Maps of violence, maps of hope:

Using place and maps to explore identity, gender, and violence

By Mark Trudinger[1]

Mark can be contacted at PO Box 393,
Grafton, NSW, 2460, Australia.

What might be some of the possibilities of exploring the relationship of 'place' to identity in the lives of the people with whom we work? This article explores some ideas that might inform this work, and details one practice-based example: working with young men on issues of gender and violence. Part 1 explores the relative invisibility of 'place' in narrative therapy and its source texts, as well as in the broader histories of thought in western culture, before looking at some possible sources of inspiration and thinking about how we might be able to explore place more fully in narrative practice. Part 2 examines the social construction of maps and their relation to identity, looks at how mapping has been used to support new directions in the lives of individuals and communities, and wonders how maps might be taken up as therapeutic documents in narrative therapy. Part 3 is an outline of a workshop the author has run with young men based on the preceding ideas, which examines the perpetration and resistance to violence in local places, and in the young men's negotiation of those places.

Keywords: place, identity, maps, gender, violence, narrative practice

PART ONE: THE PLACE OF PLACE IN NARRATIVE THERAPY

What is the place of place in narrative therapy? Most writings about narrative therapy define the stories, or narratives, which are constitutive of people's lives as 'the linking together of experiences of events in sequences which unfold through time, according to themes or plots' (for example, Morgan 2000, White 2000a). These definitions don't usually mention *place*.

'Place' is not usually included in the broader explorations of the thinking that informs narrative therapy, and doesn't often feature in practitioners' accounts of their work. The most common occurrences of place are brief questions to locate events ('where did this happen?'), but this 'where' is then not usually explored further[2].

There are some important exceptions to this. For instance, the New Zealand-based Just Therapy Team's descriptions of 'belonging' and 'identity' as being shaped by people, culture, and relationships to land (Waldegrave et al 2004), and the writings of Indigenous Australian Jane Lester (2001), have invited the field to consider how identities are linked to land. And some narrative practitioners have thoroughly engaged with the landscape in which their work takes place, such as Aileen Cheshire and Dorothea Lewis in their work with young people on adventure-based treks (Cheshire & Lewis 1998)[3]. Generally though, such explorations of place are uncommon.

In contrast, metaphors related to place are often used in narrative practice. These include conversations being 'transportive', and metaphors of 'opening space', journeys, reclaiming 'territories' of life, the 'location' of problems, and so on. Spatial metaphors also inform some of the ideas about narrative practice and training, such as 'maps' or 'micro-maps' of practice. But the relationship of place *itself* to identity is not often explored. The 'territories of life' are usually metaphorical, not literal; we have re-engagements with history, but not re-engagements with *place*.

While not offering this brief overview as a critique of narrative practice, I am surprised that place has not featured more in this work. Given that 'the living of lives takes place in places', I'm excited by the possibilities available in explorations of ideas about place. Let's first consider how notions of place are engaged with in some of the texts that have been influential in the development of narrative practice.

NARRATIVE 'SOURCE' TEXTS ON PLACE

In the realm of narrative theory, Jerome Bruner, mentions 'place' and 'settings' in narrative thought (1986), but does not explore this in detail. Setting, place, or space do not feature in his discussions of the 'nine universals of narrative realities' described in one of his most systematic articulations of the narrative metaphor (1996).

In cultural anthropology, Barbara Myerhoff's writing about an elderly Jewish community (1986) specifically mentions the space of their community centre, and the nearby boardwalk, but doesn't explore space as such. However, one of her accounts provides some useful 'jumping-off' points for further exploration: 'These people inscribed their self-interpretations on the spaces and surfaces they touched – walls, neighborhoods, media ...' (p.266). This suggests that:

- People don't merely 'inhabit' space, but *inscribe* themselves on it.
- These inscriptions themselves, as 'self-interpretations', are interpretive, performative, and reflexive.
- The engagement with space can be seen as the 'physical' (walls), through 'spatial and cultural' (neighbourhoods), to the more 'mobile' and less place-bound aspects of culture (media).
- This inscription in and on space demands an audience.

TIME IN NARRATIVE THERAPY

As mentioned earlier, concepts of time are emphasised within narrative therapy. This is for several important reasons, as Michael White describes:

> *One of the things that drew our attention to the narrative or story metaphor was the way in which it enabled the dimensions of time and sequence to be elevated and attributed greater significance in our understandings and in our work. The narrative metaphor*

takes in what is often referred to as the temporal dimension. It encourages a focus on the ways in which the events of people's lives are routinely coded into time, on the ways in which events are read into unfolding accounts of life … People are pretty specific about how these events of their lives are linked to each other in sequence. They are also very specific about time. (White 2001, p.134)

Focusing on time is essential for perceiving changes and differences that occur in people's lives. In this way, the narrative metaphor has benefits not found in other metaphors such as maps, paradigms, structures, and restraints (V. Bruner 1986, p.153; White & Epston 1990, pp.2-3).

Considerations of time also provide a way to stand aside from foundationalist and scientific modes of thought, which has implications for practice and ethics:

As the logico-scientific mode of thought concerns itself with the derivation of general laws of nature and the construction of a world of universal facts deemed to be true for all times and in all places, the temporal dimension is excluded. Not only does the temporal dimension have no bearing on the interpretation of events in this world, but these interpretations must be beyond the effects of time; they must 'stand the test of time' and demonstrate invariance in order to qualify as worthy or be considered to be 'true'. In contrast to this, temporality is a critical dimension in the narrative mode of thought … (White & Epston 1990, p.81)

In suggesting that ideas of place could be brought more into narrative practice, I don't propose to displace time with place, or even to see them 'on a par'. People often locate the events of their lives more in the temporal dimension than the spatial. The following section, however, briefly explores how time has been privileged in relatively recent western thought, sometimes to the active disqualification of the concept of space. This will provide some context for how time and space have been considered in relation to each other, and the implications this may have in relation to how ideas of space can be more fully taken up in narrative practice.

TIME AND PLACE IN WESTERN THOUGHT

Time has often been privileged in the history of western thought[4]. As Michel Foucault described: 'A critique could be carried out of this devaluation that has prevailed for generations … Space was treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time, on the contrary, was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic.' (1980b, p.70)[5] When used as metaphors, this privileging of time over space can have real implications for considerations of power:

Metaphorising the transformations of discourse in a vocabulary of time necessarily leads to the utilization of the model of individual consciousness with its intrinsic temporality. Endeavouring on the other hand to decipher discourse through the use of spatial, strategic metaphors enables one to grasp precisely the points at which discourses are transformed in, through, and on the basis of relations of power. (Foucault, 1980b, pp.69-70)

In the context of Foucault's use of spatial metaphors, narrative therapy can be considered to have adopted a 'both/and', rather than an either/or approach, often weaving explorations of the '*literal*' time of events in people's lives and spatial *metaphors*, to be able to examine identity in the context of relations of power. However, this still leaves us with the question of the relationship of people's lives to space 'in the world', rather than 'just' as metaphor.

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF SPACE AND IDENTITY

Foucault saw considerations of space as critical to understandings of people's lives:

I think it is somewhat arbitrary to try to dissociate the effective practice of freedom by people, the practice of social relations, and the spatial distributions in which they find themselves. If they are separated, they become impossible to understand. Each can only be understood through the other. (1984, p.246)

This spatiality was not just that of metaphor, but of physical space, especially in the context of power:

'Space is fundamental in any form of communal life; space is fundamental in any exercise of power' (Foucault 1984, p.252), with space being a central issue in his discussions of the 'technologies of power'[6].

The importance of space and identity can become more apparent when we consider that space is 'ubiquitous'. Life is always being lived some*where*, and these 'somewheres' have implicit and explicit histories and politics:

> *A whole 'history of spaces' could be written, that would be at the same time a 'history of the powers' (both these terms in the plural), from the great strategies of geopolitics to the little tactics of housing, institutional architecture, from the classroom to the hospital organization, by way of all the political and economic implantations. It is surprising how long it took for the problem of spaces to be viewed as an historical and political problem. For a long time space was either referred to 'nature' – to what was given, the first determining factor – or to 'physical geography'; it was referred to as a kind of 'prehistoric' stratum. Or it was conceived as the residential site or the field of expansion of a people, a culture, a language or a State. In short, space was analyzed either as the ground on which people lived or the area in which they existed; all that mattered were foundations and frontiers … we must cease to think that space merely predetermines a particular history which in turn reorganizes it through its own sedimentation. Spatial arrangements are also political and economic forms to be studied in detail.* (Foucault 1996, p.228)

As Paul Rabinow writes (2003) in a summary of Foucault's ideas about space, the idea was not to create a theory of space, but a way of considering the 'question' of space in relation to history and people's lives:

> *Just as Foucault was not and is not attempting to construct a general theory of power, he is not, I think, trying to construct a general theory of space which has somehow been suppressed from the corpus of philosophy. In both instances, he is, I think, looking to develop what he calls an analytics. That is to say, to isolate a group of historical characteristics which permit us to see how in a particular situation these components have provided a grid of intelligibility which enabled those engaged in action to proceed in a way that seemed intelligible to them; to make sense of how these practices and intentions have gone beyond the conscious intentions of the historical actors, but nonetheless still have a signification … and finally to engage us today to pick out these historically given but alterable elements which have made us what we are, without positing any laws of history or of consciousness, an inherent logic, a determinism, an essentiality, or a conscious design of those combinations.*
> (p.355)[7]

These sorts of considerations of space lead to questions such as: What are the histories of the physical spaces we inhabit? What power relations are involved in the conceptualising, altering, and management of these spaces? How have these power relations changed over time, and how have the spaces then changed over time? What sorts of spaces have created what kinds of conditions for life to be lived? How might people's negotiation of identity occur in relation to the spaces they live and work in? And so on.

In turn, these questions enable certain key understandings:

- first, that the physical spaces in which lives are lived are the products of culture and history, and are not inevitable or immutable;
- second, that identity is formed in the context of these various spaces and places;
- third, that while certain spaces directly affect the subjectivities formed within them – schools, prisons, and so on – there are always resistances and negotiations of these subjectivities and these spaces; and
- fourth, that the meanings of space – and physical spaces themselves – are contested and altered through these engagements.

FEMINIST THOUGHT, PLACE, AND SPACE

In questioning people's relationships with places, the influence of feminism has been significant. Within feminist thought, three main threads have explored ideas of space: feminist geography, feminist critiques of the built environment and planning, and ecofeminist thought. It seems relevant to consider each of these briefly here.

Feminist geography has inquired broadly into notions of space in culture, including geography theory; examined the uses of geography and space within patriarchy, especially in homes, workplaces, and public space; and explored the interplay of the construction of identity, place/space, and gender (see, for example, Rose 1993 and McDowell 1999). Feminist geography has also pointed out critical gendered differences between concepts of 'space' and 'place'. For example, Kayte Fairfax (1995) describes how what are considered to be 'public spaces' are, in reality, men's *places* at night[8].

Sherilyn MacGregor provides an overview of feminist engagement with the built environment and environmental planning, and identifies three main critiques: 'the critique of the "products" of planning, that is, of the planned environment and its impact on women's lives … the critique of the process of planning in terms of how and with whose participation decisions about the planned environment are made … [and] discussions about planners' values and underlying assumptions' or "epistemological critiques"' (MacGregor 1995, p.29).

Ecofeminist writings share similar concerns, while taking up questions of 'the place of ecology in feminism, and the place of feminism in ecology'. Ecofeminists enquire about the relationship of women and nature; the impact of global economics, production, and consumption on people and the environment; and issues of third world 'development' (see, for example, Plant 1989, and Mies & Shiva 1993).

In all of these feminist approaches, place is given a central role in understanding the construction of identity, and in critiquing modern culture, social relations, and power. Much feminist writing also contains passionate calls for active re-engagement with both 'human-constructed' and 'natural' places for the mutual benefit of people *and* places. These are calls which, I believe, narrative practitioners can respond to.

