THEATRE FOR DEVELOPMENT (TfD): HISTORICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Dissertation von Abdul Karim Hakib

2022

THEATRE FOR DEVELOPMENT (TfD):
HISTORICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Inaugural Dissertation

zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophie

der Ludwig Maximilians Universität München

vorgelegt von

Abdul Karim Hakib

aus

Kumasi, Ghana

München, 2022

Referent/in: Prof. Dr. Christopher B. Balme
Korreferent/in: PD Dr. Nic Leonhardt
Tag der mündlichen Prüfung: 22.02.2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In examining “the complex transnational processes that led to an institutionalisation of theatre in emerging nations after 1945", one cannot ignore "the stubborn divide between an affluent Global North and relatively impoverished or "undeveloped" Global South" (Balme, 2017:125). The logic of this divide frames the complex relationship between actors on each side of the Iron Curtain. This relationship has affected and continues to affect nearly all aspects of life in the Global South. Its history is traceable to different political eras, several global ideological shifts, and man's quest to be free. The latter was the basis for launching the independence struggle in Africa that is now situated in the politics of epistemic coloniality and decolonisation. It also indicates the complex and elaborate relationship between culture, identity, change and development; concepts which both overlap and stand alone.

Globally, the understanding of these concepts is mostly subjective and conditions for negotiating them also vary. The crucial thing to note is that the concepts function in a context. What each of these concepts evokes in the Global North might not be the same as in the Global South. Even if it is the same, the geopolitical conditions framing it differ. However, what happens in the “developed” world directly or indirectly affects what happens in the “developing” world. Fortunately, in a not too distant past and due to the evolution of intergovernmental organisations, there is now a common platform for deliberation and an attempt at mutual coexistence, albeit both the active and passive observer will agree that there is no equity nor equality.

On this basis, one can appreciate the African condition; one that deserves the apt description that Ayi Kwei Armah gives it: “the dismembered continent”. He admonishes that “the accident of history makes us what we are today, but we can work to shape the course of our future if we give ourselves the trouble to know what it takes”(2010:9). The quest to know what it takes drove many scholars, such as Theophile Obenga (2004), Ali Mazrui (1980; 1986; 1990), Walter Miglono (1995; 2000; 2011; 2018), Achille Mbembe (2001; 2017; 2019; 2021), Frantz Fanon (2008; 2004), Wole Soyinka (1976; 2019) and Walter Rodney (2009) to investigate the condition and what can be done about it. These scholars make us understand that “not all crimes necessarily engender sacred things. Certain crimes in history have resulted in nothing but stains and profanity, the splendid sterility of an atrophied existence: in short, they show the impossibility of “making community” and rewalking the paths of humanity” (Mbembe,

2021:2). The atrophied existence begets the condition that created the impossibility of existence. It is what Wole Soyinka describes elsewhere as tragedy; “the most insistent voice that bids us return to our own source” (1976:141).

The return to “our own source” unfortunately for Africa, was not straightforward. It was many-sided, internal and external. It "applies not only to indicators of health, education, and income but also to access to cultural and artistic institutions” (Balme, 2017:125). It further applies to all the cultural movements and political struggles. Out of all these struggles, a movement called Theatre for Development (TfD) surfaced. This movement imbricates the concepts of colonialism, emancipation and more. It speaks to grassroots aspirations and commitment. As was alluded to earlier, it encapsulates culture, identity, development, and freedom. Although firmly rooted in the performative arts, its cardinal drive is social change and societal growth. The movement accentuated the African condition and established a performative inquiry into how the “dismembered continent” can be re-membered. Hence, TfD argues that for social change and transformation to happen, every society’s performance ethos must be “a means by which people reflect on their current conditions, define and/or re-invent themselves and their social world, and either reinforce, resist or subvert prevailing social orders” (Drewal, 1991:2).

TfD functions within a new epoch termed globalisation, an epoch that changed human relationships in the world. Indeed, in researching developing theatres that helped build expert networks for theatre in emerging countries after 1945, TfD cannot be disregarded, because research “which undertakes a fundamental re-examination of the historiography of theatre against the background of internationally coordinated "development" and "modernisation" programs that linked funding organisations, artists, universities, and governments in networks of theatrical expertise” (Balme, 2017:126) must necessarily include TfD. It is, therefore, against this background that this study investigates the networks of TfD experts and expertise, organizations and their conditioning after 1945. It seeks to re-examine TfD's histories and historiography and how TfD evolved and developed into a formidable organisational field.

RATIONALE AND METHODOLOGY:

TfD as a theatre form sui generis emerged in the 1970s out of different activities and under differing labels, a 'confluence of cognate practices' as Tim Prentki puts it (Prentki, 2015:15). Theatre in Education, Popular Theatre and Community Theatre all pre-existed TfD and either reformed around the new term, “Theatre for development”, or provided particular techniques

or institutional contexts.[1] Tim Prentki, Kees Epskamp, and Ross Kidd have each traced the narrative of this story and we are familiar with the common denominators and founding fathers and mothers: Ross Kidd, Kimani Gecau, Martin Byram, Michael Etherton, David Kerr, Ngugi wa Thiongo, Rose Mbowa and Penina Mlama, to name only some. What is less well understood is how and why this particular configuration of people, places and practices coalesced to form such a powerful and influential movement that came to assume institutional characteristics.

The following study shall examine some of these histories in detail, the theories and cultural conditions that foregrounded their roots in African theatre and community development. It will delineate how a fundamental re-examination of the histories and historiography of the praxis reveals the points and stages at which the field was configured. The question to be investigated is: How was the emergence of TfD determined by broader transnational movements and pressures? How did it come to be institutionalised in its current forms and practices? This research proposes the thesis that the globalisation and institutionalisation of TfD coincided with a seismic shift in development policies and strategies that saw a movement away from top-down, centralised strategies and towards a recognition of local needs as the drivers of development aid. To put it another way: TfD contributed to the move away from constructing hydroelectric dams and towards building latrines, from funding universities to creating grassroots HIV-prevention programs. However, the shift to a grassroots approach led paradoxically to a proliferation of international involvement: the more local the context, the greater the involvement of NGOs and parastatal and state organisations in theatrical activity.

Investigating the historical and institutional perspectives of TfD in Africa and how it developed into a formidable organisational field demands that one employ several methodologies. This research is qualitatively based, however it employs some quantitative approaches. Regarding the qualitative aspect, the study combines archival research and library research methods. To achieve the objective of this research, a broad array of materials were consulted, including academic articles, letters, policy documents, reports, conference declarations and minutes, and grant application documents. In some rare cases in which documents were not available, structured in-depth interviews were employed, mostly with key actors directly involved in the aspects that concern them. Since the research is looking at the histories and historiographies of TfD, it primarily regards the archival "sources as artifacts that have been left by the past. They

[1] See also Jane Plastow - Domestication or transformation? The Ideology of Theatre for Development in Africa," Applied Theatre Research 2 (2014): 117. She also includes 'edutainment'.

exist either as relics, what we might call “remains,” or as the testimonies of witnesses to the past” (Howell and Prevenier, 2001:17).

DEFINING THEATRE FOR DEVELOPMENT

Fundamentally, TfD can be explained as a fusion of performance and theatrical methodologies, used as mechanisms for investigating the socio-cultural realities of a people, with social change and development as its goal. It is a dramatic process of (re)presenting analysed challenges of a people for a complete transformation of their socio-economic reality. It employs local modes of communication so that subjects can comprehensively discuss their problems in a way that leads to collective action. For Prentki (2006: xvi), it is a “practical form of social analysis” that creates new “ways to connect its micro practices at the local level with the macro-agendas that directly impact upon the lives of the participants in those projects". Ross Kidd shared a similar insight when he wrote that TfD "is a part of an educational and organisational process used in bringing people together and creating contexts for collective reflection and action. It draws out participation and encourages expression and analysis". Accordingly, it is, as David Kerr (2014:207) indicates, a movement "opposed to elitist models of communication; it seeks to empower subaltern communities by using their own language and culture to strategise solutions to their problems". Similarly, Byram and Kidd, in a related but different context, discuss TfD as people's theatre. They argue that TfD is a

> People's theatre speaking to the common man in his language and idiom and dealing with problems of direct relevance to his situation. As a dramatic representation of local problems, it provides a codification of reality which can be used by the participants in analysing their situation and finally as a collective expression and a communal activity, it creates the context for cooperative rather than individual thinking and action - it creates the possibility for horizontal communication or peer learning, rather than top-bottom, centre-periphery one way communication (1979:3)

By deduction, TfD contextually interpolates local knowledge and skills and sometimes exogenous concepts and methods to investigate and solve community challenges. As an academic discipline and an art form, it represents some brokerage: one that mediates between culture, creative arts and development; between performance and literature; between bureaucracy and seamless community organising; and finally between theory (usually academic and official) and practice (sometimes non-academic and uncensored). It is a negation of dependency, advocating an approach to development which "involves a cultural process by

which a society comes to a full awareness of itself, transforming itself according to values that it uniquely holds" (Byram and Kidd, 1978:81). TfD exposes hegemonic contradictions by helping people to holistically understand their existence: how and why they came to be who they are; and how they can change their circumstances without external support.

Although TfD is primarily used as the umbrella term for applied performance practices geared towards social change and development, its broad usage and acceptance was not established without contestation and rival propositions, because some African practitioners and scholars were of the view that "the term carries a patronising air of outsiders attempting to uplift or develop communities, which is opposed to the theory, if not the practice of this theatrical movement"(Kerr, 2014: 207). For a long time, some scholars, mainly from Southern Africa and Asia (especially India), preferred to use the term popular theatre. These scholars included Penina Mlama, Ross Kidd, Nat Colletta, Martin Byram, and Mamunur Rashid. The challenge, however, is that popular theatre can be associated with a wide-ranging variety of theatre globally. It is a kind of theatre that saw a significant rise in the twentieth century as a collective political, social and economic struggle of peasants worldwide against feudal, colonial and imperialist regimes (Mlama, 1991:50). Other competing terms that emerged include "Theatre for Integrated Rural Development", "Community Theatre", "propaganda theatre", "case drama", "developmental theatre forum", and "Folk Theatre/Drama" (Kamlongera, 2005:435). However, as much as these terms fall within what is generally described as TfD, they do not fully capture the thrust of the genre. They align with aspects of the praxis because they "indicate to some extent what TfD is about, but not fully" (Kamlongera, 1989:87). The current global buzzword, which shows some signs of dethroning TfD, is "Applied Theatre" (Balme, 2008; Preston and Prentki, 2009; Prendergast and Saxton, 2009; Nicholson, 2005; Prentki, 2015). Although it sounds less condescending, it comes with its epistemic politics and risks sounding too "academic". To a large extent, Applied Theatre evokes reservations about epistemic coloniality, making it an uncomfortable term thus far, at least in Africa. That is why Kerr admonished us to give it time to evaluate "whether "applied theatre" or some still-to-be-invented term will dethrone "TfD" (2014:207).

Most scholars fail to confront whether TfD should be explicitly applied to Africa and the "Third World", where the term and praxis originated and is preferentially used or can be applied globally to practices that share similar characteristics. For this research, TfD shall be employed in an African context and, where necessary, in the context of other third world countries. This research will contextualise the evolution of TfD in selected countries in Africa: namely

Botswana, Tanzania, Zambia, Cameroon, Nigeria, and Ghana. The list of countries does not exhaust how the practice has permeated throughout the continent and cannot be said to be a fair representation of the practice in Africa. However, the selection will give us the necessary basis to establish how TfD developed into an independent organisational field, because these countries help us to understand the dominant models of TfD in Africa and how their peculiar practice evolved. This will further aid in appreciating the context and antecedent events that influenced the evolution and diffusion of TfD praxis in Africa. Furthermore, it will help us tease out the common threads often ignored or not given the required prominence when discussing TfD histories and historiographies.

The contemporary practice of the genre is credited to the Laedza Batanani (1974-1977) project, which took place in Botswana (Byam, 1999:37; Epskamp, 2006:14; Byram and Kidd, 1978:170). The project employed "popular theatre as a medium of encouraging participation, raising community issues, fostering discussion and promoting collective action. Laedza Batanani is the most documented of such projects in Africa" (Mda, 1993: 13). Although it is arguably the most documented project in Africa, can the Laedza Batanani project really be said to be the beginning of contemporary TfD? Is the timeline often cited by scholars the timeline of the evolution of TfD in Africa? These questions will be answered as part of the analysis of the country-specific case studies. However, it should be noted here that TfD is a product and a process inspired by everyday life. It is usually categorised as the theatre of the "ordinary people" or "people's theatre". However, its diffusion, systematisation and institutionalisation cannot be said to have been done by the "ordinary people". Notwithstanding, the dynamism and peculiar characteristics of the African TfD is what distinguishes it from other practices elsewhere.

Looking at TfD in the context of popular education and societal development, one can advance an argument to the effect that its evolution came out of a combination of peoples' collective interventionist practice and then vigorous academic discourse. Its beginnings can be attributed directly to the combined efforts and experience of "ordinary people", theatre workers, popular educators, and adult education specialists working in the field through sustained experimentation that helped refine their work for transformation. Borrowing from different sources and practices (both local and external), critiquing their work and experimenting with new approaches created a fertile ground for the emergence of the contemporary practice.

TfD AND THE WORD “GRASSROOTS”

The concept of 'grassroots' is found throughout the literature on TfD, and it is used extensively both by its practitioners and its scholars, who are often the same. Therefore the term requires some more detailed parsing to understand the fortuitous confluence of a global developmental agenda advocating ‘grassroots’ engagements and a new practice of theatre that demanded the same approach.

Steve Oga Abah (2006:245) defines TfD as “a means of articulation by ordinary people to discuss their predicament”. Lexically "grassroots" refers to "ordinary people" and is often associated with rural areas. This meaning dates back not much more than a century and has its origins in US English, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Today, we would associate the term with broadly leftist, even Marxist, oppositional strategies to top-down governmental approaches. However, some applications of the term are associated with post-development (Escobar, 1992) and coalesce around marginalised groups, whether peasant farmers, squatters or even women (Pieterse, 2000: 185).

It is perhaps one of the laws of conceptual history (*Begriffsgeschichte*) that its objects of research do not necessarily respect ideological borders. Balme (2021) indicates that our current understanding of the term in relation to development practice can be traced to US government policy and one man, David Lilienthal, director of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), perhaps the most famous of the New Deal initiatives of the 1930s. The TVA, which still exists, has a fascinating history as a development project, and there is no doubt that President Truman's famous inaugural speech Point Four in 1949 declaring the development century as a way to combat the spread of communism was grounded in no small way in the achievements of the TVA. A tireless apologist for the TVA, Lilienthal popularised the notion of 'grassroots' administration as a synonym for decentralisation and as a program for local consultation as a means to generate policy and practice. Although the massive programs of the TVA, in particular the hydroelectric dams, harnessed huge amounts of state funding, other aspects included fighting malaria, town planning, expanding recreational facilities and promoting agricultural policies, especially soil management, to help alleviate poverty amongst Southern farmers. Lilienthal's basic principle envisaged and realised “a national program administered so close to the grassroots that it is possible promptly to see and, by enlisting the interest and participation of the citizens affected, to remedy each conflict between the objectives of general regulations and the problems of the individual” (1940: 366). Lilienthal's grassroots method also

contained explicit political goals: “the vitality of democratic decision also depends in large measure upon the extent to which the grassroots can furnish facts and judgement *to the central authority*, so that it may not grow anaemic on a diet of “fundamental principles" and a priori reasoning” (1940: 367).

Lilienthal’s influence transcended the US. His seminal work, *TVA: Democracy on the March* (1944), was distributed widely by the Office of War Information, with 50,000 copies made available in China alone (Ekbladh 2002: 346). By addressing poverty, poor education, over-population and 'traditional' agricultural methods within some areas of the US, the TVA and its grassroots approach was regarded as a kind of template for developing countries. Lilienthal employed its techniques in various private consultancy projects in Iran, Colombia, and Puerto Rico, before returning to semi-public office in the 1960s when he attempted to 'tame' the Mekong river during the Vietnam War, a transregional project energetically supported by old school developmentalists, most notably Walt Rostow. The project failed for several reasons but chiefly because of the deepening war in the region. As David Ekbladh puts it: 'Talk of implementing programs at the grassroots level based on the example of the TVA was confronted by the fact that people at that level faced lives pushed into a persistent state of flux by armed conflict' (2002: 368).

The Americans explicitly invoked the grassroots level during the bloody Vietnam War, where the ideological positions could not have been more apparent. Despite the concept's clear association with US developmental policy, it also appeared frequently in connection with the political and military tactics of the Viet Cong.[2] . Like most guerrilla movements, it operated at the "grassroots". TfD practitioners invoked "a grassroots approach” in the early phase of its history. They were ideologically probably more closely allied with the Viet Cong than with Lilienthal and the TVA. However, both shared the same basic approach of 'consulting' with peasant farmers, albeit with quite different agendas and methods of enforcing the goals.

OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS:

This study begins with a general outline of the nature of the African condition. Then, it briefly deals with the Global North and the Global South dichotomy. It proceeds to delineate the

[2] For example, David Nes, a top US diplomat in Saigon, already noted in a memorandum in 1964: 'the Viet Cong represents a grassroots movement which is disciplined, ideologically dedicated, easily identifiable with the desires of the peasantry and of course ruthless." Cited in Mark Atwood Lawrence, *The Vietnam War: A Concise International History*, Oxford UP 2008, 84.

rationale and methodology for the study, including the objectives and research scope. This is followed by an attempt at defining TfD and how the term grassroots became associated with the TfD movement. Below is the outline of the content of the other chapters in the study.

Chapter Two provides an overview of the evolution and subsequent institutionalisation of TfD in the context of development, education, and decolonisation. The areas covered include colonialism, conceptual decolonisation and decoloniality. It further deals with indigenous and exogenous dictates that underpin the TfD praxis. Other ideas examined are the invention of underdevelopment, the attempt at alternative development paradigms and the initiative taken towards indigenous/exogenous development.

Chapter Three focuses on the possible sources that influenced the genre's evolution and then discusses the history of selected countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. This is based on case studies that spurred the evolution and diffusion of TfD praxis in the selected countries and ultimately Africa—in essence, establishing the various foundations of TfD, especially its sources and influences. The chapter seeks to discuss the country-specific history that leads to a greater appreciation of how TfD came to be institutionalised in higher education institutions in Africa.

Chapter Four delineates TfD as an organisational field. It defines the organisational field and discusses how it evolves and is formed. Field configured events (FCEs) are closely linked to organisational fields: these are temporary gatherings that bring actors and organisations together to configure a field. In this regard, the chapter also discusses FCEs and relates them to the evolution of TfD as an organisational field. Using two field-defining TfD workshops (FCEs), namely the Theatre for Development Workshop-Murewa, Zimbabwe (1983) and the Theatre for Integrated Rural Development Workshop-Kumba, Cameroon (1984), the chapter further examines how the field of TfD was configured and gained legitimacy from actors and organisations in allied and cognate fields such as development communication, transnational philanthropic organisations, and international and intergovernmental donor agencies.

Chapter Five focuses on the diffusion of TfD in Africa. It establishes the crucial role that the 1983 Murewa workshop hosted by the Zimbabwean government played here. It also discusses two FCEs that this research argues created a platform for practitioners from different parts of the world to engage with and learn from one another. These FCEs also started the process by which cognate fields began merging that eventually led to the configuration of the field in Murewa, Zimbabwe. It is crucial to indicate that this chapter only refers to field configuration as delimitation rather than the subject matter. The emphasis is on the people from countries

who came into contact with TfD praxis for the first time, and they, in turn, ended up diffusing the praxis in their respective countries. Here, we will pay particular attention to the francophone part of Africa that was adequately represented in a TfD workshop for the first time.

Chapter Six, the last chapter, concludes with a general summary of how TfD developed into a formidable organisational field. It also offers recommendations for further research and the need to look at TfD as a soft power phenomenon.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVES

INTRODUCTION

> Popular theatre...seems to provide a connection between the education and culture... Education is essential in developing individuals, communities, and nations. It is the creation and dissemination of new knowledge, and knowledge is power. However, in our enthusiasm for modern education, we must also hold on to all that is best and unique and enriching in Botswana's inheritance. Our country is undergoing rapid and significant changes in its economy, its development programs, its educational opportunities, and its political importance. Nevertheless, let us try to remember who we are, and why we are what we are. Let us move forward through education, but let us remain in touch with our past and with ourselves, through our traditional culture. If popular theater can provide a bridge between these two great creative forces, it will help us to develop as a nation with a clear sense of identity (Morake, 1980: 12-13)

Inherent in Kebatlamang P. Morake's admonition to the practitioners of popular theatre, and by extension theatre for development (TfD), is the need for them to appreciate the thrust of its scope and praxis. He provides a solid ground for academics, practitioners and theorists of TfD to frame the evolution and subsequent institutionalisation of TfD within the context of development, education, and decolonisation. The enthusiasm with which the third world started and embraced the TfD movement in the post-colonial era can be attributed to its three-pronged vision: the need to change the condition of the people positively; the quest for a literate and skilled community capable of dealing with the challenge that the post-colonial situation presents to them; and the need to decolonise their performance practices and institutions from the colonial encounter with the African people.

Although Morake's caution was directed at the people and practitioners of popular theatre in Botswana, his observation extends beyond the country. Starting in the 1950s and for the next three decades, popular theatre practices were integrated into all spheres of life in the newly independent states in Africa (see Barber et al., 1997). Most, if not all, faced similar challenges, albeit in varying degrees. There was an urgent need to rebuild their societies and ensure the stability of their respective countries by empowering communities and individuals to lead their transformational agenda. This was partly due to the state in which the colonial settlers left the countries and the countries' illiteracy rate at the time of independence.

Therefore, post-colonial Africa is replete with performative experiments geared towards social change and cultural emancipation. This constant aspiration is a direct result of the colonial experience of the African people and, by extension, the Global South. Theatre for Development (TfD), as one strand of the plethora of experiments, situates itself within the classification above. Its forms are diverse, its scope is broad, and understanding the genre demands an appreciation of critical terminologies that foreground the discipline and the context in which it was employed and its current manifestations. Therefore, this chapter reviews the literature of crucial terminologies and concepts that underlies the TfD phenomenon. The review will help situate the TfD movement in Africa in its proper context.

Above we see that reflexivity is the nature of Theatre for Development (TfD); that ability to pull back and interrogate by examining and monitoring an individual's and community's behaviour and experience. This makes it a fluid concept that is hard to confine to a single definition or practice. It is at best an amalgamation of ideas, aspirations, philosophies and themes. Nevertheless, the varied manifestations and sometimes contradictory ways the concepts are employed in people's social reality makes TfD the desired vehicle for decolonisation (Thiong'o 1986, Mlama 1991, Walter and Walsh 2018), education (Kidd and Byam 1982, Etherton 1982, Byam 1999) and development (Tim, 2015, Epskamp, 2006); a triad of concepts this chapter will examine in detail.

THEATRE FOR DEVELOPMENT AS DECOLONISATION (DECOLONIALITY)

TfD is one of the emblematic concepts of decolonisation in Africa. It captures the spirit and psyche of the times and presents itself as a viable agent for recent experiments and negotiations in the global intellectual, political, and cultural ideological discourse. The political and cultural climate of the pre-independence era created fertile conditions for the evolution of TfD. This begets the question of the state of Africa before the advent of colonialism. J.E. Casely-Hayford cited by Rodney (2012:33) writes that "before even the British came into relations with our people, we were a developed people, having our own institutions, having our own ideas of government". However, the sustainability of institutions and socio-cultural interaction depends on power relations: an experiential phenomenon that defined the unequal relationship that left Africa heavily dependent on the west. Perhaps, this is the notion, which prompted Walter Rodney in his book *How Europe underdeveloped Africa* to argue that:

> Power is the ultimate determinant in human society, being basic to the relations within any group and between groups. It implies the ability to defend one's interests and, if

> necessary, to impose one's will by any means available. In relations between peoples, the question of power determines manoeuvrability in bargaining, the extent to which one people respect the interests of another, and eventually the extent to which a people survive as a physical and cultural entity. (2012, 224)

The consequences of these power imbalances and their associated complexes have long-term effects on the socio-political standing of (post)independent nations. Many of the power hierarchies present in this field of performance evolved from decades of borrowing from performance methodologies from other cultures and the sourcing of funding from western organisations. The preconditions of these funds, whether visibly stated or not, have in diverse ways influenced the dissemination of the developmental needs conveyed through performances in the respective rural communities. On the methodological front, African practitioners are drawn to notable or seeming conventional TfD performance forms, such as Augusto Boal's Forum Theatre methods, which make it easier for individuals seeking funding to defend the feasibility of their projects to the detriment of local traditional forms that could make the desired impact in the targeted local communities.

The power interplay in TfD in post-colonial sub-Saharan Africa is complex. As mentioned earlier, its roots are steeped in this region's colonial past and the developmental strategies prevalent in the 1970s and 1990s. The deep interconnectedness of these periods in the decoloniality phase of TfD indicates that we should consider these epochs in greater detail.

COLONIALISM

Michel Foucault (1976) argues that discourse is an institutionalised way of thinking which dictates what can be said, performed and written about a subject. He asserts that the structure of any discourse is such that it is selected, organised, controlled, and disseminated systematically. He further posits that "each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; … the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true" (1980:131). By implication, discourse can be termed as an invented truth, controlled and determined by the ruling class more than the subaltern classes of a given society. The ruling class determines and controls the way of thinking, knowing and doing. Foucault, in discussing discourse, inevitably is discussing power relations as expressed in colonialism and in coloniality: a phenomenon we will deal with later.

Colonialism, as defined by Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2007:243), "denotes a political and economic relation in which the sovereignty of a nation or a people rests on the power of another nation…" Depending on another nation, the dependent nation comes to be defined and characterised in specific terms. Its image and outlook rely on the way it is imagined by the other. To understand colonialism, one must explore what Manjapra termed "the excesses and disruptions arising at the sites of conquest, occupation, and forced displacement, including the varieties of transformative response and resistance", especially in Africa (2020:3). The reason is that "Colonialism is the story of conquests and occupations, but also of runaways, rebels, strikers, preachers, artists, community organisers, healers, futurists, revolutionaries, and chosen kin who continuously resist the ruling designs" (Manjapra, 2020:11). Thus, colonialism is a panoply of covert and overt relationships that unfolds in many ways and dictates the balance of power. Goulet et al. (2011) reflected this view. They expanded the idea by writing that colonialism "is a process that happened in the past, but is ongoing in the present, enacted in relationships of power and privilege that have been constructed historically through many means, including war, law, policy, theoretical constructs, and the media, to name a few". Consequently, the Colonial Matrix of Power (CMP), that "underlying logic of the foundation and unfolding of Western civilisation from the Renaissance to today" (Mignolo, 2011: 2), helps us to understand the way the African has been perceived and defined. This matrix forms the basis for “identifying and outlining the lasting legacy of colonialism and its subtle mutations as they found expression in the socio-cultural and economic system of hierarchies that outlasted formal colonialism and became embedded into succeeding social orders” (Quijano, 2000:537).

One crucial approach by which colonialism was entrenched was by a deliberate negation of African culture. It is said that "to control a people's culture is to control their tools of self-definition in relationship to others" (Ngugi 1986:16). The attempt to define Africa within the Colonial Matrix of Power (CMP) and European epistemologies can be glimpsed in the works of notable anthropologists, writers and philosophers such as Hegel, Joseph Conrad, and Levy-Bruhl. These works captured the thinking (of the ruling class) of the time and subsequently set the stage for a discourse that was used to imagine Africa. It will suffice to say that, for them, colonialism "involved two aspects of the same process: the destruction or the deliberate undervaluing of a people's culture, their art, dances, religions, history, geography, education, orature and literature, and the conscious elevation of the language of the coloniser (Ngugi 1986:16)". A clear agenda made them miss the nuances and potential of African performative culture, an integral aspect of the African way of life prior to the beginning of settler rule.

The functional nature of the performing arts (music, dance, drama and poetry) in pre-colonial Africa has been documented extensively (Msimuku, 1988, Epskamp, 1999, Coker, 2005, Banham, 2004). Although heavily reliant on ritual that focuses on religion, it also served as a means of education, entertainment and communal identity (Nketia 1974:27, Chinyowa 2001, Echeruo 1981:138). The transmission of culture through these media helped shape and strengthen community identity and cohesion. Kees Epskamp (1999:97) points out that "It prepared them (children and youth) for the future by teaching them the 'why' of social behaviour and societal traditions". It was not solely for entertainment; it also served as a carrier of the communities' lineage by bequeathing relevant knowledge, social cohesion, and communal progress. Accordingly, the performing arts played a critical role in pre-colonial African societies. I concur here with Ngugi wa thiong'o's comment on the situation in Kenya when he contends that:

> Drama in pre-colonial Kenya was not, then, an isolated event: It was part and parcel of the community's rhythm of daily and seasonal life. Among other activities, it was an activity, often drawing its energy from those other activities. It was also entertainment in the strict matter of life and death and communal survival (1986:23)

With colonisation in full force and missionary agents of the colonial powers having been deployed, such performative practices were outlawed (Asante, 2000; Plastow, 1996; Parry, 1999). Their civilising mission was to deny and negate culture; this became "an attempt to graft upon us (Africans) the trappings of a foreign culture so as to make us tools in the market place of the coloniser", as Mohammed Ibn Abdallah (1987:14) observed. This encounter set the stage for the dislocation of "cultural and artistic creations from their historical and socio-cultural frames of reference" (Boscolo, 2010:96). The coercive manoeuvring of the empire led to a gradual fizzling out of African performance tradition in favour of euro-centric performance (Plastow, 1996:14). The colonisers aimed to "instill European nationalism through art" (Graham-White, 1974:168; Byam 1999:3) and "also to inculcate European values and attributes among the colonised as part of the cultural domination crucial to the colonisation process" (Mlama, 1991:57). The "denials and destruction of knowledge, humanity, spirituality, and cosmo-existence became the modus operandi" (Walsh 2018:16) of the colonial regime in order for them to be able to entrench their domination.

Commenting on the effects of the colonial encounter, Aimée Cesaire (1955:5) revealed that the societies were "drained of their essence, cultures trampled underfoot, institutions undermined,

lands confiscated, religions smashed, magnificent artistic creations destroyed, extraordinary possibilities wiped out". Indeed such high-handedness and its resultant effects gave rise to refusal, resistance and the need for cultural reclamation. This theme would eventually form the nexus of the last colonial struggle and the post-colonial era and gives credence to why Ngugi classifies the African reality into two mutually opposed forces; an imperialist tradition and a resistance tradition (the latter being the carrier of the decolonisation agenda).

The resistance tradition, mainly driven by peasants, as Ngugi avers, understood that relying on the colonial structure and institutions to reinvent culture and the social order would not yield the desired results. Instead, they felt that it was vital to do away with what affects the mind and the body and soul (McKegney, 2007:21). Popular culture (dance, music, and drama) became the appropriate avenue, an all-inclusive approach which did not discriminate. This is why the nature of resistance and the campaign against colonial rule were multilayered, with the ordinary people being the movement's mainstay. It appears, therefore, that the ideal strategy necessary for decolonisation is the synergy of efforts between the elite and the peasants. For this to be achieved, the players understood that the mode of engagement must be steeped within the culture of the people. As Mohanty (2003:16) postulates, "decolonisation involves both engagement with the everyday issues in our own lives so that we can make sense of the world in relation to hegemonic power, and engagement with collectivities that are premised on ideas of autonomy and self-determination". Like TfD, it "thus involves both resistance to colonisation and the reclamation of new ways of relating that entail the co-creation of new possibilities and the transformation of political and personal histories" (Goulet et al., 2011). Personal histories encapsulate the transformative ingredients that can empower the individual to affect collective re-imagination, which aims at social transformation and community development.

Therefore, it is instructive to underscore that decolonisation and or decoloniality is an ongoing process and not a one-size-fits-all affair. Undoing the damage of many centuries will not take a year. It will not be possible with one approach when the one who instituted the condition did not do so with a single style. Two decolonisation movement/experiments worth highlighting are Kwasi Wiredu's proposal for conceptual decolonisation and decoloniality as articulated by Walter Mignolo and Catherine Welsh. These philosophical proposals help reimagine the history, context and syncretic nature (see Kerr, 1995, Balme, 1999) of African theatre and TfD.

CONCEPTUAL DECOLONISATION

Conceptual Decolonisation is a project that calls for the reexamination, recontextualisation and revaluation of the histories and historiography of African philosophy. In essence, TfD in Africa and the Global South falls within this category of concepts that seeks a fundamental reexamination and revaluation of the African way of life (Wiredu, 1996:136). To decolonise, in the context of TfD is, therefore, an invitation to undertake "a highly conceptual process which implies that there will have to be intensive studies of those elements of culture that play significant roles in the constitution of meanings in various African world views" (Wiredu, 1998:23). That is to say that TfD praxis, like decolonization, is "the direct interrogation of reality" (Wiredu 1998:27), which is a reflection of one's total experience. For reality to be conceptually decolonised, it must be demystified with the mode of conception that permeates the culture of the people and their reexamined histories.

Wiredu seeks to draw our attention to the need for us to rid ourselves of the "undue influences emanating from our colonial past" (Wiredu 1998:17). However, he recognises that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to do away with everything that we inherited from the colonial interaction. Therefore, he suggests that we confront and interrogate the "undue" influences by "adopting a doubly critical stance toward the problems" and challenges left behind by the legacy of colonialism. He posits further that in dealing with the "undue" influences, we are confronted with two essential aspects of the challenge, the positive and the negative, that we need to decolonise conceptually. He writes:

> On the negative side, I mean avoiding or reversing through a critical conceptual self-awareness the unexamined assimilation in our thought of the conceptual frameworks embedded in the foreign philosophical traditions that have had an impact on African life and thought. And, on the positive side, I mean exploiting as much as is judicious the resources of our own indigenous conceptual schemes in our philosophical meditations on even the most technical problems of contemporary philosophy (Wiredu 1996:136)

Recognising the task at hand and the nature of the effort that needs to be employed, he forcefully advocates that "conceptual decolonisation is the elimination from our thought of modes of conceptualisation that came to us through colonisation and remain in our thinking owing to inertia rather than our own reflective choices" (Wiredu, 2002). His project broadly grounds the philosophical assertion that encourages the need for a new paradigm that gives

agency to the colonised. Whereas Wiredu's theory focuses on African philosophy and religion, the central idea in his proposition can be situated more widely to include other disciplines, because the "project of conceptual decolonisation aims to address the way in which foreign concepts and ways of thinking were often uncritically assimilated into African thought and conceptual schemes, largely via the imposition of foreign languages and ways of being onto peoples in Africa as part of colonisation" (Carman, 2016:235).

Thus, conceptual decolonisation becomes a suitable method for understanding how popular theatre and TfD in Africa evolved and was negotiated, because the general theoretical context of conceptual decolonisation is assumed to be a fundamental "process of intellectual liberation bearing the potential of enlightenment far beyond the confines of one culture" (Wiredu 2002:64). Recognition of this phenomenon raises the possibility of shedding light on the evolution and practice of TfD in Africa. TfD praxis has been that of resistance to the epistemic dictates of the colonial regime with regards to the ways in which post-independence African society has, is and should be fashioned (Kerr, 1999:80). It also helps project the nature of TfD as inter-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary. This is because

> inter disciplinary research is intrinsically innovative and inventive as it juxtaposes different theoretical schemes and research methods in order to examine common research problems from different perspectives…whereas…trans-disciplinary research goes beyond academic debate and impacts on the society as a whole. Moreover it often involves academics collaborating with the community stakeholders affected by the study - who help define the research objectives as co-producers and 'knowers,' rather than being simply passive informants or respondents (Collins, 2014:1).

TfD, as practised by some of the pioneers, supported a strict adherence to delinking and resurgence (Kerr, 1999). Therefore, it stands to reason that they believed the colonial legacy to be a project that needs rethinking and confronting with different techniques (not the tools of colonialism). David Kerr (1999:80), commenting on this, explains that "much of the debate in the pioneer workshops and seminars was about the extent to which TfD should be seen as a shield against colonial and neo-colonial indoctrination".

Consequently, conceptual decolonisation "then becomes an aid to the probing of perennial issues that must continue after the eventual obsolescence of the anti-colonial motivation" (Wiredu, 2002:58). One, therefore, assumes that it not only applies to the theatre legacy of colonialism but also to the community development and mass education approach employed

by the successive regimes in their bid to "develop" Africa. Accordingly, the TfD movement attempted to undo what has been done "through a critical conceptual self-awareness of the unexamined assimilation" that has been ingrained in the thoughts and action (Wiredu, 1996:136) of the colonised. Thus, the African endeavour must be conscious of the CMP that frames the events that influence their ideas and ways of life. Crucial to this process is recognising that this awareness will be the basis by which the African can consciously negotiate the colonial epistemic legacies.

TfD then offers a solid foundation on which the manifestations of CMP and the conceptual decolonisation project can be negotiated. Presumably, its praxis imbricates the themes and philosophies which help clarify its transdisciplinary nature. It further explains the various ideological manifestations surrounding the nature and scope of the TfD concept. In dealing with TfD as decolonisation, Kwasi Wiredu's conceptual decolonisation gives compelling propositions within which TfD can be interrogated closely, albeit it is not the only approach. Walter Mignolo's theory of decoloniality presents another option by which TfD as decolonisation can be examined.

DECOLONIALITY

While coloniality refers to the "long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism, but that define culture, labor, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations" (Maldonado-Torres, 2007:243), decoloniality, on the other hand, "seeks to make visible, open up, and advance radically distinct perspectives and positionalities that displace Western rationality as the only framework and possibility of existence, analysis, and thought" (Walsh, 2018:17). Decoloniality is, therefore, the reverse of coloniality. However, it is both a product and a process, an alternative proposition and not the sole approach in the decolonisation movement.

Coloniality manifests in many forms. It "is maintained alive in books, in the criteria for academic performance, in cultural patterns, in common sense, in the self-image of peoples, in aspirations of self, and so many other aspects of our modern experience. In a way, as modern subjects we breathe coloniality all the time and every day" (Maldonado-Torres, 2007:243). Hence decoloniality is "the exercise of power within the colonial matrix to undermine the mechanism that keeps it in place" (Mignolo, 2018:114). By so doing, it offers an alternative world view by which knowledge and existence can be negotiated.

The praxis of decoloniality is such that it is "a component part of (trans) local struggles, movements, and actions to resist and refuse the legacies and ongoing relations and patterns of power established by external and internal colonialism" (Walsh, 2018:15). Therefore, It is, without a doubt, a praxis like TfD, which is "contextual, relational, practice based, and lived" (Walsh, 2018:19). The concept of decoloniality did not develop out of a vacuum; it is a derivation and a response:

> to coloniality and the ongoing colonial process and condition. It is a form of struggle and survival, an epistemic and existence-based response and practice—most especially by colonised and racialised subjects—against the colonial matrix of power in all of its dimensions, and for the possibilities of an otherwise (Walsh, 2018:17).

Within the context of its theory and practice, it offers an opportunity for the people (racialised and colonised) to contribute to the welfare of their people and the world in planning their future and directing their course of events based on their knowledge systems and cosmology, a recurring theme manifestly entwined in the praxis of TfD in Africa and the third world.

Furthermore, it is crucial to underscore that the workings of decoloniality, like TfD, do not capture only one aspect of the life of the colonised. It is a holistic approach that encapsulates the origin and nature of the colonised people, their struggles, visions, aspiration and culture. Walsh (2018:17) elaborates further and reveals that decoloniality represents their (indigenous people's)

> ways of thinking, knowing, being, and doing that began with, but also precede, the colonial enterprise and invasion. It implies the recognition and undoing of the hierarchical structures of race, gender, heteropatriarchy, and class that continue to control life, knowledge, spirituality, and thought, structures that are clearly intertwined with and constitutive of global capitalism and Western modernity.

This is because the concept is grounded in extrapolating historical alternatives that help create an 'otherwise' that serves as an option to the uncontested ways of knowing and sensing within the CMP. It is what, in another framing, Adolfo Albán (2008:85-86) labels as pre-existence:

> the mechanisms that human groups implement as a strategy of questioning and making visible the practices of racialisation, exclusion and marginalisation, procuring the redefining and re-signifying of life in conditions of dignity and self-determination,

> while at the same time confronting the bio-politic that controls, dominates, and commodifies subjects and nature.

TfD, operating as a phenomenon of doing, 'undoing and redoing', survives decoloniality (Miglono, 2018:120). It confronts the bio-politics that conspire to deny indigenous people agency in the third world, especially Africa. The "reference here is to a collective resurgence—understood as renewal, restoration, revival or a continuing after interruption - of knowledges, life practices, and re-existences" (Walsh, 2018:18). An act that partly transcends the immediate. It reflects the past to confront the present and predict the future. Of relevance here is the dilemma expounded by Leanne Simpson (2014):

> We cannot just think, write or imagine our way to a decolonised future. Answers on how to rebuild and how to resurge are therefore derived from a web of consensual relationships that is infused with movement through lived experience and embodiment. Intellectual knowledge is not enough on its own…All kinds of knowledge are important and necessary in a communal and emergent balance.

Such a stance further accentuates the constant dilemma of the decolonisation movement, which Gloria Anzaldúa (2015) poignantly describes as the challenge of "how to write (produce) without being inscribed (reproduced) in the dominant white structure and how to write without reinscribing and reproducing what we rebel against". This is why scholars of decoloniality advocate epistemic delinking (Mignolo, 2007: 450) as the critical basis for its praxis. However, delinking here is not understood in the form introduced by the Egyptian sociologist Samir Amin (1985), which focuses solely on the economic and political but not the epistemic. In contrast, decolonial scholars ground their activism on the epistemological "otherwise". They argue that it will be challenging not to reinscribe and reproduce what they rebel against without delinking at the epistemic level.

Delinking can be seen as a process by which the marginalised negotiate the colonial matrix by unearthing the knowledge pathways they can use to evaluate their progress. Therefore, it stands to reason that the indigenous ways of knowing, which have been deliberately negated by the Eurocentric world order, are challenged with the concept of decolonial delinking. This conceptual option helps create the needed agency that empowers the people of the third world to evaluate their circumstances and reach within their cosmological existence to reinvent their stories, histories and chart a future that is not defined or delimited by external manipulation and design.

In essence, delinking in the vocabulary of the decolonial project implies that other alternatives exist and are capable of disputing the monopoly of (western) knowledge, which is granted omniscient stature in the field of knowledge production. Nonetheless, it does not call for the Western worldview to be ignored or rejected, but instead tries to challenge the universal application by providing an alternative perspective. Thus, decolonial delinking derives its primary definition, characteristics and form from "the answer to the question "What does it mean to decolonise?" *and this,* cannot be an abstract universal. It has to be answered by looking at other W questions: Who is doing it, where, why, and how?" (Mignolo, 2018:108). A question the praxis of TfD aptly delineates, which arguably captures the thinking behind the educational value of TfD.

THEATRE FOR DEVELOPMENT AS EDUCATION

Kees Epskamp advances the notion that there should be no distinction in the educational sector when dealing with formal, non-formal and informal education. This is because "all three types of education form part of and contribute to a permanent process of continuing education or life-long learning, and are, therefore, considered to be mutually supportive rather than competitive" (Epskamp, 2006:144). Chika Ezeanya-Esiobu agrees and believes that Epskamp's claim is justified because the significance of all education should be predicated "on the assumption that, at every point in time, it will be built around the human experiences of the learner". He elaborates further by offering a plausible explanation that since "human experiences are not certain or predetermined, education should assume an experimental direction, ready to engage in exploration and discovery of answers to emerging challenges that plague human existence." (Ezeanya-Esiobu 2019:11). This is the perspective in which traditional or indigenous education as the basis of TfD is framed, because, traditionally in Africa, education is understood to be "a conscious attempt to help people live in their society and participate fully and effectively in its organisation in order to ensure its continued existence" (Ocitti, 1988:347).

Before the introduction of formal (western) education in Africa, social, economic, cultural and political duties were taught to Africans through their respective custom and initiation rites. Education was seen as a process of transmitting a community's culture from one generation to the next or a way in which individuals and groups are prepared and equipped to live an effective and efficient life in their societies (Sifuna, 2020:63). This was often done through the initiation and 'hut' system. There are usually huts for seniors and juniors that serve as institutions for their holistic societal learning and education. Between their seclusion and reintroduction to society,

they undergo much training and acquire skills that prepare them for their lifelong journey into adulthood. The training is done by specialists, usually the elderly, who are carefully chosen because of their expertise and experience.

The initiates, both boys and girls, meticulously study the performing arts of their community, which at the same time serves as the medium of instruction and teaching salient aspects of the rites and required skills. The performing arts have many roles here. The songs, music, storytelling, dance and related arts employed have several purposes. First, they are used to transmit educational messages to the learners. Second, they instil a sense of responsibility and societal values and help the young ones internalise their culture. Third, they encourage group cohesion through the entertainment that the arts provide. This is evident in how they are taught the value and importance of specific art forms representing different rite of passage stages, as detailed in Abidogun and Falola 2020 (see also Kenyatta 1965, Turner 1981, Mbiti 1988, Gennep 1975, and Ezeanya-Esiobu, 2019).

Storytelling, an integral part of communal life, has been a highly regarded art form in Africa from pre-colonial times to the present and is often embedded in rituals. These performances are used to criticise wrongdoers in society, transmit communal history and legends to reinforce cultural identity and intellectual and moral socialisation (Ebewo 2001:49). Whether as a tool for instruction or entertainment, the theory and practice are the people's collective responsibility. Thus, the narrative and performance culture allows every citizen to have a voice. Individuals have a duty to the community, and collectively, they protect and support each other.

The claim above presents an essential dimension and has a far-reaching implication towards understanding the broader conceptualisation of TfD today. Implicit in the theoretical orientation of the TfD praxis is the notion of communal ownership and appropriation of an indigenous mode of communication, education and information transmission. This forms the nexus in which TfD evolved from its popular culture roots to the current definition of TfD and, to some extent, "applied theatre". Although contemporary articulations by scholars often credit TfD's education philosophy in Africa to the seminal work of Paulo Freire and Augusto Boal (Desai 1990:65, Okagbu, 1998:24, Harding, 1998:5, Bishop, 2008:192, Ad Boeren, 1992:260), it is essential to underscore that this assertion is simplistic and requires reflection and scrutiny. Long before Boal and Freire, Sandy Arkhurst draws our attention to the fact that Efua Sutherland had fully integrated culture, education and indigenous performance genres as a means of motivating individuals and communities to help themselves in confronting the

challenge of "poverty, environmental degradation, lack of sanitation and resources and the fading influence of indigenous cultural values" (2007:168). Mlama, commenting on this, also explained that what reinforced the notion that linked Boal and Freire to the evolution of African TfD is the fact that:

> Elite theatre practitioners engaged in popular theatre often find it easier to operate with the European-based play ***and adult education methods*** into whose skills they have been trained. Divorced from their traditional forms, they lack the courage to let the community use forms which will challenge their artistic superiority. Rather than expose their clumsiness at performing the traditional dance, recitation, or mime, they chose to work with European drama forcing the community into an alien form for which they have fewer skills than their own indigenous forms. (Mlama 2002:48)

Additionally, Kennedy Chinyowa concurs with the earlier views when he opines that most of the omissions could be attributed to what Pradip Thomas (1996:213) describes as a 'crisis of form' in African TfD because of the concentration on top-down approaches instead of making it a categorically "people-based counter-culture" (Chinyowa, 2005:10). In a similar vein, David Kerr also reflects this view when he refers to the root cause of the misrepresentation being because of the "guru-ization of Theatre for Development" (1991:72), a phenomenon which arises because of either inertia or lack of agency on the part of elite practitioners to decolonise their praxis.

Nonetheless, there is also the challenge with adherents of a school of thought Chinyowa (2005:12) classified a "folk media", a school of thought that acknowledges the indigenous performance traditions of the African people in TfD but struggles to advocate its educational values forcefully. Notable adherents are Oga Abah (1992), Owen Seda (2001a, 2001b), Michael Etherton (1988), David Kerr and Stephen Chifunyise (1984, 2002), Jacob Srampickal (1994), Ross Kidd (1979, 1980, 1983a, 1983b, 1985), Kees Epskamp (1989, 1992), Kees Epskamp and Ad Boeren (1992), Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1998) and Penina Mlama (1991a). These scholars tried to advocate for the crucial role the performance tradition of African people plays in TfD practices, albeit they treated it merely as 'tools' and 'instruments' rather than elevating it as a systemic pedagogical methodology in TfD, adult education and development communication disciplines.

