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ABSTRACT

Using Lara Foot Newton’s Reach! and Craig Higginson’s Dream of the Dog, this study explores the manner in which this selected South African playwrights deploy the themes of memory, trauma and therapy in their works as a means of recounting the horrific experiences of the apartheid regime, and the effects of these experiences on personal, social and political life and relationships in post-apartheid South Africa. Since Literary themes are sometimes burdened with open ended meanings and motifs. They are therefore always open to interpretations guided by concepts and theories of literature. The study proceeds on the assumption that the selected plays like other Post-apartheid South African plays embody sensitive issues that relate to memory, trauma and therapy. This is achieved through the use of Freudian psychoanalytic perspective which facilitate an affinity between the influence of memory and trauma on an individual’s social behaviour and literary creativity. It also investigates how interiorities motivate actions in characters in the selected South African post-apartheid plays. The study argues that playwrights occupy a central position in not only locating the South African experience within literary discourse but their plays illustrate the therapeutic approach to the study of South African experiences. The study, therefore, finds that psychoanalysis offers a unique perspective to the study of characters in South African plays. It also finds that memory, trauma and therapy influence the inner working of characters in some post-apartheid South African plays. The study thus concludes that psychoanalytic criticism is relevant in delineating how interiorities motivate actions in post-apartheid South African plays.
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CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

This study explores the manner in which the selected South African playwrights deploy the themes of memory, trauma and therapy in their works as a means of recounting the traumatic experiences of the apartheid regime, and the effects of these experiences on personal, social and political life and relationships in post-apartheid South Africa. It is germane to note that the keyword that essentially defines apartheid is segregation, segregation of blacks by white folks and foes. Apartheid was a system of racial discrimination. According to Mhlauli, End Salani and Rosinah Mokotedi, (2015: 205) “Apartheid is an almost universally recognized word, defined as “segregation on grounds of race. Not only was apartheid a system of racial discrimination, moreover, it was also imposed separation or segregation of blacks and whites in the areas of government, labour market and residency. It was, thus, pervasive in that it was deeply embedded within the economic, social and political structure of the whole country”. The apartheid rule which in terms of comparison with colonialism is the most despicable and inhuman role that nature abhors, used every means, instruments and structures of the society to implement the inordinate segregation of black majority by white minority. Accordingly, the resultant consequences of this infamous system is such experience it gave birth to: an experience of intolerant, violence, racial prejudice and war-like relationships between the blacks and the whites. Therefore, for the blacks, life was nasty, brutish and short. For black South Africans as well as white South Africans who survived
this era, traumatic memories of this violent and despicable experience is the latent cause of their actions and it defines their relationships.

Consequently, using Lara Foot Newton’s *Reach!* and Craig Higginson’s *Dream of the Dog*, the study investigates the playwright’s preoccupation with the adverse impact of memory and trauma in Post-apartheid South Africa. A critical look into South African Literary works reveals that there is a large corpus of critical works aimed at portraying the post-apartheid South Africa experiences. For example, researchers like Mekusi, Busuyi (2009), Catherine Powell (2010), Clare Stopford (2013), Ibinga Stephane (2007) have discussed the Post-apartheid South Africa experiences principally from social, political, cultural and historical perspectives. Greg Homann (2009:26) is also of the view that the selected plays in this research show “a new confidence in writing plays in which the choice of form supports the plot and thematic concerns of the writers. Thus, he observes that Foot Newton and Higginson use a realist mode of representation to tell their stories”.

Despite the contributions of these attempts, however, they have not given adequate attention to the psychological dimension of post-apartheid experiences that the selected plays embody. This study therefore, expands existing approaches by deploying psychoanalytical approach to the evaluation of Lara Foot Newton’s *Reach* and Craig Higginson’s *Dream of the Dog*, as examples of Post-apartheid South African plays. This research pays attention to the playwrights’ depiction of interiorities, which entail the interplay of conscious and unconscious traumatic memories and the conscious attempts by characters to overcome them through literary psychotherapy. This is better examined through a psychological reading of the texts under study, by looking beyond the
historical, social, political, cultural dimensions and exploring the conscious and most importantly, the unconscious state of the mind.

Post-apartheid literature consists of works of prose, poetry and drama written by South African authors both black and white beginning from the 1990, into the opening decades of the 21st century. Literary works written after the repeal of the South African apartheid system are thus categorized as post-apartheid literature (Ibinga, 2007). The post-apartheid period is further divided into pre-post-apartheid, the early post-apartheid, and, the post-apartheid era (Ibid). The period from 1990-1996 in literary reckoning is delineated as the pre-post-apartheid era. It is immediately followed by an official declaration on 2nd February 1990 which brought an end to the apartheid regime. According to Homann (Ibid), ‘this period is identified by the imminent arrival of democracy and the time of rigorous political negotiations. The trend that immediately followed the pre-post-apartheid era is the early-post-apartheid period 1996-2002. This period in South African history is critical because it was a time the South African government took a practical step towards reconciliation. Hence, it witnessed the creation of a commission known as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). According to Homann, “This period is dominated by the discourse inculcated by the TRC and can aptly be described as the ‘early-post-apartheid period’. In this period, playwrights began to intensify their projection of the essence of reconstruction of the new South Africa. The third era is the post-apartheid period, this era marked the third shifting trend ten years after the apartheid rule. According to Homann (2007:18), between 2002 and 2008 there has been a rich diverse mix of new plays. “The floodgate had been opened and what emerged were new playwrights and new works that detailed personal stories rather than exclusively social and political conditions”,
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The selected plays for this research are among the major plays that emerged from this new wave of post-apartheid theatre. Appraising the above plays and their contemporaries, Homann (2009:18), submits that: “The plays that follow speak to where South Africa is at this stage”. Where South African is at the stage, implied here, is the stage where and when reconciliation and healing from the trauma of the experience of apartheid is expedient. According to Homann (2009:17), Newton and Higginson have constructed characters who struggle to come to terms with the various ordeals of their past memories which are portrayed from different social, ideological, moral, cultural, or political positions. This is the central preoccupation of virtually all post-apartheid South African plays.

The central problematic motivating this research is linked to contemporary South African debate of “shaping the future and dealing with the trauma of the past at the same time” (Homann 2009:18). This assertion suggests that every attempt to find a way forward as far as the South African situation is concern must take into cognizance events of the past that have shaped or informed the South African experiences. In affirmation of this position, the one-time Minister of Justice, Dullah Omar, indicates that South Africans “must embark upon the journey from the past, through the transition and into a new future” (South Africa, “The Truth and Reconciliation Commission” 6). Thus, traumatic memories repressed in the unconscious inevitably influence, determine and inform personal, social and political life and social intercourse. Understanding the past is itself a process of constructing and describing identity, “because who we are is fundamentally linked to memory” (Mda, Introduction viii). Psychoanalysis as Peter Barry (1995: 105) points out associates a literary works overt content the former and covert content with the later, privileging the later as being what the work is really about, and aiming to
disentangle the two. To this end, this dissertation examines Lara Foot Newton’s *Reach* and Craig Higginson’s *Dream of the Dog* through psychoanalytic lens in order to investigate how the issues of memory, trauma and therapy are captured in post-apartheid plays as a product of past experiences. The fundamental objective of this literary analysis is to argue or establish that the ultimate aim of psychoanalysis as credibly portrayed by the two adopted texts, is to achieve healing and reconciliation between White minorities and Black majority of South African.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Critical works on South African plays have explored the post-apartheid South African experience from such perspectives as the Postcolonial, New Historicist and Feminist angles of literary criticisms. These approaches to post-apartheid South African writings have explored the works from political, social, ideological and historical dimensions. However, post-apartheid plays deploy memory, trauma and therapy to project the complexity of the problem created by the apartheid regime. This aspect has not been adequately explored by the critics. It is on the basis of this missing link that this study investigates the power of interiorities (unconscious traumatic memories) over a human psyche and the limitations it creates as far as reconciling the realities of the present and the past are concerned. In other words, it investigates how characters the selected South African post-apartheid plays manifest their interiorities. Hence, this research examines how traumatic memories of terrible incidents of the past repressed in the unconscious minds of the major characters in the plays define and motivate their actions, and how this ultimately impact on their mental and physical health. This attempt relies on the basic Freudian Psychoanalytic philosophy, that the present and the future are
only an effect of the past. Freud believes that hysteria phobia, depression and drug addiction are not caused by organic symptoms but by emotional disturbances that originate from the unconscious. Consequently, this study is predicated on the assumptions that:

- Drama is a significant genre of Literature for espousing the South Africa post-apartheid experience.
- Post-apartheid plays pay attention to memory, trauma and therapy to project the complexity of the problem created by the apartheid regime.
- The hinged objective of literary psychoanalysis in exploring memory and trauma in the selected texts is to achieve reconciliation and healing.
- Freudian Psychoanalytic criticism is a viable tool for analyzing memory, trauma and therapy in post-apartheid plays.

1.3 Aim and the Objectives

The main aim of this study is to examine the portrayal of memory, trauma and therapy in post-apartheid plays by deploying psychoanalytic criticism in order to establish a relationship between interiorities (memory, trauma and therapy) and actions. Moreover, the work aims at investigating the extent to which memory, trauma and therapy influence the inner workings of characters in post-apartheid South African plays, in order to show that South African plays have deeper meaning that can best be explored using psychoanalysis. This is significant because memory, trauma and therapy are realities of life and they are exemplified in how characters act in plays and their understanding will facilitate the interpretations of what actions could mean in literature. This dissertation, therefore, examines how the major characters in the plays wrestle with the physical and psychological implications of their odious past. The uniqueness of this
analysis lies with the fact that it enhances the understanding of actions and the interpretation of actions in literature. Hence, the specific objectives of this study are to:

- Demonstrate that drama, as a significant genre of literature is a plausible discursive form for espousing the South African post-apartheid experience.
- Establish that traumatic memories of the past inevitably shape the post-apartheid personal and socio-political life of characters in the selected texts.
- Investigate the themes of memory, trauma and therapy in the selected text.
- Show that Freudian Psychoanalytic criticism is a viable analytical framework for studying post-apartheid plays.

1.4 Justification of the Study

This study is inspired by the fact that some of the post-apartheid playwrights present issues which can be explored from the psychoanalytic perspective in order to show how playwrights imbue in their characters certain qualities and/or experiences that can be viewed from the perspective of interiorities-(memory and trauma) and actions – through a psychoanalytic appraisal of South African plays. As such, the study is anchored on psychoanalytic literary criticism which takes into consideration the affinity between the influence of memory and trauma on individual and social behaviour and literary creativity. The study reveals the psychological potentials of the South African plays, which have been largely unexplored. This assumption is predicated on the fact that a brief but critical review of the South African literary canon, shows that a tremendous amount of critical works have been done on the post-apartheid South African literature. Most of these critics either adopted the Feminism, Postcolonial, New Historicism or Historicism literary criticisms in their works. These literary critics were inspired to adopt these approaches as a result of the fact that most of the post-apartheid works (plays) have the undertones of these literary theories of analysis.
However, as laudable as these previous attempts appear, there is a missing link or an approach that has not been employed in the study of post-apartheid literary works. Hence, this study argues that conscious of the historical antecedents of South Africa (as it is abundantly made implicit and explicit in the plays under analysis), and coupled with the existential socio-political situation in the present day South Africa, to achieve a meaningful reconciliation, to shape the future of South Africans, their traumatic past must be dealt with. Judging from the selected plays, the Freudian Psychoanalytic literary criticism is instrumental in the study of South African historical traumatic past, in order to create a new South African devoid of neurosis and any form of Psychological complexes responsible for the siege mentality and mistrust that has perennially undermined the creation of a ‘New Rainbow City’ worth the sort. For instance, the most recent resurgence of xenophobia in South Africa has been attributed by some political and social analyst as arising from the figments of South African troubling past that has not been obliterated from the collective South African unconscious mind.

Against this backdrop, the choice of the works by the following South African playwrights: Lara Foot Newton’s *Reach!* and Craig Higginson’s *Dream of The Dog*, is informed by the fact that the plays are among the genres that are instrumental in explicating the relationship between memory and trauma and people’s individual and collective behaviour. Moreover, these plays, by adopting the psychoanalytic approach, which is therapeutic in nature, have healing and reconciliation as their fundamental objectives. The playwrights are famous writers who have laid the foundation for the growth of South African play. They have deployed their art to capture the ideological, socio-economic and political activities of African society at the various level of its development. Thus, these writers occupy a central position in explicating the South
African experience within literary discourse. Although each of these writers have written many plays, these ones are among the major plays to emerge from this new wave of post-apartheid theatre.

Furthermore, the choice of these plays is necessitated by the fact that they belong to the genre of literature whose expansiveness permits it to institute an in-depth discussion of South African experience. They foster the general aim of South Africans to advance their cultural imaginations as they offer insights into emerging national identity. This study therefore expands critical initiative into new theoretical approaches and enhances an insight into scholarly discourse of playwrights in particular and the South African play in general. This is achieved through looking beyond the political, social, cultural and historical dimensions and exploring the unconscious mind with emphasis on interiorities which are better examined through a psychological reading of the texts under study. In sequel, the significance of this study lies with the fact that it reveals how post-apartheid South African playwrights have molded characters from the perspectives of interiorities- memory, trauma and therapy and actions. Consequently, this study contributes to the search for paradigms that best explore the literary works on the South African experiences by employing Freudian psychoanalysis as a reading practice for studying the plays. This study also establishes the richness of the literary form to capture, foreground and reconstruct human experience. Moreover, it significantly stands as a resource material for further research on how to obliterate longtime adverse impact of unconscious traumatic memories. If literature as Graan puts it is a “…means through which individuals and communities explore, interpret, challenge and celebrate the human condition within particular material realities.” Then looking at Memory, Trauma and Therapy in South African plays through a psychoanalytical lens as is the case in this
study, offers a deeper insight into the consequences of human actions and how these consequences can be addressed through Therapy. The expediency of this analysis lies with the fact that it enhances the understanding of actions and the interpretation of actions in literature.

1.5 Scope and Delimitation

This study is limited to Lara Foot Newton’s *Reach!* and Craig Higginson’s *Dream of the Dog*. Although there are numerous post-apartheid plays, this study limits its focus to the above selected plays because they allow for an exploration of the subject matter of the study, and, also bears reflections of the same. Moreover, these plays serve as paradigms to delineate authentic literary excursus on the fact that memory, trauma and therapy are often depicted as motifs in post-apartheid South African plays (the Old and the new). For the records, this does not in any way suggest that there are no other extant post-apartheid South African plays that may serve this purpose; however, this work finds the selected plays fundamentally apt.

1.6 Research Methodology

This dissertation is based on a qualitative research method. Qualitative research methodology according to the *Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research* is a “composite of philosophy, concepts, data-gathering procedures, and statistical methods” that provides the most thoroughly elaborated basis for the systematic examination of human subjectivity. This research therefore deploys a library based data-gathering procedure and systematically examines secondary sources like books, journals, E-books and web publications. The primary sources for the study are Lara Foot Newton’s *Reach!* and Craig Higginson’s *Dream of the Dog*. This research also adopts a psychoanalytic
reading method in order to explore the covert meanings embedded in post-apartheid South African plays through the instrumentality of the concepts of memory, trauma and therapy, and their inevitable influence on the behaviour of the individual’s personal and social relationships, as foregrounded by the major characters in the plays.

1.7 Chapter Structure

This study is divided into five chapters: Chapter One, which is the introduction, provides the general background to the study and include: statement of the problem, the study’s aim and objectives, the scope and limitation, research methodology and definition of concepts that are germane to the integral underscoring of the topic of this research. Chapter two lays out the theoretical framework useful for analyzing these plays; conscious of the thrust of this research, Freud’s version of the Psychoanalytical theory is adopted for the study. In addition, it also reviews relevant literature on memory, trauma and therapy. Chapter three, titled, ‘The Place of Memory and Trauma in the Individual and socio-Political Relations’, explores the inevitable implications of the effects of the apartheid experience in shaping the individual and political landscape of the post-apartheid South Africa. Chapter four, ruminates on Higginson’s Dream of the Dog. it painstaking explores how the systematic volunteering of interiorities through attentiveness to dreams eventually brought about healing and reconciliation-the ultimate teleology of psychoanalysis.

1.8 Conceptualising Memory, Trauma and Therapy

For the purposes of clarity, brief definitions are given on the key terms used in this study. They are Memory, Trauma, Therapy and Apartheid.
1.8.1 Memory

What is memory? Is it recollection or is it remembrance? Is it the wellspring of reflection and imagination? Is it the ground we contest in struggles for dominance-of peoples, politics, and ideas? Is it natural to us as beings or is it better seen as an artifice, constructed much like we would build any other social structure? The issue of what should receive priority in our belief-personal witness or documents-is a vital question for archivists (Barbara L. Craig, 2002: 280).

The questions outlined above point to issues that discourses on memory attempt to resolve. There are personal memories, group memories, memories of tribes and localities. In fact, memory has multiple and conflicting manifestations that demand equal recognition. According to Barbara L. Craig (2002: 178), “The human capacity to remember words and things, information and actions, and then to recall these for contemplation or for adjustment, is understood universally to be our memory. Craig (278), maintains that:

Parts of it may be hidden from us, to be recalled unselfconsciously, perhaps by sights or in settings or by an aroma... Most often it is through conscious effort that we summon ideas and words, and with them the disturbing emotions that can accompany memories-pleasurable floods of happiness or perhaps rushes of anger that come unbidden with the recollection of events. We share a common understanding about our memory: it is the remembrance of the past, its aromas and gatherings, its happy times and moments of bleak despair”.

For Alan Baddeley (1990:13), memory is simply conceived as “records of percepts”. Baddeley’s designation of memory addresses the retentive faculty of memory without a corresponding attention given to the retrieval process through which memory attains its relevance. Also maintaining this line of thought, Alan F. Collins et al (1993:104), postulates that “memories are compilations, constructions or compositions of knowledge” Craig (280), expresses this thought in detail thus:

The personal and social processes of making some things memorable and the instruments of this remembrance are topics on which there are many perspectives. Historians are prolific contributors to the growing discourse on memory, but they are not the only occupants of the turf of memory studies. Cultural anthropologists, critics of art and literature, poets, novelists, and, inevitably, philosophers all have particular concepts of memory. Perhaps it is memory as a physical phenomenon, or as
psychology; perhaps as a psychic place, or as a cultural space; perhaps as a political agenda or as a special social geography. But overall, and perhaps most tellingly, these conceptual differences highlight the complexity of memory, which is not a unitary thing.

This implies that the concept of memory is a simple but complex concept.

Yates combined history, textual criticism, and art to analyze memory as a method, as a means of retrieval, and as an arbiter in learning. It was her insight into the role of memory in literature, science, and knowledge that established the commanding position of the memory metaphor. Her unusual approach rehabilitated the metaphysical side of early science and revealed the importance of memory in pedagogy, and ultimately, in knowledge production. Yates resurrected the magical side of early science and, along the way, exposed the richness in the history of the concept (284).

The information retrievable from memory may either affect the individual positively (pleasurable memory), or negatively (traumatic memory). Be that as it may, generally, this has germane implication to the shaping of the social and moral order of a people. In consequence, Wole Soyinka (2000: 23), observes that memory: “serves to preserve intimations of the infinite possibilities of such regressions of the human mind and the dangers they spell for the harmonization goals of our world, as both violators and victims, may enable us to anticipate or identify warning signs of impeding repetitions of such collective derelictions in our time”.

The selected plays for analysis in this work amply portray the fact that memory is both personal and a shared experience of a people or nation. The artistic imagination explored in the dramas in this study form a part of the expanded spectrum of memory that post-Apartheid South Africa seeks to positively appropriate. The two playwrights artistically and brilliantly portray how memory of the traumatic past shapes the personal and communal lives of South African through the use of flashbacks, stream of consciousness, slip of tongues (spoonerism), etc. Hence, the philosophical question: ‘how
can we achieve reconciliation-how can we build a new South Africa when we are still dealing with the trauma of the past.

1.8.2 Trauma

According to the National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN) (2011), “a trauma is a scary, dangerous, or violent event that can happen to any or all members of a family. Some types of trauma that families go through are: accidents or injuries, serious illness, house fires, crimes, community violence, school violence, sudden loss of a loved one, violence within the family, abuse, neglect, homelessness, natural disasters, acts of terrorism, living in or escaping from a war zone and combat injuries or death of a family member” (Trauma and Your Family January 2011 The National Child Traumatic Stress Network [www.NCTSN.org]). For J. Laplanche and J.-B. Pontalis (cited in Obi Amos, 2015:43), trauma is, ‘an event in the subject’s life defined by its intensity, by the subject’s incapacity to respond adequately to it, and by the upheaval and long-lasting effects that it brings about in the psychical organization’. It is instrumental to stress three factors that defines trauma from this definition, intensity, could imply the compelling force of such past event (s); the incapacity, may be seen as the inability of the subject handle or deal with such compelling burdensome memory; the upheaval and lasting impressions of an odious experience may create a turmoil and imbalance in the psyche of the subject. The combine effects of all these factors defines trauma.

According to Elaine Scarry, (1995:45), The field of trauma studies in literary criticism gained significant attention in 1996 with the publication of Cathy Caruth’s Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History and Kali Tal’s Worlds of Hurt: Reading the Literatures of Trauma. According to Graig (Cited in Elder, 23):
Contemporary Approaches in Literary Trauma Theory showcases some of the leading scholars in literary criticism who take trauma studies in a new direction by broadening the theoretical foundations and future directions of the field through innovative analyses of trauma in literature and culture. Trauma causes a disruption, but the values attached to this experience are influenced by a variety of individual and cultural factors that change over time. Trauma may at times forever silence one, yet trauma can equally at times reorient consciousness in an adaptive fashion that eschews pathology.

This definition of trauma aptly captures the sense in which trauma is understood in this study. Consequently, this would serve as our working definition. This is because the South Africans were denigrated by apartheid and this caused a total rapture of the harmonious social and moral orders. Hence, decades after this violent decimation, its odious impressions on the psyche of South Africans have not been obliterated. This dissertation examines trauma from a psychosocial perspective, with a specific focus on the issues of social oppression, disempowerment, violence, and disenfranchisement of majority blacks by the minority white subject. Trauma describes the repugnant pain and grief that cannot be integrated into a person’s or a people’s general value and belief system.

1.8.3 Therapy

According to Miller and Keane (1972: 456), therapy refers to “the science and art of healing or pertaining to a treatment or beneficial act. Rogers (retrieved 2016) sees therapy in terms of what he calls “the helping relationship, which is one that promotes growth and development and improved coping with life for the other person”. According to an online source, mapsnh.org, psychotherapy is a blanket expression pertaining to the healing interplay or approach negotiated between a qualified expert and a patient, couple, group, family, or client. The difficulties expressed are emotional in nature and can differ
in terms of the origins, triggers, impacts, and possible recommendations. Accurate evaluation is reliant on the practitioner’s ability and can develop or emerge as the clinician gains understanding, awareness and comprehensive expertise.

According to Osuoha, “Therapy includes interpretative processes between a person or a group and a qualified mental health professional (psychologist, clinical social worker, licensed counselor, or psychiatrist). Its purpose is the exploration of feelings, behaviours and thoughts to increase problem solving skills or achieve higher levels of functioning”. For the records, it must not go without establishing that according to Keith Green and Jill Lebihan (1996: 143), “psychoanalysis is not primarily a literary practice…: it is a clinical and therapeutic methodology. However, it has a long and complex relationship to practices of reading and to the assumptions that we make about why people write and how texts affect their readers”. This is usually considered in terms of the healing impact they have on their readers.

A profound probing into the works under analysis reveals that playwrights brilliantly employed communication therapy in their writing. Therapeutic communication involves the use of specific strategies that encourage the patient to express feelings and ideas that convey acceptance and respect. In the plays that this study focuses upon one sees replicas of therapy in the interactions between the protagonist and antagonist characters. Even when they painfully express their insurmountable differences, one sees them exhibit attitudes and words that are therapeutic in nature. These tendencies would be abundantly delineated in the analysis of the plays in chapters three and four.

Having explicated the three keywords of this research endeavour, it is essentially useful to attempt an overview of the oppressive system of governance referred to as
“apartheid”. This attempt is informed by the understanding that one cannot properly grasp and discuss post-apartheid without a basic knowledge of apartheid.

