We create dramatic art with our students—art which has dramatic form. This is the case with those of us who work in creative drama (or drama in education) just as much as it is for those of us who work primarily in the production of plays. The work to which I referred in the article which David Hornbrook took such exception to is, paradoxically, some of the finest dramatic art I have had the privilege to create with others. The core of David Hornbrook's argument seems to be as follows. Firstly, I am representative of those "agenda laden" teachers who manipulate children's experiences and responses until they agree with a predetermined "liberal" point of view. By implication these teachers include Heathcote, Bolton, O'Neill, Booth, O'Toole, etc., who have acknowledged that drama is "a learning medium." Secondly, that a concern for pedagogy eclipses the art form of theatre which is what we should be teaching.

In this brief response I will outline why, in my work, the creation of dramatic art is important to me, how I structure it so that it is not didactic, and why it is foolish to so peremptorily dismiss this way of working from the dramatic curriculum.

Rather than attacking the work of other people in our field, I believe that what we need to argue against is the creation of poor art whether it is in the classroom or in the theatre. We have all been subjected to what Peter Brook has aptly called "deadly theatre." The actors know their lines and the production is technically flawless but a piece of "living theatre" is never born; dramatic art has not been created. Similarly, we know of students who move and talk in role "doing drama" (with or without their teacher in role working alongside them), but because their work is trite or superficial they are experiencing "deadly drama" rather than dramatic art.

Making non-art is almost unavoidable in learning to be an artist and I (like most readers of this journal, I suspect) have at times been responsible for such shoddy work. On occasions I confess that I have wished that there was a "pedagogical fundamentalism" so that I could have "seen the light" and become an instant drama teacher. Though I have come across those who mimic others' work, I know of no "orthodoxy" and accepted a long time ago there is no quick way to become skillful in creating dramatic art.

The creation of all art requires shaping and selectivity; we create forms which are expressive of feelings. Similarly, in perceiving art we shape our responses as we pay attention to the details and overall form which has been created. Both makers and perceivers have significant experiences.

In the creation of dramatic art we teach our students to be selective so that they give form to their feelings. Like all artists, the

1 David Hornbrook used this useful term in his first book Education and Dramatic Art.

2 David Hornbrook caused a stir among drama and theatre teachers in the U.K. with the publication in 1986 of two articles in the New Theatre Quarterly. He raised serious concerns about the nature and purpose of drama and theatre teaching, and was highly critical of the work of both Dorothy Heathcote and Gavin Bolton and those who have worked in a similar way. An exchange followed in 2D Journal: London Drama, and the NADTE Journal in which David developed his arguments and Bolton, O'Toole, Davis, Graham, Fines and others all seriously responded to the points he made. What disappointed me in following this from the United States, however, was that there appeared to be no dialogue with the detailed response by David Hornbrook to the points made by those who disagreed with his arguments. His first book, Education and Dramatic Art and his article in this journal need to be read in the context of this exchange.

3 The summary statements about art are based in particular on the writings of Susanne Langer (especially Feeling and Form and Problems of Art), John Dewey (especially Art as Experience), as well as Robert Wilkin's The Intelligence of Feeling and Theodore Shank's The Art of Dramatic Art. I regret that I cannot elaborate here. Gavin Bolton has repeatedly made reference to the art of classroom drama work (especially in Drama as Education and his most recent article "Although" in Drama Broadsheet).
students will be expressive through the forms they create. Similarly, we want our students to respond to art by having aesthetic experiences. We do not want our students to have deadly experiences, which is why we are rigorous in our demands that they are selective.

When Dorothy Heathcote was working with those students on the funeral, having noticed that they were having difficulty carrying the body, she asked them if they wanted to continue to work on the scene. Having said that they did, she patiently but rigorously demanded that they repeat their work until they became serious in their attempts to show a burial. She was not ignoring an intention to create a comic scene; she was insisting that they be selective so that they would shape their movements and thus express some feelings about attitudes to death.

Fortunately, I did not have such difficulties with the three groups with which I worked in exploring the interment of the Japanese-Americans in World War II. Though we had many light-hearted moments, I was also rigorous in my expectations of seriousness and continuously encouraged the participants to select and shape their words and movements. The sixth grade students, for example, chose what they would show in their photographs and chose what they would take with them to the camp and how they disposed of their other possessions. They were consequently giving form to their feelings about being caught between two cultures and the pain of losing treasured possessions. At the same time, the students also took up the perspectives of FBI agents who viewed their possessions suspiciously and the perspectives of those who had the chance to buy valuables from those who had to sell.

I completely agree with David Hornbrook that we have paid too little attention to audience in our work in theatre and drama in education. What we have not realized, however, is the significance of the fact that students can function as an audience to their own work as they are improvising as well as when they perform their work for others not involved in their devising. As I have shown at length elsewhere, Heathcote is repeatedly requiring students to function as audience to their own work. She puts them in a position where they can reflect on what they are in the process of making and thus appreciate their own work and experience it aesthetically. In other words,

like the playwright and director, she structures the work so that the students will create form and as they respond to what they have created they will shape their interpretations of the work. However, rather than waiting until they have "finished," she enables them to do all of this while they are in the process of creation. She requires the students to pay attention to the forming decisions they are making; she is teaching them how to make and appreciate dramatic art.

