

The Other Eye #2

Germany versus
Norway: On Education.
Articles from the
seminar.

The Other Eye #2

Performing Arts Hub Norway (Oslo) and BIT Teatergarasjen (Bergen), arranged the second of four seminars addressing the theme Germany versus Norway: inter- changing theatrical strategies. The development of theater art is affected by the artistic approach, the methods, content and structures of education. This also applies on how the said development is received in the public discourse and research. We invited two keynote speakers, and a panel of additional five theatre scholars from Germany and Norway to discuss the following questions:

How has the educational institutions changed and evolved over the last 20 years? How has the development of education manifested itself in practice, both in art production and intellectual discourse?

The seminar was initiated by the Norwegian Embassy in Berlin, due to their observation of an increasing artistic dialogue and collaboration between artists and representatives from the vibrating performing art sectors in both countries.

Location and time for the second seminar was: USF Verftet/BIT-Teatergarasjen, Bergen. 22nd of October 2013, at 11 am-16 pm.

The seminar was supported by: The Norwegian Embassy in Berlin, Performing Arts Hub Norway, BIT-Teatergarasjen Bergen.



Danse — og
teatersentrum
Performing Arts Hub Norway

bit teatergarasjen

HOYDEPUNKTER FRA HELE VERDEN | WWW.BIT-TEATERGARASJEN.NO



NORWEGISKE KULTURDEPARTEMENT



NORWEGIAN MINISTRY
OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS



NORWEGIAN CONSULATE GENERAL

The Other Eye #2: Education



BY ANETTE THERESE PETTERSEN

The second seminar in the The Other Eye-series took place during the Meteor Festival at BIT-Teatergarasjen in Bergen. The topic this time was education and how the development of theater art is affected by the artistic approach, the methods, content and structures of education. This also applies on how the said development is received in the public discourse and research.

How has the educational institutions changed and evolved over the last 20 years? How has the development of education manifested itself in practice, both in art production and intellectual discourse?

The seminar opened with two lectures by keynote speakers Siren Leirvåg (University of Oslo) and Christel Weiler (Institut für Theaterwissenschaft der Freien Universität Berlin). The lectures were followed by a panel discussion, led by Tore Vagn Lid (Transiteatret Bergen).

In addition to Leirvåg and Weiler, the panel consisted of:

Karmenlara Ely (The Norwegian Theatre Academy in Fredrikstad), Hans Henriksen (Oslo National Academy of Arts), Keld Hyldig (University of Bergen), André Eiermann (Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main), Martin Gruber (Ernst Busch Hochschule für Schauspielkunst).

With Siren Leirvåg's initial speak, it must be admitted that the future of theatre science looks grim. The changes within the universities are described in Leirvåg and Weiler's articles, and they were also the

main topic of discussion later in the panel discussions.

The members of the panel had different backgrounds and approaches to the field of academia, and thus brought different perspectives to the discussion. The Norwegian institutions (the University of Bergen and at the University of Oslo, The Norwegian Theatre Academy in Fredrikstad and Oslo National Academy of Arts) are presented in Siren Leirvåg's article – just as the German institutions (Institut für Theaterwissenschaft der Freien Universität Berlin, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main and Ernst Busch Hochschule für Schauspielkunst) are presented in Christel Weiler's article.

Hans Henriksen, Karmenlara Ely and Martin Gruber represented institutions from the more practical side of the theatre – whereas Keld Hyldig, Siren Leirvåg, Christel Weiler, and André Eiermann represented the more theoretical side. But at the same time there are no clear borders between theory and practice anymore, something both the initial lectures stressed – as well as was repeatedly discussed throughout the seminar.

Before starting at The Norwegian Theatre Academy in Fredrikstad, Karmenlara Ely had worked at New York University's Tisch School of the Arts. Here 2000 students attend the studies at the same time, and Ely was worried as to how the school becomes a huge machine that more or less 'pops out' students every year. She valued the approach in Fredrikstad where a very few students are accepted

every year, and the school being able to be more attentive towards creating potential in the students. The acting students at Fredrikstad starts out their studies by making scenography, learning how to deal with space – as well as how to deal with the audience.

