

Ariane de Waal

Staging Wounded Soldiers:

The Affects and Effects of Post-Traumatic Theatre

The resurgence of documentary theatre in the UK in the new millennium has often been attributed to a desire for authenticity, facts, and truthful accounts in the ‘war on terror’ era.¹ At a time when politicians (mis)led the UK into war in Iraq, based on false claims about weapons of mass destruction that could be launched within forty-five minutes, theatre rediscovered its capacity for responding promptly to current events in a fact-based manner.² The thorough research process and arrangement of materials in dramatic forms that seem to re-present their original sources authentically was seen as an appropriate response to a ‘perceived democratic deficit in the wider political culture’ (Megson 2005: 370). A cursory overview of the shows staged in London in 2014, among which were Alecky Blythe’s *Little Revolution* at the Almeida Theatre, Tess Berry-Hart’s *Sochi 2014* at the Hope Theatre, and Lloyd Newson/DV8’s *John* at the National Theatre, suggests that the form retains its appeal, despite the growing number of critiques of verbatim theatre’s truth claim (see especially Bottoms 2006). What these and most other verbatim productions have in common is that they rely on interviews with real people involved in recent events, whether the 2011 riots in London or the LGBT rights struggles surrounding the 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi. In most cases, actors stand in for those people whose lived experiences are the subject of the plays.

In this article, I ask what happens when those real people take to the stage themselves. While seeming to exceed verbatim theatre’s promise of authenticity by confronting audiences with the individuals involved in the real-life story, this approach comes with its own set of concerns about the exposure of non-professional performers to the audience’s scrutiny. This is especially so when the performers in question are ill or disabled. In Bravo 22 Company’s production of Owen Sheers’ *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* (2012), the real bodies of psychologically and physically wounded service personnel irrupt into the theatrical frame of an otherwise fictionalised play about their front-line experiences and return to British society. Hans-Thies Lehmann discusses the ‘irruption of the real’ in the context of postdramatic theatre, which ‘is the first to turn the level of the real explicitly into a “co-player”’ (2006: 100).

This production, however, cannot be neatly situated in a postdramatic paradigm, for it does not operate with an ‘aesthetics of undecidability’ in Lehmann’s sense (100). Whereas he postulates that ‘the main point is not the assertion of the real as such [...] but the unsettling that occurs through the *indecidability* whether one is dealing with reality or fiction’ (101), it is precisely the reality of the injured bodies that becomes the ‘main point’, or at least the unique selling point, of the show. Audiences’ expectations about the confrontation with real soldiers are aroused by the company’s partnership with the armed forces charity The Royal British Legion, which set up stalls and

donation boxes for each performance, as well as by publicity materials, which marketed the production as ‘the first time that the MOD [Ministry of Defence] had allowed a theatre company access to their wounded soldiers’ (Malpass 2014: 1). To invert Lehmann’s dictum, then, the performance is unsettling precisely because of the assertion of the reality of the soldiers’ wounds, as the opening lines of a theatre blog entry suggest: ‘I find this a very difficult play to review. All plays have something which ties them to reality [...]. But *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* is as close to reality theatre as you can possibly get’ (Aloess 2012). Other reviews echo the impression of ‘the true grit of authenticity’ (Cavendish 2014); ‘this is the truth and not some sanitised account of combat life’ (Smart 2014).

If being so ‘close to reality theatre’ makes it difficult to review a play, this raises questions about the way in which this type of theatre positions spectators and prompts an enquiry into the ‘poetics of immediacy’ (Megson 2006: 530) at work in performances that put real people on stage. How do measures of distance and proximity apply to (re)representations of the real? Can they pull us so close as to remove the reflective distance necessary for a critical assessment? This article approaches these questions by reading the representational strategies of *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* against other types of reality-based theatre, discussing the production in the context of post-traumatic theatre, and analysing the nexus of affects and effects produced at the site/sight of the real injured body.

By focusing on the role of the evocation of closeness and immediacy in upholding the truth claim of *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.*, I reveal a number of paradoxes and problematic assumptions that underlie the production. First, a degree of distance not only inheres in the structure of trauma but also in the relationship between the performing and performed ‘selves’ of the soldiers. While the performers’ sanity depends on maintaining a distance from the trauma, the linear and factual rendering of the moment of being wounded purports to bring audiences closer to ‘what happened’, thereby occluding both the inaccessibility of trauma per se and the distancing mechanisms at play in the performance. Second, the heightened affective impact of the injured bodies leads to a close identification with the soldier-performers in ways that casts the soldiers as victims rather than perpetrators. Again, it is the closeness to the wound that obstructs audiences from thinking through the presence of the soldier-performers to the pain those soldiers inflicted on distant others. Third, the physical proximity of audience and performers does not necessarily lead to greater access to the real. Even though theatre audiences for *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* are spatio-temporally co-present with the performers, the real voices of the soldiers remain at a remove as a result of strategies of selection, arrangement, and poeticisation in the development of the script. In contrast, viewers of the televised making-of documentary of the play can bear witness to the frail and vulnerable voices of the soldiers in ways that theatre audiences cannot.

Thinking through Genres

The Two Worlds of Charlie F. was originally developed at the Theatre Royal Haymarket in London’s West End in 2012, where it premiered in a fundraising gala performance in support of The Royal British Legion. It went on its first UK tour and to the Edinburgh Fringe Festival in the same year, where it won the Amnesty International Freedom of Expression Award, and toured the UK and Canada in 2014. A live recording was released on DVD in 2012, and a making-of documentary (*Theatre of War*, dir. Chris Terrill) aired on BBC One in the same year.³ In the production, real soldiers, most of whom had fought in Iraq and Afghanistan and had been injured during service, act alongside a small number of professional actors who take on subsidiary roles. ‘Drawn from the personal experiences of the wounded, injured and sick Service personnel involved’ (as the production’s publicity material states), writer Owen Sheers created a play that

spans the soldiers' recruitment and departure for the front line in Afghanistan, the traumatic moment of their injury, their ongoing struggle with the symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder—nightmares, flashbacks, relationship problems—to their recovery in physio- and psychotherapy. Although the combination of dialogue with frequent audience addresses, song, dance, movement, and verbal narration accompanied by physical acting resonates with the number format of variety theatre and the circus also often found in postdramatic theatre (Lehmann 2006: 61–62), there is still a teleological sequence to the fast-paced scenes. While the first of the two roughly hour-long acts primarily revolves around the soldiers' recruitment, training, and front-line experiences and ends with the collectively re-enacted moment of being wounded, the second act is mainly devoted to the thorny path of recovery and ends with their discharge from the services.

