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Abstract:
People crossing borders in search of safety and a better life are challenging governments, rousing politics, taxing the capacity of international relief agencies, and raising difficult questions about national identity, social cohesion, fairness, safety, morality, and the rule of law. Since the late 1980s, the increasing number of refugees arriving in Western countries has frequently been met with alarm, and the refugees have been treated with hostility, prejudice, and even violence. This paper tackles The Jungle (2017) by Joe Murphy and Joe Robertson, two British dramatists. The two recent Oxford graduates gained firsthand knowledge of their subject during their seven-month stint as volunteers at the Jungle, a refugee camp in Calais, France, established in 2015. The play examines the stories of the people who lived in this encampment after fleeing oppression in their home countries, as well as the sense of community that developed there. In The Jungle, the playwrights bring people from various countries together, including migrants from Afghanistan, Iraq, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran, Syria, Sudan, and others. By creating spaces and places which enable voices to be heard, The Jungle aims to give a face to the faceless and a voice to the voiceless. Using theatre as a space for reflection and expression, the play discusses the border and the change between the visible and invisibility and explores how borders can move beyond binaries and create a new space – a third space. The play attempted to increase empathy and understanding by allowing audiences to vicariously experience aspects of refugees' lives. 

Keywords: border; home; jungle; refugees; place.
عندما يصبح المكان منزلة اللاجئين و المساحة الحدودية في مسرحية
جو ميرفي و جو روبرتسون "الغابة" (2017)
د. هالة سيد أحمد المتولي إبراهيم
أستاذ مساعد بكلية الآنس جامعة عين شمس- القاهرة- مصر

الملخص:
الأشخاص الذين يعبرون الحدود بحثًا عن الأمان وحياة أفضل يتحدثون الحكومات، ويثورون رجال السياسة، ويسترزون قدرات وكالات الإغاثة الدولية، ويثورون أسلحة صعبة حول الهوية الوطنية، وتعمل الإ트احة الاجتماعية، والعدل، والسلامة، والأخلاق، وسيادة القانون. منذ أواخر الثمانينيات، كان العدد المتزايد من اللاجئين الذين يصلون إلى الدول العربية يقابل بالذعر، وعومل اللاجئون بالعداء والتحريز وحتى العنف. تتناول هذه الورقة الباحثة مسرحية الغابة (2017) للكاتبين البريطانيين جو ميرفي وجو روبرتسن، تنبئ المسرحية على أحداث حقيقية حيث أمست الكلاب سبعة أشهر يعملان كمتطوعين في الغابة، وهو الإسم الذي أطلق على مخيم اللاجئين في كاليه، فرنسا، تم إنشاؤه في عام 2015. تتناول المسرحية قصص الأشخاص الذين عاشوا في هذا المخيم بعد الفرار من الشعراء بالاضطهاد في بلدانهم الأصلية. يجمع العمل المسرحي أشخاصًا من بلدان مختلفة مثل أفغانستان والعراق وإريتريا وإثيوبيا وإيران وسوريا والسعودية وغيرها، ويضعهم جميعًا معًا في مجتمع جديد يتكذبوه ويطالبوا لهم بإنهاءهم في الكثير من التحديات ويسردون ما مر بهم من محن وينتقدون عن أمورهم في تجاوز الحدود والعيش في أمان. حاولت المسرحية تعبر معهم الحدود ولا تقدم من خلال إعطاء وجهة لمن لا وجه لهم وصوتو لمن لا صوت له وخلق مساحة جديدة- مساحة ثالثة يتعرف من خلالها المشاهد على حياة اللاجئين على نحو غير مباشر.

الكلمات المفتاحية:
الحدود- المنزلا- الغابة- اللاجئين- المكان.
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People crossing borders in search of safety and a better life are challenging governments, agitating politics, taxing the resources of international relief organizations, and raising difficult questions about national identity, social cohesion, fairness, safety, morality, and the rule of law.

There are more refugees of one kind or another now, well into the twenty-first century, than at any time in the previous seventy years. Since the late 1980s, the increasing number of refugees, the international homeless, arriving in Western countries has frequently been viewed with alarm, and the refugees have been treated with hostility, prejudice, and even violence.

Laws are being tightened across Europe, and anti-refugee sentiment is becoming more entrenched. The resulting mistrust and suspicion have created a crisis, and all contemporary refugee theatre and performance takes place against this background.

Refugee theatre has been created by citizens of the countries where refugees have sought asylum, as well as by refugees and asylum seekers themselves, but all of these efforts take place against a background of fear, suspicion, and mistrust on all sides.

When refugees participate in creative projects that are explicitly designed for their participation, a broader range of work is produced. Looking at these shows how important it is to question assumptions about trauma and understand how bureaucratic performance can act to encourage victimhood narratives in theatre and performance.

Theatre allows refugees to express themselves through their own creativity, talents, ideas, opinions, and imagination by producing an original theatrical production: “Theatres are
refuges...Theatres are not just places of performance or sites of community, but they are essentially refuges and historically sites for gathering, fortifying and surviving the outside world” (Miller 502). This permits refugees to communicate with their host communities.

Theatre has also been used as a tool for education and awareness-raising about refugees, opening up new avenues for empathy, solidarity, and even political action. Theatre, as a site of debate, has evolved into a space where alternative narratives can be created. Refugee cultural expectations are reflected in arts and cultural activities involving refugees: expectations of silence, passivity, trauma, and victimhood.

When refugees are able to share their stories with the communities in which they find themselves, all of the abstract discussions about integration and intercultural dialogue fade away in the face of genuine human interactions.

Theatre is a place where issues are “framed, problematized, opened up and made accessible to analysis and critique...an alternative form of border space” (Nield 144). Narratives from theatrical and cultural performance can tell stories about some of the positive and complex experiences of refugeeness. “Catachrestic naming, rejections of naming, questions of identity that deny or confirm bureaucratic naming are all strategies that are seen frequently in refugee theatre and performance” (Jeffers 40).

This paper tackles Joe Murphy and Joe Robertson’s *The Jungle* (2017). As two recent Oxford graduates, the British dramatists had a firsthand experience with their subject, growing out of the seven months they both spent running as volunteers at the Jungle, a refugee camp in Calais France. There, they ran a theatre called Good Chance, named after a comment they heard regularly from residents: “There’s a good chance I’ll make it to England today, smuggled in by truck or ferry.” Good Chance was regarded as an art center that offered theater workshops, dance and music performances, even kung fu lessons and connected people, stories, and cultures with a focus on refugee populations.
In *The Jungle*, the playwrights bring together people from diverse countries, such as migrants from Afghanistan, Iraq, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran, Syria, Sudan, and elsewhere. People met at the Good Chance Theatre to express what they were going through, reflect on their situation, trade information and stories, mourn and celebrate, and find a space to escape or confront the situations they were in. Thus, both the Jungle and Good Chance become a “borderland where individual and nation, past history and present situation, oppression and freedom clash, and however imperfect they are, they function as places where people meet and experience healing and change” (Matthews and Chung 1). By creating spaces and places which enable voices to be heard, *The Jungle* aims to give a face to the faceless and a voice to the voiceless. Using theatre as a space for reflection and expression, the play discusses the border and the change between the visible and invisibility and explores how borders can move beyond binaries and create a new space – a third space.

What kinds of theatre and performance styles were created by people who fled war zones and sought refuge in other countries? Studying the various theatrical ways in which refugee stories are presented help the listener comprehend how these stories function and operate. Some stories are prized for their honesty, as a means of validating or authenticating refugees' plight, while others show the lengths to which people may go to lie or perform their way to a better life.

Refugee studies, as a discrete academic discipline, emerged in the early 1980s. There has been an increasing number of stories told by refugees about their thoughts and experiences. To claim asylum, refugees need a credible story of individual persecution to convince the authorities of their right to stay in the country to which they have fled. Alison Jeffers in her book *Refugees, Theatre and Crisis* explains that refugees’ stories are troubling, troubled and troublesome: “Troubling because they are hard to hear, troubled because persecution, trauma and suffering are essential
Examining cultural artefacts created by and about refugees uncovers layers of thought and practice that are analyzed through discourses on performance, diaspora, migration, and identity. It is not just a numerical catastrophe; it is a crisis that cuts to the heart of debates about the nation state, identity, and belonging. The word 'home' connotes security, belonging, and rootedness, whereas the word 'away' connotes fear, inhospitality, and the unknown. Identity constructions are based on rootedness assumptions.

