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Abstract:  
Athol Fugard’s political drama is socially relevant since they pertain to the dismantling of apartheid and its replacement with a democratic and un racist system. In his plays, the dialectic of the self and other is always present, and its purposes are varied from one play to the other and from one character to the next. These purposes might be useful to the existence of the colonized people. They might strength the psychological, mental or physical position of the character. To make the oppressed able to force the hostile world that accepts them as others, as marginalized people is a necessary goal in these plays of Fugard. He aims to show the obstacles that lead the black and coloured characters of his plays to be the others and how these characters able to overwhelm these obstacles and get their true self.
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INTRODUCTION:  
The subject of the self and other is in the core of every post-colonial literary work since it shows the relation that is supposed between the colonizer and the colonized, also it shows the effect of that hateful period on the souls, minds, present and the future of the colonizers. However, it is said that one of the main features on which South African literature relied, and on which many scholars agree is the “issue of relevance”; that is South African writings should be, first, socially relevant; giving its context of apartheid politics. Second, this notion of relevance must pertain to the dismantling of the apartheid system and its replacement with a just, democratic and human system. 1

In fact, the African society in general plays a major role in forming the African literature. There is a saying that “Africa goes where its literature takes it”. This observation makes the African writer and the African literature as an educational institution. The African writer has the role to educate and reeducate his people by transforming them from the real to the ideal. By showing them not only reality, but more importantly from a certain angle, a perspective or vision.2

It is said that the non-black South African writers like Nadine Gordimir, Alan Paton, Alex la Guma and especially Athol Fugard have been included in the list of South African literature, not only because they were born and may still live in South Africa, but because their work is characterized with a high score of social relevance.3 The kind of literature Fugard presented is based on accurate observation of the South African environment mixed with vivid different
imagination and creative use of language. This literature of Fugard is, as Ngugi wa Thiong’o has described, shaped by the different experiences that his society has undergone.

One of the advantages of the apartheid era is that it helps in the formation and production of what is called “Workshop Plays” through the collaboration of black performers and white writers and directors. The result is that the actors become ‘writers’ as much as the authors of the script. In the introduction to The Statements Plays, Fugard wrote that he admires Grotowski, whose theatre experiences encouraged a radically actor-centered theatre, and whose sense of actors is that of ‘creative’ artists, not merely ‘interpretive’.

In fact, Grotowski helped crystallize notions and instincts Fugard had long possessed. According to Fugard, his encounter with Grotowski coincided with a crisis in his relationship to his increasing dissatisfaction with the type of theatre he had been making. Fugard states that Grotowski gave him the confidence

*To do something I had wanted to for a long time...turn my back on my securities, which is to write a play in total privacy, to go into a rehearsal room with a completed text which I would then take on as a director and which actors-under my direction-would go on to ‘illustrate’, to use Grotowski’s phrase;* 8

In this sense Grotowski provoked Fugard to be ‘less orthodox’ in the way he created plays: “My work had been so conventional! It involved the writing of a play; it involved setting that play in terms of local specifics; it involved the actors assuming false identities...I wanted to be free again”. 9

In addition, Anna Fucks states that the aim of the Workshop Drama is “to create a non-racial society through their very association with black and white contributing specific cultural artifacts and technique which were into a new form of theatre which was itself a metonymic image of a New South Africa” 10.

The purposes of the dialectic of the self and other in Athol Fugard’s Sizwe Bansi is Dead and Boesman and Lena as post-colonial drama from South Africa.

Sizwe Bansi is Dead is one of a group of five “Township plays” performed in the year 1958 until 1973. These plays show the role of theatre in a situation of oppression. They are called so because the black characters, who are from the Township outside the city, have been given the chance to produce these plays which have taken their inspiration from the urban life of the blacks in South Africa.

One of the most important things that these plays of Township emphasized is the struggle to speak in order to survive. Speak out is an important sign in the face of increasing oppression and pain. When the play first acted, Fugard noticed the reactions of the audience and states that he was watching a very special example of one of theatre’s major responsibilities in an oppressive society; “to break... the conspiracy of silence.... The action of our play was being matched...by the action of the audience. ... A performance on stage had provoked a political event in the auditorium” 13. This intervention summarizes Brecht’s idea of the active spectator, but it is in the African form.

From the point of view of protest and social and political relevance, Sizwe Bansi is Dead is regarded a good example of South African drama that describes with pain the state of banning,
arrests, prohibitions, dehumanization and other forms of state harassment. It describes the dire conditions under which the black of South Africa live during the apartheid regime. The skillfulness of the play lies not in the description of the actions, but in the way the sordid details and truths about apartheid are exposed. 15 Apartheid had produced laws and legislations that carefully formed to separate the races into a hierarchy of power and made them all subservient to the white rule as the purest and most powerful race. Every single aspect in South Africa had been governed by race. The black were told where to live, what schools to attend, whom they could marry, and how much money they could earn at work.16 The Native Urban Act and The Pass Laws Act were designed to jail the blacks in certain places and to establish what is called the ‘white South Africa’, which in order to be entered by the others, all the blacks should carry a passbook that contains certain information like name, age, district of the black man and also name and address of the employer who must be a white person and for how long the black sort is going to stay. Anyone whose pass book is invalid or is caught without a passbook is going to be dismissed out of the city or sentenced for several months. 17

In order to provide a basic image, a vitality and an assertion of life, Fugard tends to make use of the experiences of the group of the Serpent players. 18 Thus the presentation of the play comes in the form of a collaboration between Fugard and two of his black actor friends John Kani and Winston Ntshona whose technique of improvisation gives the play more realistic sense. 19 In the same respect, the play contains some of Fugard’s memories as a clerk in the Court where pass law offenders were tried. It was an unforgotten experience through which Fugard saw how the black people treated, jailed and exiled from their own country because they hadn’t got the necessary stamp on their pass book or because they come to find work in order to feed their children without a work permit. 20 The play, in this sense, is a biting indictment of South Africa’s pass law. It is designed to attack apartheid and to convey the dreadful effects of its laws. The playwright’s strategy and the major aim of the play is of the such that no one can leave the theatre without knowing something of what it means to have a black skin in South Africa. 21

The first appearance of Sizwe Bansi is Dead was in October, 1972. The play had been performed in Cape Town before a multi racial audience. Then it was prevented for its attack the white and the whole system of apartheid. 22 All the play's actions, dialogues and monologues have been taken place in the only setting that is of Styles Photographic Studio in the African township of New Brighton, Port Elizabeth. The setting is very simple so that it allows the actions to continue. It is Brechtian in orientation in the sense that it is austere, effective and contributes to achieve the emotional detachments of the audience. 23

The play is structured as an overlapping series of monologues through which characters like Styles and Sizwe can inform us about their past and its effect on the present. It becomes easier to perceive the seeds of the past or the hopes of the future mixed with the fears of the present. 24 The story of the play is about Sizwe Bansi, a black man who comes from his city in King Williams to find a job in Port Elizabeth in order to support his family. But, unfortunately, he couldn’t find any job because there is no white man can give him the permission he needs, instead he has to leave within three days, otherwise he would be imprisoned. So, he decided to stay in Buntu’s house; a friend from the city. 25 After a return from the shebeen, Buntu and Sizwe found a corpse of a black man covered with a rag. The dead man is called Robert Zwelinzima and his pass book contains a work permit. 26 Buntu convinced Sizwe to switch
his identity and papers with the dead man.27 The result is that Sizwe Bansi becomes Robert Zwelinzima who goes to Stylus's studio to take his photo in order to send it to his wife.28