More than thirty wounded, injured and sick service personnel were interviewed for or contributed to the play, twelve of whom performed in the original 2012 production. They were supported by five professional actors, who occasionally played non-injured soldiers, but mainly took on the roles of civilians, such as nurses, (physio)therapists, or the soldiers' mothers or partners. Of the original cast, only two of the soldier-performers were women, resulting in a somewhat male-centred perspective. More than half of them had clearly visible injuries, such as amputations, while other physical injuries, such as spinal damage, vision impairment, or brain injury, were less visible (at least to the medically untrained spectator). Regardless of the (in)visibility of their wounds, however, the soldier-performers were at all times distinguishable from the professional actors, not only by means of their physical stance and vocal delivery but also as a result of the production's casting strategy: whereas each non-actor adopted one character, the professional actors played multiple roles. The main strategy of authentication is thus tied to the injured soldiers' appearance as (a version of) themselves in the play. The 2014 touring production differed from this configuration insofar as actors replaced a number of the soldiers who had left the cast, causing critics to mourn the show's loss 'of its straightforward emotional surge for this touring revival, in which professional actors swell the ranks of soldiers' (Trueman 2014). Having seen the DVD recording of the premiere and the revived performance at Richmond Theatre in London in March 2014, I would claim that the basic observation about the spectators' ability to differentiate between actors and non-actors and the authenticating function of the real soldiers' bodies holds in both cases.

In terms of genre, *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* is somewhat difficult to pin down. It is precisely its location at the intersection of such trends as documentary and (proto-)verbatim theatre, auto/biographical and disability performance, testimonial and community-based theatre, Teya Sepinuck's 'Theatre of Witness' and Rimini Protokoll's 'theatre of experts of the everyday', that makes an analysis of the piece useful for thinking through the ontological status of the real person within and across such categories.⁴ This list of genres is perhaps reminiscent of Carol Martin's enumeration of forms of 'theatre of the real', which she defines as

types of theatre [that] claim a relationship to reality [...]. In this kind of theatre, there is an obsession with forming and reframing what has really happened. There is the desire to produce what Roland Barthes dubbed the 'reality effect,' the result of a form of citation that confers the status of legitimacy upon the artwork with the concomitant sense that what is represented is real or has a relationship with what is real (2013: 5).

For Barthes, the reality effect is produced through the inclusion of superfluous elements in a narrative to which they are incidental. Seen as such, the bodies of the soldiers would provide no more than 'background texture' and 'the aura of real life' (Johnson 2005: 78)—a notion that would

undervalue their affective potential and the diverse ways in which these bodies ‘matter’ both within and beyond the world of the play. Ulrike Garde and Meg Mumford’s definition of ‘Reality Theatre’ as ‘marked by the use of “authenticity effects”, strategies for creating [...] a sense of direct contact with living people and truthful representations of their lives and social contexts’ (2013: 148), thus appears more directly applicable in this context.

Previous studies of the genres cited above offer crucial insights into the respective techniques and effects of staging real people. Garde and Mumford read the ‘authentic’ in Reality Theatre as ‘the product of a contract between performers and spectators’: when real people appear on stage, certain aspects of their performance, such as moments of vulnerability or uncertainty, might affirm the ‘authenticity contract’, while the impression of rehearsed performance segments might destabilise it (149). Contemporary disability performance, by contrast, negotiates a different kind of contract, as would appear from Petra Kupperts’ account of artistic practices that encourage audiences to read the disabled body not as authentic, but as a performing body (2003: 47–50). The need to overcome fixed subject positions of the spectator as voyeur and the performer as ‘exoticized and deliberately tragic other’, often reified through an ‘aesthetic of injury’, is emphasised in Julie Salverson’s work on refugee performance (2001: 122). Scholarship in this area, and testimonial theatre more generally, is also characterised by a concern with what Caroline Wake terms the ‘risks of repetition’, that is, the possible retraumatisation of subjects who testify to painful or violent events (2013: 104). Concerns surrounding the (re)production of spectacle resurface in Carole-Anne Upton’s criticism of ‘Theatre of Witness’ for ‘positioning its audience as voyeurs, whose only possible mode of engagement [...] is affective’ (2011: 215). The affective dimension is, however, also where the transformative potential of auto/biographical performance might lie, as Deirdre Heddon implies: ‘That I believe something *has* happened [...] does place my experience of the theatrical event into a different emotional register. The ‘real’, even if intellectually understood as contingent, [...] retains its pull’ (2008: 10). What unites these scholarly discourses is the emphasis placed on the spectator, who—at least potentially—confers authenticity and auto/biographical status on the work, empathises and identifies with the real people on stage, and recognises the subject’s agency and performativity. This article brings these theoretical considerations into a dialogue in order to argue that the semblance of immediacy and authenticity created in the spectators’ confrontation with real traumatised bodies in *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* impedes a critical engagement with the ethical and political questions at stake in that encounter.

In *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.*, non-actors play semi-fictional characters whose stories are in most cases thinly disguised versions of their own biographies. The relationship between ‘the self who is performed’ and the ‘performing self’—which is variously layered and complicated in auto/biographical performance, as Heddon has shown (2008: 27)—is here posited as one of equivalence, as evident from the accompanying documentation of the production. In several interviews, the performers have pointed out that they fully identify with their characters. As participant Lyndon Chatting-Walters maintains: ‘My character is basically me, to be honest. It almost in every way is about me’ (Terrill 2012: 41:55–42:03). Indeed, the scripted self-narratives of the characters closely match the ‘Bravo 22 Company Biographies’ published alongside the playtext. Yet, by integrating the biographies into a fictional framework that deploys all characters to the front line in Afghanistan and reunites them in the British rehabilitation centre, regardless of when, where, and how the performers’ injuries occurred, the production parts company with the methods of theatre collective Rimini Protokoll and much verbatim theatre. Like Rimini Protokoll’s ‘experts of the everyday’, the non-actors are recruited as specialists, because of their expertise in a particular area. Equally, their biographies serve as the material for the production. Unlike the ‘experts’, however, the soldiers do not exactly speak for themselves, in their own name, but recite

a rehearsed text. Despite drawing on the personal biographies and testimonies of the soldiers, the piece is not technically a verbatim play either. Although the script is loosely based on the interviews that preceded rehearsals, the soldiers' statements are not transcribed verbatim into the playtext. Sheers' decision to alter the exact words of the participants raises the question, to which I will return shortly, of whether the staging of real bodies appears to render faithfulness to the real word obsolete.