INDIGENOUS PEOPLE, PEOPLE OF COLOUR, AND PLACE

Indigenous people and people of colour have experienced some of the most extreme disruptions of place, through colonisation, displacement, and enforced travel during slavery. Colonisation did not only alter built environments and physical structures, but also radically altered the flora and fauna of places – crucial for indigenous people's survival – often beyond recognition (see Crosby 1986)[9].

Indigenous people and people of colour have also offered some of the most vocal invitations to re-engage with the spaces and land where people live, and to have this become a key part of how people think about their lives. They have also had to assert their own cultural understandings of place, and relationships with places:

> *Orientation is essential for Indigenous people because each person belongs to a place. Understanding orientation to place is essential in order to grasp what it means to be related. Many Indigenous people recognize seven directions: the four cardinal directions, above, center, and below. This way of viewing orientation creates a (literal) sphere of relationship, founded on place that evolves through time and space.* (Cajete 1999, p.7)

Often, this relationship is quite different to the 'truths' of the dominant culture, such as in Aboriginal Australian people's notion of not owning land, but belonging *to* the land.

Indigenous considerations of place and identity offer profound challenges for work within the mental health field. The work of Taimalieutu Kiwi Tamasese (2002) in her research relating to mental health within Samoan communities in New Zealand, has demonstrated that the Samoan concept of self and identity is intricately linked to land, sea, and forest. This research calls for mental health services in New Zealand to find ways to honour these Samoan concepts of self. This would entail a considerable revision of standard western psychiatric understandings.

PLACE AND IDENTITY

So, how are we to understand the links between conceptions of identity and place? Much of what has

been written about place and identity is cast as global, unitary *theories* of the relationship between the two. Sometimes, these theories draw out naturalistic accounts of 'human nature' ('it's natural for humans to need certain kinds of spaces'), and/or environmentally-deterministic accounts ('people's identities are directly caused by the geography of where they live').

An alternative approach to exploring place and identity can be to read and listen to people's diverse and particular accounts of how they engage with place, and how they regard this engagement[10]. Such an approach can be guided by questions like:

- How do individuals and communities relate to the places they live in?
- How might place be constitutive of identity?
- How might some places be experienced as enabling different ways of being?
- How does the relationship of people to places change over time?
- What are the power relations operating in various places? How are these subjectifying of people / what subjectivities do these bring about? How are these power relations negotiated and resisted?
- What effects might places have on relations of class, gender, sexuality, age, and so on – and *vice versa*?
- How might some places be experienced as having negative effects on the people who live in them?
- How is the 'taken-for-grantedness' of places contested by individuals and communities?
- How does the negotiation of identity in place alter both places and identities?

These sorts of questions explore how meaning can be made in places, about places, and even when *reflecting on* places. These can be current places, lost places, special places, imaginary places, 'difficult' places, everyday places, and even places that are the location of dreams about the future[11].

PLACE AND ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS: SOME QUESTIONS FOR THERAPY

Family therapy, while engaging with challenges posed by the inequalities and power relations of gender, race, class, sexuality, and so on, has been conspicuously silent on issues of the environment (Kidner 1996)[12]. Considerations of ideas of place and space often lead to reflecting on the broader 'natural' environment, and render environmental problems and issues – and people's concerns for them – more visible. In this context, engaging with ideas of place may be an entry point for therapists to take up environmental ethics in their work.

People live in a broader environment than the usually-considered contexts of social and family relations; they live *in relation to* that environment; and are very much *dependent* on that environment, which, in most parts of the world, currently faces great peril. The broader 'culture of consumption', so often implicated in therapists' writings and practice about addiction and anorexia, also has massive environmental impacts that affect the lives of everyone on the planet. Environmental concerns are implicated in many of the more common 'illness narratives' that therapists attend to – such as the rise of asthma with the increase of the burning fossil fuels, and cancer with chemical manufacture.

While narrative practice usually does not take up issues of etiology, it does concern itself with context. How might it be possible to avoid the problematic quagmires that can come with trafficking in etiology, while still being available to the very real effects of the multiple contexts of environmental issues in people's lives? How can we engage with nature without being 'naturalistic'? How might we be able to address the environmental impacts of our therapeutic and community workplaces and events? And what might happen if we were more attuned to considerations of the environment when attending to the 'territories' of people's lives[13]?

PLACE IN NARRATIVE PRACTICE – ORIENTING QUESTIONS

In considering the possibilities for exploring place in narrative practice, I have found the following orienting questions helpful:

- How might we be able to listen more carefully for implicit or explicit references to spaces and places in our conversations with people, and the possibilities this may open in our work?
- What might happen if we asked questions not just about people's identities and relationships

with others over time, but relationships with places over time?

- How might people prefer to relate to the spaces in their lives? How might they prefer the spaces to be different?
- How might the meanings of place change over time for people?
- What places do people find help put them more in touch with the preferred accounts of their lives? What places might people experience as being 'therapeutic' for them? What places might be experienced as calming, generative, renewing, exhilarating, encouraging of reflection, and so on?
- How might we be able to 'bring these places into the therapy room', as we bring in other people and characters[14]?
- How might place intersect with class, gender, sexuality, and so on, in people's lives, and how might we be able to be more available to these understandings in our work?
- What importance might considerations of place take when arranging rituals?
- How might physically changing place (for example, in moving to a new town or school) in itself be a 'rite of passage', and how can we be attentive to whether such changes have recently happened, and be available to people's concerns about these?

NARRATIVE QUESTIONS ABOUT PLACE

Narrative questions about place could help to literally locate the problem-saturated or dominant stories of people's lives, to give a more detailed account of the effects of the problem[15]. Being able to remember *where* significant events have taken place might also help put people more in touch with what else was happening at the time, what they were thinking, how they felt, and so on. Place is the implicit 'where' that things happen in the 'landscape of action' in re-authoring conversations. Questions about place can also help 'thicken' the alternative stories of people's lives, making accounts of preferred ways of being more 'concrete', tangible, or 'visible in the mind's eye'.

I have included below a range of possible questions about place that might be useful in the 'everyday' conversations of narrative practice. Some may be strung together to gain more 'richly described' accounts of place and identity, while others may simply provide quick, context-setting questions in broader conversations[16].

Questions that might be used in the 'statement of position map' and 'externalising conversations map'[17] include:

- What places are encouraging of [the problem]?
- Does [the problem] occur in some places more than others?
- How does [the problem] affect what you would normally be doing in those places?
- [In family conflicts:] Are certain places more contested than others? Do fights happen in some places and not others?
- In what places does [the problem] have less of a say? Is there anywhere in your life where [the problem] never makes an appearance?
- How do you account for this[18]?

'Landscape of action' questions about place in 're-authoring conversations'[19] include:

- Where were you when this development happened?
- Where were you when you were leading up to this development …?
- When you want to 'get some distance' from [the problem] is there somewhere that you physically go? Somewhere that you pop into for a few moments, somewhere you visit for an hour or so, somewhere you go on a holiday to …?
- Are there other places like this where these kinds of developments have occurred?
- Is there a common theme in each of these places? Is there a reason you specifically go there? Is it being surrounded by nature, or certain kinds of people; does the place evoke something special for you …?
- In your plans in relation to this, is there somewhere that you have in mind for trying out your next steps? Why would you choose there?

Possible 'landscape of identity' questions include:

- How is that you were able to step more into these other ways at this place? (For example: 'How is it that you are able to care for yourself more when you visit the beach?')
- Is there something about this place itself that allows you to …?
- Is going to this place to 'get away from it all' [or to 'reflect on life', or whatever] something that you had done before, or was this a new idea?
- Has going there helped with other times in your life?
- What other possibilities for your life become available to you when you go to this place? What wishes for your life are you more able to get in touch with there?
- How has your relationship with this place changed over time? How has your relationship with [the problem] changed over time in connection with these changes to your relationship with this place?
- As you step more into these other ways of being, are there places you can imagine that you will spend more time in?
- If this could work for you in other places, would that be positive or negative, or …?
- What might make it possible for you to do this in other places[20]?

Questions about place that might be useful in 're-membering conversations'[21] about significant *people* as members of others' lives include:

- When you spend time with [significant member of their life], is there somewhere that you like to go together?
- Why is that? What meaning does this place hold for you both?
- Is this somewhere that you used to go to previously, or is it a new place you have discovered together?
- [Or, when the significant person is no longer living:] Is there somewhere that you and [the person] used to spend time together? Have you visited there since they died? What was/might that be like? Did/would visiting there put you more in touch with your connection with [the person]?
- What aspects of your histories together does being in this place help remind you both of, or put you more in touch with?
- Does this place make certain conversations more possible between you?

Questions that might be used in 're-membering conversations' about *place* include:

- What places are special in your life?
- What do these places mean to you?
- How do you relate to yourself (or the problem in question) differently when you are at that place?
- Who introduced you to this place? Who else have you shared it with? What significant things have happened there?
- Are there some places that have been sites of difficult times for you that you have re-visited (either physically, or in your 'mind's eye') which now have different meanings for you?

Place questions might also be relevant to planning rituals and definitional ceremonies:

- Where might you like to have this ritual?
- Why there? Is it somewhere you've been before, or somewhere you've never been, and that this in itself would be a significant step [or 'a realisation of a dream', etc.]?
- Does that place have a specific meaning to you?
- Is this meaning shared with the other people who will be attending the ritual, or is this meaning something that you would be interested in sharing with them as part of the ritual process itself?

RE-AUTHORING PLACES OF MY CHILDHOOD

To give some account of where exploring the relationship of place and identity can lead in narrative practice, I offer the following short account from my own life. Like many children, some of the places I spent time in were filled with joy, some with sadness, and some violence. During this time, walking around my neighbourhood (and sometimes running away into it), and, later, riding a bicycle in it, were cherished times for me. They were one of

my primary means of independence, as well as connectedness with my friends, one of the ways to escape from difficult situations, and one of the ways to literally 'get some space' and reflect on life.

When I first became interested in ideas about place, I decided to revisit – literally – some of the places of my childhood. As a young man of 23, I grabbed my bicycle, and rode out to my childhood neighbourhood. I visited, in turn, two houses I had grown up in (one with two parents, the next with one), the childcare centre I spent some mornings and afternoons in, a church that was part of my early life, the house of a 'care' family I spent some time with (whose practices were often anything but caring), my primary school, and the site of some urban bushland, which had contained a much-loved BMX track built entirely by my cohort of 12-year-old friends.

While I went there *specifically* with the intent of revisiting these places to re-engage with some of the more cherished times of my childhood (and to renegotiate some of the sites where violence and abuse had occurred) and had brainstormed in advance questions like the ones listed above, I was quite unprepared for how profound the experience was of physically going to places I hadn't seen for more than a decade, and reflecting on the events that had occurred in them.

Memories I had completely forgotten appeared – some good, some challenging – that I doubt would have had if I had not actually gone to the places where those events occurred. Reflecting on what it meant to be 'white' and growing up on Aboriginal land; seeing the places where my mother, sister, and I stood in solidarity against violence; remembering where a teacher powerfully invited me to lessen anger's hold on my life; remembering the examples of connection between school friends in such a regimented environment – and dozens of other 'little epiphanies' – had quite a remarkable effect on how I viewed these places, the events of my childhood, and my sense of self as an adult.

In that one day, some injustices were remembered in more detail, some ghosts were put to rest, and many past and current knowledges of life were made more apparent. This exercise was one of the most significant turning points in my life, in terms of rewriting multiple stories from childhood, tracing histories of a passion for community and justice, and finding renewed enthusiasm in my life. And this has had an ongoing effect. Now, when I pass these places, rather than a sense of fear, sadness, or nostalgia, I experience a sense of hope, connection, and purpose. This process, then, was an active re-engagement, with very real 'ripples' into the future.

SUMMARY

This first part of this paper has explored the relative invisibility of 'place' in narrative therapy and its source texts, as well as in the broader histories of thought in western culture. It has also described some possible sources of inspiration and a range of questions to enable richer explorations of place in narrative practice.

The next section of this paper will explore the realm of maps and the part they play in the construction of identity.

PART TWO: MAPS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY

One of the ways to bring place into therapy and community work is to use maps. I don't think that using maps is at all essential in being able to explore issues of place in the lives of people we work with, but there may be some contexts where this is generative.