André Eiermann has a background from Angewandte Theaterwissenschaft at the Justus-Liebig University in Giessen (as further described in Christel Weiler's article), and agreed with Ely on the value of giving students the possibilities to explore. At Giessen the students can work both alone and in critical analysis with the teachers, and have the possibility to try things, to fail and then analyse this in order to further develop.

Another returning topic during the discussion was how the Bologna process has changed theatre studies. Several of the members of the panel expressed concern regarding the increased bureaucracy and public management. The vanishing possibilities for theatre students, both within the practical and the theoretical approach, to develop their potential – to be able to try and fail as a part of their education, was a returning topic of the discussion. The same was the relation between the practical and theoretical studies.

What sort of knowledge should one expect a theatre scholar to have regarding the practical issues of the performing arts? And, likewise; what theoretical insights and knowledge should or could one expect from the students within acting, directing and scenography? As Hans Henriksen put it: some actors are most intelligent *on* stage, without words. And, as I would put it: some scholars are most intelligent behind the books and computers, without practical theatrework. Weiler brought up the question regarding what knowledge is, what we consider to be knowledge, how we define it – and how do we create theory? This also highlighted the importance of different forms of documentation of work and practice (such as acting techniques) – in order to transform the experience into the future.

The discussion did not come to any conclusions beyond addressing a common concern for the future of theatre studies – both on a practical and theoretical level. But it seemed clear that both the educational institutions as well as the theatre practice has changed significantly over the past twenty years, and that this change is still in process. How these changes will implement the arts and the education in the future though, is still a bit unclear.

Negotiating the performing arts education «**betwixt and between**» practice and intellectual discourse



BY SIREN LEIRVÅG

A historical outline

In a historical perspective, performing arts education in Norway has been characterized by a lack of recognition of artistic practice and intellectual discourse as mutually dependent aspects of art production as well as the dynamic between the «inside», the practice, and «outside», the institutions of the discourse. (Foucault¹) As a university discipline within the humanities, theatre research, as it was called after the German Theaterwissenschaft, was established in the 1950s as an act of emancipation from literary studies. From the start the university education and the arts education have lived separate lives (apart from individual scholar's own personal approach). This means that there has been limited contact and exchange between the separate institutions. Why is this? Traditionally, theatre practice has been transferred from generation to generation as a kind of «learning by doing» which means that an older actor has mentored a younger actor within the frames and conventions of the theatre. It was not until the establishing of the Academy of Theatre (in Oslo) in 1953 that the methodology of acting and directing became a

matter of education. Founded on the ideas of the Russian actor/director Konstantin Stanislavskij (1863 – 1938), the Academy of Theatre both reproduced the style of psychological realism in the Norwegian Theatre institution and provided actors ready to take on the task of transferring new blood to this modern and fundamentally literal tradition. The ABC of a modern institution of the performing arts has as its basic assumption that a) it should at all times create new and progressive strategies for artistic development, b) it should at the same time sustain the national foundation that it was based on, and c) it should at all times fulfill the basic demands of the cultural policies of the government (as dominant sponsors). This does not apply to the independent field of the performing arts in the same way. Since 1965 the Arts Council in Norway has organized the funding of the independent projects within theatre, dance, scripts, and everything in between – in what has been called «an arms length distance» – which means as little interference from political control as possible. Whether this is actually the case is an ongoing discussion among artists, cultural bureaucrats and – politicians.

As the short historical outline above shows, there has been a positive drive and will on many levels in the field of performing arts education and practice to establish solid grounds for a broad spectre of production and intellectual discourse, although seldom together and in mutual contexts.