From the very beginning, the dialectic of the self / other appears in Styles’s photography studio. Styles is introduced to the audience as an educated man. He reads the newspaper headlines and makes comments and predictions. Above all he is a man of choice. Also, he has the ability to speak the three languages of the country and to translate from one to the other.29 Through his light-hearted monologue, Styles speaks directly to the audience, narrates his story as a former worker in the Ford car plant, and the day in which Bass, Bradley, the chief at work, asked him to translate to the workers that Mr. Ford, the Big Bass, is going to visit the company.”Tell the boys in your language ...”30

The long monologue Styles directed to the audience, describes the circumstances that led to his quit of the job in Ford plant and starting the new business as an owner of a photography studio. It shows the relation between the ‘others’; Styles, and his fellow black workers, and his antagonists Bass Bradley and the all regime which are described as “the horde of cheeky cockroaches” 31 that invade the studio, to be considered as the ‘self’.32

The importance of the first scene and Styles’s monologue, says Albert Wertheim, is that it is about acting and role-playing as a means of survival. As a photographer, Styles took the role of different characters that represent the whole South African society. 33 He plays the role of the recorder, the witness on his people’s dreams, hopes and fears, and a mediator of their experiences to the audience. Styles took the role of himself as a worker in Ford plant, Bass Bradley the manager, the black workers “audience”, the family members who are supposed to take a photo and finally Styles the photographer. These roles Styles took, in fact, serve as creating a context for the action and prepare the audience, through the use of humor and inventiveness, to be brought into the play. 34 Thus, Styles is seen to have the ability to take all the roles of blacks, whites, worker, manager, ‘self’ and ‘other’. It is a message Fugard sent that since the black man can take the role of the white on the stage, he easily and convincingly can perform the same role in the real life.35

It is clear that the structure of Styles’s monologue is seen to be based on the “Bass-boy” relation. It is a relation that connects the white and the black at work. But, it is not a relation based on richness and poverty as some may claim, rather it is based on deep and external forces of domination and racism, which directs the desire of self recognition and which asserts the hatred between the ‘self’ and ‘other’.36

Moreover, Robert Young explains that postcolonial literature offers a way in which the reader is going to see things differently through the use of language and the way the text is presented. It gives a vivid picture of the division of the west and the rest with the priority of the interests of the ‘others’, the colonized to come first not last. The sounds of the oppressed are going to be loud and then well justified.37 In Sizwe Bansi is Dead, the South African experience is presented from the mouth of a black actor and a black experience and viewpoint. It is not a written script that the actor should strictly follow, rather it is acting according to real experiences. The actors are given the opportunity, through improvisation, to expose and to shout loud the pains of the black community.38

However, textually, Styles explains directly to the audience that he is fed up with being treated as an ‘other’, as nothing in his own country and an animal like. For Styles, the visit of Mr. Ford to the plant is important since it reveals the facts that he and his fellow workers are
completely unseen, 39 they are the circus monkeys who must work appropriately to impress their master:

STYLES. Say to them, Styles, that they must try to impress Mr. Henry Ford that they are better than those bloody monkeys in his own country; those niggers in Harlem, who know nothing but strike and strike all the time. Tell the boys. (S.B.D 7)

One of the critics has written that in their interpretation of “simple blacks”, many white South African writers fail “to see and underline the fantastic ambiguity, the deliberate self-deception, the ever-present irony beneath the mock humility and moderation of speech,”. In Sizwe Bansi is Dead, However, Fugard clearly shows the “façade as façade”. From the very beginning Styles realizes he must appear subservient, but he has not internalized feelings of inferiority.40 By only playing at being obsequious, he remains in full control of his actions, which allows him consciously to create the impression he desires; the other workers do the same. After Bradley orders Styles to tell the workers in their own language that they should look happy when Mr. Ford comes in, Styles says to them

STYLES. ‘you must see to it that you are wearing a mask of smiles. Hide your true feelings, brothers. You must sing. The joyous songs of the days of old before we had fools like this one next to me to worry about.’ (S.B.D 7)

With the coming of all of the white to the plant, Styles comes to the Brechtian anti-capitalist realization through watching that he has no role to play here. He has seen that their roles as citizens of this country have been taken by those white capitalists who came from America and Britain. 41 They are treated as ‘others’ who have to follow orders „and who, although hide their true feelings and follow the orders without complains, nobody looked at them. Convincing himself that if he stays more, he will remain for all his life alienated and indentured servant whose soul is owned by his white capitalist masters. 42 Thus, Styles reaches a critical moment in his life in which he discovers the reality of his ‘self’; to see his own situation clearly with a new and different perspective. 43

STYLES. We heard all the time, nobody heard us…. We were watching them, nobody was watching us. We are just left alone. I saw it all when the big door opened, but the first time I saw them playing my role all life and didn’t laugh. (S.B.D 8)

The role of Styles as a translator shows, although temporarily, his control over Bass Bradley. For Styles the time of translation becomes a time of vengeance through which he can express, attack and contempt the white policy that makes his language an anathema. 44 Indeed, Styles is presented, through Fugard’s vision, as a black hero who owns the desire to change. It is the desire of ‘self’ assertion which becomes a sign of political resistance and a call for change. And for this reason it becomes a forbidden desire. 45 In fact, Both Styles and Buntu describe indignations their father had had to suffer. These stories emphasize the difference between appearance and essence. Styles has not internalized feelings of inferiority, but he has grown tired of even appearing subservient. After having decided to leave the factory, he had explained to his father that when he becomes free and his own self master, then, he would be a man.46

STYLES. Daddy, If I could stand on my own feet and not be somebody else’s tool, I’d have some respect for myself. I’d be a man. (S.B.D 10)
Tired of being a dehumanized ‘other’, a servant for another man, Styles takes the decision to be the master of himself. He leaves his job in Ford plant and becomes a photographer. He becomes the Master, the Bass and the owner of the studio. He becomes the ‘self’ no more ‘other’. 47

**STYLES.** I stood here in the middle of the floor, straight! You know what that means? To stand straight in a place of your own? To be your own…General Foreman, Mr. ‘Bass’, Line Supervisor- the lot! I was tall, six foot six and doing my own inspection of the plant. (S.B.D 11)

He has his own studio, which he describes as “the strong- room of dreams”. It is a dream of not only his self recognition, but also of independence and political freedom. 48

**STYLES.** ... No, my friends, this is more than just a studio, do you know what I call it; this is a strong – room of dreams. The dreamers, my people. Here lies the dreams of my people, here lies the history of my people that you never found mentioned in the history books. (S.B.D 12)

According to Styles, there are no statues or monuments that can document the history of his country and his people, or make them being remembered for a long time. But, it is due to the power and meaning of a photo that Fugard uses, his people are going to be alive. Styles is turned to be not only a photographer, but, in fact, he becomes a historiographer and a recorder of his people’s history. The photos he is going to take and hang on the walls of his studio or at homes are going to be a record of South African people who are the ‘others’, the marginalized, the forgotten, and who has no history because they have no life at all. 49