Stemming from the arguments raised above, the general theoretical context of TfD as education in Africa requires a broader understanding of the role TfD plays *as* and *in* education relative to

its participants. This is because the primary educational concern of TfD is transformational learning, where learning is conceptualised as "a creative process of ad-hoc and lifelong problem solving" (Epskamp: 1992:11). Therefore, to situate education appropriately within the historiography of TfD, it needs to be recontextualised within two broader categorisations: First, indigenous/endogenous epistemic dictates relate to the knowledge perspective and educational values emanating from a body of thought and cultural signifiers rooted in African cosmological ontologies and lived realities (Sefa-Dei-2020:12). Second, exogenous or adapted epistemic concepts encapsulate the theories and concepts borrowed and adapted into African TfD from outside Africa either because a variant existed or the theories and concepts have been systematised and employed in TfD praxis and other disciplines elsewhere. This view is supported by Christopher Kamlongera, who, based on a slightly different but related premise, indicates that one cannot ignore the indigenous educational orientation of TfD because of its long history. He states that TfD in Africa "is as old as indigenous practices are on the continent on the one hand, and as old as colonialism on the other" (1982:207). Perhaps, this assertion by Kamlongera gives credence to the fact that, although there can be some vestiges of colonial educational input in TfD, there is also a connection between the educational attributes of African indigenous performance practices and that of TfD as practised from its inception till today.

INDIGENOUS/ENDOGENOUS EPISTEMIC DICTATES

Discussing indigenous/endogenous epistemic dictates as sources of inspiration for TfD praxis in Africa should be considered new insights in furtherance of the ideas that have not been clearly articulated in the discipline's mainstream. It must be considered through the prisms of three interrelated concepts of "participation, empowerment and transformation of social, cultural and material reality" of the African people (Dogbe, 1996: xi).

TfD projects rely on action, and its educational impact comes mainly through its practice. The approach most practitioners employ favours immersive and total education involving the body, mind and soul. Indigenous education in Africa is replete with these processes and methods. Commenting on the challenge with educational and social institutions in the Global North, Carl R. Rogers points out that modern education concentrates on learning materials that do not have personal meaning to the learner. He asserts that “they have focused so intently on the cognitive, and have limited themselves so completely to 'education from the neck up, that this narrowness is resulting in serious social consequences”. He further states that “as a consequence of this

overstress on the cognitive, and of the avoidance of any feeling connected to it, most of the excitement has gone out of education" (1977:40-41). In an earlier study, Archibald MacLeish, cited in James Reston (1970), addressed the same challenge succinctly when he affirmed that "we do not feel our knowledge. Nothing could better illustrate the flaw at the heart of our civilisation…knowledge without feeling is not knowledge and can lead only to public irresponsibility and indifference, and conceivably to ruin". This implies that the educational institutions favour learning, which focuses only on the mind and seldom consider feelings or personal meanings to the learner; thus, there is no compulsion to consider the entire body.

On the other hand, indigenous African education is targeted at the comprehensive physiology and psychology of the individual, employing the interactions between events happening in the person and the external world. That is to say, traditional education and learning place a premium on learning outcomes in which skills, values, and knowledge form an intrinsic part of the psychosomatic wiring of the learner (Banda and Kapwepwe, 2020:207). In other words, there is no teaching, successful learning engagement, and transfer of knowledge and skill if the whole human being is not factored in and involved in the action and the learning process. Hence, the reliance on modes of learning that cannot be separated from the people's day-to-day drudgery and cultural manifestations. This method aligns with the approaches that purposefully rely on the traditional knowledge system of the people.

The traditional knowledge systems from which TfD derives its aesthetics and educational attributes are what Nat Colletta (1980:9) describes as "culturally symbolic systems for communicating shared meaning". They constitute the oral creative expressions of the people such as proverbs, ceremonies, customs, songs, praise-singing, narratives and dance, which employ dialogic and immersive techniques in negotiating the act of learning between participants irrespective of social class and hierarchy. Therefore, we can conceivably agree with Chinyowa when he writes that these culturally creative expressions, which serve as the symbolic systems of communication, do not "only communicate the African people's philosophy but also play an intrinsic role in human pedagogy" (2001:18). The minister of education, Hon. E.H.K. Mudenda, at the Official Opening of the Theatre for Development Workshop, held at Chalimbana In-Service Training Institute on 19 August 1979, gave credence to the preceding argument when he stated that:

> There are many reasons why our forefathers chose to use songs, dance, drums and masks to educate their young, to comment on the socio-political conditions in their

> societies and to preserve their historical legends. One of the reasons is that our forefathers realised that one of the most effective methods of education is through audio-visual aids of what was familiar. In other words our forefathers subscribed to the modern education axiom that if he sees and hears he remembers. They also realised that by presenting ideas through a variety of media such as songs, dance, mime, poetic recitals, ordinary narrative and masquerades, one is able to capture the imagination of the people. It was the function of our traditional theatre, not merely to entertain, but also to instruct.

Suffice to say that Mudenda was bemoaning the struggle by African TfD practitioners to contextualise their practice and evolve their peculiar aesthetics. This could be because they did not provide a framework of praxis understood by the people who are the subject and not the object of the TfD projects and development. In this regard, this research uses the indigenous/endogenous performative practices and aesthetics as an illustrative framework to tease out the traditional educational attributes that underscore the evolutionary context of TfD and its manifestations today. To discuss this in detail, we will employ a sample of African oral creative expressions (trickster-tale and festivals/ceremonies) as paradigms to extrapolate the parallels. It is essential to add that the selection does not exhaust the African indigenous performance traditions that have the potential to enrich research on the evolution of TfD in Africa. On the contrary, they are selected because of their ubiquity; more so, they are commonly "used as a vehicle for constructing, transmitting and understanding a people's worldview at the aesthetic, behavioural, cognitive and emotional levels" (Chinyowa, 2001:18).

TRICKSTER TALES: It is an understatement to say that indigenous trickster tales in Africa contain within them some functional elements. Usually, this takes the form of didactic messages. Albeit some of the performances might be exaggerated and sometimes spectacular gestures employed, bringing out the aesthetic elements, inherent storytelling acts and performance sessions are instructive and special messages targeted at the entire community or select audience members. All African communities have examples of indigenous trickster tales and their performance conventions. This creative expression exists in urban, peri-urban and rural areas on the continent. Abiola Irele posits that "there is an obvious sense in which it ***(storytelling)*** can be considered as the “true” ***communal*** literature of Africa. It is the literature that is still the most widespread and with which the vast majority of Africans, even today, are most readily attuned" (2007:79). They are not just a spectacle for entertainment; they act as a potent "mode of communicative action that has in the past been finely honed to fit a myriad of

different social, ideological, and aesthetic needs in many different societies on the continent" (Gunner, 2007:67).

Although communities have their peculiar conventions, all the variants come across as not mere acts in which the teller of the tale assumes an omnipotent stature, but is instead a negotiator or facilitator of a comprehensive performance in which the cognitive, emotive and transformational instincts of both the teller of the tale and the participating audience are stimulated through active engagement in the storytelling session. Thus, the storyteller employing multiple elements from his or her person skilfully negotiates the pedagogical instincts that help create an agency with the participating audience. In his article, Harold Scheub arrived at a similar conclusion about *the oral artist's script*. He affirmed that storytelling "involves the aesthetics of performance: the body of the performer, the music of her voice, and the complex relationship between her and her audience". Scheub, in recognition of this dialogic phenomenon, further states that the storyteller understands that one can

> "use the narrative surface as a tool to be utilised in a theme, to create an argument, or to elicit some emotional or intellectual response from the audience…the narrative surface can be manipulated by the artist, and made to project a certain idea at one time, a special emotion when it is produced the next time, a solution to a problem plaguing the society the next" (2007:98).

One could be forgiven for mistaking the oral artist or storyteller in a trickster tale as described by Scheub for a facilitator in a TfD project or performance. Nevertheless, the similarities should prod us into re-evaluating the origin and evolution of most elements, aesthetics and methods employed in TfD or applied theatre today, especially in discussing its educational or functional nature.

Another feature worth mentioning that can be directly linked to the characteristics of contemporary TfD is the democratic nature of the trickster tale performance sessions. The only rule or condition for any person to participate, comment, criticise or actively engage in the act is to be present at the session. The tale-teller does not have a monopoly over the stories, and as such, participating audiences have the right to give instant feedback. This establishes another dimension of the pedagogical possibilities of this performance tradition. It builds transformational desires and inquiring attitudes by allowing the participants to constantly engage and have the liberty to reinvent tales told to fit different circumstances and speak to emerging issues.

Consequently, the participating audience, having engaged actively in a storytelling session, will learn and know the story and, at the same time, learn the art of storytelling itself. They then begin to re-create the same tales to fit different circumstances. This attribute makes the trickster tale a valuable educational art form filled with the power to mirror society and stimulate participating audiences for both community and individual artistic development. It is in this vein that Chinyowa forcefully argues when writing about the *Sarungano* (trickster storyteller) and Shona Storytelling that:

> Storytelling offers wide possibilities for human pedagogy. Not only is it an artistically pleasing way of sharpening the audience's creative imagination, but it is also a storehouse of the Shona people's morality and an image of the wider African philosophical world view. While training the mind to think, the … trickster narrative has been found to possess the capacity to challenge the society out of its usual conformist attitude, and to view the world as changeable. (2001:29)

The capacity to challenge society to confront its usual conformist inclinations means it can cause people to effect change at the individual and communal levels. These characteristics are prevalent in TfD manifestations today, both in style and content.

FESTIVALS/RITUALS AND CEREMONIES: When popular forms of art survive and reinvent themselves to fit with contemporary events, it can be said that the art form is replete with elements that help the people deal with their prevailing and changing circumstances. Dealing with such situations helps create new realities by shaping historical perceptions and interpreting contemporary circumstances. Rituals, ceremonies and festivals fit this category. For, as Karin Barber asserts, such activities and events "create new social and intellectual pathways and forge new kinds of social constituency, and these in turn shape historical developments. But they are also responses to history, interpretations of social reality from within and from below" (2018:3). By implication, they serve as a platform for the ordinary person to comment on a given person's political, social, and cultural life without fear of retribution from despotic or vindictive authorities.

These evolving narratives and dynamism of ritual and related arts, and how they adapt to the changing times, is what Raymond Williams (1982:203:204) refers to as 'residual and emergent dynamic forms', meaning a dual atmosphere of negotiation co-exists, which often leads to a situation where recreated rituals and ceremonies retain a residue of the old, which acts as the basis of continuity in the newly created and experimented one. It does not end there. The

recreated ceremonies or ritual give a sense of identity and belonging to both the old and new generations because remnants of the old are found in the new, although it adjusts to fit the changing times. Such experiments or adaptation of rituals, ceremonies and festivals have been employed in some TfD works in Africa. Mention can be made of the accounts by scholars and practitioners like Abah (1997), Ugboaja (1982), and Koch (2008), who describe how rituals, ceremonies and festivals have been adapted and appropriated as techniques for implementing TfD projects and development programs in rural communities in Africa. Perhaps, this confirms why Van Duin (1981:4-8) tells us that these popular arts, which are the foundation of popular culture, should be understood as having both conservative and progressive orientations.

Furthermore, Kolawole Ositola commenting on ritual today and how its educational values are essential for community and business development reveals that the essence of ritual is to make the initiate "gain knowledge of the work, the knowledge of their mission, where they are going, the obstacles and challenges" (1988:41). They are equipped with all that one needs to negotiate life and be successful by going through the rites and the community performing these events. This implies that these ceremonies prepare the participant and expect them to be fully prepared for life's journey. Indeed, they are expected to live a progressive life. Ositola further points out that another essence of these rituals and festivities is that they embolden us to be able to "even do something concrete to our own world, something more concrete that is appropriate to {our} organisation. The sense is that we must have the knowledge of what we are going to do {in the future} and what, and what not, to do". He further states that, when we understand this inherent educational value of ritual, "we can bring ritual into business, community development, and government if we really know the essence of the culture and follow it up" (1988:41). We can infer from this that participation is integral if one intends to gain the full benefits of a ritual process. This characteristic also foregrounds the practice of TfD today, in which the method is essential, but the active involvement of the subject is much more paramount.

Generally, certain limitations in adapting some of these communal arts might be apparent. What is essential is that most, if not all of them, offer pedagogical values, participatory opportunities and enable individual and communal agency. They create spaces for the participants' voices to be heard and used as not only a learning process but the basis for decision making. Most of these traditional performance elements can be found in the evolution and manifestations of African TfD practice today. The integration and fusing of such traditional performance culture in TfD methodologies and processes may differ depending on the culture and the geographical location. Accordingly, Kamlongera (2005:435) argues that "some work

in Theatre for Development is a direct result of recognising *these* characteristic*(s)* in indigenous African performances".

EXOGENOUS OR ADAPTED EPISTEMIC CONCEPTS

One of the functions of TfD is to creatively and imaginatively explore realistic alternatives based on the demand for social change and human rights. Theatrical and educational approaches that endeavour to achieve the same vision mostly become a convenient system for practitioners to adapt into TfD praxis. There have been such movements globally, and radical theatrical propositions have evolved in different contexts and countries (van Erven, 2001:2). Some have had more significant impacts, while others remained untapped and unexplored. Within the context of TfD in Africa, there are two primary external or exogenous theoretical and practical educational influences.

The primary source is embedded in the work on critical pedagogy by Paulo Freire, which attracted and influenced works of adult education, development workers and radical academics globally from the 1960s onwards. His experience in the Latin American adult education campaigns coalesced in developing a liberation pedagogy of education, hinged on the belief that learning must be steeped in the learner's reality. It advocates that all teaching must be based on dialogue where both teacher and student exchange ideas to learn from one another (Prentki, 1998:422). Hence, Freire affirms that "only dialogue, which requires critical thinking, is also capable of generating critical thinking. Without dialogue, there is no communication, and without communication, there can be no true education" (Freire 1972: 65). The propositions contained in his concept of pedagogy of the oppressed (1972) became a widely appropriated model integrated by pioneers and subsequent practitioners and scholars of TfD in Africa (Kidd and Kumar 1981: 28). The inference here is that it encourages participation and demystifies education by dealing with the strict power relation between learners and teachers. Denis Goulet asserts that

> Education in the Freire mode is the practice of liberty because it frees the educator no less than the educatees from the twin thralldom of silence and monologue. Both partners are liberated as they begin to learn, the one to know self as a being of worth-notwithstanding the stigma of illiteracy, poverty, or technological ignorance-and the other as capable of dialogue in spite of the strait jacket imposed by the role of educator as one who knows. (2013: xi)

This participatory and fluid educational method, devoid of strict adherence to hierarchies, found expression in African TfD mainly because it is in tune with indigenous African educational approaches. The theoretical alternatives developed by Freire reach beyond the immediate confines of literacy education, constantly inviting people to reexamine their long-held human-development methods. As James Blackburn asserts:

> To the poor, he offers philosophical and methodological tools allowing them to perceive afresh, analyse, and transform an oppressive reality into liberating one. To the development workers working in solidarity with the poor, his approach is a challenge; not only is its essence revolutionary in calling them to work with the poor to challenge established norms, behaviours, and institutions in society; it is also a call to challenge those 'oppressive' characteristics within themselves (2000:4).

The other aspect of the exogenous epistemic influence on TfD is the educational characteristics of popular and participatory theatre. This theatrical movement developed in various parts of the world in different shapes and forms. What is crucial to TfD in Africa is the quest for this type of theatre to gravitate towards the proletariat in society because it seeks to unravel the root cause of injustice, inequality and oppression in all forms. The works of Bertolt Brecht (1898-1956) and Augusto Boal (1931-2009) are seminal in this context.

This form of theatre emerged in the 1920s in Europe, when theatre practitioners like Reinhardt, Meyerhold, Piscator and Brecht experimented with new ways of creating relations between dramatists, directors, actors and audience. However, the development in the field took a different turn in the 1970s. According to Epskamp (1989:47), whereas "Meyerhold and Brecht had aimed at a theatrical reforms on the basis of their social commitment", others engaged in similar practice elsewhere "were interested not primarily in preserving a theatrical institution and tradition, but in a fusion of theatre and social context". The Latin American Chicano and North American Black Theatres are examples of the latter.

Even though using theatre in the public education space in Europe was not a novelty, the use to which Brecht put it was unique. Arguably influenced by the theatrical practice and political condition of his time, he created a different theatre that did not encourage passivity on the part of the audience. On the contrary, he wanted an audience and a type of theatre that would stimulate the reasoning abilities of the audience, so could not only reflect and act on what was happening on stage, but also juxtapose it with events in their lives and on the streets in a rational manner. He encouraged the critical engagement of the audience in demystifying the fourth

wall. This technique eventually influenced various ideas, adaptations, and experiments using theatre as a medium and didactic (educational) instrument. His "practice and theory continue to form the foundations of contemporary notions of theatre intended to provoke social change" (Prentki and Breed, 2018:20). The grassroots leanings of his theatre and how it overlaps with some characteristics of African performance tradition made it a technique that was easy enough to adapt both in literary theatre and TfD praxis in Africa, especially when the institutionalisation of TfD started in higher education in Africa.

Augusto Boal is the other theorist and practitioner. His work within the corpus of *popular* or *people's theatre* has had a significant influence on the theory and practice of TfD globally. He derived his theoretical influence from Freire and dramaturgical inspiration from Brecht. When asked about his influences in theatre, Boal confirmed that "one of them was Bertolt Brecht. He was a great influence because he taught us that our obligation as artists was to shed light on reality, not only to reflect and to interpret reality, but to try to change it" (Driskell, 1975:72). Furthermore, Epskamp asserts that Boal developed his critical dramaturgy because of his "eagerness to see audience participate in theatrical events" (2006:12). His concept of *Theatre of the Oppressed* has been adapted in much socially engaged theatre in Africa and the Global South. However "in some cases, to a rather blind following of a perceived system that is either not appropriate for certain situations or stifles creativity" (Plastow, 2009:295). The work he engaged in helped him to develop these "didactics of progressive theatre techniques, experimenting with the use of theatre as a rehearsal of social interventions. He viewed theatre as a laboratory and platform for conscientisation, awareness raising and problem solving" (Epskamp, 2006:12). This establishes the link between his practice and Brecht's.

Having understood the need for theatre to be an instrument for unpacking reality, Boal then proceeded to experiment and created a kind of theatre that can be classified as a "participatory" or "people's" theatre, which type rejects the notion of seeing theatre as a finished product prepared to be sold to the people. Instead, his praxis advocated that theatre must be used as a rehearsal for negotiating existence. Hence, he believed that it is immoral to commodify theatre. The only way to stop is by recontextualising and recreating theatre as a metaphoric language that is available and accessible to all, a way in which both rich and poor can appropriate the theatrical language as an agent of change. This idea of his theatrical practice is what endeared his works to the practitioners of TfD in Africa and the Global South, making him the other practitioner worthy of consideration within the context of the exogenous epistemic influences on African TfD.

PAULO FREIRE AND AFRICAN TfD: Aside from his works in Guinea-Bissau, Freire's theories and educational philosophy became ingrained in African TfD through adult education workers in African Universities. Most of these adult education experts, who were part of the university system, became the pioneers of TfD in Africa. In their search for appropriate methods of engaging with communities for effective social change and development, they adapted and integrated key Freirean pedagogical propositions in their community development experiments. This is evident in the University of Botswana's Laedza Batanani project carried out by the Department of Adult Education in the mid-and late 1970s. Zakes Mda indicates that this project is one of the most documented in Africa (Mda, 1993:13).

Freire's interest in Africa grew out of his desire to contribute to the continent's post-colonial education vision and challenges during the reconstruction phase of the newly independent states. He became associated with the African educational programmes through his work at the World Council of Churches (WCC) department of education and the Institute for Cultural Action (IDAC). Although he is widely known for his work in Guinea-Bissau, his first encounter with Africa was in Tanzania. Five years before he was invited by Mario Cabral to collaborate in literacy education for adults in Guinea Bissau, he had been active at the University of Dar es Salaam and surrounding communities (Freire, 2016:1). Freire would then work in Angola, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Sao Tome, and Principe.

Freire started the development of his education pedagogy in 1962. He worked in Brazil as an adult educator, where he enjoyed the support of the social-democratic government of Joao Goulart. However, when the government of Goulart was overthrown in 1964, he was arrested and later went into exile because of what the military regime considered as a revolutionary teaching method that fused the analysis of social circumstances in the acquisition of literary skills. Furthermore, the methods he developed made the peasants conscious of their role and power in the development process, which the military government saw as unfavourable to their political agenda. For this reason, Freire went into exile and eventually ended up in Geneva, working with the World Council of Churches (WCC) and the Institute for Cultural Action (IDAC).

The features of Freire's pedagogy that made him appear a threat in Brazil endeared him to African educators, development workers and subsequently TfD practitioners. Dialogue, codification and community participation, which are an integral part of African traditional education, became the point of convergence between his ideas and the post-colonial education

and development desires of Africa. While Freire employed pictures and readings as codes, African educators adapted and substituted them with performance (drama, music and dance), a more popular and appealing medium. Kidd and Byam confirm this about Laedza Batanani: "instead of using pictures as problem-posing "codes" for discussion, the organisers (Laedza Batanani project) decided to use socio-drama"(1982:92). Manifestly, Freire was implanted into TfD educational philosophy because of the innovations and adaptation of his pedagogy by university teachers in Africa, many of whom were from English and adult education units. Mention can be made of Ross Kidd and Martin Byram in Botswana, Michael Etherton and Oga Steve Abah in Nigeria, Ngugi wa Thiongo and Ngugi wa Mirii in Kenya and David Kerr in Zambia. However, it is crucial to point out that people do not often employ Freire's pedagogy because of their interest in its liberating features. Some use it because it represents a departure from the traditional ways of doing things; others, a deliberate attempt at domesticating the oppressed or projecting a top-down development agenda.

For this reason, it is common to find the application of his philosophy in a different ideological context. Byam arrived at a similar conclusion when discussing African artists and adult educators. She writes that:

> some of these artists/educators did not necessarily pursue the pedagogy because of their interest in liberation philosophy, but as an alternative to the traditional paradigms. It is, therefore, possible to find ongoing Freirean pedagogical programs with diverse ideological leanings (1999:18).

Attempts at experimenting by fusing theatre and drama with his critical pedagogy within the framework of adult education, community development, and development support communication reinforced the notion of Freire as synonymous with TfD in Africa and the Global South. However, although his theories played a significant role in foregrounding the practice in its early years, they cannot be solely credited with TfD's epistemic functions. Nevertheless, it is paramount to discuss some of the characteristics of Freire's pedagogy that are analogous to what David Kerr underscored as the salient features of the Laedza Batanani project, which eventually became the template for experimentation and further development of the TfD genre in Africa (1995:33). Most of these elements are what the early practitioners appropriated from Freire's adult education theories, hence, his long association with TfD. They are dialogue, participation, and the philosophy of conscientisation.

Dialogue is central to Freire's critical pedagogy, and it is also the lifeline of TfD. It is the channel used to create an experience for both learner and teacher. It is what Abah (2007:438) refers to as methodological conversation; "the synergising of apparently conflicting approaches in order to synthesise and address issues of common interest". It is assumed that every human being has the right and ability to speak, especially in TfD, and the pedagogic experience that Freire created was an antithesis to the 'banking' system of education; a system that regards the student as a receptacle only to be filled with information by the teacher. Education, as conceived in the pedagogy of the oppressed, is supposed to be a liberating experience and not one of domestication. This liberating type of education can only be achieved if founded on dialogue. According to Freire's theory, dialogics is crucial to achieving critical consciousness. He stresses the potential of dialogue as the medium for creating an atmosphere of trust between the learners, students, trainees and their teachers, trainers, animators or facilitators. He sees dialogical practice as integral to the process of knowledge production and knowing, but cautions that it must not be understood "as a mere technique". He writes that:

> In order to understand the meaning of dialogical practise, we have to put aside the simplistic understanding of dialogue as a mere technique. Dialogue does not represent a somewhat false path that I attempt to elaborate on and realise in the sense of involving the ingenuity of the other. On the contrary, dialogue characterises an epistemological relationship. Thus, in this sense, dialogue is a way of knowing and should never be viewed as a mere tactic to involve students in a particular task. We have to make this point very clear. I engage in dialogue not necessarily because I like the other person. I engage in dialogue because I recognise the social and not merely the individualistic character of the process of knowing. In this sense, dialogue presents itself as an indispensable component of the process of both learning and knowing. (1995:379)

In essence, Freire explains that the people's social reality engaged in dialogue is essential. Moreover, it is crucial in the process of discovery that is aims to change their circumstance. Hence, problem-posing pedagogy does not objectify people but instead sees them as subjects—a clear departure from most standard forms of education designed for domestication.

The pedagogical process frames every subject or issue in a question format. This problem-posing technique ensures the examination of the subject's history as a fundamental element for understanding his or her present conditions. The learning process is a joint effort by which the learner and the teacher, or in the context of TfD, the animateurs and the community, learn from

each other. The idea of the animateur or teacher being the repository of all knowledge or the supplier of development is discouraged and discarded. Instead, utilising dialogue, the stakeholders can understand the dialectical relationship between them and the world, with liberation and development as the ultimate aim. By inference, Freire establishes as a fundamental condition that, for one to learn effectively, it is vital to relate lessons and codes to the social histories and circumstances of the learner. In other words, "to challenge the conditions of the world requires praxis, the ability to reflect and act upon the world. Dialogue, best achieved through participatory research" (Byam, 1999:24) empowers the participants and the community to be able to critically evaluate their circumstances to increase their level of awareness and consciousness.

TfD, when employed as either process or product, thrives on dialogue and the exchange of ideas between the animateurs, development practitioners and the community. It investigates the social reality of the community and its members through dialogue with development and social change as its primary goal. The challenge, however, is that when the animateurs visit these communities for information gathering purposes, they seldom engage in dialogue. Instead, they focus on interviews which are most often under a strict schedule. This lack of attention to dialogue precludes a detailed examination of the community's needs, resulting in a domesticating approach to TfD project implementation. This was further compounded when TfD became institutionalised in higher education institutions in the 1970s and 1980s. Students usually have limited time to execute their projects and graduate, so they sometimes overlook some of the core principles to meet their timelines. Suffice to say, however, when dialogue is employed correctly in both TfD praxis and Freire's conception, it is likely to lead to a sustainable social change and development.

Participation: The need for community members to actively examine their imagined and real problems is a given in TfD. It is an attempt to prevent widespread alienation, deliberate community silencing and induced inaction, which are some of the bureaucratic schemes that preclude the active participation of community members in the development design and implementation. This justifies TfD's underlining principle that makes participation a prerequisite for sustainable community development and societal renewal. Whether at the level of problem identification or devising a solution to identified problems, to the point of project implementation, participation of the people is fundamental in TfD praxis. In Freire's language, it should "be what it should be: not pseudo-participation, but committed involvement" (2005:69).

On the other hand, Freire also indicates that participation is the foundation of practical education. He emphasises that without the active participation of the subjects in their transformational process, it is likely that nothing will be achieved. He further posits that, although he has experimented with many communication methods and abandoned the ineffective ones, the only approach that remains unchanged and fundamental to his critical pedagogy is the demand for active participation and involvement of the people or subjects of any literacy work. He stresses that it is the only way anything meaningful and 'authentic' can be achieved. He confirms writes that "I have experimented with-and abandoned various methods and processes of communication. Never, however, had I abandoned the conviction that only by working with the people could I achieve anything authentic on their behalf" (2013:39).

This conviction leads Freire to deconstruct labels and titles that reinforce the alienating concept imbued in the "banking" system of education, a system Freire associates with passivity. To this end, he asserts that in the critical education paradigm, "instead of teacher, we had a coordinator; instead of lectures, dialogue; instead of pupils, group participants; instead of alienating syllabi, compact programs that were "broken down" and "codified" into learning units" (2013:40). The aim, then, is to ensure the basic requirements of participation start from the way the entire critical pedagogy is labelled. That way, it will be understood and approached as essentially participatory because every step of the process is designated with words that promote inclusivity.

Conscientisation is perhaps the central idea of Freire's critical liberation theory. It is understood as a series of actions and steps people take to understand and become conscious of their underdeveloped and oppressed conditions. Conscientisation happens through reflection, the process by which the oppressed becomes aware that the oppression, illiteracy, underdevelopment or poverty he or she suffers is not permanent and can be changed. This is because human beings are different from animals; they can reflect on the happenings around them by investigating their root causes (Freire, 1972:24). In much the same way, based on reflection, they have the agency to choose a future course of action to remedy their circumstance. The challenge, however, is that often the oppressed are disadvantaged in this context. They usually lack the confidence intellectually (if they are illiterates) or economically (if they lack the means of sustenance and organising due to poverty) to reflect upon their situation vis-à-vis the world and evolve their transformational agenda. Furthermore, they may be oblivious to the fact that their predicament is not a permanent one, but that, which is born

out of unfair structures and mechanisms in the world which, once understood, can be transformed. Above all, they may have imbibed and internalised the "values of the oppressor" and thereby find themselves powerless and reluctant to critically examine their situation in the world and what the alternatives are that are available to improve their circumstances (2000:24).

Conscientisation, then, can be explained as the process by which the critical thinking potential of the oppressed can be deepened, either of themselves and their community or the larger society and country. Since socially constructed bottlenecks can thwart the oppressed desire for a better life, "conscientisation, and the process of becoming aware, provides a space in which one's perception of reality may change. It is the first step in the quest of the oppressed man's quest for greater humanisation" (Blackburn, 2000:7). The approach to creating such awareness or making the oppressed conscientized is not solely theoretical. It is a dual process of dialectic engagement between action and reflection. Action in this context begets further reflection, which leads to liberation, meaning conscientisation is a panoply of action based on reflection and reflection borne out of action. Thus, conscientisation or awareness can only happen when action and reflection are mutually integrated into the process of liberation. It is what in the end forms and underlies the philosophy of TfD, thereby making Freire's pedagogy one of the exogenous influences of TfD in Africa and the Global South.

BERTOLT BRECHT AND AUGUSTO BOAL:

Brecht and Boal, in theatre, represent a radical departure from Aristotelian drama. Their influence stretches beyond the realms of theatre to social change and community development (Prentki, 1996:34). Although it varies somewhat, their dramaturgy is mutually symbiotic and, in some instances, regarded globally as part of both the foundation and the consolidation of the conscious integration of theatre and performance in social change, political transformation and development (Breed and Prentki,2018:20). It stands to reason why Brecht indicates that his type of theatre seeks to prove that "it is important not only to interpret the world, but to change it" (Kuhn et al., 2015:251).

The technique they each developed offers an alternative way of understanding audience integration into theatrical events and actions. Further, by placing theatre and performance at the centre of social, cultural and political inquiry, the artists aim to prompt people to reexamine their personal and societal conditions. They invite audience members to ultimately aim at reflecting on and changing their circumstances.

Brecht's theatrical oeuvre, as established within the context of his *Verfremdung or alienation effect theory* and the *Lehrstücke* "is a counter hegemonic device that encourages the audience to position itself mentally where it becomes exposed to the socio-political contradictions that hegemony disguises" (Prentki, 2008:98). It is a theatrical aesthetic directed at creating a performance that explores social ambiguities and tensions capable of igniting change. For Prentki, the experiments carried out by Brecht "featured a number of elements which have subsequently become defining characteristics of TfD" (2015:18). This aligns with Brecht's wish for theatre to be communal and community-based. He writes that:

> The bare wish, if nothing else, to evolve an art fit for the times must drive our theatre of the scientific age straight out into the suburbs, where it can stand as it were wide open, at the disposal of those who live hard and produce much so that they can be fruitfully entertained there with their great problems (Willet, 1978:248).

This is because, like TfD, the practical orientation of *Verfremdung* and the *Lehrstücke drama* is the promotion of political and social awareness, the inclusion of the audience in dramatic action and the elevation of drama beyond cathartic entrapment. It is also a promise to write and perform the oppressed condition aimed at mental liberation and surreptitious insurrection. In much the same way, Epskamp asserts that the characteristics Paul de Bruyne (1980:117-118) identified after a survey of some of Brecht's works also shed more light on the connection between Brecht's dramaturgical experiments and TfD aesthetics. He writes that de Bruyne identified five characteristics, which help unravel and summarise the pedagogical basis of Brecht's work:

> The approach of the performer should be 'experimental and explanatory' and he should strive for a blend of instruction and entertainment; multiple methods should be used; the performer should be open with regard to using other media; and the play in one way or another should bear a relationship to everyday life. The fifth pedagogical attitude is that the combined use of the other four should make the teacher superfluous (1989:48)

The principles established in Brecht's work, as pointed out above, foreground the pedagogical conditions that became critical to paving the way for what Brecht himself described as "pleasurable learning, cheerful and militant learning"(1964:73), the kind of learning that confronts the audience with their reality. It is that which critically examines and juxtaposes the performance with the lived experiences of the audience members. Brecht's Theatre, with its many aims, serves "to keep the public from identifying themselves too much with the characters

and succumbing to the dream effect of the conventional narrative" (Epskamp, 2006:13). According to Brian Crow (2009:195), "part of Brecht's desire in revolutionising stage-audience relationships was to make what he regarded as inert, passive spectators into active, judging moral communities". The point here is that Brecht believed the theatre should be a conversation that drives change and not a coercive system that dictates how people should live.

Indeed, the social reengineering that Brecht sought to achieve through his theatre is what Boal adapted, enhanced and expanded in creating his people's theatre pedagogy. The seminal work of Boal, titled *Theatre of the oppressed*, established a method of dramaturgy that is deeply rooted in intangible human experience and inspired by Freire and Brecht. Its theoretical and practical formulations express human struggle as it manifests in social relationships and is consistent with lived experiences. According to Schutzman and Cohen-Cruz:

> The techniques, potent as they may be in revolutionising participants' experience of social relationships, point to a much greater "body"—a complex, interdisciplinary, multivocal body of philosophical knowledge that encompasses, among other things, the work of Paulo Freire and Bertolt Brecht, carnival and circus, the Brazilian theatrical avant-garde of the mid-twentieth century, the influences of political theorists such as Hegel and aesthetic theorists such as Aristotle. (1994:1)

Boal aims to break the fourth wall by offering agency to the spectator who, hitherto, has been a mere observer, to be transformed into an active participant, from spectator to "spect-actor" (Boal 1976). Therefore, the audience or the observer now can influence and change the condition of oppression as captured in every scene by actively participating in the action to share his/her opinion. Tufte and Suzina assert that "within this dynamic, the character thinks and acts in the place of the spectator, as he interrupts the action to formulate, through participation, his ability to act and his understanding of what is happening" (2020:416).

From TfD's perspective, Boal's conceptualisation of Theatre of the Oppressed advocates and endorses TfD's quest for a participatory community development practice that offers voice to the voiceless and does not regard them as *objects* (observers or spectators) but *the subject* (partners) of their development and liberation. From another perspective, it contributes to the global movement of theatre practitioners who formulated a dramaturgical departure from Aristotle because of the need to make the audience a stakeholder in accessing the total transformational capacity of a performance encounter (Fischer-Lichte, 2008). In this situation, the audience becomes the focus of the theatrical activity to break the barrier between actors

and spectators, empowering the latter to engage in the transformation process actively. This approach involves the willingness of the people (audience) to enthusiastically observe, reflect and propose alternatives to the showcased oppressed condition. This is in line with the TfD principle that no one understands the condition of people more than they themselves. Therefore, they are the best people to collectively articulate their challenges by reflecting on their condition to find solutions (Kidd, 1984:225).

Accordingly, Clara de Andrade and Christopher Balme (2020:15) assert that, in the 1970s, the "broad move in theatre that questioned the model of high culture and which led to projects where theatre was redefined as a tool for social development" played a significant role in the diffusion of Boal's theatrical experiments worldwide. His participatory theatre principles have been innovative and adapted by academics and practitioners of TfD globally (Schutzman and Cohen-Cruz, 1994). The poetics have had a significant influence on the contemporary practice of TfD in Africa because they generated a considerable degree of excitement on account of the skilful empowerment and transformation of the spectator into 'spect-actors' (Prentki 2015: 15-16).

Notwithstanding the above, Epskamp points out that, for many critics in the North Atlantic world, Brecht's and Boal's ideas were no longer valid during the twentieth century. The irony, however, is that these ideas found expression in the curricula of theatre schools in the Global South, especially in their special programs that focus on community theatre, popular theatre and people's theatre. Epskamp further states that "this is not surprising: first, non-psychological realistic acting techniques, such as those Brecht advocated, already formed part of the local theatre traditions; second, Boal did indeed offer several accessible acting and dramatic forms useful to the making of participatory theatre"(2006:14).

Freire, Brecht and Boal represent the exogenous path to understanding the TfD phenomenon. Their practice and theory have been integrated and, in some cases, adapted faithfully or with some alterations in many African countries. Freire's ideology came through adult education and that of Brecht and Boal through theatre. Therefore, it is instructive to note that most contemporary practices of TfD, especially in urban areas in Africa and in countries that use borrowed languages (English, French, and Portuguese) as official languages, seldom practice TfD without integrating theories from any of the scholars and practitioners discussed.

THEATRE FOR DEVELOPMENT AS “DEVELOPMENT”

The continent of Africa, in some parts, has over 5000 years of historical records and documentation available. In contrast, in others, it is only through legends, myths and oral literature that the past is recorded, reenacted, articulated and rearticulated for successive generations (Zaki, 2004:13). This illustrates the difficulty of establishing historical facts and documentation for some parts of the continent. As an invaded and colonized continent, Africa was imperilled by the imposition of foreign languages and a system of governance, which makes it difficult for Africa to "have a convenient linear history" (Banham, 2004: xvi).

Furthermore, the continent has rich and enormous cultural diversity whose development was truncated at some point because of external interruption. This raises a number of challenges and leaves questionable gaps when one attempts a homogenous definition and understanding of conceptual phenomena such as history, culture and development in the African context. This is why Paul Tiyambe Zeleza posed the poignant question: "Is autonomy of African *development* history possible, can this history *of development in Africa* be written without European referents, is it possible to liberate African *development* history from the epistemological traps of Eurocentrism?” (2005:1). Given the persistence of such concerns, Amin also asked:

> Should development be conceived per the demand of the international order, or conversely, is it necessarily in conflict with it. Can the international order be transformed and 'adjusted' to the priority demands for Third World development, or conversely, can the latter only be the result of the reverse 'adjustment'? (Amin, 1990: 60)

The questions posed by Zeleza and Amin are germane. On the one hand, they accentuate the need to unravel and unpack the hegemonic contradictions entrenched in 'universalized' terminologies with covert agendas often interpreted within a Eurocentric worldview. On the other, their questions serve as an opportunity, at least within the context of this research, to situate TfD as the alternative paradigm capable of reclaiming lost histories, demystifying and localizing the concept of development, and offering an unconventional pathway towards delinking the African worldview from epistemic coloniality. In other words, TfD is a convenient mechanism, which forms the nexus between the colonial, neo-colonial, decolonial and development desires of Africa. It straddles the political, economic, and socio-cultural

histories and aspirations that Africa has, over the years, tried to negotiate as most of its countries entered their independence era and beyond.

Functioning as “a social analysis conducted through practice by the members of a community who have a vested interest in using culture for transformation” (Prentki, 2008:103), TfD defies the logic of dogmatic entrapment. It must not be understood not merely as “a series of random production events but a process of grassroots, concrete analysis that inaugurates a cultural movement: not *only African* consciousness, this time, but people's consciousness." (Prentki 2008:104-105). A call that aligns with the postcolonial nationalist developmental aim of eliminating what Thandika Nkandawire dubbed the "unholy trinity of ignorance, poverty and disease" (Nkandawire, 2005:13).

For many years, there has been an increasing sense of puzzlement as to why the industrial nations of North America and Europe must unquestionably be the models for African, Asian and Latin American nations when it comes to the question of development (Escobar, 1995: vii). Given that historical and cultural conditions globally do not favour a wholesale imposition or importation of development paradigms from one cultural context to another, it is questionable that Euro-American corporations and international agencies often expect African, Asian and Latin American countries to follow an exogenous development plan that is akin to the imperialistic ideology of cultural Darwinism. For Akwasi Asabere-Ameyaw et al. (2014), this is one of the reasons why, irrespective of the vast literature on the subject of development, there is no generally accepted definitional consensus on the subject. They posit that:

> No term is so heavily contested in social science literature/nomenclature than 'Development'. Why is this so? In many ways, the contentions speak to the failure of development theories, theorists and field practitioners to agree on what development is, what constitutes development and how such development practice should be pursued. One would expect that with the generous vast literature on development, scholars and field practitioners should at least have arrived at some shared intellectual consensus on what really constitutes development. For one thing, the problem has been one of colonial making and cultural imposition. This is because what passes as development in one cultural context has been imposed and promoted as what is the 'correct' path to development *globally* (Akwasi Asabere-Ameyaw et al., 2014:1).

Thierry G. Verhelst confirms this and expands further by arguing that, for so many years, development has been “like a Trojan horse, introducing Westernization into the Third

World…development constitutes a rape, whether by coercion or by seduction" (1990:1). Nnimmo Bassey highlighted similar challenges and underscored that "the pursuit of "development" has promoted butchery on the African continent. The notion that the path to development taken by others is what we must follow is essentially imperialist, used to justify colonialism, neo-colonialism and neo-liberalism" (2019:3). This exposes the inherent contention in the how the word is variously understood and received globally, thereby reinforcing the need for a deconstruction of the concept by reframing it in context and based on the socio-historical experience of the subjects involved at any given time. More so, the notion of development as a subtle neo-colonial tool and "portable knowledge" articulated above requires a critical evaluation of what constitutes development generally and exploring sustainable options embedded in African cultural systems and intellectual traditions as exemplified in TfD praxis.

THE INVENTION OF UNDER-DEVELOPMENT

When Harry Truman engaged in the politics of naming by designating a part of the world as "underdeveloped areas", he was undoubtedly using his inaugural speech platform on 20th January 1949 to project what he termed as a "democratic fair deal" for the world, a concept that not only entrenched coloniality, but also contributed to the global classification of and disagreement about who, what or which country or individual is "developed" or "underdeveloped". He declared that:

> More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate, they are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people. . . I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. . . . What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing. . . Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge (Truman [1949] 1964).

By classifying a part of the world as a people who lack "technical knowledge" that can "help them realize their aspirations for a better life", Truman ushered in an era that made it possible

for the “developed” nations of the time (American and European countries) to export by way of imposition what they understood to be development to other parts of the world. This singular act began a new chapter in geopolitics that set the stage for "creating "abnormalities" (such as the "illiterate," the "underdeveloped," the "malnourished," "small farmers," or "landless peasants"), which it would later treat and reform" (Escobar, 1994:41). The declaration helped entrench "how the "Third World" has been produced by the discourses and practices of development since their inception in the early post–World War II period" (Escobar, 1995:4-5). Significantly, the messianic gesture of Truman did not come without conditions. It became a necessary venture because what he termed "their poverty" of the "underdeveloped" areas was visibly becoming a "handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas". Furthermore, to access the "technical knowledge", a country had to fall within the category of "peace loving people", another condition solely defined by Truman and the American system at whim without external input.

Analogously, Gustavo Esteva concluded in his study that Truman's declaration not only made people cease "being what they were", but it also confined them to an abject description that denied them their diversity and "transmogrified them into an inverted mirror of other's reality". He writes:

> Underdevelopment began, then, on 20th January 1949. On that day, 2 billion people became underdeveloped. In a real sense, from that time on, they ceased being what they were, in all their diversity, and were transmogrified into an inverted mirror of others' reality: a mirror that belittles them and sends them off to the end of the queue, a mirror that defines their identity, which is really that of a heterogeneous and diverse majority, simply in the terms of a homogenizing and narrow minority (Esteva, 1992:2).

Notwithstanding the above, it is essential to clarify that Truman was not the first to use the word “underdeveloped”. However, his proclamation gave it global legitimacy. On the one hand, it came when globally, countries were trying to recover from the effects of World War II. On the other, it obtained the required political backing and global approval because the United States of America, at the time, occupied an influential position in shaping global politics and international relations. Hence, that "address enshrined international development as a key priority for US foreign policy – and by implication, as a priority for all of its international allies" (Vokes, 2018:10). A closer inspection of the historical usage of the word confirms that, long before Truman,

> Wilfred Benson, a former member of the Secretariat of the International Labour Organization, was probably the person who invented it when he referred to the 'underdeveloped areas' while writing on the economic basis for peace in 1942. But the expression found no further echo, either with the public or with the experts. Two years later. Rosenstein-Rodan continued to speak of 'economically backward areas'. Arthur Lewis, also in 1944, referred to the gap between the rich and the poor nations. Throughout the decade, the expression appeared occasionally in technical books or United Nations documents. But it only acquired relevance when Truman presented it as the emblem of his own policy. In this context, it took on an unsuspected colonizing virulence. (Esteva, 1992:2)

From then on, the preoccupation of political actors, international development practitioners and theorists has always been the need to situate development within the scope of the economic and social problems of the Global South. It has been a politics of naming and representation: where African, Asian and Latin American countries are imagined, defined and represented through Euro-American standards and points of view. This approach helped consolidate the notion of "developed" and "underdeveloped" in the vocabulary of the global polity. The challenge, however, lies in the question, what is development? Should it be considered a one-off event or a process? Must it be a homogenous concept, a globalized one-size-fits-all, or it should be context and content-based, taking the cosmology of a place, country, and region into consideration. To a large extent, these questions form the bedrock of the intervention that TfD adumbrates in the context of epistemic contestations involving theatre, performance, international development, education, social change, and communications.

DEVELOPMENT

Although one can say that the objective of actors in the development field (international organizations and donor agencies) is finding a lasting solution to poverty and dehumanization, the approach and results of experiments, programs and projects globally (especially in Africa) from the 1940s to date do not support these perceived aims and claims (McMichael, 2019:12). When western political actors, economists and political scientists began debating and experimenting with the concept of development, it was based on the notion of the west taking "on the role of champions, promoters and financiers of development, progress and the socio-economic advancement of the peoples of the South"(Verhelst, 1990:1). However, reality portrays a different picture: one that suggests a projection into a different environment and

culture of ideas and experiences that are not in line with the people's conceptualization of progress and development. Escobar reached a similar conclusion in his study, in which he writes:

> Development was—and continues to be for the most part—a top-down, ethnocentric, and technocratic approach, which treated people and cultures as abstract concepts, statistical figures to be moved up and down in the charts of "progress." Development was conceived not as a cultural process (culture was a residual variable, to disappear with the advance of modernization) but instead as a system of more or less universally applicable technical interventions intended to deliver some "badly needed" goods to a "target" population. It comes as no surprise that development became a force so destructive to Third World cultures, ironically in the name of people's interests (Escobar 1994:44).

Although the dark cloud commonly created around development rhetoric and developmentalism can be justified in many ways, a paradigm shift will effectively situate the concept appropriately. Given that the hope that often accompanies development agendas produces little or no positive results in third world countries, as captured in the quotation be Escobar above, the word itself can be stripped of its inherent coloniality. This is the first step towards ensuring that "development" is decolonized and made to function as a culture-specific concept. In this regard, the development in "*Theatre for Development*" should be understood normatively, empirically and critically as praxis in a continuum, because it opens up opportunities for interrogating the desirable, observable and critical elements of development and offering alternatives derived organically from a people's lived experiences. The hypothesis here is that TfD, be it as a product or as a process, concerns itself with growth, liberation, positive change, and the constant human struggle to end dehumanization in all shapes and forms. In much the same way:

> Development cannot delink itself from the words with which it was formed – growth, evolution, maturation. Just the same, those who now use the word cannot free themselves from a web of meanings that impart a specific blindness to their language, thought and action. No matter the context in which it is used, or the precise connotation that the person using it wants to give it, the expression becomes qualified and coloured by meanings perhaps unwanted. The word always implies a favourable change, a step from the simple to the complex, from the inferior to the superior, from worse to better.

> The word indicates that one is doing well because one is advancing in the sense of a necessary, ineluctable, universal law and towards a desirable goal. The word retains to this day the meaning given to it a century ago by the creator of ecology, Haeckel: 'Development is, from this moment on, the magic word with which we will solve all the mysteries that surround us or, at least, that which will guide us towards their solution. (Esteva: 1992:6)

On the contrary, Wolfgang Sachs establishes a convincing case that, irrespective of the simple and positive connotation that comes with the word, "the idea of development stands like a ruin in the intellectual landscape. Delusion and disappointment, failures and crimes, have been the steady companions of development and they tell a common story: it did not work" (2010: xv). In its primary definition, characteristics and form, "the idea has become stale and institutionally ossified" (Sachs 2019: x), maybe because "previously, in Marx's or Schumpeter's time, development was used for an intransitive subject, like a flower that seeks maturity. Now the term is used transitively as an active reordering of society that needs to be completed within decades, if not years" (Sachs, 2019: xii). The conviction, however, is that, whether as growth, promise or progress, development must be decolonized and deconstructed intellectually, ethically and socio-culturally. It must follow a pathway that accommodates cultural alternatives and recognizes the existence of the "other". It must not be conceptualized as a "linear, unidirectional, material and financial growth, driven by commodification and capitalist markets" (Kothari, A et al., 2019: xxii) or made to function as "something that "experts" manage in pursuit of economic growth, and measure by Gross Domestic Product (GDP), a poor and misleading indicator of progress in the sense of well-being" (Kothari, A et al., 2019: xxii). Instead, theorists and practitioners must operationalize development as a central agenda (especially in developing countries) for a socio-cultural transformation interlaced with scientific and professional innovation that does not lead to exclusion or coerced apathy.

