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Perhaps Lexicon itself needs a definition. Although to have included it amongst our 26 entries here might have been a little too self-referential.

A Lexicon – we might also have called it a glossary – is a list of the keywords used within a particular field or profession. In critical theory the most famous example is Raymond Williams’ Keywords (1976), which describes itself as a vocabulary of culture and society. For us this Lexicon is a vocabulary of theatre and performance (or at least 26 alphabetical possibilities).

A Lexicon is in many ways a product of the world in which it has currency. The contents of this Lexicon reflect the values and obsessions of our contemporary theatre practice. It is no mistake that some traditional keywords associated with theatre – such as catharsis, director; protagonist – are missing; replaced with others – body, risk, text – that speak of the kinds of performance and aesthetics within which we operate. Our Lexicon says something about who we think we are.

At the same time our Lexicon, our vocabulary, might without our knowing it start to limit and determine the nature of our practice. We risk thinking only within the patterns and models determined by the Lexicon at our disposal, without easily being able to stray beyond those boundaries.

Unlike a dictionary this Lexicon does not always seek to offer definitions, sometimes it won’t even give you their meanings. Instead this Lexicon engages with values, with usages, with possibilities and with the performance of language.
Our whole world is a multitude of matrices engaged in interaction. Things rubbing up against stuff and stuff rubbing up against other things. A buzzing hive of activity breathing with sweet and sticky actions. Our feelings and our thoughts are honey. Our action – our every motion – is our lifework.

We are active. Even when we are asleep and breathing – we are dreaming. And we are in contact. Right now we are in contact. This is telepathy – this act of reading – and you are active in it.

You are activating this text. Now. You always have a role to play. In everything. You are significant. Without you the world would be entirely different. Because you are a part of its body. Your actions are its actions. Its actions are yours. So throw yourself into it.

And here is a warning:

If you convince yourself that you do not have a role to play – if you say ‘I’m not important’ – then you will disappear. Your hive will be empty. Your ribcage will be empty. Your mind will be blank. You will give up. And when the day comes to take action – when the world is in motion and the tides are about to turn in your favour – you will lie down and die. Your dying words will be: ‘I am not part of this’. Such lies! You are part of this. You are a part of everything. You always have been.

The French phenomenologist Maurice Merleau-Ponty highlighted the centrality of the lived body (Leib), which provides the medium with which we as people come into being and access the world.

The body is in flux; vacillating between different modes of perceptual orientation. Creative practice and performance experience is a constant reminder that bodies, our bodies, are not limited by the boundaries of the skin, but they are subject to what Garner terms ‘transformation, modification and multiple modes of disclosure’.

Theatre and performance provide a platform, a laboratory of immediate exchange and encounter between bodies – the performers, the observers – modulated in response to different mechanisms, techniques, media, patterns and conventions involved in a performance at any particular moment in time. In the realm of performance, the body is proven constantly to be a site of discovery.

Most importantly in performance the body is never just an object – unless it is ‘forced’ to become one. Rather it is a live conduit that opens up the subject to new possibilities of experience.
that when the audience arrive they experience something truly magnificent. As a member of this community you know when to lead and when to bite your tongue; you work ‘t’il 1am painting the ceiling black and start again at 6am looking at the budgets. You do it because you care, because you don’t want to let your people down, because what you do matters.

Prefix: often understood to mean less than, below par, amateur, specialist, or ‘other’.

If we take the noun ‘community’ and place it before something – community art, … theatre, … music, … dance – we typically find a new meaning entirely.

Art made by ‘communities’ and not ‘artists’ is often misunderstood; sometimes dismissed as not ‘proper’ art, but instead an amateur attempt at impersonating the ‘real’ thing. This ignores that the vast majority of art endeavours are not produced in isolation, they are the product of the community within which they are made. Arguably all art is community art and any art that doesn’t pay heed to its context is unlikely to be any good.

Thankfully Joseph Beuys brought this debate to a close with his repeated proclamations that ‘everyone is an artist’. That really is the best starting point one can begin with when doing anything in a ‘community arts’ context.

Dramaturgy is one of those offbeat words.

It is a curious term most commonly associated with the role of the dramaturg (a critical friend), whose task (of many examples) might be to tease out of a creative work-in-progress developed thinking about how space, time, action, language and structure relate or juxtapose.

Commonly, the dramaturg has been described as the ‘outside eye’. However, as Synne Behrndt observes, it is valuable to examine the dramaturg not as an objective, detached and authoritative analysis producing machine. We might, in particular, want to question the construction of internal/external and viewer/maker in a way that challenges the concept of dramaturgy itself. As a result dramaturgy as a concept does not always exist through a conscious intervention by a person in a role, but emerges in the abstract, out of the material constructed and has a particular flow, shape, rhythm and developing inner logic.

Dramaturgy offers collaborative possibilities to both the subject and architecture of theatre and enables the development of a script, text or score. Dramaturgy is also the process of examining and unpacking composition, because performance making is fluid. Fragments can be viewed in relation to one another; their similarities, differences and returning concepts form a specific identity where artists create a signature way of working and shape their own dramaturgy. A 20th Century example is found in Brecht’s valuable fracture points where, according to Pope, actors were encouraged ‘to explore the problems and possibilities of plays both through their own improvisation and through alternative scripts’.