Directing his speech to the audience, Styles declares that apartheid leaves the South African nothing but themselves:

The photographic images emphasized through the play include both imaginative and real world. Those Styles creates in his studio and the one on the passbook that allows Sizwe to assume the identity of the dead man are two perspectives of a photograph. Further, it is often assumed that a photograph is “an objective and an utterly truthful record of a particular reality and that the lens presents an object in its black and white essence.” As Styles embellishes his stories with detail, imposing on them his perspective and interpretation, so he manipulates the camera and its subject to create ultimately his picture. 50

Photo graphs nourish dreams, as Styles suggests. They also create an image that leads to a kind of immortality- perhaps the only kind possible when a name is less important to official dom than a number, and when most citizens are treated as a uniform, faceless mass lacking any individuality or identity. As important as photographs may be during a man’s life, after his death they become graphic proof that he once lived. 51

Clearly, this makes the play’s concern, as which becomes the audiences’ concern, is not about great men who make history, but, it is about the anonymous, the nameless and little people of South Africa whose hopes, desires and smiles will remain as snaps on the stage. 52 Styles explains how he makes a dead man immortal through a card he had previously taken with all of the family members:

**STYLES.** ‘Here, Look at your father...He looked at them in silence.. the tear went slowly down his cheek. But, at the same time...I was watching him carefully...something started to happen as he saw his father...he began to smile ‘That’s it, brother I said Smile !Smile! at your father Smile at the world (S.B.D 16-17)
For Fugard, the power of transformation is crucial in getting a tragic victory over the oppressor, even if this victory is more mental rather than physical. Thus, this power becomes a vision and a theme in most of his plays. This victory, according to Fugard, is achieved first through recognizing one’s own ‘self’. It is this power of transformation through which Styles is going to make all his people immortal, to make them have memories that will be never forgotten like the memories of his father. In other word, Styles’ photo is going to be another way of survival, because it is a proof of identity exist. 53

In Styles’ studio the story of Sizwe Bansi is revealed when he comes to take a photo to be sent with a letter to his wife who is left with his four children in King Williams Town. Sizwe, (called a man in the text) although reluctantly, introduces himself as Robert Zwelinzima. 54 While posing for Styles for a snapshot, Sizwe creates in his mind and for the audience the letter he is going to send to his wife, Nowetu. He tells the audience about the difficulties and bizarre adventures in Port Elizabeth and New Brighton. 55

In fact, Sizwe becomes a picaresque hero who narrates how he left his native village to find a job in the Johannesburg mines where he finds adventures waiting for him. But, Sizwe is not a white Eurocentric picaro, rather he is a black picaro whose journey and adventures are all a struggle to get survive and self estimation. 56 It seems that the difference between Styles and Sizwe is so obvious. Sizwe seems diffident and inept a role player. He has no ability to take the role of one dead character in order to survive. 57 Yet, since he enters Styles’ strong room of dreams he, with some encouragement, has established the image of ‘self’ he wishes to project. He has made the first step towards an expressive “versatility” that Styles has already brilliantly exemplified. 58

However, Sizwe and Buntu explain, using satire and comedy, the way in which labor is controlled through the use of labor bureaux and elaborate conditions which are often applied to prevent the rural black to get permits. It is a criticism of the laws of apartheid, which are aggressively used to divide not only the country, but also the black into rural and urban citizens. 59 Buntu summarizes Sizwe’s problem, which is shared by all South African labors, that since Sizwe has no white man to start with, it is difficult for him and for any other black man to get a permit for a job and to get an opportunity to live. Without a white man, a black man either stays jobless or dies trying to find one. 60

BUNTU. There’s no way out, Sizwe. You’re not the first one who has tried to find it.
Take my advice and catch that train back to King William’s Town. (S.B.D 25)

The play in this sense describes the meaningless journey of the blacks in a world dominated by the white who created the passbooks to ensure that black lives are completely subject to white whims and dominated by white rules. 61 Buntu explains to Sizwe that it is useless to burn his passbook because it is the white made. All his life is connected to this book.

The role of Buntu, played by Styles, is very important since he gives main ideas and utters the central statements of the play. 62 Buntu explains to Sizwe, who is afraid of being caught, and to the audience the dilemma of getting a work permit in Port Elizabeth. To get a job in his own country, the black man needs a permission offered by the white. And then, the black man is going to be a puppet between the oppressive hands of the white. 63
Although the dialogue between Buntu and Sizwe about accepting the idea of transferring the identities shows that both of them look as ‘others’, subjugated by the white, it shows Buntu as the one who has control over things. It shows his ability to convince others, like Sizwe, that the best way to fight is to survive not to surrender. When Sizwe refuses to live as another man’s ghost, Buntu argues that he is already a ghost since he and all the blacks live in the shadow of the white man. They are invisible, not existed in the eyes of others. 64

BUNTU. No? When the white man looked at you at the Labour Bureau what did he see? A man with dignity or a bloody passbook with an N.I .number? Isn’t that a ghost? When the white man sees you walk down the street and calls out, ‘Hey, John! Come here…. to you, Sizwe Bansi… isn’t that a ghost? Or when his little child calls you ‘Boy’… you a man, circumcised with a wife and four children … isn’t that a ghost? Stop fooling yourself. They’ve turned us into. Spook them into hell, man! (S.B.D 38)

In a state of anger, Buntu describes the motive of exploitation, robbery and dehumanization when he remembers the life and sufferings of Outa Jacob, one of the relative who spends his life moving from place to place to support his family till his death.65 This leads him to conclude that a non-white life is a dehumanizing journey from farm to farm, employer to employer, town to town, bureaucracy to bureaucracy whose only end is death.66, In Buntu’s speech, there is a sign of revolution and unsatisfaction of the situation that leads to revolt against the laws of the passbook . In fact, it is said that through the pain, oppression and experience, the heroes of the play gain ‘wisdom’ through which they could present a way out of their people, society and themselves. 67

Indeed, names for Buntu are useless in South Africa, where a man is identified through his number in the passbook. It is very essential since it represents the biography and the entire life of man. It is the record through which his life exists, otherwise he has no life at all. 68 Everything is connected to that number in the passbook without it the black man doesn’t exist. 69

BUNTU: N-I-3-8-1-1-8-6-3 Burn that into your head, friend. You hear me ? it’s more important than your name. (S.B.D 39)

The names of the blacks are false pride for Buntu, because they are interchangeable in a country governed by the white. For the white, the others are no more than tools that could be substituted any time and that could be get rid of when they are useless and no more productive. 70

BUNTU. [angry] All right Robert, John, Athol, Winston…Shit on names, man! To hell with them if in exchange you can get a piece of bread for your stomach and a blanket in winter. Understand me brother, I’m not saying that pride isn’t away for us. What I’m saying is shit on our pride if we only bluff ourselves that we are men. S.B.D (43)

Moreover, games and role playing are thematically fundamental to Sizwe Bansi is Dead. Buntu takes the roles of different characters; a policeman, a priest in the church and a bass who gives money to the black workers at the end of a work day. All what Buntu does is to ensure that Sizwe had memorized his new number. In fact, through acts of imagination, it seems that the transience of a superficial human identity is made obvious and emphasized. Basically, these games are much more than playful. As the imaginary car ride in The Blood Knot had been a means for Zach and Morris to discover their brotherly bond. 71