Distance and Proximity in Post-Traumatic Theatre

Cassidy Little, who plays the semi-fictional protagonist Charlie, addresses the audience in the opening scene with the stump of his amputated leg resting on a crutch. Whereas Charlie '*wears his prosthetic leg*' in other scenes (Sheers 2012: 24), the play begins with a set-up that accentuates the visible injury. The opening scene stages the mutilated male body, quite literally, as a body of evidence, as a visual signifier of trauma in a way that resonates with Cathy Caruth's famous description of trauma as 'the wound that cries out' (1996: 4). Caruth's work explores the communicative encounter at the site of trauma as 'an address that remains enigmatic yet demands a listening and a response' (9). To a certain extent, the production forges such an encounter between the traumatised subjects as the speakers and the audience as the hearers of trauma.

Although potentially intimate, this encounter can never be fully immediate. First of all, a certain distance is already built into the structure of trauma, as the subject cannot consciously access the traumatic event or possess the traumatic memory. Rather, the event returns repeatedly and uncontrollably in the form of nightmares and flashbacks. In order to counter trauma's grip on the subject, it needs to be integrated. Although Caruth problematises 'the transformation of the trauma into a narrative memory that allows the story to be verbalized and communicated', she concedes that it may work to 'tell a "slightly different story" to different people' (1995: 153)—which is precisely what the performers do. Instead of speaking as the 'experts' of their own biographies, they are offered an alter-ego character and a script that is not identical to their original testimonies. This technique inserts another layer of distance between performed and performing 'I'. However much the characters may approximate their own sense of self, they relieve the performers of having to speak in their own name and thus enable them to tell a 'slightly different story'.

The presentation of the traumatic material within a fictive text-cosmos could be seen to protect the participants from retraumatisation, providing a safe mode for retelling and re-enacting their traumatic experiences with a difference. So, rather than speaking of his own recurring nightmares about the actual bomb blast in which he lost both his legs, Daniel Shaw speaks on stage as Leroy: 'in my sleep [...] I still get blown up [...]. Every time. Sometimes I'm in my wheelchair, but no one says anything, like, "Why's Leroy in a fucking wheelchair?"' (Sheers 2012: 58). The storied experience of Leroy may be nigh on identical to Shaw's actual lived experience, but the narrative frame renders it distant, making it possible for the performer to share intimate things with the audience without giving away too much of himself. This technique is somewhat reminiscent of the popular trope of telling potentially embarrassing stories in the third person, as if they happened to 'a friend'. The distancing mechanism employed here ties in with the Freudian concept of 'working through' trauma, which 'allows for a gradual liberation from the repetition compulsion through the very mechanism of repeating, albeit repeating in a slightly different form' (Wald 2007: 106). Whereas trauma is acted out unconsciously and compulsively in flashbacks and dreams, working through 'involves a certain emotional and intellectual distance' (106). The displacement of life-stories into a dramatic script serves to provide the 'emotional and intellectual distance' that allows performers to engage with their slightly defamiliarised traumatic memories.

Yet I wonder whether the distance thus established, as well as the distance that inheres in trauma, is sufficiently acknowledged in performance. Karen Jürs-Munby, who has written on the curious affinities between the post-traumatic and the postdramatic, argues that the fragmented, open, referential form of postdramatic theatre may be linked to an attempt ‘to find an aesthetics that can intimate the inaccessibility of trauma’ (2009: 20). By contrast, the performers’ (self-)narratives in *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* often work to occlude the incommunicability of the traumatic memory in favour of a linear, coherent representation of what happened. Such representational forms of engagement with trauma rarely grasp, as Amanda Stuart Fisher argues, the ‘traumatic truth that fail[s] to be disclosed by a literal and factual account of “what happened”’ (2011: 113).

The first lines of Charlie’s audience address in the opening scene use an analogy to imply that spectators can be made to comprehend (his) trauma by thinking back to their own experiences of pain, however trivial:

You know when you fell off your bike? As a kid? Do you remember that pain? The one you don’t feel at first, but then you look down at your hand, your knee and it’s all gritty from where you bounced along the pavement. And that’s when it comes on, pulsing, and you’re like, ‘Ow, ow, ow, what the fuck?’ That’s what I remember. That kinda feeling (Sheers 2012: 10).

By evoking a childhood scene that almost everyone will have experienced, this direct address intimates a shared potential for registering and empathising with each other’s pain. Caruth’s ‘wound that cries out’ becomes the gritty knee sustained in a child’s bicycle accident. The precise nature of the analogy is perhaps not as noteworthy—given that Cassidy Little came up with it during the preceding interviews—as the playwright’s positioning of the passage at the beginning of the play. The extension of an analogy to the audience counterbalances the potentially unsettling confrontation with the performer’s stump. As a female, able-bodied, civilian audience member, I found my proximity to this, in many ways, differently located subject in this initial scene instantly captivating and poignant. Rather than being invited to perceive the Otherness of the performing body, however, I felt solicited by a narrative that insists on sameness.

A tendency to privilege a version of trauma that verges on the comprehensible can also be detected in a scene where a psychologist enquires, ‘Do you want to talk about your “when”, Charlie?’, upon which all performers begin positioning themselves within a linear narrative:

CHARLIE. Sure. I was taking part in an op ... [...]

DANIEL. I was commanding a company ...

RICHARD. I was on top cover ...

FRANK. I was against a wall ...

ROGER. I was in a Snatch ... [...]

ALL. When / When / When / When ...

A sudden simultaneous moment of contact. The sound of explosions and gunfire. In slow motion Frank is hit by an RPG. Richard is blown from his vehicle. Roger’s Snatch turns over. Chris, Daniel, Charlie and Leroy are hit by IEDs. [...] As the medics work the wounded Soldiers sit up to speak.

DANIEL. I was blown twenty metres ...

FRANK. I heard the rocket coming in ...

RICHARD. I was blown sixty feet ...

CHRIS. I caught the backlash ...

