

‘Being in the State of Crossing’: Drama Education and Transnational Space

Joe Winston

Associate Professor (Reader), Institute of Education, University of Warwick

Chia-yu Lo

PhD Candidate in Drama and Theatre Education, University of Warwick

Xiao-di Wang

MA Student in Drama and Theatre Education, University of Warwick

Email: J.A.Winston@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

One of the results of globalisation is that increasing numbers of students from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds come together to learn in one space. This article theorises an ethical approach to this challenge for drama educators, drawing principally on theories of transnational fiction (Stephen Clingman)⁽¹⁾, cosmopolitan ethics (Kwame Anthony Appiah)⁽²⁾ and cultural understandings of space (Doreen Massey)⁽³⁾. The central metaphor of drama as a means for ‘navigating boundaries’, it argues, is more politically apt if less ‘sexy’ than Giroux’s more commonly cited metaphor of ‘border crossing’. The relationship between this theory and an ethical drama praxis is illustrated by examples drawn from work carried out by two Asian postgraduate students currently studying at the University of Warwick.

Keywords: Chinese Stories; Cosmopolitanism; Navigating Boundaries; Space / Place; Transnationalism

'We have left one shore – perhaps many shores – without reaching any safe haven ... Differentially, unevenly, symptomatically, hopefully, we are in the space of navigation. It is the space of our history at this time'. (Clingman, 2009, p.26)

'the highest possible idea of the theatre is one that reconciles us philosophically with Becoming.' (Artaud, 1958, p.109)

Crossing borders or navigating boundaries?

Every year a number of what we in England call 'overseas' students literally cross borders to come and study the MA course in Drama and Theatre Education at Warwick. Last year we welcomed ten such students from China, Hong Kong and Taiwan, a micro statistic in the ever-increasing globalisation of education. Metaphors of flow dominate the language of globalisation – flow of goods, capital, human beings, information – and we are constantly being reminded that the boundaries of the nation state are being eroded, pushing us into imagining a world of what Doreen Massey has described as 'unbounded free space'. Many of the key issues and concepts that dominate the political and cultural discourse of globalisation can be traced to this tendency towards flow and the heterogeneity it inevitably produces, the fact of the many coming together and necessarily struggling to find ways of living alongside one another in shared time and shared spaces. Educational establishments of all kinds – schools, colleges and universities – have had no choice but to respond to these new realities. The task of education in any era, however, should never be simply to reflect society and respond to economic pressures but, in important ways, to theorise and model what a good society might be like when faced with the pressing issues of its time. Writings in applied theatre and educational drama are testimony to this struggle to find theoretical frames of sufficient strength and aptitude to guide a praxis that can respond both effectively and ethically to the challenges that modernity poses for practitioners. This article is a tentative step in this direction by someone who works in higher education and examines the *navigation of boundaries* as a potential metaphor to help fashion such a praxis, a metaphor applicable to the fictions we work with *and* create and to the social

space of the drama studio itself.

Borders, if not boundaries, have become familiar conceptual territory to drama educators and applied theatre practitioners and the metaphor of *border crossing*, as theorised by Henri Giroux, is now firmly embedded in the discourse⁽⁴⁾. Inspired by the Marxist pedagogy of Paolo Freire, Giroux has positioned the politics of voice and difference – difference in race, class, gender and sexual orientation – at the heart of a critical education for social justice, one that places issues of culture at its heart. Culture is seen by Giroux as ‘a vital source for developing a politics of identity, community and pedagogy’. It is not monolithic and unchanging, as the dominant educational discourse would have us believe, but:

‘a site of multiple and heterogeneous borders where different histories, languages, experiences, and voices intermingle amidst diverse relations of power and privilege.’ (Giroux, 1992, p.169)

In the face of this reality, the school becomes a ‘pedagogical cultural borderland’ where these subordinated cultures are more usually than not ignored or silenced. The job of the ‘radical critical educator’ is to provide the conditions for these voices to be heard so that the school can offer students ‘a sense of identity, place and hope.’ The following, lengthier quote is typical of Giroux’s prose:

‘Voices forged in opposition and struggle provide the crucial conditions by which subordinated individuals and groups can reclaim their own memories, stories, and histories as part of an ongoing collective struggle to challenge those power structures that attempt to silence them.’ (Ibid, p.170)