1.9 Concise Overview of Apartheid System in South Africa

Never, never and never again shall it be that this beautiful land will again experience the oppression of one by another and suffer the indignity of being the skunk of the world. Let freedom reign. The sun shall never set on so glorious a human achievement! (Mavis B. Mhlauli, End Salani and Rosinah Mokotedi, 2015: 203-204)

The above considered view is an excerpt from Nelson Mandela’s Inaugural Speech at the down of South African independence from apartheid. It precisely captures the nefarious and despicable nature of the apartheid system in South Africa. The infamous concept ‘Apartheid’ is an oppressive system of government that ordered people by the color of their skin. According to Mhlauli, End Salani and Rosinah Mokotedi:

Worden attributes racism in South Africa to the expansion of European colonialism which was part of the scramble for Africa in the middle of the nineteenth century and its notion of “civilizing inferior natives.” This purported civilization is aligned to the Darwinist notions of evolution and hierarchy that was applied to human beings. This theory of Darwinism made Whites believe that they were at the top of the evolutionary scale which was exhibited through their advancement in technology and imperial expansion. Worden asserts that Apartheid emerged as the slogan of the Gesuiwerde Nationale Party which was a splinter group from the Hertzog’s National Party in 1934 and became popular among Afrikaners” in the 1940”s. It is important to note that Afrikaner nationalism is a topic surrounded by mythology and has created its symbolism and its own history stressing the unified experience of the Afrikaner Volk (204).

Systematized racial discrimination in South Africa did not begin when the Nationalist Party came to power in 1948. It is a result of many factors; it can be traced as far back as the pre-industrial period, similar to what happened in Europe, Asia and America. It dates back to the days of colonial rule when the Dutch first settled at the Cape 1652 and their establishment of a fort at Table Bay (Worden, 1994; Marx, 1998 cited in Mhlauli et al. 204).
The subsequent formation of apartheid as a legalized system of racial discrimination was influenced by the emergence of Afrikaner nationalism, an ideology that promoted Afrikaner supremacy and pride in response to British invasion as well as the threat from blacks, who were resisting subordination (Worden, 1994). During this period, the Afrikaner nation had endured British Colonial rule throughout most of the 19th century. The Afrikaner nation sustained by maintaining their cultural identity through their language (Afrikaans) and religion (Dutch Reform Church), in this way, cultivating a sense of group Nationalism. Winning political power, thus, put the Afrikaners in a position to steer the country in any direction they so desired. The greatest desire of the Nationalist Party was to take over the major institutions, that is, the economy, the political and educational systems. In order to achieve its goals, the National Party had to design a system which would elevate whites over other racial groupings through economic and political deprivation (Zungu, 1977; cited in Mhlauli et al. 204).

1.9.1 Apartheid as a Systemic Segregating of Blacks

The keyword that essentially defines apartheid is segregation, segregation of blacks by white folks and foes. The most baffling and ironic thing about this racial segregation is that it is a discrimination of blacks who constitute majority of the population of South Africa by the white minorities group. This makes apartheid infamously incredible. According to Mhlauli et al. (205):

Apartheid is an almost universally recognized word; defined as segregation on grounds of race. Not only was apartheid a system of racial discrimination, however, it was also imposed separation or segregation of blacks and whites in the areas of government, labor market and residency. It was, thus, pervasive in that it was deeply embedded within the economic, social and political structure of the whole country.
This implies that this pervasive and divisive system permeated every facet, existence and experience of South Africans during the time it prevailed. It refers primarily to the conditions in South Africa from 1948, when the National Party (NP) was voted into power, until 1994.

According to David Welsh (2009: 146), “Even in 1948, racial segregation was not new. Governor van Riebeeck had ordered that a fence be built between blacks and whites in Cape Town in 1659. The Natives Land Act of 1913 declared that Africans could buy land only in reserves. Africans were only sojourners in urban areas; whites had preference in certain jobs, and residential segregation was in place. Under the new NP government in 1948, however, a comprehensively racialized segregation of the state became institutionalized. South Africa was not the only nation that discriminated harshly on grounds of race, but it was unique in doing so openly and legally. Consequently:

In order to implement its policy of divide and rule, the Nationalist Party passed a series of laws. Some of the most prominent included the prohibition of mixed marriage, the Immorality Act of 1950, the Group Areas Act of 1950, which promoted the placement of blacks and whites in separate residential areas on a comprehensive and compulsory basis, the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act of 1953, which enforced segregation in the use of public facilities such as transport, cinemas, restaurants and sports facilities and the Bantu Education Act of 1953, a policy for separate schooling and curriculum on the basis of race and the abolition of missionary schools. The latter also introduced a curriculum which emphasized „Bantu Culture. The Verwoerdian rhetoric of Bantu culture” was presented as largely rural, and static and was a clear attempt to create a limited vision of Blacks within the broader context of South Africa (Hartshorne, 1992; Worden, 1994).

From this scenario, the introduction of the use of mother tongue in schools was not basically an advantage for the Blacks since it was perceived to be myopic and unable to capture some of the scientific concepts as well as lacking the standard orthography. This was a plan to subjugate the Blacks and render them inferior economically, politically and socially through education (Welsh cited in Mhlauli et al. 205). Be that as it may, it is
logical to adduce that the apartheid rule which in terms of comparison with colonialism is the most despicable and inhuman of its kind, used every means, instruments and structures of the society to implement the inordinate segregation of black majority by white minority. Accordingly, the resultant consequences of this infamous system is such experience it gave birth to: an experience of intolerant, violence, racial prejudice and war-like relationships between the blacks and the whites. Therefore, for the blacks life was nasty, brutish and short. For black South Africans as well as white South Africans who survived this era, traumatic memories of this violent and despicable experience would be the latent cause of their actions and this defines their relationship, in various areas.

By way of foregrounding of apartheid, the two post South African plays adopted for this study vividly illustrate the nature of life during apartheid era before the Post-Apartheid. For instance, in *Reach*, the two major characters speak eloquently about their apartheid experience. Marion may be sensitive and thoughtful, but she is by no means immune to racial prejudice. When Solomon enters, uninvited, Marion at first assumes he is a criminal: “If you are here to murder me, just hurry up and get on with it” (Foot, 33). Owing to the siege mental image and mutual suspicion, which is the aftermath of apartheid that the post-apartheid survivors must deal with, even as their relationship develops, Marion remains suspicious of Solomon’s motives, repeatedly asking him why he has come and who has sent him:

**MARION:** Was it your grandmother who sent you? Or is it those protestors? The ones who want my land. Have they put you up to this?

**SOLOMON:** No.

**MARION:** Maybe you are painting the house for them?

**SOLOMON:** No.

**MARION:** Then they can have the rice-paper house.

**SOLOMON:** No (Foot, 49).
Marion’s unfriendly quizzing of Solomon arises from her experience in the Apartheid era, an experience of intolerant, violence and war-like relationships between the blacks and the whites. This experience continues to define their relationships even after apartheid. According to Geoffrey Nwaoye, “Solomon’s reluctance to yield information speaks to his own wariness in approaching Marion. Marion’s sharp curiosity and Solomon’s succinct responses create a tense environment loaded with both silent and partially spoken accusations” (Geoffrey, 2015:90).

Please! And open all that up again? The newspapers. The television. The photos of my boy on the front page. Lying naked in the scrap yard. The speculation: was he gay? Was he involved in drugs? Anything to make is not arbitrary. Anything to substantiate why he was asking for it. Why it could happen to him but not to someone else. Are they all fucking blind? This country has been breeding murderers for the past century. Isn’t that clear? There doesn’t need to be a reason. Anger, despair! That’s the reason! That’s the motivation. Isn’t it obvious? But why my boy? Why mine? Why not somebody else’s? then they come with, ‘well, there has been violence in poor communities for decades now’. I know that! We know that! But does that make it any better? What? If we can’t distribute the wealth, then at least we have succeeded in the equal distribution of violence. Does that make sense? Is there any sense in that? I don’t know. Perhaps there is. (Foot, pp. 62-3).

The above expression of frustration satirizes the nature of political life during the Apartheid regime. A society epitomized by violence, mutual mistrust and intolerance. South Africa emerged from an oppressive system of government popularly referred to as Apartheid or separate development that ordered people by the color of their skin into a democratically elected government on the 10th May, 1994, a historic moment in the lives of all South Africans. South Africa is well known throughout the world as one of the countries that has practiced arguably the worst form of racism despite criticism from all over the world including isolation from participation in world affairs and politics (Mhlauli, et al. 204).
To overcome this negative image of South African in global politics, there was the urgent need to rebrand South African by creating a “New South Africa” by way of reconciliation. Indeed literature: drama and theatre, plays, novel and other genres and sub-genres of literature played a vital role in the post-apartheid South African society and politics. In what follows, specific attention is paid to the emergence and development of drama (play) and theatre in post-apartheid South Africa.

1.10 The Emergence and Development of Drama and Theatre in Post-Apartheid South Africa

Anything that will get people to think and feel themselves, that will stop them delegating these functions to the politicians, is important to our survival. Theatre has a role to play in this (Fugard, 1990: 12).

The above postulation by Fugard leverages on the fundamental assumption that literature is a critique of culture and a watchdog of the society. The post-apartheid South Africa literature emerged to reflect and recreate on the aftermaths of apartheid that mortally disrupted and restructured the political, moral and social orders of South African; and this inadvertently provided materials for intellectual discourses. The political and social turmoil that restructured the space of the stage also became material for the drama of the period, which knitted discussions of key social crisis points into the fabric of public spectacle. Writing on the specific and vital role literature, and especially theatre played and continues to play in shaping the South African Political landscape through and yond apartheid. Consequently, even while apartheid subsists, countless plays and performance texts helped a disempowered people to understand their plight. Thomas Elemas (2008: 309), indicates:

Arts and culture are located within the sphere of hegemonic struggle, the struggle to provide intellectual, moral, aesthetic and ideological leadership within society. While those who control political power have instruments of coercion such as the legislature, the judiciary, the police and defense forces to oblige their subjects to
accept their rule, they also exercise significant control over the instruments of socialization: the educational system, the mass media and cultural institutions which help to shape the values, the beliefs, and the worldviews of their citizens, in accordance with their own. Thus do we come to be ruled, not only by coercion, but by our own consent.

This implies that the forces (apartheid rule and its antics) in the society which the literary critic must contend with is formidable. In this regard, one may logically extrapolate that Ashraf Jamal should be commended for positing that theatre projects as well as protest, intuits as well as states, dreams as well as concretizes. Figural and literal, total and partial, theatre necessarily straddles a contradiction. As South Africans continue to forge their new national imagery after apartheid, and the daunting role of theatre in that task is ongoing. In many ways, the theatrical canon, both performance driven and literary, that became known during the apartheid era, documented the country’s troubled history far more aptly than what was allowed to be recorded in newspapers and history books. This is to say that to some extent, theatre is somewhat immune from the interference of government and the influential, and to this extent it gave unbiased documentary account of the South African unique checkered history. Albeit, Homann (2), argues, “The words, the characters speak proffer an idea of us. This idea may not be a shared position or one a majority may hold but that is the wonder of theatre; a play from the pen of a single person can offer multiple views or a singular dissident stance”. Does this imply that theatre is subjective?

Concerning the unique disposition of theatre to expose the contradictions which Homann reflected, Ashraf Jamal (2005: 128), maintains, “Because of its formal hybridity and its liminal impurity in relation to other arts, each of which theatre absorbs in order to make itself, theatre is well planned to espouse the contradictions with the treatment of a
projected national unity while, at the same time, providing a way forward”. Furthermore, Homann (148), recounts:

For many years, South African theatre was dominated by plays that offered a united front against an oppressive regime. The result was a theater that subjugated the homological mode. The activist theatre-maker became synonymous with the identity of our local ‘new play’ scene. It was not the place of such an individual in a non-democratic state to present social commentaries that did not firmly criticize the harsh context that was apartheid in South Africa. As we shift as a nation towards our visionary constitution, significant changes in the mode, style and theme of our nation’s theatre has begun to take hold. It has been a slow process: redefining one’s identity, is always a complex battle.

Similarly, Buti maintains that South African theatre and playwrights have surfaced into a new period, one that signals new themes and changes. The mode of representation has shifted and the monological form we came both to loathe and to love has dissipated to suite a democratic society grappling with multiple points of view. This change after apartheid triggered a South African actress, Janet Suzman, in 2002, to asked a profound question: “But when the enemy is gone, what do you write about?” (The Independent, 25 August). Perhaps, in reaction to Suzman’s inquiry, Homann (2009: 2), wrote, “Theatre, a strong and vital form of protest during apartheid, is well placed to now, ‘expose’ the contradictions which threaten a projected national unity, while, at the same time, providing a way forward”. In order to contextualize the analysis of the plays that follows, it is necessary to give a brief overview of theatre in South African after apartheid. Homann categorized the shifting trends in the emergence and development of the post-apartheid south African theatre into three,’ ‘The Pre-Post-Apartheid Period, The Early-Post-Apartheid Period and The Post-Apartheid Period’.

1.10.1 The first Trend: 1990-1996
It is instrumentally instructive to assert that to meaningfully and properly trace the emergence of the post-apartheid theatre, this foremost trend (1990-1996) is crucial owing to the precursory role it played. Mindful of this Homann (3), describes this strand thus:

In the series of lectures I give each year to a class of students at Wits University I have for sometimes now proposed that the 1990s was a period of vacant postulating by local theatre-makers searching for new subject matter beyond that of the protest and agitprop theatre that has come to define what Temple Hauptfleisch has called our ‘unique theatrical system. I base this premise on the fact that the decade before has delivered a substantial list of play that received both local and international acclaim with many of them touring extensively both at home and abroad. A few titles from this list include: Borne in the RSA, Sophiatown town, Sarafina!, Master Harold... and the Boys, Woza Albert!, Saturday Night at the Palace, Asinamali!, Black Dog/Inj'emnyama, You Strike the Woman, You Strike the Rock, Marabi District Six, The Hungery Earth, Have You Seen Zandile? and This is for Keeps.

He further explained that one cannot generate the list of similar acclaim of proportion from the 1990s. One could argue that this may have been the result of a focus shift away from current affairs centering on South Africa as a country at the height of turmoil and on the brink of liberation, but this would imply that international interest waned after the country’s first democratic elections, a statement that is easily debunked. A more likely hypothesis would be to argue that theatre-makers were at a loss. The long-standing routine of creating protests-styled work was no longer relevant. Questions like: ‘what now?’ ‘What are our stories?’ and ‘what is theatre’s functions in this new society?’ became the issues well-established playwrights and theatre-makers puzzled about (ibid 3).

According to Temple Hauptfleisch (1997: 160):

Responses to the equally tumultuous daily events in what has on occasion rather heartily being referred to as pre-post-apartheid South Africa. It was also a time of great uncertainty among artists and administrators, and intense soul-searching among the more responsible critics. The problem is of course, everyone wants to know what is going to happen to theatre in the new South Africa and no one can really tell with any degree of certainty.
Hauptfleisch (cited in Grag Homann, 2009, p.4), enunciates four general dimensions that summarized these six-year ‘pre-post-apartheid’ period thus:

- Exploring forms, practices and subject matter that have been abandoned under the apartheid state, essentially an exercise in embracing taboos and in celebrating avant garde practices. Hauptfleisch included in this category the methods of Applied Theatre and Theatre in Education.
- Staging plays from the classical and more recently established canon of local and international writers (Chekov, Shakespeare, Wilde, Fugard, etc.) along with Ballet and Opera.
- Mount productions purely for their entertainment value (Broadway and West End-type musicals, vaudeville, cabarets and comedies).
- Advancing the project of combing what at Hauptfleisch tend Western and African forms in a unique South African hybrid or ‘crossover’ style.

Ruminating on the above enunciations of Hauptfleisch, Homann (4), observed that the trends identify here prioritized little in the way of new literary plays. The continuing growth of the body of work identify as ‘hybrid theatre’ did advance the south African literary canon but much of these works stemmed from the workshop process that has been sharpened under apartheid. This way of working resulted in no single playwright been credited with the creation of the final product. Furthermore, he maintains that:

In effect Hauptfleisch has highlighted in this period the absence of solo playwright painstakingly plodding away at refining dialogue and stage direction. Rather, it was a time when South African theatre-makers either perpetuated the modes of creation refined in the decade before or borrowed, with the aim of repositioning, an international tradition of theatre for which they have been systematically isolated by the international cultural boycott. Even the avant garde or experimental project would not and did not advance the body of our literary works. However, a few established writers persisted to limited acclaim (Ibid).

At this crucial historical stage, one of the remarkable plays that featured in the South African theatre is Dark Outsider by Anthony Akerman (2000). Lesley Marx (1995), is of the view that:
Critics Gillian Anstey and Guy Willoughby praised *Dark Outsider* foreshowing the way forward in a post-apartheid South Africa in searching for new stories to tell. Anstey described it as ‘a myth play which, by subjugating politics by personal, bodes well for the future of South African theatre’ (Sunday Times Metro, 18 June 1995). She and Willoughby suggested that ‘by recreating the past, Akerman has helped us envisage the future’ (Sunday Times, 16 July 1995).

Owing to the analysis above, it becomes logically plausible to infer and concur with Homann, that in this pre-post-apartheid period, there are few new plays that are likely to occupy the shelve on which the accepted anthology of South African plays sit. Rather, it is the absence of significant new plays that defines this period.

### 1.10.2 The Second Trend: 1996-2002

As established above, this period in South African history is critical because it was a time the South African government took a practical step towards reconciliation. Hence, it witnessed the creation of a commission known as Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). According to Homann (7), “This period is dominated by the discourse inculcated by the TRC and can aptly be described as the ‘early-post-apartheid period’. Ubu and the Truth Commission (1997) and *Ipi Zombi?* (1996) are two performance texts that captured the complexity of this capricious time. Simply put, the first deals with intricacy of truth-telling, framed within the context of the TRC. The latter dramatizes a story and it is set in a small rural area of Kokstad where the deaths of twelve school boys in a road accident on 29 September, 1995 were allegedly caused by witchcraft; based on a research earlier carried out”. According to Homann (8):

The drought the local theatre scene had been experiencing was, perhaps, about to break and clearly there was a thirst for innovative and freshly-themed new plays. But *Ipi Zombi?* And *Ubi* and the Truth Commission are the works of *Auteurs* rather than playwrights. The authorship of these works remained so imbibed in the practices and aesthetics of the makers that it is unlikely that we will see subsequent performances without the participation of those who conceived the works. Nonetheless, the texts shifted the paradigm in South African theatre.
In 2003, John Matshikiza (14), reflected on the plays Bailey had made before 1999, stating: ‘over the last two years Bailey (2003:19), has brought bold inquiry into theatre back into our midst, as part of the cautious dialogue we are beginning to have amongst ourselves as citizens of the new south Africa’. Bailey’s creations explored the deepest recesses of African spirituality and an area many will deem forbidden terrain and unchartered territory. He wrote ‘A recurrent theme in my work is a fascination with that something which is not accounted for by the laws of reason: that boundless chaotic domain underling the thin skin or order upon which we build the flimsy structures of our existence. His explorations led him to an aesthetics that denounced traditional western theatre forms and embraced ritual, ceremony trance and rural performance practices. As a white director and theatre-maker, bailey had given himself the task of indulging his curiosity about ‘the other’. The result, a theatre rich in images was seen as a vibrant and provocative arrival in an otherwise dreary theatrical landscape. Roulf Solberg helps identify the stylistic shift which Brailey was concerned about.

In his determination to move away from what he calls ‘massage theatre’ towards a more savagery entertaining medium, he believes more suited to the grotesque repeating history as a farce. Farce specifically, Bailey (cited in Coplan David, 2007: 378), says he is interested in patterns of cultural colocations of the spirit between Africa and the west, and the chaos this cause.

Ashraf Jamal (2005: 137), in his illuminating study entitled Predicaments of Culture in South Africa comments: ‘in both works Ubu in the Truth Commission and Ipi Zonbi? The audience is positioned with an outside ‘truth’. In both works, this shift allows for a more flexible deployments of the mechanics of staging the enigma that dogs
received truth. One of the striking characteristics of emancipatory politics is that it heightens the subjectivity of truth and challenges its hegemony as an *a priori law or value.*

### 1.10.3 The Third 2002-2008

This era marked the third shifting trend ten years after the abolishment of apartheid rule; a rule that may be rightly and properly designate as the most arduous and repugnant regime natural justice abhors. According to Homann, “between 2002 and 2008 we saw a rich diverse mix of new plays. The floodgate had been opened and what emerged were new playwrights and new works that detailed personal stories rather than exclusively social and political conditions.

On 4 July 2002, John Kani *Nothing But the Truth* premiered at the National Arts Festival in Grahamstown. Kani has been the co-creator (with fellow actor Winston Neshona and playwright Arthol Fugard) of two of the most important plays created during apartheid- *Sizwe Bansi is Dead* and *The Island.* This was his first solo outing as a playwright. *Nothing but the Truth,* as its title suggests, addresses notions of truth, thus further contributing to the growing body of works centering on this subject. The play opens with Sipho and Thando nervously awaiting the arrival of Mandisa Mackay, Sipho’s ‘English-born nice’ who will be facilitating the burial of her exiled father, Themba Makhaya. Mandisa is yet to meet her estranged South African family which set up the potential for the sharing of family history. Skillfully foregrounding the TRC, the play revolves around the revelation of the hidden stories of a family deeply affected by the political struggle that was responsible for Themba’s exile. The arrival of mandisa- an outsider brought up in another country with a different set of cultural practices-act as a
catalyst for father and daughter, uncle and nice, cousin and cousin, to share untold stories of deceit, animosity and betrayal. The audience witnesses the unveiling of a number of family secrets, and, in revealing them, the play constructs a microcosm of broader public debate. Lara Foot Newton’s collaboration with Gerhard Marks led to the creation of the remarkable *Tshepang* (2003), which told the devastating true story of the rape of a 9 month old baby. In 2004, *Green Man Flashing* by Mike Van Graan probed corruption and evasion in “The party”; almost prophetically Van Graan’s narrative paralleled the circumstances of the rape trial of Jacob Zuma, the then vice president of the country.

The selected plays for this analysis *Reach!* by Lara Foot Newton and *Dream of the Dog*, by Craig Higginson are among the major important plays to emerge from this new waves of post-apartheid theatre. They foster the general aim of South Africa to advance their cultural imaginations as they offer insights into emerging national identity. Appraising the above plays and their contemporaries, Homann (5), optimistically submits:

> The plays that follow speak to where South Africa is at this stage. Reflects the multitude of challenges, concerns, preoccupations and questions we as South Africans confront in our nascent democratic state. Of course I will like to hope that these plays will, in years to come, be recognized as significant contributors to defining our theatrical landscape; perhaps more notably, it is the way they shift our thinking that is important.

Meanwhile, according to Graan (2006:283), “our current theatre is generally so anaemic, so supportive of, so aligned to the political status quo, so unquestioning”. Similarly, Homann maintains, “our current theatre is rich in affirmation, criticism, celebration and questioning. The main thematic and stylistic trends that starts to germinate in words in the 1990s and early 2000s are further cultivated in the plays”.

### 1.11 A Brief Profile and Literacy Background of Craig Higginson

xxxix
Craig Higginson grew up in Johannesburg and studied at Wits. Multitalented, he is a playwright, novelist, theatre director and lecturer. He is an internationally acclaimed writer and theatre director. His original plays include: *Dream of the Dog, The Girl in the Yellow Dress* and *Little Foot*, which was commissioned by the National Theatre for the 2012 Connections Festival (extended version NAF Main and Market Theatre). Other works credited to him include an adaptation of Nabokov’s *Laughter in the Dark* (staged at RSC and adapted for BBC R3), and *Truth in Translation and Ten Bush*, which he co-wrote and which toured internationally. Craig’s plays and directing have been nominated for and won several awards in South Africa and the United Kingdom, including winning the Sony Gold Award for the Best Radio Drama in the UK, an Edinburgh Fringe First and Naledi Awards for Best New South African Play and Best Children’s Play. All his original plays – along with his adaptation of *The Jungle Book* – are published by Oberon Books. Craig is also a published novelist. There is little doubt today that Higginson’s star is surely and steadily on the rise, but the vocation took a while to crystalize (http://www.Hagginson/biography_Craig.mtv).