Perceiving development in a "linear pattern etched by the global North, is a rigged idea that stacks nations into developed and underdeveloped categories" (Bassey, 2019:3). It perpetuates a cycle that entrenches unequal competition rather than promoting cooperation. Suffice to say that this model does not create opportunities for social justice and a rights-based approach to development. It instead supports the will of the mighty and promotes, through consolidation, the agenda of the rich and industrial (Euro-American and now Asian) nations. This further creates the apposite condition for the continuation on the path of development that involves unsustainable exploitation of nature and undue abuse of lands and peoples. The certainty of

such unsustainable exploits is the reason why Vandana Shiva sounded a clarion call on the need “to move beyond the discourse of “development” and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as shaped by capitalist patriarchal thinking, and reclaim our true humanity as members of the earth family” (2019:6).

For that to happen, Amin suggests that we must begin to see "'development' *as* a holistic process that implies the definition of its political objectives and their articulation such as the democratization of society and the emancipation of individuals, affirmation of the ' nation' as well as power and autonomy of these in the global system" (Amin: 2009:59). Amin is advocating a shift from the point where local ideas are forced to universalize to a point where the global system is made to understand a nation's freedom to chart a holistic development that guarantees its democratic autonomy and the right to self-determination.

The lack of this is what Ngugi wa Thiongo describes elsewhere about the African condition as a "Cultural Bomb". He elaborates on what he means by it and further explains its effects on the psyche of the African people:

> The effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their language, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement, and it makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves; for instance, with other people's languages rather than their own. It makes them identify with that which is decadent and reactionary, all those forces which would stop their springs of life. It even plants serious doubts about the moral rightness of struggle. Possibilities of triumph or victory are seen as remote, ridiculous dreams. The intended results are despair, despondency and a collective death-wish. (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 1986: 3)

The "despair, despondency" and that "collective death-wish" which often lingers, especially in Africa, is what calls for the kind of development that Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2018:21) deems "partly a struggle to end dependency and broadly a re-humanizing process after long years of denied humanity". Today, the shift in definition has occurred, and dominant meanings can be teased out from historical and contemporary events. Commenting on the above, Alan Thomas argues that the dominant meaning of development in the 21st century is framed in three parts. First, as an idea, a vision, or a proposition that describes or measures the state of being of a desirable community or a society. Second, it is seen as a methodical social change process

where communities, societies and countries are transformed over a long period. Finally, development is understood as deliberately putting in place strategies for social reorganization geared towards improving the lives of a given people (2000:777). Thomas captures a notion of development that, in a way, signifies the importance of the human factor in ensuring sustainable and effective long-term development strategies.

Equally important is the fact that conceiving development as a vision, as a methodical social change process, and a deliberate strategy for social reorganization is likely to increase an individual and a nation's "capacity to regulate both internal and external relationships" (Rodney, 1982:3). If done without external influence, the agency that ensures a nation or an individual can regulate internal and external relationships will decrease dependence and establish self-reliance. Furthermore, it will lead to many experiments to find alternative and autonomous development paradigms.

AN ATTEMPT AT AN ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM

Over the years, the lack of substantial change in the development desires and the increasing global marginalization of Africans forced them to realize that the path to development, in which they relied on western philanthropy, would not change their condition positively but would further plunge them into the abyss of maldevelopment and underdevelopment. This awakening made them realize that "Africa needed to actively strive to reduce its dependence on external nations and to replace this dependence with a self-sustaining development strategy based on the maximum internal use of the continent's resources" (Brown and Cummings, 1994:23). This led to the collaboration between the Organization of African Unity (OAU), now the African Union (AU), and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) that produced what can be described as a homegrown solution to Africa’s development: what came to be known as the Lagos Plan of Action (LPA) of the 1980s.

Francis Nguendi Ikome describes the LPA as "a watershed in Africa's regional cooperation history in that it was the first genuinely indigenous continent-wide effort to forge a comprehensive, unified approach to the continent's problems of economic development" (2007:2). Ndlovu-Gatsheni believes that the plan was a strategy "to reduce dependence on external powers and to replace it with self-reliance… At the centre of the plan was not complete delinking, but strategic disengagement from those features of the international economic system that were keeping Africa dependent, underdeveloped, weak and poor" (2018:28). This resulted from the continent's experience with many failed global development plans.

The preamble of the LPA is emphatic. It laments that the partnership that resulted in the implementation of global development plans for several years yielded no positive results for Africa. Instead, the plans made the continent "more susceptible than other regions to the economic and social crises suffered by the industrial nations". It states that:

> The effect of unfulfilled promises of global development strategies has been more sharply felt in Africa than in the other continents of the world. Indeed, rather than result in an improvement in the continent's economic situation, successive strategies have stagnated and become more susceptible than other regions to the economic and social crises suffered by the industrialized countries. Thus, Africa is unable to point to any significant growth rate, or satisfactory index of general well-being, in the past 20 years. Faced with this situation and determined to undertake measures for the fundamental restructuring of the economic base of our continent, we resolved to adopt a far-reaching regional approach based primarily on collective self-reliance (1981:4).

Nevertheless, the reality is that most homegrown African development plans capable of decreasing African dependency on the global system are often opposed by these global actors. Adebayo Adedeji termed this system the Development Merchant System (DMS). He states that all the locally created plans, such as the Lagos Plan of Action (1980-2000), the African Priority for Economic Recovery (1986–1990), and the African Alternative Framework to Structural Adjustment Programmes for Socio-Economic Recovery and Transformation, were not supported by the donor community and African development. He states that

> unfortunately, all of these were opposed, undermined and jettisoned by the Bretton Woods institutions and Africans were thus impeded from exercising the basic and fundamental right to make decisions about their future… instead, the implementation of exogenous agenda has, perforce, been pursued because of the operation of the development merchant system (DMS) under which foreign-crafted economic reform policies have been turned into a new kind of special goods which are largely and quickly financed by the operators of the DMS, regardless of the negative impact of such policies on the African economies and polities (Adedeji, 2002:4).

Generally, these reactions have taken several forms. Some took the form of direct policy formulation usually without the required funding to back its implementation, while others took the shape of critique and activism, which happened and continue to happen locally. This led to indispensable conditions that made a convincing case for investigating unorthodox approaches

that present alternatives for small scale projects that have the potential to lead to large scale social change and development. TfD is one such alternative that started as a form of community engagement and empowerment to create a path to development and social change delinked from external interventions. However, the irony is that most of these attempts at alternative paradigms often rely on syncretic approaches. It is because "the impact of colonialism and rapid urbanization created an urgent need for new cultural forms through which the uneducated and semi-educated populace could meditate and interpret the rapid economic and social transformation it was experiencing" (Kerr, 1981:148), a situation that exemplifies how rooted western hegemony is in Africa and depicts the complications in mediating these challenges. Such a scenario is a reality experienced in an environment where unequal opportunities awaken human survival instincts.

TOWARDS AN INDIGENOUS/ENDOGENOUS DEVELOPMENT

Globally, initiatives that emerge from people's actions and other forms of community organization are regarded as expressions of indigenous/endogenous development (Asabere-Ameyaw et al., 2014:4). A typology of practices situated within the remit of such development is usually validated according to the relevance of the projects to community needs, the motivation behind the community initiatives and the community's mode of organization. Such practical considerations are important because they help establish whether projects and programs should be classified as indigenous/endogenous or exogenous, because integrating expressive cultures into development planning can be internal or external. The viability of classifying such projects as indigenous/endogenous rests in the approach; whether the initiative is planned and executed internally, usually without external financial and sometimes logistical support. A study by Malcolm Adeseshia, as quoted by Zeydler-Zborowski (1987:8), advances the notion of development that frames the activist nature of community initiatives. He explains what will spur communities to initiate projects that speak to their communal aspirations.

> Development is a form of humanism. It is a moral and spiritual fact as much as material and practical one. It is an experience of the wholeness of man responding to his material needs (food, clothing and shelter) at the same time as his moral requirements (peace, compassion and charity). It is the expression of man in his greatness and his weakness, ever striving forwards and further, but without ever ensuring the redemption of his errors and his folly. (Zeydler-Zborowski, 1987:8)

This pattern of development practice came as a result of the constant search for alternatives because of the incompatibility of programs and their estranged philosophical underpinnings with the African reality. The Euro-American approach proved to be ineffective, driving many Africans to begin examining their plights compared to other continents. It is also because most people in the third world and especially Africa have "come to understand that the main reason of this maldevelopment has its origin in the fact that people have been deprived of the opportunity to organize their lives by themselves, having instead foreign formulas and patterns imposed upon them"(Zeydler-Zborowski 1987:9). In an attempt to change these conditions, initiatives began to spring up from multiple sectors, communities and departments in different African countries.

The TfD movement in Africa is one such initiative. It is community mobilization aimed at dialogue that exposes the root causes of community challenges geared towards locally generated intervention. Dickson M. Nwansa expounds on this when he writes that:

> This is the type of theatre that aims at community animation for effective intervention into socio-economic processes that govern their lives. It is theatre with an overt aim of popular education. It combines research work into many issues that affect a particular community, production of skits to reflect the problems to the people in the community, holding discussions with the people and making plans to start changing things in the community. (1984:25-26)

The people who take such paths have come to terms with the fact that their conditions need to change. They try to understand the complexities of their situation, address any bottlenecks and devise a working strategy to mitigate the challenges internally. In trying to devise ways to mitigate the untold hardships that came as a result of the colonial encounter, postcolonial experiments and the implementation of external economic plans, TfD gave the actors, such as development practitioners and theorists, cultural activists and academics, alternative ways of learning from and engaging the ordinary people. The TfD approach allows people to move from being bystanders in designing their fate and destiny to active participants and partners in creating homegrown solutions to mitigate the challenges they have identified.

This falls within the broader context of the postcolonial agitation, which started in the 1950s and permeated all aspects of social life in Africa. From social science literature to creative works, "writers and other artists were always thoroughly engaged with the socio-economic and political affairs of the continent (much to the chagrin of the Western literary establishment

which accused the artists of writing "sociological literature" rather than true "universalist" art)" (Dogbe, 1996:58). Some of these writers paid for their activist writing with imprisonment and exile. Their patriotic and nationalistic ideas were seen as a subversive plot to instigate political insurrection through their creative works. However, a cursory consideration of African writings and creative works with social and development themes suggest a conscious investment of creative energy in the service of social change and development. Notable amongst these writers are Sembene Ousmane with his work God's Bits of Wood (1960; 1962), Ayi Kwei Armah's The Beautyful Ones are Not Yet Born (1968), Wole Soyinka's A Dance of the Forests (1960), to mention but a few examples. These writings deal with the sordid nature of African societies occasioned by bad governance, an unholy partnership between African leaders and western governments and institutions, resulting in maldevelopment and the exploitation of the masses and African resources. Akwasi B. Assensoh (2001), in his article titled *African Writers: Historical Perspectives on Their Trials and Tribulations,* detailed case studies of writers forced into exile or persecuted for writing and creating works that speak against the dysfunctional nature of African societies. These writers used the tools available to them to change the status quo. They tried to point out the conditions under which the people were living and suggest ways to mitigate the untold hardships.

Accordingly, the development of TfD falls within this remit, but it elevates the discourse to a different level. It presented an approach that excavates the past, negotiates the present, and projects into the future. It served and continues to serve both the cognitive aspirations and the physical developmental needs of communities. It navigates social change's polemical and political performance space by creating platforms for local agency and traditional wisdom. It creates an avenue for convergence between radical and conservative ideas to find new ways to change communities and societies. The underlying rationale in the transition from exogenous development to indigenous/endogenous development establishes the basis for validating the TfD methods and their movement in Africa, because the praxis's general theoretical and practical context is fundamental and coherent with the indigenous/endogenous development needs of African people, communities, and institutions.

CONCLUSION:

TfD is a people's movement and represents hope and critique. As a language inscribed in people's daily lives, it ensures that decisions are devolved to make the process of development and social change accessible. Through the language and mode of expression of the ordinary

person (dance, music, drama, narratives and related arts), it has survived indigenous/endogenous and exogenous experiments in Africa aimed at social change and development. From independence struggle to national consciousness building, to mass education and social change campaigns, TfD has played an integral role.

Therefore, this chapter established the philosophical basis and provided a broader perspective for understanding African TfD. It demystified some long-held misconceptions and framed the praxis in the proper context. Looking at it within the scope of decolonization (decoloniality), education and development makes it easier for theorists, practitioners, researchers, and students to understand the context of TfD's evolution, institutionalization and varied manifestations.

This chapter has outlined a number ways one can broadly appreciate the conditions that paved the way for the emergence of TfD. It provided three contexts in which TfD was situated. On the aspect of education, the chapter established the two ways by which scholars, practitioners, researchers and students can appreciate the many perspectives and philosophies that coalesced to create a formidable grassroots approach to lifelong learning tied to social change and development. It confirmed that although there is some degree of influence on the genre from without, it also borrows several characteristics and conventions from within.

The chapter also discussed the challenge of development. It attempted a genealogical exposition of the word and how it has been applied across cultures and continents. This is particularly important since the label of the genre in itself bears the word “development”. Therefore, it would have been inappropriate to do a comprehensive review of the philosophical and contextual basis of this field of enquiry without its root word. Moreover, understanding the application of the word and how it is appreciated in different contexts further enhances how actors in the field navigate the genre. It is in this regard that the chapter looked at both indigenous/endogenous experiments and external/exogenous interventions claiming development as its end game.

In relation to colonialism and decolonisation, the chapter projected TfD as an active action-oriented discipline. It upheld the notion that TfD is a decolonial praxis, one that provides alternative ways of delinking and revaluating the colonial experience. It further proposed how TfD can be seen as a viable alternative for decolonizing development and confronting epistemic coloniality since it offers theoretical and practical decolonizing methodologies. Significantly, the chapter invited researchers, practitioners, and scholars of TfD to begin examining and contextualising the unexplored aspects of TfD praxis. Albeit Prentki (2015:16) asserts that “the

philosophical bedrock of TfD is Marxism", meaning TfD is fundamentally socialist. A closer examination reveals otherwise. He might have argued this because most of the names associated with the emergence of TfD "were all-and continue to be-strongly socialist and inspired by concepts of inclusivity, community, empowerment and enablement of the poor and marginalised to take control over their own lives" (Plastow, 2014:108). This chapter outlined various alternatives. It emphasised that the indigenous/endogenous dimension that has not been explored adequately is accentuated at each point when dealing with the theoretical and philosophical dictates of TfD. The goal is to elevate, epistemically, the local mores and African cosmologies that must become the conceptual and philosophical bedrock of TfD. The subsequent chapters will deal with select country-specific histories, actors and networks responsible for the institutionalization of TfD in African countries and higher education institutions.

CHAPTER THREE

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

INTRODUCTION

Having discussed TfD in the context of decolonization, education and development in the previous chapter, this chapter will delineate the possible sources that influenced the genre's evolution and then discuss the history of selected countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. It will be based on case studies that prompted the evolution and diffusion of TfD praxis in the selected countries and, ultimately, Africa. In essence, establishing the various foundations of TfD, especially with regards to its sources and influences, will enable a discussion of the country-specific history that will lead to a greater appreciation of how TfD came to be institutionalized in higher education institutions in Africa.

The historical antecedents of TfD can be traced back to multiple factors and events in Africa and globally. On the one hand, some global events triggered the thinking that informed the conceptualization of TfD; on the other hand, the functionality of African performance genres played a crucial role in the genre's evolution. These are rituals and secular performances, global people's, popular and community theatre movements, and the colonial and post-colonial mass education campaigns and community development initiatives in Africa (Kamlongera, 2005:436-438; Ferreira, 1953: 35-40; Kidd, 1979:3). These cultural markers, colonial attempts at behavioural change among Africans, and local and imported performance repertoires form the bedrock on which contemporary TfD was built. Suffice to say that this chapter cannot pretend to provide a comprehensive discussion of the histories and linkages between these historical events and the evolution of contemporary TfD. Instead, it will offer indicators that point to how TfD derived its practical ethics from such performative practices, because the discussions of the histories of various countries in this study revolve around these markers, and will trace TfD's evolution in a way that reflects the premise established in this paragraph. It is also a fact that the TfD movement evolved as a strategic discipline and a performance genre, positioned to deal with development and societal transformation issues based on the perceptions and influences "in a society moving through colonialism to nationalism, independence and beyond" (Gibbs, 2009:vii). It informed the decolonial movement in Africa in the early independence era, as discussed in the previous chapter. It also served as a fertile socio-cultural and economic space for contesting and shaping the mode of operations of

international non-governmental organizations working within the scope of global development cooperation.

HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS AND GLOBAL CULTURAL INFLUENCES

According to David Kerr (2014:208), "ritual and secular performances in Africa going back many centuries helped generate the cultural conditions, which made TfD popular in the late twentieth century". This is an important historical assumption because of the nature and scope of TfD. Functioning as an avenue and medium of critical engagement, these rituals and secular performances created conditions necessary for societal introspection and communal critique. The *Kpashimo* of the Ga people in Ghana, the Yoruba *Egungun* in Nigeria, the *Mwari* rain-making cult of the Shona and the Zambian/Angolan *Makishi* are worthy examples in this regard. These rituals and traditional performances serve as avenues for criticism, reconciliation, and resistance and as mechanisms for purging societies' ills (Mogobo, 1995: 47; Kuper, 1952:47). They help build individual and communal agencies for social engagement and criticism. Characteristically, these traditional forms constitute the basic elements that helped shape the field of TfD. Thus, Kamlongera believes that "in some way, this particular theatre (TfD) continues the functional nature of indigenous theatre into our modern age" (1989:87). Functionality in indigenous cultural practices therefore predates most formal and institutionalised theatrical movements in Africa. This is reflected in Dandaura's position on the role of theatre in pre-colonial Africa. He posits that “theatre … served as a medium through which deviant behaviors were checked" (1995:13). Therefore, one can safely assume that the TfD "tradition of theatrical performances in both form and substance, evolved from these festivals and rituals" (Adeluba and Obafemi, 2004:138).

Steve Ogah Aba (2003:89) also delineates how local festivals and rituals were revived and appropriated in some TfD projects and practices. He refers to the *Kwang-hir* in Nigeria and *Pungwe* in Zimbabwe, which were revived and employed in TfD practices in the 1980s. Some of these aesthetics organically merged into the praxis, while others were consciously refined and manipulated for easy integration into TfD to achieve popular appeal. Another example can be drawn from the Tswana people and their initiation ceremonies: Bogwera (male) and Bojale (female) versions. These rituals are used for instruction, and the initiates are made to hunt down one or more dancers disguised as lions in what is known as the "lion dance", in order to teach them their role as they become adults through role-playing. For Thulaganyo Mogobe, the entire performance is "a mixture of choreographed military precision, ferocity and humour in "a well-

structured piece of theatre" (Kerr, 2004: 271-272, Kuper, 1952:47). Therefore, it is apt to say that one of the historical factors that paved the way for the evolution of TfD and its diffusion in Africa is the development of such hybrid performance traditions. Most of the features in TfD today can be linked to the development of hybrid practices that emerged as a result of the encounter between two or more of such performance acts.

Elements of pre-colonial secular performances in traditional storytelling also inspired and influenced the TfD genre. This is because TfD borrowed from and experimented extensively with the comic features and participatory aesthetics of the indigenous storytelling traditions. Some of these aesthetics are palpably manifest in TfD praxis today. They include: the presence of trickster heroes or its variant, which is typified by the extensive comic stereotyping and exaggerated characterization found in some TfD methods; the freedom of tale-tellers to criticize people in performance sessions and also be criticized is one feature that is an integral part of TfD praxis; TfD is non-hierarchical, it triumphs on the agency of audience to actively participate in the process of performance by offering suggestions, which is a direct appropriation of the storytelling characteristics; and the integration of different art forms-music, dance, narration to mention a few (Kerr, 2014:208). Most of these characteristics can be seen in the roles of facilitators and animators in contemporary TfD. The TfD technique that encourages deliberations and does not debar any participant from contributing to discussions or suggesting alternative plots and solutions is a testimony to the influence of the ethics borrowed from the traditional trickster tales.

Another important factor is the agency of the "commoners", which made them appreciate and contribute their share by either criticizing or enhancing what "outsiders" brought to them in the form of theatre or as a development communication method. This is another source of TfD's evolution in Africa. From the colonial mass education campaigns and community development initiatives in the 1940s and 1950s in Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya and Malawi (see Kerr, 1981; Pickering, 1950a, 1950b; Kamlongera, 1986) to the Travelling Theatres of the 1960s and 1970s, especially in Uganda, Ibadan, Dar-es-Salaam, Lusaka, and Accra (see Mlama, 1991; Gibbs, 2009; Collins, 1994), local people, using their indigenous knowledge and experience, contributed to either changing the methods or helping the "outsiders" rethink their approach. Often, this led to the adaptation of hybrid methods and procedures in the execution of community projects and mass education campaigns or a total rethink of the modus operandi of the leaders in the case of the travelling theatres. For example, the mass-education campaigners in Gold Coast (now Ghana) did not explicitly include drama as part of their planning.

Therefore, the resource persons assembled did not include a dramatist. Although music, physical recreation and audio-visual aids were part of the planned activities, it was at the instance of the community members that drama was employed (Dickson, 1950:22). Hence, its integration in the entire mass-education campaign.

Furthermore, when the Chikwakwa travelling theatre of Zambia reached a deadlock during their Kasoma workshop in 1969, they had to reach out to a local person to teach the team from the University of Zambia the dance and music of the community so it could be incorporated into their work. As a result, they found out that their blueprint needed to be modified (Kamlongera, 1989:190). Such ingenuity on the part of the people indicates their appreciation and value of drama in discussion and community education. Such initiatives also inform the evolution of TfD and its wide acceptance in Africa.

The hybrid theatre forms created by Africans due to the colonial encounter also influenced the evolution and diffusion of TfD in Africa. The didactic and instructional format manifest in such theatrical forms is an important aspect that many scholarly works have discussed: Kwabena N. Bame (1985) detailing the form and exploits of the Ghanaian Concert Party; Biodun Jeyifo's (1984) exposition on the Yoruba Popular Travelling Theatre in Nigeria; David Kerr's discussion on Malipenga in Malawi (Kerr 1997: 46–69); and Amandina Lihamba's treatment of Tanzanian Vichekesho (Lihamba 2004: 237–238) are examples here. Fortunately, in a related context, Kerr (2014:210) states that the common didactic elements in most of these hybrid African created performances often condemn "vices such as witchcraft and drunkenness, while endorsing the virtues of community solidarity and respect for elders. Unsurprisingly, many of these virtues and vices reappear in TfD". This illustrates the extent to which performance traditions served as a source of inspiration for TfD practice in Africa.

Other performance forms that help create the atmosphere needed for the evolution of TfD can be traced to the global community, people's and popular theatre movements, because the ethics of all the variations of these performance genres "lie buried in the various forms of counter-cultural, radical, anti- and post-colonial, educational, and liberational theatres of the 1960s and 1970s"(van Erven, 2007:1). Discussing the role of theatre in this context, Oga Steve Abah (2003:81) asked whether "in situations of deprivation, of poverty, of disease and of hunger, should theatre be complacent or should it be active in confronting issues, in shaping and indeed altering ways of thinking and seeing?" The obvious answer to this question captures the thrust of people's, community, and popular theatre movements worldwide, especially in third-world

countries. Functionaries and advocates of such theatre use it either to challenge long-held assumptions that are often detrimental to the populace or mobilize to protest and contest unfavourable conditions. It means that theatre in this context takes on a functional liberating role instead of a coercive and cathartic one.

Jan Cohen-Cruz (1999:115) writes that these types of performances are "popular mode(s) allied with identity politics and targeting under-represented groups in quest of collective expression". She further asserts that while these theatres are "related to TfD, there are important differences. Community-based theatre (people's theatre or popular theatre) is partisan, dealing with a particular group: TfD is bi-partisan, dealing with a particular population AND a "civil society" institution". One sees that clearly, the former influenced the latter, in that the latter borrowed a lot of its characteristics, philosophy and practices from the former. However, TfD modified most ethical borrowings by upgrading the approaches and philosophy to fit its evolving context. An important observation that must not be glossed over is that as much as TfD focuses on individual and community development, it also considers the external context, unlike earlier movements. Eugene van Erven agrees that people's theatre, popular theatre and community theatre influenced TfD. His argument is based on the conviction that, like TfD, these performance forms are also "popular cultural practice that operates on the cutting edge between performing arts and socio-cultural intervention" (2001:1).

Equally important is the socialist fervour that swept through Africa during the independence struggle. It brought with it not only ideological appropriation but also theatrical adaptations. TfD was influenced by some top-down theatres that can be traced back to communist cultural policies. For example, Mumford (2010:13) explains how the country used Agitprop Theatre to teach peasants about agriculture and other Soviet policies in the USSR. This practice was systematically formulated and transported elsewhere in the world. Accounts of the use of agitprop in China in the 1950s and India in the 1960s shows how the practice travelled across the globe.

Regarding Africa, Mda's account of how the Marotholi travelling theatre of Lesotho employed agitprop in their TfD works shows the extent this theatrical form that was developed in the USSR influenced TfD in Africa (Mda, 1993). In another instance, Agyeman-Duah (1996-viii) depicts how the Zambian Chikwakwa travelling theatre also created their performances following the agitprop theatre format. The Chikwakwa theatre will eventually become the rallying organization behind which the TfD movement of Zambia is formed.

In a nutshell, the contemporary practice of TfD borrowed, experimented with and modified many forms of theatre before its standardization. Despite the above discussed possible sources, influences and practices that helped shape what has become TfD today, its adaptation in specific African countries varies. However, there are some similarities with regard to the evolution of TfD in many African countries. Some countries practised variations before they were officially introduced to the current systematic method of TfD. The study will now examine and discuss how TfD was developed in selected African countries.

BOTSWANA

The TfD movement in Botswana started with the Laedza Batanani project, a non-formal education project aimed at encouraging community participation in development. The project arose out of increased apathy and lack of interest in the efforts of government concerning community development, perhaps because one of the most inclusive and participatory avenues that were part of the lives of the people was rendered inefficient and not eclectic during the country's colonial encounter-this being the *Kgotla*.

One of the unique democratic features of the pre-colonial traditional Batswana community can be found in their *Kgotla*: a village meeting place where the community gathers to share ideas, discuss the challenges it faces and decide on appropriate collective action. It serves as a community centre that offers a platform for active citizenship through participation and communal belonging. It is one of the prominent local traditional establishments used for recreational and developmental purposes. During the *Kgotla,* community members employ several artistic mediums, such as storytelling, dancing, singing, puppetry and masquerades, enhancing community cohesion and arousing the interest of citizens. Such meetings depend on the involvement of the opinion leaders and traditional rulers and the populace having a stake in civic engagements, enacting communal laws and deciding on community actions for future development. It was also an integral part of village and community life that every community member anticipates and is anxious not to miss. However, with the advent of colonialism, and even after independence, this practice increasingly faded out. Apathy grew towards community activities because the traditional leaders who were the rallying force for such gatherings had lost their relevance. They were made to cede local governance of the communities to colonial representatives and later to the independent government agencies as part of the new governance arrangements.

Equally important is that the *Kgotla* is not the only communal institution that suffered. The performing arts of the people, which is their indigenous cultural expression, were also relegated and discarded. Since they had been an important medium used to reach out to most people in the Batswana community and country at large for development, behavioural and social change was also affected. These traditional forms of communication that the people can identify with and which serve as a means of education, entertainment and socialization were relegated to the background and regarded as a mere artefact. It is fair to assume that this is one of the reasons why Botswana had "a much less vibrant tradition of the performing arts than many other Third World countries" (Kidd and Byram, 1978:171).

Nevertheless, the country's traditional performance traditions always ensured the fusion of entertainment and social change messages, like elsewhere in Africa, to criticize and challenge long-held views or encourage community participation in community development. Kidd and Byram (1978:85) believe that "this is, of course, a traditional function of songs in Botswana". They noted that "a song or poem in which a person is criticized for his behaviour is called *sekgalo*-a corrective performance". Thus, irrespective of the circumstance, their traditional songs and poetry still maintained their social criticism role.

The Botswana case study is not an isolated situation. It falls within the larger socio-economic climate that most Southern African countries experienced in the 1970s. Because it was a landlocked country surrounded by Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa and Zambia, many people left Botswana to seek a better livelihood in neighbouring countries due to the economic hardship. The majority of its agile population left to seek employment, particularly in the South African mines, with the result that the children, older people and wives who were often left behind had to ensure the community's survival. They took up the responsibility of caring for the family, community and properties. This situation led to the weakening and breakdown of the social fabric. It also, to some extent, led to apathy and a lack of interest in the activities of the community and government. The people did not see the need to be a part of initiatives that did not improve their living conditions. Moreover, by this time, as stated earlier, the *Kgotla*, which used to be the mobilizing factor and meeting ground, had lost its value and influence because the traditional leaders, who hitherto had been responsible for such gatherings, had been relieved of their responsibilities (Byam, 1999:38).

The worrying nature of the situation called for an urgent creative solution to find a way of getting the people involved in the development of their community. The government and its

agencies understood that getting the people to take charge of their situation was the only way to reduce apathy and increase participation in community welfare and progress. Moreover, there was a growing frustration on the part of the extension workers who worked in the rural communities: they felt inadequate in handling the myriad problems faced by the rural population, such as poverty, unemployment, poor health and family disintegration. They realized that their impact was negligible and understood that their work was elitist and did not bring them close to the people (Kidd: 1979:5). They needed to find the right approach. In fact, they (extension workers and several government ministries) tried different solutions without achieving the desired effect. This search led to the emergence of the non-formal education campaign movement known as Laedza Batanani, a term deriving from the Setswana language.

Laedza Batanani

According to Kidd (1979:6), "Laedza means "wake up - it is time to get moving!". Batanani means "Let us come together and work together". The notion of Laedza Batanani then, is to provide an occasion where the community is drawn together, is "woken up" to their situation, and discusses what might be done about it". This community action movement was conceived as a non-formal education project which started in 1974 at the central district in Bokalaka, the northern part of Botswana. At the core of this initiative was the idea of promoting self-reliance and encouraging active community participation. This idea got its impetus at a village development conference held at Tutume, organized in collaboration with the University of Botswana. Kidd and Byram write that:

> When leaders at a village development conference responded in a lively way to dramatized case studies and recommended a follow-up programme in the villages, the organizers decided to respond with a mobile campaign using drama and other media. The first campaign was very successful and participants demanded that it become an annual event (1978:83).

This happened because, for a long time, attempts by community leaders and extension workers to achieve similar aims, that is, eliciting community participation, did not yield the desired results. There were several reasons for this. First, the approach employed by the extension workers did not have the right mechanism to instigate communal interest and encourage participation. Second, they focused mainly on information sharing and providing services. Finally, motivating people to engage in their community development activities was not a deliberate goal. There was no introspection. The adult educators and extension workers did not

feel they were doing anything wrong. However, they did recognize that most of the information they shared was based on outside prescription and not local consensus emanating from community deliberations.

Conceptualization

Largely initiated by the University of Botswana's Institute of Adult Education and led by Jeppe Kelepile, a Batswana community councillor, and Ross Kidd and Martin Byram, both expatriate experts in Adult Education, employed at the University, this TfD project was funded by the Canadian University Services Overseas (CUSO). As an integrated non-formal education campaign, it was an “all hands on deck” kind of project. During each project year, the team comprising extension workers, local councillors, and adult educators from the University toured five major villages in the district with popular theatre performances. This came to be known as the Laedza Batanani annual festival. Each performance usually lasted for about one and a half hours. The campaign took place in five villages, Maitengwe, Tutume, Sebina, Nkange, and Mathangwane. The project ensured that the extension workers in all the areas were directly involved from the beginning to the end, from conceptualization to execution. Some of them who were community organizers performed as actors. The processes in the communities were also led by two local councillors, who at the same time were responsible for providing overall leadership for the campaigns. The community also constituted their local organizing team, and it was mandatory for all involved to attend the pre-campaign planning workshop, which served as the platform where priority issues were identified, discussed and agreed upon (Kidd and Byram, 1978:8).

The entire Laedza Batanani project followed this sequence: planning, organizing, performing, discussion, follow-up and evaluation. It involved researching the issues, discussing what to prioritize, improvising the performances, performing to the community, community discussions and follow-up action. The process started with community planning workshops, in which the traditional leaders, extension workers, opinion leaders, the various village development committees and the people from the university met to discuss pressing issues affecting the communities. After brainstorming, the issues were prioritized, and the participants agreed on the concerns they deemed urgent and for which they were willing to commit to finding a solution. The yardstick for agreeing on an issue to be dealt with was that it must be "small tasks which people can easily achieve (e. g., clean-up campaigns rather than large infrastructural project); problems which require a local response rather than government action;

problems whose solution can easily be supported by regular extension work" (Kidd and Byram, 1979:14).

After agreeing on the concerns to be tackled, they moved to the next stage, the actors' workshop, in which detailed discussions took place among the participants selected from those who participated in the village planning workshop. Here, the focus was examining communal thinking about identified issues, discussing the knowledge gap between what prevailed in the various villages and what the ideal situation should be, identifying local resources that could be used to solve the problems, agreeing on what was feasible to achieve and what was not, and finally, understanding the indigenous practices that could be enhanced and incorporated and what needed to be discarded. The reason for all these drills was so that people could understand the heart of what they were dealing with in order for them to be able to improvise well. The people were also selected from the participants of the community planning workshop because it was assumed they understood the needs of the people. After all, they were part of the discussion.

The next phase was the performance: the group toured with the piece they had created throughout the villages and also performed at the *Kgotla* or the annual festivals. According to Kidd and Byram (1978:171), the performance made use of "transplanted media (drama and puppetry) along with indigenous media (dance-dramas and songs)". They combined foreign and local genres that served their agenda. The combination created new and hybrid forms because the old (strictly indigenous) ones had been lost or could not serve their purpose well. It also allowed the organizers to distinguish their hybrid creations from the purely indigenous ones and experiment with art forms capable of instigating the radical response they envisaged the project eliciting. It is not misplaced to say that this is why the leaders sought to use the ideas of Paulo Freire in the entire campaign.

After each performance, the people were divided into groups, where they held a discussion about the issues raised in the performance, then each group presented their agreed views for the larger group to deliberate, leading to a consensus-building on the required action. The project leads ensured that the creation of the performance employed the lived reality of the people as the subject represented in the performance: this included the use of the peoples' language and their peculiar forms of expression, engaging local people as performers, and performing in the traditional way, which is the open-air manner of African performance. The entire creative process, too, rested on the people's eagerness because it was not based on a

prepared script but a plot-line agreed upon by the actors with lots of improvisation. As Byram and Kidd state, "this approach work{ed} well precisely because the actors are familiar with the issues and the situations they are presenting and develop their dialogue, gesture, and action in response to each other and the audience, rather than having to remember a fixed script" (1978:172). We can also appreciate the entire process through David Kerr's review of the Laedza Batanani project.

> The Laedza Batanani model of Theater for Development consisted of a workshop (usually of about two weeks) held in the target area. Community workers researched the developmental problems of that area, created plays through collective improvisation which highlighted some of the issues at stake, and performed the plays for the community to stimulate discussion, leading to community action that would hopefully overcome the development constraints (Kerr, 1991:59)

Generally speaking, the Laedza Batanani campaign yielded some positive results. In the context of the work done in the country, the project helped solve a problem that, for a long time, the extension workers and government had not been able to solve. The consensus was that the campaign helped reverse the level of apathy and restored the importance of the *Kgotla* in the communities. It also helped the people appreciate the role of local performance traditions in social mobilization and non-formal education. Through the medium of engagement and deliberations, their evaluation also revealed they could help community people reexamine their lives and turn over a new leaf at the behavioural change level. The people began attending clinics regularly due to the campaign, and draconian laws, such as the cattle theft law, were amended. (Kidd and Byram, 1979)

Additionally, because Laedza Batanani was regarded as a success, other groups, departments and agencies in Botswana began experimenting with the method. Kidd and Byram summarize the achievement of the project below:

> The success of Laedza Batanani has encouraged other groups of development workers in Botswana to experiment with this approach. Three other districts are using popular theatre as part of integrated NFE campaigns. Puppetry and discussion have become a new technique for the Ministry of Agriculture's mobile campaign teams…In the remote rural areas socio -drama, performed by the participants themselves, is being used in conscientizing exploited cattle workers and other underprivileged groups (e.g. Basarwa). In the towns, popular theatre is being considered as one medium in

> communication support programmes for squatter area upgrading projects. A national inter-agency committee has been formed to promote the development of popular theatre educational work in Botswana…The University's Institute of Adult Education is largely responsible for the training required. Under their leadership, the committee is currently planning a two-week national workshop (May 1978) for representatives from all extension agencies, districts, and towns. It is expected this will stimulate further popular theatre initiatives all over Botswana (Kidd and Byram, 1978:175).

This shows how the Laedza Batanani approach managed to gain a foothold in the country and subsequently diffused TfD praxis to other neighbouring countries through workshops in other countries and also because of their network with other adult educators, international organizations and universities.

Notwithstanding these achievements, the project leaders themselves identified some methodological and practical shortcomings in their approach. From the project's onset, they indicated that they were following Paulo Freire's theory and concept as delineated in his theory of "education for critical consciousness". This aim was not achieved in totality. Their implementation did not follow religiously how Freire conceptualized most of the critical concepts in his theory. While the program aimed to increase the participation of the local people in the development process, they were not integrated from the conception of the project to the end—a clear violation of the concept of participation in Freire's terms. When the project was conceptualized at the university, the community people were not involved in the planning and execution of the maiden project. Instead, some extension workers and government people met and decided what the community needed based on a top-down agenda. Here, the notion of participation, dialogue, and action, as established by Freire, was not followed.[3]

Context in Africa

Generally, the Laedza Batanani model is considered the beginning of contemporary TfD, and it can be credited with some of its practical and theoretical underpinnings. For example, some of the conventions that have become an integral part of TfD were introduced during the Laedza Batanani project. One such idea is Freire's concepts in the context of individual and community development. The project's initiators were familiar with Freire's ideas because they were experts in adult education. They were also conversant with his works in Latin America and

[3] Lee Dale Byam (1999) did a comprehensive review of the Laedza Batanani project based on Freire's concept.

other parts of the world. In order to achieve their aim of reducing apathy, they resorted to Freire's philosophy of education for critical consciousness. Byram and Kidd believed that the ideas had the potential to get the people involved in their development processes. Hence, the claim that Freire's theories and works are the beginnings of TfD Africa.

The methodology employed in Botswana for the duration of the Laedza Batanani project is another significant contribution that the project made in the evolutionary process of the TfD movement. It became the basic template for the practice of TfD in Africa and the Global South. This happened through intellectual exchanges by means of workshops and practical demonstrations. The method follows the sequence of research, data gathering, analysis, improvisation, performance, and post-performance discussion. By the end of the project in 1978, the initiators started insisting that extension workers pay attention to follow-up as an integral part of the process, which was adopted by many countries, with some countries adapting it to suit their local circumstances. It gradually started to be improved because some of the countries varied it for effective project results. In essence, the methodology that became widespread throughout Africa in the early stages of the evolution and diffusion of TfD can be credited to the Laedza Batanani experiment in Botswana.

Additionally, it was leaders of the Laedza Batanani project who started the collaborative initiatives that spearheaded the diffusion of the TfD concept and methods using the workshop format. The first such workshop to which practitioners and academics from other countries were invited took place in 1988. It is referred to as the Molepolepo regional TfD workshop (Kerr, 1995:153) and brought together theatre experts and popular theatre practitioners from some selected southern African regions. This became the avenue for disseminating the method both internally within countries and externally beyond countries and continents. It became, in the historiography of TfD, the first intercountry field configuring event that helped in the diffusion and the institutionalization of TfD in higher education intuitions and its adaptation as a development communication tool and methodology.

ZAMBIA

The stark similarity between Zambia, Zimbabwe and South Africa is how their respective indigenous cultures were relegated to the margins during colonization. This was done through the enforcement of a policy of separatism. However, for Zambia, the spark that brought culture, in this context, theatre and development together in a symbiotic relationship, is the lifeline that was given by Kenneth Kaunda's national humanism ideology, 1969 to 1979. The philosophy

offered an avenue for establishing a mutual relationship between politics, theatre and culture in the course of social transformation.

Therefore, when discussing the history of Zambian theatre today, one must look at three different forms: two which are distinct from each other and existed during the colonial era and the other an attempt at hybridization which manifested in creative works of the citizens during and after independence, especially with the launch of the idea of Zambian humanism. The first is the traditional performing arts of the people, which for a long time was confined predominantly to rural areas and, to some degree, among cultural groups in the urban centres. The second type can be described as "expatriate theatre' or "western theatre". It is that which is solely western-inspired and akin to the theatrical productions on Broadway or in the British West End. It was mainly based on classic or modern plays by established western playwrights. The third category can be described as contemporary Zambian theatre that deals with the struggle and welfare of the Zambian people. It reflects life, experience and utilizes Zambian indigenous cultural expressions (Chifunyise, 1977:4-8). The first two existed side by the side during colonialism. However, the traditional performing arts did not receive any support from colonial administrators. The last form of theatre, which is much more contemporary, mainly developed after independence. The support they received from officialdom differed. Each type of theatre mentioned above was popular with a different demographic.

The Northern Rhodesian government and the copper mining companies, which represented the colonial regime in Zambia, began vigorously promoting and building western-style theatres in the copper mining towns in response to the growing number of expatriates recruited from Europe, the United States of America and South Africa to work in the copper mining industries and the colonial administration. Each of the towns had a standard theatre with well-equipped facilities. These theatres could be found "along the railway tracks from the Copperbelt in the North to the terminal of Livingstone in the South" (Epskamp, 1992:111). Building these theatres was a way of offering a balanced life to the expatriates so that they may feel "a taste of home" or, in David Pownall (1973:49) words "it gives life to the fantasy of the homeland being transportable". The theatres were able to attract donations, grants and support from the colonial administration and the copper mining companies to the extent that they were able to invite a number of drama groups and opera companies from Britain to perform. In fact, some of the theatre companies were able to recruit solely British actors, directors and technicians to work full time in their theatres, such was the climate that led to the proliferation of all white drama clubs and opera companies in the 1940s and 1950s. The black people, however, continue

to perform their traditional forms of theatre in the rural areas. Where black people were engaged in theatre in the urban areas, this only happened if it was based on western art forms.

In 1951, all the European drama clubs came together to form what became known as the Northern Rhodesian Drama and Choir Association (NRDA). They organized annual festivals with foreign personnel as adjudicators. The first adjudicator of the festival was brought from South Africa, the following ones from Britain. In 1958, a British professional producer by the name of Adrian Stanley was brought to run theatre workshops for six months with the aim of improving the standard of acting and production for the drama clubs. As a result of this, he was made the adjudicator of the festival that year. Equally important is the fact that that same year, the Northern Rhodesian Theatre Association merged with the Southern Rhodesian Theatre Association to form the Federal Theatre League. This organization eventually became a member of the International Amateur Theatre Association (IATA). In fact, these umbrella organizations "were part of the colonial establishments and were used to propagate European culture and to stimulate the enforcement of racial segregation in the colony" (Idoye, 1996:65). However, John Houghton's multiracial group, the Waddington theatre club, became a member of the all-white theatre association after a long debate among its executives in 1960. Although, they were made to conform to the strict European criteria that all members must follow, this singular act and the group's subsequent winning of that year's annual festival created favourable conditions for questioning theatre organized along racial lines.

Moreover, after independence, the story began to change. The fervour that came with the humanism agenda of the government swept through all departments of the state. In the rural areas, this took the form of the transformation of their agricultural work, especially by adopting the cooperative and other innovative approaches preached on the back of the humanism ideology. The government agencies started restructuring to ensure meritocracy and efficiency. In summary, all departments and agencies under the government were active in promoting the philosophy because of the desire of the government to balance traditional life and knowledge with development. They sought to look within their culture for inspiration and ideas for national development. They also consciously tried to do away with the class structure created by the colonial encounter.

In spite of what was happening all over the country during that time, the NDRA that metamorphosed into the Theatre Association of Zambia (TAZ) continued in its old ways. They were still following the strict European theatre tradition, continuing to focus on producing and

staging European plays with expatriate actors, although open to all Zambians. It was not until 1963 that another organization (Zambian Arts Trust) was formed with the mandate to encourage the development of indigenous arts. Around this time, the university community also created their channel of contributing to the development of new theatrical culture in the country. This was the beginning of the Chikwakwa travelling theatre of the University of Zambia.

Chikwakwa Travelling Theatre

Although it is true that independence in most African countries came with changes in all sectors in a country, this was not, however, reflected in any significant way in the theatre space in Zambia. The status quo continued and the dominance of the white clubs entrenched because they did not cede the management of their theatres to the government. The only thing that existed in most white theatre clubs was concessionary membership for blacks. Chifunyise observes that the policy of concessional membership "meant that black people could be considered members as long as the play under production required black characters. After such performances, their membership was terminated" (1977:112). As a result, the university became the major point of departure from the prevailing circumstance. It began to showcase the richness of popular theatre by presenting productions devoid of elitism that used indigenous culture and mores as their resource.

This was done through the University of Zambia Dramatic Society (UNZADRAM), which was formed in 1966. Their guiding principle was the creation and production of theatre for the masses, theatre that all Zambians could attend and appreciate. In fact, this idea did not really become truly concretized and widely conventional until 1968. UNZADRAM became the standard for the people and a destabilizing group for the white theatre establishment. Albeit UNZADRAM, from its beginnings, participated in the activities of TAZ, it was palpable that they had contrasting ideologies. They constantly disagreed on how things should be done and what should be staged. Even so, it is reasonable to assume that this was a strategy to see how they (UNZADRAM) could effect change from within. However, it did not last because the constant criticism from UNZADRAM led to the two organizations falling out in 1971. It should be noted here that earlier, before the disagreement between the two organizations, some members of UNZADRAM expressed dissatisfaction about its association with TAZ. One of its notable radical and gifted artists by the name of Masautso Phiri left UNZADRAM to form his own theatre club because of their association with TAZ.

Fortunately, before the relationship between UNZADRAM and TAZ ended, Michael Etherton and Andrew Horn started the Chikwakwa travelling theatre. This was propelled by two major developments: the establishment of a drama course at the English Department in 1970 and the building of an open-air theatre with the backing of the University, faculty and drama students 4 kilometres from the University Campus. This theatre building was named Chikwakwa Theatre, and thanks to Chikwakwa, the country came to appreciate that with the right implements, one can create "standard" drama by using indigenous resources, and given the right circumstances, the ordinary people will welcome theatre of any shade with enthusiasm. This became the thrust of the Chikwakwa movement and guided the philosophy of their exploits and achievements.

As a theatre movement, their two main goals were to create experimental productions using African indigenous resources for theatre audiences on campus and in the city and to tour rural communities with productions that the people could relate to easily. Soon, the methods changed to creating drama with the people, which expressed itself in their drama workshop formats. A strong argument in favour of their experiment was made by Etherton (1971:2) when he observed that Chikwakwa theatre was "more than an open-air theatre building in the bush near Lusaka; it is a commitment to the development of theatre in Zambia from existing cultural roots as they manifest in the performing arts and rituals". He also commented elsewhere that " the main aim of the experimentation in Zambia is to get the audience and actors in a joint exploration of the potential of the new aesthetic, the basis of which is the addition of certain elements like dialogue and uncertainty of outcome to the traditional performing situation" (Etherton, 1973:48).

It is noteworthy that Chikwakwa was not the first organization to start experimenting with travelling theatre, neither were they the first to start drama workshops. They fed into an existing phenomenon and enhanced its visibility in the country. Etherton confirms this when he writes that "what he found interesting in the country was the widespread existence of touring companies producing plays among the people-frequently political, and entirely self-contained, without any whites around at all-in fact, almost consciously kept a secret from them" (1973:44). There were also workshops that predated Chikwakwa, such as the 1969 Kasama Theatre Workshop organized by the department of extra-mural studies and several theatre workshops

for Africans by the Northern Rhodesia Youth Council.[4] Chikwakwa, however, continued the tradition that had already been established by the ordinary people themselves and, in line with the humanism agenda, explored a number of subjects that directly affected the people. Their workshops gave many people the opportunity to understand and appreciate the rudiments of production, acting and management. These led to the proliferation of theatres club that were led by Zambians and created within the philosophy of Chikwakwa, such as Bazmai Theatre, Tikwiza theatre, and Takita Theatre Company.