This is powerful, rousing rhetoric but I have to admit to sharing some of the reservations hinted at by Helen Nicholson. She does indeed acknowledge the relevance of Giroux’s language to the era of globalisation, particularly with regard to the spatial metaphor of the border and border crossing. But, as

she points out, the Marxist principles that underpin the theory imply that the teacher can engineer, through her pedagogy, 'a critical vantage point from which a transparent "reality" can be clearly visible' (Nicholson, 2005, p.44). The fundamental assumption that it is possible for the teacher 'to stand outside, transcend or transgress contemporary realities in order to critique them' is surely questionable. Nicholson does not reject the metaphor of border crossing but qualifies it. We do not transcend the learning contexts we are involved in when we cross into new, imagined territories during drama experiences, she suggests. We can, indeed, leave something of our old selves behind when we begin to identify with others and their perspectives, but we are always in two worlds, the imagined world of the dramatic fiction and the world of the workshop itself. Whatever new insights we manage as a result of such experiences can never be removed from the contexts in which they are constructed. Citing the work of Kate Donelan, she nonetheless insists that this can in itself create valuable opportunities to develop intercultural understanding, 'when intercultural boundaries are mapped, challenged and rewritten through the process of theatre making.' (Ibid, p.45).

It is this metaphor of boundaries, or more precisely, that of *navigating* boundaries upon which I intend to focus the trajectory of this article and I draw it directly from theories of transnational fiction as argued by Stephen Clingman (2009). Transnationalism is itself a slippery term but a key concept in the language of globalisation. As examined in the work of Ong and Nonini (1997), with specific attention to the Chinese experience it centres upon the cultural, political and ethical consequences resulting from the ways in which capital, people and ideas now transcend national boundaries. The resultant tensions they see between complex narratives of difference and diversity on the one hand and emergent tendencies for cultural essentialism on the other are not dissimilar from Giroux's preoccupations but their political and ethical conclusions are more complex than those that ring out from Giroux's rhetoric. The false narratives of cultural homogeneity that they feel need resisting, for example, include those that have emerged from non-western, post imperialist ideologies – Chinese triumphalism, for example, and Islamic extremism – as they are themselves racist, sexist and feed larger global antagonisms that lead

to a strengthening rather than a weakening of ideological borders within which people find illusory shelter (Ibid).⁽⁵⁾

Clingman accepts the ethical ambiguities of transnationalism; the fact that there can be 'bad transnationalisms' is freely admitted (2009, p.24). Most importantly, like Nicholson, he avoids claiming that differences between the self and others can be transcended or that there is any easy navigation between identities or any ready solution to the massively unequal terms in which people approach one another, in terms of power, resources and authority. However, he argues that transnationalism conceives of boundaries and difference as 'positive invocations ... to the transitive.' In other words, they are not barriers to navigation but 'the very ground of its possibility and necessity.' The boundaries that exist between cultures and people, within and beyond the self, are ethically and politically complex but they are nonetheless 'points of encounter' and as such they can be inspected. In this sense, I see his use of the phrase 'navigating boundaries' as potentially a more apt metaphor than 'border crossing' for the kind of work many of us engage in. This latter is sexier, of course, conjuring up as it does romantic images of rebelliousness, transgression, heroic incursions, guerrilla warfare and so on. But the border suggests something fixed, patrolled, to be wary of, something clearly identifiable that we need to penetrate in order to get to another side. The phrase 'navigating boundaries', on the other hand, keeps our attention squarely on the boundaries themselves. It implies that, however acutely we need to be aware of them, we may not be sure *where* they are exactly, nor *what kind* of boundaries they are and whether, indeed, we ought to attempt to cross them or not. If the verb *crossing* implies a journey from one 'state' to another, *navigation* is different:

'Whether it concerns language, fiction, identity or location, navigation does not mean crossing or having crossed, but being in the space of crossing. It means being prepared to be in the space of crossing, in transition, in movement, in journey'. (Ibid, pp.24-25)

In applying this conceptualisation to education, then, the emphasis on navigation clearly indicates that the journey itself is both the means *and the*

ends of the learning. This is at once a more cautious and expansive metaphor, implying an educational project strongly ethical in its concerns if not politically certain of its outcomes. It chimes, too, with two other conceptual frameworks, as we shall see, those outlined by the cultural geographer Doreen Massey in her influential book *For Space*, and with Kwame Anthony Appiah's examination of the philosophical principles of cosmopolitanism. These, too, have emerged in response to the discourse of globalisation and both are equally ethical in their concerns.