Thinking culturally about contemporary refugees leads to questions about borderlands, limits, margins and liminal spaces which have been much discussed in recent years across a range of disciplines associated with a growing interest in place (Cresswell 103). In performance studies, noting that “borderlands traditionally exist as sites of political contestation, risk, and risk-taking” leads Roach to suggest that “the refugee is the cultural epitome of the postmodern condition” (Reinelt and Roach 13).

Borders continue to play a persistent part of the daily lives of human beings. In Bhabha’s conception any notion of ‘building blocks’ of identity gives way to interstices, borders and frontlines where “the boundary becomes the place from which something begins its presencing” (Bhabha 5). Once one has crossed the border, one does de facto enter another country. In the The Routledge Research Companion to Border Studies, David Newman argues that borders may signify the point or line of separation between distinct entities, separating one category from another, in some cases institutionalizing existing differences, while in other cases creating the difference where none existed previously. He explains how, depending on social and political conditions, borders experience processes of opening or closing, reflecting the degree to which cross-border separation or contact takes place. Newman continues, “When borders open, trans-border frontier regions, or borderlands, evolve, areas within which borders are crossed, the
meeting of the differences takes place and, in some cases, hybridity is created” (18).

For Stuart Hall, “identity emerges as a kind of unsettled space, or an unresolved question within that space, between a number of intersecting discourses” (339). He argues that metaphors of identity have been traditionally located in images of depth: “In here, deep inside me, is my Self which I can reflect on,” and he asks, “what is replacing that depth?” (340)

Throughout the individual’s life identities, and concepts of identity, change and this is not something that happens in a vacuum but always in relationship to the Other: “only when there is an Other can you know who you are” (Hall 345). The presence of migrants, forced or otherwise, provides a chance to re-define all identities as ethnically produced. Avtar Brah has created the concept of ‘diaspora space’ defined as the space where ‘multiple subject positions are juxtaposed, contested; proclaimed or disavowed’ (208). This concept uses ethnicity as a way to define all groups so that diaspora space becomes “the point at which boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, of belonging and otherness, of ‘us’ and ‘them’, are contested” (Brah 209). Using diaspora space is to weaken the grounds on which the native and the diasporic subject are created, throwing the emphasis onto an account of the ways in which both identities are constructed within the nation space.

In performance studies there is a prospect to re-envision these terms about meetings and interactions giving them a temporal and spatial quality in the theatrical space. This opens the door to addressing details where diaspora space is small enough to investigate instances of meeting, such as the space between two individuals on a stage or the distance between audiences and performers.

Alison Jeffers in her book *Refugees, Theatre and Crisis* argues that understanding refugees from a political perspective, as
A result of conceptualizing bureaucratic performance, is a crucial precondition to a more ethical understanding. Thinking morally about refugees starts with hospitality and responsibility for the Other, with tiny, inherently flawed acts of hospitality that stand in for larger-scale hospitality. Given the inability to combine political and ethical requirements and wants on a geopolitical level, this may be the most that can be hoped for, for the time being, explains Jeffers.

Meanwhile, theatre and performance have an important role to play in creating a more understanding climate and in showing the way in which these small acts can be achieved and perpetuated. Importantly, “the act of creating theatre itself can be seen as a manifestation of the possibilities of generous action, of acting ethically with refugees and people seeking asylum” (Jeffers 19).

‘Convention refugees’ are acknowledged as those refugees who conform to the 1951 Refugee Convention. They are defined by UN as persons or groups of persons, “who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights ... and who have crossed an internationally recognized State border” (Jeffers). They have crossed a border, fleeing their own country and entering another's. “To be recognized as a refugee under the terms of the 1951 Convention, or the 1967 Protocol, refugees have to have travelled outside their country of origin, to be able to demonstrate past persecution in that place and a reasonable fear that persecution would continue were they to return” (21).

Western countries had a distinct image of what a refugee looked like when the 1951 Refugee Convention was enacted; mainly Europeans fleeing wars, religious persecution, or oppressive regimes. Similarly, countries' obligations to refugees were clear: give political asylum in the short term, followed by the right to work and settle. Forty years later, the picture had drastically changed, and by the early 1990s, the majority of
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Refugees were non-Europeans from the global south's poorer countries. Refugees were also present in much greater numbers and, while asylum claims to Western Europe averaged 13,000 in the 1970s, annual totals had risen to 690,000 by 1992 (Gibney 145). In 2005, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) estimated that there were approximately 19 million people in the world who were displaced either within their own borders or outside them. Refugees accounted for just over half this figure at 9.2 millions and asylum seekers were said to number 838,000.

Whatever the reasons for the increase in the number of refugees, the perception that refugee movement is “global, diverse and increasing” (McMaster 33) has sparked fear, leading to the creation of a "refugee crisis" and the perception of refugees as a "problem" to be dealt with. Several studies have been carried out into attitudes of citizens towards refugees and asylum seekers. These indicate a significant level of hatred toward asylum seekers in particular, yet numerous critics have demonstrated that these hostile attitudes are founded on incorrect assumptions. (Pedersen et al. 115).

Myths or false beliefs about refugees and asylum seekers emanate in part from the press and are widely disseminated through print journalism in particular. (Jeffers 24) This has resulted in a situation where the term ‘asylum seeker’ functions as a “code word for a range of meanings, variously referring to people as illegal immigrants, scroungers or potential criminals” (Faulkner 95). A great deal of refugee theatre is concerned with challenging these beliefs.

By 2002, asylum seekers had entered the lexicon of moral panic. S. Cohen concluded that the overall narrative about asylum seekers is “a single, virtually uninterrupted message of hostility and rejection” (xix). When the media manipulates and defines erroneous notions in order to construct a framework through which to perceive the subsequent terror, moral panic occurs. “This panic
is characteristically disproportionate and volatile and it generates hostility by creating a consensus that a serious threat exists” (Jeffers 25).

Despite minor regional differences, myths and mistaken beliefs regarding refugees and asylum seekers are very similar in all Western countries.; “that ‘parasitic’ asylum seekers deprive native citizens of resources, receive favourable treatment from the government, and that they are ‘illegal’” (Pedersen et al.120).

Associations of immigrants, refugees and terrorists have become linked in a “metonymic chain”, exemplified by the words of Conservative British politician Michael Howard when he said “Firm border controls are essential if we are to limit migration, fight crime and protect Britain from terrorism” (Charteris-Black 574). The perception exists that asylum is somehow a terrorist’s refuge in a post-9/11 world and the inexplicable indirectness of this situation is emphasized by Gibney who illustrates that ‘the attacks that fateful day led to war; war created refugees; refugees fled in search of asylum’ (Gibney 40). Regrettably, all refugees appear to pose a threat to national security and integrity.

Legal definitions and the language of international law fail to the difficulties inherent in the multiple layered journeys that refugees take to western countries. They also neglect the need of refugees to express themselves in ways that do not conform to the legal or cultural obligations that have been imposed on them. Despite the fact that legal definitions fall short of accurately reflecting complicated human experience, they have a significant impact on that experience and the many ways in which it is reflected on and represented. Unfortunately, this circumstance influences most, if not all, current refugee theatre and performance.

Understanding bureaucratic performance reveals the severe indistinctness surrounding concepts about refugee identity, as well as the ways in which that indistinctness feeds into existing hesitations and uncertainties in national identity conceptions in general. Realizing bureaucratic performance allows those who have not had that experience to gain a better understanding of the
feelings of powerlessness, terrible frustration, and impotence felt by so many asylum seekers in the West, leading to a better recognition of the potential implications of the power of naming in the case of refugees and asylum seekers.

Theatre makers have taken the task of raising questions about the treatment of refugees and asylum seekers in the West, producing a ‘growing corpus of theatre about asylum’ in Australia (Gilbert and Lo191) and in the UK what was called a ‘growing canon of asylum dramas’ (Billington 5).