In studio practice, I find creative material is often in dialogue with an evolving dramaturgy when the practice matures to a point of creative complexity – when action and text (or text and action) reveal several layers of imagination. Remember that familiar moment in the space when we know ‘it works’ but we don’t know why? This phenomenon, of what we may encounter as the ‘epiphany’, offers the process of dramaturgy some vital stepping stones towards a richer ecology of performance; an exciting invitation to develop context and to nurture a more defined practice in a complex, slippery world.
Most of us probably think of ethics as institutional procedures we must go through. Student performances or applied practice involving risk for the performer, participant or audience must be flagged up by tutors and obtain ethical clearance. This inevitably entails the completion of lengthy forms and much discussion over tiny details. The task is often complicated by risk-averse bureaucracy and becomes a time consuming evil.

Let’s consider some hypotheticals. If we are devising a piece of theatre based upon a family member’s experience, our ethical considerations might begin with obtaining permission to tell the story; ensuring that they understand the repercussions of their experiences being made public; and considering the degree of control and ownership participants have over the content of the final piece. If we are facilitating a series of theatre workshops with inmates of a prison we might consider how the intervention would be beneficial to them (and not just to ourselves and our career/grades).

It would be important to know how we would keep ourselves and other facilitators safe during workshops and to have strategies of how we might manage difficult situations and disclosure of personal information. During individual workshops, if exploring difficult themes, it would be important to consider the emotional state of participants in the closing section, and plan exercises that might distance them from the work they’ve done.

If we are creating a performance in which we intend to scare or shock our audience we must consider the implications of this. We cannot assume that audience members will be in good physical or mental health. We might consider how to build necessary expectations before the event and what support it might be necessary to offer afterwards. In each of these contexts, ethics is an act of reflective practice. It is a conscious engagement with and taking of responsibility for the effect of our practice upon both ourselves and the people we engage with. Such reflection asks us to question whether we are doing harm through our actions and take measures to prevent or reduce that potential.

Constant questioning of the ethical repercussions of our work is essential to professional practice and wholly necessary to ensure the ethical answerability of the work that we produce.

Once upon a time, folk was a story, a dance, a tune, a song, and a way of life. Once upon a time, folk was learnt by heart and embodied in the daily lives of successive generations of farmers, fishermen, housewives, itinerant workers and other working people. Once upon a time, folk culture was the culture.

Today, certainly for the majority of people born in the Western world, life seems far more complex and less certain and folk has become something of the past. We live in more mobile and fragmented societies, without such strong genealogical connections to people and place in which folk is rooted. Today we are sometimes afraid of the connections between folk and fascism; or fear that folk is empty nostalgia; or that folk is inherently unfashionable.

But we need to remember that folk is singing for fun; it is dancing for joy and making something purely for the love of it. Folk is you and me. Folk is us and we and love and life. Folk is what holds us together. Folk is what makes us.

Folk might be wearing a knitted jumper and singing with a finger in your ear. Folk might be found in some dark back room of a pub where real ale is sold and bell-clad Morris dancers single and double step around the car park to mark the beginning of a new year. Folk might be traditional costumes worn for the opening ceremony of the Olympics, and for photographs on tourist information centre walls.

Folk might no longer be the preserve of an oral/aural tradition located within a specific community, but just as with much else about our culture has become more fluid and multiple. Folk today is both local and global; folk today is naturally multicultural. Folk today is perhaps typified by projects such as Imagined Village, where fiddles and guitars are combined with drums and sitars; or by The Lock In, a theatre show that unites clog and Morris dancing with street dance, hip hop and human beat-box.

There’s nowt as queer as folk.
4. A number is mathematical unit used to measure, label or count. There are negative numbers, rational numbers, irrational numbers, perfect numbers, even hyperreal numbers. And then there are grades. Either way they are just numbers and only operate within mathematical system in which they relate to other numbers.

5. Remember that the number has been honestly and painfully reached.

6. Remember that the number is inadequate.

7. Remember that the number doesn't relate to you. It isn't you being graded, but the work being measured against a particular set of criteria.

8. Remember that old counting song: 1, 2 miss a few. 99, 100. It wont help but it might put a smile on your face.

9. Contemplate alternatives. Rather than a grade you get... cake? Double chocolate cake for rich, complex and deeply textured work; a dried-out sponge cake for dry and spongy work.

10. Carrot cake for liberal minded work.

11. Parsnip cake for worthy but indigestible work.

12. Devil’s food cake for risqué work.

13. Enjoy the cake when it is good, shrug your shoulders when it is bad and think about changing the recipe. But don’t fixate on the cake. Remember the cake is just a cake.

There are good reasons to be afraid of the dark. Somewhere between science and superstition, there is another world; a world of darkness. More horrible than horror! More terrible than terror! Expect nothing less than sheer... Horror. How much SHOCK can YOU stand?

Satan's done waitin’. There is something evil out there... Possessed by a force that doesn't belong to this world - and it's going to kill me!

'I warned you not go out tonight.' Pass the warning. Enter at your own risk. Horror has found a new home.

This woman has just cut, chopped, broken, and burned five men beyond recognition... but no jury in America would ever convict her. The men she loved lived to love no others! They won't stay dead! See them dig from their graves and put to work as slaves to murder. Sometimes dead is better.