Some of these groups began merging development issues into their performances, which eventually gained the support of NGOs and aid agencies. Even the National Immunization campaigns began employing drama in their information dissemination programs. Most of these initiatives supported by the Zambian aid organizations set the stage for the launch of TfD in the country by the end of the 1970s. This became the basis of the Chalimbana TfD workshop of 1979, which can be considered the first truly international TfD workshop and which highlights the manner in which TfD began to spread to other parts of Africa.

Chalimbana TfD workshop

Although a regional workshop, it was the first major international TfD workshop in the history of the praxis in Africa. This event set the stage for how the Laedza Batanani methodology method started spreading, first in the region and then throughout Africa. From 18th August to 1st September 1979, dramatists, students, adult educators and development workers, particularly health and agricultural workers from different parts of the world, gathered in Chalimbana, a community situated 34km from Lusaka Zambia. In all, there were sixty-nine participants, fifty-seven were from Zambia, and the other twelve were from other countries, such as Tanzania, Lesotho, Botswana, Canada and the United States of America. Some of the names associated with Laedza Batanani present at the workshop are Ross Kidd and Martin Byram, and the Tanzanian participants included Amandina Lihamba and Eberhard Chambulikazi. The director of the Negro Ensemble Company of New York, Douglas Turner-Ward, was also present. The funds for the workshop were provided by a number of organizations - The Canadian University Service Overseas (CUSO), the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, the United National

[4] This is to establish the fact that the idea of conducting a drama workshop did not start with Chikwakwa or their leaders. For more on the many theatre workshops and their histories, see Chifunyise, 1977; Kamlongera, 1989; and Epskamp, 1992.

Independence Party (UNIP), the Ministry of Education, to mention a few. The workshop was initiated and organized by the Zambian International Theatre Institute (ZITI) and coordinated by the staff of the University of Zambia (Chifunyise et al. 1979:2-3).

The reasoning that propelled ZITI to initiate the project was that extension workers all over the country were looking for new ways of engaging their constituents because of the enormity of the country's developmental needs. They were dissatisfied with the existing modes of communication between them and the people they served. They observed that although the extension workers had employed drama in some of their earlier works (in the '60s and '70s), they had not achieved the needed effect. One of the reasons ascribed to this was the lack of expertise of the extension workers on how to use theatre for extension works properly. (Chifunyise et al., 1980:1). They also came to the reasonable conclusion that the approach of the travelling theatres like Chikwakwa, theatre clubs, and theatre companies varied and were a departure from the kind of methods the extension workers were trained to use in dealing with the masses. Thus, there was a need for a TfD workshop that would bridge the gap by helping both disciplines learn from each other (Chifunyise, 1979:8). This motivation was reflected in the aim of the workshop, which was:

> -To bring together theatre practitioners from East, Central and Southern Africa so that they may exchange, develop and apply their skills to help solve problems of rural development in their countries.
>
> -To stimulate awareness among participants of the relevance of theatre arts to the problems of the community and the individual in the development of their own communities.
>
> -To identify problem areas in rural development that can be gainfully evaluated and researched for future planning and organization, which should involve the application of skills and insights derived from performing arts. (Chifunyise, 1979:8)

The methodology followed the same tradition as that employed by Laedza Batanani in Botswana. They identified a community, researched the community to identify their challenges, came back to discuss it, after which they created a performance that they toured to perform in the various communities. After the performance, they had post-performance discussions, which the organizers insisted on in all the places where they performed.

A number of art forms were employed in this workshop. Each participant was assigned a group based largely on his or her expertise and area of competence. This is why there were different performances for different communities. One group created their performance based on drama, another on dance and the third group solely on puppetry. The most interesting aspect of the workshop was that "it was generally agreed that the Chalimbana workshop was not an ideal sample of Theatre for Development work. Delegates were expected only to see it as a demonstration of the capabilities of this work" (Kamlongera, 1989:215). The participants also tasked the ITI with liaising with government agencies so that more workshops could take place. In fact, the ITI, in their final report, indicated that they had already approved projects in six provinces in Zambia (Chifunyise et al., 1980:57). ZITI can be said to have become the centre of activity in relation to the diffusion of the TfD concept and methodology in Zambia. Nevertheless, since most ITI branches do not have a steady budget, it would be interesting to see how this responsibility turned out in the long run: a task that is not within the scope of the present study.

Context in Africa

The climate of nationalism that was created by the pursuit of the humanism agenda in Zambia is the main policy decision that changed the cultural and development landscape in the country after independence. On the one hand, this proclamation gave the needed impetus for indigenous initiatives to prosper and thereby to make the Africans a part of the development aspirations of their country. It repositioned indigenous contribution and local people's participation in the nation's progress from the periphery to the centre and made the people an integral part of the socio-cultural and economic development of the country. On the other, it helped bring theatre to the forefront and empower people who believed in using and experimenting with a hybrid resource to create the kind of theatre that people from different cultural persuasions could appreciate.

Because the underlining principle of the humanism agenda as espoused by Kenneth Kaunda's regime was the harnessing and advancing of local customs and culture, the Chikwakwa example of creating theatre for, with and by the people became one of the high points in the cultural landscape. The experiment helped train cultural agents and change-makers at the university and in the communities. It further created a fertile ground for the integration of TfD practices in development initiatives. Through the Chikwakwa experiments, the people became increasingly aware of the potency of theatre in behavioural and social change. Besides, the

initiative also helped create a number of theatre practitioners who became conscious of using their craft and expertise for the socio-political and economic development of their country.

In a wider African context, the Zambian situation can be considered as the beginning of the diffusion of TfD methodology and the standardization of the praxis, because it was the first time that a conscious effort was made by another country to adopt the methodology employed in Botswana during the Laedza Batanani project in the framework of their nation's progress. It can also be regarded as the place where the internationalization of the genre began because it was the "first major international workshop on theatre for development" (Byam, 1999:56). At this Chalimbana 1979 workshop, people from eastern, central and southern parts of Africa were invited to be part of the entire process. Those who were involved in the Botswana case study participated as resource persons. Others from neighbouring countries were invited to contribute their experience and help in the practical evaluation of the methodology. That is why the theoretical part of the workshop discussed the scope, methodology and elements that foreground the nature of TfD praxis. Most of this part of the workshop was led by the leaders and initiators of the Laedza Batanani project in Botswana.

The alliance between TfD practice, practitioners and international organizations also began with the conceptualization and execution of the Chalimbana TfD workshop. The rallying entity behind the organization of the workshop was the Zambian International Theatre Institute (ZITI), one of the oldest African members of the International Theatre Institute (ITI). The funds for the organization of the workshop also came from four different international donor agencies, as stated earlier. This pattern of funding TfD workshops would manifest in other workshops in many African countries. It is safe to assume that this workshop firmly established the relationship between the donor agencies and TfD practitioners. It also introduced the TfD methodology to some donors and development agencies. The number of international organizations involved grew from one in the case of Laedza Batanani to four in the case of Chalimbana.

In summary, the evolution and diffusion of TfD in Zambia cannot be separated from the way in which its theatre landscape was shaped from colonial times to the post-independence era. The internationalization of the theatre during colonial times exposed theatre practitioners in the country to international collaborations, which was carried on to post-colonial times. That ZITI was the main organization that spearheaded the diffusion of TfD is worth highlighting and a testimony to this fact. The expansive network of being part of ITI is a strength that the Zambian

situation because it allowed them to know what was happening elsewhere. It also gave them access to funding agencies that were likely to deal with local organizations with an international outlook.

TANZANIA

Among all the case studies selected for this study, Tanzania presents a unique scenario. They seem to have had the ground prepared for them for a seamless embrace of TfD praxis. The country's political history, especially after independence, provided a suitable climate for experimenting and institutionalising TfD in their higher education. They had vibrant local systems that ensured the integration of traditional values in all aspects of the country's formal and informal education. Kiswahili being their official language made it easy for both the literate and illiterate to appreciate theatre and the experiments by the higher education art institutions. Even during colonialism, remnants of their traditional repertoires were seen as a developed art form that had the space to flourish together with the colonial forms of theatre (Mlama, 1991 :). The main similarity with the development of theatre in other African countries is that the shift towards TfD happened by means of taking theatre to the people and using theatre for social change and development. The former was short-lived while the latter still exists. Even in taking theatre to the people, Tanzania had a peculiar structuring that was different from other African countries.

The two types of theatre noted above belong to the category of theatres considered as grassroots. Furthermore, because these two types of grassroots theatre movements happened in the sixties and eighties, their flourishing can be placed within the political developments in the country at the time. The concept of taking theatre to the people, which is a bit different from what is usually referred to as travelling theatre, found favour in the wake of the Arusha Declaration and the conscious proselytization of the socialist ideology in the system. It was not English based and, from its inception, chose the people's mode of communication as its aesthetic of presentation. On the other hand, the TfD movement, which became the rallying praxis for the theatre for social change and development, burgeoned when the Arusha declaration and its ideological manifestations became doubtful and rendered the people disillusioned, leading them to begin the search for alternative pathways to development.

Like elsewhere in Africa, the dominant theatre styles from pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial times reflect the country's historical trajectories. Hence, the development of theatre is often related to and paired with historical epochs in the country. Most of the time, the ruling

class promotes a specific type of theatre to the detriment of other types. However, the theatre in Tanzania cannot be classified according to developments in one historical period. As can be deduced in most African societies, there is no linear progression from one era to the next. What can be said of the Tanzanian situation is that the effects and ramifications of the various historical developments played a vital role in developing both conventional and non-conventional forms of theatre. To a large extent, the art scene was a case of constant borrowing and resistance between diverse ideologies and undercurrents that existed side by side and influenced one another. This unique feature manifests in all the socio-cultural life of the people and reflects their cosmological worldview and their conscious manoeuvrings from pre-colonial to colonial and post-colonial.

The history of theatre in Tanzania from pre-colonial times to the modern era has received considerable attention from researchers in works such as those by Hussein (1975), Mlama (1983), Lihamaba (1986), and Mlama (1986). They have discussed these historical transitions and their varied manifestations. These works capture, in essence, the popular base on which the indigenous performance traditions were elevated and integrated into the formal and non-formal education systems from pre-colonial times. They also deal with the politics of performance space during colonialism, the transformation of indigenous forms into full-fledged theatre, with some subsequently being described as workers theatre after independence, and finally, the complexities of different genres that developed from all these historical factors (Mlama, 1991:97-99).

The year 1967 began the shift into what can be considered a new era which is paramount to this research. It is significant not only for the redefinition of politics in the country but also for a total transformation of culture, which provided the foundation for strategically positioning theatre for social change and development. Many events changed the socio-cultural scene and created the necessary conditions for the evolution and diffusion of TfD in the country. The main event can be found in the Arusha Declaration, which Lihamba (1985:58) argues is not a single event but "a set of policy proclamations given from February to September 1967". This series of proclamations is regarded as an attempt by the political class to provide the needed foundation for the socialist reengineering that the country was undertaking. The policies that came to be described as the Arusha declaration include Socialism and Self-Reliance (5th February 1967), Education for Self-Reliance (March 1967) and Socialism and Rural Development (September 1967).

All three policies emphasised the need for self-reliance in all aspects of people's lives. They were also steeped in socialist ideology, although from an African perspective. For this study, education for self-reliance and socialism for rural development are the policies that are of benefit to theatre and TfD directly. They provided the base and political reasons for theatre scholars to create within the ideology. They also allowed performing arts scholars to use theatre techniques as an avenue for education, community development, and cultural development.

The development of the two types of people-centred theatre mentioned earlier imbricates the implementation of the Arusha Declaration and the disillusionment that engulfed the country sometime after. Therefore, it is not a contradiction to state that "within these two levels of reality lies both the source material of theatre practice after 1967 as well as the explanation behind the nature of theatre response after the Arusha Declaration" (Lihamba, 1985:59). Accordingly, within these historical events, the artists and cultural actors shaped the philosophical and theoretical tactics that helped them contribute to the implementation of these policies and found a way out when the populace started showing their misgivings about the effect of the implementation of *Ujamaa*.[5]

The Arusha Declaration, which was the outcome of the meeting of the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), emphasised three broad aspects: the consolidation of freedom and creating the appropriate environment for implementing African socialism; doing away with all forms of exploitation and moral vices including poverty, ignorance and diseases; and ensuring human rights and the promotion of African Unity (Lihamba, 1985:59-60). These ideals were embedded in all aspects of the people's lives, which eventually led to all European forms of theatre and aesthetics disappearing from the country's stages and academic institutions (Mlama, 1991:99). The climate began the revolution that led to the production of plays mainly in the official language, Kiswahili, and entrenching of indigenous mores in all creative endeavours of all artists, and educational institutions in the country. It is reported that:

> even the elite who had been significantly alienated from their indigenous theatre and trained to promote only English theatre responded positively to the country’s socialist aspirations. Even when using European theatre conventions, they embarked on an

[5] This is a concept coined by Julius K. Nyerere to mean familyhood or kinship. He, however, saw it as a state of mind in which the people care about one another. It is the concept of African socialism that guided the entire Arusha declaration. For more about the concept, see (Nyerere, 1977)

> attempt to build up a theatre movement that will answer to the demands of the new society (Mlama, 1991:100).

This created the requisite environment for the triumph of all theatre types that used familiar local conventions and indigenous resources. It also led to the use of theatre for propaganda purposes. As a result, many state and parastatal entities began to form theatre groups, and even village governments also created their own groups. The underlying purpose for all these groups was to propagate the *Ujamaa* concept and support the socialist policies of the government.

By the late seventies, the economic conditions began to change, things became unsettled, and the people started asking questions. A close inspection of the situation suggests that the economic hardship and its resultant effects did not favour the political, but neither did it favour the culture. This uncertainty was not only peculiar to Tanzania but to the whole of Africa (Makoye, 2008:108). It resulted in critical artworks and theatre that assessed the events critically at the time. It also led to:

> a concerted effort by the University in search of a theatre movement suited to the realities of the new society. By 1980, the theatre artist at the University realised that even though their research into traditional Tanzanian theatre forms and their experiments in production had created a solid theatre movement there was still a need to direct this movement towards answering the needs of the people at the grass root level (Mlama, 1991:106).

The prevailing conditions led them to experiment with and adopt TfD. They hoped that this would promote the needs of the people instead of propagating the ideas of the ruling elites. Moreover, they were convinced that "the people need{ed} to use theatre which they already possessed to communicate and analyse their developmental problems especially in the face of the economic crisis" (Mlama, 1991:106). Therefore, the progression towards TfD can be linked to first the travelling theatre initiatives in the sixties (solely based on taking European plays to the people). Moreover, they took theatre to the people in the late sixties and seventies (solely based on local resources and customs) and the theatre geared towards social change and development that flourished in the eighties. All these movements can be understood within the cultural climate that the Arusha Declaration created for experimentation in the country.

The TfD Workshops

TfD in Tanzania was primarily driven by the higher education institutions in the country. Most of the earlier projects were led by personnel from the University of Dar es Salaam, Bagamoyo College of Art and some cultural workers. Leading names associated with these initiatives are Penina Mlama, Amandina Lihamba, Eberhard Chambulikazi, and John Masanja, who served as animateurs in most of the initial workshops that defined and shaped the praxis in the country.

These animateurs had had a chance to participate in workshops in other parts of Africa, such as the Botswana workshop in 1978 and Chalimbana, Zambia in 1979. Amandina Lihamba indicates that "it was from these two events that Tanzanian workshop participants returned to organise similar activities within the country". She further states that their reason for starting this grassroots movement was because:

> The failure of developmental efforts after independence urged some Tanzanians to look at theatre as a possible partner in addressing serious socio-political and economic problems. The intensification of poverty and the problem of corruption, and, in spite of the Arusha Declaration, the inability of the state and its organs to build up and sustain an infrastructure that would be responsive to the needs of the majority (2004:245).

Because they had had the experience of seeing and exchanging ideas with other animateurs in other countries, they looked to avoid the shortcomings of other projects in organising their own. They generally saw the need to integrate the people into the whole project life cycle. However, they understood that it was not in their place to decide the issues that needed urgent attention or choose a medium of communication. They, therefore, sought to experiment with an approach that recognised the capacity of the people, one that had confidence that the local people understood their needs better than the outsiders who might not have even set foot in the communities before. In 1980, they started to set the stage for the evolution and institutionalisation of TfD in many TfD projects initiated in the country.

From 1980 to 1990, these pioneers embarked on projects in different communities, including Malya in Mwanza region, Bagamoyo and Msoga in the coast region, six villages in Tanga region, Mkambalani in Morogoro region, Newala in Mtwara region and in Mtwara. This led to the development of courses on TfD by the University of Dar es Salaam and Bagamoyo College of Art. In addition, they used the various project areas for on-site training for the students and further research for the faculty (Lihamba, 2004:245).

Objectives and Methodology

Although it was implemented later, the Tanzanian template followed a similar format to that of Botswana and Zambia. The processes included research and problem analysis, theatre, post-performance discussion with the audience and follow-up action. The animateurs "aimed at making people use theatre as a means through which they could participate in initiating, discussing, analysing and evaluating their own development process" (Mlama, 1991:100). Their main focus was the exploitation of "theatre as a participatory communication medium in posing developmental problems, create{ing} political and social awareness amongst the participants and seek{ing} solutions to the selected problems" (Lihamba, 1985:455). They believed that the people needed to actively reaffirm their role as subjects and not passively as objects of their development, so they should be involved in the process from conception to execution and the follow-up action. It was apparent from the beginning that the people owned the project and took initiatives at different stages in the project life span before the animateurs entered the community and before their return to the community after the final performance.

There was no language problem between the animateurs and the community. The village had hosted several village theatre groups in the past, so the community relied on most of the performers to form the Village Core Group (VCG). The research phase was easy because the people, in anticipation of the arrival of the animateurs, had arranged a performance on teenage pregnancy without the knowledge of the animateurs. After the performance, the animateurs used the opportunity to divide the community members present into three groups. Penina Mlama, Amandina Lihamba, and Eberhard Chambulikazi led the discussion with each group to first ascertain whether the issues the performance dealt with reflected their reality. They also used it as a platform to start their research and then proceeded to other areas of the village with the VCG as the core of the team for information gathering and research. The advantage was that the VCG knew the community and could guide the animateurs to ensure that they covered many households and parts of the village.

After the information gathering and research, they invited the people from the village and the VCG to discuss and prioritise the issues for the next phase, the theatre process, because they did not want a few people to decide for the community. They wanted it to be a broad-based decision that the majority of the people could claim ownership of. When the issues to focus on for the project had been decided collectively, they scheduled a day for rehearsal to start the performance creation. When the day came, more than 100 people showed up. The animateurs

did not turn anyone away, nor did they prevent them from being part of the creation process. Every person present had the right to contribute, comment and suggest a change in the performance creation process. They used indigenous dances and music for warm-ups and employed other local arts throughout the process. It was a conscious effort on the part of the animateurs not to introduce any theatrical concept that the people were not accustomed to in their daily existence. They believed the indigenous and local performance resources had the prerequisites for accomplishing their task.

On the day of the performance itself, more than 600 people showed up. After the performance, they had discussions and decided on the actions to take. At every project site, the community people present at the performance were divided into groups so that they could have the chance to contribute to the discussion and help shape the decisions. The last phase of the Tanzanian model was follow-up action, which was not a one-time event but a continuous process. They established a routine check-up on the progress made in the communities and helped identify the next phase of the project or the next issue that needed to be tackled. Another innovation here is that the University used the communities as a lab-site for its students, thereby ensuring frequent follow-up visits. When issues arose during this follow-up period, they offered an opportunity to begin the entire process again, focusing on a new issue.

Context in Africa

The Tanzanian situation can be considered as an enhancement of the previously discussed case studies. Here, the animateurs added a different dimension to the TfD methodology and conspicuously began the institutionalisation of TfD in higher education in Tanzania. Having participated in the first two workshops of TfD in Botswana and Zambia, the Tanzanian animateurs had the benefit of analysing the shortcomings of the methodology as employed in the two countries and thereby improving on it. Unlike the earlier case studies, they recognised that "the challenge of development strategies in the developing countries lies not in the integration of any culture, but rather in the integration of the culture of the dominated classes" (Mlama,1991:203). Perhaps the advantage they had comes from two aspects that helped the acceptance of their initiative and the way the idea of TfD was embraced and implemented in higher education institutions and communities. First, they were local people, meaning the entire process was initiated not by expatriates as in Botswana, and secondly, they were theatre scholars who understood their traditional theatrical traditions. This made it easier for them to engage the people by employing indigenous theatrical forms.

The acknowledgement of the people's way of life as the beginning of any transformation is another strength and contribution of the Tanzanian case study. The animateurs made the participation of the people a fundamental aspect of the process. The emphasis on seeing things from the people's perspective meant recognising individual and communal agency in deciding what their priorities were and how they wanted to tackle them. In this, they departed from the approach adopted in Botswana and Zambia. Instead, they emphasised the need for the people concerned to have a stake in deciding their community's direction and environmental needs. They also deepened the participatory aspect, which eventually contributed to the epistemic debates about the nature of participation required in TfD projects and programs.

Another innovation that the Tanzanian animateurs brought to the TfD movement was the nature of their TfD program at the University of Dar es Salaam, in which they integrated the theoretical aspect with the practical. Most of their projects sites served as training grounds for the students studying TfD in the institution. This created a situation where there was a continuous and consistent follow-up of the projects. It also made the evaluation of the project and the development process initiated in the communities through the project manageable. Since the project was also not on a short-term idea, it afforded the animateurs opportunity to step in when the need arose. This approach would be employed by other countries later in their development.

A closer inspection of the Tanzanian situation establishes a connection between successful projects and funding sources. The Tanzanian projects were funded locally and employed the community's resources, which placed the responsibility of sustaining the project on the people. In contrast, projects in other countries were tied to funds from donor agencies and were primarily geared towards the focus of the donor agency and not the needs of the people. The fact that the people contributed their human and economic resources to the process made the sustainability of TfD projects assured from the onset. In essence, the community owned the project and dictated how it was done with the guidance of the animateurs.

NIGERIA

Nigeria presents a complex and vibrant theatre scene from pre-colonial times through to colonial times and the present. The country has many rich and eclectic theatre traditions compared to some African countries. Nigeria had and still has an excellent theatrical representation on the African continent from oral, literary, and contemporary forms. As the most populous and one of the most dynamic countries in Africa, its theatre scene can be

described as a cultural tapestry, one that is constantly in search of new implements to construct new products. It is a heterogeneous country with a great deal of diversity, marked by the many linguistic, ethnic and religious groupings living and co-existing together within its boundaries. Their "performance spaces are a *mélange* of traditional and modern heritages, architecturally and in terms of content, styles, genres and forms" (Adelugba, Obafemi and Adeyemi, 2004:139). As Awam Amkpa observes, Nigeria has a "long story of human movements, incursions, displacements, intermixtures or successions of peoples, and of the impact of these on the beliefs, attitudes and social organisation of the various peoples who today inhabit this great area" (2003:77). For instance, Captain Hugh Clapperton described an event during his travel in Yoruba land on 22nd February 1826.

> It is the custom during the time that the caboceers from the different towns remain on their visit to the king to act plays or pantomimes… The first act consisted in dancing and tumbling… The second act consisted in catching the boa constrictor … The third act consisted of the white devil… They appeared indeed to enjoy this sight and the perfection of the actor's art… The spectators often appealed to us, as to the excellence of the performance … and certainly the actor burlesqued the part to admiration. (Clapperton, 1829: 53 as cite in Boscolo, 2010)

Christina Boscolo (2010:92), commenting on Clapperton's observation, indicates that the nature of the artistry and the level of skill described is common with all the egúngún aláré. The Yoruba peripatetic entertainers are referred to as alárìnjó or apidan. She based her claim on the fact that "already in the sixteenth century, *these performers* had become itinerant, and thus brought their performances with their astonishing transformations to towns and villages of the different Yorùbá kingdoms". Such is the tradition of performance scattered in all parts of the country. Among their well-developed and widely acclaimed popular indigenous forms of performances are:

> the Ekpe festival as a religious festival and dance drama, the Bori spirit mediumship as ritual drama, the Alárìnjó as traditional travelling theatre, the Adimu-Orisa (Eyo) funeral rites, the Gelede, the Kwagh-hir theatre, the Bornu puppet show, the Yankamanci Hausa comedy, the Ikaki Tortoise Masquerade, Ezeinogbe: Igbo masquerade play, the Okun-Okura Masquerade Ensemble, the Urhobo Udje Dance Performance and the Ozidi Saga (Adelugba, Obafemi and Adeyemi, 2004:140).

Such is the effervescence of traditional performances on the Nigerian stage that defy the logic of rigid categorisation, as is evident in the debates that continue to rage in the literary scene as to whether these performances are drama, theatre, ritual, or a new genre yet to be invented. (See Adedeji, 1971. 1981; Echeruo, 1981). This debate raged from the colonial period to contemporary times, albeit in different forms. It was at the heart of the disagreement that ensued during the colonial era among the churches who hitherto were supposed to be serving the agenda of their colonial masters. While some churches decried the use of indigenous art in worship, others felt that was the sure way to get the people to come to church, so they employed traditional dance, songs and related arts for their church service, a phenomenon that "encouraged native drama and gave it a purposeful sense of direction' (Gbileka, 1997: 10). Throughout this period, the traditional performances developed and survived all the theatrical movements in the country. They form the bedrock of most literary and community theatre experiments in Nigeria today.

Theatre for Development in Nigeria

The TfD movement in Nigeria developed around Samaru, Zaria in the 1970s and 1980s and was led by the drama students and lecturers at Ahmadu Bello University (ABU). It was conceived as a new creative space with the potential to empower and subvert. It was a challenge to tap into the innate capacity wielded by performance modes of indigenous traditions of rural Africa to confront the oppressed with the realities and significance of their oppression (Abah and Etherton, 1982:228). The focus was on the rural farmers, who were dealing with a myriad of issues which included but were not limited to land occupation and encroachment, lack of political awareness, education and health matters. The leading figures in TfD understood it to empower local agencies, communities, and the populace to begin the change they wanted to see by taking action themselves. They saw the initiative as an opportunity "at building relationships with less privileged section of the society surrounding the University" (Amkpa, 2003:95-96).

Most of the projects that ensued during this period happened under the label of the ABU Collective (ABUC). The leaders of the ABUC wanted a way to reach out to the communities in order to bridge the gap between the academy and the communities around them. Theatre, within the frame of the projects, was conceptualised "as a system of signification that could facilitate the transformation of groups of people into proactive communities willing to transcend their differences as they work to improve their lot in the nation"(Amkpa, 2003:96).

These experiments started with the arrival at the university of Michael Etherton, who had had experience in such experiments as a former director of the Chikwakwa theatre in Zambia, and Brian Crow, who also had significant experience with the Ugandan travelling theatre.

The Wassan Mainoma, Wasan Maska, Wasan Samaru and Wasan Borno community theatre projects, which took place in the predominantly Hausa areas, mark the beginning of the TfD movement in ABU, an initiative geared towards creating a kind of theatre that speaks to communal issues. The entire TfD program at ABU and, to a large extent in Nigeria as a whole can be summed up as follows: The Community Theatre Projects, the Samaru projects, and the Theatre for Integrated Development (TIDE), because it was ABU's method that most practitioners and higher education institutions in the country employed and adapted. The methods and manner of implementing these projects depict the progression of ABUC in creating an actual people-centred theatre. They also highlight how the different strands of TfD methodologies evolved over time at ABU and beyond. Notable figures who were integral in the evolution, institutionalisation and diffusion of TfD at ABU and subsequently in Nigeria are Michael Etherton, Brian Crow, Sandy Arkhurst, and later Steve Oga Abah, Saddique Balewa, Salihu Bappa, Tunde Lakoju, Iyovwuese Hagher, John Sanni Illah and Tar Ahura.

The community theatre or drama projects mark the beginning of the entire experiment. Here, the students went to the communities to gather information, analyse the information, create plays and perform them for the university audience. "The plays were not taken back to Samaru, to the people who had supplied the information — because the main purpose of the exercise was to teach the students improvisation techniques" (Abah and Etherton, 1982:224). The Samaru projects more or less followed the same path. The improvement here was that they validated their information and sought input from experts on campus. After all the performance creation through improvisation, they also took the performance back to the community. While the Samaru project was a training program for the first-year students and took its name from the village which served as the lab site for the project, the community projects were dedicated to training second-year students. However, the TIDE project took place in many parts of the country in collaboration with the government, NGOs and donor agencies. This third phase marks a change in the way TfD was taught and practised at ABU and in the nation as a whole.

Theatre for Development Workshops

There has been a long tradition of TfD workshops in Nigeria, beginning in the late seventies. The first was held in 1977 in the Soba district, along the Jos-Zaria road. Some of the workshops

that come directly under the term the “community theatre” are the Maska project of 1979, the Borno project of 1980 and the Tudun Sarki Project of 1981. Some of these projects attracted funding from organisations like the World Health Organization (WHO).

The workshops took a nationwide turn from the eighties, when other agencies and government departments partnered with higher education institutions to execute them. Most of these workshops were international because they had experienced international TfD/popular theatre experts, researchers and donor organisations participating and sharing experiences. With the help and support of the Benue State Council for Arts and Culture, the first of this series of workshops happened in Yandev, Benue State, in 1982. It was followed by the Katsina-Ala TfD workshop in 1983, also planned and funded by the Benue State Council for Arts and Culture. By this time, the college of education at Katsina-Ala had established itself as one of the leading higher education institutions teaching and running TfD projects in the country, thanks to Tar Ahura. Other institutions that developed TfD programs at that time include the University of Jos and the Kafanchan College of Education in Kaduna State.

Another is the Akpa district TfD workshop of 1989 organised by the Nigerian Popular Theatre Association (NPTA) and supported locally by the Directorate for Mass Mobilization for Social and Economic Recovery (MAMSER) at the office of the president of Nigeria, the Benue State MAMSER and the Nigerian Television Authority. Other international bodies that supported the workshop are the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (UNESCO), UNESCO Centrum Nederland, the World Association of Christian Communication (WACC), the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA), Canadian University Services Overseas (CUSO)-Nigeria, the Commonwealth Foundation and the German Foundation for International Development (DSE) (Abah, 1997:1).

Zaria Popular Theatre Alliance (ZAPTA)

The ABU collective, after a number of years spent engaging communities, morphed into an organisation known as the Zaria Popular Theatre Alliance (ZAPTA). In 1987, the ABU Collective and five other groups, including the Muna Fata from Palladan, So Dangi from Hayin Dogo, Haske from Samaru, and the drama wing of the feminist group Women in Nigeria, teamed up to form an organisation. They embarked on monthly workshops to spread the practice and mythologies where the groups were based. "The workshops entailed training and researching performance and cultural traditions of the local communities as well as identifying key regional social and developmental issues" (Amkpa, 2003:104). Ampka further states that

it was not compulsory for students at the University or the department to join the group but was mandatory for the lecturers teaching Popular Theatre and Community Theatre related courses.

The success of ZAPTA led to the formation of a national network of TfD practitioners and community-based theatre artists known as the Nigerian Popular Theatre Alliance (NPTA). Most of the work that ZAPTA engaged in centred on health, poverty the living conditions of marginalised Nigerians. Amkpa says that the most significant achievement of ZAPTA is that "its large-scale community work drew national attention to ABU's drama program, legitimating the practice of "Theatre for Development" as an academic discipline and a forum for activist theatre training" (Amkpa, 2003:97).

Nigerian Popular Theatre Alliance (NPTA)

In 1987, an ethnoreligious conflict ensued in Zaria that led to the truncation of the programs and successes of ZAPTA. The crisis, however, did not deter the TfD enthusiasts. They saw it as an opportunity to use their expertise to contribute to changing the prevailing conditions. To this end, Steve Oga Abah and Jenkeri Okwori began a new movement. They understood that the nature of TfD is such that it triumphs in times of crisis. Its purpose is to help marginalised communities and individuals in crisis find homegrown solutions to better their circumstances. This led to the birth of a much broader nationwide network of TfD practitioners named the Nigerian Popular Theatre Alliance (NPTA). By the end of the eighties, they were able to rally the support of practitioners from all over the country to be part of the organisation. NPTA became officially incorporated as an NGO in 1989. The organisation consists of a secretariat and zonal coordinators who represent six zones of the country. The secretariat is made up of the executive director, deputy executive director, secretary and treasurer. Each of the six zones, the northwest, northeast, middle belt, southwest, southcentral and southeast, has one zonal coordinator. They described themselves as a

> non-profit alliance of theatre artists, performers, cultural and development workers who are interested in using Theatre for Development purposes. Its emphasis is communication and development through alternative means for empowerment and the general welfare of the rural and urban populace. (NPTA statement 1989)

They indicate on their website that their mission "is the promotion of participatory, gender sensitive as well as sustainable development through the use of Theatre for Development (TFD) and other participatory strategies to build the capacity of NGOs, CBOs and women's groups so

that they can realise their development agendas", and their vision is to ensure "a world of equal opportunities where women, men children participate in making their development aspirations realisable".

Members of the organisation meet and run joint projects together within their respective zones. They also meet up quarterly on a national level, where they conduct workshops, seminars, and lectures to exchange experiences. They also use these quarterly meetings as an opportunity to plan joint national and international projects and workshops. In addition, they used to operate a travelling theatre unit and a community theatre unit. In 2000, the Ford Foundation helped NPTA set up a TfD Centre (TfDC), which became the training and research unit of NPTA. The centre is also affiliated with the ABU Department of Theatre and the Performing Arts. This was a move "to enable the Centre further its research goal and to function as a laboratory for training students in the methodology of Theatre for Development as research tool and as a strategy for development intervention".

Performance Studio Workshop (PSW)

The Performance Studio Workshop (PSW), formed in 1988, is another organisation that played a crucial role in helping spread the TfD methodology in Nigeria. It is a "Lagos-based laboratory for alternative communication, social development, community empowerment and the perpetuation of mutual understanding between peoples through culture and performance art" (Mike et al., 1999:61). It was pioneered by Chuck Mike, who was Wole Soyinka's assistant in several political theatre projects. The PSW is a non-profit collective of professional artists which focuses on using TfD as a panacea for solving development-related challenges. They train actors for their outreach work and create TfD Cells in higher education institutions and senior high schools. The professional actors form the core of their animateurs, while the trained senior high school students and the other "TfD Cells" complement their efforts and serve their respective surrounding communities. Unlike the practice by the university-based TfD practitioners where the people of targeted communities are actively involved in the processes and final performance, PSW uses the service of only professional actors who have trained with them. These trained professionals also serve as resource persons for the "TfD Cell" training workshops.

PSW methodology follows the same format as standard TfD with a slight variation, and they also stress that all their apprentices and their Cell members understand the rudiments of research. Take, for example, a one-week creative orientation session PSW had for their new

TfD Cell members of the University of Ibadan, Department of Theatre Arts, in preparation for a new project.

> The first day was used to acquaint the Cell with improvisational techniques…For two days the performers soaked themselves in the world of the material, learning and discussing *the issues*. Four days were given to the creation of the material from the story-line conceived by the group…a comprehensive tutorial was held on the last day of the workshop by the Studio's IEC officer. The 'researchers' were introduced to techniques of community liaison, information retrieval, how to carry out community surveys and participatory research (Mike et al., 1999:61-62).

The premium placed on research techniques shows the commitment of PSW to quality community research, which compensates for them not using the community people as part of their performances. Some of the organisations that have funded PSW are the MacArthur Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Association of Reproductive and Family Health, and the Inter-African Committee (IAC).

In summary, some of the notable organisations whose combined efforts helped consolidate TfD in Nigeria are the Ahmadu Bello University Collective, Nigerian Popular Theatre Association, Chuck Mike's Performance Studio Workshop (PSW), Collective Artists, and the Theatre Arts Department, University of Ibadan/UNESCO collaborative projects.

Context in Africa

The evolution and diffusion of TfD in Nigeria progressed in a linear fashion. It follows a situation where animateurs tried to understand the living reality of the people as source material for their creative works to create with the people towards devising a way to solve community challenges. Although social issues were an essential aspect of the performance of the traditional travelling theatres associated with the many ethnicities in Nigeria, the TfD phenomenon differs in content and form. Here, the experiments at ABU are used as the starting point for the analysis and as a catalyst that propelled the spread of the genre throughout the country. The linear nature of the progression of the experiments at ABU can be classified into three stages: first, researching in the community to create performances for the university people; then researching in the community to create performances for the community; and lastly researching, creating and performing with, by and for the community. The phases are linked to the level of participation of the people in the process. The first stage does not involve the people; they are just sources of data for the students and faculty's creative works. In the second

stage, the people benefited from the performances because the final output of the students was brought back to the community. The final stage is where the people became subjects of their challenges and worked with the people from the university to research, create and perform for change.

There are several factors behind the approach employed at ABU. Primary among these was that different faculty members brought diverse experiences from their previous employment. As a result, they had experimented in one way or the other with several communities and travelling theatre approaches. Mention can be made of Michael Etherton, who was one of the first initiators of the Chikwakwa travelling theatre in Zambia; Brian Crow, who was also one of the leaders of the Ugandan travelling theatre; and Sandy Arkhurst, who had considerable experience with Efua Sutherland's experiments both on conventional stages and in the communities in Ghana. Thus, the ABU collective can be credited as leading the institutionalisation of TfD in higher education in Nigeria, because, as in Tanzania, their TfD exploits were tied to a large extent to the community theatre course at the drama department, ABU.

Looking at it from the more prominent African perspective, the Nigerian situation can be described as a site for methodological experiments. They constantly experiment in order to be able to discover the best approach for integrated community development. The approach towards community work changed significantly as they experimented to discover new ways of doing things. From their first workshop, which happened in 1979, the methodology adopted permanently changed. Successive workshops often became an experiment geared towards improving the previous methods employed and updating the prevailing state of the field in Africa. Therefore, the Nigerian case continuously grows from strength to strength, making it one of the formidable sites of TfD scholarship.

Although the animateurs collaborated with a number of agencies in their bid to achieve results, the unique thing about the Nigerian situation is that most of the organisations and initiatives were devoid of external direction. Instead, they developed their own institutions and organisations and used them as the medium of collaboration, consensus building and getting funding for their projects. This is in a way linked to and shows the progress made at different stages of the evolution and development of TfD in the country. Turning the movement into organisations and institutions started with ABUC, then ZANTA, and finally NPTA. Interestingly, at the stage of ABUC, only the lecturers and students at ABU were part of the

organisation. With ZANTA, it expanded to include organisations and people in the localities and villages in which they carried out their community theatre and TfD projects. When it became NPTA, it took a nationwide turn, in which people from different universities and parts of the country became a part of the organisation and movement. This is one of the unique initiatives in the Nigerian context that made the projects and initiatives sustainable to this day. It is also why the institutionalisation of TfD in higher education in Nigeria was embraced and supported by various governmental and non-governmental organisations.

Furthermore, the events in Nigeria paved the way for a number of parallel organisations registered as NGOs operating in other parts of the country with their methods and approaches to TfD, which adopted the basic philosophy of TfD, but enhanced the methodology to serve their purpose. A typical example can be found in the Performance Studio Workshop (PSW), which has a permanent secretariat in Lagos with dedicated trained professionals, which is at the core of their method. Their point of departure from the usual TfD approach is that they employ trained professionals to execute their projects instead of relying on community members who often do not have any formal acting training.

In conclusion, the practitioners of TfD understood their practice's challenges because of the global neo-liberal agenda. They, therefore, strategically adapted the capitalist clothing with a socialist outlook. They evolved their coalitions and collectives into NGOs, attracting funding from global philanthropic organisations. These partnerships permeated throughout the country and manifested themselves in different formats. While the British Council was the key funding organisation behind the Performance Studio Workshop, the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture of UNESCO, the MacArthur Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Swedish International Development Agency, the German Foundation for International Development, and the Canadian University Service Overseas were some of the global donor agencies and philanthropic organisations that supported and continue to support other TfD movements.

GHANA

The history of TfD in Ghana, as in some other African countries, is directly linked to the political and socio-cultural transformation of the nation. The various influences that created the atmosphere required for the development of TfD in Ghana today reflect the traditional history and changing circumstances of the nation. It is also part of the historical continuum of drama and popular culture from pre-colonial to colonial and post-colonial Ghana, because socially

engaged theatre has a firm root in the country's theatrical and political tradition. Every epoch in the country's historical development usually comes with its performance traditions that either help domestication, insurrection or dialectical engagement with the status quo. This extensive repertoire of performance traditions helped shape the field of TfD in Ghana today. Some of these theatrical traditions developed early and survived all historical epochs, while others were short-lived, but with an impact that is still felt. An example of the former can be seen in the concert party traditions, while the latter can be seen in the travelling theatre experiment of the *Legon 7* by James Gibbs and the *Legon Road* by Mohammed Ibn Abdallah in the late sixties and early seventies.

However, discussion of TfD histories and socially engaged theatre in higher education institutions in Ghana has always been limited to the mass education campaign of the 1940s and the situation at the University of Ghana today (see Abdallah, 2018; Yankah,2006; Nyatuame, 2017, Gibbs, 1999). Although these references are essential, they do not tell the whole story. Other landmark projects happened within the context of socially engaged theatre and are worth highlighting, because most of these works either influenced the local evolution and institutionalisation of the genre or had a much more significant influence on the genre's evolution in Africa as a whole. Byam highlighted this when she observed that the pioneers of the Laedza Batanani project, which is considered the beginning of TfD today, were influenced by experiments in socially engaged theatre and "cultural developments in Ghana where concert parties, a type of traveling theatre, had been used as a means of reviving culture" (1999:39).

There are many historical events in the field of socially engaged theatre that had a direct bearing on the TfD movement in Ghana. In the context of this research, the following are of importance: the concert party travelling theatre tradition, colonial mass education and community development campaigns, the UNESCO puppet for community development workshop, the Institute of Adult Education's people education association's non-formal education and community development project, Efua Sutherland's experiment at Ekumfi/Atwia, and institution-based community theatre projects. All these programs and projects contributed to the consolidation of TfD in Ghana today and they provided the basis for appropriating concepts, aesthetics and motives for engaging in TfD. It is noteworthy that most of these projects happened because of a need to mobilise the citizens towards a national course geared towards solving an identified challenge in a community, thereby depicting a conscious effort at employing theatre and the creative arts for either domestication, insurrection or liberation.

Concert Party Travelling Theatre

One example is the concert party travelling theatre tradition, which started long before independence with a degree of local and international influence. This travelling theatre movement was initially performed purely for entertainment, but assumed a different purpose during the post-world war II era because of its capacity to mobilise the masses and shape public perception. It is said that because colonial Ghana was a strategic location for the British, it became one of the most extensive and intensive sites for large-scale wartime propaganda (Holbrook, 1978: 401). The colonial government employed a number of strategies to spread information about the war from their perspective. They commissioned concert parties to create performances about the war to shape public opinion and reception in the country.

An example can be seen in the Gold Coast Two Bobs' production titled "*The Downfall of Adolph Hitler"*. In addition, in the market squares, prayer grounds and in city streets, mobile film units of colonial Ghana roamed the country showing footage from the frontline, all in their bid to ensure there was local support for the war (Clarke, 1986:48; Collins, 1976: 52). This can be classified as taking theatre to the people and as a form of domestication theatre.

Catherine M. Cole elaborates further and reveals that because of "…their geographic mobility and widespread popularity, concert parties participated first-hand in the transformation of public consciousness in Ghana during the post-war and independence years". Additionally, she throws light on how their performance aesthetics changed and incorporated the local context depending on where they performed. She writes that "as concert troupes travelled in cities, towns and villages throughout Ghana they adapted their shows to the language needs and aesthetic tastes of particular audiences". The attention paid to local performance aesthetics and communication modes is one of the essential features of TfD, and claiming that the concert parties might be one of the influences on TfD is not an exaggerated claim, because "like living magazines, they transmitted fashions, manners, dances, characters, and ideas across geographic distances" and more importantly, "in the absence of widespread literacy, the concert party served as one of the primary media through which colonial Ghanaians shifted from local identifications to the more abstract realm of regional, ethnic, and national affiliation as the country moved towards independence"(1997:264). This places this kind of theatre as one part of the performative practices that share characteristics with the practice of TfD today. It also means that the concert party did more than amuse; it also played a crucial role in ensuring local and national cohesion through theatre.

Furthermore, after independence, Kwame Nkrumah, the first president of Ghana, made a conscious effort to promote popular drama and specifically concert parties as part of his cultural development agenda, endorsing a number of state and parastatal concert parties. John Collins writes that "Nkrumah, recognising the vital role of local popular entertainment in the independence struggle and the creation of national and Pan-African identity endorsed numerous state and parastatal highlife band and concert parties" (2005:23). One important reason for his action is that they toured the country, disseminating his ideology and communicating his policies to Ghanaians. In fact, he is credited with the introduction of female actors into concert parties because he insisted that women must be made an integral part of the company.

Mass Education and Community Development Campaigns

Beginning in 1948, a mass education and community development campaign started in colonial Ghana. The aim was "to provide opportunities for training voluntary leaders of social development and Mass Education *and* to organise this training in short intensive courses held in rural areas in such a way that they constituted a technique for arousing and stimulating understanding and enthusiasm among the local community" (Dickson, 1950:22). The idea for this project came from the colonial office summer conference held at Cambridge in 1948. At the conference, it was agreed that it was imperative for the mass education campaign to prioritise the training of leaders if it was to succeed and be sustained. The team were then tasked with, among other things, executing the project in a way that guaranteed the continuous stimulation of social life in the rural areas. They believed that doing this would make it easy for the people to understand the dynamic and exciting prospects in voluntary social service (Dickson, 1950:22). In order for the project to achieve all its stated aims and specific objectives, they designed the course to focus on physical recreation, music, first aid, literacy, craft, discussion groups and later drama which Pickering (1958:62) indicates was introduced by accident and was, he says, "a happy inspiration". This is because drama was not originally planned as part of the courses, and Gibbs (1999:7) confirms that there was nothing in the training manual about drama. Even the expertise assembled from the various organisations and agencies confirms this assertion because there was no drama expert on the team. To this end, Dickson posits that:

> A number of organisations helped the training staff to prepare for this work. Achimota lent musical instruments and helped prepare the mass literacy material… The Army

> helped with equipment and training for physical recreation, the Red Cross with lecture syllabuses and charts for first aid. The Methodist, Presbyterian and Catholic Missions each loaned the services of one of their finest young Ewe teachers. The Police lent one of their best bandsmen and the Medical Department a male nurse-dispenser. (1950:22)

What is interesting about the entire process is the fact that Ken A. Pickering later writes that "village drama is in many ways the most noteworthy of the audio-visual aids used in mass education in Ghana today" (1958:62). Nevertheless, before discussing village drama, let us detail the mobilisation process.

The team understood that they needed the acceptance of the people. It was clear to them that if they were to succeed and the project was to be sustained, they needed the people as part of the process. Dickson (1950:23) reported that "the leader personally visited every Native Authority, every School Manager, every Senior School Head- master and every Departmental Officer in the area, addressing meetings and answering questions". Much like TfD today, they realised that the people must be subjects of their own development and not the objects. Dickson further stated that "it soon became apparent that the chances of the work being maintained after the courses depended upon the support of one, or perhaps two or three, of the leading citizens in each locality where the course was held". To achieve this, they ensured that the people who were the main reason for the project understood it and became an integral part of the implementation.

Equally important is the fact that village drama took a life of its own. It developed organically and became one of the most effective information dissemination and training methods. Gradually, both the team and the people realised the potential of the medium of drama because some challenging aspects of mass education could only be resolved through drama. Moreover, more noticeably, "and of first importance, village drama is the most truly Ghanaian audio-visual aid, depending as it does upon a nationwide aptitude and liking for drama and by its intimate relation to local custom and tradition" (Pickering, 1958:62). Preparing and using 'village drama' did not require special skills, neither did it call for complicated scenery or unique settings. " The " stage " was a clearing in the crowd, a space between two palm trees, an open stall in the village market: the " stalls ", rush mats or the trunk of a fallen tree, and " raising the curtain " a simple statement by the team leader that the audience was about to see a play" (Pickering, 1958:62). The entire performance was created through improvisation after a thorough discussion of the action, content and context with the people who were selected as

actors. They ensured that the performance was interlaced with proverbs from the locality and integrated the people's customs during the improvisation to avoid cultural blunders. Since humour is a given in the communities, all the village dramas employ it. Thus, the peoples' mode of communication, which was an easy way to get them to appreciate the process, was key to the drama's success. In effect, after the accidental discovery of drama and its integration into the process to the extent of making it a part of the courses taught, it took centre stage in the entire mass education and community development project. Commenting on the value of drama in the entire campaign, Pickering states that "its value in the special context of mass education in Ghana is greatest in the most difficult campaigns, involving the most radical social change or demanding the adoption of an unpopular course of action" (1958:67). This presents a curious case for understanding the mass education and community development campaign as one of the influences of TfD in Ghana.

