing the emotion without being overwhelmed by it. This causes a psychic tension that is often released physically through laughter, shaking, blushing or crying. Such behaviour signifies the occurrence of catharsis. (1994: 114)

Catharsis, says Landy, is the ability to recognise that the contradictions in one's life can exist simultaneously. It is the moment of recognising the dramatic paradox, of seeing oneself playing two roles at once. It is accepting ambivalence (1994: 114). Balancing of roles and integration into the role system is the result of catharsis.

Catharsis often happens naturally in the identification with a character in a story, but only if aesthetic distance is achieved. Boal's criticism of Aristotle's definition of empathy in Greek tragedy can now be understood from a different perspective. An audience member identifying with a character in a story may become under distanced, unable to maintain the faculty of critical thinking that Boal tries to retain. Brecht, on the other hand suggests an over distanced position, where the audience member does not get emotionally involved at all, remaining at a critical distance. For Landy, Aristotle and

Brecht find themselves at opposite ends of the continuum. For him, the way to ensure that a dramatic presentation creates aesthetic distance for an audience member is for a therapist to be present who can guide the process.

The drama therapist can use this relationship between person and character, or rather the role symbolised by the character, to help create aesthetic distance, by applying the role method discussed above (1994: 114-115).

### **2.2.5 Critical Analysis**

I will analyse Robert Landy's work firstly in relation to that of Augusto Boal and secondly in relation to the needs of the multi-cultural class of adolescents.

Landy agrees with Boal that Brecht's idea of distancing audience from characters is incomplete leaving the audience powerless to act. For Landy it is not desirable for audience members only to think about what is happening on stage, it is also important for them to feel (1994: 111). Otherwise a state of over distancing is maintained and catharsis cannot occur. However, he agrees with Brecht, and with Boal, that pure emotional empathy with characters is not sufficient either. Observation and reflection, is equally important. The moment of aesthetic distance can best be achieved through role-play where the client is both spectator and actor, just like in Boal's work, but under the guidance of a therapist. Boal's version of a therapist is the Joker, but his role is not so much helping the participant to relate her dramatic action to her life, as it is to entice her into participating in the first place.

There are some other important differences between Boal's work and that of Landy. Firstly, in Landy's idea of role-play, the client is not playing herself, but only a part of herself as symbolised by the role she is taking on. Furthermore, the role is fictional and only compares with her personal reality in type and quality. Lastly and most importantly, the client plays not just one role, but explores the same story from the perspective of many roles and so comes to a greater insight into the various feelings, thoughts and values that are exposed by the different roles. She then learns to accept ambivalence and contradiction, and balance is restored.

It may be argued that Boal's Rainbow of Desire techniques aim to achieve the same thing, externalising all the different voices or desires, within the individual. However the source of 'voices' in Boal's work is the individual and those in the forum who identify with her. Landy provides an external source of possible 'voices' or roles – the taxonomy of roles - and can therefore present more conflicting perspectives.

For the purpose of devising a programme on values for adolescents in a multicultural class, Landy's work offers some interesting possibilities but also asks for some re-interpretation.

Firstly, the idea of distancing provides the necessary tool to help adolescents gain distance between their actions and their emotions as suggested by Emunah (1994). Using fictional roles in fictional stories is one way of achieving such distance.

Furthermore, Landy's idea of the self as consisting of a system of interrelated roles may prove useful for learners who need to come to terms with a wide range of belief systems often presenting them with conflicting values. His idea of leading the individual to accept ambivalence and to use role to mediate between herself and others, is also appealing. However, the tool Landy puts forth for helping the individual in identifying the conflicting voices: the taxonomy of roles proves problematic.

By his own admission the source of his taxonomy is limited to Western theatre. Ditty Dokter (1995) finds the idea of a limited repertory of possible roles to choose from to be reductionist and potentially impotent when applied to clients from other cultures. She argues that it not only limits one's choice of roles, but also interaction, or rather, interchanging of roles. This is so because qualities are limited to certain roles and not 'allowed' to mingle with qualities that belong to other roles. All in all the taxonomy limits people's creativity and possible ways of being.

This is where Landy's work is most limiting. Not only does he restrict the participants' creativity in ways of being but also their creativity in creating and playing out characters in new situations. Agreeably some kind of limitation is necessary: the purpose of this study is finding a frame through which the self in all its complexity can be limited in order to understand it. However, it proposes a different approach: creating a character, whose attributes and actions are limited by clear dramatic character creation

and not by a single role whose qualities and purpose have been predetermined. The proposed programme wants to use the very creation of a character and the development of that character by playing it out in the context of new stories as a parallel process to discovering self.

It now becomes necessary to make a clear distinction between character and role. For the sake of this study a *character* is a fictional system of roles, a fictional self. The same character can play many different roles, just as the same person can. If characters are limited to one role only the character cannot be used to frame the self. In this sense the character is larger than the role. However, the same *role* may be played by a character in a story as well as by the person in real life, e. g. the role of victim. This is how role creates the connection between drama and real life and ensures a way of learning from the drama. In this sense role is larger than character.

The devising of a fully rounded character, who can undergo growth in fictional contexts, opens up two possibilities. Firstly, the character can be explored in many different ways, role being but one of them. Role may be used to create the character by looking at roles in stories familiar to an individual. Or, once the character is created, it can be further built upon by looking at possible roles it might play within its fictional context. By using role to understand characters, pupils get practice in using role to understand self. If the character is created through spontaneous improvisation and story-telling, the initial role of the character will still be one the pupil identifies with, as suggested by Landy in the invocation of the role. However, that character may be expanded upon using character creation techniques derived from theatre practitioners across the spectrum. Such an approach will not limit anyone's creativity in the use of roles, because role will be just one of many ways in which the character will be explored.

Secondly, possibilities open up with regards to the contexts and stories that the character finds himself in. If the character is not limited by a particular story, but by clear character creation, the possibilities for situations the character may end up in, are vast. The character may be put into many different situations, ones that test his beliefs, and the way he reacts within the situation will provide information for reflection. Landy also works with many different stories, existing ones and ones made up by the client, but

while the role remains the same, the characters keep changing. The role of victim is, for instance, played out by many different characters in many different stories. In a sense this study suggests the opposite: many different stories and the possibility of many roles, but the character remains clearly defined and his actions motivated from within set parameters.

What is needed now is a way of defining these parameters, in order to create clear characters that offer enough complexity to open up possibilities for growth, but who are limited for their actions within particular situations to be dictated by the parameters. In the context of the study these parameters would have to include beliefs and values. To find a model for creating such characters the discussion turns to the field of actor training and specifically the work of Gary Izzo and Bertolt Brecht. For a model that would supply the parameters for the creation of a story that would enable the characters to grow, the work of Christopher Vogler in the field of script writing will be studied.