7. Intercultural Reorganisation in Performing Arts

Through the cultural diversity dispositive (cultural policy discourse on diversity and the materialisation of this discourse through actions such as funding programmes and theatres subsidised through those incentives) in various chapters, this research analysed to what extent cultural policy plans, strategies, and implementation measures consider intercultural reorganisation an integral dimension of a future-oriented performing arts scene.

As shown throughout this research, in cultural policy terms, the intercultural opening of cultural institutions has gained importance in the last decade. It is evident from the examples shown in Section 3.3 that interculturality, albeit perceived and implemented varyingly, has become an omnipresent concept for promoting cultural diversity at the *Länder* and municipal level. Similarly, as illustrated in Chapter 5, the national government has been introducing intercultural funding programmes or programmes with intercultural features to foster intercultural awareness, dialogue, and exchange. Nonetheless, after almost 15 years of introducing various views on the matter, the intercultural reorientation of the theatrical landscape is still one of the main subjects of cultural policy discourse and discussions. There are still many conferences and events dedicated to the pluralisation of the theatre domain. And yet, the status quo is maintained, and the (public) theatre remains a White institution.

Since national cultural policy does not offer an intercultural perspective, through the illustration of some new intercultural approaches at the *Länder* and local level, the study aimed to identify the shortcomings of cultural policy that need to be addressed in order to take an adequate intercultural direction. Further, this research sought to examine the aspects overlooked by cultural policy and recommend a frame of mind that would facilitate the intercultural reorganisation of the theatre realm, while exploring how the consolidation of current intercultural strategies might contribute to federal cultural policy making the intercultural reorganisation of the performing arts scene a priority objective.

What immediately comes into view regarding the perception and implementation of interculturality by the *Länder* and municipal governments is that although the concept has been employed in various modes by different actors

of policymaking bodies, it remains an inclusion/integration strategy, aimed to be achieved through intercultural dialogue, addressing residents with a "migrant background" and lately refugees.

Similarly, at the national level of policy, "migrant others" with overlapping identities (i.e., non-European, non-Western, non-Christian, Black people, POC) and refugees are perceived as the target groups of intercultural work and intercultural programmes. Correspondingly, cultural diversity and interculturality are understood as part of the field of immigration, theatre pedagogy, and cultural education, and these programmes are designed for immigrants and refugees within cultural education strategies, frequently interrelated with the socio-culture practice. Even well-intended cultural education and cultural participation funding programmes employ interculturality in a manner that implies that forced migration produces a collective "refugee identity" or a "refugee culture"; therefore, refugees are recognised as the sole recipients of most intercultural programmes and projects.

Interculturality is also often understood as the concept of reaching out to immigrants as new audiences. None of these intercultural funding programmes is concerned with the absence of racialised and marginalised theatre professionals in the performing arts scene. Although the examined funding programmes of the key national policy institutions, namely the German Federal Cultural Foundation, Performing Arts Fund, and the Socio-Culture Fund, incorporated valuable features of interculturality, in the absence of a relevant intercultural policy framework these remain isolated measures. The analysis of the cultural diversity dispositive indicates that cultural policy has failed to provide a structured intercultural frame and vision that would encourage institutionalised theatres to accommodate immigration-related diversity within their organisational culture.

The newly updated federal cultural policy disappointingly continues to relate cultural diversity only to intercultural dialogue. In this interpretation, intercultural dialogue refers "both to conversations within the country (with groups of the population who have a 'migrant background' [emphasis added]) and those at the international level" (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 29). It perceives "intercultural theatre, music and film festivals or the Carnival of Cultures, a parade of different ethnic and cultural groups on the streets of, e.g., Berlin, Bielefeld or Frankfurt" (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 29) as offers of intercultural dialogue. Moreover, federal funding programmes, interconnected with intercultural education, are understood to enhance intercultural dialogue, which enables respecting different cultural traditions and values of other ethnic or religious groups, and contributes to combating racism, xenophobia, and right-wing extremism (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 31). This perception insistently asserts a link between interculturality

and "the others"; this provides insights useful in comprehending the association of diversity with alternative forms of integration. However, regardless of how well-intentioned, the pathways for cultural integration into German society often present explicit conditionalities based on cultural differences, especially for "migrant others" and refugees. Approaching interculturality through an ethnic lens demonstrates that intercultural dialogue is seen as instrumental in bringing closer the distant homogenous cultures (the cultures of those "particular" immigrants and refugees), assumed to be separated by concrete partitions between them and German/European/Western culture.

In the absence of a deliberate intercultural perspective, the federal government's funding bodies carry on introducing additional subsidy programmes that aim to promote cultural diversity. However, such programmes hardly make any contribution to the pluralisation of the performing arts scene. Without clear policy objectives, planning, and solid implementation strategies around an intercultural approach that aims to promote equal opportunities, they are incapable of addressing the systematic exclusion of the immigrant artistic workforce and far from stimulating the theatrical landscape towards improving the access conditions (including both the performing arts field and funding policy instruments) for those artists. In contemporary Germany, fulfilling the requirements of the long-lasting claim that "cultural policy is social policy" (Spielhoff, 1976) hinges on the willingness and ability of cultural policy to respond to cultural diversity fairly and effectively.

The intercultural approach introduced in this study entails the renouncement of strict hierarchies of cultural differences between what is designated as German/European/Western and non-German/European/Western. This vision of interculturality is interested in the emergence of a new "us" that does not assign the positions of subject and object in an encounter (Ahmed, 2000); therefore, first of all, it calls for a change of mindset towards abandoning the perception of German society in compartments. Further, it proposes a paradigm shift in cultural policy for the reformation of the theatre system, which cannot be disassociated from the transformation of traditional ideas, beliefs, values, and habits of White cultural-political decision-making.

When considered from this point of view, the updated national cultural policy of 2020 remains a brief on the current developments and examples of initiatives and programmes promoting intercultural dialogue. It neither provides an intercultural policy framework, nor does it recognise the intercultural reorganisation of cultural institutions as a priority policy objective.[1] It indicates

---

1   The current priorities of the *BKM* are "women in culture and media – asserting equal opportunities, cultural education and integration, art in exile, dealing with cultural assets from colonial contexts and film promotion" (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 20).

that immigration will continue to be approached through measures of cultural education and integration (Bundesregierung, n.d.).

Today, German cultural policy stands at a historic crossroads. The demand of "culture for all" formulated by the New Cultural Policy of the 1970s urgently requires a more inclusive interpretation. Although the Basic Law restricts the involvement of federal cultural policy in cultural affairs, the national importance of immigration, the backlash of previous immigration and current refugee policies, and the rise of right-wing extremism, xenophobia, and racism give national cultural policy a significant mediating role. The complexity of cultural diversity and the current fragmented, uncoordinated, and disconnected policy approaches indicate that a vertical governance between different levels of cultural policymaking is essential for shaping a forward-thinking, receptive, and dynamic cultural policy – one that responds to the requirements of an intercultural society. The absence of such cooperation points to the question of how the federal government justifies its intervention in the field of culture since the promotion of culture is not a federal task to begin with (Ehrmann, 2013, p. 250). Similarly, the ability and willingness of the *Länder* and municipalities to take steps towards the realisation of their already developed intercultural perspectives should be called into question as well.

This research acknowledges that providing the theatrical sphere with impulses to *think and act interculturally* should be one of the primary responsibilities of cultural policies at all levels. Based on the theoretical exploration and empirical findings, this study claims that cultural policies have yet to manifest the dynamism of cultural diversity. They are not responsive enough to employ cultural diversity *in motion*. The national, *Länder*, and local policies fail to support the development of a fairness-based discourse on cultural diversity, which focuses on the enhancement of access conditions for all to the cultural sphere in an intercultural society. Thus, they still have not provided explicit strategies and measures to accommodate immigration-related diversity even years after the late and reluctant acknowledgement of Germany as an immigrant country.

Participation of all also entails the production of culture by everyone. Cultural participation thus involves not only generating new audiences but, more importantly, dismantling the barriers for those who are denied access to the performing arts scene as artistic workforce. Access to culture is the precondition of participation and can only be achieved through decisive orientation, planning, and strategies targeting the development of equal rights and opportunities for all cultural professionals.