1.12 A Brief Profile and Literacy Background of Lara Foot Newton

Lara, Foot Newton is a South African theatre director, writer and producer, she has been recognized nationally and internationally for her unique vision and the courage and honesty with which she approaches her work. Story telling is Foot Newton’s passion, and after winning the Standard Bank Young Artist of the New Year Award in 1995, she brought her skill to senior directing posts, including at Johannesburg’s market theatre from 1996 to 2000. She has directed more than thirty productions, twenty three of which has been new South African works, including the largely acclaimed *The Well Being,*
which played to sold out audiences at the National Art Center in 2004. In 2005, Lara Foot Newton was appointed Rolex Protégé in theatre under the mentorship of Sir Peter Hall. The two worked together on *Tehepang*. She grew up in Pretoria, but in 2005 relocated from Johannesburg to Cape Town with her family to take up the position of Resident Director and Dramaturg at the Baxter Theatre. She is an award-winning playwright, writer and director. In January 2010, she was appointed CEO and Director of the Baxter. She completed her BA (Hons) degree at Wits University in 1989 and in 2007. She obtained her master’s degree at the University of Cape Town. She has directed over 40 professional productions, 29 of which have been new South African plays. She also founded the Barney Simon Young Directors and Writers Festivals and has been essential in the development of more than 35 new South African plays. Her passion is the development of new indigenous work, young writers and directors. Her plays include *Tshepang* (2003), *The Well Being* (2004), *Hear and Now* (2005), *Reach* (2007) and *Karoo Moose* (2008).
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter critically analyses and reviews Psychoanalytic Criticism as the theoretical and conceptual framework for this research. Psychoanalysis associates the surface interpretation of a literary work with its deeper meaning, presenting the latter as being what the work is really about. The chapter examines the key proponents of the theory, the basic assumptions and the application of psychoanalysis in literary criticism, with particular attention to Freudian psychoanalysis as the suitable strand for this study. The chapter also reviews related literatures on memory, trauma, and therapy, paying attention to the contributions of the selected plays to the thematic preoccupation of post-apartheid theatre under the prevailing circumstances at the time; with the view to foregrounding the approach adopted in this research.

2.1 Psychoanalytical Criticism as Analytical Framework
Psychoanalytic theory is traditionally associated with Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), Jacques Lacan and Carl Jung (1875-1961). It was conceived by Sigmund Freud an Austrian psychologist in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, who pioneered the techniques of psychoanalysis. It is a clinical and therapeutic methodology that centers on the human psyche, the personal and social life that is assumed as having a universal affirmation. Peter Barry states that, “psychoanalysis is a form of therapy which aims to cure mental disorders ‘by investigating the interaction of conscious and unconscious elements in mind’. This theory was developed outside the realm of literature. Horney cited in Aafa Bola-Boro (2010: 26) states that the field became popular because of Freud’s interest in providing an efficacious treatment for patients who had hysterical or neurotic symptoms. His motivation arose when he realized that hysteria phobia, depression and drug addictions are not caused by organic symptoms but by emotional disturbances that originate from the unconscious. One of the basic discoveries of psychoanalysis is the repressed unconscious, which is situated in the mind. Barricelli and Gibaldi (1982: 23), assert that, “The mind is not a simple unity but a divided unity, motives and the meanings of actions are actively kept from consciousness in the interest of self-protection and self-delusion”. According to Green and Lebihan 1996:148), “the psychoanalytic process relies on attaining an understanding of the operation of repression. It does not give access to the unconscious as such; it merely recognizes symptoms of it when they surface, in the form of dreams, puns, parapraxes (examples of which include deliberate mistakes, forgetting specific things or names, misspellings and slips of the tongue) (Green and Lebihan”. The forms of unconsciousness makes itself known are radically modified, and deliberately ‘in disguise’. The traumas that have been repressed are extremely painful and damaging (ibid 149). Hence, as an opium to
douse the dreaded impact of terrible memories, repression which is delusional becomes an option.

Psychoanalysis is a vital aspect of Literary Criticism because it helps to uncover deeper meanings by exploring the psyche of characters in order to unravel the complexity of the human mind. This is categorical because, understanding the main characters in the text (play) needs a firsthand understanding of their psychological makeups. Psychological makeup implies the inner working of the characters that inevitably inform and influence their behavior and these are in turn referred to as ‘interiorities’ in literary psychoanalysis. Hence, through psychoanalytic probing, critics excavate these latent causes of the characters’ actions. According to Keith Green and Jill Lebihan (1996:143), the relationship between psychoanalysis and literature can be looked at in different ways but we can reduce it to a question of what is being subjected to the analytic process, and what repressed meaning we thereby hope to uncover. Felman, cited in Green and Lebihan (1996:143), observes that normally, we tend to see psychoanalysis as the active practice performed upon text, “While literature is considered as body of language – to be interpreted – psychoanalysis is considered as a body of knowledge whose competence is called upon to interpret. Psychoanalysis in other words, occupied the place of a subject, literature that of an object; …”.

Jill Baker as quoted in Wolfeys (2001:98) states that: “Both literary criticism and psychoanalysis engage in the interpretation of text. The former emphasizes texts which have been crated and (usually) published. The latter uses artlessly spoken texts, which are treated by the analyst as a source of information about the unconscious mind of the speaker, and used therapeutically”. In other words, psychoanalysis is a viable tool in the analysis of
literary texts because of its ability to illuminate the activities of the authors and/or characters’ “unconscious”. Literary Criticism deploys psychoanalysis by using its methods, concepts and theory in the criticism of the literary texts. This method of criticism is referred to as psychoanalytic literary criticism and has contributed immensely to the understanding of literature. This notion is leveraged on Peter, Emeka’s (2014: 45) explanation that one of the fundamental ways by which psychoanalytic theory has contributed immensely to the understanding of literature, is that, “its basic assumptions and theoretical framework is applied in the reading and explication of literary works”. He further explains that as psychoanalysts probe into the unconscious to reveal latent but potent cause of human behaviour, so do literary critics import the same mechanism to unravel the unconscious or hidden layers of literary works, thereby fostering a brilliant interpretation and understanding of literary cannons (ibid, 46). It fosters a brilliant interpretation of literary cannons because its methodology and assumptions are practical and pragmatic to understanding the relationship between the individual’s emotions and psyche and mental and physical health as foregrounded in literary works. It remains to add that the truth-value of this factual assumption lies with the fact that literature mimics, interprets and critiques man and his social and political climes.

Freudian’s psychoanalysis ensued because it shuttles between the discourses of scientists and that of artists, playwrights, novelists and poets. It is to this effect that Freud wrote several essays on literature which he used in exploring the psyche of characters and authors. Writing on the critical importance of knowledge of psychoanalysis to literary critics, Peter Barry (1995: 16), enunciates that psychoanalysis help the critics to:

- Give central importance, in literary interpretation, to the distinction between the conscious and the unconscious mind. They associate literary works overt content the former and covert
content with the later, privileging the later as being what the work is really about, and aiming to disentangle the two.

- Pay close attention to unconscious motives and feelings, whether these be (a) those of the Author (b) those of the character in the work
- Demonstrate the presence in the literary work of classic psychoanalytic symptoms, conditions or phases, such as the oral, anal and phallic stages of emotional and sexual development in infants.
- Make large scale application of psychoanalysis concepts to literary history in general, for example, Harold Bloom’s book “The anxiety of influence (1973) see the struggle for identity by each generation of poets under the threat of the greatness of the predecessors, as an enactment of Oedipus complex.
- Identify a ‘psychic’ context for the literary work at the social or historical context, privileging the ‘psycho-drama’ of class conflict. The conflict between generations or siblings, or between competing desires within the same individual looms much larger than conflict between social classes.

Consequently, psychoanalysis is primarily construed as a literary practice but unlike any of the other theories, it is a clinical and therapeutic methodology. However, it has a long and complex relationship with practices of reading and writing and to the assumptions that we make about why people write and how texts affect his/her readers. Psychoanalysis has evolved into different strands with each critic having their point of divergence from Freud’s theory. A few examples are: self-psychology, Lacanian psychoanalysis, Archetypal psychoanalysis of Carl Gustav, and others.

2.1.2 Lacanian Psychoanalysis

Jacques Lacan was a French psychoanalyst who re-conceptualized Freud using Post-structuralism. His writing was first published in the 1930s, and his impact has grown since the publication of *Ecrits* in 1966 and *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis* (1977). He founded several schools for training analysts and caused immense controversy with both his style of teaching and practicing psychoanalysis. According to *The Routledge*
Dictionary of Literary Terms, Lacan provides a radical rereading and rewriting of the texts of Freud, particularly those relating to the coming-into-being of ‘self’. He was a pioneer of the tradition of reading Freud as creative writer, rather than as a constructor of a rigid science. In terms of cultural studies, the debates over the work of Lacan have been advanced by feminist engagements with his theory (The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms, 453).

A crucial contribution that Lacan brought was in the emphasis on language in the creation of the self and psychic and sexual life. In his Post-Freudian interpretation of Oedipal and other early infant sexuality, Lacan saw the female position as being non-essential, a view that was taken up by feminists. Leveraging on Freud’s famous Oedipus crisis, Lacan presents a paradigm shift, as he projects the child into the symbolic stage from which they can become a speaking subject. According to him, it is not just the father, but language that creates the division. Language is used to represent desire and is an 'intersubjective order of symbolization' and force that perpetuates the 'Law of the father'. The father prohibits the desire of the mother, subverting this desire into language. As desire and connection is created through language, Lacan explains this through Saussure’s signifier and signified, which are seen not as referring to objects but to psychic representations created by their interplay and by culture and history (3). This implies that within language, the subject vainly tries to represent itself. The subject is an effect of the signifier put into language. Language becomes a mask to disguise the impossibility of desire. The unconscious is less something inside the person as an 'intersubjective' space between people. According to Lacan, 'the unconscious is structured like language.' Hence, Lacan sees “the child not as the agent of symbolization but as the recipient of desire from
an Other (the Mother). When the child plays with things disappearing and finding them again, he is recreating the missing mother” (4). Lacan’s discovery of the mirror-phase and his less well-known work on psychopathology offer versions of the construction of the subject which have proved congenial to literary and other critics searching for explanations of the constitutive power of language and image.

According to Newman (2009:13), Lacan rejected attempts to link psychoanalysis with social theory, saying 'the unconscious is the discourse of the Other -- that human passion is structured by the desire of others and that we express deep feelings through the 'relay' of others. He thus saw desire as a social phenomenon and psychoanalysis as a theory of how the human subject is created through social interaction. According to him, desire appears through a combination of language, culture and the spaces between people.

Lacan focused largely on Freud's work on deep structures and infant sexuality, and how the human subject becomes an 'other' through unconscious repression and stemming from the Mirror phase. The conscious ego and unconscious desire are thus radically divided. Lacan considered this perpetual and unconscious fragmentation of the self as Freud's core discovery. Thus, as a sort of novelty, Lacan sought to return psychoanalysis on the unconscious, using Ferdinand de Saussure’s linguistics, structural anthropology and post-structural theories. In lieu of the latter, Mmadu, Abuchi (2003:23), is apt to indicate that, “Lacanian psychoanalysis is rather ruthless in its aggressive challenging that seeks to dismantle the imaginary sense of completeness (as in the Mirror phase) and to remove illusions of self-mastery through a mirror image”. He further explains that a strong ego is seen as defensive deceit and expressing it during analysis is seen as resistance to change.
Fear of disintegration and lack drives the person to realize themselves in another imaginary individual. Lacan would cope with transference by suddenly terminating the session.

In a nutshell, Lacan implies that the unconscious is inserted into the symbolic order from the 'outside' and is 'structured like a language', operating according to differential relationships in language. It thus, does not 'belong' to the individual and is an effect of signification on the subject. Hence, issues of fundamental importance in Lacanian psychoanalysis could be summarized as follows:

- The de-centering of the subject
- The loss and impossibility of unified psychic life
- The primacy of signifier over what is signified in the unconscious
- The fragile and precarious relationship with the Other.

As a way of foregrounding the poetics of Lacanian literary psychoanalysis, it is important to note that the image of the mirror-both the reflection in the mirror, and the representation of the mirror itself- is a frequent one in literature, and a character’s examination of herself and himself in the glass often marks a textual turning point, but the reflection of self-mirrored by the Other that is precisely, not the self (because it is a reflection) does not have to occur in a mirror, or even a photograph or portrait. Frequently, the not-self is given back to the self by another self-person: that is, subject hood is dependent on the definition provided by another (Green and Lebihan, 166).

One of the key assumptions of Lacanian psychoanalysis that literary theorists hold on to, is that ‘the unconscious is structured like a language’. The significant property of language to psychoanalysis is that which established order through systems of syntax, and polarities learns or internalizes the structure of the society, and, more specifically, the
differences of gender (Green and Lebihan, 168). This implies that the position and identity of the subject is constructed by language. According to Keith Green and Jill Lebihan (161), “the main reason that Lacan’s writing is so important to feminist criticism is due to his controversial discussion of the (metaphorical and physical) figure of ‘woman’, and his location of this figure as somehow outside or ‘other’ to cultural structure such as language”. Therefore, some authors believe that Lacan’s brand of psychoanalysis tends more toward feminism. Writing on Lacanian strand of psychoanalysis, Jide Balogun (2005: 202), asserts:

Lacanian Psychology (and the critical theory produced by it) acknowledges “the unconscious as the realm of repressed desire”, it romances with the deconstructionist’s view of using language to express the abstract (metaphysical). The abstract express in the word (language) belongs to the unconscious desire whose attainment is illusive or unattainable.

Within literary studies, Lacan is discussed in relation to his theories of language. He reconsidered some Saussure’s model of the relationship between the signifier and the signified, and what impact this has on meaning (Balogun, 162). Hence, Structuralists in most cases employ the Lacanian analysis of language in their study of literary works. Mmadu affirms this when he posits that the Lacanian strand of psychoanalysis has some structuralist undertone and, also tends to be speculative in nature (Mmadu 2003:100).

From the foregoing, it is obvious that the Lacanian perspective of psychoanalysis is more susceptible to feminism and structuralism. Despite the merits of the Lacan perspective of psychoanalysis, it falls short of the aim and objectives of this work. Besides, Mmadu argues that “Lacan’s more speculative than concrete to a large extent more feminist inclined”.

2.1.3 Carl Gustav Jung’s Psychoanalysis
A more concrete and popular dimension of psychological criticism is that which was founded on Carl Gustav Jung’s psychoanalysis commonly referred to as Jungian symbolism or Jungian criticism. Once a favoured pupil of Freud, Carl Jung (1875-1961), a Swiss physician, psychiatrist and a philosopher, eventually broke from his mentor, then built on his teacher’s ideals in ways that make Jung an important figure in the new field of psychoanalysis. His insights have a significant bearing in literature as well. Like his teacher, Jung believes that our unconscious mind powerfully directs much of our behaviour. However, where Freud conceived of each individual unconscious as separate and distinct from that of others, Jung asserted that some of our unconscious is shared by all other members of the human species. He described the human psyche as having three parts: a personal conscious, a state of awareness of the present moment that, once it is past becomes part of the individual’s personal unconscious. Beneath both of these is the collective unconscious, a store house of knowledge, experiences and images of the human race (Ann B. Dobie, 2012:62). The principle of Jungian criticism hinges on the assumption that all mortal beings have a common universal or what is technically termed collective unconscious within which individuals and racial unconscious functions. Jung and his followers posit that within the collective unconscious, individual and racial unconsciousness are found as archetype (universal symbols, forms of human experiences and pattern) (202).

In literature, archetypes are usually represented in recurring themes, characters, plots, events, settings and other indexes of literary production. An important issue in archetypal criticism is the universality of those images, symbols, patterns and experiences called archetypes (202). Jung’s criticism is also concerned with the concept of individuation (the process of discovering what makes one different from everyone else). He labelled three parts of self: the shadow, or the darker, unconscious self (usually the villain
in Literature); the persona, or man’s social personality (usually the hero); and the anima, or “man’s soul image” (usually the heroine). A neurosis occurs when someone fails to assimilate one these unconscious components of the psyche.

These various strands (Freud, Lacan and Jung) of psychoanalysis arose because of the experiences and research of other psychoanalysts and therapists which further deepened the insights into the field of psychoanalysis. However, it important to state that Freud remains the most popularly known analyst when it comes to psychoanalysis. For the purposes of this study however, Freud’s Approach, especially the aspects that deal with dream interpretation, slips of tongue, deliberate mistakes, and so on; hold a better prospect as far as having insights on repress traumatic memory in the unconscious mind is concerned. Furthermore, beyond popularity of Freud’s strand, its viability in exploring the plays under consideration can be linked to the fact that the plays understudy are replete with interiorities only accessible through the above windows as enunciated by Freud. Moreover, his contribution to psychoanalytic theory have made meaningful impact in shaping the ideas of this school of thought.

2.1.4 The Basis of Freudian Psychoanalysis

Freud does not have a coherent body of work, and there is not a single definitive version of his approaches that can be adopted in a straightforward manner, either for literary purposes or for therapeutic ones. There are certain standardized practices within Freudian therapeutic practice as a profession, although even here there are frequent controversies. In critical approaches to Literature, the ground is even more uncertain, and just as much analytical energy is employed in examining Freud’s texts themselves as it is in looking at literary works (Keith and Jill, 146).
Although a highly original thinker, Freud was also deeply influenced by a number of diverse factors which overlapped and interconnected with each other to shape the development of his thought. As indicated above, both Charcot and Breuer had a direct and immediate impact upon him. Rahim (2002), is of the opinion that Freud was learning hysteria under Dr. Joseph Breuer. But some of the other factors, though no less important than these were of rather different nature. First of all Freud himself, was very much a Freudian—his father had two sons by a previous marriage, Emmanuel and Philip, and the young Freud often plays with Philip’s son John, who was his own age. Freud’s self-analysis, which forms the core of his masterpiece “the interpretation of Dream” originated in the emotional crises which he suffered on the death of his father and the series of dreams to which this gave rise. This analysis revealed to him that the love and admiration which he had felt for his father were mixed with very contrasting feelings of shame and hate (such a mixed attitude he termed ambivalence) particularly revealing was his discovery that he had often fantasized as a youth that his half-brother Philip (who was of an age with his mother) was really his father, and certain other signs convinced him of deep underlying meaning of this fantasy—that he had wished his real father dead because he was his rival for his mother’s affections. This was to become the personal (though by no means exclusive) basis for his theory of Oedipus complex. Second, and at more general level, account must be taken of the contemporary scientific climate in which Freud lived and worked.

The evolutionary doctrine of Charles Darwin radically altered the prevailing conception of man—now as well as before. Man had been seen as a being different in nature from the members of the animal kingdom by virtue of his possession of an immortal soul, he was now seen as being part of the natural order, different from non-human animals only in degree of structural complexity. This made it possible and plausible for the first time, to
treat man as an object of scientific investigation, and to conceive of the vast and varied range of human behavior, and the motivational causes from which it springs as being amenable in principle to scientific explanation. Much of the conceive work done in a whole variety of diverse scientific fields over the next century was to be inspired by derive from, this new world view, which Freud with his enormous esteem for science, accepted implicitly (2014:234). More influence on him also came from Physics. He was the first to postulate that there is such a thing as “psychic energy” that the human personality is also an energy system and that it is the function of psychology to investigate the modifications, transmissions and conversions of psyche energy within the personality which shape and determine it. This latter conception is the very cornerstone of Freud’s Psychoanalytic theory.

2.1.5 The Basic Tenets of Sigmund Freud’s Theory

In the history of psychoanalysis, Freud’s works have come to be received as canonical work and there are numerous ways of reading him (Uzo, 2014:108). However, this work only outlines some of the concepts associated with his name as they have been used for the analysis of literature. Moreover, this work considers the basic tenets of the Freudian strand of psychoanalysis that are useful for the analysis of the texts selected for this work. This borders on the thesis on the unconscious mind- which is a vast sea inhabiting traumatic memories of which dreams, slips of the tongue etc. are media through which one have a glimpse into this vast sea. In other words, memories and traumas are the interiorities buried in this hidden pit, and one can only have a glimpse of the content of this reservoir by paying critical attention to dreams, slips of the tongue, deliberate mistakes e.tc.

According to Ann B. Dobie (2012: 54), “…the most significant aspect of Freudian theory pays on the primacy of the unconscious. Hidden from the conscious mind, which
Freud compared to that small portion of an iceberg that is visible above the surface of the water, the unconscious is like the powerful unseen mass below it”. In Freud’s psychoanalytic theory of personality, the unconscious mind is a reservoir of feelings, thoughts, urges, and memories that are outside of our conscious awareness. Most of the contents of the unconscious are unacceptable or unpleasant, such as feelings of pain, anxiety, or conflict. According to Freud, the unconscious continues to influence our behaviour and experience, even though we are unaware of these underlying influences. Rahim (2012: 43) asserts that in Freud’s view this unconscious level of the mind is the source of man’s motivations. An unconscious mental process or event, for Freud, is not merely can be dug out of consciousness at a given time but is rather one which cannot, except through meticulous psychoanalysis, be brought to the forefront of consciousness. The postulation of such unconscious mental states entails, that the mind is not, and cannot be identified with consciousness. To employ a much-used analogy, it is rather structurally analogous to an iceberg, the bulk of it lying below the surface, exerting a dynamic and determining influence upon the part which is amenable to direct inspection—the conscious mind (342). According to Tosin Bayo (2005: 67), “This basic belief in the unconscious mind is also imported by literary analysts in the study of literature, by holding that there is the unconscious aspect of literary works. Novelists, playwrights and poets usually portray characters acting under the inexorable impulses exerted from their unconscious mind”. This basic creed in the unconscious thesis is the tool of analysis that this work adopts in examining how the traumatic memories repressed in the unconscious inevitably influence, and inform the personal, social, political life and social intercourse of characters in the plays understudy.
The idea of Repression is another key concept of psychoanalysis as enunciated by Freud. Repression is the action that produces the unconscious by retendering experiences, thoughts, desires, and memories irreversible. Psychoanalysis is a process whereby clues to repression are recognized and represented in such a way that can be understood by the conscious mind (Green and Jill, 147). Hence, Freud (1957:122), lists what he calls the ‘corner-stone’ of psychoanalytic theory thus:

The assumption that there are unconscious mental process, the recognition of the theory of resistance and repression, the appreciation of the importance of sexuality and the Oedipus complex—these constitute the principal subject matter of psychoanalysis and foundations of his theory.

Freud discusses the function of repression through a number of different models. Fundamentally, he describes conflict at work in the operation of the subject, whose physical and emotional demands and desires often come into conflict with forces of reality, including social customs, taboos as well as a physical safety and material possibility. The ‘reality principle’ struggles against the ‘pleasure principle’ in the mind, and through this struggle the subject has to learn to postpone pleasure and accept a degree of discomfort or ‘unpleasure’ in order to comply with social demand or in order to attain its desires in the future (Jill and Green, 147). This implies that repression is a defensive mechanism through which the psychotic individual momentarily runs away from emotional disturbances arising from unpleasurable past experiences. In the plays under analysis, one sees the major characters acting under the impulses of repressed traumatic memories from apartheid, even when they are unaware of the potent causes of their actions, behaviour and attitudes. This observation tallies with Bayo’s (34) indication that literary works are replete of characters acting under internal contingent factors—repressed unpleasant events, phenomena, experiences and other
Another basic tenet of Freud’s psychoanalysis is the concepts of **dreams and dream symbols**. The psychoanalytic process relies on dream for attaining an understanding of the operation of repression. It does not give access to the unconscious as such; it merely recognizes symptoms of it when they resurface, in the form of dreams, puns, parapraxes. Freud believed that the content of dreams is related to wish fulfillment and suggested that dreams have two types of content: manifest content and latent content. The manifest content is the actual literal subject-matter of the dream, and it is the hidden psychological meaning of the dream. While the latent content is the underlying meaning of these symbols. Freud believed that the latent content of dreams is suppressed and hidden by the subconscious mind in order to protect the individual from thoughts and feelings that are hard to cope with. This implies that, the mind by this singular act, acts as an opium. According to Freud, information or data stored in the unconscious whether traumatic, pleasurable or zest memory is retrieved through a process called ‘dream work’ or slip of tongue. The dream walk, is the process by which events or desires are transformed into dream images. To explain how this process by which events or desires are transformed into images, Freud, postulates what he refers to as the ‘primary revision’ and the ‘secondary revision’.