Conversation, navigation and the place / space of drama

'In this throwntogetherness what are at issue are the terms of engagement of those trajectories ... those "stories-so-far", within (and not only within) that conjunctuality.' (Massey, 2005, p.142)

The drama studio is a secure and well-known space for me. It is very familiar as I have worked in it for nearly twenty years and have even had some input into its material re-construction over that period. In other parts of the university I feel less at home; here I feel confident, free enough to act and teach as I wish. In Tim Cresswell's terms, then, this 'space' has become for me a particular kind of 'place' with its own memories and emotional attachments: I find it empowering, a kind of home (2004). When new MA students first arrive, they may well be used to working in drama studios, yet it will inevitably take time before this *space* can become one with which they can identify sufficiently for it to carry the (hopefully) positive associations of *place* that it has for me. And of course, given my position of authority, it will always be more my space than theirs, at least for the duration of this course, as none of us can be sure where our future trajectories will take us.

So in one sense my task as an educator is to enable this space to become a 'homeplace' for our students as quickly as possible by encouraging them to feel secure and included within it, to come to feel it as theirs as well as mine. However, the noun 'space' – as opposed to 'place' – is ever present

in drama teaching; 'find a space'; 'work in your own space'; 'walk through the space'; 'share the space equally' – such phrases may well trip off the tongue of the drama teacher several times a lesson. Space, not place, because space is conceptually fluid and ill-defined, open and yet to be imagined as something more specific. Space is the raw material of the drama classroom and Doreen Massey has theorised it in ways that help us appreciate the boundaries that exist within it, many of them invisible, but most of them dependent upon the students who populate it at any one time.

First of all, she insists that space is not superficial, not depthless, and this depth is intrinsically related to the narrative trajectories of those who are sharing it. 'Perhaps we could imagine space as a simultaneity of stories so far,' she suggests (2005, p.9). Such an imaginative act will have political ramifications as it will 'force into the imagination a fuller recognition of the simultaneous coexistence of others with their own trajectories and their own stories to tell' (Ibid, p.11). This defines space as relational, rather than empty and suggests that it cannot be uprooted from time, cannot be de-historicised, cannot be seen to have any 'timeless authenticity'. 'The specificities of space are a product of interrelations – connections and disconnections – and their (combinatory) effects' (Ibid, p.67). As Nicholson has pointed out, this view of space undermines the common conception of the drama studio as an empty, liberated space within which we can remove ourselves from the political realities of the outside world in order to gain authentic understandings (2005). Its real emancipatory – or educational – potential lies elsewhere, in what Massey refers to as the 'spatialisation of stories' that it enables. Her own reference point is the eurocentric accounts of the fall of the Aztec Empire, where the dynamic flow of agency is always seen as issuing from Europe outwards. 'Spatialising that story,' she insists, 'enables an understanding of its positionality, its geographical embeddedness; an understanding of the spatiality of the production of knowledge itself' (2005, p.63). In other words, there is more than one story to be told, and none should assume any easy authority over the other. Hence the need for us to re-imagine stories as *encounters*, as *processes*, not as closed, discrete artefacts but as open-ended, capable of releasing our imaginations into more open attitudes of being (Ibid). This is where Massey's ethical theory

of space chimes readily with Clingman's definition of navigation as dependent upon a state of preparedness, what the French writer Andre Gide called 'disponibilité'.

'It means accepting placement as displacement, position as disposition, not through coercion of others or by others of ourselves but through 'disposition' as an affect of the self, as a kind of approach.' (2009, p.25)

It is this ethical disposition that, according to Clingman, is an intrinsic part of transnational fiction and it pertains to form as much as it does to content, what he describes as 'a way of being and seeing' *in relation to* the fiction rather than a feature of the kind of story being told. It is this issue of *form* that takes us back to the drama studio.

When Massey writes of spatialising stories, she has in mind our re-conceiving them in terms of their geographical origins, as we have seen. But the drama studio is a place where, in a more literal sense, fictional stories are spatialised as a matter of course. Whether devised, improvised, created from scripts or other textual sources, they are played out in space in embodied form by the players themselves. This carries with it the potential for stories to be opened up for investigation, to be treated as malleable processes rather than static artefacts. If approached as a democratic, group task, players must of necessity navigate their way through one another's understandings and responses to the story. Thus the process of dramatisation can become a journey into a space of crossing, where different imaginations come into creative contact with one another. The more varied the geographical and cultural backgrounds of the players, the greater the difference in imaginative response is likely to be; yet it is this very difference that can be conceptualised as having positive, heterogenous, creative potential. If, as Clingman emphasises, 'navigation occurs not despite but because of the boundary' (Ibid, p.21), then what matters is that the drama studio becomes a secure enough *place* for the players to perceive *displacement* as an acceptable disposition, as the very grounds for creative response.