In my work I also repeatedly structured the work so that students would reflect on their experiences and verbalize their feelings. For example, in role as Japanese-Americans, as they looked at family photographs they remembered what they had said when the photographs were taken. Later, students remembered their feelings after selling family heirlooms like a priceless Noh mask. By contrast, in role as FBI agents, the students reflected on how they felt before they arrested the Japanese-Americans and then after they found out where the Japanese-Americans had been taken.

Though some of those who have learned from Heathcote are presumably using practices "owing little to commonly-held ideas about theatre" and doing little else than adopting "pedagogical tricks" which are permissively "progressive," Heathcote's contribution to our field cannot be so easily dismissed. There are unfortunately "art" rooms in schools on both sides of the Atlantic where little happens except undemanding teacher-dictated craft. However, this should not be used as an argument against teacher involvement in the creation of any of the arts.

Heathcote makes it clear why she intervenes in students' work and why she is so rigorous. She wants to create art with the students; she wants them to have significant experiences. In order to do so with many groups who are unused to working together and are unaware of dramatic structures and theatrical conventions, she argues that the teacher will have to structure much of the work. Robert Witkin (1974) also has no hesitation in advocating teacher involvement throughout the whole process of the creation of art. He argues that it is the responsibility of the adult to interact and assist the students as they form and playwrights as well as actors and that the teacher is structuring to enable this to happen.

Paradoxically, this was the subject of my workshop at AATE with Rives Collins. I agree with using David Hornbrook's categories of making, performing, and responding as the basis of the dramatic curriculum. However, I argue that this tripartite model applies to the actual process itself of creating improvised drama with no external audience as much as it does to the creation of any product.
their expressive acts. His research noted that a teacher's practices which are external to the students' processes "often lead to the opposite of what he intends with respect to self-expression" (p. 169).

Heathcote encourages the expression of attitudes because she is internally involved in the students' creation of dramatic art. She is not using her power to indoctrinate students; on the contrary, she wants to empower their thinking. In discussing her own teaching, she notes that "The teacher wanted them to take over her power. Not the power to control the quality of the experience (no teacher can abdicate from that) but the power to influence their own construct of the meaning in the event" (1984, p. 132). In her most recent writing, Heathcote (1990) refers to Freire (1987) who distinguishes between the manipulating authoritarian educator who retains power, and the liberating educator who when necessary assumes the responsibility for initiating learning but at the same time seeks to hand over that responsibility to the students.

Cecily O'Neill notes that, "Eventually, if the teacher is successful in transferring power and responsibility for the work to the students the developing meaning of the event will be in their hands and they will make it their own" (1991, p. 4). I controlled the structure tightly at the beginning of each drama on the interment of the Japanese-Americans, however, the students were in control of the feelings and ideas which were expressed. I was able to respond to the students in my decision with each group about shaping their work. In each case, by the resolution of the work the participants not only had more control over which structures they used but were even more in control of the ideas and feelings which were expressed.

I aspire to be a "liberating educator" and I find no contradiction with my aspiration to be a "dramatic artist." I also agree with those who argue that dramatic artists should not have an intention to teach some "lesson." However, I think that what they are describing is didactic teaching or direct instruction and not the sort of education which Freire, for example, envisioned and which guides my work in the classroom. Freire argues that educators want students "to ask questions about their own experiences" so that they "discover the living, powerful dynamic relation between word, action and reflection" (1989, p. 38). I know that dramatic art can be powerful in doing this. The students can always have power over the ideas in dramatic art created in the classroom even though the teacher has the power over much of the structuring process. If you reread my ar-

ticle I hope that you will agree that the students were not "subtly steered towards the moral denouement." They were empowered to examine and express their feelings about racism as we created dramatic art together.

A distinction needs to be drawn between moralizing and dealing with moral issues. All drama is about the concerns and relationships between and among human beings as they struggle with moral issues, make choices and take actions which effect others and themselves. Dewey (1934) reminds us that morality is the unavoidable concern of actors, playwrights, and audience, when he notes that "a person's ideas and treatment of his fellows are dependent upon his power to put himself imaginatively in their place" (p. 348). Our students imaginatively put themselves in the place of the people in their plays and their improvisations. They, or their teachers, would be moralizing if they suggested trite or easy solutions to the moral issues they encounter, but not if the students struggle to respond to, and ultimately attempt to reconcile their own views of the world with the different perspectives they encounter. The actors and audience in the stage version of To Kill a Mockingbird are confronted with many faces of racism and the difficulties for the characters involved in coming to terms with those realities. Similarly, in my work the students struggled with moral issues, but were not expected, and certainly not required, to moralize.