The demand for a theatre reform has been long articulated. However, structural problems that had led to the theatre crisis in Germany of the early 1990s, which then deepened in the 2000s, have for a long time been associated with the reduction of theatre budgets nationwide (Hughes, 2007). Dissimilar to those approaches, in the *Jahrbuch für Kulturpolitik* (Cultural Policy Yearbook) of the *KuPoGe*

(2004), structural change in (public) theatres was discussed from many aspects, including audience development and marketing, public theatres adopting new artistic production methods seen in independent theatre regarding the social role of theatre, suggestions of new models for municipal theatres, the impact of new media, cultural industries, and globalisation.

In the coming decade, these debates acknowledged the significance of including the topic of immigration into artistic production and reception for a democratic society (Schneider, 2011) as well as the intercultural opening of theatres (Sharifi, 2011a; Terkessidis, 2010). Immigration has also become part of the theatre reform debate, along with the legitimacy of public theatres in context of the decline of the well-educated middle-class audience and, on the other hand, public expenditure on these institutions (Schneider, 2013c), and the perspective of intercultural audience development (Mandel, 2013). The "Hildesheim Theses"[2] also stressed that the impact of immigration and cultural diversity should be incorporated into the cultural policy intended to transform the performing arts field (nachkritik.de, 2012). Moreover, the online independent theatre portal *nachkritik.de* (2015) has created a space for readers to actively take part in the discussions on the prerequisites of a future theatre policy.

The *KuPoGe* has been a key policymaking actor that contributes to the developments in the field of cultural policy. As early as the beginning of the 2000s, the *KuPoGe* expressed that incorporating an intercultural policy perspective was vital, and raised crucial questions, which are for the most part still relevant almost two decades later:

> What cultural policy needs to do at the federal, *Länder*, and above all, the local level is make intercultural cultural policy a reality. How can non-German artists and immigrants engaged in culture be more closely involved in the opinion-forming and decision-making process of cultural policy? What instruments of support do we need to utilise? Which models of intercultural work can we learn from? How can we expand the canon of cultural heritage, referred to by cultural policy, to include elements of other cultures' traditions? How can we create a positive approach to the topic of "cultural policy in an immigrant society"? (Kröger & Sievers, 2003, p. 305)

In the first half of the 2000s, Scheytt (2007), the former president of the *KuPoGe*, announced that the future of cultural policy was intercultural. Later, the *KuPoGe* once again demanded an intercultural agenda from cultural policy (KuPoGe, 2012);

---

2   These theses were part of the lecture series (*Theatre-Development-Planning: Cultural Policy Concepts for the Reform of the Performing Arts*) of the 2012/2013 semester at the Department of Cultural Policy, University of Hildesheim, bringing theorical and practical approaches together.

yet, this agenda has still not been set as one of the priorities of national cultural policy.

Today, in addition to these perspectives, intercultural reorganisation requires being perceived as a part of theatre reform discussions regarding theatre policy (Schneider, 2017a). Now is the time for a progressive cultural policy to look beyond the consequences of the German unification and focus primarily on people themselves (Schauws, 2016, p. 45). The structural transformation of the theatre realm includes acknowledging the German society as intercultural. Consequently, the debates concerning the future of theatre should first deal with the question of what culture we denote when referring to "German culture", and then engage with the related questions: Theatre for whom, by whom, and by way of what theatre aesthetics?

This study is ultimately concerned with the incorporation of the cultural capital of artists and cultural professionals categorised as people with a "migrant background" into the German theatre system (Sharifi, 2011a). It recognises that theatre policy should address the Whiteness of the German theatre sphere. A future-oriented theatre policy should deal with deconstructing structural barriers preventing or limiting access conditions for all theatre professionals, in order to create an inclusive theatrical scene (Sharifi, 2011a, 2017; Terkessidis, 2010). A theatre policy that endeavours to transform the 19th-century structure of public theatre does not solely pertain to the allocation of more funding or restructuring of the funding scheme. It is rather about "planning for cultural development; theatre for more people with a conceptual diversity perspective and related funding programmes" (Schneider, 2017b, p. 5).

Considering the methodological and empirical examinations, the research concludes that the theatre realm requires the intercultural policy perspective articulated in previous research (Sharifi, 2011a). As expressed by Schneider, "for the survival of the performing arts scene, we need a redesign, with new networks and new structures, practical ideas with a conceptual basis: Ideas drawn from theory, an understanding of history, current experience and our vision for the future" (2017a, p. 577). In this context, the researcher envisions *thinking and acting interculturally* as a cognitive roadmap for the intercultural reorganisation of the theatrical sphere that reflects the mindset of an intercultural society.

7.1   Diversity in Motion: Thinking and Acting Interculturally

Concept formation is an integral part of the empirical analysis; thus, this research is concerned with introducing the idea of *thinking and acting interculturally* as a new concept. This engagement of the study is firmly connected to the absence of diversity in staffing, programming, and audiences in the German theatre realm.

More importantly, to do justice to the vitality of the phenomenon of diversity, the researcher offers *thinking and acting interculturally* as an active and responsive concept that recognises diversity as an open-ended process *in motion*. Through case study analysis and casing formation, the researcher developed the criteria for rethinking theatre as a fairness-based heterogeneous space that reflects the preconditions of *thinking and acting interculturally*.

In this regard, *thinking interculturally*, based on the adverbial form of interculturalism, proposed by linguist Peter McDonald (2011), was reified to underpin the main features of a theatre system that relies on the principle of equality. McDonald (2011) offers thinking intercultural*y* as an alternative conceptualisation to multiculturalism, varieties of cosmopolitanism, and interculturalism. He claims that "the adverbial form identifies the intercultural as a diverse, risky and lived process" (2011, p. 372). McDonald argues that cultures are never separated and distinct but always exist interculturally:

> The merits of a formulation like 'thinking interculturally' lie firstly in the fact that it avoids the bounded logic of the prefix 'multi-', giving priority to this movement across cultural borders of various kinds. It still, of course, assumes that such borders exist and, therefore, that culture (…) plays a powerful role in the world, contributing to many individual and group self-understandings. What the adverbial formulation underscores grammatically is that these borders are porous and labile. (…) Since all cultures, including dominant ones, are less coherent and more mixed than we like to believe, or that the political pressures of a particular moment might require us to believe, the intercultural as an ongoing, open-ended process is all-pervasive. (2011, pp. 372–373)

Further, the adverbial formulation is instrumental in comprehending the changing demographic structure of contemporary societies as well as the individual dimension of identity; it also makes room for a new understanding of an intercultural community, which is envisaged in constant progress and transition. This understanding emphasises that "singular beings with their plural identities [are] confronted by underlying structural forces around them, and these forces may put their singularity at risk" (McDonald, 2011, p. 381). People, with their multiple identities, are the subjects of interaction. Being in an encounter with one another opens the process of a living dialogue that includes both agreement and conflict between dynamic identities (Ahmed, 2000; Cantle, 2012; Wood et al., 2006). Hence, the proposed adverbial usage of the concept is beneficial in acknowledging the fact that interaction takes place not between cultures but between people. As theatre scholar Christine Regus precisely articulates:

> It is not the cultures that interact, but people – individually or as social groups. Cultures cannot act or meet; they are dynamic systems of meaning. It

is problematic to confuse individuals with cultures, to see in them, above all, representatives of inherently defined collectives. This is misleading, especially in the case of art, since it is often produced by people, representing very original, self-contained artistic positions and refusing to be perceived as proxies to any culture, nation, or other community. (2009, p. 38)

In this context, thinking interculturally is also a heuristic attempt at reconsidering the meaning of cultural diversity outside the prescribed frames that operate as promoting versions of a static, insulated, and impermeable "us" within a nation-state, not allowing multiple othernesses to occur.

Thinking interculturally by no means suggests cultural hybridity. It describes a curious, relentless learning process that allows co-creating versions of culture in constant motion, and it includes ambiguity, conflict, negotiation, and transition. In this understanding, marginalised positions are not determined as "the other" since the idea recognises the meeting of multiple fabrications of otherness, inspired by the conceptualisation of Fiona Sze (2004, p. 127). Thinking interculturally enables transformative encounters for all members of society.