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.14738/assrj.312.2389.
However, Andre Brink claims that Buntu tries to find a way out for Sizwe. At the same time he wants to discover Sizwe as a man of resolution. He first suggests Sizwe to give up and return to his city one hundred and fifty miles. But Sizwe rejected the idea and challenged the laws of the government. The second thing Buntu suggests is finding a job on the mines, but, also, Sizwe rejected the idea, saying that "You can die there". At this moment Buntu "taking possibly his first real look at Sizwe" 72.

\[ BUNTU. \text{...If you need work so bad go knock on the door of the Mines Recruiting Office. Dig gold for the white man. That's the only time they don't worry about Influx Control.} \]

MAN. I don't want to work on the mines. There's no money there. And it is dangerous, under the ground. Many black men get killed when the rocks fall. You can die there.

\[ BUNTU. \text{[stopped by the last remark into taking possibly his first real look at Sizwe]} \text{You don't want to die?}\]

MAN. I don't want to die. (S.B.D 26-27)

Worthy to mention that Sizwe Bansi is Dead is a play about how to survive, resist and achieve a self-recognition in a world in which the blacks are treated as 'others'. And one of the ways to get survive is through reincarnation and resuscitation not through rituals of the ancestors, but, through ways that suit the circumstances of apartheid. The act of switching identities between Sizwe and Robert is in fact an act of surrogation; a process of conjuring the dead to give energy and reassert the power of the living. Thus, Robert is resurrected when he was remembered as a brother, a member of the family and the one who will remain alive again and again. 73

\[ BUNTU. \text{Look brother, Robert Zwe linzima... if there are ghosts, he is smiling tonight. He is here, with us, and he 's saying 'Good luck, Sizwe! I hope it works.' He is a brother, man. (S.B.D 43)} \]

In this way the operations of apartheid are spoiled through the coexistence of the indigenous hidden transcripts of death and life and ancestor and living relations. 74 The sense of purgation is blocked in Sizwe Bansi is Dead, because the only chance for black survival is to put aside sentimentality, religion and pride in favor of pragmatism. 75

BUNTU. Look, if someone was to offer me the things I wanted most in my life, the things that I would make me, my wife, and my child happy, in exchange for the name you think I wouldn't swop? (S.B.D 42)

However, Fugard's theatre is a revolutionary one in the sense that it makes a protest inside man, which in turns leads him to be aware of his responsibilities towards himself and his people 76 and one of these plays that makes this great effect is Boesman and Lena which is regarded by many critics as one of Fugard's greatest Port Elizabeth plays and the most powerful play of the 1960's 77.

In his Notebook, Fugard states the allegorical importance of the couple when he writes, "Boesman and Lena_ their predicament, at the level at which it fascinates me, neither political, nor social but metaphysical...a metaphor of the human condition which revolution or legislation cannot substantially change" 78. In this play Fugard has deepened both; "his
awareness of the personal deprivation and suffering of black and coloured people under apartheid and at the same time his exploration of how consciousness and self-identity are constructed in basically theatrical ways." 79

Boesman and Lena is similar to any modern play in which plot is less important than the characters and that past events and states of mind are generally revealed instead of new events and relationships being created. 80. It is a drama of inaction in which the characters are distinguished through “the internal moments of consciousness or its absence” and this is going to be the difference between Lena and her partner. 81

In this play, as in most of his plays, Fugard tries to embody the life of the marginalized people of South Africa. Taking marginality and centrality as the main feature in post-colonial context, 82 Fugard criticizes the white regime of apartheid, although indirectly, for its responsibility to the hunger, death, and displacement of thousands of black and coloured of his people. 83 Yet it would be too simplistic to regard this plight on the African continent as the sole theme in this play. Fugard tends to focus on the details in relationships, trying to express the motives in the characters, the forces that drive and control them, and the internal and external powers affecting and effecting attitudes. 84

However, in the figurative if not the literal sense, the marginalized person is described as “no owner of soil”. His roots and identity lay split between two groups and two cultures he belongs to neither of which. In his The Marginal Man, quoted in Janet and Kura Mancini (2007), Everett Stonequist describes the marginal person as:

The marginal man is poised in psychological uncertainty between two or more social worlds; reflecting in his soul the discords and harmonies, repulsions and attractions of these worlds, one which is often “dominant” over the other; within which membership is implicitly if not explicitly based upon birth or ancestry (race or nationality); and where exclusion removes the individual from a system of group relations. 85

Boesman and Lena are a couple whose home is bulldozed by the white agents of apartheid. They are a simple of the South African ‘others’ who wake up in the morning to find themselves homeless and to start a meaningless journey for a ‘home’. 86. They are the two Hottentot South African marginalized coloured, miscegenates, whose position in the country is on the very periphery of identity; They are caught between South Africa’s black and white races. Their inappropriate names, Lena, a European name, and Boesman or “bushman”, one of the worst things a South African black man can be called, ironically remind us that they are the “mixed race” of coloured unwanted, unaccepted by either race responsible for their being.” 87. Moreover, “Bushman” is a political label and an identification of one’s culture. Lena’s song at the end of the play indicates that Boesman is “Bushman”, which is a political label for the Afrikaners use it as a general term of abuse against the Africans and coloureds. That Boesman wears a “Hottentot’s hat should not go unnoticed” because a Bushman is considered less civilized, and so lower on the social scale, than a Hottentot. Bushman therefore, can be said to scorn his identity and falsely attempt to assume another to regain a sense of dignity, even if in the discourse and practices prevalent in the white scale of values, not his own. 88

The couple are itinerant coloured nomadically roaming the Eastern Cape rural and industrial suburbs of Port Elizabeth looking for work and living in temporary housing, usually a makeshift hovel formed of corrugated iron scraps, cardboard, and whatever other waste materials come to hand. 89. The play is made to deal with life, death and self assertion in South
Africa during the detestable regime of apartheid. The story of the play depends on the factor of simplicity which gives an extraordinary humanness to the characters, who are trying to find their reality on the stage. Boesman and his wife are seen as a sample of those who are in a state of moving, simply because they couldn’t find a place that can be called ‘home’ and if they find one, the white will come and destroy it by using their machines. They are obliged to keep moving, searching not only for their home, but also for their ‘self’ which is lost or distorted by being false. 90

As one of Beckett’s generation, Fugard tries to put Boesman and Lena in the same metaphysical conditions in which Didi and Gogo created by Samul Beckett in Waiting for Godott. However, the political conditions of Boesman and Lena are seen to be more clear, powerful, and specific to suit the people of South Africa. 91 Boesman and Lena are in search of employment, of a home, of an ultimate meaning to their lives, lost in a nondescript landscape, and locked in a volatile, dysfunctional relationship outside of which neither could survive; the parallel to Waiting for Godot is self-evident. 92 Fugard gives the generalized Beckettian landscape a very specific geographic place. The paths where Boesman and Lena can be seen on any South African map. The two Hotnott are described by the playwright as “ciphers of poverty”. It is a description of the way in which the ‘others’ live, and it is an answer to the rhetorical question of how they spend their days. Destitution is a quality in their life that leads their life to be, as some may describe, “the violence of immediacy”. They are turned from being a couple whose relationship is supposed to have the characteristic of equality into a master and his slave, or a ‘self’ and ‘other’ 93 .In spite of its specificity of the South African surroundings, Boesman and Lena is able to comment on Beckettian and existentialist questions of human meaning in the universe, since it bears a national message, even if these questions bear the social, political, and racial situations of the playwright’s country and people 94 .The play, in this way, emphasizes a sense of contradiction; all the places that Lena and Boesman have passed are real and familiar, yet none of which is a home. To make the play set in the mud of Swartkops Fugard ensures the fact that the couple is unable to put down roots because it is an isolated place in the saline. And this gives the sense that they will continue moving to the unknown 95 .