The ethical and educational potential of theorising the dramatisation of stories in this way can be further amplified with reference to Kwame Anthony Appiah's ideas about cosmopolitan curiosity and the conversations this disposition can engender. Whilst accepting the fact that people increasingly confront differences of all kinds in their day to day lives, Appiah is concerned to undermine the idea that common human understandings are therefore unattainable, that we are inevitably condemned to a world of mutual mistrust and incomprehension. In attempting to redraw the imaginary boundaries that inscribe how people of different cultures approach one another, Appiah uses the philosophical stance of cosmopolitanism to re-imagine our common humanity, to think optimistically about how we can fashion a way to live peacefully with one another, to find shared values in a nonetheless complex world. Central to this, he suggests, is the significance of stories and, in particular, of talking about and evaluating stories. This, he argues, is a key way in which we align our responses to the world: 'It keeps our language of evaluation honed, ready to do its work in our lives. And that work ... is first *to help us act together*.' (2006, p. 30. My italics) Although, of course, different cultures share different stories it is important for us to hear and think about a range of such stories as they can introduce new ideas to us, new ways of thinking about the world: for what it is reasonable for us to think in our daily lives, he suggests, depends upon ideas we already have or have been introduced to. He uses the term *conversation* as a metaphor for engaging with the ideas of others in a non-coercive manner and sees storytelling and art as practices that can both stimulate conversation and that can, in themselves, constitute such conversations. He is worth quoting here at length.

'Conversations across boundaries of identity – whether national, religious or something else – begin with the sort of imaginative engagement you get when you read a novel or watch a movie or attend to a work of art that speaks from some place other than your own. So I'm using the word conversation not only for literal talk but also as a metaphor for engagement with the experience and ideas of others. And I stress the role of the imagination here because the encounters, properly conducted, are valuable in themselves.'

Conversation doesn't have to lead to consensus about anything, especially not values; it's enough that it helps people get used to one another.' (Ibid, p.85)

If the vocabulary Appiah uses – of boundaries, identity, stories and encounters – resonates with those implicit in Clingman's metaphor of navigation, then so too does his emphasis on cosmopolitan curiosity as a virtue, as a disposition that encourages us to find out about those ideas and values we share but also 'to be able to enjoy discovering things that we do not yet share.' In this way we can learn from one another or 'simply be intrigued by alternative ways of thinking, feeling, acting' (Ibid, p.97). Either way it is *enjoyment* that matters, which returns us to the drama studio and to the activity of drama making itself. We as teachers often have lofty, educational intentions (this paper being no exception to this tendency); but deep down and fundamental to our practice is the concept of play, of entertainment, of enjoyment, of the sheer delight that engagement in the art form can at times afford us. It is a delight we can associate with the surprise that the drama space can unleash – the chance of space, the surprise of space, what we find when we come in direct contact with difference, with alterity, and are disposed to linger and explore it for a while.

Conversations at the boundary: examples drawn from practice

'How can we know what it means if we will not combine with it or allow it to act in combination?' (Clingman, 2009, p.28)

In the remaining part of this article, I will analyse two examples of work recently carried out by Warwick students from China and Taiwan in order to illuminate the theoretical relevance of the above considerations to actual practice.

The first of these is relatively straightforward. Chia-yu Lo, a Ph.D student from Taiwan, was recently working with a class of English primary

school children and had introduced them to a Chinese story entitled *From Bad to Good to Bad to Good* (Kendall & Li, 1980). It tells of the fortunes and misfortunes of Sai Wong, a farmer with a great love of horses who lived with his only son. When his favourite horse runs away, the villagers are sad for him but his response is to remain calm. 'It is sad to lose one's horse but who can tell what blessings may come from this misfortune?' Soon his horse returns with a beautiful wild stallion by its side. He is congratulated by the villagers but remains subdued, pondering what misfortune might emanate from such apparent good luck. Sure enough, whilst riding the stallion, his son is thrown and breaks his leg. Once again, Sai Wong is resistant to the sympathy offered to him and his son, saying that good fortune may yet result from this. And so it does, when his son's broken leg saves him from being enlisted to fight in a battle in which nine out of ten of the soldiers are slaughtered. As a result, both Sai Wong and his son live to a ripe old age.