ROGER. The Snatch went over and I hit the roof ... [...]. (47–49)

The structural parallelism between the lines indicates a certain equivalence between the experiences of traumatising and conveys the sense that ‘what happened’ is relatable in a clear narrative formula triggered by the ‘when’ question. Again, Stuart Fisher’s criticism of factual accounts for failing to grasp traumatic truth, as well as her argument that verbatim theatre betrays the singularity of traumatic stories (2011: 118), is relevant here. Yet the fact that these accounts are not re-presented by ‘intermediaries’ (116), but by the traumatised subjects themselves, also calls for a slightly different critical perspective. Griselda Pollock argues that the conversion of trauma from incomprehensibility to narrativity and linear temporality ‘encases but also mutes trauma’s perpetually haunting force by means of a structuration’ (2009: 40). The combination of parallel narratives and simultaneous body movement in the moment of the on-stage explosions constitutes just such a structuration. The stylised and schematic re-enactment of the original traumatic incidents, repeated throughout rehearsals and performances, can be seen as another instance of the mechanism of working through.

The external perspective the performers necessarily have to take up in order to speak about an event they cannot remember is, however, obfuscated by the first-person speaking position. The speaker who tells us, ‘I was blown twenty metres ...’ or ‘I caught the backlash ...’ insinuates some kind of conscious access to and narrative authority over the event. Although these formulations seem to resonate with the testimonial mode, they fall short of the dramaturgy of testimonial theatre as defined by Stuart Fisher. Drawing on Yael Farber’s *He Left Quietly* (2008), performed by Duma Kumalo, whose experience of death row is at the centre of the play, Stuart Fisher argues that testimonial theatre allows for ‘unknowingness and the fragmentary way the testimonial subject encounters an event’ (2011: 119). In contrast to the meditative, subjective, and incomplete exploration of testimonial/traumatic truth that Stuart Fisher outlines, the stories the soldier-performers tell have to be seen, by virtue of their integration into a linear, coherent narrative and representational re-enactment, as dramatic mediations—rather than testimonies—of the traumatic events they experienced. It is questionable how far the inevitable distance to the original traumatic event is acknowledged in the production—certainly, the reviewers’ impressions of closeness, authenticity, and truth would suggest otherwise. That the performance was commonly perceived as presenting truthful, unmediated testimonies about injury is also evident from audience members praising the ‘real, raw stories from our war veterans’ or describing the evening as an ‘[e]motional journey [...] in the dramatic company of British soldiers wounded in Afghanistan’. The company ‘retweeted’ these statements on their Twitter feed without clarifying that some of the performers were in fact injured while on exercise or in other war zones.

I would argue that the narratives are likely to be (mis)read as authentic testimonies due to the apparent fit between representational and material orders. Even though the performance doubtlessly highlights the materiality of the injured bodies appearing on stage in wheelchairs, on crutches, with prosthetic legs, or moving on their stumps, these bodies are never merely self-referential. Unlike the grotesque bodies that inhabit the stage world created by Societas Raffaello Sanzio, for example, the soldiers’ bodies continuously bear a distinct relationship to the dramatic characters they represent. Drawing on Erika Fischer-Lichte’s terminology, one could state that the materiality of the phenomenal bodies never fully overrides the semiotic attributes, as the injuries always ‘make sense’ as part of the semiotic bodies of the characters (2008: 76). However, since the phenomenal bodies function as real referents of injury and damage, they seem to validate and authenticate the characters’ re-enactments in ways that at times obscure their representational status.

This is problematic insofar as the semblance of proximity to the ‘wound that cries out’ may undermine the audience’s ability to keep a reflective and emotional distance. Patrick Duggan holds that the ‘kinaesthetic connection between bodies in a shared space’ is part of what makes performance ‘the ideal site for traumatic exploration’, but he also points out (via Simon Shepherd) that the spectator’s ‘kinaesthetic empathy’ with the performers engenders a transmission of affects that bypasses an intellectual engagement with the performance (2007: 54). By pulling spectators closer to what is (re)presented as the real wound, the focus of the play remains on the figuration of the soldiers’ suffering, thereby constructing them as victims within the trauma paradigm and absolving them of complicity in acts of violence. The performance encounter heightens the sense of responsibility to the victims in our vicinity, rather than the victims of the violence committed in a distant theatre of war.

Ostensibly, the emphasis on injuries points to a thorough engagement with the costs of war, as evident from Sheers’ expressed hope that the play is about saying ‘this is what those three letters mean, this is what war is’ (Terrill 2012: 46:37–46:40) or from the protagonist’s invitation, ‘Let’s go on a tour’ (Sheers 2012: 12), extended to the audience in the first scene. At the heart of this engagement, however, is a crucial elision, for the injuries and deaths inflicted on the Other are rendered invisible, insignificant. As one soldier says in the play: ‘On my second tour we never saw them, not once. It was like fighting ghosts’ (46). Arguably, there is one scene that alludes to Afghan casualties, yet the fact that it is entitled ‘Flashback’ already indicates that its concern is primarily with the impact of warfare on the British soldiers, rather than the Afghan population. Positioned as the second scene of act two, which is initially set in a physiotherapy room with the soldiers doing exercises, it begins with a ‘massive blast’, upon which ‘the patients and physios collapse to the floor’ (Sheers 2012: 55). Their motionless bodies are meant to signify as Afghan civilians, who were accidentally killed by the soldiers. However, since these same bodies almost instantly begin to ‘shift and turn [...], repeating a sequence of movements of discomfort’ (56–57) and rise in the next scene to sing a song about nightmares and insomnia (‘It’s not re-living it. It’s living it. You’re in it. You’re there, doing it’ [57]), the scene is clearly framed as an obstacle in the soldiers’ recovery process, not in terms of an ethical sensibility. Throughout, the audience’s empathy rests with the British soldiers.

In consequence, the performance perpetuates what Judith Butler describes as the differential global distribution of the value and grievability of lives. According to Butler, the deaths of Iraqi and Afghan civilians in the ‘war on terror’ vanish ‘in the ellipses by which public discourse proceeds’ (2004: 35). By providing no names, faces, or (hi)stories to the Other, public discourse renders both their lives and deaths unreal, unmarkable, making it impossible for ‘us’ to grieve for ‘them’ (33). Insofar as it constructs only the British soldiers’ lives as apprehensible, real, and grievable, the production becomes vulnerable to Butler’s charge that ‘discourse itself effects violence through omission’ (34). There is a concern, then, with the way the poetics of immediacy operate through a series of blind spots, occluding not only the inaccessibility of trauma but also the wounds inflicted on distant Others. Despite the play’s potential for forging a communicative and affective encounter with trauma, then, there is also the need to point out, as Catherine Silverstone does, ‘the limitations not only of performance, but also of criticism, in acknowledging (and writing) the trauma of others’ (2011: 134).

