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Abstract

This chapter shows how process drama in education can create unique opportunities for students to develop ethical understandings. It provides a new framework for understanding the moral dimensions of process drama. The author considers how process drama can enable students to construct, explore and critique their own ethical understandings.

Brian Edmiston is an assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison where he directs the Drama/Theatre & Education program. He has studied, taught, presented and published internationally. He is especially interested in teacher-research and process drama which promotes ethical understandings.

INTRODUCTION

What should we do with the prisoners? Should they go off in the spaceship? It doesn’t matter if they die, they’re worthless anyway.

... I’ve changed my mind. You can’t decide for people. Even if we need the money we can’t make them go - they’re people too.

In this chapter I will consider how process drama work can enable students to construct, explore and critique ethical understandings. I will show how students’ views of the rights and wrongs of actions can be foregrounded to enable them to explore such ethical concerns as justice, fairness, prejudice and tolerance.

In what I will refer to as the Space Traders Drama, I recently explored the central moral question of how we should treat other people. I worked with a group of thirteen-year-old students for four 45 minute drama sessions. Jeffrey Willhelm, the students’ classroom teacher, had asked me to work with the students in preparation for reading some literature which dealt with the theme of racism. I had been reading a short story, “The Space Traders" and thought that the central conflict in the story might be a useful starting point for the class. The story comes from Derek Bell’s collection Faces at the Bottom of the Well, which examines racism in America. It is set in a future when the United States is approaching economic and environmental collapse. The government is near
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bankruptcy and desperately needs money in order to rebuild and restore the country. "Alien" people from another planet land on Earth and offer the government all the gold they need for economic recovery in exchange for all the African American people in the country. The short story ends with the offer being accepted.

I had intended to establish a drama context similar to that in the story. However, after some preliminary brainstorming with the class I decided that, in exchange for the gold, in role as the aliens' representative I would ask for all the people "on Welfare." I made this alteration in planning after my initial session with the class. I expected that the issue of prejudice could be more productively examined by such a change and I was not disappointed. Jeff had told me that the students believed that their school and community were neither racist nor prejudiced. Their class had no "minority" students in it and the students had said that they treated everyone equally, regardless of race. The students live in a rural area which has small populations of Hmong immigrants, Native Americans, and African Americans. In contrast to this professed lack of prejudice, I was surprised to hear students make dismissive and stereotyping comments about people who receive governmental public assistance. In brainstorming with the class we listed what government spends money on; the class noted welfare payments alongside expenditures on the military, the police, schools, roads, environment. When asked what could be cut or reduced to save money, Welfare was the first to be cut and no students publicly disagreed with this position. In defence of this proposal, students made comments such as "They're lazy," "They should get a job," and "It's a waste of our taxes." It is important to note that this discussion took place as the U.S. House of Representatives was voting on massive public spending cuts and that students would have heard a great deal of rhetoric in the media much of which largely endorsed these positions.

In this chapter I describe and apply, in particular, some of the theories of Mikhail Bakhtin and relate these to how we can structure drama to enable students to forge ethical understandings.\(^1\) Bakhtin's theories offer views of ethical action, the self and dialogue which both challenge much of current thinking on moral education and provide a new framework for creating and understanding a moral perspective on process drama in education.

ETHICS, DIALOGUE AND MORAL EDUCATION

As Peter Singer (1991: v) makes clear, "We cannot avoid involvement in ethics, for what we do - and what we don't do - is always a possible subject of ethical evaluation. Anyone who thinks about what he or she ought to do is, consciously or unconsciously, involved in ethics." We form ethical understandings as we evaluate the morality of our own and others' actions, as we wonder whether actions were "good" and "right" or "bad" and "wrong." Philip Jackson (1993) has shown that there are moral messages and meanings in every classroom interaction and every teacher choice. In process drama, teachers can position students so that they evaluate the morality of actions and thus enable students to create their own ethical understandings about issues of importance to them.