Thinking and acting interculturally, on the other hand, signifies a conceptual tool, a frame of mind, which should be manifested in the strategies, actions, and organisational structures of theatres. *Thinking and acting interculturally* does not correspond to a particular theatre genre. Thus, its theoretical premise, in all respects, differs from theatre models such as intercultural theatre, which emerged in the 1970s, conveying a "hybrid derived from an intentional encounter between cultures and performing traditions" (Lo & Gilbert, 2002, p. 36), and post-colonial or syncretic theatre that fuses indigenous performance traditions into Western drama (Balme, 1999). It also neither denotes the later developed form of intercultural theatre concerned with the Western appropriation of intercultural exchange by Patrice Pavis (1996), nor his more recent interpretation of intercultural performance as a form of interdisciplinary hybridity, reflecting on the impact of globalisation on theatre (Pavis, 2010). *Thinking and acting interculturally* seeks to offer a reflective outlook on dealing with the processes of othering and the underlying power dynamics.

7.1.1   Indicators of Interculturality in Performing Arts

Through casing, this study aimed to link the theoretical proposition to the empirical basis (Ragin & Becker, 1992), in order to reify this conceptualisation. The evaluation of the casing indicated different elements of *thinking and acting interculturally*. Moreover, in this query, the academic and practice-based knowledge exchange of the *PostHeimat* network (see Section 6.5) enabled determining various attributes of the concept of *thinking and acting interculturally*.

The following interlinked aspects are identified as the essential features of *thinking and acting interculturally*. By no means is the list of criteria complete; it is instead envisioned as a stepping stone for a semantic shift in diversity discourse, a contribution to the efforts towards recognising cultural diversity beyond a management model that employs cultural differences for organisational efficiency (Faist, 2009). The criteria are considered analytical parameters for a change in mindset for the White-dominated German performing arts field. Hence, they are formulated as indexes of an interculturally organised theatre practice. For this reason, the features of *thinking and acting interculturally* listed below signify a cognitive tool for the theatrical scene rather than a cultural policy measure. One should bear in mind that learning to deal with difference and ambiguity does not alter the existing structural inequalities (Nising & Mörsch, 2018, p. 142). Cultural policy should tackle institutionalised inequalities through an explicit cultural policy vision, careful planning, and implementation strategies for the pluralistic transformation of the theatrical sphere.[3]

The criteria refer to the interconnected ways of engaging with various axes of difference, the social and political construction of otherness, attributed only to "migrant others" and refugees, and the power disparity between partners in artistic exchange:

1. The factor of motivation: Critically examining one's own conduct and motives for "making diversity a goal" (Ahmed, 2012). Theatres and theatre practitioners should genuinely ruminate on their intentions for working on "trendy" topics such as diversity, migration, and displacement, and, correspondingly, working with excluded immigrant and refugee professional and amateur artists with various intersecting labels. The foremost question is whether the commitment to diversity is related to the fact that "it is obviously (now) 'the right thing to do'" (Vertovec, 2012, p. 306). Hence, people that hold privileged positions should interrogate the credibility and authenticity of their motivations (Süngün, 2016, p. 151), especially within White artistic practices and institutions. In this regard, motivation is a decisive signal for determining whether engagement with diversity is understood as an artistic interaction between different realms of experiences and knowledge.

2. Process-orientation: Recognising process as an open-ended and continuous learning practice, not limited to various phases of artistic production. Process-orientation fundamentally denotes the processes of encounter and exchange, which involve ambivalence, conflict, and contingency. It refers to all forms of deliberation and communication between institutions/initiatives and amateur

---

3   Recommendations for achieving a pluralistic performing arts scene are introduced in the following subsection, Section 7.2.

and professional artists with observable exclusions and different overlapping identities. It also refers to the relationship with the audience. At the level of reception, it means to perceive process as a way of conveying a diverse array of views, expressions, knowledge, and experiences by means of performance. These creative processes make theatre a space for the mobilisation of juxtapositional othernesses without neutralising it.

3. The ethical dimension of dialogue: Being occupied with the question of how to develop an ethical approach without perpetuating the existing frames that treat some people as "the other". First and foremost, ethical communication refers to a mindset that "resists thematising others as 'the other'" (Ahmed, 2000, p. 144). The ethical premise in this context primarily entails disowning the narrow perception of the human condition. Creating a heterogeneous space includes acknowledging human beings as multiple othernesses with various perspectives, orientations, and affiliations. For the actors of the theatre field, this means being able to not set any cultural borders in artistic conversation.

   On a related second level, the ethics of communication calls for abandoning superior positions that carry the traces of colonial continuities. In this interaction, the White German majority society is internalised as normative, the one that dominates, and "the other" is assigned as subordinate. Terms of communication, on the contrary, require seeing the performative space through a non-insular lens that recognises intercultural society as the norm.

4. Conditions of emancipation: The frame of empowerment starts with questioning the basis of intent and the terms of autonomy. Given the scale of profoundly and historically rooted power dynamics, the liberation of the artistic expressions of "the other" often rests on the perception and accompanying implications of the dominant positions. Thus, a critical engagement with empowerment recognises "the hegemonic discourses that reproduce hegemonic positionalities, such as whiteness, heteronormativity, patriarchy, Eurocentrism, etc." (Steyn, 2015, p. 382). In turn, such an understanding entails a self-reflexive critique that questions the ways of "giving a voice" to the systematically silenced (Cañas, 2017a, para. 3). The claim of commitment to diversity further raises questions about the sites of emancipation: What is the basis of emancipation? Who is in the position to set the boundaries of empowerment, and what are their intentions? What are the limits of outside intervention? It should also be taken into account that the aspiration to empower marginalised groups and artists for a fairer representation could unintentionally reproduce clichés; hence, there is a possibility that "the representations of 'the other' [might] imprison the subjects in stereotypical images strengthening the ideology of 'the national-self and the immigrant-other'" (Benjamin, 2013, p. 23). This suggests that the recognition of marginalised people as autonomous subjects and equal partners

in determining the conditions of empowerment and negotiating power is vital for the establishment of non-hegemonic forms of interaction.

5. Standing in solidarity: Challenging the unequal distribution of power and opposing various forms of exploitation of excluded performing arts professionals, seeing artistic solidarity and cooperation as a mode of resistance, confronting the binary lines between "us" and "the other". Theatre as a space of resistance also means a reflection of an artistic practice that seeks to transgress the historically constructed privileged positions. Hence, it is essential to acknowledge solidarity as a counter-strategy for the self-empowerment of marginalised people in their struggle against exclusion. It follows that what lies at the foundation of constructive cooperation is whether it is mutually beneficial. Building fair cooperation, based on trust and consensus, entails a continuous exploration of its conditions, structures, and processes; from the onset, there is an agreement on cooperation itself as an experiment (Hampel, 2015). However, one should not dismiss the possibility of cooperation being challenged by conflicting expectations and needs.

6. Networking: Given the exclusionary structure of the German performing arts scene, networking is one of the modes of solidarity practised through artistic exchange to overcome structural barriers and share know-how and resources (see *PostHeimat* as an example of such networking in Section 6.5). The synergy between performing arts institutions and initiatives, artists, and researchers could be considered a form of cultural activism in which the arts, politics, and activism blend together (Verson, 2007), as well as a mode of cultural resistance (Duncombe, 2002) envisioning the concept of democracy through collective action which contributes to the development of participatory approaches (della Porta & Diani, 2006). In this regard, it is also a modality of a bottom-up, alternative policy prospect that explores the possibilities of new equality-based political-artistic imaginaries in the theatrical space.

7. Aesthetical frame: Aesthetics refers to a mode of negotiation of the self through knowledge exchange. This negotiation process is understood more as an act on a political and ethical level than the aesthetics of performance. It is characterised by the motivation to deal with existing inequities in artistic exchange, and concerned with the ways of production of theatrical knowledge outside the Western canon. It searches for trajectories that explore exchange beyond the hybrid, universal, or cosmopolitan appropriation of culture proposed and practised by the same Western theatre vision. As articulated by Bharucha, "the 'universal minimum' that can be said to initiate any intercultural exchange is extremely fragile, based more on intuition and good faith than on any real cognisance of the Other" (1999a, p. 15). In this context, the answers to the following crucial questions serve as measures of a genuine interaction: What does the aesthetical frame aim to convey? Who

determines it? What are the conditions of that particular aesthetics? How and for whom is it designed?

