Editorial
Alison Forsyth, Aberystwyth University, Amanda Stuart Fisher, Royal Central School of Speech and Drama

Evoking Freud's essay *Remembering, Repeating and Working Through*, first published in 1914, the title of this special issue of *Performing Ethos* invites us to think about the ethics of enactment and performance in relation to remembrance and the event of trauma. Yet to draw on Freud's terminology in this way stages something of a paradox because, for Freud, the process of acting out is a form of resistance to remembering. When 'acting out', Freud tells us, 'the patient repeats rather than remembers' (2006:395), suggesting that 'acting out' is an act of 'compulsion' rather than deliberative meditation and therefore becomes a repetitive *symptom* rather than an *act* of remembrance. The therapist's task, Freud tells us, is to use the process of transference to go into 'battle' with this compulsive behaviour and to work with the patient to turn this 'into a means of activating memory' (398). Remembering, then, for Freud, becomes a means of working through the events of the past. Philosopher Paul Ricoeur draws attention to Freud's original German title for this essay *Erinnern, Wiederholen und Durcharbeiten*, and suggests that with the term '*Durcharbeiten*' Freud introduces the concept of 'the 'work of memory', or memory as work' (Ricoeur 1999:6). To conceive of memory as something which is deliberate, conscious and which can be put to work firmly positions memory as an 'action' rather than in involuntary, intuitive reaction and this enables Ricoeur to develop an argument for thinking about the uses and abuses of remembering, and what Ricoeur refers to as the 'duty of memory' (2006:87). It also requires us to think ethically not only about remembering but also about forgetting, for as Ricoeur points out, 'To say: you will remember, is also to say: you will not forget' (87). This positions the subject who must respond to this obligation to remember in a somewhat precarious temporal position, turned simultaneously towards a futurity informed by the ethical injunction 'not to forget', but also responsible for the recuperation of a past which must be remembered.

One of the difficulties of remembering is finding a language with which to speak of that which is no longer present. This is something that historians have long grappled with and it continues to echo in many embodied or performance practices which to use Diana Taylor's terms can become 'acts of transfer' that '[transmit] social knowledge, memory, and a sense of identity' (2003: 4). The process of remembering, of course, becomes all the more complex and ethically acute in the context of the event of trauma. For as we have seen, from the extensive work undertaken by trauma studies, the event of trauma can be understood to exceed cognition and communicability and therefore resists any representational articulation. From a Lacanian perspective, trauma is theorised to be radically outside of the symbolic realm and of language. Developing this idea further in his discussion of the memory processes of trauma survivors, Dori Laub describes trauma as possessing an 'otherness' and a 'timelessness', and he goes on to argue that consequently trauma is an event that resists memory because it 'has no beginning, no ending, no before, no during and no after' (Felman and Laub 1992:69).

Perhaps, however, it is precisely the timelessness and unknowability of trauma, its radical otherness and its unrepresentabilty that means performance practices are well placed to forge

a meaningful engagement with sites of traumatic memory. For performance is constitutively affective and ephemeral, existing in a constant negotiation of what is said and unsaid and what remains unsayable. Performance can evoke both the real and the unreal simultaneously whilst raising questions around visibility and invisibility, remembering and forgetting. For Peggy Phelan, the ontology of performance is predicated upon disappearance and she describes performance as 'moving from the aims of metaphor, reproduction, and pleasure to those of metonymy, displacement, and pain, performance marks the body itself as loss' (1993:152). For Diana Taylor, performance's ephemerality is less about loss than about the trace and the remnant of what remains through that trace. As Taylor remarks:

> My view of performance rests on the notion of ghosting, that visualization that continues to act politically even as it exceeds the live. Like Phelan's definition, it hinges on the relationship between visibility and invisibility, or appearance and disappearance, but comes at it from a very different angle. (Taylor 2003: 143)

The themes of disappearance, visibility, invisibility and remembering inform many of the performance practices that are considered by the contributors to this issue. Sarah Beck, for example, reflects on how verbatim theatre should be positioned in its endeavour to tell the story of the wrongful police shooting of Jean Charles de Menezes at Stockwell Station, London on 22nd July 2005, the day after the four bomber's unsuccessful attempt to detonate explosives on London transport. Media reportage in the immediate aftermath of the police shooting focussed on a series of allegations against de Menezes, suggesting he was an illegal immigrant, that the police had pursued him as he 'vaulted' over the ticket barrier, that he was carrying a suspicious looking rucksack or even a 'bomb belt'. However, the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) later revealed these 'facts' to be completely untrue. In her discussion of the two verbatim plays that she developed in response to the shooting, Beck reflects on questions of responsibility and authorship and considers the visibility (and invisibility) of the 'real' Jean Charles de Menezes both in the play that was created and in the mediatised accounts of the shooting which mis-reported what had actually happened.