The West, bureaucratic performance necessitates the correct kind of refugee story, one that smooths out complications to create a simple linear narrative of individual crisis and flight. Stories regarding refugees’ harsh treatment after they arrive in a safe nation can be given precedence over narratives depicting a mainly trouble-free arrival. Questions regarding unjust treatment, a lack of justice, and racist experiences are frequently preferred to stories of immigrant resilience and resourcefulness. Narratives in Western theatre therefore often necessitate refugees to be portrayed as victims, “a deserving cause, worthy of sympathy, assistance, and a new life” (Jackson 83).

Similarly, reasons for seeking asylum in the West which may not be due to persecution in the refugee’s home country, “are suppressed in many theatrical presentations in favour of simpler, but often traumatic, narratives of corrupt regimes, forced imprisonment and mistreatment in the refugee’s place of origin” (Jeffers 46). Reij M. Rosello shows how “the bad refugee stretches the definition; the real refugee must be innocent, powerless, a victim” (156).

Some theatre practitioners may regard this deliberate downplaying of ambiguity and complexity as important in order to confront unfavourable views about asylum seekers. It may also have the unexpected but unpleasant consequence of disempowering refugee subjects by instilling in audiences an image
of a victim or even a victim mentality in refugees themselves. Furthermore, such narratives may tend to promote unfavourable and inaccurate opinions about the countries from which refugees have fled among non-refugee audiences. Simple narratives of corruption in African governments, for example, are much simpler for an audience to believe than the complexities of the reasons for corruption, let alone the participation of many Western countries in the establishment and sustenance of corrupt regimes.

Joe Murphy and Joe Robertson, on the other hand, feel that art and politics are inextricably linked, and that theatre can be a useful beginning point. They see theatre as a secret weapon that can help initiate a conversation that leads to the formation of new social bonds. They call the theatre “ceilings” where they construct “safe spaces” for what they consider “dangerous conversations”. Dangerous conversations are important.

The two playwrights were determined to give a true account of their experiences. Everything that happened in The Jungle seemed meaningful to them. They discovered the fundamental framework of a society there. It was a pivotal moment in history. They saw the Jungle as a little map of the world, with individuals of twenty-five different nationalities, several languages spoken, and many religions coexisting, making it feel like a microcosm. It was a place where people had to get together and live together despite their differences. Fiona Mountford comments, “Playwrights Joe Murphy and Joe Robertson set up Good Chance, which established a temporary theatre space in the Jungle and this expansive, baggy and heartfelt piece, which drips with authenticity in every hard-lived line, is their work.”

Everyone wanted to tell stories about what was going on and in that process the dramatists met so many people and heard a lot of varied stories. They attended workshops with the folks they met in The Jungle and then began to discuss how they should portray what they saw there. The authors tell the stories of individual refugees who were attempting to find sanctuary in a land that did not belong to them. The playwrights bore witness to the
individuals they met and the things they observed through these stories, without resorting to political didacticism or emotional pity. Murphy and Robertson are fascinated by the idea of transmitting life as it appears, sounds, and even smells.

*The Jungle* intends to call attention to the ongoing European immigration problem by portraying the story of its creation in Calais, France, in 2015 and its eventual destruction in 2016. The drama explores the politics of the French and British borders, the perils of the asylum process, and the errors made by all parties involved in attempting to manage the campsite. It deals with the rising tensions and dwindling hope during this makeshift stopover, as well as the growing indignation at the deplorable surroundings.

In order to develop empathy, the playwrights have experimented with immersive forms of theatre, which aim to give audiences a more physically challenging experience than usual. Between the European migrant crisis, which has shaken the political orders of the United Kingdom and the Continent, and American debates over immigration, which resulted in two of the three government shutdowns in 2018, the question of who belongs where seems to be on people's minds all over the world. The fundamental questioning of ideas that a piece of theatre may inspire is lost in the frenzied debates on cable television and the opinion pages of large and small newspapers.

In 2015, the camp's population skyrocketed, prompting French authorities to begin evictions. The Joes were present during the camp's evictions, which began in March 2016. “It was utterly apocalyptic, to be honest,” says Robertson. “The big argument was that you could evict these people but you have to make sure there are places for them to go, especially the kids. They fall prey so easily to traffickers. About 198 children went missing. We never saw them again,” Robertson added.

Following the French government's bulldozing of the camp, the two dramatists returned to London and composed a play called
The Jungle to reproduce the camp's physical and emotional presence. The English volunteers' observations during their seven-month stay in the jungle prompted them to write The Jungle, an immersive drama. It is the Joes' first full-length play and is a result of their experience in The Jungle. The play depicts the day-to-day existence of these Middle Eastern migrants living on a landfill just across the Channel from England in 2015-16. The Jungle, a self-contained community, was one of several informal camps sprung up around Calais, where 6,000 people resided on a former landfill near the Channel Tunnel's entrance.

The drama recreates the real-life Calais camp, which housed thousands of refugees, including hundreds of unaccompanied youngsters, fleeing more than a dozen countries and anxiously awaiting asylum while facing eviction by French authorities and are attempting to travel to England for eleven months. The final stumbling block is the Jungle. They wait there before attempting to cross the border into the United Kingdom to seek refuge by taking ferries, vehicles, and trains. They hide in trucks or the Eurostar train, or stowaway on ferries, often paying smugglers to help them. In the meantime, the French government sees the Kurdish, Syrian, Somali, Eritrean, Afghan, Palestinian, Iranian, and Iraqi communities as an increasing threat.

The residents could see the White Cliffs of Dover across the river on a clear day. (Dover is some 25 miles by ferry from Calais.) It is the prospect of a better life that is in sight but out of grasp. Thousands of destitute people were drawn to Calais by the promise of crossing the short distance between France and the United Kingdom—men, women, and children eager to start new lives far from their impoverished, authoritarian, or war-torn homelands: “Has anyone ever told you about England? Because it’s so small, everyone has to be kind. They have to get on and make things work. There’re parks with slides, big swings. Beautiful, old schools…Teachers who love you. And anywhere you go, any time of day, you’re always welcome” (7) However, the last leg of the migrant route from Africa's poverty, tyranny, and
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war to the legendary promised land of the United Kingdom was painful.

Meanwhile, the production has one of those amazing sets that completely turns the theatre space into the world of the play while also vividly immersing the audience in the reality of the real-life migrant and refugee camp of the same name. The piece's method places the audience right in the middle of the action. With *The Jungle*, the ever-changing Brooklyn space has been drastically altered, and the venue has been completely converted into a spectacular design feat. St. Ann's Warehouse in Dumbo, Brooklyn, has been transformed into the Calais Jungle, a busy and colourful refugee camp on the French coast. It was the desolate migrant settlement in northern France, built on empty ground: “It was a bad place. It was wind and rain and cold and freezing and no electricity. It was not a proper place to live,” says Mohammed Sarrar, a Sudanese refugee.

St. Ann's has been turned into a to-scale reproduction of the enormous French infamous refugee camp of the same name in Calais by scenic set designer Miriam Buether. Buether takes the Afghan coffeehouse, which served as the heart of this multiethnic community, from Calais to Brooklyn. The seats have been removed, and the Afghan restaurant has been built in their place, with the white cliffs of Dover in the background. This is duplicated inside the theatre space, where the scenery functions as both a set and a seating and playing area.

The theater's ticket counter is housed in a dilapidated hut, and the bar has been relocated to a canvas and metal arena. The audience enters the theatre through a blue-sheeted tunnel, passing through a commissary with orange Coke and Marlboro cigarettes. Audiences sit on long wooden benches at modest tables on dirt floors with oil cloth-covered wooden tables, and walls and ceilings composed of tarps, cardboard, textiles, and miscellaneous objects. They savour steaming mugs of delicious chai tea poured from a big thermos, swept up in the nervous energy and dubious pleasures of
life in the now-demolished refugee camp. This is the Afghan Flag restaurant, where people of many nationalities come together to eat. The restaurant's tables and benches are depicted in the set's central section. As a result, the audience clusters rather than sits, as though around a campfire. There are 300 spectator spaces squeezed into fourteen different sitting zones. The action takes place all throughout the theatre, with the players frequently acting on elevated wooden pathways that weave across the crowd. The immersive set puts the audiences right in the middle of the action, allowing them to immerse themselves in a time-space where they do not just watch the play; they see, feel, smell, and dive right into it. Alison Jeffers comments, “The opportunity of a face-to-face encounter with a ‘real’ refugee created a strong dramatic move in a system where refugees are routinely incarcerated and where official strategies deliberately obscure the humanity of refugees” (152).