8. Narration of a multiplicity of experiences: Various forms of narrativisation of experiences foster the development of new theatrical expressions. The Western appropriation of the "cultures of the other" tends to fabricate reductive cultural narratives around diversity, migration, and displacement. These narratives hinder the authentic articulation of artistic expressions by the racialised and marginalised artists and performing arts professionals coming into contact with the majority society.

    In the German context, considering particularly the current overexcitement around engaging in "refugee work" and doing migration-oriented "diversity/intercultural/transcultural projects", even the most well-intentioned approaches often generate victim narratives. These perspectives confine "migrant others" and refugees to a frame that forces them to perform victimhood and stereotypical roles assigned to them. Alison Jeffers describes this attitude, which unveils itself in the emerging canon of refugee theatre in the UK, as "the need for the 'right' kind of refugee story in which complexities are smoothed out to create a simple linear narrative of individual crisis and flight" (2012, p. 46). This perception does not serve the aim of perceiving "the other" as creative, skilled, knowledgeable, or autonomous beings. On the contrary, as Cañas aptly points out, "this perpetuates a dynamic in which those remain a passive, self-apologetic voice in the national place rather than a galvanising force, utilising social commentary, and involved in acts of political engagement" (2017b, p. 69). Hence, a range of multiple narrations of experiences would facilitate the exploration, validation, and circulation of different types of stories in which racialised and marginalised voices are not (re)imaged by the Western theatre canon and reduced to simplistic fictitious characters.

9. Multilingualism: Monolingualism is recognised as one of the indexes of German drama theatre. This is related to the historically rooted establishment of theatre as a medium for representing the national interest of the *Bürgertum* (bourgeoisie; Israel, 2011, p. 61). On that account, the German language is still associated with the ideals of the nation-state, which prevail in the theatrical canon, although its educated middle-class audience has been shrinking (Mandel, 2011, 2013). This aspect also reveals whose needs and expectations the programming is designed for. In addition, "multilingualism is used by the majority of theatres at most as a conscious stylistic device in individual, content-wise appropriate productions, if, for example, communication problems on a linguistic level are thematised" (Holthaus, 2011, p. 154). Considering the transnational configuration of the world, showing disinterest for linguistic diversity is no longer a possibility. As Bicker states, "it

is inevitable that immigrant artists will change the formal language of German theatre practice; hence, it will not be possible to maintain the primacy of the pure German (stage) language for long" (2009, p. 30).

Recognising the interaction between languages is an integral part of multiperspectivity and the reality of an intercultural society. If theatre is understood as the self-reflection of society, then it should be conceived as a space that communicates with various characteristics of this society, including its languages. The linguistic aspect refers not only to the modes of communication between theatre, actors, and audiences as a feature of performative strategies but also a connection between the memories of citizens and the histories of societies; the history of the past, present, and future in the making.

10. Being self-critical and self-reflexive: Having the willingness to develop self-reflexivity and a critical mode of self-understanding to confront the established boundaries and the deconstructive absolutisation of differences in interactions in the theatrical space. For reflexivity to be transformative for all parties involved, the question of "how we can at the same time do justice to the other's otherness (and [their] (...) own situatedness) as well as to ours" (de Schutter, 2004, p. 51) should be embodied as a vital principle. Following this logic, self-reflexivity reopens a potentiality for thinking critically about deficit-oriented imaginaries of difference ascribed to "the other". One's self-understanding depends primarily on the question of whether the differences are entrenched in essentialist partitions attributed to "the other" within the structure of an artistic medium but also in one's own mind.

7.2   Intercultural Cultural Policy Framework for the Theatre Landscape

This study deduces that, to pluralistically reconstruct the theatre landscape, cultural policy calls for an intercultural framework. The below outlined recommendations take the question of "what intercultural opening should achieve" (Sharifi, 2017, p. 372) as the starting point, bearing in mind that intercultural theatre policy should fundamentally deal with the absence of equal rights and opportunities for attaining cultural justice and cultural democracy.

Based on the in-depth analysis of the cultural diversity dispositive concerning immigration presented in various chapters, the researcher makes the following cultural policy recommendations to support a fairness-based diversity frame in the performing arts field.

Acknowledgement of Interculturality as the Norm of Society

Interculturality means more than a mere concept for funding programmes or a mode of production referred to as "intercultural work". By only associating interculturality with immigrants and refugees in context of cultural integration, one runs the risk of separating people into ethnic and religious compartments (Sen, 2006). This assumption is based on the construction of "particular" immigrants as "the other". Viewing non-European, non-Western, and non-Christian as the binary oppositions of European, Western, and Christian produces an arbitrary cultural hierarchy between the two sets of distinctions, and singles out those "particular" immigrants and refugees as the addressee of policy measures and programmes claiming to be intercultural. Community identities might, without a doubt, be situated at the core of the identities of individuals. However, the intercultural vision of this work rests upon the idea of identity as multiple othernesses (Sze, 2004). Here, the notion of intercultural society signifies the recognition and valorisation of these multiple modes of otherness. Consequently, those "particular" immigrants (subject to cultural integration) are not to be conceived as a homogeneous group of representatives of their countries of origin.

As demonstrated by the *Sinus Sociovision* conducted in 2007, to have a migration experience or be born to an immigrant family are not the only factors that play a decisive role in forming one's (cultural) identity. Many socio-demographic variables such as education, age (generation differences), family values, occupation, and income are also influential, and more importantly, postmodern immigrant (young, third-generation) milieus differ from the traditional immigrant milieus (Sinus Sociovision, 2007). Unquestionably, in the case of artists and cultural professionals, there are many more determinants involved in the creation of their identities.

Based on the examination of various intercultural policy approaches, the research concludes that interculturality is often misinterpreted. Interculturality is commonly understood as a more practically oriented replacement term for multiculturalism that is about modifying one's perspective to recognise the differences of others and learning to behave in different cultural contexts (Terkessidis, 2010, p. 5). This view does not consider the fact that culture is constructed through the discovery of cultural differences recognised through enunciation, in a continuous process of identifying alternative possibilities in search for new meanings (Bhabha, 1994). Conversely, the recognition of an intercultural society requires abandoning the ethnic and religious-centred gaze towards "the other".

Intercultural society refers to "a community that is never final, always, infinitely, in process, a community without fixed borders, which, furthermore, has a singular 'membership' that constantly puts assigned roles or, indeed, the idea of membership as such, in question" (McDonald, 2011, p. 378). This spontaneous

process appoints various forms of otherness as the subject of transformation. Thus, a cultural policy that embraces a profound intercultural perspective should revise its language to avoid contributing to the (re)production of outsiders. Ultimately, all planning, strategies, and funding decisions for the theatrical landscape should strive for reinforcing the recognition and dissemination of the intercultural society's cultural capital without labelling some citizens as people with a "migrant background".

Equality as the Fundamental Principle

Accommodating cultural diversity entails going beyond the symbolic representation of excluded immigrants in the organisational structure of theatres. In achieving this goal, it is crucial to consider the question of whether the intercultural reorganisation of the theatrical scene is achievable and sustainable without identifying the imbalanced power structure that generates inequalities. The structural exclusion of "migrant others" from the theatrical scene indicates a continuation of a hierarchy between cultures predetermined as superior and inferior, even though policy actors claim otherwise. Cultural policy has hitherto not initiated the dismantling of hierarchised diversity; therefore, the marginalisation of cultural differences and the Eurocentric aesthetical coding still prevail within the German theatre landscape.

The principle that "cultural policy is social policy" and the liberal ideas of the New Cultural Policy of the 1970s under the objectives *Kultur für alle* (culture for all; Hoffmann, 1979) and *Bürgerrecht Kultur* (civil rights culture; Glaser & Stahl, 1974) are due a new rendition in the intercultural society. In the two decades following these developments, the contemporary German cultural policy introduced a broad understanding of culture to the discussion (Scheytt & Zimmermann, 2001). However, today, those objectives entail a reinterpretation of culture that hinges on the dissolution of boundaries between high culture and socio-culture (Heinicke, 2019, p. 193), and correspondingly, the renegotiation of "Germanness" through the artistic canon.

