

**EAST EUROPEAN
PERFORMING ARTS
PLATFORM**



Foreword

Paweł Potoroczyn, Director of Adam Mickiewicz Institute

At the Adam Mickiewicz Institute we believe that culture is crucial not only for a given society but for a family of societies that want to lead a happy life together. We also believe that for culture to exist it is indispensable to have a dynamic exchange and an open debate. These are not possible without established contacts and regular communication.

Having said that let me add just one more thing - as cultural exchange professionals we want to use the best tools available to pursue our goals. If such tools are not readily available, we try to develop them. The East European Performing Arts Platform (Theatre and Dance), established in 2010, is a case in point.

I am convinced that this platform will help us build bridges between Europe and the Eastern Partnership countries, that it help us gain a better understanding of each other and eventually enable us to create and present works that will be of the highest artistic value. I also truly believe that these works will be socially and politically relevant – and so they will help us build a better future for us.

An overview of reports from EEPAP countries

Paweł Płoski

Authors of country reports

Armenia – Ara Nedolyan

Azerbaijan – Sabuhi Mammadov

Belarus – Viktor Pietrau, Alex Strelnikov

Bosnia and Herzegovina – Tanja Miletić Oručević

Bulgaria – Kalina Wagenstein, Nelly Stoeva

Croatia – Jelena Kovacić

Czech Republic – Jakub Škorpil

Georgia – Levan Khetaguri

Hungary – Dalma Szakmáry, Attila Szabó

Kosovo – Jeton Neziraj

Macedonia – Nelko Nelkowski

Moldova – Larisa Turea

Romania – Iulia Popovici

Serbia – Andjelka Jankovic

Slovakia – Vladislava Fekete

Slovenia – Tomaž Toporišič

Ukraine – Tina Peresunko

Table of contents

EEPAP – a platform for the development of performing arts (theatre and dance) in Central and Eastern Europe	7
Introduction	9
I. On the wave of great changes	10
II. Organizational models of public theatres.....	13
III. New initiatives.....	21
IV. International cooperation.....	28
V. The situation of contemporary dance in Eastern Europe	37
VI. Theatre legislation.....	43
VII. Reforms and legal solutions– examples.....	47
Conclusions.....	54
List of tables.....	56
Appendix.....	57
East European Performing Arts Platform – Country Reports	61
Armenia.....	63
The Republic of Azerbaijan.....	73
Republic of Belarus.....	81
Bosnia and Hercegovina	93
Bulgaria.....	109
Croatia	123
Czech Republic.....	145
Georgia.....	157
Hungary.....	175
Kosovo.....	199
Republic of Macedonia	217
Republic of Moldova	227
Romania	239
Republic of Serbia	261
Slovakia.....	275
Republic of Slovenia	285
Ukraine.....	293
Authors	347

EEPAP – a platform for the development of performing arts (theatre and dance) in Central and Eastern Europe

An introduction by Marta Keil

EEPAP can trace its origins to a conference of Central and Eastern European artists, critics, and theatre historians in Budapest in November 2008 addressing the state of political theatre after 1989.¹ It was there that we discovered that despite our common history we have virtually no common experience. Not only do we have dissimilar development paths and systems, but we also know surprisingly little about each other. In the past two decades we have observed a burgeoning growth of international theatre festivals in both Central and Eastern Europe, occasionally verging on almost absurd excess, but this phenomenon rarely translates into genuine cooperation between the artists. We do not go to our neighbour's festivals nearly often enough, nor do we carefully observe foreign artists, and the interests of theatre critics and curators continues to be directed toward the west of the Old Continent. Matters are slightly different when it comes to dance, where out of necessity international contacts are more developed (local funding is usually so meagre that only international cooperation allows the artists to be active and new performances to be produced). The connections between Eastern Europe and Germany, France, Great Britain, and the Netherlands are much stronger. They are a direct result of the soft-power strategy and cultural policies adopted by these countries. To put it bluntly and shortly, contacts and communication develop where the money is. Moscow, however, still remains an important point of reference (especially for the countries of the Eastern Partnership).

Additionally, in the realm of the performing arts, Central and Eastern Europe suffer from a poor flow of information and a still dominant sense of isolation (especially in the countries excluded from the European cultural circuit because of their unstable political situation). Cultural production has become dominated by small, private organizations, often located in apartments or makeshift studios, with no public support. And those very projects, carried out beyond institutionalized theatre—in performing arts and in artistic ventures on the border of disciplines and norms—are where the most interesting artistic events take place – events that are capable of generating discussion and questioning the prevalent opinions and stereotypes.

It was out of this, that we came up with the idea for the Eastern European Performing Arts Platform. The project, initiated by the Adam Mickiewicz Institute as part of the Polish EU Presidency, has thus far reached eighteen countries: Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Moldova, the Ukraine, Belarus, Kosovo, Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Poland. The program has been created as a result of cooperation between independent experts from Central and Eastern Europe, the Zbigniew Raszewski Theatre Institute in Warsaw and close contact and collaboration with artists from the representative countries.

The platform operates in three principal spheres: information, education, and co-production, with a special focus on the Eastern Partnership countries (Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Ukraine, & Belarus). Information is conveyed through a web page where artists, curators, festival directors and producers can publish updates on their work. Education will be supported by the creation of a program for curators and producers. The third goal will focus on artist residences. I believe in the creation of another network project only if it is to be clearly defined as a tool for the artists' work.

The following report is the result of the first year of EEPAP's operation. Its aim was to gather information about the state of theatre and dance in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Our goal is not

1 *What was there before the after?* – a conference organized in November 2008 by the Contemporary Drama Festival in Budapest and by the Budapest Theatre Institute and Museum.

to present ready theses, for it is much too early for that. This publication is the result of the first stage of a research project planned for several years, whose aim it is to try to map out the directions for development of theatre and dance in Central and Eastern Europe. We hoped to gather information about the consequences of the transformation of the political system at the turn of the 1990s on the organization of theatre and dance. We examined the structures that determine the work of artists in this European region and how they have been shaped in the past twenty years. We collected data based on reports prepared by specialists (critics, researchers, artists) from each of the countries listed above. The selection of authors for the national reports was based on our partners' recommendations. Collecting information is only the beginning of our work; it will allow an open discussion that requires amendments and counterarguments from other researchers. The closing of this stage of our work demands above all that we formulate precise questions and map out directions for further research.

After all, we are negotiating a difficult terrain that requires special attention, watchfulness, and openness. We are linked by history, but divided by different experiences of that history. That is why the concept for this network was not drawn up over coffee in Warszawa during one of the festivals. EEPAP is a *process* (and a fascinating one to be clear!). Its shape is being negotiated in numerous meetings with artists, performing arts critics, and theoreticians from all over Central and Eastern Europe. Our joint efforts in the coming year will show whether or not a project designed in this way can succeed.

Introduction

By Paweł Płoski

Despite geographical proximity and common history, mutual knowledge about the culture of both the near and the more distant neighbours in Eastern Europe is minimal. Despite their location on the same side of the Iron Curtain and the declared politics of friendship, there have been few publications to testify to this closeness. The first and foremost goal of this work is to increase mutual understanding through the comparison of the situations that dance and theatre find themselves in the countries of Eastern Europe.

The following report is an attempt to sum up the results of the seventeen country reports commissioned by EEPAP, (the Platform for the Development of Performing Arts in Central and Eastern Europe.) The authors of the reports based their research on the questionnaire (attachment no.1) in which we formulated a number of questions pertaining to the organization of theatre and dance in Eastern European countries. For example, this included questions about structure, funding, artistic activity, and international cooperation.

Due to the very large amount of material, we decided to focus the report on the organization of dance and theatre in relation to the transformation of the political system in the countries covered in our research. Therefore the focus of our research pertains to the beginning of the 1990s and the following two decades. We also posed questions about the ways systemic reforms were introduced, the directions that were chosen, the attitude of the authorities, and the preparation of government agencies for managing theatre and dance institutions.

Among the main topics, there are models of public theatre organization (chapter II) and new initiatives (chapter III). In the light of the creation of our network, issues related to international cooperation in theatre and dance were particularly important (chapter IV). A separate section is dedicated to the development of contemporary dance (chapter V). We also decided to devote one of the chapters (chapter VII) to a broader discussion of the examples of political and legal actions related to dance and theatre that seem interesting and exceptional in regard to other initiatives undertaken in the countries of Eastern Europe. The issue of legislation is addressed separately (chapter VI). We abandoned a separate discussion on financial matters and art production because of the lack of sufficient data. This is not to say that these matters were entirely ignored, as they found their way into each of the chapters (particularly chapters II, III, VI, and VII).

We tried to create a balanced presentation of the situation of theatre and dance in the countries addressed by the study, but this was not always possible considering the various degrees of specificity of the reports. We want to think of the report as a starting point for future research and of the conclusions we have reached not as final theses but as first steps initiating a broader discussion. In the next stage of our work, in 2012, we will supplement the report with missing or incomplete data.

The document is based on data collected in country reports. Only in selected cases did we resort to other sources (e.g. in the description of the transformation of city theatres in Prague and of the Slovenian and Serbian dance initiatives). Authors of Armenian and Georgian reports faced a particularly difficult task. In Georgia the process for the regular collection of data pertaining to cultural life is still being created, while in Armenia no government agency or ministry is in possession of statistics or databases related to theatre life.

In the case of Poland, no separate country report was commissioned. In 2009, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage in connection with the Congress of Polish Culture in Kraków, commissioned

two reports on theatre and contemporary dance, describing their evolution in the years 1989-2009. The report on contemporary dance was prepared by Jadwiga Majewska, a dance critic, and Joanna Szymajda, a dance scholar, currently deputy director of the Institute of Music and Dance (created in 2010). The report on theatre was prepared by Paweł Płoski, a theatre scholar and chair of the literature section of the Narodowy Theatre. After the Congress of Polish Culture, three more events in the field took place: the 1st Dance Congress (April 27-29, 2011) and the Polish Theatre Forum (December 20-12, 2009 and November 22-23, 2010), accompanied by special reports on the current situation of dance and theatre.²

Our report is preliminary in character and, as was said above, needs supplementation and further work. We hope, however, that we are already able to capture certain phenomena, tendencies, and directions, and present various approaches to theatre and dance, conditioned by different national contexts. In such a broad and diverse sphere of inquiry it is impossible to establish a single definition, a description of a homogenous system, or a suggestion of one solution. One may, however, discern certain common tendencies. We were not aiming at finding a model pattern of change, but at comparing processes and different types of practice as these may serve as a source of inspiration or provide clues in determining which factors may have contributed to the failure of some concepts and the success of others.

The report describes the situation in dance and theatre in a period of change in their relation to society and to the authorities. At the threshold of the new system, in 1990, the Polish theatre creator, Tadeusz Kantor, angrily commented on the political reforms: "I would so much want to hear in the language of all these politicians, for them to at least once mumble something about art, but none of them have even used that word. No one! Not once! And they will lose! For only the artists are capable of leading the nation." Unfortunately, politicians are immune to the spells cast on them by artists. Nevertheless, the politicians did remember about art in the last two decades. The effects of those actions are presented below.

I. On the wave of great changes

Independence and new political systems in Eastern Europe brought with them many unknowns. The last decade of the 20th century in Eastern Europe was also a very important moment for the cultural life of Eastern European countries. In the majority of these countries since 1945, culture was the domain of the state and all its institutions were nationalized. The 1990s brought a major transformation in this sphere. Based on free market principles, a new film and music industry came to life, and the book and media markets grew. However, these dramatic changes were less visible in theatre and dance.

The nationalization of culture after World War II was a reflection of Soviet cultural policy on the shape of social life of most of the countries studied by the EEPAP. One needs to emphasize, however, that while on the Eastern side of the iron curtain the state took it upon itself to popularize culture among the broad masses and financed its organization, following the social-realist, centralist Soviet model, at the same time in the west the authorities were developing the welfare state model, progressively taking culture under their care as well.

Let us quote some examples. After the war, in Great Britain—a country where the decision about public funding of the theatres was made relatively late—the National Theatre was established in 1949 and its enormous, modern building constructed in 1976. In France, in the 1960's the minister of culture Andre Malraux created a national network of *les maisons de la culture*. In 1970, the activists of the Norwegian International Theatre Institute proclaimed with great satisfaction that the last private theatre in Oslo was closed down and transformed into a city-financed institution. Stabilization of cultural activity was the common feature of the cultural policy in the majority of the countries of post-war Europe.

2 All materials were published only in Polish. Reports on contemporary dance and theatre prepared for the Congress of Polish Culture in 2009 were published at the Congress website: www.kongreskultury.pl. Regional reports on dance were published on the website: www.kongrestanca.pl. *Teatry polskie 2007–2009. Analiza polskich publicznych teatrów instytucjonalnych pod patronatem MKiDN*, ed. Bartosz Zaczykiewicz, Stowarzyszenie Dyrektorów Teatrów, Warsaw 2010 is a report published in book form on the occasion of the 2nd Polish Theatre Forum.

In this context one also needs to mention the cultural policy implemented in the United States at the time of Kennedy's and later Johnson's presidency, and the creation of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and Theatre Communications Group, meant to organize and support the more ambitious American repertory theatres.

"This was 'meritocracy': the opening up of elite institutions to mass applicants at public expense or at least underwritten by public assistance," is how the English historian, Tony Judt, sums up the cultural achievement of the welfare state. "It began the process of replacing selection by inheritance or wealth with upward mobility through education."³

In the 1980s the situation changed radically. New economic thinking by the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and of the U.S. President Ronald Reagan came to dominate the understanding of the function of the state not only in their respective nations, but in many other countries as well. Therefore, at the turn of the nineties the success of the political transformation of the Eastern European countries was often measured by the decrease of state influence in all spheres of life. And in keeping with the spirit of the times, if one wanted to succeed, change was what mattered most.

It is also at this time that big business radically changed its *modus operandi*: from stable development within a bureaucratic frame to the light speed of short-term financial operation. American sociologist Richard Sennett observes that in the last years, "institutional beauty consisted in demonstrating signs of the internal change and flexibility, appearing to be a dynamic company, even if the once-stable company had worked perfectly well before." Today stability is perceived as a sign of weakness, a signal that the company is not innovative enough, that it cannot manage change, while readiness for destabilization is a positive sign. "Big governments and civic institutions have tried to dismantle their institutional past following this model," continues Sennett. "The very image of large, stable bureaucracies providing long-term, predictable benefits horrifies political reformers."⁴ This way of thinking also influenced culture. British Theatres had a particularly difficult time under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

In the context of these tendencies in the world, art communities in Eastern Europe at the threshold of independence were prepared for serious changes. It was obvious that theatres would no longer be able to function according to the rules defined by the socialist states. In Bulgaria, changes were set off not only by the change of political system but also by the crisis of theatre that began in the 1980s: excessive employment, lack of competitiveness, ineffectiveness. Other countries had to deal with the serious problem of the decline of audiences (Ukraine) and the crisis of the theatres themselves (Poland).

Serious institutional change was feared in some countries. In the Czech Republic, after the political transformation, there was great anxiety about the possible collapse of the theatre network (which had been systematically developing and expanding in the post-war years). In the end only one theatre in Prague and two in the provinces were closed down.

In Poland in 1989, the announcement of the possible closings of institutions was accepted as the necessary result of the political changes, but similarly this positive attitude soon changed. Already in 1990, and in the following years, the spectre of shutdowns loomed large over the debates on the reform of theatre life, although in the end only two theatres with permanent staff were closed down. It is worth pointing out that one of these theatres was reborn thirteen years later on the initiative of the local authorities.

Essentially, for Eastern European theatre communities, particularly for their more important representatives (Poland, Czechoslovakia), the experience of transformation was not particularly dramatic. Most did not experience the kind of trauma that befell the German theatre community when in 1993 the

3 Tony Judt, *Ill Fares the Land*, Penguin, 2011, p. 53. (Polish edition: *Źle ma się kraj. Rozprawa o naszych współczesnych bolączkach*, trans. Paweł Lipszyc, Wydawnictwo Czarne, Wołowiec 2011, pp. 58-59.)

4 Richard Sennett, *The Culture of the New Capitalism*, Yale University Press, 2007, pp. 40, 46. (Polish edition: *Kultura nowego kapitalizmu*, trans. Grzegorz Brzozowski and Karol Osłowski, Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie MUZA SA, Warsaw 2010, pp. 35-39.)

Berlin Senate decided to close down the largest, and for years the most important, stage in West Berlin, namely the Schiller Theatre, in order to pass its huge subsidy on to the theatres of former East Berlin.

But in other Eastern Countries that were regaining their independence, theatres experienced much more dramatic conditions. Georgia, with its complicated political and economic history of the first half of the 1990s, had no time to deal with cultural issues. Theatres had to manage on their own, and the shortages of electricity and heating caused by armed conflict basically made their work impossible. After a time, theatres improvised and secured their own technical support by setting up power generators and independent heating systems. This is emphatic proof of the adaptability and vitality of these theatre communities and institutions. All of the Eastern European theatres had to deal with the challenges of the new political system, and growing costs not matched by increased subsidy.

Theatres in Kosovo experienced dramatic circumstances. First they faced persecutions by the regime of Slobodan Milošević, when Albanian actors were fired from the National Theatre, then the murder of a young actress, Adriana Abdullah from the independent Dodona Theatre. During the war, much of the theatre infrastructure was destroyed. But the bombed-out theatre buildings were rebuilt, in a gesture characteristic for Eastern Europe, suggesting on the symbolic level that the national culture persists.

There is a temptation to distil a certain pattern in the models of transformation that took place in the cultural life of Eastern European countries. The occasion to sum up the situation of culture in broadly defined Eastern Europe arrived with the meeting of cultural leaders and experts in 2009 on European cultural policy at the conference in Kraków: *Kultura a Rozwój 20 Lat Po Upadku Komunizmu w Europie* (Culture and Development 20 Years After the Collapse of Communism in Europe). Peter Inkei, director of the Budapest Observatory, a specialist in the field of European cultural policy, and his team identified six groups of countries, as defined “by the degree of transparency and coherence of cultural policies, the role of the state, and other subjects.”⁵

- The countries of the Visegrad Group and Slovenia completed the process of transformation; this group is joined by Croatia, whose cultural system and policy is closest to the achievements of the countries of Central Europe
- The aims of the cultural policy and actions are less transparent and coherent in the Ukraine, Russia, Belarus and Moldova, where a conglomerate of socialist and capitalist tendencies results in a combination of both the good and bad aspects of both systems, including corruption and strong tendency toward introverted self-sufficiency
- Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro declare the readiness to adopt the European standards in shaping politics but still embrace many elements inherited from the old system (such as state-run publishing houses and a largely dysfunctional network of cultural institutions)
- in Georgia and Armenia, the shaping of cultural policies is largely hermetic and dominated by nationalism; similar tendencies make it impossible to classify Macedonia with the group above
- Bosnia, Kosovo and Albania do not have a sufficiently coherent cultural policy and are not significantly integrated with the European systems
- Belarus was classified among the countries dominated by the “activity of patronizing dictatorial quality”

In the specific sectors of cultural activity the above division needs rearranging, as shown in the later part of the report based on data from EEPAP country reports, for example related to directorial appointments.

In the period of transformation, those countries faced numerous important challenges and the organization of cultural life was not a priority. At the same time, politicians did rise to the challenge in crisis situations when an institution needed to be saved from collapsing. Professor Zygmunt Bauman, sociolo-

5 Peter Inkei, *Background paper* [in:] *Kultura a rozwój 20 lat po upadku komunizmu w Europie / Culture and Development 20 years after the Fall of Communism in Europe*, Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury, Kraków 2010, pp. 47, 49.

gist and philosopher clearly defines the prospect of new challenges: "What is at stake in today's phase of the age-old push-and-shove is not only the answer to the question 'who is in charge' but the very sense of managing art, the purpose of management and its desired consequences. We could go further and presume that what is at stake is the survival of the arts in the form in which they existed from the times when the walls of the caves in Altamira were covered with drawings."⁶

In contemporary Europe, we observe cultural policy becoming an important challenge in the face of serious social transformations: demographic changes and changes in the modes of cultural participation. After all, managing culture within the public sector relies on, among other things, a network of cultural institutions based on a model designed several decades ago. Instead of thinking about how effective are the classic institutions of culture, it is worth trying to understand the mode of cultural participation for young people, for whom the media (computers, internet, cell phones) are not only the natural tools of entertainment but also of the reception and production of culture.

Theatre and dance in Eastern Europe over the last two decades experienced great transformations, and new phenomena are already visible on the horizon. We will not find answers to the question of how to effectively manage the challenges of modernity, but we do have a chance to prepare ourselves to confront them.

II. Organizational models of public theatres

In the majority of the countries represented in our study, the transformation of the organization of theatre life was focused on decentralization. Decentralization was understood as the state relinquishing direct management of cultural matters and handing them over to lower administrative levels. Such models were adopted in Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Kosovo, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and, to a certain extent, Bosnia.

Decentralization was not a new idea in the countries of the former "People's Democracies." In Poland, after the thaw of 1956, discussions had already begun concerning the relinquishing of control by the Ministry of Culture and Art in favour of regional authorities (later, in the 1980s, the majority of theatres were moved back under the authority of the state). In Yugoslavia, state authorities decided to perform a similar move in the 1970s. In Hungary, on the other hand, the process of decentralization was understood as the creation of a network of new regional institutions. For example, in the 1980s, ten local puppet theatres were created in place of one Central Puppet Theatre in Budapest.

What is important and quite characteristic is that the organization of cultural life in the countries of our study had a very similar form at the outset of the transformation. The centralized, state system, dependent on the party and current ideology, required immediate repair. In the majority of the countries the means to that end were sought in immediate decentralization, in line with the tendencies in European politics of the time.

Decentralization of the decisions in the realm of managing and funding culture became the cornerstone of cultural policy of the day. Experts emphasized that the level of decentralization was the marker of the quality of cultural policy. "Only thanks to decentralization of power it is possible to observe the principle of subsidiary fundamental to modern societies, according to which decisions are made as close as possible to those whom they concern."⁷

Usually the decentralization of theatres was the direct effect of administrative reform in a given country. Local governments acquired new powers, among them responsibility for supporting culture.

6 Zygmunt Bauman, *Culture in a Liquid Modern World*, Polity, 2011, p. 110. [Polish edition: *Kultura w płynnej nowoczesności*, Narodowy Instytut Audiowizualny & Agora SA, Warsaw 2011, p. 129.]

7 Dorota Ilczuk, *Polityka kulturalna w społeczeństwie obywatelskim*, Narodowe Centrum Kultury & Jagiellonian University Press, Kraków 2002, p. 13. English edition.

New managers, new problems

State administrators in the new political system decided to share responsibility for culture with local and city authorities. This decision had one main practical goal: to relieve the state budget. One cannot forget, however, that the aim was also to narrow the range of matters influenced directly by the state, although state authorities were guaranteed the right to introduce correctives into the shape of cultural life if that was deemed necessary. Nevertheless, decisions about decentralizing, even if theoretically right, sometimes fell on completely unprepared ground.

In Kosovo, because of a lack of preparation by the local authorities, the decentralization of responsibility for the theatres led to a serious crisis in small town theatres. Currently the only functional theatre is the Kosovo National Theatre.

In Romania, according to report author Iulia Popovici, the local authorities do not have funding but have total power that they consistently fail to use for the benefit of the institutions depending on them because the officials and politicians at this level are not prepared for administering culture. Paradoxically, practice has demonstrated that national theatres and not local ones have a better dynamic, more financial stability, and artistic freedom. The cooperation of these theatres with local governments is much more constructive.

Polish decentralization happened gradually in the years between 1991 and 1999. In the first stage (until 1996) cities remained the founding organs. In 1999, in the last stage of decentralization, theatres were entrusted to the newly formed regional authorities. The decision was made that theatres would be financed by funds from the local governments. In the first years after decentralization city theatres (those “decentralized” earlier) were in a better financial situation. To support regional governments that lacked legislation to acquire funding for financing their institutions, a special reserve was created in the central budget. This prosthetic aid lasted many years, first as a reserve, then as a separate “Mecenat Państwa” [state patronage] fund. Only in 2009 did the ministry of culture announce that the fund would be closed down. Currently, especially after the integration into the EU, the financial situation of regional governments has improved a great deal.

Real trouble often began when the new governing organ did not wish to take an institution under its care. Such cases were noted in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Political transformation and independence influenced the country’s system of organization. Earlier, administrative bodies at successive administrative levels were well coordinated and disciplined, skilfully sharing responsibility. As the author of the country report, Tanja Miletić Orućević observes, in contemporary Bosnia and Herzegovina various levels of public administration are often perceived as separate political entities, their areas of competence are badly coordinated, and often they attempt to avoid responsibility under the pretext that a given issue should be managed at a different administrative level. Additionally, these administrative bodies do not want to be perceived as successors of the former local or regional organs of power in former Yugoslavia.

Chaos concerning the spheres of competence and responsibility has affected some theatres. There are situations where institutions, which have existed for many decades, no longer have an official founding body and thus no stable source of funding, because at no level of administration do the authorities want to take on that responsibility. Such a situation, where there is no clarity about the responsible body and funding, is present in Mostar, Zenica, and Tuzla.

“The most dramatic situation related to the problem of founding organs and the budget is present in Mostar. Because of the war, the city has been practically divided into two ethnic parts: Croatian and Bosnian. In 1993, a group of Croatian employees left the National Theatre in Mostar and established the Croatian National Theatre; both of these theatres still exist today. However, neither receives regular funding, because neither the city of Mostar, nor the Herzegovina-Neretva canton want to take over the founding organ rights and both theatres finance themselves by temporary grants. The political split complicates matters substantially: in several rounds of negotiations organized by the international community, a merger of the two theatres was suggested with the possibility of staging performances in two

languages, but the management of the Croatian theatre rejected the idea. The National Theatre in Mostar completed their last season, trying to reach its goals in a concerted media campaign, but the future of both theatres is unclear.”⁸

The problem does not result from the financial difficulties of the regional authorities. Rather, it is political in character and results from ignorance and lack of interest among politicians and public opinion. The lives of those theatres thus verge on the illegal, as they resort to legal provisions not applicable to theatre activity. Only Sarajevo, in the Bosnia and Herzegovina Federation, and Banja Luka, in the Serbian Republic, resolved the situation of their theatres within their own budgets.

Unclear principles

In some cases the decentralization of theatres was performed without clearly defined principles.

Iulia Popovici, the author of the Romanian report, observes that within the distribution of the theatres among the different administrative levels, similar theatres have different status. Unclear division into various administrative levels happened for two reasons: it was either inherited from communist times or depended on the financial potential of a given administrative body. It appears that in Romania theatres working in the same city would like to come under the authority of the same administrative level.

In Poland the division of the theatres among different administrative levels gave many institutions new development opportunities. In the first years of transformation, the state conferred upon the city governments the responsibility for the “weaker” theatres. The local officials soon decided to aid the development of those theatres and cared for them better than the previous state “organ in charge”. Among the institutions that benefited from this arrangement were the city theatres in Łódź, Szczecin, and Wrocław. When decentralization was completed, in 1999, and the state authorities were in charge of only three theatres, it turned out that general rules concerning the assignment of state theatres to particular administrative levels had never been defined. Polish specialists (Dorota Ilczuk, Wojciech Misiąg) unequivocally describe decentralization in culture as an arbitrary process, where no official justification was given for the decisions that were made. Some logic of the distribution of theatres may be discerned, however, mostly by prestige: operas and repertory theatres were assigned to the regional authorities, while puppet theatres landed with local/city authorities. In the latter case, the lower management costs may have contributed to the decision. A decade later, the then minister of culture Joanna Wnuk-Nazarowa mentioned that up until the last moment negotiations were going on about how many institutions should remain state-run and that despite decisions made by special commissions, ultimately the one to decide was the deputy minister for Internal Affairs delegated to the Ministry of Culture.

At the beginning of the 1990s decentralization was happening also in Slovakia. The majority of the theatres run by the Slovakian Ministry of Culture were turned over to the regional and city governments. In the first phase of decentralization a failed attempt was made to create three centres for Slovak theatre (Southern-Slovakian, Eastern-Slovakian, and Middle-Slovakian). As the author of the Slovakian report recollects, this attempt, made in the atmosphere of conflict between the politicians and the cultural representatives did not aim at a typical decentralization but, rather, aimed to control the flow of financial resources (the three centres were to supervise not only theatres but also galleries, museums, cultural centres, libraries, and concert halls). The plan of the politicians failed and the three centres collapsed before they even started to function properly. The second attempt at decentralization, based on an agreement with the representatives of culture and the network of regional theatres, is quite stable today.

In Slovenia, where three national theatres and ten organized by local authorities are in operation, it is still the state that bears the majority of financial responsibility for their support. The State budget finances eight theatres, while three are financed jointly with the City Municipalities. Therefore, full decentralization, including the delegation of financial responsibility, has not taken place.

8 Tanja Miletic Orucevic, *EEPAP Report–Bosnia and Herzegovina*.

In Bulgaria the application of decentralization is rather contradictory. Although decentralization has been declared a primary objective in designing cultural policy and managing the theatre system since the beginning of 1990s, its effective application has yet to be seen. The Ministry of Culture has made several attempts to transfer the responsibility for a number of theaters to the municipalities, but the latter show strong resistance to the process because of their limited finances and lack of administrative capacity.

In addition, it should be emphasized that the districts (the regional level of government) have too narrow an authority and virtually no budget for funding the activities of cultural organizations based in their territory. This is the reason why regional cultural institutions in Bulgaria are almost non-existent (with the exception of recently created regional libraries and museums).

Centralized theatre management

In some countries management of theatres is still centralized. In Azerbaijan, the old Soviet system of administration is still being followed today. In Moldova, decentralization was planned (in the years 1991–1992), but never completed. Later declarations also promised changes, but the old Soviet model still holds strong and no real action was ever undertaken. In Serbia, the authorities only declared their support for the idea of decentralization and regionalism, while doing nothing about it.

In Bulgaria, a vast network of theatres covers the entire country. The state and city authorities fund their budgets jointly, while the buildings are owned either by the state or the municipality. Nevertheless, the salaries of the actors and technical staff depend predominantly on state subsidies.

In Macedonia, the process of decentralization has begun, but slowly, especially in the realm of financing. The funding of culture at the local level is still only vaguely defined. Peter Ineka's diagnosis that: "the stated cultural policy of Eastern European countries is only practiced by some," seems to be confirmed.

In Armenia, the Ministry of Culture is still in charge of the majority of theatres. Only a few have been taken over by regional authorities and many local theatres collapsed. In 1998, the decision was made to go back to the centrally planned model from the time of the USSR. Regional theatres that had closed down did not reopen and the functioning theatres, including private ones, were nationalized.

Only in Belarus did the system always remain centralized, and if any attempts were made to change the situation, they were only grass-root efforts. After 2000, there was a chance that private theatres would contribute to decentralization, but they did not stand the test of time. In the majority of cases these theatres ceased to exist, and in several cases they were absorbed by the centralized system as city institutions.

Interestingly, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which functions as an asymmetrical confederacy with undefined spheres of competence on the state level, centralist and decentralist tendencies clash with each other. In Serbia centralization is advancing, for example the role of the Serbian National Theatre in Banja Luka is growing in the light of the absence of other theatres in other cities. In other parts of the federation theatres are managed by cantons or cities, and thus decentralization is more popular.

The effects of decentralization

The decentralization of theatres, the result of political and cultural tendencies in Europe, is usually considered a positive move, if for no other reason than its positive effect on the growth of democracy in a given state.

In Slovakia, the earlier hypothesis that funding for culture would grow on the regional level was confirmed (despite the fact that as an overall percentage regional budgets spending on culture decreased from 6.19% in 1993 to only 3.52% in 2008). Polish local governments similarly proved to be nimble managers with limited funds.

In the Ukraine decentralizing tendencies appeared soon after the independence. In 2001 a list of state institutions with "national" status was announced that would be financed from the state budget. All other institutions of culture were taken over by the local authorities. Specialists observe that on the

one hand, this was a good decision as it allowed artists and the authorities to shape repertory policy and solve organizational issues in their immediate environment. On the other hand, this situation effectively limited the possibility of the state having a comprehensive policy in the sphere of theatre. A similar situation arose in Poland in 2003 when a conflict about the nomination of a theatre director in Łódź proved the ultimate weakness of the central authorities as they simply had no tools to manage the dramatic situation. However, in the aftermath of this event, a legislative change was enacted that gave the Ministry of Culture greater say in personal decisions in institutions of culture.

In the Ukraine, another negative aspect of decentralization resulted from assigning theatres to districts as opposed to cities. This limited the ability of the cities to be in charge of their own cultural policy and to develop art tourism. Tina Peresunko, the author of the Ukrainian report believes that decentralization led to the weakening of professional contacts between artists from different cities and regions, but also fostered the establishment of local, regional, and thematic theatre festivals. In any case, the weakening of artist contacts may have been caused by the pauperization of those institutions over the last two decades of the 20th century.

Marek Waszkiel, director of the Polish Puppet Theatre from Białystok, an institution that collaborates closely with countries of Eastern Europe, aptly commented on the changes in the Polish theatre community: "Since the authorities resigned their control as a result of decentralization, everyone started looking for artistic freedom on their own, everybody started making their own contacts, their own space. We began to guard our own territory more than before. . . . It's like 'this is my territory, and I will not share it or make it available.' . . . We are still too poor—already too rich but still too poor—to allow ourselves the comfort of cooperation."⁹

Decentralization may have also had its psychological dimension. On the whole, however, it seems that the decentralization processes had a positive impact on theatre management as institutions gained more independence. A closer relation with the founding body, even if only in geographical terms, usually made both sides feel more responsible for their actions.

National theatres

Countries that decided to decentralize, usually kept several representative theatres under state management. This is the case in Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia and Poland. In Croatia the state co-manages only the National Theatre in Zagreb (together with the municipality), despite the fact that four theatres have the status of national theatres. In Slovakia, Nova Scena in Bratislava is a national theatre, although it is essentially a commercial musical theatre, financed by the state.

In the majority of the countries, theatres are under little pressure from the authorities and preserve a good deal of autonomy. The theatre repertoire is ideologically inflected in Moldova and Armenia, where theatres remain under the strong influence of the authorities.

In Kosovo, on the other hand, the authorities deem it natural that the national stage should perform a nation-building function. Jeton Neziraj, the author of the Kosovo report calls it a "nation-mania" of the authorities: the role of the theatre is to contribute to the uplift of the nation and national values. This is accompanied by an excessive attachment to hierarchies that take on some extraordinary forms. Neziraj recalls an anecdote, if one may call it that, demonstrating the relationship between the Kosovo National Theatre and the state. "Soon after the independence proclamation, one morning officials put up a board over the entry to the theatre with large lettering that spelled out 'The Republic of Kosovo', underneath this, in smaller letters, 'Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport', and at the bottom, in tiny letters, 'Kosovo National Theatre'. After several comments in the media, the board was removed and not put up again". This story demonstrates emphatically the instability in the "relations of power" and reflects rather poorly on the "autonomy" of this theatre in relation to the state. The main state institutions (the government

9 *Być w obiegu*, a conversation with Marek Waszkiel, "Teatr," no. 10/2008.

and the office of the president) still use the theatre as a space for various events, primarily those honouring national heroes from the past and from the last war.

It is worth pointing out that in three countries national theatres received new buildings. In 2002, a new building for the National Theatre in Budapest was opened (the project was completed in a mere three years, 1999-2002). Some commentators claim that "the decision to build the theatre was likely influenced by the political situation at the time. The Fidesz government whose term in office was ending in 2002, and whose support came mostly from outside Budapest, tried to use the theatre as a good opportunity to gain the support of the residents of the capitol. Successive governments had been promising a new theatre for years, and this government succeeded. The opening ceremony took place on March 15, 2002, on the anniversary of the outbreak of the Spring of Nations revolution, Hungary's most important national holiday."¹⁰

It is an altogether different history with the Slovakian National Theatre building, whose construction started in 1986 and ended in 2008. Construction work was delayed by continual financial difficulties with the Slovakian government that at one stage even considered selling the building under construction.

The Polish National Theatre (the dramatic stage) was opened in 1996, after eleven years of reconstruction work after a fire in 1985. Ironically, 60% of the work was done in the last three of those years when the decision to speed up the process was made by the Minister of Culture and Art Kazimierz Dejmek, a former director of the National Theatre in the 1960s. If not for his decision, the construction may have taken even longer (the delays were very profitable for the contractors).

Let us add that new buildings for representative theatres are being constructed all over Europe: the Oslo opera has a remarkable new building. The Royal Danish Theatre in Copenhagen acquired two new buildings in three years (2005-2008) for the opera and for the dramatic stage.

Minority theatres

In the countries of Eastern Europe, the state or local government finances numerous minority theatres. In Georgia, the government finances the Russian, Armenian, and Azerbaijani minority theatres. There are also Abkhazian and Ossetian theatres. In the Ukraine there are fourteen Russian theatres.

In the Czech Republic, there is a Polish stage in the dramatic theatre in the Czech border town of Cieszyn. In Rijeka, in the Croatian National Theatre Ivan pl. Zajc, there is an Italian Drama company. In Poland, in Warsaw, the Jewish Theatre has been active for many decades (co-financed by the city and by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage).

In Romania, there is a Hungarian Theatre in Cluj and a Hungarian company (next to a Rumanian one) at the National Theatre in Tîrgu Mureş. The capital city Bucharest finances the National Jewish Theatre.

In Slovakia national minority theatres are among the institutions financed from regional budgets: Hungarian Theatres in Komárno and Košice; the Ukrainian-Rusyn theatre in Prešov; and the Roma theatre in Košice.

In Hungary minority self-governments are the founding organs of theatres. The Roma Minority Self-government is in charge of the activity of the Cinka Panna Roma Theatre and the Romano Teatro Cultural Association. The Slovakian Theatre Vertigo is run by the National Slovakian Self-government. The German self-government in Hungary, together with the Regional Government in Tolna, runs the Deutsche Bühne Ungarn German Theatre.

In the Eastern European melting pot of nations, the presence of national minority theatres financed by public funding can be considered a good sign, indeed, a necessary element of mutual understanding and, depending on the context, of reconciliation.

10 Joanna Nowostawska-Gyalókaý, Zoltán Gyalókaý, *Czy genius loci? Scena narodowa nad Dunajem*, "Autoportret" no. 19 – "Przestrzenie sceny," pp. 38-39.

Capital city theatres

Capital cities usually gather the largest number of theatres. It often happens that they are also the founding organs of the largest number of theatres. Among the capitals of Eastern Europe, Warsaw has 19 theatres, Budapest 16, Bucharest 15, and Kiev 15. In 2002, Prague owned 13 theatres, and after the first stage of the transformation of city theatres into other legal entities, the city now administers 9 theatres, while the four that have been affected by the transformation still use four-year city grants. Out of 15 venues that regularly program theatre and dance in Sofia only 4 are owned by the city authorities.

This comparison suggests that Warsaw is the leader in theatre organization. To be precise, the city started in 1991 with 12 theatres taken over from the state. In the 1999 administrative reform the city did not receive any new theatres. But unfortunate decisions were made to hand over several long-standing and famous theatres to the new levels of territorial government (the Warsaw district and the Mazovian province). The new self-governments did not have appropriate budgets, so the theatres in their care experienced serious financial breakdowns. The Warsaw district was eventually done away with and in 2002 all district theatres came back under the care of the rich Warsaw City Council. Then, in 2005 Warsaw took over the Studio Theatre from the Parliament of the Mazovian province. The Warsaw capital thus became a theatre potentate on account of badly planned decentralization.

Is the situation of other European capitals comparable? The Berlin Senate finances 9 theatres. The Copenhagen City Council is in charge of 11 *Små Storbyteatre* (Small Metropolitan Theatres); self-government separately finances *Københavns Internationale Teater*, with performances from all over the world (also the circus). In Vienna four large stages are supported jointly by the central budget and by the city authorities because of their special cultural and historical value. Additionally the municipality finances independent theatres of which Vienna boasts several hundred. One third of total city spending on theatres goes to the support of independent theatres.

In Eastern Europe, the capital cities support more theatres than in Western Europe, but one should not draw too many conclusions from that fact. It is worth taking a closer look at the details, the history of the theatre institutions, the scale of financing, the size of the theatres, employment, and the context: how many national theatres compared to how many independent ones. Then the differences may not appear so substantial.

The increase in the number of public theatres

Despite the fact that political change threatened to lead to the closing down of theatres (as unprofitable, ineffective, overstaffed), the general tendency proved otherwise. Ukraine may serve as a good example. In 1985 there were over fifty professional national theatres. After independence, new institutions were established and by 2006 there were over 130 theatres. Currently in the Ukraine there are 125 state theatres and only a small number of private ones.

Various indicators demonstrate growth. In Hungary in the 1990s the number of small theatres increased. Similarly in Poland: in the last two decades almost every public theatre has acquired a small stage.

In the Czech Republic and in Poland the number of theatres increased dramatically as well. Official Polish statistics show a growth from 111 in 1990, to 142 in 2008. The data of the Institute of Theatre is even more impressive: in 2010 there were 559 theatres in Poland (professional, public and private, independent, and amateur). According to the data from the Czech Institute of Theatre there are 630 various theatres and companies in the Czech Republic (again from professional to amateur).

Summary – Public theatre organization models

Table 1. Organization models based on country

Decentralized model	Croatia, Czech Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Kosovo, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine
Centralized model	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Macedonia, Moldova
Mixed model	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria

Table 2. Effects of decentralization

Positive effects of decentralization	<p>Democratization of the management of culture</p> <p>Increase of funding for theatres on the local and regional levels</p> <p>Decrease of the direct influence of the state on theatres</p> <p>Increase of theatre independence in programming and funding</p> <p>Closer relationship between the institution and its environment (the society, the public, the authorities)</p> <p>Making use of the availability of the EU resources for regional spending</p>
Negative effects of decentralization	<p>Inconsistency in the division of theatres into various administrative levels, local and regional</p> <p>Failure in maintaining consistent theatre policy in the city, the region, and the state</p> <p>Lack of preparedness of politicians and officials for managing institutions of culture</p> <p>Weakening of contacts between different theatre centres</p>

Table 3. The number of theatres and companies in the EEPAP countries: division on the basis of theatre organizational status for the year 2009. Based on the EEPAP country reports.

	state	regional	city	NGO	private	co-run	together
Armenia	20	3	1	4	10	–	38
Azerbaijan	25	5	5	1	2	–	38
Belarus	7	17	5	–	3	–	32
Bosnia and Herzegovina	–	14	15	20	0	–	49
Bulgaria	42	0	9	20	1		72
Croatia		1	22	77	0	5	105
The Czech Republic	7	2	34	48	46		137
Georgia	12	7	19		15	2	55
Hungary	7	10	54	106	–	1	178
Kosovo	1	–	5	3	–	–	9

	state	regional	city	NGO	private	co-run	together
Macedonia	23	–	–	–	2	–	25
Moldova	12	3	3	1	2	–	21
Poland	3	34	70	121	122	16	366
Rumania	17	25	53	27	–	–	122
Serbia	2	2	16	70	2	–	92
Slovakia	4	19	3	27	–	–	53
Slovenia	3	–	10	12	1	–	26
Ukraine	9	67	49	less than 10% of the total number of theatres			140

III. New initiatives

In each of the countries in this study, the regaining of independence and/or the change of the political system liberated the creative energies of artists – many of whom did not fit in or were stifled by the old system. Many artists decided to practice at their own risk.

In the Czech Republic, the change of the political system brought about a flourishing of private, independent, and commercial theatres, particularly musical ones. In Slovenia, the 1990s were a fertile time in the development and growth of alternative and experimental theatres, with many specializing in dance, multimedia, and interdisciplinary work, in sharp contrast to the collapsing institutional theatres.

In Croatia, from the very first moment that new laws were implemented allowing for the establishment of arts organizations by individual artists, 57 new theatres were created (and many dance institutions – it is difficult to find an exact number – but at least 20 dance organizations are currently very active and therefore the most visible). Among those 57 arts organizations 47 were established and operate in Zagreb; four operate in Split, and one for each of the following locations: Vinkovci, Bjelovar, Ivanić Grad, Dubrovnik, Koprivnica, and Osijek. Additionally, all three independent theatre companies were established and operate in Zagreb. This is a good example that illustrates how independent theatre activity usually coalesces in Capital cities. However, it is also worth mentioning that all of these arts organizations are not equally active, so although the number is big, the real level of output and impact is a different story.

New initiatives not only changed the institutional landscape but also influenced the artistic dimensions of theatre as well. In Romania it is the independent theatres whose repertoire shows the greatest engagement with social issues. The minimalist aesthetic of AKT Theatre, which exists thanks to a private sponsor, has already had a significant influence on Romanian theatre.

Space for new activities

The authorities reacted with different speed to the grass-roots movement of new theatre initiatives. In 1992 space opened up in the Czech Republic for private theatre initiatives. The same happened in Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia and Poland from early 90's. In Georgia in the years 1998-1999 the government legalized various kinds of theatre activity, including those that were privately supported.

In some countries it took a long time before the authorities noticed the independent sphere. In Belarus, private theatres still do not have any legal status, and it was not until 2010 that independent theatres gained some support from the government. In Kosovo the decision was made in 2010 to allocate 30% of the general theatre fund for independent theatres.

Independent theatres, however, often go through difficult times. In Bosnia, the theatre policy for the Sarajevo Canton, while recognizing theatres as non-governmental organisations, nevertheless forces them to act under strict and strange conditions. For example, the policy states that it is necessary for a theatre to have an auditorium with seats fixed permanently to the floor. At this time, only one independent theatre has announced its plans to build a house. In Croatia the situation is similar: most independent theatres don't have their own space.

In Bulgaria, many independent and private theatres and dance companies have emerged since 1990, but they have all suffered difficulties due to unfavourable legal regulations and limited financial resources. In effect, independent activities usually take the form of mobile and flexible structures set up to carry out a single project or programme, and are later dissolved. In 2009, private theatres and independent companies in Bulgaria united for common cause to form the ACT Association (Association for Free Theatre) in an effort to better their working and operational conditions.

In the Czech Republic new organisations have to follow the same rules as those already in existence. There is no special support programme for them so they must compete with the more experienced organisations on an equal footing. However, it is commonly acknowledged that grant committees attend to them with particular care. In the Czech Republic, the support of new activities and organisations lies mainly in the hands of city/local authorities and international funding bodies. The Ministry of Culture (with very limited funds) is widely regarded as supporting more established theatres and events.

Recent years have seen the decline of many initiatives and organizations in Kosovo. At present only two theatres (Oda and the barely active Teatrit të babes) together with the MULTIMEDIA centre remain open to the public.

In Moldova, artists have tried to organise private theatres, but most of them did not last longer than two years. Although the law allows for the private subsidizing of cultural projects, the state does not really support private initiatives.

In Macedonia, new initiatives and organizations have to be registered, and the producers of performances have to fulfil certain criteria established by the Ministry of Culture. There are quite a number of registered private theatres, but only two of them offer a set repertoire. Both public and private projects are supported.

In Poland, following the era of general nationalisation, the first private theatres began to be established in the 1980s. At the end of the decade there were already 65 such theatres in Poland (ranging from one-person-theatre initiatives to whole enterprises). Initially, the private theatres filled niches that were not explored by state theatres, so they were not seen as a threat to them. With time, however, the theatre market began to be spoiled by some private theatres that staged classics in the schools. Today, the number of theatres that are not state-owned has risen significantly: there are approximately 150 to 180 theatre companies, consisting of big (commercial or non-commercial) theatres that have their own stages, or one-person theatre companies. According to the data collected by the Theatre Institute, almost a hundred professional independent theatres gave premieres in 2008. Apart from the system of grants there are no special support programmes, nor any special legal solutions.

Serbia does not have any official regulations for new theatre initiatives. However, there are some tendencies. In recent years the emphasis has been on the development of contemporary dance.

In Slovakia, most of the new initiatives have failed due to financial problems. Independent and non-commercial theatre groups have the lowest priority in the system of subsidies – at the state, city or regional level. The theatre system has not changed from the old system, and there is no law that would regulate the establishment of new theatre institutions or groups, or the transformation of already existing structures. In 2010 one of the leading commercial theatres called WEST went bankrupt, quietly, without any media coverage. If it were not for ministerial grants, the more recently established independent theatre groups could not survive (as this is usually their only source of funding.)

In Hungary there is no theatre that sustains itself purely on a commercial business basis. The Budapest Operetta Theatre and the Madach Theatre, which specialize in famous Western musicals, come

closest to that business model. They have expensive tickets yet both of them also receive large state subsidies.

More commonly, however, theatres established as private initiatives are able to maintain themselves through the grants they obtain, or – to a lesser degree – through sponsorship. Having gained visibility and public interest, they can get more and more funds from the state's budget. This is the case of the Krétakör Theatre, which gained support not only from the authorities, but also from influential foreign partners that financed its activities. One example is Béla Pintér's theatre that followed this same path. In the years from 1998-2003 they received a total of only 3.5 million forints. In 2007, they were awarded with 39 million forints, and in 2008 – 40 million forints. The Béla Pintér's group serves as an example that through hard artistic work one can win a stable position in the theatre system, but in order to make that happen, one needs to engage in a wide range of activities: stronger marketing, lobbying, advertising, image building and avoiding bank loans to cover budget shortages.

In Hungary, the majority of puppet theatres are private initiatives. One example of a privately owned dramatic theatre is the Karinthy Theatre of Budapest. In recent years one can also observe strong theatre patronage in the field of variety theatre.

Young creators of dance and theatre

One common reason for new initiatives to spring up is the fact that young artists enter the labour market of dance and theatre, making their debuts just after graduation. Whether theatre institutions remain open to new creators often depends on their financial situation. Sometimes it depends on the attitude of more experienced artists and the theatre establishment towards the debutants. There are also times when young artists consciously choose to set up their own theatre company because they do not feel fulfilled working within already existing institutions.

One can see young artists establishing theatre companies in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where there are many theatre colleges and departments, but the existing theatres rarely expand their teams or employ new actors. For that reason, some young graduates have decided to start their own theatre companies or even to found a small theatre. Such theatres as Jazavac in Banja Luka or Cabaret Theatre in Tuzla are now positioned as the second most important institutions right behind largest main public theatre.

In Poland a vibrant community of young creators has emerged in Białystok where the Puppetry Art Department branch of the State Theatre Academy of Warsaw is located. After 2004 successive graduates of the Puppetry Art Department decided to organise their own companies (which were small, consisting of up to five people). Young artists were motivated by the experience of small teams of puppeteers from Western Europe, where the puppet theatre market was never heavily institutionalized as in the countries of the former Soviet Bloc. Young puppet theatre artists resigned from stability and full-time employment to try their own artistic paths. Unlike the puppeteers, young creators of the dramatic theatre in Poland have not shown a similar interest in private activity (rather it is more often to be found among more experienced actors).

In Belarus the generational change of executive positions proceeds at a very slow pace. Only recently have new faces appeared, whereas in the 1980s or 1990s, or at the beginning of the 2000s, young leaders had little chance of managing theatres.

Privatisation of theatres

In the questionnaire for the national reports we asked about the privatisation of state theatres, assuming that the authorities of particular countries, working within the framework of capitalist reforms, would give up on a large network of public institutions. However, we were informed that in almost all cases such a solution had not been enacted. The authorities of the majority of the countries we investigated did not attempt to privatise theatres, focusing instead on truly commercial business enterprises.

It was only in the Czech Republic that the theatres were broadly privatised. This was made possible with the 1992 change in the theatre law. Public theatres started to be privatised by emerging private enterprises. Sometimes even actors or directors took over the theatres. In most cases the privatisation processes took place through renting or the purchase of unused theatre spaces. In the transformation of the city theatres of Prague, which has been happening since 2002, one can trace some important elements of privatisation (these issues will be discussed further in the chapter *Reforms and legal solutions – examples*).

The idea of “wild privatization” springs up in the context of the changes in Kosovo. As Jeton Neziraj, author of the national report, wrote, the authorities had succeeded in protecting a network of cultural centres from the practices of “wild privatization,” which had previously consumed the cinemas. When the cinemas were sold a few years ago they lost their original function.

In the years 1990-1991, Poland also experienced a process of “wild privatization” that took place in the theatre community against the law and prevailing customs. After seizing twelve of the state theatres, the authorities of Warsaw, the country’s capital, raised the issue of privatisation because there were not enough funds to maintain all of the theatre institutions. First, the city administration started to rent out some of the theatres to private enterprises. The people working at the theatres were not considered at all. The lessees soon became insolvent. This practice was blocked with the introduction in 1991 of the new *Act on the Organising and Conducting of Cultural Activities* and the issue of privatisation was forgotten. The premises of two Warsaw theatres were taken over by a new owner who terminated the contract with the public theatre. One theatre was transformed into a chain store.

Institutionalisation – a success of independent theatre?

Rather than privatise, the authorities more often choose to confer the status of a public institution on to independent theatres.

At one point in Armenia the authorities decided to nationalize the theatres (resorting in the 1990s to the practices of the Soviet Union) – now the Armenian artists founding their own theatres regard nationalization as a success. Every new initiative debuts at festivals and once it grows recognisable it seeks nationalization.

In Azerbaijan new initiatives in the performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) are most often created on a public basis as they can be financially supported with the help of different funds, including governmental and non-governmental organizations. At the same time, private studios and theatres are trying to gain public status just to survive and obtain the same subsidies. Six theatres have been “nationalized” since 1991: YUGH Theatre, Youth Theatre, The Public Pantomime Theatre, Municipal Theatre, Theatre of Miniatures, and Chamber Theatre – all of different genre, form and style.

In Belarus, many private theatres and amateur groups transformed into state theatres. The owners of the theatres are convinced that the government and its funds will make work easier for them.

Even though the state does not support independent theatres in Moldova, the private Eugene Ionesco Theatre has been nationalized (as mentioned above, most private theatres do not last long).

In many countries the status of independent theatres changed once they filled an important gap in cultural programming, and it became in the city’s interest to support them. For example, in the Romanian city of Bucharest the city took over care of two theatres (a children’s theatre and a street theatre). In the Polish city of Kraków the city institutionalized street theatre and a ballet of historical dances.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, non-governmental organisations were institutionalized that reached far beyond amateur or educational activities, venturing into the territory of the experimental and alternative theatre. After the war such activities turned professional – the production of performances was closely associated with education (in Mostar, for example) and elsewhere (in Prijedor) public professional theatres evolved from amateur ones.

In Poland, immediately after 1989, the authorities nationalised (and thus protected the stability of) the theatres that had returned home from emigration (the Theatre of the Eighth Day) as well as

the theatres whose importance was confirmed in their work (for example, the Gardzienice Theatre of Włodzimierz Staniewski). In recent years, as the financial situation of the local authorities became stable, the status of a number of theatres changed – in Kielce and in Kraków the already existing non-governmental organisations were used as a platform to create several dance and theatre institutions. In 2006, the Podlaskie Regional Assembly along with the Ministry of Culture established the Wierszalin Theatre out of the existing foundation that had originally nurtured this important theatre. Another way independent initiatives are supported in Poland is through the creation of joint foundations through the merging of public institutions of culture by the Ministry or local authorities and an NGO. Although this process became legally available as early as in 1991, it has been utilized only recently.

In Hungary the Ministry of Culture and Education shelters not only the state theatres but also the Krétakör Theatre Foundation, contracting the Foundation to perform certain tasks. This famous theatre company then became financially stable, and it has retained the status of a non-governmental organisation.

The idea behind these practices is to support active non-governmental organisations and provide them with a sense of stability. Nevertheless, no general criteria or procedures have been created concerning the institutionalisation process anywhere so far. It is rather a gesture of support towards independent theatres that have made a name for themselves.

Grant policies

Independent theatres depend on grants awarded by the authorities. In the Czech Republic (Prague), Poland (Poznań, Warsaw) or Slovenia there are already long-term grants based on a transparent criteria.

In Prague the four-year grant system was introduced in 2000 and six theatres were provided with four-year grants. Currently, there has been an increase in the number of theatres receiving grants (including those that are part of the transformation of the city theatres). The grant policy also provided effective support in an emergency situation when the city was able to finance the purchase of technical equipment in theatres that had been devastated by flooding.

In Poland a three-year grant system was introduced by the authorities of Poznań and Warsaw (support for twelve independent theatres) as well as by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, where the organisers of festivals started to apply for subsidies for a three-year period. This particular solution was aimed at the most important national events and enables the organisers of festivals to prepare a programme for a number of years in advance. Among the festivals that were supported are the Malta Festival, the Poznań Mozart Festival and the Poland Contact Festival.

In Slovakia, the grant policy still remains unclear, and independent theatres depend solely on the subsidies they get from the Ministry of Culture and are not supported by the local authorities at all. In addition, there are no multi-year grants as in other countries.

Generally, independent theatres receive grants for particular projects, but they are not given any money for general operation, and this remains an important problem. In Romania, a number of theatres get certain material help from the authorities such as free space, rent or utilities as is the case of two theatres in Tîrgu Mureş.

In Croatia, there are active independent theatres but the vast majority of them do not own their own space and co-produce their plays with city theatres or cultural centres. In this way, they can make use of the technical staff, utilize promotions and marketing, and have a place for rehearsals and performances. Other independent theatres, however, stage their plays in alternative spaces. Only a few independent theatres work in their own spaces, usually obtained or leased from a municipality, or stage their performances in the rooms of cultural centres.

In countries with a centralized system of theatres, grants are a rare occurrence. The Serbian Ministry of Culture is currently investigating the possibility of launching a competition for the organisers of the alternative scene and of developing a system of long-term grants. As mentioned before, it was not until 2010 that bigger funds for independent theatres were released in Belarus and Kosovo.

In the Czech Republic, an idea appeared temporarily in the municipal council of Prague that would match the funding of theatres to their ticket sales volume. It was quickly understood that this would direct the most funds to the large commercial theatres. The protests that followed caused the project to be abandoned.

A similar process can be observed currently in Bulgaria where a new system of so called “delegated” budgets has been introduced to the state theaters. Their subsidies are highly dependent on the number of tickets sold, although other criteria such as artistic quality and participation in festivals are also included.

In all of the countries investigated in this report, non-commercial independent theatres depend on ministerial or municipal subsidies. In Slovakia, for example, they all seek ministerial grants, because the municipal authorities do not provide them with enough money to maintain their programming.

Other sources for funding projects

There are currently no alternate sources of funding (meaning private individual support through tax initiatives) in the countries under investigation. There are also no private foundations, in particular. For a time the foundations associated with the Open Society Fund of George Soros were active in the cultural field in the region, but at one point they stopped supporting cultural activities and redirected their resources to other social programmes (although in Armenia, for example, the fund continues to support cultural projects). Foreign cultural agencies (the Goethe Institut, the British Council, Pro Helvetia etc.), which have the means to support certain local artists, have come to play an important role in the local market.

Sponsorship, a concept that was supported in each of the countries investigated in this report from the very beginning of the transformations, failed. Companies that sponsor programs or events are looking for an opportunity to do business, and the theatre has too little marketing potential. It would appear at this time that supporting culture through sponsorship will never be a significant contribution. The example of the United States of America is often invoked with a view to promoting sponsorship. But research brings unexpected results: “On average, each year Americans hand over more than 250 billion dollars to non-profit organisations. The figures have been growing steadily since the 1960s, particularly over the last decade – but the distribution of these donations by source remains stable: 74.5% donations come from individuals; 10.9% from foundations, 9% from bequests from private persons, and in last place at 5.6% business enterprises. So the patronage of business enterprises does not play a significant role in the non-commercial sector of the United States of America, contrary to the common belief.”¹¹

In some cases there are wealthy patrons who decide to support an important initiative. American businessman and patron of the arts, Kirk Kerkorian, an Armenian by descent, donated 15 million dollars to support theatre art in Armenia. He made the Ministry of Culture responsible for the distribution of the money, and the Ministry spent it on the restoration of the theatre buildings, without any consultation.

In Azerbaijan, additional financing for cultural institutions dedicated to the performing arts can include subsidies obtained from sponsors or donors, although this appears to be a very rare practice. Only one or two organizations (non-governmental organizations or private institutions) usually succeed in gaining sponsorship and these are either for short-term projects or aimed at one particular production.

In 2009, the “*America for Bulgaria*” foundation was created in Sofia. It annually provides more than 3.5 million U.S. Dollars for grants on Culture and Arts projects.

In Georgia, patron Bidzina Ivanishvili decided to finance the full renovation of all the most important theatres in Tbilisi (at present the Tbilisi Opera and Ballet Theatre are being renovated). He then

11 Frédéric Martel, *Polityka kulturalna Stanów Zjednoczonych* [De la culture en Amérique], trans. Agata Czarnacka, Grażyna Majcher, Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog, Warsaw 2008, p. 294.

financed the salaries of the management and the most important actors – at the same time, he asked to remain anonymous.

In 2004, Poznań businesswoman Grażyna Kulczyk created the first program in Poland fully devoted to the presentation of contemporary dance, open all-year-round, leaving the state and the municipal councils behind. The Old Brewery New Dance programme has not only become a shelter for artists but has also created a regular public for dance.

Summary – New initiatives

Table 4. Grant policies – long-term grants

Countries where long-term grants are available	Czech Republic, Poland, Slovenia
Countries where long-term grants are not available	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Hungary, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Ukraine

Table 5. Privatisation of the public theatres

Countries where theatres were privatised	Czech Republic
Countries where theatres were not privatised	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Hungary, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine

Table 6. Institutionalisation of independent theatres

Countries where the independent theatres were institutionalised	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova, Poland, Romania
Countries where the independent theatres were not institutionalised	Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Kosovo, Macedonia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine

In collaboration with EEPAP, Goran Injac divided the countries investigated in this report into three groups on the basis of the relation between institutionalised and independent theatres:

- The first group consists of the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovenia, where the differences between the independent and official institutions have faded. This experiment has become a part of the official scene, the institutions are open to a variety of means of expression, and the distribution of state funds does not exclude or restrict any activities.
- In the second group are Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and Ukraine, where there still remains a strict division between the official culture and the independent culture – the two spheres do not permeate one another. What is more, as Injac notes, the biggest and best theatre events (i.e. festivals) are produced outside public institutions.
- The third group includes Armenia, Belarus, Georgia and Moldova, where artistic work has only begun to develop (financially and artistically) within the framework of independent activities. However, only those institutions that are state-controlled can seek state funding.

One of the central issues for the organisation of theatre in the countries of Eastern Europe is the balancing of relations between the institutional public stages and the new independent initiatives.

IV. International cooperation

The change of political systems in the majority of the countries investigated by EEPAP facilitated travelling and allowed for the establishment of connections abroad. With the emergence of new trends in cultural policy – the development of festivals and the effectiveness of co-productions – as well as the availability of European cultural funds, new platforms for international cooperation appeared. How the institutions of theatre and dance use these opportunities is the topic of the next section.

Using EU resources

Among the countries investigated in this report, seven: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia are members of the European Union. The others have different relations with the EU.

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia and Serbia have filed motions for EU membership. Of these, only Croatia and Macedonia have official status as a candidate. The Eastern Partnership programme, produced by the European Union in 2009 within the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy, offers trade cooperation, visa facilitation services and the EU Help Funds. The purpose of this program is to prepare candidate countries for accession to the European Union. Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine participate in the Partnership. In 2010, the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme was launched to provide institutional strengthening in the cultural sectors of the partner countries. The activities undertaken within the programme are meant to help formulate cultural policies, to reform cultural institutions, and to prepare the way for accessing opportunities provided by EU cultural programmes. The partner countries can count on the EU to provide help in the reform of their cultural policies at the government level and to provide financial support for civil society and cultural institutions. The EU has assigned 12 million euro to the programme.¹²

The status of Kosovo remains highly complex in relation to the EU. A few EU countries have still not recognized its independence – the EU Committee itself recognizes Kosovo to be an administrative district of Serbia under international supervision.

The EU member states benefit from a variety of programmes and EU funds – from the Culture 2007 programme (and the earlier programmes available in the pre-accession period, such as Kaleidoscope, Theorem, PHARE, and Culture 2000).

Bulgarian projects supported by the EU are exceptions – they are limited to the support of festivals and for minority partners in multilateral projects (Culture 2007 programmes). In Bulgaria, theatre and dance institutions seldom use EU programmes because there is no state or ministerial fund (programme) to help Bulgarian institutions participate in EU projects. Recently, however, the Sofia Municipality “Culture” programme started providing funds for Bulgarian partners in EU financed projects.

Similarly, in Romania public institutions do not use EU programmes and funds due to a lack of professional experts, bureaucratic procedures, and the system by which public theatres function. One exception is the “Ion Dacian” National Operette Theatre that is collaborating with the Accademia Teatro alla Scala from Milan on a project called “SCENART - Support for Skills Improvement in the Romanian Performing Arts.” This 3.7 million-euro three-year project is financed from the Sector Operational Programme - Human Resources Development. The Romanian independent groups are more active in using the EU programmes (the most active among them being the 74 Theatre from Tirgu Mureş, 4Culture and the Gabriela Tudor Foundation from Bucharest, and ColectivA from Cluj). The biggest problem they face is a lack of local funding for their participation in the projects.

In the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia theatres use the Culture 2007 programme as well as structural improvement funds (infrastructural investment), the Interreg programmes,

12 Information on the the Eastern Partnership, www.ms.gov.pl.

the Norway grants, the Operational Programme Infrastructure Fund and Environment (where culture is Priority 9).

In Slovakia, grants from the Culture programme are very popular – each year the number of new applications grows. Increasingly, Slovakian institutions and associations act as leaders for the projects funded by the Culture programme. Both the Czech Prague and the Slovakian Bratislava Cultural Contact Points (that coordinate the grant distribution from the Culture programme) are working in partnership with the Culture Programme in their respective Theatre Institutes.

In recent years, many Hungarian theatres have participated in the Social Renewal Operational Programme (TÁMOP) or have received a subsidy for their own performances. In Poland, the Promesa programme of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage has existed since 2004 helping to finance national contributions for selected cultural projects co-financed with EU funds. Many theatres have also used EU structural funds to improve their infrastructure. The building of new complexes, such as the opera houses in Białystok and Kraków, has also been supported by EU funds.

The countries that seek EU membership also make use of the Culture programme. For ten years now Macedonia has been participating in a variety of EU programmes. Two years ago it created its own Cultural Contact Point. Croatia has been active in the programme since 2007. In addition, Croatian organisations use the resources of the European Cultural Foundation.

Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Ukraine, and the other partner countries, do not use EU funds yet. Direct use of the Culture Programme became possible only after the establishment of the Eastern Partnership. Prior to that, the institutions from those countries – formally regarded as third countries – could only take part in a project financed by the EU as a “co-organiser” or an “associated partner,” which was complicated and involved the mediation of organisations from EU member states.

Bosnia and Herzegovina is currently at the stage of signing an agreement on the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance and other pre-accession EU funds. In Moldova such cooperation is “rare and without significant success in the theatre field.” Kosovo does not benefit at all.

The author of the Ukrainian report remarks that: “the participation of Ukrainian institutions in EU programmes is rare due to the lack of international fundraising experts and managers educated in foreign languages who could professionally engage in the non-profit branch of Ukrainian performance arts. On the whole, the inert development of theatre management and the lack of any effective government policy in the field of Ukraine’s cultural Euro-integration are the main problems here.”

It is only now that a deeper integration of the countries of the Eastern Partnership and the European cultural sphere is starting to take place. The artists from the countries of the Eastern Partnership are already pointing to problems related to the incompatibility of standards for artistic work in different countries. This might also make the cooperation on projects financed by the EU more challenging in the beginning.

Theatre networks

The EU cultural programmes promoting collaboration between different countries stimulated the development of networks in the form of associations, unions and societies. “For non-commercial art, which has always struggled with the problem of insufficient funding, networks have become an opportunity to raise additional funding without having to abandon ambitious artistic goals. (...) ‘Network’ and ‘networking’ have become both a practice and a general philosophy of how to behave in the artistic market, as well as the basic strategy for a group or an institution to survive.”¹³

Despite the variety of networks their aims are basically the same – to develop a particular field of art, to raise its quality, to establish professional cooperation, to facilitate the flow of information, to exchange knowledge and to share good practices. In recent years, the creation of networks has become such an

13 Joanna Leśniewska, *Sieć – ale jaka*, “Teatr” no. 7-8/2011.

intense practice that, as dance curator Joanna Leśniewska remarks, some cultural activists begin to see the benefits of leaving networks (with all the contacts acquired there).

Eastern European countries seem to be at the beginning of this road and they still consider network cooperation an attractive and effective way of carrying out international projects.

Non-EU countries and networks

Armenia and Azerbaijan are the only nations that have not reported any cooperation between its institutions and outside networks. In Belarus, the NAVINKI Performance Art Festival is a member of the International Association Performance Art Organisation (IAPAO) network.

There are many organisations in Bosnia and Herzegovina that are members of a network. The Centre for Drama Education at the Mostar Youth Theatre participates in the international network of theatre education IDEA. The International Peace Centre of Sarajevo is a member of the International Society for the Performing Arts (ISPA) and the International Association of the Biennale of Young Artists from Europe and Mediterranean. The Sarajevo MCP and the *Mostarsko proljeće* festival belong to the European Festivals Association (EFA). Some theatre institutions take steps to join ASSITEJ and other international networks.

In Croatia there is the ITI centre in Zagreb, ASSITEJ, and UNIMA. The international puppet festival PIF belongs to the European Festival Network. While the Epicentre Theatre of Zagreb, a stage for children and youth, created a network of independent theatres – the Balkan Network for Children's and Youth Theatre "Epicenter". Theatres and individual theatre artists are members of IETM, two theatres (Zagreb Youth Theatre and City drama theatre Gavella) are members of ETC. Some individual artists are members of IETM. Croatia is also active in Nomad Dance Academy and Balkan Dance Network.

In Georgia, five institutions belong to the Informal European Theatre Meeting (IETM) and one institution belongs to the International Festivals & Events Association (EFEA). More than 60 institutions and individual members belong to the Caucasian Arts Managers Network (CAMN). In 2008 the Georgian Regional Theatre Network was established as a network and open to foreign members. It now counts 25 theatres and individual members.

The Kosovan Oda Theatre is a member of IETM; Qendra Multimedia is a member of the European Off Network and the above-mentioned Epicenter network from Zagreb.

There is an ITI centre located in Macedonia. In addition, the International Theatre Festival MOT is a member of IETM. The organisation Theatre Youth of Macedonia cooperates widely on the international level; it belongs to the International Association of theatre critiques (IATC), the International Association of Amateur Theatre (AITA/IATA), the International Drama in Education Association (IDEA), the International Association of Theatres et Universities (IATU), the International Association of Theatres for Children and Youth Theatre (ASSITEJ), and the International Association of Culture in Society (AMATEO).

The Puppet Theatre "Licurici" of Moldova belongs to UNIMA. The Serbian Stanica / Station is a member of several networks: IETM, the Nomad Dance Academy, the Balkan Dance Network, the European Network of Performing Arts (ENPARTS), the International Young Makers Exchange (IYME).

Ukraine discovered many internationally acknowledged social network organisations only after it won its political independence. After 1992 Ukraine joined UNIMA, AITA, ITI, and ASSITEJ, among others. In 2008 the Lviv National Solomiya Kruselnicka Opera and Ballet Theatre became a member of the International Opera Association OperaEuropa.

Much has changed as far as dance is concerned. Ukrainian organisations belong to the International Dance Sport Federation (IDSF), the World Dance and Dance Sport Council (WD&DSC), the International Dance Organisation (IDO) and, conditionally, the International Professional DanceSport Council (IPDSC). Ukraine's cultural institutions join international organisations, but due to the shortage of relevant specialists and managers they use the opportunities for international cooperation in this area inefficiently.

EU countries and networks

In Bulgaria, the participation of institutions and organisations in networks is rather limited. Few theatres and organisations are members of IETM. The National Academy of Theatre and Film Art is a member of the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA) and the (International Puppetry Association) UNIMA. The latter is joined by several other puppet theatres and festivals. There are also a few members in other networks, such as Trans Europe Halls, and Euromed(in)culture. In the Czech Republic, the following centres of international organisations are located: IETM, OISTAT, AITA/IATA, ASSITEJ, SPACE, CID, UNIMA, CIRCOSTRADA, FIT. In Slovenia IETM, ETC, IITM (and others). In Hungary puppet theatres belong to UNIMA and ASSITEJ. Currently no Hungarian theatre belongs to the Union of the Theatres of Europe (the Katona Theatre has become a member of the informal Mitos21 network). In Romania the Hungarian State Theatre in Cluj is also a member of that organisation.

In Poland the following organisations are active: ITI, UNIMA, ASSITEJ, OISTAT, and AITA. IETM has seven members (including the Malta Festival, the National Audiovisual Institute, and the Lublin Culture Centre). The Poznań New Theatre is a member of the European Theatre Convention. The Old Theatre in Kraków left the Union of the Theatres of Europe and joined Mitos21 instead. The Helena Modrzejewska Theatre is a member of the interACT network (devised in Skopje). The Shakespeare Festival in Gdańsk was the initiator of the European Network of Shakespearean Festivals that gathers festivals from Poland, Romania, Hungary, Germany and Great Britain (with festivals from Spain, Czech Republic and Armenia expected to join). The Old Brewery New Dance in Poznań belongs to several dance networks.

In Romania, single theatres belong to European networks: ColectivA from Cluj to “Temps d’Image”; 4Culture from Bucharest to “Jardin d’Europe”; two theatres: “Bulandra” from Bucharest and the State National Theatre from Cluj belong to the Union of the Theatres of Europe; the National Theatre of Timișoara is a member the European Theatre Convention. The Shakespeare Festival in Craiova is a member of the European Network of Shakespearean Festivals and three organisations belong to IETM: the 4Culture Association, ArCuB (Bucharest Centre for Cultural Projects) and Uniter (Union of Theatre People of Romania). Uniter is also a member of Culture Action Europe, the network “Pépinieres Européennes pour Jeunes Artistes” and constitutes the country’s ITI centre. Many theatres belong to ASSITEJ and UNIMA as well as to the EUNETART and Epicentre networks.

The purpose of this detailed account is to provide an insight into which networks are the most prominent in Eastern Europe. As can be easily seen, the traditional organisations UNIMA and ASSITEJ still enjoy a strong position. The situation of ITI – once a very influential organisation – varies from country to country. The name IETM appears quite often.

However, the scale of network participation demonstrates that the network has not yet become a tool commonly used by the theatres of Eastern Europe for the development of international relations.

Co-productions

Theatres engage in co-productions not only with a view to sharing costs, but also because they expect some “artistic synergy” to come out of the encounter between two good groups of artists and two kinds of art. Another aim is to enrich an institution’s repertoire – some institutions participate in cooperative projects so that they can present a renowned company on their stage.

International co-productions entered Central European countries as a result of the growing interest in the region’s artists. The THEOREM programme proved especially conducive to the international careers of directors from Bulgaria, Macedonia, Poland and Hungary (as well as Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia). Of course similar co-operations had taken place earlier (e.g. the works of Tadeusz Kantor’s group were financed by festivals in Italy and France), but it was at the turn of the century that Central European theatres took a more serious interest in this phenomenon.

Major opera theatres from Western Europe started to organise co-productions of their premieres – chiefly within the *stagione* system (when the production is performed for some time after the premiere, and then returns after a year or not at all). This solution proved the most profitable. Often Western European impresarios cooperate with Polish or Ukrainian theatres to produce shows that are subsequently delivered as part of the tour in Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium.

Co-productions have become common in most Eastern European countries (only Moldova has no record of a co-production, though inviting stage-managers from other countries to create in Moldovan theatres is a common practice). The Soros Foundation and the embassies of some countries, particularly France and Great Britain, support co-productions in Armenia.

In recent years in Azerbaijan, there have been a few trials of such collaborations and some of them were quite successful. In general, those projects are fully or partially subsidized by the state, through the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and they gain partial financial support from the partner institution as well.

Belarusian state theatres do not cooperate with foreign establishments. The well-known exception is the independent Free Theatre of Minsk. Other independent theatres also happen to participate in international co-productions financed by international institutions. Many Belarusian artists take part in foreign projects (Germany, Poland, Czech Republic, France and Switzerland – but most of all in Russia, thanks to the existence of the Union State of Russia and Belarus).

In Bosnia and Herzegovina the International Theatre Festival MESS and the National Theatre manage numerous international – and primarily regional – co-productions. The East West Theatre Company has successfully carried out a series of international co-productions that premiered and toured in many countries.

In Bulgaria, co-productions are rare and based on individual directors' personal connections. No active promotion of international contacts, partnerships or participation in international initiatives is carried out on the national level. International contacts are most often the effect of a directors' private initiative. It is worth emphasizing that the Minister of Culture and the National Culture Fund cover part of the costs of such projects – transport costs and, less frequently, the production costs that are supposed to be covered by the Bulgarian partner.

In Croatia, the Centre for Drama Art has existed since 1995 with international cooperation as one of its main aims. Most of the international co-productions were realised by the Zagrebačko kazalište mladih (Zagreb Youth Theatre), which has cooperated with New York's La Mama, France's La Comédie de Saint-Étienne and Théâtre de la place Liege, and also within the Orient Express theatre project that included five more partner countries (Serbia, Turkey, Romania, Slovenia and Germany) – a train ride from Ankara to Stuttgart. Currently the Zagreb Youth Theatre is working on a co-production with the German Braunschweig City Theatre, which is financed by the Department of Culture of Germany's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and involves Croatian and German actors. The project has also received financial support from the EU Culture Programme 2007–2013. There are also different international collaborations between Croatian and foreign festivals and some dance companies are working on international cooperation as well.

In the Czech Republic, it is most often the younger generation of artists that reach beyond the country's borders and widen the impact of their work. They often prepare their projects with the help of foreign partners. The most active organisations participating in international projects are the Archa Theatre, the 4+4 Days Festival and the Prague Dance Festival.

In Georgia, co-productions began after the year 2000, thanks to cooperation with centres from France, Germany and the Netherlands. Many organizations financed these co-productions including the Goethe Institut, the Alliance Française, the KulturKontakt Austria, the British Council, the Adam Mickiewicz Institute, and the OSI Culture network or Theorem.

The National Theatre of Kosovo realised co-productions with theatres from Albania and Macedonia. The Multimedia Centre realised a number of co-productions with foreign companies including the Markus Zohner Theatre Compagnie (Switzerland) and the Nomad Theatre (Great Britain). The Oda Theatre has also cooperated with an American theatre recently.

In Macedonia several co-productions are popular, thanks to the activity of institutions such as the Centre for New Initiatives in the Arts and Culture LOKOMOTIVA or the MOT Festival (including cooperation with festivals in Slovenia, Montenegro and Romania).

In Poland, the number of international co-productions is growing. Between 2007 and 2009 16 opera, 8 drama and 1 puppet show were co-produced (in the group of 89 public theatres). In two cases festivals were organised as a result of coproduction. Polish theatres rarely use EU funds when organising co-productions with foreign theatres. It is worth mentioning that over the last decade more and more co-productions are realised among Polish theatres. From 2007 to 2009, 22 theatres out of a total 89 public theatres under consideration, co-produced performances. Some examples are: public dramatic theatres jointly co-producing, opera theatres jointly, public with private theatres, as well as theatres of different profiles: drama and puppet theatres cooperated with operas, concert halls, dance theatres and motion theatres. More and more often theatres and dance companies co-produce shows together with one-time events or festivals.

In Romania there are no regular coproductions, apart from rare dance productions and certain theatre productions of the acclaimed stage director Silviu Purcărete; now the „Radu Stanca“ National Theatre in Sibiu is working on developing a co-production network with the long-term partners of the International Theatre Festival it organizes. In 2008–2010 the National Dance Centre realised a joint project *What to affirm/ What to perform* together with the Vienna Tanzquartier, the Zagreb Centre for Drama Art and the Ljubljana Maska Institute, financed by the Austrian Allianz Kulturstiftung. The DramAcum group of directors dedicated to promoting new Romanian drama cooperates with various foreign institutions, such as the Royal Court Theatre of Great Britain, the Lab Theatre of Sweden, NADA of Serbia and Teatr.doc of Russia.

In Serbia, it is dance producers that have benefitted from foreign and domestic co-productions. Costs are split in various ways: sometimes one theatre provides the infrastructure and the logistics, while two others cover the rest.

In Slovakia, it is mostly dance companies that engage in co-productions (Contemporary Dance Society, Sphérique, A4 – Association for Contemporary Culture, elledance) as well as the Divadelna Nitra Association – the main organiser of Slovakia's largest international theatre festival. The EU Culture Programme finances co-productions in Slovakia.

In Slovenia, co-productions are very popular among national theatres, independent producers and festivals. The Culture Programme usually finances these programs along with other partners including the Goethe Institut, AFFA, ONDA, Pro Helvetia, the Japan Foundation, and the British Council.

In Ukraine, the general opinion about co-productions is as follows: “cases of successful international cooperation for the creation of an artistic work under mutually beneficial conditions are not common in Ukrainian reality.” Nonetheless good examples do happen. Every year the DACH theatre organises co-productions at the Hohofest (ACHE Theatre of Sankt Petersburg, the Teatr.doc of Moscow, and the Teatro La Fura del Baus of Spain – the last one with the support of the Embassy of the Kingdom of Spain). The Les' Kurbas Centre has realised projects with partners from the Netherlands and Montenegro, Sweden and Poland. According to the Les' Kurbas State Centre for Theatre Arts, Ukrainian theatre is entering the European space, mostly as a result of informal professional connections.

In Hungary international cooperation consists mostly in inviting artists from abroad, thanks to which many foreign directors, choreographers and designers have worked in Hungary. Hungarian artists, on the other hand, have also participated in many international projects (e.g. the directors Robert Alföldi and Árpád Schilling). A new group of artists are entering the European stage, including Kornel Mundrczo, Bela Pinter, Viktor Bodo, Zoltan Balazs. The director Kornel Mundrczo's shows are co-produced by foreign co-producers.

There are a growing number of co-productions in the countries of Eastern Europe although the numbers are not yet significant. This may be caused by the low level of mutual trust, characteristic of Eastern European societies (as noted by sociologists), as well as by the insufficient financial stability of the theatres, for which long-term commitments are problematic due to the annual cycle of budget planning.

International festivals

Over the last two decades Europe has seen a flourishing of festival life. Sociologists, including John Hanigan, David Harvey, Maria-Louisa Laopodi, Greg Richards and Julie Wilson, go so far as to describe the growing “festivalisation” of the cultural life of cities. On the one hand, the multiplication of festivals is the result of the global tendency for this form of cultural activity to expand. On the other hand, authorities have responded to the needs of creators and consumers and consequently have started to support a variety of cultural initiatives. Festivals have proved to be the relatively easiest to support due to their unique features (a limited and short duration, the accumulation of events) as well as being attractive for the promotion of cities, regions and, last but not least, politicians.

One need only take a closer look at the history of the development of festivals in selected countries. In Croatia the first 3 festivals were established in the 1950s then respectively: in the 1960s – 1, in the 1970s – 2, in the 1980s – 2, in the 1990s – 8. After 2000, 14 new festivals were created – almost as many as within the five preceding decades. Similarly in Poland: between 1989 and 2009 the number of theatre festivals rose from 19 to nearly 280. A 2009 study shows that out of the total of 41 festivals organised by Polish dramatic theatres, 14 saw their first edition in recent years (2007-2009). In Spain the number of theatre festivals (excluding dance festivals) rose from 277 to 712 between 1995 and 2005. It seems that such a growth of the number of festivals is a widespread phenomenon on Europe and more and more international festivals are organised.

In Armenia, three international festivals take place: Hifest (created by the independent producer Artur Grigoryan), the Armmono festival and the Mimu festival. In Azerbaijan there is only one international festival – the International Festival of Puppet Theatres.

Although Belarusian theatre is “almost completely cut off from global cultural processes,” Belarusian theatres still prove successful at international theatre festivals, particularly in the former countries of the USSR. These festivals have replaced the system of exchanges between former Soviet republics. Smaller theatres gain legitimacy with the authorities when they are successful at festivals. All of the Belarusian festivals (20 in total) are open to foreign productions. Among independent festivals, two are international: the Navinki festival of performance art and the “Dach” festival.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina there are five international and a range of regional theatre festivals. Other than small independent projects, the country does not have dance festivals.

In Bulgaria, the most important international theatre and dance festivals impose their own profile that distinguishes them from other cultural events in the country. In theatre, Varna Summer ITF, a festival that reached its 20th anniversary last year, presents an annual selection of the best Bulgarian productions of the season, a showcase of Bulgarian performances addressed to foreign guests, and guest performances of renowned authors and companies. It enjoys a very good reputation with both local audiences and professionals. The Sofia Dance Week festival has a shorter history but has become increasingly popular. Its goal is to introduce the Bulgarian public to the context and tendencies of contemporary dance in Europe. Every two years, a Festival for puppet theatre for adults “Pierrot” is held in Stara Zagora. This unique formula makes it well known in Europe and North America.

In Croatia, there are currently 35 festivals that take place annually, including 22 theatre festivals and 3 dance festivals of which 28 are international. Most of the festivals take place in Zagreb. However, the last decade saw the tendency to decentralize cultural life, with more festivals being organised outside of Zagreb.

There are 15 international festivals in the Czech Republic. The most important ones include the Divadlo Festival in Plzeň, the Theatre of the European Regions Festival in Hradec Kralové, Divadelní svět in Brno, Without Borders in Český Těšín, and in Prague: Tanec Praha, Letní Letná (a new circus festival) and 4+4 Days. Also notable is the German-language theatre festival in Prague and the Setkání/Encounter in Brno (a festival of theatre schools). Moreover, there is the puppet theatre festival that travels between two cities: Liberec (Mateřinka – addressed to children) and Plzeň (Skupova Plzeň – addressed to adults).

Georgia has four international festivals. There is no dance festival as of yet, but Batumi may soon become the site of a festival of contemporary dance. Tbilisi has been hosting its traditional GIFT (Georgian International Theatre Festival) for many years, but in 2009 a competitive project emerged: the Tbilisi Mayor launched a new international event, TIFT (the Tbilisi International Theatre Festival) and allocated considerable funds towards that end, which provoked a conflict in the Georgian theatre circles.

In the city of Pristina in Kosovo, two international festivals are held. In Macedonia there are five international festivals: three in the capital Skopje (MOT, SKUPIFEST and the amateur theatre festival), in Ohrid and Strumica.

Three international festivals take place in Moldova: the Biennale of the Eugen Ionesco Theatre, the solo performance festival at the Arts Centre Coliseum in Chisinau, and the International Gala of Puppet Theatre in the Licurici Theatre.

In Poland, nearly half of all the dramatic, puppet and musical theatres organise festivals, out of which 17 dramatic theatres organise international festivals (in one case two festivals) and 8 puppet festivals have an international status (out of 12 in total). It must be added that festivals are also held by NGOs and cultural centres. A 2007 study found that close to 80 Polish festivals (of various scale) are international. Most of them take place in large cities: 18 in Warsaw, 15 in Kraków, 10 in Wrocław, 6 in Poznań, 5 in Lublin, and 3 in Gdańsk. The largest group of international festivals are dedicated to dramatic theatre (30), but there are quite a few dance and street theatre festivals (11 and 17, respectively); other events are dedicated to puppet theatre (9), opera (8) and performance art (5).

The number of foreign guests or partners participating in Romanian theatre festivals is growing. There are currently 24 international festivals. The Radu Stanca National Theatre in Sibiu organises the most important international festival and presents productions from all over the world.

In Serbia, 10 international festivals are held every year, of which 7 are for theatre and 3 are for dance. The theatre festivals are as follows: in Belgrade – BITEF, FIST (a festival of student theatres), the Slavija festival, the festival for children and youth TIBA, in Kragujevac – the puppet festival *Zlatna iskra*, in Subotica a regional theatre festival and a festival for children, in Novi Sad – the Festival of Alternative and New Theatre INFANT and the Kvartet festival, in Vrsac – the *Vrsac* Theatrical Autumn. In terms of dance festivals there is the Belgrade Dance Festival, the Festival of Choreographic Miniatures, and the Kondenz Contemporary Dance Festival.

In Slovakia 23 international festivals are organised. In Slovenia there are between 7 and 13 international festivals. In Ukraine there are 14. In Hungary there are 29 international festivals (and 34 domestic).

