

Response by Ute Pinkert

Dear Judith, dear Stanislaw,

In the encircling of awkwardness, your text is dedicated to a less illuminated side of our human communication. It allows me as a reader to experience how content is formed in the moment of speech, how it is still quite 'raw' and how it is linked to the depths of our personal history and, of course, to the conditions of the reality in which we live. For me, your text is, on an overarching level, a text about the painful realization of being a wounded and vulnerable being in a perfection-obsessed society. The feelings associated with this are complex; shame is an essential part. Thank you for your courage to reach this level of discussion! For me, the success of your attempt has a lot to do with the fact that you enter a real dialog. It is exciting to read how you two meet but also how you miss each other and how your relationship progress.

When I imagine myself as a participant in your dialog, I remember my experience of the PAC conference in Zurich in October 2022. I share your perceptions and, at the same time, I am surprised that you do not mention the importance of language as a medium of communication. We all came together from different language areas and it was a matter of certainty that we would communicate with each other in English. Sometimes there were translations, but it was assumed that everyone had a sufficient command of English. Admittedly, I found this to be the biggest challenge at the PAC meeting. I can speak English, but not well enough to express myself in a differentiated way, leading to a few moments of shame and anger. They always occurred when I had

the impression that things were being oversimplified when I tried to formulate them. I remember that one of PAC's predecessor projects wanted to tackle this problem of different (specialist) languages. The "Glossary Project" wanted to address the phenomenon that our subject, the performing arts in social fields, is anchored in different cultural areas and is based on different traditions and concepts. Manfred Schewe and Florian Vaßen, who are pursuing the project with regard to the relationship between theater pedagogy in the German and English-speaking world, put it this way: "The comparison between German and English terminology made us aware of how strongly the respective theater, cultural and political tradition impacts the translation work and, consequently, can cause significant challenges for translators." You will find further information about the glossary project under the following link: <https://www.ucc.ie/en/scenario/scenarioforum/glossaryperformativeartsdramatheatreineducation/>

We are currently very good at recognizing power relations and enabling accessibility at all levels. But the hierarchies and exclusions that are exercised through the dominance of a language (and the concepts associated with it) form a blind spot in our discussions. If you were to ask me if I know of any other solution for communicating at international meetings, then I believe that artificial intelligence will soon provide us with ways that we can think in our mother tongue and still be understood internationally.

The other aspect that struck me in your text is the notable absence of artistic practice. Isn't the friction in communication, the feeling of awkwardness, one of the strongest motives for the artistic search for a different, more appropriate (symbolic) form? In any case, I find it interesting to think about how the 'desire' to create arises and how I can support it in a professional way. What will distinguish the human capacity for artistic articulation from the creations of artificial intelligence in the future? In my opinion, human creativity needs a foundation in its vulnerability. In this context, I am currently looking again at "resonance" as a world relationship (according to Hartmut Rosa) and its significance for our discipline. Building a relationship of resonance first of all requires recognizing the foreign as foreign in the sense of something unavailable. The

second step then involves not rejecting the foreign, not appropriating it, but allowing it to speak with its own voice. Then, we can subsequently respond to it. In my opinion, this response can only be awkward because it arises anew in every situation and in each unique encounter. I know that this is idealistic: who has the time to listen and to answer in everyday life, especially in our warlike times? I find, however, the (performing) arts provide the space to practice answering and to feel—even endure—the awkwardness of such an answering language in the broadest sense.

I didn't think I would defend awkwardness in the answer to your text..., but I believe that with the unpredictable future of artificial intelligence we are facing, we have to rethink a lot...

Thank you for your impetus.

All the best,

Ute