According to Freud, the unconscious does not operate according to the same set of paradigmatic and syntagmatic rules that govern conscious thought and language. Its associations and substitutions are quite different, and specific to individuals rather than shared by a linguistic community. The structure of the dream is formulated according to the associative patterns of the dreamer’s experience, rather than according to any normative assumptions of what is appropriate. It is during analysis that such individual partners of
association (such as inappropriate food being served, or the recurrence of voracious reptiles) become clear, and can then be made sense of in terms of the dreamer’s experience. This analytic practice has been transcribed directly into the study of literature, with critics looking for reoccurring imagery, scenes or character types in a writer’s work, and drawing conclusions about what these patterns say about the author. Through the idea of dream, this research examines memory, trauma and therapy from the view of individual experiences. This is because the works under examination are adorned with ample evidence on how the major characters through the recount of their dreams are able to come to terms with the latent causes of their ordeal and predicament. According to Freud, the forms in which the unconscious makes itself known are radically modified, and deliberately ‘in disguise’. The traumas that have been repressed are extremely painful and damaging: the unconscious acts as a protective mechanism to prevent the subject’s realization of these agonies. In dreams, the process that the repressed undergoes, before it surfaces in the remembered dream, is called ‘dream work’, and it is considered to operate in a fashion analogous to the creation of art or literature. The ‘dream work’ is the transformation of the repressed, forbidden or taboo thought or desires into the manifest. The manifest elements are what a dreamer remembers, but they are equivalent to what slips off the tongue by mistake, or a hysterical crying fit, or a panic attack. The latter symptoms are less approachable for literary analysts, who are used to narrative, poetic and other linguistic forms, so it is the process of dream interpretation that we will consider in more detail here. This is because the texts under analysis employed the use of dream to reveal the latent causes of the behaviour and actions of their major characters. According to the Freudian strand of psychoanalysis, some of the basic processes of the dream work is the transformation of the latent content into the manifest dream. They are as follows:
**Condensation:** This is the compression of two or more elements into a single form. It is a process of over – determination. Freud argues that condensation has the function of representing a large amount of latent material in a small, manifest space: ‘the manifest dream has a smaller content than the latent one, and it is thus an abbreviated translation of it’ (Freud, 1973:205). The familiar dream image Freud uses as an example is a person who: ‘may look like A perhaps, but be dressed like B, may do something that we remember C doing, and at the same time we may know that he is D’ (206). There must always be some connection between the figures that become collapsed into one another and Freud stresses that no matter how unfamiliar the resulting condensed image or narrative might be, it has been made out of something that the dreamer knows. He insists, importantly for the literary critic, that ‘the “creative” imagination, indeed, is quit incapable of inventing anything; it can only combine components that are strange to one another’ (206). Condensation is essentially a production of private signifying chains, the whole of which can be invoked by one image. This image may appear original, but its constitutive components are familiar ones to the creator. In terms of literary analysis, the process of condensation is often linked with the operation of metonyms, where there are connection between the image and the thing for which it stands.

**Displacement:** This is a process of transferal, whereby elements in the manifest dream come to replace elements in the latent dream as a method of disguise. Its function is that of censoring sensitive latent material so that ‘the allusions employed for displacement in dreams… are connected with elements they replaced by the most external and the remote relations and are therefore unintelligible’ (Freud, 1973:208-9). Freud explains that the process of displacement has two main aspects: first, ‘a latent element is replaced not by a component part of itself, but by something more remote-that is, by an allusion’ (208);
second, ‘the physical accent is shifted from an important element on to another which is unimportant, so that the dream appears differently centered and strange’(208). An important object can be replaced by something neutral, and an unimportant object becomes charged with the energy or trauma that really belongs to something which is taboo or repressed. The process of displacement is often linked with the operations of metaphor in literature. There is an ample portrayal of the fact of dream work in the texts selected for this study. The characters in attempts to recount their dreams to their utter dismay find it difficult to make intelligible the figments of their dreams because of the bizarre, complicated and vagueness of their dreams.

In applying the tools of Freudian psychoanalysis, critics seek to examine how useful is the understanding of the dream-work to the analysis of works of literature. In terms of the relationship between psychoanalysis and literature, there are number of conflicting issues. Literature and other forms of art can be seen as expressing samples of the return of the repressed just as dreams are. They are the result of neurotic infantile wishes or traumatic memories of gory experiences of the past, which resurface without the control of the writer or artist. In fact, the author’s work becomes precisely something which has evaded his or her control. This tends to produce the kinds of readings whereby the task of the critic is to attain the ‘true’ and ‘latent’ meaning of a text, which consists of the private fantasy of the author (Jill and Green, 153). In this light, the text becomes something which has been created out of the manipulated fantasies of the writer to produce particular effects. The kind of psychoanalytic reading here would tend to focus on the texts or on echoes that the texts produces in the readers, the extent to which the reader recognizes the influences of the unconscious-traumatic memories on the characters and repressed desires in the works being...
examined. In other words, it examines the portrayal of how the latent materials from the unconscious mind induces actions of the characters in the texts.

Freud, in his, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, addresses the fundamental aspects of psychoanalysis, a treatment in which a patient talks to an analyst about dreams, childhood and relationships with parents and authority figures. Using free association, slips of language, and dreams, Freud found ways for an analyst to help a patient uncover the painful or threatening events that have been repressed in the unconscious and thus made inaccessible to the conscious mind. The essence of this is to help the patient achieve healing or relief. In psychoanalytic criticism, the same topics and techniques form the basis for analyzing literary texts. In like manner, this work looks at the portrayal of how the prominent characters in the plays understudy are able to achieve healing or relief (therapy) by paying attention to their dreams.

Freud was not alone in asserting the relationship between dreams and art. In 1923 Wilhelm Stekel published a book on dreams, saying that no essential difference exists between them and poetry. Around that same time, F. C. Prescott, in *Poetry and Dreams* argued for a definite correspondence between the two in both form and content. The concern with literature soon turned to the writers themselves and to artists in general as Freud questioned why art exists and why people create it. In that search, he wrote monographs on Dostoevsky, Shakespeare, Lionando da Vinci, Goethe, and others. Freud’s sense of the artist, finally, was that he is an unstable personality who writes out of his own neurosis with the result that his work provided therapeutic insights into the nature of life not only for himself but also for those who reads. As Freud commented in *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. The artist has also an introverted disposition and has not far to go to
become a neurotic. Today psychoanalytic criticism shows few signs of slowing down. Nevertheless, Freud’s work continue to provide the foundation of this approach. Although not all of his explanation on how the mind operates are applicable to literary criticism, the concepts explicated above has had enormous impact on how we understand what we read. They have also affected the way writers construct their works. They give access to the unconscious or latent depth of a literary piece thereby expanding knowledge.

It is plausible to naturally think about literature in terms of dreams. Like dreams, literary works are fictions, inventions of the mind that, although based on reality, are by definition not literally true. Like a literary work, a dream may have some truth to tell, but, like a literary work, it may need to be interpreted before that truth can be grasped. We can live vicariously through romantic fictions, much as we can through daydreams. Terrifying novels and nightmares affect us in much the same way, plunging us into an atmosphere that continues to cling, even after the last chapter has been read or the alarm clock has sounded. (Eyre, 502).

The notion that dreams allow such psychic explorations, like the analogy between literary works and dreams, owes a great deal to the thinking of Freud, who in 1900 published a seminal essay, *The Interpretation of Dreams*. The premises of Freud's thought have changed the way the Western world thinks about itself. Psychoanalytic criticism has influenced the teachers our teachers studied with, the works of scholarship and criticism they read, and the critical and creative writers we read as well (p. 504). What Freud did was to develop a language that described, a model that explained, a theory that encompassed human psychology. Many of the elements of psychology he sought to describe and explain are present in the literary works of various ages and cultures, from Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* to works being written in our own day (504).
In recognition of the above, Peter indicates that “Psychoanalysis is primarily a literary practice, unlike any of the other theories, it is a clinical and therapeutic methodology. However, it has a long and complex relationship to practices of reading and writing and to the assumptions that we make about why people write and how texts affect their readers” (56). The relationship between psychoanalysis and texts can be looked at in different ways, but we can reduce it to a question of what is being subjected to the analytic process and what repressed meaning we thereby hope to uncover. Shoshana Felman (1982:5), affirms this as he explains that we normally tend to see psychoanalysis as the active practice performed upon the passive text, “While literature is considered as a body of language-to be interpreted- psychoanalysis is considered as a body of knowledge whose competence is called upon to interpret. Psychoanalysis in other words, occupies the place of a subject, literature that of an object; …”.

Consequently, Felman suggests that psychoanalysis of literature creates a power struggle. She suggests that the structure of the relationships between the critic, the text and the writer can be discussed in relation to the structure of relationships between the analyst and patients. This uses psychoanalysis as a determining model, but also challenges that model, by suggesting that there are things that the analyst/critic can find out about himself or herself through questioning the patient/text. It is not only the patient/text that is subject to scrutiny. This way in which readers and critics are themselves caught up is a very important concept to remember when using psychoanalytic theories, especially when trying to avoid creating overly prescriptive commentaries (Jill and Green, 144). This implies that, according to Felman (1982:9), these structural relationships between psychoanalysis and literature are not the only connection between the two discourses. Some of the most important concepts in psychoanalysis are defined by their reference to classical myths and historical writers:
The key concepts of psychoanalysis are references to literature, using literary ‘proper’ names-names of fictional characters (Oedipus complex, Narcisssm) or of historical authors (Masochism, Sadism). Literature, in other words, is the language which psychoanalysis uses in order to speak of itself, in order to name itself. Literature is therefore not outside psychoanalysis, since it motivates and inhabit the very names of its concepts, since it is the inherent reference by which psychoanalysis names its findings..

This implies that there exists a necessary connection between psychoanalysis and literature, with literature providing a practice ground for the analyst as well as informing the theoretical principles on which the analytical methodology is based. According to Uzomah (2015:6), psychoanalysis gives us access to the unconscious of the writer, it creates in the reader the assumption that literature is produced almost without the writer’s volition. Furthermore, Uzomah (10), maintains that psychoanalysis give us asses to the unconscious world of the text. Through this approach many latent elements, and salient facts about the text, the context of its ideological structure that might otherwise not be available to us, could be revealed. Uzomah’s assumption is justified by the text under study, wherein through the use of dreams, slips of the tongue etc., the playwrights reveal how dramatic memories of the major characters affects their social interactions and individual actions. Against this backdrop, Mmadu (190), asserts that “we are able to make meaningful judgments about a text by looking at the unconscious motives and wishes of characters. And that it is appropriate to apply the same analytical techniques to the narrator or implied author as we would to a character. This implies that our critique of a text have an unconscious aspects, that is, we reveal something that we ourselves do not recognize.

Another key concept of psychoanalysis is its therapeutic approach. According to Mmadu (109), “psychoanalysis does not only seek to excavate the unconscious traumatic memories of the patient, it also initiate a systematic healing process”. In like manner, literary psychoanalysis is appraised plausible by critics because of its therapeutic approach and intent. The texts selected for psychoanalysis in this work have therapeutic intent as their
ultimate or interior motive. This fact becomes intelligible in the analysis of the texts in the proceeding chapters.

Based on the explication above, psychoanalysis provides a framework that is useful in analyzing the characters in the selected plays. It is in the light of this that this dissertation adopts psychoanalysis as a theoretical lens in exploring the concept of memory, trauma and therapy, and their inevitable influence on the behaviour of the individual’s personal and social relationships. Freud’s theory is suitable in analyzing the Genre because it reveals the conscious and unconscious dimensions of characters as they affect character formation and personality. These features, which are foregrounded in South African plays, have resonated and remained fundamental to psychoanalytic discourse, but yet has been tacitly neglected by critics. Hence, this study reflects on the South African experience and demonstrates the extent to which South African Plays capture not only political and socio-economic issues but also psychological issues. In Freud’s theory of the unconscious, the experience of the real world, ‘day-work’- becomes ‘dream material’, some of which mixes with the unconscious and remains there, never to resurface again. However, some of these repressed materials are momentarily released back into consciousness through a stimulant, and usually in a transformed shape or form. Freud calls this material of the unconscious ‘latent conceptions’. Freud’s work depends on unconscious, which is then part of the mind beyond consciousness, which nevertheless has a strong influence upon our actions. Linked with this is the idea of repression, which is the forgetting or ignoring of unresolved conflicts admitted desires, or traumatic past events, so that they are forced out of conscious awareness and into the realm of the unconscious. Hence, this study explores how these latent or covert materials affect the interactions of the characters in the selected plays.

2.2 Literature Review
This section of the study reviews germane critical literature on the concept of memory, trauma and therapy in relation to how it is applied in literature, especially drama. Also central to this section is the review of critical works on Lara Foot Newton’s *Reach* (2007) and Craig Higginson’s *Dream of The Dog* (2010). This review pays particular attention to asserting how post-apartheid South African continues to shape the post-apartheid South African theatre.

### 2.2.1 Memory, Trauma and Therapy

Memory and Trauma are vital parts of human existence and psychological concepts whose influence on the individual’s behavior is phenomenal. Man is defined and either induced or refrained from action by congeries of his past experiences (hidden and obvious memories). The memory that has the most profound defining impact on man’s actions is the hidden memories, especially traumatic ones. This assumption is premised on the fact that psychoanalysis associates a literary work’s surface interpretation with its deeper meaning which influence the individual’s behaviour and conduct. According to Joel (2017: http://www.joel/repression_simon.mtv):

One fundamental strategy that perpetrators rely on to distance themselves from their past actions is repression. Repression is one of the limitations that characterise the process victims undertake to remember past violations. Repression, as a phenomenon intimately associated with memory, could be analogously treated alongside remembering or recall. Repression maintains a close link with forgetting in memory discourse. While forgetting could be unnaturally induced, repression is made possible by a conscious attempt to push into the background what once occupied a dominant place in the memory system. However, it should be noted that because of the connection that exists between events stored in memory, an attempt to remember a particular event could cause the suppression of others while efforts made to suppress a certain memory might cause it to be recalled.

Joel’s broad configuration of memory above brings out the idea of memory that this work is concerned about. It investigates not just traumatic memory in general, but traumatic
memory retrievable from the unconscious mind especially through dreams. In other words, it pays attention to memories that proceeds from the interiorities of the characters. The fundamental objective of psychoanalysis either as a clinical method or as a literary theory of criticism is to achieve healing and reconciliation-therapy. According to Miller and Keane (1972:456), therapy refers to “the science and art of healing or pertaining to a treatment or beneficial act. Rogers (1961: 16) sees therapy in terms of what he calls “the helping relationship, which is one that promotes growth and development and improved coping with life for the other person”. According to an online source, mapsnh.org, (retrieved 2016), psychotherapy is a blanket expression pertaining to the healing interplay or approach negotiated between a qualified expert and a patient, couple, group, family, or client. The difficulties expressed are emotional in nature and can differ in terms of the origins, triggers, impacts, and possible recommendations. Accurate evaluation is reliant on the practitioner’s ability and can develop or emerge as the clinician gains understanding, awareness and comprehensive expertise. This implies that the ultimate goal of psychoanalysis is to achieve healing, for the analysis of the unconscious or repressed materials will be of no value without a therapeutic end in view.

Foregrounding the above configuration of repression, Temple (45), indicates that, South African post-apartheid plays display with overwhelming lucidity how characters wrestle with the return of traumatic materials repressed in the unconscious. When they encounter certain events or incidents, they inevitably turn back to materials they have made conscious effort to obliterate. For instance, he says a perfect testimony of this could be seen in Reach when Solomon puts on Jonathan’s clothe and how Marion gets mad at him because it brings back afresh the traumatic memories of the murder of Jonathan she had fought hard to repress. The above observation implies that suppression as a mechanism is not a solution
to traumatic experiences because the repressed experiences cannot elude the conscious memory. Paul Ricoeur (2004: 40), opines that the brain contributes to the recall of the useful recollection, but still more to the provisional banishment of all the others.

In psychoanalytic reckoning (as established above), there are two fundamental media through which the return of the repressed traumatic memories can occur—dreams and slip of the tongue. The process of remembrance as explicated in the activities of various characters in the texts being used precedes the idea of forgetting and forgiving as well as the reconciliation requested by the TRC process (440). This is more so amongst the representatives of black and white South Africans who negotiate the memory of their past to construct a new South Africa. Memory traces could be inscribed on the plane of historiographical operation, impressed in the psychical schema or constructed cerebrally in the cortical order (http://www.southafrica/memory.mtv). The form of memory traces crucial to this study is the psychical. This is suggestive of the images of the past individuals have internalized and which could be recalled at a later time.

Analogous to the proposition of psychoanalysts, the trauma of the victims of the haunted South African past, even though it appears inaccessible and unavailable, revisited through the advent of the TRC. This is vividly demonstrated in the emotions of those testifying and their interpreters, who went beyond an engagement with linguistic properties to dramatically reinforce the process with non-verbal manifestations. According to Craig (321):

Contemporary Approaches in Literary Trauma Theory showcases some of the leading scholars in literary criticism who take trauma studies in a new direction by broadening the theoretical foundations and future directions of the field through innovative analyses of trauma in literature and culture. Trauma causes a disruption, but the values attached to this experience are influenced by a variety of individual and cultural factors that change over time. Trauma may at times forever silence one, yet trauma can equally at times reorient consciousness in an adaptive fashion that eschews pathology. This collection of
essays argues that trauma in literature must be read through a theoretical pluralism that allows for an understanding of trauma’s variable representations that include yet move beyond the concept of trauma as pathological and unspeakable.

One other shade of memory that is brought to bear in this research is the place of trauma in the functioning of human memory. Taking a cue from research done in cognitive psychology, Alphen further submits that memories have a narrative structure and collectively and individually help in the formation of identity and reconciliation.

Specifically and characteristically, trauma… ruptures an individual’s sense of internal and external worlds which leaves post-traumatic legacies such as dissociation, depression and hypersensitivity (Field: 31). Therefore, traumatic events are able to injure in one sharp stab, penetrating all psychological defensive barriers of participants and observers, allowing no space for denial mechanisms and thus leaving those affected with an acute sense of vulnerability and fragility (Vertzberger, 1997:864). These descriptions are aptly represented in the plays under analysis. The plays expose major characters whose lives are influenced, shaped and defined by interiorities that are in the most part beyond their conscious grasp.

From the manifestations of the characters, (in the plays selected for this study), one learns that trauma is the scar that a tragic event leaves on an individual victim or on a witness sometimes even on the perpetrator. This justifies Didier Fassin’s (2009: 34), claim that, “trauma is the collective imprint on a group of a historical experience that may have occurred decades, generations, or even centuries ago”.

When trauma is experienced on a large scale, this usually produces group ties, identification and camaraderie between individuals who would build a platform to share their pains, mourn their losses and reprimand identified enemies allegedly seen to be responsible for their condition. Even though there are some suspicion that victims of traumas do not always remember details of a past traumatic experience, there is a consensus
that such happenings are capable of either consciously or unconsciously coming back to influence them later on in life. For instance, in Higginson’s *Dream of the Dog* (55), the unimaginable rape of Grace by Richard is symbolically linked to the anecdotal memory of the past maltreatment of Look Smart her lover and co-slave. The veracity of this manifestation is enhanced by Ross, who claimed that all experiences leave something like a memory trace behind …. Memory residues are a by-product of the social conditioning received, most especially the subordination one is subjected to in a socio-cultural society.

On the whole, while the imperatives of human relations have often been predicated on race, this research underscores the relevance of one’s psychical disposition and its subtle but potent implication to social interactions or social intercourse. To understand what is responsible for the present condition of post-apartheid South Africa, the covert realm of memory must be dialectically and profoundly probed. The imperativeness of the negotiation between memory, trauma and therapy to reconciliation should be appreciated and projected.

Criticisms of plays by South Africans, just like other kinds or classes of writings, have been largely through Postcolonial, Gender criticism etc. But there have been invaluable contributions from some critics of these texts that tend towards psychoanalytic criticisms. Although in their various critical attempts, they reflect on the effects of memory and trauma on their characters, however, their genuine attempts are devoid of psychoanalytic reading. The peripheral handling of the inner workings in the minds of the characters has however necessitated this study. Most of these contributions do not reveal the extent to which the unconscious reacts with the conscious factors in a character to achieve a type of behaviour. Nevertheless, these critics provide adequate thematic analysis of these texts enough to facilitate our attempt to complement the efforts to unravel the unconscious processes in characters of narrative literature (drama) and especially the ones under our investigation.
These unconscious processes would assist to further unveil the factors responsible for disoriented behaviour, siege mentality, xenophobia and mutual suspicion often glossed over in criticisms of affected texts. This work intends to achieve this through this explication on repressed memory and trauma. Some South African scholars in their critical analysis have always been conscious of the impact of traumatic memories on characters, hence, in one way or the other, even when they do not totally gravitate towards psychoanalysis are apt to reveal the impact of the past on their characters. Elie Wiesel famously said that every work of literature is about finding what has been lost, and in a sense, these are plays concerned with the restoration of memory. The interesting thing about this opinion is that they all point towards psychological issues that are of interest to psychoanalytic criticism.

Furthermore, analysts like Collins John and Ceazear, postulate that the works under analysis are primarily being preoccupied with racism, neo-colonialism and sexism in her creative works. According to Imafidion Eghosa (342), in Craig Higginson’s Dream of the Dogs, Richard’s blotted ego as an ideal ego represents the primary motivation of the disposition of the minority white towards blacks in South Africa. Furthermore, he (142), asserts that “identification with an ideal ego entails identification with the image in which we appear likable to ourselves. It is plausible to argue that expression inclines more towards psychological interpretation just like those of Martin Opkali whose allusion to Oliver Golden’s validation of patriarchal culture in Okpali’s Gender Issues in Dream of the Dogs in Golden’s “Gender Conflict in Mike Van Graan’s Plays” is in concordance with Mmadu Abuchi’s (21), position that Opkali Gender Issues in Dream of the Dogs, exposes “products of the crossroads of the urban city centres”.

Furthermore, other critics whose contributions are worth acknowledging because they unarguably forged the psychoanalytic criticism of plays by South African include
James Bush and Evelyn Obalin (43), who described the character Marion as a portrayal of “intense racial prejudice and tribal politics which inform life in South Africa, and under which women too often become victims”. This reveals more of feministic tendencies. In like manners, *Dream of the Dogs*, as portraying “the chaos of the modern, fragmented society which produces the psychologically disoriented individual, the typical twentieth century protagonist” (233). Moreover, Collins Austin (452), observes that South African post-apartheid plays are always concerned with the central issue of the struggle of the protagonist to resolve his or her inner crisis by an effective engagement with the outer world.

With all the efforts by the critics as outlined and explicated above, it is reasonable to believe that readers still expect critical works, which will examine these texts more deeply from the psychoanalytic dimension that will explain the processes involved in the workings of the inner mind of the characters. From the foregoing, it is deducible that the surface reading of Craig Higginson and Lara Foot Newton’s plays has necessitated this study, which reveals inner workings of characters’ minds. This study therefore goes a step further by trying to explain how unconscious factors complement the conscious ones to bring about certain types of behaviour, which sometimes manifest in the individual characters’ relationship with other characters. The efforts discussed above with the remarkable contributions to psychological and psychoanalytic criticisms still leave yawning gaps desiring to be filled, as filling it will be of immense and invaluable significance to literature. This is especially as it relates to unconscious determinants of characters’ behaviour. At this point it must be understood that the process of revealing and theorizing about the unconscious even in the classical Freudian psychoanalysis has moved from the analysis of the unconscious of the author to that of the reader, to that of the text, and finally to that of the character. As mentioned earlier, “psychoanalysis is not primarily a literary practice…: it
is a clinical and therapeutic methodology. However, it has a long and complex relationship to practices of reading and to the assumptions that we make about why people write and how texts affect their readers” (143). This is usually considered in terms of the healing impact they have on their readers.

The task of theatre is to facilitate dialogue rather than to try to be celebratory and to try to make people unified.” And all of these plays are divisive. They unsettle expectations and needle out sometimes uncomfortable nuances of emergent identities. Homann says: For many years South African theatre was dominated by plays that offered a united front against an oppressive enemy. The result was a theatre subjugated by a monological mode. He claims that these new plays are “dialogic” rather than “monologic,” but he also describes them as part of the process of forging a new national identity that has shifted since the days of apartheid (Anton, 242).

This implies that the essence of these plays is therapeutic, and the central task of psychoanalysis is to achieve reconciliation and dialogue. In order to achieve this, perpetrators are expected to show certain remorse, which it is hoped would lead to forgiveness from the latter group. In engaging this process, this dissertation observes the intrigues of recalling the repressed memory of the past. In sequel, this dissertation deductively argues that an exposure of past deeds, a show of remorse and penitence and forgiveness elicited from victims by recognition given to their circumstance, enhance the process of reconciliation. This is more expedient rather than an attempt to repress the past or embark on claims and counter-claims of guilt and culpability. This is indeed the hallmark of psychoanalysis.