Do you know what the most FRIGHTENING thing in the world is? Apparitions? Evils? Corruptions? They're here. Night monster with the blood lust of a savage beast! The terrifying lover who died - yet lived! The night HE came home. Demon to some. Angel to others. The devil inside. Meet... The CREEPER! It crawls... it creeps... it eats you alive! You'll never go in the water again. Human zombies rise from their coffins as living corpses! Can They Be Stopped? Clawing monster from a lost age strikes from the Amazon's forbidden depths! Just when you thought it was safe to go back in the water. Everything that makes life worth leaving!

Imagine your worst fear a reality. They're back. Those who foretold it are dead. Those who can stop it are in grave danger. The lucky ones died first... Who will survive and what will be left of them?

Who said the dead don't walk? SCREAM... no one will hear you! RUN... and the silent footsteps will follow, for the dead are restless! Watch out! They get you while you're sleeping. A scream that wakes you up might be your own. If Nancy doesn't wake up screaming, she won't wake up at all. In space, no one can hear you scream.

Check in. Relax. Take a shower. Houses don’t have memories. Whatever you do... DON’T GO INTO THE ATTIC.

Once you've seen it, you will never again feel safe in the dark. This Is Horror!

MR.
IMAGINATION

‘You can kill a King without a sword and light a fire without a match. What needs to burn is your imagination.’ Konstantin Stanislavski

The first time I read this quote by Stanislavski it sent a thrill up my spine. It seemed to encapsulate completely the uniqueness of the theatre experience for both actor and audience. Theatre is the product of the imagination. As an audience, we don’t need actuality on stage to be moved or be encouraged to think. We can imagine, we can fill in the gaps, we too can sign up to Stanislavski’s Magic If... (if this were real...). We can go on the journey with the performance.

But we do need to be convinced. And this, of course, requires the actor’s imagination to be the significant other. If the actor can sufficiently imagine they are lighting that fire without the appropriate tool, than we can buy into it as well. Many, many times when working with young actors I have said – if you can just see it in your head, the audience will too. Odd but true.

It is this unspoken contract, a pact that both actor and audience will hold up their side of the bargain and make sure their corner of the imaginative cloth doesn’t drop on the floor, which makes theatre. At its best it is a truly collective art form.

In considering a play for performance, I have often considered one simple question: would it work better on screen? If it would, then maybe it’s not the best choice for the stage. I love the space that is left in theatre to be filled by the audience, to provoke questions through suggestion, rather than supply all the naturalistic detail of a setting. Doing so demands an active mental engagement from its audience rather than telling them everything so there is almost nothing left for them to contribute.

As well as imagination, ‘I’ here could also have stood for Idealistic. Most theatre makers are, as no matter how much mediocre or simply ‘good’ work we end up making or seeing we still believe theatre can be a life-changing experience. And this is because theatre allows us to imagine ourselves differently. When we consider the increasingly complex global challenges that human beings are being faced with, surely this is a muscle that we need to exercise?

JOUISSANCE

Jouissance is the kind of word we come across in difficult bits of critical theory. It is sometimes translated as bliss, occasionally as pleasure, but more often left simply in the original. Perhaps in italics – jouissance – to warn us that we are about to encounter strange foreign concepts that will be beyond our Anglo-Saxon comprehension.

In terms of current use, the word was popularized – if that is the right term for what remains fairly obscure literary terminology – by the writings of Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes. It has, we are frequently told, a sense of sexual pleasure.

Pausing, we might again wonder about good, solid and more familiar Anglo-Saxon alternatives.

A way forward can be glimpsed in Barthes’ ‘The Pleasure of the Text’ where he makes a distinction between texts of pleasure (plaisir) and texts of bliss (jouissance).

Texts of pleasure are texts that content; that give us a sense of comfort and familiarity. We might think of these as the artistic equivalent of a well-used armchair, which holds us and satisfies us and which we welcome returning to at the end of a long day thinking. There is nothing inherently wrong with such things, but they don’t challenge either us or the culture we are within. Rather the opposite, they are linked to comfortable practices of consumption and maintain rather than break the cultural status quo.

Texts of bliss by contrast, are far more disturbing. These are experiences and encounters with art that we cannot simply assign to known expectations or familiar patterns of consumption. They might, instead, entail a sense of loss, of being up-rooted from engrained patterns, of being surprised by the intensity and urgency of the encounter. They might result in jouissance.

There is perhaps a parallel to be made with Peter Brooks’ concept of ‘deadly theatre’, which often involves good plays performed by good actors in good theatres. This is comfortable, secure, pleasurable even – but seldom an encounter that will engulf or transform the spectator. ‘Real art’ writes Susan Sontag, ‘has the capacity to make us nervous’ and this is the domain of jouissance.
Kindness

Kindness is not a luxury, but something fundamental to the theatre making process. No matter what the experience or background of the performer, the act of performing will always involve risk. Rehearsals involve testing ideas, exploring text, and discovering character, all of which expose the performer to potential criticism or to different forms of failure. This can be seen by the associated language within rehearsals, such as ‘offers,’ ‘gifts,’ and ‘present.’ These risks are often what make exciting, new and dynamic theatre, and are only able to exist if received with an open mind and heart – i.e. with kindness.

Of course, that’s not to deny the existence of egos, prima donna and the bully, as well as the ambiguity around what is defined as an act of kindness.