In order for anti-discriminatory knowledge to thrive, this endeavour involves the adoption of equality as a fundamental principle for the diversification of knowledge including production, dissemination, and reception. It also recognises that cultural policy should pursue democratic equality, which aims "to create impartial institutions in the public sphere and civil society where this struggle for the recognition of cultural differences and the contestation for cultural narratives can take place without domination" (Benhabib, 2002, p. 8).

The universal values of equality today include both the expansion of social equality to cultural equality and a new comprehension of human rights that involves the cultural extension of citizenship. In this regard, cultural citizenship

should be at the foundation of a cultural policy concerned with the pluralisation of the theatrical domain "for unhindered representation, recognition without marginalisation, acceptance and integration without 'normalising' distortion" (Pakulski, 1997, p. 80). Hence, the steps already taken towards strengthening equal opportunities to reduce gender inequality and combat patriarchy in the cultural sphere, and accordingly in the theatre landscape, should expand the equality claim to "devalued" immigrant artists and cultural professionals.[4]

Interculturality as an Overarching Policy Objective

As admitted by the national government, although a very diverse intercultural practice has emerged in recent years, a considerable development is still needed in cultural policy and established cultural institutions, including theatres (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 37). The considerations made in previous chapters of this book indicate that the national cultural policy continuously links interculturality with cultural integration. It sees "the integration of people of different ethnic backgrounds, religious orientations and cultural traditions (...) as a significant challenge to cultural work and cultural policy" (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 37). In retrospect, it becomes apparent that historically and ideologically rooted ideas, beliefs, and values (i.e., *Kulturnation*, *Kulturstaat*), with minor alterations, still guide the framework of cultural policy (see Chapter 4 for the discussion). At all levels of policymaking, the concept of interculturality is reduced to promoting intercultural practice through intercultural programmes (Association of the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends, 2020, p. 37).

Cultural diversity-oriented policy measures have mostly been introduced by local policies. In this regard, some reassuring recommendations were made by municipal governments, such as the *Stuttgarter Impulse* in 2006 and the *Kölner Appell* in 2008 (see Section 3.3 for the analysis of both documents). In addition, North Rhine-Westphalia is one of the few examples of government at the *Länder* level impressively engaged in intercultural discourse and supporting coordinated action plans, as shown in Chapter 3.

Germany is a country shaped by immigration in all fields, including culture. As early as the beginning of the 2000s, the *KuPoGe* stated that given the scale

---

4   Since the mid-1990s, the *Deutscher Kulturrat* has been carrying out research projects to map out female representation in culture and the media. In 2016, a survey conducted by the Council, revealed the absence of gender equality, especially in management positions (Schulz et al., 2016). In 2017, the *Deutscher Kulturrat* set up a project office, *Frauen in Kultur & Medien* (Women in Culture and the Media), for three years to offer concrete measures and support the discourse on gender equality (Deutscher Kulturrat, n.d.).

and importance of immigration at the national and global level, it should be self-evident that intercultural cultural policy affects all levels of politics, and therefore, interculturality should be reflected in all levels of cultural policy (Kröger & Sievers, 2003, p. 316). Incorporating cultural diversity into all cultural policy concepts is a forward-thinking approach, as suggested by the *Stuttgarter Impulse* (Bundesweiter Ratschlag Kulturelle Vielfalt, 2006). To this end, the efforts concerning interculturality as an overarching cultural policy objective should be adopted by the national, *Länder*, and municipal governments. The different levels of decision-making bodies should discuss and reach a consensus on the framework conditions of an intercultural cultural policy, which aims to generate an inclusive new discourse on cultural diversity, and focuses on a mentality change in policymaking towards supporting a pluralistic theatre scene, so that theatre practice can respond to the diversified expectations of the intercultural society.

In contemporary Germany, the ongoing debate about a paradigm shift in cultural policy cannot ignore the fact that a change in mindset should take immigration-generated diversity as a departure point any longer. As expressed by Julius Heinicke, this paradigm shift implies that:

> A sustainable cultural policy must consider a shift from the idea of a homogeneous German culture to a heterogeneous cultural landscape, and create strategies that align with the changing cultural landscape long term, with the help of public funding and other financial incentives. In the future, cultural capital will increasingly lie in the ability to grasp and negotiate cultural diversity. (2019, p. 191)

The paradigm shift demand, as articulated by Oliver Scheytt, the *aktivierende Kulturpolitik* (activating cultural policy), no longer geared towards the educated middle-class, but the activation of the cultural citizen (2006, pp. 33–34), requires a sincere willingness to create a new cultural policy entirely guided by the principle of interculturality.

Intercultural Planning and Development of Related Strategies

Unquestionably, the reorientation of the theatre landscape relies on cultural policy planning (Heinicke, 2019; Schneider, 2013b). Since the 1970s and 1980s, making cultural policy and cultural funding more conceptual and plan-based has been one of the main preoccupations of many municipal and *Länder* cultural policies (Föhl & Sievers, 2013, p. 63). Later, in the *Kultur in Deutschland* report, the *Enquete-Kommission* recommended that the federal government should delineate a regularly updated cultural development concept with concrete goals for each respective cultural field (Deutscher Bundestag, 2007, p. 105). However, at the national level, no promising development has taken place to date. The anti-planning reflex in the

promotion of culture and the autonomy of the arts (Föhl & Sievers, 2013; Haselbach, 2013) still prevails.

In addition to their reluctance to plan, the political and administrative federal structure often creates complexities in determining the objectives of cultural policy and accordingly assigning responsibilities and tasks at the national, *Länder*, and municipal level. As stated earlier by Patrick Föhl and Norbert Sievers, "it is neither evident what the goals of cultural policy are ('policy'), who formulates and determines them, in which procedures ('politics'), nor who is ultimately responsible for their implementation in the network of cultural policy ('polity')" (2013, pp. 69–70). This ambiguity complicates the realisation of cultural planning. The long-disregarded immigrant nature of the country, however, demands the development of a central cultural policy planning structure with clear intercultural objectives, identification of cooperation, and a coordination scheme between three levels of government.

The concept of interculturality is not a field of its own to be promoted through intercultural programmes only; it should be an integral part of cultural policy planning, strategies, and funding structures (interkultur.pro, 2011). A policy engaged with generating impulses for a progressive theatrical scene entails intercultural planning with clearly defined priorities and strategies, and corresponding measures. Policy planning and strategies should focus on the following questions: "Why are immigrants not present in the German cultural policy system? In which committees, boards of trustees, juries, cultural offices, and non-profit associations are immigrant cultural professionals represented today?" (Kröger & Sievers, 2003, p. 317), and what plans and strategies are required for creating equal opportunities and improving immigrants' access to the performing arts scene and mainstream funding as artistic workforce?

Efficient structural measures concerning intercultural planning include the introduction of overarching intercultural guidelines and concrete implementation steps. Nonetheless, one should bear in mind that steering cultural policy in an intercultural direction is a complex and ongoing process that rests on, first and foremost, political will, commitment, and cooperation between all levels of policymaking actors, partnership with civil society organisations, and flexibility in decision-making processes.

In contrast to top-down approaches, cultural planning should include policy associations, artists, cultural practitioners, representatives of the cross-cutting areas relevant to culture, and other external bodies to ensure neutrality (Föhl & Sievers, 2013, p. 72) and reaching consensus (at least on the general intercultural framework), which are the prerequisites of cultural pluralism.