Bakhtin's view of ethics is grounded in human relationships and interactions. He questions the fundamental assumption of Western culture that there is a distinction between the individual and the social. Thus, the notion that morality can be an individual matter is unacceptable to him. He argues that we cannot separate self from

\(^1\) See my 1994 article for a more general analysis of the relevance of Bakhtin's theories for process drama.
other - from birth to death, who we are, how we think, what we understand and how we act is always dependent on our present or past relationships with other people. He argues that even our consciousness is social and not individual. If we are conscious then we are engaged in dialogue. In our dialogic interactions we effect and are effected by other points of view. "To live means to participate in dialogue: to ask questions, to heed, to respond, to agree, and so forth. In this dialogue a person participates wholly and throughout his whole life ... He invests his entire self in discourse, and this discourse enters into the dialogic fabric of human life, into the world symposium" (Bakhtin, 1984: 293).

In addition to questioning an individual view of morality, Bakhtin rejects the idea that we can rely on moral codes or other people to tell us how to act. Bakhtin (1990, 1993) is emphatic that ethical responsibility is unavoidable. This is because each person, adult or child, has a unique perspective on the world and on every interaction. He states quite clearly that "everyone occupies a unique and never-repeatable place, any being is once-occurrence" (1993: 40 his emphasis). Thus, each of us is always answerable for what we do or do not do in a particular situation; we can never say that we were somewhere else. Despite our relationships with others, each action or reaction is an unrepeatable act by a unique self acting at a unique time and place. One person's acts are non-transferable to another because others always have different perspectives. Being aware of this reality makes our actions ethical: "Ethical action is born of a sense that each act in unrepeatable and responsibility is nontransferable" (Morson & Emerson, 1990: 179).

Since one person's actions are unique, it is ethically untenable to retreat to either moral relativism or fixed codes of behavior. An "anything goes" approach to ethics is a denial of how each of us responds to what others do. Equally, a "tell me what to do" attitude is an abdication of individual responsibility. Though we are responsible for our actions and the development of ethical positions we are never alone in our thinking. Because we are always in relationships, we can always dialogue about ethical matters as we create ethical understandings.

As drama educators we are always concerned with relationships among people and, if we accept Bakhtin's position, we are therefore also moral educators.1 If we do not draw students' attention to the morality of their actions, then we will tend to reinforce whatever ethical assumptions the students bring into the classroom and express in their opinions. Further, if we want students to develop their own morality, then we cannot tell them what to think, nor should we encourage them to endorse moral relativism.

Bakhtin's arguments resonate with scholars like Carol Gilligan and Nel Noddings who have seriously questioned dominant philosophical and pedagogical concerns with the individual formulation and application of moral rules and principles, abstract moral reasoning and decontextualized moral judgments. In place of ethical hierarchies and moral imperatives Gilligan (1982: 74) advises us to look for webs of relationship and proposes a view of ethics "that revolves around a central insight that self and other are interdependent." In place of a legalistic view of justice she argues for an ethic of justice and care with "the vision that self and other will be treated as of equal worth, that despite differences of power, things will be fair; the vision that everyone will be responded to and included, that no one will be left alone and hurt" (Gilligan: 63).

---

1 Robert Colby, in his 1982 and 1984 articles, usefully outlines much of the theory of moral development. He demonstrates how students are reasoning morally in drama.
Noddings (1984: 24) concurs and argues that the primary aim of the moral educator is to preserve and enhance caring among people. She advocates a vision of an "ethical self" which "is born of the fundamental recognition of relatedness; that which connects me naturally to the other, reconnects me through the other to myself."

I agree with Noddings central educational aim to promote caring. I work diligently to create and maintain an atmosphere in the classroom which is safe, respectful and caring. Within such a caring community it can become safe to explore less caring ethical attitudes towards "others" outside the classroom: for example people who are demonized, spoken of as objects, or treated as scapegoats. Jeff Willhelm's classroom had a friendly, respectful atmosphere with students who laughed, listened to each other and seemed to feel safe enough to share honest opinions. The group seemed ready to examine and critique some of their ethical understandings.

ETHICS, EVALUATION AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION

Bakhtin argues that as we dialogue and reflect on our ethical actions we are in a sense creating our selves. "When my act is a specifically ethical act, then my reflection upon it and my account of it start determining me as well and involve my own determinateness" (1990: 141). Acts are ethical when we accept responsibility for their consequences. Dialogue about one's own actions develops ethical responsibility when we connect our words with our deeds. In ethical dialogue we make connections as we dialogue about what we have done. As Liapunov and Holquist (Bakhtin, 1993: xii) put it, a person feels responsible "only if the subject from within his own radical uniqueness weaves a relationship to [his or her acts] in his accounting for it. Responsibility then is the ground of moral action, the way in which we overcome the guilt of the gap between our words and our deeds." If we resist dialogue then we tend to minimize our sense of responsibility and ossify our thinking. Our morality becomes more "monologic," static, fixed and judgmental rather than dynamic and open to change.