As a result, the audiences become more or less active, voluntary co-actors, and are urged to put themselves in the position of an "asylum seeker" and share their experiences and perceptions. Ran Xia comments, “While making sure that every audience member can observe and enter the action without hindering it in this tricky space, Daldry and Martin choreograph the space so meticulously that it’s become a living thing.”

Hans-Thies Lehmann in his book *Postdramatic Theatre* argues that if the distance between performers and spectators is reduced to the point where, “the physical and physiological proximity—breath, sweat, panting, muscle movement, cramp, and gaze, then, a space of a tense centripetal dynamic develops, in which theatre becomes a moment of shared energies instead of transmitted signs” (150). Lehmann goes on to say that blurring the boundaries between real and fictive experience has far-reaching implications for how we interpret the theatre space: it transforms from a metaphorical, symbolic space to a metonymic space. A scenic space is said to be metonymic if it is highlighted as a part and extension of the real theatre space rather than symbolically standing in for another fictive universe. (150)
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The Times of London gives the makeshift Afghan restaurant a four-star rating, praising Salar’s chicken liver for its "finesse." Customers are thus immersed in the story, within the migrant camp, rather than just being shown a dramatic depiction of this gigantic refugee camp that helped bring public attention to the plight of refugees. Salar, the nice restaurant manager, provides courteous caution to customers seated in dangerous seats that “the action might get ‘exciting,’ but we are careful and will keep you very safe.” (5)

Each area of the room is named after one of the nations that the refugees fled, just as the camp in Calais. During intermission, food is available for purchase just outside the restaurant, within a geodesic dome lined with images and signs that attempt to recreate the Jungle's atmosphere. One sign is entitled “Workshops Today,” next to little cardboard clocks with the various times: “Kung Fu with Yasin. Theatre with Knee-high. Music with Mohamed.” This was the very dome where Joe Murphy and Joe Robertson set up their Good Chance Theater at the camp. The only source of illumination is a flashlight that one of the characters shines on the other. Sound design adds to the immersion by shaking the chamber when tractor-trailers pass by on the neighbouring highway, as well as providing a constant industrial vibration as a background.

Although the refugees are filthy, fatigued, and depressed by their ill fates, which is often brought on by first-world countries, they are also educated, brave, strong, and creative people who make the best out of the worst situations.

“When does a place become a home?” the play asks. It starts to feel like one when you see the people celebrate every small blessing and happiness. A.A. Gill notes in the play's preface that everyone's urgent hope is that this is only a temporary halt. It was a brief, cold, and hard experience. However, despite the best intentions, the Jungle is beginning to become a place, “with churches and theatres and art and restaurants. It is germinating into that collective home. But then, isn’t this how all places once
began? With refugees stopping at a river, a beach, a crossroads, and saying, we’ll just pause here for a bit. Put on the kettle, kill a chicken.” (iii).

The authors attempted to describe the tale of how that society came to be, as well as the decisions that prompted people to want to build a peaceful organization. They emphasized how the people in that area dealt with major issues and obstacles. The tale of how that came to be and how it grew into a place with churches, mosques, restaurants, and cafés is fascinating. The authorities would then eventually destroy such society. Many of the stories that the dramatists experienced - many of the individuals, the experiences that were reflected into it - are revealed in the process. As a result, the Jungle has evolved into a type of United Nations for the nationless.

The drama follows Okot, a young Sudanese boy who is attempting to enter the United Kingdom, and Beth, a British volunteer who is determined to assist him. Their friendship is at the heart of the drama, as is their helplessness to aid due to the circumstances. The drama is driven by this bond, and the camp is built and destroyed around it.

Nonetheless, rather than focusing on the creation of a traditional plot, as with bureaucratic performances, the performance focuses on the characters. The characters wear red and white keffiyehs or knit skullcaps, t-shirts, or military surplus jackets. They are played by a cast of twenty actors, some of them were camp refugees and Good Chance Theater performers. “Through them we get a glimpse of what it was like in this sprawling temporary town, complete with restaurants, shops, schools, mosques and churches.” (Johnathan, Para. 4)

The audiences are introduced to eighteen characters, including refugees, camp residents, and a well-intentioned British volunteer team who joins the refugees and works tirelessly to better their living conditions. They do not grasp what is going on, despite their best efforts. For example, the audience meets Helene, the church's head, and the perennially intoxicated Boxer, who wears
odd hats and plays the banjo, as well as the forthright Paula, who is in charge of all the children. “Look at this place!” says Paula “Give people a chance, a hammer, some nails, build a city in a day!”; Beth, who runs the school, despite being only 18 years old and Sam, an Eton student with magnificent ideas to develop a housing complex for the camp. there is also Derek, who is idealistic and well-intentioned but ignorant. “Jerusalem was a place like this once,” says Derek. The presence of voluntary UK helpers elicits a wide range of reactions: first viewed as intruders, their contributions in home construction, childcare, and education are eventually appreciated. Alexandra Schwartz stresses, “Beth is one of a band of well-meaning English folk who show up in the Jungle to try to personally compensate for their government’s catastrophic indifference to the refugees’ plight. They give more of themselves in a few months than most people do in a lifetime, and it’s not nearly enough.”

The play starts at the very conclusion of the story. It is split into seven scenes, each with its own title. The first scene, "The Judgment," opens in a state of turmoil, ruin, and sorrow: the migrants are facing eviction by the French government. Inside the makeshift Afghan restaurant, the drama begins with an emergency meeting of the helpless inhabitants and volunteers: “It is late at night, freezing cold. The restaurant is restless and busy. More and more people congregate, meeting, embracing, exchanging” (1). Paula, the British volunteer who is devoted to defending the children, is taking down the names and contact information of the locals: “We are conducting a census. A record of every man, woman and child living in the Jungle today. Age. Country. Time you’ve been here. I need this from everyone…This is how we are going to fight. Legally. Peacefully” (2-3). It is middle of the winter where, “Everyone is dirty, exhausted, and wide-eyed on energy drinks, emotional, frightened, and cold. Deep, rattling coughs punctuates the noise of talk in many languages and multiple generators growling all around” (1). A new eviction notice has
been issued. Derek, the well-intentioned British, argues that it
gives the police the authority to clear the entire southern half of the
jungle. (1) Derek, the idealist, considers the eviction to be illegal
due to the large increase in the number of people found in the camp
in comparison to the few compensatory spaces provided upon
eviction. A whole community cannot be wiped out in that manner:
“DEREK. The census is complete! We have the results!
Translators? 5,497 people live in the Jungle. 3,455 in the eviction
zone. 445 of those are children. 305 unaccompanied. Now we
know who we are. This eviction is illegal” (4). However, because
the Jungle poses a major threat to public safety and morality, the
Judge grants legal permission to commence the eviction process.

The news of the death and funeral of a fifteen-year-old
Afghan kid adds to the melancholy. Salar's assistant, Norullah, gets
killed on a neighbouring highway. They are burying him in the
cemetery with Beth exclaiming, “How can they bury him in the
mud in Calais?” (5). Norullah's life has been built on hope and the
ability to imagine new possibilities. He used to call his mother in
Afghanistan once a week to tell her that he has arrived in London
and is staying with friends because he is too disgraced to tell her
the truth: “SALAR. His mother in Kabul. He phoned her every
week, told her he was in U.K. In London, with his friends. He was
in a house. A family had taken him in. He had made photographs
in front of Big Ben. He was starting at a school. He was learning
English” (7). He liked to brag to his mother about how happy he
was. Despite their best efforts to build a city together and turn a
wasteland into a home, the refugees were unable to transform an
illusion into a paradise. Hopelessness, misery, and terror have tied
their lives together.