Real Voices vs. Real Bodies

Contrary to the coherent narratives offered in the dramatic engagement with trauma, it is interesting to note that the making-of documentary includes interview segments where participants hesitate to put their feelings into words. Gareth Crabbe, for example, struggles to articulate a response to what was presumably a question about how he is feeling. He stammers: ‘I ... I’m in

absolute agony ... and ... I take ... so many painkillers. I've tried all of them just to get through the day' (Terrill 2012: 07:36–07:45). The very brief interview extract conveys a deep vulnerability on the part of Crabbe and provides the smallest glimpse of the 'wound that cries out'. His hesitation corresponds to Caruth's remark about 'survivors' reluctance to translate their experience into speech' (1995: 154). But the stammering of the soldier in pain does not appear in the final script. Instead, Crabbe, who appears as Darren in the play, introduces 'himself' alongside the other characters according to his medical history in the second scene:

Injured on April 2007 on Salisbury Plain whilst commanding 105mm artillery light gun. Gun crew accidentally crushed me bringing gun into action. Spinal damage and losing use of left arm. Had spinal surgery but remain in chronic pain and reliant on strong medication (Sheers 2012: 15).

The spontaneous description of his condition as being 'in absolute agony' becomes the more technically worded account that could come straight out of a medical report. Notably, as more and more soldiers appear and begin to speak simultaneously, '*until the stage is filled with wounded soldiers reciting their histories*' (13), it is impossible for the audience to discern Crabbe's/Darren's words among the polyphony of voices. The medical, matter-of-fact description of his injuries may be easier for the performer to deliver, yet not only does it get audibly lost, but the technical wording also makes it difficult to see the individual behind it. The real body may be present on stage, but the real voice, with all its frailty and hesitations, cannot be heard.⁵

In another interview contained in the BBC documentary, Stephen Shaw admits,

I don't really have a social life anymore ... Because basically ... the risk of falling over, because occasionally I've actually pissed myself – with the pain, when you go down, your bladder just lets go ... There's always that ... worry that you'll be out, having a good time, something will happen, you'll be on the floor in a puddle of piss, basically. Which has happened in public before. And everybody just looks at you like you're a freak (Terrill 2012: 45:30–45:57).

The hesitant articulation of a voice that speaks from a place of damage and embarrassment, is, in the play, converted into a more stabilised speaking position within a coherent self-narrative. Shaw's character, Roger, tells a businessman who incredulously asks him, 'what's wrong with you?' (since he has no visible impairments), that 'I broke my back in two places, [...] I'm addicted to meds and sometimes the pain is so bad I collapse and piss myself in public. What's wrong with you?' (Sheers 2012: 81). While Shaw understandably has difficulties articulating his concerns about continence and public exposure to the camera, the on-stage character is snappy, aggressive, and pushes the intrusive civilian brusquely away. The vulnerable masculinity to which the documentary testifies is transformed into a resilient masculinity that is more in line with the idealised image of the male soldier as warrior. This might be seen as another case of the theatrical frame providing protection, for Crabbe does not risk the dreaded exposure as a 'freak' on stage, where he appears self-possessed and in control. In this manner, though, the performance misses the opportunity to make spectators bear witness to the real person's anxieties and vulnerabilities or motivate a reconsideration of military masculinities in the face of trauma.

The juxtaposition of the scenes with the documented interview sequences reveals what has been lost in the development process: the frailty of the voice and its articulations of pain, anxiety, and vulnerability. To that extent, the production fails to make the soldiers' voices heard, despite the documentary showing Sheers assuring the participants before the start of rehearsals, 'I do very

much see this play as being your play, as being your voice' (Terrill 2012: 11:00–11:06), and director Stephen Rayne reminding the cast before the premiere, 'The way this show works, [...] why it's so unique, is because it's your voices, as soldiers, telling your stories' (59:24–59:36). This contrasts sharply with verbatim theatre's emphasis on the real voice. In a typical verbatim production, where actors stand in for the real people, it is the voice, and the testimony it gives, that becomes the link to external reality. As Stephen Bottoms puts it in his astute critique of the form, "'verbatim theatre" tends to fetishize the notion that we are getting things "word for word," straight from the mouths of those "involved"' (2006: 59). The dramatic strategies of authentication linked to the 'fidelity to the word-for-word interview' (Stuart Fisher 2011: 113) are sometimes based on a seemingly exact imitation of the original inflections and speech patterns, including hesitations, interruptions, and repetitions. This technique is employed, for instance, in Steve Gilroy's *Motherland* (2007), which re-presents the testimonies of women whose relatives or partners were or had been serving in Iraq/Afghanistan. In such productions, 'the audience looks at and *through* the performer in order to see beyond him or her to the real person who preceded the representation' (Taylor 2013: 371). The performers in *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* are not perceived as mediators between the real person and the audience; there is no need to look or listen through them, for the reality to which they testify is already there. Or so it would seem.

Paradoxically, though, where the presence of the real bodies appears to pull us closer to that reality, the real voices remain at a remove. It is here that a distinctive advantage of the verbatim technique of word-for-word retelling emerges. Seen against this method, Sheers' and Rayne's promises to make the participants' real voices heard appear slightly disingenuous, given the selection, arrangement, and poeticisation of their testimonies. This is problematic precisely because the presence of the real bodies seems to heighten, rather than critically reflect on, the truth claim of the production. The evidential quality of the injured bodies comes to replace the authentication strategies of verbatim theatre. It seems that, when the real person is present, the real word as reified in a verbatim script becomes obsolete, at least in this case study. If, in documentary theatre, 'Absence [...] creates presence' by evoking the illusion of 'unmediated access to the words of the originary speaker' (Bottoms 2006: 59), *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* insinuates a double presence by purporting to give access not only to their lived experiences but to the originary speakers themselves. As the productive tension between absence and presence disappears from a representational frame premised on presence only, the spectators' distance to the theatrical representation seems to become diminished. This is why Bottoms calls on documentary theatre to show its workings through theatrical and textual (self-)reflexivity.