However, Walking in Boesman and Lena is very important than the temporary stops in that the absurdity of their situation is found in this continual, useless, repetitive cycle of walks. The play could be called “Walking for Godot” to “emphasize the importance and, paradoxically, the meaninglessness of the action”. However, Boesman and Lena know their “Godot” and his purpose:

LENA: You are the hell-in. Don’t look at me, ou ding. Blame the whiteman. Bulldozer!
[Another laugh] (B.L.144)

Because they are the ‘others’ whose existence is predetermined by the whiteman who chased them from one area to another. 96

LENA: This time heavier than last time. And there’s other times coming”Vat jou goed en trek! [Take your things and go] Whitman says. Remember the old times? Quick march! Even run... [a little laugh]...when they chased us. Don’t make trouble for us here. Boesman I can’t run any more. 97
Boesman and Lena is a two act play. The first performance was in 1969. The play starts with Boesman entering the stage first, followed by his wife, Lena. Both Boesman and Lena appear as ‘others’, as two wretched, poor vagabonds, who are evicted by force from their shacks and now a stray, living in the streets in a totally meaningless way 98.Yet, the demolition of their shack catalyzes Boesman to look for his ‘self’ after long years of being an ‘other’. He sees the destruction of their trivial pondok as a kind of freedom that the white man has given him over a long period of the humiliating definition of ‘self’ that such poor residence space imposes. He is happy for he becomes free, untied by the whiteman’s shackles: 99.

**BOESMAN:** Why shouldn’t I be happy?
**LENA:** Ja, that’s the way it is. When I want to cry, you want to laugh.

**BOESMAN:** Cry!

**LENA:** Something hurt. Wasn’t just your fist.

**BOESMAN:** Snot and tears because the whiteman pushed over a rotten old pondok? That will be the day. He did me a favour. I was sick of it. So, I laughed

**LENA:** And now?

**BOESMAN:** Yes, you think I can’t laugh now? You want to hear me? (B.L.146-47)

He describes the situation in what is regarded by many as “the most abject expressions of the interrelationship of subjectivity and domestic space in all of South African literature” 100 “A rotten little house for the rotten person”.(B.L.149)

It can be said, however, that the dialectic of the ‘self’ and ‘other’ becomes apparent with the eviction from the shacks. If Boesman finds the eviction as freedom, for Lena the matter is different. The destruction of the shack is in fact a destruction of her effort to get peace and self recognition. Although she is able to wander freely from one village to another and from one city to another, Lena is imprisoned inside her psychological fears that turns her to be a thing rather than a being. 101 Furthermore, the relation between Boesman and Lena is revealed when they are evicted from their shack. Thus, the destruction of the shack is a work of violence that beats the romantic life of the couple and turns them not in terms of equality and passion, but to a ‘self’ and ‘other’, a dominant male and a dominated female 102. Lena remembers how life before the eviction was. It was equal, full of songs and interests:

**LENA:** [Holds up a clenched fist in an imitation of Boesman]

That’s how he talks to the world...Ja,so it goes. He walks in front. I walk behind. It used to be side by side, with jokes. At night he let me sing, and listened. Never learnt any songs himself. (B.L.168)

Throughout the play, the audience will see that it is Lena, who tries to find out her truly ‘self’. She is no more able to be dealt as ‘other’ by the white or by her husband, who remains static in the play, and who is cheated by his false ‘self’. It is Lena, who develops into a character that tries to remember and regain her “individual human dignity”. The play doesn’t settle on suggestion of national identity, but on principles of human, individual identity that once achieved, could supply a steady basis for the creation of a future national identity 103.

Lena, in fact, seeks a definition of her being. The questions she poses to Boesman links her to him, and he to her as inextricably as does the simple coordinating conjunction of the title, which is the most important word in it. Where Boesman seeks validation of his assumed identity through Lena, Lena needs a witness to her existence through Boesman. 104
Lena’s arrival to the stage immediately sets up their relationship and their identities. She follows Boesman onto the stage and asks “Here”? Both the action and the question are a deferral of power to Boesman. Lena in this sense exists as a slave, an ‘other’ to Boesman’s position as a master. And like Estragon in Godot, Lena lacks the sense of the chronology of their lives 105:

LENA: What was I doing?
BOESMAN: You were looking for that brak of yours.
LENA: Brak? “Haal?” Was it this morning?
BOESMAN: You almost twisted your head off, you were looking behind you so much. You should have walked backwards today. (B.L. 146-147)

In questioning Boesman, she gave him the authority to decide her history and identity, while Boesman’s remark that she should have been walking backward, reveals the ties of her sense of ‘self’ to the past, to history. Boesman is happy to occupy the seat of power in this relationship because he does not have to reflect or look back on his oppressed life. Instead, he has become the oppressor, “whiteman reincarnated” 106. Boesman, like a whiteman, decides that Lena is not equal to a white lady. She should live in the mud, eat from the rubbish, and remain astray for the rest of her life. Questioning Boesman informs us, too, that when and where they stop is Boesman’s male decision, that he is ruler and she ruled. And in the play’s larger realm, “Here” is an existential question for Lena, who will spend her time on stage searching for the meaning of her life and for her values as a human being. 107

LENA: I know what it is like in there!
BOESMAN: It’s all you’ll ever know.
LENA: I’m sick of it
BOESMAN: Sick of it! You want to live in a house? What do you think you are? A white madam?
LENA: It wasn’t always like this. There were better times.
BOESMAN: In your dreams may be. (B.L.158)

Lena cannot remember where she has been and her partner cruelly taunts her by adding to her confusion. He ignores her, tries to mislead her in order to show his ‘self’ and power over her. She is a victim for Boesman’s oppression and cruelty, which is a natural result for the whiteman’s oppression against the marginalized coloured people. As a way of insulting her intelligence, Boesman never tells Lena where they are, even if she is right in determining their position 108. Although she is conscious of Boesman’s faults, Lena remains inextricably tied to him, for she believes he holds the key to her past, and so her identity;

LENA: Do you really know, Boesman? Where and how?
BOESMAN: Yes
LENA: Tell me. [He laughs] Help me, Boesman
BOESMAN: What? Find yourself? (B.L.156)