The first scene ends with French police firing tear gas into
the restaurant, despite the fact that the Judge had stated that the
 eviction would be gentle. “Armed! And they are wearing body
armor. Now this dehumanizes them. They have tear gas. Now
when they shoot, you need to cover your faces. But don’t wear gas
masks because the police consider them to be weapons…It’s our
job to rehumanize the situation” (7). The eviction is dramatized in
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the play and is one of dramatist Joe Murphy's most poignant moments. He states, “It typifies a spirit common in The Jungle which is an acknowledgement that we are from all over the world but we are here together now so we might as well stand together.” Salar insists, “No. We resist. He stands on a table, raises a sign which reads: WE ARE SEARCHING FOR FREEDOM IN EUROPE BUT WE FIND NONE” (8). Like Salar, Beth refuses to move and reminds the officer who advises her to speak French because she is in France, that “This is not France” (8). The scene concludes with Safi stopping the officer from spraying pepper spray into Beth's eyes.

Safi Al-Hussain, a thirty-five-year-old former English literature student from Aleppo, Syria, is the one who brings the audience back to the beginning of the story in scene two, “The Birth”: “My name is Safi Al-Hussain, thirty-five years young. Former student of English literature and languages in my home town, Aleppo, so I know a little bit about telling stories” (9). Al-Hussein serves as a mediator among his irritable neighbors “Some will tell you living together is easy, but you mustn’t trust them,” he says (9). He also acts as an occasional narrator and a guide who finds in the camp “more hope than you’ve seen in all lifetimes.” As a result, he takes on the role of the piece's moral conscience. He says that the migrants who have made it to Calais have the right to apply for asylum in France, but none of them want to. Instead, they fantasize about the United Kingdom, which is only twenty-two miles over the English Channel but feels like a thousand because of the difficulty of getting there.

The play returns to the camp's early days in the second scene, tracing the site's growth over eighteen months to show how a multinational assemblage of refugees fleeing violence and other horrors in Syria, Afghanistan, Sudan, Eritrea, Palestinian territories, and Iran attempted to establish a system for living together and build their own place. The play depicts a diverse range of life within its surroundings in realistic detail. One can
witness how a diverse group of refugees transforms into a town of over 6,000 people who live in a constant state of optimism and despair.

MOHAMMED. There are tensions between our people. Before, we lived in separate places. Now, we must live together.
SALAR. So, we live apart.
MOHAMMED. There isn’t space to live apart.
SALAR. Look around. It’s already done. They divide the land.
ALI. This is Kurdistan.
YASIN. Here is Iraq.
OMID. This Iran.
HELENE. Eritrea.
SAFI. Syria.
SALAR. Sudan?
MOHAMMED. If this is going to work, you and I must stand together.
SALAR. We will, my friend. We will.
MOHAMMED. Sudan.
SALAR. And this is Afghanistan.
SAFI. We were forced from many places into one, and this place we called:
SALAR. Zhangal! (10)

For Foucault heterotopic sites are those sites in which all other sites within a culture “are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (Foucault and Miskowiec 24). Even though it would typically be impossible, numerous incompatible sites can be brought together in the heterotopic site: Foucault cites the “rectangle of the stage where one after the other, a whole series of places that are foreign to one another” can be simultaneously viewed (25). Heterotopic sites become sites of resistance, something which is achieved by “disrupting the flow of meaning, unsettling because they have the effect of making things appear out of place” (Foucault 25). There are many different people and traditions coexisting. Safi comments on the call to prayer saying, “This was five times a day at home. Now it is from mosques in Zhangal. It means, ‘Come to pray. Come to success.’ At home they were fighting. In Zhangal they were praying, Sunni and Shia together” (11). People in the jungle resolve to stop fighting and live
in peace: “SALAR. No more fighting. We are hated by enough people. We do not hate each other” (15).

The community is taking shape, with refugees and migrants from all cultures and wrecked nations attempting to construct a new home, or at the very least a temporary shelter. The Jungle appropriates space in order to construct a "heterotopia" as a resistance place. Over the course of two years, Salar's Afghan restaurant becomes the site of disputes among the camp's ethnic groups and nationalities, as a true community emerges in the Jungle. The restaurant is organized into ethnicities, so customers are seated in various countries, similar to The Jungle. This is a device used to highlight the ethnic divisions and tensions that arise in grimy conditions. Food, like music, brings people together without the need for an interpreter, and it acts as the centrepiece of all the stories. “SAFI. A restaurant. Mosques, churches, shops. And people from many countries for the first time living together in peace” (13).

Over the course of two and a half hours, the drama covers daily life at the camp, community meals, impassioned argument among the camp's leaders about how things should be run, Islamic prayers, and joyful interludes of music and dance. At various times, the characters are seen baking bread and playing instruments, dancing, fleeing, fighting, singing, grieving, and praying at various points. Despite the fact that each of the eighteen cast members has a unique role to play, they appear to be a large group. The play excels at depicting the conflict between world-building optimism and absolute desperation that lies beneath this contested, lost area of Calais.

Everyone tries to get to the United Kingdom. Camera phones are rolling from within the restaurant, and TV monitors are set throughout the venue. With the continuous footage of individuals travelling from country to country to Europe, different portions of the restaurant are seen from different perspectives. The
refugees attempt, fail, and try again as they jump trucks and climb fences.

Those forced to escape their homes owing to violence, war, persecution, famine, climate change, and genocide have at least three characteristics: resilience, hope, and the ability to imagine a better future. Safi illustrates, “Residents from many nationalities start to arrive at Salar’s restaurant. But more. More hope than you have seen in all lifetimes. More people of heart and song than you have ever heard. When you do not have enough of anything, you make from nothing” (15). Hope also becomes tangible: “Great is the hope that makes man cross borders. Greater is the hope that keeps us alive” (15). Despite its numerous challenges and ethnic diversity, the Calais Jungle has developed into a cohesive and dynamic community.

However, in spite of the fact that the play deals with serious issues, it does not lack comedy, tenderness, or hope, which is bolstered by the musical aspects. The show focuses on the happiness that some people had in this environment that had become their home. Ran Xia argues, “When you hear the sound of a guitar that’s crossed deserts and oceans, surviving everything alongside its owner, you learn that music survives, sustains, and is a universal language of inclusion. Storytelling without words becomes a necessity when you have nothing, not even language.”

Nevertheless, the unpleasant reality of the refugees' lives, on the other hand, interrupts such temporal liveliness; the present is simply a brief respite from their dreadful pasts: “Zhanghal is unclean…Sometimes good chance, sometimes no chance. Yes, little food, water, space, tents, clothes. Yes, you see children play in European mud” (15). The statement made by Syrian refugee Safi throughout The Jungle that the European powers that colonized most of the world share culpability for the refugees' plight is easy to grasp. The second scene concludes with Beth entering the room, carrying her phone, which displays a photograph of a small kid named Alan Kurdi who was discovered dead on the beach.
Beth shows the photo of the boy washed up on the shore in the third scene, titled The Arrival. Paula, the British volunteer who bears care for all of the youngsters, has brought a thousand tents for the new arrivals to the Jungle refugee and migrant camp. Safi comments, “We spend months trying to get to UK. And in September, UK came here” (17). This camp, Paula declares, no longer belongs to France; it is a city where people collaborate and community elders meet to address issues. Derek outlines the Jungle's Law saying, “Now this is the Law of the Jungle, and the Law runneth forward and back, the strength of the Pack is the Wolf, and the strength of the Wolf is the Pack” (18). Derek is confronted with his own sense of civic responsibility: “On behalf of my country, I am so sorry…It’s a shame on us” (18). When another British volunteer, Boxer, explains that he is fleeing his ex-authoritarian wife's regime, Derek surprises the audience by saying that he is not running away from anything; rather, he is running towards something: “Community.” He illustrates, “I’ve found things here that have disappeared in Britain…our country has changed. People don’t talk to each other” (22). Following that, each refugee begins to describe what he or she is fleeing. According to Safi, the cause is Syria's civil war.