One can detect traces of such textual reflexivity in Gregory Burke's *Black Watch* (2006), which makes a similar claim to 'tell the "real" stories of the soldiers in their own words' (Burke 2007: xii). In this piece, the playwright has famously inserted himself as interviewer into the theatrical frame, which highlights authorial mediation in a way *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* does not. In the latter play, the interviewer is only partly implied in the figure of the psychologist, who does not disrupt the dramatic cosmos of the play. I am aware that the insertion of the writer into the text represents only one tactic of self-reflexivity of (proto-)verbatim productions, yet I turn again to this rather obvious case because I would like to suggest that there is something productive about the tension between the writer and the soldiers staged in *Black Watch*. The crucial point here, for me, is that it underlines the impact of the inter-subjective relationship between speaker and listener on the inevitably partial version of traumatic truth offered in the interview (and the resulting drama). As sociologist Les Back emphasises, 'True dialogue also means being open to the possibility that those involved will refuse to have dialogue or the participants [...] may subvert the tacit rules of the ethnographic game itself' (2007: 19). There would have been room in the dialogue between the psychologist and the characters for elements of self-reflexivity, for instance, by allowing for the

soldiers' reluctance or refusal to account for 'what happened' to them. Instead, the characters embrace the psychologist's probing questions, which invite the kinds of self-narratives that are sanctioned by therapy.

From the Freak Show to the Physio Room⁶

The prominence of the therapeutic discourse in the play corroborates Eva Illouz's claim that 'the therapeutic ethos [has] moved from being a knowledge system to becoming [...] a "structure of feeling"' (2008: 156). Just as Illouz writes of therapeutic culture more generally, it operates in the play as 'a deeply internalized cultural schema organizing perception of self and others, autobiography, and interpersonal interaction' (156). The therapeutic ethos also informs the production's aesthetics in its representation of injured bodies. Here, the affective potential and ethical questions at stake in the perceived proximity to the wounded bodies come into view.

The exhibition of disabled bodies on stage, perhaps inevitably, recalls the visual regime of the freak show, 'the displays of human oddities that were so central to nineteenth-century British popular culture' (Durbach 2014: 41). Despite the inventive and empowering uses to which freak displays have been put in contemporary disability performance (Chemers 2003), profound anxieties about the exposure and exploitation of freak performers persist. At the same time, the ubiquity of 'abnormal' bodies in reality TV formats—widely seen as the contemporary manifestation of the Victorian freak show—both normalises 'our' desire to stare at these bodies and blurs the boundaries between 'us' and 'them', for '[t]he act of surveillance, self-discipline and focus on oneself as freak characterizes much of popular culture and everyday life' (Kuppers 2003: 36).

The Two Worlds of Charlie F. situates itself explicitly against the tradition of the freak show. Cassidy Little is quoted in the *Nottingham Post* as saying, 'the Ministry of Defence was concerned [the performance] could look like a freak show. But that isn't the case – it's exploring us, not exploiting us' (2014: n.p.). Little's rejection of the form is founded on the common historical misconception that freak performers have always and invariably been exploited, which ignores the 'mountain of favourable testimony [...] from freaks, stretching all the way back to the 1840s' (Chemers 2003: 287). It also runs counter to his character's implicit endorsement of reading disabled bodies as freakish, as Charlie's comment upon welcoming spectators to the physio room for recovering soldiers at the start of the second act suggests: 'It's a bit of a freak show to be honest with you. [...] I mean, a few weeks ago I was a steely-eyed dealer of death. Then [...] I'm in this circus' (Sheers 2012: 55). The aerobics dance routine with which the scene concludes (choreography: Lily Phillips) has the quality of spectacle. Yet what appears spectacular is not the deviance of the amputated bodies thus exposed, but their dynamic and vigorous movement alongside the able-bodied performers. The choreography, indeed, resonates more with the style of the circus, in which performers astonish audiences by virtue of their virtuosity, rather than with the freak show's exhibition of bodily aberrance—although it may contain representational traces of the talent displays of freaks. In any case, the audience's gaze is directed towards the ways in which these bodies can perform in line with the norm, rather than fall outside of it.

This is where the therapeutic ethos underlying the aestheticisation of the disabled bodies becomes apparent. It not only codes the performers' narratives but also their physicality in terms of recovery and recuperation. A scene that offers a variation on the *pas de deux* is paradigmatic in this respect: three of the male performers who have lost limbs enter the stage in wheelchairs and engage in dance duets with the professional actresses, who take on the roles of their mothers or partners within the diegesis. The disabled performers appear dignified and strong, fully capable of holding

and steadying their dance partners. The aesthetic representation does not capitalise on the extreme qualities of the unusual bodies but foregrounds what they are still able to do, such as performing a strong and supportive heteromasculine identity. The disabled bodies are not enfreaked; they do not signify as the Other against which spectators construct themselves as 'happy, restrained, appropriate, normal' (Kuppers 2003: 34). Instead of the objectifying stare of the freak show, the spectators' gaze becomes a therapeutically inflected look of recognition that validates the recovery process of the injured bodies.

The empathetic identification that is encouraged both at the narrative and the visceral level culminates in the final scene, which arranges the bodies of all performers in a concluding stage picture. They move downstage to confront the audience as Charlie gives his final speech on the 'regiment of the wounded':

we're leaving the services, but we're also joining the oldest regiment there is. The regiment of the wounded. It's a regiment with an illustrious history [...]. You might not be familiar with all its victories, but believe me it has thousands to its name. [...] And it's deploying too. Every day. Not to a battlefield, or to a base. But to you. [...] Because we don't live in two worlds, do we? (Sheers 2012: 85).

In performance, the sentimental tone of the speech is underscored by an acoustic version of Snow Patrol's popular ballad 'Chasing Cars' (2006). As the song increases in volume, the stage fills with wounded soldiers, who freeze at the edge of the stage, looking into the auditorium. This confrontation turns the spectatorial act of looking into a reciprocal gaze, one that seeks to forge an emotional bond between spectators and performers, reinforced by the inclusive metaphor of the 'regiment of the wounded'. The theatrical event is designed to create a community that transcends the us/them binary between the 'two worlds' of soldiers and civilians. As a communal event, the show (potentially) functions to include all audience members in this bond, regardless of whether individual spectators identify as civilians or service members, able-bodied or disabled—as various statements on the company's Twitter feed seem to indicate. Civilians, veterans, and disabled/able-bodied spectators alike have testified to the affective power and/or therapeutic benefits of the production. To cite just two examples, taken from either side of the ostensible civilian-military divide: 'It really helped this Afghanistan veteran, thank you so much' (Shenton 2014); 'truly emotional [play] about the courage of our wounded brethren in armed forces' (Stokes 2014). The latter commentator also added the hashtag, '#weallliveinoneworld'. When I saw the production, I felt gently coerced by this final scene into an emotional identification with a 'totalizing "we"' (Salverson 2001: 120). While I seemed to share a tear-filled sympathy for the performers who held our gaze with many of my fellow audience members, I found myself bound to the soldiers on the terms of an emotional contract I had been neither able to negotiate nor dissociate myself from.