Unable to extricate a sense of herself from Boesman, she pursues the problem alone, and produces a small identity; if she can be hit and bruised, then she exists. Moreover, if she is Lena, identified by her servile, oppressed relation to him, then he is Boesman, the oppressor. She can affirm, therefore, that they are Boesman and Lena” 109. Lena’s laugh at the beginning of the play is born of the “pathetic meaninglessness of her life”. Without a shelter, she and her man
are, like a naked person, standing in front of the world. Her laugh is the comic absurdity of their meaningless, earthbound life. Standing in the mud, in the cold with bear feet and shabby clothes, Lena sees a bird in the sky and envys it. 110 She compares its freedom with her jail and absurd life on earth:

LENA: [She is obviously staring up at a bird softly...] Jou moer! [You cunt!] [She watches it for a few seconds longer, then scrambles to her feet and shakes her fist at it.] Jou moer! [... Her eyes follow it as it glides out of sight.] So slowly...! Must be a feeling, hey. Even your shadow so heavy you leave it on the ground...Tomorrow they'll hang up there in the wind and laugh. We'll be in the mud. I hate them. (B.L.144)

The structure of the play is built on departure and arrival. It is a meaningless circular trip that reflects the senselessness of Lena's existence. It is a journey that has neither a start nor a vision of an end. Fugard tends to make the journey endless in order to suggest the impossibility of escape from the social and political dilemma of South Africa 111. And what adds to Lena's despair is Boesman's devalue her and her language. He deliberately tries to denigrate her speech, the only means of human communication she has 112. For Boesman, her language is "as glossolalia, as verbal defecation, and as even less than that: "rubbish".

LENA: It was almost that way today.
BOESMAN: Not a damn! Wasn't long enough. And I knew it. When she puts down her bundle, she'll start her rubbish. You did.
LENA: Rubbish?
BOESMAN: That long drol of nonsense that comes out when you open your mouth!
LENA: What have I said? (B.L. 145)

Boesman tries to master the situation by any possibility he has, by denying Lena the right to speak as well as the right to think, or even by using his fists to stop her dreams of freedom, and of getting self recognition:

LENA: Coega to Veeplaas.
BOESMAN: You talked there too. So I thought it again.
LENA: Mistake.
BOESMAN: Mistake. Every time you opened your mouth...until I stopped listening.
LENA: I want somebody to listen.

When Boesman says that Lena's life is a cursed one, he, in fact, is right since she is doubly a subalterner. First as a coloured, poor woman from South Africa brutalized by the whiteman and his vicious regime of apartheid. And as a female owned by a "dumb animal like submission to Boesman" and the attacks of his fists. Lena becomes aware of the dilemma of her life, especially after the presence of Outa, the old black man. She tries to assert her existence and her humanity through singing, dancing, remembering good times and sweet food. She has the faith that one day "something going to happen", and she will be able to break the jails and be free from the meaningless circuity of her life: "and then I'm gone goodbye, darling. I've had enough.'Struse' God, that day I'm gone". Boesman acts, however, at every chance to deny her dreams, her world, her humanity, herself hood, and any idea that her life could have meaning. 113.
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Boesman: Now is the only time in your life.


Boesman. In the mud where you are. Now. Tomorrow is will be there too, and the next day. And if you're still alive when I've had enough of this, you'll load up and walk, somewhere else.

In the midst of their argument, and in the midst of darkness, Lena recognizes something. She asks Boesman to go and check. She tells Boesman that this thing is a person and he might be a whiteman. Through the physical state and body language, Fugard makes clear the differences between the ‘self’ and ‘other’ as between the white and the black. In the South African location, it is easy for Boesman to identify, through the “language of physical stance and movement”, the personality of the stranger as neither white nor coloured, but a black man. Generally, Fugard recognizes that, on the stage of life and more specially on the stage of South African life that he knows well, races enact their desperate roles, projecting who they are, what they can and cannot become. Boesman easily state the man is black, because he knows well that no white man can sit in this way and in that place. It is a matter of ‘differences’ between races: 114.

LENA: He’s stopped. May be he’s going to dig. Or he’s a whiteman.

BOESMAN: When did you see a whiteman sitting like that! (B.L 159)

Outa’s alleged silence, or murmur of Xhosa words, meaningless to Boesman and Lena and the audience members, marks the juridical silencing of the majority of black South Africans, who, like Outa, have until recently existed under an oppressive silence and removal of subjecthood. 115 The conversation between Outa and Lena is described by the stage direction as “an illusion of conversation”, because it is not a two-way conversation. Rather, it is Lena, who speaks about herself, pain, sufferings and life, whereas Outa murmurs garbled syllables like an audience 116.

In fact, Boesman and Lena's life, attitudes, partnership, and existence are affected by the presence of Outa, the old black man. His presence states new relationship between the couple, and gives new energy, new definition and new terms to their life. For Lena, “Outa is another pair of eyes”(B.L:161) that will acknowledge her existence 117. Such eyes can register outrage and recognize injustice. One of the critics suggests that “Lena asks to be affirmed in reciprocal exchange for the human value she had witnessed in the ‘other’, and if she can evoke no more from the old man than the repetition of her name and his unwitting audience to her act of pathetic biography, it is sufficient.” Lena , in this sense, has transformed this new “chain of sympathy” into a new social tied that will effect the political environment of the country. In fact, in most of Fugard’s plays the change of “the camaraderie of the damned into a community of sympathy and strength” is always present 118.

The old black man is seen as the racial ‘other’ for Boesman and Lena, whose presence alters the dimensions of the dramatic action, and whose presence raises up the psychological conflict inside the protagonists, and that will decide who they are and how they act. 119.

On apartheid’s social scale, the white is superior to Boesman and Lena. They are the ‘others’ who must live in the nowhere in the saline, and whose shacks should be demolished in order new houses for the white should be constructed. And now, with the coming of Outa, it is their role to show their ‘self’, and their superiority over the black man who is called by Boesman as “kaffer”, a very hard and abusive insult that the black man might be called in 120.
Lena’s personality and attitudes have witnessed a sudden change. She seems to be more resonant, confident and full of strength to speak. She, for the first time, seems to be able not to follow Boesman’s orders 121.

**BOESMAN:** You think I care what you do? You want to sit outside and die of cold with a kaffer, go ahead!
**LENA:** I’d sit out with a dog tonight. (B.L.163)

Standing between white and black, Boesman tries to imitate the white by playing the role of the oppressor who humiliate him for years. He scares Outa to death and even tries to kill him. The presence of Outa makes Boesman a racist who shows no respect for both the black as well as women. He is turned from a man who has no respect to his wife to a racist who calls his wife a “Hotnot” which is a very abusive word for coloured. 122.

**BOESMAN:** Finished with him already? Ag nee, wat! You must try something there. He’s mos better than nothing. Or was nothing better? Too bad you’re both so useless. Could have worked a point. Some sports. You and him. They like Hotnot meid [Hottentot women]. Black basterds! [Lena is wandering around helplessly]. Going to call again? You’ll end up with a tribe of old kaffers sitting here. That’s all you’ll get out of that darkness. They go there to die. I’m warning you, Lena! Pull another one in here and you’ll do the rest of your talking tonight with a thick mouth. Turn my place into a kaffer nes [nest].(B.L.163)

Outa becomes Lena’s link between her past and present. She is given the chance to reveal the painful stories of her past to a human fellow. Their conversation is in fact “a stream of consciousness monologue”, through which she utters what is said to be “Fugard’s most eloquent prose”. She reveals her memories about her child that she has never seen 123.