Music brings people together without the need of a translator, and when everyone is an outcast, no one is: “The volunteers are alone in the centre, the residents looking at them. There is a strange, brief moment: ‘us’ and ‘them’. Norullah breaks it by pulling Beth into a dance, which sparks off the whole restaurant” (23). The scene concludes with Salar, the restaurant manager, escorting the British out of his establishment and deciding to ask them to leave permanently on the grounds that they are not religious. The others, on the other hand, refuse and insist that the people of the Jungle require them: “This is a good chance for us. A lady wants to build a library. There are plans for a children’s centre. Real wooden houses- there may be a theatre for entertainment…All of these things are important” (24).
eventually vote on whether or not to accept the British man's assistance. They ultimately choose to keep them solely for support and not to make decisions with them. Safi comments, “First they stayed one night. Then they stayed two nights. Then they moved in…” (25).

Scene four, The Gold Rush, considers how The Jungle aims to give a face to the faceless and a voice to the voiceless. It makes spaces and places for people's voices to be heard. The theatre is used by dramatists as a place for reflection and expression. Derek opens the first full meeting of the Jungle, welcoming the first democratic meeting in the Jungle's history. He exclaims, “I am Derek, I have come from the UK to stand in solidarity with you. Safi and I will chair these meetings. They are a safe space where all voices can be heard. We have organized translators for all languages of the camp. I only ask that we are respectful towards one another” (26). The meeting begins with a suggestion to change the name of their new home; they believe the name "Jungle" is inappropriate because the jungle is for animals, not humans. Derek notes, “Yes, it’s a town. A thriving, bubbling town. A town of hope. So, I want to propose we change it. A new name!” (26). It has become their temporal home. Salar praises the British saying, “Thank you to British man for coming here. Already you have been great help. Now is like gold rush in the Jungle! I know it can be difficult to treat all nationalities equally. But I know you will find ways of being fair. And of maintaining peace in the Jungle. Thank you, British man!” (26).

On the agenda are various issues such as education, housing, distribution, drinking water, and sanitation. The refugees are then confronted with their desperate attempts to flee to England. Essentially, the prospect of crossing the short distance between France and the United Kingdom has drawn thousands of homeless people to Calais—men, women, and children eager to start new lives far from their impoverished, oppressive, or war-torn home countries. Together, Norullah, Omar, Yasin, Maz, and Helene explain, “We climb up top to lorry roof, then cut the canvas…Have knife…Then climb to hole…then take the strings from shoes for tie
up hole…To stop the light come in when police have search! Then we hide in the box! Box furthest from the door” (27). They try five times each time. When discovered, the police say, “Go back to Jungle, no chance” (30). Derek then discusses housing distribution with Sam, another British volunteer. Sam illustrates, “This is my methodology for distributing houses. I have considered many factors, of which nationality is only one. I’ve done a very basic count of the areas, by tents. This is the map I’ve made. I’m estimating the Sudanese are the largest population” (33). Salar maintains that Afghanistan has the largest population. Sam then goes on, “We will distribute in proportion. So, if I can build one hundred houses a day, let’s say, I’ll start by building twenty in Afghanistan and twenty in Sudan. Ten each in Syria, Eritrea, Iraq, Iran, Kurdistan. And the remaining ten for the smaller nationalities” (34). The second consideration is need. Sam explains that this falls under five sub-categories: “Gender, age, illness or disability, time spent in the Jungle and the condition of your current dwelling. So, a woman with children will generally be housed before a single man, but a single man who has been here for five months, who has scabies, whose tent is flooded, may get a house before a single woman” (34).

Several of the refugees in the camp are followed in the story. Some of the residents share their own stories, which include tales of extraordinary human suffering and resilience. Safi elucidates, “People meet and laugh and eat together. Share stories of great journeys, with excitement like I have never heard” (11). One of the most moving stories is that of Okot, a seventeen-year-old refugee who made the perilous journey from Darfur, Sudan. He makes his first appearance in the fourth scene. He describes how he was smuggled to Europe on an overcrowded boat. His eyes light up with remembered happiness when he describes a sunrise in his native Darfur. He declares, “A refugee dies many times.”

Okot spends the first half of the performance in relative silence before describing his nightly attempts to cross the Channel
in horrifying detail and piercing voice. He gets into conflicts with Norullah, usually about food, and cannot wait to get out of the Jungle: “I have one dream only. To stand on white cliffs of Dover” (32). Okot and Safi are left to compete for a place in a smuggler's lorry, where possessing an onion to fend off guard dogs is the only way to survive.

Safi begins scene five, The Test, by posing a critical question: “When does a place become home?” (38). By November, the Jungle had grown into a city. Safi argues, “I could walk from Sudan through Palestine and Syria, pop into a Pakistani café on Oxford Street near Egypt, buy new shoes from the marketplace...stop at the sauna, catch a play in the theatre, mass at the church, khutba in a mosque, before arriving at Salar’s restaurant in Afghanistan” (38). Salar's restaurant receives a four-star rating from the Times of London.

Safi and Beth discover that Okot has been arrested and beaten nearly unconscious. Beth tirades and threatens the French guard into releasing Okot: “He’s a seventeen-year-old boy...This is not France! You’ve forced him to sign documents! He doesn’t speak French! He should have a translator, that’s the law...No translator, forced to sign, seventeen years old, cuts, bruises all over his body. Where did he get those?” (41). “Go! And if I see him again, you won’t.” (41) Once safe, Okot removes his shirt to display his tense, scarred, traumatized body, which bears witness to the terrors he has witnessed on his journey to Europe: “Okot takes his top off. He has scars, old and new, all over his body.” (42) Alison Jeffers comments, “The need for evidence of the corporeal wounds of ‘conventional refugees’ shows how important it can be for the figure of the refugee to be a heroic survivor in order to gain the sympathy of the audiences. Wounded asylum seekers become a symbol for human suffering...” (56). The mutilation of Okot’s body alludes to J. Kristeva’s notions about the dismal body: the body as the site of decay, “the cadaver at the border of the condition of living” (Kristeva 3).
Okot enjoys singing to his phone's ringtone, “(There'll be Bluebirds Over) The White Cliffs of Dover.” One also learns about the day Okot had to stop being a boy, leave his mother, and leave Darfur. (“the most beautiful place in world”). When Beth begs to hear his story, Okot asks Safi with disbelief, “You think she could understand?” (42). She cannot, and neither can the audiences. Though he is referring specifically to Beth, the question encompasses the audiences, too. Okot talks about what life was like in Darfur and the horrors of the genocide.

To “speak one’s past is always an invitation to others to think and possibly speak of their own,” suggests H. Rosen (17). When Okot tells the agonizing tale of his escape, a journey involving torture, extortion, depravity, and death, the other refugees – Safi, Salar, Ali, Norullah, Hussein, Mohammed, Mahlet, Maz, Hamid, Omid, and Felah – add a line here and there, telling Okot’s story alongside him, as if it were their own. “How did you survive?” Beth asks, shaken. “We didn’t,” says Helene, responding in their behalf. “But you're here now,” Beth continues. “This is not us,” says Okot. “We’re different now. New, says Safi. “What can we give you?” Asks Safi. “Before, I could give you anything. I could give you myself,” Okot replies. When Helene asks him, “What do we have now?” He says, “This journey. This story” (46). Okot’s hope, like steam rattling a pot lid, finds a way to surface. While the refugees are still alive, they are no longer the individuals who initiated the journey. They claim that even though they consider themselves dead, they have something to offer. After all, the play does not sugarcoat the tragedies that each character has faced; its firm inclusiveness indicates that these refugees' individual, painful narratives are blurred into a single cry of pain. Meanwhile, by being forced to confront the storyteller, the audience is forced to confront their own sense of responsibility as citizens.

During the play, the TV monitors in the four corners of the restaurant, which were showing a Bollywood movie with the sound
turned off, are used to show alarmed news reports about the Jungle and the recent terrorist attacks in France, in which terrorists murdered 130 people in Paris, in restaurants, a stadium, and a theatre that were mistakenly linked to the Jungle. A Sudanese man fell asleep with a lit candle in his wooden house in the jungle at the same time. It engulfed half of Sudan in flames. The two incidents were said to be connected. It was also reported that a Syrian passport was discovered alongside the body of one of the attackers. Safi comments, “It was fake. But does it matter? In that moment, the refugee, terror, the Jungle and me, were bound together…The night of 13th November changed everything again. The horror I escaped had found me” (47). This helps describe why the French are fearful of the newcomers in their midst. Though Safi is writing an open letter on behalf of all Jungle residents condemning the attacks, none of this will be enough to stop the tightening of laws across Europe and the anti-refugee sentiment that is becoming more entrenched. The resulting mistrust and suspicion have caused a crisis.