Kindness should not be confused with being nice. Directness, honesty and ambition are undoubtedly beneficial qualities, but theatre making is a collaborative game: voices need to be heard, backs need to be scratched, and the extra mile always needs to be gone. Kindness is knowing that theatre making involves bringing different people – all of whom have different ideas and skills – together for a collective aim.

Perhaps the link between theatre making and being kind runs deeper than convenience. At its core, theatre is about people and their world. Theatre makers practice empathy: the act of sharing and understanding the feelings of another. Initially, theatre makers must empathise with their characters within the performance. They then empathise with those they are working with: other performers, crew, stage managers, funders. And finally (or perhaps foremost) they empathise with their audience. A theatre makers’ job is to facilitate one group of people to invest with the action on stage, a job nearly impossible without the ability to empathise.

Kindness is about how we relate to others in a manner that is actively considerate, actively giving, actively empathetic.

It was almost like I was straddling, not on, but between and over two borders. A margin with a double identity: both Syria and Iraq. I was on one side, behind the starting line, ready to go but without ammunition. On the other side were mum and dad, waving their own flag whilst clinging onto the material of my t-shirt, holding me back. Then, I was sat on the edge of something, peering out over a jagged cut in the landscape, watching a light climb towards me through the darkness, growing larger.

Now, I am sat on the fourth wall, my feet dangle over the edge of the stage, into the orchestra pit. A foot behind me and perhaps twenty five meters up rests the lintel, a solid state of affairs that holds the rest of the frame in place. A foot further and we can see the top of the curtain, a thin veil between the real of the auditorium and the performed of the stage behind. In this empty space I can become the moon that waxes and wanes, the snake who, in a deathly deception, appears to die only to shed its old skin and appear in a new one.

The space becomes a wild abyss, the womb of nature and perhaps her grave, of neither sea, nor shore, nor air, nor fire, but all these in their pregnant courses mixed.

Before me is the auditorium – all permanent grace, made from matter and sewn into the red velvet of the rows upon rows of seats lined up below the showstopper; the chandelier. Later tonight, those same seats will be filled with hundreds of people, each bringing with them their wishes and desires, their pains and troubles. As they watch the transportations of the performers on stage, they too will be going through some transitions of their own. Some will be pregnant, about to give birth; others will have just started a new job. There will be teenagers in the audience, young lovers and couples who are engaged to be married. There will be newborns and elderly people, each on the edges of their lives. Each journey, each life-stage of the audience will reflect itself into and onto my performance.

So I sit on this border: between the physical communication of images and the dreams of my audience. And I look a while. For my journey begins here and I can become anything within this liminal space.
Imagine lying down. Imagine lying on warm sand, or a wooden floor, or long grass.

Your body lowering as you give in to gravity. The reaching, bending, anticipating; the folding and collapsing of joints and releasing into the ground.

Imagine lying on your living room floor and noticing the sudden change of horizon as the entire room tilts and the crystals in your inner ear adjust and reconfigure. Impulses fire and arrive at the same time. Your pupils slowly contract to the size of a pinhead. You’re forever moving. Your arms are nestling in your shoulders, silently humming and lengthening. Scapulae like blades, widening and embracing your back. Your pelvis, hollow from intention, still remembers the shifting of weight when you leant forwards and the momentary falling as you took a step to keep yourself upright. You step and catch. Legs now comfortably resting with blood vessels busy carrying and delivering are crowded, urgent and spiralling through pathways.

The gentle winding of fibres, from your inner arches to your hip sockets, keeps one space open and closes another, like two winding staircases wrapping around and arriving at your spine. Doing and undoing.

Your mass on the wooden floor, grass or sand, an ever renewing of cells, re-organising while you wait. Splitting and dying while you sleep and eat. Warm breath softening your ribcage as you exhale. Your diaphragm sending it back skywards as you inhale. Just like that. Your eye sockets cup your flickering eyes, still vividly recalling images and playing back frame after frame as your muscles remember. Reels of moving stills passing, pausing, leaving. You twitch involuntarily as your flesh separates from your bones, loosening their grip and pulls away. Carved into your frame and leaving pathways are the millions of actions dormant and stored in your cells, bones and muscle fibres.

**Movement**

*Movements, performed and choreographed daily, pattern and mould your tiniest of gestures; pattern your voluntary and involuntary actions and anticipate your rising back to standing and your decisions thereafter.*

**Narrative**

The dictionary tells us that narrative is a narrative account.
The dictionary tells us that narrative is a story.
The dictionary tells us that narrative is the art, technique or process of narrating.

My English teacher told me to never start a piece of writing with a dictionary definition.

My English teacher told me to never split my infinitives.

My English teacher told me that George Orwell wrote: ‘Good writing should be like a window pane’.

My English teacher told me not to rely too much on quotations.

My English teacher told me to find my own voice.

My English teacher told me to avoid repetition at the start of sentences.

I am breaking the rules.
With narrative, there are no rules.
With narrative, there is only potential.

A narrative can happen in a haiku.
A narrative can happen on a page.
A narrative can happen on a stage.
A narrative can be fictional or factual.
A narrative can be biographical or autobiographical.

Walter Benjamin wrote: ‘The traces of the storyteller cling to the story the way the handprints of the potter cling to the clay vessel.’
We will leave our handprints on the stories we tell.