In order to address these issues of unconscious processes in character motivation and how these have been reflected in the three plays selected for this study, critical attention will be paid to analyzing how repressed materials surge up from the unconscious to influence the behaviour of the characters. The major preoccupation of the proceeding chapter is to probe the selected plays in order to identify the examples of dreams and other windows to the
unconscious mind of the characters in order to examine the unconscious motivations for their mal-adaptive behavior, in their personal and social relations, in line with Sigmund Freud’s theory of the unconscious. Having reflected on scholars’ explication on memory, trauma and therapy, what follows is a review of existing studies on the selected plays that relate to the issues raised in this research.

2.2.2 The Selected Plays and Post-Apartheid Period Theatre

The selected plays for this analysis Lara Foot Newton’s *Reach* (2007) and Craig Higginson’s *Dream of the Dog* (2010), are among the major plays that emerged in the period referred to as post-apartheid theatre in literary canon. These plays over the years have enjoyed the attention of literary critics as embodying the thematic preoccupation of the post-apartheid South African theatre. They are among the few recent play-texts that enter into a debate about South Africa’s troubled past, and that contribute to a discussion of current struggles to be free (Anton, 237). Free from both overt and covert memories of the past to forge new identity. Moreover, Anton (238), avers that:

..What the… plays have in common is that they can stand on their own as works of literature, and they could all quite possibly be re-staged in the future by new directors and performers. In some way, then, these plays contribute to the preservation of heritage in South Africa. In their performance they become part of a living heritage, and in published format part of a tangible heritage that might be archived and preserved.

The above description correlates Mmadu’s (421), allusion that, “They foster the general aim of South Africa to advance their cultural imaginations as they offer insights into emerging national identity”.

The choice of these plays is premised on the fact that the plays are instrumental in explicating the relationship between memory and trauma to people’s individual and collective behaviour. The playwrights are writers who have laid the foundation for growth.
of the post-apartheid South Africa theatre, because according to Mmadu (2007:13), they have deployed their art to capture the ideological, socio-economic and political manifestations of African society at the various level of its development. The ideological, socio-economic and political manifestations here referred to is succinctly encapsulated by David Mamet, who asserts that the two plays to an extent, can be described as moral pieces, in that they try to grapple with ‘issues’ facing contemporary South African society, such as violence, crime, and justice. The plays highlight encounters between white and black and the consequent conflict between races. Moreover, they interrogate the issue of the abuse of women. As a result, researchers like: Busuyi Mekusi, Ibinga, Catharine Powell and Greg Homann have prefer to study these plays with Postcolonial, New historicism, Realism theories respectively. The intent of their respective literary criticism is to unravel aspects of overt memories that instigate racism, political and socio-cultural issues. Using the feminist theory Stopford Clare (2013), focus on violence against the women forks. Describing her thrust in this feminist reading of the plays, she opines, “my aim is to extend the feminine modality into the style of its dissemination by taking the reader into the ‘feeling’ of the modality in a style of writing that embody the personal, intimate, intuitive qualities it invokes. I also take a more analytical view, assessing the efficacy of the feminine modality by using the lenses of materialist feminists such as, Dolan and Diamound, as well as Irigaray’s ‘relational alterity’. The outcome of this exploration is that the feminine modality is both a solution and a problem, depending on material circumstances…” (ii). However, they have not paid attention to the hidden aspects of the south African memory of the past which also have an unmatched grave impact in shaping the new identity of post-apartheid South Africa. This assumption stems from Freud whose psychoanalytic thesis posits that the interiorities (unconscious memories) represent a mass of materials that influence the
conduct and behaviour of individuals in their personal and social intercourse. This work attempts to establish that these South African post-apartheid works embody layers of latent materials (hidden information) that have not been explored by literary critics, where they have, it has not been profoundly explored. It is plausible to underscore the term latent materials as used by Mmadu to imply interiorities, unconscious materials that induce the actions of characters of the works under study. Hence, from the Freudian perspective, to exhume or excavate these interiorities, the analyst or therapist must pay keen attention to the dreams, slips of tongue, deliberate mistakes and other human acts of the major characters that foster glimpse into this vast sea called the unconscious.

Thus, these writers occupy a central position in explicating South African experience within literary discourse” (Mmadu, 23). Although each of these writers has written many plays, these ones (adopted for this analysis) are among the plays to emerge from the new waves of post-apartheid period. Appraising Reach!, Dream of the Dog and their contemporaries, Homann (2009:8) optimistically submits:

The plays that follow speak to where South Africa is at this stage. Reflects the multitude of challenges, concerns, preoccupations and questions we as South Africans confront in our nascent democratic state. Of course, I will like to hope that these plays will, in years to come, be recognize as significant contributors to defining our theatrical landscape; perhaps more notably, it is the way they shift our thinking that is important.

Meanwhile, according to Graan (2006:283), “post-apartheid theatre is generally so anemic, so supportive of, so aligned to the political status quo, so unquestioning”. Moreover, evaluating the viability and acceptability of these works, Homman posits that the plays evidence a new confidence in writing plays in which the choice of form supports the plot and thematic concerns of the writer. Foot Newton and Higginson use a realist mode of representation to tell their stories. When these plays (Dream of the Dog and Reach) premiered at the National Arts Festival in Grahamstown in 2007, many audience members
mistakenly coupled them together as two sides of the same coin. In reality, they merely share a similarity in setting and central character. In both cases, the action unfolds in a home managed by a white female figure. The central relationship of the plays reflects a common South African bond between an older white generation and a younger black generation who have shared, in their past, a domestic environment. In theme and structure, they are quite different (26). Furthermore, Homann (27), asserts that “Each play offers a unique vision of South Africa’s future. In *Reach! Redemption* has been found in the new bond between Marion and Solomon. He has chosen to call her ‘Mies’ and the implication is that he is choosing to do so from place of caring rather than subjugation. We are left believing that Marion will continue to find strength and joy in spending time with Solomon. In return, Solomon will be able to purge his demons and face his responsibilities as a man, with Marion at his side to support and counsel him. This is a world where connecting across divides will reward you with hope of a better tomorrow”. This reflects the most crucial task of psychoanalysis which is therapeutic in nature. Hence, this work explores how an integral understanding of the unconscious through analysis of dreams of the major characters mentioned above in the text help to achieve reconciliation and healing.

Also, Homann (26), opines that *Dream of the Dog* promotes a vision of a South Africa in which the only way to advance our society is to take personal responsibility. In the closing moments of the play Patricia recognizes the valiant contribution Beauty has made in quietly going about her duties”. The primary themes explored by Lara Foot Newton and Craig Higginson-reconciliation, matriarchy, justice, accountability, corruption, truth, memory, landscape and violence-reflect the challenges and questions South Africans are currently confronted with as we advance towards the dream outlined in our constitution. The two playwrights are forthright in their attack on the inadequacy of our post-apartheid milieu,
signaling that, despite our miraculous transition from apartheid to a democratic state, our subsequent progress has really being commendable. Despite these, the resolution of each play were enlightened that the playwright’s outspoken evaluation of who we have become stems from a desire to prod us to participate actively in building our young democracy. According to Anton (243), Each of these plays is an indication of new identities emerging: mothers grieving for surrogate sons, wives rising up against their husbands, sons hoping to make sense of the confusion of unfamiliar cultures, and daughters seeking solace from older generations. These plays ask for new interpretations of relationships and new configurations of South African identities.

Consequently, the significance of this study lies with the fact that it reveals how post-apartheid South African playwrights have molded characters from the perspectives of interiorities- memory, trauma and therapy and actions, and its psychological implication on the characters. The playwrights occupy the central position therefore in not only locating the south African experience within literary discourse but their plays illustrate variously the therapeutic approach to the study of South African experiences. Consequently, this study contributes to the search for paradigms that best explore the literary works on the South African experiences by employing Freudian psychoanalysis as a reading practice for studying the plays. This study establishes the richness of the literary form to capture, foreground and reconstruct human experience. They foster the general aim of South Africa to advance their cultural imaginations as they offer insights into emerging national identity. Moreover, they reveal the conscious and unconscious dimensions of characters, and how they define, influence and motivates their actions and choices of behaviour. These features, which are foregrounded in the South African play, have resonated and remained fundamental to psychoanalytic discourse. Hence, the reflection on South African experience
is applicable to some of the populations of psychoanalysis and demonstrates the extent to which the South African Play captures not only political, socio-economic issues but also psychological issues. As such, this study is situated within the ambience of rich South African literary experience of domination, suppression and the quest for reconstruction. The aim of this study is to investigate the extent to which memory, trauma and therapy influence the inner workings of characters in post-apartheid South African plays, in order to show that South African plays have deeper meaning that can best be explored using psychoanalysis.

In summary, the studies reviewed above have not attempted a psychoanalytic reading of the selected plays. It is in the context of all these revived works that this thesis takes another strand of thought. It is on the basis of this that psychoanalytic criticism is relevant in delineating the vision that investigates how interiorities motivate actions in post-apartheid South African plays. Consequently, the next chapter attempts a detailed analytic excursus on Reach, to reveal how memory and trauma impacted negatively on the lives and relations of the major characters, and how the eventual sharing and taken responsibility of these interiorities wrought healing and reconciliation.
CHAPTER THREE

LARA FOOT NEWTON’S REACH!: MEMORY, TRAUMA AND THERAPY IN THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

This chapter examines the deployment of repressed memory and trauma in Lara Foot Newton’s Reach! to recount how the bearing of traumatic experiences under the apartheid, influence personal and social relationships and political life in post-apartheid South Africa. It explicates how a shared exchange of traumatic memories between post-apartheid white and blacks bring about inner healing and sustainable reconciliation as the major characters in the play exemplify. The play pays attention to memory and trauma (especially repressed traumatic memory) to project the complexity of the problem created by the apartheid regime. Relying on Freud’s perspective of psychoanalysis, this chapter pays attention to dream interpretation, deliberate mistakes, etc. as tools for exhuming materials inadvertently stored in the unconscious. Using the psychoanalytic lens, the chapter also investigates the unconscious mind of the playwrights and the characters to reveal how the inner workings of the former is implicated/expressed in the later.

The thematic thrust of Post-Apartheid South African plays often centers on the horrors and after effect of Apartheid. In this regard, Foot Newton’s Reach! captures the psychological impact of the Apartheid regime on the personal, socio-political life and social intercourse of the South African people. This plausible endeavor by Newton finds a firm leverage on Mba’s (2017: viii) assertion that “Understanding the past is itself a process of constructing and describing identity, “because who we are is fundamentally linked to memory”. In the same vein, Marshall McLuhan (1964) posits that each time “We look at the present through a rear view mirror, we march backwards into the future”. 
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The play under study consciously establishes the therapeutic impact of negotiating memories and repressed traumas. Homman (17), in an introductory note remarks that:

…the play has constructed characters who aiming to come to terms with the various ordeals from their past, volunteered memories from different social, ideological, moral, cultural or political positions. For some of the characters the motivation for their reflection is longing to surpass the injustices played out by an older generations, for others, it is an attempt to reconcile what happened to fathers, mothers, daughters, sons and other loved ones”.

This view expresses the paraphernalia and psychological implication of oscillating between the realities of a horrid past and that of a promising present. In lieu of this, this research examines the portrayal of memory, trauma and therapy in post-apartheid South African plays by looking beyond the political, social, cultural, economic interpretations of post-apartheid South African plays and exploring the conscious and unconscious mind with emphasis on the latent contents, which are better examined through a psychoanalytical reading of the texts.

The Primacy of the unconscious is one of the tenets of Freudian’s psychoanalysis which Freud compared to that small portion of an iceberg that is visible above the surface of water. Novelists, playwrights and poets usually portray characters acting under the inexorable impulses exerted from their unconscious mind. According to Freud, the unconscious continues to influence human behaviour and experience, even though we are unaware of these underlying influences. Wilson Tosin (2013:127) also avers that this basic belief in the unconscious mind is imported by literary analysts in the study of literature, by holding that there is the unconscious aspect of literary works. In Newton’s Reach! the protagonist, Marion Banning is a manifestation of a recurring repressed traumatic memory in South African literature: the solitary, ageing white woman who has been abandoned by her children and must now confront a chaotic, changing, and often violent society. Worse
still, she must contend with how to deal with her interiorities subtle and compelling force overwhelming her. According to James, Mmadu (2015:342), “Instances of such protagonists abound in the literature of the late- and post-apartheid years, appearing in works as different in tone and intent as Coetzee’s novels and Nicholas Spagnoletti’s popular play *London Road*, and, a whole host of others”. *Reach* incorporate several psychoanalytic tenets: exposes group ties amongst a traumatized people, identification and camaraderie between individuals who would build a platform to share their pains, mourn their losses and reprimand identified enemies allegedly seen to be responsible for their condition by volunteering their dreams, and in their daily interactions inadvertently exhuming latent information from the haven of the unconscious through deliberate mistakes and slips of the tongue. This is epitomize by the intercourse between the principal characters of the play Marion and Solomon. The essence of this is that it offers the possibility of integral healing and renewal. The larger problems of reconciliation and healing in the new South Africa are represented in microcosm in the interactions between these characters.

The play *Reach* employing the characters Marion and Solomon, appears as a nuanced, thought-provoking, and ultimately optimistic meditation on cultural divides, history, truth, and reconciliation. Moreover, Marion’s uniqueness lies in brilliantly exploring psychoanalytic tenets and assumption to portray how genuine healing and reconciliation can be achieved. An exploration of the nuances of individual lives and interpersonal interactions offers hope for a richer and more complex literature. This is also, in Ndebele’s eyes, the means by which the new South Africa may be built. In other words, the fundamental objective philosophy of psychoanalysis that *Reach* embodies is that accepting one’s traumatic past experiences and problems is healthy and therapeutic. While on the contrary, denying the same and bottling them up by means of repression  is not only an effort in
futility, but also inimical to one’s mental and physical health and wellbeing. Having established this basic fact, what follows is a psychoanalytic reading of *Reach*.

### 3.1 *Reach* and the Question of Repressed Traumas

In *Reach*, Lara Foot Newton explores a timely political question, the nature and possibility of reconciliation through a detailed and accurate presentation of “ordinary” interactions between two well-developed characters (Osuoha, 2016:24). The materials for this interaction are provided from the hidden and overt memories. However, these memories are not pleasant memories but disturbing and heart-rending recollections, some known and other long forgotten. According to Steve Ejiofor (2015: 45), the rich and believable characterizations and accurate dialogue of *Reach* allow Newton to present a thoughtful account of the roles care and (mis) understanding in the drama of reconciliation. Furthermore, Ejiofor (cited in Steve: 49), asserts that, “*Reach* is, in tone and content, a much richer work. It centers around the protagonists mutual revelations of their personal histories; in the plays, these personal histories intersect in a moment of violence, while the interior lives and thoughts of the protagonists are revealed through letters, phone calls and heart to heart physical conversations”. Although, Ejiofor’s explication is quit an apt analysis of *Reach*, however, it did not point out that *Reach*, in tone and content is unarguably rich in psychoanalysis. As already established in the preceding chapters, *Reach*, is a masterpiece that exemplifies the unique intimate relationship between literature and psychoanalysis. In other words, it stands as a literary psychoanalytic interpretation of practical life experiences of individuals in the society, and how the same influence and define future personal and interpersonal interactions of individuals. The fundamental teleology of this psychoanalytic effort is to achieve therapy.
The play *Reach*, is an extended conversation between Marion and Solomon punctuated by Marion’s brief asides to her daughter. Divided by race, class, and age, Marion and Solomon are bonded by a shared history and their respective states of isolation, traumatic past, and the expedient need to attain reconciliation. *Reach* opens with Marion writing a letter under the influence of repressed memory, to her daughter in Australia. She begins with a description of the landscape around her: “Things are the same here. The mountain still cuts the sky in half and it still has its many colours of orange, pink, purple, and grey. Still no rain and still major power cuts” (Foot, 32). The situation is neither better nor worse; the beauty and the frustration remain, side by side. In saying that “things are the same,” Marion also implies that she is the same: still stubbornly rooted in this place, unwilling to move. As it becomes clear later in the play, Marion and her daughter have fought over Marion’s self-withdrawal and unwillingness to leave South Africa. Marion is symbolically represents a neurotic, because of her inability to accept, own and deal with her past traumatic experiences. The series of incidents in her past life has made her to withdraw into herself, refusing to open up nor share with her family and significant others, and this affects personal and interpersonal relationship. The frustration she means here could be seen as arising from interior memories of the past that makes her present state being adorned with mix-feeling of obsession and shallow contentment; as she later tells Solomon, the grandson of her former domestic worker Thozama, “my life has been full here. Painful but full!” (Foot, 40). Her life, personality and therefore her identity, are experiences in South Africa. This description of Marion’s present life correlates Chris Chukwuma’s (2016: 50) description of the psychoanalytic basic assumption of the aftermath of repression, that, “repression ineluctable leaves the individual obsessed and neurotic. As a result of this, her unwillingness to leave her
present background is unconsciously influenced by her past unresolved terrible experiences.

However, her unwillingness to leave may be justified, for according to Gagiano, “the removal of an individual from a familiar environment to a new one causes trauma” (Gagiano, 2002:2). Understanding Marion’s memories of the past is fundamental because they give meaning to her present. To leave therefore would mean that her “life had been worth absolutely nothing” (Foot, 40). This is so because even in the past when her family members were all with her, she still was lonely. An undertone of this, suggests that she is a sort of rigid and complex introvert personality. Nonetheless, Marion’s physical environment is also a source of fear. Describing a recent walk to her daughter, Marion says that she “came across a dead mossie all covered in goggas. It made me feel quite nauseous why do they always have to do that?” (Foot, 33). Mossie has a mental picture that Foot intended to pass a psychoanalytic message. This is seen as Solomon later reveals that the sight of the dead mossie caused Marion to sit down and cry. This happens as a result of the mental image of goggas repressed both in her conscious and unconscious right from infancy. It is imperative to recall here that Freud refers to the act of repression as a defensive mechanism that is only but temporary, because the return of the repressed is sure to happen. The fact that Marion herself describes her life as “full, but painful’, is an assertive and impeccable justification of Freud’s basic thesis.

The death and decay which are inescapable parts of the physical arena terrify and sadden Marion. She tries to reject this aspect of her daily experience, displaying the first clues of a conscious attempt to reject or deny traumatic incidents that prove deeply problematic within the play. According to, Ejinaya, Justin (2015: 34), “psychoanalysts are apt to point out that deliberate blindness or repression is delusive and complicates to
fixation and complexes”. The veracity of Ejinaya’s claim is evidently exposed in Marion’s personal and interpersonal relationships or interactions. First, Solomon who is an uninvited guest seems to have come to warn her that she is not safe in her house. Rather a critical probing reveals that as the play and the characters develops, Solomon who is burdened with the traumas of his past has equally come to help this traumatic chap to take a lip into their gory past to reveal the interiorities responsible for their obsessions and neurotic psychosis (as their dreams portray). This they could effectively do by volunteering their dreams, which according to Freud is one of the most viable transports into the habitat of the vast sea of the unconscious materials.

Marion’s attitude is neither moral nor political, she does not point out nor seek to atone for her privilege. Instead, her view is a practical and personal one, as she asks to keep this place which embodies the things she does own, her history and her past only until her time is up. Marion’s stance is believable, to an extent; she finds a way to reconcile her personal needs with larger political and social demands, at least in her own mind. As she tells Solomon at one point, she was “even a little involved in the struggle. Not bravely so, but involved” (Foot, 40). The gullibility of such a remark makes it seem unintentionally comic. Yet Solomon does not challenge Marion’s statement, nor is her attitude towards the land claims or her role in struggle history ever explored further. Instead, this brief discussion provides an easy way to eliminate the problematic question of Marion’s own guilt and historical complicity (all of which are responsible for her present traumas). Moreover, the common grounds that unite Marion and Solomon are their shared dramatic past and their present states of loneliness. In spite of these links, the divides between them are real, significant, and, in some cases, apparently irreconcilable. Not minding the cultural or other artificial divides between Marion and Solomon, the
intention of Foot is to achieve therapy. Hence, *Reach* focuses on an exploration of connection and reconciliation across boundaries of culture and loss; in this area, the play offers precise and rich configuration of psychoanalysis.

Marion may be sensitive and thoughtful, but she is by no means immune to racial prejudice. When Solomon enters, uninvited, Marion at first assumes he is a criminal: “If you are here to murder me, just hurry up and get on with it” (Foot, 33). Owing to the siege mental image and mutual suspicion, which is the aftermath of apartheid that the post-apartheid survivors must deal with, even as their relationship develops, Marion remains suspicious of Solomon’s motives, repeatedly asking him why he has come and who has sent him:

**MARION**: Was it your grandmother who sent you? Or is it those protestors? The ones who want my land. Have they put you up to this?
**SOLOMON**: No.
**MARION**: Maybe you are painting the house for them?
**SOLOMON**: No.
**MARION**: Then they can have the rice-paper house.
**SOLOMON**: No (Foot, 49).

Marion’s unfriendly quizzing of Solomon arises from her experience in the Apartheid era, an experience of intolerant, violence and war-like relationships between the blacks and the whites. This experience continues to define their relationships even after apartheid. According to Geoffrey Nwaoye (2015:90), “Solomon’s reluctance to yield information speaks to his own wariness in approaching Marion. Marion’s sharp curiosity and Solomon’s succinct responses create a tense environment loaded with both silent and partially spoken accusations”. As with much of the dialogue in the play, this exchange is well-paced and accurate; it allows a clear picture of both characters and their relationship to emerge organically. This assumption is hinged on Chukwuma’s (54), pertinent observation that “the journey towards the attainment of therapy, which is the
ultimate goal of psychoanalysis is a tough but systematic approach”. Consequently, *Reach*, reasonably designs that, while mutual suspicion and mild hostility should drive Marion and Solomon apart, their loneliness and shared history of traumatic past draw them together, in order to eventually achieve reconciliation and healing. Hence, in their first encounter, Marion softens to Solomon when she realizes that she knew him as a child: “My goodness! You’re not little Solomon! Ha! You used to play in the fishpond while I pruned my icebergs! Terrorized the tadpoles! Captured them in jam jars” (Foot, 33). Initially, suspicious of an unknown black man entering her house, Marion becomes more welcoming when she realizes that she knew Solomon as a child.

A shared sense of alienation helps to unite these two unlikely friends; this alienation is produced by artificial social boundaries rather than international borders. These social boundaries are based on age-long racial stereotypes that define and influence the relations between white and black South Africans. However, the volunteering of their shared interiorities which have a potent therapeutic value is to eradicate their artificial boundaries. For instance, Solomon, having lost his parents to HIV/AIDS, suffers the rejection of his community: “the people in our village were all gossiping, they said it was AIDS. Some would not come near our house” (Foot, 47). Marion, in contrast, rejects her own community after the murder of her son, as she is sickened by the portrayal of his death in the media: “The newspapers. The television. The photos of my boy on the front page. Lying naked in the scrap yard. The speculation: was he gay? Was he involved in drugs? Anything to make it not arbitrary. Anything to substantiate why he was asking for it” (Foot, 62). These hard-core questions that agitated her mind, unfortunately never got answered until the historic (life-changing) encounter with Solomon. The gory dramatic mental image this gruesome murder created in her unconscious mind becomes the
bedrock that is to define her mode, worldview, personal and public relationships and attitudes.

She feels traumatized by her society’s deliberate refusal to grasp the situation around them. The voyeuristic exploitation of Marion’s personal grief, the intrusion of the public into the private further drives a wedge between Marion and her community. She withdraws into the isolation and safety of her own pain: “it’s mine. No one else’s. I need it to be mine” (Foot, 63). However, in psychoanalytic reckoning, this obviously is not the right approach to handle unpleasant interiorities. As a result, it destroyed her marriage and alienates her from daughter, who accuses her of choosing to “stay with a dead son rather than leave with a healthy daughter” (Foot, 65). As Solomon points out, she has ended up utterly estranged from her surroundings, “in-between...not in town...not in the township” (Foot, 41). Sickened by her traumatic past, she withdraws inside. The concept, ‘dead son’ can be underscored to symbolize lost (trauma) memories. Memories of the gruesome murder of his son by some unidentified psychopaths, fills her with contempt to the extent of breaking her emotionally, physically and socially. This situation loudly claims the psychoanalytic fact that self-withdrawal and isolation is inimical to the individual’s mental and physical health. This truism is succinctly encapsulated by Horney cited in Aafa Bola-Boro (2010: 26), that, Freud believes that hysteria phobia, depression and drug addictions are not caused by organic symptoms but by emotional disturbances that originate from the unconscious. So, Freud’s interest in psychoanalysis is to provide an efficacious treatment for patients who had hysterical or neurotic symptoms.