Bakhtin (1981: 334) argues that individual acts "are essential in order to expose - as well as to test - his ideological position." Bakhtin is talking about a character in a novel but his comments also apply to process drama. He wants to emphasize the difference between words and deeds. Saying what we would do is very different from what we actually do. Moral reasoning is not the same as moral action. The challenge in process drama is to enable students to connect words with deeds and thereby both expose and affect their ethical understandings.

The potential for ethical dialogue is one of the significant aspects of process drama. If students have opportunities in drama to dialogue and connect their words with their deeds they can develop responsibility as well as construct, explore and critique their own ethical positions and thus their selves. For ethical understandings to develop we must evaluate our own deeds.

Firstly, we must evaluate our actions because ethical understanding which goes beyond repeating others' moral positions requires us to critique our actions as we reflect on them. As Bakhtin argues, "understanding is impossible without evaluation" (Bakhtin, 1986: 142). Thus, students need to do more than experience from the point of view of fictional people, or reflect generally on what was said and done. Students need to make evaluative connections between what they do and what they think. In the Space Traders Drama after meeting the "alien" one student, Melissa, wrote, "I'm not going to make any quick judgments about this being. I don't want to make any foolish mistakes on the future of
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this nation. This being could be lying to us." Every student had been asked to give an initial response to the proposed trade by actually walking along a continuum and standing in a space to demonstrate how much they agreed or disagreed with the trade. This student was clearly evaluating her own reactions to the situation.

Secondly, we must evaluate our own actions. Another student, Jenny, had decided to accept the trade and agreed to walk out of the prison cell in which she was being held. However, after dialogue with other students she reconsidered her position and wrote, "I went with the aliens because being in jail was the worst. I'm not so sure I'm going to go with the aliens because some of the others made me think of how much I'm going to miss my family and I'll never see them again. So I'm very confused right now." She was evaluating her initial action and reconsidering the wisdom of her choice.

Students will frequently want to evaluate what others do. However, if we want to develop students' ethical understandings we need to see student A's evaluation of student B's actions as part of student B's process for forging her own ethical positions. As students wondered whether or not to leave the jail, those who had decided to leave with the alien dialogued with the others who wanted to stay and tried to convince them to change their minds. Many students became very animated as they evaluated what they saw as errors in judgment: "You shouldn't go. How can you be so sure it's going to be so great on the planet? They might make you slaves." "What about your family? Are you just going to leave them here?" When Jenny wrote her response to her decision she had clearly been influenced by what others had said to her. She had decided to leave the jail because being there was "the worst." However, after dialoguing with her peers she thought about her actions from a different point of view: her relationship with her family. "I'm not so sure I'm going to go with the aliens because some of the others made me think of how much I'm going to miss my family and I'll never see them again." The significance of the dialogic interaction, from an ethical perspective, was not related to an ability to convince someone else or change someone's position. Rather, dialogue can enable someone to change their own position. Whenever we are promoting an exchange of ideas, as we moderate in or out of role, we can ask such questions as "Did what she say make a difference for you?" In doing so we can press students to listen to each other, hear other perspectives and reconsider their own points of view.

SPECTATOR PERSPECTIVES IN ART AND EVERYDAY LIFE

As I will discuss below, in process drama students can evaluate their own actions in ways similar to Bakhtin's views of how this happens in both art and in everyday life. I will now briefly discuss Bakhtin's relevant views.

For ethical understandings to develop, we evaluate our completed deeds from an outside, or spectator point of view. Bakhtin argues that, "it is immensely important for the person who understands, to be located outside the object of his or her creative understanding ... [otherwise our understanding] would merely be duplication and would not entail anything new or enriching" (Bakhtin, 1986: 7 his emphasis). Adopting a spectator point of view allows us to see our own actions (in Bakhtin's words) as "objects" which are "complete" or "finalized."
Ethical Understandings and Art

The arts are important for Bakhtin, from a moral point of view, because art gives form to actions which can then be evaluated ethically. Art crystallizes actions with which we can empathize. Though our experiences of art are very real, the actions depicted are, of course, imaginary. Because of this they are in a sense "out of time" existing in the aesthetic time of the art form. This fact enables us to adopt a spectator point of view looking at the lives of people represented, for example, by actors on a stage or in lines of poetry. Form "finalizes" actions so that when we view art aesthetically we can critique those people's actions ethically. Similarly, in process drama the form finalizes the students' own actions and allows them to contemplate them in reflection from a spectator perspective. Bakhtin argues that actions in art become objects to contemplated.