When I think of narrative I think of a quote from Matthew Goulsh’s book 39 Microlectures: In proximity of performance: ‘Some words speak of events. Other words events make us speak’.

When I think of narrative I think not so much about what it is but why it is. *Why are you telling this story? Why are you telling it? Why are you telling this story? Why is it a story? Why is it? Find a story that only you can tell. Tell it in a way that only you can tell it. Goulsh suggests you read Italo Calvino’s If on a winter’s night a traveller.*

It is a book all about narratives. I wish my English teacher had told me about that. But some things we have to find out for ourselves.
Like the stories only we can tell.
O looks very like a circle. It’s a bit squished but otherwise quite circular. O is also a bit nought. A little zero. Nothing like. It is also central to God.

Modernism had as its shiniest trick the ability to ‘move from zero’, to step outside the paradigm and start from nothing. It created an original not a development ‘of’ tradition. Priding itself on conjuring up the new and shocking us with its leaps, its fountains (Duchamp), its silence (Cage), its endless postponement (Beckett). But even as the shock was still wearing off we were told that it wasn’t original, it was only a ‘tissue of quotations’ cobbled together to give the illusion of the new. In fact underneath the copies of copies lies... nothing. Truth hides the truth that there is no truth (work that one out if you can).

Plato had originals, perfect blueprints, though we only ever saw imperfect replicants. Bjorn Again are the original Abba tribute band. Fosters is the original Australian lager. And in the beginning of it all was... well who knows, but if 13 (unlucky for some) billion years ago a universe poofed into existence then it, and its minuscule unevenness, may have some claim to being the originator of all things different.

The bit about the circle? Oh yes. We can walk around the circle to infinity but we will notice that the ground repeats. We started somewhere but that was an arbitrary starting point. The circle itself doesn’t have a start or an end, yet is complete in itself (no originality these circles). It is an ouroboros, a snake eating its own tail. An infinity that is a totality. A thing with a severe identity crisis.

God? Oh yes, that as well. Same argument as for the universe really, the first thing and all that. But truthfully, it was just that there is an O in the middle.
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Let’s talk Queer! I’ll try not to lisp too much...

Since the taboo of homosexuality has slowly began to lift in Western society (and I say lift with the intention of removal), it seems culture has discovered that the giant homosexual chainsaw, which had been precariously dangling above their heads, isn’t as dangerous as once thought, resulting in a boom of queer pop-culture insurrection. With television programmes such as Queer as Folk and Queer Eye for the Straight Guy emerging from the closet, the days of censorship are slowly phasing out, making way for decades of suppressed nonconformity. This is the Dawn of the Age of A-queer-ius! And rising from it, comes the rather imaginatively named, ‘Queer Theory’.

At face value, Queer Theory seems a rather insensitive concept. It implies that in secret labs around the world, there reign seasoned experts in Queerology (unofficial term), scrutinising [us] non-heteronormative folk like abnormalities, in an attempt to comprehend the ways of the gays! But as deliciously paranoidal as it sounds, there is an element of ‘other-ness’ about it. Queer is different. However, what Queer Theorists (Queerologists (unofficial term)) are actually doing, is attempting to de-stigmatise homosexuality by subverting archetypal gender and sexuality against the heteronormative discourse.

What this means in context is acknowledgment that the representation of the queer sense of self is equally as subjective as its heterosexual counterpart; and of course the defining characteristics of sex, gender and sexual identity perception are strictly subjective. Yet, as we see in relation to the Western Queer Rebellion (aka Queer as Folk), portrayals of homosexuality seemingly favour the stereotypical ‘camp’ archetype, pandering to society’s lack of awareness and ignorance regarding queer identity.

To paraphrase Judith Butler and Giles Deleuze it is a shift of ideology – ‘queer’ as the study of an existing being vs. ‘queering’ as a deliberate attempt to flux predetermined ways of thinking. So with the giant homosexual chainsaw put away, how we examine the Dawn of the age of A-queer-ius relates not only to the age in which we are becoming, but what became of the age before it.

And I didn’t lisp once! Think about it.

Ethical: When creating a show you must consider sensitivities relating to gender, race, sexuality etc. You most consider your responsibilities in representing other people and the potential for your choices to consciously or unconsciously harm or upset a performer or audience member. As practitioners you must be empathetic whilst still pushing boundaries and challenging your audience. Kidnap by Blast Theory is a key show to consider when thinking about the artist’s responsibility for his/her audience members.

Physical: Performers working physically in a space take risks with their body in lots of ways. Franko B and Frantic Assembly are just two examples of performers who push their bodies to the limit, to the point where they can no longer keep moving physically. I miss you is a show that demonstrates the risk artists/performers are willing to go through in order push our perceptions of the human body. This performance exposes the tension between physical risk and artistic intention that must be considered when performing in front of an audience.

Emotional: Since Brechtian techniques of alienation were established alongside Stanislavskian realism, many performance artists have been making audiences think as well as feel. Artists take risks when they seek to challenge their audiences with material that asks emotional and intellectual questions about society and ideology. Artists are constantly pushing emotional boundaries, using sensitive, sometimes taboo material. Feminist performance practitioners – such as Bryony Kimmings, VALIE EXPORT, Annie Sprinkle and Carolee Schneemann – engage with the body in a manner that challenges and exposes.
Story is the zeitgeist. A quick scan through any theatre season programme, or a day spent listening to talk radio, will yield you up the magic word over and over again: this is a play about story and how it makes us... this is a story which needs to be told... we are all storytellers, aren't we...