Every day is a battle for survival, and hopelessness is palpable. True understanding is realized between people whose fates are linked by hopelessness. Nonetheless, Okot persuades Norullah to lay down his gun: “If you are crying you still have hope.” Derek, the British volunteer insists, “Rest, everyone. Stay strong. Don’t lose hope” (48). Salar asks Norullah not to go to school anymore at the end of the scene: “You do not go to the school any more…Don’t get involved. You heard me. You don’t go to the school anymore” (49). Safi is left alone, stunned, and spat out.

Scene six, The Rain, features some heated debates. It demonstrates how the play, like Salar's restaurant, emphasizes universality over difference and foreignness by bringing different cultures to the same table. As refugees are not permitted to enter Carrefour, Norullah offers Okot food from the trash. They've become friends, and they talk about the fire that left Okot homeless. Norullah suggests that Okot stay in his tent with him. While Salar, Sam, Safi, and Derek are discussing the construction
of new numbered houses for Sudanese and Salar is advocating for more rights for Afghans. Helene, the Eritrean, announces that she has sought asylum in France: “You won’t be trying anymore. No more trains or lorries. No more smugglers,” Paula comments (55).

Sam and Beth then discuss their respective roles in the Jungle, with Sam building houses and Beth running the school. Okot is now homeless, and Beth, as a British citizen, believes that the government has a role to play: “Maybe the government would be forced to act… We’re part of the problem” (50). Beth has a strong bond with Okot. When Sam advises her to go home for a break, she replies, “I don’t need to go home! Okot can’t go home!” (50). Nevertheless, Sam insists that there is nothing Beth can do to help solve the refugees’ problem; it is beyond the capacity of individuals; governments must intervene. He argues, “What do you do? Open the border? Let everyone through! The Jungle disappears and Okot’s safe. But next week another ten thousand people arrive in Calais expecting to get across…You have to house and clothe and feed. Where do you house them? Who pays? It’s expensive” (50-51). This will not solve the problem. Sam continues, “There’ll be uproar. And crucially, they don’t want to be housed! They want to get to Britain! There are sixty-five million refugees in the world! So, come on! What do we do?” (51)

Indeed, the recreation of a migrant camp in France provided a timely but surprisingly distancing look at border politics. Between the exhilarating scenes of fevered dancing, singing, and drumming, between the desperate factional disagreements, tense struggles, and heartbreaking stories, the audience feels uneasy about the fact that this entire spectacle was created by two white writers and two white directors. It is a show that focuses on the British people's clumsy attempts to make sense of a crisis caused, at least in part, by their own government.

The Jungle delivers inexorably harsh truths. It is real and passionate. While the play provides a powerful depiction of lived experience, it also leaves one wondering how the world should
respond to what is perceived to be a migration catastrophe. The play broadens one's horizons while also appealing to one's emotions. It magnifies the voices that the world's dark forces strive to silence. Beth expresses her disappointment saying, “What sorry state have we got into if we can’t honestly express our horror at what is happening? That you can’t cry at the picture of a boy, dead on a beach, without some fucker telling you you’re lying” (57). The horrifying photo of Alan Kurdi, the 3-year-old Syrian boy whose drowned body washed up on a Turkish shore, altered everything.

The play exemplifies what theatre can do when it is at its best in terms of exposing spectators to a world they may otherwise overlook. Anyone capable of even a smidgeon of human decency could not help but be impacted by the human face of this passionate and highly immersive play, regardless of their opinions on politics and fences. The piece tackles a number of topics and strikes a striking chord in the current political climate, putting a human face on the global dilemma of displaced peoples and the global migrant crisis. Beth yells, “But now I hear you, Paula, tell me there’s a law that might have saved him, but that the law isn’t being used even though it’s been agreed by everyone. Not just one law. Loads of laws. Still, he had to get on a boat that sank and killed him. Along with a lot of other people” (57).

*The Jungle* brings viewers into the lives of some of the faceless souls whose futures are all too often preyed upon by a politician's worst tendencies. The refugees depicted in *The Jungle* are not statistics, but individuals whose strengths and flaws are portrayed in their all-too-human dimensions, allowing spectators to use their imaginations and connect with a subject prone to sloganeering. Refugees, like everyone else, have unique histories, goals, families, and the right to protection. Beth makes a sarcastic remark: “I remember being awestruck by this incredible place with all the laws we’ve ever made…It’s all one big virtue signal. ‘Look at us. Look at how much we care. These people have human rights! They do exist!’ Until they’re standing at our door, screaming for help” (57). Nobody responds when things reach this point, “The
The singing of carols and 'Jerusalem' is one of the overemotional deliberate methods used to induce British audiences to react in a certain way. It is Christmas, and the Eritrean Women's Choir is singing 'Oh Come, All Ye Faithful' loudly off stage in the church. Christmas brings up painful memories of loved ones who are far away from the refugees. Boxer asks, "How many of you are away from your bairns and all? Your mums and dads? Your brothers and sisters? Bet that makes lot of us" (60). All of the refugees in the Jungle have expressed a desire to leave. They want to get to the United Kingdom. It's their only hope, or possibly illusion. Norullah has been lying to his mother about the truth of his predicament for months. He has been lying the entire time, claiming to be safe and sound in London: "But she just go crazy if she know I am in Jungle. Yes, my mother! I am so safe! I say I am with my friend, best friend, UK friend! She is saying, you eat food, you warm, you live house – Mothers going crazy for us, I think! I am in school! I am in house! I am in family! I am in new life, Mother!" (62).

Beth meets Ali, the smuggler, to help Okot go to the UK. Ali comments, "Why him? There are many boys in the Jungle. This doesn’t happen, a British volunteer coming to me. For a friend of Safi’s… €1,000" (64). The scene concludes with Okot and Norullah deciding to board a lorry bound for the United Kingdom without waiting for Beth's assistance. Norullah is apprehensive, but Okot encourages him: "I’ve done this before. I know it can work… Listen to me, Norullah. You don’t want to be left on your own here, OK? You need to get out of Jungle… You have to help yourself!" (67).

The Great Move is the title of the final scene, scene seven. The play begins and ends with a scene depicting the camp's destruction by French police using tear gas and bulldozers in
February 2016. The action begins with a crisis meeting at Salar's restaurant. “‘The regular incursions of migrants on to the road is posing a threat to public safety.’ We need translators,” says Derek (68). Regrettably, all refugees appear to pose a threat to national security and integrity. The most vehement internal disagreement is about whether to accept a French relocation offer or battle to retain the present, self-made society. The French begin to draw lines around the camp, allowing refugees to sleep, eat, and build their homes in certain areas but not in others. The notification authorizes police to clear a hundred-meter strip of ground surrounding the Jungle's full perimeter. It's a three-day partial relocation that needs to be completed: “Relocate them before the police do it,” warns Henri (68). Salar’s restaurant is included: “My restaurant! They destroy my restaurant!” (68). “I have been moved, and moved, and moved, and moved,” he murmurs, almost like an incantation. “I can’t be moved again…I will not move” (71).

Refugees are fed up with being relocated and are planning to fight back. Henri assures Sam that there will be no more evictions. As a result, Sudan, Eritrea, Iraq, and Iran have decided to relocate. Nonetheless, the Afghan people, as well as Kurdistan, choose to resist. Derek argues in their favour, saying: “They have every right to resist the destruction of their home…Their home, Sam! Not houses! This is bigger than houses, bigger than the Jungle. I’m sorry to say it, but you don’t understand that, and you don’t know what it means to resist” (70).