As one can see from the statistics above, a great many festivals take place throughout Eastern Europe and it is likely that their number will grow. Some believe this is a problem. Bernard Faivre d'Arcier, a long-standing director of the Avignon Festival, draws attention to the evolution of festivals, which were initially a social phenomenon, promoting certain aesthetic and moral values, while today “people seem to grow satiated with what has become over the years more of an empty form than a state of mind.” He goes on: “The true role of the festival is to enable artists to embark on projects and activities they would not be able to start in traditional institutions.”¹⁴ Arguably, the largest festivals still work in this way. But one must accept the fact that smaller events have the character of a review.

Summary – International cooperation

For Eastern European theatres international cooperation is still based predominantly on tours, guest performances of foreign companies, and occasional exchanges of productions with a partner theatre from abroad. Theatres often invite foreign artists (directors, stage designers) to work on a specific performance. Theatres and

14 Bernard Faivre d'Arcier, *A Stage for European Theatre* [in:] “Culture Report: Progress Europe,” no. 1, The Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen 2007 (Polish edition: *Przyszłość europejskich festiwali teatralnych* “Raport o kulturze. Postęp Europa,” no. 1, 2007, pp. 224-5).

dance organisations are sensitive to cultural diplomacy in their area of influence (they host diplomats, make professional connections with theatres, and participate in the activities of various networks).

One should keep in mind that guest performances are an important element in a country’s promotion and branding. To put it very simply: the Czech brand is promoted by the Forman Brothers, the Georgian by Robert Sturua, Polish by Krystian Lupa, Krzysztof Warlikowski and Grzegorz Jarzyna, Hungarian by Arpad Schelling and Kornel Mundruczó. Meanwhile new outstanding artists are on their way up.

However, the situation differs from place to place. The author of the Belarusian report points out that the picture of Belarusian theatre in the world is being built by the Free Theatre of Minsk: “This is ironic, since the team members openly refused to be part of the Belarusian theatre scene and thus they lack a deeper knowledge of the processes that operate within it.”

Slovenian authorities have set up a programme to financially support the tours of domestic companies outside of the country.

The analysis of national reports yields the following conclusions:

- The countries of Eastern Europe do not yet utilize EU grants for cultural projects to a large degree
- The number of festivals, including international ones, organised in Eastern European countries is growing rapidly (a similar trend is observed all over Europe)
- Networks are not yet a very popular way of developing international relations, especially in the case of public theatres
- The theatres of Eastern Europe are discovering the benefits of international co-productions. However, it is dance organisations that have learned the art of international cooperation more readily, partly because it is a condition of their survival

Table 7. The number of international and total festivals in EEPAP countries

	International festivals	Total Festivals
Armenia	3	4
Azerbaijan	1	3-4
Belarus	10	20
Bosnia and Herzegovina	5	14
Bulgaria	15	55
Croatia	28	35
Czech Republic	15	32
Georgia	4	6
Hungary	29	63
Kosovo	2	5
Macedonia	5	13
Moldova	3	4
Poland	80	280 (567)
Romania	24	36
Serbia	10	no data
Slovakia	23	29
Slovenia	7-13	20
Ukraine	26	42

V. The situation of contemporary dance in Eastern Europe

The question of contemporary dance in Eastern Europe pertains mostly to the countries from the southern part of the region: Slovenia, Romania and Croatia.

There are no contemporary dance groups in Moldova (although there are some very talented sports dance and folkloric dance ensembles). In Georgia classical and traditional dance retain a strong position, while there are only a few contemporary dance groups, usually independent, almost garage style, which makes them negligible in official accounts.

In the remaining countries contemporary dance is at the beginning of its organisational stage, which can be compared to the Flemish scene in the early 1980s.

European experiences

In his account of the development of contemporary dance in Western Europe, the Polish scholar Wojciech Klimczyk points out that “the gradual development of contemporary dance theatre [...] had an organisational dimension in addition to the artistic one. At stake were autonomy and appropriate work conditions. Artists experimented formally, asked inconvenient questions, often undermined traditional solutions, so the point was to create an adequate framework for those subversive actions. If contemporary dance was to gain a strong position in modern culture, it had to be perceived as a valuable phenomenon. That could be achieved not only through spectacles, but also through promotional and legitimising practices. A telling example can be found in Belgium, where contemporary dance had to begin from scratch in the 1980s. There was no recognizable local tradition [...]. Therefore, young innovators [...] had to work out a separate, distinct identity.”¹⁵ With that purpose in mind they started publishing their own magazine – a platform for new dance, a breeding ground for a new critical discourse. With that purpose in mind they started setting up their own institutions, convinced there would be no place for them elsewhere (as if following the idea of the Polish opposition leader Jacek Kuroń: “Do not burn the committees. Set up your own.”).

As Ann Olaerts, former director of the Flemish Theatre Institute in Brussels emphasizes, in addition to creating alternative models of theatre activity and creating the framework of critical and theoretical reflection, it was essential to “stick your head out of the borders of Flanders” in addition to committing to the long process of persuading decision makers and effecting legal changes. In the end a system was created in which “almost anything is possible and I can hardly imagine a project that could not get funding.”¹⁶ The artistic achievements of the Flemish scene are well known – their grass-roots activism for organising support can be treated as a practical hint on how to succeed.

A completely different course of action was adopted in France, where the Ministry of Culture created an excellent institutional framework for dance: the National Dance Centre in Paris, the Maison de la Danse in Lyon, and 19 national dance centres across the country. Moreover, in 2008 the French Minister of Culture made the unprecedented decision to turn one of the national theatres – Théâtre National de Chaillot – into a stage dedicated mostly to dance projects. Despite wide protests from the representatives of “spoken theatre,” the authorities did not rescind the decision.

The French Ministry of Culture supports 250-300 projects annually (half of which are permanent companies, the other half are individual projects). Thirty companies have developed enough organizational structure to make them eligible to sign a three-year contract with the Ministry. In addition to this, local authorities provide support for nearly 200 projects. However, the French are beginning to notice an

15 Wojciech Klimczyk, *Wizjonerzy ciała. Panorama współczesnego teatru tańca*, Korporacja Ha!art, Kraków 2010, p. 202.

16 Ann Olaerts, *Nadążyć za zmianami* [in:] *Polityka wyobraźni – scena flamandzka*, comp. & ed. Dorota Semenowicz, Katarzyna Tórz, Malta Foundation, Poznań 2011, p. 144.

“overvaluation” of the creative act, which leads to an observable overproduction – the supply outweighs the demand, the criteria get blurred, the relationship with the spectators falters. Nevertheless, it is evident that the problem stems from an excess of support rather than from the faults of the system, which is the case, for instance, with Polish dance theatres.¹⁷

To be sure, the models described above are only two examples of various activities on behalf of dance – distinct due to their pronounced differences. It is also worth noting that if in France the development of dance owes a great deal to the generosity of the government, in Belgium a new model for the distribution of existing means was implemented that proved crucial for the successes of the country’s artists.

In the forefront

The Eastern European dance scene is evolving slowly. But some developments can be seen on the horizon. Andrzej T. Wirth, an outstanding theatre scholar, and founder of the famous study programme *Angewandte Theaterwissenschaft* at the university in German Giessen states that “Germany is the powerhouse of world theatre.” Arguably, this description can be borrowed to refer to the Balkans as the probable “powerhouse of modern dance in Eastern Europe.” The good progress in Slovenia and Serbia is already emanating into neighbouring countries – Bulgaria, Croatia or Macedonia (where several dance theatre companies are active, despite the weakness of independent theatre).

One of the important regional activities is the Nomad Dance Academy (NDA) network. Since its inception in 2005, its activities have been aimed at creating a strong, recognisable Balkan scene of contemporary dance. NDA is a platform of cooperation, a tool of promotion, a programme of education and creation, and a self-reproducing organisation model. NDA works to intensify regional cooperation and exchange. It consists of six regional partners: Brain Store Project from Sofia (Bulgaria), Fičo Balet from Ljubljana (Slovenia), the Lokomotiva centre from Skopje (Macedonia), Stanica / Stadion from Belgrade (Serbia), the Tala Dance Centre from Croatia, and Tanzelarija from Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina).

The years 2005–2007 were significant for the development of regional cooperation within the Nomad Dance Academy. Among other initiatives, a series of annual activities was carried out to deepen connections and enable exchanges. Since 2007, NDA has been implementing a number of programmes in education, research, productions and co-productions, and promotion. Moreover, in 2008, the NDA partners agreed to create and support four new contemporary dance festivals in the Balkans: LocoMotion in Skopje, Zvrk in Sarajevo, Antistatic in Sofia, Kondenz in Belgrade.

As part of their strategy, in 2011 the NDA members decided to set up organisations that will have the capacity to become future partners and organisers. The following new organizations will be created: NDA Slovenia, NDA Macedonia, NDA Serbia, NDA Croatia, NDA Bulgaria, and NDA Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Slovenia has become an important centre for dance. Currently there are 12 dance companies that work there, but it is not solely the artistic activity that determines the country’s role, it is also the developments in dance criticism, theoretical reflection, and the education of dance dramatists.

In 1994, the Contemporary Dance Association Slovenia was established for dancers, choreographers, educators, critics and theorists. Its main aim is to devise a strategy for dance politics in Slovenia. It is also dedicated to developing the sector and creating conditions for professional work. It participates in a number of domestic and international projects, offers lectures and workshops, and holds archives. Since 2010, it has managed the Slovenian Dance Festival Gibanica (Moving Cake). This biennial festival has existed since 2003 and it presents the most important achievements of the domestic dance scene

17 See CHANGE / EXCHANGE. Contemporary Dance / Conference as part of 7th BODY/MIND Festival, Warsaw 2008, ed. Edyta Kozak, Joanna Szymajda, Barbara Machnicka, Fundacja Ciało/Umysł, Warsaw 2009. PDF material.

from the previous two seasons. The programme selection is carried out on a competitive basis (about 12 productions are selected out of 50 candidates).

However, there is a shortage of rehearsal space in Slovenia. The only institution of contemporary dance is Ljubljana Dance Theatre (PTL), a production house for young choreographers and dancers. The cultural and congress centre *Cankarjev dom*, on the other hand, presents a dozen or so foreign dance productions every year in order to keep the Slovenian public up-to-date on the international developments in contemporary dance.

The Romanian experience is worth reminding in this context. In the 1990s, thanks to the initiative of French institutions, a generation of dancers and choreographers were educated under French expertise, but most of the times they were performing their pieces (many times, produced with international funds) outside Romania, due to the lack of scenes, dance infrastructure and knowledgeable audience. It was in 2005 that the first self-sufficient dance institution was established. Under the influence of serious public debate and international impulses, the National Dance Centre in Bucharest (CNDB) was created. The Centre produces and coproduces pieces, finances projects and promotes the Romanian dance scene abroad. In 2010 the CNDB's grant budget amounted to about 20 000 euro (45.000 euro in 2011) – the competitions are organised twice a year (once in 2011), and the grant may cover up to 90% of the costs.

However, in early 2011, the situation of the Centre changed. The Centre lost its space, and the modest support on the part of the government is insufficient to allow the rental of a new space. Currently, the Centre cannot produce new performances or even revive older ones. The Minister has yet to announce a competition for the Centre's new director and the exiting incumbent is acting as the institution's interim director. All of this taken together makes the CNDB's situation very unclear.

Dance-related NGOs – 4Culture and Collectiva – also develop international cooperation and apply for foreign grants. Similarly, in 2008–2010 the CNCB cooperated with Tanzquartier in Vienna, the Centre for Drama Art in Zagreb and Maska from Ljubljana.

Balkan trials

Despite 60 years of tradition in Croatia, the activity of dance artists usually takes place outside of institutions. The dance scene is comprised of individual artists as well as arts organisations and citizens' associations. According to the membership records of dance organisations, there are currently 204 dance artists working in Croatia. Three dance festivals take place each year. The only institution specialising in dance in Croatia is the Ana Maletić School of Contemporary dance in Zagreb.

There is not a single building for dance theatre in Croatia, and so performances take place in other institutions of culture, such as theatres and culture centres or alternative spaces. In most cases, the artists are obliged to pay for the use of spaces for performances – the costs coming from programme funds. In contrast to theatres, which enjoy the status of public institutions and have infrastructure, and whose employees' pay is covered by a budget plan, dance theatre, being classified as independent, receives only programme funds.

On 26 October 2009, the Zagrebački Plesni Centar (Zagreb Dance Centre) opened as the first building in Croatia erected for the sole purpose of hosting dance. Unfortunately, the centre does not have the status of an institution and still lacks regular funding and the city budget does not currently have the necessary funds for the centre's maintenance. For now, the operating costs of the ZPC are covered by the budget plan of the Hrvatski Institut za Ples i Pokret (Croatian Institute for Movement and Dance) as well as its own programme funds, box office returns, and tuition gained from workshops organised for citizens of all age groups.

The Croatian Ministry of Culture funds dance arts by way of four equilateral sources of funding: music, stage, and dance initiatives; international cultural cooperation; the project "Entrepreneurship in Culture"; and the project "Culture 2007" as part of an EU programme. In 2010, the Ministry of Culture

funded 51 dance programmes (performances, educational, festivals, and guest performances). The Municipal Department of Education, Culture and Sport in Zagreb financed 31 dance programmes (dance projects, presentations, performances) and two dance festivals.

In Serbia, over the last few years there has been a strong emphasis placed on the development of contemporary dance by focusing on four areas: career development of young artists, education of the public, presentations of dance performances outside of dance centres and guest performances by foreign companies.

The Serbian dance scene has been growing since 2000. Over the last decade, several significant developments have taken place in dance that constitute the basis for the growth of this field in Serbia. In 2001, the Belgrade Dance Festival was founded. The Nomad Dance Academy chain has seen growth thanks to the support of the initiative Stanica/Station (Service for Contemporary Dance in Belgrade.) Stanica/Station was established to improve and strengthen the standing of the dance community in Serbia. In 2000, the Walking Theory/Teorija koja Hoda (TkH) group for artistic research and theory was founded in Belgrade and went on to create a new organisation, the TkH Centre for Performing Arts Theory and Practice two years later. The purpose of TkH is to provide a platform for critical and experimental activity and discourse within the local context as well as its promotion within a broader regional and international context.

The Serbian National Theatre branched out to create the New Dance Forum ballet company. Additionally, the BITEF Festival founded its own dance theatre, which performs in the BITEF theatre building.

The author of the Serbian report underscores, however, that in Serbia there is still a lack of self-sufficient institutional dance and movement theatres. Several companies provide new work and programming, while the two above-mentioned companies operate regularly within the framework of other institutions.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the support of volunteer and non-governmental organisations was critical during the war and afterwards. The movement that had organised humanitarian aid and moral support for citizens of the war-torn region, evolved into a movement offering a broad range of social and civic initiatives, in which artistic activity played an important role. While most theatres were destroyed and companies shrank, artistic activity was maintained by a group of non-governmental culture organisations. Such initiatives still function, albeit on a smaller scale, in the form of certain non-profit performing arts institutions. The most notable of these is probably Tancelaria, a small independent dance and non-verbal theatre institution that is practically the only one of its kind in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Beginning of the road

Despite the fact that both the Czech Republic and Poland boast a large number of dance theatre companies (97 and 66 dance and movement theatres of various status respectively – and among these several self-sufficient institutions), the dance scenes in these countries seem to be just getting on their collective feet.

In Poland, dance is still a field that is not strongly institutionalised – when taking into consideration the possibilities in the country. Three dance theatres operate as self-sufficient institutions of culture: the Polish Dance Theatre in Poznań, the Silesian Dance Theatre in Bytom, and the Kielce Dance Theatre in Kielce. The Polish National Ballet operates within the structure of the Teatr Wielki – Polish National Opera in Warsaw, while the Baltic Dance Theatre has a place in the Baltic Opera in Gdańsk. Additionally, the Lublin Dance Theatre functions within the framework of the Lublin Culture Centre, and Teatr Okazjonalny as part of Off De Bicz Stage in Sopot.

Polish dance is still awaiting real support. There are still disputes over the method for supporting dance theatre in Gdańsk, where a large community of independent dancers is active. In 2008, the choreographer Leszek Bzdyl dedicated his production *Don't Tell Me You Love Me* to his difficult relations with the authorities and to the vagaries of cultural policy.

There is a positive tendency in the fact that some dramatic theatres are inviting residencies by dance theatres (recently in Gdańsk and Warsaw), though this is still rather uncommon.

A real exception in Poland has been the programme *Old Brewery New Dance* founded in 2004 and coordinated by Joanna Leśniewska in Studio Słodownia +3 / Stary Browar Art Centre located in the Stary Browar shopping centre in Poznań. The programme also enjoys the support of Grażyna Kulczyk's Art Stations Foundation. It is a unique "dance venue/dance place" where dance performances are produced and presented, and also supports choreographers and runs large-scale workshop and educational activity. If not for private patronage, a year-round theatre institute would be non-existent in Poland. Ironically, it is precisely independent organisations that have created venues for year-round dance presentations (Poznań) or rehearsals (Gdańsk, Kraków).

In 2010, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage undertook action for the benefit of dance by creating the Institute of Music and Dance, which is intended to support Polish dance with the help of the programme *Stage for Dance*. Unfortunately, the situation is not as bright at the level of municipal government. The authorities of the largest cities – Warsaw, Łódź, Poznań, Kraków, Gdańsk – as well as the smaller Białystok, remain distant to local dance communities and are reluctant to undertake any decisions in their favour.

Subletting

The author of the Croatian report, Jelena Kovacic, brilliantly described the situation in her country: "contemporary dance is still a sub-letter of cultural institutions." This opinion can be extrapolated to the situation of dance in all of Eastern Europe.

Infrastructure for dance is very undeveloped. Sometimes, the authorities understand the situation, for example, the Department of Culture in Zagreb, who urged the institutions in its jurisdiction not to charge dancers for the use of stages. Only in a few cases has there been success in addressing problems associated with the lack of venues. The Youth Theatre in Zagreb hosts the Zagreb Dance Company and the Contemporary dance Studio on its stages, and offers them space for rehearsals and practice as well as a limited number of performances. The Pula branch of the National Theatre in Istria has been co-producing its own dance performances and has opened its doors to contemporary dance as an institution. The ITD Theatre, belonging to the University of Zagreb, produces one dance performance annually and includes performances of other productions in its repertoire. The Tala Dance Centre received a space to use from the City of Zagreb, though funds were insufficient to adapt the space to be used for dance. The city theatre in Trešnja, a theatre for children, regularly produces dance performances for children that are made by Croatian contemporary dance choreographers with Croatian dancers and actors.

The above-mentioned Zagreb Dance Centre possesses three studios that are used daily by professional dancers for rehearsals, productions, and experimentation. One of the studios was adapted for the purposes of smaller performances. The lack of space and funding is an incentive for artists of dance organisations to regularly collaborate with theatres on productions and to form mutual allegiances.

A similarly challenging situation of a lack of venues for performance and rehearsal spaces was revealed by reports prepared for the 1st Dance Congress organised by the Polish Institute of Music and Dance. Even institutional companies do not have their own spaces. The long-lived and respected Polish Dance Theatre in Poznań has been waiting for its own official home for nearly forty years.

Dance Education

In Serbia, authorities have undertaken a program to support the education of young artists and to foster the growth of new audiences. As mentioned earlier, dancers and choreographers in Romania are trained thanks to the support of French institutions.

Professional education in contemporary dance has existed in Bulgaria now for more than 15 years. In 1994, the New Bulgarian University in Sofia began offering a bachelors degree in Dance Theatre, and in 2009, a M.A. program in Contemporary Dance Choreography. In 2003, the National School for Dance Art introduced a 5-year high school course in Modern Dance. Starting in 2011, the first educational program outside the capital for contemporary dance practices was created at the National School for Music and Performing Art in Burgas.

Croatia still lacks higher education institutions for dance and dancers and choreographers must seek higher education abroad. Recently, the Ministry of Culture along with the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports have taken steps towards opening a contemporary dance and ballet college that is to be part of the Academy for Drama Art in Zagreb. Due to financial shortages and the complexities associated with introducing new faculties, there is still no expected date for the launch of this initiative.

Conversely, a project to introduce higher education for dance and choreography has been successful in Poland. An important achievement was the opening of the Dance Theatre Department in Bytom as a branch of the State Drama School in Kraków by Jacek Łumiński, the director of the Silesian Dance Theatre. The department educates researchers as well as actor/dancers. Huge support for the initiative came from EU funds and from the favourably inclined authorities at the school that had until then educated only dramatic actors, puppeteers and directors. This was a significant event that may positively influence the perception of dance among authorities and governments for years to come.

It is worthwhile to point out a problem associated with educating young dancers and choreographers (in Poland and earlier in Romania): given the chance, they often go abroad in order to study in schools in Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany and the UK and rarely return. After all, they don't have anything to return to. In Poland, for example, there is a lack of proper structure and not enough funding.

Summary – The situation of contemporary dance in Eastern Europe

Table 8. Development of contemporary dance in Eastern European countries

Group I most highly developed system of operation and support	Slovenia, Serbia, Romania
Group II cultural policy towards dance recently starting to take shape	Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia,Czech Republic, Macedonia, Poland, Slovakia, Hungary
Group III lack of support for dance, lack of attention from authorities	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kosovo, Moldova, Ukraine

Dance institutions and companies

- Contemporary dance is practically absent from cultural policy in most of the countries.
- Most of the countries still a lack a cohesive policy of support for dance despite the constant emergence of new dance companies
- Public dance centres function in several of the countries (including Croatia, Romania, Slovenia)
- No grant programmes for dance artists.
- Small degree of openness on the part of existing institutions (dramatic and musical theatres, culture centres) towards regular presentations by dance companies and rare instances of residencies

Dance infrastructure

- Even long-lived dance theatres do not have adequate spaces in which to function
- Lack of venues for performances and rehearsals for dance companies

Dance education

- In the Balkans, an excellent theoretical and intellectual structure is in place for dance arts
- In some of the countries, higher dance education is beginning to be offered at academies (as a major/diploma studies)
- The education of potential dance audiences is a significant aspect of support for the development of contemporary dance (especially in the Balkans)

VI. Theatre legislation

“Great times call for great men.” With this statement Jaroslav Hašek began his story about the good soldier Schweik. Likewise, a new system demands new law. In Eastern Europe, cultural life, which had been nationalised, requires a new legislative framework for both the public organisation of culture and liberalised private initiatives. New regulations have emerged, and in some of the countries theatre activity is regulated by industry-specific statutes.

Without theatre law

Armenia and Belarus lack laws regulating theatres, although general legislation concerning cultural activity does exist in both countries.

There is no theatre law in the Czech Republic either, though such a circumstance is not the result of neglect but rather a conscious choice. The theatre law passed at the beginning of the political transformation was suspended in 1995. Lengthy discussions led to a decision favouring liberalisation instead of laws governing every detail. A solution was reached whereby the state dictates only the basic conditions for the activity of theatres without interfering in the system (by creating a network of theatres, as was the case between 1945 to 1970) and allowing individuals the freedom to operate as they see fit. It should be noted that in the Czech Republic, the government still regularly issues documents related to the country’s cultural policy. Still, although there is no theatre law, there is not a “vacuum” and everyone must submit to common laws.

In Bulgaria, after the year 2000, a series of laws establishing general guidelines for the functioning of culture (including independent initiatives) was put in place. Currently, legislative work is underway on a new theatre law. Discussions concerning the legal status of theatres are moving towards allowing more autonomy and flexibility with more independence in the management of finances. Macedonia has also seen similar progress, with discussions concerning the establishment of new theatre law in progress. Earlier, in 1998, a culture law that liberalised cultural policy was enacted, although the planned decentralisation of funding was never introduced.

In Poland, Slovenia and Serbia, the organisation of theatres is regulated by general laws concerning cultural activity enacted in 1991, 1994 and 2009 respectively. In Slovenia, documents determining the direction of cultural policy are regularly issued.

The Polish law defines the shape of public cultural institutions and frames private initiatives by dictating that all legal entities and physical persons can apply for public funding. In the last year, work has begun on updating the law including new amendments to regulate the new seasonal and contractual approach to the employment of art groups as well as periodical assessments. Consultation was widely sought regarding the proposals but the critical remarks, concerns, and suggestions of actor organisations (and later director organisations) were never implemented. In the end, parliament never passed the proposed amendments.

Theatre laws

Azerbaijan established laws on Culture in 1997. In 2006 their parliament enacted the Law on Theatre and Theatre Practice. All of the laws were discussed in parliament and were also debated in public and

in theatre-specific circles. In 2009, important legislation and a ten-year plan were enacted under The National Program of Azerbaijani Theatre 2009–2019.

Three of Bosnia and Herzegovina's ten cantons have theatre laws. In many cantons, theatres operate on the fringes of the law. Changes to the law in the canton of Sarajevo were introduced quickly and without any consultations (they were simply meant to ease the post-election standing of the cultural authorities of the time.) Sarajevo's statute concerning theatres outlines formal guidelines for the activity of a newly-established theatre institution, irrespective of its form of ownership – public, private or being the initiative of private individuals. A significant feature is that the statute affirms that: "a theatre may be established under any form of ownership on condition that it fulfils all material, technical and personnel stipulations." For example, in accordance with the stipulations, a drama theatre must consist of 15 actors and several other artists under full-time employ (an opera must have at least 16 soloists; a ballet – 4 solo dancers, and so on).

When it comes to new initiatives, such high personnel demands are most likely one of the largest hurdles. In addition to the personnel stipulations, the minimum stage length is set at 12 metres. This is a size fit for a rather large building. Andjelka Jankowic, the author of the Serbian report, points out that "it is quite a strange situation in that the regulations determine such detailed conditions, technically and otherwise, for establishing a new theatre, while it is well known that the general situation in theatre is very complicated. Funding is low and there is an audience crisis that is connected with changes in social structure and with the huge migration from villages to cities during and after the war. One would think that the regulations would enable and support the simple start up of new theatre spaces." Despite the details mentioned above, the regulations still lack any description of key issues such as funding, legality and the responsibilities of a theatre's founding body.

Croatia possesses thorough legislation concerning theatre activity. Actually, Croatia is the only country where the law regulates the functioning of both public institutions (Act on Theatres, and rights for full-time artists) and independent organisations (Act on the Rights of Independent Artists and the Development of Cultural and Artistic Activity, Association Law).

In Kosovo, there are a series of legal acts: statute on theatre, enacted in 2005; a statute on ballet; and a statute on the "Shota" National Folk Song and Dance Formation. The documents guarantee creative freedom and the freedom of expression. They also regulate the activity of the Kosovo National Theatre, which is publically funded. Theatre law is not very functional and overly centralised as the legislature ensured that it would have influence in the selection of directors, boards, etc. The regulations essentially ignore the activity of independent theatres (mentioning only that "independent theatres may also apply for funding from the Ministry of Culture").

In Moldova, a culture law was introduced in 1999 and in 2002 a law on theatre was enacted. Although both pieces of legislation were discussed in public, they are ineffective and imprecise. Before the ratification of the theatre law, theatre directors and critics raised concerns that the document would not encourage creative growth but would rather serve to restore the former model of ideological control.

In Romania, a new law on theatre institutions was passed in 2009 and introduced serious changes – most notable with respect to employment. Instead of the old system of tenured theatre staff, contractual work and annual assessment were favoured. The aim was to reduce the costs associated with fixed-staff theatres. Unfortunately, many difficulties were encountered in the implementation of the regulations.

In Slovakia, no legal norms to regulate the functioning of cultural institutions were defined in the twenty years since the beginning of democratic rule. The definition and activities of a theatre were established in a statute in 1997. The statute does not determine who may establish a theatre, nor the method for the establishment. The statute does incorporate classifications such as national professional theatre, municipal and regional professional theatre, independent professional theatre and amateur theatre.

In the Ukraine, theatre and dance policy is regulated by legal acts of general and industry-specific nature. From 1992 to 2010, a series of "legislation guidelines in the field of culture" defined the legal, economic, social and organisational foundations for cultural development in the Ukraine. The Supreme

Council introduced new legislation in 2010. In 2005, theatre reforms were initiated and ushered in new laws on theatres and theatre activity. The bill was discussed by various committees of the Supreme Council (Culture and Religion Committee, Budget Committee, Finance Committee), followed by eight Ukraine-wide public hearings in the Supreme Council. The Council never passed the blueprint determined by these public consultations into law. Instead, the final law turned out to be vague, inconsistent and incomplete. Experts believe its main shortcomings to be its failure to see theatres as legally equal with non-commercial organisations, and its failure to allow tax deductions for donations towards culture. The law also introduced a system of contractual employment that was in violation of Ukrainian employment law (and thus became a dead letter). In 2003, the Ukraine saw the ratification of the “Act on Guest Performances in the Ukraine” which delineated levies to be imposed on visiting foreign performers with the aim of raising financial resources for the support of domestic performance artists.

In Hungary, it was nearly twenty years after the political transformation that the democratic authorities undertook the issue of theatre legislation. In 2008, Act XCIX on the employment conditions and methods of funding of arts organisations was ratified. The law was an attempt to find a solution to problems that had bred chaos and disorganisation within the Hungarian theatre for years. With this goal in mind, a series of debates with the participation of theatre personalities was organised. After nearly two years of discussions, arguments, and debates, Minister Istvan Hiller presented representatives of theatre, music and dance with proposed legislation resulting from cooperation between the Ministry of Education and Culture and representatives from the arts (The proposal was announced on 21 September 2008, on Hungarian Drama Day). Modifications were made after consultations with arts organisations and on 8 December 2010 the Hungarian National Assembly ratified the bill. The law not only recognises the status of artists and acknowledges the need for state funding, but also enables long-term planning (even over multiple years) thanks to the establishment of a transparent system of funding. The law introduced explicit models related to funding and legal issues and defined the responsibilities of the funding entities. Organisations applying for state subsidies must be registered. During the registration process, organisations are categorised into 6 priorities according to the project’s profile. (A more thorough overview of the law can be found in the section *Reforms and legal solutions – examples*)

The status of artist – towards employment liberalisation

From several of the above mentioned cases (Poland, Romania, Ukraine, Hungary), we can see plainly that Eastern European countries are initiating or striving to initiate employment liberalisation in culture as has been the trend in Europe as a whole. However, it must be noted that these decisions are rarely accompanied by support in the form of formal frameworks for artists who are not employed full-time.

For example, in Hungary, employment law recognises the concerns of artists under full-time contract. The regulations are meant to ensure that artists have greater stability and planning options. The law defines individual work duration, rehearsal duration, and even requires an institution’s management to extend offers for yearly contract renewal or contract termination within a prescribed timeframe (by 1 March). The law gives institutions mobility and the ability to ensure artistic growth, while affording the artist stability and a sense of fairness. Yet, this system still evokes protest since, due to high tax rates and high benefit expenses, it forces individuals to set up proprietorships in order to provide “artistic services”. Actors forced to take such measures would not feel taken advantage of if the promises to reduce their taxes were kept. The situation in Poland is similar – the law recognises the rights of only those artists who are under full-time employment.

Bulgaria and Hungary have included the issue of artists’ status in their laws. Such provisions are lacking in Poland, while the ministerial Artist Retirement benefit committee has the authority to include willing unemployed artists into the state pension system. Unfortunately, the Polish Ministry of Culture does nothing to promote this option among artists – in effect, this option remains unknown among the general public.

The country with the most thorough approach to the issue is Croatia, where authorities have ratified important legal acts: the Act on the Rights of Independent Artists and on Cultural and Artistic Development. That act concerns either artists without full-time employment or the means and methods of creating independent arts organisations.

It is worthwhile to note that in 2009, the International Federation of Actors (FIA) and the International Federation of Musicians (FIM) published the *Manifesto on the Status of the Artist*. The document presents the main problems associated with the situation of working as an artist. The authors of the *Manifesto* believe that “safeguarding the status of the Artist is vital in order for a career as a performer to be viable. In the current climate, trends towards greater ‘flexibility’ and mobility threaten the livelihood of performing artists.”¹⁸

Directors

The issue of the hiring and management of personnel is a decisive factor when it comes to legislation and cultural policy. The conviction seems to prevail in the minds of authorities that the appointment of positions in cultural institutions is of central importance. The authorities of Eastern European countries are not eager to relinquish their influence on personnel decisions despite the fact that in most of the countries, the official procedure for appointing a director of a theatre is by means of a competition. Yet, whether in Hungary or Serbia or Slovakia, the decision of the competition committee is regarded merely as an opinion to be considered by the founding body. At the end of the day, appointments retain their political character. The same can be said for competitions taking place in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Croatia, Poland and Slovenia. In Azerbaijan directors are appointed directly by the Ministry of Culture.

In Armenia, Bosnia and Moldova, directorial nominations are strongly dependent on the political climate. In Armenia, ideological obligations towards the government are even stronger than they were during Soviet rule – but today they are compounded by obligations concerning finance and profitability. Ara Nedolyan, the author of the Armenian report went so far as to use the term “criminalisation of theatre” when describing the tangled situation in which theatres find themselves. In Belarus, directors are appointed by the theatre’s corresponding level of authority (ministries, regional governments).

In Georgia, the issue was addressed in one go. In 2004–2005, changes to the theatre law were made and the position of theatre general director was endowed with more power. The Minister of Culture along with a special appointed committee (selected by the Minister) oversees competitions. In 2005–2006, the first competitions were organised and the old administrators were replaced with young “new-school” managers en masse. This change resulted in the Georgian directors being closer to their German counterparts with respect to methodology. The changes empowered their position and in the end made them more attuned to political partisanship and ministerial policy. As stated by the author of the Georgian report, the move decentralised the funding of theatre, but centralised the control of directorial personnel in the whole country. Eventually though, the above system was repealed and appointment without competition returned. Recently, in mid-2011, the well-known director Robert Sturua was dismissed from his post as director of the Shota Rustaveli Theatre for making improper political remarks.

In Moldova, directors are appointed by the Minister of Culture and currently most of them have held their post for 10–15 years. What is interesting is that in Poland – where wide-scale decentralisation of theatres has been carried out – the average theatre director has maintained his post at his institution for ten years. This data is from 2009, when a study of several dozen public theatres in Poland was conducted. At that time, 29 of the directors had been selected by means of a competition, and 30 without a competition (many of these had been appointed before the implementation of the competition method). The director with the longest tenure in Poland has held his post since 1961.

18 *Manifesto on the Status of the Artist*, FIA-FIM 2009

In Romania, all EU citizens (on condition that they speak Romanian) are eligible to take part in competitions for positions of director – yet the competitions are held without consultation, and usually only media attention can lift the veil of secrecy during directorial selection.

For the sake of example, in Hungary, several dubious nominations have been awarded since 2006 – posts have been granted to individuals with right-wing sympathies (Kaposvár, Szolnok, Kecskemét, Székesfehérvár). According to the author of the Hungarian report: “the promised national-centric repertoire targeted at mass audiences caused a departure of sensitive and thoughtful audiences who understood contemporary theatre and had been developed over decades (in Kaposvár, in Szolnok) and heralded a further commercialisation of the repertoire (Vásárhely 2008).”

All this points to the fact that competitions will often only be a facade until there is a change in the civic culture in the countries in this study.

Summary – Legislation

Table 9. Instances of theatre law

No theatre law	Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Macedonia, Poland, Serbia, Slovenia
Theatre law in effect	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Kosovo, Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Hungary, Ukraine

The situation of artists on the labour market

- Of great significance is the definition of the status of artist, and the resulting system of rights and obligations
- Few legal acts regulate the labour situation of actors who are not under full-time employment (especially issues of social security and pensions)
- Trend of liberalising the employment structures of theatres: undertaking of initiatives towards making contracts and seasonal work agreements the standard form of employment

Appointment of institution directors

- Fixed-term directorial contracts becoming the standard
- Almost universal selection of directors by way of competitions
- Despite the popularity of competitions, the appointment of directorial posts is influenced by external factors

VII. Reforms and legal solutions– examples

In most of the countries there have been attempts to implement reforms in theatre. A specific type of reform involved changes to the way theatre institutions are funded and organised.

In Eastern European countries, theatre has been a conduit for national content and an assurance of the continuity of languages since the 18th century. For this reason, authorities were reluctant to transform theatres into institutions having modern management and funding.

In the next section, are examples of actions that brought about reform in the way theatres operate in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Croatia and Hungary. They are examples of very complex actions described in the original reports from these countries. In most countries, decentralisation did not cause changes to the funding and management methods of theatre institutions. The attempts made by the above-mentioned countries are not model examples. Instead, they can help give insight on the thought processes of the most determined reformists.

Bulgaria – a trial with quangos¹⁹

In 1991, several national art centres appeared in Bulgaria (theatres, museums, galleries, and literature, music and dance centres). These new institutions – founded as non-government organisations – were meant to function on an “at arm’s length” basis with the state. This was an attempt to shield the process of funds distribution from any possible direct political pressure.

The Bulgarian action was the first attempt in Eastern Europe to introduce *quango*, or *quasi-ngo*, institutions, which had proved to be effective in the UK and the Netherlands in socialising decisions and increasing the degree of social oversight on the distribution of public funds. Many experts noted that the establishment of various boards, committees, and intermediate bodies helped to achieve a higher level of competency in the decision making process. The Bulgarian centres were an embodiment of this idea – it was hoped that they would bolster the growth of cultural organisations and uncover new sources for culture funding. Another important aspect of the opening of the centres was the introduction of a new model of state funding for the arts: project based subsidies. This was a significant change in how the organisation of cultural life had been perceived.

The Bulgarian centres were intended to create the conditions for a decentralisation of culture management and protect individual art sectors from the volatility of Bulgarian politics and ideological pressures. “The ministry should not be a direct producer of culture, but should encourage culture, create possibilities and provide promotion. Other organisations should conduct cultural activity and create the products of culture,” wrote Charles Landry in a report for the Council of Europe on cultural policy in Bulgaria. “The role of the ministry does not lie in the production of culture, but in assembling financial resources – by way of licensing fees and other similar sources – which should be distributed in accordance with the priorities of cultural policy.”

Centres were funded by the state budget but also with funds from other sources such as donations, endowments, sponsorship, etc. This feature allowed the creation and growth of various types of arts organisations as well as multiple sources and methods for their funding.

However, in 1996, the Council of Ministers rescinded the art centres’ legal independence. The decision once again centralised the system under the administration of the Minister of Culture. It was a definitive step backwards. The argument was that the centres were excessively and too directly involved in the process of procuring funding. Moreover, the centres were disparaged for their apparent lack of experience in budget management.

In 1997, independence was again restored to the centres and this state of affairs lasted until 2006, when their activity was again suspended and they were relegated to being organs of the ministry. In accordance with the latest changes in the organisational regulations of the Ministry of Culture in 2009, the centres no longer exist (with the exception of the National Film Centre). The functions of the National Theatre Centre and The National Music and Dance Centre were partly transferred to the General Directorate of the Arts.

The outcome was a reversal in the clear division of functions. The Ministry of Culture defined a general framework for cultural policy and the centres acted as the entities to carry out the dictates of the policy. Art centres – despite their difficulties and occasionally insufficient efficacy – are regarded as one of the more interesting initiatives of the Bulgarian Ministry of Culture in the last few decades. The reason for the failure of this model in Bulgaria was the Ministry of Culture’s unwillingness to delegate real authority and to ensure the independence of the Centres. “The at arm’s length” was too short to allow the Centers function to be detached from the immediate political pressure. They couldn’t transform themselves into a significant factor for change because they had neither the opportunity to introduce real reforms, nor sufficient funding to influence the development of their respective cultural sectors.

19 Subsection based on the report from Bulgaria.

With this in mind, it is worthwhile to mention that Poland saw a dissolution of the state's Culture Development Fund (which collected resources, e.g. one percent of income tax, ever since the 1980s), with its funds transferred to the accounts of the public Culture Foundation (1991). Compounding the collected capital, the foundation was meant to support various fields of art. Unfortunately, the methods of managing the funds proved ineffective, resulting in financial losses and diminishing capital (as early as 1992). The foundation gradually lost relevance but it must be understood that it was established as a one-off temporary initiative for the creation of a different source of funding for cultural projects (one that was outside of the state and municipal government budgets).

The Czech Republic – transformation of theatres in Prague²⁰

An important subject in the discussion of theatre reforms (as well as reforms of other cultural institutions) is the matter of the institutions' legal status. In the Netherlands, museums were transformed into foundations that manage collections and are independent of the state. In Italy, the transformation of operas into foundations began in late 2000/early 2001. The goal was to minimise costs, to increase revenues and efficiency, to enable the possibility of acquiring non-public funds (fundraising), to improve management (especially long-term) as well as to solidify the relationship of the institutions with their surroundings.²¹ The move was successful in part – operas are managed in a more prudent way, though fundraising did not turn out to be as reliable a source of funds as had been expected.

Of the Eastern European countries, only in the Czech Republic, especially in Prague, did authorities decide to carry out a transformation of municipal theatres into organisations of public interest or enterprises.

In 2000, 17 public theatres operated in Prague, 13 of which were municipal theatres (12 having a full-time staff plus the production company Archa Theatre). In 2007, there were already fewer in operation as the number of municipal theatres decreased to 10. In 2003, the City of Prague's spending on culture amounted to 5% of the city's budget, of which one third went to municipal theatre or various grants for theatre initiatives. This level remains to this day.

A long discussion took place in the Czech Republic on the subject of the inequality of theatres in regard to the distribution of public funds. In Prague, like in other European countries, there is no clear-cut division between commercial theatres and independent non-profit ones (like there is in London and New York with their West-End and Broadway).

The first steps in the transformation of Prague's theatre system were taken in 1996. Grant competitions were introduced in order to bridge the financial divide between the 16 public and the 50 independent theatres. However, it was only in 2000 that substantial steps were taken when a research group was assembled to prepare a concept for the municipal theatre policy based on research done in other European countries.

20 This sub-section is prepared on the basis of the Czech report and materials from the Prague City Council: *Conception of Cultural Policy of Capital City of Prague; Grant Policy of the City of Prague in the Field of Culture and the Arts*; as well as materials from the website theatre.cz – *Transformation of Institutions Receiving Contributions from the State Budget - Theatres Established by Prague Capital*; Stepan S. Simek, *Financing of Czech Theatre*; Bohumil Nekolny, Ondrej Cerny *The performing arts in the Czech Republic: the theatre network, its function, system of financing and support – 2001*, and the paper by Agnieszka Luty, *Reforma praskiej sieci teatralnej – próba analizy pierwszych działań transformacyjnych* [Reform of Prague's network of theatres – an analysis of the first phase of transformations], doctorate thesis, Jagiellonian University, Fac. of Management and Social Communication, Institute of Public Affairs, Kraków 2008.

21 Alessandro F. Leon *Il costo del melodramat. Enti lirici: conseguenze della trasformazione in fondazione* [in:] A.F. Leon and Marcello Ruggieri *Quaderno della rivista „Economia Della Cultura”*, Il Mulino, Bologna 2004; on the basis of the working translation: *Instytucje operowe: konsekwencje przekształcenia w fundacje*, trans. Agnieszka Kacprzak. Unpublished materials of the Pro Cultura Foundation.

The following conclusions were made. First, art in general, and theatre specifically, should be defined as a “public service”. Additionally, the state should earmark funds for culture but should not have direct influence on the dispersion of the funds, and should not oversee any arts institutions. In order to ensure the independence of arts institutions, a diversity of funding sources should be enabled – equally available to all by means of competition on the basis of clearly-defined criteria. In 2002, during efforts to formulate the main premises for a municipal cultural policy, the following points were articulated:

- it is vital to create a system of support which would provide all theatres with equal access to public funding
- the city is obligated to fund but not operate or manage theatres
- transparency with respect to the conditions of dispersing public funds and their use by theatres (annual audits, publically-accessible financial reports) is a key condition to the functioning of theatres
- healthy competition should be fostered within the sphere of theatre – independent and qualified organs are to decide on the distribution of funds to theatres on the basis of qualitative and quantitative criteria
- it is necessary for both theatres, as the recipients of funding, and the city, as the provider, to maintain flexibility
- the funding of municipal theatres should include sources beyond the city level, such as from the Czech Ministry of Culture and the private sector
- it is recommended to operate private theatres in partnership with the city

In 2002, it was decided to change the form of public theatres into various types of companies or non-government organisations functioning as a public service. It was resolved that the public theatres with new legal classifications would retain their existing level of funding for the first four years. The level of funding did not change but the funding proportions did. Whereas in 2001 the ratio of funding for municipal theatres to funding for independent theatres equalled 90% to 10%, by 2003 the ratio had shifted to 80% to 20%. Public funds are awarded by means of grant competitions according to transparent criteria.

The first transformation of theatres was carried out in 2002-2003. Činoherní Klub Theatre and Archa Theatre became public service organisations (*Obecně prospěšná společnost*). Theatres operating in the form of non-government organisations have management boards and supervisory boards.

Semafor Theatre was transformed into a limited liability company and received start-up capital in the form of a donation. Jiří Suchý, the founder of the theatre (established in 1959) became its owner. “Komedie” Theatre also became a company – in this case the theatre’s building belongs to the Ministry of Finance, so the city became the chief lessee and the theatre the sub-lessee. The first impressions revealed that in the new structure, financial decisions were faster and more effective while the theatres’ accountability with respect to management of funds increased. Currently, all of these theatres operate on a system of four-year grants.

Semafor, which was transformed as a “commercial company” (*s.r.o.*), changed its legal definition to NGO (*o.p.s.*) in 2008. The cause is both funny and sad: Mr. Suchý, a great actor, comedian and poet, is very sentimental about pre-war Czechoslovakia and he decided to become an *s.r.o.*, because – as he said – he remembered the “*s.r.o.*” from that noble era. However, during the fights against “sold ticket funding”, he was publicly accused (even by posters posted in Prague), that as a private *s.r.o.* his company might be “keeping the funds in the pocket”. So they changed his company to *o.p.s.*

The second phase of the transformation was planned for 2006-2008 (with the transformation of six theatres anticipated) but this never came to fruition. The municipal Vinohrady Theatre was intended to become the centrepiece theatre. City authorities hoped that its prestige would surpass that of the National Theatre.

The advantages of this organisational model for municipal theatres lie in profits that are solely financial. The true goal was to create new conditions for awarding funding and to redefine the relationship

between theatres and the authorities. Both sides were also eager to minimise bureaucratic hindrances and dependency on the decisions of the theatres' organisers.

It is the hope of the Czechs that the new organisational form will allow former municipal theatres to take advantage of a broader range of funding sources (governmental, non-governmental, European) then they had originally been denied access to due to their legal status. Doubravka Svobodova, director of Divadlo na Zbraslavi, sees creative and psychological sense in the transformation of municipal theatres. According to her, a theatre is an institution which is dynamic and variable, and which constantly needs to revise its *raison d'être* and its mission, whereas automatically awarded funding causes complacency.

Independent theatre artists did not hide their concerns that the well-known municipal theatres, which had existed for years, would be favoured by city politicians who would pander to the theatre establishment, leaving no room for new companies, actors and directors.

The initial effects of theatre operation after the transformation showed that the reform did not bring with it the expected economic benefits. Theatres do not receive greater funding within the system of grants – on the contrary, the funding tends to be less (as in the case of the Archa Theatre, whose funding decreased by 40% in 2008). Another problem is the difficulty in locating other sources of funding.

Currently, transformation is again a very hot topic. David Pařízek, who was subleasing Divadlo Komedie, decided to leave the theatre because of insufficient funding. The main problem is that the city of Prague does not follow (once again) its own rules, and builds the oversight committees strictly by political decisions. It is now believed that the transformation has been permanently stopped and city-owned theatres are now to be the subject of competitions for the position of director/intendant.

Prague's transformation is constantly in danger of political intrigue while politicians tend to hold onto their influence in the theatre in order to "make themselves look good" in the eyes of voters. Even though there is an official "cultural policy" giving rules (for example on how to appoint committees and juries) – no one is willing to follow them. The result is a number of conspiracy theories and growing disagreement and unrest in the younger generation.

Croatia – law on arts organisations²²

In Croatia, a method that was flexible and comfortable for artists was implemented to define new principles for creating new theatre institutions: specifically, independent theatres and companies.

The Croatian *Law on Theatres* differentiates between theatres, theatre venues and theatre companies. According to the legal definition, "theatres are legal persons who prepare and organise, and later perform, works of drama and drama/music, who have the use of suitable functional theatre space equipped for the performance of works of drama or drama/music, who employ the necessary artistic personnel and administrative and technical staff. Theatre companies are legal persons who collaborate to prepare and perform works of drama or drama/music. Theatre venues are legal persons who have the use of suitable functional theatre space and employ the necessary personnel."

Any private individual who wants to establish a theatre or a theatre company for the purpose of conducting theatre or other performing arts in an organised, non-institutional and independent fashion has three options: they can establish an arts organisation, an enterprise or an institution. Each of the listed legal entities can be set up by both Croatian and foreign legal or natural persons. The above structure allows private theatres and theatre companies to enter Competitions for Public Requisitions in Culture announced by the city, region or Ministry of Culture. A fourth option involves the establishment of a citizens' association having theatre as its primary activity. Citizens' associations are not registered with the ministry and so, are not classified as theatres in the legal sense.

Among Croatia's independent theatres and theatre companies, the majority possess arts organisation status. The establishment of an arts organisation is regulated by the *Act on the Rights of Independent Art-*

22 Subsection based on the report from Croatia.

ists and on the Development of Cultural and Artistic Activity. In order to receive the status of a legal person and begin activity, each arts organisation must be entered into the Registry of Arts Organisations of the Ministry of Culture. The founders must submit an application for entry into the Registry. The application for entry into the Registry must be accompanied by:

- the decision on the establishment of an arts organisation
- the arts organisation's statute
- a list of founding members and members of the arts organisation along with these persons' notarised personal data and signatures
- confirmation from the appropriate industry authority on the organisation's status of artist
- the name and surname of person responsible for the arts organisation
- a list of persons authorised to represent the arts organisation.

Arts organisations may work in various fields of art. Arts organisations working in theatre must submit an application for entry into the Catalogue of Theatres. "The Catalogue of Theatres contains detailed information on all public and independent theatres, theatre companies and theatre venues in the Republic of Croatia that conduct theatre activity as legal persons or as discrete entities acting within the framework of a legal person."

This is an example of the simplest method of achieving legal personhood for new theatre initiatives among the countries studied.

Hungary – theatre funding reforms²³

As mentioned earlier in this report, Hungary, addressed the issue of theatre legislation in 2008, with Act XCIX on employment conditions and methods of funding for arts organisations was passed. Organisations applying for state funding must be registered. During registration, they are grouped into one of six priorities according to the project's profile. *Priority I* covers theatre and dance arts organisations that have use of their own building and staff, and organise at least 180 performances annually and produce at least two new productions. *Priority II* are production theatres and theatres that host other companies, with 100 to 140 performances annually. *Priority III* organisations are ballet and dance companies putting on at least 50 performances annually. *Priority IV* consists of theatres having at least 100 annual performances. *Priority V* covers theatres of national and ethnic minorities as well as street theatres, on condition that they give a minimum of 50 performances annually or sell 50,000 tickets to performances (50,000 viewers per year).

The most controversial element of the system lies in *Priority VI*. In accordance with the act: "Priority VI consists of those independent theatres that have been in operation for at least 2 years and do not meet the criteria of Priorities I – V." Funding for Priority V and VI organisations is not automatic. It is awarded on the basis of competitions that are evaluated by a special committee every year. The act also states that the standard funding amount is equal to at least 10% of the current budget funding, which guarantees higher funds for the entire priority than had been available earlier.

Citing the necessity of introducing cut-backs in response to the economic crisis, the ministry froze 66% of the funding for the Priority in the 2010 fiscal year. The disbursal of these funds is currently uncertain. The non-payment of the grant funding prevented many professional and regularly-performing theatre companies to shut down in 2010.

Priority VI is also quite heterogeneous in scope: in addition to university, student and amateur companies, it encompasses various types of festivals and companies who have been garnering international success for decades, such as Béla Pintér and his Group, the Yvette Bozsik Foundation, the *Studio K* theatre, and youth companies who regularly represent Hungary at international festivals (the Maladype Theatre directed by Zoltan Balazs, and the Sputnik Shipping Company headed by Viktor Bodó).

23 Subsection based on the report from Hungary.

The institutions listed in Priorities I-IV rely on regular support but the funding amounts can differ each year due to various factors. Whereas, in the past, local governments received a single sum from the budget to fund theatres, today, every theatre receives individual funding on the basis of the *Act on Theatre and Performing Arts*, with the remainder provided by the local government. The founding body's share of the funding is determined by the budget regulations, and the funding is proportional to the previous year's level. The theatres' share of the funding as determined in the budget regulations is calculated by the number of viewers paying for tickets two years earlier – with consideration for the capacity of the venue.

Ballet and dance companies falling into Priority III and theatres from Priority IV receive funding which is proportional to the amount that the founding body had access to from the central budget in the previous year, the amount of which is regulated by the budget law.

The act is meant to encourage local governments to invest in their own theatres, because by doing so they can receive higher amounts from the central budget. The act also encourages actions aimed at increasing audience numbers. The criteria of the number of paying audience members is a co-factor in risk minimisation and encourages institutions to adopt a more diligent approach to putting on plays that are either very costly or more targeted at smaller audiences (due to small-capacity venues or the nature of the play).

In Priorities I and II, the local government and the institution each contribute 50% to the funding awarded, while the multipliers pertaining to the type of performance are applied as listed here: puppet performances 0.5; children's theatre 1.4; opera (only with live orchestra) 3; classic operetta 1.2 (only with live orchestra); ballet and dance 2.0; study performance 2.0.

Theatres classified into Priorities V and VI are awarded funding by way of competition. In considering an application from the Arts Council, the Minister asks for the opinion of an industry committee. If the minister's decision contradicts the committee's recommendation, the minister is obliged to provide justification for the decision.

The reforms of theatre funding were met with wide-scale criticism even though fiscal year 2010 constituted the first trials in the operation of the new system. Funding sources were withdrawn, mainly due to the economic crisis, and thus, it is impossible to accurately evaluate the new law's implementation. Puppet theatres complain that the multiplier factors were set without consultation, and that their factor of 0.5 has resulted in serious losses. The existence of puppet theatres now depends on how deep into their reserves the local governments are willing to reach to supplement the puppet theatres' budgets. From the very outset, it was known that theatres playing to smaller audiences (e.g. the Kolibri Theatre, which specialises in children's and youth theatre) are not able to amass large profits and cannot increase audience numbers. The situation is similar for dance entertainment theatres.

Problems started as early as the registration phase: priority III was created especially for dance companies funded by local governments, but only two such companies were able to get registered. Moreover, blaming modest budgets, local governments awarded lower funding to their theatres, so, for the time being, the new law has failed as a measure to bolster and broaden sources of funding. Also suffering are dance theatres, which are funded directly by the national government (e.g. Honvéd Együttes, Állami Népi Együttes). These theatres are not encompassed by the funding stipulations of the new law, which is why they are experiencing drastic cuts in the ministry's funding. Priority VI has already been discussed when it comes to the difficulties faced by independent theatres.

The funding of certain established theatres is currently not tied to any objective parameters, as the viewer, depending on which theatre he/she chooses to patronise, can receive a rebate towards the price of the ticket in the amount of 1,400 to 10,400 forints, and up to 15,000 forints annually. The distribution of funds is historically-informed, and it is doubtful that anyone today remembers how the amounts defined in the law were arrived at. Neither geographic location, nor population, nor diversity of art had any clear influence on the numbers. No report was prepared to compare the activity and efficiency of the theatres, which would have revealed similarities and differences among them. On the current state

of the new law, Dániel Jánosy writes: “Overall, the new law must be evaluated negatively on account of the industry situation. In its priorities, it does not reflect social and artistic needs with respect to the diversity of theatre activity.”

Conclusions

Over the last twenty years, the countries of Eastern Europe experienced immense changes in their political systems, society and culture. This report presents actions undertaken in sixteen Eastern Europe countries that have influenced the current shape of the theatre and dance reality in this region.

With respect to theatre, in most if the countries of Eastern Europe, a decentralisation of their management has occurred, which was in line with the general European trend regarding culture management. This decentralisation did have its positive sides; most notably, it allowed theatres independence in both programming and finances by reducing the state’s direct influence. Theatres were also able to open up to direct relations with the community. The drawback of the process of decentralisation was, among other things, the inconsistent dispersal of theatre institutions among the various levels of local and regional governments. This proved to be a regular obstacle to the formation of effective and cohesive theatre policy.

Theatre life in almost all of the countries began to welcome a broader range of theatre initiatives – from private to commercial to non-profit, and from the ambitious and to the light-hearted. However, in almost all of the countries it took at least a decade for private independent theatres to gain the acknowledgement of the authorities in the form of aid, programme grants, etc.

It seems, however, that the issue of finding a balance in relations between institutional and public stages and new initiatives remains one of the key issues concerning the organisation of the theatre industry in the countries of Eastern Europe. Moreover, an area of further study should be the reform of theatres themselves – how have the institutions changed? Have new models for their activity been created? What new internal management structures have appeared?

In light of the unstable situation resulting from the recent global economic crisis, a remark of the author of the Hungarian report seems uncannily fitting: “Crisis-mode management is becoming an increasingly important branch of theatre administration.” And this is a fact. The organisational transformations described in the report instigated and drove the adoption of a more flexible approach to theatre industry management. Unfortunately, the transformations did not resolve the issue of finances. Attempts to create novel sources of funding, for example, an advanced system of sponsoring, private patronage or the establishment of foundations, proved to be incongruous with the financial reality. Neither entrepreneurs nor citizens were eager to extend any considerable generosity for the sake of culture. We must, however, take note that this model of society’s behaviour towards culture is consistent with what has been observed in all of continental Europe.

The report reveals the poor condition of dance in Central and Eastern Europe. If not for the exceptional efforts of dance organisations in the Balkans, the picture of the dance scene in the Eastern end of the continent could leave a morbid impression. One could come to the conclusion that in the countries behind the iron curtain, dance was never given a chance to develop, despite the fact that governments did not spare funding for other art forms.

In recent years, the situation of contemporary dance still does not enjoy a large degree of support from the authorities. Perhaps, something that could prove beneficial is the creation of a best practice base created out of detailed descriptions of actions undertaken in the countries falling under the EEPAP study that are effective and advantageous to contemporary dance.

It is clearly evident that there has been growth in the network of international contacts. Theatres from EEPAP countries are involved in foreign projects, collaborate on co-productions, and, where possible, apply for funding within the frameworks of the EU’s multi-faceted system of subsidies. The number

of international events has also risen. Yet, the picture unfolding is still not complete. In our work on the reports, we encountered the following questions and areas that need further examination.

First, a significant issue for further study is the state of theatre contacts between the countries within the EEPAP range. The reports suggest that public repertoire theatres, which are accustomed to day-to-day operation for a local audience, tend to have more difficulty in engaging in meaningful collaboration with foreign counterparts. What is more, these theatres rarely contribute to the general circulation of productions from their countries and abroad. In all of the countries, there is a clear lack of institutional networks (especially outside of the capital cities) that could support the exchange of productions. With respect to the existing exchange of productions, does it involve only neighbouring countries, or do we see the organisation of profiled events (festivals, co-productions) focussed especially on collaboration between Eastern European countries?

Secondly, we must turn to the issue of interdisciplinary activity and whether artists of various fields in a single country want to work with each other and if so, how.

Another issue would be to check how EEPAP countries fit into the circulation of culture in Europe as a whole and to answer the question of what is the reason for the isolation, and lack of contact between artists and performers that the reports point to. Mobility is one of the buzzwords of recent times. Obviously, in certain countries there are ministerial or governmental funds to foster foreign performances and co-productions. It would be worthwhile to take a closer look at the scale of such possibilities within Eastern Europe.

Using culture to increase a nation's *soft power* seems like an obvious element in the policies of the older European Union countries. In the examples appearing in this report, we regularly encounter the names of cultural agencies from Austria, France, the Netherlands, Germany and the United Kingdom. The goal of foreign cultural policy is often not only to promote artistic achievements, but also to aid foreign and economic policy. We must not forget that large-scale cultural projects are conducive to encouraging unity among nations – a process that is complex and long lasting. It appears that Eastern European countries are just learning to build strategies for their foreign activity, including activities involving culture.

The report clearly reveals that the border of the Schengen Area (EU countries and Croatia, Macedonia, Serbia), to a large degree, also marks the boundary of the circulation of European culture. Eastern European artists and curators point to a deep feeling of isolation – a lack of information and inspiration. There is a glaring absence of artists and curators from other regions of Europe, who do not leave the Schengen Area because the stereotypes they still harbour convince them that Eastern Europe holds no artistic importance. Consequently, local curators have very meagre opportunity to travel in the EU for the obvious reasons resulting from visa and financial issues. Hence, contact is often doomed to failure from the very outset. To overcome this isolation and to facilitate the exchange of knowledge are the key tasks for EEPAP.

List of tables

Table 1. Organization models based on country..... 20

Table 2. Effects of decentralization..... 20

Table 3. The number of theatres and companies in the EEPAP countries: division on the basis of theatre organizational status for the year 2009. Based on the EEPAP country reports. 20

Table 4. Grant policies – long-term grants..... 27

Table 5. Privatisation of the public theatres..... 27

Table 6. Institutionalisation of independent theatres..... 27

Table 7. The number of international and total festivals in EEPAP countries..... 36

Table 8. Development of contemporary dance in Eastern European countries..... 42

Table 9. Instances of theatre law..... 47

Appendix

The questionnaire below was sent to the authors of the national reports.

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009 (2010?).

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

- 1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?**
- 2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?**
- 3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?**
- 4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?**
- 5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?**

Section B.

Number of theatres

- 6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?**
- 7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):**
 - institutions of the central government
 - institutions of regional governments

- institutions of municipal governments
- non-governmental organisations
- private enterprises

Are there any mixed forms?

8. Forms of theatre activity (number):

- dramatic theatres
- puppet theatres
- musical theatres
- opera theatres
- dance theatres (movement, pantomime)
- impresario theatres
- arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones)
- other

Section C.
Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- amount of general subsidies
- amount of project subsidies

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government
- funding from local governments
- own revenue of theatres

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

Section D.
Artistic activity

- 15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)**
- 16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)**
- 17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)**
- 18. Average production cost of a performance/project**
- 19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project**
- 20. Number of festivals (national and international), location**

Section E.
International co-operation

- 21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?**
- 22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?**
- 23. Are there any international coproductions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are coproductions financed?**
- 24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?**

**East European
Performing Arts Platform
– Country Reports**



Armenia

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Ara Nedolyan

It should be taken into account that Armenia has no tradition of publishing public reports on the activities of State departments, as well as any centralized information resource dedicated to the theater. Therefore, the information provided in many respects are approximate or estimate.

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

Basically there is a centralization of most theaters, including provincial, have the status of “state” that is under the Ministry of Culture, and only a very small amount of the responsibility of local authorities.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

No new documents in this period was not accepted, a public consultation on this issue has not been.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

There was a widely known case of such privatization, when the theater room was used by the private owner for other purposes, other privatizations was not done.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

There are no formal rules, in any case widely known, does not exist, private theater initiative seeking to participate in festivals, and then start trying to get the status of the state, in rare cases -municipal, after which they begin to receive funding and building. So that the transition from the status of private to the status of state theaters generally considered a success.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

Formally, the directors sign a contract with a limited term, but actually led by as much as it pleased the ministry or municipality. The criterion for their appointment is usually successful, in terms of ministry, acting as an independent director.

Section B. Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

About 40, about 12 of them in province, other – in capital, Yerevan

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- institutions of the central government – app 20
- institutions of regional governments – app. 3
- institutions of municipal governments – 1 known
- non-governmental organisations – 4 known
- private enterprises – app 10

Are there any mixed forms? – Not known

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

- dramatic theatres – app. 20
- puppet theatres – 2
- musical theatres – 1
- opera theatres – 1
- dance theatres (movement, pantomime) – 4
- impresario theatres – 4
- arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones) – app 5
- other – 4-5, undifferentiated

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

No

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- amount of general subsidies
- amount of project subsidies

Exact data are unknown, estimated - about \$ 1 million per year (state financing)

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government – app. 85 %
- funding from local governments – app. 1%
- own revenue of theatres – app 15%

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

One year, only

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

The debt of state theaters for communal services or salaries is unknown, these costs are paid by the government. Repair -sometimes made by sponsors, as well as visits to the tour. In general - no theater can not expect on commercial credit in order to have commercial debt.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

Sponsorships, grants, and commercial participation in state theatrical performances

Section D.
Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

Approximately 12-15 per year in state theaters and probably as many in the independent

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

The total number of performances can be estimated as approximately 300 per year, not including festivals, performances and non-of theaters, performances are often one can see it at festivals.

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

No data, roughly - about – 10000 per year

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

The average price of a single performance can be estimated at 20 thousand dollars, but it should be borne in mind that this is a very Variation figure, since many private performances are prepared without any funding. Some state is probably more expensive.

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

Probably payback is about 30 percent

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location

4, 3 international and one domestic, 3 of them are in Yerevan, one - in the resort town

Section E.
International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

No data

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

Is known about the involvement of the Soros Foundation and the embassies of some countries in Armenia, in particular – France and Britain

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

3 - Hifest, is usually carried out in the summer, organized by a single, apparently, independent producer Artur Gevorgyan. The other two festivals - Armmono and Mime Festival

Database of some theatres of Armenia

1. Yerevan Drama Theatre after Hrachya Chaplanyan (state)

28 Isakakyan st. Yerevan

Tel (+37410) 524723

www.ydt.am ydt68@mail.ru

2. Hamazgayin Theatre (state)

26 Amiryan st. Yerevan

tel (+37410) 501060

vardantheatre@gmail.com

3. Armenian National Academic Drama Theatre after G.Sundukyan (state)

6 G.Lusavorich st. Yerevan

Tel (3741) 525772, fax (3741) 520610

gsundukyan@mail.ru www.nationaltheater.am

4. Yerevan State Pantomime Theatre

3 Moskovyan st. , Yerevan State Youth Theatre

Tel 091(601594)

dadasyan@yahoo.com

5. "Agora" Theatre Troupe (independent)

26 Amiryan st. Yerevan

Tel (+37410) 501060

smhovsepiyan@gmail.com

6. "Mihir" Theatre (independent)

4 Sayat-Nova st. Yerevan, State Puppet Theatre after Hovh. Tumanyan

Tel (010) 460789, (091) 383356

www.mihrtheatre.com mihrtheatre@yahoo.com

7. Yerevan State Institute of Theatre and Cinematography "Student Theatre"

26 Amiryan st. Yerevan

tel (+374) 539415

h-e-n-r-i@mail.ru

8. "Real" Theatre (independent)

11 Abovyan st. Yerevan, National Center of Aesthetics – Small Theatre

Tel (+37477) 359777, (+37455) 359577

irakantheatre@mail.ru

9. Theatre Workers Union of Armenia

13 Mashtots st. Yerevan

10. Yerevan State Youth Theatre, Yerevan Municipality

3 Moskovyan st. Yerevan,

Tel (+374) 10563127, fax (+374) 10581974

info@youththeatre.am www.youththeatre.am

11. Yerevan State Musical Chamber Theatre

1 Proshyan St Yerevan

Tel 588813, 521069

Hakobyan-david@mail.ru www.musicalchambertheatre.am

12. "Metro" Theatre (state)

G.Nzhdeh Square, District of Metro, Yerevan

Tel (010) 42-27-42

www.metrotheatre.am metrotatrongak@mail.ru

13. "Tatronik" Troupe (independent)

52 Artashisyan st. Yerevan

Tel (010) 420573, (091) 551076

14. "Agape" Theatre Troupe (independent)

13 Mashtots st. Yerevan

Tel (374) 556660021, (374) 94898386

metamorphus1990@gmail.com

15. K. Stanislavski State Russian Drama Theatre

7 Abovyan, Yerevan

Tel 580223, 583962

russkiiteatreveren@yandex.ru

16. Youth Experimental Theatre (independent)

26 Amiryan st. Yerevan

Tel (094) 877886, (099) 282833

Eduardh90@mail.ru

17. Cultural & Business Center "Moscow House in Yerevan" {Russian state}

7 Argishti st. Yerevan

Tel +37410510200, +37493329777

dommoskvi@mail.ru

18. Vanadzor State Dramatic Theatre after Hovh. Abelyan

3 Taterakan st, Vanadzor

Tel (0322) 44773, 20879

abelyanart@mail.ru

19. Gyumri State Dramatic Theatre

4 Sayat-Nova st. Gyumri

Tel (+374312) 55948, (+37494) 443299

Gyumri.pettatron@mail.ru

20. Dramatic Theatre of Hrazdan

41 Spandaryan st. Hrazdan

Tel (0223) 22427, (093) 540784

21. State Dramatic Theatre after L.Kalantar, Gegharkunik Region

2 Grigor Lusavorich st. Gavar
Tel (+3740264) 22843, 22024

22. Artashat State Dramatic Theatre

23 Ogostos st. Artashat
Tel (+37493) 961769

23. Yerevan State Puppet Theatre

4 Sayat Nova st. Yerevan
Tel (37410) 563243, fax (37410) 520254

24. Cross of Armenian Unity "Anirjner" Theatre (independent)

36 Shahumyan st. Echmiadzin
Tel 023145610, 098009717

25. Naregatsi Art Institute of Shishi (independent)

6 Muratsan st. Shushi
Tel +374 (0477) 31466, 31865
nara@naregatsi.org, mary@naregatsi.org, www.naregatsi.org

26. Stepanakert State Dramatic Theatre

15 Lusavorich st. Stepanakert
Tel (047) 944147, (097) 244147, (097) 232529

27. Goris State Dramatic Theatre

28 Komitas st. Goris
Tel (0284) 204096
goristatron@rambler.ru

28. Kapan Drama Theatre (state)

Syunik Region, 11 Toumanian st. Kapan
Tel (0285) 22106, 23209

29. Abovyan Dramatic Theatre (state)

4 Hanrapetutyun st. Abovyan
Tel (+91) 337758, (+91) 914640
Ashotchtchyan@yahoo.com

30. Mim Studio National Nteatre Art Association (independent)

4 Sayat-Nova st. Yerevan
Tel (+37493) 056740
mimeara@mail.ru



The Republic of Azerbaijan

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Sabukhi Mamedov – Producer, self-employed (cast_manacer@mail.ru; sabuhi_itv@mail.ru)

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

After accepting the priorities of universal human values, the Republic of Azerbaijan chose to build a democratic, secular and lawful state. This includes the principle of sanctioning and respecting the supremacy of law, which appears to be the fundamental condition both for a civilized integration of the nation into the world community, and for a normal functioning of all fields of its vital activity, including the field of culture.

Society reached a consensus in terms of the impermissibility of command-administrative methods for the regulation of the cultural life in general and each of its spheres in particular – the processes of creation, preservation, popularization and assimilation (perception) of cultural values. It acclaimed the necessity of a culture administration that employs various types of resources – material, financial, professional and information.

The structural characteristics of state regulations of theatre activity haven't changed much. Though only partially, the old Soviet system of administration is still being reproduced today

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

After the proclamation of independence by the parliament of the Republic of Azerbaijan – Milli Mejlis – 21 basic laws in the field of culture were announced. The laws proclaimed were discussed in parliament as much as in public and theatre-specific circles.

No.	Name of law	Date
1.	On the Reintroduction of the Azerbaijani Alphabet with Latin Graphics	December 25 th , 1991
2.	On the Mass Media	July 21 st , 1992
3.	On the Copyright Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan	September 10 th , 1993
4.	On the production association «AZERKINOVIDEO»	December 13 th , 1993
5.	On Copyright and Adjacent Rights	June 5 th , 1996
6.	On Advertisement	October 3 rd , 1997
7.	Law on Culture	February 6 th , 1998
8.	On the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments	April 10 th , 1998
9.	On Grants	April 17 th , 1998
10.	On Freedom of Information	June 19 th , 1998

No.	Name of law	Date
11.	On Cinematography	July 3 rd , 1998
12.	On Architectural Practices	July 3 rd , 1998
13.	On the Library System	December 29 th , 1998
14.	On Tourism	June 4 th , 1999
15.	On the Basics of Town Planning	June 11 th , 1999
16.	On the National Archive Fund	June 22 nd , 1999
17.	On the Mass Media	February 8 th , 2000
18.	On Museums	March 24 th , 2000
19.	On Publishing	May 30 th , 2000
20.	Law On Theatre and Theatre Practice	December 29 th , 2006
21.	Azerbaijani Theatre between 2009-2019. The National Program.	May 18 th , 2009

3. Privatization of the theatres. Have the public theatres been transformed into private theatres (commercial or non-commercial)?

No. Public theatres haven't been transformed into private theatres.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of "nationalisation" (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

New initiatives in the performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) are created, most of all, on a public basis and can be financially supported with the help of different funds, governmental and non-governmental organizations. At the same time, private studios and theatres are trying to gain a public status just to survive and obtain any subsidies.

The theatres which have been 'nationalized' since 1991 are: YUGH Theatre, Youth Theatre, The Public Pantomime Theatre, Municipal Theatre, Theatre of Miniatures, Chamber Theatre. They are all of different genre, form and style.

5. Directors – please, describe the order of election (competition, nomination, if any consultations are held); do they operate on a limited duration contract with limited competences? What is the duration of contract of directors?

Directors are appointed by the Ministry of Culture. They work for a limited term contract (1 year or more).

Section B.
Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

1. National Academic Dramatic Theatre of Azerbaijan – Baku
2. Azerbaijan State Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet – Baku
3. Azerbaijan State Theatre of Musical Comedy – Baku
4. Azerbaijan State Theatre for Young Spectators – Baku

5. Creative Scene “UNS” - Baku
6. YUGH Theatre – Baku
7. Azerbaijan State Theatre of Song - Baku
8. The Public Pantomime Theatre – Baku
9. IBRUS Theatre – Baku
10. SIMSAR Theatre Studio - Baku
11. Theatre of Miniatures– Baku
12. Baku Marionette Theatre – Baku
13. Azerbaijan State Theatre of Russian Drama – Baku
14. National Puppet Theatre of Azerbaijan – Baku
15. The Azerbaijan State Mugam Theatre – Baku
16. Nakhchavan State Drama Theatre - Nakhcha
17. Ganja State Drama Theatre – Ganja
18. Ganja State Puppet Theatre – Ganja
19. Sumgait State Theatre for Musical Drama – Sumgait
20. State Dramatic Theatre – Lenkaran
21. Qazakh State Drama Theatre – Qazakh
22. Shaki State Drama Theatre – Shaki
23. Mingachevir State Drama Theatre – Mingachevir
24. Qakh State Puppet Theatre – Qakh
25. State Puppet Theatre – Salyan
26. Lezgin National Drama Theatre – Gusar
27. Shushyn State Theatre for Musical Drama – Baku
28. Irvan Azerbaijan State Drama Theatre – Baku
29. Azerbaijan State Dance Ensemble – Baku
30. Azerbaijan Song and Dance Ensemble - Baku
31. Municipal Theatre - Baku
32. Azerbaijan State Folk Song and Dance Ensemble - Baku
33. Academic Theatre of The Azerbaijan State University of Culture and Arts – Baku

7. Legal status and structure of organizations (number):

- state institutions – 25
- municipal regional institutions – 5
- municipal city institutions – 5
- non-governmental organizations – 1
- private institutions – 2

Are there any mixed forms? – No hybrid forms exist.

8. Forms of theatre activity (number):

- dramatic – 15
- puppet – 5
- musical – 2
- opera – 1
- dance theatres (movement theatres, pantomime) – 5
- impresario theatre – 1
- art centres (including interdisciplinary centres) – 1
- other private theatres – 3

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

State theatres are subsidized and each year they get a few governmental orders for staging plays, which, however, would not be fully paid (the state pays only the wages of the theatre workers). Non-governmental and private organizations as well as state theatres are allowed to gain subsidies from other funds, charitable trusts and commercial structures (sponsors, donors).

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- Total value of earmarked subsidies 22.716.677 Manat (for year 2009)
- Total value of grants-in-aid 351.531 Manat (for year 2009)

11. The total value of public subsidies for theatres and dance centres includes:

- government budget spending 13.180.000 Manat
- local government spending 6.560.000 Manat
- individual incomes of theatres 2.625.146 Manat

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

Government budget allots the budget to theatre institutions; the budget would be set for a year. Budget accounting would be managed on the basis of the preceding year's spendings as well as on the basis of the spendings on state- and local-level events and new spectacles in frames of governmental order that are planned for the coming year.

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

The problem of debt in cultural institutions dedicated to performing arts is not common, though there are some cases. This kind of problem would be solved as an internal matter of the institution itself or occasionally with a help from the ministry of other institutions.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

As mentioned above, the sources of additional financing for cultural institutions dedicated to performing arts can be any subsidies obtained from sponsors or donators, though this appears to be a very rare practice. Only one or two organizations (basically non-governmental organizations or private institutions) succeed in gaining sponsorship, which would be either short-term or be aimed at one particular spectacle.

Section D. Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (advisable between 2007–2009 or at least in 2009)

for year 2009 – 92 premieres

16. Number of performances (advisable between 2007–2009 or at least in 2009)

for year 2009 – 4257 spec

17. Number of spectators (advisable between 2007–2009 or at least in 2009)

for year 2009 – 754,7 thousand spectators

18. Average costs for the production of a performance/project.

57 000 Manat – excluding the cost of renting the stage and other spaces, utilities and fees.

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project.

82 000 Manat

20. Number of festivals (national and international) and their locations.

There are 3 or 4 festivals in a year. They take place mostly in the capital, sometimes in other regions of the country as well.

Section E.
International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

No.

21. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

No.

22. Are there any international coproductions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are coproductions financed?

In recent years there have been a few trials of such collaboration and some of them were quite successful. Mainly directors from abroad are involved in such projects. In general, those projects are fully or partially subsidized by the state, by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in particular, and they gain partial financial support from the partner institution as well.

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

One – the International Festival of Puppet Theatres.



Republic of Belarus

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Alex Strelnikov

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

When Belarus was a part of USSR, Belarusian theatre had a centralized structure that consisted of National and Republic Theatres at the top, Regional Theatres in the middle and City Theatres at the bottom. Today, just as during the Soviet period, independent and amateur theatre groups remain attached to local “cultural centres”, lay outside of this structure and out of the reach of official statistics. Total number of theatres in Belarus has been increasing largely because of these amateur and independent groups and the possibility of them acquiring professional status. Thus, despite the fact that the overall theatre structure has not changed significantly over the last 20 years, the total quantity of theatres has noticeably increased. In the beginning of 1990s, the rise of independent studio movement had the ability to produce numerous private theatres, which, in turn, could result in eventual decentralization of theatre scene in Belarus, but by the turn of the century, most of the studios ceased to exist, while few of those that remain integrated into the centralized system as city theatres.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

There is no special law in independent Belarus that regulates the performing arts. Need of such law is only discussed within a close professional environment and has not been brought out to public level.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

To date, there are no known cases of privatization of theatres. On the contrary, many private theatres and amateur groups have become ‘state’ theatres. This is largely due to private theatre owners believing that government help will help facilitate their work.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

Theatres usually have the status of state (public) institutions and are financed by the state. Private theaters often do not have a legal status. Theatrical performances also take place on a legal basis different concert agencies and Producing centers that have the right to engage in rental productions. Last year (2010) was the first time when a private theater received government funding.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

Public theaters have a dual form of administration: the arts are managed by the chief director or art manager, while the finances are the responsibility of the head manager. For all state theatres, these positions are held by appointment by an appropriate governing agency (Ministry of Culture for National and Republic theaters, Department of Culture of the Regional Executive Committee for both regional and local theatres). As recently as last year, majority of Belarusian theatres saw new people appointment as producers or stage managers; some of those replaced had held their appointments for up to 30 years. As expected, transition to new management is a long and difficult process ridden with confrontations. There is currently no system of supervisory boards in place.

In the 1970s, many academic theatres were headed by young and energetic directors. All in their thirties, Valery Rajewski, Boris Lutsenko, Valeriy Mazynsky, Andrei Androsik taken Belarusian Theatre from its provincial homeliness and transformed it into a true performing art.

At the turn of 1980-90s, Belarus underwent a period of explosion of theatrical life. Many new drama studios have appeared across the country, young new art directors and producers have made their names known. Many thought-provoking, socially-significant and notable plays were put to stage and saw their audiences. Vytautas Grigalyunas, Rid Talipov, Vitaly Barkovsky, Nicholaj Trukhan, Vladimir Savitsky, Yuri Lizengevich seemed to be the obvious choices to replace an aging generation of producers and directors. Only by mid 1990s it was found out that the older managers would not be let go. While there was no open opposition or aggression toward the younger directors, the situation has become tense. Out of the many talented producers, only very few have secured appointments in Belarus. Vitaly Barkovsky became the chief producer of the Yakub Kolas National Theatre in Vitebsk. The majority, however, have either left the theatre scene or moved on to small, marginal theatre projects. Some have left Belarus altogether.

The generation of producers that came out in 2000s found even less opportunities than the previous one. At best, Vladimir Scherban, Pavel Harlanchuk, Michail Lashitsky, Katerina Ogorodnikova, and Denis Nupreychik were able to put together a few performances before being pushed out of the mainstream of Belarusian theatre life and into the periphery.

This situation has changed following the wave of new appointments that was initiated just a few years ago. As a result, Nikolaj Pinigin, a well-known Belarusian arts director, became the chief producer of Yanka Kupala Theatre (Minsk). Sergey Kowalczyk headed Maxim Gorky Theatre. City Theatre in Mogilev is now headed Katerina Averkova, who herself has only graduated from the Academy of Arts a few years ago.

Section B.
Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

In 2009, there were thirty two professional theaters in Belarus. It should be noted that in Minsk alone, there were ninety two amateur drama clubs, of which forty seven hold awards of various levels of prestige, which raises their status to that of 'semi-professional' theatres. These numbers do not include the large number of amateur groups that have no legal registration and status.

Emphasis on choreography, fluidity and flexibility of shape and movement have been becoming increasingly popular among Belarusian theatre youth. Young choreographer Evgenij Korniyag regrets the lack of training in plasticity of movement in performance during this period of study at the National Academy of

Arts. Kornyag conducted his own research and study of plays that employed plasticity of movement. Having collected and studied recordings of such performances, Kornyag proceeded to produce his own 'plastic' sketches. Rather unexpectedly, they have generated much interest both from the general Belarusian public and at international festivals. Kornyag's plays, such as «Birthday-party», «NON-DANCES», «INFINITLY», have all been received very well, especially by the younger audiences.

Still, legally speaking, Kornyag-theater does exist. Rather, it is a group like-minded individuals that is realized only during the time of the performances.

Much earlier before Kornyag-projects existed Theatre of Vyacheslav Inozemtsev "Inzhest", practicing theater "butoh".

Young Choreographers Olga Skvorzova and Dmitrij Zaleski have created their own theatre, DOZSKI.

Graduates of the Academy of Arts generally unite and form theatre groups around their young and ambitious teachers – Andrew Savchenko and Katerina Averkova. More often than not, these art and drama groups are not stable; they disintegrate after only a few performances.

7. Official numbers of theatres in Belarus:

- State (public) Theaters – 29;
- Theatres of Republican Subordination – 7;
- Regional (provincial) Theaters – 17;
- Regional (city) Theaters – 5;
- Private theaters – 3.

8. Official numbers by type of theatre:

- Drama theatres – 20;
- Puppet theatres – 7;
- Music theatres – 3;
- Opera – 1.

* It is difficult to estimate the number of dance (plastic or choreographic) theatres, as they are not officially registered. In Minsk alone, about five professional groups of artists perform regularly; about as many do in the rest of the country.

Estimating the number of private theatre projects is nearly impossible due the diverse forms of their ownership.

Centers of Arts are not counted because, strictly speaking, there are no such centers in Belarus.

Section C.

Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

Government funding of theaters in Belarus is done through a system of planned budgets. Individual theatres must declare to their governing authorities all the products planned for the coming year. This is then used to calculate the total amount of funding that will be allotted from state and local budgets.

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

There is no publicly available information regarding available grants or funding for theatre-related activity. In 2009, the total budget of the Ministry of Culture amounted to 200 billion Belarusian roubles, of which no more than 5 billion has gone toward funding theatre productions. Planned funding of staging performances of a single theatre may reach 400 million Belarusian roubles (100,000 Euros). The total amount funding depends on the official status of a theatre.

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government
- funding from local governments
- own revenue of theatres

According to some estimates, about 80% of total production budget of state theatres is secured through government funding, while remainder is covered by the earnings of that theatre.

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

The budget of a given theatre is decided on for one or five years ahead and depends on the workings of the approving authority (the Ministry of Culture or Regional authority).

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

Any debt incurred by state theatres is paid for from the budget of local governing structures. To date, there are no known cases of the state assuming responsibility for debt incurred by private theatres.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

Private funding of production costs is a rare occurrence in Belarus. Generally, private sponsors are generally more likely fund festivals and theatre tours.

Network of non-governmental organizations in Belarus remains hugely underdeveloped. There is no existing relationship between independent business and culture. Arts, culture, and performing arts specifically, do not receive any regular funding from Belarusian businesses. There is no network of arts and culture funds, just as there are no experts on effective fundraising and art management.

Philanthropy is not a well understood concept in Belarus. History of Belarusian culture practically lacks any tradition of generous gift-giving or sponsoring of an artist by a wealthy patron. Instead, Belarus has a history of theatres of serfs that were eventually replaced by state theatres. At best, a wealthy person who had interest in the arts would sponsor himself and his own hobby.

Nevertheless, there have been a few important- albeit rare- cases that show that some progress is being made in non-government funding of theatres. As such, Belgazprombank (a bank) has not only partnered with Yanka Kupala Theatre in creating Panorama Festival, but it has sponsored performances and tours by outside theatre groups during the so-called 'Theatre week with Belgazprombank.'

Section D. Artistic activity

15. Total number of premieres in professional theatres in 2009

146;

16. Total number of performances for 2009

8194 shows (for comparison, amateur groups in Minsk staged 517 performances);

17. Total amount of viewers in 2009

1,931,062;

18. Existing figures of the average cost of production vary greatly.

Big-scale theatres (National and Republican) are eligible to receive large one-time funding for their productions. According to some estimates, the total amount of this funding can vary between 10 and 50 million Belarusian roubles (2,500-12,000 Euros).

19. The average cost of renting productions is estimated at about 5 million Belarusian roubles (1000 Euros and up). This includes rental fees, advertising and other expenses.**20. Annually, about ten theatre festivals are held in Belarus. Some of the traditional festivals include Panorama, Puppet Theatre Festival (Minsk), Belaya Vezha (Brest), Mart-Kontakt (Mogilev), Slavic Meetings (Gomel). From time to time, festivals take place in Vitebsk, Molodechno and Bobrujsk.**

Belarus doesn't have a single national theatre festival that would showcase the best performances seen in the country that season (although the idea of creating it is not new).

Regional theatre festivals have been going on for years. Belaya Vezha festival in Brest has been around for 15 years; Mart-Kontakt festival in Mogilev- for 6 years. In Minsk, the well-promoted Panorama, as well as the Puppet Theatre Festival, generate much interest. Unfortunately, financial limitations make it impossible to invite the stars of contemporary theatre. Lithuanian, Russian and Polish theaters are happy to come to Belarus, but to see Warlikowski, Lupa, Nyakroshus, Hermanis, which seem to be very near, for the Belarusian audience is easier to go to Russia – do not pay for a visa. There is another problem – not everyone knows these names.

As a result, festival programs rarely challenge the boundaries of traditional theatre. In the end, visiting performances do not transform Belarusian theatre; instead they appear to confirm that it is moving in the right direction as it is.

However, appearance of independent theatre festivals could challenge the existing trend.

Section E.

International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

Generally speaking, Belarusian theaters do not participate theatre life of the European Union. There is one known exception to this, Free Theatre Minsk, but the theatre does make much information pertaining to its activity publically available.

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

There is no publicly available information regarding participation of Belarusian theaters in international networks.

23. Are there any international coproductions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are coproductions financed?

International co-productions are quite common; they are mediated by the Embassies of the countries involved. Belarusian actors and producers participate in foreign projects organized together with Germany, Poland, Czech Republic, France, and Switzerland, but mostly with Russia, which is due to the joint budget of the Union State of Russia and Belarus.