A consideration of *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* with reference to the distinction between affects and emotions illuminates the show's trajectory of effects produced at the sight/site of the wounded body. Erin Hurley differentiates between affect as something that 'happens to us ([...] it is out of our conscious control)' and emotion, which 'names our sensate, bodily experience in a way that [...] makes it legible to ourselves and consonant with others' experiences' (2010: 22–23). Whereas the initial confrontation with the performer's stump works primarily on an affective register, and the use of melancholic pop tunes, soft light, and the choreographed movements of unusual bodies on stage carries a strong affective potential, the final scene in particular works to translate these affects into emotions. 'If emotion is made in the relationship between stage and audience', Hurley writes, 'it cannot simply be projected by actors and caught as the same emotion by the audience. The theatre's emotional labour, then, is, in part, a negotiation' (20). If the emotional labour of *The*

Two Worlds of Charlie F. bears fruit, it successfully configures the relationship between the (mainly civilian) audiences and the wounded soldiers as a bond based on empathy, understanding, and charity.

Conclusion

With its potential for reshaping the relationship between Self and Other, emotion, as Illouz declares, has the capacity to move to action (2008: 11). As I left the production at Richmond Theatre in March 2014, collection buckets for The Royal British Legion gave audience members an opportunity to donate money in support of (former) members of the Armed Forces. If the show works as emotionally effective theatre, the audience can ultimately translate the affects and emotions experienced in the confrontation with the injured soldiers into charitable activity. This is where the passage from affect to emotions may result in real-life effects that might be less easily achieved in productions with trained actors.

The show does not, however, employ this potential to engender a heightened sense of responsibility towards those Others who are elided by public discourse, but draws spectators into identification with subjects who are already accorded a considerable degree of recognition. I do not wish to diminish the plight of wounded, injured and sick service personnel, yet it has to be noted that wounded veterans have a noticeable (media) presence in the UK, with such highly public figures as Prince Harry, who in 2014 launched the Paralympic-style Invictus Games for injured soldiers, championing their cause. While the participation of real soldiers in the production affectively enhances the engagement with trauma, pain, and suffering, the show does not challenge audiences to see injured soldiers otherwise or think through their presence to the wounds they potentially inflicted on others. This throws into sharp relief the elisions that a poetics of immediacy conceals. The 'fetish for first-person testimony' (Back 2007: 125) and face-to-face encounters with the real may at times make us forget what these faces and voices cannot show or tell.

This prompts me to reflect on those other real soldiers, silently standing in the corner of exhibition rooms in Santiago Sierra's performance piece *Veterans of the Wars ... Facing the Corner* (2011–). Local veterans of diverse wars, which are inserted into the title of Sierra's constantly evolving piece, assume the eponymous pose reminiscent of 'naughty' children. Museum or gallery visitors can share in their mute presence; they will not answer any questions or turn away from the corner. In the wordless and faceless encounter, visitors are free to pursue their own thoughts about and implication in the wars the title points them to. There is no testimony available, but the static male body in the iconic pose of guilt and punishment triggers diverse associations, without providing easy identifications of victims or perpetrators.

Notes

1. For Stephen Bottoms, the fact that many recent British documentary plays are 'concerned with aspects of the post-9/11 history of Bush and Blair's "War on Terror" is not surprising: indeed, this is one of the factors that explains the trend [of verbatim theatre]' (2006: 57). 9/11 is, however, by no means the only trigger for the rise of verbatim theatre. Janelle Reinelt, for example, attributes British theatre's (re)turn to current events to the success of Richard Norton-Taylor's play about the Macpherson Inquiry into the Stephen Lawrence murder, *The Colour of Justice*, staged at the Tricycle Theatre in 1999 (2006: 81).

-
2. Salient examples are the Tricycle Theatre's tribunal productions, which (re)opened the cases of the death of weapons inspector David Kelly and the 'sexed-up' dossier used to justify intervention in Iraq in *Justifying War* (2003), Tony Blair's (lack of) accountability for war crimes in *Called to Account* (2007), and the death of Iraqi detainee Baha Mousa in *Tactical Questioning* (2011).
 3. The success of the show can be further measured by the export of the format to Australia: the Australian Defence Force invited director Stephen Rayne to work on a similar project with the Sydney Theatre Company, resulting in the play *The Long Way Home*, written by Daniel Keene, which opened at Sydney Theatre and toured Australia in 2014.
 4. Patrick Duggan defines 'proto-verbatim theatre' in the context of the Paper Birds' production of *Others* (2010): 'although making use of "real words" gathered from those being represented, there is no claim of exact truthfulness here. The company does not suggest [...] that the production is anything other than a piece of theatre' (2013: 149–50).
 5. My reading here is indebted to Jenny Hughes' insightful argument about staging the frailty of the voice in light of democracy's failings. She writes that 'the critical potential of verbatim theatre resides in its dramatization of the diminishment and abjection of the voice during a time of crisis' (2011: 92).
 6. This title is inspired by Laura Backstrom's article 'From the Freak Show to the Living Room: Cultural Representations of Dwarfism and Obesity', *Sociological Forum* 27.3 (2012): 682–707.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the editors Ulrike Garde and Meg Mumford, as well as the two anonymous reviewers, for their helpful and thought-provoking comments on an earlier draft of this article. Many thanks also go to Catherine Silverstone and Maggie Inchley for discussing trauma, performance, and this particular production with me.