Although the scope of this research is limited to cultural policy, the study recognises that cultural policy and cultural management should be thought

of together in the development of intercultural policy planning, taking into consideration the below outlined aspects:

- supporting the development of an equality-based intercultural discourse and the proliferation of *intercultural literacy*[5] for a deeper understanding of society beyond the perspective that targets the cultural integration of "migrant others" (while explicitly clarifying what interculturality refers to),
- determining what intercultural reorganisation encompasses, in addition to the diversification of staff and audience composition and programming/repertoire of performing arts institutions, and the involvement of excluded and marginalised immigrant artists and cultural professionals in these discussions as one of the main stakeholders,
- adopting an interdisciplinary approach to reimagining theatre across and beyond theatre categories (e.g., music theatre, dance, drama) as a prerequisite of an intercultural society (Schneider, 2017a, pp. 593–594); harmonising all planning and funding schemes accordingly,
- recognising socio-culture and cultural education as indispensable dimensions of interculturally oriented policy planning; as Goebbels (2013) elaborates, envisioning a contemporary performing arts field beyond the aesthetical conventions of past centuries,
- establishing a multidisciplinary policy working group, coordinated with the national, *Länder*, local governments, and related umbrella organisations,
- identifying the priority areas of intercultural planning (in line with defining accessibility and the explicit access barriers for excluded artists),
- defining short-, mid-, and long-term objectives according to the priorities (setting realistic goals around what should be achieved in each of the phases of the intercultural process),
- creating periodical action plans, reviewing, and, if necessary, revising them; having a cultural development planning document that delineates how the cultural policy strategy corresponds to cultural policy objectives and governance (Haselbach, 2013, p. 100),
- outlining the existing intercultural planning approaches at the *Länder* and local level, and generating a holistic framework benefiting from examples of good practice,

---

5   Intercultural literacy implies a process of mutual learning for a different way of communicating and reading situations, signs, and symbols (Cantle, 2012, p. 152).

- drawing perspectives from good international policy models, which have already made further progress in opening cultural institutions to racialised and marginalised immigrants,[6]
- providing intercultural training to cultural administration,
- exploring whether or to what extent the objective of gender mainstreaming could be combined with intercultural mainstreaming,[7]
- taking into account the situation of immigrant performing arts professionals who are not attached to an institution,
- including immigrant theatre professionals, cultural organisations, and networks working for a fairer representation of cultural diversity as equal actors of discussions and decision-making processes in planning and strategy development,
- supporting artistic platforms, think tanks, NGOs, and cultural entrepreneurs to contribute to the creation of an equality-oriented discourse on cultural diversity and the enhancement of cultural pluralism,
- promoting the establishment of a *learning laboratory* for intercultural development at the national level,[8]

---

6   Although countries characterised by immigration have significantly different historical, political, legal, and cultural legacies, international experiences and sustained achievements can provide valuable learning opportunities. For instance, the Arts Council England implemented a crucial law in 2010, the Equality Act, to provide equal opportunities and tackle discrimination in the cultural sphere. The Equality Act covers nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender (sex), and sexual orientation (Arts Council England, 2017, p. 5).

7   Where gender mainstreaming is already well developed, intercultural orientation can make use of the structures, experiences, and instruments that are available, and thus also benefit from synergy effects (Handschuck & Schröer, 2002, p. 8). Additionally, gender mainstreaming is a concept developed almost four decades ago, then applied from a binary perspective on gender; the researcher, however, applies the term in a way inclusive of the entire spectrum of gender identity.

8   A good example of such a space is the Diversity Arts Culture, established by the *Senatsverwaltung für Kultur und Europa* (Senate Department for Culture and Europe) in Berlin in 2017, to implement the coalition agreement for the legislative period from 2016 to 2021 for diversity development. The Diversity Arts Culture is a consultation office with a critical diversity perspective, aimed at making cultural institutions in Berlin accessible. The diverse staff composition of the office reflects the motivation of the Senate to accommodate diversity in the cultural sphere. Similarly, the *Diversity Access Point* (*DAP*), proposed by the newly emerged performing arts network, *PostHeimat* (funded by the *KSB*), is envisioned as a platform/service agency at the federal government level, meant to introduce a new discourse for cultural policy and theatre practice to deal with structural access barriers for racialised and marginalised performing arts professionals (see Section 6.5 for more details on the *PostHeimat* network and the *DAP*).

- cooperating with universities and research institutions engaged in accommodating diversity in cultural institutions that bridge the gap between theory and practice,
- revitalising the present participatory approaches in the field of cultural policy by opening policymaking institutions to non-White cultural policy researchers in order to augment the current narrow circle and acquire diverse viewpoints and new impulses,
- introducing jury appointment guidelines and transparent jury selection procedures for funding programmes based on diversity-conscious criteria.

The recommended modes of action indicate a necessity for a synthesised approach. Discussions regarding intercultural planning and the prerequisites partially described above should be furthered with the inclusion of a cultural management perspective.

Vertical Cultural Governance Between Different Levels of Policymaking

Previously, the *Enquete-Kommission* recommended that the federal, *Länder*, and local governments should strengthen the German theatre landscape, especially in its diversity of cooperation, networks, and models (Deutscher Bundestag, 2007, p. 116). However, this close collaboration has yet not taken place, at least not to a sufficient extent. In terms of theatre policy, although the *Länder* secured their cultural sovereignty in the last federal reforms, theatre reform was assigned to the central government, which entrusted this task to its foundations (Schneider, 2017a, p. 576) although some of them have taken arbitrary measures. Today, this cooperation and, consequently, managing resources productively, calls for extensive dialogue and an agreement between all policymaking levels to generate structural solutions for the transformation of the theatre realm.

As expressed earlier, while various intercultural conceptualisations and intercultural opening strategies have been developed by some of the *Länder* and municipal governments, there is no mainstreaming of intercultural policy with adequate instruments and structured implementation measures (applicable day-to-day practice), and interculturality as a policy priority still seems to not be on the agenda of the central government. Moreover, cultural policy decisions of different levels of government often run in parallel to one another, and although cooperation and networking are praised, joint strategies between the federal, *Länder*, and local authorities are scarce (Bisky, 2016, p. 361). To attain sustainable intercultural planning, rather than aiming at impotent collaboration, a vertical cultural governance model should be established between the national, *Länder*, and local governments. Parallel actions are counterproductive, and as stressed by Siegmund Ehrmann, former chairman of the Committee for Culture and Media

of the German Parliament, uncoordinated efforts are part of the problem that is keeping cultural policies from producing meaningful and desirable outcomes with the given budgets:

> In the constitutional tension with the cultural sovereignty of the *Länder*, the federal government primarily promotes culture in a subsidiary manner, complementary to the cultural funding of the *Länder* – at least in theory. In practice, a lack of coordination often prevents this complementary effect. (2013, p. 249)

Federalism ensures the division of power and safeguards cultural decentralisation. Thus, the role of the federal government in the cultural sphere is limited to indirect interference (at least de jure) through additional incentive programmes. Nonetheless, the increasing engagement and contribution of the *BKM* and its funding institutions to the performing arts scene is not inconsiderable. As illustrated in this study, for instance, the *KSB* is a primary federal cultural policy body, introducing significant funding programmes that are specifically aimed at the performing arts scene and supporting countless diversity-oriented projects and networks. However, this implicit involvement or the growth in funding does not generate sustainable outcomes, since the funding is given for a limited amount of time; it is not designed to support the development of diversity processes. Similarly, efforts at the *Länder* and municipal level are in vain without clear policy objectives and the determination to take action in implementing an interculturally-oriented cultural policy.

Redesigning a transparent cultural policy requires vertical governance with legally binding, clearly defined responsibilities and tasks between decision-making cultural-political actors. Interconnected governance between different levels of policymaking utilises the conceptualisation of a holistic intercultural framework. It also increases the success rate of precise strategies and related measures meeting the demanded results, which, as understood in this study, is the pluralistic transformation of the performing arts scene. In this regard, Franz Kröger and Norbert Sievers proposed a renewed version of an interagency or interdepartmental working group for the development of a cooperative policy between the *Länder* and local bodies, or at least for reaching an agreement between the offices and departments in order to pool resources and coordinate measures regarding policy with an intercultural perspective (2003, p. 318). This research considers that this consensus should be sought at the national level, while the existing regional and local intercultural knowledge and experiences should serve a basis for the development of a national intercultural policy frame.

This, however, by no means suggests bypassing the obligation of the *Länder* to take measures for the promotion of culture. It should rather be conceived as joining forces to develop a framework for overcoming the ongoing inertia – which

is to some extent interrelated with legislative and administrative segmentation – in the cultural policy field and react dialogically to the demands of the intercultural society concerning the theatrical domain. Undoubtedly, this cultural-political consensus involves an explicit definition of the conditions and scope of cross-divisional cooperation and coordination of action areas, as well as the distribution of competences between cultural-political actors and cultural policy institutions.