Because of the lack to trust toward Belarusian experts, the public consciousness is very sensitive toward any evaluation that comes from abroad. Since Belarus- let alone Belarusian theatre- is not well known globally, Belarusian theatre, as a structure or a system, remains nearly entirely isolated from global cultural processes.

This does not keep some theatres from successfully participating in International theatre festivals.

Many of these festivals take places in the countries of the former Soviet Union. Festival movement here has simply replaced the usual practice of exchange tours that characterized Soviet Theatre. For smaller theaters like the Theatre of Belarusian Drama, successful participation in an international festival becomes something that can be presented to the authorities as a sample of their work.

Occasionally, Belarusian theaters participate in top-tier festivals. Productions “Richard III” by Theatre of Belarusian Drama and “Chagall, Chagall” by Yakub Kolas Theatre of Vitebsk are just two examples of this. Production “Around capital” was shown at two German festivals dedicated to contemporary drama. However, it should be mentioned that international participation is rare. Yanka Kupala Theatre was invited to Chekhov festival in Moscow via a production that was created together with the festival itself, as well the production group from Moscow.

In the end, it should be admitted that Belarusian theatre, as a whole, bears no significance to global theatre. Specially created “export” projects are the only exceptions. So actually it should be recognized, that Belarusian theater is of little interest in the world theater community. Exceptions are perhaps only projects specifically designed “for export”. Activity of Free Theatre Minsk is centered around participating in international festivals. Leaders of this theatre have reached an extreme by coming to represent contemporary Belarusian Theatre across the globe. More often than not, the world’s understanding of the state of affairs in Belarusian theatre is shaped on the bases of information provided by Free Theatre Minsk. This is ironic, given that members of this theatre have openly declared their refusal to participate in Belarusian theatre scene and have a weak understanding of the processes that are taking place within it.

24. All of the festivals that take place in Belarus and are referred to in paragraph 20 are open to participation of international players.

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Viktor Pietrov, performer, critic, curator of a Navinki performance festival, vitam@anitex.by

Section A.

Theatre and a non governmental performance culture

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

After gaining independence and after political changes it became possible to talk about modern art as it is. However such culture does not have a legal status. Experimental theatre and performances and struggle for performance art, as an experimental art, are forbidden in a political context. An artist and freedom are considered as opposite to each other, and art as a process is forbidden. Anything that is impossible to be understood by the government, is forbidden. From these theatres none of the governmental structures came out. Experimental theatre groups and artists who act individually focus their attention on international festivals (such as Navinki, Art-process, Minska wiosna (Minsk's spring), Chronotop, Dach (Roof)) or they do acting in cafes, parks or on the streets.

Understandably, Belarusian government does not give funding for such events. Also, such proceedings and festivals are closely scrutinized by the government and whether there is something the government does not approve of, such event or festival is shut down (it happened more than once). Directors and administration of theatres, clubs and culture centres at which festivals and plays are taking place, can shut them down regardless of the sponsorship, no money is returned. These are conditions for NGO performance art in Belarus.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

There are still no governmental documents regulating politics of culture and public debate gives no substantial results.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

These festivals are non commercial therefore their privatization is impossible. There is no basis for such process.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of "nationalisation" (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

New initiatives of performing art take place (medley, performance art) thanks to the private curator's schemes, these are not financially supported by the government.

Festival and theatre group directors must have their own initiatives.

Section B. Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

There was an attempt to arrange theatre and performance groups into an organization 'Modern Arts Association'. However, in Belarus there is no juristic law to register an organization that deals with culture.

Theatre groups and medley projects in the country:

General number of the organizations: 5 (NGO organizations)

- „Jana Try Jon” theatre and performance group (Minsk)
- „Teatr Psychicznyj neuraunawazansci” theatre and performance group (Minsk)
- „Zywaja Planieta” theatre and performance group (Minsk)
- „Mechaniory kultury” theatre and performance group (Minsk)
- „Petli” performance group (Minsk)

Medley projects in the country .

At the moment we have two of long term projects:

- International festival of performance-art “Navinki” 1999-2011 – 12 festivals
- International festival “Dach” 2009-2011 – 3 festivals

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

NGO organisations

Presently, they do not have a legal status at the international festivals and theatre groups.

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

These theatre and performance art festival projects do not receive any financial support from the government. Private companies and sponsors are not interested in supporting cultural initiatives (whether they are independent or official) as they do not get discount on tax for that. In Belarus all companies are required to spend money on building of sport venues. Festival and theatre project organizers turn to the foreign cultural organizations for funds. Money of the Belarusian sponsors can only be used for the official, approved by the government, festivals such as „Slawianski bazar” in Witebsk.

10-14. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

As it was shown earlier, the government does not provide any financial support for the theatre or performance shows. Apart from that, the government and directors of cultural enterprise take money from the artists for their shows in the state's venues. The whole profit from festival tickets goes to the state administration. There was never a situation when an artist received a percentage from such profit. This is how international performance festivals are run in Belarus.

Section D.
Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres between 2007 and 2010:

46 in different spaces such as theatres, café, clubs, on the streets.

16. Number of performances between 2007 and 2010:

about 100 shows

17. Number of viewers between 2007 and 2010:

about 80,000

18. Average cost of a play production:

1,000 euro, of a festival project 8,000 euro

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

Project, production and a show are carried on at the same cost range

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location

From out of five independent international festivals in Belarus : Navinki -Minsk, Atr-proces – Witebsk, Minska wiosna – Minsk, Chronotop – Minsk, Dach – Minsk, two remained: Navinki and Dach.

Section E.
International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

Festivals in Belarus do not participate in any of the EU programs

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

Festival “Navinki” is a member of International Association Performance Art Organization, (IAPAO) of a year 2001. In the rankings of IAPAO the festival is among best performance art festivals.

23. Are there any international coproductions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are coproductions financed?

international co-productions are taking place with the participation of international institutions (galleries, modern art centers, clubs, museums). Financial support of a specific festival is provided by the foreign institutions.

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

- International performance art festival “Navinki” took place 12 times between 1999 and 2001
- International festival “Dach” took place 3 times between 1999 and 2001

These festivals are open to all performance tendencies.



Bosnia and Hercegovina

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Tanja Miletić Oručević theater director, lecturer at Academy of Arts in Mostar

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

To present the situation and structure of theatre scene in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is necessary to explain quite specific politic structure of the country, which influences all public structures and institutions.

Bosnia and Herzegovina has claimed its independency from Yugoslavia after the referendum and received an international recognition in 1992. Shortly after that date, Serb separatist political forces led by Serb Democratic Party and supported by paramilitaries and Yugoslav Army from Serbia started the war on whole territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The war lasted until 1995, with atrocity effects of about 100.000 victims, many thousands of victims of ethnical cleansing, concentration camps, 4-years lasting siege of Sarajevo, genocide of more than 8000 civilians in Srebrenica and many other war crimes. The war was officially stopped with signing the so called Dayton Agreement (The General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina) on 14th of December 1995. The present political divisions of Bosnia and Herzegovina and its structure of government were agreed upon as part the constitution that makes up Annex 4 of the General Framework Agreement concluded at Dayton. Therefore Bosnia and Herzegovina is consisted of two entities—a joint Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) (mostly Bosniak and Croat) and the Republika Srpska (RS) (mostly Bosnian Serb entity) -- each presiding over roughly one half of the state's territory. Besides, The city of Brčko in northeastern Bosnia is a seat of the Brčko district, a self-governing administrative unit under the sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina; it is part of both the Federation and Republika Srpska. The district remains under international supervision. The Federation is further divided into cantons, which are then subdivided into municipalities. Republika Srpska is divided directly into municipalities.

Although the Dayton Agreement has stopped the atrocities of war, its solutions did not bring real peace and stability in Bosnia and Herzegovina; moreover, the political structure of the state as predicted in Annex 4 (and practically functioning as the Constitution) is being criticised widely, and very often recognised as the most important barrier for effective functioning of the state in its all areas – from human rights and political representation, to the functioning of public health, social care and culture.

“The war created ‘Republika Srpska Krajina’ in Croatia and ‘Republika Srpska’ in Bosnia-Herzegovina. But whereas the international community helped to restore Croatia within its own borders, they divided Bosnia into two entities whose borders were established at Dayton in November 1995. This settlement, intended to end the war, has no terminal point. It was reached with the participation of Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro - a legal absurdity, since only a country's own citizens have the right to shape their future. The entities and their borders are equally preposterous: they are unnatural, historically and economically unjustified, and ethnically unfounded. A height of absurdity is represented by the district of Brčko, whose sole purpose is to tie together the northern and eastern segments of Republika Srpska.

(According to the 1991 census, the population of the present-day Brčko district was only 20% Serb.) Such a resort to the ethnic principle in territorial demarcation on the part of the international community is unreal and impractical. In all democratic constitutions, citizens not nations appear as the normative category. It is not surprising that Dayton Bosnia-Herzegovina cannot function. This weird construction, which has no perspective, awaits a final dissolution. What is worrying is that an essentially anarchic situation is being allowed to continue, although it is unsuitable for a prolonged duration and injurious to both the state of Bosnia-Herzegovina and its citizens.”¹

Bosnia and Herzegovina: Ministry of Civil Affairs (co-ordinates activities, harmonizes plannes of the entities' governing bodies and defines strategies on the international level in the areas of : health and social care, pensions, science and education, work and employment, culture and sport, geodetic, geologic and meteorology issues).		
Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina : Federal Ministry of Culture and Sport	Republic Srpska: Ministry of Education and Culture	Brčko District: Department for Economical Development, Sport and Culture
10 Cantons: Cantonal Ministry of Culture and Sport (Sarajevo) or Cantonal Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport (others)	Municipalities	
Municipalities, Town Councils		

In the area of interest for this report, the culture, the governing structure looks like this:

Therefore, Bosnia and Herzegovina is nowadays practically asymmetrical confederation of two entities, with quite unclear competences on state level.

These different competences and unequal legislative that follows it, produce many differences in practical theatrical activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. For instance, the status of independent artist is a legal category in only two Cantons in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Sarajevo and Una – Sana Canton); artists from all other cantons and Republic of Srpska have no rights for such a status. As they are in the competence of Cantons, budgets of theatres are varying significantly, from one canton to another. Many other legal and statutory issues are staying unsolved, or are being solved in chaotic manner.

In that overall complicated situation, it is difficult to answer directly the question if centralisation or decentralisation processes are stronger within theatre scene in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In some places we can observe centralisation processes, such as rising the importance of National Theatre of Republic Srpska in Banja Luka as central national house of the entity; it is, nevertheless, observed that theatre houses in other towns of Rebulic of Srpska practically do not exist. On the other hand, most of theatres in Federation are governed by cantonal and municipal level, which can be understood as s process of decentralisation.

The unclear situation about competencies and responsibilities has often been an alibi for political bodies to avoid financing theatre houses from their budget. It has been happening for years in towns of Tuzla and Mostar, and makes work of those theatre houses extremely difficult. As the law generally predicts that some level of government should be the official founder of theatre house, after that having a duty to finance it from its budget, and a right to name a general manager and board of directors, the same law is applicable in somehow absurd situation where theatres that exist 60 years are obliged to register with founder again. But, political bodies simply do not vote for taking over those founders' rights, so theatre houses stay in legal and budget vacuum, they survive from some grant incomes, etc.

Finally, important issue in new situation of theatre in Bosnia and Herzegovina is the issue of ethnic rights, language and national culture. The multicultural Bosnia and Herzegovina had its cultural unity

1 „Bosnia: a single country or an apple of discord?“, Dragoljub Petrovic, Bosnian Institute 2006, Translated from a longer text in Helsinska Povelja (Belgrade), nos 91-92, January-February 2006

during many centuries, but one of the outcomes of the latest war was destruction of culture to its ethnic components. Therefore in new “political correctness” culture is often considered to be service of so-called national interests, pushing the artistic quality into the second plan.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

The only document that was adopted in this period concerning theatre policy was a Law of Change of the Law of Theatre Activities in Canton Sarajevo (where the most Bosnian public theatres are situated), accepted on the 1st of September 2010. This change says that director of the theatre must have finished studies of humanistic or social profile (before the director of theatre was obliged to have diploma in theatre or performing arts profile).

It is interesting that this change has been accepted just before the general elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Unofficially there were comments that the change was connected with the expected changes in political and cultural governing structures, one minister is supposed to take the direction of a theatre, another person should be able to legally get the place of director.

There was no real public debate before adoption of this law (apart from very formal short event organised in premises of the Ministry, just to fulfil minimal legal requirements); moreover, it was proposed and voted extremely quickly, almost without fully informing the Cantonal Assembly that voted it.

It is worth pointing out the legislative situation for theatre activities remains unclear in many areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Only 3 out of 10 cantons in Bosnia and Herzegovina do have a Law on Theatre Activities (Sarajevo, Tuzla and Zenica – Dobož cantons). If there are public theatre institutions in other cantons (and there are 5 public theatres in Mostar, a cultural centre organising big puppet theatre festival in Bugojno, a cultural center organising summer theatre festival in Bihać, cultural centre organising state theatre festival in Jajce, etc), they function somehow half legally, or are in practice being regulated by some other legislative which is not completely implementable to theatre activities. Moreover, that kind of structural gaps very often produce situation where no ministry of culture or artistic professionals are making decisions about funding and functioning of theatre life, but political representatives, very often not really competent to even understand the problems.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

Law about Theatre Activities predict the possibility of founding the private theatre, as well as form of theatre activity within non-profit NGO, so called association of citizens or informal theatre group as group of individuals (“physical persons” in that legal terminology, not “legal persons”). There have been some small venues using the possibility of organising theatre performances on impresario basis, but no new private theatre was founded. The Law gives quite strict and demanding technical conditions that have to be fulfilled in order to found a new theatre: many demanding conditions related to premises, technical equipment, space and security issues have to be fulfilled (there are even such strange obligations, as the one that “theatre must have audience space with chairs fixed to the floor (?)”, which is basically unrealistic in financial and cultural surrounding of nowadays Bosnia and Herzegovina).

East – West Theatre Company, found in Sarajevo in 2005, has in the beginning of year 2010 announced signing the contracts of support for building their future site in Sarajevo. That would be the first new theatre building in Sarajevo to be built for many years, and one among very rare in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

There were no cases that public theatre house becomes privatised. Basically, the Law does not give a possibility to privatise a public theatre institution; rather, the only possible way to privatise a theatre would be to finish the activity of public theatre and found a private one; but still, there could be impossi-

ble to use the premises of public theatre for new private one, because they belong to the city, and private founder of the theatre should be the owner of the premises. It is also significant that the Law defines that “the founder is obliged to ensure funds for funding and activity of theatre”²; it means that private theatres would not be legally appointed to apply for public budgeting, only exceptions could be some very small grants.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

The Law on Theatre Activities defines the formal rules for funding a new theatre institution, no matter which form of ownership it is – public, private or initiative of individuals – such as:

- “Theatre as public institution can be founded by Canton, Town or municipality, by bringing the document on founding the theatre.
- Theatre as institution can be founded by local persons and institutions by bringing the document on founding a theatre.”³

Furthermore:

- “Theatre can be formed in any form of ownership if all the material, technical and personal (staff) conditions for its founding were fulfilled.
- Technical and personal (staff) conditions for founding and work of theatre from previous article is being defined by special document by Minister of Culture in Canton.”⁴

It has been defined that, for instance, dramatic theatre must have 15 actors and several other artists employed full time (opera must have at least 16 solo singers, ballet house – 4 solo dancers etc). For some new initiatives it is huge staff and it probably is one of the obstacles that makes an initiative of founding new theatre unrealistic. Also, the minimal predicted length of stage should be 12 meters, which already is significantly big venue.

It is perhaps strange that legislative prescribed in such details technical and other conditions for opening new theatres, if we know that the overall situation of theatre life is very complicated, financing is low, there has been huge crisis of audience, related to extreme migrations and change of social structure from village to towns’ population during and after the war; we should rather expect legislative to enable and support quite simple start of new theatre venues. On the other hand, some, probably key issues were practically not treated in legislative: besides very general statement that “the founder is responsible for funding the activities of theatre” the system of funding, rights and obligations were not defined by law.

New initiatives in theatre in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and new theatre institutions are mostly coming from three directions:

- Professionalization of amateur theatres
- Institutionalization of activities of NGO’s
- Individual initiatives of mostly young actors finishing theatre schools.

Some amateur theatres in Bosnia and Herzegovina have had long and rich tradition of theatre work. Whole system of amateur activities was well developed and strongly supported in socialistic Yugoslavia – groups and theatres were organised almost everywhere, there were many festivals and the work of amateurs was well recognised and often professionally evaluated. Therefore in some situations already in

2 Law on Theatre Activities of Canton Sarajevo, article 8

3 Law on Theatre Activities of Canton Sarajevo, article 6

4 Law on Theatre Activities of Canton Sarajevo, article 7

1980's the activities of such groups have often left area of pure voluntarism, enthusiasm and education, and became more connected with experimental and alternative theatre events. Therefore it was possible to professionalise their work after the war, connecting the education component to the theatre production (as in Mostar). In some places, amateur theatres became a basis for founding public professional theatre in towns where audience had such a need (Prijedor).

The cultural and theatre scene in Bosnia and Herzegovina was very much supported by different voluntary and non-government organisations during and after the war. The movement which originated in humanitarian aid and moral support to citizens of country in war, has developed into a movement of wide initiatives of civil society, among which artistic activities had important place. In the situation when many theatre houses were damaged and their ensembles reduced, cultural NGO scene was keeping activities alive. Such initiatives have remained, although in quite modest range, in some non-profit performing arts institutions; probably the most interesting between them is Tancelaria, small independent institution for dance and nonverbal theatre, practically only group of a kind in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Finally, as there are several theatre faculties and high schools in the country, and existing theatre houses quite rarely enlarge their ensembles and engage new actors, some young graduates have decided to start their own theatre groups and even small theatres. Such theatres as Jazavac in Banjaluka and Teatar Kabare in Tuzla are actually figuring as second city theatre, besides the biggest and central public theatre.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

Director is being appointed by the Managing Board, with previous agreement with the founder. Managing Board organises public competition and chooses the director, but there are consultations held with political representatives of the community funding the theatre. He / she is appointed for 4 years.

It could be said that theatre houses in Bosnia and Herzegovina are under high influence of local political structures. Their work is so often instrumentalised for political purposes, and for sure – the procedure of appointment of the director, as direct impact to power structure in the institution (and their audience as well) is generally pretty much a public political gesture. It has amongst other to do with specifics of funding procedures in Bosnian theatres, where own income and sponsorship income are presenting too small part of income of theatre houses; huge majority of funds are coming from public budgeting. Therefore theatre institutions, personalised in their director, start becoming dependent financially from local government bodies. In that situation potential critical thinking and more independent attitude on the scene is not welcome, because any misunderstanding can be too risky for theatre's existence. Therefore tendencies to such theatre, politically critical and aesthetically provocative are usually not characteristics of the chosen directors.

Generally, there is certain unclearness in division of competencies between general director, artistic director and dramaturgist in theatres in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Some important theatre houses have neither artistic director nor dramaturgist, and all operative and artistic decisions are mostly made by single person (i.e. Kamerni teatar 55 and Pozorište mladih Sarajevo, Pozorište lutaka and Lutkarsko kazalište in Mostar, Mostarski teatar mladih etc.) Many houses do not have employed dramaturgist, although the studying programmes in dramaturgy exist in Sarajevo and Banjaluka. It is also interesting that position of director of theatre, traditionally mostly taken by theatre directors, dramaturgists or writers, is in Bosnia and Herzegovina most often taken by actors (at least 6 important public theatres in the country are led by actors). Some of them are very young actors, with modest professional experience.

According to the law, each theatre has to have Artistic Council, which decides about repertoire and activities of the theatre. In practice it is not so useful body, and it usually is very much politically influenced, because only one or two members of the Council are employees of the theatre; others are nominated by

local political parties, and very often they are citizens of various professions, who have no professional competences in theatre art. Similar situations happen also with Managerial Board. Their duty is to choose a director at competition. But again, members of this board are nominated by political parties, and most of them are not theatre professionals. Then there happen bizarre situations when, for instance, candidate for director is asked to present strategy of repertoire and work of theatre within four seasons, but he / she is then supposed to discuss the strategy at the interview with Managerial Board, meaning – persons who judge it are some doctors, teachers, etc. It has been said that Managerial Boards are the strongest instrument of political control and pressure on theatre institutions, because they are not – as they are supposed to – representing public interests, interests of local community, but they are implementing requests of political parties who nominated them (participation in managerial boards is paid for).

All the above mentioned problems result in lack of general programme and vision in theatres in Bosnia and Herzegovina. There is practically no theatre with original and coherent artistic vision, theatres are not profiled (it is possible, for example, to expect the same play in big stage of National Theatre, chamber stage of Kamerni teatar 55 and children and youth orientated house of Pozorište mladih). Most of the repertoire seems to be chosen by chance, and very often plays are populist and commercial, so it seems that any sense of responsibility for public art (made for public money) has disappeared. Finally, the level of responsibility of directors is very low. They are very often financially insolvent and have debts, even to the artists, who often must fight for their honoraria at court. There are public theatres in Bosnia and Herzegovina that make only one premiere in season, and play maximum 5 reprises each month. They think they have good excuse, because local government is not financing them enough, but the fact is there is no public mechanism forcing them, for instance, to produce and play more.

Section B. Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

There are about 35 – 40 different performing arts organizations and about 10 festivals in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to state final and precise number of organisations, because some of them are amateur, interdisciplinary, temporarily activated or irregularly active.

These are the locations of performing arts organisations (at least – most of them):

Republic of Srpska:

Banja Luka

- Narodno pozorište Republike Srpske
- Gradsko pozorište Jazavac
- Studentsko pozorište
- DIS teatar
- Dječije pozorište RS

Prijedor

- Gradsko pozorište Prijedor

Amateur theatres in:

- Mrkonjić Grad
- Laktaši

- Novi Grad
- Zvornik
- Obudovac
- Trebinje

Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

Sarajevo

- Narodno pozorište
- Kamerni teatar 55
- Pozorište mladih
- SARTR teatar
- Poetski teatar Juventa
- Scena Jelićeva
- Scena ASU
- Poetski teatar Juventa
- East West Theatre Company

Tuzla

- Narodno pozorište
- Teatar Kabare Tuzla
- POzorište mladih Tuzla
- Lutkarski teatar Sale
- Bosanski kulturni centar

Zenica

- Bosansko narodno pozorište

Mostar

- Narodno pozorište u Mostaru
- Hrvatsko narodno kazalište Mostar
- Lutkarsko kazalište
- Mostarski teatar mladih
- OKC Abrašević

Amateur Theatres in

- Konjic,
- Bugojno,
- Zavidovići,
- Visoko

Festivals:

- International Theatre Festival MESS Sarajevo
- Pozorišne igre Jajce
- Mostarsko proljeće
- International Festival Sarajevo Winter
- Theatre festival Brčko
- Festival of contemporary domestic drama Zenica
- Summer Festival Bihać
- TKT festival Tuzla
- Theatre days Tuzla

- Days of Youthe Theatre Mostar
- Puppet Theatre Festival Bugojno
- Amateur Theatre Festival Bugojno

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- institutions of the central government – 0
- institutions of regional governments – 14
- institutions of municipal governments – 15
- non-governmental organisations – 20
- private enterprises – 0

Legally, there are no mixed forms, because it is defined by the law that each public organisation has to have a founder; if it is institution of regional government, they are obliged to finance the theatre institution.

Nevertheless, as budget incomes from the founders are usually not enough for all activities, theatre institutions often ask for additional funds from other level of government, through grants or other forms of financing. Sponsoring is also a form of financing that is developing more and more.

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

- | | |
|---|----|
| – dramatic theatres | 25 |
| – puppet theatres – 5 | |
| – musical theatres – 0 | |
| – opera theatres – 1 (Narodno pozorište Sarajevo) | |
| – dance theatres (movement, pantomime) – 2 (Ballet – National Theatre Sarajevo and NGO Tanzelaria – contemporary dance and pantomime) | |
| – impresario theatres – 0 | |
| – arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones) | 10 |
| – other - | |

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

General rules of funding public and private theatres are defined by the Law on Theatre activities; they say that a theatre institution must have a founder – it can be municipal government or regional government, or private persons in case of private theatre, and the founder is legally obliged to finance the work of theatre – through public budget or private investments.

But, although this rule looks simple and transparent to follow, it does produce certain situations of legal gaps and misunderstandings in practice, for many years.

The first basic legal problem is the issue of continuity of institutions and (dis)continuity of governmental bodies. Mainly, most of public theatres in Bosnia and Herzegovina were actually founded in period after the Second World War, and continued their work for 60 or more years. There were, of course, at that time founded by adequate legal, political and administrative procedures, meaning practically that all levels of local administration – from municipality, through Federal Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to state level of Yugoslavia were legislatively harmonised in the system of managing and financing public

culture. In contemporary Bosnia and Herzegovina different levels of public administration are often understood as different political subjects, they are poorly harmonised in competences, and they often are trying to escape their responsibilities, with explanation that it should be responsibility of other level of government. Therefore there is often quite absurd situation, that theatre houses working for 60 years do not have a legal founder, because no political level wants to “take over the founders’ rights” and with it an obligation to fund a theatre. Those political subjects are, which is another absurd, allowed to deny that they are legal ancestors of municipal or regional organs of government in Yugoslavia.

Such unclear situation about founders and budgets exists in Mostar, Zenica and Tuzla. Only Sarajevo in Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Banja Luka in Republika Srpska have solved the status of their theatre houses in their budgeting.

The most dramatic situation related with problem of founders and budgeting is in the town of Mostar. Due to the war, this town was practically divided into two ethnic towns, of Croats and of Bosniaks. In 1993 group of Croatian staff has left National Theatre in Mostar and formed Croatian National Theatre, and both of those houses exist till now. But, they are not regularly funded, because neither Town of Mostar nor Herzegovina – Neretva Canton want to take over funders’ rights; they have been living from temporary grants mostly. The political parallelism complicates the situation extremely, because there have been suggestions in some tries of negotiations organised by international community, that two theatres unite, eventually with two ensembles playing in two languages, but Croatian theatre management rejected the idea. National Theatre Mostar stopped their work in last season, trying to achieve their goals through strong medial campaign, but the situation has not been solved yet, and the future of both theatres is unknown. It has to be stressed out here that this problem is mainly political problem and consequence of ignorance of politicians and public opinion, and not the matter of lack of funds; with many new local taxes the local budget income has raised during the last years.

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- amount of general subsidies
- amount of project subsidies

It is very difficult to get the information about total amounts of subsidies for theatre houses in Bosnia and Herzegovina, because no central institution collects such data. Budgets and complete public administration are divided in two completely separated systems of Republika Srpska and Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which practically have nothing in common; moreover, the subsidies are noted separately in each of 10 cantons of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as no theatre is funded by budget of Ministry of Culture of Federation (there have been information lately that this ministry is probably going to be closed at all). Therefore, only some partial information concerning the most important theatre houses are publicly available.

Budgets for the last several years are generally stabile, although there have been slight reductions in subsidies for theatres; nevertheless, as they are calculated mostly on the basis of the number of employees and material costs, which are not significantly changing, they remain mostly the same from 2007. to 2010.

- Republika Srpska had total of 9 810 800 KM⁵ subsidies for institutions of culture in 2009, out of that about 2 000 000 KM for National Theatre of Republika Srpska.
- National Theatre in Tuzla received about 1 000 000 KM from budget of Tuzla Canton.

In Sarajevo, the cantonal budget subsidies in 2009 were given as follows:

- Narodno pozorište – 6 159 800 KM
- Pozorište mladih – 1 119 800 KM

5 KM is Bosnian currency, Convertible Marka, 1 KM = 0,511 EUR

- Kamerni teatar 55 – 1 346 900 KM
- Theatre SARTR – 902 100 KM
- International Theatre Festival MESS – 1 117 400 KM

The Town of Mostar gave public subsidies to their theatre houses in 2009 as follows:

- National Theatre Mostar – 125 000 KM
- Croatian National Theatre – 100 000 KM
- Mostarski teatar mladih – 69 784 KM
- Lutkarsko kazalište – 192 110 KM
- POzorište lutaka – 172 313 KM

Total budget of Zenica – Doboj canton for institutions of culture in 2009 was 2 854 000 KM and 220 000 KM for extra grants; it can be assumed that – at best – one fifth of the sum was given to Bosnian National Theatre in Zenica.

For all other theatre institutions in whole country public subsidies were significantly lower, mostly reduced to one- time grants of several thousands of convertible marks.

Most of the subsidies are aimed for salaries of the employees (averagely about 70 % of the sum) and material costs (averagely about 30 % of the sum). Therefore, subsidies for the projects are minimal, in some cases theatres do not receive any subsidies for production of performances.

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government
- funding from local governments
- own revenue of theatres

Central government gives no public subsidies for theatre houses, as it was explained above.

There is quite small percent of own revenue of theatres. The reason for that can be seen, first of all in very small number of played performances.

This is, for illustration, number of performance played during one month in 2010 in several theatres in Bosnia and Herzegovina:

- National Theatre Sarajevo – 15
- National Theatre Banjaluka – 12
- Pozorište mladih Sarajevo – 11
- Kamerni teatar 55 Sarajevo – 12
- Bosansko narodno pozorište Zenica – 22
- SARTR Sarajevo – 6

Some other theatres (in Mostar) often play more than 5 times in whole month.

The price of tickets in theatres is low, but it is probably inevitable, because general population of Bosnia and Herzegovina is very poor, and changes in society after the war have resulted with extreme fall of number of theatre audience.

Although some theatres (National Theatre in Banjaluka, for instance) claim that they usually have 80 to 90 % sold tickets to each performance, many other theatre houses have averagely 30 to 50 viewers to see a performance.

This is how percentage of own revenue is presented in budget report for Sarajevo Canton in 2009:

- National Theatre – 4,7 % of the budget is own revenue, 95,3 % subsidies
- POzorište mladih – 6,5 % of the budget is own revenue, 93,5 % subsidies

- Kamerni teatar 55 – 9,6 % of the budget is own revenue, 90,1 % subsidies
- SARTR – 6,3 % of the budget is own revenue, 93,7 % subsidies
- International Festival MESS – 59 % of the budget is own revenue, 41 % cantonal subsidies

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

Time horizon of budgeting in public theatres is one year, and it is usually being budgeted and evaluated within the fiscal year (from January to January), together with other public institutions, which is not synchronised with rhythm of seasons in theatre, and makes planning in theatres more complicated.

Budget performance is evaluated under principles of treasury operations. All particular costs within the management and production must be very carefully planned and applied for, what sometimes is difficult in the course of artistic production.

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

Indebtedness of performing arts institutions was huge problem in the second half of the nineties, because there were many cases that institutions used to have debts in public sector. With the change of the structure of financing and accountancy to treasury operations the risk to this kind of debts was reduced significantly. Nevertheless, performing arts institutions are quite often avoiding paying out honoraria to artists and having debts with private persons. It is serious problem, because artists' rights are not protected by any institution, there is no association of performing artists or any kind of their syndicate or professional legal support for artists in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Therefore they can only sue theatre institutions in civil processes in courts. These processes usually last long and are expensive for artists, so many decide not to start them, and so allow to be robbed from the earned honoraria.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

Sponsorship is available form of additional funding, but it mostly does not function for continuous productions in theatre houses. Festivals usually receive significant sponsorship funding because of their medial visibility. There are no tax reliefs for business subjects for the purposes of funding of culture, so they are mostly not interested in long time sponsorship contracts.

In the nineties cultural agencies of European countries (such as Goethe Institute, British Council, Pro Helvetia etc) were very actively participated in Bosnian cultural production, and their projects were some source of funding for performing arts institutions. But in last time they do not fund theatre; sometimes there are exceptions in particular subsidies for concrete projects, from foreign cultural centres or embassies (as continuous co-operation of East West Center in Sarajevo with British Council and USA embassy).

Section D.
Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

In the period of from 2007 – 2009 there have been about 190 premieres in public professional theatres and up to 50 in amateur theatres.

Most of those performances are dramatic performances, except from 11 operas and 17 ballet performances in Narodno pozorište Sarajevo and 15 premieres in puppet theatres.

The number of premieres is structured in entities and cities as follows:

Federation of Bosna and Herzegovina

- Sarajevo – 75
- Zenica – 31
- Tuzla – 13
- Mostar – 22

Republika Srpska

- Banjaluka – 24
- Prijedor – 8

Any precise data for amateur theatres working throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina are unfortunately not available.

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

As explained above, overall data are unreachable.

It could be estimated that up to 5000 performances could be held in 2009.

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

–

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

It differs very much from small independent production and any production in towns as Mostar or Zenica, where financial means are minimal, to Sarajevo, where funds are much bigger.

Average cost of performance is considered to be 20 to 30 thousands EUR.

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

Average cost of hosting a performance differs very much in different circumstances in which host performances are being organised, but is generally considered to be up to 5000 EUR.

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location

14 Festivals:

- International Theatre Festival MESS Sarajevo
- Pozorišne igre Jajce
- Mostarsko proljeće
- International Festival Sarajevo Winter
- Theatre festival Brčko
- Festival of contemporary domestic drama Zenica
- Summer Festival Bihać
- TKT festival Tuzla
- Theatre days Tuzla
- Days of Youthe Theatre Mostar
- Puppet Theatre Festival Bugojno

- Amateur Theatre Festival Bugojno
- Teatarfest Sarajevo
- Amateur Festival in Trebinje

(There are some more festivals of smaller significance, local, for school children theatre groups etc.)

Section E.

International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

Not yet. Bosnia and Herzegovina is only in phases of signing agreements about IPA and other pre-accession funds of EU.

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

- Center for Drama Education (CDO) in Mostarski teatar mladih is member of International network for drama education IDEA.
- The organizer of the “Sarajevo Winter” Festival is the International Peace Center Sarajevo. International Peace Center is a member of the International Society for the performing Arts (ISPA), the European Festival Association (EFA) and Association of Biennials of Young Artists of Europe and Mediterranean (BJCEM).
- Festival Mostarsko proljeće is member of the European Festival Association (EFA).
- There have been activities in some theatre institutions to join ASSITEJ and some other international networks.

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

- International Theatre Festival MESS and National Theatre have had many international and, especially, regional co-productions. These projects were prepared for the festival. They were financed by joint fundraising of co-producers in both countries of their work.
- East West company has had several successful international co-productions, which were premiered and toured in many countries.

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

There are 5 international and several more regional theatre festivals in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Apart from very small independent venues, there are no dance festivals in the country.



Bulgaria

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Kalina Wagenstein, Artoffice, Sofia, Bulgaria, kwagenstein@artoffice.bg
Nelly Stoeva

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

The cultural policy in the field of performing arts in Bulgaria in the past 20 years has passed through a continuous period of transition from support for infrastructure to support for activities and projects. This process has encountered a number of difficulties and controversies and still cannot be defined as completed. The transition has been predetermined both by the changed public and political situation and by the crisis in the performing arts system, the beginning of which was visible already before the changes. A crisis occurs, when certain models of organisation, management, structuring and financing cease to be efficient and can no longer play the role of regulatory mechanisms. Some of the symptoms of this crisis were the following: similar structure of the organisations in the field of performing arts; over-staffing, hidden unemployment, lack of competition, aging of ensembles, inefficient use of resources, etc., which later (particularly, in the conditions of a financial and economic crisis) coupled with acute underfunding. In this context, in the period under review the Ministry of Culture repeatedly initiated restructuring of the network of Bulgarian theatres, their organisational and management model as well as the structure of their financing so as to ensure efficient and rational operation of this network.

The main moments of the reforms in this period can be summarized as follows:

- Introduction of joint (public – municipal) financing of part of the theatres (mostly in the country), by which the municipalities have begun to take up higher responsibilities regarding cultural life in their regions and this was a step towards achieving harmonization between the regional cultural needs and priorities and the financial efforts to maintain theatre art, made by the state and the local administration.
- Broad application of the principles of competitive beginning – an exceptionally promising mechanism under which state aid is provided on the basis of competition rather than administering. Competitions for a state subsidy for theatres (infrastructure), annual competitions for financing separate theatre projects as well as three-year competitions for the selection of directors of the separate theatres are held.
- Diversification of the functional model of theatres. There are already different types of theatre depending on their structure and way of financing: repertoire theatres and open stages as well as a higher percentage of municipal theatres.
- Since 2000 there has been a “Dramatic-puppet theatre” as well. This format was introduced by Council of Ministers’ Decree No. 204 of 1999, State Gazette No.105 of 2 December 1999 and involved merging of the dramatic and puppet theatres in several cities: Kurdjali, Pazardjik, Shoumen and Vratsa. They were later followed by Silistra, Haskovo and Pleven, by which the number of such mergers increased up to seven. As of this year the Silistra theatre has again been divided into dra-

matic and puppet theatres. The merging of dramatic and puppet theatres was made with the purpose of optimization and more efficient operation as well as for the sake of easier administration.

However, the transition has not yet been completed and all undertaken measures, for one reason or another, remain partial. This results in a number of outstanding and urgent problems in the theatres:

- The problem with the statutory provision. The reform was launched in a rather complicated statutory situation. There is not yet a special law on performing arts although a procedure for its drafting has been repeatedly launched through the years. Currently, intensive work on the drawing up of a Performing Arts Bill is carried out and it is expected to resolve a large part of the problems, accumulated in the sector in the past 20 years.
- The problem with the financial provision of the reform: the only certain source of funding of the performing arts organisations is still the national budget allocation, which is drafted on the basis of the staff size. There is no fixed allocation for culture, neither a percentage of it that goes for theatre. There are no additional or independent funds for financing performing arts in place either at central or at regional level. The measures undertaken to encourage sponsorship and donation have a rather limited effect. It is hard for the performing arts organisations to find other sources of financing but the Culture Ministry and the municipalities. This makes them strongly dependent and limits their ability to show initiatives. State theatres are also faced with a series of restrictions stemming from their status of public-financed organisations. For example, they are not free to set the salaries of their payroll staff but have to accept the average pay for the sector, determined under the National Budget Act for the respective year. On the other hand, they have no right to transfer revenues, accumulated through the year, for the next one (they are obliged to contribute all own revenues to the national budget). This does not allow applying a market approach to the management of these theatres, runs counter to the logic of strategic management and, finally, hinders the development of theatres as structural units with a development strategy longer than one year.
- The different functional models are not sufficiently clearly characterized by type. The diversification is actually confined to two models: organisations with companies and organisations without companies on the pay-roll, financed mostly by two sources: the national and the municipal budgets. The newly established open stages have turned to be a deceiving solution to the problem of the shortage of performance halls, because they behave like monopolists and require from external companies to pay for their performances. This is due to the fact that they themselves need revenues for their operation.
- The reform does not include measures regarding the existing performing arts organisations in the Bulgarian cultural spectrum – municipal or independent. They have the right to apply only within calls for project proposals. On the one hand, they are excluded from the system of institutional support and, on the other, they are in urgent need of legislative and tax changes, preferences upon registration and other types of non-financial aid from the state.
- The lack of qualified and competent experts in the field of administration, management and marketing of the performing arts organisations is also a problem.
- The pay-roll/performance relation is still problematic. There are no established efficient mechanisms that tie up the quality of the performance of a theatre with the subsidies, which it receives.
- The size of the extended project subsidies is rather limited staying steadily within the range of 1-2 % of the overall subsidy for performing arts.
- The theatres have a very low level of autonomy. It is still difficult for a theatre to reinvest its own revenues in its main activity. This is a major obstacle to the searching for alternative sources of financing. This problem is tackled in the new Performing Arts Bill but is still not applied in practice.
- Regardless of the efforts at many levels, there is still no sustainable and steady market of the artistic labour. The staff size-based budget and the lack of specialized labour legislation do not

encourage Bulgarian actors to become free-lancers. The problem of hidden unemployment – the impossibility to diversify the staff by laying off “inactive” members of the company and recruiting young people, etc. – persists. The inefficiency of the structures is not yet overcome regardless of the considerable redundancies in this sector.

- Regardless of the numerous attempts to hold discussions, a proper debate has not been carried out. The media image of the reforms as a “battle field” does not correspond to reality. The activities are not a result of a consensus regardless of the exaggerating of the problem in the media. The dialogue of the people carrying out the reform with the other main institutions working in the area of theatre – the Union of Artists in Bulgaria, the Bulgarian Theatre Association, the Association of Theatre Directors in Bulgaria, the Bulgarian Association of Employers in the Field of Culture and the Act Association – is not always smooth.

The latest reforms in the system of performing arts, introduced by Council of Ministers’ Decree No. 152 of 28 July 2010 (promulgated in the Official Gazette No. 58 of 30 July 2010) involve mostly merging of theatres with the purpose of cutting part of the administrative costs, related to their management, as well as transforming part of the state philharmonic orchestras into symphonettes and the opera-philharmonic companies again into operas so as to reduce their staff and curtail part of the state funds needed for the sector.

During a considerable part of the period key structures, responsible for the implementation of the state policy in the field of art, were the national arts centres (the National Theatre Centre, the National Museums, Galleries and Fine Arts Centre, the National Book Centre, and the National Music and Dance Centre) with the Culture Ministry. They were established following heated public debates in 1991 as non-profit organisations in the field of culture. They are bodies, through which the state exercises its managerial powers regarding the separate arts.

Initially, they did not have a status of legal entities but were designed to create conditions for decentralization of the arts management system. Their long-term perspective was to function as a separate power leaving only the fund provision obligation to the state, to protect the separate spheres of culture from the uncertainty of the political vicissitudes and provide them with a sustainable operational environment regardless of the frequent changes of cabinets, ministers and policies throughout the transition.

They were conceived to be “at arm’s length” from the Culture Ministry. This principle implies that “the Ministry itself should not be the direct producer of culture, but encourage it, offer it opportunities, help it and promote it. Other organisations should carry out the cultural activities and create cultural products. (...) The Ministry’s role is not to produce culture but, via fees from licenses and other similar sources, accumulate resources that should be redistributed in accordance with the cultural policy priorities.” (Landry, Charles “Cultural Policy in Bulgaria”, Report of the International Expert Group of the European Programme on National Cultural Policy Reviews of the Council of Europe).

The centres were granted a status of non-profit legal entities several years later by Council of Ministers’ Decree No. 139 of 1993, which specified that “the national centres are specialized non-profit budget units in the field of culture and have a status of legal entities. They are budget spending units.” The centres were registered as non-profit organisations in the field of culture under Council of Ministers’ Decree No. 23 of 1991 and were financed under the budget.

Owing to this status the centres began to turn into key instruments of carrying out the national cultural policy in their fields. Their objects was defined as development and circulation of the separate arts, financing of art projects, distribution of information, holding of forums, festivals, symposia, etc.

The centres’ operation was financed mostly under the national budget but also through allowances from existing funds, donations, wills, sponsorship, etc. The establishment of other funds for arts promotion was also envisaged but these plans were not effected.

According to the statutory acts, the national arts centres were conceived as modern institutions corresponding to the similar European structures in this field and complying with the new market conditions and

competition. They allowed the establishment and development of different types of organisations in the field of art as well as diverse sources and methods of their financing. The application of a new model of subsidizing art on the part of the state – the project subsidy – was already indicative of a change of the managerial thinking and seeking ways to enhance the efficiency of extended funds although they were actually decreasing.

However, Council of Ministers' Decree No. 196 of 1996 cancelled the legal independence of the arts centres and their function as spending units. This meant elimination of the "arm's length principle" and new centralization of all managerial functions in the field of arts on the part of the state in the person of the Culture Ministry. The formal argument about this step backward was that, as spending units of the budget allocations of state organisations, the centres were too much dependent on the direct process of drafting and implementation of the budget for their respective activities and this diverted from the initial idea about their functioning as an autonomous intermediary unit between their activity and the political body responsible for the formation of the cultural policy. The lack of experience in handling their own budget was also quoted as reason.

The centres' legal and financial independence was restored in 1997 to remain effective until 2006, when they were again transformed into directorates within the Culture Ministry. Under the latest amendments to the Rules of Organisation of the Culture Ministry as of 2009 the centres are no longer existent (with the exception of the National Film Centre Executive Agency) and the functions of the National Theatre Centre and the National Music and Dance Centre have been partially taken up by the newly established Arts and Artistic Generation Directorate. Thus the separation of functions – of the Culture Ministry as outlining the overall framework of the cultural policy and the centres as entities implementing this policy – was eliminated. However, although accompanied by hardships and problems and not always sufficiently efficient, this separation is quoted by everyone as one of the most promising initiatives of the Culture Ministry.

Regarding the newly-established structures, many private and independent theatre and dance companies have emerged since 1990 but their existence has been tough due to the unfavourable statutory environment and the rather limited possibilities for financing. In most cases, they are mobile and flexible structures and are often established for the implementation of a single project or programme, after which they are disbanded. Unfortunately, there are no statistical data about their number and activity and it is difficult to find reliable data about them at the moment. This problem is beginning to be partially resolved with the help of the independent formations themselves, which have begun to pool their efforts together for the sake of the common objective of countering the unfavourable situation in which they are functioning. A specific result of this uniting of efforts has been the establishment of the Act Association (<http://actassociation.wordpress.com>), which unites both individual theatre artists and theatre organisations (mostly independent theatre companies). A representative of the Association has been invited to participate in the working group in charge of the drafting of the new Performing Arts Bill.

By the adoption of Council of Ministers' Decree No. 152 of 2010 the number of state and municipal drama, dramatic-puppet and puppet theatres was 51. Of these 12 are in Sofia. The number of the state theatres is 42, of which seven function as open stages. These are the theatres in Yambol, Turgovishte, Dobrich, Montana, Dimitrovgrad and two Sofia theatres – Sulza & Smyah [Tears & Laughter] and Theatre 199. There are nine municipal theatres. These are the theatres of Pernik, Kyustendil, Dupnitsa, Vidin and Kazanluk as well as four Sofia-based theatres: Sofia Theatre, Small City Theatre Off the Channel, Vuzrazhdane Theatre and the Sofia Puppet Theatre.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

The statutory documents regulating the policy in the area of performing arts in the period under review were adopted mostly after 2000. They were not specially designed to the activity of performing arts organisations. These were the Culture Protection and Development Act, the Patronage Act, the Non-profit Legal Entities Act and a number of by-laws, mostly Council of Ministers' decrees.

Public debates were held repeatedly and different civic organisations were asked about their stands and opinions. It should be noted, however, that in many cases the opinions of civic and professional organisations were disregarded and debates were chaotic, inconsistent and unreliable.

Currently, a new Performing Arts Bill is under discussion and it envisages providing greater independence and keeping the own revenues of performing arts organisations.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

No state theatres have been privatised. Yet, there are state theatres that have been transformed into municipal ones (the theatres of Pernik, Kyustendil and Vidin). For several months now heated debates have been held regarding the re-registration of theatres under a different form as this would allow greater independence, flexibility in handling their budgets and own revenues.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

There are no specific regulations. The newly established organisations have the opportunity to register as non-governmental organisations (associations or foundations) under the Non-profit Legal Entities Act (promulgated in State Gazette No. 81 of 6 October 2000) or as companies under the Commerce Act (promulgated in State Gazette No. 48 of 18 June 1991). They receive from the central and local government only project subsidies for separate projects and are not entitled to capital or current subsidies.

There are no cases of nationalisation.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

(information from Ordinance No. H-4 of 2007 on the holding of competitions for directors of state cultural institutes, promulgated in State Gazette No. 50 of 22 June 2007)

Competitions about directors of state theatres are held on a three-year basis – for directors of state cultural institutes and on a five-year basis – for directors of cultural institutes of national relevance (National Theatre, National Opera and Ballet) by an ordinance of the Culture Minister. The announcements are published on the website of the Culture Ministry and in one national daily. Along with the application documents, the applicants should submit a concept about the development of the cultural institute for a period of three or five years, respectively.

The concept should contain:

- a) For a theatre director:
 - Artistic indicators: a detailed repertoire schedule for the first year of management, tendencies in the repertoire development in the following years and possibilities for extending the audience;
 - Financial and economic indicators: planning on the basis of the following key indicators number of performances per year, number of spectators, average fare, planning of joint projects with other theatres, international and other organisations,
 - Management strategies and employment policies.
- b) For a director of a state cultural institute in the area of music and dance:
 - Strategy for artistic development of the state cultural institute with a detailed repertoire schedule for the first year and the artistic intentions for the whole period;

- Compliance of the concept with the specific cultural environment, in which the cultural institute operates: demographic and cultural peculiarities, artistic staff and policy of optimal employment;
- Financial management of the institute and possibilities to raise additional funds;
- Possibilities for extending the institute's audience;
- Maintaining and upgrading of the facilities.

The applications submitted are considered by a commission, appointed by order of the Minister and including an expert of the respective area (theatre, dance), a human resources expert and a jurist. The commission drafts a protocol of candidates, admitted and not admitted to the competition, which is submitted to the Minister.

Non-admitted applicants are notified in writing of the reason for their non-admission and may appeal the decision within a seven-day term.

The competition is conducted by a commission, appointed by an order of the Culture Minister. The commission consists of at least seven people possessing the required qualification and experience to assess the applicants' professional merits. It should necessarily include a representative of the specialized administration of the Culture Ministry, a jurist and an expert of the Culture Ministry in charge of the financing of the state cultural institutes. The competition is conducted by considering the applicants-submitted documents and concepts about the development of the institution and an interview. During the interview each commission member fills an assessment card.

An applicant having gathered at least 2/3 of the maximum number of points under the assessment cards is considered to have won the competition. The commission takes a decision by a majority of half plus one of its members. The results are communicated to the bidders within three days of holding the competition and are published on the website of the Culture Ministry.

Section B. Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

There are 84 permanent professional performing arts organisations in the country. The current information about the state structures has been taken from Council of Ministers' Decree No. 204 of 1999, as amended and supplemented on 30 July 2010 – State Gazette No. 58 of 30 July 2010.

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- institutions of the central government – 54
- institutions of regional governments – 0
- institutions of municipal governments – 9
- non-governmental organisations – about 20 (permanent)
- private enterprises – 1 (permanent)

Are there any mixed forms?

There are theatres of joint financing by the state and the municipality on the territory of which the respective theatre is located.

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

- Dramatic theatres – 20
- Dramatic-puppet theatres – 6

- Puppet theatres – 12
- Philharmonic orchestras – 3
- Symphonettes – 3
- Opera theatres – 5
- Musical and dramatic theatre – 1
- Theatre and music producing centre – 1
- Musical centre – 1
- State musical and ballet centre – 1
- State folk ensemble – 1
- Impresario centres – 0
- Others – these numbers do not include non-governmental and private structures (about 20), the profile of which is difficult to determine due to the lack of sufficient information.

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

According to article 5 of the Protection and Development of Culture Act (PDCA, State Gazette No. 50 of 1 June 1999), the state cultural institutes are state-financed legal entities, established, transformed and closed down by the Council of Ministers on proposal of the Culture Minister or by law. These institutes are financed fully or partially under the Culture Ministry budget (in the latter case – by municipal funds based on agreements with the Culture Ministry or with the participation of other legal entities or natural persons).

The so-called state cultural institutes of national relevance have a special status, defined by article 7 of PDCA. These are cultural institutes performing all-national and representative functions regarding the creation, permanent protection and distribution of cultural and historical values. This status is granted and revoked by the Council of Ministers on proposal of the Culture Minister. The state cultural institutes of national relevance are fully financed under the budget of the Culture Ministry by priority. Such organisations in the field of performing arts are the Ivan Vazov National Theatre, the Sofia Opera and Ballet, the Sofia Philharmonic Orchestra and the Filip Koutev State Folk Ensemble.

Regarding the municipal cultural institutes: their status and financing are stipulated in article 8 of PDCA, which says that they are legal entities of independent budget that are established, transformed and closed by decision of the municipal council coordinated with the Culture Minister. They are financed under the municipal budget as, upon the drafting of the municipal budget for the respective year, the size of the subsidy for each of the municipal cultural institutes may not be lower than the one for the previous year regardless of what their revenues have been.

Apart from these provisions, there are no other specific statutory regulations in place regarding the financing of the performing arts organisations. The practice of the past 20 years has shown, however, that state theatres generally receive between 55 and 95 % of their financing from the state, 1 to 20% from municipalities, between 10 and 45 % are their own revenues and between 1 and 10% are obtained through sponsorship, donations and other alternative sources.

The key indicators for setting the size of the state subsidy are the institution's costs for salaries and utility services (about 85% of the total subsidy) and only up to 15% for activities (costs on new performances, tours, marketing, specific programmes on work with audiences, etc.).

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- Annual subsidies for theatre art for 2009 (without project subsidies) – 16,744,776 leva;
- Subsidies for projects in the field of theatre for 2009 – 356,500 leva;
- Total amount of annual subsidies for theatre: 17,101,276 leva;
- Annual subsidies for music and dance for 2009 (without project subsidies) – 20,954,680 leva;
- Subsidies for projects in the field of music and dance for 2009 – 242,000 leva;
- Total amount of the annual subsidy for music and dance for 2009 – 21,196,680 leva;
- Total annual subsidy for performing arts for 2009 – 38,297,956 leva;
- Project subsidies for 2009 – 598,500 leva.

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government
- funding from local governments
- own revenue of theatres

State financing accounts for 55 to 95% of the total subsidies for theatres depending on the individual case.

Financing at local level is affected on the basis of arrangements, which vary for the separate municipalities, as municipalities provide between 1 and 25% of the total subsidies for theatres.

Theatres' own revenues cover between 5 and 55 % of their costs depending on the specific nature and the location of the theatre (they are lower for the Sfumato Theatre Workshop and the theatres outside Sofia), as they are formed mostly from ticket proceeds. It is important to specify that due to the restrictive centralized financial policy theatres' own revenues are contributed back to the budget rather than constituting a part of their consolidated budget. Theatres may not dispose of their own revenues but need a special approval for each cost item by the Financial Department of the Culture Ministry. This results in considerable difficulties in the planning and programming of their operation. This situation will probably change after the enactment of the currently drafted Performing Arts Bill.

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

The budgets are planned for a period of one year given that the state subsidy for theatre is planned and extended within this time horizon. Evaluation is made on the basis of criteria listed in the table below:

CRITERIA	INDICATORS
Statutory provision of the programme	Relevance of the statutory instruments; the frequency of changes in the legislation.
Policy of optimization of the functioning of the theatre network in the country	Level of optimization of the functioning of the theatre network in the country.
Provision of resources – financial and personnel	Budgeted funds; actually received and disbursed funds within the programme; ratio between number of envisaged pay-roll employees and actual appointments; employees with highest evaluation.
Support for the implementation of artistic projects for performances based on Bulgarian dramatic works	Planned and implemented financing of projects – number of projects and amount of the financial support.

CRITERIA	INDICATORS
Support for theatre organisations in the staging of high-quality performances for children and youth	Planned and implemented financing of projects – number of projects and amount of the financial support.
Support for the spreading of theatrical performances for socially disadvantaged persons	Planned and implemented financing of projects – number of projects and amount of the financial support.
Support for publications in the field of theatre studies and reviews	Planned and implemented financing of projects – number of projects and amount of the financial support.
Support for the distribution of performances within festivals	Planned and implemented financing of projects – number of projects and amount of the financial support.
Support for enhancing the infrastructure and the technical conditions of the theatres' facilities	Planned and implemented financing of projects – number of projects and amount of the financial support.
System of monitoring and evaluation of the adequacy of the performance reporting indicators	Undertaken corrective actions, if necessary

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

The question is not applicable to the situation in Bulgaria: the performing arts institutions may not accumulate considerable debts due to the specific nature of the statutory framework.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

Financing by private persons – private persons may institute fellowships for school children/students of arts schools or provide the operation of the cultural organisations on the basis of a written agreement between the parties (relations, regulated in the PDCA);

Sponsorship – it is provided, given that there is corresponding prestatation (i.e. if the name of the sponsor is mentioned for advertisement purposes). If there is no agreement about such corresponding services, the question is about donation.

Patronage – any grant aid related to the creation, preservation and promotion of works of culture. The assistance includes provision of funds for premises and technical equipment and experts for storing the archives, while the promotion involves provision of funds for publication of works of culture in a circulation of at least 20 items as well as for organizing concerts, exhibitions, staging of performances, releasing of films, etc.

The Patronage Act (Official Gazette No. 103 of 23 November 2005) envisages the establishment of art lottery – a lottery game aimed at promoting and financing culture. Unfortunately, due to contradiction with other statutory documents and the lack of a categorically expressed political will, such game does not yet exist in Bulgaria.

The Culture National Fund provides funds under various programmes. For example, the Debut Programme offers a chance to young artists from all spheres of art, including the performing art, who are at the beginning of their career to demonstrate their abilities. Due to the budget restrictions this programme was not implemented in 2010.

The Culture Programme (2007-2013) – the objective of the programme is to promote the mobility of culture workers, the free cross-border exchange of works of art, cultural and artistic products and promote intercultural dialogue.

Other European and international programmes

Regardless of the pointed sources, we should note that the real possibilities for obtaining additional financing for theatres are rather limited. There are no special funds for culture or theatre, which creates

hindrances before the performing arts organisations in ensuring sustainability and independence from state financing.

Section D. Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

- Premieres for 2009:
- A total of 327
- Theatrical :152
- Premieres in the field of music and dance: 175

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

Number of performances	2007	2008	2009
Theatrical	7,728	7,964	7,315
Music and dance	1,225	1,297	1,250
Total	8,953	9,261	8,565

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

Number of viewers	2007	2008	2009
Theatrical	1,024 879	1,197,942	995,111
Music and dance	256,031	298,309	312,665
Total	1,280,910	1,496,251	1,307,776

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

There are no official data to this effect. There is considerable difference between state and independent organisations as well as between Sofia-based companies and the ones in smaller population centres.

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

There are no data regarding this indicator at national level either. Besides, possible average costs would be misleading given the big difference in the technical and artistic characteristic features of performances.

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location

The number of festivals is about 55. These include established national and international festivals for professional theatrical, music and dance art. They are distributed on the territory of the whole country (source: the National Cultural Calendar for 2010, the Culture Ministry).

Section E.

International co-operation

There is no sustainable regularly implemented policy at national level to promote actively international contacts, partnerships and the participation of Bulgarian performing arts organisations in international initiatives. Most international contacts, relationships and initiatives are rather a result of the efforts of separate theatre and dance managers. In this context the Culture Ministry may contribute considerably to the provision of information, the coordination and active promotion of international contacts and initiatives, participation in networks, joint projects, etc. It should be noted, however, that both the Culture Ministry and the Culture National Fund cover partially costs on international projects, mostly travel costs and, more rarely – ones for activities that should be covered by the Bulgarian partner.

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

As a whole, theatre and dance organisations rarely avail themselves of the possibility to apply for financing under EU programmes. This is mostly due to the fact that these programmes require considerable co-financing and there is no fund or programme in Bulgaria providing additional funds supporting applications under such programmes. This considerably limits the possibilities for Bulgarian culture-oriented organisations (not only ones operating in the field of performing arts) to receive financing under European programmes. This conclusion applies most fully to independent organisations, which cannot rely on own revenue while state theatres lack adequate capacity for drafting and implementation of projects. The projects implemented within EU programmes are rather an exception and are few in number. They involve mostly support for festivals under the programmes Kaleidoscope, Theorem, PHARE, Culture 2000 and Culture 2007. In the cases of artistic projects (not festivals) under the Culture Programme, Bulgaria has minor rather than leading participation.

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

The participation of Bulgarian arts performing organisations in international networks is rather limited. The following can be quoted rather as exceptions:

- The Act Association and the Luben Groyss Theatre College are members of IETM <http://www.ietm.org>
- The National Academy for Theatre and Film Arts is a member of the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA) <http://www.elia-artschools.org>, as well as of the International Puppetry Association (UNIMA) <http://www.unima.org>

The list is hardly exhaustive (there are also cases of individual membership in organisations and networks, where applicable) but show clearly enough the tendency of a relatively low level of inclusion.

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

International co-productions are made very rarely and may be rather described as isolated cases on the basis of individual contacts and efforts of separate active theatre and dance managers.

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

There are about 15 festivals for theatre and dance art on Bulgarian territory with serious rather than incidental international participation.

Remark: Figures and statistical data used in this questionnaire have been provided by the Culture Ministry.



Croatia

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Jelena Kovacic, theatre critic, playwright, Zagreb, Croatia, jelenakovacic.zg@gmail.com

THEATRE SCENE

1. General characteristic

- Croatian theatre life can be divided into an institutional and an independent scene.
- Institutional scene is linked to a repertory theatre, mostly public theatres which plan their repertoire in advance.
- Independent scene is connected to the cultural organizations, private enterprises and civic associations that deal with theatre.
- The division into an institutional and an independent scene is conventional and results from producer's predisposition; often happens that the authors, especially of the younger generations (directors, playwrights, actors without permanent employment, not being members of any team) work together as a part of an institutional and an independent scene.
- Theatre season begins in September and ends in June.
- To the artists related to theatre apply following rules: theatre enactment, labour law (permanently employed artists of public institutions), an enactment of independent artists' rights and of the development of cultural and artistic creativity (artists without permanent employment), law on associations.
- Most of directors, playwrights, scenographer and make-up artists are independent artists who are being engaged with specific projects.

Theatre artists are associated in two organizations: Hrvatsko društvo dramskih umjetnika (www.hddu.hr) [Croatian Playwright Association], and a paramount organization trade Hrvatska zajednica samostalnih umjetnika (www.hzs.hr) [Croatian Independent Creators Association].

The remaining associations are:

- Hrvatski centar ITI (www.hciti.hr) [Croatian IT Centre] - non-profit of the trade organization, dealing with international promotion of Croatian drama, theatre and dance.
- Hrvatski centar ASSITEJ (www.assitej.hr) [Croatian ASSITEJ Centre] – Croatian professional theatre association for children and teenagers, representative of Interplay in Croatia.
- Theatre epicentre (www.theatre-epicentre.org) [Theatre epicentre] – centre of creators focused on the scene for children and teenagers; a network of independent theatres with its own publishing activities.
- Centar za dramsku umjetnost (www.cdu.hr) [Playwrighting Center] – an association active since 1995 focused on performative arts, consists of four projects:
 - FRAKCIJA [Fraction] – a magazine of performance art, it is bilingual, Anglo-Croatian
 - AKCIJA [Action] – this edition consists of translations of the most important modern theoreticians of performative arts (Hans-Thies Lehmann, Jon McKenzie) and the works of Croatian authors (Branko Gavella), that reconstruct the most pivotal moments of performance art in the modern history of Croatia

- AKCIJA / FRAKCIJA [Action/Fraction] – a program of presentation and international exchange
- IMAGINARANA AKADEMIJA [Imaginary Academy] – educational program.

2. Private theatre and troupe establishing

Croatian Theatre Act differentiates theatres, theatrical institutions and troupes. According to the definition *theatres have separate legal personalities that organize and prepare, and eventually stage publicly plays and musicals, they provide a appropriate and functional theatre space, they hire the necessary artistic personnel and also administrative and technical employees. Troupe are legal persons which team up in order to prepare and stage a play or a musical. Theatrical institutions are legal persons that provide a suitable and functional theatrical space and hire a necessary personnel.* In short: theatres have their own actors employed while theatrical institutions do not. This makes their own performances harder to make and forces to organize guest performances of plays already existing. Troupes have their own performances but they do not have their own space and when working with theatres they rent their space.

Each private person who wants to establish a theatre or a troupe in order to deal with theatre or performance art in an organized, non-institutional and independent way, has three options: they can establish an artistic organization, private enterprise or institution. Each of them can be established by a Croatian or a foreign, legal or a private person. Such legalization allows private theatres and troupes to apply for the Competitions concerning Public Demand in Culture, which are organized by cities, provinces and the Ministry of Culture. The fourth option is to establish citizens association with a basic theatre activity. Citizens associations are not registered in the Ministry therefore in legal terms they are not listed as theatres.

The highest number of private theatre and troupes in Croatia has a artistic organization status. Establishing of artistic organizations is regulated by the Act of the Independent Artists and the Act of Cultural and Artistic Progress. In order have a legal status and begin its activity, each artistic organization has to be registered in the Registry of Artistic Organizations in the Ministry of Culture. Their founders have to apply for an enrolment to the Registry. To the application one has to attach:

- A resolution on establishing of the artistic organization.
- Rules and regulations of the artistic organization.
- A list of founders and members of the organization with their Personally Identifiable Information and notarized signatures.
- A confirmation concerning the status of an artist provided by the appropriate association.
- Name and surname of a member responsible in an artistic organization
- A list of people authorized to represent an artistic organization.

Artistic organizations can engage in different artistic domains. Artistic organizations that deal with theatre activity must apply for an enrolment to the Theatre Catalogue. *Theatre Catalogue consists of detailed data of all theatres public and private, troupes and theatre institutions in the Republic of Croatia that deal with theatre activities as legal persons or separate units working within the scope of another legal person.*

3. Director or director general electing

- The procedure of election and nomination of a theatre director differs depending on whether the theatre is public or private. The director is the head of the city theatre and the national theatre is managed by the chief executive officer.
- The procedure of election and nomination is described in the Theatre Act.
- The chief executive officer of the Croatian National theatre in Zagreb is nominated and dismissed by the government of the Croatian Republic pursuant the common resolution of the

minister of culture and the president of the city of Zagreb, after previous consultation with theatre assembly.

- The chief executive officer of other national theatres, is nominated and dismissed pursuant the theatre assembly resolution, by a unit representing the founder, and a decision is confirmed by a minister of culture.
- The director of a public theatre and the director of a public theatre troupe, the founders of which are counties, the city of Zagreb, cities and communes, are nominated and dismissed, pursuant the theatre assembly resolution, by a unit representing the founder
- The chief executive officer or the director is nominated pursuant the results of a public contest, for the period of four years.
- The contest is announced at least a year before the chief executive officer or the director's term ends. The contest is announced and conducted by the theatre assembly.
- The chief executive officer or the director is nominated on the basis of the submitted four year program including necessary financial and personnel plan of the realization of the proposed program.
- A private theatre and theatre troupe are managed by the director. The director is nominated by the founder according to the procedures and on the conditions stated in the bill, establishment act and the statute.
- The statute and the remaining general acts are approved by the director with the permission of the founders and according to the private theatre or theatre troupe regulations. (A quote from a Theatre Act)

4. Theatre in numbers

- According to the data from the Ministry of Culture and the Catalogue of Theatres in Croatia, presently there are ninety one theatres (public and private), this includes 57 artistic organizations, 3 private enterprises and 31 institutions.
- The Catalogue does not keep a record of citizens associations thus according to the law they are not listed as theatres.

Private theatres (artistic organizations, private enterprises)

- Among 57 artistic organizations 47 were established and are active in Zagreb, 4 were established and are active in Split. There is one artistic organization in: Vinkovci, Bjelovar, Ivanić Grad, Dubrovnik, Koprivnica and Osijek.
- All of the three private enterprises were established in Zagreb and are active there.
- Private theatres differ in their activity level, most of them do not have their own space and work in cooperation with city theatres or culture centres in order to be able to use their technical personnel, promotion, space for rehearsals and for staging plays or to stage their plays in the alternative space.
- There are a few examples of private theatres that work in their own space that they obtained or rented out from the city, alternatively using the space of a culture centre.

A list of the most active private theatres (artistic organisations, private enterprises, associations)

- TEATAR EXIT (www.teatarexit.hr) [THEATRE EXIT]
- MALA SCENA (www.mala-scena.hr) [SMALL SCENE]
- BACAČI SJENKI (shadowcasters.blogspot.com) [SHADOW CASTERS]
- MONTAŽSTROJ (www.motazstroj.com) [MACHINE ARRANGING]
- LUDENS TEATAR (<http://ludensteatar.hr>) [THEATRE LUDENS]
- BAD com. (www.badco.hr) [BAD.com]

- KAZALIŠTE LICEM U LICE [THEATRE FACE TO FACE]
- PLAY DRAMA (www.playdrama.hr) [PLAY DRAMA]
- GLUMAČKA DRUŽINA HISTRION (www.histrion.hr) [ACTORS GROUP HISTRION]
- KAZALIŠTE „HOTEL BULIĆ“ [THEATRE „HOTEL BULIĆ“]
- TEATAR GAVRAN (www.teatar-gavran.hr) [THEATRE CROW]
- GRUPA KUGLA [GROUP SPHERE]
- PLANETART (www.planet-art.hr) [PLANETART]
- KUFER [TRUNK]
- KAZALIŠTE ULYSSES (www.ulysses.hr) [THEATRE ULYSSES]
- TVORNICA LUTAKA [DOLL FACTORY]
- TIGAR TEATAR (www.tiagrteatar.com) [THEATRE TIGER]
- LUTKARSKA SCENA I.B.MAŽURANIĆ (www.scena.ibm.hr) [DOLLS' STAGE I.B.MAŽURANIĆ]
- TEATAR RUGANTINO (www.rugantino.hr) [THEATRE RUGANTINO]
- KAZALIŠTE MERLIN [THEATRE MERLIN]
- MALO SPLITSKO KAZALIŠTE (www.malosplitskokazaliste.hr) [SMALL THEATRE IN SPLICIE]
- MERKURI TEATAR [THEATRE MERKURY]
- TIRENA (www.tirena.hr) [TIRENA]
- LUTKARSKI STUDIO KVAK (www.kvak.hr) [DOLL STUDIO KWAK]
- BJELOVARSKO KAZALIŠTE [THEATRE IN BJELOVAR]

The list is enhanced by three institutions, which do not have a formal theatre status:

- DJEČJE KAZALIŠTE DUBRAVA (www.ns-dubrava.hr) [THEATRE FOR CHILDREN DUBRAVA] a theatre working as a part of peoples' university Narodno sveučilište Dubrava, without a formal theatre statute. Narodno sveučilište Dubrava is a public institution that deals with cultural and educational activities. Its main task is to realise cultural and educational programmes aiming at different age groups. Although the theatre is one of many activities of the centre, Dječje kazalište Dubrava has its own repertoire for 55 years.
- KAZALIŠTE SLIJEPIH I SLABOVIDNIH NOVI ŽIVOT (www.novizivot.hr) [THEATRE FOR THE BLIND AND PARTIALLY SIGHTED NEW LIFE] is an amateur theatre that works with professional directors, playwrights, actors and musicians. For many years they have been staging plays for children and adults.
- KNAP (www.kcpscenica.hr) [PRECISELY] a theatre as part of a centre Kulturni centar Pepčnica in Zagreb, for past few years it has been preparing its own repertoire for children and adults in cooperation with professional theatre artists.

Public theatres (institutions)

- Among the 31 of institutions 22 were set up by different cities, 3 by a city and a county, 1 institution by the Republic of Croatia and the city of Zagreb, 1 institution was established by a county, 1 university Sveučilište in Zagreb, and 2 by private persons.
- among the 31 institutions, 4 have a national institution statute: Hrvatsko narodno kazalište Zagrebu in Zagreb [Croatian National Theatre], Hrvatsko narodno kazalište in Osijek [Croatian National Theatre], Hrvatsko narodno kazalište Ivana pl. Zajca in Rijeka [Croatian National Theatre] (as a part of Italian Theatre), Hrvatsko narodno kazalište in Split [Croatian National Theatre].
- All of the national institutions except HNK in Osijek have their own play, opera and ballet productions. HNK in Osijek has only play and opera scene.

Institutions according to their localization and founders**1. founder: city (22 institutions)**

- the city of Zagreb: 7 institutions
 - Gradsko dramsko kazalište „Gavella“ (www.gavella.hr) [Municipal Drama Theatre „Gavella“]
 - Gradsko kazalište „Trešnja“ (www.kazaliste-tresnja.hr) [Municipal Theatre „Cherry“]
 - Gradsko kazalište „Žar ptica“ (www.zar-ptica.hr) [Municipal Theatre „Fenix“]
 - Gradsko satiričko kazalište „Kerempuh“ (www.kazalistekerempuh.hr) [Municipal Satirical Theatre „Kerempuh“]
 - Zagrebačko gradsko kazalište „Komedija“ (www.komedija.hr) [Municipal Theatre in Zagreb „Comedy“]
 - Zagrebačko kazalište lutaka (www.zkl.hr) [Doll Theatre in Zagreb]
 - Zagrebačko kazalište mladih (www.zekaem.hr) [Youth Theatre in Zagreb] – member of European Theatre Convention
- the city of Split: 2 institutions
 - Gradsko kazalište lutaka Split (www.gkl-split.hr) [Municipal Doll Theatre Split]
 - Gradsko kazalište mladih (www.gkm.hr) [Municipal Youth Theatre]
- the city of Vinkovci: 1 institution
 - Gradsko kazalište „Joza Ivakić“ Vinkovci (www.kazaliste-vinkovci.hr) [Municipal Theatre Joza Ivakić Vinkovci]
- the city of Osijek: 1 institution
 - Dječje kazalište Branka Mihaljevića u Osijeku (www.djecje-kazaliste.hr) [Children's Theatre Branka Mihaljevicia in Osijek]
- the city of Rijeka: 2 institutions
 - Gradsko kazalište lutaka Rijeka (www.gkl-rijeka.hr) [Municipal Doll Theatre Rijeka]
 - Hrvatsko narodno kazalište Ivana pl. Zajca u Rijeci (www.hnk-zajc.hr) – member of European Theatre Convention
- the city of Dubrovnik: 1 institution
 - Gradsko kazalište Marina Držića (www.kazaliste-dubrovnik.hr) [Municipal Theatre Marina Držića]
- the city of Požega: 1 institution
 - Gradsko kazalište Požega (www.gkp.hr) [Municipal Theatre Požega]
- the city of Sisak: 1 institution
 - Gradsko kazalište Sisak (www.domkkv.hr) [Municipal Theatre Sisak]
- the city of Karlovac: 1 institution
 - Gradsko kazalište Zorin dom (www.zorin-dom.hr) [Municipal Theatre Zora's House]
- the city of Velika Gorica: 1 institution
 - Gradsko kazalište – Scena „Gorica“ (www.pouvg.hr) [Municipal Theatre – Scene „Gorica“]
- the city of Varaždin: 1 institution
 - Hrvatsko narodno kazalište u Varaždinu (www.hnkvz.hr) [Croatian National Theatre in Varaždinie]
- the city of Zadar: 1 institution
 - Hrvatsko narodno kazalište Zadar (www.hnk-zadar.hr) [Croatian National Theatre Zadar]
- the city of Pula: 1 institution
 - Istarsko narodno kazalište – gradsko kazalište Pula (www.ink.hr) [National Theatre in Istra – Muncipal Theatre Pula]
- the city of Šibenik: 1 institution
 - Šibensko kazalište (www.sibensko-kazaliste.hr) [Theatre w Šibeniku]

2. founder: private persons (2 institutions)

- Kazalište „Licem u lice“ in Split [Theatre „Face to Face“]
- Kazalište Epilog in Zagreb (www.epilog-teatar.hr) [Theatre Epilogue]

3. founder: cities and provinces (3 institutions)

- Province splitsko-dalmatin and the city of Split: Hrvatsko narodno kazalište Split (www.hnk-split.hr) [Croatian National Theatre Split]
- Province osjeck – baranjski and the city of Osijek: Hrvatsko narodno kazalište in Osijek (www.hnk-osijek.hr) [Croatian National Theatre]
- Province virovitičko-podravski and the city of Virovitica: Kazalište Virovitica (www.kazalistevirovitica.hr) [Theatre Virovitica]

4. founder: The Republic of Croatia and a city (1 institution)

- The Republic of Croatia and the city of Zagreb: Hrvatsko narodno kazalište in Zagreb (www.hnk.hr) [Croatian national Theatre]

5. founder: city council and Culture Centre (1 institution)

- City council of the city of Čakovec and the Cultural Center Čakovec: Družina Pinklec (www.kdpinklec.hr) [Pinklec Group]

6. founder: province (1 institution)

- The province of zadarske – Kazalište lutaka Zadar (www.kzl.hr) [Dolls Theatre Zadar]

7. founder: University (1 institution)

- The University of Zagreb – Students' Centre In Zagreb – Theatre ITD (<http://itd.sczg.hr>) [Theatre ITD]

5. Financing of a play

- In Croatia there is a yearly model of financing.
- The means used for financing theatrical productions come from the budget of the Republic of Croatia, budget of local and district (regional) administrative units, that provide for the public needs.
- The means that are used for production of theatre projects can also come from the income of their own activity, from foundation, sponsors, donations and other sources compatible with the law.
- Public and private theatres take part in competitions and public applications concerned with financing of a program of public needs in culture, once a year written by:
 - The Ministry of Culture
 - City/commune council
 - Province
- All of the competitions are project type.
- Financing and division of means on particular projects occur in a following way: a city provides a budget plan that is validated by the City Council. Municipal Education, Culture and Sport Department that divides the means to different domains. The culture council working with a civic office gives suggestions on which project should receive a support and how much. The final decision on the means distribution is made by the City Council, its executive or deputy.
- The competition of the Ministry of Culture occurs in a following way: the parliament votes in a budget plan, the Ministry of Culture distributes the means to specific areas and a culture coun-

cil of the Ministry suggests which project should receive support and how much. The council's role has an advisory character. The final decision on the distribution of means is made by the director responsible for a specific domain in an institution or his deputy, the minister has the right on deciding about the distribution of means.

- The criteria of the means distributing are regulated by the rules describing the criteria.
- Municipal theatres are fully financed by the city's budget that keeps the sources for a program realization, expenses and wages for the employees. One can apply for the competition with following objectives: international cooperation and other program activities related to the festivals organized by specific municipal theatres.
- The Ministry of Culture is financing a play by the course of four equal sources of financing: a play activity, international cultural cooperation, a project „Entrepreneur in culture“ and a project „Culture 2007-2013“ as a part of the EU program.
- Since the 4th of May 2007 Croatia is a Program member with full rights thanks to the signing of a memorandum on the communication agreement between the Republic of Croatia and the European Union. It was concerned with the Republic of Croatia taking part in the program Culture 2007-2013.
- The Cultural Contact Point (CCP) is an unit in the Department of International Cooperation in the Ministry of Culture. It is responsible for implementation of the program Culture 2007-2013 in Croatia. The Department is responsible for the program organizing and cooperation of Croatian representatives taking part in the program.
- In 2010 the Ministry of Culture financed 108 theatre programs (festivals, manifestations, guest performances, plays) for the sum of 26.550.000,00 Croatian kuna.
- Municipal Department of Education, Culture and Sport of the city of Zagreb in the year 2010 sponsored 7 public municipal theatres, 6 culture centres, Teatar&TD [Theatre &TD], Ansambl narodnih plesova i pjesama LADO [People's Association of Song and Dance LADO], 35 theatre groups, associations and projects for 29.115.000, 00 Croatian kuna, of which 17.115.000,00 Croatian kuna for the institutions, and 12.000.000,00 Croatian kuna for the independent productions.

6. International co-productions

Most of the international co-productions in Croatia has Zagrebačko kazalište mladih [Youth Theatre in Zagreb], this is why I chose it to provide an example of all possible international co-operations that Croatian theatres take part in.

- 1) *Garaža* [Garage] – a co-production with the American theatre La MaMa, its premiere took place in the USA (New York) and In Croatia (Zagreb), the American theatre booked a space in New York for rehearsals and plays and divided the income from the tickets into half.
- 2) *Polet* [Imaginativnes] –co-production with the French theatres La Comédie de Saint – Étienne and Théâtre de la place Liège, the same authors' group prepared the same play with two groups of actors– Croatian and French. Both play used the same scenography which travelled depending on needs. After the Croatian and French premiere there was a change – Croatian play was staged in France and French in Croatia.
- 3) *Sedam dana u Zagrebu* [Seven Days In Zagreb] – a play that is a part of a theatre Project Orient express, in which another 5 partnership countries take part (apart from Croatia in this project participate: Serbia, Turkey, Romania, Slovenia and Germany). Theatre wagon took off from Ankara and for more than two months was stopping on different train stations In the countries that were taking part in the project , becoming in such a way a scene for plays from a hosting country and a country from a previous station. The train arrived at Stuttgart, to its final destination and all the plays were shown at the international theatre festival.

- 4) Presently ZKM prepares a co-production with a German Municipal theatre Braunschweig, that is financed by the Department of Culture of a German Ministry of Foreign Affairs employing Croatian and German actors. The program is sponsored by EU as a part of the Program Culture 2007-2013.

7. Statistics

1. Statistical data on the theatre life in Croatia were provided by the website of the Central Statistical Office that examines professional theatres, professional theatres for children and amateur theatres. Unfortunately in the reports there is no mention about the art of dance. Below there is data published in the Year-book, Statistical Review, in bulletins and statistical reports. Last published data are from the 2008/2009 season as presently we do not have data from 2009/2010.

2. OFFICIAL STATEMENT – ARTISTIC CREATION AND STAGED PLAYS IN 2008/2009 SEASON.

„In the 2008/2009 season 64 theatres were active. Some of the Professional theatres have permanent stages inside of a building or in other localizations, thus apart from 23 professional theatres there were 6 small scenes active as well. Professional theatres for children – 14, including 7 dolls’ theatres. There were also 27 amateur theatres actives.

7 388 plays were staged, less than In the previous season (o 1,2%). 1 580 788 people saw the play, 5,1% less than In the previous season. An average of 143 plays and 249 viewers were at a play for one professional theatre, together with the stages. In All of the theatres 877 plays were staged, of which 475 were by Croatian authors which is 54,2%.“¹

3. YEAR-BOOK

Year-book of the Republic of Croatia is a solid yearly publication of the Central Statistical Office. This is where the results of statistical tests are published, that are made in cooperation with other institutions that run official statistics. In the case of a play, statistical records are prepared basing on the data that each theatre is obliged to provide by the end of the year – a yearly report of artistic creation and staged plays.

A

PROFESSIONAL THEATRES				
	Theatres	Places	Plays	Audience, in thousands
2003/ 2004	29	8 156	4 101	1 043
2004/ 2005	29	8 278	3 972	952
2005/ 2006	22	8 176	3 918	941
2006/ 2007	22	7 855	3 972	959
2007/ 2008	22	7 872	4 119	1 067

1 Državni zavod za statistiku Republike Hrvatske, Priopćenje – Umjetničko stvaralaštvo i reproduktivno izvođenje u sezoni 2008 / 2009, Zagreb, 17.prosinca 2009 [Central Statistical Office of the Republic of Croatia, Official statement – Artistic creation and staged plays in the 2008/ 2009 season, Zagreb, 17.12.2009].

B

PROFESSIONAL THEATRES FOR CHILDREN			
	Total	Plays	Audience, in thousands
2003/ 2004	13	2 459	436
2004/ 2005	13	2 278	374
2005/ 2006	13	2 238	370
2006/ 2007	13	2 408	419
2007/ 2008	14	2 325	404

4. NUMBER OF PREMIERES OF PROFESSIONAL THEATRES AND TROUPES IN 2009

Data on the play premieres in 2009 were taken from the website www.kulisa.eu, an Internet Press dedicated to culture and scenic art and also from a list of premieres prepared by Goran Ivanišević. According to this list in 2009 in Croatia there were 137 premieres, including 31 premieres of children's plays and 106 premiere plays for adults.

Most of the premieres, 9, had In 2009, theatre Zagrebačko kazalište mladih [Youth Theatre in Zagreb]. Zagrebačko kazalište mladih is also a theatre with the highest number of co-productions In 2009—among 9 premieres, 5 are a result of co-productions.

City	ZAGREB	RIJEKA	SPLIT	OSIJEK	DUBROVNIK
Number of premieres	64	13	14	9	4
City	VARAŽDIN	BJELOVAR	KOPRIVNICA	PULA	SISAK
Number of premieres	7	1	1	3	3
City	ŠIBENIK	VELIKA GORICA	VIROVITICA	VINKOVCI	ZADAR
Number of premieres	2	5	4	2	5

5. AVERAGE COST OF A PLAY IN A MUNICIPAL THEATRE

- An average cost of a play in a municipal theatre depends in different criteria – theatre budget, whether the a play will be staged on a big or small scene, scenographic, make-up and costume requirements. With an exact data provided we can evaluate the cost between 40 and 50 thousand euro.

6. AVERAGE COST OF GUEST PERFORMANCES OF MUNICIPAL THEATRES

- An average cost of a guest performance depends on whether the play is staged in Croatia or abroad and on how big it is.
- An average cost of abroad is about 5 thousand euro without accommodation.

8. Festivals

- Presently in Croatia there are 32 festivals taking place, 29 of them are theatre festivals and 9 dance festivals.
- Of the 32 festivals, 25 have an international character
- Most of the festivals take place in Zagreb. In the last decade there is a tendency to decentralize culture by organizing festivals outside of Zagreb.

- Such tendency of decentralizing is a result of individual efforts of theatre and dance artists.
- Among the 31 festivals, 5 is dedicated only to the children's' theatres.
- The festivals are financed from the state and city budget, thanks to the sponsors, income from the ticket sales and thanks to the support of the foreign institutes of culture in Croatia.

City	ZAGREB	SPLIT	RIJEKA	DUBROVNIK	OSIJEK
Number of festivals	12	3	4	1	1
City	BJELOVAR	SVETINČENAT	KRAPINA	ZAGVOZD	ŠIBENIK
Number of festivals	1	1	1	1	1
City	PULA	POREČ	UMAG	ZADAR	VUKOVARSKO-SRIJEMSKA ŽUPANIJA
Number of festivals	1	1	1	1	1
City	ČAKOVEC				
Number of festivals	1				

A LIST OF FESTIVALS

1. Bjelovarski odjeci kazališta / BOK-fest [Bjelovarski's Theatre Echoes]

- For the first time took place in 2003.
- It takes place once a year.
- The festival program is based on the choice of the best theatrical productions from all over Croatia and from guest performances.
- Plays for children and for adults are specific for the program.
- Location: Bjelovar

2. Dani satire [Satire Days]

- For the first time took place in 1976.
- It takes place once a year in the organization of the theatre Gradsko satiričko kazalište Kerempuh [Municipal Satirical Theatre „Kerempuh“].
- The festival program consists of the Best comedy and satirical pieces of Croatian theatre productions and guest performances from abroad.
- The festival Has a competition's characteristics.
- Location: Zagreb

3. Dubrovačke ljetne igre [Summertime Games in Dubrovnik]

- For the first time took place in 1950.
- It takes place once a year.
- Dubrovačke ljetne igre is the biggest cultural manifest In Croatia.
- The program has three parts: drama, opera and music. The whole city is used as a stage.
- Location: Dubrovnik
- Official website: www.dubrovnik-festival.hr

4. Eurokaz [Euroindicator]

- For the first time took place in 1987.
- It takes place once a year.

- The festival program is not genre limited, plays, dance, performance and related arts are included.
- Apart from the guest performances from abroad, Eurokaz shows a Croatian scene, independent and institutionalized, highlighting the innovative theatrical ways of expression..
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.eurokaz.hr

5. FAKI – Festival alternativnog kazališnog izričaja [Alternative Means of Theatrical Expression]

- For the first time took place in...?
- It takes place once a year in the organization of Attack! association.
- The program focuses on theatrical groups and artists that is difficult to assign to the already existing theatrical currents, type of theatre or movement.
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.attack.hr/faki

6. Festival glumca [Actors' Festival]

- For the first time took place in 1994.
- Takes place once a year in the organization of Hrvatsko društvo dramskih umjetnika association [Croatian Drama Association]
- Actors' Festival is a national festival of actor's creation that took place in previous year as a part of monodrama, small-audience theatre and more broad forms.
- The festival has a competition's characteristics.
- Location: gradovi Vukovarsko-srijemske županije, svake godine u drugom gradu
- Official website: www.hddu.hr

7. Festival svjetskog cirkusa [The World Circus Festival]

- For the first time took place in 2005.
- Takes place once a year in the organization of Mala performerska scena [Small Scene of Performing]
- The Program's bases on a modern dramaturgic usage of circus art in the context of theatre and a new approach to the circus as an artistic phenomena.
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.cirkus.hr

8. Festival plesa i neverbalnog kazališta Svetivinčenat [The Festival of Dance and of a Nonverbal Theatre Svetivinčenat]

- For the first time took place in 2000.
- Takes place once a year in the organization of an association Zagrebački plesni ansambl [Dance Association in Zagreb]
- The festival program consists of dance, street theatre, cirrus and artistic installations and Dance works hops lead by Croatian and foreign creators.
- The Festival consists not only of education and presentation, but also production („artists in residence“ and by coproduction with particular institutes and theatre groups)
- Location: Svetivinčenat
- Official website: www.svetivincenatfestival.com

9. Festival svjetskog kazališta [The Festival of World Theatre]

- For the first time took place in...?
- Takes place once a year.