Works Cited

- Aloess, Veronica. 'Edinburgh Fringe Review: *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.*', *A Younger Theatre*, (12 August 2012), <http://www.ayoungerteaatre.com/edinburgh-fringe-review-the-two-worlds-of-charlie-f>.
- Back, Les. *The Art of Listening* (Oxford: Berg, 2007).
- Bottoms, Stephen J. 'Putting the Document into Documentary: An Unwelcome Corrective?', *TDR: The Drama Review* 50.3 (2006): 56–68.
- Burke, Gregory. *Black Watch* (London: Faber and Faber, 2007).
- Butler, Judith. *Precarious Life: The Power of Mourning and Violence* (London: Verso, 2004).
- Caruth, Cathy. 'Recapturing the Past: Introduction', in Cathy Caruth (ed.), *Trauma: Explorations in Memory* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 151–57.
- . *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996).
- Cavendish, Dominic. '*The Two Worlds of Charlie F.*, Richmond Theatre, Review', *The Telegraph*, (21 March 2014), <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/theatre/theatre-reviews/10714446/The-Two-Worlds-of-Charlie-F-Richmond-Theatre-review.html>.
- Chemers, Michael M. 'Le Freak, C'est Chic: The Twenty-First Century Freak Show as Theatre of Transgression', *Modern Drama* 46.2 (2003): 285–304.
- Duggan, Patrick. 'Feeling Performance, Remembering Trauma', *Platform* 2.2 (2007): 44–58. <https://www.royalholloway.ac.uk/dramaandtheatre/documents/pdf/platform/22/feelingtraumafinal.pdf>
- . '*Others*, Spectatorship, and the Ethics of Verbatim Performance', *New Theatre Quarterly* 29.2 (2013): 146–58.
- Durbach, Nadja. "'Skinless Wonders": *Body Worlds* and the Victorian Freak Show', *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 69.1 (2014): 38–67.

- Fischer-Lichte, Erika. *The Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics*, trans. Saskya Iris Jain (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008).
- Garde, Ulrike, and Meg Mumford. 'Postdramatic Theatre and Productive Insecurity: Destabilizing Encounters with the Unfamiliar in Theatre from Sydney and Berlin', in Karen Jürs-Munby, Jerome Carroll, and Steve Giles (eds.), *Postdramatic Theatre and the Political: International Perspectives on Contemporary Performance* (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 2013), 147–64.
- Heddon, Deirdre. *Autobiography and Performance* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
- Hughes, Jenny. *Performance in a Time of Terror: Critical Mimesis and the Age of Uncertainty* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011).
- Hurley, Erin. *Theatre & Feeling* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- Illouz, Eva. *Saving the Modern Soul: Therapy, Emotions, and the Culture of Self-Help* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2008).
- Johnson, Steven. *Everything Bad Is Good for You: How Today's Popular Culture Is Actually Making Us Smarter* (New York: Penguin, 2005).
- Jürs-Munby, Karen. "'Did You Mean Post-Traumatic Theatre?': The Vicissitudes of Traumatic Memory in Contemporary Postdramatic Performances', *Performance Paradigm* 5.2 (2009): 1–33.
<http://www.performanceparadigm.net/index.php/journal/article/view/78/78>
- Kuppers, Petra. *Disability and Contemporary Performance: Bodies on Edge* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2003).
- Lehmann, Hans-Thies. *Postdramatic Theatre*, trans. Karen Jürs-Munby (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006).
- Malpass, Amanda. 'The Two Worlds of Charlie F.: Press Release', (2014), 1–5.
- Martin, Carol. *Theatre of the Real* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
- Megson, Chris. "'This Is All Theatre": Iraq Centre Stage', *Contemporary Theatre Review* 15.3 (2005): 369–71.
———. 'Verbatim Practices in Contemporary Theatre: Symposium Report 2006', *Contemporary Theatre Review* 16.4 (2006): 529–32.
- Nottingham Post*. "'The MoD Was Concerned It Could Look Like a Freak Show": The Two Worlds of Charlie F.', (10 April 2014), <http://www.nottinghampost.com/MoD-concerned-look-like-freak-worlds-charlie-f/story-20943138-detail/story.html#ixzz3VdUJgMPO>.
- Pollock, Griselda. 'Art/Trauma/Representation', *Parallax* 15.1 (2009): 40–54.
- Reinelt, Janelle G. 'Toward a Poetics of Theatre and Public Events: In the Case of Stephen Lawrence', *TDR: The Drama Review* 50.3 (2006): 69–87.
- Salverson, Julie. 'Change on Whose Terms? Testimony and an Erotics of Injury', *Theater* 31.3 (2001): 119–25.
- Sheers, Owen. *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.* (London: Faber and Faber, 2012).
- Shenton, Rob. (@runningMDSrab). Twitter post, 23 May 2014, 3.44 pm. <https://twitter.com/runningMDSrab>
- Silverstone, Catherine. *Shakespeare, Trauma and Contemporary Performance* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
- Smart, Andy. 'Review: *The Two Worlds of Charlie F.*, Theatre Royal', *Nottingham Post*, (15 April 2014), <http://www.nottinghampost.com/Review-Worlds-Charlie-F-Theatre-Royal/story-20959663-detail/story.html>
- Stokes, Mark. (@markelstead). Twitter post, 23 May 2014, 2.11 pm. <https://twitter.com/markelstead>
- Stuart Fisher, Amanda. 'Trauma, Authenticity and the Limits of Verbatim', *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts* 16.1 (2011): 112–22.
- Taylor, Lib. 'Voice, Body and the Transmission of the Real in Documentary Theatre', *Contemporary Theatre Review* 23.3 (2013): 368–379.
- Terrill, Chris (dir.). *Theatre of War* (London: Uppercut Films, 2012). BBC 1, 26 June 2012. 88 min.
- Trueman, Matt. 'The Two Worlds of Charlie F. Review: An Unflinching Look at Life after War', *Guardian* (24 March 2014), <http://www.theguardian.com/stage/2014/mar/24/two-worlds-charlie-f-review>.
- Upton, Carole-Ann. 'Real People as Actors – Actors as Real People', *Studies in Theatre and Performance* 31.2 (2011): 209–22.
- Wake, Caroline. 'To Witness Mimesis: The Politics, Ethics, and Aesthetics of Testimonial Theatre in *Through the Wire*', *Modern Drama* 56.1 (2013): 102–25.
- Wald, Christina. *Hysteria, Trauma and Melancholia: Performative Maladies in Contemporary Anglophone Drama* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

ARIANE de WAAL (ariane.dewaal@rub.de) is a *PhD candidate at Ruhr University Bochum. Her project analyses the negotiation of subject positions in the 'war on terror' discourse in British drama. She recently co-edited the special issue 'Bodies on Stage' for the Journal of Contemporary Drama in English (2013) and published on '(Sub)Versions of the Them/Us Dichotomy in Iraq War Drama' in JCDE 2.1 (2014).*