Knowledge and practice in the heart of the performing arts education

The present situation may illustrate the argument that the lack of a coherent policy in the performing arts education and a continuing institutionalized separation of practice and discourse can result in a fundamental crisis: Theatre Studies at the University of Oslo is being «phased out»! (The University of Bergen and NTNU (Trondheim) both stay in the game!) This means that Performance Studies, which had developed into an important part of the Oslo profile and curriculum, together with the historical and aesthetic disciplines, is no longer available to the students to the same degree as before. And as important, which is also what actors, directors and critics in Oslo point out in their reaction to the UiO's decision: The production of knowledge and discourse in direct contact with art practice in Oslo has been made even more difficult than it has been.

On the bright side, the performing arts education in artistic production has flourished and developed more diverse disciplines of acting, directing, scenography and stage writing. The National Academy of the Arts (KHiO), also situated in Oslo, is currently reorganizing the educational structure, with MAs in theatre: acting, directing, scenography and stage writing, from 2013. They are definitely expanding their education in a direction where theory plays a larger part of the practical education.

The Norwegian Theatre Academy at Østfold University College (Fredrikstad) has created a profile specializing in interactions between visual arts and theatre, theatre and society and theory and practice, for acting and scenography at BA level (since 2003). This obviously represents a more up to date approach within theatre education. The Nord-Trøndelag University College (HiNT) offers a BA in Theatre practice, i.e. acting and theatre production (since 2005). University colleges around the country still offer education in visual and dramatic arts within the teacher education programmes. However, the HiNT-education has developed a curriculum on the art of acting that

communicates with the acting practices in Norway often referred to as «alternative» acting styles, meaning to The National Academy.

The present situation also shows that there have been some fundamental changes and developments in the last decade or so. As a whole we can say that the idea of a broad approach to performing arts education has been appreciated by the arts institutions and the university colleges (some of them now new universities) while the opposite has happened at the «old» universities. At the University of Oslo, there seems to be a withdrawal of attention from parts of the humanities, particularly the arts *studies*, to the so-called life *sciences* and social *sciences*. To me this looks like a withdrawal back to a tug of war between natural sciences and cultural studies, both on prestige and money, which makes it more resistant to critique from what is already considered marginal academic disciplines. As paradoxical as it may sound, this development brings us more than half a century back in time.

Performing arts education as a university discipline – three models

In a comparative and broader perspective, and as far as I can see, performing arts education as a university discipline in Europe and the US are profiled and organized along three models or modes:

- Theatre Research/Theaterwissenschaft – a historical model, initially founded to be inscribed as an equal part of the Humanities to literary studies and arts history in particular
- Applied Theatre Studies/Angewandte Theaterwissenschaft – a production oriented model which seek to find new combinations and new research methods in the meeting places between performance theories and practices
- Performance Studies – a broad spectrum of theories and practices in close collaboration with other university disciplines, such as anthropology, culture studies, sociology and life sciences

The first model is closer to theatre historiography and research than to the performing arts or performance studies. The second applies to institutions where intellectual discourse and art production are closely connected in the curriculum. And the third is based on the idea that the performing arts are as much social and cultural phenomenon as aesthetic works and thus have to be researched in various interdisciplinary contexts.

Knowledge and power at the core of the performing arts discourse

As an endnote, let me return to Foucault and his view on the discourse as a *mise-en-scène* and negotiation between practice and institutions, between knowledge and power. It may serve here as a reminder that a discourse always is controlled and disciplined and the power is distributed and organized to avoid the subjects «coincidental speech». I think we need to address this power play in order to open the space of discourse for new relations between practice and intellectual discourse in the performing arts education. Reconsidering the relationship between art production and intellectual discourse then brings us to the main argument of this paper: By creating a discourse «betwixed and between»² performance practice and intellectual discourse, in a collapse of binary concepts such as *theory* and *theatre* ((both from Greek: *theōria*: to see, contemplate, speculate and *théatron*: a place from where one views) and in a double vision of the «inside», the practice, and «outside», the institutions, of the discourse, we may have a less vulnerable and more comprehensive performing arts education.

NOTES

- 1 Michel Foucault: «L'ordre du discours», Collège de France, 1970.
- 2 Erika Fischer-Lichte, who refers to Victor Turner in *The transformative Power of Performance. A New Aesthetics*, Routledge, 2008.