- The program focuses on the best and the most innovative world theatrical creations.
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.zagrebtheatrefestival.hr

10. Gavelline večeri [„Gavell’s“ Evenings]

- For the first time took place in 1973, and in 1991 was suspended due to the war.
- It was re-launched in 2005.
- Takes place once a year In the organization of the theatre Gradskog dramskog kazališta „Gavella“ [Municipal Drama Theatre „Gavella“].
- The program focuses on the best and the most innovative local theatrical creations.
- The festival has a competition’s characteristics..
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.gavella.hr

11. Glumački festival u Krapini / GFUK [Actor’s Festival in Krapin]

- For the first time took place in 2008
- Takes place once a year .
- The festival’s aim is to present theatrical and musical creations of Croatian theatres and troupes.
- Location: Krapina
- Official website: www.gfuk.hr

12. Glumci u Zagvozdju [Aktorzy w Zagwoździu]

- For the first time took place in 1997.
- Takes place once a year.
- The festival’s program consists of plays, concerts, folk performances, exhibitions and promotion.
- Popularity of the festival in Zagwoźdz was a reason of changing the main square’s name to the Actor’ Square.
- Location: Zagvozd

13. Kamovfest [Festival Kamov]

- For the first time took place in 2010.
- Takes place once a year in the organization of the theatre Hrvatsko narodno kazalište Ivana pl. Zajca u Rijeci [Croatian National Theatre Ivan pl. Zajca]
- The program focuses on the artistic legacy of Jank Polić Kamov
- Location: Rijeka
- Official website: www.hnk-zajc.hr

14. Mali Marulić [Small Marulić]

- For the first time took place in 2008.
- Takes place once a year in the organization of the theatre Gradsko kazalište lutaka [Municipal Doll Theatre Rijeka], as a part of manifest of Marulićevi dani [Marulici’s Days].
- The festival’s program presents the scope of the best Croatian plays’ adaptation of Croatian works for children .
- The festival has a competition’s characteristics.
- The festival has also a competition for the best drama work for the doll and children’s theatres
- Location : Split

15. Marulićevi dani [Marulici's Days]

- For the first time took place in 1991.
- Takes place once a year.
- The program is focused on Croatian drama staged by Professional theatres in Croatia and abroad.
- The festival has a competition's characteristics.
- Apart from drama it also consists of scientific and literary program.
- At the beginning of the festival the laureates of Marin Držići award are chosen. It is an award given by the Ministry of Culture for the best drama of a previous year.
- Location: Split
- Official website: www.hnk-split.hr

16. Međunarodni dječji festival Šibenik [International Festival Children's Šibenik]

- For the first time took place in 1958.
- Takes place once a year.
- The festival's program combines professional and amateur creations, focusing on three domains: yearly overview of teams from Croatia and abroad, children's workshops, symposium organization with creative art and other aspects in bringing up children
- Location: Šibenik
- Official website: www.mdf-sibenik.com

17. Međunarodni festival malih scena [International Festival of Small Scenes]

- For the first time took place in 1994.
- Takes place once a year.
- The initial idea of this festival was to invite the best Croatian creations of small-audience theatres that were created in the production of Croatian institutionalized and independent theatres; since 1999 the program includes also foreign plays.
- The festival has a competition's characteristics.
- Location: Rijeka
- Official website: www.theatrefestival-rijeka.hr

18. Međunarodni kazališni festival mladih [International Theatre Festival of Youth]

- For the first time took place in 1996.
- Takes place once a year.
- The festival is educational and presentational, its program does not have previously prepared plays, it focuses on the presentation of theatre and dance workshops.
- Since 2008 the Festival consists of two parts: Pulski forum [Pulski's Forum] and Ljetna škola plesa [Summer School of Dance]
- Location: Pula
- Official website: www.ink.hr

19. Naj, naj, naj festival [The most, most, most Festival]

- For the first time took place in 2001.
- Takes place once a year in the organization of the theatre Gradsko kazalište Žar ptica [Municipal Theatre „Fenix“].
- Since 2007 it has been international.
- The program consists of the best plays for children from the professional theatres from Croatia and abroad.
- The festival has a competition's characteristics.

- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.zar-ptica.hr

20. Osječko ljeto kulture [Culture Summer in Osijek]

- For the first time took place in 2001.
- Takes place once a year.
- Osječko ljeto kulture is a cultural manifestation that focuses on theatre, music, literature and art.
- Location: Osijek
- Official website: <http://ljetokulture.osijek.hr>

21. PIF / Pupteatra internacia festivalo [Pupteatra internacia festivalo]

- For the first time took place in 1967.
- Takes place once a year.
- The festival's program focuses on Croatian and foreign plays of doll theatres for children and adults.
- The festival has a competition's characteristics, jury consists of two groups: children's and international jury of specialists.
- Presentation of UNIMy PIF was included into the European Festival Network
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.stkpula.hr/pif-festival/

22. Platforma mladih koreografa [Young Choreographer's Platform]

- For the first time took place in 1999.
- Takes place once a year.
- The festival's program consists of Dance shows, workshops, lectures, discussions, exhibitions, installations and round tables.
- The Festival brings together Croatian and foreign choreographers and dancers.
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.tala.hr

23. Queer Zagreb [Queer Zagreb]

- For the first time took place in 2003.
- Takes place once a year.
- The festival's program consists of theatre, film, art and multimedia.
- Considered as the most queer festival in Southern-East Europe, brings together trends of contemporary theatre production, especially inspired by new and unconventional aesthetics.
- The festival has also its own theatre productions.
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.queerzagreb.org

24. Splitsko ljeto [Splick's Summer]

- For the first time took place in 1954.
- Takes place once a year in the organisation of the theatre Hrvatsko narodno kazalište in Split [Croatian national Theatre].
- Splitsko ljeto is a traditional summer festival of opera, drama, dance and music.
- Apart from its own productions, the festival hosts many musical, stage and dance performance from Croatia and abroad.
- Location: Split
- Official website: www.splitsko-ljeto.hr

25. Street Art Festival [Street Art Festival]

- For the first time took place in 2001.
- Takes place once a year.
- The festival's program brings together all of the forms of artistic expression from musical and stage performances, art projects to different acrobatics on the street and performances.
- In the festival theatre troupes, Dance groups, musicians, jugglers, performers, artists and others from Croatia and abroad.
- Location: Poreč
- Official website: www.street-art-festival.com

26. TEST! [TEST!]

- For the first time took place in 2001.
- Takes place once a year.
- TEST a festival of student' theatre and performance art, brings together local and foreign student's Project.
- Apart from presentations, there are also workshops.
- Test! Is a member of international university theatre association AITU.
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.test.hr

27. Tjedan suvremenog plesa [Contemporary Dance Week]

- For the first time took place in 1981.
- Takes place once a year in the organisation of the Institut za pokret i ples [Institute of Dance and Movement].
- The festival's program consists of the most recent Dance performances of Croatian and foreign artists.
- The festival spread also outside of Zagreb and often has guest performances with festival's program in Zadr, Rijec and Karlovac.
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.danceweekfestival.com

28. Zadar Snova [Zadar of Dreams]

- For the first time took place in 1997.
- Takes place once a year.
- Zadar snova is a multimedia project of new theatre, modern dance and music, performance, artistic actions and installations.
- Location: Zadar
- Official website: www.zadarsnova.hr

29. Zlatni lav [Golden Lion]

- For the first time took place in 2000.
- Takes place once a year.
- Zlatni lav is an international small-audience theatre festival, based on the idea of *triangulum-convivenza* three nations neighbouring with each other: Croatian, Slovenian and Italian.
- In the festival performances from different countries of the region also take part.
- Apart from the performances the festival organises round tables about the performances. A separate part consists of open space plays for children.
- Location: Umag
- Official website: www.zlatni-lav.hr

30. Revija lutkarskih kazališta Rijeka [Doll Theatre Overview Rijeka]

- For the first time took place in 1996.
- Takes place once a year in the organisation of the theatre Gradsko kazalište lutaka Rijeka [Municipal Doll Theatre Rijeka] and department Odjeo gradske uprave za kulturu grada Rijeke [Department of the City Council of Rijeka].
- The festival has international characteristics.
- Location: Rijeka
- Official website: www.gkl-rijeka.hr

31. Riječke ljetne noći [Summer Nights in Rijece]

- For the first time took place in 2004.
- Takes place once a year in the organization of the theatre HNK Ivana pl. Zajca. [Croatian National Theatre Ivan pl. Zajc]
- The festival's program consists of concerts, plays, and Rother cultural events.
- Apart from guest performances Riječke presents their own theatre production.
- Location: Rijeka
- Official website: www.rijeckeljetnenoci.com

32. Festival ASSITEJ [Association Internationale du Théâtre pour l'Enfance et la Jeunesse]

- For the first time took place in 2001.
- Takes place once a year.
- Festival Assitej is a festival of theatres for youth and children , in which the member theatres of ASSITEJ local and from abroad take part.
- The festival has a competition's characteristics.
- Location: Čakovec
- Official website: www.assitej.hr

A contemporary dance scene**1. General characteristics/ data**

- 1) The situation of a contemporary dance is different and more difficult as having sixty years of tradition it is realized outside of institutions.
- 2) According to law dance scene consists of units, artistic organizations, civic associations.
- 3) The only institution in Croatia that takes care of dance is the Contemporary Dance School of Any Maletić in Zagreb.
- 4) On the 26th of October 2009 Zagrebački plesni centar [Dance Centre In Zagreb] was opened, it is the first public facility opened for dance but it does not have a public institution statute.

Dancers are associated in two organizations: Udruga profesionalnih plesnih umjetnika PULS (www.uppu-puls.hr) [Professional Dance Artists Association] and Udruga plesnih umjetnika Hrvatske (www.upuh.hr) [Artist Dancers Association of Croatia] with an division in Rijeka.

According to the members of both organizations, presently 204 dancer artists are active.

Dancers and choreographers with a independent artist statute are members of a paramount trade organization Hrvatska zajednica samostalnih umjetnika (www.hzs.hr) [Croatian Association of Independent Artists].

There is no dance theatre In Croatia. Dance shows take place in already existing cultural institutions – theatres and culture centres or in alternative spaces

In most cases artists are obliged to pay for the usage of space for their shows, they use program funds for that.

Dance scene as an independent scene has only program funding, as opposed to theatres that have a public institution statute and infrastructure so their staff receives salary that is included in a budget plan.

In Croatia three dance festivals take place every year: Tjedan suvremenog plesa [Contemporary Dance Week], Festival plesa i neverbalnog kazališta Svetivinčenat [Dance and Nonverbal Theatre Festival Svetivinčenat] i Platforma mladih koreografa [Young Choreographer's Platform].

There is no Dance Academy in Croatia, no dance college, therefore dancers and choreographers get their education abroad.

The Ministry of Culture along with the Ministry of Science, Education and Sport initiated opening of a school Preddiplomsko sveučilišno studijo *Suvremeni ples i Baletna pedagogija* [Pre-diploma Higher Level Study Centre *Contemporary Dance and Ballet Pedagogy*], that would become a part of a university Akademija dramske umjetnosti in Zagreb [Theatre Academy]. However, considering the process of setting up a new subject and a lack of financial support, the date of making this project come to life is unknown.

2. Surveys– zagreb 2005 -2007

In 2008 UPUH – Udruga plesnih umjetnika Hrvatske [Dance Artists' Association In Croatia] published a brochure based on their own surveys, in which 18 artistic organizations in Zagreb took part in and they were a stem of modern dance scene in Croatia. Surveys were concerned with the years 2005 – 2007, and their aim was to analyze and to describe the position of the modern dance scene in Zagreb and problems that it deals with. The data for the brochure were prepared by Davor Mišković.

Below are a few of conclusions:

1. *The stem of a dance scene consists of artists that everyday continually take care of different things - artistic and organizational – and a modern dance is a key point of their professional life. This stem of the mentioned 18 organizations (that took part in the survey) consists of 127 people.*

2. *None of the dance artists is employed in the provided organizations due to lack of stability in remuneration and long term employment contracts.*

3. *Authors/organizers that receive means to realize their programs stop being solely creators of artistic projects, they become organizers and producers of their own production. They take care of marketing, administration, distribution and postproduction of a project.*

4. *Modern dance is usually a lodger of cultural institutions. This highly messy approach is enforced by the personalities of people involved. This is why it is hard to specify any sort of regularity or model that would describe key points of specificity of dance scene lodging.*

5. *Dance scene in Zagreb lacks of space for performing but also work, rehearsals and trainings. Only 4 out of 18 surveyed organizations has their own office.*

6. *The city of Zagreb provides about 3,3 million of Croatian kuna per year (2007), financing the production of modern dance, dance manifests and educational programs.*

7. *Number of staged dance acts in 2005-2007 in the city of Zagreb rose 1,9% , guest performances in Croatia 6,7% , and guest performances abroad 62,2%.*

8. *Dance scene in Zagreb is above 50 or so of accomplished artistic and educational projects, above 200 different public shows of Croatian production staged and above 30 plays of artists and dance groups from abroad.*

9. *Dance organizations in Zagreb provide above 50 local and foreign plays.*

The situation of dance scene has not change much since 2007. Although a center Zagrebački plesni centar [Dance Centre in Zagreb] was opened, as it was not modelled after the public institutions, in

the state budget there are no means for supporting it. For the moment present ZPC expenses are covered from a budget plan provided for the institute Hrvatski institut za ples i pokret [Croatian Dance and Movement Institute] and from their own means from the program, income from the ticket sales, and workshops organized for the residents from all age groups. Modern dance is still a subtenant of cultural institutions, in most cases it pays also for the room rental for its performances even though the Culture Department of the city of Zagreb suggested not to take money from the dancers for renting out the stage. Only in some cases it was possible to find a solution to the problem of the lack of rooms. Zagrebačko kazalište mladih [Youth theatre In Zagreb] lets in their rooms Zagrebački plesni ansambl [Dance Group in Zagreb] and Studio za suvremeni ples [Modern Dance Studio]

enabling them to have rehearsals and trainings and a number of performances. Istarsko narodno kazalište u Puli [National Theatre in Istre – Pula division] for two years is a co-producer of its own dance performances and as an institution, it opens doors for the modern dance. Teatar ITD [ITD. Theatre] – theatre that belongs to the univerity Zagrebačko sveučilište [University in Zagreb] – produces one dance performance a year, and in its repertoire has shows of different production.

Plesni centar Tala [Tala Dance Centre] received from the City of Zagreb a room to use, but there was a lack of means for adopting it for the dance needs. The earlier mentioned centre Zagrebački plesni centar [Dance Centre in Zagreb] Has three studios that are being used every day from 9 to 5 by professional dancers – rehearsals, productions, searching for new expressions. One studio has been equipped for the needs of smaller plays. In reality it is a space for public presentation of dance searching of new means of expression. However, due to a lack of local infrastructure it is used as stage. The lack of spaces and financial means is for artistic dance organizations an encouragement to have a regular co-production with theatres or to unite with each other.

3. Financing of dance art

- In Croatia there is an annual model of financing.
- The means aimed for the production of dance project come from the budget of the Republic of Croatia, budgets of local and administrative district (regional) municipal administration units, to such a degree that would fulfil public demand.
- The means aimed for the production of artistic and educational dance project can come also from the income of their own activity, foundation, sponsors, donations and from other sources that are legal.
- Artistic organizations and associations for citizens participate in competitions and public announcements related to the financing of the program, connected to the public demand in culture, once a year prepared by
 - the Ministry of Culture
 - city/ commune
 - province
- All of the competitions have a project's characteristics.
- Financing and division of the means for specific projects takes place in a following way: a city gives a budget plan that is ratified by the city council. City Department of Education, Culture and Sport distributes the means between respective domains, and a culture council that acts by the city council suggests which project should receive a support and how high it should be. The role of the culture council has an advisory characteristics. The final decision concerning the means distribution is made by the City Department, a person running it or his/her deputies.
- The Ministry of Culture completion takes place in a following way: the Parliament votes in a budget plan, the Ministry of Culture distributes the means between respective domains, and a culture council that acts by the city council suggests which project should receive a support

and how high it should be. The role of the culture council has an advisory characteristics. The final decision concerning the means distribution is made by a director responsible for a specific domain in a given institution or his deputy, it is left to the minister's discretion to decide about the means distribution.

- The criteria of means distribution are regulated by the regulations setting the criteria.
- The Ministry of Culture finances the art of dance by the four equal sources of financing: music, stage music and dance activity, international cultural co-operation, project 'Initiative in culture' and a project 'Culture 2007-2013' as a part of EU program.
- In 2010 the Ministry of Culture financed 51 dance programs (plays, education, festivals, guest performances) for 1.324.300,00 Croatian kuna.
- The funds for single programs differ depending on the program's character – allocations for plays, education and guest performances are between 5 thousand and 40 thousand Croatian kuna. For the festivals 80 thousand and 300 thousand Croatian kuna is allocated.
- The Municipal Department of Education , Culture and Sport in 2010 financed 31 dance programs (dancing projects, plays and performances) for 2 075 thousand Croatian kuna and two dance festivals for 1 645 thousand Croatian kuna.

4. A list of the most active artistic organizations and public associations that take care of dance, dance pedagogy and education

1. ANSAMBL APSOLUTNOG POKRETA [ABSOLUTE MOVEMENT GROUP]
2. ANSAMBL PLESNOG STUDIJA „VEM“ (www.vesna-mimica.iz.hr) [DANCE STUDIO GROUP „VEM”]
3. ANSAMBL SLOBODNOG PLESA LIBERDANCE (www.liberdance.hr) [FREE DANCE GROUP LIBERDANCE]
4. BADco. (www.badco.hr)
5. dance_lab collective
6. EKS-scena / Eksperimentalna slobodna scena [INDEPENDENT EXPERIMENTAL SCENE]
7. Hrvatski institut za pokret i ples (www.danceincroatia.com) [Croatian Institute of Movement and Dance]
8. Studio za suvremeni ples (www.ssp.hr) [Modern Dance Studio]
9. kombinirane operacije (www.kombiniraneoperacije.hr) [medley operations]
10. Profesionalni plesni ansambl Kelkope (www.kelkope.hr) [Professional Dance Group Kelkope]
11. llinkt! Plesni projekt [llinkt! Dance Project]
12. MARMOT – Autorska Radionica Međudnosa Objektivna i tijela [MARMOT – Author's Workshop of Lens and Body Relation]
13. OUUR
14. Plesni centar TALA (www.tala.hr) [Dance centre TALA]
15. KIK MELONE
16. Sodaberg (www.sodaberg.hr)
17. Zagrebački plesni ansambl (www.zagrebackiplesniansambl.hr) [Dance Group in Zagreb]
18. Trafik (www.trafik.hr)
19. HISTERIA NOVA (www.histeria-nova.hr) [NEW HYSTERIA]
20. ZADARSKI PLESNI ANSAMBL [Dance Group in Zadr]

5. Dance festival list

1. TJEDAN SUVREMENOG PLESA [**MODERN DANCE WEEK**]
 - For the first time took place in 1981.

- Takes place once a year in the organization of the institute Institut za pokret i ples [Dance and Movement Institute].
- The festival's program consists of the newest dance plays of Croatian and foreign artists.
- The festival developed beyond the city of Zagreb and often does guest performances with the plays from the festival program in Zadar, Rijeka and Karlovac.
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.danceweekfestival.com

2. FESTIVAL PLESNOG I NEVERBALNOG KAZALIŠTA SVETIVINČENAT [**FESTIVAL OF DANCE AND NON VERBAL THEATRE SVETIVINČENAT**]

- For the first time took place in 2000.
- Takes place once a year in the organization of the group Zagrebački plesni ansambl [Dance Group in Zagreb]
- The festival's program consists of Dance performances, street theatre, cirrus show, art. installations and dance workshops run by the Croatian and foreign artists.
- The festival does not only take care of education and presentation but also its own production (according to the rule „artists in residence“ and by a co-production with specific institutes and artistic groups)
- Location: Svetivinčenat
- Official website: www.svetivincenatfestival.com

3. PLATFORMA MLADIH KOREOGRAFA [**PLATFORMA MŁODYCH CHOREOGRAFÓW**]

- For the first time took place in 1999.
- Takes place once a year.
- The festival's program consists of the Dance performances, workshops, lectures, discussions, exhibitions, installations and round tables.
- The festival brings together Croatian and foreign choreographers and dancers.
- During the festival the following awards are given: Audience Award, annual trade award UPUH-a and an award for the best developing choreographer during the evening competition BREAK A LEG
- Location: Zagreb
- Official website: www.tala.hr



Czech Republic

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Jakub Škorpiš, theatre critic, Svet e Divadlo, Czech Republic, skorpilj@upcmil.cz

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

The change of the system brought the theatres independency. After forty years of central planning, managing and censorship was to give the theatres (and the culture) understood as primary objective. So first of all many of the theatres that has been part of bigger theatre entities (such as state theatres, National Theatres etc.) became independent subjects. That was followed by the privatisation: firstly – in 1990 – the civic associations were given the right to establish new theatres/companies and in 1992 the “business” was finally opened also for natural and legal persons. So through all the nineties we saw hectic theatre activity – first in form of many mainly musical productions, but soon also a lot of private and independent theatres and companies appeared. At the same time was also established a number of independent theatre associations (Actors Union, Association of Regional Theatres, Theatre Community a.o.) and private talent and literary agencies.

In term of management, financing and organizational structure, the nineties brought in particular decentralization and disestablishment. Following the disappearance of old structure of the state organization was responsibility for the culture moved from the central government to the local governments and the cities. (The tendency confirmed in 2000 by the law dividing the Czech republic into new regions, where the responsibility for financing culture is clearly stated.) The state became establisher and direct subsidizer of only National Theatre in Prague, State Opera and Laterna Magica. It was planned, and declared in various governmental documents, to transform all the theatres into public organizations or publicly beneficiary organizations, but this plan was never turned into the law, so until today this process, know as “transformation of subsidiary organizations” is not finished. The existence of “subsidiary organizations” is generally understood as un-systematic, as those organizations still suck up majority of public subsidy for the culture and are even the source of various controversies as some private theatres are complaining against un-fair competition: some subsidized theatres are given public money even though their repertoire is quite similar to the private theatres.

Disestablishment and privatization of the theatres brought of course fears of collapse of the theatre network. The truth nevertheless is that closed was only one theatre in Prague and two in regions. The situation however remains tense as there is constant danger of closing some regional theatres, or – quite contrary to tendencies in 1990s – merge some subject to bigger entities. The reason is of course repeating financial crisis and also falling importance of the culture in the eyes of political representation.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

The last theatre law was in Czech republic adopted in 1978. After 1989 was that law couple of times amended, mainly in the sense of abolishing central planning and management, privatization of the thea-

tres and opening the system to new private and independent activities. In 1995 was that law definitely abolished and theatre is from that time on following only quite general rules of The Trades Licensing Act (*Živnostenský zákon*).

The non-existence of the theatre law is the result of discussions from early 1990s, when two main tendencies were considered: centralizing and giving the state more responsibility and also the power to control theatre system and one seeing future in more decentralization and independence of the theatres. Winning was the model, where the state only creates basic conditions allowing the theatres to function, but does not otherwise afflict the system (by – for example – constructing and maintaining some kind of theatre network) and liberally leaves the activity, or choice, on citizens.

The only governmental “programs” are therefore not very regularly announced or updated conceptions, documents and “Programs of state cultural policy”. The last such document is “State cultural policy for years 2009-2014” from year 2008. Those documents and conceptions were in time of their preparation open to public discussion and commenting, as well as prepared and not yet realized law establishing “public, or publicly beneficiary, organizations.”

Parallel to the official, governmental activities, there was number of non-governmental initiatives, mainly thanks to newly established independent professional associations. Especially active on this field were the Theatre Institute and theatre magazine *Svět a divadlo*: their collaboration brought as yet most complex document named “The concept of the state financing of professional theatres”. Its main authors are Josef Herman and Karel Král and it proposes the instrument of “continuous, multi-annual, annual and onetime grants” as well as clear and transparent grant system based of classification on points, while keeping some space for individual evaluating of artistic qualities of the project. Even though the principles of the document were never fully adopted, it serves as a base for progressive change of various grant systems on the state and mainly on the local level. It also more or less corresponds the recommendation of EU commission, which was recently deciding in the suit between private theatre TaFantastika and City of Prague in the matter “un-faire competition” created by the Prague’s grant system.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

As mentioned theatre law in 1992, opened the system for civic associations, private as well as legal persons and natural persons and allowed the privatisation of theatres.

Main wave of privatisations took place in nineties, when newly established subjects privatised the theatres or when also many theatre personalities (actors and directors) active before 1989 gained theatres for themselves. More frequent than privatisation of existing public theatres to the “private hands” was renewal of unused theatre spaces.

Specific is the situation in Prague. Town council of Prague decided in 2000 about so-called “transformation of theatre network in Prague”. This decision was based on public discussion and extensive analysis prepared by The Theatre Institute, which defined the main principles of the transformation as well as basic principles of Prague’s cultural policy. The main purpose of the transformation was to unbind the theatres from the position of “subsidiary theatres”, give them new legal statute, while keeping non-profit character, and independence on any decision of their former establisher. In the “first wave” were transformed Theatre Archa, Činoherní klub (both are now o.p.s. = “publicly beneficiary organizations”), Semafor (now s.r.o. = Ltd “limited liability company”; this is one of the cases when the legendary actor and director – Jiří Suchý – practically privatized, while keeping in this case remaining non-profit, the theater which he founded during the communist era) and Divadlo Komedie, which also is s.r.o. and where the new management was established on the base of competition. The city of Prague wants to keep only one theatre (traditional drama scene Divadlo na Vinohradech) and so next wave of transformation was to follow almost immediately, but due to many reason was not realized and is said to take place in 2011.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

The rules for new initiatives are same as for existing ones. There is no special program for their support. Their chances are equal to the existing activities, even though it is generally understood that grant committees should take special care for them.

Everybody can apply for the one-year grant, both natural and legal persons. Preferred is the legal form of civic society, which by the law guarantees the non-profit character of the organization. Only those applying in Prague for multi-annual grants must exist and work for at least four years.

No case of nationalization has appeared after 1989.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

The directors of state established theatres (National Theatre, State opera) are nominated by the minister of culture. He can regard the opinion of his committees and boards of respective institutions, but the final decision is only on him. Those directors are appointed for 5 years.

The directors of so called “subsidiary theatres” (theatres established by the local governments and cities) are chosen in competition and then have contracts. Its length varies. Usually is 4 or 5 years, but can also be unlimited (as is situation in Prague as result of expected “second wave of transformation”). The contracts are often automatically prolonged (after presenting the establisher with so conception or plans for next years), which – of course and unfortunately – depends on how good are the relationships between the director and local government.

The directors of non-profit, or theatres as “publicly beneficiary organization” are chosen by their “board of trustees” either after the competition or in plain nomination.

Section B.

Number of theatres

all data refer to 2009 as given by statistical reports gathered by Czech Ministry of Culture (see <http://www.nipos-mk.cz/?cat=126>). This is the only reliable source of statistical information in the Czech Republic. It has however its limits as it depends on the good will of the subjects to provide such data. Esp. civic associations (often independent and non-professional theatres and companies) and entrepreneurs are not always willing to do so.

In the statistics there is only 38 civic associations and 10 generally beneficial companies, but there has been 115 subjects applying for theatre grants in the City of Prague.

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

- according to Ministry of Culture: 198 subjects (including stagions), 146 ensembles and 254 permanent scenes and spaces
- qualified guess is that there is 300-400 subjects.
- Directory of “theatres and companies” prepared by Theatre Institute has 630 entries, including private agencies and theatre (spaces) that only buy (host) performances and neither have their own company or produce

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- institutions of the central government
 - 3 – established by Ministry of Culture –
 - 4 – established by Ministry of education, Youth and Physical Training – (basically theatres at university-level art schools)
- institutions of regional governments – 2
- institutions of municipal governments – 34
- non-governmental organisations – 48 (see note above)
- private enterprises – entrepreneurs – 30
- entrepreneurial subjects – 16

Are there any mixed forms? NO

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

NOTE: there is no such statistic available in the Czech Republic (Ministry of Culture only presents “number of production by the genre” – see below).

Following data are based on Directory of Czech Theatres and Companies prepared by Theatre Institute and should therefore be considered as only approximate as many subjects are listed in various categories.

- dramatic theatres – 386
- puppet theatres – 106
- musical theatres – 72
- opera theatres – 56
- dance theatres (movement, pantomime) – 97 = dance
 - 38 = pantomime
 - 38 = ballet
 - 35 = movement
- impresario theatres – (no data available)
- arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones) – (no data available)
- other
 - black theatre – 16
 - operetta – 28
 - alternative theatres – 126
 - street theatres – 31
 - new circus – 8
 - for children and youth – 202

number of productions in 2009 – total (premieres)

- total – 2360 (612)
- plays – 1160 (335)
- operas – 181 (49)
- operettas – 63 (18)
- musicals – 102 (23)
- ballets – 89 (21)
- dance and physical theatre – 96 (34)
- puppet theatre – 393 (60)
- literary evenings – 23 (14)

- multimedia shows – 21 (6)
- other – 232 (52)

*of which for children and young people – 791 (160)

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

Businesses and private sponsors are free to finance whomever they want. There are no rules in this “field”. They can support private or non-profit theatres and they can also give money to the state theatres such as National Theatre. Big companies tend not to support theatre at all, as there is limited (in comparison to the sport) chance on self-presentation. The situation changes a little on the local level, where local (city-based etc.) companies (or local branches of big companies) support some activities such as festivals or city theatres. Their support to independent theatre activities is however very limited.

central and local governments: The majority of funds is distributed through grant system. On central level is limited to non-profit organizations by the statute of the government. The situation is same on the regional level, but some cities, esp. City of Prague are more open to give the money to private (commercial) theatres as well.

Grant system in Prague (which is seen as example to other cities) is constantly changing and in 2008 there even was quite radical attempt to change the system, by implementing so called “Subsidy on sold ticket”, which meant, that more tickets the theatre sells the more money it gets. Even though it was then only one of four “pillars” of the grant system, it was heavily criticised (leading to demonstrations before Town Hall) as it took money from the project subsidies and handicapped non-profit and alternative theatres. After the criticisms, the “subsidy on sold ticket” was cancelled and the grant system reworked once again. The majority of supported subjects are non-profit, but there are still two entrepreneur theatres remaining in the system.

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

NOTE: Latest available official data are from 2008 (source: Ministry of Culture). The 2009 data are unofficial and result of my compilation of various sources. figures in thousands

- amount of general subsidies –
 - 2008: 3.158.851
 - 2009: 3.359.907
- amount of project subsidies –
 - the statistics do not differ between general/project subsidies so such data is obtainable

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government-
 - 2008: 26%
 - 2009: 23%
- funding from local governments
 - 2008: 74%
 - 2009: 77%
- own revenue of theatres

comment: the data above refer to percentage share of subsidies from central/local government on the total amount on subsidies on the theatre in each year.

Should you be interested in percentage share of subsidies on culture on total public spending in Czech republic, the data from 2008 (again: only available at the moment) are:

- total (in thousands) – 24.470.086
- central government – 9.203.834 = 37,6%
- local governments – 12.666.252 = 62,4%
- total spending on culture in relation to GNP in 2009 was 0,68%

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

The theatres and dance institutions are preparing the budget on year basis (so called fiscal year equal to one calendar year. That is subject of frequent discussions as the theatres would rather be budgeting by “theatre seasons”).

Public financing of the theatres is also working on one-year basis. The only exception is the City of Prague, which is also giving multi-annual grants (usually 4, sometimes 2 year). That the Ministry of Culture is unable (not willing) to give multi-annual is also subject to frequent criticism.

Evaluation:

All institutions getting any form of subsidy from public sources are obliged to present statement of account at the time given in subsidy agreement. The horizon for this is usually 30 days after the end of the project/ year. Those reports (or their digest/results) are also presented to grant committees any next time the subject applies for the subsidy.

Theatres established by the state and local governments (or theatres as “subsidiary organizations”) are also obliged to subject to third-party financial audit, should the establisher wish.

“Subsidiary organizations” and the subjects receiving bigger subsidies are also obliged to prepare “annual reports” a present them publicly on their web pages. Their accounting should also be open to control at any time.

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

- financial indebtedness: all publicly financed (non-profit) subjects are obliged to keep their accounting balanced and are therefore required to either to match their projects to the sources available and get another sources of financing it “Established theatres” although sometimes produce a debt, which is then covered by their establisher. The grants usually cover 70% of the budget. According to the statistics, own revenue of “subsidiary theatres” is between 28 and 30%.
- actual indebtedness: it is common in theatres established by the central or local government, that their “establishers” do feel, that when they give the money, they should also have some influence on what is happening in the theatre. Especially local governments are “famous” for that. From time to time such conflicts emerge and known are cases when the director was forced to change the artistic management.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

- most important sources on the European level are Culture and International Visegrad Fund. In 1990s was also very important Open Society Fund.

- some festivals are also supported from EU Funds such as European Territorial Cooperation
- projects realized in the Czech republic are also supported by the Cultural Centres of respective countries (such as British Council, Institut Francais, Goethe Institute, Instytut Polski etc.)
- Czech project realised abroad are supported by Czech Centres and by the Ministry of foreign affairs and (scarcely in the case of theatre/dance projects).
- The key role also has various public foundations, especially State fund for Culture (which is unfortunately operating with very limited resources), Nadace Český literární fond (Czech Literary Fund), Nadace Život umělce (Life of an Artis Foundation), Czech-German Fund of Future, and European Cultural Foundation.

There are also private foundations, which are nevertheless operating mostly on the local, or very specialized level (even though it might be programs of big national companies, such as main producer of electricity ČEZ, black coal mines OKD, Komerční banka or tobacco producer Phillip Morris). The financial crisis (or – more rather – the excuse of it) lead to more limiting of this type of sources.

- Direct sponsorship is limited to only small amounts (less than 10% of project/performance budget). In the case of big companies it often has form of paid advertisements, smaller companies prefer – besides advertisements – in-kind form of sponsorship.
- Personal sponsorship is scarce in the Czech republic and also limited to small sums. The tradition of patronage has been interrupted by the communist period and there is also quite complicated tax law that makes it uneasy to direct certain amount (traditional 2%) of the taxes to selected non-profit organization

Section D. Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

- 2007 – 582
- 2008 – 628
- 2009 – 612

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

- 2007 – 25.785
- 2008 – 25.703
- 2009 – 26.921

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009) in thousands

- 2007 – 5.448
- 2008 – 5.606
- 2009 – 5.657

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

depending on the scale of the project and the type of theatre/company it is between 40.000 and 200.000 CZK

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

between 20.000 and 50.000 CZK

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location

- there is 15 international festivals in total.

The biggest and most important are International festival Divadlo in Pilsen, Festival of European Regions in Hradec Kralové, Divadelní svět (Theatre World) in Brno, Tanec (Dance) Praha, Letní Letná (New Circus festival in Prague) and 4+4 Days festival based in Prague. Theatre Without Borders at Český Těšín. Very interesting is also annual showcase of the German speaking theatre at Prague and Setkání/Encounter in Brno, which is the festival of theatre schools. There is also one international puppet theatre festival, which switches places between Liberec (Mateřinka – focused on children) and Plzeň (Skupova Plzeň – adults). Prague also host annual Prague Fringe Festival.

- there is 17 major national festivals.

excluded are “showcases” of the theatres and minor festivals of non-professional theatre. Majority of the festivals take place in Prague and big cities like Brno, Ostrava, Plzeň, Zlín, Olomouc and Hradec Králové, that means “regional capitols”.

Section E.

International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

As mentioned above the most important is program Culture, which has its office in Theatre Institute in Prague.

As also mentioned, some of the festival organisers are able to get money from Structural Funds of EU, esp. European Territorial Cooperation and its Interreg programs and programs of cross-boarder cooperation.

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

International theatre/dance/performing arts centres operating in Czech republic are:

IETM, OISTAT, AITA/IATA, ASITEJ, SPACE, CID, UNIMA, CIRCOSTRADA, FIT

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

Especially younger generation is used to exceed national scope in their work and often – and quite naturally – prepare the project with foreign collaborators. Advantage of such projects is that they can use much more develop funding network in other European countries.

Notable organizations preparing their project in international co production are Theatre Archa, festival 4+4 days and Tanec Praha. Their direct partners are foreign theatres/companies or performing arts centres and the projects are co-financed by cultural organizations of respective countries.

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

see paragraph 18.

Sources:

- Ministry of Culture – www.mkcr.cz
- The National Information and Consulting Centre for Culture (NIPOS) – www.nipos-mk.cz
- Financing of the Culture from public sources 2001-2009 – <http://www.nipos-mk.cz/?p=10342>
- Statistics on culture 2009 – <http://www.nipos-mk.cz/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/Statistics-on-culture-2009.pdf>
- Theatre Institute – www.divadelni-ustav.cz
- Ministry of Finances – www.mfcr.cz
- Czech Statistical Office – www.czso.cz
- ProCulture – <http://www.proculture.cz/english/>
- Svět a divadlo – www.svetadivadlo.cz
- Bohumil Nekolný a kol : Divadelní systémy a kulturní politika (Theatre systems and cultural policy), Divadelní ústav, 2006 (<http://www.divadlo.cz/box/clanek.asp?id=12180>)
- Stepan S. Simek: Financing of Czech Theatre, 2005 – www.divadlo.cz/box/clanek.asp?id=8641
- Essays on culture 2004 – 2009. Prague: Ministry of Culture, 2009. <http://www.mkcr.cz>
- National Cultural Policy of the Czech Republic 2009 – 2014. Prague: Ministry of Culture, 2009. – <http://www.mkcr.cz/cz/kulturni-politika/statni-kulturni-politika-na-leta-2009-2014-4892/>
- <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/czechia.php>



Georgia

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Levan Khetaguri, performing arts theoretician, Professor, Director of Arts Research
Institute of Ilia State University, Georgia, lkhetaguri@hotmail.com>

SHORT INTRODUCTION

Georgia Area total 69,700 km² and its population is almost 4.5 million,

Capital city Tbilisi, official language Georgian

Ethnic groups 83.8% Georgian, 6.5% Azerbaijani, 5.7% Armenian, 1.5% Russian, 2.5% others

History of Georgia started from ancient times with the kingdoms of Iberia and Kolkhida – I and II millenniums BC. Kingdom of Georgia started from 300 BC, Georgia adopted Christianity as state religion in 337.

For this moment there are in the country 2 autonomic republics, 9 regions, 67 municipalities and 5 self governed cities

First Russian occupation 1801, second 1921 and last occupation with 20% of the territory was in 2008 when Russia straggled Georgia.

History of Georgian Theater takes his history from ancient times. You still could find remains of Greek and later Roman theater presence in artifacts. You still could see ruins of amphitheaters in Uplistsikhe /city in the caves close from city Gori/ and Gonio /Roman fort close from city Batumi/, different theatrical masks in Dmanisi and other places.

Georgia was rich with ritualistic, so call sacred theatre forms, some of them you still could follow in mountain part of Georgia, like Svaneti, Khevsureti etc.

In yearly medieval times were popular street theatre forms like Berikaoba and Keenoba, which was performed by amateur and semiprofessionals on a city squares market places and at the villages. This forms was somehow similar as Italian Comedia de L' Arte, using different social masks and improvisation in story and acting. But in few fixed stories were established characters, which were kept through the time through masks and costumes.

First information about professional theatre in Georgia we founded in 1790-ies. It was baroque / French style classicism/ theatre at the Georgian Royal Palace, in Tbilisi, during the King Erekle Second, we know that at the repertoire of the theatre was Jean Racine's plays /particularly Phedre/, which was translated in Georgian language by prince Cholokashvili. All theatre company members were died during the straggling of Tbilisi in 1795 by Agha Mahmad Khan /from Iran/, they take part as worriers in Royal Army to protect the city and country.

First Georgian professional plays appeared in 1820-ies. The stories were historical and patriotic one.

Italian Opera in Tbilisi was opened in 1845, after burning first venue, in 1884 was build one of the beautiful opera venues, which still in the city center, so call Mauritanian style /mix of European and Oriental, with some Sufi elements in decoration/.

First independent Georgian professional drama theatre was established and opened in Tbilisi 1851 by Giorgi Eristavi.

In 1879 by famous Georgian Intellectuals and writers was established Georgian Theatre Society and reopened national theatre, which later was called as Rustaveli national Theatre.

By the citizens it was billed as the remarkable theatre venue for National theatre, one of the beautiful theatre spaces in the country.

In Georgia there was theatre companies in different cities, how history of Georgian theatre mentioned in XIX century, amateurs and professionals performing plays, giving performances of so call live images /live photos/ in cities, villages, private palaces of rich and well-known Georgians.

In XIX century Tbilisi was Caucasian capital of Culture not only for Georgians but already for Armenia and Azerbaijan. First Armenian and Azerbaijanian play writers were citizens of Tbilisi, first plays was written in Tbilisi as well as first professional theatres of Armenia and Azerbaijan before they move to Yerevan or Baku were created and opened in Tbilisi.

At the beginning of XX century Tbilisi was real cultural centre, bridge and crossroad for European and Asian cultures. In Tbilisi was created and developed performing arts education /1918/ through acting courses /Giorgi Jabadari/, movement /Jeanne de Salzmann/, sacred dances /Giorgi Gurdjieff/. Already Georgians who trained or studied in Europe or Russia returned back to create and developed national performing arts.

At the beginning of XX century in Georgia was more than 20 theatres, working on Georgian, Azerbaijanian, Armenian, Russian, English /British Sailors Theatre/, Shadow theatre Karagoz, street theatre companies and artists etc.

In Georgia was published few magazines dedicated to the problems of art and performing arts.

In 1921 Georgia was occupied by Soviet Russia.

During the Soviet time Georgian Theatre was one of the leading performing arts scenes. Many artists and intellectuals was arrested and killed by Soviet KGB.

It was necessary few decades to recover and start again experiments at the theatres.

Few remarkable names of important Georgian directors: Sandro Akhmeteli /arrested in 1935, murdered in 1937/ Kote Marjanishvili, Giorgi Tovstonogov, Dodo Aleksidze, Mikheil Tumanishvili, Archil Chkhartishvili etc.

Several generations of Georgian Theatre directors and actors, play writers and stage designers keeping leading positions again mainly starting from 70-ies, after first repressions which Georgian Theatre faced in 30-ies, when leading artistic forces were arrested and murdered by Soviet KGB.

Last decade of soviet Georgia

In 1980-ies in Georgia was operated 48 theatre companies among them:

- Opera and Ballet Theatres in Tbilisi and Kutaisi – 2,
- Youth theatre /Georgian, Russian, Abkhazian/ – 3
- Puppet theatres /among them, Russian in Tbilisi,/ 8
- Marionette Theatre, 1
- Pantomime theatre 1
- Drama theatres / among them minority theatre: Russian, Armenian, Abkhazian, Osetian / 33

Before this number several amateur theatres /among them Kurdish/.

For each theatre was obligatory at list 6-7 premiers and the total number of the performances during the year was approximately at least 240 performances, in some cases more. As usually theatres was full with audience above 75-80%.

After liberation 1991

In 1991 after liberation, situation in Georgia was changed, first years was critical with civil war, ethnic conflicts, when Russia start new occupation of Georgia and from Georgia with force was separated Abkhazia and South Osetia, which was ended with war in August 2008, when Russia officially occupied 20-25% of Georgian territory.

In 90-ies was long transition, the first years theatres were involved in political life, after was short interval when most of theatres in the country was shut down, because in the country were economi-

cal crises, blockade from Russia, stopping gas and electricity, which was reflected on heavy situation of population limited electricity, collapsed central heating and hot water system.

I fixed these details just to realize that 100% of theatres weren't ready for all this radical changes and they stopped. During the winter theatres count working, because there was no heating at all, light was with special schedule, but already was many unexpected shortcuts. It was impossible to run performances, because very often during the show was shortcut and nobody could tell when light would come back. Only starting from the second part of 90-ies after 1995-96 theatres start to adopted to the new circumstances, most of them starting buying generators for alternative electric power, and starting from the end of 90-ies most of the theatre installed autonomic heating systems for their venues. It was necessary to pass through all the examinations, to become experienced how to behave in the periods of transition and turbulence times, but it really was extraordinary situation.

Starting from 90-ies till long time theatres presented their shows only 1-2 evenings during the week, mostly from Friday includes Sunday. Unfortunately many theatres keep these limited evenings for performing till now.

Exploitation of the big venues became very expensive and not profitable. Few private small theatres with 80-120 seats, which were established after 1997, became more profitable with percentage then big venues.

Dance in Georgia

It's necessary to gave explanation for the dance development in Georgia. For this moment there is strong classical ballet and so call traditional dance or Georgian National Ballet – folk dance which are strongly developed in all country and connected with system of education like folk schools for children's. Georgian dance are teaches to children starting from 5-6 year. With new curricula at the secondary schools in whole country traditional dance became part of obligatory studies like sport lessons at the schools in Georgia.

Unfortunately for this moment there are no modern or contemporary dance groups, time by time was created temporary dance projects with participation of the Netherlands, Germany, and France etc.

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

After collapse of Soviet Union the main structure of the theatres in Georgia was fixed stuff repertoire theatre /52 professional theatres with venues, and several armature companies in different cities of Georgia/. Above 50% of all theatres are located in the capital city Tbilisi.

Theaters were centralized under the theatre department at the ministry of Culture, but same time theatres outside from capital had ownership from local governance too, with local departments of culture. In late 80-ies soviet centralized system slowly was collapsing. First was disappearing censorship, after was taken off long term planning system, artistic councils at the theatres etc. In 90-ies management system of the theatres was old, but with new environment and reality. Theatre governance was theatre Administrative director who expected funds from the state budget to spend them and artistic director, who was a local leader, president at the theatres. At the majority of the theatre was a big number of workshops, actors, assistance team etc – in large theatres all number of stuff around 200 or more persons.

This situation was for decade, before theatres start first reforms.

In 1996 theatres start to adopt contract system /from one to three year/, in general at the majority of the theatres this process was peaceful; in few theatre companies were protests from the actors, without positive results.

1998-99 by the Georgian parliament was adopted a new regulation about theatres, which gave permission to exist all forms of theatres, registered with space, without venue, project based etc. There was a formal debate, without NGO's and independent experts involvement, which means that was semi public debates.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

For this moment wasn't privatization of the theatres, but was created different private theatres in new venues, which was build or reconstructed some spaces.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of "nationalisation" (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

There are no specific rules for fundraising of new initiatives, but during last years there are chances for NGOs and private initiatives to get grants or program funding from Central and municipal authorities.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

In 2004-05 was adopted changes in the theatre law, when was created a position of general managers of the theatres, as the main figure in it, position which is based on open competition and the council created by the ministry of culture after the competition procedure is announcing and approved the general managers for all theatres in the country. In 2005-06 after the first competitions all old theatre administrators were replaced by young new style managers. The new changes make closer Georgian general managers to German theatre "intendants" and make them powerful and more linked with political groups and policy of ministry. On one hand ministry decentralized funding of theatres but centralized managerial stuff of all theaters in the country. But later state changes this and return back to the system of appointing of managers

In capital theatres have general managers and artistic directors separately; in most of the provincial theatres general managers not invited artistic directors, but invited stage directors for single performance directing during the year. There is no time limitation for appointed managers as well as directors or artistic directors; managers and artistic directors could be replaced any time by central and local authorities. This is still tools in the hand of authorities for theatre stuff manipulation.

Unfortunately, till now there is no State Cultural Policy /as published document/ for theatre and dance, as well as no papers for the general cultural policy.

Section B.

Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

In Georgia for this moment registered 58 theatres

Theatre Contact details in Georgia

N	Name of the theatre	Address	General Manager, Artistic Director	Ownership
1	Zakaria Paliashvili Tbilisi Opera and Ballet State Theatre	Tbilisi, Rustaveli ave., 25 www.opera.ge	General Manager David Sakvarelidze +995 77 140000 Artistic Director for Ballet Nino Ananiashvili d.sakvarelidze@opera.ge	Central Government
2	Shota Rustaveli Tbilisi State National Drama Theatre /include three stages/	Tbilisi, Rustaveli ave., 17 www.rustavelitheatre.ge	General Manager Zaal Chikobava +995 77 565796 Artistic Director Robert Sturua PR service elene.baka@rustavelitheatre.ge	Central Government
3	Kote Marjanishvili Tbilisi State Drama Theatre /include three stages/	Tbilisi, Marjanishvili str., 8 www.marjanishvili.ge	General Manager Eka Mazmishvili +995 77 516 850 Artistic Director Levan Tsuladze gofishingfirst@gmail.com	Central Government
4	Nodar Dumbadze State Central Youth Theatre	Tbilisi, David Agmash- enebeli ave., 99/1	General Manager Mikheil Antadze +995 99 5556 439 Artistic Director Giga Lordkipanidze	Central Government
5	Tbilisi Vaso Abashidze Music Comedy and Drama State Theatre	Tbilisi, Agmashenebeli ave., 182	General Manager David Doiashvili +995 92 545959	Central Government
6	Tbilisi Marionette State Theatre	Tbilisi, Shavteli str., 26 www.gabriadze.com	General Manager Natela Tsiklauri	Central Government
7	Tbilisi Mikheil Tumanishvili Film Actors Theatre	Tbilisi, David Agmashe- nebli ave., 164	General Manager Zurab Getsadze +995 99 550 912 odishariamaiko@yahoo.com - info@tumanishvilitheatre.ge	Central Government
8	Tbilisi Giorgi Mikeladze State Puppet Theatre	Tbilisi, David Agmashe- nebeli ave., 145	General Manager Temur Badriashvili +995 99 502080	Central Government
9	Tbilisi Alexander Griboedov Russian State Theatre /include two stages/	Tbilisi, Sulkhan-Saba str., 11 <a href="http://www.gri-
boedovtheatre.ge">www.gri- boedovtheatre.ge	General Manager Avtandil Varsimashvili a.vars@rambler.ru	Central Government
10	Tbilisi Petros Adamian Armenian State Drama Theatre	Tbilisi, Ketevan Tzame- buli str., 8 <a href="http://www.tbi-
larmtheatre.ge">www.tbi- larmtheatre.ge	General Manager Felix Khachaturov +995 41 656 744	Central Government
11	Tbilisi Azerbaijan State Drama Theatre	Tbilisi, Gorgasali str., 1	General Manager Gocha Kapanadze +995 99 903 151 Azerbaijan.theatre@posta.ge	Central Government

N	Name of the theatre	Address	General Manager, Artistic Director	Ownership
12	Shadow State Theatre "Apkhazeti"	Tbilisi, David Agmashenebeli ave., 103	General Manager Zurab Kvachakhia +995 99 733 022 Artistic Director Gela Kandelaki	Central Government
13	Tbilisi Sandro Akhmeteli State Drama Theatre	Tbilisi, Ilia Vekua str., 8	General Manager Tamaz Gogoladze +995 99 176 502	Tbilisi Municipality
14	Tbilisi Pantomime Theatre	Tbilisi, Rustaveli ave., 37	General manager Amiran Shalikashvili +995 55 596814	Tbilisi Municipality
15	Tbilisi Veriko Anjaparidze One Men Show Theatre "Veriko"	Tbilisi, Veriko Anjaparidze str., 20	General Manager Ioseb Bakuradze +995 99 989215	Tbilisi Municipality
16	Tbilisi Theatre Globe*	Tbilisi 9 April Garden	General Manager Davit Iluridze	Tbilisi Municipality
17	Tbilisi Liberty Theatre	Tbilisi Sulkhan Saba str., 11	Owner Avtandil Varsimashvili Manager Tornike Glonti +995 77 444 917 a.vars@rambler.ru	Private
18	Tbilisi Royal District Theatre	Tbilisi, Gia Abesadze str., 10 ntavadze@caucasus.net	Manager Nika Tavadze +995 77 450 770 Artistic Director Merab Tavadze	Private
19	Tbilisi Rustaveli Basement Theatre*	Tbilisi, Rustaveli ave., 24	General Manager Eka Mazmishvili	Private
20	Theatre Arts Development Center	Tbilisi, Chavchavadze ave., 32	Manager Otar Egadze +995 77 237 724	Private
21	Tbilisi Atoneli Theatre	Tbilisi, Atoneli str., 31	Manager Nana Pachuashvili +995 99 509 880	Private
22	Tbilisi Theatre Nabadi	Tbilisi, Rustaveli ave., 19	Manager Nino Turabelidze +995 99 961 077	Private
23	Tbilisi Theatre Sakhioba*	Tbilisi, Guramishvili ave.,	Artistic Director Gia Kakheli +995 538 677	Private
24	Tbilisi Movement Theatre	Tbilisi, Agmashenebeli ave.,	Artistic Director Kakha Bakuradze +995 99 538 677	Private
25	Batumi Ilia Chavchavadze State Drama Theatre	Batumi, Rustaveli str., 1	General Manager Zaza Khalvashi +995 93 330309 Artistic Director Giorgi Tavadze +995 77575 570 khalvashizaza@yahoo.com	Adjara Autonomous Republic Government
26	Batumi Puppet and Youth State Theatre	Batumi, Mmed Abashidze str., 20/18	General Manager Medea Charkviani +995 99 904 140	Adjara Autonomous Republic Government
27	Khulo State Drama Theatre	Khulo	General Manager Guram Abuladze	Adjara Autonomous Republic Government

N	Name of the theatre	Address	General Manager, Artistic Director	Ownership
28	Sokhumi Konstantine Gamsakhurdia State Drama Theatre	Refugee theatre – permanently located in Tbilisi	General Manager Merab Brekashvili +995 99 794 844	Abkhazia Autonomous Republic Government
29	Sokhumi Youth Georgian State Theatre “Tetri Talga”	Refugee theatre – permanently located in Tbilisi	General Manager Giorgi Ratiani +995 99 167 293	Abkhazia Autonomous Republic Government
30	Tzkhinvali Ivane Machabeli State Drama Theatre	Permanently located in Tbilisi, Agmashenebeli ave., 182	General Manager Zaza Tediashvili +995 77 428 399 zaza.tadi@yahoo.com machabelitheatre@yahoo.com	Ex South Osetian Permanent Government
31	Meskheti / Akhaltsikhe/ State Drama Theatre	Akhaltsikhe, Tamar Mefe str., 8	General Manager Lia Suluashvili +995 93 279 6363 mesxetis.teatri@mail.ru	Central Government and Local Municipality
32	Akhaltsikhe Puppet State Theatre	Akhaltsikhe, Tamar Mefe str., 19	General Manager Rusudan Sisauri +995 99 508 863 Artistic Director Nodar Ionatamishvili	Central Government and Local Municipality
33	Telavi Vaja Pshavela State Drama Theatre	Telavi, Freedom Square 3	General Manager Demetre Skhirtladze +995 77 77 5000	Local Municipality
34	Gurjaani State Puppet Theatre	Gurjaani, Tamar Mepe str., 6	General Manager Givi Tabakhmelashvili +995 95 571 679	Local Municipality
35	Kutaisi Lado Meskhishvili State Drama Theatre / include two stages/	Kutaisi, David Agmashenebeli square 1	General Manager Giorgi Sikharulidze +995 93 306 135	Local Municipality
36	Kutaisi Meliton Balanchivadze Opera and Ballet State Theatre	Kutaisi Tsminda Nino str., 19	General Manager Roza Dvalishvili +995 77 441 336 Artistic Director Nodar Javakhishvili	Local Municipality
37	Kutaisi Iakob Gogebashvili State Puppet Theatre	Kutaisi, Tsminda Nino str., 9	General Manager Ia Iashvili	Local Municipality
38	Kutaisi Theatre Workers Union’s “Second Floor Theatre”*	Kutaisi, Levan Sagardadze str., 1	Artistic Director Levan Rokhavadze +995 99 155 969	Private
39	Kutaisi Satire and Humore Theatre	Kutaisi Faliashvili I entrance N3	Artistic Director Gizo Kakauridze	Private
40	Kutaisi Masks Theatre	Kutaisi Solomon I str., 52	ARTISTIC Director Davit Jishlariani	Private
41	Kutaisi Davit Kldiashvili Young Theatre	Kutaisi, Grishashvili str., 17	General Manager Zurab Pkhakadze	Private

N	Name of the theatre	Address	General Manager, Artistic Director	Ownership
42	Chiatura Akaki Tsereteli State Drama Theatre	Chiatura Chavchavadze ave., 5	General Manager Nana Tsereteli +995 99 199 068	Local Municipality
43	Zesaponi Ushangi Chkheidze State Drama Theatre	Zestaponi, Rustaveli str., 23	General Manager Rene Abesadze +995 99 226 041	Local Municipality
44	Ozurgeti Alexander Tsutsunava State Drama Theatre	Ozurgeti, Chavchavadze str., 1	General Manager Zaza Jincharadze +995 93 220 735 Artistic Director Otar Kutaladze jincharadzezaza@mail.ru	Local Municipality
45	Poti Valerian Gunia State Drama Theatre /new building under the construction/	Poti, Rustaveli 1	General Manager Tengiz Khukhia +995 93 360 137 tkhukhia@yandex.ru	Local Municipality
46	Zugdidi Shalva Dadiani State Drama Theatre	Zugdidi, Theatre str., 2	General Manager Maya Kalandia +995 77 955 930 maiakalandia@yahoo.com	Local Municipality
47	Senaki Akaki Khorava State Drama Theatre	Senaki Theatre Square	General Manager Tengiz Topuridze +995 95 328 864 Artsitic Director Irakli Adamia	Local Municipality
48	Gori Giorgi Eristavi State Drama Theatre	Gori, Chavchavadze ave., 10	General Manager Nodar Mdinardze +995 99187 893	Local Municipality
49	Rustavi Municipal Theatre	Rustavi, Pirosmeni, str., 7	General Manager Lali Tabagari +995 99 109 740	Local Municipality
50	Dmanisi State Drama Theatre "Kvemo Kartli"	Dmanisi House of Culture		Local Municipality
51	Borjomi State Puppet Theatre	Borjomi Kostava., 9	General Manager Khatuna Tevdoradze +995 93 117 515	Local Municipality
52	Sokhumi Samson Chanba Apkhazian State Theatre **	Sokhumi Pushkin str., 1	Territory occupied by Russia	
53	Sokhumi Youth Russian Drama Theatre**	Sokhumi, Lenin str., 2	Territory occupied by Russia	
54	Tskhinvali Kosta Khetagurov Osetian State Theatre**	Tskhinvali, Stalin str., 21	Territory occupied by Russia	
55	Fingers theatre	Tbilisi, Marjanishvili str., 8	Artistic Director Beso Kupreishvili	Private
56	Shishveli Theatre	Tbilisi	Artistic Director Nana Kvashvadze	Private
57	New Theatre	Tbilisi, Kiev str., 12	Artsitic Director Nika Mesablishvili	Private

N	Name of the theatre	Address	General Manager, Artistic Director	Ownership
58	Batumi Opera and Ballet State Theatre***	Batumi	Not yet appointed	Adjara Autonomic Republic Government

*Those Theatre practically not operating

** We haven't any information about those theatres

*** Building under the construction and theatre not operated yet

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- institutions of the central government 3

Includes Ministry of Culture of Georgia /as federal institutions/ and two ministries of Culture and Education at the Adjara Autonomic Republic and Abkhazian Autonomic Republic, as usually at the Ministries there is one of the deputies, who are responsible for performing arts and one department for arts or specifically for performing arts. Ministries announcing program priorities for specific program funding, applicants need to submit application according the rules of ministry of culture.

- institutions of regional governments 9

Governor's offices have advisers or officers for culture and education but often depend on decisions of individual governors itself.

- institutions of municipal governments – $67+5 = 72$

In Georgia now are 67 municipalities and 5 self governed towns all of them had departments for culture responsible for the subsidies for culture through local decisions based on applications from applicants

- non-governmental organisations – 14*

As extra from this number we could add international NGO's like British Council, Goethe Institute etc – + 3

*number of NGO's changed often, because some time they are project based institutions

- private enterprises – Information not available

Are there any mixed forms – Information not available

In 2008 was created Georgian Regional Theatre Network – GRTN. More than 25 theatres are members as well some individuals.

*number of NGO's changed often, because some time they are project based institutions

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

- dramatic theatres – 38
- puppet theatres – 10 /include marionette, fingers, shadow/
- musical theatres – 1
- opera theatres – 3
- dance theatres (movement, pantomime) 5 / but if we account traditional national ballet companies would be 5 more and total number 10
- impresario theatres- 0
- arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones)- 0
- other – youth theatres – 4

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

Most of the institutions were created during the soviet or before soviet time, they were funded through the state budget and they still receive subsidy by the inverse.

In this funding was made few principle changes, they receive budget as subsidy based on their annual proposal, state not regulated size of expenditure in each paragraph.

This is only rules for performing arts sector, which is not enough, because there are no clear criteria for financing as well transparency for decision making procedure, and this is the same for central and local authorities.

It's difficult to explain the principles of participation of central government in funding for certain theatre companies. On one hand clear is the financing of National theatre or Opera and Ballet theatre, but again just to underline that without the cultural policy document, funding and priorities guidelines the choices for funding is still not clear.

Business funding related with the business interests, promotion of label or company and etc, quite standard packages.

Private sponsors – is the special case and important to mention and underline that, one of the Georgian mecenats Mr. Bidzina Ivanishvili gave a unique example of charity in the nearest history of Georgia – he was a private sponsor for fully renovation of all main theatre venues in Tbilisi /Now he is funding State Opera and Ballet Theatre venue renovation/, with new equipment, after renovation he continue to funding a salaries for top stuff and leading actors at the theatres, most of this information is confidential and Mr. Ivanishvili always asking not mentioned his name, which explained that for him this is clear charity and haven't any further in kind of income.

From the total number of theatres 58 in Georgia

- Central funding theatres are – 12
- Local funding theatres are – 27
- Mix funding theatre is – 1
- Private theatres are – 15
- No information about the theatres in occupied territories – 3

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- amount of general subsidies

Approximately – 17. 589.000 GEL

- amount of project subsidies

Approximately – 1.740.000*

Central – 300.000 GEL

Local /through municipalities/ – 1.440.000 GEL

*Some time project amount at the municipalities covers not only performing arts and same time we had examples, when as the special funding without general municipal guidelines or policy document, some of the festival events receive more than 1.000.000 GEL, for this moment its difficult account such kind of budgeting or spending public money, without public decisions.

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance* centres of:

- Funding from the central government – 10. 589.000 GEL
- funding from local governments – 6.669.000 GEL
- own revenue of theatres – 1.700.000 – 2.000.000 GEL

*In this amount there isn't accounted funding for dance.

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

The budgeting and applications for the program funding is starting from August, applications must be mostly for one year subsidy.

Most part of budget is cover sculleries and communal expenses, and there is small shift funding for production cost. For the production cost, company must use self generated income or attracted funding from different sources.

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

There is no indebtedness of performing arts institutions.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

Additional funding could be from International and local foundations and institutions, Embassies and Ministries of Foreign Affairs.

Since 2009 for the Georgian performing arts institutions are evaluable EU funding through Eastern partnership program.

Section D.
Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

Based on information from Ministry of Culture only 19 premieres in 2009 were at the Puppet theatres in Georgia.

The total number of Premiers in the rest of the theatres is approximately -160

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

Number of the performances approximately – 6300

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

We count account this number because the majority of the theatres not gave the info and they yet not account it on systematic base. But approximately number of spectators in all country is 720.000

Theatres in Georgia*

N	Name of the Theatre	Budget for 2010 in GEL**	Number of audience		Number of premiers and performances			
			2009	2010	2007	2008	2009	2010
1	Zakaria Paliashvili Tbilisi Opera and Ballet State Theatre	5.000000			3	11	4	1
2	Shota Rustaveli Tbilisi State National Drama Theatre	1.822.558	23182	35718	149	9 168	2 166	18 226
3	Kote Marjanishvili Tbilisi State Drama Theatre	980 000			8	8	10	5
4	Tbilisi Vaso Abashidze Music Comedy and Drama State Theatre	550 000			1	1	3	2
5	Tbilisi Mikheil Tumanishvili Film Actors Theatre	320 000			5	1	4	6
6	Tbilisi Sandro Akhmeteli State Drama Theatre	200 000			2	4	3	5
7	Batumi Ilia Chavchavadze State Drama Theatre	861 500	55580	40800		2	2	2
8	Batumi Puppet and Youth State Theatre	341 400	13600	17 742	2 227	2 264	2 216	6 190
9	Meskheti /Akhalsikhe/ State Drama Theatre	200 000		14 104	8	6	7	6
10	Akhalsikhe Puppet State Theatre	80 000			2	1	2	2
11	Telavi Vaja Pshavela State Drama Theatre	700 000			1	2	1	3
12	Kutaisi Lado Meskhishvili State Drama Theatre	700 000						
13	Poti Valerian Gunia State Drama Theatre	223000	3240	3800	3	3	3	3
14	Ozurgeti Alexander Tsutsunava State Drama Theatre	175 000	1200	2100	3	3	3	3
15	Chiatura Akaki Tsereteli State Drama Theater	239927	5400	6500	5 45	3 50	3 55	3 57

*Special questionnaires was send to 45 theatres but only 15 of them return back partly feel out applications

** 1 USD = 1. 8 GEL

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

7000 – 70.000 GEL

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

5.000 – 30.000 GEL

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location

There are 6 festivals – 4 International and 2 local

Theatre Festivals in Georgia

N	name	since	internet	Contact	
1	Gift	1996	tbilisigiftfestival@gmail.com	Keti Dolidze	Annual Internationa
2	Theatre+Video	1996	www.caucasusfoundation.ge ibccp@caucasusfoundation.ge	Iuri Mgebrishvili	Annual International
3	International Culture Fair	2003	www.caucasusfoundation.ge iuri@caucasusfoundation.ge	Iuri Mgebrishvili	Biannual International
4	ArdiFest	2008	http://www.myspace.com/ardifest ntavadze@caucasus.net	Nika Tavadze	Annual Local
5	Georgian Drama Festival	2006	Meskheta /Akhlatiskhe/ State Drama Theatre	Lia Suluashvili	Biannual Local
6	Tbilisi International Theatre Festival	2009	http://www.tbilisiinternational.com	Ekaterine Maz-mishvili	Annual International

Section E.
International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

No, not yet, because there was no formal permission for institution based in Georgia to apply for such kind of funding.

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

Yes -

- IETM – Informal European Theatre Meeting /5 institutions/
- EFEA – International Festivals & Events Association /1 institution/
- CAMN – Caucasian Arts Managers Network /more than 60 institutions and individuals/
- Negotiations with EFA for membership – European Festival Association

In 2008 was created Georgian Regional Theatre Network – GRTN*. More than 25 theatres are members as well some individuals. Network open for a membership on local and International level.

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

The traditions of co-productions started since 2000, in this field the active participation was from France, Germany, and The Netherlands etc.

As co-producers were International institutions or projects like Goethe Institute, Alliance Frances, KulturKontakt Austria, OSI Culture network program or Theorem /project of Avignon festival/ etc or local and international NGO's as well as individuals like independent producers. In past local active producer were SCF and some temporary projects.

Yes there are few co-productions, was done with initiative of GRTN – just last year we could underline projects with Poland and Germany with co-funding from Goethe Institute and Adam Mickiewicz institutes and matching funds was from other local institutions as well from partner theatres itself.

This two projects are:

- *Ratenyard*, by P. Turini, Director Ralf Ziebelt, Germany at the Valerian Gunia Poti state Drama Theatre 2009
- *Beniamin*, by R. Pachoha, Director Irakli Gogia and Tomasch Leschinsky, Poland, Shota Rustaveli Georgian State National Theatre.

At the Rustaveli National Theatre were co-productions with participation of UK, Armenia stage directors.

But there are other projects to when foreign plays with the support of British Council or Goethe Institute are translated and then staged at the Georgian Theatres, but not with inviting foreign directors, actors or designers etc.

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there? – 4 /till now there are no special dance festival but we are working to set up contemporary dance festival in Batumi/.

*GRTN young but very active institution for international cooperation, international co-productions and international companies touring in the country. Just for a short time through this institution was realised few co-productions, with Germany, Poland, Iran; was organised a tours in Georgia /5-6 cities/ of different companies from Norway, Lithuania, Iran. GRTN could be a very flexible partner for different type of international partnerships which will include not only co-productions and touring, but already workshops, trainings, translations, master classes, round tables etc.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

In Georgia this is first research in performing arts scene and because there is no tradition of previous researches or existing any data in this field, which could be used for this new research its make this first document not very strong, with weakness of full information about all institutions in the performing arts or exact figures of budgeting etc. We hope that starting from 2010, such kind of research became more regular in Georgia and Arts Research Institute of Ilia State University, Tbilisi, will take over to continue it for following years.

Institutions for Cooperation

	Name	contact
1	Georgian Regional Theatre Network/GRTN	grtn@live.com
2	Art Research Institute of Ilia State University /ARI	www.iliauni.edu.ge ari@iliauni.edu.ge
3	Stichting Caucasus Foundation /SCF	www.caucasusfoundation.ge scf@caucasusfoundation.ge

Additional info about awards in the performing arts field

Still traditional awards in performing arts are organized by Theatre Workers Union, which based on former soviet traditions and more and more award are results of corrupted agreements between the

stuff of Union and different individuals and institutions, its why this awards more and more haven't any values.

Starting from 2009 private company REDIX decide to established national award for best directing with amount 20.000 GEL, which is based on decision of invited independent Jury, which during two month were traveling in whole country and watching performances which was proposed by theatres or groups for competition. This award now became annual.

In Georgia, there are already some national awards which already time by time covering performing arts masterpieces too.

Report is prepared by Dr. Levan Khetaguri, Professor and Director of Arts Research Institute of Ilia State University, Tbilisi



Hungary

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Szakmáry Dalma, Szabó Attila

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

Hungarian theatre is a system based on continuous ensemble development and repertoire performances, established after the nationalization in 1949, and even after the change of the political system in 1989, it still plays a major role in further development. In the spring of 1989 – at the time of a political hiatus – István Szabó (Director of the Department of Theatre at the Ministry of Culture) initiated a complex analysis of the theatre system, and changes in the main areas of development were suggested. The document basically emphasizes the necessity of continuation: “In the past few years, discussions about theatre mainly addressed the system of theatre institutions and structure, rather than its aesthetic and artistic values. Some participants questioned the exclusive right of existence of theatres with permanent drama companies. However, it would be a mistake to completely ignore the current theatre network, as it is thanks to this network that Hungarian theatre has survived the difficult times of crisis” (Szabó 2008). It delineated the most crucial changes, while maintaining the same level of government subsidies, taking into account also alternative forms of the creative process, which are so important from the artistic point of view, yet which were partly or completely banned under Kádár’s “mild” dictatorship (the University Scene, the Szkéné Theatre, Studio K, the JATE Scene); alternatively, persons involved in them were forced to emigrate (Peter Halasz). “Initiatives from outside the established structure – aid, management and integration – are one way of ensuring further development. Of course, the lack of flexibility in the theatre system is being criticised, and rightly so: new initiatives – especially if they do not fit within the system – do not get sufficient support, while old achievements still guarantee others a legal right to operate.”

The most important phenomena of **the 1990’s** include the increase in the number of small venues (about 3,500 seats in Budapest) and a boom in the number of theatre companies, mostly independent ones. Due to small venues the real costs increased; however, the funding remained the same, in spite of the growing number of actors. Therefore a large part of the system did not receive sufficient funding. This system basically reflects the funding policy of the previous system, and the Act of 2010 has not introduced any significant changes, which often leads to problems with artistic values.

The current theatre network in Hungary is based in a group of buildings, constructed upon the initiative of regional municipalities in the 19th century; in the capital, this development was due to the fast growth of the city after the establishment of Austria-Hungary in 1867. After nationalisation, these buildings became the core of the theatre system, and most of them became publicly funded repertoire theatres with permanent ensembles.

The buildings constructed in the 19th century had diverse layouts, mostly due to various performance styles; some of them were built for different purposes (cinemas, community centres, etc.) and only later converted into theatres. As such, they have often faced problems stemming from the lack of rehearsal space, dressing rooms, store room and other premises necessary for repertoire activities. This was taken

into consideration during their refurbishment. Apart from their reconstruction just after WWII, these buildings have been refurbished twice, first at the turn of the 1970's and 1980's; the second refurbishment phase started in the late 1990's and is still ongoing. During the earlier reconstructions, new, smaller venues were added on where possible to serve the needs of experimental theatre or small audiences. The fact that all the buildings that had been converted into theatres in 1949 are still housing them can be considered a success of Hungarian theatre.

In the period of 1945-1989, only one new theatre building has been constructed as the town of Győr did not have a representative historical theatre building. On the national level, however, a large number of community centres have been built, which put other places (Zalaegerszeg, Nagykanizsa, Szombathely) on the theatrical map of Hungary by hosting guest productions. After the change of the political system some of them have been transformed into permanent theatre venues, such as the one in Szombathely. Likewise, in the last two decades, only the National Theatre has moved into a new building (2002); at the same time, many new professional theatre venues have been created by radical conversions – for example, the Bárka Theatre has been operating as a permanent theatre company since 1999 in a fencing hall converted on the basis of a project by Bálint Nagy and Éva Arnóti. In the past few years, many **alternative spaces** have been transformed into permanent theatres, especially in Budapest: it is normal to go see events organised by professional theatre companies, independent associations or student groups, performed in “random” places – former factories (Bakelit), an artistic forge in the complex of a closed down school (Tűzraktér), the basement of a pub frequented by artists (Sirály). Cultural domination, which shows also in theatre, is quite obvious in the capital, which is disproportionately large (1.7 million inhabitants) in relation to the country's size. Half of the actors within the official theatre structure work in Budapest. Independent and amateur scenes also concentrate in the capital (big university towns such as Debrecen, Szeged, Pécs are an exception).

The attempts at **decentralisation** after the change of the political system have influenced the restructuring of Hungarian theatre. Ever since the 1950's, the role of the Déryné State Theatre was to act as a touring theatre in provincial towns and villages located far from the capital. However, as more independent theatre groups started to emerge, the central touring theatre was losing its territory and from the 1970's until its closing in 1991, it only performed in small towns and villages. After the change of the political system, there were only a few medium-sized towns left without a permanent theatre company (Székesfehérvár, Nyíregyháza, Sopron, Eger). The establishment of new companies resulted in a more intensive and cyclical drama activities, which also had an influence on the artistic variety of evening entertainment in individual towns. Due to the lack of permanent companies in these towns before the change of the political system, the towns would host many well-known guest productions from Budapest. A production by the director of a permanent company was limited to their hometown only.

The lack of mobility (only individual artists, not whole productions, would occasionally host somewhere else) had a negative impact on the productions outside the capital. In other cases, an establishment of a separate company resulted in a recognized theatre.

Before the change of the political system, only the theatres in Kaposvár (and sometimes in Szolnok) were places of true dramatic art; as they were also attended by audience from Budapest, other Hungarian theatres did not view them favourably. From the beginning of the new millennium, theatres in Eger, Debrecen and Nyíregyháza are making similar efforts, to high critical acclaim.

Decentralisation has manifested itself in the fact that the hegemony of the National Puppet Theatre, founded in 1949, was contested by the establishment of 10 new puppet theatres in the 1980's. In 2000, the National Theatre Encounters (POSZT) moved to Pécs. Theatre festivals organised in other towns started to compensate for the domination of the capital, at least for the time of their duration (Dance Festival in Veszprém, Shakespeare Festival in Gyula, Festival of Foreign Theatre in Kisvárd, etc.). Likewise, in the spirit of decentralisation, Imre Zoltán and László Hudi jointly applied for the post of director of the National Theatre. According to their concept, National Theatre should operate partly as a production theatre, and as such, provide opportunities for theatre companies from other towns, thanks to its su-

perior technical and financial possibilities. It was obvious that these ideas would not work – even though they had significant media coverage, the Hungarian theatre system was not ready for them yet. In the end, Róbert Alföldi was appointed director. This actor and director has preserved the 2008 repertoire, while at the same time he is not afraid of experiments and manages a modern, popular group of talented actors from all age categories.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

Only 20 years after the change of the political system has the new, democratic government decided to review the legislation pertaining to theatre. **Act XCIX of 2008 on the employment conditions and ways of financing art organisations** was designed in order to solve problems that have been plaguing the theatre and making life difficult for artists. This idea was suggested in 2006 by István Hiller (the then-Minister of Culture) at a meeting with theatre executive directors that took place in the Kolibri theatre. This has started a cycle of debates with the representatives of the theatre domain. After almost two years of discussions, disagreements and debates, the minister presented a draft of the act to the theatre, music and dance professionals. The draft was an outcome of co-operation between the Ministry of Culture and art professionals. This presentation took place on September 21st, 2008, which is the Hungarian Drama Day. Some changes were made after consultations with art organisations, and on December 8 the National Assembly passed the act, with 221 representatives voting for and 155 against it.

The act not only recognises the status of an artist and the need for government subsidies, but also provides the possibility of long-term planning, thanks to creating a predictable system of financing.

The manifold forms of activities and financing, especially within dance companies, used to make future planning almost impossible, as funding could only be ascertained for one year ahead. However, the act containing new normative elements has established a clear funding model and defined the rights and duties of sponsors.

Organisations applying for state funding need to register.

During the course of registration, they will be assigned to one of 6 categories, which are based on institutional profiles. Class I includes art organisations that specialise in theatre or dance and have their own building and troupe, provided that they perform at least 180 times a year, and stage 2 new performances. Class II consists of production theatres and theatres that host various ensembles, with the required number of performances ranging from 100 to 140 a year. Ballet and dance companies in Class III should perform at least 50 times a year. Class IV includes theatres with a minimum of 100 performances a year, while Class V comprises theatres of national and ethnic minorities, along with street theatres, provided they either give at least 50 performances a year, or sell 50 thousand tickets for their shows (50 thousand spectators a year). Class VI is the most critical point of the system. According to the law, “Class VI should include those independent theatres that have been operating for at least 2 years, and which do not qualify for Classes I-V”. Funding allocation in Class V and VI is not automatic, but based on annual competitions evaluated by a special committee. The law also states that the overall amount of financial support in Class VI equals to at least 10% of the current budget funding, which guarantees much more backing for the whole class. In the fiscal year 2010, due to the economic crisis, the ministry – citing the necessity of making budget cuts – has frozen 66% of subsidies in this class; their imbursement is currently uncertain. A proposal to pass an amendment of the act, which would limit the overall amount of funding (to 5, alternatively 8%), has encountered strong resistance on the part of the organisations included in this class; the outcome is still not clear. Not receiving the money from the allocated grants has stalled the activities of professional, regularly performing ensembles in 2010. Incidentally, this class is very heterogeneous: besides university, student and amateur groups, it includes various festivals and internationally acclaimed companies, such as Pinter Béla and Ensemble, the Yvett Bozsik Foundation, Studio K, along with new groups that regularly represent Hungary on international festivals (the

Maladype Theatre managed by Zoltán Balázs, Sputnik Sailing Society managed by Viktor Bodó). This begs the question whether the new law is able to reflect the real changes in the theatre system, rather than just preserve the status quo of the financing practices.

Labour provisions included in the act are designed to provide the artist with more security and planning possibilities: these provisions limit individual work hours, the length of rehearsals, and require the management to either offer a contract for the current year, or give notice in due course (by March 1st). The act gives mobility and artistic growth possibilities to institutions, while giving job security and fair treatment to the artists. However, these provisions only affect artists with employment contracts. The artists protest against this system, as due to high taxes and national insurance payments, they are often pressured to become self-employed. When it comes to self-employment, actors providing “art services” would not feel exploited, if the promise to lower their taxes was fulfilled.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

Before WWII, private theatres were a natural part of artistic life; however, they have completely disappeared after the war. As part of democratic changes after 1990, anyone can now establish a theatre, provided it is done in accordance with the legislation. Currently there is no self-sufficient theatre in Hungary that would operate on purely business principles. The ones closest to this model are the Budapest Operetta Theatre and the Madách Theatre, which currently specialise in famous Western musicals. Their ticket prices are well above the average, and they also apply for government funding (in 2010, the Operetta Theatre received 675 million forints in subsidies, while the Madách Theatre received 502 million). They differ from similar theatres that also stage West End and Broadway productions in that they operate in the repertoire system (and therefore have more shows on offer) and have permanent ensembles.

However, many theatres founded upon private initiative are able to operate based on grants and – to a lesser degree – on sponsoring. Once they become known to the public and attract its interest, they can apply for subsidies from the government budget.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

The success story of the *Kréta*kör Theatre over the years is largely due to the professionalism of its administrative director, Gáspár Máté. He joined the company in 1998 and suggested they operate as a foundation. Director Árpád Schilling became its founder, and Gáspár Máté the chairman. At the beginning, the troupe toured the country in a lorry, performing plays based on minimal funding, until the Thália Theatre gave them an opportunity to perform in the capital. In 2002, the MC93 theatre from Bobigny near Paris provided 100% of Krétakör's budget, in exchange for the right to stage plays. Thus a strong core of the team was born, as Krétakör had hired Eszter Csákányi, Werner Tilo, Péter Schere, Zoltán Mucsi, László Katona and Viola Gábor. Their play called “Hazam hazam” (Homeland homeland) was performed 34 times in France and 25 times in Hungary, which allowed them to apply for Hungarian financial backing. The then-Minister of Culture had a favourable view on the matter, and in 2003 the company received a total of 70 million forints from various grants. In 2004, a new, so called ‘Alternative Class’ was created, which resulted in a total budget of 200 million forints, 100 million of which was Krétakör's own contribution. In 2007, at the height of its success, the company managed to provide 55% of its own input into its budget, which is unheard of in the Hungarian system. The key part of the contribution came from revenues on various home and foreign festivals.

In contrast, ticket sales revenue has never been important (in 2007 it constituted 1% of the budget): on the one hand, the company performs in small venues with limited audience space, on the other hand they only receive a part of the ticket price, as they need to pay for the venue.

Since the company does not have any permanent premises that would require maintenance, and since some of its productions incur minimal costs (Seagull, Hamlet), it can spend more money on the artists salaries, marketing and PR than permanent theatres.

In 2008, the foundation's founder decided to make changes in the company, as the current form did not present any more artistic challenges. He therefore turned to experimental theatre, creating various projects ranging from street theatre to international circus events, in cooperation with professional and amateur authors. The company received a grant of 25 million forints in 2010, based on article 4.d of the new art law.

The story of **Pinter Béla and Ensemble** is similar. In the period 1998-2003, its overall government funding was only 3.5 million forints. In 2007, it was already allocated 39 million, in 2008 – 40 million, and in 2010 it is applying for 69 million in Class VI subsidies. It is worth mentioning that this company, first considered an amateur group, has won significant support of the public and grant advisors by its high artistic standards. Its critical acclaim kept growing, and in 2002 the theatre was awarded the Drama Critics' Award for its *Peasant Opera*. Each year, one or two of its performances receive an award, usually for the "best alternative production". In 2006, during the National Drama Encounters in Pécs, the company was given the best performance award (*My Mother's Nose*), which is the pride of the company's director, along with their international awards. Based on Class VI of the new act, the theatre applies for funding every year, and even though it does receive high subsidies as part of the category, it only maintains its funding by keeping up the good work that influences the decision-makers. *The Pinter Béla and Ensemble*, together with the *Kréta Kör Theatre*, are good examples showing that fascinating artistic work can attain a stable position in the theatre system, but in order to find entry into this system as a "permanent theatre", wider horizons are necessary in order to avoid taking out loans to patch up the holes in the budget: better marketing, lobbying activities, advertising, PR, etc. Their "isolation" in the capital is caused by the fact that they perform exclusively in the Szkéné Theatre at the Polytechnic, where they have to share the stage with other groups. Thus they only give about 10 performances a month, and as they very rarely perform abroad, it is very difficult for them to qualify for any of the funding classes, which demand a certain number of performances. On the whole, they have a small yet faithful audience, and therefore the auditorium is always full.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

In publicly financed institutions, theatre directors have wide competences: they can make decisions about hiring artists, about the yearly programme, and also about the use of state subsidies.

Article V/2 of the Theatre and Performing Arts Act regulates the procedure of appointing directors of those organisations that operate as public institutions: the statutory organ must announce the recruitment for the post of theatre director.

The recruitment is carried out by a panel consisting of 9 members, which include 4 representatives of the Performing Arts State Board, and other representatives of the Ministry of Culture, the city council, the employer or the labour unions. The panel votes on the results, but the final decision is made within 15 days by the appropriate organ (different for each type of theatre – it could be the local government, the city council, etc.). The decision, together with the panel's evaluations, has to be published. The director is appointed for a 5-year term, and is required to have a relevant degree (in Arts, Law or Economics). If the director has no finance background (which is often the case), a director of finance needs to be appointed as well. Directors of theatres financed directly by the Ministry of Culture are appointed by the Minister.

The panel's decision is not binding, and therefore there can be frequent and profound disagreements if the statutory organ decides to appoint another candidate on political grounds, thus ignoring the panel's opinion. Since 2006, there have been a few doubtful appointments in different places, usually connected with appointing persons sympathising with the right-wing party (Kaposvár, Szolnok, Kecskemét, Székesfehérvár). Their aspirations to create a repertoire which would be "national in character and concentrated on the audience" have resulted in a decline in the audience figures. It had taken years to attract these sensitive, understanding spectators with an interest in contemporary theatre; however, they are now losing interest, which results in further commercialisation of the repertoire (Vásárhely 2008).

Section B.

Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

Number of registered institutions active in the country: 178

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

a) Central government institutions:

Name	Founding Body	Form of Funding
1. National Theatre, Plc.	Ministry of Education and Culture	Central government budget
2. National Dance Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Ministry of Education and Culture	Central government budget
3. Hungarian State Opera	Ministry of Education and Culture	Central government budget
4. Pest Hungarian Theatre	Ministry of Education and Culture	Central government budget
5. Budapest Chamber Theatre	Ministry of Education and Culture	Central government budget
6. Teréz körút Avenue Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Ministry of Education and Culture	Central government budget
7. Krétakör Foundation	Ministry of Education and Culture	Based on contracts with the minister of culture

b) Regional theatres:

Regional centres : Budapest, Miskolc, Debrecen, Szeged, Pécs, Győr

- **Central Hungary:** Puppet Theatre in Budapest, Operetta Theatre in Budapest, Attila József Theatre, Katona József Theatre, Kolibri Theatre, Madách Theatre, Mikroszkop Scene, Örkényi István Theatre, Radnóti Miklós Theatre, Free Space Theatre, Thália Theatre, Trafó, New Theatre, Joy Scene, Víg Theatre, Bárka Theatre, Komédia, Piccolo, Budaörs Theatre
- **Central Transdanubia:** Vörösmatry Theatre in Székesfehérvár, Petőfi Theatre in Veszprém, Kabóc Puppet Theatre, Jászai Maria Theatre in Tatabánya, Bartók Theatre in Dunaújváros
- **Western Transdanubia:** National Theatre in Győr, Vaskakas Puppet Theatre, Petőfi Theatre in Sopron, "Fairytale Shop" Puppet Theatre in Szombathely, Weöres Sándor Theatre, Hevesi Sándor Theatre in Zalaegerszeg, "Griff" Puppet Theatre
- **Southern Transdanubia:** National Theatre in Pécs, "Bóbita" Puppet Theatre, Trio Theatre, Croatian Theatre, Csiky Gergely Theatre in Kaposvár, Deutsche Bühne in Szekszárd

- **Northern Hungary:** National Theatre in Miskolc, Enchanted Mill Puppet Theatre, Gárdonyi Géza Theatre in Eger
- **Northern Great Plain:** Csokonai Theatre in Debrecen, “Vojtina” Puppet Theatre, Zsigmond Móricz Theatre in Nyíregyháza, “Szigliget” Theatre in Szolnok
- **Southern Great Plain:** National Theatre in Szeged, Kövér Béla Puppet Theatre, Jókai Theatre in Békéscsaba, Puppet Theatre in Békéscsaba, Katona József Theatre in Kecskemét

c) Local government theatres (based on the grant list of the Ministry of Culture)

Name	Founding Body	Organisational Type of the Founding Body
1. Békés County Jókai Theatre	Békés County Council	local government
2. Bóbita Puppet Theatre	Pécs Town Council	local government
3. Budaörs Theatre	Budaörs Town Council	local government
4. Puppet Theatre in Budapest	Budapest City Council	local government
5. Operetta in Budapest	Budapest City Council	local government
6. Theatre Central, Ltd., non-profit	Budapest City Council	local government
7. Ciroka Puppet Theatre	Kecskemét Town Council	local government
8. Csiky Gergely Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Kaposvár Town Council	local government
9. Csokonai Theatre	Debrecen City Council	local government
10. Géza Gárdonyi Theatre	Heves County Council	local government
11. Griff Puppet Theatre	Zalaegerszeg Town Council	local government
12. National Theatre Győr	Győr City Council	local government
13. Sándor Hevesi Theatre	Zalaegerszeg Town Council	local government
14. Attila József Theatre	Budapest City Council	local government
15. Kaboca Puppet Theatre	Veszprém Town Council	local government
16. József Katona Theatre	Kecskemét Town Council	local government
17. József Katona Theatre	Budapest City Council	local government
18. Kolibri Children's and Youth Theatre	Budapest City Council	local government
19. Madách Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Budapest City Council	local government
20. Fairytale Shop Puppet Theatre	Vas County Council and Szombathely Town Council	local government
21. Mikroskop Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Budapest City Council	local government
22. Enchanted Mill Puppet Theatre in Miskolc	Miskolc City Council	local government
23. National Theatre in Miskolc	Miskolc City Council	local government
24. Zsigmond Móricz Theatre	Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg County Council	local government
25. Pannon Castle Theatre, Ltd., a non-profit organisation specialising in theatre and drama development	Balatonfüred Town Council	local government
26. National Theatre in Pécs	Pécs City Council	local government
27. Pro Kultura Sopron – Ltd., non-profit	Sopron Town Council	local government
28. Miklós Radnóti Theatre	Budapest City Council	local government
29. National Theatre in Szeged	Szeged City Council	local government

Name	Founding Body	Organisational Type of the Founding Body
30. Szigliget Theatre	Szolnok Town Council	local government
31. New Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Budapest City Council	local government
32. Vaskakas Puppet Theatre	Győr City Council	local government
33. Petőfi Theatre in Veszprém	Veszprém Town Council	local government
34. Vig Theatre	Budapest City Council	local government
35. Vojtina Puppet Theatre	Debrecen City Council	local government
36. Vörösmaty Theatre	Székesfehérvár Town Council	local government
37. Sándor Weöres Theatre	Szombathely Town Council	local government
38. Komedium Scenic Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	V. District Council Centrum-Lipótváros	local government
39. Trio Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Pécs City Council	local government
40. Maria Jászai Theatre, Folk Theatre	Tatbánya Town Council	local government
41. Thalia Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Budapest City Council	local government
42. Contemporary Artists Centre „Trafó”, Ltd., non-profit	Budapest City Council	local government
43. Art Centre in Ferencváros	IX. District Council Ferencváros	local government
44. German Theatre Deutsche Bühne Ungarn	Tolna County Council and Local German Self-Government	local government
45. Bárka Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	VIII. District Council Józsefváros Budapest	local government
46. Bartok Chamber Theatre and Arts Centre	Dunaújváros Town Council	local government
47. Napsugár Puppet Theatre	Békés County Council	local government
48. Harlekin Puppet Theatre	Heves Community Council	local government
49. Béla Kóvér Puppet Theatre	Szeged Town Council	local government
50. Serbian Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Lórév District Council	local government
51. Agria Scene and Cultural Services, Ltd., non-profit	Eger City Council	local government
52. Gyula Castle Theatre	Gyula Town Council	local government
53. Jurisics Castle Arts Centre and Castle Theatre	Kőszeg Town Council	local government
54. Castle Theatre and Arts Centre in Kiszárda	Kiszárda Town Council	local government
55. Croatian Theatre in Pécs	Pécs City Council	local government
56. Regional Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Szarvas Town Council	local government
57. Romano Teatro Cultural Association	Roma minority self-government Hejőkeresztúri	local government
58. Free Space Theatre, Ltd., non-profit	Budapest City Council	local government
59. Open-air Theatre and Festival Events in Szeged, Ltd., non-profit	Szeged Town Council	local government
60. Marketing Centre and New Community Centre, Ltd., non-profit	Szentendre Town Council	local government

Name	Founding Body	Organisational Type of the Founding Body
61. Castle Theatre and Mobile Culture, Ltd., non-profit in Esztergom	Esztergom Town Council	local government
62. Slovak Theatre Vertigo	Slovak Minority Self-Government	local government
63. Summer Theatres – Arts and Culture Association, non-profit organisation in Zala	Egervár Community Council	local government
64. Karaván Art Foundation	IX. District Council Fencváros Budapest	local government
65. Cinka Panna Roma Theatre	Roma minority self-government Pestérsébet Bp.	local government

d) Arts-related non-governmental organisations (associations, foundations, and other organisations registered as charities, without any local government funding) classified as Class VI of the Act.

1.	Ágens Association, a registered charity
2.	AKT Theatre, a registered charity
3.	Alternative Arts Foundation
4.	Foundation for Alternative Arts Workshops
5.	Andaxinház Drama Association
6.	Anglophone Theatre – a foundation registered as a charity
7.	Aranyszamár Theatre Educational Association
8.	Art Sector Foundation
9.	ArtMan Arts Association for Movement Therapy
10.	Artus Contemporary Arts Association
11.	Astoria Theatre Educational Association
12.	Aulea Artists Foundation
13.	Babszem Jankó Children's Theatre, a registered charity
14.	Bakelit Multi Art Center Foundation
15.	Baltazár Theatre Foundation
16.	Bozsik Yvette Foundation
17.	Lenvirág Budakalászi Foundation
18.	Metalworks Troupe Budakeszi Drama Foundation
19.	Budapest Dance Theatre Foundation
20.	Budapest Chamber Opera Foundation
21.	Dadu Art Artistic Services, a registered charity
22.	Margit Dajka Arts Foundation
23.	Dream Team Drama and Culture Association
24.	Theatre Association for Drama Education
25.	Duna Arts Association, international multi-cultural foundation
26.	Nocturnal Theatre Cultural Association
27.	Foundation for Artist and Author Support
28.	Élőkép Arts Association

29.	Érintéspont Arts Foundation
30.	Erős Tánc Foundation
31.	European Association of Freelance Artists
32.	Formiusz Public Association
33.	Forrás Cultural Foundation
34.	Ginger and Fred Art and Drama Foundation
35.	GK Association, a registered charity
36.	Gyula Gózon Foundation for Chamber Theatre
37.	Hungarian Evergreen ART Cultural Association
38.	Happy Art Foundation
39.	Harmony Association
40.	Héttükör Children's Theatre Foundation
41.	Hókirálynő Association for Healthy, Cultured Children and Families
42.	Holdvilág Cultural Foundation for Chamber Theatre
43.	Hólygcirkusz Association
44.	Stepp – Association of Professional Irish Dance Performers
45.	Junion Theatre, a registered charity
46.	Kacsacsörű, a registered charity
47.	Katlan Group Arts Association
48.	Coffee Academy
49.	Kerekasztal Association
50.	Kontakt Dance Foundation
51.	Foundation for Contemporary Ballet
52.	Foundation for Modern Dance and Contemporary Theatre
53.	Central European Dance Theatre Association
54.	L. 1 Independent Dancers Association
55.	Drama Association M.- Metanoia Theatre
56.	Chamber Ballet, a registered charity
57.	Foundation for Hungarian Ballet Theatre
58.	Hungarian Festival Ballet Foundation
59.	Hungarian Art Movement Association, a registered charity
60.	Drama Foundation for Magyarrock Music Theatre
61.	Maladype Theatre Association, a registered charity
62.	Manna Culture Association
63.	Márkus Színház Foundation, a registered charity
64.	Central Hungarian Alternative Drama Association – MASZK
65.	Culture and Education Arts Association – MEDÁLIAK
66.	Misina Arts and Dance Association
67.	Mozgó Ház Foundation
68.	MU – Drama Association
69.	Arts Production Studio Foundation

70.	Foundation for National Chamber Theatre
71.	Nyitott Kör Association
72.	OFF Foundation
73.	Operencia, Regional Cultural Association
74.	Orkesztika Foundation
75.	PanoDráma, a registered charity
76.	Pécsi Sándor Guruló Drama Association
77.	Picaro Theatre
78.	Pincszínház, a registered charity
79.	Pintér Béla and Ensemble
80.	Pintér Association
81.	Rivalda Studio Arts Bureau, a registered charity
82.	Scalla, a registered charity
83.	SIN, Arts and Culture Association, a registered charity
84.	Lajos Soltis Theatre Cultural Association
85.	Spiritusz, Youth and Children's Drama Association
86.	„K” Studio Foundation
87.	Focus, Drama Foundation for All Contemporary Art Forms in Szeged
88.	SZÉLL Cultural Association
89.	Szemiramisz – Theatre, Culture and Sports Events Management, a registered charity
90.	SZEMÜVEG Art Foundation in Szeged
91.	Szeredas, Association for Preservation of Traditions
92.	Szöveg Theatre Drama Association
93.	Szputnyik, a registered charity
94.	TÁP, Theatre and Arts Foundation
95.	Természetes Vészek, a registered charity
96.	Terminal, Foundation for Arts Movement Education
97.	Térszínház Association
98.	Tiszta Művészet Association
99.	Tünet, Culture and Arts Association, a registered charity
100.	Új Előadóművészet Foundation
101.	Új Színház Foundation
102.	Utca-szak Cultural Association
103.	Municipal Arts Theatre, a registered charity
104.	Zirano Arts Theatre, a registered charity
105.	Zugszínház Association
106.	Zsámbéki-medence Tourist Association

e) Private activity

Most puppet theatres in Hungary are privately-owned (e.g.: Tintaló Társulás, Pélyi János bábszínház, Márkus Színház); as for drama theatres, the Karinthy Theatre in Budapest operates on this basis. Theatre

sponsorship, especially of entertainment shows, has increased in the past few years. Tibor Orlai is a person worth mentioning for setting up his own production company, which organises performance tours.

8. Forms of theatre activity (number):

Permanent regional theatres stage all types of productions: drama, musical, dance, opera, children's shows and readings. In larger provincial towns, there are many puppet theatres with their own venues.

- 1) Vojtina Puppet Theatre, Debrecen
- 2) Harlekin Puppet Theatre, Eger
- 3) Vaskakas Puppet Theatre, Győr
- 4) Ciróka Puppet Theatre, Kecskemét
- 5) Csodamalom Puppet Theatre, Miskolc
- 6) Kövér Béla Puppet Theatre, Szeged
- 7) Mesebolt Puppet Theatre, Szombathely
- 8) Kabóca Puppet Theatre, Veszprém

Musical theatres include the Madách Theatre in Budapest, which specialises in musicals, but also includes drama in its repertoire. In the past few seasons, the Central Theatre in Budapest has mounted a few musical productions. The Operetta in Budapest is a permanent venue for operettas and musicals. National State Opera is an internationally acclaimed institution, which stages opera and ballet productions. The National Theatre in Szeged and the Csokonai Theatre in Debrecen also have opera ensembles. Dance performances in various places are organized by the National Dance Theatre. Many drama associations have their own venues, and there are also many theatres that willingly host dance productions (e.g. Bethlen Scene, Central European Dance Theatre, Bakelit, Atrus Studio, Arts Movement Studio, SIN, Gödör Club, MU Theatre, Szkénél Theatre, Merlin Theatre, Trafó – Contemporary Community Centre, Arts Centre Festival Theatre).

Other:

National minority theatres in Hungary: Croatian Theatre in Pécs, German Theatre in Hungary/Deutsche Bühne Ungarn/, Serbian Theatre in Hungary, Malko Teatro, Vertigo Slovak Theatre, Cervinus Slovak Minority Theatre and drama associations of Roma and Jewish ethnic minorities. Anglophone troupes operating in Hungary: Scallabouche Company, Madhouse Theatre Company.

We lack information about impresario theatres. Production companies qualifying for Class VI do not have their own venues, and therefore host theatres usually give them an opportunity to perform.

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

Chapter 4 of the Theatre and Performing Arts Act regulates the extent of subsidising the institutions that are on the central or regional government budget. The institutions included in Class I-IV can count on permanent support, but the overall amount of subsidy can differ each year for various reasons. While the local governments would in the past receive a lump sum to redistribute among all the theatres, nowadays each theatre gets an individual sum based on the Theatre and Performance Arts Act, and the remainder of its budget is financed by the local government. The institution's own contribution to its budget is defined in the budget policy, and the subsidy is proportional to that received in the preceding year. The amount of the theatre's contribution to its own budget is based on ticket sales figures in the last two years, taking

into account the size of the venue. Class III dance and ballet companies, and Class IV theatres receive subsidies proportional to those allocated to their founding bodies from the central government budget in the previous year. This is also regulated by budget legislation.

The Act is therefore meant to encourage local governments to invest into their theatres, as doing so, on the one hand, can increase the amount of subsidies from the central government budget and, on the other hand, the Act also encourages activities aimed at increasing the number of spectators. Evaluation of ticket sales figures is another factor that contributes to risk reduction, and encourages institutions to take greater risks by staging more expensive or niche productions (small venues or alternative plays). In Class I and II, the contribution ratio of the local government and the institution itself is 50% – 50%. Multipliers assigned to various art forms are given below: puppet performance 0.5; children's performance 1.4; opera (only with live orchestra) 3; classical operetta 1.2 (subject to employing a live orchestra); ballet and dance 2.0; drama 2.0.

Subsidies for Class V and VI theatres are allocated in funding competitions. Taking into consideration the Art Council's petition, the minister asks the arts committee for their opinion. In case the minister's decision differs from the committee's recommendations, the minister is obliged to justify his/her case.

The theatre funding reform has been largely criticised, even though the fiscal year 2010 was just the first test of the system's functioning. The sources of financing have been frozen, mainly due to the economic crisis, and it is therefore difficult to evaluate the new system. Puppet theatres complain that the multipliers have been set without consulting them, and in their case 0.5 has caused them significant losses. The existence of puppet theatres now depends on the willingness of local governments to allocate more funds to meet the theatres' needs. It is already clear that theatres with a smaller audience (e.g. Kolibri Theatre, specialising in youth and children's shows) are unable to generate large profits and cannot increase the number of spectators like dance and entertainment theatres.

Problems already started at the outset of registration: Class III was designed specifically for dance companies funded by local governments; in spite of that, only two companies have managed to register. On the other hand, local governments have decreased the funding of their theatres, citing lack of resources. Therefore, the Act cannot fulfil its role of stimulating and expanding the sources of funding. Government-subsidised dance theatres (such as Honvéd Együttes, Állami Népi Együttes), which don't fall under the financial provisions of the Act, are also in a difficult situation due to a drastic drop in funding from the ministry. As for Class VI, see above.

Subsidies of some permanent theatres cannot be currently based on objective criteria. Depending on the theatre, the spectator's ticket is subsidised by 1,400 – 10,400 forints in the capital, and by up to 15,000 forints in the remainder of the country. This resource allocation is obsolete, and it seems nobody remembers how the quotes cited in the Act were calculated. Neither geographic location, number of inhabitants, nor the variety of art forms seem to have had a decisive influence. Nobody has done any research that would compare the activities and financial management of theatres, highlighting any similarities and differences. This is how Dániel Jánosy commented on the new act: "On the whole, the **new legislation has a rather negative impact** on the sector: the categories do not reflect the social and artistic expectations of changing the operating conditions of theatres." (Jánosy 2010).

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

The 2010 budget plans included the following figures:

Permanent subsidies

Class I (theatres, puppet theatres)	9,461.5 million
Class II (production theatres, host theatres)	500.0 million
Class III (ballet and dance companies)	53.0 million
Class IV (theatres, puppet theatres)	365.0 million

Project subsidies

Class V (open air theatres, minority theatres)	330.0 million
Class VI (independent theatres)	1,278.9 million
Amount allocated to special projects	800.0 million
	Total: 12,788.4 million Ft

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government
- funding from local governments
- own revenue of theatres

In the two years that followed after the change of the political system, local governments would be allocated lump sums for the funding of theatres. Later, based on the calculation of real operating costs of theatres, the theatres in the capital would receive 50% of their budget from the government, and provincial theatres would receive 60%. (Of course, the real costs depended on the level of local government subsidies in the past few years). In 1996, there was an attempt to separate the subsidies of theatre productions from the subsidies allocated to the maintenance of the premises, which were wholly financed by the central government. However, the system failed due to insufficient and ever-decreasing subsidies. Because of numerous cancellations and unpredictable government subsidy allocations in the past 12 years, some theatres were deprived of their subsidies, and it became necessary to change the system. The Theatre and Performance Arts Act defines the ratio of central to local government subsidies: “The local government subsidy shall be proportionate to the amount allocated in the preceding year.”

This summary presents the income structure of permanent theatres in Budapest and other cities, and includes the proportion calculations (in %).

	2003	%	2009	%
Central Government Budget Subsidy	13 700	52	10 709	40
Local Government Subsidy	6 300	24	8 137	30
Ticket Sales Revenue and Other Revenues	6 200	24	7 900	30

As you can see, in spite of the recent increase in ticket sales revenues, they are still too low to enable the theatres to function independently. When comparing the capital with other towns, it is important to note that in provincial theatres, the ticket sales percentage is the lowest (12%), but on the other hand, these theatres' other revenues are comparatively high (12%). These theatres often rely on sales of season tickets. Even though these are cheaper, they nevertheless provide a more predictable income. This way, they minimize the economic risk of having a flop. The subsidy system established by the new legislation makes it essential for regional theatres to maximize the number of spectators. In general, theatres in the capital have the highest ticket sales revenues (34%), whereas average ticket sales revenues of other theatres equal 19%.

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

The mechanism of budget planning is not synchronised with the “life cycle” of theatre operational activities. The time horizon cannot span longer than one year as the amount of the subsidies is different

every year, both for regional and independent theatres. Theatres that qualify for Class VI cannot be sure that they will receive a state subsidy, because subsidies are allocated in a competitive selection process. Despite this, the most important representatives of Class VI can plan more freely – if they continue to create theatrical productions of high quality, the subsidy amount will remain the same during the following year. There is no doubt, however, that they are subjected to continuous professional assessment. The lack of possibility of further planning (3 years or more) makes international cooperation difficult, even impossible.

Permanent theatres maintained by local governments can count on continuous subsidies; however, the amounts vary each year, making it difficult to plan for a longer period. Incidentally, fluctuations in multi-million subsidies may lead to the bankruptcy of these institutions, as maintaining the buildings and large infrastructure absorbs most of the budget. Having to secure the missing funds elsewhere often leads to disputes with the founding body, which is trying to maintain its theatres from lower subsidies. Claiming to have little money, it does not ensure the continuity of repairs, modernisation, or the comfort of the audience. Only a greater central subsidy can make a larger investment and modernisation possible.

Moreover, law does not specify what is expected of theatres when it comes to theatrical genres, aesthetics or audience figures; however, someone will ultimately be held accountable for the decreasing audience figures (The new law, which specifies the number of premieres and spectators will strongly affect the amount of state subsidies). Narrowing the genre specialisation is not in the interest of the owner, because it involves new expenses, both for the trips to festivals abroad as well as hosting guest performances. The founding body expects that the theatre will set aside enough funds to cover the costs or will manage to get them from another source.

Section 22-23 of the Theatre and Performing Arts Act also outlines accounting practices. “Local governments should record the subsidy used for its intended purpose by December 31st of the relevant year, as part of the process of compiling the end-of-year report. Other receipts for subsidies for activities taking place until December 31st must be recorded by June 30th of the following year. The report on the allocation of budget subsidies should be created completed by June 30th of the following year, and immediately made public.

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

Unfortunately, crisis management is becoming an increasingly important branch of the theatre economy. Recently, the Budapest City Council has decided to reduce the subsidies for its theatres by 216 million forints. However, the number of tasks that need to be done has not decreased, the management of the theatres had to refer to crisis management. There are two causes of falling into debt: costs that are higher than planned or revenues that are lower than planned.

One such example is the József Attila Theatre in Budapest. Inadequate management of this institution caused the debt to grow up to 270 million forints in total over the years. In 2010 a financial audit was carried out, which revealed that the theatre had by the end of June spent three quarters of its annual subsidy, and therefore did not have enough money to pay the wages in August. The Tax Office is investigating the bankruptcy issue, suspecting personal misconduct and lack of internal controls. The theatre was bailed out through the Act, because the founding body made the payment of the due subsidy in December. Taking precise and radical measures (cancelling unnecessary advertisements, increasing the number of performances, setting up an in-house tailor workshop, temporary wages and reducing the salaries) has prevented the theatre from cancelling its premieres and from having to lay off staff.

The National Theatre in Pécs has repeatedly been on the verge of bankruptcy due to a decrease in central government subsidies, the local government being unable to counterbalance that. The opera sec-

tion was nearly shut down in 2007, and as a result, 26 people were made redundant. The new legislation plans to decrease the overall theatre subsidies for this year by 2 billion forints, despite the fact that Pécs is the 2010 European capital of Culture. In this case, the theatre can count on a subsidy from two sources: The new legislation has allocated 800 million forints to a so-called 'crisis fund,' which can counterbalance any deficiencies. However, it would be more important to increase the amount of local government theatre subsidies, as in these figures will have an impact on the amount of central government subsidies in the following year.

Dr. Sándor Venczel, an expert on the economics of theatre, has proposed the following strategy for managing the crisis: review the wages and the number of employees (the Madách Theatre has laid off 10% of its dancers, and reduced the salaries of all artists by 20%; staff reductions have also occurred in other theatres); delay immediate payments; issue exclusive season tickets; rent out the hall; change opening night dates; freeze in-house activities (education, festival organisation, leaflet publication); and improve the marketing. Many theatres reduce the number of premieres, which reduces the costs: the Thália Theatre has reduced the number of premieres from 2 to 1, the Radnóti Theatre – from 4 to 3, the Kolibri Theatre – from 8 to 5. The József Katona Theatre will have only 5 premieres in the following year. The Director of Vígszínház has implemented a hiring freeze, and the director of The Puppet Theatre in Budapest has staged a premiere together with another puppet theatre; the savings almost equalled the amount of the withdrawn subsidy. In order to increase their revenues, the Madách Theatre, the Szabad Tér and the Operetta are planning to increase the number of performances. The Thália Theatre and the Puppet Theatre are planning to raise ticket prices for popular shows by 5-10% (Venczel 2010).

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

The Theatre and Performing Arts Act includes a new corporate tax provision, which states that companies can deduct a donation of up to 80% of the ticket sales revenue from their taxes. The European Commission adopted this amendment and since 2010, when the law was passed, local governments and theatres can benefit from this provision. Sponsoring is not yet a common form of financing. Sponsors are more likely to finance theatres from outside the capital (local multinational companies) and drama festivals or festival projects with a large audience and a large budget (Budapest Spring Festival, Budapest Autumn Festival, National Drama Encounters in Pécs). The legislators hope that the film industry will likewise be vitalized by an additional infusion of funding coming from the tax allowance.

Permanent theatres have a chance to obtain extra income through the occasional rental of the auditorium and the building, symbolic sale of box seats and regular seats, and exclusive performances for companies. In addition to competitions, independent groups also have other means of obtaining funding for their activities.

The Theatre Panel of the National Cultural Fund (NKA) announces grant competitions with varied funding and topics (creating a production, giving a performance, writing a drama; e.g. in 2009 "an open air performance of a new production"). The NKA has its own critic portal (www.revizoronline.hu), which includes evaluations written by people associated with the industry, and the grant awards figures. It is possible to obtain additional sources of funding for a joint national production or a multinational one, using regional and EU grants. The TÁMOP programme offers a source of funding through trainings designed for improving the cooperation in theatre work, and the Visegrád Fund supports cooperation based regional and Central-European themes.

Percentage breakdown of theatre revenues according to the type of theatre (source: Jánossy 2010, 40)

In %	Subsidy	Grant	Entire subsidy	Ticket Sales Revenue	Patronage	Entrepreneurs	Total Income	Total
Budapest	51	1	51	34	0	15	49	100
State	79	0	79	15	0	6	21	100
District Independent	51	19	69	16	1	14	31	100
Outside the capital	74	2	76	12	0	12	24	100
All	68	2	70	19	0	11	30	100

Section D. Artistic Activity

The following statistics are based on databases and publications of the Ministry of National Resources, the National Museum, and the Institute of Theatre History.

15. Number of premieres in a season (drama, opera, children's shows, dance theatre): 800

16. Number of plays in the period of 2007-2009 (drama, opera): 1800

17. Number of spectators and other statistical data:

3. Arts Institutions									
3.1 Theatres ^{1) 2)}									
3.1.1. Number of theatres, seating capacity, performances, number of spectators, employees, ticket sales revenues, budgetary expenditure ^{1), 2)}									
Year	Theatres	Performances ³⁾	Budgetary Expenditure in millions of forints ⁵⁾	Audience in thousands ⁴⁾	Full-Time Employees	Revenue from Tour Tickets in millions of forints	Revenue from Home Tickets in millions of forints	Ticket Sales Profit in millions of forints	Seating Capacity
1970	34	20 307	11 907	5 470	–	-	150	–	-
1980	33	20 737	11 520	5 635	5 420	119	411	–	-
1990	43	23 600	11 534	4 991	6 345	–	2 564	–	-
2000	52	29 543	12 682	3 938	4 962	2 629	23 898	–	-
2001	52	28 494	12 304	3 898	4 876	2 911	19 921	2 761	150
2002	54	26 917	13 176	4 152	5 078	3 806	22 606	3 611	195

Year	Theatres	Performances ³⁾	Budgetary Expenditure in millions of forints ⁵⁾	Audience in thousands ⁴⁾	Full-Time Employees	Revenue from Tour Tickets in millions of forints	Revenue from Home Tickets in millions of forints	Ticket Sales Profit in millions of forints	Seating Capacity
2003	54	29 394	13 473	4 198	5 049	4 780	26 157	4 549	231
2004	56	30 069	14 329	4 365	5 005	5 793	26 368	5 432	361
2005	55	30 065	14 301	4 412	5 123	6 713	26 520	6 189	524
2006	56	30 929	13 994	4 156	5 616	7 311	25 457	6 747	564
2007	56	31 839	13 484	4 049	5 348	7 958	26 346	7 405	553
2008	74	30 531	14 803	4 076	5 452	7 667	29 794	5 720	1 947
2009	130	33 138	19 057	4 488	5 638	8 172	29 260	6 455	1 717

1) Starting from 2008, the table also includes independent theatre data.

2) Starting from 2009, the table also includes the data from theatres registered under the provisions of Act No. XCIX from 2008.

3) Private theatre performances (productions).

4) Number of spectators at the performances (productions) of private theatres.

5) Data of public institutions (Hungarian State Treasury).

3.2. Outdoor shows ¹⁾						
3.2.1. Stages, seating capacity, performances, audience, ticket sales, current expenses (in forints)						
Year	# of Stages	# of Seats	# of Performances	Audience (in thousands)	Ticket Sales Revenue (in mil.)	Current Expenses (in mil.) ²⁾
1970	8	–	120	175,7	4,6	-
1980	18	–	335	196,9	12,3	-
1990	20	–	213	286,6	67,7	-
2000	18	16 067	169	110,6	170,0	277,3
2001	16	17 529	174	134,7	225,1	276,4
2002	17	24 914	189	115,3	229,1	317,3
2003	25	32 561	289	175,4	251,4	220,5
2004	31	47 204	261	118,6	313,1	535,8
2005	35	42 479	261	124,3	403,0	303,1
2006	34	45 084	351	160,8	454,5	404,7
2007	34	20 283	336	157,1	611,0	562,4
2008	40	22 641	361	166,1	631,1	877,1
2009	31	29 756	283	161,1	532,3	929,4

1) Number of theatre performances and spectators only

2) Basic data from the database. Budget subsidies up to 2007, founding bodies' subsidies and various grants from 2008.

3.2.2. Audience Figures in Open Air Theatres			
Year	Number of Spectators per performance	Ticket Sales Revenue per Performance	Ticket Sales Revenue per Spectator
1970	1 464,1	38,3	26,2
1980	587,7	36,7	62,5
1990	1 345,4	317,8	236,2
2000	654,4	1 005,9	1 537,1
2001	774,1	1 293,7	1 671,1
2002	610,1	1 212,2	1 987,0
2003	606,8	869,7	1 433,4
2004	454,4	1 199,5	2 639,6
2005	476,2	1 544,0	3 242,0
2006	458,1	1 294,9	2 826,5
2007	467,6	1 818,5	3 889,2
2008	460,1	1 748,2	3 799,5
2009	569,1	1 880,9	3 304,2

19. It is not possible to give exact figures of the **average cost of production** when it comes to shows or projects. The average cost of guest productions in Hungary ranges from 3,000,000 to 12,000,000 forints. The estimated costs of independent theatres are much lower than the costs of guest performances by permanent companies. The average cost of a premiere in a theatre in Budapest is about 15-20 million forints. **Art theatres stage 5-6 premieres a year, unlike the non-art theatres, which stage 3-4 premieres. The difference of 2-3 shows a year, each of which costs 15-20 million forints, means that it is necessary to secure additional funding of 40-50 million forints a year.**

20. Local and international festivals since 2007:

- **Local festivals : 34**
- **International festivals: 29**

	Name	Place
1.	National Drama Encounters in Pécs	
2.	Alternative Encounter in Székéné	
3.	Budapest Autumn Festival	
4.	Budapest Spring Festival	
5.	Plank Festival	Debrecen
6.	Art Valley	Kapolcs and the surrounding area
7.	Gesztus Festival	Budapest
8.	Golem Festival / International Jewish Festival	Budapest
9.	Children's and Youth Drama Biennale	Kaposvár
10.	Meeting of Hungarian Theatres from Abroad	Kisvárdá
11.	Kolibri Festival	Budapest
12.	Kabóciédé Family Festival	Veszprém

	Name	Place
13.	Contemporary Drama Festival	Budapest
14.	L1 Contemporary Dance Festival	Budapest
15.	Hungarian Dance Festival	Győr
16.	Dance Panorama in Keszthely	Keszthely
17.	Hungarian Drama Student Festival	Eger
18.	Makó Operetta Festival	Makó
19.	Miskolc International Opera Festival	Miskolc
20.	International Puppet and Street Theatre Festival	Budapest
21.	Theatre Season Opening Festival	Budapest
22.	International Festival of Contemporary Puppet Theatre	Eger
23.	International Festival of Monodrama	Eger
24.	International Solo Dance Festival	Budapest
25.	Shakespeare Festival	Gyula
26.	Spinoza Jewish Festival	Budapest
27.	„Winged Dragon” International Festival	Nyírbátor
28.	Theatre Without Borders	Tiszaújváros
29.	International Festival of Solo Dance, International Festival of Partner Dance	Budapest
30.	Local and International Conventions of Contemporary Artists	Veszprém
31.	International Convention of Independent Theatres	Szeged
32.	Veszprém Fairy Tale Festival	Veszprém
33.	Municipal Theatres Encounters/Rivalda	Budapest
34.	Vidor Festival	Nyíregyháza
35.	VOLT Festival	Sopron
36.	International Puppet Festival „Puppet in a Bag”	Sárospatak
37.	Jewish Summer Festival	Budapest
38.	“Devil’s Cauldron” Festival	
39.	National Music Theatre Encounters in Kecskemét	Kecskemét
40.	Alternative Theatre Festival in Szeged	Szeged
41.	Open-Air Performances in Szeged	Szeged
42.	„Színváltás” Student Theatre Festival	Budapest
43.	Tihany Open-Air Performances	Tihany
44.	Alternative Theatre Encounters	Debrecen
45.	Andocs Art Days	Andocs
46.	International Dance Encounters in Pécs	Pécs
47.	University Drama Festival in Pécs	Pécs
48.	Hungarian Dance Festival	Győr
49.	Dance Artists Biennale in Győr	Győr
50.	BÁBU Puppet Festival in Budapest	Budapest
51.	Mezzo TV Festival and Contest	Szeged

	Name	Place
52.	Festival of Five Churches	Győr
53.	Hungarian Puppet Theatre Encounters	Kecskemét
54.	Minorities' Theatre Encounters , ARCUSFEST	Budapest/Thália Színház
55.	Hungarian Drama Festival	Szekszárd
56.	Pendulum – Swinging into Motion Theatre Series	Budapest/Trafó
57.	Hungarian Puppet Theatre Festival	Kecskemét
58.	International Festival of Puppet Theatre	Békéscsaba
59.	International Puppet and Street Theatre Festival in Pécs	Pécs
60.	Györkőc Festival	Győr
61.	Sziget Festival	Budapest
62.	Gyereksziget Festival	Budapest
63.	International Festival of Circus Theatre	Budapest, Millenaris

Section E. International Co-operation

21. EU projects and programmes

Cultural institutions specializing in drama and dance frequently take part in EU projects. Many theatres have taken part in the Social Renewal Operational Programme in the past few years, or received a grant for their projects.

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

Our puppet theatres are members of these theatre associations: UNIME (International Puppet Theatre Association) and ASSITEJ (International Association of Children's and Youth Theatres). There are no Hungarian members of the European Theatre Union at present, but the Hungarian State Theatre in Romania is a member.

23. International co-production

International co-operation consists of hosting artists, and this means many foreign directors, choreographers, and designers have worked in our country, while Hungarian artists took part in many international projects abroad (opera directors Róbert Alföldi – Tobias Picker's *Emmeline* at New York Dicapo Opera Theatre, or Arpad Schilling co-directing with French students at Centre National des Arts du Cirque (CNAC).

The budget of the co-produced performance is based on the contracts of the participants.

Szakmáry Dalma, Szabó Attila

Bibliography

Bálint László (2008) Parliament Passes the Theatre and Performing Arts Act, *Vasárnapi Hírek* 2008. 12. 14. [Http://www.nefmi.gov.hu/kultura/eredmenyek/helyi.onkormanyzatok-090803](http://www.nefmi.gov.hu/kultura/eredmenyek/helyi.onkormanyzatok-090803)

Jánosy Dániel (2010) Public resources and culture. Introduction and case studies of Hungarian theatres. Állami Számvevőszék (NIK), Budapest., July 2010
http://szinigazdasag.hu/images/TANULMNY_kultura_s:sznhz.pdf

Kosztolánczy Gábor, New Methods of Financing, www.terasz.hu
Mészáros B. Endre (2009), On the Brink of Bankruptcy – National Theatre in Pécs, www.bama.hu
<http://www.bama.hu/baranya/kultura/csodkozelben-a-pecsi-nemzeti-szinhaz-261073>

Nagy Gergely Miklós (2010), József Attila Theatre Bailed Out, *Népszava*. November 24, 2010.

Szabó István (2008), The Political System is Gone – the Theatre is Still Here, a conference/performance, Contemporary Drama Festival Budapest 2009 *Twenty Years Later* conference, publication forthcoming in spring 2011.

Szabó István, Venczel Sándor, Vársárhelyi Mária (2005), *Theatres Here and Now – Theatres in the Future*, NKA research *Színpad* 2009 nr. 1, National Museum and Theatre History Institute, Budapest *Színpad* 2009 nr. 2.

Tölgyesi Gábor (2009) The Theatre Act and Its Evaluation. Viewers in Puppet Theatres Count as Half a Person. The Gap between Goals and Reality. *Magyar Nemzet* 2009. December 8.

Vársárhelyi Mária (2008): Is This the Future? Look at the Theatres, *Élet és Irodalom*, 2008. 10. 03.

Venczel Sándor (2008) Krétakör – Economics of Private Theatre, *Színpad* 2008. Nr 3.
Online: <http://szinigazdasag.hu>

Venczel Sándor (2010). Economic Crisis in Theatres. Online: <http://szinigazdasag.hu>

[http://szinigazdasag.hu/index.php?option=com_content\(and\)view-article\(and\)id-26435,valsagkezeles-a-szinhazakban\(and\)catid-2tanulmanyok\(and\)Itemid-2](http://szinigazdasag.hu/index.php?option=com_content(and)view-article(and)id-26435,valsagkezeles-a-szinhazakban(and)catid-2tanulmanyok(and)Itemid-2)

Véner Orsolya (2009), *Pintér Béla and Ensemble – Economics of Private Theatre*

Wettstein Tibor (2010) Theatre Subsidies in 2010. Online: <http://szinigazdasag.hu>

[http://szinigazdasag.hu/index.php?option=com_content\(and\)view-article\(and\)id-37672:szinhazak-tamogatasa-a-2010-evben\(and\)catid-2:tanulmanyok\(and\)Itemid-2](http://szinigazdasag.hu/index.php?option=com_content(and)view-article(and)id-37672:szinhazak-tamogatasa-a-2010-evben(and)catid-2:tanulmanyok(and)Itemid-2)

Databases of the National Museum and the Theatre Institute

Ministry of National Resources www.nefmi.gov.hu

Art and Production Bureau www.eloadomuveszetiiroda.hu

National Museum and Theatre Institute Annual Bulletin, published each season.



Kosovo

Theatre in Kosovo – Challenges in a New Country

1. Historical Background

Before giving a more detailed account of the current theatre and dance scene in Kosovo, allow me to briefly outline the history of establishing the first drama and dance companies, their functioning in communism and under Milosevic's oppression. This overview will help you understand the current situation of Kosovo's theatre and dance scene, which is undoubtedly the poorest one in Europe!

The first theatre companies in Kosovo were established after WWII in Prizreni, Prishtina and Mitrovica, but later on also in Dakovica (Gjakova), Gnjilane (Gjilan), Pec (Peja) and other Kosovan towns. In those days, theatres attracted amateur artists, enthusiasts and theatre aficionados. Until the 1960's, productions were mainly based on plays about partisan wars. It was an ideological and didactic theatre, which used the then common characters of a courageous partisan and communist hero who faces the enemies – the Germans and the bourgeois. "Erveheja", a play by the late director Muharrem Quena, which was staged at the National Theatre of Kosovo Province, was a breath of fresh air when it came to its theme and directing. A powerful drama about nascent love, it was inspired by the director's own life. In the 1960's and 1970's, the plays by Beckett, Shakespeare and other world-renown playwrights started to be mounted for the first time. Simultaneously, a new generation of directors and actors was emerging – mainly the graduates of drama schools in Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana. Besides drama theatres, 1972 also saw the establishment of a ballet company, which operated as part of the National Theatre of Kosovo Province, with seat in Prishtina. The company's dancers were young people educated at academies in Skopje (Macedonia), although dancers from former Yugoslavia and other countries also joined the company. The ballet company was functioning until the early 1990's, its later existence being jeopardised by the political situation of that period.

In the 1980's, dramatic political events put a new spirit into Kosovan theatre. As it was forbidden to address political topics explicitly, Albanian playwrights increased their use of symbols and images. Some of the symbols were universal, while others could be understood only by Albanian audience. A white horse symbolises freedom, a black cloud – violence, a cross represents pain, fire is an omen of war, a long leather coat indicates a person working for the authorities, etc. Obviously, these and other symbols had various connotations.

A serious political schism that took place in the early 1990's, together with the Milosevic regime's repression, did not create favourable conditions for theatre in Kosovo. Most of the theatres were either closed or under the control of people loyal to Milosevic. This was also the fate of the Kosovan National Theatre. Most of the Albanian actors and directors were made redundant. During more than a decade, only a handful of Albanian plays were mounted, whereas the Serbian ensemble of the theatre was operating as usual. Obviously, those Albanian plays that did get staged at the time, had to get past the censorship of the new Serbian administration. In those plays, Albanian playwrights had drawn on various topics from the past, thus showing analogies with the contemporary political and social situation. One of the most important productions of that period, Xhevat Qorraj's "Nata e fundit në Goli Otok" ("The Last Night in Goli Otok") talks about the murdering and torturing of Albanian prisoners in an infamous Yugoslav prison. Actors on the stage and the audience would shed real tears. At the time, the play was performed about 100 times. After the war of 1999 it started running again, but without much success.

The reasons for its lukewarm reception after the war are surely manifold, but undoubtedly the spectators did not carry the same emotional and political burden as they had ten years before. This situation can also be explained by the fact that while ten years before, the Albanian audience had no real choice, and every play in Albanian Language was important, whereas the choice in the period of freedom has been much more varied.

2. Cultural Resistance – the Dodona Theatre

In the early 1990's, the first independent drama groups start to appear, albeit performing sporadically, mainly in alternative venues. At any rate, history of Kosovo in the period of 1992-1998 is inextricably linked with the Dodona Theatre – a small children's and youth theatre, established in the 1990's and situated in a remote Prishtina suburb. During those years, up until the end of the Kosovan war, it was actually the only place in Kosovo where various cultural events in Albania took place. This modest theatre, with a small stage and 162 seats in the auditorium, would organise as many as five different cultural events a day, for various audiences. At that period, the theatre was headed by Faruk Begolli, actor and director. In the 1970's and 1980's, Begolli was a star of the Yugoslav cinema. He ended his brilliant career in Belgrade, and in the late 1980's returned to Pristina, where he set up an acting course at the university.

In the period before the war in 1999, the Dodona theatre produced mainly comedies and dramas by various authors from the around the world. Among the props for Beckett's "Waiting for Godot" (1995), there was, apart from others, a miniature tank. In Fadil Hysaj's take on this drama, Godot was seen as a symbol of freedom that never comes. The tank, just like other elements of the play, was supposed to embody the repressive and violent actions against the Albanians by Milosevic's regime. This director has also staged Ionesco's "Chairs" – a play that can be perceived as a metaphor of spiritual emptiness and isolation, so dominant in contemporary Kosovo.

The first part of the most brilliant comedy of that period, "Profesor, jam talent se jo mahi" ("Professor, I've got talent, and it's no joke") by the late actor and director Faruk Begolli, was performed about 360 times. The auditorium of the theatre was always full. The crowd would sometimes break down the door, and there were instances of spectators trying to get into the building through the roof. In the contemporary atmosphere of violence, the theatre was an oasis, a place where one could breathe freely and regain human dignity. The Dodona was like a forbidden fruit – the spectators stood up to their fear of the Serbian police, and came to the theatre to see a play... The actors usually slept on the premises, as the return home at such a late hour was too dangerous. Once, after a tour performance, Serbian police ordered the actors to burn the Albanian flag used as a prop in the play. The choreodrama "Odisea Shqiptare" ("Albanian Odyssey") by Abi Nokshiqi, a famous choreographer, was banned on the day of its premiere under the pretext that it contained "Albanian national elements". Dodona closed down five days before NATO started bombarding Serbian military and police forces. Before its closure, unknown assailants had murdered Adriana Abdullahu, a young actress in Dodona, and injured a few other people. Adriana was one of the most talented actresses of her generation. During the war, most of Dodona's actors were forcibly removed from Prishtina. Faruk Begolli managed to escape and hide in his sister's house in the suburbs.

3. Theatre Resurrection

During the war in Kosovo, the building of the Kosovan National Theatre (formerly the People's Theatre in Kosovo) was destroyed by bombs, just like other theatre venues. Only long after the end of the war could these theatres start working again. One of the first plays staged in Kosovo after the war was Shakespeare's Hamlet in the National Theatre, directed by David Gothard from England. "Hamlet" was chosen as a play that would confront the Albanian spectator with the issue of revenge. One of the actors on the stage apron narrates his story. During the war, he was taken prisoner by Serbian soldiers. First they beat him up, and then ordered him to act something out of Shakespeare. The actor chose Hamlet's

monologue (“To be or not to be?”), which clearly epitomised his own dilemma – will I live or will I die? “Hamlet” was the most successful play in the post-war period, and ran for over two years, which is quite unusual. Just after the war, the Dodona mounted a few plays for children, aimed at spreading awareness about landmines.

After the war, many Kosovan plays about war were documentary in character, recalling the war times with pathos. At the same time, some authors started avoiding the topic of war, or portrayed it in an indirect way. In Bekim Lumi’s take on Ionesco’s “Lesson”, the lead actor was made to look like Hitler, and the chair on which the murder is committed, was marked with a Star of David. The whole play was supposed to be a metaphor of human aptitude for violence against others.

Theatres and independent drama groups have been quite rare in Kosovo in recent years. Besides the Oda Theatre and the Teatrit të babes (currently virtually closed), there are no independent theatres in Kosovo. When it comes to theatre companies, most of those formed after the war in Kosovo did not last, with the exception of the MULTIMEDIA Center. Some of them had performed once or twice, and then split up. The MULTIMEDIA Center, founded in 2002 and managed by young theatre professionals, is the success story in Kosovo’s theatre scene. Its first performance was realised in co-production with the French drama group “L’espace d’un instant”. The play, co-authored by nine Kosovan playwrights, was produced in Kosovo. “Udhëtimi në UNMIKISTAN” (“The Journey to Unmikistan”, directed by Dominique Dolmieu) portrays the post-war period in Kosovo, under the UN administration, which many people considered to be “contemporary colonisation”. Besides Prizreni and other theatres in Kosovo, it was also performed in the recently founded Oda Theatre. The MULTIMEDIA Center was initially particularly active as a children’s theatre as part of the “Qendra për Zhvillimin e Teatrit për Fëmijë” (“Centre for Children’s Theatre Development”) programme, known abroad as the CCTD (abbreviation of the English name of the programme). The CCTD has introduced new aesthetics to children’s theatre, producing original plays with the participation of professional actors, which up until then was not very common. The CCTD addresses topics that are taboo in children’s theatre. One of the pieces, “Mësimi i ndaluar” (“Forbidden Lesson”) by a group of young dramaturges, is a “mosaic play”. The play, directed by Gareth Potter from Wales, introduces young people to the topic of sexuality and taboo. In the past two years, MULTIMEDIA Center has focused on theatre for adult spectators, experimenting with dramaturgy, space and language, etc. This is being done in co-production with European theatres. Directors hosted by the MULTIMEDIA Center mostly come from Europe, but also from Canada (Michael Devine) and the USA (Scott Strode). The MULTIMEDIA Center’s most successful productions include “ENEA 06”, directed by Michael Devine from Canada. “ENEA 06” consists of two short plays that share a common topic and some of the characters. Later on, MULTIMEDIA Center created one of the largest theatre projects in the post-war Kosovo. “Darka e fundit” (“The Last Supper”) was completed in 2007 in co-production with the Markus Zohner Theatre Compagnie from Switzerland. For two months, a group of Swiss and Kosovan artists was working on the so-called “happenings” in unconventional theatre venues. After intensive preparations, their play “Darka e fundit” was performed in on the premises of the now derelict Rilindja building, which used to be a media centre and is one of the best-known buildings in Prishtina. The play consists of two parallel narratives. The first one includes the actors’ stories about their Kosovo war experiences. Some of these stories are real, some are imaginary. The other narrative is based on dialogues between “murderers” and “victims”. It is a fictional narrative, which attempts to find a philosophical and political answer to questions regarding revenge and forgiveness, especially in Kosovan context. Is forgiveness possible? How can it be attained? Does forgiveness require the murderer to ask for it? Does committing a murder make the murderer stronger or weaker?

Oda is the first independent theatre in Kosovo, founded by two young artists, who started their careers just after the war by managing the National Theatre. Since its founding 5 years ago, the Oda Theatre has had considerable success. It started out as an alternative venue for more innovative theatre projects, and at times it operates under severe financial constraints, which threaten its further existence.

In order to survive the financial crisis, the venue is used for occasional theatre events, and other commercial activities. Even so, some of the productions, including guest productions of this theatre can be considered important drama events. The Oda Theatre's debut performance was "Monologët e vaginës" ("The Vagina Monologues"), which is worth mentioning for its bold subject. Comedy "Tre gjermanët e trashë" ("Three fat Germans") had quite a long run in this theatre, and later on became the basis for a TV show with tens of episodes. The humour in "Tre gjermanët e trashë" is strongly inspired by the Monty Python's Flying Circus.

4. Kosovan National Theatre

As a young country, Kosovo has created its own laws regulating theatre activity. The Theatre Act guarantees creative freedom in all aspects of artistic and stage expression, while regulating the establishing, structuring, operating, managing and financing of the theatres, along with other theatre-related issues. The Act also broadly identifies the role and functioning of the Kosovan National Theatre (Teatri Kombëtar i Kosovës – TKK) as the highest-ranking theatre institution in the country, which stages drama productions and presents the most valued works of national and world drama to its spectators. At the same time, the image and role of theatre are still in the process of formation. The vision of the relation of theatre with audience, national drama and the government is crystallising very slowly. In particular, the relationship between the theatre, national drama and the government is one of the most heatedly debated topics in the most recent history of the drama milieu.

The new government provides financial support for the TKK also because it is one of the "national institutions" that symbolise the Kosovo republic. A country must have its "national theatre"! However, beside this "national mania", the government does not show particular interest in the theatre or its development. At the same time, the government and its administration are trying to, in a sense, retain control over the theatre. It has to be pointed out that this is not about political control or censoring the productions. Generally, this control pertains to the use of the stage and the remaining space of the TKK. The (unofficial) hierarchy of power over the TKK spans from the level of the Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports (sometimes even higher – the Prime Minister and the Presidential Office) through the level of the Secretary of State, the Director of the Culture Department, the Performing Arts Bureau and finally to the TKK management. Such a legally unfounded system of power over the TKK stems principally from the fact that TKK is funded from the national budget. Any attempts to avoid this "professional hierarchy" result in resignation (or redundancy) threats, funding constraints or delays in cash flow, blackmail and bureaucratic pressure.

Shortly after the announcement of Kosovo's independence, the government officials had a plaque installed over the entrance to the theatre, which read (in large letters) "The Republic of Kosovo", below that (in smaller letters) "The Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports", and at the bottom (in tiny letters) "Kosovan National Theatre". After a few comments in the media, the plaque was removed and no further attempts at its installation have been made. This plaque and the disproportional size of the letters in the names of specific institutions give the best picture of the "government relationship" hierarchy, and reflect the "autonomy" of this theatre in relation to the state structure. The main state structures (the government and the president) still use the stage of the theatre to organise various events, mainly honouring heroes from the olden days or from the times of the last war.

When the director of the TKK in 2009 rejected the demand of the Prime Minister's Office to organise a memorial service in the theatre, it caused a media and political scandal, which almost led to the resignation of the theatre's director. He resigned a few months later, due to the growing political pressure and the burgeoning bureaucracy at the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports.

When it comes to the programme aspect, the theatre has recently established a "politically correct" repertoire policy. It means that the theatre does not "worry" the government, on the contrary, it contributes to the "nation-building" by promoting "national values". In principle, the theatre has absolutely no opportunity to create opinions or to stimulate them. Given the long-term audience crisis, its role in

society is marginal. Its “opportunist” role was identified as one of the main causes of the low interest of the spectators in this theatre’s production.

In these new political circumstances, the theatre faces the most basic questions: What, in fact, is national theatre? Which plays of the Kosovan dramaturgy should be staged in the national theatre? Which “important national topics” are worthy of its attention? Do Kosovan plays make the national theatre more national? Does the national theatre become less national if it stages plays by Shakespeare, Molière, or other contemporary European playwrights? There are many more questions and dilemmas.

The situation that arose after the announcement of Kosovo’s independence has also prompted another debate: What are the “borders” of national drama? The broad concept of Albanian drama (which includes the whole creative corpus of Albanian playwrights) started to be narrowed down to “Kosovan drama”. These tendencies are mostly shown by playwrights interested in “quantitative market segmentation”. The smaller the market, the bigger the opportunities.

In the past two years, the proportion of world drama to national drama staged in the TTK was 4:2. This proportion is still one of the most heatedly discussed topics in debates about theatre. Critics argue that since it’s the “national theatre”, its repertoire should mainly consist of national drama. Their reasoning is that local authors are aware of the problems of our society, and since theatre is a “mirror that reflects social problems”, the concept of a more national drama is valid. That is true, and there are also legal grounds for it. However, problems arise from the very works of Albanian authors and their attitudes to these problems. In most cases, they lack criticism and the courage to tackle many problematic and taboo topics. The past is treated selectively by choosing moments and events that fit the schema. Such a schema excludes the weaknesses, mistakes and guilt of the Albanian society, or presents them as a result of external pressures, “hostile influences”. What has caused the emergence of such a schema and why does it still influence our artists? The main reasons stem from the political and social conditions of the Albanians’ lives. As a repressed, politically fragmented nation, Albanians have naturally strived for freedom. Plays that do not promote this ideal, and tackle other (“marginal”) problems, are usually considered dangerous and they are treated as an obstacle on the way to the ideal. Putting our problems into spotlight sparks worries that in this way we present (to the surrounding world) an image of ourselves as a society that does not deserve freedom. An Albanian mother could not have been a whore, a “freedom fighter” in a play cannot betray the “national cause”, the Serbs are always drunk soldiers who curse and murder in cold blood. Not even the Albanian directors are ready to take up Albanian drama. As their drama interests are usually more narrow than those of the theatre as an institution, they usually prefer to direct a play from the world drama, rather than national drama. The few directors working with national drama mostly just present the spectator with certain drama “codes”, which are supposed to induce associations with something “historical”, “cultural”, “traditional” or “national”.

Given the current identity crisis of Kosovan theatre, the most important questions are full of difficult challenges. What exactly are these “national values”? If the government currently (given its “national interests”) promotes the value of Albanian-Serbian co-existence, is theatre supposed to accept this “value”, or can it question it, depicting everyday reality, where this “value” is being rejected? Such a “value” (supported by the government), even though very important, is often challenged, but on the other hand, its questioning can fuel nationalism and endanger the existence of the new state. The compromise, which consists of not tackling the subject at all, can be perceived as opportunism, with no positive outcome for the theatre.

Moreover, what are the currently important “national topics”? According to a caste of pseudo-artists, these topics stem from history and are connected with the concept of nation and state formation, etc., and include the period of Skanderbeg’s wars with the Ottoman Empire, the Prizren League, the colonisation of Kosovo, Albanian declaration of independence, etc. According to this view, every play tackling one of the above topics should be staged in the National Theatre. Based on this reasoning, the National Theatre constitutes a bastion of this subject matter, hence its name “National Theatre”. Such subject matter excludes any confrontation of “historical facts” or any confrontation with the potential “dark side” of historical events, which is immediately branded “anti-national”.

5. Organisation, Structure and Funding

The theatre scene in Kosovo mainly consists of “public theatres”. This category includes the following theatres: the Kosovan National Theatre (in Prishtina), municipal theatres functioning only in some Kosovan towns, and the Dodona, a youth and children’s theatre and a puppet theatre. The other type of theatres consists of independent theatres and theatre companies.

In terms of competence and functioning of public theatres, there is still a lot of chaos, with very slow improvement. Immediately after the war, the Kosovan National Theatre and some of the municipal theatres, e.g. those in Gnjilane (Gjilan) and Dakovica (Gjakova), were subordinated to the Ministry of Culture. The latter ones were branded “national theatres” some time after the end of the war. It happened on a euphoric wave of “nation mania”. Both theatres were supposed to gain immediate access to better funding from the Ministry of Culture. Meanwhile, other municipal theatres – such as those in Urosevac (Ferizaj), Pec (Peja) and Mitrovica – have transformed from amateur theatres into professional ones, e.g. the Prizren theatre was re-named “Prizren Professional Theatre”. These categories have also been created in order to get more funding from the ministry of Culture. Problems emerged as a result of decentralisation and delegation of competences to the local level. Municipalities wanted to accept full responsibility for their theatres, but at the same time, they still expected to get funding from the Ministry of Culture. Currently, based on binding legislation, municipal theatres are run and funded by individual towns. These theatres can apply for extra funding from the Ministry of Culture, even though the Ministry has no obligation to finance them, as the theatres are wholly subordinated to municipalities. However, it is quite a burden for the towns, as they lack managerial skills and funds, or they only finance one or two drama projects a year. In effect, the theatre scene in those small towns has plunged into a deep crisis. The theatre in Dakovica (Gjakova) used to stage up to ten new plays a year, but last year, it managed to stage only one. The Kosovan National Theatre is the only comparatively well-functioning theatre; it is still funded by the Ministry of Culture.

The Theatre Act passed by the Kosovan Parliament in June 2005 proved to be dysfunctional and too centralistic, especially when it comes to delineating the powers and duties of the authorities (the appointment of directors, the executive board, etc.). In the case of public theatres, the executive board is appointed by the Ministry of Culture or the city council. The directors are appointed for the period of three years. The director is nominated by the executive board, with the Minister of Culture or the mayor having the final say. The post of artistic director has recently gained more importance, as it involves the responsibility for the repertoire and the programme of artistic activities. However, due to the powers of the authorities (local and central), the appointment of a director is often a result of party interests.

Besides that, it is worth mentioning that current legislation does not take into consideration the role and existence of independent theatres. The provision related to the functioning of these theatres says that “independent theatres also may apply for funding from the Ministry of Culture”!

This year, an amendment has been drafted, which would require the Ministry of Culture to allocate 30% of its theatre budget to independent theatres. Just like other new concepts, however, there is no guarantee that this amendment will gain the support of all the parliamentary committees before the vote. This identifies another problem: the amendment, which has full support of both the Ministry of Culture (which has initiated this project) and the artists, must pass through a maze of bureaucratic and finance committees; this will result in such alterations to its final version that will render it dysfunctional. However, those that will be bound by the amendment have no influence on the shape of the final version at all.

Kosovo has also passed a new law regulating the functioning of ballet, as a part of the new Kosovan Opera, Ballet, Philharmonics and Choir Act. There is also a separate law that regulates the National Folk Song and Dance Ensemble “Shota”, whose main goal is to promote and preserve national folk heritage. When it comes to dance, the ballet company is the only publicly funded professional ensemble.

The dance scene is virtually non-existent. There have been a few attempts at establishing independent groups, but without success.

Some theatres in Kosovo operate in the “community centres” built in communism. Such “community centres” exist in virtually every town in Kosovo, even though most of them are either closed down or used for other purposes. The buildings are still managed by the government – they have not been subjected to chaotic privatisation, which had affected the municipal cinemas, some of which were converted to serve other purposes. Besides Prishtina and a few other relatively large towns, where there is a need for a wide array of cultural activities, the smaller towns lack an organised artistic milieu that could make use of the existing community centres.

On the other hand, some of the community buildings in Prishtina are still rented out or used by KFOR (the NATO troops in Kosovo) or other national or international organisations. The buildings of the former “Kosovafilm” film studio currently serve as a KFOR military base.

In this unfavourable atmosphere, there are few opportunities for the development of an independent performance arts scene. Currently there is only one private theatre in Prishtina, the capital of Kosovo (the Oda theatre), as well as one independent theatre company (Qendra Multimedia). Independent initiatives have never been supported by the government, and have rarely been funded from the public budget. The notion of supporting only the “national” cultural institutions is still deeply ingrained. From the legal point of view, those few independent “national” institutions are registered as NGO’s, but they almost never use public funding.

On the whole, the number of public and independent performing arts institutions is rather low. There are no more than 15 of them altogether. 10 out of those operate in Prishtina, the remaining five (theatres) in some of the towns mentioned above. The managerial structure in every theatre consists of the executive board, the director and the artistic director. Besides the administrative and technical personnel, public theatres are required to have their own ensembles. That is the modus operandi of the Kosovan National Theatre, the theatres in Gnjilane (Gilan) and Dakovica (Gjakova), and of the ballet company. The permanent drama company of the National Theatre consists mainly of actors of the older generation, who have been working there for the past 30-40 years. A new permanent company is supposed to be created soon, however, this process is hindered by financial problems and the fact that performing artists (just like other artists) still have a status of “government employee” – this category includes the employees of all the public and state institutions. Currently, the monthly salary of an actor in the Kosovan National Theatre is €140, about half the salary of a teacher in a provincial school. In these circumstances, nobody is too eager to create a new permanent drama company, as it would be impossible to attract good, new actors, who obviously prefer to work for TV for better pay.

In the past few years, the overall annual budget for culture, sports and youth was about 9 million euro. A large part of this amount is usually allocated to the so-called “capital investment”, i.e. the reconstruction and conservation of religious and historical buildings destroyed during the war or by the passage of time. In 2008, the Kosovan National Theatre, being the main cultural institution, was allocated a budget of €120,000. In 2009 and 2010, the budget was increased to €220,000. In 2008, the Kosovan ballet was allocated about €40,000, and in the past two years (2009 and 2010) – €70,000. These amounts are solely intended to fund the artistic production. On the other hand, the overall annual budget of a municipal theatre is about €30,000-€50,000. Ticket sales revenues are minimal and do not play a significant role. The price of a ticket at the National Theatre (including ballet) is €3, while the students, senior citizens and the disabled only pay €1. The Kosovan National Theatre stages about 6-8 plays a year, with the ballet staging 2-3 productions. Municipal theatres are hardly able to stage 2 or 3 plays a year.

The only children’s and puppet theatre in Kosovo – the Dodona – is theoretically a municipal theatre in Prishtina. The council provides funding only for the salaries of 20 actors (including puppet actors), with the amount of funding not exceeding €5,000-€10,000 a year. The theatre is able to stage only one or

two children's plays or puppet shows, and mainly serves students and independent drama companies as a venue for independent shows.

A few years ago, a popular Kosovan actor, formerly also known in Belgrade, where he started his acting career – Enver Petrovci – founded an independent theatre, Baba, in his father's house. Currently the Baba theatre is not operating due to the lack of funding and audience. There are no exact figures related to independent theatre funding from public sources, but the amounts are likely to be very small. Oda, the only independent theatre with a relatively regular repertoire, would either not receive any public funding, or would be allocated about €10,000-€15,000 annually, during the eight years of its existence. Independent companies, with irregular activities, might have been allocated funding from public sources, but the amounts were definitely minimal. The Oda theatre and the Qendra Multimedia drama company are mainly financed from international sources. These sources are not intended for the arts, but for promoting democracy, human rights, reconciliation, etc. Given the interests of their sponsors, the Oda theatre and the Qendra Multimedia, along with other independent companies, often stage productions of a high artistic standard.

Altogether, there are 20 premieres a year in Kosovo, with the overall number of 300 performances. There are two international drama festivals and three so-called local drama festivals in Kosovo. The two international festivals, including a student festival, take place in Pristina. Local festivals take place in the towns of Suva Reka (Suhareka), Gnjilane (Gjilan) and Urosevac (Ferizaj), but all of them are badly organised and the artistic level of the performances is very low. The exact number of spectators is not available, but it is estimated to be about 20,000 a year. In 2009, the National Theatre had 10,000 spectators. This quite low number of spectators is a signal of an already visible audience crisis.

Since Kosovo has only recently become an independent country, it did not formerly have access to EU programmes designed to support culture and the arts. To this day, none of the cultural institutions in Kosovo has participated in UE culture support programmes. Of course, various EU member states sometimes finance cultural activities in Kosovo. The main contributors include the European Cultural foundation (the Netherlands), the Olaf Palme International Centre (Sweden), Pro Helvetia (Switzerland), the Goethe Institute, and foreign embassies, mainly the French, German and American embassy, etc.

When it comes to international networks, the Oda theatre is a member of the IETM (International Network for Contemporary Performing Arts) and probably also of a regional network. Qendra Multimedia is a member of the European Off Network and the Balkan Children's and Youth Theatre Network, "Epicenter", with a seat in Zagreb. So far, the government policy has not been favourable towards the development of an independent performing arts scene. This obviously has certain consequences, as the cultural life is dying out...

6. The New Theatre

Visa problems, financial difficulties, humiliating treatment on the part of the government, bad management, corruption and other factors are leading Kosovan theatre into deep isolation. Kosovan plays are rarely performed outside the country, and it is quite difficult to organise a national tour. Even guest performances by foreign theatre companies are rare. Such a lack of communication with the "outside drama world" has undoubtedly led to a rupture with the aesthetics currently dominating in contemporary European drama. There aren't many drama experiments, as few directors make successful attempts at experimentation. While the whole international community has directed its aid and funds to the rebuilding and economic growth of Kosovo after the war, the theatre was one of the last things anyone would want to sponsor. Given these problems, Kosovan theatre has quite a bleak perspective. But isn't theatre the place where miracles happen?

Besides that, Kosovan theatre has to get rid of the schemas, clichés and auto-censorship. The new political climate after the announcement of independence requires the theatre to drop the "important national topics" and to concentrate on real problems of contemporary society. This does not mean turn-

ing away from the past. On the contrary, it is about showing it in a new light, without the constraints it has been subjected to so far.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that theatre in Kosovo should fulfil an autonomous role; articulate the needs and expectations of the spectators in Kosovo; undertake critical reflection of the past and the present in high-level artistic productions; affirm Kosovan drama in the world and at the same time stage important pieces of world drama in Kosovo; realise its emancipatory aesthetic role; be open and ready to tackle also other than “national” topics; and it should be a theatre that speaks the voice of the weak and the persecuted.

Kosovan theatre should be a free theatre!

The author is a playwright, currently working as the Artistic Director at the Kosovan National Theatre.

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Jeton Neziraj, playwright from Kosovo, currently artistic director of the Kosovan National Theatre, jeton@quendra.org

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

Theatre life in Kosovo is surviving mainly from 'public theatres'. Under this category, the following theatres are listed: the National Theatre of Kosovo (based in Pristina), town theatres that are functional only in some of the Kosovo towns, and the children's, young people's and puppet's theatre 'Dodona'. The second category includes independent theatre and theatre companies.

The only puppet's and children's theatre in Kosovo, theatre 'Dodona', is supposed to be a town theatre of Pristina.

As for the competences and the ways how public theatres function, there is still chaos in running, and it is very slowly settling down. Right after the war, the Ministry of Culture had under its competence the National Theatre of Kosovo, and some of the town theatres, such as Gjiilan and Gjakova theatre. The two latter ones, after a period of time after the war, got promoted into 'national theatres'. This happened during the euphoric wave of 'national-mania'. The aim was to enable these two theatres to have direct access to bigger funds at the Ministry of Culture. In the meantime, other town theatres, such as the one in Ferizaj, Prizren, Peja and Mitrovica, from their status as amateur theatres, grew into 'professional' theatres. E.g. the theatre in Prizren became 'the Professional Theatre of Prizren'. This category was invented, again, for aiming at bigger funds at the Ministry of Culture. However, the problems started with the decentralization and the passing of competences at the local level. The towns wanted to have all the competence over their theatres, but, in the meantime, they wanted to continue having the support from the Ministry of Culture. At the moment, according to the regulations that are in power, the town theatres are managed and financed by the respective towns. These theatres are free to apply for extra funds from the Ministry of Cultures, even if the latter is not obliged to finance these theatres anymore since they are completely under the town umbrella. However, this seems to be a very heavy burden for the towns which are completely incompetent in managing and financing these theatres. Or they only finance one or two theatre projects during a year. This has caused the theatre life of these little towns to enter a very difficult crisis. The theatre of Gjakova used to have before up to ten theatre premieres in a year, whereas last year it hardly managed to produce one single performance. The only theatre which is somewhat functional is the National Theatre of Kosovo, which continues to rely in its main source of funding, the Ministry of culture.

Some of the theatres in Kosovo develop their activities in the so called 'Culture House's', which were erected by the communist regime. These 'Culture House's' are present in almost all Kosovo towns, and most of them are not functional or are given for temporary usage. These buildings are managed by the state and they have not been open to the wild privatization process, which is what happened to the town cinema theatres, most of which were sold without keeping their primary destination. Apart from the capital, Pristina, and some other bigger towns, where the needs for more spaces for cultural activities are

evident, in smaller towns there is no organized artistic community, which could put in use the existing premises of the House of Culture.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

As a new state, Kosovo has regulated theatre activities by law. The law on theatre guarantees the right of creative freedom in all forms and artistic-scene expressions and, at the same time, regulates the establishment, organization, functioning, directing, management, and financing of theatres and other important issues of theatre. Kosovo has also a law, which regulates the scope of ballet. This is part of a law which covers Opera, Ballet and the Philharmonic Orchestra and Choir of Kosovo. Also, there is a special law for the State Ensemble of Folkloric Songs and Dances, 'Shota', which is oriented mainly in the promotion and preservation of the national folk heritage. The theatre law, which was approved by the Kosovo Parliament on June 2005, has proved to be non-functional and too centralist, especially when it comes to the competences and jurisdiction that the government has reserved for itself (the selection of directors, the Managing Council etc). Also, it is important to note that the law in power almost completely ignores the role and the existence of independent theatres. The point about the financing of these theatres says "the independent theatres can also apply for funds at the Ministry of Culture"! This year, the re-amendment of this law was initiated, obliging the Ministry of Culture to give 30% from the theatre fund to the independent theatres. This and other new and fresh ideas are not sure to be able to pass tens of parliamentary committees before being approved by the Parliament. This brings us to another problematic point: a law supported fully by the artistic community and the Ministry of Culture (as the sponsor of the law), has to get filtered through bureaucratic and finance committees which will affect the final draft as to being changed and non-functional, whereas the audience influence has finished at an earlier stage.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

No. Public theatres are still "public theatres", although most of them are not functional for the moment.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of "nationalisation" (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

Theatres and independent theatre companies are what Kosovo theatre lacked in these last years. Apart from "Oda" theatre and "Teatrit të babës" (which is now practically unfunctional), there is no other independent theatre in Kosovo. Regarding companies and theatre groups, apart from MULTIMEDIA Center, many of those that were established after the war in Kosovo did not manage to survive. Some realised one or two productions and then vanished.

MULTIMEDIA Center, established in 2002 and managed by a group of young theatre artists, is a success 'story' of Kosovar theatre.

"Oda" is the first independent theatre in Kosovo, established by two young artists that started their career of management of National Theatre after the war. "Oda" theatre has proven to be quite successful in its work since its establishment, five years ago. It was conceptualised as an alternative space for more innovative theatre projects, though being sometimes affected by financial pressures that had put at risk its existence. In order to be able to face this financial crisis, this space was divided into infrequent theatre activities and other commercial activities. Independent initiatives have never had any support from the state, and they rarely managed to get some share from the public funds. The logic of supporting only the 'national' cultural institutions still continues. From a legal point of view,

these few independent 'national' institutions are registered as NGO's, but they almost never benefit from public funds.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

The managing structure of each theatre is consisted of: the Managing Council, the General Director and the Artistic Director. Apart from the administrative and technical staff, public theatres are obliged by law to have their own resident ensemble. This is what the National Theatre of Kosovo and the Theatre of Gilan, Gjakova and the Troupe of Ballet function. The troupe of resident actors of the Nacional Theatre is consisted of mainly actors from the older generation that have been part of the troupe since 30 or 40 years ago. Soon, a new resident ensemble will be established, and this process has been blocked so far due to financial problems, and also due to the fact that the performing artists (as well as other artists) are continuing to be treated under the status of 'civil servants', a category which is consisted of all servants from all public and state structures. At the moment, the monthly salary of an actor of the National Theatre of Kosovo is 140 euro, which is half the salary of a village teacher. Under these circumstances, no one wanted to initiate the establishing of a new ensemble of residential actors since it would not be possible to recruit new and good actors who, naturally, prefer television because the payment there is more dignifying.

Regarding the public theatres, the Ministry, respectively the Town Assemblies are in charge for founding the Managing Councils of the theatres. Then, the theatre directors are chosen with an open vacancy process, for a 3 years mandate. The Managing Council makes the selection of the director, whereas the Minister of Culture takes the final decision, respectively by the town managers. Recently, significant importance is given to the position of the Artistic Director, who is responsible for the repertoire and the programme of artistic activities. However, due to the reserved competences of the Government (local and central), the selection of the directors is often a result of party influences.

Section B.

Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

The general number of public and independent institutions of the performing arts is relatively small. In total, this number doesn't go beyond fifteen. Out of all these institutions, ten are in Pristina, whereas five others (theatres) are in some of the towns that were mentioned above.

Some of the theatres in Kosove develop their activities in the so called 'Culture House's', that are present in almost all Kosovo towns.

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- institutions of the central government
- institutions of regional governments
- institutions of municipal governments
- non-governmental organisations
- private enterprises

Are there any mixed forms?

Main theater and dance institutions are 'public'. Under this category, the following theatres are listed: the National Theatre of Kosovo (based in Pristina), town theatres that are functional only in some of the

Kosovo towns, and the children's, young people's and puppet's theatre 'Dodona'. The second category includes independent theatre and theatre companies. As for the competences and the ways how public theatres function, there is still chaos in running, and it is very slowly settling down. Right after the war, the Ministry of Culture had under its competence the National Theatre of Kosovo, and some of the town theatres, such as Gjilan and Gjakova theatre. The two latter ones, after a period of time after the war, got promoted into 'national theatres'. This happened during the euphoric wave of 'national-mania'. The aim was to enable these two theatres to have direct access to bigger funds at the Ministry of Culture. In the meantime, other town theatres, such as the one in Ferizaj, Prizren, Peja and Mitrovica, from their status as amateur theatres, grew into 'professional' theatres. E.g. the theatre in Prizren became 'the Professional Theatre of Prizren'. This category was invented, again, for aiming at bigger funds at the Ministry of Culture. However, the problems started with the decentralization and the passing of competences at the local level. The towns wanted to have all the competence over their theatres, but, in the meantime, they wanted to continue having the support from the Ministry of Culture. At the moment, according to the regulations that are in power, the town theatres are managed and financed by the respective towns. These theatres are free to apply for extra funds from the Ministry of Cultures, even if the latter is not obliged to finance these theatres anymore since they are completely under the town umbrella. However, this seems to be a very heavy burden for the towns which are completely incompetent in managing and financing these theatres. Or they only finance one or two theatre projects during a year. This has caused the theatre life of these little towns to enter a very difficult crisis. The theatre of Gjakova used to have before up to ten theatre premieres in a year, whereas last year it hardly managed to produce one single performance. The only theatre which is somewhat functional is the National Theatre of Kosovo, which continues to rely in its main source of funding, the Ministry of culture.

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

- dramatic theatres
- puppet theatres
- musical theatres
- opera theatres
- dance theatres (movement, pantomime)
- impresario theatres
- arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones)
- other

All theatres in Kosovo are dramatic theatres, excluding theatre "Dodona" which is puppet theatre.

Section C.

Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

Defined rules for funding exist only for the public theatres and dance institutions. Rules for funding are regulated in a general terms by the law. But in practice, it is proven that those rules are not applicable and they keep changing based on a 'will' of who is the Minister of Culture etc.

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- amount of general subsidies
- amount of project subsidies

There are no official data for the general subsidies for the theatre and dance scene, nor for the project subsidies.

These last years, the general annual budget for Culture, Sport and Youth was about 9 million euro. Out of this total, a big chunk would every year go to the so-called 'capital investments', such as restoration and refurbishment of religious and historical buildings that were damaged either from the last war, or as a result of time. In 2008, the National Theatre of Kosovo, as the main cultural institution, had a budget of 120,000.00 euro. In 2009 and 2010, the budget went up to 220,000.00 euro. The Kosovo Ballet, for 2008, had only 40,000.00 euro, while, for the last two years (2009 and 2010), it had 70,000.00 euro. These totals are destined only for the artistic production. On the other hand, the annual total budget for one town theatre (out of five) is around 30,000.00 – 50,000.00 euro. Revenues from ticket sale are minimal and completely irrelevant.

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government
- funding from local governments
- own revenue of theatres

Most of the funding (around 80%) comes from the central government, while only a small amount of that total comes from the local governments. An exact data of this can not be secured, as this keeps changing from year to another year.

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

Public institutions (National Theatre of Kosovo, The National Ballet of Kosovo etc.) 'get' their budgeted annually, in the beginning of each year. The total, which is 'promised' in the beginning of each year (February, March), then is allocated to the institutions bits by bits during the year.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

Private funding (banks and business institutions) and funding from other public companies: Post Telecom of Kosovo, Prishtina International Airport. But also from international agencies and funding bodies.

In general, incomes from those recourses are minimal.

Section D. Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

The overall number of premieres in Kosovo within one year is aprox. 20.

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

The overall number of performances per year is aprox. 300

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

There are no exact numbers about the audience, but it should be around 20,000 for the whole year. During 2009, the National Theatre had 10,000 viewers. This relatively small number of audience is an indicator of what has become evident, and that is 'the audience crisis'.

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

Production costs can be from 10,000 (low budgeted productions) up to 40,000 EURO (for productions at the National Theater of Kosovo)

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

For hosting local production, average costs can be from 200 euro – 1,000 euro, for international performances is from 1,000 up to 5,000 EURO.

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location

In Kosovo there are two international theatre festivals, and three so called national theatre festivals. Two of the international festivals, one of which is a student festival, are held in Pristina. National festivals are held in Suhareka, Gjilan and Ferizaj, but all three of them are known for their poor organization and the poor level of performances presented.

Section E.
International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

Because Kosovo has recently become a state, it didn't have access to most of the EU programs that support culture. Even today, not one of the cultural institutions in Kosovo has benefited from EU programs in support of culture.

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

As for the international networks, 'Oda' theatre is a member of IETM and perhaps a regional network. Qendra Multimedia is a member of European Off Network and the Balkan Network for Children's and Youth Theatre 'Epicenter', based in Zagreb.

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

National Theater of Kosovo is sometimes coproducing with the theatres in Macedonia and Albania. Multimedia Center did several co-productions with international theatre companies such as: Markus Zohner Theater Compagine (Swiss), Nomad Theater (UK) ect. Oda theatre did recently a co-production with an USA theatre company.

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

In Kosovo there are two international theatre festivals, and three so called national theatre festivals. Two of the international festivals, one of which is a student festival, are held in Pristina. There are no international dance festivals in Kosovo.



Republic of Macedonia

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Nelko Nelkovski, founder and chief editor of theater magazine
and portal www.teatar.com.mk, nelkomk@gmail.com

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

The transition happened in Eastern Europe after the fall of communism and the arrival of democracy, unfortunately has not yet happened in the theater as a medium in the country. Much flexible were other segments of culture, art and social life. For example, in media democratization are unzipped so that we have about 30 private TV stations and as many radios, print media also saw expansion, and there are numerous private galleries that are developed by market principles. The only theater is not transit. Still, as a country we haven't adopted the Law on Theatre nor any precise regulation. The decentralization process started 3 years ago after signing a framework agreement on the rights of Albanians in the country (we had a military conflict in 2001) so that the theater operates in post-transitional conditions with legislation from the old system. Has not yet been made on decentralization and cultural competence in the theater are mainly under the Ministry of Culture and local authorities have powers just around the maintenance of infrastructure facilities in the country.

Formally has registered more private theater companies, but officially, seriously, with full repertoire act only two private theaters.

The dance is a little "life" and slightly flexible in organizational sense of production and there are several private and independent companies.

Of course, new times bring more opportunities for youth and alternative theater, so that there are in almost every city in the alternative and amateur companies who work mainly in schools and local cultural centers.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

During the 1998 law was enacted new culture which is the basis for the organization of culture in post-socialist period. The level of legislation has serious grounds for liberal cultural policy, but not implemented fiscal decentralization affect substantial revival of the financing of theaters locally. The theater is always the most magical and most complicated art and creation of conditions for its formation in post-socialist period and it is very complicated.

Yes, during 2002, in cooperation with the Council of Europe, Macedonian Ministry for culture organized a broad social debate and was made a National Cultural Program for the period 2004 to 2008 year. It is a national action plan which should structure and link the need and supply of cultural production in the country. Unfortunately, since 2006 are available to various changes in law and culture have not been made a new program for the period 2008 – 2012th

Cultural Council meeting in October 2010 took the initiative to adopt a law on theatre, so we expect in 2011 this social process to develop and get to the first integrated legal solution that would regulate the field of theater and stage of arts in the country.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

It is not yet implemented the privatization process in a culture in the country. Several years ago passed a law on private-public partnership, but it has not been applied in the culture and in the real life.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

New initiatives in the theater should be either registered as an organization / company, or producer who organized the shows and they must meet certain production conditions, according to the criteria of the Ministry of Culture of the country.

Ministry of Culture every year announces the distribution of perceived culture for projects of public interest for the country that can compete with all cultural operators in the country, public and private projects. Establish committees of experts in all aspects of art that bring the appropriate decisions.

Have not happened any theatrical institution to receive additional national status by the “nationalization”. No idea about such a possibility in the country, although the Law on associations and foundations.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

The directors of national institutions are appointed by a public announcement by the Ministry of Culture, where can apply all interested and competent persons. Conditions for application are: to be citizen of the Republic, not be convicted, to have five years experience in the area and offer a program of work for its mandate. The mandate of the directors is 4 years with the right to reelection. After the registration of candidates, the Minister of Culture set up a commission to give its opinion on the most appropriate candidate. The decision adopted by the Minister of Culture. The mandate of the Director is 4 years, with the right to reelection. Change of Director is made by Minister of Culture. Director may be amended before the expiration of the term due to poor performance.

Section B.

Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- **institutions of the central government**
- a) City of Skopje
 - National institution “Macedonian opera and ballet” – Skopje
 - National institution “Dramski teatar” – Skopje

- National institution “Macedonian national theatre” – Skopje
- National institution “Theatre for children and youth” – Skopje
- National institution “Albanian theatre” – Skopje
- National institution “Turkish theatre” – Skopje
- b) City of Bitola
 - National institution “National theatre” – Bitola
- c) City of Gostivar
 - National institution – Center for culture – “ASNOM” – Gostivar
- d) City of Delcevo
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Nikola Jonkov Vapcarov” – Delcevo
- e) City of Kicevo
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Koco Racin” – Kicevo
- f) City of Kocani
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Beli Mugri” – Kocani
- g) City of Kumanovo
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Trajko Prokopiev” – Kumanovo
- h) City of Negotino
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Aco Gjorcev” – Negotino
- i) Ohrid
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Grigor Prlicev” – Ohrid
- j) Prilep
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Vojdan Cernodrinski” – Ohrid
- k) City of Struga
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Brakja Miladinovci” Struga
- l) City of Strumica
 - National institution – Center for culture “Anton Panov” – Strumica
- m) City of Tetovo
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Iljo Antevski Smok” – Tetovo
 - National institution – Tetovo Theatre – Tetovo
- n) City of Veles
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Jordan Hadzi Konstantinov Dzinot” – Veles
- o) City of Stip
 - National institution – Center for culture – “Aco Sopov” – Stip
- p) City of Debar
 - National institution – Center for culture – Debar
- q) City of Kriva Palanka
 - National institution – Center for culture – Kriva Palanka
- **institutions of regional governments**
 - We haven’t regional institutions
- **institutions of municipal governments**
 - We still haven’t municipality cultural centres because the decentralisation is not done completely. We have some kind of municipality centres with support from the central government.
- **non-governmental organisations**
 - We have about 10.000 NGO in Republic of Macedonia and we can’t find clear list with all NGO which working in the theatre and dance are. So, something about 50 NGO’s are frequently present in the performing arts.
- **private enterprises**
 - We have a lot of private companies, but just two are in good condition and with permanent repertoary in the countrly.

Are there any mixed forms?

Still we haven't any mixed form of partnership in the theatre institutions.

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

- dramatic theatres – 14
- puppet theatres – 1
- musical theatres – No
- opera theatres – 1
- dance theatres (movement, pantomime) 1 – National Balet
- impresario theatres – No
- arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones) – 10
- other – NO

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

Ministry of Culture at the state level, in the frame of the competition for projects of public interest in the Republic of Macedonia has established precise rules for the financing of the performing theaters and cultural centers. Units of Local Self-Government have just opened a broad legal possibility for funding of cultural institutions, but no precise legal obligation, which makes the local culture, depends on the mood of the managers or the relation of political forces at the local level.

Sponsoring is not yet established minimum quality of the tax exemptions for companies that sponsor the culture, so, interest in sponsoring real small. A serious problem is the established structure and long-term partnerships between traditional manifestations and wealthier companies in the country that directly affect the penetration of new cultural events and institutions in the country.

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- amount of general subsidies
- amount of project subsidies

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government
- funding from local governments
- own revenue of theatres

We can't find information to answer correctly of the questions 10 and 11!

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

In the contract of with the Ministry for culture, each organisation has obligation to send report to the Ministry of culture In the end of the year.

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

Yes. Sometimes some national institutions has a problem with indebtedness and the Ministry for culture with additional support solve that kind of problems.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

Some partnership between business and cultural institutions or partnership between several cultural institutions. But it is not very frequent.

Section D.
Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

Here are the answers of the questions 15, 16. And 17.

Presented data are obtained by the statistical survey – Theatres in the Republic of Macedonia, which as a regular statistical survey is conducted annually by the State Statistical Office.

The last available data are referring on the period from 01.09 2007 till 31.08 2008.

Presented data are referring to the number of theatres (professional and amateur), employed persons in professional theatres and active members of amateur theatres, performed titles, guest appearances, number of performances and concerts, attendance etc.

Professional theatres are independent cultural and artistic organizations with a permanent professional staff and artistic ensemble.

Amateur theatres are cultural and artistic organizations which mostly consist of amateurs, organizationally independent or as part of some other business subject.

Professional theatres for youth and children are independent cultural and artistic organizations with a permanent professional staff and artistic ensemble which regularly gives performances for children

Basic Statistical Data on the Theatres in the Republic of Macedonia

	Professional theatres	Number of theatres	Performed titles	Performances Visitors
2003/2004	11	148	1 256	268 249
2004/2005	121	150	1 221	282 422
2005/2006	12	126	954	228 312
2006/2007	13	126	851	232 335
2007/2008	14	136	982	233 351
Professional theatres for youth and children				
2003/2004	1	17	175	24 710
2004/2005	1	19	183	20 820
2005/2006	1	14	174	19 399
2006/2007	1	18	192	20 015
2007/2008	1	15	182	18 842
Amateur theatres				
2003/2004	7	20	106	21 892
2004/2005	7	11	75	17 210
2005/2006	8	21	117	25 463
2006/2007	7	14	72	17 519
2007/2008	9	15	79	14 765

1) Vo According to the status changes in 2004, the Albanian and Turkish Drama within the Theatre of Nationalities are processed separately

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

10.000 Euro

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

5.000 Euro

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location

- National theatre festival “Vojdan Cernodrinski” – Prilep
- International theatre festival “MOT” – Skopje
- Chamber theatre festival “Risto Siskov” – Strumica
- National Drama Amateur Festival – “DAF” – Kocani
- International Amater Theatre Festival “Faces without masks” – Skopje
- International Ohrid Summer Festival” – Ohrid
- National Days of comedy – Kumanovo
- National Festival of Albanian theatre – Debar
- International theatre festival SKUIFEST – Skopje
- International pantomime festival PANFEST – Skopje
- International actors festival ACTOR OF EUROPE – Resen – Prespa

- International monodrama festival – Bitola
- International Festival for contemporary dance

Section E.

International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

Yes, for ten years the Macedonian cultural operators, dance and theater operators participating in various European programs. Two years ago in the Republic of Macedonia exists very active European Cultural Contact Point, which permanently, at least 8 times a year, at different levels organized presentations of programs and projects of the EU. Especially discusses the Culture Program 2007 – 2013 year. In the past our cultural point organized a series of educational sessions where it was presented by applying good practice in European funds from organizations from Croatia, Poland, Ireland. It is particularly important that the presentation is organized segmented and prepare different modules for different types of organizations and cultural operators, such as theaters and performing arts, galleries, museums and other types of organizations.

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

The International cooperation is concentrated in several national organizations. Theatrical Youth of Macedonia is a national theater organization and is a member of the following organizations:

- IATC – International Assotiation of theatre critiques
- AITA/IATA – International Assotiation of Amateur Theatre
- IDEA – International Drama in Education Assotiation
- IATU – International Asotiation of Theatres et Universities
- ASSITEJ – International Assotiaton of Theatres for Children and Youth Theatre
- AMATEO – Internatinal Assotiation of Culture in Society

Macedonian ITI center:

- Member of International Theatre Institute

International Theater Festival MOT:

- Member of ITEM

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

- Yes, we have several successful coproduction projects:
 - LOKOMOTIVA – Center for new cultural initiatives Skopje
 - SKOPJE – Youth Bienale of Culture 2009 – Coproduction between 10 countries and institutions.
 - Cooperation between Macedonia and region of Normandia – France
 - Coproduction between Festival MOT – Skopje – Macedonia, Festival “Ex Ponto” – Ljubljana, Slovenia, Festival TEUTA – Kotor – Montenegro and International Theatre Festival in Sibiu – Romania

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

- International theatre festival “MOT” – Skopje
- Chamber theatre festival “Risto Siskov” – Strumica

- International Amater Theatre Festival “Faces without masks” – Skopje
- International Ohrid Summer Festival” – Ohrid
- International theatre festival SKUPIFEST – Skopje
- International pantomime festival PANFEST – Skopje
- International actors festival ACTOR OF EUROPE – Resen – Prespa
- International monodrama festival – Bitola
- International Festival for contemporary dance



Republic of Moldova

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Larisa Turea, university lecturer,
President of AICT-IATC Moldavian section, larisaturea@gmail.com

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralization or centralization)?