Consequently, Marion’s long isolation inadvertently makes her receptive to Solomon’s repeated intrusions into her life. She says: “At first I was suspicious,” she tells her daughter, “…but now I think that he, like me, just needs a little company” (Foot, p.
Ironically, immediately after writing these words, Marion comes close to using her longstanding grief over the loss of her son to drive Solomon away. When Solomon accidentally puts on an old shirt of Jonathan’s, Marion flies into a rage: “Take it off! How dare you! You think you can come into my house and fucking well take over my life. Fucking well wear my son’s clothes. Who the hell do you think you are?...You thought nothing! This is my shirt! My Jonathan’s shirt and now you’ve gone and ruined it. Made it dirty. It’s filthy (Foot, p. 55). Solomon intrudes into the solitude (interiority) of Marion’s grief, a domain she has vigorously protected over the years. It should be established that the shirt wasn’t the cause of the sudden outburst of enrage, rather the shirt triggered an image—a gory traumatic memory of the violent death of Jonathan repressed in the unconscious mind. As Gail Ching-Liang Low (202), notes, “clothes function as the privileged sites of racial and cultural difference...the magic of costume lies in its ability to substitute a part for a whole”. By appearing in Jonathan’s shirt, Solomon threatens to replace her dead son, thereby dishonouring Marion’s own grief. Although, previously considered a friend, Solomon now comes too close to becoming a circumstantial enemy. His offence is that he unknowingly triggered the return of the repressed.

Another basic tenet of Freud’s psychoanalysis is the concepts of dreams and dream symbols. The psychoanalytic process relies on dream for attaining an understanding of the operation of repression. It does not give access to the unconscious as such; it merely recognizes symptoms of it when they resurface, in the form of dreams, puns, parapraxes. Solomon has information that, once revealed to Marion, would essentially release her from seven years of psychosis or neurosis that followed the death of her son. Not only that, the release would go further in time to further the release of traumatic memories about an
incidence that occurred in Jonathan’s lifetime. Motivated by his Xhosa cultural beliefs, Solomon arrives at Marion’s ageing Victorian house to tell the story of what he witnessed the day Jonathan was killed. When the onerous deal is eventually done, lessons will be learnt, when Marion gains insight into Solomon’s heritage and, conversely, Solomon is able to relieve some of the grief Marion has lived with by helping her process the murder of her son. Solomon recounts his motivation thus:

In my culture, the last person to see someone alive is supposed to speak at the funeral. You are supposed to tell the listeners what you saw and what you heard so that the living can be at peace with the whole story, with the truth about the death. I’ve been coming here for years, watching you, trying to find the right time. Carrying this thing with me. Walking with it. If you do not do this then you can become sick, you can be cursed with bad memories and bad dreams. I think that is why I got sick. Then last year I went to the mountain, I became a man. On the mountain we are taught to face our responsibilities. (Foot, p. 63).

Solomon’s assertion motivated by cultural mores has some psychoanalytic connotations with the appeal to dreams. This coincidence of cultural and psychoanalytic belief system can be termed in this work as culture-psychoanalytical creed. Solomon has been provoked into action by the warnings not just of his aunt (*a sangoma*) and by the value system instilled by his community, but most significantly by the repeated bad dreams. Also by this testimony, Newton aptly projects the basic psychoanalytic assumption that repression and denial are inimical to problem-solving, rather acceptance and responsibility is veritable to problem-solving. Moreover, by this testimony of Solomon, the playwright graphically affirms the Freudian psychoanalytic basic tenet that dreams provides a glimpse into the unconscious.

Freud believed that the content of dreams is related to wish fulfillment and suggested that dreams have two types of content: manifest content and latent content. The manifest content is the actual literal subject-matter of the dream, and it is the hidden psychological meaning of the dream. While the latent content is the underlying meaning of these symbols.
Freud believed that the latent content of dreams is suppressed and hidden by the subconscious mind in order to protect the individual from thoughts and feelings that are hard to cope with (34). According to Freud, information or data stored in the unconscious whether traumatic, pleasurable or zest memory is retrieved through a process called ‘dream work’ or slip of tongue. The dream walk, is the process by which events or desires are transformed into dream images. To explain how this process by which events or desires are juxtaposed into images, Freud, adduces what he refers to as the ‘primary revision’ and the ‘secondary revision’. Freud’s configurations on the nature of dream and its image is concisely captured by Newton in Solomon’s dream thus:

When I was sick with the liver, when I was in the hospital… I started to have dreams. The same dream. Jonathan saying ‘Solomon, tell my mother I wasn’t scared’. Then Jonathan’s face became my face, and then the shots wakes me up (Foot, p. 63).

Going by the strength of Freud’s analysis of the nature of dream and dream image, the manifest content of Solomon’s dream is the actual literal subject-matter of the dream, and it is the actual psychological meaning of the dream. While the latent content is the underlying meaning of these symbols. The latent content of dreams is suppressed and hidden by the subconscious mind in order to protect the Jonathan from thoughts and hard feelings that are hard to cope with, Jonathan’s face is transfigured into Solomon’s. This is basically, to ameliorate or caution the full impact of the harsh feelings and dread that could possibly emanate from the incidence. This implies that, the mind by this singular act, acts as an opium. Hence, it is philosophically and psycho-emotively significant and sound to postulate that, the human internal mechanism has so designed this reflex process to keep the individual in relative tranquility.

Moreover, the play is expressively as much a reminder of the need for reconciliation as it is a warning that reconciliation is an ongoing process, and this is the
teleology of psychoanalysis. Solomon confesses to playing a part in Jonathan’s killing. In addition, he brings with him Jonathan’s dying message. It is after revealing this information that he offers to assist in bringing the murderers to book. Marion’s response is emotional and loaded with pain. Stating that she cannot bear the thought of ‘opening all that gap again’ she cites the reports and sensationalism that dominated the media immediately after the killing. Marion’s rant, exposes her anger with the country and through it we hear the voice of the playwright: “This country has been breeding murderers for the past century…If we can’t distribute the wealth, then at least we have succeeded in the equal distribution of violence”.

Solomon’s historic visit to Marion is symbolic, in the sense that it is intended to be the beginning of the herculean journey towards unloading their shared traumatic interiorities. From the early conversation of Marion with Solomon, one finds out that the cause of her wariness which sucks her, results from the kind of stereotypic and myopic lifestyle she led in the past. She recounts in regret “no. I never lent money to anyone. It was my policy. But had I known that things were so bad at home I’m sure I would have. Or at least I like to think I would have. Strange how one sets principles, lives by then, and then later one realizes that one’s principles are worth nothing in the light of reality (Foot, 48). This implies that her present ordeal or predicament is partly caused by memories of her uncharitable past. The traumatic effect of this resulted to restiveness or restlessness. This is graphically portrayed by Solomon revelation, “…You always sleep all the time. Wake up in the morning, drink tea and then sleep on the couch. Two or three hours, wake up, sit for a long time looking at nothing. Then read without really looking. More tea, more cigarette, then sleep. Then the sun goes down. Dark comes. More tea and then write. Sit at your desk for a long time stirring at nothing (Foot, 49). This obsessive
routine, from the line of our argument is explainable only by overt and covert dreaded memories of the past. In the following conversation, Solomon sort to know what Marion continuously looks at:

Marion: it wasn’t at the bird, it was at the maggots.

Solomon: you threw a brick at maggot?

Marion: yes.

Solomon: and then you cried for a long time. Put your behind on the ground and cried like a wildebeest

Marion: I don’t like maggot… what else have you seen me do? Do you watch me on the toilet? In the shower? What my privacy?

Solomon: I’ve seen you sitting on your bed looking at nothing, sometimes for the whole night. My grandmother use to do that. What are you thinking about? (Foot, pp. 49-50).

The conversation portrays Marion as intensely burdened and sobered from her inglorious past. With the frequent visits of Solomon, he awaits for the right time and moment to disclose a vital traumatic information that has continually given him bad dreams and bad memories. He becomes use to Marion to the point that he is allowed to assist in some home chores. However, he stumble on an item that would open up a traumatic incidence Marion has worked so hard to repress. He goe to the garage to fetch some tools to tidy up the un-kept garden and says to Marion:

Solomon: Mies Marion, I found all the garden equipment. Spades, picks, everything! They were under the old canopy.
Marion: where did you get that shirt?
Solomon: I found it in the boxes in the garage.
Marion: take it off!
Solomon: what?
Marion: take it off!
Marion: how dare you! You think you can come into my house and fucking well take over my life. Fucking well wear my son’s clothes. Who the hell do you think you are? (Foot, 55)

Marion’s outburst reveals a key tenet of psychoanalysis ’repression’ as enunciated by Freud. Repression is the action that produces the unconscious by retendering
experiences, thoughts, desires, and memories irreversible. Psychoanalysis is a process whereby clues to repression are recognized and represented in such a way that can be understood by the conscious mind (Green and Jill, 147). Freud discusses the function of repression through a number of different models. Fundamentally, he describes conflict at work in the operation of the subject, whose physical and emotional demands and desires often come into conflict with forces of reality, including social customs, taboos as well as a physical safety and material possibility.

Barricelli and Gibaldi assert that, “The mind is not a simple unity but a divided unity, motives and the meanings of actions are actively kept from consciousness in the interest of self-protection and self-delusion” (145). This implies that repression is a defensive mechanism through which the psychotic individual momentarily runs away from emotional disturbances arising from unpleasurable past experiences. In this play, one sees the Marion acting under the impulses of repressed traumatic memories from apartheid. Marion’s sudden outburst of emotions and the casting of aspersions on Solomon are not deliberate, rather it was induced from the inner recesses of her minds. The mere sight of Jonathan’s shirts triggered memories of the tragic death of Jonathan repressed in her unconscious. This involuntary action validates the Freudian assumptions that materials from the unconscious are chiefly responsible for our actions and behaviour. In other word, Marion is oblivious of the contingent latent cause of her actions. Abashed at this unusual behaviour, Solomon drops the shirt and says: “Mies Marion, I’m sorry, I thought you said…” and Marion retorts, “You thought nothing! (she picks the shirt.)This is my shirt! My Jonathan’s shirt and now you’ve gone and ruined it. Made it dirty. It’s filthy, it’s… it’s… oh my God, it’s nearly seven years. Seven years without my boy… (Foot, 55). Now aware of the symbolism of the shirt in question, Solomon intensifies his
heartfelt apology, “Mies Marion. I didn’t … I’m sorry…I’ll go now. Mies Marion…”

This remorseful gesture of Solomon brings Marion back to her right senses as a result, she beckons on Solomon, “Marion: Please don’t go, Solomon, it’s not your fault. I … oh God, of course you can have the shirt. Of course you can wear it. I just… I just got a fright. For an instant I saw Jonathan …. I bought him this shirt for his graduation. I remember it well- I wanted him to wear a crisp white shirt but he refused. He wanted something bright, something different. (Foot, 56).

It is relevant to establish that Marion’s impulsive reaction happened even when she is unaware of the potent causes of her actions, behaviour and attitudes. This observation tallies with Smith Bayo’s (2015:34), indication that literary works are replete of characters acting under internal contingent factors-repressed unpleasant events, phenomena, experiences and other neurotic obsessions… Literary works express the author’s interiorities repressed and totally hidden from their conscious awareness. Moreover, it affirms Freud’s basic believe that repression as a defensive mechanism is but a futile temporary solution to one’s problems. According to Catharine Powell (2010:44), Marion’s inability to cope with her loss effectively has long prevented her from healing. While the outburst over Jonathan’s shirt could easily produce a final estrangement between Marion and Solomon, it instead lays the foundation for the play’s final scenes of reconciliation. In other words, it became the fulcrum and catalyst that would eventually change the cause of both Marion and Solomon’s lives. In her outburst at the sight of the shirt, Marion illustrates the failing that has slowly destroyed many of her relationships: the inability to “reach” beyond her grief, across the boundaries that divide her from others around her, in order to find peace and to reconcile herself with her loss. She recognizes this failing as the source of her solitude: You learn to keep it (grief) xcvi
a secret...I could have reached out, I suppose, to Frank (her husband) and he could have to me. That was the problem; we didn’t know how to reach one another. A lifetime together and no way of reaching (Foot, 63). Their marriage quickly fell apart after Jonathan’s death, in large part because Marion, unable to reach beyond her own suffering, refused to grant Frank an equal partnership in her grief (44).

At this point in the play, Marion begins to recognize and reckon with this failing. Immediately after attacking Solomon for wearing Jonathan’s shirt, she relents and tries to make amends; she reaches out to Solomon by asking him to tell her one of the stories that he enjoys sharing with the orphan children he works with. Instead, Solomon narrates a dream he often has, and Marion reciprocates by sharing one of her dreams. Both dreams illuminate Solomon and Marion’s shared fear of loss and death, so that their interactions in this scene end with an exchange of care and intimacy. As this scene illustrates, such intimacy is borne as much from misunderstandings as from shared experiences. As a result, a valid logical implication of this is that sharing of experiences brings about good mental and physical health. This in the final analysis points to the therapeutic prospects of psychoanalysis.

Consequently, after this scenario, the bond between Marion and Solomon increased to the point Solomon starts asking her personal questions, “you never talk much about your husband. Are you divorced? Marion graciously and freely answers him “yes, six years ago. After… Jonathan, there was no reason to stay together. We couldn’t bear to even look at each other anymore. It’s a shame; he wasn’t a bad husband, old frank, but he was always quite a weak man. A raging hypochondriac, a miser and, at times, a bit of a fool. But, he was the provider and he did take his role very seriously” (Foot, 59). Marion further narrates in detail events culminating in the death of her husband:
Marion: good… is the story about a night he was closed to death. He woke me up in the middle of the night screaming in agony. ‘Marion, Marion, I’m dying!’ well, I turned the light on and there he was sweating, crying and looking quite blue. ‘ah, the pain!’ he said, ‘it’s cutting through my belly like a knife. I feel like I’ve been poisoned’. I was quite concerned; we tried the warm tea and the buscopan and whatever else I had in the house, and finally ended up calling the ambulance (she laughs). On the way to the hospital he thanked me for all the wonderful years, and for being a beautiful mother and a kind wife- we were both in tears. I remembered all the good things about him-the way Anne was born and he bought me three-dozen red roses, and the holiday when Jonathan was stung by a blue bottle and Frank picked him up and ran all the way up the hill and over the bridge to the hotel. Then we arrived at the hospital and there’s this young, fat intern on duty. Frank insists on ICU and specialists. But the intern says he needs to first give Frank an examination. (she laughs again) so he prods Frank’s stomach, here, there and everywhere and suddenly (laughing so much she can hardly speak), Frank lets out this god-awful fart! The longest fart in the history of civilization (Foot, 59-60)

Marion’s recount of her husband’s death reveals the bitter situation of helplessness that she faces in the face of losing a loved one. The reminiscence points to the prevailing pain and/or trauma which are all rooted in the past but hunts her present. Thus, offering insight to the reality of individual experiences and courage to others who have chosen to remain silent over certain traumatic experiences. This is why after keenly listening to Marion share her traumatic memories, Solomon gets a moral stamina to deliver the great massage that have always given him bad dreams:

I saw Douglass, Sticks and Arthur- these were boys that my grandmother said I should never speak to, but they were walking with Jonathan to the scrap yard. And so I ran to join them. ‘Hey mfuwe tu (friends), wait for me!’ I ran after them and cut up when they got to the ford truck, the one with no wheels, the upside down one…

Solomon:… then I saw that Douglass was holding a gun, a real one, and that Jonathan had his hands tied behind his back with plastic that you find oranges in. Jonathan was making drowning sounds-he was crying-I say he pissed in his pants and so I also started to cry.

Douglass screamed at me! ‘Vok off, you devil, if you tell anyone I will kill you and all of your family! Vok off! Voetsak!’ As I turned to go, Jonathan said something to me it was a massage for you. That is why I am here. That is why I have being coming here to give you the massage. (Foot, 61)

The message that Jonathan gave to Solomon to relate to his mother has far-reaching effect on both Marion and Solomon. Solomon recounts what Jonathan said thus:

‘Solomon, please tell my mother I wasn’t scared’ (Foot, 61). This emotive massage
makes explicit the fact that Marion expectation of Jonathan is that he lives a life of courage and not fear. This is glaring in the advice Marion offers her son when he cried because Marion shouted on Mrs Gibbs. She tells him: ‘Jonathan, my boy, I just never ever, ever want you to be scared’. The message therefore proves that Jonathan heeded his mother’s advice even in the face of death.

In line with psychoanalytic basic thesis, Solomon recalls how his dreams provide him a glimpse into his unconscious mind, “In my culture the last person to see someone alive is supposed to speak at the funeral. You are supposed to tell the listeners what you saw and what you heard so that the living can be at peace with the whole story, with the truth about the death. I’ve been coming here for years, watching you-trying to find the right time. Carrying this thing with me. Walking with it. If you do not do this then you can become sick, you can be caused with bad memories and bad dreams. I think that is why I got so sick. Then last year I went to the mountain, I became a man. On the mountain we are taught to face our responsibilities (Foot, 63). From this cultural perspective, the playwright consolidates the psychoanalytic basic creed that facing one’s traumatic memories squarely and responsively is expedient towards achieving sustainable healing and reconciliation. In other words, acceptance and responsibility is essential to healing as against denial and repression. Furthermore, Solomon notes, “When I got sick with the liver, when I was in the hospital… I started to have dreams. The same dream, Jonathan saying, ‘Solomon, tell my mother I wasn’t scared’. Then Jonathan face becomes my face, and then the shot wakes me up”.

Solomon’s dream is susceptible to Freud’s psychoanalytic explanation of ‘dreams and dream symbols’. The psychoanalytic process relies on dream for attaining an
understanding of the operation of repression. It does not give access to the unconscious as such; it merely recognizes symptoms of it when they resurface, in the form of dreams, puns, parapraxes. Freud believed that the content of dreams is related to wish fulfillment and suggested that dreams have two types of content: manifest content and latent content. The manifest content is the actual literal subject-matter of the dream, and it is the hidden psychological meaning of the dream. While the latent content is the underlying meaning of these symbols. According to Freud, information or data stored in the unconscious whether traumatic, pleasurable or zest memory is retrieved through a process called ‘dream work’ or slip of tongue. The dream walk, is the process by which events or desires are transformed into dream images. To explain how this process by which events or desires are transformed into images, Freud, postulates what he refers to as the ‘primary revision’ and the ‘secondary revision’.

According to Freud, the unconscious does not operate according to the same set of paradigmatic and syntagmatic rules that govern conscious thought and language. Its associations and substitutions are quite different, and specific to individuals rather than shared by a linguistic community. The structure of the dream is formulated according to the associative patterns of the dreamer’s experience, rather than according to any normative assumptions of what is appropriate. It is during analysis that such individual partners of association (such as inappropriate food being served, or the recurrence of voracious reptiles) become clear, and can then be made sense of in terms of the dreamer’s experience.

Consequently, through the recounting of Solomon’s dreams they are able to come to terms with the latent causes of their ordeal and predicament. According to Freud, the forms in which the unconscious makes itself known are radically modified, and
deliberately ‘in disguise’. The traumas that have been repressed are extremely painful and damaging: the unconscious acts as a protective mechanism to prevent the subject’s realization of these agonies. In dreams, the process that the repressed undergoes, before it surfaces in the remembered dream, is called ‘dream work’, and it is considered to operate in a fashion analogous to the creation of art or literature. The ‘dream work’ is the transformation of the repressed, forbidden or taboo thought or desires into the manifest. The manifest elements are what a dreamer remembers, but they are equivalent to what slips off the tongue by mistake, or a hysterical crying fit, or a panic attack. The latter symptoms are less approachable for literary analysts, who are used to narrative, poetic and other linguistic forms, so it is the process of dream interpretation that we will consider in more detail here. In the dream Jonathan’s face transfigured to Solomon’s, and what Solomon was able to recall in the dream is only but a tip of the iceberg.

After relating this disturbing massage of Jonathan, afraid of the earlier warning of the murders, Solomon enquires from Marion if she would go to the law enforcement agency to seek for justice. Marion answers in the negative because of the sensationalism that heralded the ugly incidence. She retorts:

Please! And open all that up again? The newspapers. The television. The photos of my boy on the front page. Lying naked in the scrap yard. The speculation: was he gay? Was he involved in drugs? Anything to make is not arbitrary. Anything to substantiate why he was asking for it. Why it could happen to him but not to someone else. Are they all fucking blind? This country has being breeding murderers for the past century. Isn’t that clear? There doesn’t need to be a reason. Anger, despair! That’s the reason! That’s the motivation. Isn’t it obvious? But why my boy? Why mine? Why not somebody else’s? then they come with, ‘well, there has been violence in poor communities for decades now’. I know that! We know that! But does that make it any better? What? If we can’t distribute the wealth, then at least we have succeeded in the equal distribution of violence. Does that make sense? Is there any sense in that? I don’t know. Perhaps there is. (Foot, pp. 62-3).
The above expression of frustration satirizes the nature of political life during the Apartheid regime. A society epitomized by violence, mutual mistrust and intolerance. All of these maladies culminated in the murdering of Marion’s son Jonathan, an incident that influences her life, her personal and inter personal relationships never the same again. Furthermore, Marion reveals the impact of this traumatic incidence on Frank, “That why me and Frank lost each other at that time. He would sit staring at a chessboard- it was the one thing that he and Jonathan did together-play chess. And then I would work into the lounge and see him with tears rolling down his face, and all it did was make me angry” (Foot, 62). Moreover, she inadvertently underscores the basic assumption of psychoanalysis that repression and withdrawal is inimical to one’s mental health; as she speaks further: “Do you no he let them give me shock therapy; he signed the document? Marion Banning having shock therapy. it takes your pain away, you know. It sort of lies beside you like a book on a coffee table; back… and then you learn to keep it a secret… I could have reached out, I suppose, to Frank-and he could have to me. That was the problem; we didn’t know how to reach one another. I life time together and no way of reaching” (Foot, p. 63). This implies that, the fundamental factor that caused the disintegration of their marriage was the absence of the vital ingredient of marriage, ‘communication and openness.

The zenith to which Solomon and Marion’s retrospective conversation that expresses the goal of psychoanalysis is encapsulated in the following conversation:

**Marion:** So now your task is fulfilled?

**Solomon:** Yes. I’m so sorry, Mies Marion. I did not want to make your heart sore again.

**Marion:** So now you job is done? No more bad dreams? (Foot, p. 64).
This implies that psychoanalysis is therapeutic in nature because the whole essence of Solomon and Marion volunteering their shared traumatic memories is for the purpose of achieving healing-health of mind and body.

When the onerous and noble mission was accomplished, Solomon leaves Marion. After Jonathan leaves, Marion concludes her letter by revealing the origin of the emotive message of Jonathan:

…. and then he left, and hasn’t been back in over two weeks. You understand, Anne? That is why he has been visiting me. To deliver our Jonathan’s message. I don’t know if you remember that time when Jonathan went on a school outing to the science museum. He was in grade two. All of seven years old. They were supposed to be dropped off at the school at one and I was to pick Johno up at two-thirty. He was staying on for cricket. When I got to the school he wasn’t there. I asked some of his friends if they and seen him, and they said he hadn’t been at cricket practice I was immediately in a panic and phoned his teacher. She said that she had last seen him at the museum and she thinks that he was returned to the classroom at one. ‘you think he was returned’, I screamed. ‘are you fucking mad? What do you mean you “think”?’ I slammed down the phone, jumped into my car and sped off to the museum. I cried all the way there and prayed to God that he was alright. When I got there he was sitting on the floor next to the skeleton of a great white shark and sobbing to himself. He was terrified that he would have to stay there the whole night. The stupid bitch at the front desk had said that he was not allowed to use the phone and that he should use the call box. He had lost his card and was too embarrassed to ask for money. The next day when I took him to school I grabbed his teacher, Mrs. Gibbs, by her stingy hair and said, ‘don’t you ever do that to my child again, you stupid idiotic, irresponsible excuse for a teacher’. Then she started to cry, and Jonathan started to cry, and it was pandemonium. I took Jonathan outside to console him, and he said, ‘Mom, why are you still so angry? I have almost forgotten about it’. And I said, ‘Jonathan, my boy, I just never ever, ever want you to be scared’. Do you think what the message is about, Anne? I cant think that I can be anything else? Do you think perhaps he remember that say? Why that massage? Why-’Tell my mother I wasn’t scared’ (Foot, 64-5).