Casting an eye on education

Public discourse and education



BY CHRISTEL WEILER

The German education system has, for quite some time now, provided a lot of noticeable public discomfort. In some ways, this crisis of educational institutions is comparable to the eternal crisis in theatre. This is most evident in daily newspapers, that have stated, over an extended period of time, that, comparatively to other European countries, the German education system leaves a lot to be desired in the skills of our school children.

In light of universities after the Bologna Reform, the press underlines that these institutions have become places ‘without soul’, in which economic interests and questions of image-cultivation play major roles, in addition to students lamenting their fate due to an increased pressure in gaining higher marks.

The fact is that universities are more and more requested to provide external funds for research projects, and their respective departments are demanded demonstrable quality in government assessments.

As a result, and not only in academia, there is a lot of reflection, of asking, analysing, and searching new models for the future. This has resulted in a rather broad debate, consisting of suggestions, pros and cons, without an ideal solution that might tackle the diversity of problems and challenges.

This is further aggravated by the enormous speed with which ideas, and society itself, change, in opposition to the slow, ponderous pace with which institutions transform; what might be reasonable today can become nonsense overnight. Central to determining this change are economic reasons, quoted to justify non-action; this might as well be down to the sheer excessive demand, creating a vortex that is hard to escape, and can only be solved systematically.

These preliminaries are an attempt to outline an atmosphere, rather than analyze a situation that of course, prompts comprehensive study. To begin with, these introductory remarks indicate that it’s important to locate considerations of future models in university education within a wider framework. This depends on the specific needs and motivations of these studies that may develop in various directions.

Discourse on Education and the University – two examples

1) At the theatre department of Freie Universität Berlin¹ a first and rather classic, phenomenological step was made in 2008. Together with Jens Roselt, we organized a conference under the slogan: *Schauspielen Heute: Die Bildung des Menschen in den performativen Künsten* (Acting today. Forming

mankind in performing arts). In the first place, we asked what we mean when we talk about education, how as a term, it could be defined and re-defined. In order to stray away from the abstract, we invited teachers from acting academies as well as actors, enabling a dialogue through which to examine the issue from a range of perspectives.

The German word 'Bildung' (education/formation) connotes the making, giving shape – a process of becoming, a state of being (gebildet sein). It refers to 'Bild' / Image, pointing to both our mental and spiritual capacities.

Accordingly, we attempted a structural differentiation between *Einbildung* (imagination, presumption), *Selbst-Bildung* (self-fashioning, self-education) and *Ausbildung* (education, training, apprenticeship). Although we had actors and spectators in mind, we think that these more fundamental reflections could be applied – to some extent – to other agents as well. In short: we started from the assumption that the theatre – as an exemplary institution – is a place where this three-fold education takes place. By analysing these processes within this microstructure we could come to more general insights concerning both society and other fields of education. Our guiding question was: what do actors learn at acting academies? Does this generate specific aesthetics? What is the difference between skills, practical knowledge and the power to transform? How do physical and cognitive abilities correlate? What kind of 'habitus' or bearing evolves out of acting training? Where do actor training and cultural features meet? Is there an ethos of actor training/acting? How do systems of training relate to diversity in society? How does acquired knowledge and skill meet practical demands, or better: how do trained actors live up to the standards of daily work in an average municipal or independent theatre?²

It is of course, impossible to answer these questions to any satisfactory level, let alone solve the problems that emerged during our conversations. Speaking from the perspective of a teacher working in a theatre department, one might argue that the point of these deliberations is the construction of a heightened awareness of the complexity of the topic – for students, scholars and teachers. In addition, one might underline that there is a particular insight that emerges in the dialogue between scholars and actors, teachers from acting academies and those from universities, which might need further encouragement. As for 'solutions' and progress: the

best case scenarios is that all these exchanges and thoughts forge ahead into teaching and acting in rather unspectacular ways.³

2) A more sociological/political and critical approach to what is happening at the moment in regards to the educational system will be the starting point for an endeavour within the Giessen theatre department. The University's website advertises an international conference with the title: The Public Commons and the Undercommons of Art, Education and Labour, which will take place in May 2014.