The Republic of Moldova (the former region of Bessarabia, which on June 28, 1940, in accordance with the secret protocol of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact with Nazi Germany, was forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union after the latter forced Romania to evacuate its administration from Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina) is a young state which came into existence after the fall of the Soviet Union and is located in south-eastern Europe, between Romania and Ukraine, being surrounded by the Prut and Nistru rivers. It covers a territory of approximately 33.8 thousand km², its population counting 3 million 563,7 thousand people (National Bureau of Statistics estimate on January 1st, 2010). Its capital, Chisinau, is home to approximately 780,000 people.

Unlike its economy that is in transition to capitalism, the culture of the Republic of Moldova is still preponderantly functioning after the soviet model. The fully national theatrical landscape is mainly localized in the capital Chisinau, which is the most densely populated city of the country. The capital has three permanent crew theatres, two puppet theatres and an opera and ballet theatre. The dance-theatre doesn't have a tradition in Moldova per se, but there is a very strong sports dance federation, the Co-dreanca dance ensemble having conquered numerous international prizes and an institutionalized folkloric dance collective-the Joc ensemble.

Twelve of the 14 theatres have performances in Romanian, the Licurici puppet theatre and the lyrical theatre (National Opera and Ballet Theatre) having both Romanian and Russian language crews. Two theatres the Chekhov theatre and the "S ulitzy roz" (Rose street) theatre perform exclusively in Russian. At the moment, the founding of a municipal theatre in Soroca is in the process, but this project has an uncertain, semi-professional status. Decentralization, although announced and launched in 1991-1992 did not really occur: there is a large theatre in Balti, the second largest municipality after Chisinau to the north, in Cahul to the south, and a Russian theatre in Tiraspol (Transnistrian region). However, separatist Transnistria doesn't strictly count as Moldovan territory: the eastern area on the border to the Ukraine declared its independence in 1992 and is not recognized internationally. The theatres mentioned above are under the authority of the ministry of culture and the local public administration of the localities where the theatres are located.

The rigid theatre system doesn't leave much room for experiments. One can't call it a really well articulated theatre movement yet. Since the dissolution of the USSR in 1991, there have been many attempts of creating an independent theatre. Due to financial reasons none of them have lasted more than two years. Only recently, has a free theatre opened in the basement of one of the most important playhouses in Chisinau. Behind this new theatre called "Project 513" named after the host location "Club 513", is Mihai Fusu, a stage director, actor and theatre professor. His first attempt of a studio for contemporary

drama was in 1996, and he founded the “one actor’s theatre” independent theatre group in 2006. The idea of “Project 513” is to lure the audience into coming to the theatre on Mondays, – all theatres in Chisinau are usually closed on this day – by means of recitals of poetry, readings or performances. At the latest National Theatre Festival, Mihai Fusu presented Neil LaBute’s “Bash” trilogy (under the aegis of the Coliseum Arts Centre). Also Mihai Fusu is lately the caretaker of the Foosbook theatrical workshop, with interactive, musical and improvisational performances which are different from what “official” theatres offer, in the immediate proximity of the viewer, with fresh texts, sometimes especially created. There was also the short-lived “Nameless theatre” founded by playwright Val Butnaru and stage-manager Anatol Durbala; lately the Small Theatre was launched at the initiative of actor Mihai Iorga (formed from an actors class from the Academy of Theatre, Cinema and Visual arts in Chisinau).

The most long-lasting projects are the ones animated by young playwright Nicoleta Esinencu, whose works already have earned European notoriety. Her METT (Mobile European Trailer Theatre) is an independent theatrical group that was formed in 2007 and is seen as an international experiment, with only one premiere in Chisinau until now: The “Antidote” performance, shown in November last year as a part of the After-Fall project of the Goethe Institute. It was perceived in Chisinau as a somewhat exotic play.

At the moment in Chisinau and Balti, there are a number of performances inspired by the April 7th 2009 events, when peaceful protests against election fraud have brought into the streets thousands of young people insulted by the betraying gesture of their grandparents’ and even parents’ generations that have voted for the communists, thus selling out their grandchildren’s future.

In Bucharest, the Camil Petrescu Cultural Foundation and the “Teatrul Azi” magazine have published a documental theatre volume, including works of some playwrights from the Republic of Moldova like Irina Nechit, Constantin Cheianu, Dumitru Crudu, who were joined by the protean Mihai Fusu. Again, the initiative belongs to the playwrights that practice latest events theatre or “newspaper theatre” as Dumitru Crudu called it. This is no news: Soviet theatre excelled in approaching the social topics, i.e. in touching the subject “where it hurts”, expressing metaphorically, by specific means, things that cannot be explained otherwise. That is our advantage to western theatre, where one could express everything and anything.

Dumitru Crudu is the most successful and productive Moldovan playwright. Several of his works have been translated into German, English etc. The author has a very diverse array of topics: the barely controllable flow of media, attempts to migrate and related misery, refugee disaster, and much more. After more than ten plays, Constantin Cheianu has been a success with “The Container” and “Volodea, Volodea” (a play written in rap rhymes).

His first play deals with the young generation’s migration to the West, “the promised land”, while the second one tackles corruption, a topic worrying the majority of the countries from the former Eastern bloc.

In „Cu bunicul ce facem?” (“What should we do with grandpa?”) Constantin Cheianu draws the picture of an uncomfortable social reality: the only thing that the Republica Moldova, a parasitary state produces are Moldovans. Here we have a pendulum between the extremes, black and white without nuances. The author emphasizes on the missing link-responsible parents: the wise generation is quasi-absent, having gone to work abroad.

Actually, as I was mentioning earlier, the professional cultural institutions are, traditionally, located in the capital of the republic. Where it occurred, decentralization left culture in the care of local authorities that are not at all interested in supporting it. Cultural institutions did not evolve as desired also because of the insufficiency in (both quantitative and qualitative) human resources. Twenty years of social-economic transitions have also affected performing arts, many experts in the field having emigrated while others have changed their activities and even opted for new professions, choosing to work in more profitable institutions.

While witnessing some pretty timid signs of democratization (decentralization, transparency, adaptation to the market economy mechanisms), the state still holds monopoly over cultural institutions and activities. Artists claim excessive state pressure on the cultural sector: the political forces use culture

as a propaganda tool, most often the Ministry of Culture appointing the executives leading institutions from people devoted to the government, without taking into account their professional and organizational skills. At the same time, many people of culture aren't prepared to accept more democracy and independence: being afraid of free competition, they prefer to stay under the protective wing of the state for as long as possible.

For many years one of the supporters of culture and art in the Republic of Moldova was the Soros Foundation by creating various programs, and awarding grants and funds. Currently, there are no such programs and in the current conditions of crisis, cultural animators are forced to cooperate with state bodies.

Another solution is to obtain funds to support the collaboration of artists and cultural institutions from international organizations supporting the political, economic and social life in the Republic of Moldova. But, unfortunately, the cultural actors often lack adequate information or just do not elementary know where to apply to get support for their projects. At the same time, it should be noted that international organizations are not so interested in awarding grants to arts and culture, especially theater and dance. For the time being, these areas are not a priority for international donors. It seems that unlike other countries of the region (e.g. Ukraine), the cultural institutes of other countries (for example, the United Kingdom, Germany or Spain) are not active in Moldova. An exception seems to be that of the Alliance Francaise (French Alliance), whose activity is restricted to French language teaching and the promotion of French culture.

The performance "A saptea kafana" ("Seventh kabana") for example, targeting women trafficking, was staged with the support of international organizations, particularly the ILO. Dumitru Crude's "Oameni ai nimanui" (Nobody's people), was also staged with the support of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) Mission in Moldova, with the financial support of the European Commission within the project "Fight against human trafficking in Moldova". Recently, the "Coliseum" Arts Center staged the "Casa M" performance with financial support from the OSCE Mission to Moldova, the performance describing issues related to domestic violence and the threat of trafficking threat.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

The Law on Culture, organic law No.413 of 27.05.1999 was passed, but unfortunately, has only a declaratory and formal character, this being the reason for the need to pass a new law on Culture. Theatrical activity is regulated by the Law on theatres, circuses and concert organizations, (Organic Law No.1421, of the 31.10.2002). Although both laws have been subject to public debate, they do not function and are imprecise. Before being passed by Parliament, the law on theatres, circus and concert organizations sparked a wave of protests, theater directors and critics having denounced its old-fashion character that does not stimulate creativity in the field, but rather tends to restore strict ideological control on the activity of theaters (which it proclaimed "non-commercial institutions", a nonsense for a market economy) and other performing arts institutions, does not take into account the dynamic of reality, does not offer solutions to solve the current economic disaster, does not include social protection mechanisms of employees in the industry, no tax and other exemptions, or innovations in employment. Although it has numerous official amendments adopted by Parliament, the Law on theaters continues to be imperfect, according to the theatrical community.

3. Privatization of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

None of the 14 existing theaters has been privatized, there were few unsuccessful attempts in this regard, the idea being eventually abandoned, out of financial reasons. There were attempts to establish inde-

pendent theaters in the early 1990s (Ionesco Theatre, Pocket Theatre) but due to lack of support and an inadequate legal framework, they agreed to become “state-owned”. Independent theaters currently operating – the METT and Cleaner’s Theatre, were created by playwright Nicole Esinencu and are almost entirely financed from foreign sponsorships.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidize them? Are there cases of “nationalization” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

The current Eugene Ionesco Theatre, which existed in its first year as a private theater, then became a state institution. Although the legislation allows governmental subsidies for cultural projects, the state provides no de-facto support for private cultural initiatives. Private cultural institutions appear not to have specific operating guidelines, their activity being regulated like in the case of other private initiatives (like firms, for example).

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

The directors are still as in Soviet times appointed by the Ministry of Culture, despite the fact that there is a legal provision stipulating that they are chosen on the principle of open competition. Limiting the term of office is more formal, while the extension of the director’s mandate is almost automatic. Although the mandate ought to be 3 years there is currently no theater director with a term of less than 10-15 years. The activity of theater directors is not evaluated based on performance and merits but rather on the obedience to the minister of culture and his ministry.

Section B.

Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organizations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

The institutional structure of performing arts consists of a network of drama, comedy and music theaters, three theaters for children and youth, the National Theatre of Opera and Ballet. In Moldova there are 14 theaters, 12 of which are located in the capital Chisinau, one in the north in Balti, and another one in the south in Cahul.

7. Legal status and structure of organizations (number):

- **institutions of the central government**-12
- **institutions of regional governments**-3 (Gagauz Theatre, Bulgarian Theatre, Russian theatre in Tiraspol)
- **institutions of municipal governments**-3(“Satiricus” Municipal Theatre, Chisinau; “Guguta” puppet theatre, Chisinau; “Veniamin Apostol” theatre-Soroca)
- **non-governmental organisations**-2 (Theatrical Union, Choreographers’ Union)
- **private enterprises**-2 (METT, Cleaner’s Theatre)

Cleaner’s Theatre (www.spalatorie.md) is one of the projects that currently involves Nicoleta Esinencu. It is the initiative of a group of young artists. Every Monday, they give a performance, a show or

a lecture performance in a random location in Chisinau. “Cleaners Theatre”- Nicoleta says – is primarily here to react critically to what is happening now in Moldova in particular, but also in the region and the world in general. In the future we want to invite maximum number of artists possible from the region, to both showcase their works as well as to possibly stage a show or a performance with them together with local actors. Performances are presented in Romanian or Russian, or in both languages, our intention being to create a common space for the whole Moldovan public and to overcome a kind of language barrier”.

Are there any mixed forms?

There are no mixed form cultural institutions at the moment

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

- dramatic theatres – 10
- puppet theatres – 3
- musical theatres – 1
- opera theatres – 1
- dance theatres (movement, pantomime) – none
- impresario theatres – none
- arts centers (including interdisciplinary ones) – Coliseum Arts Centre. It was founded in 1997, by a group of artists and theatre managers, painters and communications managers, with support from a private sponsor, to diversify artistic forms, produce alternative performances and events, attract private funding, organize international events, and to involve youth in cultural events. Lately the Centre has focused on producing performances related to social issues, organizing international tours, and developing international artistic cooperation.
- Others – none

Section C.
Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centers (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

There is a formal, incomplete regulation that is not respected. State subsidy is distributed automatically, regardless of performance indicators. As such, Moldova’s culture financing system is inherited from the defunct Soviet Union, being a consolidated ossified seven decades old system of “state culture”, always under the supervision of the party and kept permanently in the collimator of the bodies that were operating to tame any free will with whips and sticks.

The single party and totalitarian regime that impose their “line” and will in the sphere of production and dissemination of cultural values, the ordered promotion of creativity have developed an adequate and convenient model to finance cultural action: perfect hierarchy from top to bottom. At the union, republican and local level, it held tight control of all initiatives and actions, ordered and regulated all movement. From the central budget on all levels – political party committees, according to rank, dictated hierarchically over subjects deprived of rights and freedoms not only the total amount of revenue and expenditure, but also the strict distribution of the articles and paragraphs. Ideological principles were dominant – the artists were supported, fed or penalized according to their merits to the party, according to the degree and level of dedication and commitment shown continuously.

The current economic context of the Republic of Moldova (the poorest country in Europe) is extremely difficult – the GDP level is ever decreasing, feeding a budget deficit and increasing the

external debt, real incomes have declined significantly, inflation is obvious – the ability of effective intervention for funding cultural activity is reduced substantially, while the principles of awarding subsidies have not changed much. Institutions, cultural institutions, artists in general found themselves suddenly in a more than dramatic situation out of which increasingly fewer are being able to exit. Money obtained directly from creative activities – tours abroad for the performance and concert institutions, works of art and selling tickets, conditions of chronic poverty among the public and lack of resources and capital equipment, the props, transport for journeys etc. are insignificant. The economic crisis has had a very negative impact on the arts, resulting in the decayed material and technical basis, and because of low wages, many artists have chosen to work other fields. Today an employee's salary in the sphere of culture is the lowest a beginner actor being employed for a maximum of 780 Moldovan Lei (about 47 Euro).

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centers:

Virtually all professional theaters are State-owned, the Ministry of Culture taking responsibility for their financing (although laws passed stipulate that the theaters are to be financed by the state in a proportion not less than 60 percent of their operating needs, subsidies, are de facto partial, decreasing and can only cover operating expenses, not those connected to creation and installation), openly supervising their work and appointing the calling the economic and artistic director.

The regime in which theatres function is euphemistically called “partial self-financing” with budget allowances of no more than 30-40 percent of the necessary expenses, provided that there are other means to be obtained from sponsorships, donations, rental of space, rooms, etc.

Ticket price is small, which is normal in terms of the population's purchasing capacity – between 15 and 50 lei, or 1 and 3 euros, the Law on theaters, concert and circus organizations is not implemented in practice. The lack of financial resources and a centralized funding mechanism for cultural institutions does not stimulate the activity and creativity of cultural institutions. There are strict regulations that would establish a mechanism of theater funding priorities and principles.

The amount of general subsidies under the “Theatrical institutions subsidies” act for the year 2009 amounted to 44.712.100 lei/approx. 2.790.000 euros (out of the total 190 million lei/circa 11.875.000 euro budget of the Ministry of Culture), an amount that only partially covers the needs of cultural institutions. Typically, subsidizing covers the wages (subsistence level) and maintenance of infrastructure. Sponsors or other sources of income are sought in order to finance the staging of performances, the main alternative source of income being the rental of premises – many theaters renting their halls, auditoriums, stages, rehearsal spaces and even actors' booths to third party companies and organizations...

There are no project subsidies in state owned theatres.

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centers of:

- **funding from the central government** – almost a hundred percent
- **funding from local governments** – almost total in the case of municipal theatres
- **own revenue of theatres** – very small

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

The budget is distributed for a year and usually does not provide sources for staging. There are no criteria for assessing budget subsidized performances. Central and local budget remains the sole source of funding institutions and cultural activities. Non-state institutions and organizations have no de facto access

to these funds. One possibility for theatrical and concert institutions to solve their financial problems are tours outside the republic. For example, the crew of the Theatre of Opera and Ballet in Chisinau has numerous trips abroad which last for several months each year. For this reason, the number of performances presented in Moldova is decreasing. The economic crisis in recent years has affected the situation in the sphere of culture.

Thus, in 2004, there were 1833 performances, in 2005, their number was 2117, and the number of spectators who visited the theater has increased from 314,000 to 368,000.

In 2009, the Ministry of Culture theater system presented 1799 performances to 348,4000 viewers. Theaters which are almost entirely subsidized by the budget, vegetate. Paradoxically, it is more profitable in economic terms, to keep the band on a subsistence level payroll, to rent rooms indiscriminately, and not to stage: staging a performance involves the expenditure of human and financial resources, and the consumption of electricity, props... A theater running with public money can afford to play less than 10 shows every month, there are no programs for children and young people. The picture is saddening: creative impulses here and there, fueled by the enthusiasm of individual personalities, dimly flashing lights, chaotically going on and off, totalitarian drama patterns persist, the fashioned type of institution is the one with an all-powerful director obeyed by faithful servants and pariah actors, totally deprived of their rights, there is no coherent cultural policy, no educational programs for disabled spectators, a bad repertoire policy, titles are repeated on the posters of several theaters, few contemporary plays actually reach the stage. Stage-director Sandu Grecu and the crew of the municipal Satiricus I. L. Caragiale theater, is an exception: they rapidly stage everything local playwrights write. Although ticket prices are relatively low, ranging between 15 and 150 MDL (about 1 to 10 euros) (if the performances are staged in successful theatres) given the low purchasing capacity of population, the level of theater attendance is very low: according to statistical data, only 113 out of a thousand inhabitants go to theatres and not more frequently than once a month.

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

Public debt is sometimes a problem for institutions. As a rule it is covered by budget funds, nobody being held accountable for failing to accomplish the programmed indicators (the annual statistics report of the Ministry of Culture, posted on its website, provides examples in this regard). None of the theaters reporting to the ministry of culture meets the planned number of shows or spectators. Everything is a formality that is not taken into account, a continuous inertia, like the already classic example of the National Theatre which for 3 years, between 2001-2004, has not paid its statutory Social Fund, the state having later erased this debt.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

The main source of non-budgetary financing is the rental of halls for events and rental of spaces not used by theater companies or institutions. Absolutely all the theaters have rented corridors, halls, the stage, rehearsal spaces, and even actors' booths to organizations and companies. In the case of national heritage objectives, such as the "Mihai Eminescu" National Theatre, the building is wearing out, deteriorating physically.

Several theater projects (of social nature) were supported by international organizations such as (in Nicoleta Esinencu's case) IOM, the OSCE, the Goethe Institute. A less common financing option (not always disinterested and not always legal) is the sponsoring of a production by one person (a businessman or an actor of the political scene).

Section D. Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009) According to a report of the Ministry of Culture, for the year 2009, there were 41 premieres in Moldova’s centrally subsidized theatres.

Nicoleta Esinencu received two awards in 2007: for “Face control” in Stuttgart and “Mothers without pussies” in Paris. In 2008 there were three premieres: “Zuckerfrei” in Dresden, “Radical.md” in Berlin and “Antidote” in Chisinau. In 2009 Nicoleta staged Footage and revised “Mothers without pussies” in Chisinau.

In 2010 she revised “Radical.md” and had the premiere for A(II)Rh + in Chisinau.

Constantin Cheianu had 3 premieres between 2007 – 2010, (1 at the “Alexei Mateevici” theatre and 2 at the “Satiricus” theatres) (plus 3 premieres in Romania, in Bucharest and Iasi). In 2010 Irina Nechit had 3 premieres, in the Balti “Vasile Alecsandri” theatre, in “Satiricus” and at the Mihai Eminescu National Theatre (Studio Hall).

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009) Also, according to the report of the Ministry of Culture for 2009, in Moldova, 1799 performances were held in Moldova, in theaters belonging to the Ministry of Culture.

Nicoleta Esinencu performances in Chisinau: In 2007 there were three performances: 2 performances of “Mothers without pussies” and 1 of “Face control”. In 2008, Zuckerfrei was played once, Radical.md 3 times and Antidote 7 times, totaling 11 shows. In 2009, Footage was played 5 or 6 times, Mothers without pussies 11 times, the Antidote was played on tour (in Poland, Denmark, Germany, Romania) 6 times, making up to a total of 22-23 performances. In 2010, Radical. md has played four times and A(II) Rh+ 2 times.

Performances by Constantin Cheianu: approximately 140 performances in 4 years

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007-2009, or at least in 2009): According to the report of the Ministry of Culture for 2009, in Moldova, the theaters reporting to the Ministry of Culture had had 348.4 thousands spectators.

Nicoleta Esinencu’s performances: the number of viewers was not calculated, but basically in Chisinau they were played mainly in areas with a capacity of about 50/60 people, having full houses at every performance.

Nearly 40,000 viewers attended Constantin Cheianu’s performances in the same period.

18. Medium production costs per performance/project:

Every new production costs, according to the possibilities of institutions from 7 to 10 thousand euros at the most; this is a confidential number in the case of Moldovan theatres and is usually not made public.

Constantin Cheianu’s performances have an average cost of 6-7 thousand euro;

Nicoleta Esinencu tells us that the average cost for productions presented in Moldova range from 100 to 200 euros, the costs being supported by the playwright, with the exception of Antidot, a performance of the Goethe Institut with 4000 euros and 50.000 (approx. 3000 euros) support from the Chisinau Mayoralty.

19. The medium stage cost per performance/project

ranging from about 150 to 1500 euro.

20. Number of (national and international) festivals, location:

- Biennale of the Eugen Ionesco Theatre, Chisinau, www.tei.md;
- National Theatre Festival, Chisinau, www.eminescu.md;
- One man show, Chisinau, Coliseum art center
- International Gala of Puppet Theatres, Chisinau, Republican Licurici Theatre, www.licurici.md

Section E.
International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centers (and festival organizers) use any EU programs? Which ones?

Rarely and often unsuccessfully. Unlike other countries of the region (e.g. Ukraine), it seems the cultural institutes of other countries (for example, the United Kingdom, Germany or Spain) are not active in Moldova. The exception seems to be the Alliance Francaise, whose activity is rather strictly circumscribed to French language teaching and the promotion of French culture, although participants of the consultation meeting did mention that it sometimes funds projects.

22. Are performing arts centers in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

The "Licurici" republican puppet theatre is a member of the UNIMA

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

There are none

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

Three international theatre festivals: Biennale of the Eugen Ionesco Theatre, One man show, Chisinau, Coliseum art center, International Gala of Puppet Theatres, Republican Licurici Theatre

Conclusions: The theatre confronts inherent problems of growth and maturation, adaptation to new conditions and creative activity. The evolution of the Bessarabian theatrical scene as well as the main trends of the last two decades are characterized by innovation and imitation. In this context, mimicry has no negative connotation, but rather a natural evolution, after 50 years of isolation behind the Iron Curtain. However, there are reasons for optimism: as opposed to ossified collectives, financed from budget means, an innovative theatrical movement seems to be on the rise, formed of forward-looking youth, who assume the risk of giving new names to old, complicated realities and that are not only heard by their peers. Broadly speaking, we can say that there are two categories of artists in our area: the ones who praise the government and the ones who confront it. Power struggles between these two sides. The governors continue to appreciate artists judging by their degree of immediate usefulness, and not their artistic and social merits. Unfortunately, as theater critic Valentina Tazlauanu notes "in our country culture is still being seen as a company gall" (and sometimes as an electoral campaign gall), whose services are sometimes required". However, in spite of all, theater exists; it is getting ever younger and seeks new forms of expression, but also operation.



Romania

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009-2010,
unless otherwise mentioned

Author: Julia Popovici

Nota bene: Since – as it will appear – in Romania there is only one public dance center (the Bucharest National Center for Dance – CNDB), all data regarding subsidies etc. refer to theatres, except for otherwise noted. Romania has a less than generous law of sponsorship, which makes the private funding of performing arts to be an exception (theatre is, also, not seen as an image enhancer for business companies), so unless Maecenas involvement is relevant, the information about funding systems only addresses the public funding issues.

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

Immediately after December 1989, the Romanian theatre, which was seen as a factor of “cultural resistance” to communism, suffered a huge crisis in popularity. By that time, there were no underground/ samizdat theatre initiatives, only an extensive network of repertory theatres, and nothing new emerged from the caves of anticommunist movement, and the typical form of “metaphorical contest and freedom” embedded in Italian stage productions was perceived as obsolete. The reaction of the theatrical world was emerging of an important number of private companies, lead by well-known actors, willing to re-invent themselves. For several years, these companies toured in the country and performed in improvised venues, but eventually they all succumbed financially, and the actors went back to their repertory theatres of origin.

A number of Romanian stage directors (such as Andrei Șerban) came back from the exile and became theatre managers (Șerban took over the National Theatre in Bucharest, the biggest performing arts institution in the country), and so did other young directors, not compromised during the communist times (Alexandru Dabija at Odeon, an important theatre in Bucharest). The Romanian repertory theatre had several years of explosive creativity, until resistance from the part of the older actors and political interventions forced most of these managers to quit their positions and stopped the reform movement. Since 1996-2000, the picture of the public repertory system in Romania has remained largely unchanged, despite the succession of managers.

During the last 20 years, the general policy of decentralization – the spending of community money should be decided by the community, for the benefit of the community – made that the local and regional authorities have now total power over the system of local performing arts institutions they inherited, in terms of appointing the directors and control of budget and repertory.

The attempt to pass the National Theatres (there are six of them, plus the Hungarian State Theatre in Cluj) and the operas from central to local administration has failed until now, for two kind of reasons: the local authorities refuse to engage themselves in more expenses (in cities like Cluj, at the moment the local authority subsidizes one theatre, and the central government – four, all of them, big-sized), and the managers of the institutions fear the local political pressures and the financial cuts. The experience proved that the institutions funded by the central government have better dynamics, financial stability and artistic freedom, and they can collaborate with the local authorities in a constructive way.

Until 2004-2005, there was no formal structure for dance in Romania. During the ‘90s, a series of workshops and international exchanges, initiated mainly by dance organizations in France, lead to the emergence of a strong, active and very creative new generation of dancers and choreographers. For sev-

eral years, they were remarkably active exclusively on the international scene, rarely performing on Romanian (Bucharest) theatre stages (even if, contrary to what happened with artists from other emerging countries, they never actually went to live abroad). As a result of important public debates and international pressure, the National Center for Dance (CNDB) was founded in 2004 and started its activity, with the first managerial team, in 2005. The Center produces performances, co-produces (with festivals like eXplore dance festival), it funds project and represents Romanian dance scene in international context. It was and it still is subject to criticism (mainly coming from the older generation of modern dance choreographers), it has quite small budgets and at some level it is undermined by internal conflicts. In 2011, due to the radical rehabilitation of the National Theatre in Bucharest (CNDB was located, alongside with other arts institutions, in the building of this theatre), the Center lost its spaces and was only given several rented offices and a shared rehearsing studio. The modest support on the part of the government is insufficient to allow the rental of a new space with the appropriate structure for performing. Currently, the Centre cannot produce new plays or even perform the old ones. The Minister has still not announce a competition for the Centre's new director – the exiting incumbent (who has run the Center since 2005 and reached the end of his term) is acting as the institution's ad interim director. All of this adds up to make the CNDB's situation very unclear.

The independent performing arts field emerged as such in Romania around the years 2000-2002¹. In artistic terms, the most interesting aspects are connected to the emergence of community art, socially committed theatre, political theatre, documentary and site-specific theatre.

In administrative terms, the independent cultural sector in Romania is not structured; there is no legal basis for the forming of companies, little collaboration between different organizations and no national networking, which does the endeavor of "mapping" the landscape very difficult and complex. Even so, from an organizational perspective, there are three types of independent functioning in the field of performing arts:

- 1) Bars, galleries etc.: venues having primarily a non-performative destination, open to performing arts events; either the bar, gallery etc. is also a performance producer (Monday Theatre at Green Hours, Bucharest), a co-producer or it only hosts performances (Montage Gallery and Godot Café Teatru, Bucharest; Fabrica, Bucharest).
- 2) Independent initiatives dedicated to producing artistic events (performances, research projects, festivals) that don't have a constant venue (the Offensive of Generosity, Bucharest; 4Culture, Bucharest; dramAcum, Bucharest; "Gabriela Tudor" Foundation, Bucharest; Dramafest, Tirgu Mures; Impossible Theatre, Cluj).
- 3) Organizations managing their own venue, as producer and host. Some of these venues operate throughout the year (Yorick Studio and Theatre 74, Tirgu Mures; Apropos Theatre, Bucharest; Garage and Courtyard Theatre, Timisoara; ACT Theatre, Bucharest), and the managing organization doesn't work outside the venue. The others organize specific events, like festivals, and operate occasionally, in a project-based system (all the independents in the Brush Factory, Cluj: ColectivA, GroundFloor Group Association ...; LaBomba organization, Bucharest, until 2011).

The entities in the no. 1 category mainly self-finance themselves, in some cases attracting private sponsorship and/ or applying for public project money. The ACT Theatre is a private-commercial venue, living out strictly of ticket selling and sponsorship². In the no. 3 category, usually there is a certain form of collaboration with lo-

1 The beginning of the economic „boom” lasting until 2008.

2 The ACT Theatre is a special case in the Romanian theatre landscape. Aesthetically, it does not belong to the commercial theatre (in the end, it has a studio stage with 120 seats, in a basement in the heart of Bucharest), nor to the alternative theatre (it works with established artists, not emerging ones, the level of experiment and innovation of the productions is limited, and it follows a repertory system in terms of performing, even if it doesn't have a company of actors). It is an artist's theatre (the only one in Romania), founded by a famous actor and it practices a form of minimalistic art theatre. ACT Theatre had a huge impact on the Romanian stage between 1998 and 2004, exposing for the first times the artists and the audience to this minimalism, to the extreme proximity between the

cal state authorities: either the city council provides the space (Yorick Studio and Theatre 74, Tîrgu Mureş) or it supports the venues in terms of rent costs or maintenance expenses. The most active, dynamic and creative entities in the independent sector usually find additional sources of financing on the international “market”.

In 2009, a new Law of Performing Arts Institutions was supposed to come into effect; following several other reformative attempts, it was meant to reshape the idea of regular company/ ensemble in theatres, operas and philharmonics, introducing temporary contracts and annual evaluation instead of permanent employment for the actors (which would have guaranteed a certain dynamic and competition within the art market) and other measures that would have reduced the running costs of the institutions and would have put a pressure on the artistic quality of the repertory, its diversity and community ties. The law, initiated by an actor, former director of the “Csiki Gergely” Hungarian Theatre in Timișoara and, by then, state secretary in the Ministry of Culture (András István Demeter), was consulted in public debates and amended several times, following the demands of the theatre unions. In 2010, there were two theatres (“Radu Stanca” National Theatre in Sibiu and the Hungarian State Theatre in Cluj) with ensembles entirely employed on temporary contracts and only a handful of public institutions (only theatres) applying the new law. In 2009-2010, the Government suspended the application of the law, in the expectation of a new legislative project regarding the financial retribution of the public service personnel as a whole, including the personnel in performing arts institutions. As such, the future law will exclude, once again, the artistic evaluation of performing arts companies.³

No public theatre has been turned into a private one.

There are no specific formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts, different from the ones required for any NGO or commercial company. Cultural initiatives are not treated specifically in the Romanian legislative system – they can either be a non-profit organization (formula preferred by the large majority) or a business (option generally prevented by the huge bureaucracy and high taxes). Many public funding sources are opened only to non-profit organizations. The independent field is not regularly supported by the public authorities, but there are important exceptions: in Tîrgu Mureş, two alternative theatres, Theatre 74 (Romanian-speaking) and Studio Yorick (Hungarian-speaking) have their own venues in spaces owned by the local authorities and are supported by the Local Council⁴.

Private theatres becoming public

The cases (in the last ten years) of two Bucharest-based theatres – “Excelsior” (a children theatre) and “Masca” (street theatre and *commedia dell'arte*) – passing from private to public were hardly seen as nationalization. From the many theatre companies surged, especially in Bucharest, immediately after 1990, these were among the very few to actually have a constant venue, so they have managed to survive, becoming a presence in the Bucharest artistic landscape. “Excelsior” is lead by a well-known actor of the older generation (Ion Lucian), and the theatre was took over by the Municipality Council when its venue was menaced with the disappearance. “Masca” has a profile unique in Romania (where there are no other professional street theatres⁵), has a significant international exposure and the founder and director of this theatre is an actor (Mihai Mălaimare) with an important political career. These were the factors determining the passing of “Masca” Theatre under the authority of the Municipality Council,

actors and the spectators, and leading to a kind of performing and staging very different from the classical and widely spread Italian stage theatre (which ended up by having a huge influence on the way the public theatres ‘see’ now the function of their own studio spaces). Thanks to the visibility of its founder, it is the only institution beneficiary of a constant support from sponsorship/ private money.

3 The entire field of the public administration and work legislation is currently under revising and the general evolution is difficult to predict.

4 The venues are in the old castle of Tîrgu Mureş and supporting them is part of the City Hall’s strategy of cultural revival of the old town.

5 There are now certain other attempts towards street theatre performances, but they are not yet formalized.

which allowed investments in a new venue (a second one, after the space “Masca” has had in a Bucharest neighborhood, also owned by the local authorities).

Appointment of directors

The appointment procedure for managers in performing arts institutions follows the general rules and regulations stipulated by the Law of Management in Public Institutions. There is an open call for proposals, publicized on the website of the competent authority and in the media – open to EU citizens (usually a good knowledge of the Romanian language is required), owning a university degree, with a certain experience in management and in the field of performing arts, with no criminal record whatsoever. Upon the acceptance of the personal file, the candidates are to propose a management project for the institution. The management project proposals are evaluated and noted (from 1 to 10) by a committee; the competent authority nominates the members of this committee, who are independent experts (sometimes proposed by the Romanian Theatre Guild – Uniter) joined by a law/ financial expert from the funding authority. The candidate getting the biggest grade – based on the project evaluation and an interview – will sign a management contract (which, according to the Romanian law, is a special form of work contract) for a period of five years; during this time, the director is evaluated by the funding authority on an annual base. At the end of the five-year contract, there's a final evaluation, based on a management report, and if the director is graded over 9, she/he has the priority in proposing a new management project. There is no public or professional (formal) consultation regarding the appointment of directors, even if, sometimes, the public and press reactions do have their influence. The number of terms in office are not limited, as proved by the examples of Harry Eliad (born 1927), the director of the Jewish State Theatre in Bucharest since 1989 (before the change of regime), and that of the stage-director Gábor Tompa, who runs the Hungarian State Theatre in Cluj since 1990.

Until now, only the management reports of institutions funded by the central authority are public (on the website of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage). The reports and the evaluations (partial or final) do not focus and sometimes do not even consider the artistic achievements of the management (aspects such national and international collaborations, originality and complexity of the projects, other than the staging of preexisting texts, or the theatrical/ creative relevance of the productions in the local or global context) or the private-public partnership/ collaboration (which is not encouraged, despite the general discourse in the whole field of public initiative).

The reports (thus the evaluations) follow patterns of financial and administrative performance based on the increasing number of premieres, number of annual performances and number of tickets sold/ number of spectators, and on structural investments (refurbishment of the buildings and technical modernization of the stages). In the end, the perspective of this kind of evaluation and the demands of the funding authority lead to a pressure towards just producing, preferably for big stages/ big houses, and a certain tendency towards investing more in buildings than in people, artists or the community.

Section B.

Number of theatres

See the annexed list of performing arts institutions.

Section C.

Theatre funding

There are no defined rules of funding (public) performing arts institutions in Romania, and similar institutions, in similar cultural contexts, but in different locations on the country map are beneficiary of very different statute.

Example: Two medium-sized towns, Arad and Oradea (Western Romania, at the Hungarian border), at less than 100 km distance from each other, both with a dramatic and a puppet theatre. At Arad, all the performing arts institutions are subsidized by the regional authority (Regional Council/ *Consiliul Județean*), while at Oradea, they are funded by the local authority (Local Council/ *Consiliul Local*)⁶. Even if it is to be supposed that the institutions subsidized by the regional authority serve the cultural need at a regional level, the theatres in Arad don't tour in the region more than do it the theatres in Oradea, in their respective *județ*.

The only noticeable tendency is for all performing arts institutions in a town or city to be dependent on the same authority. The reasons for the choosing of the funding authority are historical: either it's about following the previous organization, from the communist times, or at some moment it was decided which one of the two authorities (the regional or the local) has the financial potential to support the theatre⁷.

Due to decentralization, there are little possibilities to estimate the amount of general subsidy for theatres at local and regional level. The endeavor is also complicated by the fact that, usually, the "culture" topic is financially melted into a "culture, sports and entertainment" budget category. The budget of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage for 2011 is estimated at 171 million euro (720 million lei), or 0,006% of the state budget (it was 0,003% in 2010), and the ratio has the tendency to replicate at local level, in the case of larger cities/ towns and regions, but it also depends on the number of funded institutions. The budget of the sole project funding public authority at state level (the National Cultural Fund) was, for the performing arts sector, of 190.000 lei (less than 50.000 euro)⁸, and the project budget of the National Center for Dance (which has its own calls for applications) until 2011 ranged around 20.000 euro (with a significant increase, to almost triple the budget, in 2011, when the Center became unable to act as a direct producer).

Percentage of subsidy in the total budget and budgetary system

The percentage share in the public subsidies does not depend on the funding authority (central, local or regional), in all situations the subsidies cover between 75 and 90 per cent; as a general rule, the smaller percent – hence, the bigger own revenue – regards the public theatres in Bucharest and the puppet and children theatres (where it is hardly noticeable, because of the regularly low budgets⁹). Also as a general rule, a ticketing revenue of more than 10 percent allows for the theatre more expensive productions.

The time horizon of budgeting in public performing arts institutions is limited to one year, due to fiscal regulations, which affect the whole sector. Due to the same law of public institutions, indebtedness is not allowed – all the costs have to be kept within the limits of the annual approved budget. Along the year, the budgets are revised, usually twice, but it is not possible for a public performing arts institution to engage into payments unless the actual budget allows it, in their respective budget categories (the institution cannot engage a payment in concepts of copyright, for instance, if it only has resources in the functional costs

6 The two theatres in Oradea had each of them two 'companies' (ensembles), of Romanian and respectively Hungarian-speaking actors, sharing the same venues, administration etc. In spring 2011, the regional authority decided to re-organize them according to ethnicity and language, instead of theatre genre. As for now, Oradea has the same number of theatres, two, but one performs dramatic and puppet productions in Romanian, and the other one, dramatic and puppet productions in Hungarian.

7 The latest evolutions (in July 2010, the Government initiated a very sudden reform of the local administration) saw the passing of certain theatres from one authority to the other, in order to conform to new personnel standards (theatre companies being assimilated to public service personnel).

8 In 2010, the National Cultural Fund had only one call for applications.

9 With the exception of Bucharest-based puppet and children theatres, with higher budgets and important production departments, which makes them more expensive. Outside Bucharest, puppet theatres manage the by default more expensive nature of animation with less premieres or using alternative theatrical formulas.

budget category). Because the budgets (state budget, then the regional and the local ones) are approved, as a rule, very late – mid-February, beginning of March –, and the financial year ends, practically, by November 30th (the financial reports have to be revised by the end of the year, December 20th), the actual active year for performing arts institutions is nine months, including the two summer months.

The yearly budgets and the impossibility to engage payments in advance (which prevents indebtedness) have an important impact not only on public institutions, but also on the independent sector – since the entire public funding system works on the same principles (see below, about additional/ alternative sources of funding) –, dramatically marking the whole landscape. The future productions, the festivals and any project in general cannot be planned in due time (unless it's an informal planning – theatres reserving an empty slot on the stage directors' agenda), and lately some theatres (like "Figura" Theatre in Gheorgheni) have rescheduled their festivals from spring/ early summer to the second part of the year. The result is – on one hand – the unpredictability of the season programming and limited options in the selection of international festival guests, and – on the other hand – the tendency of the cultural offer in general to concentrate during two or three months, overbooked with events (May – October – November).

Alternative funding sources

The available additional sources of funding follow the same pattern (they are usually accessible in the second half of the year – exceptionally, for the year 2012, the call for projects was launched by the National Cultural Fund in November 2011; the contracts will be signed in March 2012). The main ones, at national level, are the National Cultural Fund (AFCN), the National Center for Dance, the Romanian Cultural Institute (for projects with international exposure) and the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage. At local level, the City Halls and Local Councils have, in theory, the mission to open call for applications for external projects. The Bucharest Municipality has its own center for cultural projects (ArCuB), with the same aim (in the recent years, ArCuB turned into a producer itself).

The National Cultural Fund has its budget formed through tax contributions (for commercial activities such as the selling of erotic magazines; in 2009, the National Lottery was excepted from contributing) and state money. It usually has two calls for application each year, for the whole area of arts and culture, and two for books, cultural magazines and editing in general. It may cover up to 90% of the project costs, not exceeding 70.000 lei (ca. 17.000 euro), and it is open to Romania-based both public and private/ independent institutions. The grants are decided by a jury of independent experts, upon propositions made by the actors in the cultural field. The payment of the grant is, generally, conceived as reimbursement of the costs¹⁰. The budget for 2012 is 8.300.000 lei (ca. two million euro).

The National Center for Dance has one or two calls each year, covers up to 90% of the costs, without other limitations (but the project budget is very low). It appoints a jury of experts (joined by the artistic director of the Center), it's opened to the public and private field, it funds dance, interdisciplinary and editorial projects and the grants are conceived as reimbursement of costs.

The Romanian Cultural Institute works similarly in terms of grants, has a number of programmes (for international collaborations, participations to international festivals...) and the calls are opened to cultural actors not exclusively based in Romania. The grants are up to 100.000 euro.

The Ministry of Culture and National Heritage has no programmes for funding anymore (the Mobility Fund etc. were closed because of the financial crisis, in 2009), but it does accept applications throughout the year. It finances projects with international components (such as those object of a EU grant) and festivals, but there is no competition, the funding decisions are taken internally and there's no transparency concerning these decisions.

10 The cultural project funding follows the same fiscal law as all public funding, including the construction of freeways.

The same lack of transparency undermines the project funding at local and regional level, where usually there is no call for applications. The Local and Regional Councils do finance projects, but nobody knows exactly which ones, how and why. The noticeable tendency is, though, to finance projects of their own institutions (like theatre festivals). In Bucharest, ArCuB has stopped its calls for applications and has turned into a cultural actor itself, organizing their own events and developing their own projects (like a festival of street theatre or the production of theatre performances).

Section D. Artistic activity

Due to the vast diversity of the field and to the lack of information related to the total number of viewers and performances (they are not subject to public record), we will present these data in relation to certain nominated theatres, representative for the general landscape. The time structure is in certain cases dual, since the budget figures are given by year but the number of premieres and, sometimes, the number of performances and tickets sold are reported by the theatres by season (September/ October – May/ June). The information are given, in most cases, by the representatives of each theatre and may differ according to their opportunity to compile different official documents, since this kind of statistics is not usually asked or offered.

Case #1. The German State Theatre in Timișoara.

It is a repertory drama theatre subsidized by the local authority (the Local Council and the City Hall). Due to its profile, it benefits of financial support from different public institutions in Germany and sometimes does co-productions with German theatres. It is located in a culturally very rich area, in competition with other public performing arts institutions, sometimes with the same financial source (both the German Theatre and the “Csiki Gergely” Theatre are subsidized by the Local Council, they both organize festivals, with partial funds from the local authority).

It shares the scene with the “Csiki Gergely” Hungarian Theatre (three days per week each). The hall has 126 seats. The ticket price went in 2010 between 2,5 and 5 euro (10 to 20 lei). The theatre has 78 employees.

- **2008**
 - Number of performances: 80
 - Number of tickets sold: 8.987
- **2009**
 - Number of performances: 104
 - Number of tickets sold: 10.262
 - Total budget (subsidy+tickets revenue+funds from German public institutions dedicated to supporting German-spoken theatre outside Germany): 1,1 million euro
- **2010**
 - Total budget (same sources): 690.000 euro

Number of premieres in the season 2009-2010: 5

Production costs: 163.613 euro, ranging between 12.000 euro (*The Wizard of Oz*, a children performance) and 94.000 euro (*Shaking Shakespeare*, a Shakespeare collage); production average: ca. 39.000 euro.

Case #2. The Youth Theatre in Piatra Neamț.

It is a repertory drama theatre subsidized by the regional authority (the Regional Council). It is the only public performing arts institution in the region (*județ*). It has 70 employees, and the price of the tickets starts at 1,5 euro (up to 2,5 euro).

- **2008**
 - Total budget: 768.000 euro
 - Subsidy: 669.00 euro
 - Number of performances: 108
 - Number of tickets sold: 14.931
- **2009**
 - Total budget: 653.000 euro
 - Subsidy: 600.000 euro
 - Number of performances: 144
 - Number of tickets sold: 15.830
 - In the season 2008-2009, there were a number of 5 premieres. In the season 2009-2010 there were 4 premieres. In 2009-2010, the production costs went from 7.500 euro to 23.000 euro.¹¹

Case #3. Bucharest National Theatre.

Subsidized by the Minister of Culture, it is the biggest performing arts institution in Romania. It has 4 scenes: the Main Stage (1.114 seats), the Amphitheatre (353 seats), the Workshop Stage (between 158 and 219 seats), the 99 Hall (75 seats). In 2010, the ticket price goes between 1,5 and 12 euro (6 to 50 lei). The theatre has 442 employees.

- **2008**
 - Number of premieres: 7
 - Number of performances: 511
 - Number of tickets sold: 115.900
 - Total subsidy: 7,6 million euro/ Total budget: 8,7 million euro
 - Production budget: 416.000 euro; average production costs: 59.000 euro
- **2009**
 - Number of premieres: 10
 - Number of performances: 603
 - Number of tickets sold: 173.639
 - Total subsidy: 6,2 million euro/ Total budget: 7,5 million euro
 - Production budget: 428.000 euro; average production costs: 42.800 euro¹²

Case #4. “Ariel” Children and Youth Theatre in Tirgu Mureş.

A puppet theatre, subsidized by the regional authority, also with a small programme of contemporary drama productions. Two scenes: the main stage (120 seats) and an underground studio (50-70 seats). The tickets are between 1,2 and 2 euro (5 to 8 lei) and the season ticket is 3 euro (12 lei)¹³. It has an ensemble of 12 actors.

- **2008**
 - Total budget: 460.000 euro
 - Number of performances: 430

¹¹ In 2011, the building of the theatre went under rehabilitation and they are now performing in improvised locations.

¹² All data according to the annual management reports of the Bucharest National Theatre, available at www.cultura.ro (the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage). Because the building went under rehabilitation, the data for the season 2010-2011 are not relevant for the normal activity of the institution.

¹³ Season tickets are an audience practice that can generally be found only in Transylvania, in connection to the Hungarian theatre system.

- Number of tickets sold: 38.000
- Average production costs: 3.000 euro
- **2009**
 - Total budget: 480.000 euro
 - Number of performances: 420
 - Number of tickets sold: 37.000
 - Average production costs: 3.000 euro

Case #5. “Odeon” Theatre in Bucharest.

A repertory drama theatre, subsidized by the Local Council, in the richest (culturally and financially) city in Romania. Two stages, the Main one, with 300 seats, and a studio with a modular structure (between 100 and 170 seats). It has 149 employees.

In the season 2009-2010: 5 premieres. In the period 2007-2009 (up to the end of the season), it had 13 premieres.

In 2010, the budget of the theatre was 1.850.000 euro, with a subsidy of 1.530.000 euro.

Section E.

International co-operation

For the list of festivals in Romania, see the annexed list. The performing arts festival in Romania tend to have, by default, an international component, even if it's about one or two productions from the neighboring countries. The exceptions – festival with 100% national program – are marked as such.

Due to bureaucratic procedures, to the lack of professional personnel (with expertise in working with EU requirements) and, the most important, due to the functioning system of public theatres (which are required, by definition, *only* to produce – and for the local audience), the public institutions mainly do not access EU programmes and funds. The situation is different for the independent sector, where the most important problem in applying for these funds is the lack of money (the personal contribution asked for EU projects).

There are some exceptions in the public field. The “Ion Dacian” National Operetta Theatre develops, in the period October 2009 – October 2012, the project “SCENART – Support for competences in performing arts in Romania”, co-financed by the Social European Fund, through the Sectoral Operational Programme for Human Resources. The three-year project, in partnership with Accademia Teatro alla Scala in Milan, has a 3,7 million euro approved funding.

The same SEF, through the Sectoral Operational Programme for Human Resources, approved in July 2010 the financing of the 26 months project “Theatrical Practice in the Center and North-Western Regions”, initiated by an independent institution – Theatre 74 in Tirgu Mureş – in partnership with Tirgu Mureş Arts University.

In other situations, the Romanian institutions and NGOs are the primary (“Gabriela Tudor” Foundation, with the project “E-motional cities”) or secondary partners in projects with EU funding. Bucharest-based dance NGO 4Culture is part of the “Jardin d’Europe” network, beneficiary of a five-year grant from the European Commission (through the Culture Programme, DG Culture and Education) and dedicated to the establishment of a sustainable European infrastructure for the professionalisation of emerging dancers, choreographers, dance administrators and dance writers. Cluj-based ColectivA is a member of „Temps d’Image” network, beneficiary of a similar five-year European Commission grant; its members organize throughout Europe an interdisciplinary festival (connecting visual and performing arts). Both 4Culture and ColectivA co-produce, inside their networks, mainly dance performances with budgets not exceeding 10.000 euro.

dramAcum, a group of stage directors involved in the promotion of new drama, is connected to a number of similar organizations (from the Royal Court Theatre in UK – informally, to Theatre Lab in Sweden, NADA – Serbia, and teatr.doc in Russian Federation), and LaBomba, an organization (and venue) working in the field of active art, community and social artistic projects, also have an international presence, not formalized in network participation.

Apart from the above-mentioned networks, two Romanian public theatres – „Bulandra” Theatre in Bucharest and the Hungarian State Theatre in Cluj – are members of the Union of Theatres in Europe (UTE) network. The National Theatre in Timișoara is part of the European Theatre Convention, a network of public theatres dedicated to promoting new drama, supporting the international mobility of artists and developing artistic exchange in Europe. The Shakespeare Theatre Festival (Craiova/ Bucharest) is a member of the Shakespeare Festivals network. Some public and independent actors are members of IETM (International Network for Contemporary Performing Arts): 4Culture Association, ArCuB (Center for Cultural Projects of Bucharest Municipality), Uniter (Romanian Theatre Guild). Uniter is also member of Culture Action Europe and “Pépinières Européennes pour Jeunes Artistes” networks and it is the Romanian branch of the International Theatre Institute (ITI).

Many puppet and children theatres are members of specific international networks such as UNIMA, ASSITEJ, EunetArt, Epicentre (comprising of children theatres in South-Eastern Europe).

The National Center for Dance worked in 2008-2010 with Tanzquartier in Vienna, CDU Center for Dramatic Art in Zagreb and Maska in Ljubljana in an international project. “What to affirm/ What to perform”, exploring the question of affirmation as a performative method and political positioning. The funding was private, through the Austrian Allianz Kulturstiftung.

For the time being, with the exception of the dance productions already mentioned, there are few cases of international co-production. Previous situations, in 2002 and 2003, comprised co-productions – *Play* by Samuel Beckett and *Juliet* by András Visky, both directed by Gábor Tompa, general manager of the Hungarian Theatre – between the Hungarian State Theatre in Cluj and the Thalia Theatre in Budapest (Hungary). In this formula, the Thalia Theatre contracted the artists, the Hungarian Theatre provided the production funds and covered the copyrights for the text, and the shows were performed in both venues. The same way function all the situations of co-productions between Hungarian-speaking theatres in Romania and theatres in Hungary, situations that randomly may appear. As a member of UTE, the Hungarian State Theatre in Cluj is now working in a co-producing network, with results to be seen during the next period.

“Radu Stanca” National Theatre in Sibiu, organizer of the most important international theatre festival in Romania, has collaborations all over the world and is now involved in European and largely international co-productions.

Annex I – List of performing arts institutions in Romania, according to their source of financing

Department/ Region	Regional Capital/ Other Towns	Institutions of Central Authority (Min. of Culture)	Institutions of Local Authority (City Halls or Local Councils)	Institutions of Regional Authority (Regional Councils)	Independent organizations and/or venues
Alba	Alba-Iulia	–	–	“Prichindel” Puppet Theatre	
Arad	Arad	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Ioan Slavici” Classical Theatre• Arad Puppet Theatre• Arad House of Culture	–	

Department/ Region	Regional Capital/ Other Towns	Institutions of Central Authority (Min. of Culture)	Institutions of Local Authority (City Halls or Local Councils)	Institutions of Regional Authority (Regional Councils)	Independent organizations and/or venues
Argeş	Piteşti	–	–	„Alexandru Davila” Theatre	–
Bacău	Bacău	“George Apostu” Cultural Center (interdisciplinary)–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Bacovia” Municipal Theatre • The Puppet Theatre 	–	
Bihor	Oradea	–	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Szigligeti Színház • “Queen Mary” Theatre 	
Bistriţa-Năsăud	Bistriţa	–	–	–	
Botoşani	Botoşani	–	“Mihai Eminescu” Theatre	–	
Braşov	Braşov	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Sică Alexandrescu” Theatre • “Arlechino” Children and Youth Theatre • Braşov Opera 	“Reduta” Cultural Center	
Brăila	Brăila	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Maria Filotti” Theatre • “Cărăbuş” Puppet Theatre 	–	
Buzău	Buzău	–	–	„George Ciprian” Theatre (project theatre)	
Caraş-Severin	Reşiţa	–	–	Reşiţa Western Theatre	
Călăraşi	Călăraşi	–	Călăraşi Cultural and Creative Center/„Aurel Efteterescu” Popular Theatre (host and project theatre)	–	

Department/ Region	Regional Capital/ Other Towns	Institutions of Central Authority (Min. of Culture)	Institutions of Local Authority (City Halls or Local Councils)	Institutions of Regional Authority (Regional Councils)	Independent organizations and/or venues
Cluj	Cluj-Napoca	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Lucian Blaga” National Theatre • Hungarian State Theatre • National Romanian Opera • Hungarian Opera 	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Puck” Puppet Theatre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brush Factory Federation: ColectivA Association, Groundfloor Group Association, Art-Hoc Association, The Small Hall (Sala Mică) Theatre • The Impossible Theatre • ArtReSearch Association • ArtAct
	Turda	–	Turda Municipal Theatre	–	
Constanța	Constanța	–	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constanța State Theatre • Constanța Children and Youth Theatre • „Oleg Danovski” National Dance and Ballet Theatre 	
Covasna	Sfintu Gheorghe	“Arcuș” Cultural Center (interdisciplinary)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Tamási Aron” Theatre • “Andrei Mureșanu” Theatre 	“Háromszék” Dance Ensemble	Studio M (dance-theatre company)
Dâmbovița	Târgoviște	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • „Tony Bulandra” Theatre • „Mihai Popescu” Children Theatre 	–	

Department/ Region	Regional Capital/ Other Towns	Institutions of Central Authority (Min. of Culture)	Institutions of Local Authority (City Halls or Local Councils)	Institutions of Regional Authority (Regional Councils)	Independent organizations and/or venues
Dolj	Craiova	“Marin Sorescu” National Theatre		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • „Elena Teodorini” Lirical Theatre • „Colibri” Children and Youth Theatre 	
Galați	Galați	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • „Nae Leonard” Musical Theatre • „Fani Tardini” Theatre • „Gulliver” Puppet Theatre 	–	
Giurgiu	Giurgiu	–	–	The Valach Theatre (originally a repertory theatre, project theatre since 2009)	
Gorj	Țirgu Jiu		“Elvira Godeanu” Dramatic Theatre		
Harghita	Miercurea Ciuc	–	“Csiki Játékszin” Theatre	–	
	Gheorgheni	–	Figura – Stúdio Színház Theatre	–	Figura Association
	Odorheiu Secuiesc	–	“Tomcsa Sándor” Theatre	–	–
Hunedoara	Hunedoara	–		Hunedoara Regional Theatre (project theatre)	
	Deva	–	Dramatic Art Theatre	–	
	Petroșani	–		„I.D. Sârbu” Dramatic Theatre	
Ialomița	Slobozia	–	–	–	
Iași	Iași	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Vasile Alecsandri” National Theatre • National Romanian Opere 	–	„Luceafărul” Theatre (children theatre)	
Ilfov ¹⁴	Buftea	–	–	–	–

14 This region is the metropolitan zone of the capital Bucharest and shares its cultural infrastructure.

Department/ Region	Regional Capital/ Other Towns	Institutions of Central Authority (Min. of Culture)	Institutions of Local Authority (City Halls or Local Councils)	Institutions of Regional Authority (Regional Councils)	Independent organizations and/or venues
Maramureș	Baia Mare		Baia Mare Municipal Theatre	–	–
Mehedinți	Drobeta Turnu-Severin	–	„Severin” Municipal Theatre (project theatre)	–	
Mureș	Țirgu Mureș	National Theatre (with a Romanian and a Hungarian section)	–	„Ariel” Children and Youth Theatre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorick Studio/ Yorick Cultural Association • Theatre 74 • Dramafest Foundation
	Mediaș				Tam-Tam Association
Neamț	Piatra Neamț	–	–	The Youth Theatre	
Olt	Slatina	–	–	„Eugen Ionescu” Municipal Theatre	
	Caracal		Caracal National Theatre (host theatre)	–	
Prahova	Ploiești	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Toma Caragiu” Drama Theatre • “Majestic” Cabaret Theatre • The Children Theatre • “Echinox” Theatre 	–	
	Sinaia	European Cultural Center (interdisciplinary)	–	–	
Satu Mare	Satu Mare	–	–	Satu-Mare Northern Theatre	
	Carei	–	Carei Municipal Theatre/ Carei Cultural Center (host theatre)	–	
Sălaj	Zalău	–	–	–	
	Cehu Silvaniei				Berekenye Youth Association

Department/ Region	Regional Capital/ Other Towns	Institutions of Central Authority (Min. of Culture)	Institutions of Local Authority (City Halls or Local Councils)	Institutions of Regional Authority (Regional Councils)	Independent organizations and/or venues
Sibiu	Sibiu	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Radu Stanca” National Theatre • „Gong” Children Theatre 		
Suceava	Suceava	–	–	–	
Teleorman	Alexandria	–	–	–	
Timiș	Timișoara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Mihai Eminescu” National Theatre • National Opera 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • German State Theatre • “Csiki Gergely” Hungarian Theatre 	–	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Auăleu” Garage and Courtyard Theatre • At4t Association
Tulcea	Tulcea	–	–	„Jean Bart” Theatre (in 2010, it became a section within the „Jean Bart” Cultural Center)	
Vaslui	Vaslui				
	Bârlad	–	–	„Victor Ion Popa” Theatre,	
Vâlcea	Râmnicu Vâlcea	–	–	„Anton Pann” Theatre, Râmnicu Vâlcea (with a puppet theatre company)	The Magic Theatre (circus)
Vrancea	Focșani	–	Focșani Municipal Theatre (project theatre)	–	

Bucharest

Institutions of Central Authority (Min. of Culture)	Institutions of Local Authority (City Hall/ Local Council):	Independent organizations and/or venues
„I.L. Caragiale” National Theatre	„L.S. Bulandra” Municipal Theatre	# MONDAY Theatre at Green Hours
National Opera	„Odeon” Theatre	The Offensive of Generosity (O2G)
„Ion Dacian” National Operetta Theatre	The Small Theatre/ The Very Small Theatre ¹⁵	Foundation „Theatre Without Borders”

15 We are talking about two different venues, with different names, but in legal and budget terms, The Small and The Very Small Theatre are one institution.

Institutions of Central Authority (Min. of Culture)	Institutions of Local Authority (City Hall/ Local Council):	Independent organizations and/or venues
Bucharest National Center for Dance	„Nottara” Theatre	dramAcum Association
	Comedy Theatre	Gruia dell’Arte Foundation
„Romanian Youth” National Art Center	Metropolis Theatre	# Montage Gallery
	Jewish State Theatre	# Teatru.ro Association/ Apropro Theatre
		tangaProject
	Excelsior Theatre	# laBOMBastudios*
	„Tândărică” Puppet Theatre	4Culture Association
	„Ion Creangă” Children Theatre	„Gabriela Tudor” Foundation
	„Nicolae Bălcescu” UNESCO European Center for Culture	Passe-Partout Company
	„Masca” Theatre	# ACT Theatre
	„Constantin Tănase” Cabaret Theatre	# Center for Visual Introspection**
		# subRahova
	Globus Circus	# Godot Café-Teatru
	The Children Comic Opera	D’AYA Company
		# La Scena
		# Lorgean Theatre***
		# Unteatru

- **53 (38+15 in Bucharest) performing arts institutions depending on the local authority**
- **24 performing arts institutions depending on the regional authority**
- **18 (13+5 in Bucharest) performing arts institutions depending on the central authority**

The administrative structure in Romania is divided between central Government, the regional authorities (the 41 departments/ *județe*, with their own capital; the president and the members of the Regional Councils are elected directly; there is also a prefect, appointed by the Prime Minister, but she/ he does not play any role in the funding of theatres) and the local authorities (City Halls and Local Councils; the maire and the members of the Council are also elected). The capital Bucharest is a separate administrative unity, divided in six “sectors”; Bucharest has a General Maire and a Municipality Council, the “sectors” have their own maires and Local Councils, but most of the theatres are subsidized by the Municipality Council.

Even if the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage (formerly Ministry of Culture, Religious Affairs and National Heritage) is the regulatory body in the field, due to decentralization practices – any local or regional authority can fund a performing arts institution at its wish -, it does not have an inventory of public theatres and dance institutions in Romania¹⁶. There is a large number (more than a hundred)

16 In July 2010, a governmental decision stipulated up to a 30% personnel cut in all local and regional public institutions, including theatres. A large number of them were though excluded, since they were not originally founded by the local or regional authority (most of the theatres date from the 40’s and 50’s). It appeared that the Ministry of Culture did not have a database with this information and asked the theatres to send their documents of establishment. This personnel cut has lead to a reorganization of the bureaucratic theatre functioning (i.e. institutions passing from one authority to another or changing their status), which appears to be an ongoing process.

of NGOs – independent structures – but only a few of them are active on a regular basis and even fewer have their own venue. In the following statistics, we only mention the independent companies/ organizations responsible for one or more projects during at least three years in a row, and the statistics does not cover amateur events, associations and foundations for amateur or educational theatre and event organizers.

We present a list of performing arts institutions and organizations according to their regional location. For all public institutions, the sources are the official websites of the Ministry of Culture, of the local and regional authorities. For the independent organizations, the main source are the list of competitors for the three latest calls for projects of the National Cultural Fund, the Coalition of the Cultural Independent Sector and the National Register for NGOs. Since there is no previous similar endeavor extensively covering the whole country, the list – especially the part concerning the NGOs – may be subject to updates.

The sign accompanies venues.

*Their venue, laBomba Community Center, was lost in the summer of 2011, due to the fact that the building was given back, through a court order, to the successors of the owners before 1948.

** In theory, a space dedicated to contemporary visual arts, it hosts many performing arts events, especially after the National Center for Dance lost its venues.

***The only apartment theatre in the city.

Annex II – List of performing arts festivals in Romania

Location	Organized by	Name of the festival and contact
Alba Iulia	"Prichindel" Theatre	"Stories" International Theatre Festival <i>office@teatrulalba.ro</i> <i>www.teatrulalba.ro</i>
Arad	"Ioan Slavici" Classical Theatre	Classical Theatre Festival <i>office@teatrulclasic.ro</i> <i>www.teatrulclasic.ro</i> (Romanian only)
	Arad House of Culture	Underground Theatre Festival <i>casacult@gmail.com</i> <i>www.undergroundfestival.ro</i>
Bacău	"Bacovia" Municipal Theatre	The Star Gala <i>teatrulbacovia@yahoo.com</i> <i>www.teatrulbacovia.ro</i> (Romanian only)
Oradea	Oradea State Theatre	Short Plays Festival Victoria Balint, <i>balintrichard@yahoo.com</i> <i>www.teatruloradea.ro/lang-en/</i>
Braşov	"Sică Alexandrescu" Theatre	The Festival of Contemporary Dramaturgy (national only)
Brăila	"Maria Filotti" Theatre	"Days and Nights of European Theatre in Brăila" Festival (under transformation)
Buzău	"George Ciprian" Theatre	"SeeTheatre" ("VedeTeatru") Star Theatre Festival (national only)
Cluj	Hungarian State Theatre	"Interferences" International Theatre Festival (biennial) Zsuzsanna Nagy, <i>office@huntheater.ro</i> <i>www.huntheater.ro/interferences/index.php</i>

Location	Organized by	Name of the festival and contact
	"Puck" Puppet Theatre	Puppet Theatre Festival <i>teatrulpuck@yahoo.com</i> <i>www.teatrulpuck.ro/loader3.html</i>
	GroundFloor Group Association	International Festival of Contact Improvisation <i>Kinga Kelemen, office@groundfloor.ro</i> <i>www.groundfloor.ro</i>
	ColectivA Association	"Temps d'Image" Festival (<i>interdisciplinary</i>)* <i>Miki Braniște, miki@colectiva.ro</i> <i>www.colectiva.ro</i>
Craiova/ Bucharest	"Marin Sorescu" National Theatre	Shakespeare International Festival (<i>biennial</i>)
Galați	"Fani Tardini" Theatre	National Festival of Comedy (<i>national only</i>)
	"Gulliver" Puppet Theatre	"Gulliver" International Festival of Animation <i>gulliver_gl@yahoo.com</i> <i>www.teatrulgulliver.ro/festival/prezentare/ (Romanian only)</i>
Gheorgheni	"Figura" Theatre	Colloquium of National Minorities Theatres (<i>biennial</i>)
		"Team-Work" International Festival (<i>biennial</i>) (<i>dance festival</i>)
Odorheiu Secuiesc	"Tomcsa Sandor" Theatre	"Drama" Contemporary Theatre Festival
Iași	"Time"/ "Timpul" Cultural Foundation	"EuroArt" Theatre Festival
	"Luceafărul" (Children) Theatre	International Children and Youth Theatre Festival <i>oltitac@hotmail.com</i> <i>www.luceafarul-theatre.ro</i>
	"Vasile Alecsandri" National Theatre	"Extremely Eastern Europe. Theatrical reUNIONS" (<i>guests from Romania and the Republic of Moldova; first edition in 2011</i>) <i>www.teatrulnationaliasi.ro</i>
Baia Mare	Baia Mare Municipal Theatre	"Atelier" International Theatre Festival <i>Radu Macrinici, festatelier@teatrulbm.ro</i> <i>www.teatrulbm.ro/festatelier.html</i>
Țirgu Mureș	Theatre 74	UNIDRAMA Theatre Festival (<i>first edition in 2010</i>) (<i>national only</i>)
Oradea	"Queen Mary" Theatre	Short Theatre Festival (<i>national only</i>) <i>Victoria Balint, teatruloradea2003@yahoo.com</i>
Piatra Neamț	Youth Theatre	Piatra Neamț Theatre festival (<i>national only</i>)
Ploiești	"Toma Caragiu" Theatre	"Toma Caragiu" Theatre Festival <i>Lucian.Sabados@teatrulploiesti.ro</i> <i>www.teatrulploiesti.ro (national only; first edition in 2011)</i>
Satu Mare	Satu Mare Northern Theatre	"No Barriers" Theatre Festival <i>www.teatruldenord.ro (Romanian only)</i>

Location	Organized by	Name of the festival and contact
Sfîntu Gheorghe	"Tamási Aron" Theatre	Reflex Biennial <i>bocsardi@tamasitheatre.ro</i> <i>www.tamasitheatre.ro</i>
Sibiu	"Radu Stanca" National Theatre	Sibiu International Theatre Festival <i>Petruța Popescu, festival@sibfest.ro</i> <i>www.sibfest.ro</i>
Timișoara	"Mihai Eminescu" National Theatre	Romanian Drama Festival <i>Codruța Popoiu, comunicare@ntimisoara.com</i> <i>www.ntimisoara.ro (Romanian only)</i>
	"Csiki Gergely" Hungarian Theatre	Interethnic Theatre Festival <i>www.tm-t.ro</i>
	German State Theatre	"Eurothalia" International Theatre Festival <i>varsandan@dstt.ro</i> <i>www.teatrulgerman.ro (in Romanian and German only) (no edition in 2011)</i>

Bucharest

Organized by	Name of the festival
Uniter (Romanian Theatre Guild)	National Theatre Festival <i>Pamela Pricopie, pamela@uniter.ro</i> <i>www.uniter.ro</i>
Comedy Theatre	Festival of Romanian Comedy (<i>national only</i>)
Țândărică Puppet Theatre	"Joy for Children. Top Notch Shows" International Animation Theatre Festival <i>Raluca Tulbure, raluca.tulbure@teatrultandarica.ro</i> <i>en.teatrultandarica.ro/festival.html</i>
"Ion Creangă" Children Theatre	"100, 1.000, 1.000.000 Stories" International Children Theatre Festival <i>Cornel Todea, cornel@todea.ro</i> <i>Adriana Barbu, adriana.barbu@teatrulioncreanga.ro</i> <i>www.fitc.ro (Romanian only)</i>
"Ion Dacian" National Operetta Theatre	"Life is Beautiful" International Performing Arts Festival <i>Mădălina Matei, madalina.matei@opereta.ro</i> <i>www.festival.opereta.ro</i>

*In 2011, it hosted the first national Platform for Independent Performing Arts.



Republic of Serbia

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Andjelka Jankovic – coordinator of program of Bitef Theatre, andjelka.jankovic@bitef.rs

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

Serbia is currently in the process of transition. With this in mind we cannot speak about real and visible changes. Nothing has really changed in field of culture and performing arts since the great political changes that happened in 2000. Probably now, more than ever we are under a great impact of the transition. Still there is no evident systematic change. From the project “Geocultural Map of Serbia” it is obvious that there is a still present centralisation as a working model (State model) which involves direct political control and influence. The same situation is in all other fields and sectors. Regionalization and decentralization has not been established, even though there is a new law that proclaims them as preferred values. Luckily there are some visible steps in the way of changing opinions and attitudes. There are positive thoughts and feelings about arm’s length and para-state model. The institution of public competition has been established, but still we do not have clearly defined criteria of decision making. The problem of Serbia is underdevelopment of rural areas because infrastructure and 2/3 of any aspect of life are situated in Belgrade.

Finally we cannot speak about theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systematic transition) because they are still in the process. Since the year of “great changes”, the year of 2000, there have been several great dance events and projects that has shown that contemporary dance scene in Serbia has a future. Foundation of Belgrade Dance Festival in 2001; presence of Nomad Dance Academy from Which Stanica – Center for Contemporary Dance has developed; Forum for New Dance – the Ballet Company of the Serbian National Theatre in Novi Sad) and BITEF Dance Company has been established.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

Yes there is. The Law of Culture was adopted in 2009. and formally it was argued in public before adoption.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

This kind of practice has not been used not in theatres or in culture.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

There are no formal rules when it comes to the new initiatives in performing arts. But still there are some tendencies that exist (which could be seen from the document about purposes and allocation of funds¹). special attention is given to the development of contemporary dance scene in the Republic of Serbia, through stimulation of professional development of young artists, especially young dancers and presentation of contemporary dance out of dance centers. With desire to achieve the same goal, representative visits of foreign ballet troupes and artists were financed in previous years (2009. and 2010.) There is still the same tendency to create new dance audiences and to educate them while popularizing artistic dance scene in the Republic of Serbia. Very significant year for dance scene was 2009. Artists have been noticed vitality and momentum of contemporary dance. As the authors concluded in the text published in the Yearbook of Raster² there is a new tendency in the field of performing arts which is reflected in the use of texts together with the common dance forms. Huge number of projects is showing that. One of the primary characteristics of independent scene is to go in different directions from the mainstream theatres. They are taking large part in formatting of “Second scene” and in its work.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

According to the Law of Culture directors of institutions are appointed and dismissed by the founder. Director of the institution, founded by the Republic of Serbia, is appointed by the government on the basis of the previously published tender 60 days before the expiration of the term of office. The founder appoints the director according to the proposal of the Board. Conditions for selection are contained in the Statute of the institution. An exception may be applied in the case of failure of a public competition. Duty of Director is terminated upon expiry of term of office and dismissal, or before if some other exemption happens. Term of office has been determined to be 4 years. It is possible to renew term of office only twice.

Political influence (as it has been mentioned in the previous text) is still present and nomination of directors is politicized.

Section B. Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

According to the database of Centre for Study in Cultural Development, Republic of Serbia Centre there are 1021³ organisation of performing arts (all together: amateur societies, theatres (both professional, amateur and for children) and polyvalent centres for culture. We have excluded Cultural Centres even though they have some projects that include performing arts. In the following text the reader could find separately statistical data on number of theatres and organisations divided into different groups.

1 <http://www.kultura.gov.rs/?jez=&p=56>

2 RASTER 2009 – Yearbook of the independent performing scene in Serbia
<http://www.tkh-generator.net/en/uprocusu/promocija-raster-2009-godisnjak-nezavisne-izvodacke-scene-u-srbiji-21-april-u-18h-mkm-beogr>

3 <http://www.e-kultura.net/Institucije/Pretraga.aspx>

It should be pointed out that there is no accurate information about the number of performing arts organisations in the non-governmental and private sector. In the latest release of the Protocol on cooperation of Independent Cultural Scene in Serbia and Ministry of Culture it is announced that there are more than 70 organisations and initiatives from all over the country.⁴ Yet, there is no accurate information about those who are strictly organisations of performing arts, although most of them work on the interdisciplinary projects that are very often use performing arts.

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- institutions of the central government

According to the official sources on the website of Ministry of Culture there are 24 institutions established by the Republic of Serbia⁵.

Only 2 of them are in the field of performing arts: National theatre in Belgrade and “Kolo” Ensemble of Folk Dance and Song.

- institutions of regional governments

Serbia consists of two provinces: Central Serbia and Vojvodina. Only Vojvodina is stated as province with its own governmental bodies.

Numbers of institutions which have been established by the Provincial Secretariat for Culture of Vojvodina is 9 and 2 of them are theatres (Serbian National Theatre of Novi Sad and National Theatre Nepsinhaze in Subotica).

- institutions of municipal governments

The Centre for Study in Cultural Development did the research and afterwards published the results of it in the *Publication: CULTURAL POLICIES IN CITIES OF SERBIA. Cultural resources (comparative view)*⁶. Study included 21 city (municipality) in Serbia (Valjevo, Vranje, Zajecar, Zrenjanin, Jagodina, Kragujevac, Kraljevo, Krusevac, Leskovac, Loznica, Nis, Novi Pazar, Pancevo, Pozarevac, Smederevo, Sombor, Sremska Mitrovica, Subotica, Uzice, Cacak, Sabac). The total number of institutions whose funds are covered by the budget of the city is 152, of which 16 theatres, 16 houses of culture, 25 cultural and polyvalent centres and 6 amateur societies (cultural associations that nurture traditional culture and dance).

- non-governmental organisations

Accordingg to the release published after the signing of Protocol of Cooperation of Independent Cultural Scene in Serbia and the Ministry of Culture in Zrenjanin there are over 70 independent organisations and initiatives⁷.

- private enterprises
 - 1 Theatre: opera and theatre house “Madlenianum”
 - 1 Children theatre “Puz”
 - Are there any mixed forms?
 - Nothing that is not mentioned before.

4 <http://www.kultura.gov.rs/?jez=&p=5861>

5 <http://www.kultura.gov.rs/?jez=&p=52>

6 <http://www.zaprokul.org.rs/ArticleDetails.aspx?ID=178>

7 <http://www.kultura.gov.rs/?jez=&p=5861>

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

In the following text you will find statistical data from the report of the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia⁸ for the year 2009. This office does researches in the field of governmental institutions but still they do not research non-governmental and private sector in culture. Data on institutions and enterprises in the domain of culture and other pieces of information have been collected through means of regular annual and multi-annual statistical reports.⁹

It is important to know that the number of theatres (professional, amateur and for children) was reduced by about 6% in the 2008/09 season compared to the previous season. In this statistical report theatres in Serbia are not divided into the following groups: dramatic, puppet, musical, opera, dance, impresario theatres, art centres. There are only 3 groups of theatre: professional, amateurs and for children. I have also analysed data from the Statistical Yearbook of "Sterjino pozorje"¹⁰ for the season 2008/09 and from the database "E-Culture"¹¹ published by the Centre for Study in Cultural Development of the Republic of Serbia together with previously mentioned report.

The Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia came to these results:

- Professional Theatres in total in the Republic of Serbia: 42. Central Serbia: 32, Vojvodina: 10.¹²
- Amateur theatres in total in the Republic of Serbia: 38. Central Serbia 29. Vojvodina: 9.¹³
- Children theatre in total in the Republic of Serbia: 19. Central Serbia 15. Vojvodina: 4.¹⁴

I have to point out that the Center for Study in Cultural Development, Republic of Serbia launched project the "E-Culture"¹⁵ where I found a bit different results. There database says that there are 62 theatres. The difference is lying in the fact that they are including both non-governmental and governmental theatres and other different centres. So according to these three official statistical reports in the following text you will find results and conclusions.

- Dramatic theatres – 47.
- Puppet theatres – 2. There is (in total) 2 known puppet theatres that are profiled in that manner. One is situated in Belgrade (Theatre Pinokio, Zemun) and the puppet theatre in the City of Nis.
- Musical theatres – There is only 1 official musical theatre in the region. Terazije Theatre in Belgrade.
- Opera theatres – There is no separate opera theatre in Serbia. The same thing is with ballet. There are arguments about building up new separate opera and ballet house, but still nothing concrete is happening. For now we have a permanent and unified opera, ballet and drama repertoire and ensemble within the National Theatre in Belgrade and Serbian National Theatre in Novi Sad. Also there is one private Opera and Theatre house called "Madlenianum".
- Dance theatres (movement, pantomime) – Serbia still does not have dance profiled theatres (movement, pantomime). There are few theatres that have new repertoire policy geared towards the development of the dance scene. However they are having mixed program policy: drama and

8 <http://webzrs.stat.gov.rs/axd/en/>

9 Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, the report in domain of culture, Chapter 24 CULTURE, pg. 415

10 <http://www.pozorje.org.rs/izdavastvo.htm#2>

11 <http://www.e-kultura.net/>

12 Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, the report in domain of culture, Chapter 24 CULTURE, pg. 415

13 Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, the report in domain of culture, Chapter 24 CULTURE, pg. 415

14 Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, the report in domain of culture, Chapter 24 CULTURE, pg. 415

15 <http://www.e-kultura.net/Institucije/Pretraga.aspx>

dance. These are Cultural Institutions Vuk Karadzic (Kult Theatre) and BITEF Theatre. For the first time Serbia has a dance company (BITEF DANCE COMPANY) which has been performing for one year and a half. Kult Theatre has new program “Belgrade Dance Centre” – a place for performing and they are co-producers of a large part of dance projects of the independent scene/sector. BITEF Theatre is the first city house doing contemporary dance production.

- impresario theatres – It could be the only private theatre we have “Madlenianum” Madlena Zepter
- arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones)
 - Polyvalent centres for culture 259¹⁶
 - Cultural Centres 46¹⁷
- other
 - Art colonies 152¹⁸
 - Institutes for Culture 2¹⁹
 - Amateur Societies 700²⁰

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

“Defined rules” is the topic which is very often called into question among the expert public. Financing of culture is a very complicated question. Although there is a Law of Culture adopted in 2009 there are no transparent and clear rules about financing culture. Every key decision is made within the public administration without chance for a professional community and other actors of cultural policy to take active part in the process of decision making, though Ministry of Culture adopted priorities for further work in 2001: de-etatisation, democratization, decentralization, cultural pluralism, alternative sources of funding, harmonization of legislation of EU and establishment of regional and international cooperation.

Autonomous region/province of Vojvodina and local governments bring their own programs and plans for development of culture and funds for them are provided within their own budgets. The same thing is with the institutions founded by the Republic of Serbia. According to the definition of performing arts are: drama, opera, ballet and dance²¹. They are financed on the basis of open competition unless Law of a Culture stipulates otherwise.

In the field of performing arts there is a competition for the realization of theater and dance festivals and events, programs/projects of dance and theater artists and troupes as well as for the international cooperation in these artistic fields. Attention has been devoted to developing and promoting contemporary dance scene in Serbia and it is divided into: theatre creation, dance creation, programs and projects for developing contemporary dance scene.

There is no precised rules accept in the document named “Regulations on Criteria and Indicators for the Selection of Projects in Culture and Co-financing from the Budget of the Republic of Serbia” where reader could find statements which describes some kind of rules. The projects and programs who wants

16 <http://www.e-kultura.net/Institucije/Pretraga.aspx>

17 <http://www.e-kultura.net/Institucije/Pretraga.aspx>

18 <http://www.e-kultura.net/Institucije/Pretraga.aspx>

19 <http://www.e-kultura.net/Institucije/Pretraga.aspx>

20 <http://www.e-kultura.net/Institucije/Pretraga.aspx>

21 <http://www.kultura.gov.rs/?jez=&p=56> / Law of Culture

to be funded have to meet at least 3 of 14 specified criteria. It is impossible to find any defined rule when consider local governments' and private sponsors funds.

The conclusion is that there are no clearly defined criteria for financing performing arts and dance. Also, there is neither fiscal policy (decentralization) nor privatization. Private sponsors or fundraising is the mostly not used word among the cultural workers and public. There are some steps that show progress but mostly among the independent organizations. There is no any statistical survey of sponsorship in Serbia. Probably that is because there is no legal framework for sponsors. Sponsors who support cultural institutions and organizations are very rare. There are just few companies who can support culture but only few of them are doing that. There is no provision on tax relief for ones who want to support. Gaining publicity is not motive, strong enough, to prompt sponsors. Sponsorship of other commercial manifestation and reality programs is much more cost-effective.

Ministry of Culture currently observes possibilities of calling special competition for organizations of the independent scene, and for the establishment of multi-year funding. Organization will direct they own action to the same goal – achieving of general interest in culture. This is defined in the Protocol of Cooperation of Independent Cultural Scene in Serbia and the Ministry of Culture.

Serbian researchers have noticed the main fear and difference between state funding and sponsorships. Budget of state is under public control so the financing does not depend on the individual will as it is case with sponsorships.

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- amount of general subsidies
- amount of project subsidies

Unfortunately it is really hard to find information about public spending not only for theatres and dance but also for culture in general. There is no statistical reports and evaluations which mesure amount of subsidies.

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government

I have analysed information that are available on the website of Ministry of culture. In the following text I will present statistics and results.

Ministry of Culture has provided budget of 1% (5.8 billions RSD or approximately 55.471.869,55 EUR) from the total State budget. In the year of 2010 Ministry of Culture provided total sum of the amount of 1.084.011.000 RSD for cultural programs and projects. Buget for the theatrical creativity (theatre and dance festivals, programs adn projects of dance and theatre artists' and troupes, international cooperation, for hosting visits foreign ballet artists an troupes etc.) was in the amount of 35.855.072 RSD Which is 3.3076% from the total amount that has been distinguished for cultural progmas and projects.

As I previously mentioned these are only results we could get from the official reports and institutions.

- funding from local governments

The Centre for Study in Cultural Development, Republic of Serbia published the *Publication: CULTURAL POLICIES IN CITIES OF SERBIA. Cultural resources (comparative view)*²². Study included 21 city (municipality) in Serbia (Valjevo, Vranje, Zajecar, Zrenjanin, Jagodina, Kragujevac, Kraljevo, Kru-sevac, Leskovac, Loznica, Nis, Novi Pazar, Pancevo, Pozarevac, Smederevo, Sombor, Sremska Mitro-vica, Subotica, Uzice, Cacak, Sabac). According to the resulsats from it conclusion is that average annual

budget percentage which is provided for culture is 6,75% from the total budget of local city governments. This percentage applies to the all cultural programs and projects. There is no statistical data which describe field of financing performing arts.

- own revenue of theatres
- We could not managed to get this information.

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

One year.

Budget performance is not evaluated. Evaluation does not exist and it is not used in practice.

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

We have not got any information of indebtedness of performing arts institutions.

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

Revenues from the budget, its own canals of budget users, donations from foreign countries, donations from international organizations, donations from other levels of hair, donations from non-governmental organizations and individuals, income from the sale of non-financial assets, undistributed surplus revenues from previous years, unspent funds from grants IU previous years, private sponsors (fundraising), Other funds of European Union: Culture **2007 – 2013**; ECF – European Cultural Foundation; **BCIF** – the Balkan Community Initiatives Fund. Etc.

Section D.
Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

Total number of premiers in the season 2008/2009 was 206 in Serbia, among all professional theatres.²³

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

In 2009 there was:

- 4344 performances in the Professional Theatres (3453 in Central Serbia and 891 in Vojvodina).²⁴
- 939 performances in the Amateur Theatres (848 in Central Serbia and 91 in Vojvodina).²⁵
- 1985 performances in the Children Theatres (1441 in Central Serbia and 544 in Vojvodina).²⁶

²³ Source: Yearbook of Serbian Theatres, season 2008/2009; <http://www.pozorje.org.rs/izdavastvoeng.htm#1>

²⁴ Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, the report in domain of culture, Chapter 24 CULTURE, pg. 415

²⁵ Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, the report in domain of culture, Chapter 24 CULTURE, pg. 415

²⁶ Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, the report in domain of culture, Chapter 24 CULTURE, pg. 415

- 25 performances of non-governmental organisations and theatres, art, experimental, research groups (performed in Belgrade)²⁷ and free artists.
- The independent scene produce approximately as much premiere as 4 city theatre in Belgrade produce per year²⁸

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

In 2009 there was²⁹:

- 487 000 of viewers of Professional Theatres (325 000 in Central Serbia and 162 000 in Vojvodina).
- 130 000 of viewers of Amateur Theatres (112 000 in Central Serbia and 18 000 in Vojvodina).
- 353 000 of viewers of Children Theatres (272 000 in Central Serbia and 81 000 in Vojvodina).
- There is no statistics on number of viewers for non- governmental and non-institutional organisations, projects, events and the independent performing scene.

These results show that in Serbia exist institutional cultural network that provides emptiness in many parts of the same country because of the centralisation.

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

We used as an example average value that distinguishes the City Assembly for production of one performance. Approximate value of about 2.500.000 RSD (about 24,25 000 EUR).

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

It varies. It depends of many factors. Total costs of hosting one performance/project at the BITEF Festival (as an example) is from 10 to 100 000 EUR.

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location

For answering on this question the author have used information according to the text “Cultural Manifestations in the Republic of Serbia” published by the magazine Survey³⁰, Republic of Serbia, number. 1, 2008 and Statistical Yearbook published by “Sterijino pozorje”³¹. As one of the researchers from the Centre for Study in Cultural Development, Republic of Serbia said, these information are accurate. The specified statistical data are the result of the latest finished research in Serbia. Hence nothing has really changed from 2008. The picture in Serbia is pretty the same till 2011.

In this text author is using the word “manifestation”. There is problem with definition of this term. Because manifestation mostly do not have specified program (they are not profiled); Hence in the mentioned text the authors have decided to use classification of manifestation by type of the main program. Most of them (256) are musically and scenically profiled. The authors divided manifestation into per-

27 RASTER 2009 – Yearbook of the independent performing scene in Serbia
<http://www.tkh-generator.net/en/uprocesu/promocija-raster-2009-godisnjak-nezavisne-izvodacke-scene-u-srbiji-21-april-u-18h-mkm-beogr>

28 RASTER 2009 – Yearbook of the independent performing scene in Serbia
<http://www.tkh-generator.net/en/uprocesu/promocija-raster-2009-godisnjak-nezavisne-izvodacke-scene-u-srbiji-21-april-u-18h-mkm-beogr>

29 Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, the report in domain of culture, Chapter 24 CULTURE, pg. 415

30 <http://www.pregled-rs.com/?lang=en>

31 Source: Yearbook of Serbian Theatres, season 2008/2009; <http://www.pozorje.org.rs/izdavastvoeng.htm#1>

forming (drama, music, dance, cinematography) manifestations, multicultural and agricultural manifestations, spiritual or religious manifestations.