An outside or spectator point of view is essential for Bakhtin, not in itself, but because it gives us a point of view in addition to points of view expressed in the art form. This allows for dialogue, for example, between a reader and the author of a novel or between a viewer and a character in a television program. Forms created by the novel, autobiography, poetry, photography, drawing, music, dance, television, theatre and process drama in their different ways all finalize actions. The dialogue will be ethical whenever it deals with questions of how we ought to act. In the classroom students can talk and write about the actions of characters in stories. Older students will be much more likely to evaluate the ethics of a character's actions than her own actions. In process drama, of course, the actions of the "characters" can also be the actions of the students allowing for the possibility of student dialogue about their own actions which will effect their ethical understandings.

Ethical Understandings and Everyday Life

Unlike in art, actions in everyday life are not deliberately formed for us to evaluate. In everyday life when we act we are not usually conscious of our self as an entity - we are concerned with a purpose or outcome. "The acting consciousness itself ... needs only goals and values that regulate it and determine its sense" (Bakhtin, 1990: 139). It is only when we evaluate our actions that we think of the meaning of deeds and the self who acts. It is only when an action is perceived as complete and is finalized in this way that we can dialogue with it and evaluate it from an ethical point of view as right or wrong.

There are two ways in which we dialogue and evaluate our everyday actions: when we reflect and dialogue with our memory of events and when we dialogue with others about our deeds. We evaluate our actions as we reflect on events from a spectator perspective, for example, as we tell stories, write letters, or remember what we did. We dialogue with our memory of what happened. Reflection locates us outside action and gives us a spectator point of view from which to evaluate and create understandings. We can judge others if we are watching them as they interact. However, it is only when we shift our concern away from the immediate context and look at ourselves from a spectator point of view that we can interpret and critique our own actions.

We can also evaluate our actions when we genuinely dialogue with another person. When another person evaluates what we have done she gives meaning to our actions from her perspective; she has thus given us a perspective on our actions which we did not have before. Seeing us from outside, other people are spectators on our actions which they "finalize" and see as an "object." We see other people's actions in the same way. If we can see from their point of view then we take up their spectator perspective
on our actions and we can evaluate from their point of view. As we interact with them our initial perspective will be changed and our understandings will develop. To do so we must see our actions as objects seen from outside ourselves. However, if we reject another’s point of view without considering it and defend a position from only our initial point of view then our understandings will not change.

From a moral point of view dialogue is essential if we are to avoid monologic and judgmental fixed ethical positions because only in dialogue can we see ourselves as others see us and allow their perspectives to inform our ethical understandings.

In everyday life we often avoid genuine dialogue: we frequently misremember or forget our actions and keep interactions at a superficial level. With art it is harder to avoid dialogue once we are engaged. However, if we are disinterested in the perspectives expressed in a book or movie then we are not going to engage in a significant dialogue.

Students experiences in the classroom are no different. Thirteen-year-old students will resist dialogue and may not become engaged with art work. Students will often feel unprotected and not want to reflect on their actions. Process drama can, however, create conditions for both engagement in art and for genuine dialogue. It is essential that the students become and remain engaged in the drama world; I worked hard in the Science Traders Drama to ensure that the students were interested in all activities. In the next section I will discuss how the students were engaged in dialogic interactions in which they critiqued their own actions.

SPECTATOR PERSPECTIVES IN PROCESS DRAMA

From a moral standpoint, process drama creates unique opportunities for students to adopt spectator viewpoints and view their own actions as finalized objects. Before considering different ways in which the "spectator can be awakened" (Heathcote, 1984) I will discuss a distinctive feature of process drama.