Beck's reflections invite us to consider the role of performance as a form of historiography. The false media reportage around the shooting of de Menezes matters a great deal, both ethically but also politically. Firstly, it betrayed the truth of the situation and then consequently interrupted and intervened within the grieving process of de Menezes's friends and family. Secondly, it contributed to the narrative that would ultimately (mis) represent both the shooting of de Menezes and the supposed role de Menezes played in the terrorism that had taken place across the capital.   In this sense the many verbatim theatre plays that were produced after the shooting at Stockwell were part of a collective desire to 'set the record straight' and to interrupt or even resist the hegemonic processes of historiography initiated by the media immediately after the shooting in 2005. By re-presenting the voices and perspectives of those who were excluded by the original media coverage, the verbatim plays not only re-wrote the story of the shooting but also generated a new form of remembering in relation to the death of Jean Charles de Menezes.

In a similar vein to Beck's reflection and its negotiation with visibility/invisibility, Simon Bowes' *Quietude, Restlessness and Uproar: Towards an Ethics of Speech and Silence in 'In Eldersfield, Chapter One: Elegy for Paul Dirac'* is a practice-based rumination of one of the less overt but nonetheless crucial aspects of the relationship between performance and the remembrance of trauma – silence. This article focuses on a section within Chapter One of a

devised performance by Kings of England (a company to which the author belongs) and in particular the work's exploration of the relationship between silence and trauma, and the ramifications of this relationship when it becomes the central subject of a performance. Taking the physicist Paul Dirac as inspiration (who was so traumatized as a child by his father's insistence on the use of perfect French in an English speaking household that he reduced his speech to a bare minimum) Kings of England strives to 'reconsider the potential value of passivity in a performance culture increasingly defined by a concern for agency, affirmed though a prevalent language of 'immersion', 'interactivity' and 'participation''. (Bowes XXX). Just as silence informed so much of Dirac's life subsequent to childhood trauma, Bowes articulates the challenges the Kings of England sought to overcome through their creation of an ethically authentic performance about the physicist which experientially *engages with* as opposed to *narratively alluding to* the silence at the core of Dirac's life. The Kings of England's performance raises some interesting questions not only about the problematic of representing an actual living person who - to some degree – becomes fictionalised in the moment of performance, but also how theatre positions itself in relation to its response to personal memory and the more authorised biographical accounts of a life.

The relationship between memory, history and truth is a complex and much contested affair. For some philosophers such as Ricoeur, there is a continuum between remembering, witnessing and the representational act of writing history, leading him to suggest that 'historiography' is a form of 'archived memory' (Ricoeur 2006: 148). Alternatively, historian Pierre Nora, distinguishes between *historical remembrance* which becomes secreted in a particular historical site or place and authorised by a singular official history and *collective remembering*, which emerges from a community by being woven into the fabric of lived experience. The site or place of historical remembrance is what Nora calls the *lieux de mémorie*, where 'memory crystallizes and secretes itself… at a particular historical moment' (Nora 1989: 7). He adopts the term *milieux de mémoire* to describe contexts of collective remembering that existed in a pre-modern, pre-industrial era. Nora positions the *milieux de mémoire* as the 'real environments of memory' (7) and reminds us that 'memory is by nature multiple and yet specific; collective, plural, and yet individual' (9). History, on the other hand, he claims 'belongs to everyone and to no one, whence its claim to universal authority' (9) Furthermore, the relationship between history and memory, Nora argues, is somewhat antagonistic because 'History is perpetually suspicious of memory, and its true mission is to suppress and destroy it' (9).

Diana Taylor (2003) draws connections between Nora's conceptualisation of the *milieux de mémoire* and what she calls 'the repertoire'. Unlike 'archival memory' which Taylor argues 'sustains power' by maintaining an authoritarian objectivity and separation from 'the source of "knowledge" such as documents, maps, literary texts, letters, archaeological remains' and the 'knower' who is positioned in a specific 'time and/or space' (19) the repertoire on the other hand, is more flexible and collectively constructed. The repertoire enacts, to use Taylor's terms, 'an embodied memory' through 'performances, gestures, orality, movement, dance, singing – in short, all those acts usually thought of as ephemeral, non-reproductive knowledge.' (20).

These ideas are explored and developed further across the articles within this issue. Many authors, for example, question how we should position memory in relation to history, reflecting on the role of embodied memory or performance within the process of historiography. In her article, *Laughter and trauma: making sense of colonial violence*, Maryrose Casey examines a series of traditional Aboriginal performance practices that took

place across Australia in the nineteenth century. These were highly comedic performances which appear to offer a satirical engagement with the brutal violence waged against Australia's Aboriginal indigenous people by the European settlers whose project of colonisation set out to subjugate, murder and destroy Aboriginal families and communities living across the Australian territories. In addition to sharing some extensive research into these modes of performance Casey raises some interesting questions about how we might excavate the meaning of these performance practices. For while these practices – to draw on Taylor's theorisation - could be understood as 'embodied memories' and part of the Aboriginal repertoire, Casey points out that 'Aboriginal ethical practices' mean that 'neither the dead nor terrible events such as massacres can be spoken about' (Casey XX). Casey's project to recoup and analyse these lost performances therefore becomes multi-dimensional and highly complex. It leads her to offer some interesting observations not only about the status of trauma and humour in Aboriginal culture but also how these different modalities of performance might require us to rethink the presumption that 'working through' the trauma of the past might best be served by directly speaking of it.