UNESCO Puppet training and polyvalent workshop

Between 14th August 1962 and 22nd June 1963, UNESCO sent Josef Holler, an expert in puppetry, to Ghana to conduct training on how the Ghanaian community development program could integrate puppetry into their work. He was also to "coordinate teaching by means of puppet demonstration and the presentation of puppet plays with the general programs for the mass education and community development" (Heller, 1963:1). The technical workshop covered eight out of ten regions in Ghana at the time. Each region had three field officers from the social welfare and community development department, with one woman as a representative. They recommended that local people rather than outsiders should create the puppets and perform for their people. The systematic process in using puppetry to enhance the audio-visual technique is similar to that of TfD today. The process is as follows: identification of purpose, research, organisation, creation, performance and follow-up.

Identification of purpose in this context means knowing exactly what the people need and the issue to tackle. This stage of the process is used to determine whether the main challenge of the people is sanitation, nutrition, agriculture, child care or any issue as the community and field officials will resolve after their research and investigation. The research stage entails finding out what is relevant to the communities, including its local idioms, customs and the performance needs. In the organisation stage, the field officers liaise with the community people and respective clubs. The final stage is the follow-up, a periodic visit to the communities and places where the performances took place. Seeing this process as another angle of the

community development project means that a new medium was introduced, and this follows the known stages of TfD methodology as practised today. It is therefore essential to mark this development as one of the possible sources of influence and inspiration when dealing with the evolution and diffusion of TfD in Ghana.

Efua Sutherland and the Ekunfi/Atwia Project

The many shades of inspiration in both oral and literary theatre in Ghana can be found in the complex traditional cultures of the country. Likewise, the works of J. H. Kwabena Nketia (1965), A. A. Opoku (1970), and J. K. E. Agovi (1979) attest to the social relevance of theatrical works in the country. They also show us the potency of traditional performance traditions for group cohesion and community mobilisation. Looking at it from this perspective and in the larger context of using theatre for communication and integrated development, the work of Efua Sutherland at Ekumfi Atwia deserves a brief review, because aside from it being an excellent example of socially engaged theatre for integrated community development, it is also one of the training grounds for Sandy Arkhurst, who eventually led the process of institutionalising TfD in higher education in Ghana. It can even be said that the project is one of the foundational experiments that created the necessary atmosphere for the evolution of TfD in Ghana and perhaps Africa, because while the Laedza Batanani project started in 1974, the Ekumfi Atwia started in 1964.

The Ekumfi Atwia project led by Efua Sutherland was a way of bringing about holistic development in a rural community without diluting their traditional cultural life. It is one of the all-inclusive integrated community development projects which used theatre as its mainstay in achieving individual and community development in Ghana. The project was conceived by Sutherland because she realised through experience that "when people relied on outside assistance, little got accomplished and communities became immobilised, not taking matters into their own hands" (Arkhurst, 2007:168). She, therefore, set out to create a platform, where collectively, the people could design projects and programs for individual and community progress. To this end, she embarked on the Ekumfi/Atwia community project, which among other things, built a theatre named Kodzidan. It is essential to point out that even *Kodzidan*, the theatre that was built in the community, "became more than just a place for performance"; it became a community centre, a place for mobilising people for collective action. Arkhurst put the concept in context when he observed that:

> Kodzidan was a concept which encouraged education of the residents to create the desired awareness and motivation for them to want to do things for themselves. It gave them the opportunity to be organised in their programmes for success, and provide the necessary discipline for the sustenance of the community projects (2007:170-171)

Through the program, the residents appreciated the value of information sharing and community organising. The animateurs led by Sutherland and Arkhurst paid particular attention to the process instead of the product. In fact, "the conscious involvement of the community throughout the processes gave them the opportunity to ask questions, make suggestions, argue and in fact participate in every way so as to ingrain their own belief, values, priorities, problems and goals into the development effort" (Arkhurst, 2007:171). What was unique about this project was that, after the initial discussion between the queen mother of Ekumfi Atwia and Efua Sutherland, the rest of the process developed organically. Nothing was imposed on the community. All the developmental projects and activities that came out of the collaboration were internally generated. The inhabitants of Ekumfi Atwia turned their revered art of storytelling into a weapon and a discursive frame for their developmental needs. The approach was not like most TfD projects that happened in other African countries. It was not for a fixed duration like the usual project-based TfD, and it was a process-based project that became recurrent with the focus shifting to another challenge after every project cycle. That is why "all activities were aimed at creating a platform for communal participation through theatre, in all stages of integrated development, from problem identification, through theatrical presentation of such problems, to collective discussion and, finally, action leading to growth" (Arkhurst, 2007:172). The whole experience of the Ekumfi Atwia can be summed up as a participatory exploration that is essential in preparing and spurring people on for social transformation. What is unique about the project led by Sutherland and Arkhurst is its reliance on the people and their modes of communication which gave the project an assured way to sustainability. The other thing is that, even when issues that were political in nature were raised, solutions were first sought within. This might be because they resolved to prove that they were capable of managing their own affairs. The project, therefore, cannot be ignored when discussing possible sources of influence and inspiration for the evolution and diffusion of TfD in Ghana.

Higher Education Institutions and TfD in Ghana

There are two aspects worth considering when looking at higher education institutions and TfD in Ghana. One can be traced back to the non-formal education project by the institute of adult education of the University of Ghana, a two-year project which happened from 1976 to 1977 and involved a number of cultural groups in the eastern region of Ghana. The other is the contemporary practice by most theatre departments in a number of higher education institutions in the country. This started in the 1980s at the University of Ghana, and other tertiary institutions now running TfD as a research and teaching course with community projects include the University of Cape Coast (UCC), University for Development Studies (UDS) and the University of Education, Winneba (UNEW).

The non-formal education program was a collaborative program between the Center for International Education (University of Massachusetts, UMass), the Institute of Adult Education, University of Ghana (IAE), and the People's Educational Association of Ghana (PEA), which is a site/field organisation of the IAE with nationwide coverage. This project defined non-formal education as "a wide range of non-school activities whose major purpose is to promote in people around the world the development of skills, knowledge and behaviors which will enable them to improve their life situations" (Kinsey and Bing, 1978:16). At the core of the program was a deliberate attempt at engaging people in unstructured activities that had the potential of igniting individual and community transformation. The UMass, IAE, and PEA teams worked with cultural groups in the communities who were themselves members of the PEA. These "cultural groups are village level voluntary organisations that are common, highly creative and very popular in Ghanaian society. They also provide important community services and perform at cultural functions" (Russell, 1982:84). Most of the creation of the cultural groups centred on music and dance. They provided entertainment at functions at a fee,

However, in 1976, there was a change in the way they approached their craft and creations. This happened because of a workshop that was sponsored by the German Adult Education Association (DVV) at Larteh, in the eastern region of Ghana. Participants were drawn from four different cultural groups based in the region and officials from IAE, PEA, DVV and the regional ministry of education. Russell indicates that "the three-day workshop consisted of a series of small group discussions that merged into larger discussion groups. These discussion groups eventually formed into improvisational drama working groups, and eventually into drama rehearsal groups" (1982:93). Improvisational drama was not part of the repertoire of the

cultural groups, but the partner organisations believed that it was a "useful tool for adding an educational component to the Cultural Groups' activities" (Russell, 1982:93). It was at this same workshop that community service was made a part of the work of the cultural groups.

The entire process was based on improvisation, which led to a performance in the community. The groups discussed and agreed on the pertinent issues at three different levels: that which affects the group; that which affects their community; and that which affects the community but demands intervention from the nation's authorities. Another practical approach they employed in simplifying their work was that the groups made sure.

> that each skit must contain three distinct elements: a clear definition of the problem and a clear demonstration of why the problem was a problem: each skit had to propose through its dramatic resolution a practical solution to the problem; those responsible in the village for the solution of the problem, how the problem can be resolved, and what a reasonable time line for action would be. (Russell, 1982:106).

This became the format adopted for the campaign throughout the period of the project. A significant development that needs to be pointed out is that they used improvisational drama throughout the process. The entire procedure was participatory, and participants had every opportunity to contribute to the process and decisions. This changed the dynamic of the cultural groups and made them an integral part of their community's development. Hitherto, they had only danced and sung at funerals and other social occasions. The UMass team, PEA officials and other officials from IAE helped refocus "their orientation towards community education and development through improving their drama skills" (1982:111). This project, although not termed TfD but framed within the context of non-formal education, had strong community development as its goal. In trying to achieve its desired outcomes, improvisational drama was its primary technique, which also served as the most potent of all the methods employed for social mobilisation for the project.

However, although it was led, coordinated and run by higher education institutions, it was not built into the curriculum at the IAE. It was part of their fieldwork that they conducted with their field organisation, PEA. Nevertheless, when considering TfD in higher education in Ghana, this UMass-CIE, IAE and PEA project cannot be disregarded. It must be regarded as one of the projects that created the atmosphere needed for the triumph of TfD in Ghana. It has all the features of what can be classified in contemporary terms as TfD. The other initiative is the one by the Department of Theatre Arts, University of Ghana, which was led by Sandy Arkhurst.

Sandy Arkhurst and TfD in Ghana

Theatre for Development, as a project and process-based research and teaching method, was institutionalised in Ghanaian higher education in the 1980s. As a subject of study and an academic discipline, it was introduced, first at the University of Ghana (UG) by Sandy Arkhurst in 1986, after his return from Ahmadu Bello University in Nigeria, where he was a visiting scholar. Having experienced a new format of socially engaged theatre, which in some ways differed from what he had done in Ghana in the 1960s, he brought his technical know-how and experience for the benefit of students, the university community and the surrounding environs of the university. His experience with Sutherland on the Ekumfi Atwia project and in the ABU Collective armed him with varied methods and ideas on how to use theatre and culture for sustainable development.

Sandy Arkhurst worked with Brian Crow, Salihu Bappa, Tony Humphries, Oga Abah, Saddiq Balewa, Tunde Lakoju and Michael Etherton as part of the ABU Collective. He was one of, if not the only trained theatre expert among the team that started the ABU Collective that ran the Samaru projects, the community theatre projects and later the TfD projects. He spent 1979 to 1984 working at the ABU drama department teaching, researching and experimenting with ideas for using theatre for social change and development. Aside from participating in the TfD projects, he was in charge of most of the practical courses like acting, directing and drama in education. Furthermore, Arkhurst indicates that out of about a hundred and five plays that were staged during his stay at ABU, only two of them were published plays, which happened to be by Bertolt Brecht. The rest were from the approach adopted for the Samaru and community theatre projects discussed earlier.[6].

In the beginning, the University of Ghana resisted the introduction of the course until after negotiations that lasted for the entire period of 1985 till it was agreed that the course could be allowed on condition that the name be changed from TfD to Theatre for Extension Communications (TEC). Hence TfD stared at UG with the label TEC (Deh, 2019:10-11). However, it was in 1987 that students attempted mini projects on various spots on the UG campus. Their lab sites were mainly student markets and eateries on campus, including the Bush Canteen, Night Market and Commonwealth Hall market. Theatre Arts students went to

[6] Interview with Sandy Arkhurst

these locations to gather information on various themes and created playlets and skits out of them. The first year's project focused mainly on health and hygiene (Arkhurst, 1994:4).

The first community theatre project outside the university campus happened in 1988 due to the realisation that they could make a more significant impact beyond the university environs. The students researched the various communities to gather information, came back to campus to have a discussion to prioritise the issues, improvised to create skits and playlets and performed on the streets in the communities. This characterises the first phase of the community theatre project of the department of theatre arts, UG. It did not involve the people in the process; it followed the taking theatre to the people concept and was more in line with the Samaru experiments in ABU. Arkhurst (1994:4) expressed his reservations about the process, especially about the analysis that the students engaged in after gathering data in the communities. He observed that "these discussions and the identification of focal areas unfortunately take place in the Theatre Arts Department on the University campus and away from the people of the various communities". He further asked that "how then are we sure that we are really dealing with the priority problems of the community?" These and other challenges identified in the initial approach made him rethink the process.

The rethink, as Arkhurst puts it, happened because, among other things, they realised that "the final performances are ephemeral and the experience, though interesting, is a fleeting one for the audience. The consciousness of the experience and the fragility of that consciousness find their solution in continuity" (1994:5). If that was the case, then the community people must be factored in at all stages, but unfortunately, they were not involved at any stage in the process and since it was "a component of a comprehensive academic program" it was challenging for lecturers to insist on students exploring the TfD methodology comprehensively, which would have meant the students compromising on other vital academic requirements. Moreover, "community theatre is, ideally, conceived as a continuing and regenerative, rather than conclusive, process, which must outlive each single generation of students". Therefore, Arkhurst proposed a new phase of TfD that looked at communication on two operational levels.

The first stage is where the university adopts a cluster of communities for open experimentation. Here, the students are allowed to carry out projects by exploring the fundamentals of the TfD practices and theories related to development communication and community development. The projects should be on a short-term basis and must not require a

long term commitment. One of the things this first phase will achieve is to equip the students with the basics of TfD so that they can be prepared to undertake their own complete projects.

The second stage is where the school adopts a community based on mutual agreement and on the basis of its viability with regards to problem potentiality, its proximity and the community's commitment. The idea is that students will have the opportunity to continue the work started by other students. There will be a continued and consistent analysis as well as generational project implementation that will establish a basis for evaluating the impact of TfD. In essence, "this stage involves a Permanent Community Project (PC P.). This way, there would always be available, a permanent, familiar research and experimental community project with testable indices that have evolved at a logical and natural pace" (Arkhurst, 1994:5).

These two approaches then became the method UG adopted for training TfD students. An important factor here is the influence of both the Ekumfi Atwia and the ABU experiences used by Arkhurst in trying to find a solution for a more impactful and sustainable approach to TfD teaching, research and projects by the Department of Theatre Arts, University of Ghana. It is in this same vein that the diffusion of the TfD praxis started with the department collaborating with national and international NGOs on projects, programs and training.

In summary, the TfD movement in Ghana cannot be credited to one person or one initiative. However, the institutionalisation of TfD in higher education institutions can be attributed to Arkhurst because of the role he played. Although Sofia Lokko is been a well-known practitioner who was integral to the 1982 and 1984 TfD workshops in Murewa, Zimbabwe and Kumba, Cameroon, she instead focused on integrating TfD in her drama in education courses. In an interview with Hansel Eyoh Ndumbe, she says that "i have in drama in education been thinking about 3-Cs. Conceptualise, create and communicate. And after Kumba, I have with my students, got more than 6Cs now…I think it really helped me…" (Lokko, 1991:101). It is therefore essential to change the narrative when discussing the history of socially engaged theatre in Ghana.

CONCLUSION

The 1940s to the 1980s represents a period of ferment that encapsulates in context and content a variety of conventional and non-conventional types of theatres as well as socially engaged theatre (be it indigenous, foreign or hybrid) that formed the foundation for the evolution and diffusion of TfD in Africa. This chapter discussed the sources and possible influences of the TfD genre to illustrate the wide range of events that prompted the need for such a genre and

the type of aesthetics that can adequately help to achieve its underlying aims and assumptions. The chapter also discussed the history of TfD in select African countries, some with select case studies and others with a number of initiatives in the country that coalesced to create the social and cultural conditions that helped the evolution and diffusion of TfD in the country and Africa as a whole.

On the sources and influence, the research surveyed local and international events - traditional, neo-traditional and foreign performative genres that served as a source and influence for the evolution, development and diffusion of the genre. This was traced from the colonial encounter to the independence era and beyond. The ideas and philosophy that evolved from negotiating these encounters are crucial when dealing with the histories and historiography of TfD, because the overriding ethics of TfD mainly come from the debates and aspirations that emanated out of some, if not all, of these sources.

The countries discussed in this chapter, although not many, help in understanding how TfD evolved, developed and diffused in Africa. The chapter highlighted a range of actors, networks and philanthropic organisations which supported the creation of fields of encounter and platforms of exchanges that made it possible for the transfer of knowledge and methods within countries and across borders. Among the things this chapter did in the context of this research was to establish a pattern that helps students, scholars and researchers understand some of the events that helped configure the practice of TfD and turned it into a formidable partner in development communication, education and sustainable development.

This is clearly articulated in the mode of organisation, the type of experiments, and the way the experts helped create other experts through the medium of workshops. For this reason, the research looked at Botswana and the Laedza Batanani project, an experiment credited as the beginning of the TfD movement. It is seen as the project that introduced the two-way model of communication into development communication in Africa. It served as a departure from earlier works with similar aims, although most of them were message-oriented. Another feature introduced by the Laedza Batanani project is the workshop format: a format that became the mainstay and site for methodological experiments and epistemic exchanges in the TfD movement in Africa. In addition, the chapter looked at Zambia and the Chikwakwa movement, a type of travelling theatre that experimented with a different concept but tapped into an already existing culture of workshops in the country to align their theatrical practice to suit the demands of the TfD genre. The Zambian context is interesting because this is where we first encounter

ITI through its Zambian branch, ZITI taking centre stage in consolidating and entrenching the practice of TfD in the country. The first of its kind in any African country, this obviously cannot be divorced from the general history of theatre in the country because of to the impact of the expatriate intrusion on their theatre and cultural scene.

Tanzania had a fluid evolution of TfD which was driven mainly by the adoption of local Kiswahili as its official language. On the whole, Tanzania represented a subtle methodological departure in the African TfD movement because of its peculiar circumstances. Its practitioners, unlike those in most African countries, had the benefit of participating in some of the formative workshops of TfD, namely the Molepolepo workshop of 1978 and the Chalimbana workshop of 1979. They deepened the practice and elevated it by ensuring the tenets were well respected and followed to achieve the results that praxis demands. This was evident in the Malya popular theatre project (1982-1983), the Bagamoyo popular theatre workshop (1983) and the Msoga popular theatre workshop (1985). Lihamba (1985) and Mlama (1991) give a detailed account of this. It should be emphasised that the Tanzanian situation also accentuated the importance of local languages, indigenous performance tradition and local animateurs who are in tune with the mores and politics of their lab-site. This helped to ensure the sustainable outcomes that their projects achieved.

The other countries surveyed in the chapter are Nigeria and Ghana. In the case of Nigeria, its vibrancy and continuous experimentation from 1979 till today was a meaningful context that cannot be overlooked when discussing TfD in Africa. This was a site where people from different countries with different levels of experience came together to deepen their practice through community exchanges, international workshops and collaboration that helped shape the TfD praxis in Africa. The most important aspect of their situation was the way they were able to strategically position themselves to be able to attract funding and cooperate with communities for their projects. The label changed based on prevailing circumstances at any given time, from ABUC to ZANTA and then NPTA. All these transitions illustrate the efforts the initiators put into ensuring that they remain relevant and have control of their practice and research. In terms of the integration of exogenous concepts into the works of TfD, the Nigerian experiments, especially their Benue Theatre for Development Workshops of 1982 and 1986, respectively, offered the African practitioners, especially those from the Anglophone area, a clear way of integrating Boal and Freire into the working of TfD in Africa.

Although the Ghanaian situation presents a different experiment in socially engaged theatre before the institutionalisation of TfD in higher education institutions, it has not been discussed in relation to the evolution and diffusion of TfD on the continent. This chapter established the different manifestations and collaborations that created the conditions needed for the introduction of TfD in Ghana. Some experiments, both indigenous and exogenous, were discussed, including the colonial mass education campaigns, the UNESCO puppetry workshops, the Ekumfi/Atwia project by Sutherland and the non-formal education project by UMass, IAE and PEA.

In conclusion, the chapter surveyed different practices, sources and influences. It also accentuated the role of philanthropic organisations, INGOs and donor agencies, such as the ITI, UNESCO, SIDA, DES, CUSO, CIDA, OXFAM, and CF. The next chapter will delineate how TfD evolved to become an organisational field. The processes and networking helped to standardise the praxis and how the field was structured and diffused the practice throughout Africa and the world.

CHAPTER FOUR:

THEATRE FOR DEVELOPMENT (TfD) AS AN ORGANISATIONAL FIELD

INTRODUCTION

From the survey of theatrical forms and experiments done in the previous chapter about the sources, histories and possible influences on the evolution of TfD in selected Sub-Saharan African countries, patterns emerge that can be used to generalise and ascertain how TfD's diffusion and institutionalisation in higher education in Africa occurred. The survey points out certain characteristics and practices that have been etched into TfD praxis and become a defining factor. Moreover, the mode of knowledge transfer became a site to negotiate polemic controversy, an avenue for standardisation of TfD practice, and a workspace for apprentice/expertise development. These markers and emerging characteristics combined to create the necessary atmosphere that dictated the eventual homogenisation of ethics in African TfD practice. The chapter likewise throws light on how this led to the development of TfD as an organisational field. These activities also paved the way for the structuration and standardisation of the praxis across Africa. To a large extent, these developments are attributed to several factors: the continuous exchange of ideas and testing of methodologies through the workshop model at the national, regional and international levels; the reliability of financial resources from donor agencies and international organisations; and the acceptance of the TfD methods as an effective approach for social change and community development by most African governments and transnational philanthropic organisations. This is all part of the context that led to funding being shifted from traditional sources like hydroelectric dams and latrines to TfD that happened in the cold-war and post-colonial era in Africa and other parts of the world, especially the Global South. In essence, the approaches, concepts, and case studies investigated in the previous chapters emphasise the role of culture and creative arts in shaping African people's organisational, environmental and developmental realities.

This chapter, therefore, delineates TfD as an organisational field, defining the term and discussing how it evolves and is formed. Field configured events (FCEs) are closely linked to organisational fields: these are temporary gatherings that bring actors and organisations together to configure a field. In this regard, the chapter will also discuss FCEs and relate them to the evolution of TfD as an organisational field. Using two field-defining TfD workshops (FCEs), namely the Theatre for Development Workshop-Murewa, Zimbabwe (1983) and the Theatre for Integrated Rural Development Workshop-Kumba, Cameroon (1984), the chapter

will further discuss how the field of TfD was configured and gained legitimacy from actors and organisations in allied fields like development communication, transnational philanthropic organisations and international donor agencies.

ORGANISATIONAL FIELDS

As a concept and a field of inquiry, the organisational field developed as a "critical unit bridging the organisational and societal levels in the study of social and community change" (DiMaggio, 1986:337). It functions as an attempt at establishing a basis for understanding the recurrent and interdependent relationship between organisations and institutions. Because actors in a particular field always drive social and community change, DiMaggio and Powell believe that organisational fields often emerge and become structured due to continuous interaction between diverse organisations and actors. The fields referred to here become both material and ideational sites that beget a continuous interaction. DiMaggio and Powell further claim that these organisations' continuous exchanges often lead to their homogenisation. This phenomenon becomes the basis for attracting new entities once the field is firmly established (1983:148). Moreover, in an organisational field, "the relations between organisations and other social actors do not represent only a structure resulting from its activities but also define and delimit its possibilities for action in a more interactive and reciprocal perspective of the process of institutionalisation" (Machado-da-Silva, Filho and Rossoni, 2006:33).

Accordingly, organisational fields in DiMaggio and Powell's conceptualisation are "those organisations which, in the aggregate, constitute a recognised area of institutional life: key suppliers, resources and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organisations that produce similar services or products" (1983:148), in essence, a coming together of organisations with shared characteristics and sometimes varied aims to coexist in an environment that constitutes a recognised area of institutional life. This is often the case when dealing with enduring fields trying to shape their organisational culture to consciously or unconsciously standardise their practice, a process that can either be deliberate or accidental.

Furthermore, organisational fields can also be understood as "a community of organisations that partakes of a common meaning system and whose participants interact more frequently and fatefully with one another than with actors outside of the field" (Scott, 1994:207-208). This usually happens when we perceive the organisational field as a "collection of organisations operating in the same domain, as identified by the similarity of their services, products or functions, together with those organisations that critically influence the performance of focal

organisations"(Scott, 1991:117). It should be noted that organisations do not function in isolation but interact with one another and other entities that can demonstrate influence on the organisations constituting a field. These could be donors, funding partners and in some cases, regulatory bodies. This way, there will be enough exchanges that help create experience sharing opportunities that further improve standards and augment their structuration processes.

Following the above, organisational fields can also be regarded as a web of interchanges "that emerge as structured and structuring environments for organisational and individual participants" (White, Owen-Smith, Moody, & Powell, 2004:97). Here, the participants are afforded an opportunity of contributing to the discourse that leads to the configuration of the field. Be it an organisation or an individual, a condition is created for enabling all present and participating to have an input. According to Hoffman (1999:4), "the field should be thought of as the center of common channels of dialogue and discussion...which bring together various field constituents with disparate purposes"; an understanding that helps us to appreciate why organisational fields become "necessary to understand the social actors involved, their objectives and the ideological presupposed ideas in addition to their behavior throughout the process of constituting the field" (Leão Junior, 2001:9).

Suffice to say that the many perspectives of organisational fields espoused above show the varied context in which one can situate the concept. On the one hand, the different viewpoints help accentuate recurrent ideas; organisational fields are a meeting point of like-minded social actors in a shared environment that eventually leads to their structuration. They place a premium on the communicative, which is relational and this ends up making organisations in the field homogenised. On the other, we see that, as much as they are relational and communicative, there is also the need to regard them as platforms for discourse that reveal power dynamics. In a situation where there is a contest of ideas and an opportunity for homogenisation, the prevailing view and modus operandi are likely to triumph. Therefore, identifying the power dynamics in field formation helps to unravel covert and overt agendas, if there are any, from the perspectives of the social actors and organisations who constitute the field (see Brint and Karabel, 1991). This reflects the proposition that "organisational fields provide a context in which individual efforts to deal rationally with uncertainty and constraint often lead, in the aggregate, to homogeneity in structure, culture, and output" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983:147).

Because organisational fields "constitute a recognised area of institutional life", there is the tendency for the fields to demonstrate substantial diversity in the formative stages of their life cycle. Nonetheless, once a field becomes well established and recognised, their forward march towards homogenisation becomes inevitable (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983:148). To a large extent, this process hinges on four practical features that help define the exchanges that dictate the field culture that supports "institutional structuration" or homogenisation. They are: the increase in exchanges and the extent of interaction among actors and organisations in a field; the emergence of a definite pattern of domination and coalition; followed by an increase in the information load that organisations must contend with; and finally, the development of mutual awareness among actors involved in joint activities or shared interests (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983:148). Although these processes convey an idea of flexibility, which implies a degree of allowance for organisations in a field to participate freely, the continuous interaction eventually makes the actors and organisations in the field consolidate and homogenise, an act which in the long run, precludes and ensures minimal diversity and encourages conformity. This process of consolidation that leads to homogenisation is known as isomorphism.

Consequently, it is instructive to assert that all this (field configuration and isomorphism) does not happen in a vacuum; it is context-based. This means that events often dictate the methods for achieving them. Therefore, to appreciate these processes, one must consider "field configuring events" (FCEs), an important concept that should be understood as a crucial element and catalyst for the evolution of organisational fields. FCEs are a platform for discourse that leads to the evolution of organisational fields. When these fields eventually become established, FCEs further aid in creating the conditions necessary for organisational isomorphism. Perhaps, this is why Lampel and Meyer (2008:1025) point out that FCEs "represent an important and understudied mechanism shaping the emergence and developmental trajectories of technologies, markets, industries, and professions". By extension, they play a pivotal role and function as mechanisms that shape the emergence of organisational fields. In this respect, they provide the participants and actors who have a stake in an organisational field an opportunity to innovate, reproduce and maintain the field. They "both create and enact the logics of a field" (Scott et al., 2000:172). Below is a detailed review of the concept for more evident appreciation and understanding of its centrality to field configuration.

FIELD CONFIGURING EVENTS (FCEs)

Lampel and Meyer (2008:1026) define field configuring events (FCEs) as "temporary social organisations such as tradeshows, professional gatherings, technology contests, and business ceremonies that encapsulate and shape the development of professions, technologies, markets and industries". They further posit that FCEs "are settings in which people from diverse organisations and with diverse purposes assemble periodically, or on a one-time basis, to announce new products, develop industry standards, construct social networks, recognise accomplishments, share and interpret information, and transact business". This is a derivative of an earlier definition of FCEs as "settings where people from diverse social organisations assemble temporarily, with the conscious, collective intent to construct an organisational field" (Meyer et al., 2005:467). In this definition, FCEs are events that bring actors with varied interests together on a short term basis to deliberate, showcase, observe or assist in defining an organisational field. They are also a site where actors and establishments determine and delimit the scope of their professional operation. Furthermore, they can also be seen as a platform for deliberations about rules, concepts and ideas that govern and deconstruct an emerging field that affects organisations in that field and their organisational culture (Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury, 2012:2). The latter framing deals with FCEs in institutional logic and culture.

Actors who participate in FCEs do not always have the same aim. Their aspirations might be different, just that there is always something that binds them together. They always cohere around a given phenomenon, aim or vision. Some of these motives could be the need to, among other things, standardise their practice, diffuse innovation, or use the platform as an avenue for professional practice legitimacy and recognition. This implies that "a field-configuring event has the ability to change the organisational field on both the level of the participants and their role, and on the level of ideas and their attributed importance" (Oliver and Montgomery, 2008:1150). This is in line with Powell's claim that "fields emerge out of a felicitous combination of resources, technical know-how, and supportive organisations" because their "clustering is rarely serendipitous-it is a socially structured process" (1999:45). This is why in a different but related context McInerney (2008:1090) established a convincing case that "studying field-configuring events contributes to our overall knowledge about how fields develop and change and helps connect micro-and meso-level social processes to institutional-level processes". This assertion foregrounds the importance of FCEs to both institutions and organisations. They help provide "the organising principles and practice guidelines for field participants-individually and collectively" (Oliver and Montgomery, 2008:1147).

Additionally, implicit in the theoretical analysis of organisational fields is the basic assumption that FCEs are a critical factor in sustaining fields and that fields are not stagnant. On the contrary, they continuously evolve long after they have been firmly established. FCEs by their nature drive us to appreciate that fields "rather shift over time and include a changing cast of participants that in turn shape and reshape the field's institutional logics" (Oliver and Montgomery, 2008:1148; see also Hoffman 1999). This means that “organisational fields and its institutional logic co-evolve". In much the same way, FCEs are also the connecting agent between organisational fields and their institutional logics. They create the avenue for the co-evolution, diffusion and sustainability of organisational fields and their belief systems. Here, the term "institutional logics" is used to refer to those "systems of cultural elements (values, beliefs, and normative expectations) by which people, groups, and organisations make sense of and evaluate their everyday activities, and organise those activities in time and space” (Haveman and Gualtieri, 2017:1; see also Friedland and Alford, 1991:248-249; Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury, 2012:2). Thus, one can suggest that “the evolution occurs as an iterative structuration process, where changes in the field’s structure have the potential to bring about changes in the field’s institutional logic, and vice versa”. Therefore, “...co-evolution occurs not simply around a central technology or market; it can also occur around issues and debates that result from sweeping historical changes” (Oliver and Montgomery, 2008:1148). These historical and institutional changes could be “social, technological, or economic changes that exert pressure on existing relations and reconfigure models of action and social structures” (Powell et al., 2005:1134).

In line with the argument made above and the seminal definition of an organisational field by DiMaggio and Powell (1983) noted previously, it stands to reason why organisational fields emerge when individual organisations coalesce around shared goals and forms of cooperation. Besides, the idea expressed by DiMaggio and Powell supports a basic assumption that pertinent to any organisational field is the conviction that "once a field becomes well established, however, there is an inexorable push towards homogenisation" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983:148), because characteristically, "organisations compete not just for resources and customers, but for political power and institutional legitimacy". This is where "the concept of institutional isomorphism *becomes* a useful tool for understanding the politics and ceremony that pervade much modern organisational life" (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983:150).

Following the preceding paragraphs, it is essential to acknowledge a growing body of research on FCEs in different epistemic and disciplinary contexts. Recently, researchers have begun

systematically examining the relationship between organisational fields and institutional logic, paying particular attention to FCEs. These include, but are not limited to, climate change (Schüßler, Rüling and Wittneben, 2014), art exhibitions (Delacour and Leca, 2011), Olympic Games (Thiel and Grabher, 2015), institutional and organisational change ((Hardy and Maguire, 2010), tournament rituals (Anand and Jones, 2008), conferences (Garud, 2008) accounts (McInerny, 2008) and creative industries (Moeran and Strandgaard Pederson 2011). There are also works that combine institutional theory, network analysis and theatre studies like those of DiMaggio (1999), Balme (2017, 2019), Andrade and Balme (2020), and Balme and Leonhardt (2020). These works delineate and frame theatrical practice and histories in the context of network analysis, organisational and institutional theories. They draw our attention to what Balme observes as the need for theatre "to be investigated as an institution in the sense of a complex of norms regulating social action", because "institutions invariably operate on the basis of law and impact on collectivities as much as individuals" (2017:128).

This study examines TfD as an organisational field in much the same way. It also explicates the TfD concept and its institutional logic and processes using two specific "field configuring events" (Meyer et al., 2005): the 1983 African Theatre for Development workshop in Murewa, Zimbabwe; and the 1984 workshop on Theatre for Integrated Rural Development in Kumba, Cameroon. It further argues that these FCEs help "establish the importance of examining the historical contexts and dynamic processes that underlie" (McInerney, 2008:1089) the formation of TfD as an organisational field. Most importantly, it confirms that these FCEs turn out to be sites for experimentation, negotiation and standardisation of the TfD praxis.

OVERVIEW: TfD WORKSHOPS AS FIELD CONFIGURING EVENTS (FCES)

Throughout the history of TfD and its development as an organisational field, it has constantly been configured and reconfigured by FCEs at national, regional and international levels. Whilst some of these FCEs were in a conference format, the majority happened in the form of practical workshops. Like all FCEs, these practical workshops and conferences were short-term events and gatherings where members of the TfD network met to, among other things, learn about their field innovations, test new methodologies, and negotiate the scope of their praxis. They also used these fora as an avenue to cultivate field experts, diffuse new approaches and negotiate professional legitimacy, especially with their partners (usually philanthropic and parastatal organisations).

In the historical survey of various manifestations of TfD done in the previous chapter, one sees many antecedent projects and initiatives before the evolution and development of contemporary TfD as an organisational field. Some of the projects highlighted are evidently missing in the general historical accounts of TfD by scholars today. However, all the projects mentioned in this study and those that will be discovered in further studies played a role in shaping the concept of TfD. Therefore, they must be recognised as contributing to the development of TfD, especially in trying to examine TfD as an organisational field, because they enable a reconstruction of the sources, influences and reasons that propelled the evolution and diffusion of TfD in Africa.

From 1978, starting in Botswana, after four years of local implementation of the Laedza Batanani project, its success led to a two-week national TfD workshop that brought together extension workers and adult education workers from all over the country (see Kidd and Byram 1978). This was after an inter-agency committee was formed to promote the integration of drama, culture and the creative arts in non-formal education activities. The Institute of Adult Education of the University of Botswana was charged with the leadership and organisation of the workshop (Byram and Kidd, 1978:86). This particular workshop, although national, set the stage for a series of workshops in other countries, a phenomenon that should be known as FCEs in the context of TfD. These FCEs provided a platform for continuous interaction among African and expatriate adult education experts, theatre scholars, popular theatre enthusiasts and development practitioners.

Consequently, although regional, in 1979, "the first major international Theatre for Development Workshop was held in Chalimbana, Zambia" (Byam. 1999:56). This particular workshop began the TfD field formation process in Africa and the rest of the world. Commenting on the significance of the workshop, David Kerr (1999:79) writes that:

> Perhaps the most influential workshop for launching the Theatre for Development movement was held at Chalimbana about 30 km east of Lusaka in Zambia in 1979. This provided a venue for the marriage between two types of activist-adult educators and social workers on one side (particularly the Botswana-based Laedza Batanani team of Ross Kidd, Martin Byram and Martha Maplanka) and the university-based artists with their roots in travelling theatre (such as Mapopa Mtonga, Dickson Mwansa and myself from Zambia, the Zimbabwean Stephen Chifunyise, and Tanzanians Amandina Lihamba and Eberhard Chambulikazi).

In essence, the workshop was an opportunity for learning by the different actors who came together to form an organisational field; in this context, the configuration of TfD as an organisational field. Kerr confirms this when he further states that "the workshop linked the mobilisation and social analysis skills of the adult educators to the drama and choreography skills of the theatre workers". The justification is marrying skills, sharing experience, and learning from one another. Here, learning is conceptualised in Schüβler, Grabher and Müller-Seitz's (2015:166) words, as a “predominantly intentional undertaking of individuals, teams or organisations to acquire new or deepen existing knowledge or skills". The dynamics that comes with this kind of learning are that it is "by no means only about the process of acquiring explicit knowledge; it also entails the exchange in the form of transferring and disseminating tacit knowledge to inform others, enable learning, exert power, and legitimise one's own actions" (see also Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). The formation, consolidation, and structuration path of the field of TfD has always been learning and negotiation.

The role of actors and organisations in the field continuously shifts between knowledge transfer, testing methodologies, exerting power, and legitimising experiments and actions. Fundamentally, the Chalimbana workshop was where the institutional logic of TfD as an organisational field; that is, "the belief systems and associated practices that dominated field" (Oliver and Montgomery, 2008:1147; Scott et al., 2000:170) began to be formed and negotiated on a continental basis. The guidelines that became the basis for all the other FCEs were tested at this workshop. It was driven mainly by the practitioners and leaders of the Laedza Batanani project. Kerr (1999:80) confirmed that "the Chalimbana workshop's main achievement was to develop the methodology initiated by the Laedza Batanani team". This is in line with Mlama's claim elsewhere that "in the Chalimbana workshop, theatre and development workers came together to generate ideas on using theatre as a tool for development" (1991:72).

This FCE opened the avenues for a cross-fertilisation of ideas that saw the introduction of other actors to the TfD discourse, especially the university theatre professors, who ended up playing a pivotal role in the processes that ensured the consolidation of the field as research and a course of study in higher education institutions in Africa. After the Chalimbana workshop, the TfD technique, with its numerous variations, started spreading throughout the continent. As a result, other national and international FCEs were organised in many countries, including Nigeria (Maska, 1979; Borno, 1981; Benue, 1982-1983, Benue 1986), Malawi (Mbalachanda, 1981; Liwonde, 1987), Lesotho (Maseru, 1982), Zambia (1979; 1981), Zimbabwe (Murewa, 1983; Harare, 1993, 1997), Cameroon (Kumba, 1984), Swaziland, (Mhlangano, 1981; 1982),

Germany (Berlin, 1980), Bangladesh (Koitta, 1983), Ghana, (Winneba, 1994), Sierra Leone, (1979, 1983), Canada (Edmonton, 1987), Sweden (Stockholm, 1985), and Angola (Luanda, 1994).

The role played by the university community must be acknowledged here. The departments of extramural studies, adult education and theatre arts at several universities helped to nurture TfD as an organisational field. Most of the process of the field becoming isomorphic involved actors in higher education institutions. The theatre and performing arts departments in most African countries ended up being the hub for the training and research of TfD once the field became well established. Of course, the FCEs, throughout the history of TfD, should be regarded as the fundamental "ubiquitous strategies of claim making that link(ed) diverse participants' together into a collective performance" (Rao, 2001:266). They brought them together as an effective "grid of discourse spaces created…by the most important vehicle of experimental coordination and integration" (Knorr-Cetina, 1995:131). They aimed to evolve an organisational field and ensure that it became well established and recognised globally. It must also be emphasised that the Zambians were the first to add a new dimension by involving both theatre workers and development workers as actor-animateurs in the TfD processes.

By the 1980s, TfD as an organisational field had become well established. It had become ubiquitous and recognised in most African countries. Its methods and techniques became an efficacious approach in community development and development communication. Undoubtedly, the FCEs provided an ideological framework that fostered the emergence and above-all institutionalisation of TfD as a set of well-established practices that negotiate between NGO funding and the university. Although not all TfD projects are university-based, many have a symbiotic relationship, because by the 1980s TfD had become institutionalised because it worked within an organisational field. Since the organisational field is an important term from institutional theory, it must refer to an intermediate state between institution and organisation. Following Douglass North's famous definition, institutions can be defined as "the rules of the game," and constitute "the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction" (North, 1990:3).

In contrast, organisations are the individual players, actors and "groups of individuals bound by some common purpose to achieve objectives" (North, 1990:5). However, the challenge has always been that theatre scholars tend to concern themselves with the level of organisation: specific theatres and theatre companies because it is here that theatre is made and becomes

visible. Less visible is the institutional level, which in most cases involves some form of exogenous support, whether through a ministry of culture or state-funded universities or private funding, such as transnationally operating private philanthropy or international donor agencies. All these create rules and constraints which are highly mutable. Nevertheless, in this interaction between the institutional and organisational level, structures accessible to theatre historiographical analysis emerge.

A closer inspection of the discussions so far indicates that, while all FCEs may roughly be equal, some are more equal than others. Indeed some define or configure a field rather than just maintain it. For example, in the history of TfD in Africa and its attendant FCEs, the 1983 and 1984 workshops in Zimbabwe and Cameroon, respectively, defined and configured TfD as an organisational field. They provided some key pointers and consolidated the journey of TfD as a practical and theoretical methodology for rural and community development. They also permitted different but related constituents to become aware of their common concerns, join together, share information, coordinate their action, shape and subvert agendas and mutually influence the structuration of the field (Anand and Jones, 2008:1037). In short, the FCEs in focus helped researchers and practitioners understand three things: first, the specific mode of learning and knowledge exchange that these FCEs generated as part of innovations in TfD; second, the type of innovation and learning outcomes that emerged at these FCEs; and finally, the kind of platform for innovation and learning that these FCEs provided for actors in the field. This is more in line with the questions Schüßler, Grabher and Müller-Seitz (2015) asked in their article on FCEs as arenas for field innovation and learning.

PAN-AFRICAN THEATRE-FOR-DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP (ZIMBABWE, 1983)

This African Theatre for Development Workshop took place between 15th August and 1st September 1983. The workshop's planning started long before Zimbabwe was engaged to host it. At the Theatre of Nations Festival held in Sofia, Bulgaria, the then secretary-general of ITI, Lars af Malmborg, engaged Prof. Francis Imbuga of the Kenyatta University College and discussed the possibility of Kenya hosting the workshop. He followed it up with a letter to the chairman of the Kenyan National Commission on Culture in July 1982. However, the political situation in Kenya did not present a good atmosphere for the country to host the event, because, earlier, "in March 1982, Kenyan authorities banned for the second time a popular theatre performance created by a community organisation of peasants and workers, the Kamiriithu

Community Educational and Cultural Centre (KCECC). The organisation was subsequently deregistered and the open-air theatre which the community had built was battered down" (Kidd, 1983:18). As a result, the leaders were forced to exile the country. Ngugi wa Thiong'o went to Europe, and Ngugi wa Mirii and Kimani Gecau moved to Zimbabwe. When it became evident that Kenya could not host the workshop, in November that same year, Lars af Malmborg contacted Mr John Mapondera, the then deputy chief of cultural affairs at the ministry of education and culture in Zimbabwe, and offered Zimbabwe the opportunity of hosting the workshop.[7]. In effect, this was how the first pan-African TfD workshop initiated by UNESCO and ITI ended up being hosted by the government of Zimbabwe. The International Popular Theatre Alliance (IPTA), acting as consultants on the project on behalf of ITI, worked with the Zimbabwean government to organise the event. More than a hundred participants took part in the event.-forty-three from seventeen African countries and fifty-seven from the host nation.

The account is critical because up until this particular FCE, all the other workshops that had taken place throughout Africa were either on a sub-regional basis or country-specific. This was the first time a workshop had been organised at the pan-African level and as a collaboration between several international and donor organisations. It was proof that TfD had developed into an organisational field and was recognised across the globe by this time. As noted by Kidd, one of UNESCO's consultants to the program from the International Popular Theatre Alliance (IPTA), "the Zimbabwe workshop was the first occasion to bring popular theatre workers together on a pan-African basis. Theatre workers who had heard of each other's work but never met came together for the first time, shared and debated their ideas, and talked about ways of maintaining the exchange"(1984: 8).

It stands to reason why this particular FCE played a critical role in configuring the field. The entire event should be regarded as a significant occasion where the field materialised and "jelled in the form of agreed-upon categories of relevant artefact, actors, relationships between them and the boundaries demarking the domain of the field" (Garud, 2008:1062). As a result, the actors who converged navigated and legitimised the practice and entrenched its global efficacy. Furthermore, this workshop represented a forum akin to "an active mechanism whereby any assemblage of heterogeneous elements, humans and materials, becomes configured and reconfigured in real time" (Garud, 2008:1062). A strong argument in favour of this point can be extrapolated from the concept of translation, where the translation is

[7] See letters by Lars af Marlmborg in the appendix for the details

understood as a "displacement, drive, invention, mediation, the creation of a link that did not exist before and that to some degree modifies two elements or agents" (Latour, 1994:32). The 1983 FCE in Murewa, Zimbabwe, did just that. It offered a perfect ground for such translation to occur. For the first time, different agents with different enthusiasms who had engaged in different innovations in terms of methods and approaches were brought together in a shared space that offered an opportunity to be modified, configured and maintained. In other words, actors in the field were brought together in a shared environment that helped their network and ignited the structuration and homogenisation of TfD's organisational field. One can also relate this to Comrade Dzingai Mutumbuka's call to the workshop participants (especially the Zimbabweans) to translate their experience into TfD praxis. He said, according to Kidd, that the workshop participants should translate "the liberation theatre experience into new strategies for conscientisation, mobilisation and community-building" (1984:13).

There were three broad aims for the workshop, agreed upon by all the actors, organisations and networks that collaborated to organise the event. At the continental level, the workshop's main focus was the diffusion of Theatre for Development's (TfD's) methodology and concept to theatre workers and countries in Africa, which had not yet been exposed to this approach. For the host country, since they were organising the first international popular theatre workshop under the label of TfD, it was an opportunity for them to test out the ideas of TfD and adapt them to fit their local context. It was also envisaged that the workshop would aid the host country to reassess some of its own experiences in people's theatre during the liberation struggle and train their development cadres in TfD skills and processes. Furthermore, another purpose of the workshop and the three-day conference that followed was to create an opportunity for exchange and dialogue among African theatre workers, with a significant focus on theatre as a tool for development. The final aim is more directed towards the aspirations of ITI.

The 1983 Zimbabwean workshop came about due to UNESCO and ITI developing interest in TfD. They were impressed with the efficacy of the TfD methodology and the plethora of experimentations that had happened in many African countries. Thereafter, they decided to support its diffusion to other African countries that had not experimented with the concept. In much the same way, the idea of organising the workshop was also in line with ITI's desire to increase African participation in their organisation. They also supported the development of inter-African networking, cooperation and collaboration in the theatre field. The IPTA was brought on board as a consultant because their coordinator had been actively involved in the

TfD movement. He was one of the pioneers and has written extensively on TfD and popular theatre in Africa. He was also involved in training workshops in Botswana, Nigeria and Zambia.

Apart from UNESCO, ITI and the Zimbabwean government, other sponsors included the African Cultural Institute (Dakar), the ITI-Extra European Fund, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Canadian University Service Overseas (CUSO), the Commonwealth Foundation (CF), the German Foundation for International Development (DSE), the French Agency for Cultural and Technical Cooperation (ACCA), NOVID (Netherlands), and the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). In addition, some of the participants were also funded by the International Council for Adult Education. A report written by Ross Kidd about the experience of one of the many groups that the participants were divided into was published by the Centre for the Study of Education in Developing Countries (CESO), which was based in the Hague and would go on to become a key organisation for popularising and institutionalising TfD among European funding bodies.

The workshop had participation from both the African continent's Francophone and Anglophone speaking areas. The countries represented included Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Swaziland, Tanzania, Upper Volta (now Burkina Faso), Zaire, and Zambia. The other participants were fifty-three development cadres and theatre workers from Zimbabwe. Twenty resource persons were drawn from experienced practitioners and countries with extensive practice, including Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Mauritius, Nigeria, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In addition to the African resource persons, four resource persons with practical experience in TfD also came from Britain, Canada, India and Sweden. There were also three other observers: a representative of UNESCO from the Dakar office, a Canadian popular theatre worker and a German cultural researcher.

As far as the specific objectives of the workshop are concerned, it was, for the organisers and participants from Zimbabwe, an experimental adventure, trying out the TfD approach and adapting it to suit the Zimbabwean situation. Following the desire to transform their country after independence in 1980, the workshop was also a training opportunity for their development workers and theatre artists. Aside from launching a TfD program in one district of the country, it further provided an opportunity for the country to reassess its own experience of people's theatre for conscientisation and mobilisation during the liberation struggle. The participants

from different parts of Africa saw the gathering as an opportunity to evaluate the potential and operational requirements of TfD work in a practical manner. It was also a platform for learning the skills and processes involved in TfD work, especially for those new to it. The third objective was to use the workshop to network with theatre workers and TfD enthusiasts across Africa. Finally, on the part of UNESCO, ITI and IPTA, the workshop was an avenue for transferring and diffusing TfD skills and experience to other African countries with minimal or no experience in TfD. Particularly for the initiators, the aim of the workshop was to foster exchange and cooperation among theatre workers and expand the TfD and ITI networks in Africa.