This section of this paper explores the relationship of maps and identity; investigates how maps are socially constructed; examines maps as technologies of power/knowledge; looks at the relationship of maps and subjectivities; and outlines some ways to deconstruct maps. It also considers how maps can be used by individuals and communities within local mapping or 'community cartography' projects, and as individual therapeutic documents.

MAPS, PLACE, IDENTITY

If there are relationships between place and identity, and places are represented by maps, then what might be some of the relationships between maps and identity?

> *Whether in our minds, or printed on paper, maps are powerful talismans that add form to our individual and social reality. They are models of the world – icons if you wish – for*

what our senses 'see' through the filters of environment, culture, and experience. (Aberley 1993, p.1)

While I don't want to draw any 'big conclusions' here about the relationship of maps to identity, perhaps we can look at some quick examples of how maps 'work', and what this might mean for how people think about their lives[21]. For example, how might using a printed map relate to how people think about themselves and their broader environments? As J. B. Harley (1989) wonders:

Consider, for example, the fact that the ordinary road atlas is among the bestselling paperback books in the United States and then try to gauge how this may have affected ordinary Americans' perceptions of their country. What sort of an image of America do these atlases promote? On the one hand, there is a patina of gross simplicity. Once off the interstate highways the landscape dissolves into a generic world of bare essentials that invites no exploration. Context is stripped away and place is no longer important. On the other hand, the maps reveal the ambivalence of all stereotypes. Their silences are also inscribed on the page: where, on the page, is the variety of nature, where is the history of the landscape, and where is the space-time of human experience in such anonymized maps? (p.14, emphasis added)

Maps rarely show the places created by, and important to marginalised people, such as indigenous people, women, working-class people, and children. Instead, from the large-scale to the small, the impetus for map-making has historically come from the domains of the privileged: documenting, surveying, and laying claim to empires, nation sates, and property rights (Harley 1989). How then might these maps (which are passed off as 'objective') be experienced by marginalised people?

For example, the standard map projection of the world that adorns so many classrooms, libraries, and homes, the Mercator Projection, is centred on Europe. As just one solution to how to translate a spherical image to two dimensions, it makes European countries seem relatively larger than their actual physical size – and many third world countries seem smaller (see Wood 1992). What implications might this have had for European people since Mercator's atlas was published in 1585? How might it have people in Europe and in third world countries thinking about their homelands? In presenting themselves as objective claims to the 'truth' about how places 'are', how might maps impact on people's sense of what is possible – and not possible – in the places in which they live? More broadly, what does it mean that, in modern society, while people consult maps regularly, they hardly ever create them?

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF MAPS AND PLACE

Maps, like any other cultural artefact, vary immensely across time and culture. Maps produced in western cultures in the past have been prepared differently, given very different emphases, and have often looked radically different from what is thought of as a 'map' today (see, for example, Harley 1988). Maps of only 100 years ago often included caricatures, stories, mythical creatures, and other elements that would seem out-of-place on the 'scientific' and 'objective' maps of today.

Differences in map-making are often most apparent across cultures. For example: 'Aboriginal Australian bark paintings as maps … appear to have no grid, no standardised mode of representation. Nonetheless, it is possible for Aboriginal people to know about, and to travel across, unknown, even distant territory. Their knowledge is … in the form of narratives of journeys across the landscape' (Turnbull 1989, p.26-29).

Even when such differences are explained, people of dominant cultures are often still tempted to cast other cultures' and peoples' knowledge as 'irrational', 'unscientific', 'inaccurate', and so on, and to warn of the dangers of an 'anything goes' relativism[23]. This points to the importance of not simply drawing attention to what is 'other', to show that universal claims to truth are problematic, but to situate and historicise what is accepted as 'fact' or 'truths' by the dominant culture *now*. Maps are historical, cultural, and political products.

A part of the social construction of maps involves what Denis Wood calls a 'naturalisation of

the cultural': attempting to make maps seem like a value-free, truthful 'representation' of 'reality'. When this process is unmasked, as Harley states (1989):

> *Maps cease to be understood primarily as inert records of morphological landscapes or passive reflections of the world of objects … both in the selectivity of their content and in their signs and styles of representation maps are a way of conceiving, articulating, and structuring the human world which is biased towards, promoted by, and exerts influence upon particular sets of social relations.* (p.278)

Nowhere has this been more dramatic than in relation to colonisation.

MAPS AND COLONISATION

Maps have had – and continue to have – real effects on local culture and lives of indigenous and colonised people:

> *For seventeenth century New England, the map is a text for studying the territorial processes by which Indians were progressively edged off the land. I am not suggesting that maps were the prime movers in the events of territorial appropriation and ethnic alienation. My contention, however, is that as a classic form of power/knowledge maps occupy a crucial place – in both a psychological and practical sense – among the colonial discourses which had such tragic consequences for the Native Americans.* (J. B. Harley, quoted in Wood 1992, p.46)

Benedict Anderson (1991) spells out the relationship between colonisation, map-making, classification, war and technology in some detail:

> *Like censuses, European-style maps worked on the basis of totalising classification, and led their bureaucratic producers and consumers towards policies with revolutionary consequences. Ever since John Harrison's 1761 invention of the chronometer, which made possible the precise calculation of longitudes, the entire planet's curved surface had been subjected to a geometrical grid which squared off empty seas on unexplored regions in measured boxes. The task of, as it were, 'filling in' the boxes was to be accomplished by explorers, surveyors, and military forces. In Southeast Asia, the second half of the nineteenth century was the golden age of military surveyors … They were on the march to put space under the same surveillance which the census-makers were trying to impose on persons. Triangulation by triangulation, war by war, treaty by treaty, the alignment of map and power proceeded.* (p.173)

MAPS AS TECHNOLOGIES

Michel Foucault (1997) proposed four 'technologies' that human beings use to understand themselves, which 'hardly ever function separately':

> *(1) technologies of production, which permit us to produce, transform, or manipulate things;*
>
> *(2) technologies of sign systems, which permit us to use signs, meanings, symbols, or signification;*
>
> *(3) technologies of power, which determine the conduct of individuals and submit them to certain ends or domination, an objectivizing of the subject;*
> *(4) technologies of the self, which permit individuals to effect, by their own means, or with the help of others, a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality.* (p.225)

Maps (or, how people produce, use, and relate to maps) can be seen as operating in relation to each of these four types of technologies. It is usually the first two technologies – of production and sign systems – that most analyses of maps and mapping are concerned with. While these can certainly help us place maps and their production in a cultural context (and are implicit in the preceding discussion), considering maps as technologies of power and of the self has much to offer.

MAPS AS POWER/KNOWLEDGE

As a form of knowledge, maps are implicated in relations of power. And, as inextricably tied up with power, they, in turn, produce knowledge. This is brought about not just through the overt 'misrepresentation' or 'bias' of maps, but also what Harley (1988) calls cartography's 'hidden rules':

> *The cartographic processes by which power is enforced, reproduced, reinforced, and stereotyped consist of both deliberate and 'practical' acts of surveillance and less conscious cognitive adjustments by map-makers and map-users to dominant values and beliefs. The practical actions undertaken with maps: warfare, boundary marking, propaganda, or the preservation of law and order, are documented throughout the history of maps. On the other hand, the undeclared processes of domination through maps are more subtle and elusive. These provide the 'hidden rules' of cartographic discourse whose contours can be traced in the subliminal geographies, the silences, and the representational hierarchies of maps. The influence of the map is channeled as much through its representational force as a symbol as through its overt representations.* (p.303)

It's important to remember that the beneficiaries of what Wood (1992, p.87) calls the 'embodied interest' of maps, have vast resources available to them today – more than at any other time in history. As Doug Aberley (1993) notes: 'When the fundamental importance of perceiving real and imagined space is compared to what passes for most mapping today, a huge separation is apparent … The making of maps has become dominated by specialists who wield satellites and other complex machinery' (p.1).

In this process, maps can serve to make communities, their local knowledges, and their interests invisible:

> *Maps as an impersonal type of knowledge tend to 'desocialise' the territory they represent. They foster the notion of a socially empty space. The abstract quality of the map, embodied as much in the lines of fifteenth-century Ptolemaic projection as in the contemporary images of computer cartography, lessens the burden of conscience about power in the landscape. Decisions about the exercise of power are removed from the realm of immediate face-to-face contacts.* (Harley 1988, p.303)

MAPS AND SUBJECTIVITIES

To recap some proposals I've been trying to make so far, and where we're heading:

- Places are, to some extent, constitutive of identity.
- The negotiation, interpretation, and performance of identity can be constitutive of place.
- Places are constitutive of maps.
- Maps are constitutive of places.
- Maps are, then (again, to some extent), constitutive of identity.
- The projects of identity (by individuals, localities, nation-states, etc.) can, in turn, be constitutive of maps.

All of these propositions have a harmonising theme: the relationship of maps to subjectivities. In some senses, we subject ourselves to maps. And, usually, the maps people choose to use show a representation of where they live, but they're not produced by those people. While multiple interpretations are available to map readers – 'maps can work at more than one level simultaneously and hold different meanings for different users in different contexts' (Monmonier 1995, p.8) – maps are still produced in a context of power. Maps give importance to some things, but devaluate others. Maps draw attention to the location of some things, but make other things invisible. My (Australian-produced) street directory shows the location of every (American-owned) McDonalds in my city, but not local, family-run restaurants. Official US maps do not show nuclear waste sites, which at once engenders a sense of safety and prevents community mobilisaton (Harley 1988, p.289).

As noted earlier, maps have been used as a form of surveillance in contexts as diverse (yet

interrelated) as colonisation, nation-building, resource extraction, demographic and economic data collection (usually without knowledge or consent), and mass marketing of products. In this process, the phenomenal amount of data now captured and stored about individuals and communities – which, today, goes well beyond the classic example of the census – is married to the map. As Wood notes, 'And now *everyone* is on this map, *everyone* has been caught up in this panoptic gaze' (Wood 1992, p.46).

However, following the kind of analysis that Foucault (1980a, 2000) made of power, we can enquire as to how maps are both tied to relations of domination, but also have a 'productive' or 'positive' effect (in the sense of being constitutive, rather than 'not negative'). While maps often do act in the interests of nation states, the military, and big business, they are also used by individuals, and play a part in individual and community identities: 'maps enable our living' (Wood 1992, p.12).

DECONSTRUCTING MAPS

Denis Wood (1992) encourages us to 'continually *question* the map, doubt – yes – its accuracy, but more critically what of past or future it is linking up to the present and how it is doing so' (p.26). This interpretive and deconstructive project is a departure from seeing maps as 'objective' representations of reality:

> *Maps are a cultural text. By accepting their textuality we are able to embrace a number of different interpretive possibilities … Rather than working with a formal science of communication, or even a sequence of loosely related technical processes, our concern is redirected to a history and anthropology of the image, and we learn to recognize the narrative qualities of cartographic representation.* (Harley 1989, p.7-8)

This is similar to the kind of project that Mark Monmonier calls 'carto-anthropology' (Monmonier 1995, p.3). To enable this kind of investigation, Wood (1992) identifies six broad understandings about maps, which offer a framework for locating them in culture and history:

1. Maps work by serving interests.
2. Maps are embedded in a history they help construct.
3. Every map shows this … but not that.
4. The interest the map serves is masked.
5. The interest is embodied in the map in signs and myths.
6. Each sign has a history.

He also expands on these to include other helpful ways of thinking about maps, such as 'maps construct – not reproduce the world', and 'every map has an author, a subject, a theme'. As noted earlier, he also demonstrates how maps create a 'culturalisation of the natural', and a 'naturalisation of the cultural'.

Turning such kinds of analysis into questions helps to investigate not just maps and map-making generally, but also the specific maps of specific places – and the places themselves. For example, we can ask:

- What stories do maps tell about places?
- What stories do they tell about people?
- Whose stories are they? Whose interests do they serve?
- Which people are made visible? Which people are made invisible?
- How are maps created? Who commissions them? Who pays for them?
- Who creates these maps, and how might this relate to what is included, and what is left out? Who is consulted in the process of their production?
- How might these maps be constitutive of the specific histories, places, and lives of the people represented by the maps?
- What other kinds of stories about places and people might be marginalised by maps?
- How might map-making be reclaimed for these alternative and marginalised stories to be taken up by people, and to be circulated among others?