Why do we need to emphasise this point so much, as if we were afraid story is slipping out of our grasp?

Perhaps because the rules of the contract have been forgotten. If I am going to tell you a story, you and I need to slip into an invisible room for a second to sign our agreement: you must give me permission to tell you the whole tale right to the end; I will undertake to hold you carefully and with authority and bring you safely home, whatever that means for you on that day. It's a risky business, on both sides. You could go and do something else instead. I could keep it for someone who really wants to listen – so who is going to make the first move?

This is how an Armenian storyteller asks permission to start: ‘Three apples fell from heaven – one for the storyteller, one for the listener, and one for him that paid heed.’ Did you hear that? – the one who listened and the one who paid heed were two different people!

Maybe that's part of the problem – the unfathomable gaps between the word in the listener’s ear and the images it forms in the world. The storyteller can't control that side of the triangle; she has no copyright. She can't choose a story to make a person repent, or believe, or even share his toys. She can just send out her story into the space between her and the listeners, watching their eyes all the time.

Sometimes it happens that the apple lands where she hoped it would, although this may take years rather than minutes.

As a storyteller, she might not think of herself as a ‘creative professional.’ She doesn’t expect you to remember any details of her telling – just the images it created in your own head. She has passed her own images on and hopes you will too.

In the context of theatre the word ‘text’ often refers to a script or to written language that is spoken aloud in a live performance.

Written with a capital ‘T’, however, Text is a term used in critical and cultural theory that was developed and defined by French theorist Roland Barthes. Roland said that when we think about something ‘in language’ it starts being a Text. Unlike other more common uses, Text with a capital ‘T’ can't be held in the hand. It is purely about interpretation and reading through language – not written language (necessarily) but thoughts and words spoken aloud.

A 'Text' does not have to be written like an essay or a poem. A painting can be a Text, gardens can be Texts, even a building can be a Text – or at least we can consider them as Texts and therefor as readable things. Think about it, what isn't readable? Pyjamas? Beards? A telephone?

Story is the zeitgeist. A quick scan through any theatre season programme, or a day spent listening to talk radio, will yield you up the magic word over and over again: this is a play about story and how it makes us... this is a story which needs to be told... we are all storytellers, aren't we...

Why do we need to emphasise this point so much, as if we were afraid story is slipping out of our grasp?

Perhaps because the rules of the contract have been forgotten. If I am going to tell you a story, you and I need to slip into an invisible room for a second to sign our agreement: you must give me permission to tell you the whole tale right to the end; I will undertake to hold you carefully and with authority and bring you safely home, whatever that means for you on that day. It's a risky business, on both sides. You could go and do something else instead. I could keep it for someone who really wants to listen – so who is going to make the first move?

This is how an Armenian storyteller asks permission to start: ‘Three apples fell from heaven – one for the storyteller, one for the listener, and one for him that paid heed.’ Did you hear that? – the one who listened and the one who paid heed were two different people!

Maybe that's part of the problem – the unfathomable gaps between the word in the listener’s ear and the images it forms in the world. The storyteller can't control that side of the triangle; she has no copyright. She can't choose a story to make a person repent, or believe, or even share his toys. She can just send out her story into the space between her and the listeners, watching their eyes all the time.

Sometimes it happens that the apple lands where she hoped it would, although this may take years rather than minutes.

As a storyteller, she might not think of herself as a ‘creative professional.’ She doesn’t expect you to remember any details of her telling – just the images it created in your own head. She has passed her own images on and hopes you will too.

In the context of theatre the word ‘text’ often refers to a script or to written language that is spoken aloud in a live performance.

Written with a capital ‘T’, however, Text is a term used in critical and cultural theory that was developed and defined by French theorist Roland Barthes. Roland said that when we think about something ‘in language’ it starts being a Text. Unlike other more common uses, Text with a capital ‘T’ can't be held in the hand. It is purely about interpretation and reading through language – not written language (necessarily) but thoughts and words spoken aloud.

A 'Text' does not have to be written like an essay or a poem. A painting can be a Text, gardens can be Texts, even a building can be a Text – or at least we can consider them as Texts and therefor as readable things. Think about it, what isn't readable? Pyjamas? Beards? A telephone?
Throughout the twentieth century in the West the term ‘unconscious’ has stood as a synonym for individualism in the face of an ever more mechanised and homogeneous society.

The proliferation of therapy over the last hundred years has led to the period between c.1900-2000 being known as the ‘Psychoanalytic Century’. In the arts the importance of the concept of the unconscious grew in the first half of the twentieth century because it added to the idea, coined under Romanticism, that artists, writers and musicians inhabited a space that was somehow apart from the rest of society.

For a time the ability to be creative became synonymous with the ability to plumb the depths of the unconscious; legitimating the pursuit of extreme states of mind and body using drugs and/or alcohol to produce work that added to the overall mystique of the ‘artistic temperament.’ The pursuit of the unconscious aided the rejection of realist representation that has been associated with the conscious mind and civilisation, whereas abstraction has been represented as a space of free play where unconscious desires and impulses can emerge.