THE WORKSHOP: The planning of the workshop was a collaboration between the main actors involved (UNESCO, ITI, IPTA and the Government of Zimbabwe). UNESCO provided seed funding for the workshop, while ITI and IPTA focused on fundraising and using their networks to disseminate information about the workshop to theatre workers and TfD/popular theatre enthusiasts across the length and breadth of Africa and beyond. Through its local organising committee, the Zimbabwean government took charge of the logistical arrangements and ensured the smooth running of the workshop.

The entire workshop experience was divided into two sessions. The first part focused on the theoretical and historical perspective of TfD. It served as the introduction to the workshop, in which the workshop's objectives and the process and context of TfD praxis were discussed. The session could be described as a crash course in TfD for those who were new to the concept. The second part was dedicated to the practical experience and experimentation; the participants tested both old and new TfD methodologies.

In some cases, they combined what they already knew, what they were taught (during the first two days) and what was relevant to Zimbabwe at the time. Like a typical FCE with the sole aim of configuring a field, the entire "methodology for the workshop drew on two influences: the experience in theatre-for-development accumulated over the last two decades in Independent Africa; and Zimbabwe's own experience of people's theatre for conscientisation and mobilisation during the liberation war" (Kidd, 1985:179). Specifically, "the workshop adopted the Nigerians' "theatre-with-the-people" approach and combined it with the Zimbabwean liberation theatre experience of the Pungwe" (Kidd, 1984:18). One of the reasons for the choice of the Nigerian approach was that, at the time, it was one of the most advanced forms of the TfD approach in Africa, which encouraged greater participation. It shifted the

burden of ownership of projects to the local people. The methodology ensured that the people were the subjects and not the objects of their development.

As mentioned above, the first few days served as the introductory stage of the workshop. Participants got to know one another and discussed the various conceptualisations and manifestations of TfD. This helped clarify issues because the resource persons were adherents of different schools of thought on the TfD. The belief was that they all needed to start from theory before practice and be in agreement with one another. This was also a deliberate plan to offer those coming into contact with TfD for the first time an opportunity to appreciate the varied context and theories at play in the field before the workshop. The afternoon of the second day marked the beginning of the practical aspect. Here, "the participants were given a practical demonstration-analysis process". It was a way of testing the theory they had discussed the previous day and the morning of the second day and ensured that the introductory phase was not all talk and seriousness. They combined it with "singing, dancing, and theatre games which lightened the mood and brought people together in a spirit of celebration (Kidd, 1985:182). Furthermore, it was also a way of letting the participants who were encountering the praxis for the first time experience what usually happens or what is likely to happen on the field, thus engendering a spirit of togetherness, a key strategy in almost all TfD practice and projects.

The second part of the workshop was dedicated to fieldwork, in other words, the main project and practice of TfD methodology. This part of the workshop entailed practical work in and with community members in the selected villages. The participants were divided into seven groups. Each group was made up of at least 16 people who were a mixture of resource persons, foreign and local participants. The resource persons were the most experienced practitioners and well-acquainted with the TfD approaches. The foreign participants were people from countries with minimal practical and theoretical TfD experience. The local participants were drawn from different country sectors to understand the concept and integrate it into their work. This part of the workshop started on the third day, as Kidd writes:

> The real work started on the third day when participants broke into groups. Each group worked mainly on its own, making its plans and developing its working process from this point on. However, brief plenary sessions were held every second morning to keep the whole workshop's unity, give some joint briefings, and share some of the group's learnings. (1984:21)

Although there is not much detail as regards what happened in all the other groups, the comprehensive accounts of one of the groups written by Ross Kidd (1984; 1985) and several reports submitted to UNESCO by different actors gives an idea of what generally ensued. Kidd writes that from the third day onwards, 'each group worked largely on its own, making its plans and developing its working process. However, brief plenary sessions were held every second morning to keep the whole workshop's unity, give some common briefings, and share some of the groups' learnings' (Kidd, 1985:182). Kidd further reports that his group met on the third day and further familiarised themselves with one another to understand the group members' respective backgrounds clearly. They discovered that the majority had no TfD experience and had never created a theatrical piece with village groups. As such, they needed to do a quick review of what they had learnt on the first two days regarding the theory and practice of TfD.

As one of the pioneers and most experienced members of the group, Kidd took the time to summarise the TfD processes and their theoretical underpinnings. First, he stressed the key lessons that every TfD facilitator, must keep in mind. Then, he broke the entire community activation process into many simple but progressive phases. These strategies and lessons are cardinal to the success of every TfD project. He observed that they must strive to build a relationship with members of the community and also motivate them to participate; the participants must work with the community people to study their situation and identify issues for in-depth analysis; they must try to learn the indigenous forms of cultural expression of the area and integrate them into the TfD activity. Closely linked to the purpose of learning the indigenous forms of expressions is the need for them to explore dance, drama, mime, and songs to deepen the understanding of the issues and look for solutions. The last three points concerned organising performance to bring the whole community together and agree on solutions and action; discussing ways by which the projects could be sustained; and finally evaluating the whole experience and identifying the lessons learned (Kidd, 1984:23).

The exercise the group went through on the morning of the third day was also a way of bringing the new people up to speed regarding the TfD processes and how TfD projects are executed. The group then proceeded to do a familiarisation tour of the village designated as their lab site. Unlike the usual gathering of information on the first day as established during the Laedza Batanani project, they were not in a hurry to gather information. They decided to do it gradually since they had time to go back and forth into the community. After the short familiarisation visit to the village, they returned and brainstormed strategies to adopt. They agreed, among other things, to brief and consult with the villagers; adopt local customs and ways of doing

things; and introduce themselves and their backgrounds to the community members so that it was a two-way rather than a one-way communication process. They further agreed to explain the purpose and nature of TfD to the people in order for them to appreciate why the external team members came to the village and the need for the community members to participate in the project actively; to conduct informal interactions based on mutual respect; to learn from one another primarily with regards to local songs, culture, games, communal meeting styles and the historical circumstances of the community; and finally, to recognise that the process should remain a two-way communication and learning process for all involved (Kidd, 1984:24), which should always begin with the people's shared history and an assessment of their lived experiences. This is what propels the kind of analysis directly connected to transforming the condition of the community people, which mostly leads to local mobilisation towards coordinated action in the community. It should be noted that such a process not only conscientised the villagers; it also rid the external participants of their prejudices, liberated their thinking and deepened their understanding of village life and challenges. The collaborative mode of analysis they adopted also helped reveal how village people appreciated their condition, which is often contrary to outsiders' assumptions often foisted on people who live in deprived communities (Kidd, 1984: 25). The daily routine of the group was as follows:

06:00am-07:00am	cold showers and physical exercises (for some)
07:00am-08:00am	breakfast
08:00am-08.30am	plenary session {every second day)
08:30am-10:00am	team meeting (evaluation and planning)
10:00am-10:30am	travel to the village
10:30am-11:00am	arrangements for meeting place and team discussions
11:00am-16:00pm	work with villagers
16:00pm-16:30pm	return to workshop centre
17:30pm-19:00pm	workshop steering committee
19:00pm-20:00pm	supper
20:00pm-22:00pm	evening program (for all participants)
22:00pm-23:30pm	socializing at the local bar

(Kidd, 1985:182-183)

When the first meeting was organised in the village, they used that opportunity to inform every village member about the mission and vision of the TfD project. The external participants (those who were not residents in the village) presented their objectives, which included:

> To get to know the people and for the people to know them (knowing their lives, their problems, their concerns, their aspirations); to exchange songs and dances; to work together in developing drama; to use dram-making as a way of discussing problems and looking for solutions; to use performance as a way of bringing the community together and agreeing on solutions and action (1984:33).

The belief was that they could achieve their purpose only when they could get the community members to understand them. In much the same way, the workshop participants, acting as community animateurs, also felt it necessary to understand the circumstances of the people. Indeed, this strategy worked for them and set the right tone for the village work component of the workshop. They had their first group discussions and deliberated the areas the community felt were important and needed urgent attention. The community embraced the project and gave it their blessing, which served as a sign of their confidence in the TfD workshop participants. Their work then started in earnest. From the fourth day onwards, the group vigorously followed the routine indicated above. Most of the theoretical and formal ways of doing TfD that the external participants were familiar with and were also taught (in the case of those who were new to TfD) in the first two days proved helpful, but the people always did it differently, largely because of their culture and performance history. For example, instead of formal discussions of the previous day's issues to set the tone for the day's work, the community people seamlessly integrated it into their performance. They used their songs and dances, which eventually merged into role-playing as the medium of discussions. The approach created a lively atmosphere that made everyone present free to contribute and made the process extremely democratic.

Each group (facilitators) commuted daily to their respective village from their place of residence. They worked with their communities to achieve their targets. Some used drama, others used dance. Some groups made puppetry their main act; in general, mixed media was the reigning approach. Kidd writes that "instead of imposing an alien form, we found we could work within the people's own performance traditions, incorporating and building on their songs, dances, and sketches and on the *pungwe* structure itself". At the end of the day, "this in turn helped to reinforce their self-confidence-they saw that they had relevant skills and experience to contribute and that their ideas and thinking were crucial to the process" (Kidd, 1984:39). A key observation worth highlighting is that the cultural norms and hierarchical social arrangements that pertained in the communities also played a crucial role in ensuring the success of the activities. Some of the practices that could have become a disadvantage for the

women turned out to be an advantage for the entire project. The external participants (facilitators) had to submit to the cultural dictates of the village. On several occasions, they had to work with the women and men separately. This turned out to be an advantage because the facilitators were able to get the best out of the women when they worked independently and did the same with the group that was made up of only men. The women also insisted that only the female facilitators participated in their discussions, creations, and activities. By the end of the project, each community was satisfied with the project, mainly because the development objectives were investigated from the cultural standpoint of the community.

ANALYSIS: The 1983 UNESCO/ITI workshop in Murewa, Zimbabwe, represented a watershed moment in the genre's history in both theory and practice. This particular FCE occupies a significant and unique position in the evolution of the discipline. The gathering was field-defining in several ways. First, it was a site where essential developments and methodological innovations occurred. Second, although experiments and projects had been carried out in different parts of the continent, most of these were regional and, in some cases, national. The 1983 event in Murewa, Zimbabwe, was the first time a TfD workshop was organised at a pan-African level and involved multiple local and international actors and organisations. Hence, in a fundamental sense, when looking at TfD as an organisational field, this study argues that the field was, to a greater extent, configured. Third, the process of structuration and homogenisation began at this workshop. The entire conceptualisation (theory and practice), organisation, and workshop implementation drew on the accumulated practical and theoretical TfD experiences over many decades before the workshop, which likewise negotiated and found a way of integrating new and innovative approaches derived from the storehouse of the Zimbabwean performance experience of liberation theatre for conscientisation and mobilisation. The workshop further dealt with "the micro- and macro-level processes that shaped individual and shared realities" of the local, national, regional and international actors who were present. Furthermore, it created an indispensable condition that placed some kind of responsibility, paradoxically, on practitioners and researchers in their quest towards structuration and homogenisation of the discipline. Given the preceding context, it stands to reason that the workshop created a platform where, on the one hand, there was the recognition of the participants' agency to create and believe in their ideas and experiments in order for them to make progress with their chosen approach and convince others to follow their lead. On the other, both the local and international participants were encouraged to "also be ready to disbelieve their realities and be willing to embrace the emerging shared reality even if

it does not match theirs"(Garud and Rappa, 1994:344). This was the exact situation that both the new and experienced practitioners and actors at the workshop were confronted with. That is why implicit in the aims and objectives of the workshop was the general understanding that the gathering was a way of "setting standards, defining practices, and codifying key vocabularies, as well as positioning the field relative to other fields and institutions" (Lampel and Meyer, 2008:1029). Given the plethora of actors both in the primary and ancillary fields of TfD who were part of the initiation, organisation, and implementation of the workshop, it is obvious why the workshop continues to occupy a key position in the historical and historiographical analysis of the discipline.

Undeniably, the 1983 workshop was the first time actors in the field agreed to use TfD as the umbrella term for different socially engaged theatre experiments on the continent in the approximately three decades preceding the workshop. The term TfD became well established amongst the various competing and cognate terms. In Lampel and Meyer's words, the workshop focused on "expanding, refining, and solidifying beliefs and practices, as well as tracking and reinforcing TfD field position relative to other fields and institutions" (2008:1029). The social capital of the term was created, and subsequent activities and projects reinforced it and what it encapsulates. What is more, TfD's legitimacy was concretised by the endorsement of several international organisations involved in the organisation and funding of the workshop. They paved the way through their funding for new countries to participate in the workshop. In this context, such organisations must be deemed the leading "institutional entrepreneurs" who had "an overt field-building agenda". Since most of them are recognised entities which had funded some of the national and regional projects and FCEs that happened in many countries, it seems that, by the time of the workshop under discussion, they all came to an agreement that TfD best described that grassroots approach to community and human development each of them felt was the way forward for development cooperation.

This large number of parastatal organisations further provides a crucial proof of concept and legitimation for the next wave of TfD in subsequent years. Significantly, the critical role played by the International Popular Theatre Alliance (IPTA) is worth highlighting. This professional and international organisation, which already demonstrated normative isomorphism, was at work. In this first phase of TfD's consolidation as an organisational field, the IPTA seems to have played a crucial role. It is instructive to state that even IPTA, which operated under the banner of Popular Theatre, starting from the 1983 Murewa workshop, agreed that henceforth TfD should become the defining label for the practice, movement and discipline. This is a clear

testimony to the fact that the 1983 Murewa, Zimbabwean workshop was not only field-defining in its entirety, but was also the starting point for the structuration and homogenisation of the discipline, because those who were coming into contact with TfD for the first time were likely to practice the concept based on what they learned there.

An equally important aspect of the underlying dynamics of all TfD workshops is that they are culturally constructed to serve as a place for analysis, encouraging collective action and generating solutions to real or imagined development challenges. In this respect, "the construction of organisational fields is a cultural phenomenon that involves preexisting social practices, rules embedded in power relations between groups and cognitive structures which function as cultural frames" (Machado-da-Silva, Filho and Rossoni, 2006:37). Thus, TfD is a process imbedded in a given culture at any particular time and as such "the best way of learning a process is by going through it". That is why the Zimbabwean FCE and for that matter, all other TfD FCEs must be contextualised as a forum where "the participants learn the skills (action-oriented field research, problem analysis, drama making, theatre skills, performance organisation, discussion and evaluation) not in isolation from, but in relation to a practical 'operational' context, that is, by carrying out a small, community-based 'theatre for development' project" (Epskamp, 1991:180), a reason why in a different but related context, Mlama equally contends that every TfD workshop should be regarded as "a process through which man studies and forms an opinion about his environment, analyses it, expresses and shares his view point about it and acquires the frame of mind necessary for him to take action to improve it" (1991:66). Within the context of the Zimbabwean event, the workshop format served as a critical framework for integrating the people's culture and experience into their communal and national development plan. This is in line with Chinyowa's comprehensive and explicit explanation that put the term in context. He stated that the TfD workshop is essentially "a process of creating new frames of existence through play discourse". A situation in a practical sense "may be considered as a means by which ordinary reality is suspended in order to communicate particular meta-messages about development" (2005:98).

However, in the context of the Zimbabwean workshop, one cannot say that reality was suspended entirely. Instead, it was used as a vehicle to negotiate present and future challenges and aspirations. On the one hand, it made the local people understand the agency they had to change their circumstances. On the other, it was used as a process of learning and renewal for the external participants, which happened through understudying other people’s lived reality and experiences. Thus, the workshop format was and continues to be an instrument for

innovation, structuration and building institutional frameworks that ensures the sustainment of the TfD ideology and development thinking according to the participants and the chosen community's context. Epskamp and Swart observe that, on the one hand, these workshops are held as a learning process for trainers, more like what happened in the 1983 workshop. The dialogue, interaction and conscientisation processes with the villagers and the play resulting from it must be seen as a learning process and a testing ground for the participants and the people to generate new and appropriate methodologies. On the other hand, the workshop aimed at 'conscientisation' of the rural population, making them aware of their situation, and working with them to analyse their challenges and devise solutions for them (1991:183).

Moreover, a closer inspection of African societies reveals that performative interactions are commonplace. To the African, the rhythms and cycles of life are deeply ingrained in, and to a greater extent, synonymous with performance, because performance is believed to be "life expressed in dramatic terms" (Opoku, 1964:51). Perhaps, this is why they use performance for conscientisation, and mobilisation was paramount in the liberation struggle of the Zimbabwean people. In many respects, it explains why the people in all the villages that the groups went to "were already accustomed to improvisation and the creation of their own sketches". What is more, the input of the community/village members in the workshop process "was far more than the subject matter for the drama-making: they also brought an enthusiasm and commitment, initiative and organisational capacity, and their own experience, skills, and way of structuring people's theatre as the basis for community celebration and learning" (Kidd, 1984:189). This point is crucial because most of the TfD work in Africa prior to this workshop "undervalued indigenous performance forms and the indigenous organisation of cultural activity". One of the reasons why this happened was that "elite theatre practitioners engaged in Popular Theatre often find it easier to operate with the European-based play into whose skills they have been trained" (Mlama, 2002:48). Others were also of the view that the people were "ignorant and that is why they do not do things the way "developmentalists" think they should be done"(Gecau, 1983:24). Even Mlama arrived at a similar conclusion, stating that "it is also a historical fact that experts have not displayed much respect for the grassroots community's viewpoints on account of alleged community's ignorance" (Mlama, 2002:46). The irony however was that "the "solutions" that are therefore offered do not go beyond the localised problem to its probable cause within the historical, national, and international context" (Gecau, 1983:25).

Fortunately, the Murewa workshop debunked such notions. The participants worked with the villagers' patterns of cultural activity. They adopted the *pungwe* and other theatrical forms peculiar to the people. Indeed, they seamlessly integrated TfD with the traditional performances and cultural worldview of the villagers; they blended the two (TfD and indigenous performance genres), which, as Ross Kidd puts it, "affirmed the value of the *pungwe* as an activity in its own right and as a catalyst for development". He states that, in the context of the workshop, the group:

> was adopting more than a 'traditional form' or performance medium - we were working with and adapting the people's self-organised education process. They already had a well-tried framework for community learning. All we were doing was showing how, through a few modifications, the pungwe structure could be intensified as a means both of community education and decision-making. We showed that people's cultural activity could be not simply an expression of their identity as a community but also an active force in the development of the community. (1984:201)

These reactions have had some bearing on the broader issues of integrating local mores in TfD or making them the primary ingredient of the praxis. The 1983 Murewa workshop was the defining moment. It crystalized local practitioners' long-held aspiration and commitment to see development issues projected from the subjects' point of view. It also depicted how indigenous performance genres could be used as the vehicle for achieving the aims and objectives of TfD projects. This was because the workshop was not just a mere gathering; it was an "activity of knowing: the acquisition, organisation, and use of knowledge" (Neisser 1976:1). It offered and solidified the place of the local medium of communication in TfD praxis. This highlights how the workshop helped define and configure the field.

Closely linked to the argument above is a point that needs to be made. Historically, various forms of performance (music, song, and dance) have been instrumentalised for communication. This has often been state-directed and can be traced back to the 1950s in the developing world. In 1980, the folklorist John A. Lent documented a plethora of such initiatives. He asserted that, within the context of "bringing a sense of functional relevancy" to indigenous performing arts, India was one of the first new nations to use 'folk media' in the 1950s; an initiative which led to the establishment in 1954 of a Song and Drama Division as an arm of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting for the sole aim of harnessing indigenous performing arts for development purposes (Lent 1980: 81). Earlier in 1959, anthropologist Milton Singer noted in

South India "the use of dramatic media to tell villagers the story of independence, of the five-year plan, and of specific projects for village development including both 'traditional and modern dramatic forms" (1960: 155). Although Milton's work supports the assertion by Lent, it is worth acknowledging that the overwhelming majority of folk media for development initiatives that John Lent (1980) documents took place in the 1970s and were indeed essentially state-sponsored and controlled.

The Zimbabwe workshop continued this trend and took it in a new direction. While there was some state involvement by the new Zimbabwean government, the organisational field that TfD has become had already been reconfigured to involve a wide range of local and international NGOs and parastatal actors. It had become more complex and, above all, more international. Although positive in many respects, this situation also raised questions in the minds of practitioners of TfD in Africa. Asking whether popular theatre is the highest form of cultural underdevelopment, David Kerr raises pertinent issues. He states that the extensive involvement of international donor organisations and parastatal entities in TfD "raise doubts in the minds of those who, like *himself*, have been enthusiastic practitioners of popular participatory theatre-doubts about whether such drama forms might not sometimes be abetting the same process of dependency noted by Nkrumah, rather than helping delink African societies from Northern dominance". He also asked "what imperatives have led international agencies to court African popular theatre workers? What movements in African theatre practice have paved the way for a "marriage" with the development agencies?" (1991:55-56). Even though the doubts raised by Kerr are germane and legitimate, they also illustrate the global acceptance and recognition of TfD as an organisational field, confirming that the practitioners recognise the changing dynamics of global politics and adapt to them.

The broader question that needs to be addressed here relates to the extent to which the formation of the organisational field ultimately functioned in the long term to limit and constrain TfD. Institutional forces came into play to constrain the new field from the many possible paths it might have taken based on the various 'cognate practices' to be selected from. Institutions typically constrain organisational activity (Barley and Tolbert 1997), not expand it. This often leads to the familiar phenomenon of path dependency whereby 'contingent events set into motion institutional patterns or event chains that have deterministic properties' (Mahoney 2000, 507). If the Murewa workshop produced path-dependent qualities, what were they? Critique by Eyoh (1991) and Mlama (1991) has tended to focus on the extent and form of indigenous participation in creating the material for translation into performance. This is indeed the red

thread running through much early commentary. It is particularly characteristic of participant-observers looking for best practice solutions for their work. An organisational approach might provide a different reading of the same events. The international composition and support of the workshop already point to the future course of TfD: involvement of NGOs, government and parastatal organisations. All the reports about the workshop list no fewer than twelve separate organisations from at least seven different countries. We see at least twenty-four countries from within and outside Africa represented by participants at the workshop. This means that we already see here the externalisation of TfD on the organisational level compared to the limited number of actors in the early work in Botswana and other places.

From a positive point of view, such constraints can lead to organisational isomorphism (DiMaggio/Powell 1983) that, while not necessarily the most innovative solution, has the advantage of creating efficiency in other areas and enhancing "organisational effectiveness and survival" (Wicks 2001: 662). The argument here is that if most TfD projects conform to the same set of expectations, this expedites and streamlines funding applications and other areas of activity. The follow-up workshop in Kumba, Cameroon, benefitted from such change. The significant implication of the global cold war mandated an ideological realignment away from class struggle and economic redistribution towards more broadly based goals involving poverty alleviation, health, agriculture. This meant that donor agencies required a degree of conformity or at least alignment with their funding agendas, because most of them were aligned to a government, and these governments had their own agendas and focus when funding development projects in Africa.

THEATRE FOR INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT (KUMBA, 1984)

The advent of TfD in Cameroon is a complex and exciting story. It is situated within the broader context of the theatre and socio-cultural development history of the country and Africa, which directly correlates with the country's political and economic trajectories and is intimately connected with the struggles of most African nations before and after independence. The postcolonial African predicament was caused by political blunders and deepened by global capitalist exploitation. In Cameroon, like most African nations, theatre's reaction has been that of protest through experimentation and a constant search for ways to redeem the redeemable and reclaim the lost periods. It is within this quest for a way to change the circumstances of the people that TfD emerged in Cameroon.

Tracing the genealogy of the concept in the country, John Tiku Takem (2005:24) observes that "Theatre for Development in Cameroon as in many other African countries has roots in pre-colonial indigenous African theatre", because "as an artistic medium and a catalyst for social, economic and political transformation, it has a lot in common with indigenous performances". He further grounds his argument in the fact that indigenous performances "bequeathed a certain tradition of functional and ideological commitment" to TfD, which in many respects serve as aesthetic resources for TfD practice today. Kerr (1995:2) confirms that "pre-colonial African theatre mediated…class formation and social change". Indeed, both indigenous and literary traditions of theatre in the country created the condition needed for the smooth launch of TfD. Even Hansel Ndumbe Eyoh and Bola Butake, who played a prominent role in starting and consolidating TfD in Cameroon, were products of literary theatre as much as they were of the indigenous arts; they were theatre practitioners and university drama teachers. While Eyoh, at the beginning of TfD in the country, was also the director of the University theatre troupe and a member of ITI, Butake was an accomplished playwright. Both were teaching literary theatre at the time. However, the introduction of TfD praxis led to most of the theatre practitioners in the country committing “their talents to applying its methods to promote the importance of theatre in community advancement” (Takem, 2005:55).

Indeed, Cameroon is one of the countries that came into contact with TfD at the 1983 Murewa workshop in Zimbabwe through its participants at the workshop. This means that its pioneers benefited from learning from best practices from other parts of the continent and other peoples and countries’ experience and expertise. The recap of methods and projects coupled with the intensive training they received equipped them with the skills needed to subsequently experiment with the methodology when they returned to Cameroon. Indeed, the experience Ndumbe Eyoh gained came in handy when he decided to shoulder the responsibility of starting TfD in the country.

Hansel Ndumbe Eyoh (1985:12) indicates that “the idea of a Cameroonian Workshop on theatre for development was born in Murewa, Zimbabwe, in August 1983, during the UNESCO/ITI sponsored 'African Workshop on Theatre for Development' which brought together theater and development people from many parts of the world". There were several reasons for the eventual organisation of the conference Cameroon, including the fact that there was a desire for a sequel to the Zimbabwean workshop preferably in a francophone African country. The other reason was that Eyoh had become the secretary-general of the newly formed

Union of African Performing Artists. As such, he was responsible for coordinating and organising the workshop. The decision was to organise it either in Wester or Central Africa.

Initially, the workshop was supposed to have taken place in 1985. However, the date changed because the grant they received from one of the international organisations that supported the workshop would have expired by December of 1984, hence the organisation of the workshop in December of that same year in order to be able to utilise the grant. Eyoh writes that "although originally scheduled to take place in March 1985, the workshop was moved to December 1984 because the DSE grant was scheduled to expire by that date. This of course occasioned a lot of changes in planning which were not without their inconveniences" (Eyoh, 1985:13-14).

Through Professor Joseph Owona and Professor Jean-Louis Dongmo, the vice-chancellor and the dean of faculty of letters and social sciences, respectively, the University of Yaoundé played a key role through its Department of English in ensuring the success of the workshop. The University and the Ministry of Agriculture agreed to situate the workshop in Kumba, specifically at the Community Development Specialization Training School. The other government agency legitimising the project was the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. Ndumbe writes that they were brought on board because: "firstly, the international nature of the workshop, and secondly, the fact that it would involve mobilising rural masses" (Eyoh, 1985:13). Some of the people involved in the day to day coordination and organisation included Dr Paul Mbagwana, the Head of the Department of English, Dr Etienne Ze Amvela, Bola Butake and Eyoh Ndumbe himself. In addition, they were supported by two local liaison officers for each of the three villages in which the practical workshop happened: Hope Eyoh and Dibo Ebanja for Konye; Oscar Manbo Itoe and William Diony in Kake; and Fritz Esapa and Essoka Mukete for Kurume.

The external funding and support came from several international agencies and para-statal organisations, including the German Foundation for International Development (DSE), the International Development Research Centre (Ottawa), OXFAM (QUEBEC), and the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). In addition, the grants they offered were complimented by the Cameroonian government through the Ministry of Agriculture. The International Popular Theatre Alliance (IPTA) also provided technical support and guidance. The encouragement of Ross Kidd and Rumelt Hummellen of IPTA on the need for a follow-up workshop was integral to the Kumba workshop. Eyoh captures it succinctly that it was "through the prompting of Rodd Kidd and Rumelt Hummellen of International Popular Theatre

Alliance, and discussions with colleagues of the newly formed Union of African Performing Artist, it was decided that a follow-up workshop to Murewa be organised somewhere in Central or West Africa(Eyoh, 1985:12).

Although the project was implemented under the auspices of the University of Yaoundé, the actual organisation that initiated the project and was responsible for the organisation of the workshop in Cameroon was the Union of African Performing Artists (UAPA). However, it turned out that, at the time the workshop took place, they were not a registered organisation in the country. As such, they could not legitimately operate, let alone negotiate with agencies and establishments there. Thus, they submitted the project to the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Yaoundé as originating from the Theatre Section of the English Department of the Faculty of Letters and Social Sciences. Therefore, the UAPA, the University of Yaoundé and the English Department can be credited with the 1984 TfD workshop on Integrated Rural Development at Kumba, Cameroon.

Even though the workshop was a follow-up to the Zimbabwean one, the purpose differed significantly. There was a certain degree of immediate and futuristic aspiration in the way the aims and objectives of the workshop were couched. The organisers declared that the workshop was, among other things, projected:

> to initiate the theatre people, development agents and village communities in the practice of theatre for conscientisation/mobilisation; to demonstrate the process with the view of enabling the Cameroonian authorities to evaluate its potential as a means of development; to contribute to the search for new methodologies in the practice of theatre for integrated rural development; to hold a practical experience in village-based theatre involving villagers in analysing data and in the drama-making process; to assess the effectiveness of the methodology, both in its immediate feasibility and long term impact (Eyoh, 1985:17)

The anticipated outcome of the workshop, as can be extracted from the aims, indicates that the organisers paid particular attention to the country in focus. Their objective was to create a platform that would aid not only in implanting the idea of TfD in the development aspiration of the people, but also making it an integral methodology for development activities in the country. To this end, it is essential to look at how the daily activities of the workshop unfolded.

THE WORKSHOP: Having learnt from the earlier experiences in similar FCEs, the organisers designed a manual for the workshop and made it available to participants in advance.

It "formed the basis of the initial process of induction. The manual presented the objectives of the workshop, the areas of intervention of theatre-for-integrated rural development, and the organisational procedure of preparing a workshop" (Eyoh, 1985:29). In essence, the manual can be described as the first phase of the introduction for the participants. It was mailed to each resource person before they arrived in Cameroon.

In terms of methodology, the workshop adopted a simple technique that was a slight modification of what took place in Zimbabwe. They followed an eight-stage standard procedure which started with an introduction to theatre-for-integrated rural development (Th. IRD). Here, the participants were engaged in the theoretical aspect of the workshop. The information in the manual was complemented by the resource persons in discussions with the participants in their sub-groups and plenary sessions. This was followed by data collection, data analysis, story improvisation and performance design, performance, discussions, follow-up and evaluation. Essentially, this was adapted from Kidd and Byram (1981).

In all, fifteen resource persons and twenty-five students assembled for the workshop. The resource persons came from different parts of the world. Thirteen of them were TfD and popular theatre practitioners, and the rest were community development experts. The TfD facilitators had been involved in most regional and international workshops. The community development experts were drawn from the Community Development Specialization Training School (CDSTS) in Kumba. Indeed, all the students who participated were also from the Community Development Specialization Training School.

The first day, which was scheduled to be the opening ceremony, suffered many setbacks that ultimately turned out to be a blessing. Most of the dignitaries invited did not show up; even the school's vice-chancellor (CDSTS) had travelled on an official assignment outside the country. However, the organisers and resource persons saw a tremendous strategic value in the situation and turned the opening ceremony into an orientation session. Mr Stephen Joel Chifunyise from Zimbabwe, Tar Ahura from Nigeria and Penina Mlama from Tanzania each led a different session of the day's program. While Stephen Chifunyise gave a historical background to the concept of TfD, linking it to Th. IRD, Tar Ahura gave a brief description of the Ahmadu Bello University Theatre Collective and its achievements. Both presentations illustrated what can be achieved with the TfD concept in nation building and individual/community development.

After the presentations by Chifunyise and Tar Ahura, there was a coffee break, after which they gathered in their respective groups based on the villages (Kurume, Kake and Konye) they were

assigned. The Kurume group consisted of fifteen people, Konye comprised fourteen people, and Kake had fifteen people. Each group was assigned a group leader, at least two resource persons, a rapporteur, two community/village liaison persons, and eight students. During these group sessions, the group members took turns introducing themselves and bonded through acting and improvisation games. They further discussed and deepened their understanding of the concept of Th. IRD. This was a way of initiating the students and making them understand the essence of organising a successful TfD project. It was also supposed to prepare the students unexperienced in TfD practices for what they were likely to face in the communities.

After that, each group's liaison persons gave a detailed overview of the village to the group. The overview covered the people's way of life, their history and development trajectories, the predominant occupation, and their socio-political aspirations. Each group further discussed the social organisation of their respective villages, mapping out issues that they felt their group was likely to be confronted with and required to deal with. Some of the issues they focused on included health, agriculture, commerce, politics and socio-cultural aspirations. To conclude the group sessions, they finally discussed methods of gathering information based on the tentative challenges they projected the communities might have. In the evening of the same day, Penina Mlama led all the participants in a dance-drama workshop, which Eyoh indicates was designed "to make the students realise that they possessed the potential techniques of popular theatre and that they did not have to be theatre specialists to be able to exploit these in their work" (1985:53).

The activities on the second day included two plenary sessions, an improvisation workshop, and group work/discussions. The first plenary session took place in the morning. It was dedicated to introducing the participants to Cameroon's history of community development. This session was facilitated by Philip Nchem, the director of CDSTS in Kumba and one of the local resource persons. He related the different challenges and phases of the efforts to consolidate community development in the country. Notable in his exposition was the role UNDP played in 1968 in setting up the Community Development Centre in Kumba. Equally important, he mentioned, were the roles that the forced labour policies of Germany and France and later the indirect rule of British played in weakening endogenous community development efforts. This was followed by an improvisation workshop led by Yakubu Nasidi from Nigeria and Debebe Eshetu from Ethiopia. Subsequently, the participants went on a coffee break and resumed their group work. Here, each group discussed strategies for information gathering. In addition, they took time to learn the salutations and primary languages of their respective lab

sites so that they would be prepared for integration when they got there. After the group sessions, they all returned for the evening plenary session. A drama workshop led by Sophia Lokko from Ghana and Tar Ahura from Nigeria. Essentially, the first two days were a crash course on TfD for the students to help them understand and appreciate what they were likely to face in the communities. In their respective groups, they decided on some strategies to employ when they arrived in their various communities: whom they should see first, the activities they would do, and how they would negotiate their acclimatisation during the period of the fieldwork and their stay in the villages.

A significant part of the third day was dedicated to travelling. The participants were briefed on the travel arrangements during the morning plenary session, after which each group presented its report, covering their activities for the first two days. They also performed some rehearsed performances as a prototype of what might happen after going through the processes in the village. This was akin to what Boal terms "rehearsal for the revolution". When each group eventually got to their destination, they settled in with the families that they were assigned. This was a clear departure from other TfD projects and workshops, especially the regional and international FCEs, in which the outside facilitators mostly stayed at a designated place and commuted to the project sites/villages each day. Some groups were lucky to receive a rousing welcome when they got to their villages, while others received a more muted one. For example, "the Kurume group arrived only to find out the chief of the village was away and that the traditional council had previous engagements and could not meet them immediately" (Eyoh, 1985:70). Notwithstanding whichever welcome they received, the groups settled in, had supper and planned the rest of their stay, which included what they aimed do and achieve in their respective villages for the period of their stay in the communities.

The fieldwork began in earnest on the fourth day. The groups visited and introduced themselves to the authorities in their respective villages. After that began their community interaction as a form of data gathering. They also involved themselves in all the cultural activities organised in the communities. In terms of methodology, they employed the flooding, homestead, interview and performance methods (Mda, 1993:63) as part of their information-gathering techniques. The leaders of the respective groups ensured that they covered enough ground and gathered sufficient information, because they had to report back to the plenary session on the seventh day. To this end, the Kake group, for instance, further divided themselves into four sub-groups in order to cover a wide area and reach more people. They found out that, whereas there were points of convergence in the information most of them gathered, there were other diverse issues

that they had never envisioned (Eyoh, 1985: 73-74). This helped them synthesise and prioritise the concerns related to a section of the people and those related to the village in general. On the seventh day, they all returned to Kumba to engage with the larger group to share experiences and compare notes before moving to the next phase of the workshop.

Before the plenary session, on the eighth day, the resource persons conferred and discussed issues related to theory, methodology and logistics, most of which were directly related to their experiences during the fieldwork. "Each group leader presented the work already achieved in their respective villages, indicating the problems they had encountered and how they planned to overcome these" (Eyoh, 1985:91). When they eventually met at the plenary session on the ninth day, they presented their group reports and discussed the progress achieved thus far. They also raised many challenges, which were thoroughly discussed. Some of these challenges related to group cohesion and how some of the students still felt they could communicate with the community people on their level. "Daniel Labonne expressed surprised at the fact that group cohesion did not seem to exist amongst the Kake and Konye groups, and that the students were still being uppish with the villagers" (Eyoh, 1985:96). They also discussed the fact that the Konye group should limit the geographical scope of their intervention, given that they had added two sub-villages to their initially assigned village. Penina Mlama, the Konye group leader, "assured the group that she believed they were working in the right direction, and there was no need to despair" (Eyoh, 1985:98). With regard to the specific problem of building a bridge to replace the unsafe hammock in the community, Yakubu Nasidi expressed a degree of hope that, since the people have collaborated to build a hammock before, there was hope that they could come together to build a bridge. The discussions on this issue ended with the plenary session agreeing unanimously and suggesting "that the group prepare an improvisation to try to mirror the squabbles in the Konye area, and how this dissipated development effort" (Eyoh, 1985:99). One issue that ran through all the groups, mainly among the student participants, was a demand for a unified methodology and whether the concept of TfD "was a deliberate or accidental occurrence". They wanted to know whether there was a right or wrong way of doing TfD. In answering, Eyoh recapped the history in line with what Chifunyise lectured at the beginning of the workshop and further indicated that the Kumba workshop adopt an approach that encouraged flexibility and ensured that no group is restricted to follow a laid down approach rigidly." The methodology, he pointed out, was still at an experimental stage and each group was free to manipulate it the way they thought most suitable for their situation and circumstance" (Eyoh, 1985:105). The groups identified issues ranging from health, education

and agriculture to the economy. Afterwards, each group retreated to plan the next phase of the project: story creation, improvisation and community performance.

The next day, the groups returned to their respective communities; they set out in earnest and started with story creation and improvisation. Some groups had their community people participating in the process and performed with them on the performance day, while others did not have such a privilege. Take Kurume, for instance: "the villagers who turned up for the rehearsals were more relaxed, and they advised on interpretation, they suggested changes to the storyline, they added punch into the acting, they taught song and dances, but not many of them joined the acting properly. Four were villagers of the twelve characters in the play" (Eyoh, 1985:123). This cannot be said of the Kake and the Konye people.

Nevertheless, the overall effect was that all the communities participated and contributed during the performance. They also were able to come to a consensus based on the performance. Overall, the project turned out well with moderate achievements. The participants then returned to the Community Development Training School to evaluate the process. Finally, each group presented a report after which they discussed other matters related to their developing association- the Union of African Performing Artists.

ANALYSIS: From the onset, the organisers of the Kumba workshop admitted that it was a follow-up to the 1983 workshop in Murewa, Zimbabwe. The lead organiser was convinced that the TfD methodology employed during the Murewa workshop "could be pushed even further, which resulted in the organisation of the Kumba Workshop" (1991:1). In terms of the motivation for the organisation of the workshop, Eyoh indicates that "Kumba was designed to resolve a few of the problems encountered in Zimbabwe". Therefore, it stands to reason that the Kumba workshop consolidated the processes set in motion in Murewa, Zimbabwe. Perhaps that is why he writes without equivocation that "the methodology adopted for the workshop was largely informed by that used in the ITI/UNESCO African Workshop on Theatre for Development held in Murewa, Zimbabwe, in August 1983, and which was developed by the International Popular Theatre Alliance (IPTA)" (Eyoh, 1987:4). Therefore, it offered an opportunity to tighten the loose ends identified in the processes and created a platform to surmount the challenges that participants encountered during the Murewa workshop. To this end, the Kumba workshop gives credence to the assertion made earlier that the Murewa FCEs helped configure the field of TfD. It also suggests a degree of isomorphism since what was being done in Kumba was based on what was done earlier in Murewa. Many developments

confirm this, and the outcomes indicate that homogenisation and isomorphism in the field had started, because, even before the workshop officially started, Eyoh posits that “the resource persons held several meetings to evaluate the Murewa experience to determine a consensus of approach". Then, they updated one another on what happened at Murewa, specifically, "what had worked, what did not, what was frustrating and what was superfluous" (1985:141). This is reason enough to ascertain that the Murewa, after solidifying and configuring the field, also set in motion the field's isomorphism.

Furthermore, a brief review of the entire workshop reveals the residual effects of years of national, regional and international TfD workshops, especially the 1983 Murewa workshop in Zimbabwe, on the 1984 Kumba workshop in Cameroon. This, in a positive way, foregrounds the argument of the field becoming isomorphic, as was demonstrated in the previous paragraph. Although in the 1983 Murewa workshop, the field was firmly configured and recognised worldwide by agencies and other para-statal organisations in the field, in 1984 at Kumba, the isomorphic nature and characteristics became accentuated. This point was emphasised by Eyoh in his report when he reveals that “the Kumba workshop had the advantage that it came after several other experiments of this nature and used resource persons who had already gained tremendous experience in popular theatre work”. He goes on to emphasise that “many of them were already acquainted with each other, having participated in the Murewa-Zimbabwe workshop. This eased the problem of what ideology and methodology to adopt" (1985:141). However, the resource persons questioned the workshop title because they felt it should have included “TfD”. To address their concerns, it was explained that "concerning the title of the workshop itself: Workshop on theatre for integrated rural development, it was explained that integrated approach referred to both the nature of the themes to be developed and the theatre techniques to be employed" (Eyoh, 1985:144). This confirms the isomorphic turn of TfD and depicts a strict adherence to what took place in Murewa, Zimbabwe.

A significant innovation emerged out of the Kumba experiment. All the participants lived in their assigned villages, integrated with the village people and strived to understand the issues from their point of view. This was a way of ensuring that the challenges identified and their respective solutions were home-grown and not imposed on the villagers by the visitors. It is worth noting that, prior to the Kumba workshop, the norm had been for participants to live at a designated place and commute to their lab site each day. The Kumba workshop adopted a different approach. They insisted that an essential part of the process was living in the villages with the people. The project leader made it clear that the "workshop was innovative in that the

participants were actually going to live with the villagers and share their experiences. It was no longer a question of gathering at a base point and moving into the villages every morning and returning in the evening" (Eyoh, 1985:105). This was because their community mission must not be obscured from an accurate appraisal. Perhaps, that is why the lead organiser was explicit and detailed in his justification of the process when he discussed the Kumba workshop in the context of theatre, Adult Education and Development.

> The workshop concentrated on the process rather than the product. It was mainly seen in the context of initiation, with the resulting performance as the actualisation of the people's needs rather than an imposition brought in from without. It was also emphasised that resource persons see themselves as catalysts rather than teachers. Their role was animators. The people's art forms were to form the basis of the work with the implication that as much as possible, resource persons would have to integrate themselves fully within the communities in which they were assigned. This was achieved by having the workshop participants and resource persons live in the villages where they participated in local activities. This helped them gain a deeper understanding of the reality of rural existence rather than the superficial knowledge often gathered through cursory visits to the villages. The fact of living in the villages facilitated information gathering. The workshop participants adapted themselves to the work schedules of the villagers and joined them in their daily chores, which helped build a working rapport and generate confidence. (1987:5-6)

In addition, Chinfunyise, one of the resource persons at both the Murewa and Kumba workshops, gave credence to the point raised above when he was asked about his experience at both workshops. He arrived at the same conclusion in relating what transpired. He says that "it was the first time for me to actually live in a village and carry out a popular theatre project, operating from the village and dealing with the villagers in the evenings and not in the day, as we had done in Murewa". He elaborated further that "we used these informal meetings and social occasions to gather more information and to be understood and appreciated by the people before we went about creating a drama that would sensitise them" (1991:37). This was generally agreed to be a unique innovation that the Kumba workshop added to the methodology that was employed in Murewa. Tar Ahura did not limit it to the Murewa experience alone; he was convinced that it was "an improvement on many other workshops so far organised in Africa" because "in most of the other workshops, participants stayed at base and only drove to assigned villages in the morning coming back in the evening". He asserted that the approach

use at Kumba was "self-mobilising as the villages stop thinking of the participants as intruders into their normal life scheme" but rather, genuine people who came "down to work with them for their common good" (1991:152). Although Ahura might have a point, one cannot say that it was the first time that such an approach was used in the general history of TfD in Africa, although the Kumba approach was indeed an improvement on the strategy employed during the Murewa workshop.

With regards to the sustainability of initiatives of such nature, the Kumba workshop adopted a strategy that, in the long run, was likely to create a smooth adaptation of TfD praxis in the country. It was also likely to ensure that more people adopted the method when embarking on community development projects and programs. This was done by using the workshop platform to collaborate directly with the Community Development Training School in Kumba. The entire project was a way of initiating the student participants into the TfD fraternity. The organisers also involved the school's directors in the process so that they could appreciate the efficacy of the method. This way, they were likely to integrate the praxis into the training that they gave the students in their institutions.

Moreover, it is noteworthy that, although the institution was already engaged in training students in community development, it was nevertheless not employing the TfD methodology. So in trying to demonstrate the efficacy of the praxis to the authorities in the country, the partnership with the school for the implementation of the workshop was a significant step aimed at making it easy for the method to have a unique base where it could be sustained, diffused and employed effectively. Indeed Ahura also reflected this view, stating that "the choice of the Community Development School as a base and the use of twenty five students of the school as participants in the workshop was a wise decision", because "it offered the school and students opportunities of testing practically numerous theories studied in the class using theatre as a medium" (1991:152).

The relative success achieved at the Kumba workshop drove Ahura to make some emphatic proposals concerning the future of TfD in Africa. This was directly related to developments in Cameroon at that time. Before the start of the workshop, one of the conditions given by the Cameroonian government was for the entire project to happen devoid of politics. The project leader was told that he should ensure nothing political was tackled or even discussed during the entire duration of the workshop. Ahura believed such conditions were prevalent because "most popular theatre activities or workshops in Africa are government sponsored or at least,

are partly sponsored and sanctioned by government". This tends to let the projects consider the viewpoints and agenda of those governments. He contended that this renders the processes cosmetic and positions TfD as a domesticating tool. He therefore proposed by way of a solution that the international development agencies should "intensify their funding of the projects so that popular theatre can make progress without government funding which has proved inhibitive so far". He went on to add that "alternatively ambitious international workshops should be shelved where independent funding alone may not do and modest village based activities be embarked upon in the various states in a country in such a way that individual funding can be adequate" (Ahura, 1991:151). Ahura was proposing an alternative way for the TfD projects to happen without the constraints practitioners face when their projects are supported or solely funded by their governments. This would ensure flexibility, and there would not be the need to pander to the dictates of any government. What Ahura might not have considered was what Kerr identified as a dilemma that popular theatre practitioners ended up facing. Indeed, this has even become more of a challenge today. The deepening of the challenge and its resultant effects are the subject of Jane Plastow's paper. She argues that "dogmatism, quantitative as opposed to qualitative focus from funders, and lack of true participatory engagement in work purporting to come under the rubric of Theatre for Development in Africa" (2014:107) has become the bane of community development and TfD today.

An interesting situation in Murewa saw the need for women to take centre stage. This did not happen in the follow-up at Kumba. Whether deliberate or not, it should be pointed out that this event departed from the promise most of the resource persons made in Bangladesh in 1983. As part of the resolution of the workshop in Koitta, Dhaka-Bangladesh, some months before the workshop in Murewa, some fifty-eight popular theatre practitioners agreed that "women suffer "double oppression" - composing half of the oppressed classes, and oppressed within all classes as women". Therefore, there was the need to, among other things:

a. recognise the different levels of oppression of women as well as the vital role they can play in the struggles of all oppressed people,
b. acknowledge the need for women to organise separately in order to develop the confidence to fight for their liberation, as well as to build up the collective support which will enable them to move towards building a unified movement; women, especially from among the peasant and working-class groups, should play a more active role in popular theatre work, especially that which will encourage mobilisation around issues defined by peasant and working-class women (1983:76)

Since most of the participants at this popular theatre workshop were also at Murewa and Kumba, it was expected that they would make women's issues paramount. However, unfortunately, that was not the case. Perhaps, they considered this all to be one issue since they were looking at a way of solving generic issues other than gender-specific issues. Nevertheless, the lessons of Murewa should have guided Kumba. Furthermore, the IPTA responsible for the Bangladesh workshop organisation was also a consultant to both the Murewa and Kumba workshops. Hence, they should have at least brought women's concerns to the centre instead of the periphery.