The starting questions differ quite considerably from the Berlin conference, taking into account a more practical orientation within the study path. The focus mirrors the student's own alignment; at the end of their studies, they aim to emerge as artists, preoccupied with hands on questions of artistry, thus legitimately wanting to know what lies ahead for them. The questions are phrased the following way on the Institute's website:

What does it mean or take to fight against the privatization and corporatization of the university today? Which positions and strategies can be staked out in defining the struggle? Is the corporatization of the university a global phenomenon, the «wind that comes from the West,» from Britain spreading into the continental Europe through Holland, or are there still significant differences in various social and political contexts in Europe? What is distinctive about the new academic research programs in the arts compared to the humanities? What are the aesthetic and political facets of developing artistic research under the provisions of the academy? What transformations of the arts are to be expected by the influence of the art PhDs? Should we fear the university as a «greenhouse to pamper» artists as «hothouse flowers» (James Elkins) whose art will become, as it were, more academic? And, in turn, are we also to expect an inflation of academic degrees and what effects could it have on the job market? Or, could there also be a positive transaction from the political lessons artists may learn in the institutional environment of the university into the art practices, and perhaps, even into the concerns with the public sphere in which art also participates?⁴

What becomes evident from these questions is

a deep concern for the future. But the question: 'What does the future need?' 'What do we – as artists to become – need in days to come?' can only be answered from here and now.

The future is created and constructed by what we do, how we live and what we maintain in the present. It's always made up of actual forces, energies, actions that yield and bear what will come next. So the question: 'what does the future need?' cannot be answered without some visions of the future. But as the present is always hiding forces whose effects we cannot foresee, these visions or ideas will merge with what we do not yet know. This means that we have to be prepared for taking a risk. ATW itself is a very good example of an educational institution, which at the time of its inception in 1982 ventured something completely new intramural.

Giessen and 'Angewandte Theaterwissenschaft' – a brief historical digression

The course of study was implemented at Justus Liebig Universität in 1982. At the time, nobody had thought that this 'Orchideenfach' would gain as much attention, or anticipate its influence and success in theatre in general, and German academia. As an exception, the university got the permission from the Ministry of Education to offer a course of study that brings theory and practice together, limiting the number of students to 20 each year (as a rule limitations of that kind are not consistent with our 'Hochschulgesetz/ Higher Education Act). This initiative emerged as a result of the American Studies Department, that exposed the Anglo-American model as an interesting, new way to study theatre at the university. To understand the success and the exception made in light of this new model (which at that time did not consider itself as a model at all but rather an exceptional experiment) we need to examine both the wider context of ATW's beginnings, and its premises. I will briefly list the most important ones:

- In 1982 theatre departments all over the country were far less autonomous (Mainz, Frankfurt did not exist yet, Hildesheim looked all together different, Leipzig was not accessible to the West because of the wall). There was little to no need to compete, and not a chance to draw comparisons with other theatre departments (which might well be so at the moment).
- The impact of technology on theatre has been

non-existent. Still in 1990 at Giessen University one had to go to the department of physics to send an email to the US and nobody had any idea about what computers and smart phones and e-books would be in daily life.