The bridge between these two scenes, in which Marion continues her letter to her daughter, provides only a satisfying review of Solomon’s revelation that spurred heartfelt apology from Marion to her daughter. The fundamental message of this scene is interesting, and the emotional impact of Marion and Solomon’s reconciliation a clinical healing on both. Consequently, it is logically coherent to inferentially claim that, both Marion and Solomon will never remain the same again.
From the foregoing, this chapter has investigated the extent to which memory, trauma and therapy influence the inner workings of characters in post-apartheid South African plays, in order to show that South African plays have deeper meaning that can best be explored using psychoanalysis. Thus, it is arguable that Reach! occupies the central position therefore in not only locating the South African experience within literary discourse but also illustrates vigorously the therapeutic approach to the study of South African experiences. It can be plausibly adduced that Newton achieved the teleology of psychoanalysis, which is therapy. After a painstaking and systematic exhuming of their ossified memories, they achieved integral relieve. The characters, Marion and Solomon are symbolically representative of the white and black South Africans. The traumatic memories which they shared before achieving resolution are also symbolically that of the South Africans. Consequently, this work inferentially adduces that South Africans in their bid to achieve integral and sustainable healing and reconciliation must endeavor to adhere to the fundamental objective principles of psychoanalysis as foregrounded and portrayed by Newton.

The key issue raised in this chapter centered on the fundamental good (quest) on how South Africa may achieve reconciliation and build a new South Africa in the new dispensation, when they are still dealing with the trauma of the past. This is the governing propensity of this research. In an attempt to resolve this question, the chapter adopted a psychoanalytic framework in exploring the Latent meanings embedded in Reach, a post-apartheid South African play. It critically ruminated on the relationship between the concepts of memory, trauma and therapy, and their inevitable influence on the behaviour of the individual’s personal and social relationships, as foregrounded by the major characters in the plays. It is hence, established that accepting memory of the traumatic past...
and dealing with the same is crucial to achieving healing and reconciliation. And this in turn, is veritable to achieving sound health of mind and body. Therefore, this chapter established the richness of the literary form (psychoanalysis) to capture, foreground and reconstruct human experience. Therefore, the strength of this analysis lies with the fact that it contributes to the general quest towards understanding of actions and the interpretation of actions in literature. Moreover, it highlighted the importance of taking responsibility of one’s actions, rather than denial and repression. The next chapter titled “Explicating the Place of Memory and Trauma in achieving Therapy in Craig Higginson’s Dream of the Dog aims at consolidating the claim that psychoanalysis is clinical and therapeutic in nature. It examines how the characters negotiate their interiorities to achieve reconciliation and healing.
CHAPTER FOUR

EXPLICATING THE PLACE OF MEMORY AND TRAUMA IN ACHIEVING THERAPY IN CRAIG HIGGINSON’S DREAM OF THE DOG

This chapter analyses the unconscious drive and circumstances behind the personality and actions of the major characters in Craig Higginson’s Dream of the Dogs, in order to reveal the adverse and intrusive impact of traumatic memories on personal and interpersonal relationships within the socio-political environments of Post-apartheid South African. The primary purpose of this is to establish the fact that understanding memory and trauma is an inevitable way of achieving therapy especially in line with the basic assumptions of psychoanalysis. In this regard, the issues of Memory, trauma and therapy in Craig Higginson’s Dream of the Dog, can be foregrounded using psychoanalysis postulations. Hence, drawing inference from the arguments in chapter two, the chapter posits that ample evidence from this work under review suggests that the vast sea of what constitutes the ultimate cause and determining factor of human behaviour and choice of action lies beyond the individual’s conscious awareness. In line with the forgoing, achieving a sound mental health, and reconciliation with significant others, entails that, one must be involved in self-retrospection and self-examination by paying attention, especially to one’s dreams and other factors that act as lee ways to the
unconscious abode. Subsequently, volunteering and sharing of these traumatic experiences both from the conscious and unconscious minds brings about therapy and integral reconciliation.

4.1 Memory/Trauma and Repression

Memory and Trauma are psychological concepts whose influence on the individual’s behavior is phenomenal. This assumption is premised on the fact that psychoanalysis associates a literary work’s surface interpretation with its deeper meaning which influences the individual’s behaviour and conduct. It investigates not just traumatic memory in general but traumatic memory retrievable from the unconscious mind. Meanwhile, repression as espoused in preceding chapters, is one of the tenets of psychoanalysis which is the foundation of neuroses. According to Habib, M.A.R (575), “it is regarded as a primary mechanism of defense whereby the ego is obliged to protect itself against any renewed threat of the repressed impulse by a permanent investment of energy”. The primary motive for repression is for temporary run away from the traumatic impacts of horrible memories. Usually, the adverse and unintended consequences of repression are depression, obsession and neurosis. Craig Higginson’s Dream of the Dog, reveals major characters suffering from neurosis, depression and obsession as a result of repression of traumatic memories. The play is set on the eve of Richard and Patricia Wiley’s departure from their KwaZulu-Natal farm. Under the guise of closure and reconciliation, Look Smart, one of the major characters arrives to face Patricia, the protagonist who was once like a mother to him. The confrontation between them unearths the narrative of a single traumatic day that has preoccupied Look Smart for the past fifteen years. The memories of the day Richard Willey’s dog killed Grace, the woman Look Smart hoped to marry, are as faded as the Persian rugs scattered across the floor of
the Wiley’s farmhouse sitting room. According to Levie (2015:56), “Higginson’s setting of wall with ‘cloudy damp stains’, spider’s web’, dust in the corners’ and a clutter of half-packed boxes reflects the jumbled memories Look Smart, Richard and Patricia share. The thick mist and rising fog outside further enhance a setting in which lucidly is increasingly unlikely”. The only clear account of the events of the day Grace died comes from beauty, the Wileys’ long-serving domestic worker. Ironically, her testimony is heavily prompted by Look Smart. This diminishes the validity of her version of events and leaves the audience to question whether this is in fact Beauty’s report or merely her subservient response to Look Smart’s firm coaxing.

Patricia and Look Smart contest disparate memories not only of profound and life-changing experiences but of simple moments they have shared— the clay animals, the first fish Look Smart caught in the dam. Higginson constructs Look Smart’s Memories in poetic language that endows, almost self-dramatizes this character’s point of view. Moreover, Richard the husband of the house is not left out of this obsession. In fact, he appears to have developed brain fag, but a critical examination reveals that he actually is suffering from psychotic neurosis as a result of repression and depression arising from dastardly early childhood experiences. As the play unfolds, it becomes clearer that he suffers from the effects of his cruel and inhuman actions and dream which the Dog perpetuates at his instance. Hence, ‘the dream of the Dog, is the will of the master’. The conversation below apparently portrays Richard as losing his memory:

**RICHARD**: Who told you to buy new furniture?
**PATRICIA**: That’s not new furniture, Richard.
**RICHARD**: I’m not sure I like these animal skins lying about. It’s unhygienic.
**PATRICIA**: Then you shouldn’t have shot the animals.
**RICHARD**: I shot those? (Higginson, p. 142).
The inability of Richard to remember their property and his killing of the animal shows that he is losing is memory. What this implies is that Richard’s loss of memory has in turn eroded his former self but in the actual sense, his reaction is contingent upon the unknown influence of disturbing and harrowing early experiences repressed in his unconscious mind. Once an avid hunter, he now looks askance at his trophies, unwilling to believe that he could have actually killed those animals. Although Patricia confirms this is true, Richard continues to eye the skins skeptically.

With his memory disintegrating, his mind occupies an intermediate space between the world of the living and the dead. The incidence express in the forgoing, also reviews another instance of memory loss. Richard tells Patricia that he has spoken with his father. When she reminds him that his father has been dead for twenty years, he haughtily replies: “that is extremely unlikely. I saw him only yesterday. We shared a cigarette. Do you think I was addressing his ghost?” (Higginson, 143). What this shows is that Richard’s loss memory is critical because he can hardly distinguish between the actual world and the dream world. This loss of memory that Richard suffers illustrates the psychoanalytic assumption that dream acts as a window or glimpse to the unconscious mind. All of these experiences happened in the past. According to Nwaigwe, John (201), “an obsessed individual in most cases is not able to differentiate between real life experiences from dream experiences”. This assertion by Nwaigwe best describes Richard’s condition.

Again, the extent of Richard’s memory loss is revealed when he tells Patricia that, when he was a child, his “whole family went away,” except for his mother, who stayed behind (Higginson, 144). Patricia corrects him, reminding him that his mother died when
he was three, while the rest of his family survived. Richard continues to reverse
distinctions between the living and the dead to the point that he is no longer sure if he
himself is alive or dead. This is seen in the exchange between Richard and Patricia:

**RICHARD**: Are we dead yet?
**PATRICIA**: No, we are not dead.
**RICHARD**: You will tell me when we’re dead?
**PATRICIA**: Yes, Roo, of course I will (Higginson, 144).

The exchange between Richard and Patricia reviews Richard’s lack of
consciousness to the reality and distinction between life and death. Another perspective
that the incidence brings to bare is the issue of dreams. David Carter states that “Through
close study of mentally disturbed patients and their symptoms Freud discovered that
knowledge of the unconscious was accessible through analysis of dreams”. In relation to
the case of Richard therefore, Richard’s dream can be seen as a manifestation of the
unbalance nature of his unconscious. Furthermore, In relation to Freud’s postulation
which states that dream experience comes in the reverse order because dream images
come in disguise form, Richard’s dreams are thus a reversal of the actual order of events
as they occurred in the past. The implication of this is also manifested in his loss of
memory. Memory “acts as the connecting tissue between the body and the physical
places it has occupied” (Graham, 2). Thus without it, a balance personality cannot be
attained. This explains why Richard loses his sense both the physical and temporal place
his memory once occupied.

The cause of Richard’s memory loss and his in ability to distinguish between the
dream world and reality can be linked to the scars of old trauma which constantly
emerges into the present. He tells Patricia that the ambulances are coming to fetch them,
along with the two dead children. With this statement, he gestures to a secret the murder
of his black mistress and her unborn child that will not be revealed until the end of the play. His guilt-ridden and rotted mind allows these past crimes and losses, the murder, the death of his parents to edge in and out of the present. He remains, to the end of the play, a miserable, tortured presence. This sorry state of Richard invariably justifies the psychoanalytic creed that repression as a defensive mechanism is not a solution to one’s problems, instead, it compounds one’s problems. Moreover, his traumatic condition affirms Bessel A. van der Kolk (cited in Kyeong Hwangbo, 2004:34) indication that, “The essence of psychological trauma is the loss of faith that there is order and continuity in life. Trauma occurs when one loses the sense of having a safe place to retreat within or outside oneself to deal with frightening emotions or experiences.

The conversation between Patricia and Look Smart – the major characters of the play – illustrates the height of the unearthing of a long standing trauma ensues in the conversations of Patricia and Look Smart the major characters of the play. Following the introduction of the decaying farm and its senile patriarch, Look Smart arrives to ignite the central drama of the play. Look Smart is a former resident of the farm, the child of farm workers. Lacking children of her own, Patricia took Look Smart under her wing and eventually paid for his schooling. While they were once close, he left the farm in anger as a young man and has not returned until this night. Look Smart is immediately antagonistic toward Patricia, as he attempts to assert his dominance over the couple:

**PATRICIA:** Goodness. And how well you look.

**LOOK SMART:** I am a different man.

**PATRICIA:** You certainly seem different. You’re wearing a suit.

**LOOK SMART:** This is what I’m like these days, Madam. I wear a suit.

**PATRICIA:** How extraordinary. Times have changed, haven’t they?
LOOK SMART: Oh yes. But I see you are still here where I left you. Although smaller than I remember you. Do you know, I had to look up to you once? (Higginson, 147).

His final line suggests not only physical height but also a fixed power relationship; in the old order, he was forced to acknowledge Patricia and Richard as his superiors. Now that “times have changed,” he has come to put them in their place as faded relics from the past that have no power in the present. He has come to exhume racial crimes against humanity perpetrated by Richard against his deceased maid. He drives this point home by symbolically taking up one of the apples and the knife and slowly peeling the fruit as he speaks. Richard has carried out a similar action in the previous scene. By taking the apple, Look Smart demonstrates to Patricia that he is replacing Richard by taking control of the farm, and with it, the power over life and death once held by Richard.

Look Smart’s use of the knife makes Patricia nervous; according to the stage directions, “Look Smart is aware of this, is almost enjoying it” (Higginson, 152). Look Smart uses this as a further opportunity to remind Patricia that, as a white woman, she is complicit in past crimes: “Ja. You’re afraid. Like the rest of them, you live in a constant state of fear” (152). He believes that she has now finally emerged from her delusional sense of being above or apart from her environment; he tells her that he is “glad the truth of this place has finally reached (her)” (152). Earlier in their encounter, Patricia seeks to distance herself from the farm they are leaving. “I’m going back to where I grew up,” she tells Looks Smart, “I’m a Durban girl at heart” (149). Look Smart refuses to allow her to dissociate herself from this place and the crimes interred in its soil so easily. “Come, come, Madam, you’re joking,” he replies, using the term “madam” in a biting, ironic
way, “in my head, I can’t separate you from this farm” (149). He refuses to grant Patricia the power of self-definition; instead, he seeks to project his own definitions onto Patricia, the farm, and their shared past.

Their conversation is primarily focused on the contestation of shared traumatic memories. At the beginning of their exchange, Patricia attempts to re-establish intimacy by reminding Look Smart of a fishing trip they took together when he was a child. She claims that, upon catching a fish, he found it so beautiful that he wanted to return it to the water, which he then did. Look Smart disagrees: “If I remember myself correctly, I would have wanted to eat the fish” (Higginson, p. 148). He asserts that Patricia does not and did not know or understand him. He refuses to allow her to re-kindled their closeness, as he believes their relationship was essentially unequal and flawed. It suffices to agree with A. D. Amos (2014:48), that through this ill-feeling of Look Smart, Higginson graphically pains the sort of society of master slave relationship which is far removed from egalitarian society which South Africans where unjustly confined to during the apartheid regime. Memories of the injustices of racial discriminations, inordinate segregations, apathy and other social maladies that characterized the apartheid era unconsciously forged the interpersonal and personal relations of post-apartheid black and white South Africans. This of course makes the social environment of post-apartheid South Africa one of vindictiveness and Look Smart symbolically represents this.

In lieu of the forgoing, Look Smart tells Patricia that, he could remember that, she forced him to bash the fish’s head in with a rock. In place of the tenderness and beauty of which Patricia speaks, he remembers cruelty and an unfair assertion of power. “You never knew me, Madam,” he reminds Patricia; “you don’t even know my name”
Patricia tells him that she was present at his birth and his naming. He responds with a violent outburst, his first loss of composure during their interactions: “My name is Phiwayinkosi! Phiwayinkosi Ndlovu! That is the name my parents gave me. But only after you had left. Look Smart? That is the name they gave in order to please you” (156). By this stunning revelation, Look Smart brings out one of the harrowing and traumatic experience of the blacks in the hands of the blacks. This disposition unknowingly influences Look Smarts attitude toward Richard and his household. According psychoanalytic reading, the conscious contingent materials influences the individuals attitudes, behaviour and reaction to himself, significant others and to his social environment in general.

Consequently, Patricia did not and could not ever have had access to the intimate spaces of Look Smart’s life and identity. Their entire previous relationship was founded on lies and deceptions, which Look Smart now intends to confront. Their discussion takes the form of an excavation of the unconscious, in which Look Smart interrogates Patricia in order to force her to see and admit the truth about the past. At last, he reveals the reason for his coming: he intends to claim justice for Richard’s raping and then killing Grace, his fiancée, by setting a dog on her. At first, when questioned, Patricia feigns amnesia. “I don’t know anything about that,” she tells Look Smart; “it happened a long time ago” (156). Look Smart, “a more effective fisherman now,” refuses to let her off the hook (151). He recounts the incident as it initially appeared to him and Patricia: Grace came running from the dairy followed by the dog, which then attacked Grace until Patricia pulled the dog away. According to Patricia, Richard said that Grace had “been taunting it (the dog), throwing stones at it, and that it pulled itself free” (158). Look
Smart now claims to reveal what they did not see; as she was dying, Grace told him that Richard had raped her and then set the dog on her deliberately.

Overwhelmed by the astonishing revelation, Patricia initially reacts in disbelief: “I don’t believe one word” (Higginson, 159). Look Smart follows with further accusations, claiming that Patricia at first refused to carry Grace to the hospital in her car because she didn’t want to stain her seats with blood. As a result, Look Smart has not come to reckon with Richard, but rather with Patricia, whose betrayal, in his mind, was greater: I thought you cared. But you didn’t. I thought I meant something. But I didn’t. All you cared about was protecting your seats (161). This implies that Patricia valued her car seats more than the human person, what a heart breaking discovery. In a worthy attempt to foreground or interpret this denigrating attitude of Patricia, Amos (2014:90), observes that this is representative of the debased status of the blacks in the apartheid era, where properties and material acquisitions of white South Africans are valued far more than the life of black south Africans. It suffices to aver that, this harrowing experiences is not exclusive to South Africans, rather it is a shared experience of Africans in the hands of their colonial masters who saw them as inferior, apes and savages whose lives are worthless. Hence, conscious and unconscious memories of these social malady makes the average black African exhibit obsessive tendencies towards the white in post-apartheid South Africa society.

Influenced by this obsessed memory, Look Smart is convinced that he saw the truth of their relationship on that day. He has now come to force Patricia to recognize this truth herself. It is imperative to establish that Look Smart’s intent is unique in intent and approach. Unlike the general spirit and movement of black post-apartheid South Africans
whose attitude and intent is vindictive and revenge, this is therapeutic. He is out to broker reconciliation and healing, in consequence, he stands as the epitome of the fundamental psychoanalytic essence or objective of Higginson’s *Dream of the Dog*. In this, he is successful, although the impact this success has on him is ambiguous. Realizing that Look Smart’s return is not actually to seek for revenge but to achieve reconciliation and healing, Patricia intrigued buys this incredible accusations, reacts with mix-feelings:

PATRICIA: I owe you an apology.
LOOK SMART: It still seems too easy.
PATRICIA: None of this is easy, Look Smart. But I can’t undo what happened. What Richard has done, he has done. And I will never be able to take back that terrible thought I had when that young girl lay bleeding.
LOOK SMART: But are you sorry?
PATRICIA: Will that one word be enough? Will it help you to go away and become someone new? I suppose I’m asking about hope (Higginson p. 163).

Patricia accepts Look Smart’s accusations but does not know what to offer in return. She asks for Look Smart to be healed, but he refuses to let go of his desire for her (Patricia) to accept and appreciate her guilt, which some post-colonial scholars would unwittingly interpret as revenge. So, he tells Patricia: “I wish for your guilt. Darkness! I don’t want you to leave this place without a backwards glance” (164). He demands that Patricia remains in a continued state of remorse. According to Holiday, such guilt “is itself a form of memory which consists of our being haunted by the distinctive presence of whomever it is we have wronged” (44). Moreover, in psychoanalytic reckoning, Look Smart’s approach is expedient towards achieving integral healing and reconciliation. As aptly established above, repression and denial is inimical to the quest for healing, one must first accept and owe ones past odious actions and experiences as this is the very first and inevitable bold step towards healing.
The concept of land metaphorically illustrates the concept and nature of the unconscious mind, because through an excavation of the sorrows and losses written into this land (the unconscious), a partial catharsis may be achieved. The materiality of land in relation to the unconscious derives from the relationship between man and land. This connection is expressed when Patricia reveals that the land and what it holds already haunts her, as Look Smart desires. Buried in the farm is the body of her sole, stillborn child, Rachel, whose death heralded the collapse of her marriage. Following this loss, Richard distanced himself, a “lame dog... (a) coward,” hiding himself in the farm, much as he would later use the power and privilege ownership of the farm bestowed upon him to hide his murder of Grace (Higginson, 166). This mechanism of running away from one’s troubling past psychoanalyst holds not a healing therapy but have adverse effect because the repressed and oppressed must inevitably return.

Patricia, barren and alone, remained a silent and decaying presence on the farm. In Look Smart, she saw a surrogate child, but, upon his returning from boarding school, he “started to judge...with a terrible contempt” (166). Terrible contempt because of the traumatic experiences he continually have in the farm. When he left the farm after Grace’s death, he became, to Patricia, “another dead child,” the memory of whom would haunt her (166). Patricia has not allowed herself to forget these buried memories. As she and Look Smart speak, Richard is supposed to be disinterring the body of their stillborn child, which Patricia intends to rebury near their new home in Durban. The past must be brought up out of the ground and carried with them; neither grief nor guilt can ever be left behind. Her narrative has a strong impact on Look Smart, who becomes “visibly disturbed and upset” (166). Following this exchange, he relents somewhat and allows
their conversation to take on a gentler and more personal tone. He reveals to Patricia that the farm has been bought by the company he works for. He has come back “not to reclaim the land that was taken from my people...but to establish a gated community for the newly rich” (167). Both he and Patricia fervently desire the destruction of the farm. The reason for this is not far-fetched, it is because the mental this building continually produces is that of traumatic memories of their past. According to S. A. Stanley (2014:59), “physical structures or exterior climatic properties have the propensity of infusing memories of red-lettered days on the psyche of individuals. These eventful moments might be that of euphoric moments or traumatic events”. Against the backdrop of this conscious feeling, Patricia tells him that she hopes “they knock it (the house) down, brick by brick” (Higgins 167). Look Smart then describes the complete transformation of the farm and its buildings that will take place: The hills I know so well, they will be buried in pine plantations. The wetlands will be turned into dams for farming trout. All those birds that surrounded me as a boy, that rainbow that always twittered, it will slowly fade. And one morning there will be silence...The hut I was born in, that will go too (168). A total transformation of the physical environment becomes an outward sign of the obliteration of the traumatic memories of events and experiences events that could best be described as inordinate, unjust and repugnant.

Consequently, the land, fatally polluted, cannot be reclaimed or restored. Instead, it must be irrevocably altered and partially destroyed. Look Smart took part in the deal because of his desire “to cut it up, cut up all the things I’ve never spoken about” (168). It is informative to argue that, *Dream of the Dog* raises powerful questions about the excavation of memory and the processes of guilt and forgiveness. Knowing the truth can
bring about some reconciliations, but other evils, no matter what their truth, are too great to be forgiven. It intends to communicate the psychoanalytic basic assumption that paying attention to latent memories is a veritable way of achieving real healing of the mind and body. Based on this shared psychoanalytic understanding in Higginson’s work, questions of interiorities are saturated densely. In this play, as it is obvious in this progressing analysis, memory and history are embedded in a landscape shaped both by the forces of the past (apartheid and institutionalized white privilege) and the future. Look Smart came to off load the memories of his past that has been furnished in him both from the overt and covert memory. According to him, “…Am here to talk about Grace. Grace. The sister of Beauty. The girl I loved!” (156) At first, Patricia’s disposition was that of disapproval and surprise:

**PATRICIA**: I don’t know what you’re saying, Look Smart. All of this. It’s lost.
**LOOK SMART**: Lost? It isn’t lost. I think about it every day.
**PATRICIA**: I don’t expect you to give a damn about any of this. What with your new suit. You’re the future, Look Smart. We’re from the past.
**LOOK SMART**: You think the past is unimportant (161).