One of the exercises Ms Lo conducted was to ask the class to help her list a range of nouns to describe Sai Wong, to which the children responded with many negative words such as cruel, uncaring and miserable. They then had a chance to 'meet' him through a hot-seating exercise in which Ms Lo responded to their questions, whilst playing his role in a manner influenced by her own theatrical training, stroking her chin with her forefinger and thumb to indicate his age. During this exercise, she was able to demonstrate how Sai Wong's attitude was typical of what she saw as a particular Chinese attitude to life, viewing it as an endless cycle, with joy and sorrow never too far apart. There were two interesting and immediate results. First of all the children, when returning to the list, decided to remove the words uncaring, cruel and miserable as unfair to Sai Wong; secondly, when playing Sai Wong herself later, one girl emulated the stroking of the beard in order, she told Ms Lo, to show that he was wise.

It would, of course, be hubristic to claim that these children had somehow crossed the border into a new understanding of Chinese culture. After all, these children had different narrative trajectories and, despite the questionnaires and interviews Ms Lo had already conducted with the class, she could assume

no uniform level of ignorance or otherwise on their behalf. The space in which they worked together was, indeed, 'a simultaneity of stories-so-far': theirs, her own and the fictional story of Sai Wong. However, she could surely be justified in claiming that this fiction had provided them with a navigational space, a boundary where they could meet and journey and, in the process, culturally exchange ideas and attitudes. It illustrates Appiah's argument that stories can be a form of conversation, a way in which we get to know each other and develop a positive form of cosmopolitan curiosity. The essential positivity of the encounter is illustrated, albeit in small ways, by the fact that the children removed the negative adjectives once they had 'met' Sai Wong; and, interestingly, in the way that the girl adopted without any prompting the physical gesture intended to indicate Sai Wong's age, interpreting it in a more positive sense, as indicative of his wisdom.

The second example, drawn from the MA group which I am currently teaching, is more complex and places myself as much as the students in the centre of the frame, suggesting that the teacher is also prone to become a learner in those moments when the drama studio is re-configured as a transnational space in which cosmopolitan values are encouraged. Four students – two Taiwanese, one Chinese, one British (all female and in their twenties) – were devising a small piece of storytelling theatre based upon the Chinese story *The Magic Paintbrush* for an intended audience of upper primary school children. It is a story I know well from an English picture book version, one I have used myself with children and teachers. The version they were using tells of Liang, a young boy who loves drawing but who is too poor even to own a pencil. One day he is given a paintbrush by an old man and from now on whatever he paints becomes real. The people are happy as he can paint them food and luxuries but when the Emperor hears of this gift he imprisons Liang and forces him to paint a tree upon which grows pure gold. Liang, however, also paints a river in between the Emperor and the tree and conjures up a storm when he tries to sail across it. The Emperor drowns and Liang disappears, keeping his gift secret from then on. The students had been progressing well but were presently disagreeing over how to represent the ending of the story. One of the Taiwanese was adamant that Liang should not

be seen deliberately to bring about the Emperor's death as this would send out the wrong message to children. I reminded her of the readings associated with the course and asked whether this would not best be interpreted as a symbolic death. In particular, what would the alternative be? Should Liang let the emperor continue to rule so mercilessly? Didn't it really represent the symbolic defeat of oppressive authority, something well attuned to the justifiable fantasies of young schoolchildren? At this point a normally quiet student from China vocally intervened. There was a problem with my response, she said, when viewed in the light of the historical genesis of the tale. Contrary to what I had presumed, it was not an old folk tale at all but was typical of those written in the 1950's in response to Mao Zedong's call for artists to write stories for the new regime. She argued that it was stories such as this that had brainwashed the red guards into justifying acts of murder and cultural vandalism during the cultural revolution. (I later learned that she personally did not like the tale, which had been proposed by one of the Taiwanese girls, but had accepted the majority decision of the group to work with it – one that had, incidentally, been given my enthusiastic stamp of approval.) In the end the group did not resolve their argument but came up with a morally ambiguous, aesthetic solution to cater for their disagreement. As the storm becomes more intense and the wind increases in strength, the emperor calls for Liang to halt it but Liang shouts that he cannot hear him through the wind and cannot see him through the rain. The face and voice of the actor playing Liang meanwhile convey a seemingly happy ignorance of the turmoil that his paintbrush is creating in the space behind him; whether Liang's ignorance was feigned or genuine was up to children to discuss after the show and to decide upon for themselves.