Process Drama as a Liminal Experience

Process drama is an art which is created in process but it is also actually experienced by the students. In ways similar to evaluating other art forms, process drama enables students to see and evaluate actions and people with a wholeness that is impossible in everyday life: "The human being in art is an integral human being" (quoted in Morson & Emerson: 190). However, in process drama the human beings they are looking at are not only fictional but are also themselves. In ways similar to dialogue in everyday life experiences, in process drama students can dialogue with their memories of events, as well as dialogue with each one another and with the teacher. However, when they reflect about events they reflect on formed experiences rather than disjointed memories and when they interact they have the protection of a fictional context.

In process drama the line between the actual and the imagined is blurred and the experience is often liminal - experienced on the boundary between art and life. As art, process drama protects students from the exposure of talking about their "real" attitudes and yet protects them into thinking about the "fictional" ethical positions which they

---

1 Cecily O'Neill discusses other aspects of liminality in her 1989 article.
2 For a detailed analysis of reflection in drama see my 1992 article.
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adopt in the drama. In reality, students attitudes in drama can be a mix of positions they feel strongly about in actual life and those which they are wondering about in their imaginations.

When the students experience the drama liminally they adopt both an insider and an outsider perspective on their own actions and the other events of the drama. As Gavin Bolton has noted, "The ambivalent position between fiction and reality is what creates drama's potency" (Bolton, 1985: 155). We know that the drama is fictional and yet we also know that we are actually creating it. For the students the drama is "not real" and yet "not real." The drama is experienced in a liminal world between the imagination and the external world. Bert States (1987) uses the metaphor of "binocular vision" to describe the audience's experience in the theatre: we see both phenomenologically and semiotically. We experience the people on stage as both actors and as characters. In process drama students' binocular vision is more acute when they phenomenologically experience their own movements and thoughts at the same time as they semiotically interpret our collective actions and words. As Bolton notes, this creates an experience of "metaxis" in which "The fictitious world is not 'given,' to be merely suffered. It is actively constructed, so that submitting to its experience is tempered by the treatment of it as an object" (Bolton, 1984: 142 his emphasis). Thus, in drama the students both actively chose to act but can also reflect on their actions. They both create the drama as participants and reflect on the drama as spectators.

Though students can experience from a spectator perspective at any time during the drama, there are two ways in which the drama can be structured so that they adopt more specific stances: as "narrative spectators" and as "dramatic spectators." Students can either reflect and tell a story about past or future action or reflect and be aware of the action as it is unfolding.

Narrative Spectator

Just as in everyday life, students can narrate their version of events. They can reflect on the events of the drama as they, for example, tell stories, write letters, explain their actions, interpret tableaux, or retell events for grandchildren. They can also show their narratives, for example, in still images, movements, drawings, dances or songs. In addition, they can explain or interpret their images or stories of the future. In these activities if the students can be directed to evaluate their own previous actions then they will be engaged in dialogue which will affect their ethical understandings.

In the Space Traders Drama the words quoted at the beginning of this paper were spoken by the same boy. At the beginning of the drama he said, in response to my question about what should happen to the people "on Welfare", "It doesn't matter if they die, they're worthless anyway." Two days later I asked the students to return to the continuum and place themselves somewhere between agreeing and disagreeing with the trade. He had moved from near total agreement to near total rejection of the trade. I asked him why he had moved and in explanation he said, "I've changed my mind. You can't decide for people. Even if we need the money we can't make them go - they're people too." He had evaluated his own actions, connected words with deeds and he had changed his ethical position.

Another student stood in the middle of the room with her friends and expressed no opinion at the beginning of the drama. She wrote this after she had imagined why she
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might have needed public assistance: "I don't think we should force them to go. That would be very inhuman. We should give them a choice if they want to go or not."

The thinking of the narrative spectator is similar to the type of thinking which Donald Schön has usefully called "reflection-on-action" when we "stop and think" (1987: 26) about what we have done. In contrast, "reflection-in-action" is when "we think about doing something while doing it" (1982: 94); that is similar to the thinking of the dramatic spectator.

Dramatic Spectator

Susanne Langer's (1953) explanation of why we feel tension in drama is to point out that in drama the "form is in suspense." When drama is "dramatic" we experience a "present filled with its own future." Thus, as well as thinking about what is happening, the dramatic spectator is thinking about the present in the context of a probable future.

Sometimes the future pulls present action towards it, for example, when there is a time limit. However, when the future is represented as another point of view (or points of view) in opposition to the one the students are adopting, when the future is something to dread or be cautious of, then the students will not only be participants in the event but will also view their participation as a dramatic spectator.