When used by individuals and communities to actively interpolate maps, such questions can be very helpful in leading away from seeing maps as

authoritative, ahistorical, 'objects', to the products of contextualised processes and power relations.

After offering the six deconstructive tools above, Wood offers a seventh principle: 'The interest the map serves can be yours', which leads us to what has been variously called 'local mapping' or 'folk geography', or what I like to call 'community cartography'.

INDIGENOUS MAP-MAKING, BIOREGIONALISM, AND COMMUNITY CARTOGRAPHY

J. B. Harley (1988) was concerned that: 'The social history of maps, unlike that of literature, art, or music, appears to have few genuinely popular, alternative, or subversive modes of expression.' (p.301). While not necessarily 'popular', alternative maps – like many kinds of 'cultural resistance' – have always existed, if somewhat below the radar.

For example, local mapping has been a key part of defending relationships and prior claims to land by indigenous people throughout the history of colonisation. And, when these maps did not match the form and 'accuracy' of maps of the colonising culture, they were rejected as being unsophisticated, and 'not really maps at all'. Ironically, rather than being 'simplistic', many of these maps were so incredibly intricate and sophisticated – displaying not just a 'static' image, but also telling stories with long histories; being not just representations of the physical, but also the spiritual – that colonising people *simply could not understand what they saw*. However, their pronouncements served to not only disqualify the maps themselves, but also indigenous people's claims to land rights. Since then, mapping, like language-learning, has been one of the key ways indigenous peoples around the world have claimed and reclaimed traditional knowledges[24].

The idea of making maps which serve local interests has been picked up by various community organisations, activists, and local planners, who see the use of local mapping, or 'community cartography', as a tool for social action: 'Imagine if map-borne information generated for exploitation of land and life is redirected to an equally proficient quest for social justice and integration of human cultures with place!' (Aberley 1993, p.6)[25]

Such ventures are often aligned with community projects that are informed by what has come to be known as 'bioregionalist' thought, and aim to help individuals and communities re-engage with the places they live in[26]. One of the key features of bioregionalism is that, while concerned with the relationship of people to place, the definition and extent of the 'bioregion' in question is not decided by scientists, planners, or bureaucracies, but the local residents (or 'reinhabitants') themselves. This led Daniel Berthold-Bond (2000) to suggest that 'bioregionalism subverts the mathematical, topographic, literalistic definition of place as objective geographic location – at least as a self-sufficient definition – and develops a new geography of place as experiential, subjective, and meaning-laden' (p.7).

Community cartography is premised on three key ideas: first, anyone can make maps. Artistic and cartographic skills are not required. In community projects so far, maps have been made by people who would not usually be expected as 'capable' of this, including people who claimed not to be able to draw, very young children, blind people. In contrast to the Geographical Information Systems of modern professional cartography, maps have been made in kindergartens out of coloured macaroni, and, in nursing homes, out of patchwork and appliqué! Second, there is no one 'right' way to make a map. As recounted by Briony Penn (in Berlin 1997): 'We had one little boy who mapped everywhere there were slugs, and every mushroom: that was his world. And his teacher said it was the first time that child had come alive' (p.148). Third, maps can be powerfully constitutive of people's lives and of local communities. Often, after a local mapping exercise, both people and places are not quite the same again:

> *And people actually used that map to start to perceive their home territory in a way they'd never really seen it before. They started to perceive their area as a region that had its own cultural attributes … maps like that made the northwest an idea, a territory that people really started to call home. It began to dawn on me that this was a very powerful technique – a tool for describing a home place and talking about social change.*
> (Aberley in Berlin 1999, p.151)

If, as Harley (1988) proposes, maps '"desocialise" the territory they represent', then community cartography could be said to be one effort to 'resocialise' this territory. Community cartography can thus serve to relocate people on maps, as well as their *relationships* with the places they find important: 'home' (however narrowly or broadly this may be defined), their bioregion, public spaces in urban environments, and so on. Doing both these things can not only serve as a reclamation of place, but add to what could be considered a 're-telling', as in narrative practices of definitional ceremony (White 1997, 2000).

I regard community cartography as an expression of 'local knowledge'. This term has been used, in slightly different ways, by both Clifford Geertz and Michel Foucault. Geertz (1983, p.215) defined this 'local knowledge' as: 'local not just as to place, time, class, and variety of issue, but as to accent – vernacular characterizations of what happens connected to vernacular imaginings of what can'. Foucault (2003, p.9) spoke of 'local', 'regional', or 'subjugated' knowledges, and their role in social critique: 'It is the reappearance of what people know at the local level, of these disqualified knowledges, that made the critique possible'[27].

Combining community cartography with ideas drawn from narrative therapy and community work traditions seems to me to offer many possibilities. One example is described in Part Three of this paper.

MAPS AS THERAPEUTIC DOCUMENTS

Therapeutic documents have been written about in some detail since the early narrative therapy writings (White & Epston 1990), and the kinds of documents have grown immensely since that time. Alice Morgan (2000, p.85), for example, lists documents, declarations, certificates, handbooks, notes from the session, videotapes, lists, and pictures.

I'm curious about how maps might be employed as therapeutic documents in narrative practice. Lisa McPhie and Chris Chaffey (1999) provided a map that served both as the outline of workshops for young women who had experienced sexual assault, as well as a testament in itself that documented a journey of identity. I wonder what other maps – specifically used as therapeutic documents – might look like?

Maps could be used in conjunction with externalising conversations, and mapping could itself be a way to externalise problems. While charts have been used, especially to show the relative influence of problems over time (White 1995), maps could provide us with a more multidimensional image, a more richly-textured representation. Maps could be used to represent and document the 'alternative territories of life', or of conversations based around the use of the rite of passage metaphor. Such maps could include a temporal dimension (in fitting with metaphors of journey), or they could simply be about different places in peoples' lives. They could be re-engagements with existing maps (as in the workshop described later in this paper), or they could be wholly new maps, as created through community cartography projects. For that matter, they need not necessarily be of 'real', physical places at all, but could be of places of the imagination, or of the future: physical representations of the future places of peoples' lives, or metaphorical representations of their wishes for their lives.

Maps as therapeutic documents could be specifically designed to do one or more of the things that maps are usually used for:

- To show a representation that may be difficult to conceptualise 'in the mind's eye' all at once.
- To suggest options for different routes to preferred destinations.
- To suggest different possible journeys – each with entirely different destinations.
- To make a long, difficult, or hazardous journey more achievable – for example, by breaking it down into segments, planning rest stops, charting pleasant detours, or suggesting places that could easily be climbed to get a glimpse of the bigger picture, and so on.
- To provide some of the strategies used when facing large challenges with expected setbacks – such as 'base camps' where mountaineers and climbers can return to, recover, and re-plan things, in between attempting different routes.
- To record a path, journey, or progress to date.
- To share some or all of the above with others – such as friends, family, 'professional' consultants, veterans of similar undertakings, and those considering launching their own –

to consult with or ask advice, to seek other reflections, to aid in recounting and celebrating achievements, to marvel at possibilities together, and so on[28].

SUMMARY

The preceding section of this paper has examined the social construction of maps and their relation to identity. It has described how community cartography has been used to support new directions in the lives of individuals and communities, and has speculated about ways in which maps might be taken up as therapeutic documents in narrative therapy. The following, and final, section of this paper will describe work with young men that has been informed by considerations of 'place', map-making and narrative practice.

PART THREE: MAPS OF VIOLENCE, MAPS OF HOPE – A WORKSHOP WITH YOUNG MEN

This section first sketches some considerations of young men and place, before outlining a workshop that explores issues of gender and violence – and alternative ways of being for young men.

PLACE IN OUR WORK WITH YOUNG MEN

It was young men with whom we worked who made us aware of the importance of the relation between place and their lives and local cultures. Men Against Sexual Assault (Sydney) and the Young Men's Anti-Violence Project (Brisbane) ran workshops with young men in a variety of community contexts – schools, youth detention centres, holiday programs, camps, and employment programs – and in many different geographical areas. Some of this work occurred in the inner-city of a large metropolis, while other contexts included the concrete jungles of working-class satellite cities, in beach and coastal areas, in well-off suburban private schools, and in remote, rural districts.

In each of these places, the young men's built environment was different (from harsh, grey, and unforgiving; to plush, lush, and manicured; to dry, dusty, and sparse). Their experiences of 'wild' spaces varied enormously – from little or no engagement with nature in cities, to ones where nature was obliterated under the rule of what has been referred to as 'totalitarian agriculture', to one of daily reverence in the surfer cultures of seaside towns. The different experiences of the built and natural environments had marked effects on the young men's culture, their sense of identity, and what was possible for them and their worlds. How they related to where they lived differed. Whether their surrounds were generally experienced as positive or negative differed. And, in the specific context of our work, the places where violence occurred – and the meaning placed on it – differed drastically also.

In one of the more extreme examples, David Newman and I were asked to visit a rural school that was five hours' drive from the city we lived in. We grumbled and groaned at having to get up at 4am to arrive by the starting time of 9am, only to find that this was a common wake-up time for many of the young men we worked with, who often put in a few hours of hard physical labour on family farms before going to school. When we arrived at the school, we were told that, due to the large number of young men involved in the day, the workshop venue was the local Returned Services Leagues (RSL) Club, and the young men were in the process of being taken there – squashed into the back of a cattle truck! The young men then had to walk into the club past the members' bar, and some were humiliated because their fathers were already starting their daily consumption of alcohol. While heavy drinking was common in this small rural town, having one's schoolmates witness it in this way was not[29].

Such examples were instrumental in inviting us to consider the relationship of place to culture and experience in the lives of young men – and in the violence that they and the other people in their lives were so often affected by.

YOUNG MEN, VIOLENCE, AND PUBLIC PLACE

Public places are common sites for young men to both be subjected to violence, and to perpetrate it. While almost all young men have experienced some form of violence in public, not all participate in perpetrating it. However, the high level of violence that does occur against women happens in a broader culture of dominance that benefits almost all men.

Whether actually physically subjected to violence or not, violence in public affects almost all women in some way. For example, as Carolyn Whitzman (1995, p.91) notes: 'A British study found that 90 per cent of women aged sixteen to twenty-four habitually take precautionary measures [to avoid violence in public], ranging from avoiding certain streets to not going out at all'.

Young men use coercion and violence to create social relations in public places, to mark out places, to control places, and to say what can and can't happen in places. This is often reinforcing of other aspects of power in place – for example, places are designated where women, gay men, and people of colour are not allowed, often enforced by the threat of harassment or injury.

How these power relations play out can vary dramatically between different places. For example, who dominates a space, and how, will change across sports fields, changing rooms, gyms, shopping malls, nightclubs, suburban drag races, surfing beaches, and so on. Who is subjected to what kinds of violence will vary across different places: the well-built school jock who perpetrates violence in a locker room may later use a public toilet 'at the wrong time of day', be read as gay (however he identifies sexually), and be exposed to homophobic violence himself.

This can also change over the course of a day in the one place. One group of young men we worked with spoke about their relationship to the only public park in their suburb, which had a reputation for being 'off limits' and very dangerous. This turned out not to be the full story, the young men told us. During the day, the park was relatively safe. From the time school finished, at 3pm, to about 5pm, they were able to use the space with little interference. (Young women's access to the space, however, was then limited.) From about 5pm onwards though, local gang members would occupy the space as this was the time that some of them finished work, while others needed to leave their houses as their fathers returned home from work. Conversely, the young men attending school needed not only to leave the park before this time, but to return home before *their* fathers returned home, otherwise they could face possible violent punishment for being out 'late'.

Access to a certain space can also change over the course of one's life. The same group of young men told us that, while they could not stay in the park after 5pm while still attending school, if they dropped out, or finished school, then they *would* be granted access, as violence was not so much directed at particular individuals, but at young men still attending school.

Being attentive to the specificities of young men's experience allows for a much more richly-described account and understanding of the local politics of gender, power, and violence in this work.