The spatial, writes Doreen Massey, is the realm of the configuration of potentially dissonant narratives (2005). The ruptures evident in the conflicting interpretations of *The Magic Paintbrush* that emerged during its dramatisation clearly illustrate this. My own interpretation, confidently and knowledgeably asserted, was based within the tradition of the western, liberal left, informed by the post-Marxist theories of Jack Zipes and the utopian writings of Ernst Bloch. This was brought home to me soon after the incident related above, when I heard on the radio a recorded interview with Yip Harburg, the socialist

American songwriter from the time of the Great Depression, who wrote the lyrics for the songs in the 1938 film *The Wizard of Oz*, capturing the imagination of the age with the utopian yearnings of *Somewhere over the Rainbow* and the comic exhilaration of *Ding Dong the Witch is Dead*. What particularly struck me as I listened to the interview was the explanation he offered for this latter song when faced with criticism of its ambiguous moral content. Laughingly, he replied that for him and the majority of ordinary people at the time there was no ambiguity at all. How else should they respond to the overthrow and destruction of a tyrant at a time when economic tyranny had led to years of poverty and when political tyranny was threatening the world with imminent catastrophe? It was precisely this attitude and interpretation, this *position*, that I unquestioningly brought to *The Magic Paintbrush*, one that the literal and metaphorical need to spatialise the story displaced when faced with an alternative understanding, itself constructed from a very different geographical / historical position.

In May, 1942, Mao Zedong delivered a talk at the Yanan Forum on Literature and Art that was to have a profound influence on the subsequent development of art and literature in the People's Republic of China. In it he insisted that the new literature and art should fit into the revolutionary machine, as 'powerful weapons for writing and educating the people and for attacking and destroying the enemy (to) help the people fight the enemy with one heart and one mind.' The correct stance that writers should adopt vis-à-vis their enemies was to 'expose their duplicity and their cruelty and at the same time to point out the inevitability of their defeat.'⁽⁶⁾ Although at the time of delivery the principle enemy was the Japanese army, Mao also identified an ideological enemy in those who would accumulate wealth for themselves and thus exploit the poor and the workers. It was this reading that was self-evident to the Chinese student, Xiao-di Wang, informed by her knowledge of the cruel and tyrannical history of the cultural revolution.

Clingman carries out an interesting etymological analysis of the two English homonyms 'roots' and 'routes', the latter being more often associated with a transnational vision. He points out that the 'root' of the word 'route' is

the Latin *rupta*, meaning 'broken', to be accompanied by the implied noun *via*, so that the full phrase is *rupta via* – broken road. His subsequent comment is significant:

'Routes are not simply continuous; they are broken, and disruption is built into the term. Unevenness and disparity are part of our history, part of the very definition of routes and boundaries. To be in the place of transition, in the disposition of crossing, is to encounter this reality.' (Clingman, 2009, p.26)

The triple echo of the three terms *root*, *route* and *rupture*, intrinsic to the transnational, resonates in this example of practice, in which an apparent *rupture* along the *route* of the dramatic journey, the process of spatialising the story, exposed the *root* not only of the story itself but also of the ideological dissonances underpinning conflicting responses to it. And the resolution the students found to this apparent impasse is itself telling. No story gained the upper hand: the ending they arrived at was neither an unambiguous celebration of the Emperor's demise nor a moralistic evasion of it. To use a spatial metaphor: in avoiding outright didacticism they managed to *intertwine* the two responses rather than *superimpose* one over the other. In the final analysis, despite its historical and ideological genesis, the story managed to provide enough space for its re-telling to resist out and out closure. In the final analysis, the students were happy with what they produced and the audience – including the examiners – found it entirely delightful. Good stories are never reducible to statements of principle or universal moral maxims; if they were, there would be no boundary to navigate and interpret. This returns us to our other metaphor, the cosmopolitan conversation, and to the absence of any need for it to culminate in value consensus for it to be judged as worthwhile. It is enough that such a conversation can help people engage with each other's ideas and learn to get along; in this example, it also resulted in better art.