There is also the significant intervention that, in a way, relates to path dependency, as articulated earlier. The Murewa workshop adapted a strategy of employing a "mixture of communication strategies oscillating between the exogenous and endogenous development approaches" (Chinyowa, 2005:115). This was done through mutual exchanges between the village people and the external participants (external facilitators and locals not from the area) that took the form of songs, dances, games, collective discussions and critical reflections. The strategy served all parties involved by helping break the expert/learner dichotomy that often characterises such initiatives. The Kumba workshop followed the same pattern and expanded the scope. This is a clear indication of path dependency that the workshops created in the build-up to the diffusion of TfD in Africa, because, after the first workshop, the idea found favour with many practitioners in Africa and beyond.

Since the workshop in Murewa, Zimbabwe served as a pilot project informing the design and implementation of a future workshops, it can be stated that it created the condition for the field to become homogenous and isomorphic. The participants' self-efficacy was creditably enhanced so that they could continue the practice within the context of the training they received. The follow-up workshop in Kumba, Cameroon confirms that the field has become isomorphic. Kumba used the same template as was employed in the preceding workshop. IPTA, which consulted for the Murewa, Zimbabwe workshop, also consulted for the Kumba workshop. They also provided the same workshop manual. Kidd and Hummelen indicated before the Kumba, Cameroon workshop that "out of this experience (Murewa, Zimbabwe workshop) it is hoped to produce a manual for running future workshops (1983:15).

CONCLUSION

This chapter has tried to establish how TfD developed into an organisational field. It defined the concept and situated it in the historiography of TfD. Among the many issues raised was the

pivotal role individuals, organizations and countries played in ensuring the gradual transition of the TfD concept from a country-specific initiative to an organizational field that brought together varied actors and organizations to work towards a shared goal, because after a while, the different practices and approaches became unified with a lay down procedures and techniques, which became the template that practitioners across Africa and the Global South began to employ in their projects and programmes.

This chapter further emphasised how the homogenisation and isomorphism of the field started. By examining both the 1983 Murewa workshop in Zimbabwe and the 1984 workshop in Kumba, Cameroon, the chapter revealed how organisations and actors in the field converged to configure the field because of their shared interests, values and agendas. Among the many observations worth highlighting is the critical transitions between the two workshops that provide insights into the specific innovations emanating from the context of FCEs.

Furthermore, this chapter provided essential information on the connections between international organisations and African popular theatre practitioners in the context of TfD's field formation. The critical aspect was a recreation of local social inclusion and establishing a base for integrating TfD into the global community development and the development cooperation agenda, especially in Africa. What is left to be seen is the extent to which these collaborations that emerged out of the field formation affected positively or otherwise global cultural and development complexities. Fundamentally, organisations like the International Theatre Institute have been associated with TfD from its beginnings. It is nonetheless important to acknowledge that the involvement of UNESCO and all the other international organisations helped solidify, legitimise and further entrench TfD praxis in Africa and the rest of the world.

Finally, beyond the issues of field configuration and its resultant isomorphism, the chapter raised specific issues concerning women, the importance of these issues and why they remains a missed opportunity for both FCEs. Since it was an issue that found its way in the declaration that was issued after the popular theatre gathering and workshop that took place in Koitta, Dhaka-Bangladesh, the two FCEs discussed in this chapter, which had the benefit of the lead organisers participating and curating the follow-up workshops, could have accentuated issues related to women.

CHAPTER FIVE

DIFFUSION OF THEATRE FOR DEVELOPMENT (TfD)

INTRODUCTION

This chapter may seem to be a continuation of the previous chapter or at least a brief recap of the history of TfD's workshops, because, on the one hand, the 1983 Murewa, Zimbabwe workshop on TfD happens to be the most significant initiative on the continent that created fertile conditions for a monumental diffusion of TfD praxis in Africa and the rest of the world and, on the other hand, the role that other FCEs before the Murewa, Zimbabwe workshop played in creating the atmosphere needed for the triumph of subsequent FCEs cannot be disregarded. However, the main objective of this chapter is an examination of the diffusion of TfD in Africa and as such it necessitates a review of the history of a few of the TfD workshops globally and especially in Africa, albeit in a different context. Moreover, the diffusion of TfD praxis was not a call for theatre practitioners to adopt a one size fits all technique. On the contrary, it was an interchange of cultural practices which enabled a conversation on how popular theatre enthusiasts could advocate for a possible solution to the problems of international development and cultural inequalities.

Based on this premise, this chapter focuses on the diffusion of TfD in Africa. It establishes the crucial role that the 1983 Murewa workshop hosted by the Zimbabwean government played in ensuring that this happened. It also discusses two FCEs that this research argues created a platform for practitioners from different parts of the world to engage and learn from one another. These FCEs also started the process by which cognate fields began to merge, eventually leading to the configuration of the field in Murewa, Zimbabwe. It is crucial to indicate that this chapter only refers to field configuration as delimitation rather than it being the subject matter. The emphasis is on the people who were brought into contact with the TfD praxis for the first time and who, in turn, ended up diffusing the praxis in their respective countries. Here, we will pay particular attention to the francophone part of Africa that was adequately represented in a TfD workshop for the first time.

OVERVIEW:

In postcolonial discourse, third world scholars and artists, especially in the theatre domain, were convinced that "cultural boundaries have been transgressed so often they have become meaningless" (Kerr, 1998:241). This emanated from a dilemma steeped in cultural

differentiation, leaving one confused about where a particular culture or way of life begins and when another ends, mainly if these cultures exist in the same space (Sahgal, 1993:36). Albeit a problem that raged on for a while in postcolonial discourse, a post-modernist take on it will be markedly different. It shall consider how globalised the world has become and underscore "that international media and travel render all boundaries meaningless, and that all artefacts, symbols, and art forms belonging to a specific culture are equally available to everyone else through some global supermarket of intercontinental exchange" (Kerr, 1998:241; Bharucha, 19993:67-69). Thus, one cannot claim a cultural artefact as belonging and peculiar to one culture.

On the contrary, the argument is that there is the likelihood of a variation existing somewhere else. It is therefore not surprising that Paulin J. Houtondji, in a related context, stated that "cultural traditions can remain alive only if they are exploited anew, under one of their aspects at the expense of all the others, and…the choice of this privileged aspect is itself a matter for struggle today, for an endlessly restless debate whose ever uncertain outcome spells the destiny of society" (1983:161). The journey of TfD in its varied forms and labels has been an attempt at negotiating these complexities. This was evident in the contextual exegesis of numerous cognate terms that TfD referred to before its eventual acceptance. Nevertheless, even in the contemporary sense, the debate still continues in the context of global epistemic discourse on decolonisation.

The Laedza Batanani project that started in Botswana in 1973 is often cited as the beginning of TfD in Africa (see Byam, 1999; Mda, 1993; Kidd, 1978; Kidd and Byam. 1978; Kerr, 2004; Kamlongera; 1989). This then makes it safe to assume that TfD started solely as a Botswanan affair. The practice, however, started spreading in the Southern African region in 1978 when the first TfD workshop was held as a way of celebrating the success of the project. Kidd writes that it "represented the culmination of four years of experimental work in Theatre for Development" and that "it was organised to pass the experience and skills gained from the experimental work on to development workers from other regions in the country" (1983:33). They aimed to develop local community development facilitators and non-formal education workers. The methodology was diffused in the entire country because the participation was extended to community development officers from all parts of the land. Botswana's government wanted the methodology to be adapted and appropriated in other community and non-formal education projects. Therefore, popular theatre, as it was then called, was incorporated into the integrated non-formal education campaign in Botswana (Kidd and Byam,

1978:175). It also paved the way for sharing best practices with neighbouring countries that started the diffusion process in the Southern African region and eventually to the rest of Africa and the world.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOPS AND COLLABORATIONS

The international workshops or what Kerr calls "the 'conferencization' of arts for development in Southern Africa" (1999:79) and, by extension, Africa began at Chalimbana in 1979. He even boldly contends that "perhaps, the most influential workshop for launching the Theatre for Development movement was the one held at Chalimbana about 30 km east of Lusaka in Zambia in 1979". This workshop had participants from Botswana (Ross Kidd, Martin Byram and Martha Maplanka), Tanzania (Amandina Lihamba and Eberhard Chambulikazi), Zambia (Mappa Mtonga, Dickson Mwansa and David Kerr), and Zimbabwe (Stephen Chifunyise). It is noteworthy that the primary purpose of the workshop was to "develop the methodology initiated by the Laedza Batanani team" (Kerr, 1999:80), implying that the participants from the other countries were introduced to the concept as it was experimented with within Botswana. It is not surprising that right after this workshop, the methodology started spreading rapidly with some degree of variation throughout the Southern African region (see Kerr, 1995; Mda, 1993). This diffusion was led mainly by the people who participated in the workshop. From the beginning of the movement, this indicates that the TfD methodology was mainly extended to other countries by the people who participated in such practical learning processes and international and national workshops. This phenomenon will continue throughout the life of the genre in Africa and beyond. The workshop will eventually become a format, methodology and integral dissemination mechanism in the TfD milieu (Balme and Leonhardt, 2020).

The other aspect of the methodology diffusion started in Nigeria with the Ahmadu Bello University Collective (ABUC) initiative. In the late seventies, the university welcomed several visiting lecturers from different countries in Africa. Some of these lecturers were expatriates who hailed from other continents but had worked in Africa for many years. Most of them were popular theatre enthusiasts and practitioners in their respective countries. Indeed some of them were deeply involved in the travelling theatre movements of the sixties and early seventies. Mention can be made of Michael Etherton (Chikwakwa Travelling Theatre - Zambia), David Cook (Makerere Free Travelling Theatre-Uganda), and Sandy Arkhurst (Drama studio workshop and the Atwia/Ekumfi community performance project with Efua Sutherland). Here, there was a gathering, in other words, a constellation of ideas and practical experiences that

gave birth to various TfD experiments. Undoubtedly, the experiments at Ahmadu Bello University became a landmark initiative in the history and development of the TfD genre. ABUC also served as the starting point for the diffusion of the praxis in Nigeria, which led to the formation of the Nigerian Popular Theatre Association (NPTA).

Before delving into the progression of the workshops or "conferencization", it is vital to establish that all these initiatives started in the universities. The foundational projects on most of these initiatives were linked to adult education or extra-mural departments, as elucidated in the third chapter of this work. A few can be credited to the English Departments, although this was driven mainly by the experiments carried out by drama students in such departments. Nevertheless, the drama and theatre departments eventually nurtured the concept. They developed it into a discipline of study and research in higher education institutions in Africa, albeit with a few exceptions, because the universities in question did not establish a separate department for drama, as was the case in Lesotho. Even when the Marotholi Travelling Theatre was carrying out its projects in the eighties, they were operating under the English Department and the Institute of Extra Mural Studies (Mda, 1993:65).

It is worth noting that, directly or indirectly national and international organisations have always been involved in the evolutionary scheme of TfD in Africa. Most of the inception projects had a degree of funding from international bodies. Others were organised by branches of international organisations, as will be demonstrated. For instance, the Laedza Batanani project received funding from the Canadian University Services Overseas (CUSO). Even the first crucial international TfD workshop (Chalimbana-1979) was organised by the Zambian International Theatre Institute (ZITI). In addition, funds for the workshop were solicited from some international development agencies such as the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, the Canadian University Services Overseas (CUSO), and many local agencies (Chifunyise et al., 1979:2).

Interestingly, the workshop was attended by Douglas Turner-Ward, the then director of the Negro Ensemble Company of New York. This is to establish the globalised and subtle geopolitical context that framed the evolution and development of TfD in Africa. Here too, “the staff of the University of Zambia coordinated the workshop” (Byam, 1999:56).

Much like the fervour of independence that swept through Africa in the fifties, the seventies to the nineties saw an increase in the quest to integrate the performing and creative arts into individual and community development. In the context of TfD, this is reflected in the increase

in national and regional workshops/conferences. This was because during the cold war era, competing interests made the international community develop, as Budd Hall and Brigette Freyh puts it, "an increasing interest in traditional media (folk drama, music, puppetry, etc.) and indigenous social structures (organisations, roles and processes) as methods, organising structures, and media for non-formal education". They further claim that "this growing interest *was* largely based on the conviction that development must be based on indigenous resources, indigenous solutions, and indigenous creativity" (1980:5). When he made this pronouncement in the eighties, Hall was the secretary-general of the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE). At the same time, Freyh was the director-general of the German Foundation for International Development (DSE). In these roles, they helped organise one of the field-defining conferences in the history of the praxis. They concluded optimistically, predicting that the "collection of case studies and the seminar reports" that was produced out of the conference "will help to deepen the theory, bring others into the debate and contribute to more reflective and committed work in this important field" (Hall and Freyh, 1980:7).

The exciting thing about the series of workshops that spread the praxis, as indicated earlier, is that they did not happen in only Africa. The efficacy of the African approach drew global interest, which led to some geopolitical positioning and the creation of a global alliance. Practitioners began to collaborate and exchange best practices while also not only helping countries develop but also designing new paradigms for tapping into indigenous culture for holistic development. A sample of the workshops that happened in Africa and elsewhere include Molepolepo, Botswana (1978); Borno, Nigeria (1981); Chalimbana, Zambia (1979; 1981); Maska, Nigeria (1979); Mhlangano, Swaziland (1981); Mbalachanda, Malawi (1981); Benue, Nigeria (1982-1983); Maseru, Lesotho (1982); Murewa, Zimbabwe (1983); Freetown, Sierra Leone (1983); Malya, Tanzania (1983); Kumba, Cameroon (1984); Maseru, Lesotho (1984); Benue, Nigeria (1986); Liwonde, Malawi (1987); Winneba, Ghana (1994); Epeme-Lagos, Nigeria (1995); Katsina, Nigeria (1995); and Harare, Zimbabwe (1997). On other continents: Berlin, Germany (1980); Koitta, Bangladesh (1983); and Stockholm, Sweden (1985). Practitioners and scholars in the field have discussed a number of these (see Kidd, 1984; Mlama, 1991; Mda, 1993; Chifunyise et al., 1980; Kamlongera, 1984; Harding, 1999; Eyoh, 1985; Eyoh, 1991 and Kerr, 1999).

In addition to the proliferation of the regional and national workshops, national associations and formal networks emerged globally. Formidable ones that were founded between the seventies and the eighties include the Philippine Educational Theatre Association (PETA), The

People Education Association (PEA), the International Popular Theatre Alliance (IPTA), the Union of African Performing Artists (UAPA), the Zimbabwean Association for Community Theatre (ZACT), the Zambian National Theatre Arts Association (ZANTA), the Nigerian Popular Theatre Association (NPTA), the International Drama/Theatre and Education Association (IDEA) and the Kenya drama/Theatre and Education Association (KDEA). (See to Reyes, 1997:61-68; Harding, 1999; Kerr, 1999; Mlama, 1991; Mda, 1993; Epskamp, 2006; Epskamp, 1983).

Indeed, the workshops depict the nature of change that the field underwent and the processes that led to the eventual configuration of the field. Some of the workshops mentioned above were national. Other workshops were limited to TfD practitioners and non-formal education workers in a particular region of Africa (mainly Southern Africa). Only a few of these workshops were broad enough to have covered a wide range and had participants drawn from different parts of the world and cognate fields, in some cases focusing solely on African TfD. The contention here is that, although all FCEs are essential, they do not all have the same impact and importance. More specifically, when discussing the workshops with field configuration and eventually diffusion of the TfD praxis, two FCEs need to be accentuated and put in context before discussing the main FCE, which is the focus of this chapter and contextualising it in relation to the diffusion of TfD in Africa. These FCEs are Tradition for Development: International Seminar on The Use of Indigenous Social Structures and Traditional Media in Non-Formal Education and Development, 5-12 November 1980 in Berlin, Germany; the Popular Theatre Dialogue (International Workshop), held at Koitta, Dhaka, Bangladesh, February 1983; and the Theatre for Development Workshop at Murewa, Zimbabwe (1983).

TRADITION FOR DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR, BERLIN, GERMANY 1980: Most of the early TfD projects in Africa happened in the context of social mobilisation, and adult and non-formal education. The lead facilitators were usually adult education experts and primarily expatriates. Therefore, it is not surprising that after many experiments in different countries, the ICAE and DSE organised an international seminar in Berlin in 1980. Both organisations have been at the forefront of adult education and community development in different parts of the world. It was the hope of Nat Colletta (who was with the World Bank at the time) and Ross Kidd (closely linked to the research unit of ICAE) that the seminar and the publication that came out of it would “promote further cooperation and exchange among practitioners and organisations in this field, and promote a more critical assessment of both the creative potential

and dangers in cultural strategies for social change in the Third World" (Colletta and Kidd, 1980:8). Participants were drawn from all over the world from varied backgrounds. They included "practitioners and researchers, non-formal educators and development communicators, senior civil servants and grassroots workers" (Hall and Freyh, 1980:6). It is crucial to point out that only eight of the thirty-eight participants in the seminar were women. There was also no representation from the communist bloc or the Arab world. This omission is attributable to the Cold War situation at the time.

Notwithstanding, one of the papers presented used a case study from China. Essentially, the participants can be grouped into two broad disciplinary categories: the "conventional" development workers and popular (movement) theatre practitioners. The organisers claimed that:

> Earlier international attempts to study this culture-based approach have focused more on the theoretical potential than on the actual practice; have concentrated primarily on folk arts and neglected the other institutions and processes of indigenous culture (e.g. social organisation, leadership, collective action structures, Etc.); and have failed to address the underlying political implications of this approach (Colletta and Kidd, 1980:5)

The seminar did produce one of the unique foundational volumes the shaped the field. The participants set the stage for inter-agency and interdisciplinary discussion and collaboration, especially networking and mutual exchanges. They compared and debated field experiences and examined how their respective fields overlapped. Three broad sections dealt with a different aspects of their circumstances and the field in general. The case studies presented ranged from theoretical expositions to discussions of practical projects that had taken place in selected countries. The first part dealt with indigenous structures, non-formal education and development; the second focused on folk media, popular theatre and non-formal education; while the last part consisted of working group reports. The working groups include Latin America, Africa and the Caribbean, South Asia, and South-East Asia (Colletta and Kidd, 1980).

This seminar is significant because it was not just a sharing of information and comparing notes but a field diagnostic seminar. Diagnostic in that the forum juxtaposed the practical experience and lessons learnt in both the conventional development field and popular movements globally. It "dealt with the use of popular culture and (performing) arts as small-scale media in development support communication activities" (Epskamp, 2006:15). Furthermore, they

discussed how future projects and initiatives in the various continents could be implemented effectively to benefit the masses. They also established ways of breaking down intellectual and complex concepts so that they could be understood by the popular masses. They further reinforced the belief that popular organisations should control socially engaged theatre. The Latin American working group focused on developing “a conceptual framework and outline a methodology for the use of nonconventional media for community work controlled by people” (Colletta and Kidd, 1980:595). The African and Caribbean working group focused on contextualising the definition of development. They indicated the deficiency of numerous existing definitions related to local African and Caribbean languages. Another important issue the group looked at was international relations, focusing on the relationship between funding, multinational corporations, capital outflows and brain drain. Finally, they concluded their diagnostics with the gulf between a theory of intervention and practice (Colletta and Kidd, 1980:609).

At the core of the Asian working group were issues related to how the media was used in their region to project ideas of outside agencies. Furthermore, they discussed ways by which popular forms of arts can be used as a counter-hegemonic tool for human and community development. This led to the group designing a template for future works and collaborations (Colletta and Kidd, 1980:616). Finally, in a different but related context, the other Asian group resolved that they:

> Recognise that there are a variety of processes that bring communities into interaction with their broader political, administrative, economic, ecological, and cultural environments. These interactive processes may positively and negatively impact local communities, including existing social structures and "folk media." They are a fact of life; however, they cannot be ignored. Therefore, a vital consideration of the group was how to increase possibilities for "developmental" processes to benefit rather than hurt local communities. (Colletta and Kidd, 1980:622)

In summary, the 1980 Berlin seminar organised by the DSE and ICAE contributed to shaping the field. The conference helped clarify some practical, political and methodological challenges that practitioners and development workers in many countries faced in that era. Moreover, debating case studies enabled them to appreciate the context in which development cooperation happens and the extent to which popular theatre was engaged in the community and holistic development. In the end, the conference participants unanimously agreed with Goulet's

assertion that “traditional (institutions) harbour within them a latent dynamism which, when properly respected, can serve as the springboard for modes of development which are more humane than those drawn from outside paradigms” (Goulet, 1980:483). Epskamp refers to the publication that came out of the workshop as "one of the first readers of this subject…It became a collector’s item” (Epskamp, 2006:17). The seven people who presented case studies with African content were Paul Richards, Bernard Ledea Ouedraogo, Michael Johnny, William M. Rideout Jr, Ross Kidd, Martin Byram, and Michael Etherton, the latter three of whom had been part of the TfD movement from its inception.

POPULAR THEATRE DIALOGUE-DHAKA/KOITTA, BANGLADESH-1983: At the instigation of Ross Kidd and Ahmed Faruque of Proshika, an international popular theatre meeting was held in Koitta, a village located forty miles to the north of Dhaka, the capital of Bangladesh. This international gathering brought together about fifty-eight participants from nineteen countries, the majority of whom came from Third World countries, mainly from Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. The people who took part in the workshop were popular theatre trainers and organisers, community workers, and adult educators. Leaders of popular organisations and landless peasants and labourers from Bangladesh were also actively involved. Most notable among them were “part-time actors and actresses belonging to Aranyak theatre group, Proshika animators and peasants running theatre groups in their own villages and working in small-scale and, therefore, inexpensive awareness-raising projects” (Epskamp, 2006:17). All the foreigners who participated were TfD practitioners. It meant that there was a lot of expertise and practical experience to occupy the twelve days designed for the workshop with an animated exchange of objectives, working locations, and different methodologies. Unlike many other gatherings, this one christened "International Popular Theatre Dialogue" was not officially opened by politicians or government officials. Instead, it was opened by a landless peasant from one of the local theatre groups. The organisers wanted the workshop to focus on the masses and articulate their needs and perspectives. During this period, the workshop participants:

> shared their experiences of popular theatre work in the context of the political-economic situations in their respective countries; engaged in dialogue with landless peasants and labourers in their villages on their concrete life situation and the relevance of popular theatre as a weapon against oppression and exploitation; reflected collectively on their experiences to discover how popular theatre can better serve the struggles of the

> marginalised sectors of our respective societies; and exchanged ideas and aspirations through songs, poems, dances, role-plays and dramatic skits. (Ifda dossier, 1983:74)

The exchanges helped solidify a bond of solidarity and alliance among the participants, because most of their problems were identical, and thus, they could relate and share what the practitioners and the people were going through in their respective countries. The discussions at the plenary sessions were filled with a productive and elevating exchange of ideas. Some of the critical ideas debated and significant issues that were raised and discussed in the plenaries, which became central throughout the workshop, included but were not limited to:

> The concept, philosophy and principles of popular theatre based on a Third World perspective of a conscientizing development process; the role and contradictions of middle-class and urban-based trainers and organisers who take the leadership role in initiating popular theatre activities and mobilising the participation of grassroots people themselves; the relationship between popular theatre, ideology and political parties, including the organised left in both dominated and liberated Third World countries; the role of women in popular theatre work and the need for their full participation in popular theatre work; the challenge posed by traditional folk forms, and the need to tap these rich cultural legacies but in ways where radical content is incorporated; the skills and awareness required and the type of training needed for popular theatre work. (Ifda-dossier, 1983:75)

The founding of the International Popular Theatre Alliance (IPTA) is one of the concrete results of this conference. Thus, IPTA became an informal global network of popular theatre practitioners. It was agreed in Koitta that their secretariat was to rotate every three years. The Asian region had the first opportunity of hosting and administering the network. It was housed in the same office complex as the Philippine Educational Theatre Association (PETA). Since Ross Kidd was closely linked to the research unit of the International Council of Adult Education (ICAD), it is not surprising that the modest funds that they received for administrative purposes, in the beginning, came from ICAE-Canada (Epskamp, 2006:17). The secretariat focused particularly on the exchange of information and the documentation of members' experiences. To that end, they started the IPTA Newsletter and also used conferences and workshops as avenues for meetings and collaboration. IPTA became the champion of persecuted artists throughout the world because, especially in the Third World, artists were being remanded and incarcerated because of their political positions.

CONTEXTUALISING BERLIN AND KOITTA FCEs

Significant developments came out of these two FCEs. They both serve as a good starting point in establishing the intertwined nature of TfD. They help us to appreciate the cluster of people and interests that the genre struggles to serve. One might wonder why the World Bank and its affiliates would be interested in a "negligible" concept like TfD, operating under the label of "folk media" and "popular theatre". Perhaps this was because of the history and effects of policies implemented in Africa and the Third World by the Bretton Woods institutions. It could also be because of the challenge that the ideological persuasion of the praxis posed to the objective of key organisations active in global cooperation and international development.

Essentially, the coming together of professionals from varied working contexts was a recognition of the need for synergies in the implementation of global development projects. It could be because of the realization that the processes and methods adopted by those in "conventional" development work did not yield the needed results or because of the need to understand the efficacy of a relatively new approach that was achieving unexpected results due to its strength with regards to community mobilisation and participatory politics. Be that as it may, these FCEs were a landmark in the history of TfD. They provided context and content for exploring the field. They also set in motion a lot of the contemporary values and precedents. They provided global templates that laid the foundation for collaboration and critical engagements between those traditionally in the field and those in cognate fields.

For example, the 1980 Berlin gathering resulted in one of the essential pieces of literature that became iconic in the early dialectical writings that undergird the discipline. Moreover, it made different practices, methodological contexts and political conditions available to the rest of the world. The Koitta 1983 workshop, on the other hand, provided a space for practical experiments. The participants, coming from different geographical locations for the first time, had the opportunity to compare notes and experiment with an approach together. Thus, the first conference provided a theoretical perspective to the field formation process. In contrast, the second gathering provided a space where practical experiences from different contexts were experimented with.

It should be noted that, whereas the first conference had participants from different working contexts, the second one had only people in popular theatre as participants. At the first conference, their preoccupation was examining how the many fields represented overlapped and how their respective fields could inform one another. However, the second conference

focused solely on one particular field (popular theatre), and the focus of their gathering was more practical than theoretical; it was a gathering that sought to practically experiment with the masses for socio-economic liberation through the creative arts and culture. Furthermore, the central concern of the first conference was development cooperation. In contrast, the second gathering focused on how popular theatre was used to liberate peasants in the Third World. The latter conference understood popular theatre to be framed within cultural and educational activities targeting the masses by enabling a critical evaluation of their world against a deeper appreciation of practical and enduring structural transformation.

A further point to note is that these two gatherings served as dissemination and validation platforms. Participants learnt from each other and appreciated what happened in another's context. The structure of both gatherings created an avenue for learning. There were extensive debates of concepts and projects at the Berlin conference, and detailed practical demonstration backed by experience took place at the workshop in Koitta, Bangladesh. All in all, people came into contact with new concepts and approaches and learnt from other colleagues who practiced in different geographical locations and unique contexts. By extension, the people from cognate fields appreciated and integrated the methodology in their activities. This is the point at which we begin to examine the many paths to the diffusion of TfD generally in Africa, mainly focusing on higher education institutions while using the 1983 TfD workshop at Murewa, Zimbabwe.

DIFFUSION OF TFD IN AFRICA- THE 1983 MUREWA, ZIMBABWE TFD WORKSHOP IN PERSPECTIVE:

First of all, the general theoretical and philosophical context of TfD is assumed to be fundamental to non-formal education, community development and social change. Many scholars have argued a position in the discipline and firmly established in this research. These concepts relate directly to the needs of the masses. Therefore, the complexities involved in achieving a critical mass of educated adults and community development framed the context in which TfD began spreading throughout Africa, especially in higher education institutions. The quest to understand how indigenous knowledge and customs could be appropriated and integrated as a methodology for individual and community development led to the emergence and diffusion of the praxis. The two gatherings discussed earlier confirm this assertion. They serve as a demonstrable example of why and how such a praxis attracted people who were not directly in the field.

The emergence and diffusion of TfD in higher education institutions in Africa are closely linked to how TfD workshops were structured and organised. The need to train and diffuse the praxis has always been articulated in workshops. It is also a known fact that external participation is often extended to people from academia. The Murewa workshop is used as a case study because of its broad appeal and effect. However, the fact remains that before the organisation of the Murewa workshop, a pattern had already been established by organisers of the earlier workshops referred to throughout this study. The workshops served as an avenue where new people were initiated and given the required training to spread the genre in their respective countries and institutions. For example, in 1979, at Chalimbana, Zambia, participants from Tanzania, Zimbabwe and Botswana participated in the regional workshop. After the event, they went back to their respective institutions and experimented with their acquired knowledge. Again, a pattern was established because of the nature of the workshop processes.

All TfD workshops engage participants in both theoretical and practical learning processes. Newcomers to such workshops always have the benefit of learning by doing and they practice what they have learnt when they leave the workshop. The Murewa, Zimbabwe workshop was no different. It employed the same format and built on known conventions. When ITI first proposed the idea of the workshop at the UNESCO General Conference in Paris in November 1982, the diffusion of the praxis to cover a more significant part of Africa, particularly in the francophone parts of Africa, was paramount. This was a prime concern for both the sponsors and organisers of the Murewa TfD workshop. In the conceptualisation, implementation and the follow-up, the principal and underlining motivation as captured in all documents related to the organisation of the pan-African TfD workshop was the diffusion of the praxis/methodology to other parts of Africa that had not experienced the practice at the time of the workshop.

From its beginnings, the practice had been confined to primarily English speaking countries in Africa. In the proposal IPTA wrote on behalf of ITI, which formed the basis of organising the Murewa workshop, it indicated that the TfD workshop in Murewa was expected to produce "a group of trained theatre-for-development workers who would pass their skills on to others and take the leadership in organising theatre for conscientisation and mobilisation in their respective countries."[8] Furthermore, in a report submitted to UNESCO, Ross Kidd and

[8] See page 13 of the proposal that the International Theatre Institute commissioned the International Popular Theatre Alliance to produce, which formed the basis for organising the 1983 TfD workshop at Murewa, Zimbabwe. UNESCO Archives CLT/CD B751.13.12

Remmelt Hummelen wrote that "a primary aim of the workshop was to extend the concept and practice of Theatre for Development (TfD) to theatre workers and countries in Africa which had not yet been exposed to this approach" (1983:1). Additionally, a detailed report of one of the working groups at the workshop, published by the Centre for the Study of Education in Developing Countries (CEO), The Hague (Netherlands) and International Council for Adult Education, Toronto (Ontario) states that:

> However, the main objective was to transfer the TfD methodology to countries and theatre workers who had no previous experience of theatre-for-development, in this case, 31 theatre workers from 16 African countries. It was a chance for them to try out this kind of work and assess its potential for their own countries. Many of the newcomers were theatre workers from francophone Africa (Kidd, 1984:8).

To achieve this goal, the organisers invited participants from different parts of Africa. Indeed, for the first time in the history of TfD in Africa, a workshop had participants from French-speaking countries. As a result, the workshop turned out to be genuinely field-defining. In Africa, it remains the biggest in terms of the number of external delegates (participants who were not from the host country) and the longest in terms of duration. This research argues that, among other things, the workshop played a significant role in the spread of TfD to a greater part of Africa. Implicitly, the study maintains that the large scale diffusion of the praxis that happened as a result of the workshop was because of the globalised interest that the genre attracted at the time. It further contends that the postcolonial quest for decolonial methodologies played a key role in the diffusion of the praxis. There were three conditions and some initiatives that made it easy for the diffusion to happen unhindered.

The first is that the triumvirate (UNESCO, ITI and IPTA) were able to rally other agencies and organisations to buy into the agenda and provided financial support for the organisation of the workshop. This was paramount as the challenge that often precluded many organisers of similar workshops from inviting external participants had always been funding. The second point relates to conditions and criteria for participation. ITI and IPTA ensured that many delegates came from countries with little or no TfD experience. This is the most plausible reason for the number of participants from French-speaking countries in Africa at the workshop. The last point concerns the calibre of participants that the organisers invited, their profession and status in their respective countries. Their influence and status in their countries placed them at a level where they could easily integrate the concept into their activities. All these factors contributed

to the diffusion of the praxis to a sizeable number of countries in Africa. They also aided the institutionalisation and development of the concept as research courses in higher education institutions in Africa.

Some of the agencies that sponsored the workshop include the African Cultural Institute (Dakar), the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Canadian University Service Overseas (CUSO), the Commonwealth Foundation, the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE), the French Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation (ACCT), the German Foundation for International Development (DSE), and the Swedish International Development Authority (CIDA). UNESCO provided the seed funding, while ITI and IPTA were the lead organisations that oversaw and liaised with the Zimbabwean government in preparing, coordinating and organising the workshop. It is important to note here that, without the enormous financial support of these international organisations, it would have been difficult to assemble such a large number of participants from different parts of Africa for the workshop. In all fifty-three (53) theatre workers from outside of Zimbabwe participated. Of this number, forty-seven (47) were from Africa, while six (6) came from other parts of the world (see appendix for the complete list). This was the first time that such a huge number of external theatre practitioners had participated in a TfD workshop on the African continent. It depicts the importance of the workshop, and as indicated in the previous chapter, it legitimised and solidified the praxis in Africa and beyond. It is not an overstatement to say that the coming together of these organisations to fund the workshop meant that they had tacitly agreed to adopt the concept and approach in their respective projects in the Third World. This is evident in the number of initiatives that most of these organisations funded before and especially after the Murewa, Zimbabwe workshop of 1983.

The number of countries which participated also indicates the level and the degree of diffusion that eventually happened after the workshop. This study argues that, although it was difficult for the organisers to have comprehensively evaluated and arrived at a reasonable conclusion on whether the diffusion of the TfD praxis happened a few months after the workshop, there was a clear indication that it was bound to happen. Hummelen and Kidd affirmed in the Murewa workshop report they submitted to UNESCO through ITI on the 1st October that same year that:

> At the time of writing, it is too soon to assess whether or not new TfD projects will be started in other parts of Africa. However, one can say that a tremendous amount of

> interest and enthusiasm has been stimulated, and many of the participants are now trying to organise support for TfD work in their own countries. For example, the participants from Cameroon and Zaire have already produced proposals for the TfD workshops in their respective countries (1983:15)

This was an indication that the people who participated in the workshop bought into extending the TfD concept to their respective countries and had started doing something about it. However, the fact that some have developed a proposal for a workshop in line with what they have learnt and practised at Murewa, Zimbabwe, also indicates how isomorphic the field was becoming, as indicated in the previous chapter. Kidd and Hummelen admit the attempt at standardisation, writing in their report that "the workshop itself served as a pilot for future workshops of this kind" (1983:15). This indicates that they envisaged the actors in the field to begin functioning with a standard and an agreed template. However, this only eliminates stark differences and creates the condition where certification and standardisation happen. Perhaps this is why the training of TfD practitioners in higher education institutions becomes standardised and homogenous.

In addition, the resolution passed by the participants from the French-speaking countries indicated their acceptance and commitment towards adapting and spreading the praxis. They write that “we welcome this new approach which is Theatre for Development”. Moreover, they further state that "we commit ourselves to follow up on this international meeting by providing, as individuals and as a group, the sum of impressions, our reflections, and our respective experiences in the field of popular theatre through existing networks”.[9] In addition to accepting and welcoming the TfD model as introduced to them at the workshop, they, in furtherance of the organisers' objective, expressly committed to taking action to diffuse the concept in their respective countries. They unequivocally called on ITI and IPTA to consciously take initiatives that would help diffuse the concept in the French-speaking countries in Africa. To this end, they further include in their resolution a call to action in the form of invitation which reads: "we invite the organisers of this workshop and in particular the ITI and the IPTA. To come and continue the experience of the theatre for development in one of the French-speaking African

[9] See the resolution of the French-speaking countries in the appendix
.

countries". This speaks to not only the decision to sustain the initiative but to do so in the manner that was introduced to them at the Murewa, Zimbabwe workshop.

The second point that further facilitated the seamless diffusion of the praxis throughout Africa is a conscious approach adopted in selecting participants for the workshop: country of origin and familiarity with TfD. The organisers prioritised participants from the French-speaking African countries and other countries with little or no TfD experience. Interestingly, out of the twenty-one (21) countries present at the workshop (including the host nation), eleven (11) were from French-speaking African countries and nine (9) from the English-speaking areas. Additionally, out of the fifty-three (53) participants from outside Zimbabwe, twenty-three (23) of them had no prior experience of the TfD concept. Inviting a significant number of participants from countries with little or no TfD experiments was a strategic move towards popularising the concept in those countries. In much the same way, inviting participants who had no TfD experience was also a way of extending the practice, because, at the individual level, the participant would be equipped after going through the processes and, at the country level, he or she was likely to pioneer the praxis there. Indeed, the follow-up workshop that happened in Kumba, Cameroon, is a testimony to the success of this strategy, as is the fact that the first two proposals that were developed for a follow-up workshop immediately after the workshop came from two Francophone African participants, who also encountered TfD for the first time at the Murewa workshop.

As indicated, the theory and method of carrying out a TfD project were what the workshop tried to introduce to the participants and the country (Zimbabwe). Twenty-three (23) people from different countries with no TfD praxis experience meant something. It meant hope because a change process that would help diffuse the praxis was put in motion. These participants learnt theoretically and practically. They discussed the histories and concepts. They were equipped to experiment when they went back home, and indeed some of them did. In an interview with Sophia Doreen Lokko, she confirms that "for me, this popular theatre or theatre for development is an eye-opener and a stepping stone to other things that I plan to do" (1991:98).

Similarly, Kimani Gecau noted elsewhere that "when the Zimbabwean theatre activist came out of the workshop, they felt confident continuing the process". She also added that "I know that after the Murewa Workshop, the Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture organised a number of Workshops for its Cultural Officers and is presently redeploying them into the regions to get

people involved in theatre-for-development' (1991:67). Indeed, these two accounts from a new and an old participant affirmed that the points referred to above were parts of the strategies that created a clear pathway for spreading the practice and methods widely to cover many areas in Africa.

It is noteworthy that most participants were either from higher education institutions or from a national theatre. Only a few came from private practice, government agencies and independent theatre organisations. The primary means by which the praxis was institutionalised was through collaborative creations in higher education institutions, which have been the primary site for nurturing and diffusing the praxis. Most of the well-documented case studies of TfD in Africa happened either in or with the collaboration of higher education institutions. For instance, the Laedza Batanani experiments started at the University of Botswana. The Ahmadu Bello Collective was undertaken by faculty members at Ahmadu Bello University in Nigeria. The Chikwakwa experiments and many others fall within this same category. Therefore, it is not surprising to observe that the majority of the people who were invited came from higher education institutions.

The logic was that they had the immediate audience and platform for experimentation which was likely to aid in the sustainability of the knowledge gained. They had the opportunity to integrate the praxis into their theatre courses and community development fieldwork. It can be said that they already had an ecosystem that they could use to translate the praxis in their countries. Not long after the conference, most countries started teaching and doing community development projects at the university level. A growing body of evidence shows that the participants found a way to integrate it into their institutions after the Zimbabwean workshop. It was pointed out regarding Zimbabwe that “we also now do have an ongoing programme in the University which is run by one of the resource persons who was at Murewa” (1991:68). This confirms that the university was a safe ground for incubating and spreading the methodology. Another interesting observation by Gecau is to the effect that "the methodology of theatre-for-development when brought into the University, does a lot to transform the traditional way people teach in a University" (1991:70). Lokko also provided an insight into how she utilised the knowledge she gained. She states that "I have in drama in education been thinking about 3-Cs-Conceptualize, Create and Communicate. And after Kumba, I have with my students, got more than 6 Cs now. So, I think it has really helped me” (1991:101). These are clear testimonies to how the universities helped spread the technique.

The 1984 Kumba workshop in Cameroon organised and led by Eyoh is another classic example. He was one of the people introduced to TfD for the first time at the Murewa workshop. He was a lecturer at the University of Yaoundé in Cameroon. When he eventually led the organisation of the workshop in his country, two important things happened which give confirm how the praxis was diffused and sustained, particularly with regards to the selection of participants based on status and capacity. The Kumba workshops revolved around the University of Yaoundé and the Community Development Training School at Kumba. The organisers (mainly from the University of Yaoundé) integrated the students of the Community Development School at Kumba.

The students and the schools became the first outlet to experiment with the praxis. They also brought in some lecturers from the institutions to serve as resource persons. The two institutions and their lecturers were thus automatically introduced to both the theory and the practice of TfD. Ahura, one of the resource persons in both workshops, writes specifically on what happened at the Kumba workshop: "the choice of the Community Development School as a base and the use of the twenty-five students of the school as participants in the workshop was a wise decision", because it offered those "specialised students an opportunity to assess the effectiveness or otherwise of this new medium as a tool for rural development" (1991:152). Furthermore, Gecau posits specifically on the effect of the Murewa workshop that "the University has become fairly active…the Ministry of Education has organised workshops for teachers… I think that in the next few years, we shall see the results of the Murewa workshop becoming more and more visible (1991:68). Even John O'Toole et al. agree that "since TfD began to cohere both as a generally accepted term and as a movement, some notion of education has been deeply embedded in it, and educational training structures and institutions have usually framed it. TfD has had strong roots from the start in universities" (2015:93). The fact that it has had strong roots from the start in universities is one of the reasons the organisers might have adopted that strategy. The resultant effects establish a convincing case that it was an effective action. It helped institutionalise the praxis in higher education institutions in Africa.

CONCLUSION:

TfD in Africa spread over a wide area and between many practitioners through different actions, some of which were fortuitous, some deliberate. Some practitioners unconsciously practiced it because of their indigenous circumstances, others through formal education.

However, the fact remains that institutionalized practice and teaching of TfD in higher education institutions in African happened through many channels. This chapter pointed to salient historical events that created the necessary conditions for the diffusion of TfD in Africa and, significantly, in higher education institutions.

At the level of theory and practice, researchers must understand that the historical and institutional perspective of TfD is not just a recounting of the ups and downs of the movement, but an attempt at piecing together the missing elements in a discourse format, so that students and scholars can appreciate the landmark events and notable personalities who played critical roles in ensuring that the concept and its praxis became entrenched in the development discourse of Africa.

The chapter therefore, traced the beginning of the national and international TfD workshops. It first explored the antecedent practices and situated them based on the experiments that happened in notable countries in Africa. Significantly, these practices inspired the workshops and conferences. They also formed the bedrock for the diffusion of TfD in Africa.

Having defined and linked organizational fields with field configuring events, the vital position of two salient FCEs that helped broker intercontinental exchanges between actors and workers from cognate fields and different practices was analysed. They were the 1983 Theatre for Development Workshop in Murewa, Zimbabwe and the 1984 Theatre for Integrated Rural Development Workshop in Kumba, Cameroon. These FCEs, and all others that happened before them, helped in one way or another publicize the TfD movement and its methods worldwide. The FCEs in focus are crucial because they brought the TfD practice to the world and helped established the convention in a number of countries. They can be credited with the facilitation of the diffusion of the praxis globally.

The chapter further demonstrated how the Murewa workshop became the turning point and the most extensive platform created for diffusing TfD in Africa and entrenching the praxis in higher education institutions. The many university-based participants and the massive delegation from French-speaking African countries are proven and underlying conditions that encouraged many countries to embrace the praxis, because this workshop, as demonstrated in this chapter, brought together a sizeable number of new participants from Francophone Africa who, hitherto, had not participated in any of the TfD workshops.

In summary, the chapter established the basis and networks that coalesced to ensure the diffusion and homogenization of the praxis in higher education institutions in Africa. The

starting point was the Tradition for Development seminar in Berlin, Germany in 1980, and the popular theatre dialogue that took place in Dhaka/Koitta, Bangladesh in 1983. Situating the 1983 theatre for development workshop that took place in Zimbabwe and juxtaposing it with the others mentioned earlier helped establish the pathways by which the praxis became institutionalized in African higher education.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

This research was concerned with exploring the historical and institutional perspectives of African Theatre for Development. The main focus was on how TfD developed into an organizational field. It also discusses how the praxis spread throughout Africa. This chapter concludes the study and summarises the research findings. It further delineates the implications and possibilities arising from this work. As far as possible, I discuss why understanding how TfD developed into an organizational field can contribute to a better appreciation of the historiographical and institutional perspectives of TfD in Africa. Lastly, I offer suggestions on related areas that still need further research.

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The historical and institutional perspectives of TfD that this research work investigates span past, contemporary and emerging theatrical traditions that formed the bedrock of the praxis. They open up a channel of conversation that enriches the scope of knowledge and research available for understanding how artists and scholars negotiate the politics of performance space. They also inform the many and varied initiatives that reflect the theoretical, historical and practical matters of standardisation in contemporary TfD praxis. Throughout the evolution, institutionalisation and diffusion of the genre, a critical missing element is how the field was configured and diffused broadly throughout Africa and the rest of the world. The study explores this in detail and reveals the events that illustrate the point at which the field was configured.

It is a truism that the TfD praxis innately unearths hidden societal imbalances. It advocates a fundamental re-examination of the power dynamics in societies. It also mandates a corrective and social change perspective in its praxis and projects. Most TfD projects seek to undo the long, hidden and entrenched injustices that people suffer daily through no fault of their own. Although it is a comprehensive art form that provides entertainment and communal cohesion, the main driver of the praxis is societal transformation. It creates a democratic platform that acts as a laboratory for future aspirations, where one showcases how one would negotiate future eventualities. Indeed, the unspoken rule behind all TfD experiences is the need to build individual and communal agency.

The study set out to investigate the historical and institutional perspectives of TfD comprehensively. First, it examined the histories and historiographies of the genre. Next, it duly surveyed the theories and cultural circumstances that prompted the genre's evolution and how it subsequently became a formidable social mobilization movement. Finally, the research further explored the many influences and actors who helped consolidate and configure the field.

The TfD movement is an essential one in Africa. It serves both the academic and non-academic fields. The research discovered that it is a phenomenon that has been in existence for a long time. It is part of the people's way of life, and the aesthetics are replete in African performance experiences. Scholars in the field have often ascribed the philosophical bedrock of the genre to Marxism (Prentki, 2015; Plastow, 2014). The basic reason that can be advanced in support of this assertion is that most of the pioneering scholars and practitioners were socialistically inclined and "inspired by concepts of inclusivity, community, empowerment and enablement of the poor and marginalised to take control over their own lives" (Plastow, 2014:108). This stance, although widespread, cannot be entirely accurate given the history and cultural climate in which it evolved.

The research proposes the grounding of the philosophical and theoretical bedrock of TfD in education, development and decolonization, because TfD functions as an all-encompassing genre. Educating the people through performance is very significant. It encourages and enables discourse in the performance arena. TfD projects inspire commitment in the participants and social actors, filled with the desire to transform their lives at the collective and personal levels. Looking at TfD in the context of education further revealed the many traditional values and performative aesthetics that influenced the genre from its inception. This is particularly important because the indigenous, endogenous and exogenous influences were unravelled so that researchers and students could understand the dynamics behind why some notable names such as Bertolt Brecht, Paulo Freire, and Augusto Boal became the fulcrum of the evolution and institutionalization of TfD in Africa. The praxis as it exists today has both indigenous and exogenous influences. Although most of the external influences were introduced by expatriates working in Africa, they gave it a theoretical background for it to be regarded as a field of study and research in the academic sphere.

The growing call and demands for decolonization all over the world cannot be overstated. It is now the base ingredient in most postcolonial epistemic discourse. However, decolonisation cannot be discussed without first unpacking colonialism, a concept that operates with the aim

of taken over the entirety of the cognitive, ecological and economic cosmology of a dominated class.

Among the many approaches to decolonisation, the study favoured Kwasi Wiredu's conceptual decolonisation and Walter Miglono and Catherine Welsh's decoloniality. While conceptual decolonisation advocates for African agency through a dialectical synthesis of the colonial experience and the undiluted African world view, decoloniality argues forcefully for a consensus that the European epistemic world view must acknowledge the "other". It must understand that there is not only one way of understanding phenomena, there are as many ways as there are humans in the world. The study illustrated how these decolonial concepts and theories affect the TfD discourse, which serves as a methodology for achieving these aspirations. It examined the ways TfD can serve as a credible alternative to decolonisation. It is argued in this study that both conceptual decolonisation and decoloniality find TfD a potent praxis for achieving their practical objectives.

Because development is the primary concern of TfD, the research discussed it in detail and pointed out its historical conditioning. It examined how the invention of the word by Harry Truman transformed diplomatic and international relations and discourse surrounding the concept. Aspects of development that the study evaluated are the invention of underdevelopment and attempts by Africans to approach development from within, the latter being where the discourse on TfD as an alternative way of achieving self-reliance and sustainable development was explored.

Furthermore, the study also appraised the history of TfD in selected African countries. The study highlighted sources, influences and the socio-political history and historiography of TfD in Botswana, Tanzania, Nigeria, Ghana and Zambia. These countries present critical templates that can be used to generalise the manifestations of the form of the praxis in Africa today. Therefore, the study analysed past and present examples, discussed the context and some contents regarding how they evolved, the nature of their influence on TfD and what the contemporary practice of TfD borrowed from them.