**LENA:** What more must I say? What you asking me about? Pain? Yes,! Don’t kaffers know what that means? One night it was longer than a small piece of candle and then as big as darkness. Somewhere else a donkey looked at it. I crawled under the cart and they looked . Boesman was too far away to call. Just the sound of his axe as he chooped the wood. I didn’t even have rags! You asked me and I’ve told you. Pain is a candle and a donkey’s face(B.L.169)

Because of the dispossessed life, says Brain Crow, that Lena has spent trekking hopelessly and meaninglessly on the road, She accepts her life to be watched by an almost dead black man, or even a mongrel dog. For this reason, Lena happily accepts Outa and starts to tell him some of her stories as a sign of her existence. She tells him the story of her dog that used to watc her and that is better than Boesman in many cases. 124.

**LENA:** All the things I did-making the fire, cooking, counting bottles or bruises, even just sitting, you know, when it’s too much...he saw it. Hond! I called him Hond. But any name, he’d wag his tail if you said it nice. I’ll tell you what it is. Eyes Outa. Another pair of eyes. Something to see you. (B.L.166)

For Lena, the presence of Outa is a test for her humanity that is going to be faded in this violent, unmerciful world of apartheid. She starts to find her humanity and her ’self’. She is ready to divide her share of bread between her and Outa after Boesman’s refusal to divide it into three. She finds herself responsible for the black man to give him water, food, and shelter. She is
happy to share her rag and to feel warm after Boesman has dismissed Outa to come near the fire. Near Outa, she feels warmer than being near Boesman's fire. Some critics argue that Lena has been turned to be like St. Martin or Lady Bountiful, but with a less fortune: 125.

Towards the close of act one, the audience notices a change in Lena's behaviour as well as Boesman's. At the beginning of act one, Boesman is a "personification of brutality and insensitivity". However, Lena feels now that she has the ability to reject, to revolt, and to challenge. Part of this challenge is reflected on her relationship with Boesman, who is shocked of what he is watching. As she makes her decision to revolt and stay outside the shack with the old man, the stage directions tell us of Boesman “For the first time he is unsure of himself”.(B.L. 174) 126. Boesman seems to be someone who loses control over things. He uses Lena’s absence to drive Outa away by beating him so hard and causing him to fall. Significantly, Boesman says to Outa “If you tell her, I’ll kill you”(B.L.175), stating that Lena is the authority figure for whom the fact must be hidden. The end of act one shows that Outa and Lena have "othered" Boesman; "They drink and eat. Boesman is watching them from the shelter, his bread and tea untouched before him".(B.L.175) He stands outside their feast, outside their "celebration", his existence threatened 127.

What is important to Lena is that she is going to speak and to give some sense and meaning to her useless and meaningless life. In fact, Outa helps her to celebrate her life in an important way. He becomes a witness not only to her victimhood, but also to her courageous effort to define her herself and her world 128. Through Lena’s speech, Fugard shows his believe in the power of theatre as a perfect means of change. For Boesman, Lena becomes the 'other', who is an extension of himself. She is the only proof that he is a 'self' and that he is a man of value. She becomes a human punching bag, beating her when he is angry with himself or with her disobedient. She is reduced to be no more than a thing that is useless and that could be left at any time. One of the critics assumes that "Boesman beats and abuses Lena, to whom he clings, because she is the only being that belongs to him. This negative power is the only meaning his meaningless life still has" 129.

The question why Fugard insists that Lena's life must be witnessed by others is linked to the work of drama in general and to the life of the dramatist in particular. 130. Obviously, Fugard, by presenting Outa, makes a theatrical metaphor between the dramatist, whose life and ideas are meaningless unless they are observed, enacted and witnessed by the audience, and the life of the marginalized. One of the critics argues that “If a person is unnoticed, if an actor has no audience, is he or she alive?” 131. Outa for Lena is the audience to whom she relates her life and dreams and for whom she acts out who she is. Lena uses Outa as a confessor 132. Thus, what gives his life and work being as a playwright also gives Lena being as a woman. It is a matter of continuity and of existence that turns Lena to be an actor who reflects her feelings, pains, and dreams to Outa, who, although remains silent and doesn't understand a word of what Lena is saying, is better than Boesman who turns his back to her and who treats her as a useless 'other' 133. Lena manages to use “the empty space” in the mudflat to be her world and theatre. She becomes the actor who reveals to Outa her inner feelings, brings them out and performs them in front of her audience. Boesman is watching the new event in Lena's life 134.

Although the theatre that Lena has created is life-giving and life affirming since it gives her the sense of being 'self', and endows her that feel of existence, for Boesman it is a threat. It is a challenge to his mastery and definition. If Lena is able to regain her own will, to find her own 'self' and to leave him as the one to whom she totally depends on, Boesman will lose the
beautiful sense of being a master, the only person who treats him as ‘self’, and is going to be left without a follower. Lena is turned into Boesman’s female property, slave, a victim and recipient of his blows, whereas he is defined in terms of male, leader, master, victimizer, and beater. So, Boesman starts to imagine his life without Lena as meaningless. His power and his authority has no sense without her. In the scale of power, Boesman realizes that she has as much power as he has, but she doesn’t realize that. 135.

Under the effect of cheap wine, Boesman, like Lena, creates his own theatre through which he makes a separation between himself and the rest of his people. He shows himself as a courageous man who acts bravely when the shaks have been destroyed by the whiteman. He makes himself a superior over the rest of people who are like warms, baboons and like dogs that shake their tails to their masters: 136.

Respectively, what makes Boesman says “Dankie bass” [thank you boss] is that he has no ability to escape a particular frame of mind. He is prisoned in the reflection of being a subservience to the whiteman. And this has a strong effect on his personality and psychology as ‘other’, as a marginal coloured man. Thus, Boesman becomes an oppressor who obliges his wife to say “Pleas, my bassie [pleas my little boss]” as an attempt to dispel his servility. It is a false claim of power and of mastery that reflect the intellectual engagement with the white 137.

Overwhelmed by the fear to lose Lena, the subaltern, Boesman pretends to be proud for seeing the destruction of the shacks as a transformation from the state of being ‘other’, a submissive, a humiliated, and a jailed person to a free man who has the well to choose his roads, and who finds his ‘self’ that makes him advanced over the rank of people like animals 138

For Boesman, a new life is emerged after the eviction has taken place. He declares that the whiteman is doing him a favour when these shacks have been demolished. He gets rid of that rotten world in which everything is sad, old, stinks, and has no future at all 139.
Ann Sarzin states that “the concept of Freedom has consistently illuminated the body of Fugard's work”. And it is the first time Fugard uses this word with a full resonance in the autobiographical play Boesman and Lena 140. However, Boesman's speaking is full of inconsistencies. He knows well that there is a great difference between freedom and eviction. He is no more than a boastfulness who is forced to leave his shack, in spite of being small and rotten, to stay in the mudflat without a shelter or a roof. Instead of getting self recognition, Boesman's freedom grants him “self loathing”. He and his wife carry the whiteman's rubbish wherever they go. They live on what the others throw away as their refusal. What is important is that this kind of freedom changes Boesman to a racist. A man who thinks of himself as superior over others, especially his wife. One of the critics argues that Boesman as “vacillates inconsistently from patronizing superiority to a sense of himself as coloured trash, Boesman reveals his conflicted self-image, one premised on the assumption that relationships, whether of race or gender, are power-based: one is either master or mastered” 141.