Conclusion

This article has suggested that the concept of the transnational imaginary

can be helpful to drama educators, not because it provides a curriculum of stories for us to work with or a radical political agenda for us to follow but because it proposes a set of metaphors and an ethical perspective to help frame the tasks we set our students and interpret the benefit of the processes they engage in. It is a particularly apt theory for the era we live in, one in which contact with difference is increasingly inevitable, as it does not wish away boundaries or envisage them as inevitably divisive but rather conceives of them as the very grounds on which we meet. Boundaries of all kinds exist in the drama studio. Some may be clearly visible, embodied in gender, ethnicity and culture; others may be less so, constructed from personal experience and beliefs, only becoming visible in ruptures and dissonances that emerge as work progresses. As Clingman argues, we should not attend to whether boundaries exist or not but rather to how we construct and conceive them; for to conceive the boundary is also to navigate it and to navigate it is to alter its nature (2009). The trajectory of this article has been to examine the space of drama, (meaning the conjunction of the space in which we work, with the imaginative space of the fictions we work with), as itself a boundary, as transitive, a space for journeying, for navigation, where we can encounter the difference of others through the metaphor of non-threatening, non-coercive conversation. In this way, the hope is that we become more likely to encounter difference with curiosity rather than mistrust, come to see alterity as a potential source of delight rather than an inevitable threat, and envisage the boundary as a space that not only divides us but as one that also connects us.

Notes

1. <http://www.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/LiteratureEnglish/WorldLiterature/LiteraryCriticism/?view=usa&ci=9780199278497>
2. <http://www.amazon.com/Cosmopolitanism-Ethics-World-Strangers-Issues/dp/039332933X#noop>
3. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doreen_Massey_\(geographer\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doreen_Massey_(geographer))
4. Border Crossing is one of the key conceptual groupings for contributions in Tim Prentki and Sheila Preston (eds) *The Applied Theatre Reader* (2009)
5. For a similar perspective see Amartya Sen (2007).
6. See bibliography for reference

Bibliography

- Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. London: Penguin Books.
- Artaud, A. (1958). *The Theatre and its Double*. New York: Grove Press. (translated by M.C. Richards).
- Clingman, S. (2009). *The Grammar of Identity: Transnational Fiction and the Nature of the Boundary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cresswell, T. (2004). *Place: a Short Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Kendall C. And Li, Y-W. (1980). *Sweet and Sour: Tales from China Retold*. New York: Clarion.
- Mao, Z. (1942). *Talks at the Yen'an Forum on Literature and Art*. Retrieved (March, 2010) from <http://www.marx2mao.com/Mao/YFLA42.html>.
- Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Nicholson, H. (2005). *Applied Drama: the Gift of Theatre*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nicholson, H. (2009). *Theatre & Education*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ong, A. and Nonini, D. (1997). *Ungrounded Empires: the Cultural Politics of Modern Chinese Transnationalism*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Prentki, T. and Preston, S. (eds.) (2009). *The Applied Theatre Reader*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Sen, A. (2007) *Identity and Violence: the Illusion of Destiny*. London: Penguin Books.

此為上文摘要中譯

「越界」：戲劇教育與超國界空間

Joe Winston

英國華威大學教育學院副教授

羅家玉

英國華威大學教育學院戲劇教育博士班候選人

王笑迪

英國華威大學教育學院戲劇教育碩士研究生

電郵: J.A.Winston@warwick.ac.uk

摘要

在全球一體化的衝擊下，在任何一個國家，任何一所學府，不難見到來自不同文化、口操不同語言的人聚首一堂，並肩學習。面對這新的教學挑戰，戲劇教育工作者又該如何應對呢？本論文探討一個富倫理價值取向的教育劇場。其論點主要源於 Stephen Clingman 的「超時空地域的小說觀」、Kwame Anthony Appiah 的「世界主義倫理觀」及 Doreen Massey 的「從文明角度看地緣經濟觀」。作者隱喻戲劇為「遊走界域」的工具，這比喻雖然不及 Giroux 的「跨越邊界」那般簡潔、明快，但從政治現實看來卻更是貼題。論文又引申兩名華威大學亞裔研究生的成果，以其研究個案為例，引證這以倫理為本的戲劇教育理念如何實踐於現今的倫理劇目。

關鍵詞：中國的故事、世界主義、遊走界域、時空地域、超國界主義