YOUNG PEOPLE'S ACCESS TO PUBLIC SPACE

Most public and private space is owned, named, built, controlled, and used by adults. Young people usually don't own their own 'private' space and are therefore subject to the rules, norms, disciplines, and punishments found in public space, and others' privately-owned spaces that are available to them. Outside the home, many of these are privately-owned 'public' spaces, such as shopping centres, movie cinemas, games parlours, cafes, and so on[30].

Apart from the obvious 'repressive' trappings of power – security guards, security cameras, patrol dogs, and so on – these places also have a complex web of technologies of objectification. They are often highly commercialised aesthetically, and commodified: places are owned, places sell things, some places could be seen as encouraging one to sell oneself (such as in low-paying workplaces, or shops selling branded merchandise). These aspects are often sharply felt by young people, who have less access to money than adults. To consume, to be *seen* consuming, to adopt brands and logos that extend the realm of corporate advertising to the private body: many 'private public' spaces often require consumption and subscribing to certain fashions to gain physical and social entry.

Young men have often told us that they are hassled if they are 'hanging out' in shopping centres, but not if they are obviously (conspicuously) consuming. Also, young people congregating in public space are often referred to as 'anti-social'. The irony here is that they are actually engaging in being very social – but with one another, seemingly outside the control of adults, while in an adult domain.

The design of some spaces by adults is also occasionally specifically tasked with the

subjectification of young people – especially around issues of control of sexuality. As Foucault (1996, p.229) noted: 'In these themes of surveillance, especially school surveillance, it seems that control of sexuality becomes directly inscribed in the architectural design'. For example, the changing rooms at my high school were designed so that, from a window on the entry door, a teacher could see all of us young men at once – not unlike in the design of prisons.

MAPPING GENDER AND VIOLENCE

The following workshop was designed to follow on from our general workshop on gender and violence for young men, called 'Step by step: Developing respectful and effective ways of working with young men to reduce violence' (Denborough 1996), but could easily be combined with it. 'Step by step' provides a framework to enable young men to speak about constructions of masculinity and their effects – both dominant ways of being men, and alternative preferred ways of being. It also facilitates the generation of a language with which to speak with young men about their experiences, and to unearth and respect their local knowledge and ideas about these issues. With this achieved, the following workshop utilises a process for deconstructing local space and mapping 'alternative stories'. It seeks to make the ideas covered in 'Step by step' more 'concrete'; more physically apparent, performed in places and inscribed on those places, and happening in engagements with those places.

Rather than a simple exercise in 'problem-solving', which is how many workshops that seek young people's input are structured, this workshop engages young men in an almost 'anthropological study' or 'archaeological expedition' of their local environment. It exposes power relations and broader cultural ideas and practices that invite young men to perpetrate violence, and provides a space for young men to look at how they resist these invitations, and what this says about their broader purposes, wishes, desires, and so on, for their lives.

The workshop broadly falls into six stages:

1. Mapping what's there – existing infrastructure / places that reflect or support a culture of violence and dominant men's ways of being.
2. Mapping what has happened – engagements with violence and dominance.
3. Mapping the places of care and alternatives.
4. Mapping engagements with care and other ways of being.
5. Imagining 'other' places.
6. Taking it further.

The workshop revolves around two large photocopies of maps of the local area. Drawing on the young men's analysis and experience of their local place, the first becomes a 'map of violence' (in steps 1 and 2), the second, a 'map of hope and care' (in steps 3 and 4). In practice, these names become the names of the dominant and alternative stories that young men have proposed about dominant ways of being during the earlier 'Step by step' workshop.

To give a sense of the differences between the maps, we have used different coloured marker pens when annotating the different maps. For the 'map of violence', a colour associated with danger or hazard is used, such as red or orange. For the 'map of hope and care', a colour associated as being 'calm' is used, such as blue or green[31].

Similarly, to show the existing aspects of the local landscape, infrastructure, and culture in stages 1 and 3, we have marked spaces on the maps with dots; while using more 'dynamic' stars to map the places of young men's actions and experience in stages 2 and 4. Neither of these distinctions are commented upon, as their use becomes apparent during the workshop.

STAGE 1: MAPPING WHAT'S THERE – EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND CULTURE

This stage involves two main parts: identifying places and practices of violence, and asking for the young men's position on these. Questions to identify places and practices of violence include:

- Where are the places where violence often occurs?
- Where are the places that encourage violent ways of being?
- Where are the places that you think 'are' or 'do' violence themselves?
- Where are the places where women experience men's violence?

- Where do women get hassled?
- Where are the places that homophobic violence happens? Where are the places that encourage homophobia?
- Where are the places that encourage racism?
- Where are the places that young people get hassled by older people?
- Where are the places that encourage the dominant stories of how to be a man? (This question may be asked using the young men's name for this, identified in 'Step by step' or other previous conversations. For example, 'Where are the places that you think encourage 'being the tough hero?')

We don't ask these questions in order, but use them to guide the process as needed, and to ensure that various types of violence are not overlooked. We also seek the young men's ideas – 'What other questions do you think might be useful here?' – as we consider that we are engaged in a co-exploration of the issues.

As the young men suggest places of violence, we then mark these on the map and label them. Follow-up questions such as 'what kind of violence would you call this?' or 'why does this stand with 'being a tough hero'?' help to generate a two-part label for each place: both the *name* of the place, and the *kind of violence* or *aspect of culture* identified with it.

A partial list of these places and practices from one workshop included:

- football field – sports violence [between players and in the stands]
- houses – physical and sexual assault
- carpark – robberies
- train station – 'perving' on women and insults [usually sex-based]
- video store – violent movies
- toilet block – gay bashings
- hotel – pub fights

This two-part labelling helps get a fuller picture of the different types of violence that happen in the local community (physical, verbal, visual, explicit/implicit, and so on), and the relationships between these and various places and institutions. It also helps to show who perpetrates violence, and who is subjected to it.

The map itself becomes a riot of colour and writing, and the workshop becomes far more frenetic than this simple list suggests, with the pace of labelling places and violence seeming to grow exponentially! While we are encouraging of the young men's enthusiasm for this, we also try to steer the conversation towards other questions as we go. These take the form of deconstructive questions, and 'statement of position map' questions.

DECONSTRUCTIVE QUESTIONS

Rather than just a simple naming of places and practices, deconstructive questions help contextualise and historicise places and types of violence, and the relationship between the two. We ask these questions with a sense of 'investigative reporting', or an archaeological or anthropological inquiry, which helps generate an orientation of curiosity – both for us and the young men.

Examples of the kinds of questions we ask 'on the run', as the young men name places of violence, include:

- Who perpetrates this kind of violence?
- Who is subjected to this kind of violence? Who is this violence done to?
- What are the effects of this kind of violence?
- Are there other names for this kind of violence? Is there a broader category we could call these sorts of violence?

Such follow-up questions can expose the operations of power more explicitly, and go some ways to lessen the sense of constructed places as being natural, inevitable, or immutable. Furthermore, to deconstruct something as physical or tangible as place and its attendant power relations makes inquiry about other *relations of power* more possible. For example, a decontextualised 'violence in the home' might become 'men's violence against women and children'.

Once the map is covered in places and types of violence, we take a few moments to look at the broader picture, and what it has to tell about how the larger culture of violence has been taken up locally:

- Who encourages these kinds of violence?
- How do these places and types of violence work together? How does the violence relate to the place?
- Does this kind of violence happen elsewhere? What are the similarities between these kinds of places?
- What places work 'in cahoots' with other places in supporting this violence?
- Which of these acts of violence are legal or sanctioned?
- What broader cultural practices are these acts of violence a part of? (This question may be cast as: 'What kinds of ideas 'back up' this kind of violence?', 'Are these kinds of violence related to broader attitudes in our culture?', and so on.)
- Which of these acts of violence involve people making money?
- Which of these places see violence happen randomly? Which are related to violence all the time, or are a part of a 'larger' kind of violence?
- Which of these kinds of violence happen in private? In public?
- Has this place always been this way? When did it appear? What is the history of this? What was here before? What would this place have been like 10 years ago? 50? 250? (Such questions can lead to further explorations – such as practices of colonisation and racism, the rise of consumer culture, and so on.)

TALES OF THE UNEXPECTED

One of the most useful applications of these questions is when young men identify places not usually associated with violence, or uncommon types of violence, or anything else that captures our attention and which could be useful to articulate in more detail. For example, one young man in a workshop mentioned newsagencies as a site of violence. He explained that he named them because of much of the magazine content: pornography, as well as more subtle examples of women being positioned as under the gaze of men, and magazines which glorify war. So, the local newsagencies were soon identified and added to the map.

Another young man suggested video shops because they hire out violent movies. Follow-up questions, which were soon also picked up by other members of the group, led to a nuanced analysis: while most of the young men in the room watched and enjoyed these movies, they identified them as being related to a culture of violence. Group members engaged in a debate about this relationship, but the young men were clear that there must be a link of some kind. The debate was settled in favour of context rather than causality when one young man said: 'Put it this way. What if there was a country that had no violence – would they watch violent movies? Or would there be somewhere that was violent, but had no violent movies at all? I don't think so'.

Another young man then said that some people he knew, such as his girlfriend, thought that watching violent movies could, at times, be a bit like experiencing violence itself. This led a spirited discussion where many of the young men named movies that had scared them, 'freaked them out', given them nightmares, and so on. I was fascinated to watch the complexity of this discussion: the young men were not denouncing violent movies as a whole, and listened to each others' accounts of fear with great respect and empathy.

In response to the question of 'where are places that could be thought of a part of a bigger culture of violence', one young man named the school. He said: 'Well, we're not asked if we want to come here; we're forced to. How come after 3 o'clock that would be called a detention, but between 9 and 3 it's just called 'school'?'

Finally, in response to questions about the longer history of the area (which often bring an initial response of blank faces), one quiet young man got up, walked to the map, grabbed a pen, and marked 'flagpole'. We asked him about this, and he simply said: 'Well, it's so big, it's like the place has been claimed, like on the moon. And there's no Aboriginal flag next to it'. I was so taken by the powerful simplicity of this statement, that it was a while before I noticed that his words seemed to have had a similar effect on the other young men in the group.

STAGE 2: MAPPING WHAT HAS HAPPENED – ENGAGEMENTS WITH VIOLENCE AND DOMINANCE

Locating violence in the broader local culture, practices, institutions and place in stage 1 helps to set the scene, and makes it easier for the young men to then give examples of the times when they have engaged in violence themselves – either as perpetrators, recipients, or witnesses – and we mark these with a star and a brief description. This is facilitated by questions such as:

- Where have you been encouraged to engage in violence?
- Where have you witnessed violence and not intervened?
- Where have you done something that doesn't fit with your preferred ways of being a man?
- Where have you been on the receiving end of violence – if you feel comfortable sharing this with the group?
- Where do you know an act of violence has taken place, even if you weren't there personally at the time?

We usually preface this section with a discussion about what it will mean to hear about other young men's personal experiences of violence, the importance of confidentiality, that no-one has to speak if they don't want to, and that the young men may want to take some time to consider the implications of sharing stories of either being subjected to violence or perpetrating it. We try to talk about these issues in a way that will privilege meanings of courage in the act of telling of these experiences, and of how most young men in our culture find themselves in all three positions of perpetrating, being subjected to, or witnessing violence at different times.

While the focus of the workshop is on the young men taking responsibility for ending violence, we don't believe that all of the examples given here need to be of times when they have perpetrated violence. To speak of being on the receiving end of violence, or of the complexities involved in witnessing it, can be very useful in aiding a non-violent position[32]. We are also keen to draw out different kinds of violence: physical, emotional, verbal, and the violence of dominance and privilege. While our focus is on issues of violence, we are also interested in the broader aspects of dominant men's culture, and use violence as an entry point to explore these sometimes less obvious engagements with dominance.