The basic premise of the unconscious is that the day to day thoughts that govern our actions can be determined by forces and motives that are unknown to us and which have emanated from deep seated desires. The phenomenon of the unconscious can be likened to a vault to which there is limited access from the outside and from which information flows in limited circumstances. The notion of the unconscious is a product of the Freudian school of psychoanalysis and is not synonymous with the term ‘subconscious.’ It is often described in terms of ‘primitive’ innate drives that the conscious mind struggles to regulate, such as sex and aggression, and as such is perceived as a link to a residual degree of animality in human nature.

But the unconscious can also be the mechanism by which the memory of traumatic events, which the mind tries not to think about or ‘repress’ can enter consciousness by determining the content of dreams, jokes or attaching meaning to other ‘trigger’ scenarios.

Your voice is powerful. It is uniquely your own, as individual as a fingerprint. Nobody sounds precisely like you. You can use it to demand attention, to whisper, to cajole, to convince, to sing. You can use it to express your hopes, your fears. It’s an instrument of elation or a vehicle for deep sadness. Your voice can make people listen. Use it the right way, and it can open doors. Use it carelessly, and those doors may swing shut. Your voice can make others laugh, bring them to tears, or make them think.

And in a world where so many people are silenced, what will you say with your voice? Having a voice is a responsibility and a privilege. How will you ensure you will be heard?

According to a Zimbabwean proverb, ‘If you can talk you can sing’. Be brave! Step forward and take a chance. Singing comes from... the heart, the soul, the spirit, the head, the throat, the nose, the chest, the diaphragm, the soles of your feet. You engage your whole self in the act of making noise. Singing is a dynamic, physical act. Throw your heart and soul into it. Get to know your voice. Play with it. It can do much more than you think. Listen to it. Surprise yourself. Let rip when the hairdryer/vacuum cleaner/white noise is on. There are no wrong notes only unusual harmonies. Singing releases endorphins... Try it instead of chocolate!

Try this warm up: remove your shoes. Stand connected to the ground. Relax your shoulders. Relax your belly. Unlock you knees. Yawn (no don’t fake it a real yawn) it relaxes your jaw. Breathe. (Don’t suck your breath in – instead, fill up like a balloon.) Hum... Like you are a beehive. Use fricatives (soft sounds like Sh, V, F) to begin each vowel. This allows air to flow softly over your vocal chords before you make a note. This ensures no vocal strain. Try it. Let some sounds out. Practice.

Enjoy your voice. Use it well. Add it to the sound of others.
For the dead and the living, we must bear witness.
Charles Spurgeon.

We inadvertently spectate, view, experience or witness an uncontrollable amount of information, intelligence and data each day of our lives. How we regulate and process all this sensory information is a fascinating component of the human body. How do we make decisions about what we pay attention to and what to neglect? How do we decide what we bear witness to? Further to this: how do we create a selection mechanism to process witnessed moments to include within the theatre that we craft, develop and produce?

Witnessing entails the physical/embodied act of noticing something in the world, which in turn discharges an on-going conversation in the mind. Witnessing, therefore, is not just merely observing something. It is the studying and comprehension of the ‘event’ that you have just viewed. It is the contextualization of the event. Witnessing begins the understanding process.

Interestingly, the Cambridge Dictionary defines the term ‘to witness’ as ‘to see something happen, especially an accident or crime’. Thus suggesting, the term being related to the semantic field of violation and infraction. The act of witnessing is applicable to any possible ‘event’, from witnessing a death; to the time the milkman places the milk on the doorstep each morning.

Witnessing a ‘moment’ is not a planned occurrence, nor is the immediate thinking of how it could develop to be included under a performative context. It is always a challenge to transfer a personally witnessed moment into a piece of performance. The question is often asked, can performance justify the act of witnessing? How can a performer re-establish, play homage or re-create a live moment they have witnessed? A successful attempt at this could allow the spectator to begin to re-encapsulate the original witnessed moment.

Witnessing is a powerful tool for a theatre maker. Used coherently, it can become an effective part of process and performance.

Congratulations! You are here, here in this pile of letters left over in a printer’s workshop. I know you’ve been stuck, but you’ve made it, finally, well done, ten-out-of-bloody-ten. Congratulations, you found us, here in the twenty-fourth, in all three-dimensions, in the bottom row, towards the end, the place where it all gets revealed, all the mysteries, all the loose ends, all those crossed-wires; you found a way of finding us, here, in this place.

Thank you. Kiss, kiss, bleeding kiss.
With all sincerity, faith and honesty kiss Descartes.

This is rarely said, but with all sincerity, faith and honesty kiss Weir, there in the back row.

With a common variable, and all sincerity, faith and honesty kiss at Paris Gare de l’Est. Kiss the ringed-finger, kiss the ground, kiss the men and the women and their differences; kiss the unknown, the forbidden, kiss that fly, the fly over there, get out of bed and kiss the fly and kiss the wall. Kiss as Wilhelm kissed Bertha, kissed her ringed finger, and said that life was not absolute, but we have something in common, something undoubted. Who later said, “I did not think, I investigated.” Which was overheard as, “I did not think, I invested in gaiters.” Which was later translated as, “I did not think, in a vest, about my gait.” Kiss the mistakes, kiss the negations, kiss the incorrect. Kiss an unknown person in an unknown place. Kiss as Wilhelm kissed Bertha and said, “I give you my name, and I give you my vote.” Kiss Malcolm and his dead eyes. Kiss Michael, Khoisan and Laura. Kiss those who can bowl straight. Kiss those with a straight edge; salute their commitment. Kiss John Cage; salute the unknown. Kiss the mistakes, kiss the negations, kiss the incorrect. Kiss an unknown person in an unknown place. Kiss as Wilhelm kissed Bertha, on each finger and each toe.