Part of my aim as a dramatic artist is summed up by Peter Brook who says "I know of one acid test for the theatre, a wish from the audience to see more clearly into itself" (1968, p. 136). As a director I shape plays so that they will promote insight by the audience; as a teacher I shape the drama to promote insight by the students. I want the students to question themselves and the world in which they live. I want them to question many of the attitudes I express in role and those aspects of their lives which are mirrored in the dramatic worlds we create in the classroom.

All dramatic art is concerned with aspects of people's lives. Art, as David Hornbrook notes, "deals in the strange and the unexpected; it is the creative challenging of preconceptions and the structures which sustain them." In the theatre the playwright achieves this by showing us different characters' perspectives on events. The audience's preconceptions are challenged most when they have to reconcile the apparently irreconcilable. For example, the ending of The Taming of the Shrew has provoked mountains of articles attempting to explain Kate's actions.

In the classroom I structure the work in a similar way. Like any adult who is responsible for students, I set them tasks and interact with

All drama is about the concerns and relationships between and among human beings as they struggle with moral issues, make choices and take actions which effect others and themselves.

---

4This simmering debate has included such eminent figures as Nellie McCoslin (see this journal), Otlin Corey, and Jonathan Levy.
them. When I set tasks and interact with students in role, I will initially work to support students in establishing their points of view. Later I work to enable them to challenge those points of view through the attitudes I adopt in role, the different situations we agree to explore, and the roles they adopt. My aim is to enable them to "gain as many different and conflicting knowings as possible" (Elbow 1988, p. 242). Peter Elbow argues forcefully that this is how we come to construct the concepts we have about the world. The students did not just experience the events of the interment in role as "Japanese-Americans"; their viewpoint was developed as people of Japanese heritage who had adopted American ways. The events were also experienced and "known" by FBI agents, opportunists, non-Japanese-American friends, those making racist slurs, neighbors, etc. Each perspective was layered onto the next so that whatever the students' initial points of view were, they were being challenged in the contradictions which developed as the work progressed.

Though I want students to experience contradictions, I also ultimately want them to see if they can reconcile these conflicting ways of looking at the events of the drama. My intention is not to push them towards some "moral denouement" but to see how they see themselves and the world they have created at the resolution of the work. As Elbow notes "many important insights and breakthroughs end up as a movement of thought from one frame of reference...to a larger one. There appears to be a contradiction...but the original one can finally be understood as a subset of the larger one" (1986, p. 251). Just as the members of the audience in the theatre seek to reconcile the different points of view presented in a play, the final phase of each drama required that of the participants. The role of museum curators (or film makers) gave the students a "wider perspective" on the events which required them to at least be aware of different points of view at the same time. I can, of course, only speculate to what extent the students were reconciling those different viewpoints, though that was one of my intentions. I did not, however, have a "covert curriculum of moral education" and did not hope for specific outcomes. The young girl who so passionately declared that "You try to be the best person you can be and in doing that you don't hurt anyone else" was not giving a moral incantation. If you read what she said before those words, I think you will agree that she was indeed reconciling some of the perspectives she had taken up during the drama. I do not know if she "really" holds those views; all I know is that they were stated as part of an artistic creation and that, along with other comments they formed a collective expression of students' feelings which they imagined would be placed on a memorial to the dead. Similarly, the student who said "People may not want to know the truth, but it is the truth" was not expressing an "ideologically sound view," she was expressing her attitude at the end of the drama. Though she may sound naive, she was forming her uncensored feelings at the conclusion of hours of work. Again, read what else she said. I think she would have agreed with Martin Esslin who stresses that ideally an audience in the theatre "realizes the complexity of situations" and begins to recognize that "truth is multi-dimensional" (1976, pp. 97, 114).

Like David Hornbrook I want students to become dramatically literate; I want them to be able to use the power of drama. However, I also know that they have to develop this ability as they do everything else—in process. They must experience dramatic art from the inside out. Doing plays or doing drama will not be enough; they must create art. Knowing the "great" dramatic texts and theatrical formats are of course invaluable, but improvised drama without the precondition of a formal performance is one of the most effective ways I know of enabling students to have significant experiences of dramatic structures. Having experienced, for example, tension, suspense, contrast, surprise, irony, peripeteia, and resolution (all of which were present in each of the dramas outlined in my article), students could identify those dramatic elements and would be more likely to be able to begin to use these elements in their own work in improvisation, playwriting and performance than if they had merely read about them or been told that they were present in a written text. It also needs to be stressed that when a group has created drama together they already have the kernels for future performance-based work, which in this case could have the theme of racism in America.

I no longer have the opportunity to work with students over long periods of time and thus do not have the opportunity to be a part of students' long process of learning how to create dramatic art on their own. However, I salute my colleagues who are empowering our students to become dramatic artists. I also encourage those who are novices in the creation of dramatic art through improvisation with their students to improvise, experiment and reflect! The dramatic art of both drama and theatre deserve to be included in any dramatic curriculum.
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