The events and places generated in this stage are then marked on the map, alongside the existing places. A partial listing from the same workshop included:

- behind the school pool – after-school fights
- local shopping centre – hassling girls
- home – yelled at my Mum
- local park – harassment by neighbourhood gang
- movie cinema – got angry with my girlfriend

At the end of this process, the map will be covered in dots and stars, and their two-part labels. At times, we've found stage 1 so generative, we've had to use a separate map for stage 2! (Spare copies are a great idea.) Some of the personal engagements with violence in stage 2 will have occurred at the exact same places identified in stage 1 as being sites of common occurrences of violence, such as in public places. Sometimes, the personal sites of violence show more personal locations, such as private homes, individual classrooms, specific workplaces, and so on, giving the map a unique and multi-textured feel.

THE STATEMENT OF POSITION MAP

Once the young men have a rich articulation of these acts, types, sites, and locations of violence, we briefly ask questions about their stance in relation to this, drawing on the 'statement of position map' in relation to problems (see footnote 17, White 2006). This map of narrative practice involves four steps:

a) an experience-near naming of the problem,

b) an exploration of the effects of the problem,

c) an evaluation of these effects,

d) a justification for this evaluation.

Some of these questions can be worked into the process of naming places as we go, but a quick summary at the end is important for creating a platform before moving on to the next section.

Not all of these questions can be asked of each place – this would take too long, and be repetitive. Instead, we try to ask them about the broad themes of violence that have been identified (such as men's violence against women, adult's violence against young people, homophobic violence, etc.). This also allows us to focus on any examples of violence that seem locally important or relevant, or surprising examples offered by the young men – for example, a type of violence rarely mentioned, or a relationship of violence to place that is often unnoticed.

As the 'Step by step' workshop, which usually precedes this one, draws strongly on the statement of position map, we do not write the young men's responses on a board during this section, or devote too much time to this section. However, if we were to experiment with combining both workshops, then recording the responses to these questions would be very useful.

Questions to *name* the problem include:

- What are the kinds of things that happen there?
- What would you call that kind of violence?
- How does that support the idea of 'being a tough hero'?
- Why would you say that place encourages violence?
- How are men supposed to act in different places? How do they stand or hold their bodies? How are they meant to *not* stand or hold their bodies? What are they meant to speak about in these different places? How do they speak? What are they not supposed to speak about, and how are they not supposed to speak?

Questions to explore the *effects* of the problem include:

- Who does this affect?
- How do you think this makes them feel?
- What might be some of the consequences of this?

Questions to *evaluate* the problem and these effects include:

- What do you think about this?
- Is this a good thing or not?
- What would you say about a place where this happens?

Questions inviting a *justification* of this evaluation include:

- Why do you say that?
- How did you come to hold that idea?
- Other people may not think that; why is it important to you?

STAGE 3: MAPPING THE PLACES OF CARE AND ALTERNATIVES

While stages 1 and 2 of the workshop comprise the 'statement of position map' in relation to the problem in a narrative framework, stages 3 and 4 comprise the 'statement of position map' for the alternative story. This section is highly generative of what are referred to as 'unique outcomes' in narrative practice.

As with stage 1, stage 3 of the workshop, 'mapping the places of care and alternatives', is about the local *place* itself. While the unique outcomes generated in this section are not events in the young men's lives, (which are generated in the next stage), they are of their locality and culture – *and of the young men's identification and analysis of this*. This identification and analysis can provide unique outcomes in and of itself, as it is quite an interpretive accomplishment to be able to identify aspects of a local, taken-for-granted environment as supporting alternative ways of being.

Questions in this stage include:

- Where are the places that seem to stand apart from the culture of violence?
- Where are the places that you experience as being more 'calming', more relaxing?
- Where are the places where people are generally safe?
- Where are the places that set out to offer help and care to people, rather than violence and control[33]?

Examples of the places of care and alternatives are then explored briefly through the 'statement of position map' for alternative stories – this time, an alternative story of the local environment and culture.

This map includes the same four categories of enquiry, but differently focused:

a) a *naming* of alternative story of the local place and culture;

b) an exploration of what *effects* these places, institutions, and people associated with them have that support alternative ways of being;

c) an *evaluation* of these effects – on women, young people, people from marginalised cultural backgrounds, and so on;

d) a *justification* of this evaluation – an account of why the young men have taken the position they have[34].

The places and a brief description of why they stand with a story of care are marked on another blank map of the local area. Examples of these places from one workshop were:

- The skate park – we look out for each other there ('everyone helps each other, and not just with how to skate better, but about other stuff in their lives').
- The school counsellor's room – she's pretty cool.
- My grandma's house.
- Council pool – good place to just swim and not think.
- Bushland near the creek – relaxing.

As is so often the case, this section has turned up some surprising examples. One young man mentioned that the school library was a place where 'the usual hassling' didn't happen, partly because it was designated as a quiet place, but partly because, as he saw it, there was an understanding between students that people studying there were needing time to be 'serious' and not 'muck around'. Similarly, students saw the music room as a 'safe zone', partly to prevent damage to instruments, and partly out of an affinity for music, and respect for those wanting to practise.

STAGE 4: MAPPING ENGAGEMENTS WITH CARE AND OTHER WAYS OF BEING

While the previous section of the workshop is based on the statement of position map, this section is a more fluid interplay between the statement of position map, the re-authoring conversations map, and the re-membering conversations map of narrative practice[35].

Questions to identify the places to be marked on the map might include:

- Is there a place where you have chosen to walk away from a fight?
- Is there a time when you have listened to someone and not got angry, even though you might have at other times?
- Where are the places you go to relax?
- Where are the places you go to take care of yourself?
- If you're getting stressed and angry, is there somewhere you go to 'get away from it all'?
- Why do you go there and not somewhere else? What's the appeal of that place? Does it have a broader meaning for you?
- Do you go there on purpose when you're thinking of the other things that might be different in your life?
- How does going there feel?
- How does going there help in your quest to be someone other than 'a tough jock' [or whatever the naming of the dominant plot has been]?
- When you're at this place, how does it have you thinking about how you might do other things in your life differently, or other wishes that you have for your life?
- Does this place remind you of other places where this happens for you?
- Is there a place where you usually feel respected – such as at a friend's place, with a family member or relative, or someone else who's important to you?

These questions can also draw on the general narrative questions about place listed earlier in this article. Mapping these examples of how different places can be are experienced as supporting young men's alternative ways of being, and helps to set the scene for the next stage.

STAGE 5: IMAGINING OTHER PLACES

Imagining how our lives could be different is one thing. Imagining how *spaces* could be different is another thing entirely. So often, both the physical

construction and the social construction of space are taken for granted. The following questions to invite young men to imagine how their local spaces could be different draw inspiration from a range of sources: in part, on Michael White's (1995, 2000) engagement with Gaston Bachelard's work on reverie; bioregionalist thought and community cartography practice (such as Aberley 1993, and Berlin 1997); community engagement approaches in feminist and ecological planning and design (see Aberley 1994 and Eichler 1995), and the possibilities for places articulated in Alexander et al's inspiring *A Pattern Language* (1977). I feel it's important to see this not as an exercise in identifying an 'ideal', or a unitary, utopian vision, but of imagining multiple possibilities.

Questions in this section might include:

- If places were not violent, what might they look like?
- How would your neighbourhood feel?
- How would you know if this was more the kind of place you'd like it to be? How would you be able to describe it?
- What would there be more of that already exists? What would there be less of? What existing things might stay but be improved upon?
- What would you see? Not see? Hear? Not hear? Smell? Not smell? Taste? What might you be able to touch[36]?
- What would make you stop in the street? What would capture your attention? What would make you linger and look around, rather than hurry on, only looking at your shoes?
- You said earlier that your neighbourhood was 'harsh'; how might it be 'softer'?
- You've said it's 'boring'; how might it be more 'interesting'?
- How would you know it was a safe place?
- What kinds of things could be done in this area to prevent violence against women?

THE REFLEXIVE RELATIONSHIP OF IMAGINING AND CRITIQUE

This stage is informed by the earlier deconstructive questions about places – not just about violence, but also about the broader politics of ownership, benefit and control. This present section of the workshop on 'imagining' also acts reflexively on the earlier analysis, by helping provide an alternative that the present state of affairs can be held up to – as Margrit Eichler (1995, p.164) puts it: 'The act of envisaging what might be makes us better able to critique what is'.

Some quick comments captured during one workshop give a glimpse of this process at work. Note that these comments demonstrate the multiple aspects of critique in this workshop – of place, of the map as representation of place, and of what the map helps us see and imagine about place:

> 'Look at what's on the map and what's not. The school's marked, but not the skate park.'
>
> 'There's lots of roads, but not many bike tracks. When we ride on the road we get hassled, and we're not meant to ride on the footpath. So where *are* we meant to ride?
>
> 'I never thought of this before, but look: the football field is about 10 times the size of the netball courts. Greg said before that men are meant to 'act bigger' when they're where they'll be seen … but I never thought before that the *places* were bigger too.'

STAGE 6: TAKING IT FURTHER

While young men can both reengage with their pasts and engage in conversations about their future actions and preferred ways of being, they cannot usually change the built environment and the institutions of the broader dominant culture around them. They can, however, work together to invite others to do so. As adults working with young men, we feel we have a responsibility to help facilitate this process in any way the young men would find helpful and appropriate.

This 'broadening of responsibilities' has been a key part of our work. We use it to invite people in positions of authority to help attenuate the violence young men both experience and engage in, in ways suggested by the young men themselves. It draws on what has been called an 'ethic of circulation' in narrative practice (see Epston & White 1992, and Lobovits, Maisel & Freeman 1995), while adding a dimension of broader collective responsibility in a context of power, responsibility, and access to resources (see Denborough 1996).

Before even engaging in questions to broaden the responsibility, we discuss with the young men about times we have done this in the past, the possibilities of such an undertaking, and some of the hazards. If they're not interested in taking the ideas further, then we respect this decision. However, if they're interested in exploring the options for community engagement, we continue with questions such as:

- Which of your imagined differences for your neighbourhood would you think are more likely to become a reality? Why?
- Which would have the most impact in reducing violence? Why?
- Which would mean the most to you? Why?
- Who can make these changes? Who might be in charge of making decisions about them?
- What could be a way to approach them? Who would they listen to? If you'd like us or someone else to do it on your behalf, how would you brief us so that we stay on the right track?
- What might you suggest to them? How would you raise the issues? What concerns would you point to?
- What possible challenges do you think you would face if you embarked on this? How would you deal with potential setbacks?

Once we get to the end of these questions, we review the possibilities and hazards again, and ask the young men to decide on whether they want to take the issues further, and how. We try to facilitate this discussion around consensus-based decision-making lines. In this workshop and others, the young men's choices have been varied – for example:

- To choose one project/request they feel will be considered reasonable and achievable.
- To give a 'list of requests' to various relevant individuals and institutions who have an impact on their lives – and who might be interested in ways of working together to reduce violence (in one school, for example, we met with members of the local police, who had been accused of harassing local young men).
- To approach 'powers that be' and members of the community themselves, through a representative (such as a trusted teacher), or in a conversation that we play a role in facilitating.

While it's important to not expect changes to result from each of these attempts, these conversations can have unexpectedly successful outcomes. I'm reminded of one school which decided to work with the young men on a joint proposal to the local council to build a skate park which had been long promised but not delivered.

At another school, a principal changed the school's policy of not allowing students to use the school basketball courts outside school hours. A student-elected delegation told the principal what basketball meant to many of the young men, that there were no other basketball courts available to them in the area, and how 'hanging out' in other public spaces had led to conflicts with local shop owners.

I'm aware, though, that these are not uncomplicated issues. When young men successfully negotiate for public space, this can raise concern for the safety of young women in those spaces. It could also compound the lack of choices for young women, given that young men take up disproportional amounts of public space. I'm hopeful that the impact of these issues might be moderated by the outcomes of the broader conversations these young men have been involved in, in our work in partnership with women facilitators working with young women, and in our attempts to engage the broader community to take responsibility for these issues. My hope would be that concessions for public space will also be made for young women, and that some concessions for public space proposed by young men will also benefit young women.