Horizontal Cooperation Between Cultural, Educational, and Youth Policies

Cultural education plays a decisive role in reinforcing access to and participation in culture, and broadens horizons regarding the Western-dominated form of knowledge production, recognition of, and appreciation for diversified modes of aesthetics and performance formats. Hence, it is one of the fundamental tools for the valorisation of various artistic expressions and combating stereotypes and prejudices towards "the other".

As in the case of cultural policy, German education policy almost exclusively falls under the jurisdiction of the *Länder*. Horizontal communication, networking, and collaboration across various government departments and ministries are vital not only for increasing the efficiency of measures undertaken to reform the performing arts realm but also in comprehending cultural diversity not as a liability but as the norm of intercultural societies.

In a similar vein, it is essential to advance a connection between cultural, educational, and youth policies. Access to culture for young people does not pertain to only supporting their participation as users and audiences but, equally as important, as active artistic beings. For the enhancement of young people as creators of art, the actors and programmes of cultural and educational policies should be in tune, and correspondingly, instruments regarding arts education from primary and secondary school to higher education, lifelong learning, and vocational training should be developed in collaboration between these two fields (Interarts, 2008, p. 64). Including cultural training, which recognises culture as a core aspect of lifelong learning, in the educational curriculum would ensure that cultural offers reach a broader spectrum of society (Schneider, 2017a, pp. 581–582). This also means supporting young people outside the educational and vocational training systems (bolstering their forms of expression, developing their creative potential, facilitating creation; Interarts, 2008, p. 51). However, cultural training, both in the forms of short- and long-term engagement, should be implemented as intercultural training (Schneider, 2017a, p. 582). Intercultural training as a cross-cutting area not only equips children at an early age with a broadened understanding of culture and the arts, appreciation of various forms of cultural expressions and linguistic diversity, but also contributes to the transmission of diversified artistic knowledge.

For strengthening intercultural cultural education perspectives, decision-making bodies of culture, education, and youth policies should establish a coordinated course of action. These measures should involve robust cooperation with schools as part of extracurricular cultural activities (Schneider, 2017a; Sharifi, 2011a). An example of this sort of practice is the largest nationwide non-formal cultural education programme, *Kultur macht stark* (Culture is Strength) carried out by the *Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung* (*BMBF*; Federal Ministry of Education and Research). Founded in 2013, it fosters the active engagement of socially and culturally disadvantaged children in cultural and artistic activities. One of the main target groups of the programme are children and adolescents of immigrant families and lately refugees. The programme also aims to reinforce voluntary and civic engagement at a local level through building bridges between civil society groups and cultural institutions committed to the cultural education of young people (BMBF, n.d.). According to an interim report, the committee concluded that the programme managed to reach its goal of – among others – strengthening alliances between local and regional networks of partners from cultural, educational, and youth organisations, and that their different expertise and perspectives provided sustainable support for cultural-educational offers (Prognos, 2020, p. 2).[9] Be that as it may, still, essential questions arise: "Are these projects meant to improve the opportunities for people to participate, or are they also meant to encourage the theatre to change itself?" (Schneider & Eitzeroth, 2017, p. 5). Could the impact of *Kultur macht stark* proliferate if it were coordinated with cultural and youth policies firmly focused on intercultural education, as opposed to supporting individual "intercultural projects"?

At the horizontal level, to strengthen cultural education, the federal government and *Länder* have introduced similar funding programmes (mainly organising educational activities outside formal school education). However, the programmes that seek to promote the active involvement of children and young people in the arts and culture are often not jointly designed and initiated, but launched concurrently.[10] In this way, a great deal of funding is spent without adequately considering the meaningful, sustainable, and above all, politically desirable effects of grants (Ehrmann, 2013, p. 249). The obstacles of complicated legislative jurisdictions and lack of sufficient dialogue obstruct cross-

---

9   The *BMBF* decided to fund the projects until 2022, based on the positive evaluation of the programme.

10   For instance, *Kulturagenten für kreative Schulen* (Cultural Agents for Creative Schools) of the *KSB* and *Kinder zum Olymp* (Children to Olympus) of the *Kulturstiftung der Länder* (Cultural Foundation of the *Länder*) are examples of programmes whose cultural education objectives were planned separately and established by the institutions of the federal government and some of the *Länder*.

divisional cooperation. This problem should be addressed in order to adopt an interculturally-oriented cultural education perspective in cultural policy planning and corresponding subsidy measures.

Restructuring the Funding Scheme

Discussions about theatre reform often revolve around the justification of the almost entirely publicly funded municipal and state theatre system, given the diminishing bourgeois audience and the weakening of theatre's social role. Hence, readjustments of the funding structure have, so far, mainly focused on the modernisation of the public theatre realm. In addition to these two central claims, theatre scholar Thomas Schmidt summaries other organisational issues concerning the crisis of the public theatre system as follows:

- the structure of visitors and non-visitors not reflecting demographic changes due to the ignorance of cultural-political decision-making circles but also theatres themselves,
- the tendency towards overproduction in theatres,
- the excessive focus on personnel and the shift of tasks within theatres to the detriment of artistic forces,
- inflexible and unsustainable theatre structures and production conditions, which are primarily the result of extremely long planning periods, inappropriate performance systems (repertoire versus staging system), and the impracticality of coordinating three different inflexible tariff systems in a theatre,
- inadequate training in the artistic professions, particularly in terms of preparation for the real world beyond art schools,
- finally, the chronic underfunding of theatres in the public and independent scene. (2013, pp. 193–194)

Against this backdrop, the transformation of the rigid structure of municipal and state theatres is usually associated with a change in production models, artistic formats, and new narratives, resembling the flexible organisation of the independent scene. Without a doubt, the innovation of new aesthetics, interdisciplinary production modes and artistic forms owe their emergence and development to the independent theatre scene in Germany. Today, the production perspectives of the independent scene reflect to a greater extent the vision of a theatre that indeed makes use of cultural diversity. The role of independent theatres in artistic development cannot be overlooked either. In this regard, and rightly so, there has been a demand for a fair redistribution of financial resources between the public and independent theatre scene, articulated by umbrella cultural policy

institutions, theatre scholars, and practitioners. As stressed by theatre researcher Henning Fülle, however, up to now, cultural policy has failed to address the issues of the separation of the German theatrical landscape into parallel universes and the precarious existence and working conditions of contemporary artistic productions (2013, p. 294). Nonetheless, even the independent scene is not as diverse as it should be. Diversity is understood mostly as the introduction of new theatre aesthetics and experimental concepts and formats, rather than the narratives of the intercultural society.

The future of theatre hinges not only on artistic development (e.g., heterogeneous content, modes of aesthetics, new reception models, and multilingualism) through structural reforms improving the inflexible production methods of the public scene and the improvement of production conditions and processes of the independent scene, but also fundamentally on the transformation of the modus operandi of theatres, including personnel recruitment policies.

The redistribution of financial resources should aim to remove the dichotomy between public and independent theatre systems and bolster the establishment of intense cooperation between the two worlds (Fülle, 2013; Schmidt, 2013; Schneider, 2007). Schmidt describes the elimination of this gap through a fair access to resources, equal political legitimacy, and close communication and cooperation as a prerequisite for the future of the German theatre landscape (2013, p. 212). The claims regarding a neutral and fair allocation of theatre funding, in view of cultural-political validity, should be interconnected with providing equal access opportunities for marginalised and racialised theatre professionals in the exchange and collaboration of these two theatre systems rather than enclosing these excluded theatre-makers into the third dimension – post-migrant theatre. This does not necessarily mean additional financial costs; instead, it implies a revision of the current funding mechanism.

Recognising interculturality as a foundational principle of theatre is intrinsically related to responding to the conflicting nature of how space is conceived and conceptualised by (White) policymakers and theatres (representations of space), and creating framework conditions for people as artists and audiences with diverse experiences, aesthetical perceptions, and knowledge to make sense of the theatrical space (representational spaces; Lefebvre, 1991; Soja, 1996). Advocating for the latter contributes to answering the question of *"muss Theater sein?"* (must theatre be?; Deutscher Bühnenverein, 2003)[11]; if the answer is yes, it opens a new window into what theatre should be in an intercultural society.