- The Giessen Stadttheater and German Stadttheater served as the perfect enemy – there was no greater difference imaginable than that between the concepts of Andrzej Wirth – the first to hold the chair at the department – and their common practice. Andrzej Wirth's important influences were Robert Wilson, Heiner Müller, Bertolt Brecht and various philosophers – all of them close to unknown in Giessen at that time.
- There has hardly been any distraction for the students coming in from the outside. Giessen is not the most exciting place. Focusing on one's work seemed to be the only possible way of being. The university provided a black box on campus – which is still very rare (Berlin does not offer this!) – and in the sequel two more rehearsal rooms. So the students could spend a lot of time there and got the chance to present their work throughout the year. No need to mention that all performances presented were followed by discussions, heated debates and critique.
- All the students were permitted to broaden their study – in a way similar to a studium generale – according to their interests and preferences. They could choose so-called 'Bausteine'/modules. This meant that their study followed, and still does, a modular system where all the humanities make their special offers for ATW and accept that these students are somehow 'special'. They were – and may still be – treated more like guest auditors than 'degree students'.
- Last not least: Giessen university provided the money for a continuous professorship that could be awarded to outstanding artists like Bob Wilson, George Tabori, Heiner Müller, John Jesurun, to name only a few. Gaining inspiration from these figures, learning from their practice and process presented an unparalleled and singular chance in the life of these future artists (who – and their teachers alike – by then had no idea that they would become successful at a later date. Rather the opposite was true.)

In many ways in 1982 ATW was a unique place for experimentation that was unprecedented; it presented a real open space, possibility space in the full sense. The results of this beginning – if one

may call it so – need no further explanation. René Pollesch, She She Pop, Rimini Protokoll, Moritz Rinke, Tim Staffel, Otmar Wagner, Florian Feigel, Showcase Beat Le Mot, Lose Combo and many other artists who are now, if not mainstream, successful and influential in their own ways. Their contribution to developments and changes in theatre has been enormous. One might say without exaggeration, that it surmounted national borders and now spreads all over the world.

It's not just theatre and performance art that come back to ATW, but Theatre Studies has also, to some extent, been taken over by Giessen students. One must however recognize that their academic careers have been co-modelled at the Berlin theatre department under the influence of Erika Fischer-Lichte and Gabriele Brandstetter, among others. Jens Roselt and Mieke Matzke have to be mentioned here, also Hans-Friedrich Bormann, Isa Wortelkamp, Susanne Foellmer. They are now in leading positions in academia and are contributing to progress and change there.

These established practices developed by former Giessen graduates – either in the context of the art scene itself, or academia – will become the next point for future consideration. These artists and scholars are shaping the landscape of today. Accordingly, today's students – at Giessen University or elsewhere – are confronted by a different situation. Their predecessors are now famous, they lack the Stadttheater enemy and are instead invited to enter the venues and compete with their paragons. All over the country theatres and universities are collaborating. The environment is very different from 30 years ago, which prompts the question: is this model still valuable, and what does it need to do to adapt?

Educating for the future

Heiner Goebbels, head of the Giessen department since 1999, and an artist himself – has reflected on the question 'Which theatre are we educating for?' in a very considered way. In his essay 'Organising Seeing and Hearing'/'Das Hören und Sehen organisieren'⁵ he notes that, in light of the future, everything has to be subject to negotiation. The most challenging task is to prepare the students in confronting the ever-increasing complexities of future performing arts and – this should be added – the ever-increasing complexities and diversity of societies as well. ATW is still – together with the department at Hildesheim University – a rare

study pathway that combines theory and practice in a very decisive and balanced way. Meanwhile, practical courses are being offered across all theatre departments. However at ATW, both fields are deliberately inter-related. Heiner Goebbels notes that this inter-relation is not straightforward; the students (and teachers) are preoccupied with theories of literature, visual arts, philosophy and the like, as a means of providing an inspiring detour to practical experience. That being said, if all theories are reassessed through practice, this implies that they would be filtered through and established by both our senses and experience. Since education at this department is not meant to serve a special market – or, to be precise, not meant to serve the German Stadttheater – teaching and learning can be conceived of as experimental approaches to research in the best possible sense. Goebbels asks of his students to see their studies as a laboratory for the future, which allows for a constant questioning: what do I see, hear, what does this work do to me, how does it affect me, how does it resonate? From this perspective, studying at ATW implies running the whole gamut of sensory awareness through trying out, checking, trial and error. Accordingly Goebbels remarks that in the end all theory has to pass the body, it has to be digested, embodied and enacted. Only then the artist's work is more than a mere theoretical construct. This is also what makes ATW different from most other theatre departments: it offers plenty of time and space for practical experimentation.