This 'broadening of responsibility' is not just about seeking space, resources, concessions, or respect. It is also about recruiting others in the broader community to honour the choices the young men have taken – and are taking – and their attempts to mitigate violence and embrace alternative ways of being. In this way, the maps generated in this workshop can be deployed as a form of therapeutic document (as described earlier) to both document the young men's resistances, as well as their broader suggestions for change. The

maps can therefore act as both testimony and invitation, and can play a part in conversations informed by notions of 'outsider witnesses' and 'definitional ceremony' (see White 1995, 1997, 2000).

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

In summary, this workshop:

1. Deconstructs maps.
2. Opens space for multiple readings and meaning.
3. Explores the relationship of territory to map.
4. Explores the relationship of identity to place.
5. Explores the relationship of identity to map.
6. Explores alternative stories, especially as 'embedded' or 'inscribed' in places.
7. Envisages alternative places.
8. Envisages alternative futures for young men's lives.
9. Invites broader responsibility for changing both built environments and local cultures.

The questions given in this paper are just some examples of the possibilities this exploration presents[37]. What's more important than listing the exact questions here, in some ways, is the spirit or orientation in each stage. Each stage includes a range of questions, but there are general 'flavours' to the different stages, drawing on just some of what Michael White has called the 'micro-maps' of narrative practice. I'll briefly summarise the workshop stages below, with their relevant micro-maps, so that those familiar with narrative practice have an overview to help form their own questions.

YOUNG MEN AND DIVERSITY

Similarities in each of the young men's contributions in part 1 of the workshop can help to develop a collective critique of the local built environment and the broader culture it has been created within. Such investigations can deconstruct the broader power relations of the spaces young men live in, inhabit, socialise in, travel through,

Workshop stage	Micro-maps of narrative practice	Focus of enquiry	Mapping / documenting
1. Mapping what's there	Statement of position map 1 (about the problem) Deconstruction questions	Naming of violence engendered in and encouraged by the local culture, institutions, and the built environment Explore, expose operations of dominant power	On map one, use dots to mark the various places – buildings, infrastructure, shops, institutions – which are implicated in violence and dominant men's ways of being, with a brief description of the kind of violence perpetrated
2. Mapping what has happened – engagements with violence	Statement of position map 1 (about the problem)	Examples and effects of violence and dominant ways of being the young men have perpetrated, been subjected to, or witnessed	On map one, use stars to mark the places that young men have engaged in, and encountered violence
3. Mapping places of care and alternatives	Statement of position map 2 (about alternative story)	Helps discover 'alternative stories' of the local environment and culture; young men's analysis itself can provide unique outcomes	On map two, use dots to mark, and then label places that discourage violence, that are safe, that offer support for alternative ways of being, and that engender care

Workshop stage	Micro-maps of narrative practice	Focus of enquiry	Mapping / documenting
4. Mapping engagements with care	Statement of position map 2 (about alternative story); re-authoring questions; re-membering questions	Examples of places where young men have resisted violence, meaning made of this, and explorations of how this may be more embracing of their lives	On map two, mark with stars the places that young men have rejected violence, adopted caring ways of being, and envisaged alternative paths for their lives
5. Imagining other places	Questions about possible 'different places', or how the local environment could be changed; informed by notions of reverie, and of feminist and bioregionalist planning	Imagined options for change to the local environment; engagement with the idea that places are not immutable; and allow young men's expressions of different visions for their local environment to be in and of itself a performance of, and testimony to, their preferred stories for their lives	Record (with permission) suggestions for change on board or paper
6. Taking it further	Circulation questions; questions informed by ideas of definitional ceremony and outsider witnessing	Which imagined changes to the local environment could be pursued, who to approach about this, and how	Using the map and/or list of suggested changes as therapeutic documents to both request changes, and recruit a larger community to honour young men's alternative accounts of their lives, and visions for their local community

'mark out', and are excluded from: private property and ownership, commerce and consumption, economics, architecture, social planning and government, public and private policing, adult dominance, surveillance, and so on.

Differences in their contributions help show the nuances of critique offered by young men's individual life histories and experiences, as well as their various locations in class, race, sexuality, physical ability, appearance, and so on. This 'staking out' of difference, and honouring of it, can in itself be a way that young men critique a culture of heterogeneity, and of prescriptions for masculinity. The act of young men working together to give voice to, and respect, these different experiences and positions within power relations goes far beyond

mere 'co-operation', 'listening to each other', or 'sharing opinions'. In and of itself, it is creating a different culture, a different way of relating, and a different ethos. It can also offer not only a critique, but also an example of hope.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE VIOLENCE

One thing I'm concerned about is the place this workshop could unwittingly play in *invisibilising* violence against women, despite that concern for this issue is the context from which the workshop arose. So much of what is shown on a larger map of a neighbourhood comprises public space. Carparks, parks, railway stations, and streets are shown in street directories, but individual homes are not. It is also easier for young men to talk about violence that they have seen in public, rather than what they have seen in private spaces, such as their own homes. Because of this, this workshop could run the risk of over-emphasising public violence.

This could serve to downplay the extent of violence against women, as Carolyn Whitzman (1995) has noted:

> *A sophisticated understanding of safer cities recognizes that violence prevention does not mean creating barriers that will guard against a singular violent event. Rather, violence is something that goes on every day, in popular culture, in people's homes, within workplaces, and on the street … the focus of crime prevention on 'public' crime by strangers leaves out the majority of crimes against women.* (pp.95-96)

In this workshop, this issue can be addressed in two ways. First, by asking gender-specific questions, such as: 'Where does violence against women happen?' 'Where do girls get hassled?', 'Where are images that denigrate women to be found around here?'. Second, by monitoring whether private places are listed as sites of violence, and facilitating their naming – and the kinds of violence that happens in them – in a way that does not require young men to 'come out' about violence in their own homes. To this end, generalised questions can be asked, such as: 'What kinds of violence might be hidden from the public eye?'

FINAL THOUGHTS

While this discussion of thinking related to place, its potential application in narrative practice, maps and mapping, and the outline of just one approach, has been necessarily lengthy due to the 'newness' of some of these ideas to the field, I'm aware that this is still only a brief sketch of this type of thought and practice. However, it's my passionate hope that there could be a place for 'place' in narrative therapy, and that others will extend on these ideas. I hope explorations of place and space might lead to enriched outcomes for not only therapists and community workers, and the people who consult them, but also, at times, lead to improvements for the 'real' places themselves.

NOTES

1. Many of the ideas in this article have been influenced by various men I have worked with in schools over the past decade. Subsequently, the plural nouns 'we' and 'our' usually feel more comfortable to me in describing this work. The main facilitators I have worked with through Men Against Sexual Assault and the Young Men's Anti-Violence Project are Cameron Boyd, Mark D'Astoli, David Denborough, Chris Krogh, and David Newman. Many of these workshops were done concurrently with Darlene Corry, through her work with the Brisbane Rape and Incest Crisis Survivors' Centre.
2. See, for example, Freedman & Combs (1996); Monk et al (1997); White (1995, 1997, 2000a, 2005); White & Epston (1991); Zimmerman & Dickerson (1996). Michael White (1992) does quote Burke on 'scene', but this is not taken up in subsequent explorations; White & Epston (1991, p.24 & 30) mention Foucault's work on the organisation of people in space, in relation to power. I have not had the opportunity to review all of the published accounts of narrative practice. If others have engaged with ideas of space, place, and identity in their work, I would be very interested to hear more about their experiences.
3. Within training contexts there are also exceptions. For instance, Jill Freedman and Gene Combs have developed an exercise in which 'people explore their relationship with a particular place to experience how that relationship has shaped their ideas of who they are and what is possible in their lives'. For more information about this exercise contact Jill Freedman and Gene Combs c/o narrativetherapy@aol.com
4. For a more complete summary of these issues, see Soja (1989).
5. The following two sections draw heavily on the work of Michel Foucault. I have chosen to quote him at length for three reasons: first, Foucault's work has been influential on the formation of narrative practice, and I think his considerations of space have more to offer which, as yet, have not been taken up. Second, I have

found his writings to be very useful for my own explorations of ideas of space and identity – and the practical application of these ideas in narrative work. Finally, quoting his writings at some length allows both a transparency of how I have enlisted his ideas, and an accessibility to some of the more obscure writings that might otherwise take readers some time to track down.

[6] Even in Foucault's work, it took time for space to find its place. While Foucault explicitly wrote about space in 1967 (Foucault 1998), and many of his writings focused on institutional spaces (prisons, schools, hospitals, and so on), it was only in an interview with the editors of the journal *Hérodote*, in 1976, that he acknowledged the significance of space in his work. After initially side-stepping questions about this issue, he finally stated: 'I have enjoyed this discussion with you because I've changed my mind since we started … Now I can see that the problems you put to me about geography are crucial ones for me. Geography acted as the support, the condition of possibility for the passage between a series of factors I tried to relate … Geography must indeed necessarily lie at the heart of my concerns' (Foucault 1980b, p.77).

[7] See also Wright & Rabinow (1982).

[8] For a copy of this paper, email Kayte Fairfax at kfx6@yahoo.com

[9] And this process continues today. See, for example, www.culturalsurvival.org

[10] For collections of reflections on people's engagement with place, see, for example, the collections of Vitek & Jackson (1996); Hannum (1997); Barnhill (1999); and Forbes, Forbes & Whybrow (1999).

[11] These explorations are not just engaging for me intellectually, or in my work with young men, but are also personal passions, and have contributed significantly to my own life. This passion was initially influenced strongly by Gary Foley, Chris Krogh, and Penni White, who have changed how I see myself, places, and the relationships between the two, specifically in contexts of white privilege and male dominance, explorations of the natural environment, and a sense of community.

[12] As far as I'm aware, there has been little engagement with environmental ideas in accounts of narrative therapy. One exception is Michael White (1996), who writes of meeting with men who are refusing to be distracted 'from the wholesale destruction of our environment, from the systematic poisoning of our life-support systems, and from the extent to which the planet is now threatened with oblivion' (p.164).

[13] For accounts of environmental issues that seek to avoid these hazards, see Kate Soper (1995) and Anna Peterson (1999).

[14] Alice Morgan (2000, p.78) briefly suggests that place can be used in 're-membering' conversations. I'd love to hear from others who have taken up this idea.

[15] Of course, in asking questions about the places where traumatic or abusive events have taken place in the past, it is important to have these conversations in ways that are not re-traumatising of people.

[16] The questions given in this section do not privilege one kind of place over another (for example, 'natural' over 'built' environments), or have the therapist impose some meaning to certain kinds of places. As in all narrative endeavours, it is important to ask people what is significant to them, what meanings certain places have for them, whether these are preferred or not, and so on.

[17] For notes on the 'statement of position map', see Michael White (1995, pp.205-208), and his workshop notes (White 2006). These notes also contain outlines of the other 'maps' of narrative practice; more complete accounts are given in the books in the references list.

[18] Alice Morgan (2000, p.41) writes about consulting with Rosy, a young woman struggling with the effects of anorexia nervosa, who says that this doesn't affect her at work, as 'I try really hard not to let it get in the way of my work. My work is really important to me'.

[19] For descriptions of re-authoring conversations see Michael White's workshop notes (2006) or Russell & Carey (2004).

[20] These last two questions come from an interview by Michael White (1997, p.34)

[21] For descriptions of re-membering conversations see Michael White's workshop notes (2006) or Russell & Carey (2004).

[22] Much of this analysis draws on the work of J.B. Harley (1988), Mark Monmonier (1995), and Denis Wood (1992).

[23] For a response to anti-relativism, see Geertz (2000b).

[24] For more on these issues, and for reproductions of traditional maps, see Turnbull (1989).

[25] This work, initially called 'folk geography', was pioneered in the 1970s by Gwendolyn Warren and William Bunge (one project involved mapping urban neighbourhoods entirely from children's points of view; see Wood 1992). More recent ventures have been those by the Parish Map Project in England (King 1993); people with cartography and planning backgrounds, such as Briony Penn and Doug Aberley (see Berlin 1997); and bioregionalists around the world (Aberley 1993).

[26] For examples of bioregionalist thought, see Andrus et al (1990), Berthold-Bond (2000), and Sale (2000).

[27] See also Geertz's more recent reflections (2000, pp.133-140).