Obviously, the play in this sense distinguishes between two kinds of freedom that Boesman and Lena get. It is approved that Boesman's freedom is false, since it is based on hatred and wrong assumptions 142. But, it is Lena’s freedom that changes her to the kind of ‘self’ who loves, respect and care for others. She has been turned from a thing to a being when the black old man manages to utter her name. She is no more Boesman’s follower and his rubbish porter. Outa’s sound is an evidence of her existence. She regains her life, her freedom when she gets confidence again. She speaks with the tone of a born- again believer 143.

LENA: That’s not a pondok, Boesman [pointing to the shelter]. It’s a coffin. All of them. You bury my life in your pondoks. not tonight...No! I’m on this earth, not in it. Look now. [ She nudges the old man]. Lena!

OLD MAN: Lena.

LENA: Ewe [Yes]. That’s me . You’re right, Boesman. It's here and now. This is the time and place. To hell with the others. They are finished and mixed up anyway. I don’t know why I’m here, how I got here. And you won’t tell me. Doesn't matter. They've ended now. The walks led here. Tonight. And he sees it. (B.L.182).

The significance of the word “Here” that Lena utters at the beginning of the play seems to reach its existential meaning at the end of act two. She yearns to put an end for her disorientation. For Lena, it was a mental, psychological as well as spatial loss that she once suffered from. Lena discovers the uselessness of her journey with Boesman. It is ‘here’ where she finds freedom, humanity and personality. She starts to dance, sing and clap as a sign of celebration for her regained freedom. Freedom gives her the ability to form poetry and music, to enjoy her days and even pains. 144.

The significance of dancing in the play transpasses the meaning of celebration and happiness or sorrows of life in general. Rather, Dancing in Boesman and Lena is a victory of existence over the mudflat of Korsten. It is also a pronouncement of Lena’s African identity. Naturally, it is not some kind of ritual dancing or religious celebration, but it is a celebration of the ‘self’ which is gained through the liberation of the mind 145.

Meanwhile, most critics see no hope for the disoriented, abused Lena, but Dennis Walder states that her dance has a “transfiguring effect on the stage”. Her song, which includes a list of different places she and Boesman have visited, and whose names she struggles to remember, represents an affirmation of identity, while defying her outcast status as a bruised and battered
“Hotnot meid”. In this song, Lena throws her abuse back into the face of authority and the audience as well as towards her partner Boesman 146.

Boesman is watching Lena’s happiness with jealousy. He uses all the devices and temptations of wine, food and warmth to make her leave Outa and go inside the pondok, but he couldn’t convince her. What makes her stop singing and dancing is Boesman’s sudden shout “ I dropped the empties”(B.L185) that he once strikes Lena for breaking them. The sense of losing Lena changes the scale of power for Boesman. He is no longer a master who yells, punches or throws out whatever he likes. He is now asking forgiveness from Lena as well as some of her attention. Now Lena is the one who has the power to forgive. She is the master, the ‘self’ whose presence is necessary for the life of others. Boesman, in fact, tries to hurt her again, but he couldn’t. 147.

Boesman wants to show the whiteman that he is a master just like him. That he has the power and the authority to destroy, punch, or even kill for no reason. It is a psychological complex of the ‘other’ to dream of being ‘self’. Whereas Lena, in contrast, shows Outa, the poor old black man, the physical strikes to her body. The play in this sense holds the recognition that black and coloured people of South Africa should depend on each other to get self assertion. The whiteman, who represents the system of apartheid, is never an ally to the oppressed 148.

Outa’s death is a significant for those whose lives and death are equally meaningless. Fugard, in this sense, makes the stage as a real embodiment of life in South Africa in which the ‘others’, like Outa, pass silently from life to death. The beginning and end of their lives are the same. Outa is considered a “living embodiment of Boesman’s death in life and his spiritual demise”. It is supposed that Boesman might be arrested for murdering the old man. Outa is in fact a representation of Boesman’s self-loathing 149. By contrast to Lena, Boesman represents an “anti theatrical principle in that he doesn’t wish his shame to be seen even by a dead person to whom Boesman shouts “Musha khangela” [Don’t look] 150.

After Outa’s death, Boesman thinks that Lena is going to be his female property again. But, it is Lena’s turn to show her power as ‘self’. The first sign of this ‘self’ assertion is her control over the relationship with Boesman. She decides that she is no longer a follower of him. Her refusal represents a shift in power 151. Lena’s control of the relation and her decision to leave Boesman and his rubbish is a sign of the triumph of her ‘self’. She states that her life and fate belong to nobody, neither the whiteman nor Boesman who becomes as “the tragically comic stage image” of a man without meaning. He is tied up by the baggages that add to the absurdity of his being 152.

At the end of act two, the dialectic of the ‘self’ and ‘other’ is cleverly shown by Fugard, who declares an important message for those who want to regain the self image again. Fugard, through Lena, states that the concept of ‘self’ can be ensured through generosity, forgiveness, and self denial. Lena, as a master, teaches Boesman a lesson in humanity. She asks him to “give”(B..196) in order to reach to the level of ‘self’, of humans. Lena’s compassion to Outa enables her to value her life and to see herself from a new angle. She tells Boesman that only now she feels herself alive, and he has the chance to leave aside his negative self and be free 153.

LENA: I’m alive, Boesman. There’s daylight left in me. You still got a chance. Don’t lose it. Next time you want to kill me, do it. Really do it. When you hit, hit those lights out. Don’t be too late. Do it yourself. Don’t let the old bruises put the rop around your neck.
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Okay. But not so fast. It’s dark. [They look around for the last time, then turn and walk off into the darkness]. (B.L.197)
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CONCLUSION

In their swinging between ‘self’ and ‘other’, characters in Fugard’s plays are planned to fulfill different purposes according to the political situation, economical state and physical position. Thus, in Boesman and Lena, the change from the state of ‘other’ to ‘self’ enables her to taste her humanity, to give her strength to face the oppression made by her husband and by the whiteman. The dialectic of the ‘self’ and ‘other’ serves as a means of discovering the person’s own existence that is lost or destroyed by the violence of man. In the same respect, the dialectic of the self and other makes the colonized characters mixed the pains of the past and the worries of the present to get a better future. Also, the dialectic becomes a kind of revenge that the colonized always wishes to have. Self and other, although a mental, psychological rather than a physical change, is a kind of political resistance and a call for change. It gives the power to survive in spite of all difficulties and violence of the whiteman. The dialectic becomes a kind of incarnation through which the colonized mocks death to resist and survive, and in this way Apartheid’s laws are no more valid. However, the main purpose that the dialectic of the self and other is planned to give is to escape a particular frame of mind. The colonized is designed to be the other for the rest of his or her life. Thus, characters of Fugard’s plays are those black and coloured men and women who strive to get rid of the shackles of being the others. They work hard to convince themselves and others that they exist and able to lead. It is a liberation of the mind that they want to achieve first.
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