

Myth and Theatre Festival

LAST DAYS

Please take note !

Planning below for **SATURDAY**. Suggestions welcome for **SUNDAY** tell Marta or Enrique

- Everyone will receive a **CERTIFICATE** of participation and a payment **RECEIPT**. If you need any **special letter or document**, please write it (in full) and give it to MARTA (USB or email.)
- **QUESTIONNAIRE** : please give it a thought (we will also send it to you by email – with a listing of all participants' emails.)
- **PHOTOS** : please make them available to PANTHEATRE (maybe USB stick transfer to Brenda before you leave)
- Faroque, Aurelia, Jackie? = please decide what you want to do with your **scenographic objects**. They cannot stay in Magnanerie.
- Please help tidy all equipments, chairs, wastebins, etc etc

PLANNING

MT08	Myth and Theatre <i>Festival</i> Mythe et Théâtre Scheherazade, and her voice today		update 11-juil vérifiez ce planning il change SOUVENT check this planning - it changes OFTEN
Malérargues, Centre Roy Hart		July 1 - 13 juillet	
Planning : Lectures, Performances, Discussions			
SAT	12-juil	15h-17h	Enrique Pardo : <i>The Academy of Boredom</i> : acting with objects, and a presentation of the mythological background: the uncanny alliance between Kronos and Pan. Also some images of Alchemical Laboratories. NO LATECOMERS please.
		17h30	Maryline Guitton : <i>Sound Painting</i> . An introduction.
		19h30	Discussion . Return to Scheherazade, Jay's lecture, to Jackie's performance <i>she would appreciate some feedback</i> , and introducing Sharon Feder (her material is not ready for a presentation yet.)
SUN	13-juil	am	Last workshop sessions
		pm	suggestions welcome ! From discussion by the river, to laboratories, or nothing...

Some discussion points (Enrique)

Scheherazade – and her voice today : Story telling and the voice of the story teller.

Two interlinked thoughts:

1. The obvious voice of Scheherazade today is **feminism** - the multiple voices of feminism (sometimes opposing views, but stirring “the feminine condition”.) It needs to be said.
2. The obvious danger with the figure of Scheherazade (and some feminist theories) is making her into **Sophia**... In my work I am constantly manoeuvring to fight certain voices. One of the ones I fight the most is the voice of... the story teller! This stand can be seen as an extension of my saying that "I hate intelligent actors", because they 'know' their text (and their job seems to be almost exclusively to show this off.) They 'know' how the text should be said, they know what it means, they know and show how it should be felt and emoted. They speak down to the audience as paragon models of cultural consciousness, etc. They infantilize the audience. My take in theatre is that I want to share the risk with the actor, confront and discover the story with her or him : the story behind the story (to see through the text.) This is part of what I have been calling "risk and write".

Who is "the voice of the story teller", and how to "figure it out"? It tends to be Sophia: the knowing, wise, usually 'grand-parenting' voice of a figure that is often 'revived' today with a community neo-shamanic aura. Not that I am intrinsically against story telling, or community fireside gatherings, or wise story tellers - their wisdom need not be gentle, sensitive, **sophic** and soporific: it can also be cantankerous, or dangerously gossipy, etc. - but it does tend to carry certain implications: a self-centered superior attitude (even if, or especially when pious and humble.) Its act partakes of the entertainer's trade tricks (shaman and charlatan are twin brothers.) Again, this is a philosophical question : how does Sophia come into theatre? Often, she kills theatre - deballs the King, and yes, “infantilizes him.”

On another topic.

Some time ago a critic got vicious with my stand on "choreographic theatre". Artistic militancy is part of the game - and it is a game - but it is also a deadly serious game because life is short and I value quality. One of his remarks was to say that choreographic theatre was just as valid as "cinematographic theatre". He mentioned other alternatives, but this one stayed. I am thinking of **Jackie's** piece. I even think the critic was Australian or maybe from New Zealand (which culturally is relatively predictable, actually.) Labels are labels and "choreographic theatre" is the one that suits me the most, and has stayed. Nevertheless at the core of my work (whatever the label and result) is the notion of "instinct of image". In terms of "risk and write" what interests me is how images are figured out and "cracked open": what is the criteria of risk, how to make the critical move, and how then to deal with the crisis. How to enter the shadow and the "shadow boxing"? In Jackie's case the image construction stems from writing (her text - and the story); this is set up mostly into "cinematographic" theatre. I.e. we are into "write and risk", in that order. You obtain certain images. How to then put these "cinematographic" images at risk and 'rewrite' them into theatre? How to crack them (crack their 'code'?) And how can Jackie best harvest the intelligence and emotion of this cracking up, cracking down, etc. These are my fundamental questions; they address the artist (beyond the writer and actor.) I have no ready-made answers but we can brain-storm!