For example, in the Space Traders Drama the students created images of what the future might be on the planet - some showed slavery some an ideal vacation land. Immediately afterwards I came to collect the people, but whereas many had previously agreed to leave now most refused to go. The images and voices from the future were pressing in on the present causing them to rethink their previous decision.

Other ways in which students can be positioned to view their actions as the dramatic spectator include: when people know they are being secretly overheard they will be more cautious about what they say, if they know a letter will be judged they will evaluate what they write, and if people are pretending to be someone else (role within a role) they will select their actions with more care.

Another way in which the teacher can awaken the dramatic spectator which may cause students to evaluate their previous actions is to "ventrilquate" to use Bakhtin's term. This is when we adopt a position which many students have previously held in order to allow them to dialogue with this position. For example, in the Space Traders Drama, after students agreed that the people could have been removed to prison, they represented the people and I entered as the warden. I described the people using phrases which I had heard previously "You're just worthless. I don't know why the aliens want you - you don't want to work." The students, some of whom had spoken phrases like these, were angry. One retorted "You've no right to talk to us like that" and another said, "You know nothing about work. You've never lost your job." What had been a voice from the past now became a voice in the present which was "filled with its own future." The students had to think about their present position in terms of what might happen to them on the planet; at the same time they could rethink a previous position.

In all these examples the students are no longer hearing one voice - they are listening to two: the one they readily adopt and another from the dramatic spectator. The dramatic spectator provides the students with another perspective on their actions and enables them to connect words with deeds in the process of action.
CONCLUSION

After the drama sessions the students wrote about their experiences. Jeff asked them whether or not there had been anything unfair in the drama work. Many wrote about how the drama had made them think about prejudice, discrimination, and/or fairness. Jenny, for example, had previously argued that it was the fault of the "people on Welfare" that they were unemployed. After the drama she wrote, "At first I thought that the aliens could take our prisoners or the Welfare people because we didn't need them. Then after I thought about it I kind of changed my mind. You can't put a price on someone's life. It was very prejudiced of me to do that. It's not fair to them. Maybe it was a mistake and they regret it and then it would be too late for them. Maybe they couldn't help not getting a job. We were all being too selfish." In the drama work Jenny had not only constructed ethical positions, she critiqued them. In doing so she explored issues related to justice, fairness, and prejudice.

Maxine Greene (1989) argues that by "Naming, articulating, affirming the dissonances and contradictions in our consciousnesses, we may be able to choose ourselves as ethical in unexpected ways." This chapter has explored some of the ways in which process drama can bring dissonances and contradictions into productive dialogue and thus enable students to construct, explore, and critique their ethical understandings.

Bakhtin's theories of ethical action, the self, and dialogue provide us with a fresh perspective on the moral possibilities of process drama. Though we will never be aware of many of the dialogues in which students are engaged, we can nevertheless structure drama work so that such dialogues are more likely to occur and ethical selves will be forged.

Bakhtin "imagines the self as a conversation, often a struggle, of discrepant voices with each other, voices (and words) speaking from different positions and invested with different degrees and kinds of authority" (Morson & Emerson: 218). Some students have healthy, vibrant dynamic interactions with their peers, the world and with themselves. Other students are more closed and less open to hear dissenting opinions and dissonant voices. However, all students have many more voices to share than the ones they first show us.

As a drama teacher I have come to realise the awe-ful power which we have to enter into deep and significant conversations with students which change the ways they view the world and their selves. I continue to learn how we can extend the circle of care in the classroom as we enable our students to deepen and extend the conversations they have with each other, with us, and with themselves.

I agree with Nel Noddings (1984: 51) that caring is our "basic reality" and I accept the ethical responsibility of drama teaching which can extend or shrink the circle of care we form in the classroom. When I work with students I want us all to be open to difference and tolerate of diverse views wherever these come from. I want us to listen for the silenced, to talk with the powerless, to see beneath the stereotype and hear beyond the rhetoric. I want us to listen for new voices, to continue to question, to argue, to rage, to laugh, and to literally make up our own minds.
I work for all this because I believe that "We become the voices that inhabit us" and I regard "selfhood" as "not a particular voice within, but a particular way of combining many voices within" (Morson & Emerson, 1990: 213).
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