In Carole-Anne Upton's interview with Hjalmar Jorge Joffre-Eichhorn we learn about theatre's role in another – very different- conflict. Joffre-Eichhorn is one of the founders of the Afghanistan Human Rights and Democracy Organization, an all- Afghan community-based theatre platform based in Kabul and the interview between him and Upton offers a fascinating and unique insight into the challenges and obstacles of making performance in a war zone of over thirty years' duration. Memory and trauma are, of course, a part and parcel of creating theatre in such a milieu, and to use Joffre-Eichhorn's own words, it is akin to constructing a 'bunker in a war setting' (JE xxx) where people can feel safe and free to experiment with alternatives to their own daily lives. Drawing on a range of participatory theatre making methodologies Joffre-Eichorn describes a process which not only sets out to work through individual and collective memories of the last thirty years of conflict, but is also one which imagines a new future for Afghanistan. Drawing on the work of Augusto Boal, the organisation developed a 'large women's rights project that covered roughly 5000 women in five provinces of Afghanistan' (Joffre-Eichhorn XXXX). Adopting a participatory and democratic approach to theatre making in this way, the project's methodology stands in marked contrast to the existing Afghan governmental context, where Joffre-Eichhorn argues 'generally decisions are made in a reasonably hierarchical way'. (JE XXX)

In addition Joffre-Eichhorn discusses the company's use of Playback theatre and the working up of a devised testimonial and eventually scripted play, *Infinite Incompleteness* – a work which is replete with the recall and memory of the cross gender, intergenerational, cast drawn from across the social class spectrum. Not only does this work highlight the complexity of the Afghan war and the blurry distinctions between the victims and the perpetrators which exist in a country which has undergone radical shifts in government and continues to be mired in internecine power struggles, but also it embraces the multi-ethnic dimension of a country like Afghanistan – one made up of a multitude of clearly defined communities with their own distinctive languages, customs and traditions. In this respect Joffre-Eichhorn highlights the required sensitivities of working with an often highly traumatised, restricted and diverse group of people. In the highly volatile and violent context of Afghanistan, where a young woman might be physically attacked for attending a drama workshop, the drama practitioner - Joffre-Eichon tells us- is confronted with a multitude of complex ethical choices and a sense of responsibility that exceeds the parameters of the actual drama project itself.

In contrast to the very real, visceral violence of Afghanistan, Mark Seton's *Traumas of acting physical and psychological violence: how fact and fiction shape bodies for better or worse* focuses on the risks for the actor of psychically remembering or holding onto the *fictional* trauma of drama. Focussing on actors who are directed to perform violent or traumatic narratives Seton considers the way the body and the psyche hold onto trauma – often to debilitating effect. Drawing on the experience of both actors in theatre and medical and emergency simulation exercises, Seton argues that as a result we have an ethical responsibility and duty of care to those 'who may potentially be traumatized, either directly or vicariously, through the performing of, and participation in dramatizations and simulations of physical, sexual and psychological violence.' (Seton XXX). Rather than using a psychoanalytic interpretation of trauma, Seton instead draws on neuroscience and phenomenology to propose a healing response which encourages actors to acquire the capacity for what Seton describes as 'resilient vulnerability'(Seton XX).

The etymology of trauma is of course from the Greek word meaning "wound" and it is this, perhaps, which reveals the real and the imaginary dimension of the traumatic. For while a wound may be encountered physically, the wound of trauma is also - as Cathy Caruth explains- a 'wound of the mind' (Caruth1996: 4). Certainly, it seems that it is the tension between the real and the imagined, the body and the mind, the factual and the remembered which has inspired so many of the performance practices which have been explored in the different contributions in this special edition. As editors we have very much enjoyed the diversity of the material and the tantalising moments of synergies and intersections that have emerged. We would like to thank all the contributors for their hard work and the editorial board of *Performing Ethos* for allowing us to work with the authors to produce this special issue.

References

Boal. A. (2000) *Theatre of the Oppressed* (trans. C.A. and AL McBride & E. Fryer), London: Pluto Press .

Caruth, C. (1996) *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, History*, London and Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press.

Felman, S. and Laub, D. (1992) *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History,* Abingdon: Routledge.

Freud, S. (2006) 'Remembering, Repeating, and Working Through' in A. Phillips *The Penguin Freud Reader*, London: Penguin Books, pp. 391 – 401.

Nora, P. (1989) *Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire*, Representations (trans. M. Roudebush), 26:Spring, pp.7 - 24

Olick, J., Vinitzky-Seroussi and Levy, D. (2011) *The Collective Memory Reader,* New York and Oxford: The Oxford University Press.

Phelan, P. (1993) *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*, London and New York: Routledge.

Ricoeur, P. (2006), *Memory, History, Forgetting* (trans. K. Blamey & D. Pellauer), Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1999) 'Memory and Forgetting' in R. Kearney and M. Dooley (eds) *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, London and New York: Routledge, pp.5 – 11.

Taylor, D. (2003) *The Archive and The Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*, USA: Duke University Press.