[28] In floating these suggestions, I'm not suggesting a re-privileging of the spatial dimension 'above' considerations of the temporal, and do not propose to displace the broader narrative orientation with a spatial one. Rather, I see possibilities for the spatial to be taken up in conjunction with the temporal, as just one part of the various threads of the narrative tapestry.

[29] In turn, we felt in some ways implicated in all of this, and started our workshop trying to address what had just happened.

[30] And, for young homeless men, there is often no private space at all, and limited access to these privately-owned 'public' spaces (see Carey et al 2000).

[31] I'm aware that these associations are somewhat arbitrary, and may differ between cultures and places.

[32] For more on these issues, see Jenkins (1990).

[33] I'm aware of some of the complexities with these questions. I'm not trying to suggest here that some places are more 'naturally' or 'inherently' caring. I'm

also aware that many of the institutions of 'care' – childcare centres, hospitals, nursing homes, and so on – can also be places of domination and abuse.

[34] I won't give an account of these sorts of questions here. Readers familiar with narrative practice will be familiar with this kind of enquiry. Readers who are not may like to extrapolate from the questions given in part 2 of this workshop, or refer to Michael White's online workshop notes (White 2006).

[35] For more on these maps, see White (1995, 1997, 2000, 2006).

[36] These questions are informed by ideas in mapping and town planning about the importance of all the senses in urban places (see Wood 1992, pp.85-87), as well as critiques of the privileging of sight in western culture (see White & Epston 1990, p.34, drawing on Luce Irigaray).

[37] Previous accounts of our work with young men can be found in Carey et al (1999), Denborough (1996), Trudinger, Boyd & Melrose (1998), and Trudinger (2000), which contain more complete lists of questions, and explanations of the thought informing them, so that teachers, school counsellors, and youth workers not familiar with narrative practice can run these workshops in their local settings. As this workshop is more fluid than previous ones, a comprehensive list of questions is not possible. Readers new to narrative ideas are encouraged to start with Alice Morgan's *What is Narrative Therapy?* (2000).

REFERENCES

Aberley, D. 1993: 'The lure of mapping: An introduction', in Aberley, D (ed): *Boundaries of Home: Mapping for local empowerment*, pp.1-7. Gabirola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

Aberley, D. (ed) 1994: *Futures by Design: The practice of ecological planning*. Sydney: Envirobook / Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Alexander, C., Ishikawa, S. & Silverstein, M. 1977: *A Pattern Language: Towns, buildings, construction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, B. 1991: 'Census, map, museum.' In *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, pp.163-185. London: Verso.

Andrus, V., Plant, C., Plant, J. & Wright, E. (eds) 1990: *Home: A bioregional reader*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Barnhill, D. (ed) 1999: *At Home on the Earth: Becoming native to our place: A multicultural anthology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berlin, S. 1997: 'Maps with teeth.' In *Ways We Live: Exploring Community*, pp.139-152. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

Berthold-Bond, D. 2000: 'The ethics of "place": Reflections on bioregionalism', *Environmental Ethics*, 22(1):5-24.

Bruner, E. M. 1986: 'Ethnography as narrative.' In Turner, W. & Bruner, E. M. (eds): *The Anthropology of Experience*, pp.139-155, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Bruner, J. 1986: *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. 1996: 'The narrative construal of reality.' In *The Culture of Education*, pp.130-149. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cajete, G. 1999: '"*Look to the mountain*": Reflections on indigenous ecology.' In *A People's Ecology: Explorations of sustainable living: Health, environment, agriculture, native traditions*, pp.1-20. Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Publishers.

Carey, M., Trudinger, M., Tully, D., O'Leary, P. & Boyd, C. 1999: 'A gathering for young homeless men: Dealing with issues of violence.' *Dulwich Centre Journal*, 3:pp.9-17.

Cheshire, A. & Lewis, D. 1998: 'The Journey: A narrative approach to adventure-based therapy'. In Cheryl White & David Denborough (eds) *Introducing Narrative Therapy: A collection of practice-based writings*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Crosby, A. W. 1986: *Ecological Imperialism: The biological expansion of Europe, 900-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denborough, D. 1996: 'Step by step: Developing respectful and effective ways of working with young men to reduce violence.' In Chris McLean, Maggie Carey, & Cheryl White (eds) *Men's Ways of Being*, pp.90-115. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Eichler, M. (ed) 1995: *Change of plans: Towards a non-sexist sustainable city*. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Epston, D. & White, M. 1992: 'Consulting your consultants: The documentation of alternative knowledges.' In Epston, D. & White, M.: *Experience, contradiction, narrative, and imagination*, pp.11-26. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Fairfax, K. 1995: 'Urban public spaces as men's places? The role of public transport in enabling women to reclaim our urban environment after dark.' Unpublished honours dissertation, Department of Geography, Victoria University of Wellington, NZ.

Forbes, P., Forbes, A. A. & Whybrow, H. 1999: *Our Land, Ourselves: Readings on people and place*. San Francisco: The Trust for Public Land.

Foucault, M. 1980a: *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*, Colin Gordon (ed). Harlow, Essex: Pearson/Longman.

Foucault, M. 1980b: 'Questions on Geography.' In Foucault 1980a:, pp.63-77.

Foucault, M. 1984: 'Space, knowledge, and power.' In Rabinow, P. (ed): *The Foucault Reader*, pp.239-256. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. 1996: 'The eye of power.' In Lotringer, S. (ed): *Foucault Live (Interviews, 1961-1984)*, pp.226-240. New York: Semiotext(e).

Foucault, M. 1997: 'Technologies of the self.' In Rabinow, P. (ed): *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984, Volume 1: Ethics: Subjectivity and truth*, pp.223-251. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. 1998: 'Different spaces.' In Faubion, J. D. (ed): *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984, Volume 2: Aesthetics, method, and epistemology*, pp.175-185. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. 2000: *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954-1984, Volume 3: Power*, Faubion, J. D (ed). London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. 2003: *'Society must be defended.' Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*, Mauro Bertani & Alessandro Fontana (ed). London: Allen Lane/Penguin.

Freedman, J. & Combs, G. 1996: *Narrative Therapy: The social construction of preferred realities*. New York: Norton.

Geertz, C. 1983: *Local Knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*. USA: Basic Books.

Geertz, C. 2000a: *Available Light: Anthropological reflections on philosophical topics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Geertz, C. 2000b: 'Anti anti-relativism.' In Geertz 2000a: *Available Light: Anthropological reflections on philosophical topics*, pp.42-67. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hannum, H. (ed) 1997: *People, Land and Community: Collected E.F. Schumacher Society lectures*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Harley, J. B. 1988: 'Maps, knowledge, and power.' In Cosgrove, D. & Daniels, S. (eds): *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the symbolic representation, design and use of past environments*, pp.277-312. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harley, J.B. 1989: 'Deconstructing the map.' *Cartographica*, Summer, 26(2), pp.1-20.

Jenkins, A. 1990: *Invitations to Responsibility: The therapeutic engagement of men who are violent and abusive*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Kidner, D. W. 1996: 'Why psychology is mute about the environmental crisis.' *Environmental Ethics*, 16(4): 359-376.

King, A. 1993: 'Mapping your roots: Parish mapping.' In Aberley, D. (ed) 1993: *Boundaries of Home: Mapping for local empowerment,* pp.31-34. Gabirola Island, BC: New Society.

Lester, J. 2001: 'Family equals people, land and language.' In Wingard, B. & Lester, J. (eds): *Telling Our Stories in Ways that Make us Stronger*, pp.57-62. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Lobovits, D., Maisel, R. & Freeman, J. 1995: 'Public practices: An ethic of circulation.' In Friedman, S. (ed): *The Reflecting Team in Action: Collaborative practice in family therapy,* pp.223-256. New York: The Guilford Press.

MacGregor, S. 1995: 'Deconstructing the man made city: Feminist critiques of planning thought and action.' In Eichler, M. (ed) 1995: *Change of Plans: Towards a non-sexist sustainable city*, pp.25-49. Toronto: Garamond Press.

McDowell, L. 1999: *Gender, Identity and Place: Understanding feminist geographies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McPhie, L. & Chaffey, C. 1999: 'The journey of a lifetime: Group work with young women who have experienced sexual assault.' In *Extending Narrative Therapy: A collection of practice-based papers*, pp.31-61. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Mies, M. & Shiva, V. 1993: *Ecofeminism*. Melbourne: Spinifex.

Monk, G., Winslade, J., Crocket, K. & Epston, D. 1997: *Narrative Therapy in Practice: The archaeology of hope*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Monmonier, M. 1995: *Drawing the Line: Tales of maps and cartocontroversy*. New York: Henry Holt.

Morgan, A. 2000: *What is Narrative Therapy?: An easy-to-read introduction*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Myerhoff, B. 1986: '"Life not death in Venice": Its second life.' In Turner, V. & Bruner, E. (eds): *The Anthropology of Experience*, pp.261-286, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Peterson, A. 1999: 'Environmental ethics and the social construction of nature.' *Environmental Ethics*, 21(4): 339-357.

Plant, J. (ed) 1989: *Healing the Wounds: The promise of ecofeminism*. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Rabinow, P. 2003: 'Ordonnance, discipline, regulation: Some reflections on urbanism.' In Low, S. & Lawrence-Zuniga, D. (eds): *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating culture*, pp.353-362. London: Blackwell.

Rose, G. 1993: *Feminism and Geography: The limits of geographical knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Russell, S. & Carey, M. 2004: *Narrative Therapy: Responding to your questions*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications

Sale, K. 2000: *Dwellers in the Land: The bioregional vision*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Soja, E. W. 1989: *Postmodern Geographies: The reassertion of space in critical social theory*. London: Verso.

Soper, K. 1995: *What is Nature?* Oxford: Blackwell.

Tamasese, K. 2002: 'Honouring Samoan ways and understandings: Towards culturally appropriate mental health services.' *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, 2:64-71. Republished 2003 in Waldegrave, C., Tamasese, K., Tuhaka, F. & Campbell, W. (eds): *Just Therapy – a journey: A collection of papers from the Just Therapy Team*, New Zealand, pp.183-195 (chapter 12). Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Trudinger, M., Boyd, C. & Melrose, P. 1999: 'Questioning sexuality A workshop in progress.' In *Extending Narrative Therapy: A collection of practice-based papers*, pp.63-75. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Trudinger, M. 2000: 'Young men, angry language, and the language of anger.' *Gecko: A journal of deconstruction and narrative ideas in therapeutic practice*, 3:30-53.

Turnbull, D. 1989: *Maps are Territories, Science is an Atlas*. Geelong: Deakin University.

Vitek, W. & Jackson, W. (eds.) 1996: *Rooted in the Land: Essays on community and place*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Waldegrave, C., Tamasese, K., Tuhaka, F. & Campbell, W. 2003: *Just Therapy – a journey: A collection of papers from the Just Therapy Team*, New Zealand. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

White, M. 1992: 'Deconstruction and therapy.' In Epston, D. & White, M: *Experience, Contradiction, Narrative, and Imagination*, pp.109-151. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

White, M. 1995: *Re-authoring Lives: Interviews and essays*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

White, M. 1996: 'Men's culture, the men's movement, and the constitution of men's lives.' In C. McLean, M. Carey, & C. White (eds) *Men's Ways of Being*, pp.162-193. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

White, M. 1997: *Narratives of Therapists' Lives*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

White, M. 2000: *Reflections on Narrative Practice*. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

White, M. 2001: 'The narrative metaphor in family therapy.' In Denborough, D. (ed): *Family Therapy: Exploring the field's past, present, and possible futures*, pp.131-138. Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

White, M. 2006: Workshop notes, available from www.dulwichcentre.com.au

White, M. & Epston, D. 1991: *Narrative Means to Therapeutic Ends*. New York: Norton.

Whitzman, C. 1995: 'What do you want to do? Pave parks?: Urban planning and the prevention of violence.' In Eichler, M. (ed): *Change of Plans: Towards a non-sexist sustainable city*, pp.89-109. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Wright, G. & Rabinow, P. 1982: 'Spatialization of power: A discussion of the work of Michel Foucault', *Skyline*, pp.14-15. March.

Wood, D. 1992: *The Power of Maps*. New York: The Guilford Press.