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Joffre-Eichhorn’s book on his experiences as a practitioner of the Theatre of the Oppressed in the context of development and peace-building in Afghanistan strikes a refreshingly different note from most existing literature on the field of Theatre for Development and theatre in conflict zones.

To start with, it is written in a very personal and conversational manner, in the form of a diary or weblog of the author’s own experiences in the country as an international developmental worker and theatre activist of sorts. It is full of anecdotes and personal memories, incorporating photographs and drawings from workshop processes that seem to intentionally convey a raw, unedited impression of theatre work in one of the most complex and protracted conflicts of the world. The pathos-laden title already gives an indication of the narrative style – at times flowery and sentimental, but nevertheless genuinely unassuming in its tone. To that extent, it can be classified more as a primary source text containing material on participatory theatre in Afghanistan rather than as a work of theatre scholarship.

At the same time, the book touches upon critical issues, asking tough questions and reflecting on the dilemmas of theatre-based intervention under extraordinarily grim circumstances without claiming to have ready truths or offering a finished, sophisticated analysis. It can thus be read as a form of
militant research, an intermittent chronicle of reflections that calls for further action and activist intervention. Joffre-Eichhorn’s intense personal commitment to participatory theatre, and to the people with whom he has forged longer term associations in Afghanistan, is thus more than evident.

As a German-Bolivian with a background in international development and education management, Joffre-Eichhorn has served as freelance theatre practitioner using the Theatre of the Oppressed and Playback Theatre methodologies in different parts of the world. The book presents the complexities of his own position as privileged Charidji, or foreign development aid worker, as a male facilitator from the West working with marginalized groups and as an expat who is critical towards the politics of international development aid, always treading a thin line between using and opposing the system. In this regard, the book offers a passionate, though unsystematic, critique of all that goes wrong in the name of developmental cooperation and humanitarian assistance: where the internationals live in their own segregated world in Afghanistan, with no connection to the local population and no real political will to effect change from the grassroots; where the Afghans continue to be viewed as backward and uncivilized; and where resources are misused and disproportionately distributed.

Joffre-Eichhorn’s book presents several examples of how theatre in such a setting is implicated in the neo-colonial politics of aid and military or civilian intervention in conflict. These suggest the need for a more in-depth study, as well as a broader theorization of theatre in conflict zones with reference to emergent modes of neo-liberal governance around the world.

The book is part of a German-language series that introduces recent applications of the Theatre of the Oppressed in diverse contexts. It is an interesting resource for scholars of the Theatre of the Oppressed for two reasons. First, it provides insights into the application of well-known Boalian exercises in a workshop setting: how cultural codes of communication are navigated when it comes to exercises involving physical or eye contact; how a group of war widows engage with image theatre; how children with hearing impairments respond to cooperation games; in which situations exercises involving rhythmic co-ordination fail and where exactly storytelling exercises are welcomed with enthusiasm. Joffre-Eichhorn unpacks the interpretive potentials of these exercises, but unfortunately also partly spoils that by repeatedly focusing on the question of evaluation and impact, an occupational symptom possibly internalized from working within the logic of INGOs and donor agencies. There is far more to say about a theatre workshop in a remote war-torn village than whether or not the participants found it useful. The dynamics of de-mechanizing bodies that are stultified through war and violent conflict for decades, the intricacies of language, translation, the embodiment of ethnic differences, the temporary transformation of spaces such as a mosque through an effort of collective imagination: these are profound and difficult issues upon which the book touches, yet they are left unresolved, as if the question of the political relevance of theatre can be answered more easily through participant affirmations of its use. The second aspect of interest to theatre scholars is the combination of the Theatre of the Oppressed with other methodologies such as Playback Theatre in Joffre-Eichhorn’s experiments in Afghanistan, as well as the discussion of how the methodology relates to models of transitional justice. Here the question of how truth-telling corresponds to justice in the framework and aesthetic conceptions of the theatre is crucial, and also offers scope for further investigation and reflection.
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I have been studying how I may compare
This prison where I live unto the world
– William Shakespeare,
The Tragedy of
King Richard the Second,
5.5: 1–2.

In 2003, Dr Laura Bates, an academic from Indiana State University, distributed photocopied excerpts of King Richard's last speech from Shakespeare's The Tragedy of King Richard the Second to her class of inmates at Warbash Valley Correctional Facility's Secured Housing Unit (SHU). Why? She was there to teach long-term disciplinary segregated prisoners – mostly incarcerated for murder – about Shakespeare. Dr Bates thought that inmates might be able to connect with the words King Richard is saying, as he himself is in solitary confinement. Thus began Dr Bates' journey inside the deepest, darkest part of the US criminal justice system.

Her resulting memoir is a book that focuses on her particular journey with one inmate, Larry Newton. Despite his detailed history with the criminal justice system (his first arrest was at age 10 and he was incarcerated in an adult facility at age 17, sentenced to life without parole), Larry had some unique and profound insights into Shakespeare's works. This book is not about showing off Bates' daring or achievements. It is about lessons of humanity that can be learnt while working with inmates who have all but lost theirs. It is a book about a teacher learning from a very unlikely group of students.

Some could criticize Bates for concentrating this narrative around her 'star pupil', Larry Newton, but when one reads the analysis and deconstructions Newton offers of Shakespeare's works, it is easy to see why Bates wanted to share some of his insights outside prison walls. Newton quickly developed a strong affinity with Shakespeare by participating in Bates' so-called 'group sessions' – 'so-called' because each of the six to eight participants was confined to an individual cell while Bates sat in the corridor talking to the beady eyes peeping out from the tiny cuff ports of solid metal doors. From very early on, Newton recognized that Shakespeare could be used to diffuse