---

11   In light of the "theatre crisis" debates, the *Deutscher Bühnenverein* reviewed its motto, "*Theater muss sein*" (theatre must be; created after the reunification) to "*muss Theater sein?*" (must theatre be?) to search for answers to whether the wide-ranging offers of the German theatre

Correspondingly, confining the promotion of cultural diversity to additional incentive programmes runs the risk of reducing diversity to immigration and displacement-related project support, instead of recognising it as one of the core action areas of theatre policy. Akin to this attitude is supporting "intercultural projects" through socio-cultural funding schemes. As stated by Azadeh Sharifi, policy bodies and cultural institutions treat interculturality as if it is synonymous with socio-culture, and for them, intercultural art per se does not meet the quality standards of "German high culture" (2011a, p. 242). Understanding the expectations and needs of the citizens of contemporary Germany and the transnational world is interrelated with overcoming obsolete categories of different theatre genres and the boundaries between high culture and socio-culture. Thus, sustainable and strategic funding measures should be combined with an all-encompassing interculturally-sensitive perspective to harmonise actions, particularly for promoting equal access opportunities structurally.

The preconditions of an interculturally-oriented funding mechanism require robust and deliberate funding criteria that seek to develop an equality-based diversity perspective, targeting the reorganisation of the entire performing arts scene. Current examples of supplementary cultural diversity and intercultural funding programmes raise doubts about their impact on tackling structural exclusion and discrimination and supporting the pluralistic transformation of the theatre landscape. Hence, instead of establishing individual cultural diversity or intercultural funding programmes, all modes of funding should be determined by interculturally-sensitive guidelines, and accordingly, the jury selection processes and jury panels should be transparent and reflective of these criteria in order to avoid arbitrary Eurocentric decision-making, particularly concerning the vague ongoing funding criteria of "artistic quality".

The *Enquete-Kommission* has recommended that the federal, *Länder*, and local governments provide not only institutional funding and project funding, but also conceptual funding and planning for several years to ensure stability, as well as funding for production facilities, guest performances, and networks for co-productions and cooperation (Deutscher Bundestag, 2007, p. 117). It can be concluded that all forms of funding schemes should be anchored in the long term to accommodate cultural diversity in the performing arts scene.

One of the obstacles regarding financial support is the fact that, although "cultural policy positions relate to production, distribution and reception; currently 90 per cent of funding goes to production" (Schneider, 2017a, p. 594). To stimulate the intercultural reorganisation of theatres, the distribution of subsidies should be oriented towards promoting the process and enabling experimentation in artistic

---

system (i.e., municipal, state, regional, and independent theatres) are still desirable and politically feasible.

production and reception for a better understanding of the intercultural society. The task of an adequate cultural policy should be understood as not only supporting what works but also rewarding process and failure (Schneider, 2017a, p. 593). In this way, the existing funding structure is incapable of being a driving force of improving the access conditions of racialised and marginalised theatre-makers to production resources in the mainstream theatre landscape. Instead of promoting the "best" intercultural projects through various endowments by different cultural policy bodies, a performing arts policy formulated on an intercultural foundation should create diversified financial measures to award performing arts institutions and initiatives that meet the conditions of intercultural parameters.

Furthermore, "the art of theatre and theatre in education are not additive but integrative; arts education is not the result of performing arts but the core of the business and its reflection of content, aesthetics, and above all, people" (Schneider & Eitzeroth, 2017, p. 5). Hence, new funding models should invest not only in the public and independent theatre scene but also in children, youth, and amateur theatres where there is already considerable dedication to cultural diversity, intercultural awareness, experience, and knowledge. Promoting and multiplying examples of good practice across municipal and regional structures has the potential to contribute to the intercultural reorientation of the performing arts scene.

Evaluation of Measures

Monitoring mechanisms and evaluation strategies are an integral part of overseeing to what extent the objectives and plans are achieved in the mid and long term, identifying the pitfalls and reviewing the adequacy of implementation strategies and instruments. A comprehensive and systematic assessment of policies and plans that aim at interculturality as an overall concept of action might prevent the loss of focus and drive (European Agenda for Culture, 2014, p. 20).

Moreover, surveying and developing data collection on the main access barriers for excluded performing arts professionals and audiences are vital for introducing a consolidated cultural policy approach in which interculturality is adopted as a concept embedded in all stages, from objectives to funding structure. There phases are also instrumental in setting specific priorities and creating consistent non-discriminatory, diversity-defined indicators for monitoring whether these priorities are attained. Quantitative data collection ensures the further development of cultural policy planning and secures lasting effects. The consistent empirical investigation of the *KuPoGe* for socio-culture practice is a good example of lessons learned providing reliable data as a basis for a future-oriented intercultural policy.

For a broader understanding of the demands of an intercultural society, surveys such as the first *InterKulturBarometer* (Intercultural Barometer) from 2012 shed light on the impact of immigration on cultural and artistic practices. For instance, one of the crucial findings of the first *InterKulturBarometer* was that the non-immigrant population rarely shows an interest in artists and works of art outside of European and Anglo-American regions; only 15% of the population of German origin are interested in art from Asia, 13% in art from Africa, and 3% in art from the Arab world (Keuchel, 2015). This result alone indicates how empirical research is essential in making any changes in decision-making structures for the incorporation of the cultural capital of non-European/non-Western immigrant artists into the cultural sphere and the performing arts realm. In this context, critical analysis of the implementation of policy planning enables the introduction of measures suitable for diversifying the currently Western-dominated form of theatrical knowledge and valorisation, by including various aesthetical perspectives as a new mode of artistic communication within a society on its way towards pluralisation.

7.3   Epilogue: Where to Next?

By focusing on cultural politics and cultural policy, this research strove to identify the prerequisites of a performing arts scene in which cultural diversity *in motion* can be put into practice and thrive. The theoretical and empirical findings have demonstrated the immense gap between cultural-political reality and the claim of a pluralistic performing arts field where a diverse plethora of voices of the intercultural society can be heard, respected, and appreciated.

One of the notable results of the research is that it has clarified the reasons behind this vast discrepancy between cultural-political frames and the demand for a discrimination-critical, diversity-oriented reformation of the German theatre system. When the goal is to safeguard the institution of theatre as monumental heritage of the nation, cultural policy is not sufficiently concerned with stimulating vital impulses for theatre to be an art practice relevant for future generations.

Improving various inequitable conditions between the public and independent theatre scene is fundamental for the development of a new diversity discourse; however, the support mechanism for decreasing the disparity between the traditional perspective of the cultural-political field and the aim of promoting cultural diversity should not rely solely on finding a balance between these two worlds. The performing arts field does not amount to just municipal, state, and independent theatres.

This research has identified that the plea of cultural diversity *in motion* is intrinsically connected to dismantling the access barriers for racialised and marginalised artists and performing arts professionals. Alas, in its limited scope, it

could not bring into focus other crucial action areas of opening the performing arts to all citizens, and tackle the alienation of theatre practice from society at large. To bridge this gap in knowledge, further research should investigate the cultural policy strategies and measures necessary for investing in interculturally-oriented cultural education and encouraging amateur theatres to inaugurate and expand equality-based diversity discourse that addresses the Whiteness of the performing arts field. Further, efforts that seek to imagine diversity *in motion*, which focus on the supply and funding disparity between rural areas and big cities, should extend their attention to what the tasks of cultural policy are in provinces today if it were to provide an impetus for the acknowledgement of Germany as an intercultural society, and what mediation role performing arts play in reshaping *Heimat* by all.

Regarding the support for socio-culture and cultural education in imagining diversity *in motion*, another crucial intersecting area of study entails a particular spotlight on cultural politics. Following Bourdieu, the unbalanced power structure of the traditional German public theatre system is intertwined with the habitus of the policymaking apparatus, distinguished by established White perspectives, values, and habits of actors. Thus, the processes of diversification in the performing arts scene cannot be thought of separately from the transformation of the habitus of decision-making cultural-political bodies. To this end, future research should deal with the prerequisites of activating political will and determination to create the framework conditions of an equality-based diversity discourse for the performing arts field and put this new discourse into practice through cultural education, amateur, children, and youth theatres. Likewise, the examination of alternative bottom-up cultural policy approaches in the performing arts can also provide insights into raising cultural-political awareness, lobbying for a change in mindset in cultural politics, and bridging the gap between theory and practice in the cultural policy field.