No doubt that competence in new media work is indispensable. Future theatre artists should know how to work with a range of technologies. There is a need for craft but this shouldn't serve as an end in itself. This is what distinguishes ATW from acting academies or so-called directorial training.

Of course all this sounds quite idealistic and exemplary. Nevertheless the students at Giessen University have no choice but to only participate in global competition at the end of their studies. Like everyone else they pursue recognition; they want to be praised and flourish. The questions they are asking at their upcoming conference indicate that they want to be part of the artistic design of the future. But all their reflections and considerations won't provide assurances that their future artistic practice will be crowned with success.

Future education

Christoph Wulf – one of the leading German

education researchers – conceives of education in a broader sense as a corporeal, sensuous and performative process. Within this process, he says, one needs to distinguish four different ways of learning: 1) one has to learn how and where to gain knowledge; 2) one has to learn how to act (and thus get practical knowledge in doing so); 3) one has to learn how to live with others (one could add: and how to collaborate) and last, but not least 4) one has to learn to accept oneself, which means one has to learn to be (here one could add: and become).⁶

To start from such a concept of education not only includes an aesthetic and performative dimension; it also comprises a trans-cultural dimension, which might be most important for and in the future. Theatre in the future or for the future needs to understand that there are many colours, a lot of different and diverse ways of its making. In accordance with Heiner Goebbels' remark that all theory has to pass the body, such an understanding of education also points to the importance of time. Maybe this is what future education needs most of all. Time to share, time to meet, time for dialogue and negotiation, time to try out and time to scrap in order to find out what really needs to be said and done.

NOTES

- 1 As a rule, our students at the universities are expected to be trained in analysing, theorising and historicising all phenomena, which – in the broadest sense possible – can be called theatre (including dance and music) or performance (which means cultural performances of all kinds would be included). All in all we have theatre departments at the following universities: Berlin, Hildesheim, Leipzig, Munich, Erlangen, Frankfurt, Giessen, Köln, Mainz, Bochum, Bayreuth and Hamburg. Some of them exist in combination with film and media studies, some are separate from film and media, some connect with cultural studies and also cultural management.
- 2 The lectures and debates of this conference are published and thus available for further discussions. Cf. Jens Roselt, Christel Weiler (eds.) *Schauspielen heute. Die Bildung des Menschen in den performativen Künsten*, Bielefeld 2011
- 3 The most recent evidence that the field of research and the related self-conception is in a process of transformation might be seen in the actual announcement of the German Society for Theaterwissenschaft and their call for entries www.rub.de/kongressgrw2014
- 4 http://www.frankfurt-lab.de/en/news/detail/the_public_commons_and_the_undercommons_of_art_education_and_labor-1.html
- 5 cf.: Heiner Goebbels, *Das Hören und Sehen organisieren*, in: Heiner Goebbels, *Ästhetik der Abwesenheit*, Berlin 2012
- 6 Cf. Almut Barbara Renger and Christoph Wulf in: *Paragrana*, Band 22, 2013, Heft 2



THE OTHER EYE #2

The second in a series of four seminars organised by Performing Arts Hub Norway (PAHN) and The Norwegian Embassy in Berlin.

The Other Eye #2 was organised in collaboration with BIT-Teatergarasjen Bergen.

Responsible for program: PAHN in collaboration with Thomas Irmer (German consultant), The Norwegian Embassy in Berlin and BIT-Teatergarasjen Bergen.

Participants in the seminar: Siren Leirvåg, Christel Weiler, Karmenlara Ely, André Eiermann, Hans Henriksen, Keld Hyldig, Martin Grüber and Tore Vagn Lid.

Documentation: Elisabeth Leinslie og Anette Therese Pettersen.

Articles by: Siren Leirvåg, Christel Weiler and Anette Therese Pettersen. Designer: Nina Lykke. Proofread: Diana Damian. Photos: Anette Therese Pettersen.