Higginson employs the character of Look Smart to graphically express the reveal that one’s present and future is invariably shaped by incidences (especially traumatic incidences) of the past. Memories of these incidences are either within our conscious mind or buried in the unconscious mind. Hence, Look Smart finds it ridiculous to learn that Patricia seems to hold a belief to the contrary, “…but your good manners are not that important. What I find interesting is this idea you have. That the past is… what was it? Faded away? Ja. Because that suggests that there are no consequences to people’s actions. And that I find that idea… I find it repugnant” (150). By this assertion Higginson strongly passes a psychoanalytic conviction that the past has certain definitive and unavoidable consequences on the present and future life. Like fate, if an adequate and
sustained diligent attention is not paid on these latent and obvious memories, every effort tailored toward achieving reconciliation and healing would amount to efforts in delusion and futility. In the ensuing long conversation, Look Smart emotively reveals the horrifying events that culminated in the murder of Grace in cold blood:

**LOOK SMART**: Yebo, Madam. Grace. A lot like beauty. Only more beautiful.

**PATRICIA**: Grace. The girl who died. You left…

...died or was killed, Madam? Which was it? You do not like the distinction? At the time? I saw it as murder, plain and simple. Look Smart: suddenly grace is a double creature. Half woman, half dog. She utters a sound so terrible I don’t even recognize it as her, as coming from her. But it brings a dozen farm workers into the garden within seconds. We gather around, worshippers around some ancient sacrifice, silent with terror. Whenever I tried to approach, the dog swivels around so that Grace stands between us. Always, always, Grace coming between us, and Grace, she is wailing in a strange song-like way. She utters the same few notes repeatedly, obsessively, as if her voice has found the right level, the right pitch, the right song for the pain. What I’ve told you is not the full story. It is only what we saw. What about what we didn’t see? When I was carrying Grace towards the dairy, her mouth against my ear, she whispered something I have never told to anyone. It was your husband. It was your husband Richard who caused it. Beauty saw them. She walked into that room where the milk tank was. She found them there. On the floor. Your husband was holding her down. Rapping her… She saw your husband unchain his dog, let it loose on Grace. He unchained the dog, climbed into his bakkie and drove away into the hills (Higginson, 155-159).

In the lengthy statement above, Look Smart painstakingly recounts the pathetic and horrifying scene of the murder of Grace by their master, who ironically ought to be their guardian and father figure. The horror and disillusionment arising from this horrible and inhuman act of Richard became a traumatic experience whose inevitable consequences consciously and unconsciously influences Look Smart’s relationship with not just Richard alone, but with the entire family. As a matter of fact, it becomes for Look Smart, ‘the straw that brook the Camel’s back. The traumatic effects of this dastardly and despicable act created in him a siege mentality and phobic dispositions towards the Richards. Meanwhile, this is a very strong and implicating accusation and Look Smart is
quite aware of the enormity of his allegation. So, conscious of the implication of this unequivocal allegations, Patricia ferociously puts it to Look Smart:

PATRICIA: You are calling my husband a murderer.

LOOK SMART: I believe that is exactly what I am calling him.

PATRICIA: It is not a word to use lightly.

LOOK SMART: And I do not use it lightly. (159)

In the exchange above, Look Smart affirms his statement without mincing words. Thus, despite the passion and sincere characteristic of the voice of Look Smart as he reveals this terrible crime that has continually constitute a thorn in his flesh and the bane of his psychological upheaval, Patricia is not still convince of his testimony, as she disparages Look Smart thus, “even if it’s true, even if he did have sex with her-God knows he could have, he slept with a whole line of stable girls from England-monstrous thing to say, especially when you don’t know the facts. The fact is… the girl was throwing the stones, the dog broke free and attacked her…” (160). From the tone of Patricia’s voice, one could infer that even when she sees her husband’s actions as repugnant and abominable, she also sounded quit defensive. It could be adduce that family affinity and the tacit urge to defend one’s own is responsible for Patricia’s insincere disposition. In consequence, to make impeccable his claim, the need to call in an eye witness becomes imperative, as those in the legal parlance would have it, ‘no evidence, no case’. In other words, to prove his case beyond reasonable doubt, he calls Beauty who knows the great detail of the case to such an alarming depth that no other knows. In the ensuing cross-examination by Patricia and Look Smart, Beauty fearfully lays her mind bare:

PATRICIA: What do you see, Beauty?
LOOK SMART: They are on the floor, aren’t they?

BEAUTY: Yes

LOOK SMART: his hand over her mouth.

BEAUTY: She sees me, and…

LOOK SMART: qhebeka (you have to carry on), Beauty

PATRICIA: Did she get away from him then?

BEAUTY: Yebo, Missis.

PATRICIA: The dog. Did my husband unchained the dog?

BEAUTY: Oh, missis.

PATRICIA: Tell us Beauty!

BEAUTY: He undo the chain, he undo the chain, the dog running.

LOOK SMART: Yes. And he waits to sew the dog catch her, doesn’t he? He waits to make sure, isn’t that it, Beauty?

BEAUTY: That is it (162).

In the scheme of things, Beauty’s revelation is more impeccable than that of Look Smart not only because she is first hand eye witness, but also because she reveals in detail the antecedents that culminated in the murder of Grace. Grace indulges in this unholy affairs with her master, not as a result of lost or love, but because she is enticed. According to Grace, “uBass, would pay her money each and every time. They said that Grace, she never loved Look Smart. Not like Look Smart loved her. He was too young for her. His head hard too much words inside it. She said to my madam she was not wanting to marry him (162). If it is the case that sexual gratification for Richard and financial gratification for Grace is the basis for their illicit affairs, what then led to the tragic end of their relationship? Grace reveals that “When she died, she was pregnant with uBass’s child” (162). She further explains that:

Before she died, Grace told him. It was at the diary, in that room they went to. He was angry because she wanted to keep it, the child. She told him it was against her custom, her religion to kill the child. I heard it from outside the door. Listening. Then he
started to swear. He hit her and I came inside. She ran away, screening about the child. And uBass, he freed his dog on her (176).

From this astonishing and incredible testimony of Beauty, it becomes obvious that the dog’s wild actions against Grace is unprovoked by her, rather the dog heeded the call of the master. Consequently, it is plausible to argue that the main thesis of this analysis is that the dream of the dog is to do the wicked wish of the master, to perpetuate heinous crime against humanity. This is the crust of the matter, the very epicenter of Look Smart’s covert and overt memories responsible for his trauma, a trauma he has violently bore for decades. Through the voice of Beauty, the intent of the author is heard that the dream of the dog is to carry out the bestial wish of the master.

Moreover, reading in-between-the lines of the play under analysis suggests that the memories that resulted to the traumatic condition of Look Smart is not simple but complex. Beside Richard’s brutish and nasty acts, Look Smart reveals the most memory or event that got him disillusioned:

…I wrapped her up in an old horse blanket and carry her towards your car. But you don’t want me to put her there. You think her blood will ruin the seats. You don’t say it, but I can see you thinking it. You thought it! You said we had to take her to the bakkie. And when she had to go in your car you made us put down blankets, flea-bitten blankets you reserve for your dogs! Of course you thought it, man! Then you tell us to carry her across to the dairy. To take her to the hospital in the back of the bakkie. But when we get there, there is no bakkie. So I come back and tell you. You agree to let me take her in your car. The Mercedez-Benz. You make us put down lots of blankets on the back seat. We lay her down. I drive, fast as I can to the hospital. When we get there I think she’s fallen into a deep sleep. But she’s not asleep. She is dead. I only remained at this farm to bury her. When I left, the sun was rising. All I saw were strips of meat, torn to pieces across the sky” (158-159).

The implication of this nasty and harrowing experience, in line with psychoanalytic reckoning, is that it changes the personality and interpersonal relationships of Look Smart. For Look Smart, because of the incredible nature of this experience, the trauma arising from this incident is better repressed that accepted, better
bottled up than shared with anyone and better imagined than experienced. However, this is against the basic assumption of psychoanalysis, and as such it’s adverse effect or impact on Look Smart’s personality and inter personal relationship becomes inexorable. According to Justina (2008: 50), “the therapeutic essence of psychoanalysis finds its bearing and strength in the belief that sharing, acceptance and dealing with traumatic experiences is the only one inviolable option to solving psycho-social problems”. Evaluating this assertion with Look Smart’s experiences shows that it is justified, because for a very long time, he tries to get over the experiences but to no avail.

After this heart-rending incidence, Look Smart departs from the farm, he gives the reason why his departure was expedient, and “after Grace’s death I left”. Who would the police have believed? Your husband or me? If I’d stayed, I might have killed him. I might have buried my hands deep inside of him and drawn out his heart. His heart for my heart. (159). The last phrase, ‘his heart for my heart’ requires some analytical stress. This implies that, the gruesome murder of Grace, the beloved of Look Smart shattered his heart to the point that he lost his heart. Hence, drawing out the heart of Richard the serial rapist would have served as a replacement and atonement for his great loss. Furthermore, he narrates how everything in and around their hut in the farm traumatically reminds him of the whole incidence whenever he comes back, “what I understand! The first thing I saw on getting back from burden school was a black puppy. Playing in the garden. Chewing a yellow rubber ball to bits. The second was Grace. The most beautiful thing I have ever seen. As our love grew, that dog in the garden was growing too. My love. Your fear. They grew together. And now I can no longer separate them. When I think of one, I see the other. I see that double thing, that creature, the beast, circling the garden, dripping blood. (Higginson, 160). This affirms the earlier inference that properties in one’s social
environment inevitably paints pictures that are either gory or pleasurable. It is this same blood sucking beast that encapsulate and perpetuate the dream of the master, because the dream of the dog is that of the master. Except this dream is diligently analyzed, the injuries inflicted by it would never resolved.

At this point, Patricia becomes staunchly convinced doubt about the veracity of Look Smart’s and Beauty’s revelations. Consequently, in a voice characteristic of a remorse penitent she addresses Look Smart, “what can I say to that? Do you expect me to make it all better?” (160). At this point, it becomes obvious that the intent of psychoanalysis is beginning to manifest. Still pained and traumatized by this inglorious memory Look Smart says to her, “I thought you cared. But you didn’t. I thought I meant something. But I didn’t. All you cared about was protecting your seats. But you gave up. You withdrew exactly when it was your moment to step forward. Do something. Save her (160-1). This callous attitude of Patricia is the epicenter of Look Smart’s disillusionment. According to Justina, one of the causes of trauma is the lost of confidence, especially on someone we have trusted with our being. This situation makes someone to learn how to be receptive and the extreme result is what psychoanalysts call, ‘repression’ (53). Look Smart typifies this psychoanalytic explanation of Justina, with the practical or literal effects of his repression dealing decisive on him, he becomes convinced that psychoanalysts are rather right in holding that repression is a delusive mechanism which does more harm than good.

Consequently, despite Look Smart’s concerted effort to make Patricia realize that events of the past will continue to have its consequences unabated until when resolved, Patricia adamantly insists “All of this. It’s lost” (163). However, Look Smart who could
be wisely referred to as a psychotherapist never relents nor is he in doubt about his basic understanding on the inevitability of the effect of the past, as a result, he questions, “lost? It isn’t lost. I think about it every day” (164). Patricia believes that with the present social status of Look Smart, he ought to be a happy man, but he reminds her that “there is more to a man than a suit” (p. 164). By this, he reveals that beyond the facades of the physical, lies the real substance that determines a man’s happiness and other matters there connected. This suggests that he is convinced that the psychological make-ups and disposition of the individual human person is definitive of his actions and conduct. However, on the contrary Patricia thinks that he ought to be gratified by his success. “non of this is easy, Look Smart. But I can’t undo what happened. What Richard has done, he has done. And I will never be able to take back that terrible thoughts I had when that young girl lay bleeding (p. 163). It is germane to observe that Patricia’s response that she cannot take back the terrible thought she had as she watch Beauty bleed profusely is indicative that the post colonialists’ general portrayal of the white folks has been callous is not altogether true. As a result of this understanding, D. P Dike (2013:49), is right to have asserted that, “some colonialists and some ordinary white folks that lived with Africans where very meek and humane in their interpersonal relations with their African neighbors. Some of them practically and technically openly affirms that blacks do not possess less humanity and ought to have accorded full human dignity”. Patricia happens to fall into this category configured by Dike.

Therefore, Look Smart reveals the ultimate essence of his return, “Look Smart: what are mine saying madam, is I wish for your guilt. Darkness! I don’t want you to leave this place without a backwards glance. To spend your last days looking at…. At the sea. With your mind all clear, your sleep easy. I want you to remember the dog like I...
remember that dog. I want you to feel like I feel and be haunted and… and decayed away by it! (164). Consequent upon this, Patricia started expressing an appreciable understanding and volunteering memories of her traumatic past:

PATRICIA: I think I understand how you feel.

LOOK SMART: You do?

PATRICIA: I know what it is to die quietly (164).

This exchange reveals an appreciable, remorse and a sincere assurance of a shared experience, Patricia reveals that having experienced still birth in the past coupled with Richard’s licentious and irresponsible way of life, she has been terribly obsessed with life. Moved by this touching revelation, Look Smart expresses mix feelings thus: “well, I want to make it by business. I want to know about this child, but once, a long time ago, I thought you cared about another child. You sent me to that fancy school, gave me a brand new blazer, corrected my English. You woke something up, and then you killed. You killed it as surely as you made me kill that fish” (163). However, while insisting she did not allow the metaphoric fish to escape, Patricia now volunteers her trauma about her still born child and her husband whom has been a nightmare from the time of their meeting. “I married him because I was pregnant. My father wanted to kill him when he heard. But I talked to him. He gave us this farm instead. He was a good man. My father. Perhaps the only good man in my life. When he died, he died thinking I was happy, taking my word for it. You were a little boy then, always hanging around the house. I think I was happy then. Happy for a bit” (164). Patricia: She was borne dead. (165).

She was so light. You could hold her in your hand like a piece of bread. So small. I remember thinking how small. You could see all the little blue veins running thought her. She was made of wax. Then I hard to rap he up and out her away forever in that box. A box the size for shoes. Oh, you wouldn’t know what it is to lose a child. It was a great darkness for me. Long nights and long days, everything made dark. Richard. Well. Stood there. Not meeting my eyes when I turned to him. I watched as it crept
The above harrowing experience is the core of Patricia’s traumatic and ugly past for want of an appropriate terminology she describes it with the strongest word as ‘a great darkness’, poor woman. It is philosophically significant to argue that with this heartfelt introspection and exhuming of shared traumatic memories, Patricia and Look Smart would have developed a profound intimacy, tranquility and affectionate friendship. This sound logical inference premised on the concluding note of this work under analysis, as the playwright strongly indicate that genuine therapy or healing is the end product of this long day onerous unfolding of troubling and terrible memories.

4.2 Therapy: The Teleology of Psychoanalysis

Psychoanalysis is primarily a literary practice, unlike any of the other theories, it is a clinical and therapeutic methodology. Without psychoanalysis the whole herculean adventure of psychoanalysis is but a futile effort. In other words, therapy becomes the teleology- the goal, essence or purpose of psychoanalysis. The central object of psychotherapy is to improve or increase the mental wellbeing of the client. Higginson treatment of therapy in the work under analysis leverages on Rogers’ understanding of psychoanalysis as “the helping relationship, which is one that promotes growth and development and improved coping with life for the other person” (p. 68). In the closing moments of the play, Patricia and Look Smart displayed an appreciable level of helping relationship which culminated in the drastic improvement of their welding and mental health thereby bringing about an affectionate relationship like never before. This claim is made abundantly evident in the following long conversation:
LOOK SMART: …but I am where I am because of you. For better, and for worst.

PATRICIA: And now you would leave. What was it? With your mind clear, your sleep easy

LOOK SMART: I might. I might not want that.

PATRICIA: Perhaps one day you can come and visit.

LOOK SMART: At your house by the see

PATRICIA: why not?

LOOK SMART: We could take the old Rottweiler for a walk on the beach.

PATRICIA: (laughing): we could throw sticks for it.

LOOK SMART: Make it jump through hoops.

PATRICIA: I am pleased that you have come here. I am pleased that I’ve come to know you a little.

PATRICIA: But you were like my son, and I will be lonely there in my house by the sea. I would like you to come and visit. Even if it is just to humor and old gogo (grandmother) with one or two marbles still rolling around inside her head.

LOOK SMART: (smiling): perhaps I will come. I will come with clay animals I’ve made, so that you can look at them and think—it’s art.

PATRICIA: (laughing) and I will make you and carrot cake. What I usually offer my guest.

LOOK SMART: (to PATRICIA): I will walk with you always.

PATRICIA: And one day, when I am half asleep, you’ll come, take me down to the beach. We will throw sticks (169-173).

The extract above reveals that after volunteering painful despicable memories, Patricia and Look Smart achieved healing and reconciliation. Furthermore, this analysis also portrays that the playwrights brilliantly employed communication therapy in their writing. Therapeutic communication involves the use of specific strategies that encourage the patient to express feelings and ideas and that convey acceptance and respect. Exploring this clinical perspective of psychoanalysis, Patricia and Look Smart painstakingly expressed their bitter past, blamed each other and at the end expressed words that conveyed mutual acceptance and respect. It should be noted that because of the teleological nature and essence of psychoanalysis, Amos (2012: 76), posits that this
makes psychoanalysis more significant and relevant in literary study of a peoples’ personal and collective shared inglorious past. The volunteering of their memories of past deceit and hurts ultimately is to foster good mental and bodily health in order to better their personal and interpersonal relationships, respectively.

One of the fundamental issues the foregoing analysis reveals is that, it has established the relationship between memory and trauma and people’s individual and collective behaviour. Moreover, through psychoanalytic examination of the major characters foregrounding the white and black folks of South Africa, Higginson captures the ideological, socio-economic and political manifestations of African society at the various level of its development. Therefore, he occupies a central position in explicating South African experience within literary discourse. Another important issue that this analysis highlights is that Dream of the Dog promotes a vision of a South Africa in which the only way to advance the society is to take personal responsibility of one’s past. In the closing moments of the play Patricia recognizes the valiant contribution Beauty has made in quietly going about her duties”. It highlights the basic psychoanalytic perspective that the only genuine way to resolving psychological questions is acceptance, responsibility and responsiveness and never repression. With Patricia and Look Smart achieving integral healing and reconciliation, Dream of the Dog makes a cautiously optimistic view of the world.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

The central thrust of this dissertation has been to employ the psychoanalytic literary criticism as a theoretical framework to foregrounding the post-apartheid South African experience as epitomized by the two selected plays: Reach! and Dream of the Dogs. This hinged objective has been systematically carried out in the chapters. Hence, the task of this chapter is to provide a deductive conclusion of the research.

This dissertation has therefore, explored Lara Foot Newton’s Reach! and Graig Higginson’s Dream of the Dog as examples of how South African playwrights deploy the themes of memory, trauma and therapy as a means of recounting the traumatic experiences of the apartheid regime and the effects of the experiences on personal relationships and political life in Post-apartheid South Africa. The dissertation investigates the playwright’s preoccupation with the adverse impact of memory and trauma in post-apartheid South African plays. The research has also examined the extent to which memory, trauma and therapy influence the inner working of characters in post-apartheid South African plays, in order to show that South African plays have deeper meanings that can be unearthed using Psychoanalysis. This is central because memory trauma and therapy are realities of life and they are exemplified in characters and how they act in the plays. Hence, the understanding of this enhances the interpretations of how actions could mean in Literature. The research proceeds on the basis that South African Literary works portrayed the post-apartheid South African experiences principally from social, political, cultural and historical perspectives; however, adequate attention has not been given to the psychological dimensions that the plays embody. On the basis of this, this research examines the portrayal of memory, trauma and therapy as applied to
characters in South African post-apartheid plays and how these applications help to explore the inner workings of the characters in relation to the basic Freudian psychological philosophy which posits that the present and the future are only an effect of the past. This justifies the affinity between the influence of memory and trauma on individual and social behavior and literary creativity.

This study argues that post-apartheid plays are imbued with the portrayal of memory, trauma and therapy as a reflection of the complexity created by the apartheid regime. The study shows that the study of memory trauma and therapy is useful in exploring the unconscious mind, repression and dreams in South African plays. The study also shows that memory, trauma and therapy are vital elements that shape individuals and human existence. By way of philosophical analysis the study establishes the fact that both plays are similar in plot: loss and transition provoke the intrusion of an estranged family member or surrogate family member respectively. Thus, the resulting dialogues between relatives bring about the revelation of a traumatic and contested history. This psychoanalytic reading reveals that the two works highlight the key questions of memory, guilt, and forgiveness raised by the TRC. In Higginson’s play, these themes are embedded in a discussion of white guilt and interracial reconciliation.

However, both authors admit that retrospect into interiorities (latent and overt memories, pleasurable and traumatic memories) and acceptance of the same and forgiveness is invariably the only way toward achieving integral healing; good physical and mental health. The study also shows that while memories of trauma may become integrated into the present self, their melancholic effects may never be thoroughly neutralized. In spite of this, the achievement of total healing and reconciliation with
either self or significant others is not automatic but a product of gradual and sustained effort. The study therefore affirms Graham’s assumption that for South Africans to achieve greater agency in shaping this future, they require literary psychoanalysis that excavates forgotten traces of the past, and which also develops new modes of mapping space and archiving the past and present. This explicates that subjectivity or self-retrospection, acceptance and dealing with one’s terrible past experiences are absolutely inevitable ways of achieving integral wholeness of mind and body. Consequently, this study ascertains that memory, trauma and therapy have ineluctable influence on the inner workings of the characters in South African plays and therefore justifies the basic assumption or claim of this work that post-apartheid South African plays have deeper meaning that can best be explored using psychoanalysis.

In view of the foregoing, the study further establishes the richness of the literary form as a means of capturing, foregrounding and reconstructing human experience. Moreover, it significantly stands as a resource material for further research on how to obliterate longtime adverse impact of unconscious traumatic memories. Hence, literature as a mirror of reality (society) appts becomes a medium through which individuals and communities explore, interpret, challenge and celebrate the human condition within particular material realities. Then looking at Memory, Trauma and Therapy in South African plays through a psychoanalytical lens as is the case in this study, offers a deeper insight into the consequences of human actions and how these consequences can be addressed to achieve inner healing (therapy).

In the two plays, private and domestic traumas stand in for larger national disruptions. This understanding is predicated on the universal assumption that the family defines the larger society. The morality and civility of the family necessarily defines that
of the larger society. so, if families are psychologically sick, it invariably affects or
determines the politics of the state. The small scale of the traumas discussed makes it
possible for the individual to relate to the issues at hand, whereas the immense scale of
“violence, poverty, and injustice” in the country as a whole can make an attempt to grasp
these issues on a public level, alienating and overwhelming. Larger political and social
events form a backdrop for these private explorations.

In essence, each of these plays takes similar themes and scenarios and develops them to a
different conclusion. While this may seem to indicate a lack of originality in the
contemporary theatre, it is in fact a necessary step in the working out of individual,
national, and artistic identities. One of the strengths of theatre as an agent of social
change is the fact that it can admit the existence of the many potential versions enclosed
in any given individual, or people, or country, or experience, or epoch in a way that
“empower(s) us to recreate ourselves, to refashion our own lives, to rediscover those
flickering of imagination that, in the final analysis, make us human beings.

While the plays raise key questions surrounding the formation of “new” identities
in 21st-century South Africa, as Reach portrays, Marion and Patricia may move towards
a re-making of self, but, ageing and childless, they hardly gesture towards the future. This
expository psychoanalytic analysis shows that Reach and Dream of the Dog indicate key
problems inherent in re-thinking the place of whiteness and a European heritage in South
Africa. They must also negotiate past trauma while finding ways to relate to those of
different races who were, in the past, an unapproachable ‘other’.

Based on the strength of this analysis, it is philosophically viable to adduce that
the plays considered with psychoanalytic lens are germane to the South African question.
They foster the general aim of South Africa to advance their cultural imaginations as they
offer insights into emerging national identity. Moreover, they reveal the conscious and unconscious dimensions of characters (unconscious traumatic memories) as they affect character formation and personality. These features, which are foregrounded in these South African plays, have resonated and remained fundamental to psychoanalytic discourses. Hence, they reflect the fact that the South African experience is applicable to some of the populations of psychoanalysis and demonstrate the extent to which the South African Plays capture not only political, socio-economic issues but also psychological issues. As such, this study is situated within the ambience of rich South African literature’s experience of domination, suppression and the quest for reconstruction.

Consequently, the significance and essential contributions of this study lies with the fact that it reveals how post-apartheid South African playwrights have molded characters from the perspectives of interiorities- memory, trauma and therapy and actions, and its psychological implication on the characters. Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that the playwrights occupy the central position in not only locating the south African experience within literary discourse but their plays illustrate variously the therapeutic approach to the study of South African experiences. Furthermore, this study contributes to the search for paradigms that best explore the literary works on the South African experience by employing Freudian psychoanalysis as a reading practice for studying the plays.

In essence, this study establishes the richness of this literary form to capture, foreground and reconstruct human experience. Moreover the study shows that the plays examined foster the general aim of South Africa to advance her cultural imaginations as they offer insights into emerging national identity. It is on the basis of this conclusion that the main thesis of this work is that, psychoanalytic criticism is relevant in delineating the
vision that investigates how interiorities motivate actions in post-apartheid South African plays.
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