All they have is the Jungle. The Jungle has evolved into a borderland where individual and nation, past history and current circumstances, oppression and freedom collide, and despite their flaws, they continue to serve as gathering places where people can heal and develop: “These people are the strangers of the world. Bombed, abused, humiliated,” Derek exemplifies (70). Salar sees the restaurant as a symbol of everything. He explains, “I built this restaurant with my hands. Every piece of wood, everything you see, I found. It has been a roof over our heads through rain, wind and fire. It has been our safety and refuge. It is our home. It is our heart. I will not move” (72). Alison Jeffers clarifies, “Having left
home under duress to arrive in the not-home, this move creates a not-not at home status by which asylum seekers are forced to remain in the place that they cannot leave but which is nonetheless ‘unliveable’” (64). Such an odd space beyond the home, "the unliveable" zone, within which forlorn refugee bodies exist, becomes a kind of nowhere, neither home nor not home, perhaps beyond home.

Mohamed tries to persuade Salar to change his mind: “Look at me. We promised to stand together. Your restaurant is not this land or this wood. It is us. You are my friend, and I love you. We must stand together now” (72). Sam vows to influence the authorities to safeguard the restaurant in exchange for Salar's assistance with house relocation: “The restaurant, the Afghan Flag. You have to promise me it won’t be touched. It’s the only way I can persuade them to move,” Sam asks Henri (72). Though Okot tries to give Norullah hope, “We’ll be in UK soon,” (73). Norullah speaks of his imminent death, “Fucking UK! No chance! They hate us. We’re going to die here” (73).

Following the eviction notice, the community relocates 800 houses in three days. When Salar refuses to relocate his restaurant, the entire community gathers in front of the bulldozer in solidarity:

Safi. This restaurant. Where we are sat. It was really many restaurants. Cafés, shops, places. Each of them a Jungle...It is a story of great hope because it has to be. This restaurant...is Afghanistan. And the people inside it, us, from Sudan, Eritrea, Syria, Iran, Iraq, Somalia, Britain, Germany, American, and some from France, yes, held hands to defend it. They believed in it. Great is the hope that makes man cross borders. Great is the hope that keeps us alive. (75)

They become unbeatable. It is the point at which the disparate merge and become similar. Ran Xia notifies, “so here we are, in a sort of home to some 3000 people, bearing witness to a
tragedy that’s far from us but also happening along our borders, along lots of borders in this world.”

Beth gives the smuggler, Ali, the money he needs to transport Okot to the UK, but Okot refuses to leave without Norullah. Beth promises to find him: “First thing you do when you arrive is find a police station. Tell them your story, exactly what you told me. Tell them you’re a child. Tell them you want to claim asylum… You’re going to start a new life, Okot. All of this will be finished. It won’t be you…Everything is new now. This is the hope” (75). Because there is only one onion to distract the dogs, only Safi boards the lorry while Okot waits. Safi tells the story of his journey, saying, “For eighteen hours I stayed quiet, with my onion, hardly breathing. Then the doors opened. I will never forget the face of the man who opened the box. ‘Quickly, mate. You’re in England.’ I came to a place called Maidstone and found a police station. My name is Safi Al-Hussain. I have fled Syria. I would like to claim asylum in UK” (76).

Though Safi has made it to the UK, and the restaurant is reopening, “the Southern half of the camp was evicted four weeks later In October, the north. And the Jungle was gone. Now, fields of yellow rape, six feet high, grow in the sand where the Jungle once was…Where the church stood. Mosques. A restaurant. Thank you for your hospitality” (77).

Today, roughly a thousand refugees are still residing in Calais. Any construction is prohibited by the police, any indication that things might start to grow again. Volunteers divide their little possessions. Their vehicles provide meals in parking lots, on highways, and wherever else they can. Beth meets a freshly arrived Sudanese boy whom she goes to the woods to meet at the end of the play: “It’s good to meet you, Al-Sadig. My name is Beth…It’s very dangerous for you to be here. The police are all around this area, and they’re not as friendly as they used to be…I think there are some nice Sudanese men in the woods nearby. I can take you to them” (77). She gives him lots of donations to carry, and they walk away together.
People crossing borders in pursuit of safety and a better life are posing complex problems about national identity, social cohesiveness, fairness, safety, morality, and the rule of law. Since the late 1980s, the growing number of refugees, or international homeless people, arriving in Western countries has been met with anxiety, and the migrants have been regarded with animosity, prejudice, and even violence.

The refugee theater was created by citizens of the countries where refugees have applied for asylum, as well as refugees and asylum seekers themselves, but all of these efforts are carried out in a context of fear, suspicion and mistrust on all sides.

Bureaucratic performance in the West necessitates the right kind of refugee story, one that smooths out complications to create a simple linear narrative of individual crisis and flight. Stories about refugees being treated harshly after arriving in a safe country can take precedence over narratives about a mostly trouble-free arrival. Unjust treatment, a lack of justice, and racist experiences are frequently prioritized over stories of immigrant resilience and resourcefulness. As a result, narratives in Western theatre frequently require refugees to be portrayed as victims of a deserving cause, worthy of sympathy, assistance, and a new life.

Art and politics, according to Joe Murphy and Joe Robertson, on the other hand, are inextricably linked. They see theatre as a hidden weapon capable of starting a conversation that leads to the formation of new social bonds. They believed that theatre could aid in the creation of safe spaces for what they perceived to be dangerous conversations. The two playwrights were adamant about telling the truth about their experiences. Everything that occurred in The Jungle seemed significant to them. There, they discovered the fundamental framework of a society. It was a watershed moment in history. They saw the Jungle as a miniature map of the world, with people of twenty-five different nationalities and a variety of languages spoken.
The production featured one of those incredible sets that entirely transformed the theatre area into the world of the play while simultaneously vividly immersing the audience in the realities of the same-named migrant and refugee camp. The strategy used in the piece put the audience in the middle of the action. Set in the vast refugee camp in Calais, France established in 2015, The Jungle was a borderland that addressed the realities of the individuals who lived there, fleeing injustice in their homelands. It submerged the audience in the bustling heart of a displaced people's colony, complete with improvised stores, residences, and churches, where they established a sense of community.

The easiest way to think of a border is as a line that separates two different territories. Borders could be seen as frontiers, limits, and boundaries. However, the border does not have to be a line or a barrier: it can also be a zone and a place of crossing. Symbolic borders are the invisible lines that divide or do not divide distinct communities and identities. Similarly, space is an amorphous concept with no concrete meaning. Place, on the other hand, refers to how people are aware of or attracted to a specific area of space. A location can be defined as a meaningful space. Location, physical space, and physical geography are all examples of space. A space's significance, personality, and link to a cultural or personal identity are all determined by its location. It is the culturally assigned significance to a location. Places are spaces that people have given meaning to or to which they are emotionally attached in some way. It's all that exists in the space between our two locations.

The Afghan Café, set up by Salar, served as a meeting place and as a border space for these citizens of many and no nations, with benches bordering a network of runways, making theatregoers feel like part of the customers of the improvised Afghan restaurant, joining the residents over freshly baked naan and sweet milky chai. People from various countries gathered at the Good Chance Theatre to express themselves, reflect on their circumstances, share knowledge and tales, mourn and celebrate, and find a safe place to
escape or confront their situations. As a result, both the Jungle and Good Chance become a borderland where individual and nation, past history and current circumstance, oppression and freedom collide, and they operate as sites where people meet and experience healing and change, however flawed they may be. As a result, they acted as a narrative space, the tale world's space that included the physical environment in which the narrative's characters lived and moved.

The Jungle told tales of loss, fear, community, and hope, as well as the formation and demise of the Calais camp, aiming at increasing empathy by allowing audience members to experience aspects of migrants' lives firsthand. Its goal was to get closer to refugees, or at least to the refugee experience, in order to improve understanding, which could lead to more empathy or political action.

The Jungle aspired to give a face to the faceless and a voice to the voiceless by developing spaces and places where voices can be heard. The play explored how borders could move beyond binaries and create a new space – a third space – by using theatre as a space for reflection and expression. It discussed the border and the change between visibility and invisibility, as well as how borders could move beyond binaries and create a new space – a third space.

Border turmoil would disappear if families no longer felt obliged to flee their homelands, and countries could stop erecting barbwire-topped fences and cramming desperate individuals into camps. “When does a place become home?” The question is still open. It is when a person fleeing his or her home is treated with decency and respect, and when leaders teach citizens to master their concerns, comprehend all aspects of the situation, and acknowledge how much societies have benefited from the contributions of immigrants and refugees in the past.
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