After locating the theories and historical perspectives, it was possible to examine how TfD developed into an organisational field. Several workshops were reviewed and related to the historical manifestation of the genre. The actors in the main field and cognate ones were established for a general understanding of the varied interests that coalesced to form TfD into an organisational field. It was imperative because it helped us appreciate that it was not an all

African affair; it was a global movement with roots in Africa. Furthermore, doing so helped the research appreciate the roles many actors in the field played.

Crucial to organizational fields are field configuring events. This relationship and how FCEs helped shape the institutional logics and organizational culture of TfD was surveyed. Notable FCEs, especially in the 1980s, were contextualised and situated to help in the appreciation of how the field was configured. To this end, the 1980 seminar in Berlin, the 1983 popular theatre gathering at Koitta, Bangladesh, the 1983 theatre for development workshop in Murewa, Zimbabwe and the 1984 workshop on theatre for integrated rural development in Kumba, Cameroon were dialectically discussed.

The diffusion of TfD in Africa was the final aspect of the research work. The study discussed the strategies and deliberate conditions put in place to ensure a successful diffusion of the praxis in Africa, which also ended up helping the standardisation or homogenisation of the field. It helped make the praxis similar across Africa, and practitioners began operating with a standard format. In all this, the 1983 Murewa, Zimbabwe TfD workshop is credited with many achievements, because of the mobilisation and the wide variety of actors assembled at the workshop. The international recognition of TfD and the partnership towards eradicating many social ills began between several international agencies and TfD practitioners. The research also discussed the fact that, after the workshop, most higher education institutions in Africa started teaching and engaging in TfD projects.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS AND POSSIBILITIES

The debate on decolonisation, alternative paths to sustainable development and comprehensive education continues. This research arrived at a convincing conclusion that TfD would best serve these aspirations. This is because it inherently has the conditions and mechanisms necessary for attaining the desired goals regarding decolonisation, sustainable development and comprehensive education.

A significant finding is that the field of TfD was developed and configured into an organisational field successfully in 1983, at Murewa, Zimbabwe, during the African Theatre for Development workshop. Even though there had been several workshops before 1983, the Murewa workshop consolidated all the actors and established a standard format for the praxis. At this point, all practitioners and actors in the cognate field came to agree that TfD should be the umbrella term for the many terms used to refer to the praxis. The eventual acceptance is the

making of the international bodies that legitimise it. Notable amongst them are UNESCO and ITI.

The research also concluded that the most significant initiative for the diffusion of TfD in Africa was the Murewa workshop. This was primarily due to international bodies such as UNESCO, ITI. DSE. ACCA, SIDA and CUSO. The financial and logistical support from these organisations helped finance the participation of many people from many African countries, who ended up spreading the praxis in their respective countries.

The involvement of these international agencies is akin to the notion that cultural encounters create a platform for conceptual hybridity, which leads to a reformulation and a review of the past. This is in line with the fact that no culture or phenomena, after an encounter, can remain "pure", albeit there is a likelihood of a single culture conquering the other. The contribution of these international agencies in this regard can be likened to an attempt at practical and conceptual hybridity as is manifest in the arguments in favour of applied theatre becoming an umbrella term for all socially engaged theatre (Ackroyd, 2000). What the research accentuates is that the historical and institutional perspectives of TfD cannot be adequately contextualized unless it is viewed from a globalized standpoint. This is why investigating how TfD evolved brings a different dimension to the research on TfD. It opens up a new way of looking at the histories and historiographies of TfD, mainly because most research on TfD focused on describing what pertained in workshops or describing how things are done. This research opens up an avenue for re-examining how the genre developed, how international funding became the lifeline for the genre's survival, and the implication that has for the field in the following decades.

Understanding how the field was configured also creates an opportunity for researchers to examine the role of the cold war in consolidating the praxis in Africa. It also invites investigation into how the cold war framed how the Global North embraced Africa's TfD praxis and movement. Even the liberalisation of the genre, the dilution of the socialist-leaning of the praxis and the adoption of the methods by notable intergovernmental organisations are some of the conversations that this research creates for further research.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

From the beginning of TfD to its contemporary practice, neoliberal forces have had a stake in its evolution. Although in a different context and era, the implication today is daunting. The TfD practitioner is left to either resist them or find a clever way of working with them. Some

pretend they do not exist, although the effects are palpable. The truth is that they affect every aspect of life globally. What needs to be done is to research the impact and implications of funding that emanates from the globalized neoliberal agenda. The diffusion of TfD was primarily because of the neoliberal agenda. It will be instructive for future works to trace the funding sources, their implications and effects on the practice of TfD today. One must admit that several institutions, international development corporations and higher education institutions which have become the sustainable sources of TfD benefit from the global neoliberal agenda.

Paying attention to the context is crucial. The context in which an event happens demands a treatment that conforms to that context. The context invokes the approach, polemical perspective, epistemic dictates, challenges, and intent. TfD works have taken place in different contexts. This research proposes a thorough examination of how the conventional theatrical forms influence TfD and vice versa. It is imperative because most contemporary practitioners are products of higher education institutions. It will be interesting to unravel the contextual influence and implications between literary theatre and TfD, especially in Africa.

After over five decades of TfD's lifespan, and notwithstanding significant advances in its methodology that have contributed in diverse ways to shaping development communication in and the ideal of national development, the plan articulated in its beginnings cannot be said to have been attained. While countless probable justifications can be given, it can also be argued that a contributory factor is the failure to address the future of TfD concerning technology and the changing world. Most African villages are fast becoming urbanized. Their demography has changed significantly during the evolution of TfD. An evaluation of the role TfD played in this transformation, the bridge between TfD and new media in such environments, and multilateral development agencies in such ventures are needed.

At this point, it is necessary to note that the ideological persuasions in TfD were fermented, especially in the context of culture, when there was socio-political strife of the Cold War that fell within its manifest disagreements and disputes. The climate demanded that nations on opposite sides of divide frame their involvement in their preferred ideology. The point is that one has to theorize starting from a grasp of the realities of one's existence. This research argues that TfD gave this to the practitioners and countries involved in it. Admittedly, "this does not preclude studying and borrowing from the theoretic reflections of others, produced under radically different cultural, historical, and political conditions. It does, however, preclude

mimicry and the acceptance in toto of ideological or theoretic conceptions developed elsewhere" (Wiredu, 2004:228). Indeed, TfD served as the bridge, having appropriated local and external concepts, ideas, and strategies to achieve its stated objectives

References

Agovi, Kofi E. 1979. *Kundum Festival Drama Among the Ahanta–Nzema of South West Ghana.* Legon: doctoral dissertation, Institute of African Studies,.

Ahura, Tar. 1991. "Popular Theatre and Popular Development Strategies." In *Beyond The Theatre*, Edited by Hansel Ndumbe Eyoh, 149-160. Bonn: Germany.

Anand, N., and Brittany C. Jones. 2008. "Tournament Rituals, Category Dynamics, and Field Configuration: The Case of the Booker Prize." *Journal of Management Studies* 1036-60.

Andrade, Clara de, and Christopher Balme. 2020. "Transnational networks of Theatre of the Oppressed: The Institutionalization of a Circulating Method." *Journal of Global Theatre History* 3-20.

Arkhurst, Sandy. 1994. "Community Theatre: A Rethink." *Newsletter of the School of Performing Arts-University of Ghana* 4-6.

Armah, Ayi Kwei. 2010. *Remembering The Dismembered Continent.* Popenguine: Per Ankh.

Asabere-Ameyaw, Akwasi, Jophus Anamuah-Mensah, George Sefa Dei, and Kolawole Raheem. 2014. *Indigenist African Development and Related Issues: Towards a Transdisciplinary Perspective.* Rotterdam/Boston/Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Asante, Kariamu Waelsh. 2000. *Zimbabwe Dance: Rhythmic Forces, Ancestral Voices- An Aesthetic Analysis.* Asmara: Africa World Press.

Balme, Christopher. 2020. "Arts and the University: Institutional logics in the developing world and beyond." *Journal of Global Theatre History* 4 (2): 5-23.

—. 2008. *The Cambridge Introduction to Theatre Studies* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

. 2017. "Theatrical Institutions in Motion: Developing Theatre in the Postcolonial Era." *Journal of dramatic theory and criticism* 31 (2): 125-140.

Balme, Christopher, and Nic Leonhardt. 2020. "The Rockefeller Connection: Visualizing theatrical networks in the Cultural Cold War." *Comparatio* 12 (2): 127-144.

Barber, Karin. 2018. *A History of African Popular Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barley, Stephen R., and Pamela S. Tolbert. 1997. "Institutionalization and structuration: studying the links between action and institution." *Organization Studies* 18: 93-117.

Bassey, Nnimmo. 2019. "Breaking the Chains of Development." In *Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary*, by Ashish Kothari, Ariel Salleh, Arturo Escobar, Federico Demaria and Alberto Acosta, 3-5. New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Bharucha, Ruston. 1993. *Theatre and the World: Performance and the Politics of Culture.* London: Routledge.

Blackburn, James. 2000. “Understanding Paulo Freire: reflections on the origins, concepts, and possible pitfalls of his educational approach.” *Community Development Journal* 35 (1): 3-15.

Boscolo, Cristina. 2010. “The Leaf & the Soap ('Bi ewe bd pe I'ara ose, a di gse'): A story of appropriation & resistance.” In *African Theatre 9 : Histories 1850-1950*, by Yvette Hutchison, 90-106. Oxford: James Currey.

Brint, Steven, and Jerome Karabel. 1991. “Institutional Origins and Transformations: The Case of American Community Colleges.” In *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, by Paul J. DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell, 337-360. London: University of Chicago Press.

Byram, Martin. 1980. “Oodi Weavers: Material Culture, Workers Organizations and Non-formal Education in Botswana.” In *Tradition for Development:Indigenous Structures and Folk Media in Non-formal Eduction*, by Ross Kidd and Nat Colletta, 207-244. Bonn: German Foundation for International Development (DSE).

Chifunyise, Stephen Joel. 1991. “Articulating Popular Theatre Strategies.” In *Beyond The Theatre*, Edited by Hansel Ndumbe Eyoh, 32-49. Bonn: German Foundation for International Development (DSE).

Chifunyise, Stephen, David Kerr, and Dall Fall. 1980. *Theatre for Development.* Lusaka: International Theatre Institute.

Chinyowa, Kennedy C. 2014. “By whom and for whom? An aesthetic appraisal of selected African popular theatre workshops.” *Studies in Theatre and Performance* 5-22.

Chinyowa, Kennedy C. 2009. “Emerging Paradigms for applied drama and theatre practice in Africa.” *The Journal of Apliied Theatre and Performance* 329-346.

—. 2005. *Manifestations of Play as Aesthetic in African Theatre for Development.* Queensland: School of Vocational, Technology and Arts Education. doi:https://doi.org/10.25904/1912/2564.

Clarke, P.B. 1986. *West African at War, 1914-18, 1939-45 Colonial propaganda and its cultural aftermath.* London: Ethnographica.

Cohen-Cruz, Jan. 1999. “Practice & policy in theatre & developmen: London seminar, a personal response.” In *African Theatre in Development*, by Martin Banham, James Gibbs and Femi Osofisan, 113-116. Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

Cohen-Cruz, Jan, and Mady Schutzman. 2006. *A Boal Companion: Dialogues on theatre and cultural politics.* New York and London: Routledge.

Cole, Catherine M. 1997. “'This Is Actually a Good Interpretation of Modern Civilisation': Popular Theatre and the Social Imaginary in Ghana, 1946-66.” *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 363-388.

Colletta, Nat. 1980. “Tradition for Change: Indidenous Socio-Cultural forms as a basis for non-formal eduction and development .” In *Tradition and Development: Indigenous Structures and Folk Media in Non-Formal Education*, by Ross Kidd and Nat Colletta, 9-59. Bonn: German Foundation for International Development (DSE).

Collins, John E. 1976. “Comic Opera in Ghana.” *African Arts* 50-57.

Collins, John E. 1976. “Ghana Highlight.” *African Arts* 62-8.

Decker, Corrie, and Elisabeth McMahon. 2021. *The Idea of Development in Africa: A History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deh, Tabitha Harriet. 2019. “Theatre for Development : A Tool for Malaria Education in Ghana .” *European Journal of Public Health Studies* 10-17.

Dickson, Alec. 1950. “Mass Education in Togoland.” *African Affairs* 136–50.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1986. “Structural analysis of organizational fields: a blockmodel approach.” *Research in Organizational Behavior* 335-370.

D'iMaggio, Paul, and Walter W. Powell. 1991. “Introduction.” In *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, by Paul DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell, 1-38. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.

D'iMaggio, Paul, and Walter W. Powell. 1983. “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields.” *American Sociological Review* 48 (2): 147-160.

Dogbe, Esi. 2002. “Visibility, eloquence & silence: Women & theatre for development in Ghana.” In *African Theatre Women*, by Martin Banham, James Gibbs and Femi Osofisan, 83-98. Oxford : James Currey Ltd.

DOSSIER, IFDA. July/August 1983. “Popular Theatre Dialogue.”

Driskell, Charles B. 1975. “An Interview with Augusto Boal.” *Latin American Theatre Review* 71-78.

Ekbladh, David. 2002. “"Mr. TVA": Grass-Roots Development, David Lilienthal, and the Rise and Fall of the Tennessee Valley Authority as a Symbol for U.S. Overseas Development, 1933–1973.” *Diplomatic History* (Blackwell Publishing, Inc,) 335-374 .

Epskamp, Kees. 1992. *Learning by Performing Arts: from Indigenous to Endogenous Development.* The Hague: Centre for the Study of Education in Developing Countries (CESO).

Epskamp, Kees P., and Jaap R. Swart. 1991. "Popular Theatre and the Media: The Empowerment of Culture in Development Communication." *Gazette* 177-192.

Epskamp, Kees. 1989. *Theatre in Search of Social Change:The relative Significance of Different Theatrical Approaches.* Hague: Centre for the Study of Education in Developing Countries (CESO).

Escobar, Arturo. 1992. "Imagining a Post-Development Era? Critical Thought, Development and Social Movements." *Social Text* 20-56.

Etherton, Michael. 1980. "Popular Theatre and Popular Analysis in Africa." In *Tradition for Development: Indigenous Structures and Folk Media in Non-Formal Education*, by Ross Kidd and Nat Colletta, 570-594. Bonn: German Foundation for International Development (DSE).

Ewu, Jumai. 1999. "Arts and Development II: Furthering the agenda, Ibadan." In *African Theatre in Devvelopment*, by Martin Banham, James Gibbs and Femi Osofisan, 87-98. Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

Eyoh, Hansel Ndumbe. 1986. *Hammocks to Bridges.* Bonn: German Foundation for International Development (DSE).

Fanon, Frantz. 2008. *Black Skin, White Masks.* New York: Grove Press.

—. 2004. *The Wretched of The Earth.* New York: Grove Press.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. 1992. *The Semiotics of Theatre.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Freire, Paulo. Bloomsbury. *Education for Critical Consciousness.* London: 2013.

—. 1972. *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Seabury Press.

—. 2016. *Pedagogy in Progress: The letters to Guinea-Bissau.* London: Bloomsbury.

Friedland, Roger, and Robert R. Alford. 1991. "Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions ." In *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, by Paul J. DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell, 232-266. London: University of Chicago Press.

Garud, Raghu. 2008. "Conferences as Venues for the Configuration of Emerging Organizational Fields: The Case of Cochlear Implants." *Journal of Management Studies* 45: 1061-1088.

Garud, Raghu, and M. Rappa. 1994. "A socio-cognitive model of technology evolution." *Organization Science* 334-362.

Gecau, Kimani. 1983. “A Theatre for Development in Zimbabwe.” *Africa Report* 24.

Gecau, Kimani. 1991. “Kamiriithu Revisited.” In *Beyond The Theatre*, by Hansel Ndumbe Eyoh, 61-73. Bonn: German Foundation for International Development (DSE).

Gibbs, James. 1999. “Propaganda & mass education: Alec Dickson & drama for development in the Gold Coast.” In *African Theatre in Development*, by Martin Banham, James Gibbs and Femi Osofisan, 13-23. Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

Gibbs, James. 1999. “Propaganda and mass education: Alec Dickson & drama for development in the Gold Coast.” In *African Theatre in Development*, by Martin Banham, James Gibbs and Femi Osofisan, 13-23. Oxford: James Currey.

Goulet, Linda, Warren Linds, Jo-Ann Episkenew, and Kare Schmidt. 2011. “Creating a Space for Decolonization: Health through Theatre with Indigenous Youth.” *Native Studies Review* 20 (1).

Graham-White, Anthony. 1974. *The Drama of Black Africa.* New York: University of Oklahoma Press.

Gunner, Liz. 2007. “Africa and Orality.” In *African Literature: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory*, by Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson, 9-10. Malden. MA: Blackwell Publication.

Hall, Budd, and Bridgette Freyh. 1980. “Forward.” In *Tradition for Development: Indigenous Structuree and Folk-Media for Development*, by Ross KIdd and Nat Colletta, 5-9. Bonn: German Foundation fr International Development (DSE).

Harding, Frances. 1999. “Fifteen Years between Benue and Katsina workshops, Nigeria.” In *African Theatre in Development*, by Martin Bamham, James Gibbs and Femi Osofisan, 99-112. Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

Hardy, Cynthia, and Steve Maguire. 2010. “Discourse, Field-Configuring Events, and Change in Organization and Institutional Fields: Narratives of DDT and The Stockholm Convention.” *Academy of Management Journal* 58 (6): 1365–1392.

Haveman, Heather A., and Gillian Gualtieri. 2017. “Innstitutional Logics.” *Oxford research encyclopedia of business and management.*

Hoffman, A. J. 1999. “Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the U.S. chemical industry.” *Academy of Management Review* 42 (4): 351-371.

Holler, Josef. 1963. *Final Mission Report Covering the period of 14 August 1962-22 June 1963.* Field Report, Beareau of Relations with Member States, Unesco, Paris: UNSCO.

Hountondji, Paulin J. 1983. *African Philosophy: Myth and Reality.* London: Hutchinson.

Howell, Martha, and Walter Prevenier. 2001. *From Reliable Sources: An Intriduction to Historical Methods.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Irele, Abiola. 2007. “Orality, Literacy, and African Literature.” In *African Literature: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory*, by Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publication.

Kamlongera, Christopher. 2005. “Theatre for Development in Africa.” In *Media & Glocal Change: Rethinking Communication for Development*, by Oscar Hemer and Thomas Tufte, 435-452. Buenos Aires: Clacso Books.

Kasoma, Kabwe. 1983. “Theatre for Development.” *International Theatre Information* (UNESCO) 1-2: 89-90.

Kerr, David. 1995. *African Popular Theatre: From Pre-Colonial Times to The Present Day.* London: James Currey.

Kerr, David. 1982. “An Experiment in Popular Theatre in Malawi: The University Travelling Theatre to Mbachaland, July, 1981.” *The Society of Malawi Journal* 35 (1): 34-51.

Kerr, David. 1999. “Art as tool, weapon or shield?” In *African Theatre in Development*, by Banham Martin, James Gibbs and Femi Osofisan, 79-86. Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

—. 1998. *Dance, Media Entertainment & Popular Theatre in South East Africa.* Bayreuth: Bayreuth African studies.

Kerr, David. 2014. “Theatre for Development.” In *The Handbook of Development Communication and Social Change*, by Karin Gwinn Wilkins, Thomas Tufte and Rafael Obregon, 207-225. Somerset: Wiley Blackwell.

Kidd, Ross. 1980. “Domestication Theatre and Conscientization Drama in India.” In *Tradition for Development: Indigenous Structures and Folk Media in Non-Formal Education*, by Ross Kidd and Nat Colletta, 415-502. Bonn: German Foundation fr International Development (DSE).

Kidd, Ross. 1984. *From People's Theatre for Revolution to Popular Theatre for Reconstruction: Diary of a Zimbabwean Workshop* . Reports-Descriptive , Hague : Centre for The Study of Education in Developing Countries (CESO).

Kidd, Ross. 1980. “Introduction: Folk Media, Popular Theatre and Conflicting Strategies for Social Change in the Third World.” In *Tradition for Development: Indigenous Structures and Folk Media in Non-Formal Education*, Edited by Ross Kidd and Nat Colletta, 280-301. Bonn: German Foundation for International Development (DSE).

Kidd, Ross, and K. Kamur. 1981. “Co-opting Freire: a Critical Analysis of Pseudo-Freirean Adult Education .” *Economic and Political Weeksly.*

Kidd, Ross, and Martin Byram. 1979. *Popular Theatre; A Technique for Paiticigatory Research.* Toronto: International Council for Adult Education.

Kidd, Ross, and Martin Byram. 1978. “The Performing Arts and Community Education in Botswana.” *Community Development Journal* 13 (3): 170-178.

Kidd, Ross, and Nat Colletta. 1980. “Tradition for Development: Indigenous 'structures and Folk Media in Non-Formal Education.” *International Seminar on The Use of Indigenous Social Structures and Traditional Media in Non-Formal Education and Development.* Berlin: German Foundation for International Development (DSE); International Council for Adult Education (ICAE). 639.

Kidd, Ross, and Rummelt Hammelen. 1983. *African Workshop on Theatre for Development: A Report on an International Workshop held in Zimbabwe.* Paris: ITI/UNESCO.

Kinsey, David C., and John W. Bing. 1978. *Non-formal Education in Ghana: A Project Report.* Project Report, Amherst, MA: Centre for International Education-University of Massachusetts.

Kirby, E. T. 1974. “Indigenous African Theatre.” *The Drama Review* 18 (1): 22-35.

Knorr-Cetina, Karin. 1995. “How Superorganisms Change: Consensus Formation and the Social Ontology of High-Energy Physics Experiments.” *Social studies of science* 119-147 .

Koch, Jule. 2008. *Karibuni Wananchi: Theatre for Development in Tanzania.* Bayreuth: Bayreuth African Studies.

Kothari, Ashish, Ariel Salleh, Arturo Escobar, Federico Demaria, and Alberto Acosta. 2019. *Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary.* New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Lampel, J., and A. D. Meyer. 2008. “Field-configuring events as structuring mechanisms: How conferences, ceremonies, and trade shows constitute new technologies industries, and markets.” *Journal of Management Studies* 1025–1035.

Latour, Bruno. 1994. “On technical mediation-philosophy, sociology, genealogy’.” *Common Knowledge* 29-64.

Leca, Bernard, Charles-Clemens Ruling, and Dominique Puthod. 2015. “Animated Times: Critical Transitions and the Maintenance of Field-Configuring Events.” *Industry and Innovation* 173-192.

Lent, John A. 1980. “Grassroots Renaissance; Folk Media in Third World Nations.” *Folklore* 91 (1): 78-91.

Lilienthal, David. 1944. *TVA: Democracy on The March.* North Carolina: Southern Economic Association and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Lokko, Sophia Doreen. 1991. “Conceptualizing, Creating, Communicating , and Conscientizing.” In *Beyond The Theatre*, by Hansel Ndumbe Eyoh, 98-103. Bonn: German Foundation for International Development (DSE).

Machado-da-Silva, Clóvis L., Edson R. Guarido Filho, and Luciano Rossoni. 2006. “Organizational Fields and the Structuration Perspective: Analytical Possibilities.” *Brazilian Administration Review* 3 (2): 32-56.

Mahoney, James. 2000. “Path Dependence in Historical Sociology.” *Theory and Society* 29 (4): 507-548.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Mazrui, Ali. 1990. *Cultural Forces in World Politics* . Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

—. 1980. *The African Condition: A Political Diagnosis.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

—. 1986. *The Africans: A Triple Heritage.* Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Mbembe, Achille. 2017. *Critique of Black Reason.* Durham ; London: Duke University Press.

—. 2019. *Necropolitics.* Durham ; London: Duke University Press.

—. 2001. *On The Postcolony.* Berkeley: University of Carlifornia Press.

—. 2021. *Out of The Dark Night: Essays on Decolonization.* New York: Columbia University Press.

McInerney, Paul -Brian. 2008. “Showdown at Kykuit: Field-Configuring Events as Loci for Conventionalizing Accounts.” *Journal of Management Studies* 1089-1116.

McKegney, Sam. 2003. *Magic weapons: Aboriginal writers remaking community after residential school.* Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

McMichael, Philip. 2019. “The Development Project.” In *Pluriverse: A post-Development Dictionary*, by Ashish Kothari, Ariel Salleh, Arturo Escobar, Federico Demaria and Alberto Acosta, 12-14. New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Mda, Zakes. 1993. *When People Play People: Development Communication Through Theatre.* London/New York: Zed Books.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

—. 1995. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality and Colonization.* Ann Abor: University of Michigan Press.

—. 2011. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Dicolonial Options.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Moeran, B., and J. Strandgaard Pedersen. 2011. *Negotiating Values in the Creative Industries: Fairs, Festivals and Other Competitive Events.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 2003. *Feminism without Doarders: Decolonizing theory, Practicing Solidarity.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Neisser, Ulric. 1976. *Cognition and reality : principles and implications of cognitive psychology.* San Francisco, California: Freeman.

Nketia, J. H. Kwabena. 1965. *Ghana: Music, Dance and Drama.* Legon: Institute of African Studies, Legon.

O'Toole, John, Au Yi-Man, Andrea Baldwin, Helen Cahill, and Kennedy Chinyowa. 2015. "Capacity Building Theatre (Vice Versa)." In *Applied Theatre: Development*, by Tim Prentki, 93-109. London: Bloomsbury.

Obenga, Theophile. 2004. *African Philosophy : The Pharaonic Period : 2780 - 330 BC.* Popenguine: Per Ankh.

Ocitti, Jakayo Peter. 1988. "Indigenous African Pedagogy." *Adult Education and Development.*

Okpewho, Isidore. 2007. "Oral Literature and Modern African Literature." In *African Literature: An Anthology of Cricism and Theory*, by Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson, 11-12. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publication.

Oliver, A. L., and K. Montgomery. 2008. "Using Field-configuring events for sesnse-making: a cognitive network approach." *Jpurnal of Management Studies* 1147-67.

Opoku, A. A. 1970. *Festivals of Ghana.* Accra: Ghana Publishing Corporation.

Opoku, A. M. 1964. "Thoughts from School of Music and Drama." *Okyeame* 2 (1): 51-56.

Ositola, Kolawole. 1988. "On Ritual Performance: A Practitioner's View." *The Drama Review* 21-41.

Parry, Benita. 2007. “ Resistance Theory/Theorizing Resistance or Two Cheers for Nativism: Benita Parry.” In *African Literature: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory*, by Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson, 39-40. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publication.

Peruzzo, C.M.K. 2020. “Paulo Freire's role and influence on the praxis pf popular communication in Brazil.” *The International Communication Gazette.*

Pickering, A. K. 1958. “Village Drama.” *Community Development Bulletin* 62-67.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 2000. “After Post-Development.” *Third World Quarterly* 175-191.

Plastow, Jane. 1996. *African Theatre and Politics: The Evolution of Theatre in Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zimbabwe-A Contemporary Study.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Plastow, Jane. 2014. “Domestication or transformation? The ideology of Theatre for Development in Africa.” *Applied Theatre Research* 2 (2): 107-118.

Prendergast, Monica, and Juliana Saxton. 2009. *Applied Theatre: International Case Studies and Challenges for Practice.* Bristol/Chicago: Intellect Books.

Prentki, Tim. 1998. “Must the Show Go on? The Case for Theatre For Development.” *Development in Practice* 8 (4): 419-429.

Prentki, Tim, and Sheila Preston. 2009. *The Applied Theatre Reader.* London: Routledge.

Performance Studio Workshop, Chuck Mike and Members of The. 1999. “Performance Studio Workshop.” In *African Theatre in Development*, by Martin Banham, James Gibbs and Femi Osofisan, 61-78. Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

Ravengai, Samuel. 2010. “Contesting Constructions of Cultural Production in & through Urban Theatre in Rhodesia , c. 1890 -1950.” In *African Theatre 9 : Histories 1850-1950*, by Yvette Hutchinson, 53-71. Oxford: James Currey.

Russell, Robert Isaac. 1982. *Uses of popular culture in nonformal education : three case studies: PhD Dissertation.* Amherst : University of Massachusetts .

Sachs, Wolfgang. 2019. “The Development Dictionary Revisited.” In *Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictioary*, by Ashish Kothari, Ariel Salleh, Arturo Escobar, Federico Demaria and Alberto Acosta, xi-xvi. New Delhi: Tulika Books.

—. 2010. *The Development Dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power.* London/New York: ZED Books.

Sahgal, Nayantra. 1993. “The Schizophrenic Imagination.” In *From Commonwealth to Postcolonial*, by Anna Rutherford, 30-38. Syney: Dangeroo Press.

Scheub, Harold. 2007. “The Oral Artist’s Script.” In *African Literature: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory*, by Tejumola Olaniyan and Ato Quayson. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publication.

Schußler, E., C. Ruling, and B. Wittneben. 2014. “On Melting Summits: The Limitations of Field-Configuring Events as Catalysts of Change in Transnational Climate Policy.” *Academy of Management Journal* 140–171.

Schüßler, Elke, Gernot Grabher, and Gordon Müller-Seitz. 2015. “Field-Configuring Events: Arenas for Innovation and Learning?” *Industry and innovation* 22 (3): 165-172.

Scott, W. R. 1994. “Conceptualizing organizational fields: Linking organizations and societal systems.” In *Systems rationality and parcial interests*, by H. Derlien, U. Gerhardt and F. Scharpf, 203-221. Baden: Nomos.

Sen, Amrtya. 1999. *Development As Freedom.* New York: Anchor Books.

Shiva, Vandana. 2019. “Development- for the 1 per cent.” In *Pluriverse: A Post Development Dictionary*, by Ashish Kothari, Ariel Salleh, Arturo Escobar, Federico Demaria and Alberto Acosta, 6-8. New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Singer, Milton. 1960. *Traditional India: Structure and Change.* Jaipur: Rawat Publication.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People.* London: Zed Books.

Soyinka, Wole. 2019. *Beyond Aesthetics: Use, Abuse, and Dissonance in African Art Traditions.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

—. 1976. *Myth, Literature and the African World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suzina, Ana Christina, and Thomas Tufte. 2020. “Freire's vision of development and social change: Past experiences, present challenges and perspectives for the future.” *Th International Communication Gazette* 85 (5): 411-424.

Takem, John Tiku. 2005. *Theatre and Environmental Education in Cameroon.* Bayreuth: Breitinger.

Thiel, Joachim, and Gernot Grabher. 2012. “Crossing Boundaries: Exploring the London Olympics 2012 as a Field-Configuring Event.” *Industry and Innovation* 22 (3): 229-249.

Thornton, Patricia H., William Ocasio, and Michael Lounsbury. 2012. *The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure and Process.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Torres, Maria Luisa Reyes. 1997. “Cultural Development and Environment.” *Theatre Research International* 22 (1): 61-68.

Ugboajah, Frank. 1985. *Mass Communication, Culture and Society in West Africa.* Munich: Hans Zell.

Van-Erven, Eugen. 2001. *Community Theatre: Global Perspectives.* London/New York: Routledge.

W. R, Scott. 1991. "Unpacking institutional arguments." In *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, by W. W. Powell and P. J. DiMaggio, 164-182. London: University of Chicago Press.

White, D. R., J. Owen-Smith, J. Moody, and W. W. Powell. 2004. "Networks, fields and organizations: Micro-dynamics, scale and cohesive embeddings." *Computational & Mathematical Organization Theory* 10 (1): 95-117.

Wiredu, Kwasi. 1996. *Cultural Universals and Particulars.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

GERMAN SUMMARY

Theatre for Development (TfD) als Theaterform sui generis entstand in den 1970er Jahren aus verschiedenen Aktivitäten und unter unterschiedlichen Bezeichnungen, einem „confluence of cognate practices“, wie es Tim Prentki formuliert (Prentki 15): Erzieherisches Theater, Volkstheater, Gemeinschaftstheater - sie alle existierten bereits vor dem TfD und haben sich entweder um den neuen Begriff „Theater für Entwicklung“ herum reformiert oder bestimmte Techniken oder institutionelle Kontexte bereitgestellt. Tim Prentki, Kees` Epskamp und Ross Kidd haben diese Geschichte nachgezeichnet: Wir kennen die gemeinsamen Nenner und die Gründerväter und -mütter: Ross Kidd, Kimani Gecau, Martin Byram, Michael Etherton, David Kerr, Ngugi wa Thiongo, Rose Mbowa und Penina Mlama, um nur einige zu nennen. Weniger gut durchleuchtet ist, wie und warum sich diese besondere Konstellation von Menschen, Orten und Praktiken zu einer so mächtigen und einflussreichen Bewegung zusammenfügte, die schließlich auch institutionelle Merkmale annahm.

In der folgenden Studie werden einige dieser Geschichten im Detail untersucht werden. Die Theorien und kulturellen Bedingungen, die im Vordergrund stehen, haben ihre Wurzeln im afrikanischen Theater und in der Gemeindeentwicklung. Es wird aufgezeigt, wie eine grundlegende Überprüfung der Geschichte und Geschichtsschreibung der Praxis offenbart, an welchen Punkten und Etappen das Feld konfiguriert wurde. Die zu untersuchende Frage lautet: Wie wurde die Entstehung von TfD durch breitere transnationale Bewegungen und Zwänge bestimmt? Wie kam es zur Institutionalisierung des TfD in seinen heutigen Formen und Praktiken? Es wird die These aufgestellt, dass die Globalisierung und Institutionalisierung des TfD mit einem seismischen Wandel in der Entwicklungspolitik und den Entwicklungsstrategien zusammenfiel, der eine Abkehr von zentralisierten Top-Down-Strategien und eine Hinwendung zur Anerkennung lokaler Bedürfnisse als treibende Kraft der Entwicklungshilfe mit sich brachte. Anders formuliert: Das TfD trug dazu bei, dass statt Staudämmen Latrinen gebaut, dass Universitäten finanziert wurden und dass HIV-Präventionsprogramme an der Basis entstanden. Der Wechsel zu einem basisorientierten Ansatz führte jedoch paradoxerweise zu einer Ausweitung des internationalen Engagements: je lokaler der Kontext, desto stärker die Beteiligung von NGOs, halbstaatlichen und staatlichen Organisationen an theatralen Unternehmungen.

Die Untersuchung der historischen und institutionellen Perspektiven des TfD in Afrika und wie es zu einem Organisationsfeld wurde, erfordert den Einsatz verschiedener Methoden. Obwohl

diese Untersuchung qualitativ angelegt ist, werden quantitative Ansätze verwendet. Die Studie kombiniert Archiv- und Bibliotheksrecherchen mit qualitativen Methoden. Um das Ziel dieser Untersuchung zu erreichen, wurde eine breite Palette von Materialien herangezogen. Dazu gehören akademische Artikel, Briefe, Grundsatzdokumente, Berichte, Konferenzerklärungen, Protokolle und Unterlagen zu Förderanträgen. In einigen seltenen Fällen, in denen keine Dokumente zur Verfügung stehen, wurden mündliche Interviews und strukturierte Tiefeninterviews verwendet; dies gilt vor allem dann, wenn es sich um Schlüsselakteure handelt, die direkt an den sie betreffenden Aspekten beteiligt sind.

Der Begriff *grassroots* findet sich in der gesamten TfD-Literatur, und er wird ausgiebig verwendet sowohl von Praktikern als auch von Wissenschaftlern, die oft dieselben sind. Daher muss der Begriff genauer analysiert werden, um das zufällige Zusammentreffen zu verstehen von einerseits einer globalen Entwicklungsagenda, die ein Engagement an der Basis befürwortet, und andereseits einer neuen Theaterpraxis, die denselben Ansatz fordert.

Steve Oga Abah (2006:245) definiert TfD als “a means of articulation by ordinary people to discuss their predicament”. Lexikalisch gesehen bezieht sich *grassroots* auf einfache Menschen und wird oft mit ländlichen Gebieten in Verbindung gebracht. In dieser Bedeutung ist der Begriff nicht viel älter als ein Jahrhundert und hat laut Oxford English Dictionary seinen Ursprung im amerikanischen Englisch. Heute wird der Begriff mit weitgehend linken, sogar marxistischen, oppositionellen Strategien gegen die von oben verordneten Regierungsansätze assoziiert. Einige Anwendungen des Begriffs werden jedoch mit *post-development* in Verbindung gebracht (Escobar) und beziehen sich auf marginalisierte Gruppen, seien es Kleinbauern, Hausbesetzer oder Frauen (Pietersee 2000: 185).

Es ist vielleicht eines der Gesetze der Begriffsgeschichte, dass ihre Forschungsobjekte nicht unbedingt ideologische Grenzen respektieren. Unser heutiges Verständnis des Begriffs im Zusammenhang mit der Entwicklungspraxis geht auf die Politik der US-Regierung und insbesondere einen Mann zurück, David Lilienthal, den Direktor der Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), der vielleicht berühmtesten Initiative des New Deal der 1930er Jahre. Die TVA, die immer noch existiert, hat eine faszinierende Geschichte als Entwicklungsprojekt, und es besteht kein Zweifel daran, dass Präsident Trumans berühmte Point Four Antrittsrede im Jahr 1949, in der er das Entwicklungsjahrhundert als Mittel zur Bekämpfung der Ausbreitung des Kommunismus erklärte, in nicht geringem Maße auf den Errungenschaften der TVA beruhte. Als unermüdlicher Verfechter der TVA verbreitete Lilienthal den Begriff der

basisorientierten *grassroots*-Verwaltung als Synonym für Dezentralisierung und als Programm für lokale Konsultationen zur Entwicklung von Politik und Praxis. Obwohl die massiven Programme der TVA, insbesondere die Staudämme, riesige Mengen an staatlichen Mitteln in Anspruch nahmen, umfassten andere Aspekte die Bekämpfung von Malaria, die Stadtplanung, den Ausbau von Freizeiteinrichtungen und die Förderung der Agrarpolitik, insbesondere der Bodenbewirtschaftung, um die Armut der Bauern im globalen Süden zu lindern. Lilienthals Grundprinzip beinhaltete und verwirklichte "a national program administered so close to the grassroots that it is possible promptly to see and, by enlisting the interest and participation of the citizens affected, to remedy each conflict between the objectives of general regulations and the problems of the individual" (1940: 366). Lilienthals basisorientierte Methode enthielt auch ausdrücklich politische Ziele: "The vitality of democratic decision also depends in large measure upon the extent to which the grassroots can furnish facts and judgement *to the central authority*, so that it may not grow anaemic on a diet of 'fundamental principles' and a priori reasoning" (1940: 367).

Lilienthals Einfluss reichte über die USA hinaus. Sein bahnbrechendes Werk *TVA: Democracy on the March* (1944) wurde vom Office of War Information weit verbreitet, wobei allein in China 50.000 Exemplare zur Verfügung gestellt wurden (Ekbladh 2002: 346). Durch die Bekämpfung von Armut, schlechter Bildung, Überbevölkerung und „traditionellen" landwirtschaftlichen Methoden in einigen Gebieten der USA wurde die TVA und ihr basisorientierter Ansatz als eine Art Vorbild für die Entwicklungsländer angesehen. Lilienthal wandte seine Techniken in verschiedenen privaten Beratungsprojekten im Iran, in Kolumbien und Puerto Rico an, bevor er in den 1960er Jahren in ein halböffentliches Amt zurückkehrte. Dort versuchte er, den Mekong während des Vietnamkriegs zu zähmen; ein überregionales Projekt, das von den Entwicklungspolitikern der alten Schule, insbesondere von Walt Rostow, tatkräftig unterstützt wurde. Das Projekt scheiterte aus mehreren Gründen, vor allem aber wegen des sich verschärfenden Krieges in der Region. Wie David Ekbladh es ausdrückt: "Talk of implementing programs at the grassroots level based on the example of the TVA was confronted by the fact that people at that level faced lives pushed into a persistent state of flux by armed conflict" (2002: 368).

Die Amerikaner beriefen sich während des blutigen Vietnamkriegs, in dem die ideologischen Positionen nicht offensichtlicher hätten sein können, ausdrücklich auf die *grassroots*-Ebene. Obwohl der Begriff eindeutig mit der US-Entwicklungspolitik in Verbindung gebracht wird, taucht er auch häufig im Zusammenhang mit den politischen und militärischen Taktiken des

Vietcong auf. Wie die meisten Guerillabewegungen operierte auch der TfD „at the grassroots“. Die TfD-Praktiker beriefen sich in der Anfangsphase ihrer Geschichte auf einen „grassroots approach“. Sie waren ideologisch wahrscheinlich enger mit dem Vietcong verbunden als mit Lilienthal und der TVA. Beide teilten jedoch den gleichen Grundansatz der „Konsultierung“ mit den Bauern, wenn auch mit ganz unterschiedlichen Zielen und Methoden zur Durchsetzung der Ziele.

Die Gliederung der Kapitel:

Diese Studie beginnt mit einem allgemeinen Überblick über das Wesen der afrikanischen Situation. Dann wird kurz auf die Dichotomie zwischen dem globalen Norden und dem globalen Süden eingegangen. Anschließend werden die Gründe und die Methodik der Studie beschrieben, einschließlich der Ziele, des Forschungsumfangs und der Methodik. Es folgt ein Versuch, TfD zu definieren und zu erklären, wie der Begriff „grassroots“ mit der TfD-Bewegung in Verbindung gebracht wurde. Im Folgenden wird der Inhalt der anderen Kapitel der Studie skizziert.

Kapitel Zwei bietet Akademikern, Praktikern und Theoretikern von TfD eine solide Grundlage, um die Entwicklung und anschließende Institutionalisierung von TfD im Kontext von Entwicklung, Bildung und Dekolonisierung zu verstehen. Es diskutiert TfD in drei Kontexten: TfD als Dekolonisierung, TfD als Bildung und TfD als Entwicklung. Zu den Bereichen, die in diesem Kapitel behandelt werden, gehören Kolonialismus, konzeptionelle Dekolonisierung und Dekolonialität. Es befasst sich ferner mit indigenen und exogenen Vorgaben, die der TfD-Praxis zugrunde liegen. Weitere Ideen, die in diesem Kapitel untersucht wurden, sind die Erfindung der Unterentwicklung, der Versuch alternativer Entwicklungsparadigmen und die Initiative für eine indigene/exogene Entwicklung.

Das dritte Kapitel konzentrierte sich auf die möglichen Quellen, die die Entwicklung des Genres beeinflusst haben, und erörterte dann die Geschichte ausgewählter Länder in Afrika südlich der Sahara. Dies geschah auf der Grundlage von Fallstudien, die die Entwicklung und Verbreitung der TfD-Praxis in den ausgewählten Ländern und letztlich in Afrika vorantrieben - im Wesentlichen werden die verschiedenen Grundlagen der TfD, insbesondere ihre Quellen und Einflüsse, dargelegt. Das Kapitel soll eine Diskussion der länderspezifischen Geschichte ermöglichen, die zu einem besseren Verständnis der Institutionalisierung von TfD an den Hochschulen in Afrika führt.

In Kapitel Vier wird TfD als Organisationsfeld abgegrenzt. Es definiert das Organisationsfeld und erörtert, wie es sich entwickelt und geformt wird. *Field configured events* (FCEs) sind eng mit Organisationsfeldern verbunden: Es handelt sich um zeitlich begrenzte Zusammenkünfte, die Akteure und Organisationen zusammenbringen, um ein Feld zu konfigurieren. In diesem Zusammenhang werden in diesem Kapitel auch FCEs diskutiert und mit der Entwicklung des TfD als organisatorisches Feld in Verbindung gebracht. Anhand von zwei felddefinierenden TfD-Workshops (FCEs) – nämlich dem Theatre for Development Workshop in Murewa, Simbabwe (1983), und dem Theatre for Integrated Rural Development Workshop in Kumba, Kamerun (1984) – wird in diesem Kapitel weiter untersucht, wie das TfD-Feld konfiguriert wurde und die Legitimität von Akteuren und Organisationen in verwandten und verwandten Feldern wie der Entwicklungskommunikation, transnationalen philanthropischen Organisationen und internationalen und zwischenstaatlichen Geberorganisationen erlangte.

Kapitel Fünf befasst sich mit der Verbreitung von TfD in Afrika. Es zeigt die entscheidende Rolle auf, die der 1983 von der simbabwischen Regierung veranstaltete Murewa-Workshop dabei spielte. Außerdem werden zwei FCEs erörtert, die nach Ansicht dieser Untersuchung eine Plattform für Praktiker aus verschiedenen Teilen der Welt schufen, um sich auszutauschen und voneinander zu lernen. Diese FCEs setzten auch den Prozess in Gang, durch den verwandte Bereiche zu verschmelzen begannen, was schließlich zur Konfiguration des Bereichs in Murewa, Simbabwe, führte. Es ist wichtig, darauf hinzuweisen, dass sich dieses Kapitel nur auf die Feldkonfiguration als Abgrenzung und nicht auf das Thema bezieht. Der Schwerpunkt liegt auf den Menschen aus den Ländern, die zum ersten Mal mit der TfD-Praxis in Berührung kamen, und diese wiederum verbreiteten die Praxis in ihren jeweiligen Ländern. Besonderes Augenmerk wird hier auf den frankophonen Teil Afrikas gelegt, der zum ersten Mal in einem TfD-Workshop angemessen vertreten war.

Kapitel Sechs, das letzte Kapitel, schließt mit einer allgemeinen Zusammenfassung darüber, wie sich TfD zu einem beachtlichen organisatorischen Feld entwickelt hat. Es enthält auch Empfehlungen für weitere Forschungen und die Notwendigkeit, TfD als ein Soft-Power-Phänomen zu betrachten.

APPENDIX

A compilation of National and International Workshops, Conferences and Seminars on Theatre for Development (TfD)

Year	Country	Place	Title of Conference
1978	Botswana	Molepolepo	Popular Theatre for non-formal education
1979	Nigeria	Maska	Workshop - Community Theatre Project (Ahmadu Bello Collective)
1979; 1981	Zambia	Chalimbana	International Theatre Institute of Zambia Theatre for Development workshop
1980	Germany	Berlin	International Seminar on "The Use of indigenous Social Structures and Traditional Media in Non-formal Education and Development", 5-12 November (Berlin), organised by the German Foundation for International Development (DSE) and the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE).
1981	Nigeria	Borno	Community Theatre Project (Ahmadu Bello Collective)
1981	Swaziland	Mhlangano	
1981	Malawi	Mbalachanda	Theatre for Development Workshop at Mbalachanda Rural Growth Centre drama workshop organized by Chancellor College (University of Malawi) Travelling Theatre 5th to 25th July
1982	Nigeria	Kaduna	'First Benue International Popular Theatre Workshop for Development'. Gboko (Benue State, Nigeria), 28 December-9 January, organised by the Benue Council for Arts and Culture (Harding, 1999).

1982	Lesotho	Maseru	Workshop on Theatre for Development, Maseru,
1983	Bangladesh	Dhaka/ Koitta	'Popular Theatre Dialogue', 4-14 February, organised by the International Council of Adult Education (ICAE).
1982-1983	Nigeria	Benue	Theatre for Development Workshop
1983	Zimbabwe	Harare	'Consultative Conference on African Theatre'. University of Harare, 3-5 September, held under the auspices of UNESCO, the conference gave birth to the Union of African Performing Artists (UAPA), a pan-African organization.
1983	Zimbabwe	Murewa	African Theatre for Development Workshop funded by British Council
1983	Sierra-Leone	Freetown	Local Education Activities of Rural Network workshop organized by CARE International
1983	Tanzania	Malya	Theatre for Social Development
1983	Bangladesh	Koitta	Popular Theatre Dialogue
1984	Cameroon	Kumba	International Workshop on Theatre for Integrated Rural Development
1985	Lesotho	Maseru	International Conference on Theatre for Development, Maseru, 24 February to 2 March,
1985	Sweden	Stockholm	African Theatre Conference (a section dedicated to TfD)
1986	Nigeria	Benue	International Theatre for Development Workshop
1987	Malawi	Liwonde	

1988	Mauritius		Africa Symposium Workshop (AFSYMWORK), 15-29 October, organised by the International Theatre Institute (ITI) and the International Amateur Theatre Association (IATA).
1991	Namibia	Windhoek/ Rehoboth	International Popular Theatre Workshop, 1-14 August, organised by the International Council of Adult Education (ICAE) and the African Council of Adult Education (ALAE)
1994	Ghana	Winneba	International Workshop; Grassroot Communication for Rural Development
1995	Nigeria	Epeme-Lagos	Arts and Development : Prospects through theatre
1995	Nigeria	Katsina	The Katsina Ala Theatre for Development Workshop
1997	Zimbabwe	Harare	Art for Development Seminar
1998	Kenya	Kisumu	3rd IDEA World Congress of Drama/ Theatre and Education, 9-19 July, organised by the Kenya Drama/ Theatre and Education Association. (KDEA)