In total Serbia have 950 manifestations (events) per year.

112 or 11, 7% are held in Belgrade.

Every smaller town has at least one and some of them even more permanent manifestation.

- Republic (national) manifestation 17, 8%
- Regional 19, 9%
- International 14, 4%
- Local 48, 0%

Table 1. – Cultural manifestation by district

District	Manifestation	%
Total	957	100.00
Borski	27	2.8
City of Belgrade	112	11.7
Jablanicki	26	2.7
Juzno-backi	107	11.2
Juzno-banatski	48	5.0
Kolubarski	28	2.9
Kosovski	5	0.5
Kosovsko-mitrovacki	10	1.0
Kosovsko-pomoravski	1	0.1
Macvanski	29	3.0
Moravicki	25	2.6
Nisavski	45	4.7
Pcinjski	29	3.0
Pecki	0	0.0
Pirotski	17	1.8
Podunavski	31	3.2
Pomoravski	23	2.4
Prizrenski	0	0.00
Rasinski	32	3.3
Raski	42	4.2
Severno-backi	13	1.4
Severno-banatski	26	2.7
Srednje banatski	46	4.8
Sremski	63	6.6
Sumadijski	22	2.3
Toplicki	9	0.9
Zajecarski	32	3.3
Zapadno-backi	42	4.4
Zlatiborski	39	4.1

Source – Database E-Culture (2008), Centre for Study in Cultural Development, Republic of Serbia, Belgrade (www.e-kultura.net).

Taken from the text “Cultural manifestation in Serbia”, Magazine Survey, Republic of Serbia, number 1, 2008.

Location:

- City of Belgrade 23, 9%
- City of Novi Sad 8, 3%
- City of Pancevo 3, 0%
- City of Valjevo 3, 2%
- City of Nis 3, 2%
- City of Kraljevo 3, 4%
- City of Zrenjanin 5, 3%
- Others 49, 7%

One half of manifestation has a local character. Two thirds of manifestation does not have national meaning. There is less than 3% of international manifestation.

FESTIVALS – Here we are interested in festivals. There are approximately 107 festivals in Serbia of every kind of art and culture.

When it comes to the theatre there is approximately (in total) 37 theatre and dance festivals together with mixed forms (scenic character) both professional and amateur. 3 of them are dance festivals. Over more decades it has been 20 festivals which are held every year. There are 3 most important ones, and 2 of them are held in Novi Sad. According to the data from Yearbook of “Sterijino pozorje” there is 25 professional theatre festivals and 10 of them have international character.

Section E. International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

Yes, they do.

Culture **2007 – 2013**; **ECF** – European Cultural Foundation;

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

Yes, they are.

- Stanica – Center for Contemporary Dance is a member of Nomad Dance Academy
- BALKAN DANCE NETWORK www.balkandancenetwork.org
- ENPARTS – European Network of Performing Arts www.labiennale.org/en/enparts
- IETM – International European Theatre Meeting www.ietm.org
- The IYME – International Young makers Exchange <http://www.iyme.eu>

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

There is a good practice of co-production. Dance performances are mostly done in the co-production with domestic and foreign (international) partners. Financing depends on the case and type of the performance. Sometimes domestic theatre gives infrastructure and logistic, and two sides arrange paying of additional costs. They use both domestic and international sources of financing.

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

- **7 theatre festivals:** BITEF (International Belgrade Theatre Festival); FIST (Festival of International Student Theatre); International Theatre Festival “Slavija” Belgrade; International Puppet Theatre “Zlatna iskra”, Kragujevac; International Theatre Festival for Children, Subotica; International Theatre Festival for Children and Youth TIBA, Belgrade; International Festival of Alternative and New Theatre (INFANT), Novi Sad; International Theatre Festival “Theatre Fall of Vrsac”, Vrsac; International Theatre Festival of Theatre association Kvartet, Novi Sad; International Regional Theatre Festival, Subotica.
- **3 dance festivals:** Belgrade Dance Festival, Festival of Choreographic Miniatures, Kondenz – Festival of Contemporary Dance.
- **In total: 10.**



Slovakia

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

The 2010 data are not available yet – the season is still in progress.

Author: Vladislava Fekete, Head of the Theatre Institute in Bratislava, Bratislava, Slovakia,
vladislava.fekete@theatre.sk

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

The functioning of theatres in the Slovak Republic is regulated by Act 384/1997, which took effect on January 1, 1998 (and additionally – by Act nr. 416/2001 from January 1, 2002, which regulates the functioning of regional theatres). This act defines theatre as “an independent art form, differing from other art forms in that it involves the presence of an actor or an object onstage during the performance, the presence of an audience and the possibility of interaction, aimed at conveying an aesthetic experience to the viewers. Theatre as an art combines various independent art forms and their output to create a performance.”

This act, in a long-standing need of amendment (as it does not state clearly enough which entities are entitled to establish a theatre, nor does it outline the methodology of its founding), classifies theatre as follows:

- 1) Professional state theatre, subordinate to the Ministry of Culture
- 2) Professional theatre subordinate to regional and municipal authorities
- 3) Other professional theatres, run by private companies or individuals – the so-called independent theatres
- 4) Non-professional theatre as a specific form of expression of non-professional artists

This classification is the basis of funding allocation to performance groups. Although current European trends show that a multi-sponsor system of project funding is more efficient – where only one part of the money is received from the government budget (some organisations have been operating this way for years) – the situation in Slovakia still rests on the conventional model, no matter what type of theatre we are talking about. Exceptions to this rule are rather rare – only a few performance groups and individual artists attempt to join various international networks, or to cooperate with the third sector. Ironically, the functioning of theatre as such, artistic aspect included, is dependent on the good will, possibilities and provisions of the government. This model is probably the most problematic phenomenon of contemporary Slovak theatre. It presents a threat that has been publicly criticised by culture professionals for years.

The theatre network in Slovakia consists of 26 theatres (4 state, 19 regional and 3 municipal ones) and 27 independent groups. The category of theatres funded from regional budgets includes the theatres of national minorities (Hungarian theatres in Komárno and Košice, Rusyn/Ukrainian theatre in Prešov and Romany theatre in Košice). Except for the 4 state theatres – the Slovak National Theatre in Bratislava, the New Scene Theatre in Bratislava (curiously enough, it is a commercial theatre, with a repertoire

based on musicals!), the State Opera in Banská Bystrica and the State Theatre in Košice – the remaining professional theatres are run by the so-called VÚC (Higher Territorial Units – regions) and municipalities (Žilina, Rožňava and Bratislava).

This structure was formed in the communist era and, notwithstanding certain minor restructuring attempts, is prevalent to this day. In the early 1990's, the idea of decentralisation had a significant impact: most of the theatres that had so far been operated by the Slovak Ministry of Culture became the responsibility of the regions and municipalities. In the first phase of decentralisation there has been a fruitless attempt to form three Slovak theatre centres (the Western Slovak, Eastern Slovak and Central Slovak). This attempt, accompanied by disagreements between politicians and the arts professionals, was not aimed at achieving typical decentralisation, but rather at maintaining control over the finances (these three centres were supposed to group not only theatres, but also galleries, museums, community centres, libraries, one-off cultural events, etc.). The three centres had disintegrated even before they started operating properly. The next attempt at decentralisation took place in cooperation with the arts professionals, which resulted in the stabilisation of the theatre network. This has also confirmed the hypothesis that the regional arts budget would increase. However, if we examine the regional budgets more closely, and calculate the proportion dedicated to the arts, we obtain upsetting results: the decrease in resources has led to a proportional drop in funding, from 6.19% in 1993 to barely 3.52% in 2008. Representatives of independent local governments don't consider supporting the arts from public local funds a priority, and very often they administratively group the arts with sports, education, or some other forms of "spending free time". On the regional government level, there is no grant system in place, and subsidies are awarded based on territorial or political criteria.

The end of the 1980's sees an intensive development of the independent theatre scene. The most active theatres are : Radošina Naive Theatre, S.T.O.K.A. Theatre (formerly STOKA), L+S Studio, GU-naGU Theatre, a.h.a. Theatre, Teatro Tatro, A4, MED, Phenomenontheatre, Stanica Žilina-Záriečie (Žilina-Záriečie Railway Station), NonGarde Theatre, Truc Sphérique Žilina, SkRAT, P.A.T. Prievidza, Pôtoň Theatre, DISK Trnava ... The network keeps growing, we witness the appearance of contemporary dance groups (ElleDance, B in Motion Bratislava), and nowadays it is the independent scene that offers the most interesting export productions.

Even though the whole socio-economic system ignores culture and the arts, miracles do happen, just like in fairy tales: for example, in the sphere of theatre festivals organisation. In the past few years, a number of notable festivals have appeared in Slovakia, offering an overview of drama in all its variety: the Divadelná Nitra International Festival – specialising in drama and dance; festival of contemporary Slovak and world drama Nová Dráma/New Drama – specialising in staged readings of dramatic texts; Stretnutie and Bábkarská Bystrica (Puppet Bystrica) – European puppet theatre festivals; Bratislava v Pohybe (Bratislava in Movement) – international dance theatre festival; independent theatre festival in Košice, etc. Festivals and events constitute an important element of diffusing and promoting the performing arts, not only among the local audience, but above all – among the viewers and guests from abroad. In 2009, Slovakia hosted 29 festivals and drama events (23 international festivals, 5 national and 1 regional). The number of theatre workshops, which usually present a new perspective on theatre and are popular mostly among young viewers who prefer independent/performance drama, did not exceed 30 (3 international workshops, 23 national and 4 regional). This statistics clearly shows that Slovak theatres are not overly interested in new operating models, concentrating above all on conventional monthly repertoire.

Year	2009	2008
Number of theatre organisations	53	51
Number of theatre companies	53	52
Number of permanent stages	73	68

Year	2009	2008
Number of seats in the auditorium	15,748	14,543
Number of plays in the repertoire	777	731
Number of premieres	206	167
Number of performances	7,259	6,820
Number of guest productions	647	637
Number of viewers	1,567,252	1,456,197
Number of viewers (guest productions)	110,063	11,708

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

Since 2002 no new document has been adopted, and no public debate about the reform of the current legislation has taken place. In 2009, the Slovak Ministry of Culture was asked to change the laws regulating the funding of the arts, but this postulate has never been specified and implemented: during the course of discussion, too many general issues have been brought up. The committee was unable to outline a joint project of the new cultural policy. This is due to the fact that during the 20 years since the revolution and the first democratic social changes, no legal norm regulating the operation of cultural institutions has been created. During the past few years, however, the first timid steps have been taken towards the improvement of the rules regulating the financing of the arts: individuals, organisations and companies can once a year donate 2% of their taxes to cultural projects, and the VAT on books has been reduced from the standard 19% to 10%). The Slovak Ministry of Finance does not, however, show particular inclination towards other proposals and plans designed to improve the tax system in a way that would encourage businesses to make financial contributions to cultural projects. There is also an ongoing debate about redistributing a part of the lottery revenues (Športka, etc.) to the cultural sector, but without any tangible results. The most important issue connected with the funding of Slovak arts is the establishment of a transparent, politically independent Culture Fund (the first step has been the founding of the Audiovisual Fund of the Slovak Ministry of Culture, which is based on the *arm's length* model, albeit not without problems and scandals). It is also important to define the criteria for awarding the status of an artist, and to promote understanding between the three ministries (Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Finance, and Ministry of Labour, Social Issues and Family). Currently, as part of the consolidation of the country's finances, the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Finance are undertaking steps to eliminate tax credits for artists and to increase their taxes. They are not looking for other models of direct or indirect support.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

The theatre system has not changed, there are no laws regulating the founding of new institutions and theatre groups, or the transformation of existing ones. Moreover, the year 2010 saw the bankruptcy of one of the major commercial theatres, WEST, without media coverage, quietly. Independent theatre groups founded in the past few years operate on the basis of ministerial grants, and that is usually their only income. Due to its incompetence, the Slovak Ministry of Finance is incapable of changing the rules of grant administration by introducing a system of long-term grants; moreover, it is having difficulties with distributing the EU grants. The reason is that no independent group is able to guarantee its own long-term financial contribution to the costs (state and regional theatres, which have stable incomes, cannot by definition take part in international projects financed with EU grants). Ironically, independent

culture in Slovakia is dependent on the government. However, the government does not support the so-called fiscal model – i.e. introducing regulations that could encourage individuals and organisations to provide financial support to the arts.

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

New initiatives usually fail due to the lack of funding. Private, or more precisely, independent companies are at the very end of the pecking order, when it comes to the government, municipal or regional subsidies alike. There have not been any cases of transforming a private theatre into a public one, and the reverse has not happened either.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

The selection procedure is transparent and regulated by law. If not specified otherwise, the recruitment is advertised at least 2 weeks before public interviews of the applicants. The selection panel is appointed by the Ministry of Culture (in the case of the four state theatres), or by the regional government, alternatively the municipality (in the case of other theatres). The director is appointed for four years. It is possible to extend this term, however, a new recruitment process has to take place.

Manipulation and breaking the rules are quite widespread, especially on the political level (directors of national institutions: museums, galleries, libraries, theatres... or the public media: television, radio... are mostly affiliated with the current government). The system of work in the cultural sector is not strictly controlled by the programme boards. As a statutory authority, the director (alternatively, his/her deputy) has the chief decision-making power, the programme board just playing a consulting role.

Section B. Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

53 theatres (26 state, regional and municipal ones; 27 independent ones). The first group of theatres consists of 45 permanent stages, the second one – of 28, which means that virtually every theatre has got its own space, whether owned or rented. This statistics includes all the theatres in the country.

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- institutions of the central government – 4 state theatres (Slovak National Theatre in Bratislava, New Scene in Bratislava, State Theatre in Košice, State Opera in Banská Bystrica)
- institutions of regional governments – 19 regional theatres (Bratislava, Prešov, Trnava, Martin, Nitra, Spišská Nová Ves, Banská Bystrica, Zvolen, Košice, Žilina, Komárno)
- institutions of municipal governments – 3 municipal theatres (Bratislava, Rožňava, Žilina)
- non-governmental organisations – none specialize in multimedia activities
- private enterprises – 27 independent theatres

Are there any mixed forms? – No.

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

The repertoire structure (separately for the first type of theatres + separately for the independent theatres). It should be pointed out that certain theatres have more than one scene, which can result in the mixing of genres (e.g. the Andrej Bagar Theatre in Nitra, Aréna in Bratislava, J. Záborský Theatre in Prešov – even though they mostly specialise in dramatic repertoire, from time to time they also include a musical; the situation in the state theatre New Scene in Bratislava is reverse). It should be mentioned that some theatres have more than one company (Slovak National Theatre: opera, ballet, drama; State Theatre in Košice: opera, ballet, drama)

- dramatic theatres – (17 + 22)
- puppet theatres – (5 + 4)
- musical theatres – (2 + 0)
- opera theatres – (3 + 0)
- dance theatres (movement, pantomime) – (3 + 3)
- impresario theatres – This type does not exist in Slovakia. The independent sector is funded with the Ministry of Culture grants, or with financial subsidies from the local government (funding is usually allocated to new projects/premieres, but not to infrastructure, i.e. the day-to-day functioning of a theatre)
- arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones) – there are 4 interdisciplinary centres : SkRAT in Bratislava, Stanica Žilina-Záriečie, Pôtoň Theatre in Bátovce, Studio 12 in Bratislava (under the auspices of the Theatre Institute)
- other: 0

Section C.

Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

There are no clear rules. The network of theatres established in the 1950's is with minor exceptions still the same. The changes have been minimal and did not concern the system of institutional funding. Only in the 1990's was the majority of theatres transferred to regional or municipal care, and just 4 theatres remained directly subordinate to the Ministry of Culture. (One of them, the New Scene in Bratislava, is in fact a typical commercial/musical theatre. In the course of the 1990's reforms, the new ruling cultural elite decided to solve the issue of the New Scene – according to the binding cultural strategy, this type of production was not a national priority). Since there are no fiscal regulations that would make sponsoring easier – e.g. by giving companies more tax credits – classical sponsoring as a way of funding the arts is not widespread (just like the system of donations, inheritance, cultural property purchases ... the government has no intention of giving up the tax-generated income, unlike e.g. in Holland, where tax credits for companies that sponsor the arts result in a sum almost equal to the arts budget managed by their Ministry of Culture). Independent theatres suffer the most in these conditions. Funding allocated to these theatres is not intended for their daily operations, but only for specific projects, premieres and festivals. From among the 27 independent theatres, only a handful is not on the brink of bankruptcy, and only two have a long-term commercial sponsor. (L+S Studio and WEST, which, as has been mentioned, closed down in 2010).

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

The figures below are estimates only – theatres in Slovakia are not required to disclose all the funding they have received – they must only disclose the amount of public sector subsidies. Since, however, this part of funding is quite small, I will not talk only about the public funding, but will describe the real situation of theatre financing. The funding description is given in two categories: state/municipal/regional theatre + independent theatre.

- Amount of general subsidies

State/municipal/regional theatre theatres (€ 41,375,347 from the public sector; €337,182 from donations and sponsoring; €6,857,997 from other sources of income; €221,630 from grants and income from other organisations; €0 from international grants)

Independent theatres (€375,378 from the public sector, €262,584 from donations and sponsoring; €6,857,997 from other sources of income; €221,630 from grants and income from other organisations; €27,100 from international grants)

- Amount of project subsidies

Impossible to calculate this way.

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government – 0.20% (the most recent data are from 2008) This disturbing number means that the government has neither created attractive, affordable conditions for investment into the cultural sector, nor transparent rules for investing private capital into culture and the arts. In comparison, data from 1993 show that 0.71% of national budget was allocated to culture.
- funding from local governments – 3.52 % (data from 2008)
- own revenue of theatres – The economic independence of theatres does not generally exceed an average of 21% (from 5% to 64%). This devastating number is the result of minimal funding of arts and culture. If we look at the turnout in individual theatres, which is quite high and oscillates between 44% and 100% (like in the Dance Studio in Banská Bystrica), we will realise that current problems are not caused by artists or viewers, but by absolute ignorance that accompanies political decisions.

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

1 year. The performance budget is calculated separately for each project. It is not possible to calculate an average, it would not be accurate.

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

14. What additional sources of funding are available?

I have already discussed the possible sources of funding, which, however, are not being fully used. In order to change this, the government would have to give up the income it receives from the citizens' taxes.

Section D.
Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

Number of premieres in 2009: 132 (the first type of theatres), 74 (the second type of theatres – the independent ones)

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

- Number of plays in the repertoire in 2009: 559 (the first type of theatres); 218 (the second type of theatres)
- Number of performances in 2009: 5,117 (the first type of theatres); 2,124 (the second type of theatres)

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

Number of viewers in 2009, home productions: 1,194,075 (the first type of theatres); 373,177 (the second type of theatres)

Number of viewers in 2009, foreign productions: 105,274 (the first type of theatres); 65,029 (the second type of theatres)

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

IMPOSSIBLE TO CALCULATE!

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

IMPOSSIBLE TO CALCULATE!

20. Number of festivals (national and international), location –

Festivals and events in 2009:

- Number of festivals and events in 2009: 29 (1 regional, 5 national and 23 international)
- Number of workshops: 30 (4 regional, 23 national, 3 international)
- Number of organisations taking part in festivals: 374 (245 Slovak, 129 foreign)
- Number of performances: 442 (293 Slovak, 149 foreign)
- Number of active participants: 4,099 (2,964 Slovak, 1,135 foreign)
- Number of viewers: 95,980
- Number of venues where festival projects take place: 113
- Public sector funding: €494,597
- Grants: €571,269; out of which €517,335 from Slovakia, €53,934 from abroad)
- Revenues: €120,783
- Expenses: €1,207,356

Section E.

International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

Grants from the EU Culture Programme are very popular in Slovakia. The number of applicants increases each year. Moreover, Slovak institutions and associations now more often than ever become leaders of the projects funded as part of the Culture Programme. The CCP (Cultural Contact Point) office, which coordinates the Culture grant allocations, is operated by the Theatre Institute in Bratislava.

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

ITI, IETM.

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

When it comes to co-productions in performing arts, dance companies (Contemporary Dance Association, Truc Sphérique, A4 – Association for Contemporary Culture, ElleDance) are the most active, along with the Divadelná Nitra Association, the main organiser of the biggest international theatre festival in Slovakia. The co-productions are funded from the EU Programme Culture.

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?



Republic of Slovenia

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Tomaž Toporišič, dramaturg, professor of theatre studies, theatre expert and critic,
tomaz.toporisc@mladinsko-gl.si

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

1. Description of the theatre and dance scene after regaining independence (after systemic transition). What structure has emerged, and what is the division of competences between the central government and local governments (decentralisation or centralisation)?

(Tomaž Toporišič, PhD: Slovenia: from cultural politics to politics of theatre)

As in most countries of the so called New Europe, political changes that occurred in Slovenia in 1990s were not followed by any radical breakthroughs in the area of cultural politics, but nevertheless brought changes to the “geography” of the sphere of theatre. On one hand the organizational structure of the repertory theatres was left almost intact, but on the other hand we witnessed a strong explosion of the independent or non governmental theatre and performing arts initiatives, although its foundations were established back in the socialist era.

The changes in the financing of theatrical activities encouraged the activity of independent theatres and companies. As 1990-s the beginning of 2000-s was marked by the firm although sometimes too predictable institutional repertoire background allowing for the development of noteworthy theatre laboratories, experimental theatres of the mixed media, which did not merely transfer the trends but also produced highly original and internationally competitive concepts and performances.

Some new organisms supporting non institutional scene as well as international collaboration were established:

- 1) **Asociacija** (English: “Association”) was established in Ljubljana in 2002 as an informal association of non-governmental organisations and freelancers from the arts and culture sectors in Slovenia, and was officially registered as a non-profit cultural organisation in 2004. Its first project was the publication of *The White Book* which contains statistical data from the years 1998 to 2001 about its members (currently 45 NGOs and freelance artists). Later followed published statistics about the number of cultural events produced by the members in 2006. In 2009 Asociacija launched the national project *Networking and Strengthening of the NGO Capacity in Culture*, partly funded by the European Social Fund. Featured activities include public round tables and awareness building on the role of culture in society, the position of cultural workers, and strategies for improving the functioning of national NGOs. Asociacija aims to accelerate the articulation of political will at the level of cultural policy makers in order to create conditions for long-term sustainability. It seeks to support dynamic cultural and artistic production in the independent sector, especially in spheres which are of lower priority to governmental institutions. Thus Asociacija endeavours to create an equal opportunity platform for the independent and subsidised sectors, particularly in reference to access to public financial support, working conditions, and evaluation mechanisms for cultural production. Another task of the association is to monitor legislation and propose special mechanisms for the social protection of freelancers in the cultural sector.

- 2) Established in 2001, **Artservis.org** is a web-based bilingual information resource for artists, theorists, and cultural managers who operate with/in Slovenia or abroad. It collects and publishes information on funding sources (national and international, public and private), participation opportunities (calls for proposals, invitations), educational programmes (focusing on art or theory production and management), collaboration, advocacy (including a manual for freelance artists, artists' associations, and NGOs), and provides other useful on-line resources (free legal consulting, E-mail lists, websites, databases, forums). Its free weekly e-mail Newsletter is received by more than 6,000 subscribers around the globe. Since 2006 Artservis.org has been a member of the Informal Network of SEE Cultural Portals (inSEEcP).

It is of little surprise then that in the past three decades theatre has been the art form which has received the most media recognition and won the most praise internationally. The protagonists of recent years mostly belonged to younger and middle generation with some "big" modernist names producing important new readings of classical and contemporary plays. We can list some names, some of them not unfamiliar to international theatre circles: Tomaž Pandur (working mostly in Spain), Matjaž Pograjc, Vito Taufer, Diego de Brea, Tomi Janežič (concentrating his work in Serbia and Croatia), Sebastijan Horvat, Bojan Jablanovec and his project *Via Negativa*, Marko Peljhan, Emil Hrvatin, Eduard Miler, Ivica Buljan, Dušan Jovanović, Janez Janša and others.

Also within this framework, the prestige of contemporary dance, intermedia and hybrid arts has been boosting, thanks especially to the work of internationally renowned artists and groups as choreographers Iztok Kovač and his *En Knap*, Matjaž Pograjc and *Betontanc*, Maja Delak, Matjaž Farič, Branko Potočan, intermedia artists Davide Grassi and Igor Štromajer, production centre for new media Kibla, new media venue Kapelica ...

Taking into account cultural politics and politics of theatre as two interdependent forces we can summon the situation of the last few years as follows: On one side we were witnesses of a considerable chaos in the repertoire of most institutional theatres, with not so many productions that managed to rise above the mediocre. On the other hand the attendances did not diminish. The increasing power of the so called non institutional or non-classical repertory theatre was evident also from traditionally quite conservative annual theatre meeting: *Borštnik festival*, a theatre competition for "the best Slovene drama theatre productions". The 2008 selection thus included a hybrid variety of performances, the selector Barbara Orel has chosen the shows among more than 80 productions and events she saw in the 2007/2008 season. Commenting on her pick she stated the Slovenian theatre was in good shape and responsible. According to her opinion the productions displayed "a colorful diversity of type and genre, ranging from the ritual to radically political theatre." Furthermore; she stressed the fact that social commitment and political awareness were typical of the Slovenian theatre. What she noted in particular was the keen interest for the issues concerning the Slovenian identity, which she decided to showcase in the accompanying program themed "Nation, Theatre, Community".

Contemporary Slovene theatre strives to create a liminal experience for the audience and performers alike. In the manner explored by Philip Auslander, contemporary live theatrical art exposes the majority-centered nature of mediatized perception within which a live event only seems like a temporary extension of the mediatized. In this way, it realizes a performative practice which is aware of the fact that theatre no longer exists on the basis of a naïve faith that (as Peggy Phelan believed) a performance can be understood as part of a different representational economy which is not subordinate to reproduction.

2. Are there any documents, which have been adopted in this period and regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy)? Were they consulted in a public debate before adoption?

There is a series of new documents adopted and discussed in a public before adoption, 1994 new Law defining Cultural Activities and Policy ... as well as other regulations.

3. Privatisation of theatres: Have public theatres been turned into private theatres (commercial or non-profit)?

NO

4. What are the formal rules for new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary)? Do the central or local governments subsidise them? Are there cases of “nationalisation” (e.g., a private theatre being turned into a public institution)?

Part of the Directorate for Arts, the Section for Performing Arts at the Ministry of Culture covers drama theatre, musical theatre, dance, puppetry, experimental and research theatre, street theatre and various interdisciplinary forms of stage arts that are closely related to audiovisual arts, new media arts, installation or art performance. In addition to the work of the repertory theatre houses, it supports creativity by a range of non-profit private cultural organisations which engage in various forms of performing arts.

The public cultural programmes and projects by other organisations are supported via public tenders for support. Three-year support is given to the selected non-governmental organisations who have shown their long-term excellence in production and post-production, organisation of international festivals and international touring.

5. Directors: describe the appointment procedure (competition, nomination, any consultations); is there a system of contracts or a limited number of terms of office? For how long is a director appointed?

Directors are appointed for a period from 3 to 5 years. The procedure is public, they are appointed either by the Minister for Culture or by local governments. They propose a 3 or 5 year programme and concept when they submit their application. Council and programming council of theatres are also asked to make their statement about the candidates.

Section B.
Number of theatres

6. Total number of performing arts organisations (theatre, dance, interdisciplinary projects) in the country (number), where are they located?

The Ministry of Culture and Local governments support regularly 13 theatre institutions - the three national theatre houses (Ljubljana, Maribor and Nova Gorica) and the eight municipal public theatre institutions (two puppetry theatres in Ljubljana and Maribor, two theatre houses in Ljubljana, and one theatre house each in Celje, Ptuj, Kranj and Koper). Ministry support covers the programme costs (production and post-production) as well as salaries, running costs and equipment for the 8 theatre houses (and only programme costs of Ptuj, Kranj and Koper theatre houses which are co-funded by the municipalities). The extent of the support is determined annually when the institutions are called to present to the Ministry their next year's programme.

A small amount of local theatres is supported by local communities.

7. Legal status and structure of organisations (number):

- institutions of the central government 3
- institutions of regional governments
- institutions of municipal governments 10

- non-governmental organisations 12
- private enterprises 1

Are there any mixed forms? Yes, but quite rarely.

8. Forms of theatrical activity (number):

- dramatic theatres – 9
- puppet theatres – 2
- musical theatres
- opera theatres – 2
- dance theatres (movement, pantomime) – 12
- impresario theatres
- arts centres (including interdisciplinary ones) – 4
- other – 15

Section C. Theatre funding

9. Are there clearly defined rules of funding performing arts centres (why is an institution financed by the central government, local governments, businesses, private sponsors)?

Yes. Evaluation of programmes and project applications is made by a four-member expert jury for performing arts appointed by the Minister.

10. Public spending on subsidies for theatres and dance centres:

- amount of general subsidies – 25.250.131 €
- amount of project subsidies – 1.488.273 €

11. What is the percentage share in total public subsidies for theatres and dance centres of:

- funding from the central government – 69,5 %,
- funding from local governments – 12,9 %,
- own revenue of theatres – from 1% to 16,5 %

12. What is the time horizon of budgeting in public theatre and dance institutions (one year or longer)? How and on what basis is budget performance evaluated?

From 3 to 5 years

13. Is the indebtedness of performing arts institutions a problem? How does it work in practice? How is it resolved?

NO

14. What additional sources of funding are available? European sources, sponsorship

An interesting example of a specific support is Intermedia Arts support scheme.

The support of the Ministry of Culture takes various forms, including four-year programme support for outstanding intermedia arts producers (2010–2013), four-year project support for multi-annual projects (2010–2013), project grants or subsidies, and grants for residencies via annual open calls. There is also an annual open tender for NGO vocational training initiatives. Intermedia artists are supported also via open calls issued by the Ministry of Culture Sector for European Affairs and International Co-operation. Grants are given to selected projects of Slovene artists who present their activities abroad, individual freelance artists can apply for a residency at the Ministry's New York, Berlin or London studios. Assessment of programme and project applications is made by a three-member expert jury on intermedia arts appointed by the Minister.

Section D. Artistic activity

15. Number of premieres (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

from 78 to 82

16. Number of performances (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

From 1.691 to 4.313

17. Number of viewers (preferably in 2007—2009, or at least in 2009)

775.773

18. Average production cost of a performance/project

From 40.000 to 50.000

19. Average cost of hosting a performance/project

from 10.000 to 20.000

20. Number of festivals (national and international)

20 – Borštnikovo srečanje (Maribor), Teden slovenske drame (Kranj), Dnevi komedije (Celje), mednarodni bienalni festival Lutke (Ljubljana), Lutkovni pristan (Maribor), Prelet (Ljubljana), Gibanica (Ljubljana) Mini poletje – mednarodni festival za otroke (Ljubljana), Mednarodni festival sodobnih umetnosti – Mesto žensk (Ljubljana), Emonska promenada (Ljubljana), Goli oder (Ljubljana), Festival Kluže (Bovec), Ex Ponto (Ljubljana), Exodos (Ljubljana), Preglej na glas!, (Ljubljana) Front@ sodobnega plesa (Murska sobota), Drugajanje (Maribor), Mladi levi (Ljubljana), Rdeči revirji (Hrastnik), Ana Desetnica (Ljubljana).

Section E. International co-operation

21. Do theatre and dance centres (and festival organisers) use any EU programmes? Which ones?

Program Culture (EU), other European programmes, EEA Grants, Norway Grants, Goethe Institut, AFFA, ONDA, Pro Helvetia, Japan Foundation, British Council and others

22. Are performing arts centres in your country members of international networks? Which ones?

IETM, ETC, IITM and others.

23. Are there any international co-productions with the participation of performing arts institutions in your country? Who are the co-producers? How are co-productions financed?

Yes, co-producers vary from state theatres to theatre, dance venues, festivals ...

Co producers vary from national theatres to independent producers, festivals etc.

Co-financed by Program Culture (EU), other European programs, EEA Grants, Norway Grants, Goethe Institute, AFFA, ONDA, Pro Helvetia, Japan Foundation, British Council and others

24. How many international dance and theatre festivals are there?

7-13



Ukraine

Analytical report on the condition of performing arts. Ukraine

Analytical report regarding the financing and structure of performing arts in Ukraine was prepared on the basis of collection and generalization of expert comments made by government and research institutions, creative associations and art schools as well as by individual art theorists, producers, supervisors and artists. Thus, the structure of the report reflects not only an official position and statistics provided by government bodies and research institutions, but also independent opinions of practicing representatives of the art sector. Preparation of the report lasted for one month. It requires further work due to permanent renewal of both the performing arts structure and models of cultural policy management in the field. At present, final identification of all forms and subjects that exist in the area is not possible since Ukraine has not developed a systematic approach in its public policy related to theatrical, choreographic and interdisciplinary sectors of performing arts. In addition, creative and public space is only being structured and institutionally developed. A separate problem is the lack of professional inter-sectoral partnership in the field of culture. At the moment, Ukraine does not have the experience of effective communication among the government, public, artistic and economic sectors. Moreover, Ukraine lacks independent information and analytic institutions that would accumulate innovative ideas and international experience of professional art management, allow for a retrospective view at the artistic life in the country and keep independent statistics of new initiatives in the non-government sectors of theatre and dancing. These tasks belong to the future and preparation of this document can be described as a certain challenge for national artistic community. A team that worked on the report hopes it will be useful for the development of effective models of international cooperation, creation of a professional network of performing arts institutions in Eastern Europe and will encourage the implementation of the above ideas in the Ukrainian cultural environment.

Statistical data provided in the report were received from the analytical reports and releases of the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the State Commission for Statistics issued over previous years, as well as from information sources of the Ukrainian Center for Culture Research, Ukrainian National Association of Theatre Artists and Les' Kurbas Center of Theatre Art.

A considerable number of responses to the questionnaire's questions was processed for the first time in Ukraine and requires further clarification and additional data.

Partner Institutions that provided information for the report:

- Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism
- Ukrainian regional culture and tourism administrations
- Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies
- Institute of Modern Art Studies of the National Academy of Arts
- Les' Kurbas National Center of Theatre Art
- National Association of Theatre Artists of Ukraine
- National Association of Choreographers of Ukraine

Experts who provided comments for the report:

- **Anna Lypkivska:** a leading researcher of the Institute of Modern Art Studies of the National Academy of Arts. Author of the research "World in the Mirror of Drama" published in Kyiv in 2007 and of over 400 articles on various aspects of theatre studies. Member of expert commissions of the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism and a standing panel member at regional, national and international

theatre festivals. For many years has been a member of the expert group of the Kyiv Pectoral theatre award.

- **Aniko Rekhviashvili:** Artistic director and choreographer of Suzirya Aniko (Aniko's Constellation), one of the best known ballet groups in Ukraine. A prize-winner of Serge Lifar Ukrainian and International contests. Aniko Rekhviashvili initiated the creation of and at the moment chairs the first Ukrainian department of classic choreography at Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts,
- **Andriy Lyagushenko:** founder and currently director of Kyiv Municipal Ukrainian Academy of Dancing named after Serge Lifar, doctor of Art Studies, professor of Karpenko-Karyi Kyiv National University of Theatre, Film and TV Studies.
- **Bohdan Strutynskyi:** artistic director and manager of Kyiv National Academic Operetta Theatre, theatre director, producer and teacher. Participated in numerous workshops given by such prominent theatre artists as W. Staniewski (Gardzienice, Poland, 1991) B. Golubowski (GITIS (State Institute of Theatre Arts, Moscow, 1992), the Centre of Studies on Jerzy Grotowski's Work and of The Cultural and Theatrical Research (Wroclaw, Poland, 1995-1996) and attended professional art classes led by Z. Molik (Wroclaw, Poland, 1996). Took courses in "Theatre Management" and "Theatre Producing" at Richard's workshop.
- **Vasyl Vovkun:** Ukrainian Minister of Culture and Tourism (2007-2010), theatre producer, actor and script-writer. Directed about 300 various events: state holidays, national and international festivals, days of Ukrainian art and culture in Slovakia, Poland, France and Germany, youth international events, alternative concerts and original performances
- **Vladyslav Korniyenko:** First Deputy Minister of Culture and Tourism of Ukraine (2008-2010). Studied US public policy in the field culture and management of non-profit American theatre in the USA. Studied economics and finance in the field of culture at the University of Paris III (Sorbonne Nouvelle)
- **Vladyslav Troitskyi:** founder, producer, artistic director, producer and actor of the Modern Art Center "DAKH." Graduated from Russian Academy of Theatre Art (former GITIS) (Department of Stage Directing and Acting). In 2004 set up an ethno-chaos group "DakhaBrakha." In 2007, started the annual audio-music-visual-theatre-philosophical festival "GogolFest"
- **Larysa Venedyktova:** performer, trainer and choreographer. Taught contemporary dance at International Slavonic University (1997 – 2004), conducts workshops in contact improvisation, dance techniques, composition and performance for professional dancers and actors and for amateur dancers in different cities in Ukraine. Since 2000 has been organizing Actual Dance Stage Festival (ADSF) in Kyiv. Since 2000 has been working as a performer and choreographer with TanzLaboratorium Company (Kyiv). TanzLaboratorium Company participated in a number of festivals – PerFest (Russia), Evolution (Estonia), Teatralna Platforma (Theatrical Platform) and ADSF (Ukraine), and ECITE (Austria). TanzLaboratorium makes site-specific performances in Kyiv.
- **Les' Taniuk:** Chair of the National Association of Theatre Artists of Ukraine (since 1992). Theatre and film director, professor of Karpenko-Karyi Kyiv National University of Theatre, Film and TV Studies, Vice-chair of the Ukrainian parliamentary commission for culture and spiritual life (since 2006), member of Verkhovna Rada (Ukrainian Parliament).
- **Mykhaylo Shved:** Director of the Department of Music and Choreography of the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism; one of the founders of the Ukrainian student's festival "Music of the Millennium". Within the framework of Polish government programme "Gaude Polonia" studied composition with Z. Bujarski in Krakow Music Academy (2005). Defended PhD dissertation titled "Tendencies of Development of Modern Music International Festivals in Ukraine – a new stage (1990-2005"
- **Nelli Korniyenko:** Director of Les' Kurbas National Center of Theatre Art, Doctor of Art Studies and Academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts. Her PhD was titled "Les' Kurbas as Stage Director" and the title of her post-doctoral research was "Theatre as Diagnostic Model of Society. Some Universal Mechanisms of Art Systems Self-Organization." Has about 300 publications, among them such

books as "Theatre Today-Theatre Tomorrow," "Les' Kurbas: Rehearsal of the Future," "Ukrainian Theatre on the Eve of the Third Millennium. Quest (Picture of the World. Values. Language. Forecast)." Gave lectures in the USA, Canada, Poland, Israel, Russia and other countries.

- **Oleksandr Hrytsenko:** Director of the Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies, Distinguished Artist of Ukraine, translator, Doctor of Sciences.
- **Olena Bohomazova:** Managing Director of Kyiv Municipal Theatre "Vilna Stsena" ("Free Stage")
- **Olena Voron'ko:** Director of Theatre Art Department of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism
- **Serhiy Proskurnia:** stage director, producer, winner of the "Experiment" award of the National Association of Theatre Artists of Ukraine. In 1992 started and then conducted eleven international theatre festival-laboratories "Mystetske Berezillia" ("Artistic Berezillia") in which 330 theatres from 23 countries and 21 Ukrainian cities participated. Took part in workshop classes and trainings for Ukrainian NGOs in the field of culture supported by the International Renaissance Foundation. Attended such international conferences and congresses as Congress of the International Association of Theatre Critics (IATC) – Bucharest, Romania, 2003 and Seul, South Korea, 2005; Congresses of the International Theatre Institute (ITI is a UNESCO structure) in Athens (Greece, 2002) and Manila (Philippines, 2006). Worked as advisor to the Ukrainian Minister of Culture and Tourism Vasyl Vovkun. Since January 2008 works in conjunction with the International Opera Foundation (the Netherlands) and worked as the Ukrainian producer in the international project – the production of Bizet's opera "Carmen." Was the producer and stage director of the international opera project "The Gypsy Baron."

Eastern Europe Performing Arts Platform – Questionnaire

Statistical questions in the questionnaire refer to 2009.

Author: Tina Peresunko

Section A.

Characteristics of the structure of the theatre and dance scene

Description of changes that took place in the theatrical and choreographic life after the proclamation of Ukraine's independence (i.e. after certain transformations in the country's political system). How did these changes affect artistic life in these fields? How did national and local government bodies divide their powers (decentralization or centralization)?

After the proclamation of Ukraine's independence certain changes took place in the theatrical and choreographic life. As Anna Lypkivska marks in her work "Ukrainian Drama Theatre in nowadays" they are primarily connected with the transformation of political and ideological managerial model in the country. First minor changes occurred at the end of the 1980s. At that time ideological restrictions in theatrical and choreographic life were relaxed – after the abolishment of censorship theatres could finally form their repertoire independently. At the same time, the country faced a need to expand not only artistic but also economic independence of cultural institutions, hence theatres adopted new terms of the economy. If in the Soviet times government donations fully covered all expenses of theatres and thus kept its activities under control, in the new conditions the government loosened its control. According to the Decree of the Ministry of Culture of the USSR of August 6 1986 titled "On Complex Experiment in Management and Effectiveness Improvement of Theatre Activities," theatres became more financially independent, a position of the artistic director was re-introduced and the procedure of obligatory performance approval by government art councils was abolished. At the end of the 1980s, the government initiated a complex registration of Ukrainian theatres and the annual survey of theatre-studios in Kyiv. In 1987, 83 theatres in nine Soviet Republics participated in the "theatrical experiment." It aimed to introduce a contract system of employment in theatre groups and modernization of relations between the theatre and the state. However, these steps were not effective since they implied only half-measures.

Nelli Korniyenko

New initiatives that the 1990s were rich with (at that time over 100 different studios emerged in Ukraine) were a feedback to the historical change of Ukraine's status – gaining independence. In these directions we could observe an explosion of initiatives: both in the legislative field (the Law on Culture was highly appreciated by experts) and in spontaneous emergence of initiatives "from the bottom." However, the underestimation of the sphere of humanities and arts by the government did not allow for the completion of new legislative and creative initiatives.

Anna Lypkivska

The theatre even being a few steps backward at the end of the 1980s together with other branches of the economy, performed a break-through in the development of new organizational forms, even though at the same time and irrespective of changes preserved the model of state repertory theatre. The space occupied by small producing and trading facilities: theatres (or as they were called then theatre-studios) also emerged as mushrooms after the rain

(only in Kyiv there were nearly 100 of them), and, interestingly, they functioned on the same ground of self-financing and financial self-sufficiency.

A significant structural change in performing arts was connected with an explosive increase in the number of theatres at the end of the 1980s. When in 1985 there were over 50 professional theatres in Ukraine, after the proclamation of Ukraine's independence their number considerably increased. In 2006 it was estimated to be more than 130. At the moment, there are about 137 theatres in Ukraine. However, only a small number of them are private.

At the end of the 1980s many new art institutions emerged. They searched for new forms of theatre art and contributed to an overall change of performing arts landscape. Thus, in 1987-1990 more than 100 theatre-studios opened in the country (Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv, Odesa, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhzhia, Sevastopol and Khmelnytskyi). First community and private theatres were founded. In 1987, the first five private theatres emerged on the artistic map of the country – Kyivskyi Teatr na Podoli (Kyiv Theatre at the Podil), "Grotesque" theatre, the theatre of pantomime etc. They operated on the basis of the so called "team contract." Later private repertory theatres were created, such as "Bravo" and "Sribnyi ostriv". Among other private theatres that were set up later we can mention the following: "Arabesky" (S. Oleshko – Kharkiv 1993), Modern Art Center "Dakh" (V. Troitskyi – Kyiv, 1994), "Teatr u Koshyku" (I. Volynska and L. Danylychuk – Lviv, 1997), "Vilnyi Teatr" (A. Artymenyev – Kyiv, 2000), "Teatr 19" (I. Ladenko – Kharkiv, 2000), "Atelye 16" (I. Talalayevskyi – Kyiv, 2004), and "Kyiv Modern-Balet" (Radu Poklitaru – 2006).

At that time, the development of new organizational theatre forms was preceded by the expansion of their genre range: puppet theatres, pantomimes, clownery and folk theatres, art song theatres and many other emerged. In addition, existing large theatres (Kyiv Theatre Named after Ivan Franko, Kharkiv Theatre Named after Taras Shevchenko, Ternopil Theatre Named after Taras Shevchenko and some others) opened small (chamber) stages, which allowed for diversifying the repertoire and attracting young actors, actresses and directors.

Vlad Troitskyi

In the mid-90s the outburst of studio life and the process of the emergence of alternative studios stopped abruptly. At that time, the majority of studios and theatres of that type that worked in Culture Houses, Houses of Children's Art lose their premises. At that time the majority of leaders of the independent experimental theatre leave the country (Valeriy Bilchenko, Oleh Liptsyn, Hryhoriy Hladiy, Mark Nstantiner and Yuriy Yatsenko)

However, with time a substantial majority of new initiatives failed. New market conditions that emerged during the independence years were too hard for private theatres to flourish. Only those that managed to receive a public status with respective financing from municipal and regional budgets could survive. In particular, five theatres in Kyiv (Teatr na Podoli, Workshop of Theatre Art "Suzirya," Teatr Marionetok, "Koleso" and "Vilna Stsena") Les' Kurbas Theatre and "Voskresinnia theatre from Lviv, V. Petrenko's "Virymo!" theatre and M. Melnyk's one-actor theatre "Kryk" (both from Dnipropetrovsk), V. Popov's theatre-laboratory "We" (Zaporizhzhia), O. Bielskyi's "Akademiya rukhu" (Kryvyi Rig), V. Smotrytel's one-actor theatre "Kut" and some others were among those that received financial support from the government.

Organizational changes that took place in the theatre were accompanied by the structuring of public and educational segment of the theatrical and choreographic life. In 1987, Ukrainian Theatrical Society was reorganized into the Association of Theatre Artists of Ukraine. Speaking about the Association as a specific phenomenon, it must be noted that it was one of the most prosperous institutions at that time. Five theatrical plants owned by the Association were leaders in new technologies and manufactured tights, socks, synthetic materials, make-up foundation, cosmetic glues, and make-up materials. Financial resources accumulated in the theatre fund of the Association were used for conducting laboratory classes for directors, script-writers, actors and actresses, conducting festivals and bringing in best performances

from other Soviet republics. Besides, it was possible to maintain huge library archives and keep records, which means that each performance made in the country received its own registration card. In addition, the Association's fund ordered books in theatre studies, i.e. covered publication expenses and paid royalties. In this way drama collections, almanacs and the journal *Ukrainskyi Teatr* were published. The system was very expansive and efficient. As the Association was losing its resources, the interest in its activities on the side of the theatrical community was declining. At the moment no other institutions performs functions that used to be the responsibility of the Association. Certain projects connected with experiments, research and publishing in theatre studies are carried out by the Kurbas National Center of Theatre Art set up in 1996 and headed by N. Korniyenko. In the same year the Ukrainian Academy of Arts was open. In 2001, the Institute of Modern Art Studies of the National Academy of Arts was established. Both institutions participate in research and publication activities (collections of research articles "Mystetski obriyi" (Horizons of Art), "Mystetstvoznavstvo Ukrainy" (Art Studies in Ukraine), "Suchasne mystetstvo" (Modern Art) and "Narysy z istorii ukrainskoho teatralnoho mystetstva XX stolittia" (Essays in the History of Ukrainian Theatre Art of the XXth century)).

Les' Taniuk

A lot was done here, in the theatrical association as long as we had money. When we ran out of them, we decided to set up Les' Kurbas Center. All our test projects – symposiums, workshop classes, professional art criticism etc. was transferred there. In fact, today it is our lab space. There performances are made and workshop classes are conducted. They became an international center of high theory.

In the field of education, Karpenko Karyi Kyiv State Institute of Theatre Arts was reorganized into Karpenko-Karyi Kyiv National University of Theatre, Film and TV Studies (2005) and Kharkiv State Institute of Arts named after Kotliarevskiy was reorganized into Kharkiv State University of Arts named after I. Kotlyarevskiy (2004). Ivan Franko Lviv National University opened the Chair of Theatre Studies and Acting and the Department of Culture and Arts. A number of other universities and pedagogical high schools started theatre studies departments or sections (for example, Zaporizhzhia, Ternopil, Luhansk, Simferopol and others)

The structure of choreographic life in the country also witnessed the emergence of new economic forms and new institutions, especially of educational profile. In the early 1990s a new non-profit organization, the Ukrainian Academy of Dancing was created in order to promote choreographic culture. Later a public school was open on its basis. In 2000, the latter was reorganized into a full-fledged educational facility with the same name – the Ukrainian Academy of Dancing. The emergence of private dance schools and theatre studios became an important achievement in the field. In the Soviet times, state monopoly in the sphere of arts limited professional career possibilities for young people. Educational innovations gave an impulse to a revival in public sphere. In February 2002, National Association of Choreographers was organized in order to consolidate artists around national traditions. At the same time, the league of choreographers started its work as part National Music Association of Ukraine. The latter concerned itself more with the steering of creative initiatives in the sphere of classic choreography. However, when in the early 1990s modern dancing as an artistic movement gained more popularity in Ukraine, both government and non-government communities failed to adequately respond to the change, create new institutions and establish new game rules in order to facilitate the introduction of new choreographic principles. Due to this fact, a large number of choreographers of the new time moved to the sphere of entertainment. At present, these processes are reflected in popular television dance shows. Their positive side of attracting public attention to dancing has its negative counterpart – the deterioration of the artistic level of modern choreography. In Ukraine, there are more than five influential dance and entertainment shows on popular TV channels. With lack of a coherent educational cultural government policy they establish consumer values in this sphere. A genuinely professional modern choreography as such moved underground and found itself beyond the border of public cultural policy and outside the

“system.” Typically, such institutions as Modern Dance Center and Actual Dance Association initiated by Larysa Venedyktova started as voluntary projects or used grants from abroad.

Andriy Lyagushenko

Modern choreography is the most dynamic and self-organizing branch with a lot of initiative coming from the bottom. When informal initiatives encounter government bodies it's good when they understand and supplement each other. But more often we have a situation when modern choreography is self-sufficient and from the point of view of the state little structured. But I believe it's normal because it is a certain alternative culture – underground that must also exist in art.

Serhiy Proskurnia

Today thanks to TV projects dance is popularized in Ukraine as a means of entertainment and communication. Dancing enters a community of common people and performs communicative and entertaining function. In this way, the community solves its psycho-social problems, i.e. it fills its internal vacuum with such dance shows. At present, we observe a fantastic development of salsa and flamenco dance schools, step courses etc. This is an extremely rapid and conspicuous process if compared with previous years. And here television functions as a facilitator and provocateur

Serhiy Proskurnia

Objectively, we are at the threshold of changing the vector of cultural community development in the direction of decentralization. Obviously, theatre and dancing go through the same processes. Let's say that the more bright new regional projects we have, the more multivocal and louder the orchestra of Ukrainian culture will sound.

Closer artistic contacts with the Ukrainian diaspora became an important segment of artistic life in the country after it gained its independence. In the early 1990s Ukrainian theatre groups for the first time toured the USA and Canada. At the same time, a number of joint artistic initiatives was launched, for example, such as “U Svitli” (a project dedicated to Kurbas) and a project made together by “Bud'mo!” theatre from Kyiv and “La MaMa” from New York (1991).

Speaking about a division of theatre management powers, it must be noted that after the proclamation of Ukraine's independence we can observe tendencies of decentralization in the artistic life. According to the Decree # 1557 of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine of 16.11.01 titled “On the Approval of List of Art Institutions and List of Artistic and Cultural Events to Be Financed from State Budget,” the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism would finance exclusively those cultural institutions that have the status of national. All other cultural institutions would be subordinated to local executive bodies. On the one hand, experts see it as a good tendency that allows art groups to make their repertoire policy and deal with organizational issues independently. On the other hand, the situation in question restrains the implementation of a single public policy in the theatrical sphere.

However, a problem at the regional level is a consequence of the ineffective administrative reform of the mid-1990s. It led to a situation when the majority of cultural institutions in the regions would be subordinated to regional councils and not respective cities/towns. This state of affairs eliminated a possibility to implement cultural policy and develop art tourism from the bottom, by local community and not the administrative center of the region.

Besides, the decentralization of powers in the theatrical sphere weakened professional links among artists from different cities and regions. At the same time, individual regional and thematic festivals emerged, such as “Premyery sezonu” (“Season's First Nights”) in Ivano-Frankivsk, “Melpomena Tavriyi” (“Tavriya's Melpomena”) in Kherson, “Ternopilski teatralni vechory” (“Ternopil Theatre Evenings”) in Ternopil, “Teatralnyi Donbas” (“Theatrical Donbas”) in Donetsk, “Bosporski agony” (“Bosphorus Agons”) in Kerch, Festival of Russian Theatres “Zustrichi v Odesi” (“Meetings in Odesa”), “Khersoneski igr” (“Khersones Games”) in Sevastopol, “Mystetske Berezillia” (“Artistic Berezil”) in Kyiv, “Zoloty Lev” (“Golden Lion”) in Lviv and many others.

Irrespective of certain structural changes that occurred in the world of theatre in Ukraine, most practitioners and experts are unanimous as to lack of significant positive changes in the field after Ukraine's proclamation of independence.

Vlad Troitskyi

Paradoxically, corruption, low level of culture and national self-consciousness, the treatment of theatre as a communal facility and not the institution of culture and neglect of its social functions affected the theatrical process in maybe even a more negative way than ideological exaggerations in the Soviet Union.

In addition, artistic community believes that lack of radical reforms in the area and resistances to new challenges on the side of the Ukrainian government make its managerial model even less functional than the old Soviet. The main deficiency of the current model is inefficient legislation, an obsolete financing model, complete absence of overall vision and respective reforms plus information and methodological exclusion of Ukrainian culture from modern international space of performing arts.

Were any documents that regulate cultural policy (theatre and dance policy) developed over these years? Was the elaboration of these documents accompanied with public debates and hearings?

Larysa Venedyktova

Here, the state exclusively has a negative impact on art. – it only wants to prohibit. And it is better from the Soviet only because no one is imprisoned. And if we look at their efficiency, it is even worse. In the Soviet Union social realism could exist and, respectively, alternatives to it were possible. To my mind, Ukraine has no position as a state.

Vladyslav Korniyenko

According to an established procedure, every bill undergoes all stages of public debates – from being posted on a respective site to meetings in the Ministry and Parliamentary Commission for Culture and Spiritual Development. There public representatives consider different aspects of legal regulation – and this is the main component of the contemporary democratic society in Ukraine.

In Ukraine, theatre and dance policy is regulated by general and field-specific legal documents. In 1992, Directives on Legislation in the Area of Culture were adopted. They defined legal, economic, social and organizational basics of cultural development in Ukraine. However, at present this document is morally obsolete and in 2010 Verkhovna Rada (the Ukrainian Parliament) passed in the first reading its new version. In 2003, in order to regulate guest tours of groups and performers from outside the country the Law of Ukraine titled “On Guest Tours in Ukraine” was adopted. It foresees a special fee to be paid by foreign groups and performers that will be used for financial support of Ukrainian performing artists. In 2005, a need to reform the development of theatre business in Ukraine facilitated the adoption of the Law “On Theatres and Theatre Business.” The Law was previously discussed by the Parliamentary Commission for Culture and Spiritual Life and by other respective parliamentary commissions (Budgetary and Financial) and later during all-Ukrainian Public Hearings in Verkhovna Rada (there were eight of them).

Even though the Law “On Theatres and Theatre Business” initially underwent public debates, Verkhovna Rada declined it a couple of times. As a result, a key legal document that regulates theatrical activities was passed in the edition that contains only general statements and for lack of coherence and consistency it has no positive impact on the development of the theatre. As its main deficiency experts note the fact that it failed to legally equate theatres with other non-profit organizations and to stipulate legally tax privileges for art patronage.

Besides, the key legal theatrical document introduces contract employment system in a way that contradicts Ukrainian labor legislation. Accordingly, a contract employment model for artists that was able to liberalize the model of state financing of theatres and make the artistic process was dynamic is also missing in Ukrainian reality.

What formal principles underpin new initiatives in performing arts (theatre, dance and interdisciplinary types of art)? Does the government or local authorities financially support the activities of these institutions? Have there been instances of “nationalization” of cultural institutions (for example, a private theatre becoming a state-owned institution)?

Anna Lypkivska

If in the economy, banking and business sphere a transition to a real market with all its characteristic attributes (demonopolization, privatization, new tax principles, support of the national producer, joining the network of international industrial, commercial and investment organizations etc.) goes on irreversibly, even if it is problematic and inconsistent, theatrical business in fact remains within the framework of old legislation and stagnated organizational forms.

Ukrainian state model does not offer any efficient legal principles to support new initiatives in the field of performing arts. Instead, old management traditions in the present environment of creative experiments lead not only to inertia in but sometimes enter into philosophical conflict with new ideas and approaches. A specialized ministry does not demonstrate a systematic approach to management of theatrical, choreographic and interdisciplinary sectors of performing arts. Thus, as regards choreography, the state takes into consideration classic and folk traditions only, ignoring contemporary dancing. In the theatrical area, private theatres are offered no financial support or professional collaboration. Neither the Ministry of Culture nor any other state institution dealing with matters of culture keeps record of non-government institutions – community and private theatres and dance centers. The emergence of new social and artistic organizations in Ukraine that cross disciplinary borders can be viewed as an achievement that challenges the system. New art that does not tolerate genre-divisions and is more inclined to synthesis does not find a partner in government institutions. Moreover, certain cases make us consider the expediency of a ministry that opposes new cultural initiatives. In addition to lack of ideological and administrative understanding of new interdisciplinary projects and approaches in performing arts, government bodies often attempt to put such initiatives under their control imposing on them their presence during decision-making in the community sector of arts.

Aniko Rekhviashvili

In Ukrainian choreographic art cultural policy is formed not by the system but by individuals whose initiative becomes a prerogative of success. Neither a system nor models of formal functioning of new initiatives exist. At the moment, Ukraine lacks choreographic brands. There is a problem of artists leaving the country for Russia, the USA, etc. Speaking about the financing – well, it expresses a provincial attitude to choreography

Such examples were mentioned by organizers of a round-table that was held in Kyiv about possibilities of hosting Biennale in Ukraine in 2014.

A considerable problem is the lack of statehood-oriented (protective) position of government bodies and politicians as regards support and promotion of national cultural product, leave alone effective algorithms of new initiatives support in professional performing arts. Permanent changes of political elites and ideological trends in public policy result in manipulations of cultural values (language, history, culture, directions of international cooperation etc.) in public consciousness. What remains constant at the administrative level is the attitude to culture as something redundant and unimportant

Larysa Venedyktova

Interestingly, at present new social entities emerge at the crossing of disciplinary borders. In fact, new art does not tolerate a division into genres. Following the example of our colleagues from the visual sphere, I can say that in theatre and dance we have also removed these borders. However, in this format we are almost entirely excluded from state system. If we are included, then only in a negative respect – for example, as subjects of financial check-ups etc. It turns out that this new Ukrainian “reformed system” tries to suppress new initiatives instead of supporting them and following them

Hence we can speak about formal principles on which new initiatives operate only from the position of independent decisions and managerial approaches of their creators. In the present-day Ukraine they offer their rules of game and models of art management

Serhiy Proskurnia

Hence we can say that the state does not perform its paternalistic function in the field of performing arts and culture in general. Theoretically, it must be interested in the development of all sectors of cultural life and be the antithesis of the brutal uneducated and criminal environment. But as we become hostages of permanent elections, it turns out that voters must be narrow-minded and poorly educated. And since high level of culture opposes these social phenomena, the uninterested state slows the development of its own people and the development of culture.

As the practitioner in new performing arts in Ukraine Vlad Troitskyi notes that at the moment new independent theatre groups typically exist in culture palaces and other similar municipal institutions and sometimes at universities. For example, in Kharkiv they operate under the umbrella of local theatre artists association and in the so called Actor's Palace. This form of existence allows small groups to avoid the payment of rent that is too high for such a theatre to be managed independently. Frequently, such groups do not have the status of a legal entity. As a rule, a new independent creative initiative strives to receive the status of a regional or municipal cultural institution with subsequent financing from the budget. The only exceptions are groups that receive substantial donations. The status of a non-profit organization grants tax-exemption for donations but does not allow the theatre to conduct commercial activities. Besides, a theatre can be registered either as a non-profit or private company. In the latter case, it will have to pay VAT.

Theatres that have the status of a regional or municipal cultural institution are considered non-profit organizations. In order to register a theatre of this type its founders have to prepare a request to the council's chair that in his/her turn will include it into the agenda of the municipal executive committee session. If the latter makes a positive decision the city council becomes the founder of the theatre. Then the theatre can expect at least minimal wages for its employees and basic utility fees to be covered from the budget and the allocation of space from city housing funds.

If employees wish to register the theatre as a private initiative, then they become its founders. A private theatre must open a bank account and deposit a certain amount of money on it. Besides, the registration of an independent theatre requires a statutory fund, i.e. space and equipment owned by the organization.

Vlad Troitskyi

Modern Art Center DAKH has existed since 1996 in a purchased facility, receives no state support and is financed exclusively from private funds of its founder. Legally, DAKH was registered as a private company. Modern Art Center DAKH has the status of a non-government organization. We do not consider it necessary to request the status of a municipal cultural institution because then we exchange creative freedom for minimal financing and transfer into the subordination of municipal administration and Kyiv department of culture, which means an obligation to execute all directives of superior bodies. As a rule, the financing of municipal theatres is meager (actor's monthly salary is approximately 1,200 hryven). And problems with the attraction of private money emerge.

The problem is that it is very difficult for an independent theatre, which is not financed by the state to compete with state theatres since they are initially in unequal conditions: commercial rent of the stage and rehearsal space, decorations and actors salaries are those expenses that no theatre can cover with earnings from its activities.

If we look at how the state supports financially private cultural institutions, we can mention the following projects: financial support of creative non-government associations, such as the National Association of Theatre Artists and National Association of Choreographers; a number of two-year and lifelong scholarships for prominent artists and financial support of guest tours in Ukraine that is granted to theatre groups from a special tour fund. Prior to a financial crisis of 2007-2008 the state provided funds for new theatre performances. The government budget foresees financial support of gifted youth. Besides, the government annually allocates some funds to purchase best works of drama for theatres.

At the same time, no contests are held to select projects for special financing or government grant recipients in the field of culture and performing arts.

As it has been noted above, in the mid-1990s, Ukraine underwent a process of theatre "nationalization" when private and community initiatives were transformed into state-owned institutions. Such transformations allowed many theatres to survive. However, at present this process has been suspended.

Speaking about a higher status that could give theatres more authority and better financing, it must be mentioned that in 1994 a special title of the National institution of culture and arts was introduced. In 1995, it was granted to Ivan Franko Theatre and Lesia Ukrainka Theatre in Kyiv. At the moment there are nine theatres in Ukraine that have the status of national. However, as experts claim, massive granting of titles "national" and "academic" to Ukrainian theatre reduced the significance of these statuses.

Privatization of theatres. Did the process of transformation of community and state theatres into private theatres (commercial and non-commercial) become more active?

According to the Law of Ukraine "On Theatres and Theatrical Business" theatres that are financed from state or local budgets cannot be privatized or used for other purposes. As regards creative transformations in the theatre, such as a change of its genre profile, language status etc., it can be implemented only with the agreement of the central executive government body in the field of culture. Experts claim that recently due to lack of financial motivation there have been no cases of state theatres' privatization and their transformation into non-state institutions. In current situation a refusal from state subordination means an actual collapse of the theatre. Thus, for the time being a state model of financial support either by the city or by the region is the only reliable source of income for the theatre. Current legislation of the country does not encourage the emergence of alternative sources of financing – art patronage, funds, individuals or corporations.

Oleksandr Hrytsenko

No state or communal theatre has transformed into private. A reverse process can be observed – an attempt of independent theatres to become communal and communal theatres to become state-owned. All this happens because of financial motivation. Those that managed it became communal and the number of national theatres rapidly increased from two to nine. Commercial model of theatre's operation does not work in Ukraine, in particular because people are used to a situation when the state finances theatres and an opera ticket costs 20 hryvnas (2-3 dollars) and not 200 dollars. Rich people go to night clubs and do not book a theatre loge for the entire season as it happens in San Francisco. Community is not used to paying a real price for art.

According to unofficial statistics, in Ukraine out of 100 existing theatres less than 10% are non-state ("Bravo," "Sribnyi Ostriv" and "Dakh" in Kyiv, "Benefis" in Uzhgorod and "Arabesky" in Kharkiv) and they do not make a single system.

Nelli Korniyenko

The creation of private theatres in Ukraine depended exclusively on the initiative from the bottom – let us say on enthusiasts (fanatics) who had the “primary capital” of medium-size business, as for example, Vlad Troitskyi (DAKH theatre) or Lyubov Tytarenko (theatre *Bravo*). There were no cases when state or community theatres transformed into private. Even if something like this happened, it did not mean a tendency or even an attempt to create mechanisms for such transformations.

It is also known that the system of Ukrainian private art projects is poorly developed. The expert Vlad Troitskyi believes that they cannot compete with similar Russian projects where “star” system supported by serials and movie industry that ensure their profitability. At the same time, national theatres which are fully provided by the state (as opposed to municipal theatres they receive sufficient funding from the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism to worry about quality and not bother with money-making and survival) in the reality often function as commercial institutions of entertainment.

Besides, there are few examples of working private theatrical projects in Ukraine. We can mention, for example, A. Zholdak and M. Hrynchyshyn’s producing agency and Beniuk&Khostikoyev producing agency that are more oriented at chamber performances. There used to be such one-time theatre projects as “Boulevard Sun-Set” (directed by R. Viktyuk), “Varshavska melodiya-2” (“Warsaw melody-2,” directed by I. Afanasyev), “Yakist zirky” (“The Quality of Star,” directed by O. Lysovets) with Alla Rogovtseva starring and a couple of others. It must be noted that their impact on the overall theatre situation is minimal.

Directors of cultural institutions that specialize in performing arts. Description of selection process under the contract system (are there contests, appointments or public consultations?). How long is the term of directorship?

According to the Law of Ukraine “On Theatre and Theatre Business,” management of state and communal theatres is carried out by the director or the artistic director with whom the founder (Ministry of Culture or local government) signs the agreement (contract) for a five-year term. Alternatively, based on the separation of powers between the theatre’s director and artistic director the founder signs a contract with each of them for a five-year term.

Thus, if the theatre is subordinated to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Ukraine, its manager is appointed on a competitive basis by the Minister. The same procedure is followed at the local level – the candidate’s application is discussed at the session of a regional or municipal council and the appointment follows its decision. In the latter case, the Ministry of Culture as the central executive body only agrees with the choice of the nominee and the city government approves it and makes final appointment. Employment contract is signed, accordingly, with the Minister of Culture and city mayor or head of a regional state administration depending on the subordination of the theatre.

However, as the majority of experts claim, contests are predominantly formal and lack transparency. No public consultations regarding the candidate for the position of the managing director or artistic director are held. Besides, for lack of a coherent public policy in the field of culture and performing arts, national theatres often turn into life-long “private estates” of their directors and artistic directors. Then the director can independently select the artistic staff that works in the theatre. When, for example, the director informs the founder that the position of the artistic director is not necessary for efficient management of the institution, a decision can be made to eliminate this position and the artistic director loses his/her job. Then the theatre is run one-handedly by its director.

Vlad Troitskyi

At present no one assesses the actual artistic level of what happens on theatrical stages. Ukrainian legislation does not foresee an effective system of management rotation. It is a hermeneutic corrupted system that does not allow for

a renewal. Similar to the rest of the government hierarchy, private connections and interests that can be very remote from art play the most significant role. Personally, I do not remember a single case when a director of a Kyiv drama theatre was replaced. The only example that comes up to my mind is the firing of Andriy Zholdak from the Kharkiv Academic Theatre named after Shevchenko. A perversity of this system implies that such a theatre director is not interested in the emergence of new names and enhanced positions of other stage directors. Paradoxically, sometimes actors and actresses are not interested in it either preferring a situation of hidden unemployment or extensive theatrical process, which allows them to play in serials, dub films and so on. These situations, as well as a stagnated system of theatrical education, result in the fact that in Ukraine we do not have even the concept of “young stage directors.” Representatives of the last generation of functioning Ukrainian stage directors are 45-65 years old.

Theatres can have full-time stage directors or invite them to work on a specific performance. In the latter case, they sign respective contracts with directors and artistic directors. No public debates (except for private consultations with certain experts) or contests are held. Such decisions depend on private initiative of theatre management.

Загальна кількість

Serhiy Proskurnia

We do not have an official selection system for director's appointment. I call it the period of theatrical feudalism. I do not remember a single contest for the position of the director. They might have been officially announced but they were never actually conducted because there is no publicity in this process. For example, I tried to get publicly appointed at Odesa Opera and have my theatre development programme officially approved by the Ministry's board. The end is well-known – my application was withdrawn after the interference of the Prime-Minister Yulia Tymoshenko. Instead, now they have a new director who was very quietly appointed for a five-year term without any debates or public consultations. This model is 99.9% typical for theatre system. Contract employment system is offered only for temporary stage directors. In general, a system of “carrying a coffin” is very common here – during public debates you can often hear an expression “They will carry me away from here in a coffin.” Such an approach is a threat for senior theatrical management.

Part B

Number of Theatres.

Number of cultural institutions in the area of performing arts (theatre, dance and interdisciplinary projects) in Ukraine and their location.

At present, in Ukraine there are about 140 state, communal and municipal theatres (municipal theatre is subordinated to city government but the premises it uses are owned by another institution or legal entity, for example, the regional government, while communal theatre is subordinated by the city and the premises it uses are also owned by the city – translator's note) and cultural institutions of other property forms. Twenty-three of these are located in the capital city and others in regional centers and towns of district subordination. In addition to Kyiv, theatres are located in Sevastopol, Simferopol and regional centers. In other cities there are very few professional theatres, the only exceptions being Bila Tserkva (Kyiv region), Nizhyn (Chernihiv region), Drohobych (Lviv region), Mukachevo (Zakarpattia region), Pavlograd and Kryvyi Rig (both in Dnipropetrovsk region), Mariupol and Makiyivka (both in Donetsk region) and Kolomyia (Ivano-Frankivsk region). There are towns that have rich theatrical history (Kremenchuk, Kamyanets-Podilskyi, Pryluky, Uman', Melitopol' and others) but in most of them after the Second World War theatres were closed and have never re-opened.

According to information provided by the National Association of Choreographers, there are about 20,000 dance groups of different institutional subordination, different performing levels and different

artistic styles. About 10,000 groups with the total of 130,000 participants are part of the state system, union system and ministerial system. Most of them have worked for many years. Over 370 groups have the honorary titles of “National” and “Amateur.” Folk art is promoted by cultural institutions and cultural units of enforcement structures. There are 164 artistic groups within the Ministry of Internal Affairs system, five of which are professional singing and dance groups. In the system of the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense there are six professional singing and dance groups, amateur groups in Officer’s Community Houses (clubs –translator’s note) as well as in service areas of air defense, ground and navy troops. State Committee of Border Guard Service also has its professional singing and dance group.

Unfortunately, no institution keeps official and complex statistics of the registration and location of non-state cultural institutions of performing arts in Ukraine. The Appendix offers a table with registration data of mainly state-owned theatrical institutions as well as of some private and non-profit cultural organizations that conduct public artistic activity.

Legal status and structure of cultural institutions (number):

- State (national): **9 theatres**
- Of regional local government subordination: **67 theatres**
- Of municipal and district local government subordination: **49 theatres**
- Non-government and private companies, institutions with a mixed form of ownership: no official statistics available, presumably they make no more than **10%** of the overall number of theatres in Ukraine.

Theatre’s forms of activity (number of theatres):

- Drama: – **23**
- Puppet: – **26**
- Opera: – **6**
- Theatres of pantomime and experimental theatre-studios: – **over 40**
- Private theatrical projects and art. centers: – **up to 10%** of the overall number of theatres
- Of music and drama: – **28**
- Theatres of drama and comedy: – **2**
- Children’s theatres: – **6**
- Youth theatres: – **6**

For database regarding the number and location of the institutions of culture in Ukraine see the Appendix.

Part C.
Financing of Theatres

Are there clearly defined rules of financing performing arts institutions, i.e. what is the legal mechanism of decision- making related to financing of institutions from state budget and other state sources or by businesses and private benefactors?

According to the Law of Ukraine titled “On Theatre and Theatre Business,” the funding of theatre activities depends on their ownership form, status and other characteristics determined by budgetary legislation and is carried out from funds of the state budget of Ukraine, budget of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and other local budgets as well as from funds of companies, institutions, organizations, indi-

viduals and their unions. Theatre founders provide financing of their activities in the order and amount stipulated by statutory documents. Budgetary funds and funds received from additional sources cannot be taken away from the theatre during budgetary year except for cases foreseen by the law. Funding received from additional sources does not reduce the amount of budgetary financing of state and communal theatres.

In Ukraine, the financing of theatres with state or communal forms of ownership is mainly based on a method of budgetary funding. The latter uses the principle of irrevocable financing from state budget or budgets of lower levels. This type of funding fully or partly covers institutions' expenses. Here a decisive role is played by government and local self-government bodies. However, in the situation of economic crisis there is a strong possibility that theatrical institutions will lose guaranteed funding from the state or its amount will be considerably reduced.

There are clearly defined rules of theatre financing from the state budget – in fact, it has the form of regular budgetary subsidy that must be sufficient to cover salary expenses plus utility fees (electricity and heating) and maintenance expenses. Besides, there might be some funds for the preparation of new performances and for guest visits. In addition, according to the Law “On Guest Tours in Ukraine” that foresees a special fee to be paid by visiting foreign groups and performers there is a special fund that covers expenses on guest tours of Ukrainian theatres and performing groups. At the same time, it must be noted that 80% of the overall budget funding is spent on employees' salaries. In most cases, theatre staff works full-time and has fixed salaries. The majority of theatre managers and experts in theatre management believe this system to be obsolete and ineffective (actor/actress's salary depends very little on his/her artistic achievements) and emphasize a necessity to replace it with a system of individual contracts.

Only state and communal theatres are financed from state and local budgets. Theatres with the non-state form of property are not financed from the state budget. However, there are cases when an independent artistic group after 7-10 years of its activity receives the status of a municipal institution of culture. Theatres that receive regional or municipal subordination have the status of non-profit organizations. In case of receiving the status of state or municipal subordination the theatre can expect the budget to cover its expenses on at least minimal wages for employees, minimal maintenance fees and allocation of space from city housing funds.

Bohdan Strutynskyi

There is no rule of financing, maybe only aspect is worth mentioning – the revenue part of theatre's budget. Every year the theatre must increase its financial plan. And it is very hard to do and everyone is concerned about it. We always have problems with the execution of the financial plan. For example, we needed 20 million hryvnas and received only 18 and we have to find the rest somewhere else. That's why at this moment theatres are left by themselves.

In order to liberalise the model of state financing the government required theatres to increase their financial efficiency. It means that theatres must themselves earn as much money as possible. Thus, it is not the artistic level but theatre's income that determines the amount of state expenses for the next year. As theatre managers note, an increase in theatres' earnings depends exclusively on ticket sales, i.e. the audience's paying capacity and high level of community culture. None of these are part of Ukrainian reality.

Olena Bohomazova

The cost of tickets depends on people's income. If we set a price adequate to expenses, the ticket would cost 300 hryvnas and not 35 as it is in our theatre. Every year we submit a financial plan and if our earnings are less than 12-14% of the amount of state financing, our plan is not accepted. Five years ago it could have been different and the amount of funding did not depend on the amount of income. Earlier artistic criteria were more important than financial. But this mechanism does not lead to effectiveness.

Besides, in 2005 a system of strict control and regulation of budget expenses was introduced. Many experts believe that financing structure in Ukraine is extremely obsolete since basic calculations of the amount of state subsidies are determined by salary needs of artists and do not take into account development needs of the theatre (purchase of equipment, renovation expenses, expenses on performance preparation etc.). Thus, the government pays salaries of theatre employees and in this way promotes the system budgetary funds consumption instead of encouraging investments into the development of theatre business. Experts also believe that Ukraine needs an intermediary structure (and here the experience of Lithuania might be helpful) – a fund that would coordinate special budgetary programmes and introduce a simplified system of financial reporting.

Vlad Troitskyi

For a couple of years after such theatre festivals as Berezil and Kyiv Travnevyyi discontinued, no other large theatre festivals have taken place in Kyiv. All of them discontinued because of lack of financing. The biggest financial support was given to the interdisciplinary festival of modern art GOGOLFEST (it emerged in 2007 in the Art Arsenal as an independent initiative of the Modern Art Center DAKH – and even then it was 15% of the festival's total budget. In 2009 on the occasion of Gogol's 200 anniversary. Last year the festival received from the Ministry 2% of its budget.

As regards sponsors, they are primarily interested in a possibility of advertising their products broadly and on a high level within the frame of the event, prestige of the event, the number of viewers, the appropriateness of the event to company's image as well as in other modern marketing schemes. For patrons of art, prestige of the event and its community feedback are most significant. Arts patronage gives an excellent opportunity of personal image-making that makes it possible to move to a higher level in the establishment. At the same time, there is no law on arts patronage in Ukraine and its instances are very rare. As a rule, in such cases personal links matter most. Speaking about theatre and choreographic arts, activities of Kyiv theatre "Kyiv-modern-balet" (Kyiv Modern Ballet) is an excellent example of a successful arts patronage project. It is financed exclusively by its patron, Volodymyr Filatov. We do not know other examples of theatre and dance patronage in Ukraine.

What are the average state expenses on theatre subsidies:

- amount of grant (contest) earning;
- amount of special subsidies

Most of professional theatres (in 2007, 138 theatres were registered) are Ukrainian and Russian. The largest number of theatres is located in Kyiv, Odesa, Lviv, Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv and Donetsk. Financial condition of Ukrainian theatres is diverse – to a considerable extent, it depends on their status (national, regional or municipal) and location.

Salaries make a dominant part of theatre expenses (up to 80%) covered by the budget. Employees of state theatres work full-time and receive fixed salaries. Expenses on performing activities (in particular on decorations and costumes for new performances) are mainly covered from the money earned by theatres themselves. Sometimes part of these funds is used to cover the cost of heating, electricity and renovation.

It must be noted that according to the Budget Code of Ukraine, there is no special budget item to finance performances and production of new plays. Instead, there is the whole system of Presidential decrees and directives, decisions and instructions of the Cabinet of Ministers and parliamentary decisions that foresee the financing of specific projects. Hence, the production of a new play can become part of a state programme of a certain event celebration or part of other national events. Specific programmes are financed through respective departments and offices of the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism that are in charge of the organization of events in state institutions which are under the Ministry.

Frequently, a new production is financed not through the department for theatre affairs but through others – language policy department, department of music etc. Sometimes the department for theatre affairs of the Ministry is unaware of such projects and events in theatrical life. It creates managerial chaos in the implementation of a coherent theatrical policy in the country.

If we look at the correlation between grant funds and special state subsidies for theatres and dance centers, it must be noted that in the period of economic crisis expenses on theatre's additional needs (new productions, building renovation, purchase of equipment, organizations of concerts and festivals) were reduced. In current situation, theatres receive funds only for employees' salaries (guaranteed budget item) and building maintenance (i.e. utilities fees: water supply, electricity etc.)

Bohdan Strutynskyi

Theatres in Ukraine receive financing only for salaries. No funding is foreseen for the development and new projects. If someone did receive it, it only means he/she has very good personal contacts. .

On the average, budget special subsidies for a theatre (salaries plus utilities) can range from several hundred thousand hryvnas (for small municipal theatres) to dozens of millions for national theatres in Kyiv. For example, if we look at choreography state financing of the National Dance Ensemble named after Virskyi from 2001 until 2008 increased in 17 times – from 0.74 million hryvnas to 12.4 million hryvnas.

In Kyiv, state expenses on 23 municipal theatres range from 30 to 40 million hryvnas per year. The average maintenance of one municipal theatre is estimated to be several hundred thousand hryvnas. The managing director of Kyiv municipal theatre “Vilna Stsena” (Free Stage) Olena Bohomazova informed that in 2010 the city government allocated 680,000 hryvnas to the theatre while in 2007 (prior to economic crisis) the theatre received 150,000 hryvnas to purchase the equipment. Apart from that the theatre has received no extra budgetary funding for its needs. In 2006, when municipal government was still allocating production funds for theatres, it granted 330,000 hryvnas for nine new performances.

Theatres of state subordination (national theatres) are much better financed. The largest amount of budgetary funds is allocated to National Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet named after Taras Shevchenko – in 2008 the theatre received almost 94 million hryvnas. According to the Ministry of Culture, in 2010 the Opera Theatre received 3.5 million hryvnas solely for one production –the opera *Volodar Borysfenu* (“Borysfen's Owner”) by the Ukrainian composer Yevhen Stankevych. By the way, initially these funds were to be distributed among all national theatres (9 institutions) for their production needs.

Returning to the issue of additional state donations in the form of grants for performing arts institutions which they receive within the frame of complex budgetary programmes, the following data can be provided.

According to information given in the analytical report of the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture, in 2009 within the framework of the budget-financed programme “On the Development of Museum Displays and Repertoire of Theatres, Concert Organizations and Circuses” that had the overall fund of 1 million hryvnas, 150,000 hryvnas was allocated to purchase 11 works of drama for theatre repertoire. From the general fund of state budget 137.6 thousand hryvnas was allocated to cover expenses on guest tours of the National Academic Ukrainian Drama Theatre Named after Zankovetska and National Bandura Capella of Ukraine. In addition, guest visits' fund financed tours of 15 artistic groups for the overall amount 1339.6 thousand hryvnas. Grants of the President of Ukraine were used to finance young artists' projects for the overall amount of 10 thousand hryvnas. The total amount of funds allocated within the framework of the budget programme titled “Financial Support of National Theatres” is estimated to be 304.6 million hryvnas.

What portion of the overall amount of state subsidies for theatres and dance groups is covered by:

- state budget funds
- funds of regional and local sources
- theatre's own finances

In current Ukrainian situation, there is no answer to this question since state theatres are financed solely from state budget, communal theatres – from local budgets and theatres' own funds do not belong to the category of state subsidies. However, in order to describe the overall picture of financing that state theatres receive from state budget and communal theatres from local budgets, let's have a look at the following statistics.

According to information provided by the Ukrainian Center for Cultural Research (statistics from National Report on Cultural Policy in Ukraine), all theatres have a similar revenue structure: budget financing makes about 70-80% of overall earnings; earnings from specific activities are estimated to be 15 – 25%, and earnings from other sources – 5 – 10%. Although budget funding still remains the main financial source for state and communal theatres, recently the level of their self-financing has considerably increased. In general, the financing of expenses on culture and art has the following structure: municipal and district budgets – 40%, state budget 25%, regional budgets-20% and services and special funds – 15%.

Earnings made by theatres themselves

Forms of property	Earnings (without VAT)			Fees and Taxes		Other earnings
	Overall	From main activities	From other activities	VAT	Other	
All theatres	43860,2	36170,5	7689,7	6910,3	207,6	32324,9
Private	419,8	342,9	76,9	46,6	22,7	-
State	11584,6	10684,2	900,4	1973,7	-	10470,4
Communal	31855,8	25143,4	6712,4	4890,0	184,9	21854,5

Source: Ukrainian Ministry of Culture

According to statistics collected by the Ukrainian Center for Cultural Research in 1995 and 2000 expenses of the Ministry of Culture (state budget) made 44.03 and 180.9 million hryvnas, respectively. Of that amount 11.8% and 11.1% respectively was granted to theatres and 9.5% and 40.6% respectively on other performing arts.

Local budget expenses on culture and arts made 441.37 million hryvnas in 2000 and 597.55 million hryvnas in 2001. From that amount expenses on theatres made 49.16 million hryvnas (11.4%) and 60.05 million hryvnas (10.04%) respectively. Local budget expenses on performing arts groups made 42.44 million hryvnas (9.6%) in 2000 and 68.65 million hryvnas (11.5%) in 2001.

According to official information from the annual report of the Ministry of Culture, in 2009 state budget expenses on culture and art were estimated to be 1196.2 million hryvnas, including 525 million hryvnas (43.9%) on theatres and performing organizations. From the budget programme "Financial Support of National Theatres" theatres received 304.6 million hryvnas or 96.6% of the annual plan.

It must be noted that in 2004-2008 the portion of earned income in the overall structure of national theatres' earnings considerably increased. The earned income of national theatres increased from 25.2 million hryvnas in 2007 to 32.8 million hryvnas in 2008 (see the table), that is almost by one third. Moreover, the income of two large theatres in the capital city – the National Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet Named after Shevchenko and the National Academic Theatre of Russian Drama Named after Lesia Ukrainka – increased by more than 60%.

Budget financing and theatres' earned income, 2007-2009., thousands of hryvnas

National theatres	2007			2008			2009 (9 months)		
	Budget financing	Earned income	Portion of earned income, %	Budget financing	Earned income	Portion of earned income, %	Budget financing	Earned income	Portion of earned income, %
National Theatre of Opera and Ballet Named after Shevchenko	64636.4	8167	11,2	93797.9	13862	12.9	86496.5	8514	8.9
National Drama Theatre Named after Ivan Franko	20990.9	7082	25.2	30878.9	4071	11.6	28607.0	6379	18.2
National Theatre of Russian Drama Named after Lesia Ukrainka	22338.9	5374	19.4	31019.0	8894	22.3	31372.0	6000.6	16.1
Lviv National Theatre of Opera and Ballet Named after Krushelnytska	22419.3	2994	11.8	35963.5	3925	9.8	38910.8	2827	6.7
National Theatre of Ukrainian Drama Named after Zankovetska	11846.0	1569	11.7	18140.0	2089	10.3	17479.5	393	2.2
Odesa National Theatre of Opera and Ballet	-	-	-	-	-	-	19749.7	5584	22.0
Total	142231.5	25186	15.0	209799.3	32841	15.7	222615.5	29697	11.7

Source: Ukrainian Ministry of Culture

Over the last few years the portion of national theatres' earned income in the overall amount of financial income was estimated to be 15.0-15.7%. However, during the peak of economic crisis in 2009 it went down to 11.7%.

In the period of 2001-2008 budget financing of state choreographic groups was also increasing: the overall amount of budget financing of national concert organizations and music groups went up in more than 13 times – from 8.6 million to 112.6 million hryvnas.

At the same time, for these art institutions and groups a decrease in the portion of earned income is even more conspicuous than it was in the case with theatres – from 28.2% in 2001 to 7.0% in 2008. In particular, the financing of the National Dance Ensemble named after Virskyi increased in almost 17 times – from 0.74 to 12.4 million hryvnas and the portion of earned income went down from 38.2% to 10.9%.