Now this is not for everyone, but with sincerity, faith and honesty kiss in the back row whilst Ray Milland defies the goddess of chance, cries his eyes through the abyss of everything, can’t see beauty in the woman that he loves, pokes his eyes out and screams, “But I can still see!”

Kiss to reveal all the mysteries, all those loose ends, all the crossed-wires.

On this operating system, Select all and Cut.
I’m writing these words because I am a yes-man. The inability to say no is, no doubt, quite charming, but the reality is you find yourself doing a great many things you would prefer not to do. And even if you do want to do them (it happens) you all too often discover that you have neither the expertise nor the intelligence to fulfil your self-appointed role as habitual affirmer. So there are consequences: bitterness, twistedness, resentment on one side; self-doubt, self-loathing and shame on the other. So, be warned, saying yes is not half as much fun as you might think.

Saying no sounds so much tougher – quite macho actually – whereas yes sounds a bit soft, too easy-going, lily-livered. No-saying is for really serious people with principles, standards; erect (in every sense of the word…I don’t think there are many) and selective; while yes-saying is for dilettantes, charlatans and hippies who just want to get in (or on/or get it on) with everyone and anyone. (Read Diderot’s Rameau’s Nephew for reference, and Hegel’s critique of Rameau in The Phenomenology of Spirit for some very heavy no-saying).

So why say yes? Well, probably because it does have consequences, good or bad, happy or sad, sane or mad. Saying no closes things down, imposes limits, excludes, refuses and, unforgivably, poisons the yes by reducing it to an obsessive and infinite desire to negate the no (Hegel’s ‘negation of the negation’ being the philosophical version of this monstrosity – yes him again – I blame the lederhosen).

And, finally, it is a question of space. The nay-sayers do not (because they cannot) create space, they arrive at a default space by negating, critiquing, undermining and ridiculing the space of others – a depressing and sombre clearing in the darkness. The yea-sayers are different; they open up spaces alongside, within, above, beyond and outside the space of others, and do so through affirmation alone – a bright and beautiful space for bright and beautiful people! People like us!

The idea of zero is just that: an idea. Ideas are very powerful, especially when they are harbingers of an act.

Like so much of the world, to explain phenomena someone had to make something up to see if it fits their experience of the world. In 976 AD the Persian encyclopedist Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Kwarizmi in his Keys of the Sciences, remarked that if, in a calculation, no number appears in the place of tens, then a little circle should be used ‘to keep the rows’. This circle was called sifr (‘empty’) in Arabic. That was the earliest mention of the name sifr that eventually became Zero.


A big fat zero, instead of a living and breathing theatre image in the world. However, before the idea of zero there was always something, and so there is in nothing a nascent something. Much like Marxist thinking suggests that in all forms of cultural and social structures lie the nascent of what is to come and the vestigial of what was.


‘I have this idea.’

‘But how do I get it into the world.’

From a supposed nothing to a presumed something. This is what theatre does as its daily business; in fact several times a day; from nothing to something. There is a moment before this Big Bang, no time and no space, and then kaboom a thing.

Each and every day we have to create a brand new universe, with a brand new language to talk about this brand new universe and then have to the same all over again. This terrifying alchemy of ripping theatre images from our febrile imaginations, there is a cost of this zero to one.

And then once we have one theatre image we then have to make another one to follow on. Each image infecting the next across time and space meaning accumulating accreting, faster faster until the performer and the audience are breathing together (perhaps panting). In that breathing going from a supposed nothing to a presumed something, zero to one in each and every moment.
PERFORMANCES AND EVENTS

19th – 21st January. Level 2 trip to Krakow, Poland, to visit Auschwitz I and II.


3rd February. 12.30pm. Arts Workshop. Emma Bennett Artist’s Talk.

5th February. 7.30pm. Quad South Hall. PERFORMING HOUSE. Hagit Yakira. ... in the middle with you.


24th – 28th February. Level 3 IPAR Festival.

5th March. 1.00 – 5.00pm. Research Snapshots II. Faculty of Arts Postgraduate Research Students Symposium.

5th March. 7.30pm. Theatre 1. PERFORMING HOUSE. Instant Dissidence. Caramel.

10th March. 7.00pm. York Theatre Royal. International Centre for Arts and Narrative. Narrative and Adolescence Studio Talk.

12th March. 7.30pm. Quad South Hall. PERFORMING HOUSE. Nathan Walker and Emma Bennett. Sneck Stairs.

17th March. 12.30pm. Arts Workshop. Third Angel Artist’s Talk.

19th March. 7.30pm. Quad South Hall. PERFORMING HOUSE. 12⁰ North Dance Company. Triple Bill.

24th March. 3.00pm. Theatre 1. Ridiculusmus. The Eradication of Schizophrenia in Southern Lapland.