Earned income of state and communal theatres in Ukraine, 2004, in thousands of hryvnas

	Earnings from services (without VAT)			Taxes and Fees		Other earnings
	Total	From artistic activities	From other types of activities	VAT	Other	
Overall in Ukraine	43860.2	36170.5	7689.7	6910.3	207.6	32324.9
Crimea	2137.8	1810.1	327.7	347.3	26.7	240.5
Vinnysia region	276.6	130.4	146.2	41.2	-	-
Volyn region	293.5	293.5	-	38.8	-	1286.3
Dnipropetrovsk region	3297.7	2416.1	881.6	514.6	2.2	251.9
Donetsk region	3053.9	2487.3	566.6	507.9	27.6	514.6
Zhytomyr region	374.7	175.8	198.9	57.2	28.5	5.9
Zakarpattia region	601.7	464.9	136.8	74.9	3.6	23.5
Zaporizhzhia region	695.2	367.3	127.9	90.2	28.4	1498.9
Iv.-Frankivsk regiona	792.0	447.5	344.5	91.7	-	1635.2
Kyiv region	109.5	109.5	-	18.2	-	-
Kirovograd region	198.0	166.9	31.1	24.5	-	15.6
Luhansk region	654.8	654.7	0.1	106.3	-	33.5
Lviv region	3671.7	2340.7	1331.0	564.3	-	4197.7
Mykolayiv region	760.1	747.7	12.4	126.4	-	6.1
Odesa region	3047.5	2061.3	986.2	467.4	1.0	3733.0
Poltava region	323.8	245.0	78.8	54.0	-	1577.6
Rivne region	329.4	324.8	4.6	46.5	1.4	1389.4
Sumy region	407.6	371.9	35.7	68.4	-	2.6
Ternopil region	266.3	216.0	50.3	43.9	-	-
Kharkiv region	2566.5	2316.0	250.5	427.8	1.0	2477.7
Kherson region	867.5	763.4	104.1	137.1	-	371.8
Khmelnysk region	316.5	235.7	80.8	48.9	2.3	6.4
Charkasy region	411.8	203.1	208.7	68.3	17.0	20.0
Chrnivtsi region	341.3	190.2	151.1	32.5	18.0	805.9

	Earnings from services (without VAT)			Taxes and Fees		Other earnings
	Total	From artistic activities	From other types of activities	VAT	Other	
Chernihiv region	475.5	466.3	9.2	78.4	8.1	231.5
City of Kyiv	16379.0	14821.7	1557.3	2632.0	41.8	11885.1
City of Sevastopol	1210.3	1142.7	67.6	201.6	-	114.2

Source: Ukrainian Ministry of Culture

For what period of time is state budget for theatres and dance institutions planned (for a year or more)? How is the budget calculated for theatres?

According to the law of Ukraine “On Budget Year” funding from state budget for theatres and dance institutions is planned for one year. Calculations of theatres’ budget are carried out on the basis preliminarily submitted proposals that describe theatre’s needs. The theatre itself calculates the amount of state donations on the basis of approved staff positions list (fund of salaries for artists) and the cost of utilities according to the previous year’s data (the cost of utilities is amended in accordance with rate changes in the country). In addition to its request for salaries and utility fees, a theatre also makes proposals about its planned expenses on new productions and guest visits. However, in the period of economic crisis the financing of these types of expenses was terminated with the exception of specific cases. Thus, the budget request is submitted to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Ukraine (in the case of theatres with state subordination) or to municipal or regional departments of culture (in case of municipal theatres). A decision about the amount of financing of a theatre and the branch in general is made by the Ukrainian Ministry of Finance depending on the area needs and previous consumption indicators.

Do cultural institutions of performing arts have problems with debts? How do these problems look in practice? How are they typically solved?

A problem cultural institutions debt emerged at the time of financial crisis that affected the capability of the state to carry out its obligations as regards state financing in the area of culture. A debt emerges when the Ministry of Culture or municipal government does not provide a previously planned donation on time. The reality is such that a number of events to be financed from the budget are conducted on credit and the state either post-pays for them or pays 30% of the project’s cost in advance and post-pays 70%.

A debt can also emerge when utility fees increase or when the cost of rent changes. Often a debt emerges when a government authority is not able to cover the cost of renovation or artists’ salaries. A problem with the payment of renovation costs is most widely-spread.

Bohdan Strutyynskyi

If there are debts, it’s a pain in the neck only for a theatre. For example, in 2008 when crisis began we had certain financial obligations to fulfill (for theatre’s renovation). The state did not give us the promised 500,000 and transferred this money to 2009. We did not receive it in 2009 either and it was transferred to 2010. In 2010, we did not receive it either. Hence the debt. At the moment, the contractor wants to sue us – and it is our problem. The theatre can sue the Ministry but then you will be dismissed on the following day and a more loyal manager will be appointed and it doesn’t matter whether you have a contract or not. If there’s Minister’s good will you will get the money. And again, those who have better personal contacts ...

Theatres sign agreements with contractors about the amount of works to be performed and pay for these works when they receive funding from the state. If the state does not cover the cost of fixed expenses

es on renovation, a debt emerges and theatres often have to solve the problem themselves. A practice of lawsuits against a government authority for a failure to carry out its financial obligations is not common since theatre's management may then face a problem of being fired administratively. Hence, the problem of debts that cultural institutions may have is solved by the attraction of its earned income or sometimes with private investments.

Are there any additional sources of financing?

In the Ukrainian theatrical environment the following additional sources of financing exist:

- funds earned from performance tickets sales;
- finances and property received by the theatre as a remuneration for projects it performs for legal entities and individuals;
- funds from sales of souvenirs and publishing of materials about history, theory and practice of theatre;
- payment for video recording and photographic works and for interviews on condition of preservation of copyright and/or other rights and norms foreseen by the Civil Code of Ukraine.
- Remuneration (compensation) for using intellectual property rights that are owned by the theatre and are transferred according to a special agreement;
- Sponsor's aid, charity donations, income from paid services etc.

PART D.

ARTISTIC ACTIVITIES

Number of Premiers and Performances (preferably in 2007-2009 or at least in 2009)

No institution in Ukraine keeps official statistics of first-nights and performances given by theatres and dance organizations in Ukraine. What is available is only a fragmentary statistics compiled as a follow-up of specific projects. For example, at our request to provide information as regards the above question the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism wrote that in 2009, national drama theatres in Ukraine had 21 first-night performances and gave 1108 performances. At the same time, according to the national budgetary report for 2009, within the framework of the budgetary programme "Financial Support of National Theatres" with the overall fund of 304.6 million hryvnas six national theatres receive financial support for giving 1,972 regular performances and concerts and 31 first-night performances

As experts of the theatrical department of the Ministry stated, the average number of first-night performances is estimated to be 4-5 performances per theatre. Accordingly, if we use official statistics of the registered theatres in Ukraine (137 institutions), than the average number of first-night performances ranges between 548-685 performances. Since the majority of theatres in Ukraine are repertory theatres and a typical repertoire of national and academic theatres is 20-25 performances per year, the average number of performances put on in Ukraine must be approximately 2740-3425 annually.

Number of viewers (preferably for 2007-2009 or at least in 2009)

Year	Number of professional theatres (including theatre-studios) as of the end of the year	Number of visits to the theatre per year, mln.
1990	125	17.6
1991	130	15.0
1992	127	15.1

Year	Number of professional theatres (including theatre-studios) as of the end of the year	Number of visits to the theatre per year, mln.
1993	131	12.4
1994	132	10.2
1995	136	8.3
1996	130	6.9
1997	130	5.6
1998	132	5.6
1999	131	5.6
2000	131	5.7
2001	129	5.9
2002	131	6.2
2003	135	6.1
2004	133	6.0
2005	135	6.2
2006	137	6.3
2007	138	6.6
2008	138	7.0
2009	136	6.2

Source: Ukrainian State Committee of Statistics, 1998-2010

Average cost of performance/project production and transportation

It must be noted that official calculation of the indicator of average production and transportation cost for theatre performances has been introduced only recently in accordance with a joint decree of the Ukrainian Ministry of Finance and Ukrainian Ministry of Culture # 1150/41 as of 01.10/2010 titled "On Approval of Typical List of Budgetary Programmes and Their Execution Indicators for Local Budgets in the Area of Culture." The latter was aimed at the implementation of the Concept of Specific Project Methodology in Budget-Making and the Concept of Local Budget Reforming. The ministerial decree obliges government bodies to report the efficiency of budgetary spending, including calculations and setting of the average indicator of performances and tours cost for Ukrainian theatres.

Hence, it is not possible to submit official statistics as regards these figures. Instead, we can have a look at comments made by practicing artists who also have certain experience in project management and financial reporting.

According to information provided by the report's expert Aniko Rekhviashvili, the production cost of the ballet *Videnskyi Vals* ("Viennese Waltz") at the National Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet Named after Shevchenko where she was the director of choreography, was estimated to be 150 thousand hryvnas. The Director of Kyiv National Academic Operetta Theatre Bohdan Strutynskyi says that he plans to spend 500 thousand hryvnas on the production of a renewed version of the comic opera *The Gypsy Baron* and the performance *The Bird Seller* by Carl Zeller. As the managing director of Kyiv municipal theatre *Vilna Stsena* Olena Bohomazova noted, on the average the theatre annually spends 40 thousand hryvnas on performance productions. Vasyl Vovkun, the Ukrainian Minister of Culture and Tourism (2007-2009) and theatre producer remembers from his experience in theatre and management that in the pre-crisis time state donations for performance productions were the following: from 300

thousand to 500 thousand hryvnas for a performance in opera theatre, up to 250 thousand hryvnas for a performance in drama theatre, and up to 100 thousand hryvnas for a performance in puppet theatre.

Larysa Venedyktova

The average cost of performance production ... We are put in such conditions that sometimes it is zero. We have a performance where we have nothing except for the actors and it doesn't cost anything. We start at zero and and make an artistic product, not creative experiments. This product is interesting for Europe. Such our performances are presented in Moscow during Golden Mask. No one understands how you can make a professional product out of nothing. If we speak about figures the state can spend a hundred thousand dollars - these are the taxes we pay – on a low-quality product

To describe an average cost of the performance's transportation, we can refer to information for 2009 provided by the official web site of the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism. According to the site, from the general fund of state Budget the total amount of 137.6 thousand hryvnas was allocated to cover expenses on guest tours (transportation and performance) of the National Distinguished Bandura Capella of Ukraine Named after Maiboroda and National Academic Ukrainian Drama Theatre Named after Zankovetska. In addition, guest visits' fund financed tours of 15 artistic groups for the overall amount 1339.6 thousand hryvnas. According to information of the Ministry of Culture, on the average the state allocates to one theatre for its guest tours no more than 100,000 hryvnas

Olena Bohomazova

The average cost of performance production and transportation – it is not a correct question to ask. If it is a performance for 30 actors or for two, it's cost will be entirely different. We had performances that cost 40 thousand hryvnas. In a big theatre it can be even 500 thousand hryvnas. Investors often ask me to calculate the cost of a performance and I ask them "How much can you give me? I will make a performance with this money.

Let us return to the experience of performing arts practitioners. As the Director of the Operetta Theatre Bohdan Strutynskyi noted, the cost of a guest tour with the performance *My Fair Lady* that involves 140 theatre employees is no less than 250 thousand and most of these are expenses on hotel accommodation and transportation of theatre equipment.

Number of festivals (national and international) and places where they were conducted.

Database of national and international festivals is provided in the Appendix.

Part E. International Cooperation

Do theatre and dance institutions (and also festival organizers) use opportunities provided by EU programmes?

At present, in Ukraine there is almost no possibility to fully participate in EU programmes with the exception of invitations for individual theatres and performing groups provided by foreign organizers. In such cases participation of Ukrainian groups is financed by the inviting part. It must be noted that in the context of integration into the European cultural space Ukraine only recently has received an opportunity to participate as a partner-country in the EU Culture programme for 2007-2013 (decision No 1855/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 establishing the Culture programme).

Larysa Venedyktova

We have almost no possibilities to use these programmes. It is strange why the EU believes that if they do not influence a situation in the Eastern region it will not become threatening for them? ... Hence we did not an opportunity to use EU theatrical programmes. Maybe, they will come through Poland – through the “Platform” ... It is called coming through the backdoor ... And in general, such things require a specialized culture management and we have a problem with it.

According to information of the Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Ukraine received this opportunity in spring 2010. After the ratification of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions Ukraine and other countries that participate in the European Union's Eastern Partnership programmeme were offered participation in the EU Culture programmeme for 2007-2013 on new conditions of the so called window of Eastern Partnership. Earlier, from 2007 until 2010, Ukrainian cultural and artistic institutions could participate in this programmeme only as “co-organizers” or “associated partners,” that is as an organization of third countries, which I very problematic and requires the intermediacy of EU country-members. In fact, prior to 2010 Ukraine did not take part in this Programmeme or in other EU cultural initiatives.

Vlad Troitskyi

In Ukraine, there is a small number of independent theatres that exist on European grants. They are very few since in the country a system of modern theatrical management is poorly developed. As a rule, the theatre cannot find a well-trained manager who speaks English, is able to work with European grants and is ready to work for the idea. Gogolfest did not apply for grants of the EU programme but was supported by individual European institutions and Embassies, such as the Embassy of Spain, the Embassy of Finland, the Embassy of France in Ukraine, French Cultural Center, Instituto Italiano di Cultura Kiev, Посольство Франції в Україні, Goethe Institut, British Council and others

If we look at individual cases of the participation of Ukrainian institutions in EU programmemes, they can be described as problematic due to lack of qualified experts in fund-raising and managers with knowledge of foreign languages who could work professionally in the unprofitable field of Ukrainian performing arts. A common problem here is inertia in the development of theatrical management and lack of efficient public policy in the field of cultural European integration of Ukraine.

According to information of Les' Kurbas National Center of Theatre Art promotion of the Ukrainian theatre in the European space is based on old informal professional links. Among the most significant art projects that can be seen as typical in the context of international cooperation we can mention the following: a three-year International Project MARA “Protsesiya Obraziv” (“Procession of Images,” 2007 -2010, the Netherlands – Les' Kurbas Center-Montenegro); a joint art project of Les' Kurbas National Center of Theatre Art, Vision Forum, Perfect Art Institution (Ukraine-Sweden) “Nevydyme pokolinnia” (“Unseen Generation”); five-week national Ukrainian project *PolskaKulturaUkrayina* (“PolishCultureUkraine”) that consisted of two parts: “Contemporary Polish Theatre from Grotowski to postGrotowski with the final round-table discussion “Contemporary Polish Theatre as Seen by Ukrainian Theatre Experts. A Debate” and, in response, a similar cycle of talks given by Les' Kurbas Center in Grotowski center Followed by a joint publication project; and joint theatre-research projects with France, Russia, Austria, USA, Canada and other countries. These are typical examples of artistic contacts.

Do Ukrainian cultural institutions of performing arts join international organizations? If yes, which precisely?

Nelli Korniyenko

I think that possibilities of EU programmes are used neither strategically nor systematically but sporadically. It may seem strange but a reason for it is insufficient information, instability of certain programmes and the fact that Ukrainian standards and norms of artistic activities are not adjusted to European (different “behavioral languages”)

Ukrainian institutions of culture join international organizations but do it in a non-systematic way and do not benefit from opportunities of international cooperation in that field due to lack of respectively trained experts and managers.

Ukraine discovered for itself a number of international public organizations only after the proclamation of its independence. In 1994-1995 Ukraine joined CIOFF (International Council of Organizations of Folklore Festivals), EAAO (European Association of Amateur Orchestras), and IATHA (International Amateur Theatre Association). In 1995, the Ukrainian Center of the International Theatre Institute (ITI) was created. It was headed by the National Actress of Ukraine Larysa Kadyrova.

In 1992, the Ukrainian National Center (UNIMA) was set up under the umbrella of National Association Theatre Artists of Ukraine. At present, among members of the Ukrainian National Center UNIMA there are leading artists of the Ukrainian Puppet Theatre, actors and actresses, producers, decorators, theoreticians and historians of puppet theatre and university teachers. The festival *Zoloty Lev* ("Golden Lion," Lviv) was registered in the system of international theatre festivals and in 2008 Lviv National Theatre of Opera and Ballet named after Krushelnytska joined the international organization for professional opera companies Opera Europa.

Thus, at present Ukrainian cultural institutions are members of the International Theatre Institute (ITI), The Union Internationale de la Marionette (UNIMA), international association Opera Europa, International Association of Theatres for Children and Young People (ASSITEJ), International Amateur Theatre Association (IATA), and International Confederation of Theatre Unions (with the center in Moscow) and cooperate with the International Opera Foundation. In the field of choreographic arts Ukrainian organizations are members of the International DanceSport Federation (IDSF). From 1993 to 2006 the Ukrainian Dance Council represented Ukraine in the international professional organization World Dance and Dance Sport Council (WD&DSC) and from 2006 until 2009 was member of the Ukrainian Association of Public Organizations *Sport and Dance* (VSHOST). Since 2000 it has been a full member of the International Dance Organization (IDO) and in 2007 Ukrainian Dance Council received provisional membership in the International Professional DanceSport Council (IPDSC).

Are there any joint international cultural products in the field of performing arts? If yes, with what organizations? How is this type of cooperation financed?

In Ukraine, international cultural cooperation in the field of performing arts is a widely-spread phenomenon. According to information of Les' Kurbas National Center of Theatre Art, we can mention the following initiatives: National Academic Theatre of Russian Drama Named after Lesia Ukrainka carried out a number of projects and workshop sessions in drama and state production together with its German partners. National Academic Drama Theatre Named after Ivan Franko had joint projects with producers from Poland, Russia and the USA and National Academic Theatre of Opera and Ballet Named after Shevchenko with producers from Italy and Germany. Les' Kurbas Center had projects with producers and scholars from Canada, the United States, Italy, France, Austria, India and other countries. Such projects are financed from the following sources: a) international grants; b) sponsors which sometimes are individual business (e.g. Korona company); c) participants/ own resources. Experts note that in this field there have been no cases on art patronage.

Vlad Troitskyi

Sometimes such projects emerge. Sources of their financing may include grants, sponsor's money or patron's funds. Within the framework of GOGOLFEST we have co-projects almost every year. Let me mention a joint performance with the engineer's theatre from St. Petersburg AXE called "Birthday" (financed by the theatre DAKH). a joint opening performance by the Spanish theatre "La Fura dels Baus" and the theatre DAKH (supported by the Embassy of Spain in Ukraine) and the project titled "Modern Drama Laboratory" conducted together with Moscow Theatre.doc (financed by the theatre DAKH).

The implementation of the international theatre project *The Gypsy Baron* in 2009 is an impressive recent example of a successful joint art project. The comic opera by Johann Strauss *The Gypsy Baron* brought together representatives of different countries – the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Belgium and Ukraine. The director and producer, Serhiy Proskurnia, together with Zdislaw Supierz invited to participate in the project the International Opera Foundation (Benelux) and impresariat *Supierz Music Management*. The first- night performance took place in Cherkasy Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama named after Taras Shevchenko and was followed by tours of the international group in the Benelux countries. The project was financed by the International Opera Foundation that paid honoraria to actors and actresses and covered all accommodation and transportation expenses. The overall cost of the project was estimated to be 300 thousand euro. The partner-theatre on the Ukrainian side covered only the cost of decorations, costumes and equipment, which later were accepted into the theatre's ownership. Besides, the Foundation gave the theatres a copyright for the performance.

Such cases of successful international cooperation in the creation of a joint artistic product on mutually beneficial terms are not common in Ukrainian realities. However, thanks to the efforts of individual theatre managers form a certain tradition.

Appendix

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
National Theatres		
National Academic Drama Theatre Named after Ivan Franko	Director General - Mykhailo Vasyliovych ZAKHAREVYCH Artistic Director - Bohdan Sylvestrovych STUPKA Managing Director – Danylo Danylovych FEDORYACHENKO	01001 Kyiv pl. Franka, 3 www.franco-theatre.kiev.ua nadift@franko-teatrekiev.ua
National Academic Theatre of Ukrainian Drama Named after Mariya Zankovetska	Director General - Anndriy Oleksandrovych MATSIK Artistic Director - Fedir Mykhaylovych STRYHUN Director of Accounting – Nonna Valentynivna RYDNYTSKA	79008 Lviv vul. Lesi Ukrayinky, 1 www.zankovetska.com.ua teatrlviv@mail.ru
National Academic Theatre of Russian Drama Named after Lesia Ukrainka	Director General & Artistic Director - Mykhaylo Yuriyovych REZNIKOVYCH Vice Director - Valentyn Danylovych MAKARENKO Head of Literary Section – Borys Oleksandrovych KURITSYN	01001 Kyiv vul. Bohdana Khmelnytskoho, 5 www.rusdram.kiev.ua kievrusdram@mail.ru
National Academic Opera and Ballet Theatre Named after Taras Shevchenko	Director – Petro Yakovych CHUPRYNA	01034 Kyiv vul. Lysenka, 5 tel: +38 (044) 234-04-24; tel/fax: +38 (044) 279-38-19. www.opera.com.ua operabalet@voliacable.com

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Lviv National Opera and Ballet Theatre Named after Solomiya Krushelnytska	Director – Tadei Oleksandrovych EDER	79058 Lviv Prospekt Svobody, 28 tel: +38 (032) 297-60-03, +38 (032) 242-17-90; fax: +38 (032) 297-60-03; + 38 (032) 272-88-60. www.opera.lviv.ua lvivopera@gmail.com
Odesa National Academic Opera and Ballet Theatre	Acting Director General - Mykola Moiseyevych KRYVORUCHKO	65000 Odesa provulok Tchaikovskoho, 1 tel: +38 (048) 722-22-30; fax: +38 (048) 722-49-04 www.opera-ballet.tm.odessa.ua teatr@stream.com.ua ,
Donetsk National Academic Opera and Ballet Theatre Named after Anatoliy Solovyanenko	Director - Vasyl Ivanovych RYABENKYI	83055 Donetsk vul. Artema, 82 tel: +38 (062)304-92-90, +38 (062) 338-09-69; fax: +38 (048) 305-04-73. http://donetsk-opera-ballet.org theatre2003@mail.ru
Kharkiv National Academic Opera and Ballet Theatre Named after Mykola Lysenko	Director - Lyubov Georgiyivna MOROZKO	61057 Kharkiv, vul. Sumska, 25 tel: +38 (057) 707-70-43, +38 (057) 700-40-46; fax: +38 (057) 700-40-49. http://www.hatob.org/
Kyiv National Academic Operetta Theatre	Director - Bohdan Dmytrovych STRUTYNSKYI	03150 Kyiv vul. Chervonoarmijska, 53/3 tel: +38 (044) 227-14-80 www.kiev-operetta.kiev.ua opereta@ukr.net
Vinnytsia region		
Vinnytsia Regional Academic Puppet Theatre <i>Zoloty Kliuchy</i> ("Golden Key") (communal ownership)	Director - Mykhaylo Dmytrovych BAYDIUK Vice Director - Valeriy Volodymyrivych ROHOVSKYI	21018 Vinnytsia vul. L. Tolstogo, 6 www.vinpuppets.joinfriends.com volt@ukr.net
Vinnytsia Regional Ukrainian Academic Theatre of Music and Drama Named after Mykola Sadovskyi (communal ownership)	Director - Volodymyr Vasyliovych LOZOVYI Artistic Director – Vitaliy Yevdokymovych SELEZNIOV	21050 Vinnytsia vul. Teatralna, 13 http://theatre.vin.com.ua/

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Volyn region		
Volyn Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director- Danylo Andriyovych POSHTARUK Vice Director – Mykola Petrovych KALISCHUK	43025 Lutsk vul. Kryvyi Val, 18 festival@lt.ukrtel.net
Volyn Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after Taras Shevchenko (communal ownership)	Director – Bohdan Stepanovych BEREZA Vice Director – Anatoliy Mykolayovych HLYVA	43025 Lutsk pl. Teatralnyi Maidan, 2 volyndramtheatr@ukr.net
Dnipropetrovsk region		
Dnipropetrovsk Academic Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after Taras Shevchenko (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Valeriy Ivanovych KOVTUNENKO Vice Director – Hanna Vasylivna BYKOVA	49000 Dnipropetrovsk vul. Lenina, 5
Dnipropetrovsk Academic Opera and Ballet Theatre (state ownership)	Director - Oleksandr Viktorovych SHAROVAROV	49070 Dnipropetrovsk prospekt Karla Marksa, 72a tel: +38 (056) 744-03-26; fax: +38 (056) 745- 42-02, +38 (056) 778-58-02
Dnipropetrovsk State Theatre of Russian Drama Named after Gorki (communal ownership)	Director – Leonid Yosypovych FURSENKO Artistic Director – Jan Oleksandrovych MELNYKOV	49070 Dnipropetrovsk prospekt Karla Marksa, 97
Dnipropetrovsk Regional Youth Theatre <i>Kamerna Stse- na</i> ("Chamber Scene") (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director - Volodymyr Oleksandrovyh MAZUR Managing Director – Oleksiy Mykolayovych HERASYMOV	49000 Dnipropetrovsk vul. Lenina, 9 (administration); vul. Plekhanova, 7 (theatre)
Dnipropetrovsk Municipal Puppet Theatre <i>Teatr Aktora i Lialky</i> ("Theatre of Actor and Doll") (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Mykhaylo Myklaylovych OVSYANYKOV Chief Administrator – Olena Hennadiyivna CHUMACHENKO	49108 Dnipropetrovsk prospekt Heroyiv, 40-a www.teatrkuhol.dp.ua teatrkuhol.dp.ua@gmail.com
Dnipropetrovsk Ukrainian One- Actor Theatre <i>Kryk</i> ("Shout") (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Mykhaylo Vasyliovych MELNYK	49000 Dnipropetrovsk pl. Zhovtneva, 15 www.krik-theatre.dp.ua krik@atlantis.dp.ua
Dniprodzerzhynsk Regional Theatre of Music and Drama Named after Lesia Ukrainka (communal ownership)	Director – Margaryta Andriyivna KUDINA	51925 Dniprodzerzhynsk pl. 250-ricchia mista, 2 teatr_2005@mail.ru

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Kryvyi Rig Municipal Theatre of Drama and Music Comedy Named after Taras Shevchenko (communal ownership)	Director – Nazar Yuriyovych CHYRKA Vice Director & Stage Director – Borys Leonidovych MARTYNOV	50000 Kryvyi Rig vul. Karla Marksa, 23
Kryvyi Rig Municipal Theatre of Music and Plastic Arts <i>Akademiya Rukhu</i> ("Academy of Movement") (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Oleksandr Hnatovych BIELSKYI Vice Director – Antonina Hryhorivna BIELSKA	50014 Kryvyi Rig vul. Shurupova 3 Akademiya_ruhu@mail.ru
Kryvyi Rig Municipal Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director – Olena Ivanivna KOVTUNENKO	50007 Kryvyi Rig vul. Kropyvnytskoho, 27
Pavlograd Theatre Named after B. Zakhava (communal ownership)	Director – Anatoliy AnDriyovych REVA Director of Accounting – Iryna Volodymyrivna VELKO	51400 Pavlograd vul. Dzerzhynskoho, 56
Donetsk region		
Donetsk Regional Academic Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama	Director & Artistic Director – Marko Matviyovych BROVUN Managing Director – Vitaliy Abramivych KARPOVSKYI Vice Director – Nina Stanislavivna KONONOVA	83055 Donetsk vul. Artema, 74a director@drama.donbass.com
Donetsk Academic Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Viktor Mykhaylovych STARIKOV Vice Director – Lilia Vasylivna PRYADUN	83003 Donetsk prospekt Illicha 18
Donetsk Regional Russian Drama Theatre Distinguished by the Order of Honor (located in Mariupol) (communal ownership)	Director – Hryhoriy Oleksandrovych CHEKALENKO Vice Director – Viktor Hryhorovych TYSCHENKO	87532 Donetsk oblast, Mariupol pl. Teatralna, 1
Donetsk Regional Russian Theatre for Youth (located in Makiyivka)	Director – Vladyslav Oleksiyovych SLUKHAYENKO Vice-Director – Olena Yevhenivna SCHEGOLEVA	86100 Makiyivka Prospekt Lenina, 64 maktyz@i.ua
Donetsk Chamber Theatre <i>Zhuky</i> ("Beatles") (non-state ownership)	Director – Yevhen ZHUK	83030 Donetsk vul. Oktiabria, 24, k. .27 tel: +38 (095) 5475577 olgazhuki@ukr.net evgen_zhuk@mail.ru
Folk Theatre of Music and Drama "OI" (non-state ownership)	Director – Liudmyla Viktorivna VASINA	Donetsk vul. Kirova, 24, kv. 20 tel: +38 (050)756-45-59 donklub@yandex.ru

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Zhytomyr oblast		
Zhytomyr Regional Theatre of Music and Drama Named after Ivan Kocherha (communal ownership)	Director – Natalia Mykolayivna ROSTOVA Artistic Director – Natalia Mykolayivna TIMOSHKINA	10014 Zhytomyr Maidan Sobornyi, 6 dramteatr_zt@mail.ru
Zhytomyr Academic Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director – Vitaliy Dmytrovych STRELTSOV Vice-Director – Viktor Mykhaylovych SKYBA	10014 Zhytomyr vul. Mykhaylivska, 7
Zakarpattia region		
Zakarpattia Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director – Vasyl Karlovych CHAYKOVYCH Vice-Director – Maria Vasylivna PORADA	88000 Uzhgorod pl. Teatralna, 8 bavka@rambler.ru
Berehovo Hungarian National Theatre Named after <i>Gyula Illyés</i> (state ownership)	Director – Yosyp Fedorovych BALAZHI State Director Attila Yosypovych VIDNIANSKYI	90200 Berehovo vul. Mukachivska, 1, bszinhaz@bereg.net.ua
Zakarpattia Regional State Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama (regional communal ownership)	Director – Zoryana Oleksandrivna ZINOVYEVA Acting Director – Anatoliy Opanasovych KRYMUS	88018 Uzhgorod vul. L. Tolstoho, 12 theatre@tn.uz.ua
Zakarpattia Regional State Russian Drama Theatre	Director & Artistic Director - Yuriy Stepanovych SHUTYUK Managing Director – Oleksiy Oleksandrovych UMANSKYI	89600 Mukachevo pl. Myru, 1 mukachevateatr@ukr.net
Zaporizhzhia region		
Zaporizhzhia Regional Theatre for Children and Youth (communal ownership)	Director - Vitaliy Mykolayovych SHKLYARENKO Artistic Director – Hennadiy Vadymovych FORTUS	69035 Zaporizhzhia vul. 40 rokiv Radyanskoyi Ukrainy, 55a
Zaporizhzhia Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director - Anatoliy Mykhaylovych KOLB Artistic Director – Nataliya Petrivna SOKOLOVSKA	69063 Zaporizhzhia vul. Gogolya, 60
Zaporizhzhia Municipal Theatre-Laboratorium We (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Viktor Vasyliovych POPOV Managing Director – Nataliya Vasylivna MOSKALENKO	69017 Zaporizhzhia ostviv Khortytsia, Naukove mis- techko www.art-jatse.org.ua ppp59@mail.ru

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Zaporizhzhia Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after V. Mahara (communal ownership)	Director - Valentyn Ivanovych SLONOV Artistic Director – Vitaliy Ivanovych DENYSENKO	69063 Zaporizhzhia Prospekt Lenina, 41 magara1@rambler.ru
Ivano-Frankivsk region		
Ivano-Frankivsk Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after Ivan Franko (communal ownership)	Acting Director - Volodymyr Volodymyrovych CHAYKIVSKYI Vice-Director – Dariya Petrivna KUZNETSOVA	76018 Ivano-Frankivsk vul. Nezalezhnosti, 42
Theatre of Folklore, Folk Holidays and Events (communal ownership)	Director - Nataliya Vasylivna TYKHONOVA Stage Director – Viktor Dmytrovych NEMISH	76018 Ivano-Frankivsk vul. I. Franka, 27/3
Ivano-Frankivsk Academic Regional Puppet Theatre named after Maria Pidhiryanka (communal ownership)	Director - Zinovi Illich BORETSKYI Vice-Director – Svitlana Dmytrivna YANUSH	76000 Ivano-Frankivsk vul. Sichovykh Striltsiv, 27-a if.teatr@gmail.com
Kolomyia Regional Ukrainian Drama Theatre named after Ivan Ozarkevych (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Dmytro Ivanovych CHYBORAK Vice-Director – Bohdan Ivanovych SEMENYAK	78200 Kolomyia, pl. Vichevi Maidan, 7 kolteatre@gmail.com
Kyiv region		
Kyiv Regional Theatre of Music and Drama Named after P. Saksahanskyi (communal ownership)	Director General & Artistic Director – Vyacheslav Valentynovych USKOV Managing Director – Hennadiy Mykolayovych SOBODA	09100 Kyiv Region, Bila Tserkva prov. Klubnyi 1
Kirovohrad region		
Kirovohrad Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after M. Kropyvnytskyi (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Mykhaylo Vasylyovych ILLYASHENKO Vice-Director – Serhiy Serhiyovych SERHIYENKO	25006 Kirovohrad vul. Lenina, 4
Kirovohrad Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director - Hryhoriy Mykolayovych PED'KO Vice-Director – Valentyna Vasylivna POMAZAN	25006 Kirovohrad vul. Preobrazhenska, 3a kotl@romb.net
Autonomus Republic of Crimea		
Crimean Academic Russian Drama Theatre Named after M. Gorki (communal ownership)	Director General & Artistic Director – Anatoliy Hryhorovych NOVIKOV Managing Director – Mykhaylo Mykolayovych FEDOSEYEV Commercial Director – Svitlana Volodymyrivna AKYMENKO	95000 Simferopol vul. Pushkina, 15

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Crimean Academic Puppet Theatre	Artistic Director & Director – Borys Ivanovych AZAROV Managing Director – Pavlo Volodymyrovych CHERNYI Chief Administrator – Iryna Mykolayivna PUZAKOVA	95000 Simferopol vul. Gorkoho, 9 www.ktk.com.ua krimkuk@sf.ukrtel.net ktsimf@ukr.net
Crimean Academic Ukrainian Music Theatre (communal ownership)	Director – Volodymyr Ivanovych ZAHURSKYI Chief Stage Director Borys Leonidovych MARTYNOV	95011 Simferopol prospekt Kirova, 17 ukr_teatr@mail.ua
Crimean-Tatar Academic Theatre of Music and Drama	Artistic Director & Director – Bilial Shavketovych Bilialov Managing Director – Reshat Abdurefiyovych AKHTEMOV	95011 Simferopol vul. Mendeleyeva, 5/1 bilal@sf.ukrtel.net
Luhansk region		
Luhansk Academic Russian Drama Theatre (communal ownership)	Director – Hanna Mykolayivna MYKHAYLYUK-FILIPOVA Vice-Director – Anatoliy Volodymyrovych LEONTYEV Vice-Director – Lyubov Borysivna ADVENT	91055 Luhansk vul. Kotsiubynskoho, 9a lordt@net.lg.ua
Luhansk Regional Academic Ukrainian Academic Theatre of Music and Drama (communal ownership)	Director – Mykhaylo Ivanovych KOSHOVYI Artistic Director - Mykhaylo Vasylyovych HOLUBOVYCH Chief Stage Director - Volodymyr Yuriyovych MOSKOVCHENKO	91031 Luhansk vul. Oboronna, 11
Luhansk Academic Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director – Serhiy Viktorovych TERNOVYI Vice-Director – Oleh Volodymyrovych STEPANENKO	91055 Luhansk vul. 16-Liniya, 7a
Theatre-Studio <i>Aha- T</i> (non-state ownership)		Luhansk kv. Proletariatu Donbasu, 9 tel: +38 (097)93 220 84 aga-t@ukr.net
Lviv Region		
Lviv Academic Youth Theatre Named after Les' Kurbas (communal ownership)	Director - Oleksiy Anatoliyovych KRAVCHUK Artistic Director – Volodymyr Stepanovych KUCHYNSKYI	79007 Lviv vul. Lesia Kurbas, 3 www.kurbas.lviv.ua Kurbas_theatre@yahoo.com
Lviv Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Yaroslav Volodymyrovych SYNYSIA Vice-Director – Hennadiy Yosypovych VARSHAVSKYI	79008 Lviv pl. Danyla Halytskoho, 1

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Lviv Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after Yuri Drohobych (located in Drohobych) (communal ownership)	Director - Mykola Hryhorovych HNATENKO Vice-Director - Vasyl Oleksandrovych KALYTA	82100 Lvivska oblast Drohobych pl. Teatralna, 1
First Ukrainian Theatre for Youth and Children (communal ownership)	Director General – Yuriy Vladyslavovych HREKH Vice-Director – Lyubov Yosypivna LYPETSKA	79007 Lviv vul. Hnatiuka, 11
Lviv Spiritual Theatre <i>Voskres-innia</i> ("Resurrection") (communal ownership)	Director - Yaroslav Vasylyovych FEDORYSHYN	79000 Lviv pl. Generala Hryhorenka, 5 goldlion@litech.lviv.ua
Theatre <i>V. Vozychuk & P. Levytskyi</i> (non-state ownership)	Director - V. VOZYCHUK	Lviv, vul. Medovoyi Pechery 39-a tel: +38 (093)4812539; +38 (063) 3196322 svnovograd@rambler.ru
Theatre <i>Pershi Kroky</i> ("First Steps") (non-state ownership)	Director - Nadiya MALYK	81400 Lvivska oblast Sambir vul. Mazepy, 7 +38 (067) 6806196 maryana.varkholyak@gmail.com
Theatre of Light and Shadow <i>Dyv</i> (non-state ownership)	Directors - Oleksiy ALIOSHKIN and Lyudmyla ALIOSHKINA	Lviv vul. Karpatska, 21 tel: +38 (097) 9514189 daria.alyoshkina@rambler.ru
Mykolayiv region		
Mykolayiv Academic Ukrainian Theatre of Drama and Music Comedy (communal ownership)	Director - Mykola Stepanovych BERGSON Vice-Director - Serhiy Leonidovych KHYZHNYAK	54017 Mykolayiv vul. Dunayeva 59, a/s 163
Mykolayiv Artistic Russian Drama Theatre (communal ownership)	Artistic Director – Mykola Antonovych KRAVCHENKO Vice-Artistic Director – Valeriy Oleksiyovych DIKSHTAIN	54001 Mykolayiv vul. Nikolska, 50 www.theatre.mk.ua nhrdt@mkasat.net theatre@mksat.net
Mykolayiv Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director - Viktoriya Petrivna TERESHCHENKO Vice-Director - Oleksandr Mykolayovych NOVIKOV	54001 Mykolayiv vul. Potiommkinska, 53
Odesa Region		
Odesa Academic Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after V. Vasylo (communal ownership)	Director - Valentyna Petrivna PROKOPENKO Artistic Director – Ihor Mykolayovych RAVYTSKYI	65023 Odesa vul. Pastera, 15 www.teatr.od.ua www.anons.od.ua

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Odesa Russian Drama Theatre (communal ownership)	Director - Oleksandr Yevhenovych KOLAYHORA Vice-Director - Neonila Antonivna LESCHYNSKA	65026 Odesa vul. Hretska, 48 www.rusteatr.odessa.ua rusteatr@te.net.ua
Odesa Regional Theatre for Youth Named after M. Ostroviski (communal ownership)	Director - Volodymyr Vasylyovych KHYMYCH Chief Stage Director Volodymyr Mykhaylovych NAUMOVTSSEV	65026 Odesa vul. Hretska, 50
Odesa Regional Puppet Theatre (the theatre was founded as shared property of territorial communities of region's towns, cities and townships and is subordinated to regional council)	Director - Anatoliy Bronislavovych SUKHARSKYI Artistic Director – Yevhen Yuzefovych HIMELFARB	65026 Odesa vul. Pastera 15 www.puppets.od.net teatr-kykol.od@mail.ru
Odesa Theatre of Music Comedy Named after M. Vodyanyi	Director - Olena Hryhorivna RED'KO	Odesa vul. Panteleymonivska, 3 tel: + 38 (0482) 25-09-01
Poltava region		
Poltava Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after M. Gogol (communal ownership)	Acting Director Oleksiy Mykolayovych ANDRIYENKO Artistic Director Oleksandr Vitaliyovych LYUBCHENKO	36020 Poltava vul. Zhovtneva, 23
Poltava Regional Puppet Theatre (shared ownership of region's territorial communities)	Director - Iryna Oleksandrivna CHERNIKOVA Vice-Director - Lyudmyla Hryhorivna DEMCHENKO	36039 Poltava vul. Pushkina, 32
Rivne region		
Rivne Regional Academic Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama (communal ownership)	Director - Volodymyr Yulianovych PETRIV Vice-Director - Nadiya Ivanivna KRET	33028 Rivne Teatralna Ploscha, 1
Rivne Academic Regional Puppet Theatre (regional state-communal ownership)	Director – Volodymyr Ivanovych DANYLYUK Vice-Director - Roman Anatoliyovych MYKYTYUK	33000 Rivne vul. Petlyury, 15 rivne_teatr@ukr.net
Sumy region		
Sumy Regional Theatre for Youth and Children (communal ownership)	Director General – Viktor Ivanovych KULEMZA Vice-Director for Administrative and Economic Affairs Larysa Ivanivna ZHARKOVA	40030 Sumy vul. Zhovtneva, 6

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Sumy Regional Theatre of Drama and Music Comedy Named after M. Schepkin (communal ownership)	Director - Anatoliy Ivanovych LESCHENKO Artistic Director – Oleksandr Ihorovych RYBCHYNSKYI Vice-Director for Administrative and Economic Affairs - Lyudmyla Vasylivna VASYURA	40030 Sumy Teatralna Ploscha, 1
City of Sevastopol		
Sevastopol Municipal Theatre for Children and Youth (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Lyudmyla Yevhenivna ORMANSKA Vice-Director – Iryna Heliyivna Tskhay	99028 Sevastopol prospekt Gagarina, 16
Sevastopol Academic Russian Drama Theatre Named after Lunacharski (communal ownership)	Director General & Artistic Director – Volodymyr Volodymyrovych MAHAR Commercial Director - Nataliya Valeriyivna BOBER	99011 Sevastopol Prospekt Nakhimova, 6
Ternopil region		
Ternopil Academic Regional Drama Theatre Named after T. Shevchenko (communal ownership)	Acting Artistic Director – Oleh Dmytrovych OLIYNYK	46000 Ternopil bulv. Shevchenka, 6
Ternopil Regional Academic Theatre of Actors and Puppets	Director – Ivan Vasylyovych SHELEP Chief Stage Director Volodymyr Mykhaylovych LISOVYI	46000 Ternopil vul. Sichovykh Striltsev, 15
Kharkiv region		
Kharkiv State Academic Ukrainian Drama Theatre Named after T. Shevchenko	Director – Margaryta Norikivna SAKAYAN Artistic Director – Stepan Volodymyrovych PASICHNYK	61057 Kharkiv vul. Sumska, 9 www.theatreshhevchenko.com.ua info@theatre-shevchenko.com.ua
Kharkiv Theatre for Children and Youth (communal ownership)	Director – Larysa Mykhaylivna DEDYULYA Vice-Director – V.V. DERHUNOV.	61012 Kharkiv vul. Poltabskyi Shlyakh, 18
Kharkiv Academic Russian Drama Theatre Named after O. Pushkin (communal ownership)	Chief Stage Director & Director – Oleksandr Serhiyovych BARSEGYAN Vice-Director – Oleh Petrovych SHEVCHUK	61057 Kharkiv vul. Chernyshevskoho, 11
Kharkiv State Academic Puppet Theatre Named after V. Afanasyev (communal ownership)	Director – Volodymyr Viktorovych RESHETNYAK Vice-Director – Vyacheslav Mykolayovych PANCHENKO	61003 Kharkiv pl. Konstytutsiyi, 24 puppet@ellipse.com.ua www.puppet.kharkov.ua

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Kharkiv Regional Theatre of Music Comedy (state ownership)	Director – Oleksandr Mykhaylovych DONSKYI	61052 Kharkiv vul. Karla Marksa, 32 tel: +38 (0572) 12-29-30
Theatre “Homo Ludens” (non-state ownership)	Directors – Lala BAGIROVA & Marina DAVYDOVA	lalahahirova@ukr.net +38 (097) 286 17 56
Kherson region		
Kherson Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director Viktor Oleksiyovych MOROZOV Chief Stage Director Borys Volodymyrovych CHUPRYNA	73013 Kherson vul. 40-richchya Zhovtnya, 8
Kherson Regional Academic Theatre of Music and Drama Named after Kulish (shared property of territorial communities of Kherson region – communal ownership))	Director General & Artistic Director – Oleksandr Andriyovych KNYHA Managing Director – Lyudmyla Volodymyrivna MELNYCHENKO Commercial Director – Iryna Vyacheslavivna BORDYUG	73003 Kherson vul. Gorkoho, 7 teatrkulisha@rambler.ru teatr@bigicom.net.ua
Theatre Art-Idea (non-state ownership)		73021 Kherson vul. Patona, 15 +380504944030 grendash@ukr.net
Khmelnyskyi region		
Khmelnyskyi Regional Theatre of Music and Drama Named after H. Petrovskyi (regional council's ownership)	Director – Larysa Petrivna PEREPYLYSYA Vice-Director – Halyna Leontiyivna PALIYCHUK	29000 Khmelnytskyi vul. Soborna, 60
Khmelnyskyi Regional Puppet Theatre DYVEN' (regional council's ownership)	Acting Director – Serhiy Mykolayovych BRYZHAN Chief Administrator – Lyudmyla Ivanivna BARCHYSHYNA	29001 Khmelnytskyi vul. Proskurivska, 46 www.diven.podil.com diven@podil.com
Cherkasy region		
Cherkasy Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after T. Shevchenko (communal ownership)	Director Volodymyr Oleksiyovych OSYPOV Artistic Director – Alim Ivanovych SYTNYK	18000 Cherkasy bulv. Shevchenka, 234 www.theatre-shevchenko.ch.ua theatre_cherkasy@uch.net
Cherkasy Academic Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director Lyubov Hryhorivna VELYCHKO Artistic Director – Yaroslav Ihorovych HRYSHETSKYI	18002 Cherkasy vul. Lenina, 4 www.chytlyalka.com jarkig@list.ru
Chernivtsi region		
Chernivtsi Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama named after O. Kobylanska (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Yuriy Mykhaylovych MARCHAK	58000 Chernivtsi pl. Teatralna, 1

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Chernivtsi Regional Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Director – Orest Stepanovych VASYLASHKO Vice-Director – Georgiy Todorovych ROSHKULETS	58002 Chernivtsi vul. Holovna, 22, a/s 27
Chernihiv region		
Nizhyn Ukrainian Drama Theatre Named after M. Kot-syubynskyi (communal ownership)	Director Yuriy Mykolayovych MUKVYCH Vice-Director – Ihor Oleksandrovych ZOTS	16600 Chernihivska oblast, Nizhyn vul. Vozdvyzhenska, 24 teatr@uacity.com www.nezin-dram.in.ua
Chernihiv Regional Children's (Puppet) Theatre Named after O. Dovzhenko	Director Ihor Oleksandrovych MADZHUHA Artistic Director – Vitaliy Volodymyrovych HOLTISOV	14013 Chernihiv prospekt Peremohy, 135
Chernihiv Regional Youth Theatre (communal ownership)	Director Hennadiy Serhiyovych KASYANOV Vice-Director – Tetyana Vasylivna KOVAL	14000 Chernihiv vul. Rodimtseva, 4 www.mtch.com.ua mt@gl.s.cn.ua
Chernihiv Regional Academic Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after T. Shevchenko (communal ownership)	Director General Ivan Oleksiyovych SEMENENKO Artistic Director & Chief Stage Director – Mykola Oleksandrovych KARASYOV	14000 Chernihiv prospekt Myru, 23
City of Kyiv		
Kyiv Experimental Theatre <i>Zoloti Vorota</i> ("Golden Gates") (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Valeriy Petrovych PATSUNOV Chief Administrator – Lesya Oleksandrivna SVYSTUN	01135 Kyiv vul. Richkova, 4 theatre@goldgate.kiev.ua www.zoloti-vorota.kiev.ua
Kyiv Municipal Academic Opera and Ballet Theatre for Children and Youth	Director - Volodymyr Volodymyrovych MELENCHUKOV	04070 Kyiv vul. Mezhyhirska, 2 tel: + 380 (044) 416-30-15
Kyiv Academic Theatre of Drama and Comedy on the Dniper's Left Bank (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Eduard Markovych MYTNYTSKYI Managing Director - Vadym Andriyovych AVDEYENKO	02002 Kyiv prosp. Brovarskyi, 25
Kyiv Academic Young Theatre (communal ownership)	Artistic Director – Stanislav Anatoliyovych MOYSEYEV Managing Director – Volodymyr Vasylyovych HALATSAN	01034 Kyiv vul. Prorizna, 17 www.molody.kiev.ua hamlet@i.com.ua
Kyiv Academic Puppet Theatre (communal ownership)	Artistic Director & Director – Mykola Ivanovych PETRENKO Vice-Director – Bohdan Valeriyovych STORCHAKOV	01001 Kyiv vul. Hrushevskoho, 1a puppettheatre@ukr.net www.akadempuppet.kiev.ua
Ukrainian Small Drama Theatre (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – V.H. KIMBERSKA	01034 Kyiv vul. Prorizna, 8

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Kyiv Academic Drama Theatre <i>Na Podoli</i> ("On the Podil") (state ownership)	Artistic Director & Director – Vitaliy Yukhymovych MALAKHOV Managing Director – Tetyana Volodymyrivna SHKURATOVA	01025 Kyiv Andriyivskiy uzviz, 20-a malakhov@ukrpost.net malakhov-vitaly@mail.ru
Kyiv Academic Theatre of Ukrainian Folklore <i>Berehynya</i> (communal ownership))	Artistic Director & Director – Mykola Oleksandrovych BURAVSKYI Commercial Director - Nina Mykhaylivna SOLOVEY	02152 Kyiv vul. Serafymovycha, 3
Gypsy Theatre of Music and Drama <i>Romance</i> (communal ownership))	Artistic Director & Director – Ihor Mykolayovych KRYKUNOV Vice-Director – Svitlana Georgiyivna YATSENKO	Actual address: 03057 Kyiv prosp. Peremohy, 38. Legal address: 03057 Kyiv vul. Yunkerova, 71 www.teatr-romans.com.ua amala@ukr.net
Workshop of Theatrical Art <i>Suzirya</i> ("Constellation") (communal ownership)	Artistic Director & Director – Oleksiy Pavlovych KUZHELNYI Managing Director - Iryna Vasylivna BATKO-STUPKA	01034 Kyiv vul. Yaroslaviv Val, 14-a travnevy@bg.net.ua
Kyiv theatre <i>Vilna Stsena</i> ("Free Stage") (communal ownership)	Artistic Director & Director – Dmytro Mykhaylovych BOHOMAZOV Managing Director – Olena Anatoliyivna BOHOMAZOVA	01054 Kyiv vul. O. Honchara, 71 bogomazov@svitoline.com
Kyiv State Marionette Theatre (state & communal ownership)	Director - Serhiy Hlibovych KANDYBA Artistic Director – Mykhaylo Petrovych YAREMCHUK	04070 Kyiv vul. Sahaydachnoho, 29/3 marionet@marionet.com.ua
Kyiv Academic Municipal Pup- pet Theatre (communal ownership)	Artistic Director – Serhiy Ivanovych YEFREMOV Director - Vyacheslav Borysovych STARSHYNOW	02192 Kyiv vul. Myropilska, 1 kamtl@i.ua
Kyiv Academic Theatre for Youth in the Lypky (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Viktor Serhiyovych HYRYCH Vice-Director – Natalya Vasylivna VIKARCHUK	01021 Kyiv vul. Lypska, 15/17 www.tuz.kiev.ua admin-tuz@bigmir.net
Kyiv Theatre <i>Koleso</i> ("Wheel") (communal ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Iryna Yakivna KLISCHEVSKA Vice-Director – Olena Mykolayivna BROSHCHAK	04070 Kyiv Andriyivskiy uzviz, 8 www.koleso.teatr.kiev.ua koleso@bg.net.ua
Municipal Theatre <i>Kyiv</i>	Director & Artistic Director – Valeriy Mykolayovych NEVYEDROV Chief Stage Director – Anatoliy Yuriyovych TYKHOMIROV Vice-Director – Olga Vitaliyivna НЕВСДРОВА Ольга Віталіївна	04071 Kyiv vul. Verkhniy Val, 40 www.teatr-kiev.ua info@.teatr-kyiv.kiev.ua

Institutions of Culture	Management	contacts
Kyiv Drama Theatre <i>Bravo</i> (private ownership)	Director – Lyubov Viktorivna TYTARENKO	01054 Kyiv vul. Honchara, 79 www.bravo-t.kiev.ua
Kyiv Theatre <i>Aktor</i> ("Actor") (private ownership)	Artistic Director – Valentyn Mykytovych SHESTOPALOV	Kyiv vul. Velyka Zhytomyrska, 40 www.teatr-aktor.kiev.ua aktor@teatr.kiev.ua
Modern Art Center "DAKH ("Roof")	Director – Vladyslav Yuriyovych TROITSKYI	Kyiv vul. Velyka Vasylkivska, 136 www.dax.com.ua mail@dax.com.ua
Kyiv Theatre <i>Vizavi</i> ("Vis-a-Vis") (private ownership)	Director & Artistic Director – Yevhen Vasylyovych MOROZOV	Kyiv vul. Mezhyhirska, 2 art-club <i>Egypt</i>
Art Center <i>Novyi Ukrainskyi Teatr</i> ("New Ukrainian Theatre") (non-state ownership)	Theatre's founder & Artistic Director – Vitaliy KINO	Kyiv, vul. Mykhaylivska, 24a tel: + 38 (044) 279-32-78; + 38 (067) 582-19-46
Theatre <i>Kyiv-Moderm Ballet</i> (non-state ownership)	Artistic Director – Radu POKLITARU	Kyiv vul. Mezhyhirska, 2 room 139 tel: +38 (044) 425-41-39
Art Workshop <i>Lelio</i> (non-state ownership)	Artistic Director – Lilia KLYMCHUK	02095 Kyiv vul. Knyazhyi Zaton, 21, kv. 458 tel: + 38 (067) 766-82-62 www.lelio.com.ua lelio@mail.ru
Show-ballet A6 (non-state ownership)	Artistic Director – Andriy (<i>translator's note – no last name in the original</i>)	Kyiv tel: +38 (050) 310 38 66; +38 (050) 444 74 24 fax: +38 (044) 235 42 67 a6@a6.com.ua
<i>Modern Ballet Dance Group Suziyya Aniko</i> ("Aniko's Constellation") (non-state ownership)	Artistic Director – Aniko REKHVIASHVILI	01034 Kyiv-34 tel: +38 (044) 234 54 57; +38 (050) 44 072 66 anikoballet@online.com.ua http://www.anikoballet.com.ua
Vadym Yelizarov's Dance Theatre (non-state ownership)	Artistic Director – Vadym YELIZAROV	Kyiv tel:+38 (044) 206 08 32, +38 (044) 206 08 34 www.ttve.kiev.ua
Art Center <i>Drugiye Tantsy</i> ("Other Dances") (non-state ownership)	Center's Director & Artistic Director – Marina LYMAR	49107 Dnipropetrovsk Zaporizke shose, 4/279 tel: +38 (056) 743-30-12, +38 (056) 371-0-971 lymarik@a-teleport.com http://www.freedance.org.ua

Database of National and International Festivals in the Field of Performing Arts in Ukraine:

- International
- National

International Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur Art	Organizer's Contact Information
International Theatre Festival DRABYNA ("Ladder")	Lviv city youth NGO "Mystetska Maisternya Drabyna" (Art Workshop "Ladder")	2002	annually	November, Lviv	amateur	Ukraine, Lviv drabyna@gmail.com Tel: +38(093)727-89-34 Olga; +38(097)905-39-31 Oksana
International Youth Choreographic Festival & Contest <i>Misteriya Tantsyu</i> ("Dance Mystery")	Charity Foundation <i>Postup</i> –XXI in conjunction with Foundation for Art Development Promotion	2007	annually	March, Kyiv	amateur	Ukraine, Kyiv pr. Lesia Kurbasa, 3-a, room 53 Tel: +38(067) 750 48 92 http://postup21.org.ua
International Festival of Modern Dance and Performance <i>Vilnyi Tanets</i> ("Free Dance")	Center of Modern Art and Performance <i>Drugiye Tantsy</i> ("Other Dances") in partnership with French Cultural Center and Alliance Francaise (Dnipropetrovsk)	1999	annually	April, Dnipropetrovsk	professional	49107 Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizke shose, 4/279 Tel: +38 (056)743-30-12, +38 (056) 371-0-971 Marina Lymar e-mail: lymarik@a-teleport.com http://www.freedance.org.ua
International Theatre Festival <i>Zustrichi v Odesi</i> ("Meetings in Odesa")	Odesa Regional Russian Drama Theatre and Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism	2006	annually	September, Odesa	professional	65026 Odesa, vul. Hretska, 48 Tel: +38 (048)7227250, + 7 (495)6504293 isnstd@mail.ru www.stdrf.ru
International Festival <i>Slavyanski Teatralni Zustrichi</i> ("Slavic Theatrical Meetings")	Regional Academic Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after T. Shevchenko	1989	annually	October, Chernihiv	professional	14000 Chernihiv, prospekt Myru, 23 Chernihiv Regional Academic Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after T. Shevchenko

International Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur Art	Organizer's Contact Information
International Festival of Children's Theatres <i>Interlyalka</i> ("Inter-Puppet")	Department of Culture of Regional State Administration and Regional Puppet Theatre	1990	Every 2 years, 2010	October, Uzhgorod	professional	88000 Uzhgorod, pl. Teatralna, 8 Regional Puppet Theatre Tel: +38(0312)23-30-49 e-mail: baveca@rambler.ru
International Festival of Puppet Theatres	Kyiv Academic Puppet Theatre	1991	annually	October, Kyiv Academic Puppet Theatre, Kyiv	professional	01001 Kyiv, vul. Hrushevskoho, 1a Tel: +38 (044) 278-05-66; fax: +38 (044) 278-05-56, puppettheatre@ukr.net, www.akadempuppet.kiev.ua
International Theatre Festival <i>Zoloty Lev</i> ("Golden Lion")	Lviv Spiritual Theatre <i>Voskresinna</i> ("Resurrection")	1992	Every 2 years,	September-October, Lviv	Amateur	79000 Lviv, pl. Generala Hryhorenka, 5 Tel/fax: +38(032)274-11-60; +38(032)274-13-00; www.goldenlion.lviv.ua
International Festival <i>Zirky Svitovoho Baletu</i> ("International Ballet Stars")	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration and Donetsk National Academic Opera and Ballet Theatre Named after Anatoliy Solovyanenko	1994	annually	October, Donetsk	Professional	83100 Donetsk, vul. 50-richchya SRSR, 149. Regional State Administration, Department of Culture and Tourism Tel: +38(062)305-39-49, fax: +38 (062)335-32-38

International Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur Art	Organizer's Contact Information
International Art Festival <i>Kyivska Vesna</i> ("Kyiv Spring")	Kyiv Main Municipal Department of Culture and Art and Workshop of Theatrical Art <i>Suzirya</i> ("Constellation")	1998	annually	May, Kyiv	Professional	01034 Kyiv vul. Yaroslaviv Val, 14-a Kyiv Workshop of Theatrical Art <i>Suzirya</i> Tel: + 38 (044) 278-45-87, +38(044)278-45-97, ravnevy@akcecc.kiev.ua
International Festival of First- Nights Theatre Performances <i>Melpomena Tavriyi</i> ("Tavriya's Melpomene")	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration and Kherson Regional Academic Theatre of Music and Drama Named after Kulish	1998	annually	June, Kherson	Professional	73003 Kherson vul. Gorkoho, 7 Tel/fax: +38(0552)49-22-30
International Theatre Festival <i>Odesa-Interteatr</i> ("Odesa-Inter-theatre")	Odesa Interregional section of the National Association of Theatre Artists of Ukraine	1999	Annually	September, Odesa	Professional	65026 Odesa, vul. Pastera, 62, Tel: +38(048)723-17-16, +38(048)723-11-21 Anatoliy Duda
International Art Festival Named after Bulgakov	Kyiv Main Municipal Department of Culture and Art and International Creative Foundation Named after Bulgakov	2000	Annually	June, Kyiv Academic Drama Theatre <i>Na Podoli</i> ("On the Podil"), Kyiv	Professional	01025 Kyiv Andriyivskiy uzviz, 20-a Tel: +38 (044) 425-54-89, Kyiv Academic Drama Theatre <i>Na Podoli</i>

International Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur Art	Organizer's Contact Information
International Festival of Ethnic Theatres <i>Etno-Dia-Sfera</i> ("Ethno-Dia-Sphere")	Department of Culture of Regional State Administration and Regional State Russian Drama Theatre	2001	Annually	May-June, Mukachevo	Professional	89600 Mukachevo pl. Myru, 1 Festival's Management Tel: +38 (03131) 21-359
International Ethno-Festival <i>Kraina Mriy</i> ("Country of Dreams")	NGO <i>Kraina Mriy</i> ("Country of Dreams")	2004	Annually	June, Kyiv	Amateur	04070 Kyiv, vul. Voloska, 18, room 5. NGO <i>Kraina Mriy</i> Tel: +38 (044) 432-89-66, +38 (067)466-59-69. Ukrainian and International Artists company Kyiv, vul. Khmelnytskoho, 61, room 8, tel: +38 (044) 227-75-69, info@andartists.com
International Children's Festival of Folk Choreography <i>Barvinkove Kruzhalo</i> ("Periwinkler's Circle")	Department of Culture of Vinnytsia City Council, Vinnytsia City Center of Artistic and Choreographic Education for Children and Youth <i>Barvinok</i> , Department of Culture and Tourism of Vinnytsia Regional State Administration and Regional Center of Folk Arts	2004	Annually	May, Vinnytsia	Amateur	Department of Culture and Tourism of Vinnytsia Regional State Administration 21036 Vinnytsia, Khmelnytske shose, 7 tel/fax: +38(0432)66-07-44; tel: +38(0432).66-11-93. Regional Center of Folk Arts 21100 Vinnytsia, vul. Arkh. Artynova, 33, Tel: +38 (0432)32-08-78, +38 (0432)32-49-42

International Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur Art	Organizer's Contact Information
International festival and meeting of theatre schools that prepare actors and actresses for animation theatres <i>Anima</i>	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration and Kharkiv State University of Arts Named after Kotlyarevskiy	2004	Every 2 years, 2010	April-May, Kharkiv	Professional	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration 61022 Kharkiv, pl. Svobody, Budynok Derzhpromu, pidlyzd 9 tel/fax:+38(057)705-21-16. Kharkiv State University of Arts Named after Kotlyarevskiy 61003 Kharkiv, Maidan Konstutsiys'ki 11/13, Харківський державний університет мистецтв ім. І. Котляревського, Tel: +38 (057)731-10-95
International Theatre Festival <i>Sisena Lyudstva</i> ("Mankind's Scene")	Cherkasy Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after T. Shevchenko and Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration	2006	Annually	March, Cherkasy	Professional	18000 Cherkasy bulv. Shevchenka, 234 Tel/fax:+38(0472)36-07-20. e-mail: cherkasy@uch.net www.theatre-shevchenko.ch.ua
International Theatre Festival <i>Podiyya</i> ("Event")	Kyiv Academic Theatre <i>Koleso</i> ("Wheel") and Kyiv Main Municipal Department of Culture and Art	2008	Annually	May, Kyiv theatres	Professional	Kyiv Academic Theatre <i>Koleso</i> 04070 Kyiv Andriyivskiy uzviz, 8 Tel: +38(044)425-04-22; fax: +38(044)425-14-36, www.koleso.teatr.kiev.ua, koleso@bg.net.ua

International Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur Art	Organizer's Contact Information
International Festival of Amateur Theatres <i>Pivdenni Masky</i> ("Southern Masks")	Department of Culture of Regional State Administration, Department of Youth Policy, Culture and protection of cultural heritage of Mykolayiv City Council and Federation of Mykolaiv Theatres	2008	Annually	April, Mykolayiv	Amateur	Department of Culture of Regional State Administration 54001 Mykolayiv, vul. Radyanska, 5, Tel:+38(0512) 47-38-62; fax:+38 (0512) 47-47-54 e-mail: kultura@mykolayiv-oda.gov.ua
International Festival of Theatre Schools <i>Natkhnen-nya</i> ("Inspiration")	MKT and Karpenko-Karyi Kyiv National University of Theatre, Film and TV Studies	2008	Every 2 years,	April, Kyiv	Amateur	Karpenko-Karyi Kyiv National University of Theatre, Film and TV Studies 01034 Kyiv, vul. Yaroslaviv Val, 40. Tel: +38(044) 272-1032
International Festival and Contest of Children's Folk Dance Groups <i>Zeleni Sveety</i> ("Green World")	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration and Chervonozavodskyi District Culture Center in Kharkiv	1996	Annually	August, Kharkiv	Amateur	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration 61022 Kharkiv, pl. Svobody, Budynok Derzhpromu, pidyzd 9 tel/fax:+38(057) 705-21-16. Culture Center Kharkiv, pl. Rudnyev, 19-a; tel: +38(057) 732-49-66

International Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur Art	Organizer's Contact Information
International Festival and Contest of Children's and Youth Circus and Variety Show Groups <i>Pontyiska Arena</i> ("Pontus Arena")	NGO <i>Pontyiska Arena</i> and Department of Culture of Sevastopol City State Administration	1998	annually	June-July, Sevastopol	Amateur	NGO <i>Pontyiska Arena</i> 99020 Sevastopol, prov. Novikova, 15, room 15. Tel/fax: +38(0692) 65-63- 47. e-mail: suf@ukr.net, http://arena.ho.com.ua
International Festival and Contest of Choreographic Art <i>Tantsyuyuchyvi Bryz</i> ("Dancing Breeze")	Crimean Ministry of Culture and Art, Kerch District Culture House and national ensemble of ballet dance <i>Radist</i> ("Joy")	1999	Annually	July, Kerch	Amateur	Kerch Culture House 98300 Autonomous Republic of Crimea, Kerch, vul. Lenina, 46 Tel: +38(8261) 2-01-69
International Project and Art Show <i>Nich u Lutskomu Zamku</i> ("Night in the Lutsk Castle")	Lutsk City Council and Department of Culture of Lutsk Executive City Committee	2007	Annually	June, Lutsk	Amateur	Lutsk City Council 43025 Lutsk, vul. B. Khmelnytskoho, 1, Tel/fax: +38 (0332) 7 20436; e-mail: culture@lutsk.ukr-pack.net
International Festival of Modern Dance GOGOLFEST	NGO Modern Art. Festival GOGOLFEST	2008	Annually	Kyiv	Professional	E-mail: gogolfest@i.ua, www.gogolfest.org.ua
International Holiday of Children's Choreographic Art <i>Stekhkamy Mavky</i> ("Following the Forest Fairy's Path")	Department of Culture and Tourism of Rivne City Executive Committee and Rivne City Culture House	1996	Every 2 years	August, Rivne	Amateur	Department of Culture and Tourism of Rivne City Executive Committee 33028 Rivne, vul. Kavkazka, 15 Tel: +38(0362) 22-11-93; +38(0362) 22-15-39

National Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur	Organizer's Contact Information
Festival of Non-state Theatres <i>Kurbalesia</i>	Kharkiv Theatre Center, Ukrainian Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Kharkiv Inter-regional Department of the National Association of Theatre Artists of Ukraine	2003	Annually	November, Kharkiv	Amateur	Les' Serdyuk Kharkiv House of Actors Kharkiv, vul. Krasina, 3 Tel: +38 (057) 706-34-82
Theatre Festival and Laboratory ART-ALTERNATYVA ("Art-Alternative")	International school and laboratory ART-ALTERNATYVA	2005	Annually	May, Donetsk	Amateur	Donetsk Tel: +38(095) 5475577 ev-gen_zhuk@mail.ru
All-Ukrainian Holiday of Theatre Art <i>Veresnevi Samotsvity</i> ("September Gems")	Kirovohrad Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after M. Kropyvnytskyi	1970	Annually	Last week in September, Kirovohrad and Mykolayivka in Kirovohrad district	Professional	25006 Kirovohrad vul. Lenina, 4 Tel/Fax: +38(0522) 24-14-22
Festival of Children's and Youth Art <i>Zymovi Vizerunky</i> ("Winter Ornaments")	Khmelnytskyi Regional Research and Methodological Center of Podillya Culture and Art and Exemplary Dance Ensemble <i>Podolyanchyk</i> of the Khmelnytskyi Art Palace for Children and Youth	1987	annually	January, Khmelnytskyi	Amateur	Regional Research and Methodological Center of Podillya Culture and Art 29013 Khmelnytskyi, vul. Volodymyrska, 103. Tel:+38(0382)76-45-20, +38(0382)79-55-51


National Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur	Organizer's Contact Information
All-Ukrainian Festival and Contest of Amateur Theatres <i>Rampa Druzhby</i> ("Friendship Lights")	Crimean Ministry of Culture and Art, Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies, Crimean Republican Research and Methodology Center of Folk Art and Department of Culture of Yevpatoriya City Executive Committee	1988	Every 2 years	August, Yevpatoriya	Amateur	City Center of Culture and Recreation 97414 Autonomous Republic of Crimea, Yevpatoriya, vul. Revolyutsiji, 52. Tel: +38 (269) 3-04-21
Open Festival of Theatre Art <i>Teatralnyi Donbas</i> ("Theatrical Donbas")	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration	1992	Every 2 years	November, Mariupol	Amateur	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration 83100 Donetsk, vul. 50-richchia SRSR, 149. Tel: +380(062)305-39-49; fax: +380(062)335-32-38
All-Ukrainian Festival of Theatre Art <i>Vid Hypanisa do Borysfena</i> ("From the Hypanis to the Borysfen")	Department of Culture of Regional State Administration, Regional Center of Folk Art, executive committee of Ochakiv City Council, Ochakiv District State Administration	1996	Annually	June, Ochakiv	Amateur	Department of Culture of Regional State Administration 54001 Mykolayiv, vul. Radyanska, 5. Tel: +38(0512) 47-38-62; fax: +38(0512) 47-47-54; e-mail: kultura@mykolayiv-oda.gov.ua

National Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur	Organizer's Contact Information
All-Ukrainian Festival of Author's Performances <i>Lyalkovi Randevu v Chernihovi</i> ("Dolls' Rendezvous in Chernihiv")	Chernihiv Regional Children's (Puppet) Theatre Named after O. Dovzhenko	1997	Every 3 years	November, Chernihiv	Professional	Chernihiv Regional Children's (Puppet) Theatre Named after O. Dovzhenko 14013 Chernihiv prospekt Peremohy, 135 Tel: +38 (0462)3-34-31, +38 (0462)3-42-41
Festival and contest of choreographic groups <i>Verkhovynsia Stepova Krynytsia</i> ("Verkhovynets's Steppe Well")	Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Department of Culture of Kherson Regional State Administration, Regional Center of Folk Art and Department of Culture of Novokakhovka City Council	1997	Every 2 years	September, Novokakhovka City Palace of Culture	Amateur	Regional Center of Folk Art 73000 Kherson, prospekt Ushakova, 16. Tel:+38(0552) 22-33-97, +38(0552)22-63-06; fax: +38(0552) 22-45-57
All-Ukrainian Festival <i>Ter-nopilski Teatralni Vechory. Debut</i> ("Ternopil Theatre Evenings. Debut")	Ternopil Academic Regional Drama Theatre Named after T. Shevchenko and Department of Culture of Regional State Administration	1999	Annually	November, Ternopil	Professional	Department of Culture of Regional State Administration 46001 Ternopil, bulv. Shevchenka, 6. Tel: +38 (0352) 52-20-71; tel/fax: +38 (0352) 52-62-55
All-Ukrainian Theatre Festival of Women's Art Named after Zankovetska	Nizhyn Ukrainian Drama Theatre Named after M. Kotsyubynskyi	2003	Annually	November, Nizhyn	Professional	Nizhyn Ukrainian Drama Theatre 16600 Chernihivska oblast, Nizhyn vul. Vozdvyzhenska, 24

National Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur	Organizer's Contact Information
Dance Festival <i>Zolote Kolo</i> ("Golden Circle")	Department of Culture, Tourism and Resorts of Khmelnytskyi Regional State Administration and Khmelnytskyi Regional Research and Methodological Center of Podillya Culture and Art	2004	Every 2 years	May, Khmelnytskyi	Amateur	Regional Research and Methodological Center of Podillya Culture and Art 29013 Khmelnytskyi, vul. Volodymyrska, 103. Tel: +38(0382)76-45-20, +38(0382)79-55-51
Festival and Contest of Choreographic Groups <i>Dniprodance</i>	Children's community organization Association of Dance Art Fans and the exemplary choreographic group <i>Zhemchuzhina</i> ("Pearl")	2004	Annually	March	Amateur	Vira Ivanivna Matveyeva e-mail: aatm@ukt; Tel: +38 (056) 774-08-30, +38 (056) 32-97-28, +38 (056) 59-64-02,
All-Ukrainian Festival of Theatre Art <i>Danapris</i>	Department of Culture and Tourism of Zaporizhzhia Regional State Administration and Zaporizhzhia Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after V. Mahara	2007	Annually	October, Zaporizhzhia	Professional	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration 69107 Zaporizhzhia, pr. Lenina, 164. Tel: +38 (061) 239-04-11. Zaporizhzhia Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after V. Mahara Tel: +38 (061) 764-42-87
All-Ukrainian Reader's Contest in Memory of Ostap Vyshnia	Sumy High School of Art and Culture Named after Bortnyanskyi	2007	Annually	April, Sumy	Amateur	40030 Sumy, vul Gagarina, 18

National Festivals						
Full Legal Name of the Event	Initiators & Organizers	Year of Establishment	Frequency of Conducting	Time and Place	Professional or Amateur	Organizer's Contact Information
All-Ukrainian Theatre Festival V Hostyakh u Gogolya ("Visiting Gogol")	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration and Academic Regional Ukrainian Theatre of Music and Drama Named after M. Gogol	2008	2009	April, Poltava	Professional	36020 Poltava vul. Zhovtneva, 23 Tel: +38(0532) 7-33-92
All-Ukrainian Festival and Contest of Folk Choreography Named after Vasyli Avramenko Hopak	Department of Culture and Tourism of Regional State Administration, Regional Center of Folk Art and regional office of the National Association of Choreographers of Ukraine	2008	Annually	May-June, Korsun-Shevchenkivskiyi	Amateur	Regional Center of Folk Art 18000 Cherkasy, bulv. Shevchenka, 131. Tel: +38(0472) 37-33-66; fax: +38(0472) 37-64-86

Authors



Ara Nedolyan, Armenia teatrologist, publicist, writer. Born in Yerevan, Armenia, graduated from the Yerevan Art and Theatre Institute, qualification - teatrologist, thesis - "Improvisation and Interpretation in the theater."

Enrolled in graduate school GITIS in Moscow, preparing to write a thesis "The function of the symbol in the dramatic text", but was forced to stop training in graduate school in connection with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the introduction of higher tuition fees in a foreign country.

He worked at the Art Institute of Armenian Academy of Sciences, wrote a study "The dramaturgy of Levon Shant". He edited and published philosophical journals: "Gnosis", in 1996-99, "Artziv" in 2008, worked in the journal "Language, Society and Communication" in 2010. Since 1989, participates in the Yerevan School game-technics and methodologies, operating game-technician.

Essayist, author of several political and philosophical articles and essays, in particular - "The essence of theater," "Art as Liberation Technology", "Ancient Greek revolution as an invariant for all subsequent revolutions". The author of the novel "Illumination" (2002). At the present he is a coordinator of the philosophical-political group "Little Council".

Sabuhi Mammadov, Azerbaijan currently employed by the IBRUS Independent Theatre. He is a Master of Arts and has worked in the field of theatre as producer, production manager, sound director and PR manager. He has also worked in cinema as casting manager and line producer. He has authored some documentary films and he has working experience in visual arts. Coordinator of the "East-West-2009" International Cinema Festival, manager of the TUGANLIK International Theatre festival. He has plans to organize an International Theatre Festival in Baku, create international theatre projects and to develop performing arts projects and small-scale theatre companies.

Victor Petrov, Belarus born in Minsk, Belarus. Graduated from the Academy of Arts in Minsk. Performer, curator "Navinki" international festival. Initiator and founder of art group for independent contemporary art "The Form". He was held about 25 exhibitions and actions of independent art in 5 countries, and also in Belarus. He makes performances since 1988.

Alexander Strelnikov, Belarus born in 1983, he made his PhD in Theatre science in Minsk. He collaborates with belarusian art-magazines as theatre critic and with Centre of Belarusian Drama as art-manager.

Tanja Miletić Oručević, Bosnia and Herzegovina, she is theatre director, lecturer, author and activist. Born in Sarajevo. She completed her directing studies in Krakow, under the tuition of, i.e. Krystian Lupa, and there she was one of the founders of Independent Theatre Studio Laznia. Miletić directed more than 30 professional theatre productions in theatres of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Poland, Czech Republic, Macedonia and Italy. Her performances participated in many significant international festivals and tours; they represented Bosnia and Hercegovina in the main programme of International Theatre Festival MESS three times. Her main interest is contemporary drama, so she directed several plays of south Slavic authors as their first stagings, and several European plays as first staging in the region (Sarah Kane, Mark Ravenhill, Magda Fertacz). She translated several books – i.e. Bakakaj Witolda Gombrowicza and prepared anthology of contemporary Polish drama *Mortal Kombajn*, published in Sarajevo.

Miletić founded department of drama at Faculty of Humanistics in Mostar, where she has taught for 8 years. She is about to complete her PhD thesis „Phenomen of Body in Contemporary Dramatic Theatre“ at Janaček Academy of Music Arts in Brno, Czech Republic.

Kalina Wagenstein, Bulgaria graduated from Sofia University in Journalism. She has worked for the Bulgarian News Agency, the National Film Centre and the National Film Archive. She has been a national representative of Bulgaria in the “EURIMAGES” Fund of the Council of Europe. From 1999 she was running the Sofia office of the Swiss Cultural Programme in South-Eastern Europe and Ukraine. During the nearly ten years of its operation in Bulgaria, the programme supported more than 400 projects in culture and arts, some of them with regional (Balkan) dimensions. In 2007 the Art Office Foundation has been created, with the financial aid of the Swiss Cultural Programme. Art Office is registered as a non-profit organization in public benefit engaged with promotion and circulation of performing arts. It works with Bulgarian artists and their artistic production and has activities in Bulgaria and abroad. In the last years Kalina Wagenstein had attended numerous trainings in cultural policy, project management, NGO management, fundraising, etc., in Bulgaria, France, Switzerland and Hungary.

Nelly Stoeva, Bulgaria assistant at the History and Theory of Culture Department, University of Sofia “St.Kliment Ohridski”. She has experience as a project coordinator at Theater 199 Valentin Stoychev, Sofia and as an expert in National Culture Fund with the Ministry of Culture. She took part in a number of research and practical projects in the field of cultural policy and management of the performing arts. Her research interests are directed towards arts development milieu in Bulgaria and Eastern Europe, the policies and regulative instruments, developing methodologies and indices for evaluating the effects of arts and culture programs and projects, as well as management of the performing arts.

Jelena Kovačić, Croatia playwright and translator. She graduated in Polish studies and comparative literature from the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb and is currently a graduate of dramaturgy at the Academy for drama-arts in Zagreb. From 1998 to 2002 she was a member of the group Theatre de femmes. Since 2003 she has been working as a dramaturg in different Croatian theatres. At the same time she started her collaboration with director Anica Tomić with whom she works on almost every project. She lives and works in Zagreb.

Jakub Škorpiľ, Czech Republic studied at the department of theatre sciences at the Charles University. Since middle of 1990s regularly publishes in newspapers, magazines and journals. Important is mainly his cooperation with “Denní Telegraph” (The Telegraph Daily; 1995-1997) and The Czech Radio – Station “Prague” (1997-1998). In 1996 co-founded and for four years edited theatre magazine “Obratel” (Vertebra), which was published daily during the Prague’s theatre festival of theatre high schools named “Zlomvaz”. In 1998 co-founded and for three years edited theatre magazine Cavea, which was issued for each performance of all season festival “České divadlo” (Czech theatre). Since 2001 is editor of theatre magazine Svět a divadlo. For almost 20 years is member of non-professional theatre company “Kulturné divadelní spolek Puchmajer” (or Antonín D.S. or Ing. Antonín Puchmajer D.S.). He is amateur actor, director, translator, passionate croquet player and mute at Opera of Prague’s National Theatre. He lives in Prague.

Levan Khetaguri (PhD), Georgia theatrologist, cultural analyst and culture manager, Professor and Director of Arts Research Institute of Ilia State University, President of Stichting Caucasus Foundation / NL/, Secretary General of Georgian ITI National center, founder of GRTN, member of European Cultural Parliament, invited expert and board member of various local and international institutions

Attila Szabó, Hungary theatrologist. He graduated in 2006 at the University of Pannonia in Veszprém on the Faculty of Theatre Studies. He has been employed by the Hungarian Theatre Museum and In-

stitute in Budapest since 2008, presently being the coordinator of the international department. He is writing a PhD in theatre history at the University of Pécs. He has been the coordinator of different international theatre research projects (TACE, ECLAP), organized international conferences in Visegrad cooperation and is the member of international research projects (STEP, Theatre and Coming to Terms with the Past).

Nelko Nelkovski, Macedonia theatre Director and Master of Theatre Studies from Republic of Macedonia. He is working at Macedonian National Theatre as a Director and Secretary for International Cooperation. He is a president of Theatre Youth of Macedonia and member and representative of Republic of Macedonia in these international theatre organizations: IATC, AITA/IATA, IDEA, ASSITEJ, IATU, AMATEO. He has done more than 100 participation in international symposiums, conference and projects in the country and abroad and he has done more than 300 theatre, film, *recherché* and NGO projects.

Larisa Turea, Moldova writer, playwright, journalist and theatre critic. Currently president of the AICT/IATC Moldova Section. Graduated from the Department of Journalism, Chişinău State University. University lecturer at the Chişinău State University and The Social Studies Academy (1992-2011). She was a vice-minister of Culture from 1992 to 1994, from 1994 to 1997 a member of the Cultural committee of the Council of Europe. She was a participant of the Remarque Institute Visitors program at the New York University, a prestigious scholarship within "Courant d'Est" program by the government of France.

Marta Keil, Poland performing arts curator. From 2008 cooperates with the Adam Mickiewicz Institute in Warsaw (www.iam.pl, www.culture.pl) as theatre and dance specialist. Curates the Dramaturgy Forum (www.dramaturg.e-teatr.pl), organized by the Zbigniew Raszewski Theatre Institute in Warsaw (www.instytut-teatralny.pl). Since May until October 2011 run together with the international curators collective an independent temporary performing arts centre Micamoca in Berlin (www.micamoca.com). Author and curator of the EEPAP project. Lives in Warsaw.

Paweł Płoski, Poland head of the literary department at the National Theatre in Warsaw. Member of the editorial board of "TEATR" – a Polish theatre monthly; member of the international team of "Svět a divadlo" – a Czech bimonthly magazine. He is a member of the Programme Board of Galeria El Art Centre in Elbląg and also a member of the Art and Programme Board of the National Theatre. PhD student at the Institute of Art of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Associate of the Aleksander Zelwerowicz State Theatre Academy, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University and Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities. He collaborates with the Pro Cultura Foundation. Author of the report *Organizational changes of theatre in Poland 1989–2009* for the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage.

Jeton Neziraj, Republic of Kosovo, former Artistic Director of the National Theatre of Kosovo, playwright. He has written over fifteen plays which have been staged and presented in Kosovo and abroad, in Europe and the USA. His plays have also been published and translated into several languages (German, English, French, Spanish, Romanian, Slovenian, Bulgarian, Serbian etc). His play *Liza po fle* [Liza is Sleeping] won First Prize at the national drama contest "Buzuku". Neziraj is also the author of dozens of essays on theatre, which have been published in local and international newspapers and magazines. He is also the author of several books, including a book on the famous Kosovan actor Faruk Begolli. Jeton Neziraj is the founder and leader of the cultural production company Qendra Multimedia. Neziraj lives and creates in the Republic of Kosovo. www.jetonneziraj.com

Iulia Popovici, Romania performing arts critic, editor and curator. Her current place of work is "Observator cultural" magazine in Bucharest. A graduate from the University of Bucharest, Department of Letters

(BA in Romanian and Latin Studies, 2002), she pursued her studies at the National University of Theatre and Film (UNATC), Bucharest, Department of Theatre (MFA in Playwriting, 2006) and is now a PhD student in Theatre Studies at the Arts University, Tîrgu Mureş/ Márosvásárhely, where she coordinates the translation workshop for MA students in Playwriting. Cultural journalist for the national newspaper "Ziua" (2002-2008), editor of the performing arts section at the national cultural weekly issue "Observator cultural" (since 2005, as well as employed by the National Theatre in Bucharest in 2008-2010. She writes regularly for different Romanian publications ("Scena.ro" monthly theatre magazine, "Long April – Texte despre artă", "Criticatrac" etc.). Jury member at several theatre festivals and journalism competitions. Independent expert for the National Center for Dance in Bucharest and the National Cultural Fund in Romania. In 2009 Iulia Popovici won a prize for theatre criticism, awarded by the "Timpul" Foundation.

Andjelka Janković, Serbia final year student at the Faculty of Drama Arts, Department for Management and Culture in Theatre, Radio and Culture. She is a production manager / programme coordinator in Bitef theatre since October 2010. She finished primary ballet school "Lujo Davico" in Belgrade and in the same time she started to dance Latin-American and Standard Dances. After 10 years she had a chance to compete as an amateur and professional dancer at all levels of competitions and to win medals. In the same time she was practicing ballet in Children Cultural Center and while travelling and dancing at festivals and in theatres all over the world she was discovering culture and art. At present she is a manager and producer in culture. She enrolled Faculty of Drama Arts, Department for Management and Culture in Theatre, Radio and Culture as a first on the list and she finished studies at the same level gaining ARCHONT award for the best student, innovative idea and successful management.

Vladislava Fekete, Slovakia studied Theatre Dramaturgy at the Department of Directing and Dramaturgy of the Theatre Faculty at the Academy of Performing Arts in Bratislava where she also received her ArtD in 2009. Among artistic work she focuses on translation, theatre theory and critique, organizing theatrical events and publishing. Since 6 July 2006 she works as the General Manager of the Theatre Institute.

Tomaž Toporišič (PhD), Slovenia dramaturg, translator, theatre theoretician and critic. His primary research interests are the contemporary performing arts and literature, specifically the interaction between the two fields. From 1997 to 2003 he was the artistic director of TheMladinsko Theatre, Slovenia. In 1995 he co-founded Exodos Festival of Contemporary Performing arts, has published papers on literature and performing arts. Currently he is a dramaturg of the Mladinsko Theatre in Ljubljana and assistant professor in Cultural Studies department at University of Primorska in Koper. He teaches Sociology of Theatre in Sociology department of Faculty of Arts, Ljubljana University. He is an author of books: *Between Seduction and Suspiciousness* (Slovenian Theatre of the Second Half of the 20th Century), Maska, Ljubljana, 2004. *The Vulnerable Body of Text and Stage* (Crises of the "dramatic author" in the theatre of the 1980-s and 1990-s), Knjižnica MGL, Ljubljana, 2007. *Ecdyses of Drama and Theatre*, Aristej, Maribor, 2008. *Reader Drama, Text, Scripture*, co-edited by Petra Pogorevc, Knjižnica MGL, Ljubljana, 2008.

Tina Peresunko, Ukraine. Master of international marketing and advertising (MA diploma on topic: Forming the principles of social marketing in the promoting of the national cultural product – at this time the draft law The National Cultural Product was being worked out in Ukraine). During last 3 she has been working as a host of the state radio Culture. Today she coordinates the project web-portal "Culture" (www.uaculture.com) supported by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Ukraine. Current position: Deputy Director of State Enterprise Newspaper and Magazine Publishing House of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Ukraine. This organization is subordinate to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Ukraine, which produces cultural, scientific and popular publications, including the newspaper "Culture and Life", "Krymskya Svitlytsya", "Ukrainian Culture", "Ukrainian Theatre", "Music", "Ukrainian Monuments", "Theatrical and Concert Kyiv".

The Adam Mickiewicz Institute is a cultural institution. The Institute's activities are part of cultural diplomacy aimed at promoting Poland internationally.

We organize and participate in cultural exchange programs abroad, working together with other foreign and international cultural institutions and organizations. We present Polish culture, past and present, with the support of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage and Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

We initiate and carry out cultural projects developed and implemented by a team of experts. We have a track record of organising outstanding cultural events and have equally ambitious plans for the future. Following the Polish-German Year, the Polish Season in France and the Polish Year in Israel, we have just successfully closed the Polska! Year - Polish Year in the UK. As part of these events we export the best of Polish culture (theater, film, art, opera, jazz and much more).

culture.pl web portal

is our Institute's multilingual information system about Polish culture. It contains news about events currently taking place in Poland and abroad, as well as a wealth of background material including biographies of prominent figures in Polish history.



