

**PROTOCOL**  
**Second meeting**

The meeting took place at Mime Centrum.

Attendance:

Gabi Beier, Benjamin Pohlig, Julia B. Laperrière, Moritz Majce, Anne Passow, Kareth Schaffer, Anna Muelter, Frank Schmid, Marie Schmieder, Alex Hennig, Nora Gatewood (Senatsverwaltung)

\*nota bene: As most participants of the AG were German speaking, the AG was conducted in German in English. Accordingly to the discussions that took place, the present protocol was also written in both languages.

Complementary documentation :

[https://pad.riseup.net/p/MONEY\\_and\\_FACTS](https://pad.riseup.net/p/MONEY_and_FACTS)

[https://pad.riseup.net/p/Jury\\_AG](https://pad.riseup.net/p/Jury_AG)

[https://pad.riseup.net/p/AG\\_Tanzhonorar](https://pad.riseup.net/p/AG_Tanzhonorar)

## **1. Introduction**

The meeting was led by Gabi Beier, Benjamin Pohlig and Julia B Laperrière.

Following the fact that a new plan for arts funding in Berlin has just been adopted for the next ten years, we thought the situation should be discussed, in order to understand what the current situation is. With a better understanding of this context, what should the goals and recommendations of the current AG actually aim towards?

Therefor, the first half of the meeting was dedicated to two presentations. One by Anne Passow, concerning the newly adopted funding system in Berlin, and one by the team who had met after the first AG to work on the idea of utopias and sustainable alternatives.

## **2. Presentation: Senat/Recommendations ZTB**

Anne Passow spricht über die neuen Verwaltungsvorschriften für Basis-, Konzept und Projektförderung, über was sich geändert hat bzw. neu eingeführt wurde:

- Es gibt nun eine kleine (bis zu 15000€) und eine große Einzelprojektförderung.
- Konzept- und Basisförderung werden jetzt getrennt. Konzept ist für Institutionen, Produktions- und Aufführungsorte (einzige Ausnahme Constanza Macras). Die Basisförderung ist für KünstlerInnen und Kompanien. Die Basisförderung gibt es jetzt auch als 2 und 4 jährige Förderung. Die Konzeptförderung für Spielstätten, etc. gibt es als 1,2 und 4 jährige Förderung.
- Bis vor kurzem gab es die Einstiegsförderung als Stipendium (damit gehört es als Stipendium nicht den allgemeinen Verwaltungsvorschriften an). Die Einstiegsstipendien gehen jetzt in Arbeits und

Recherchestipendien über. Wobei es jetzt erstmalig die kleine Projektförderung mit max. 15000 € gibt. Dies fällt unter die Verwaltungsvorschriften.

- Es sind für 2019 mehr Fördermittel geplant. Die Summe steht noch nicht ganz fest und bewegt sich zwischen 1,3 oder 1,6 Mio für die Projektförderung. Die Basis wird erst ab 2020 erhöht. Für Konzept gibt es noch keine Zahlen. Das Antragsvolumen aber steht bei knapp 20 Mio.  
- Wie hoch die Erhöhungen sein können, hängt am Doppelhaushalt 2020 und 2021. Die Kulturverwaltung will vom Runden Tisch klare Summen für die Haushaltsverhandlungen DoHH 2020 und 21.

- Gruppen, die jetzt Konzeptförderung beantragt haben, werden begutachtet von Konzeptbeirat, welcher über die 2 oder 4 Jahre Basisförderung entscheidet. Woher Geld kommt, ist noch unklar Problem Entscheidung ueber Geld erst im Herbst 2019  
- Alle Haushaltstitel und Förderpositionen werden neu evaluiert. Das betrifft dann Häuser sowie Gruppen. Im Moment wird die freie Szene reevaluiert, dann das Kinder- und Jugendtheater. Wer evaluiert Haushaltstitel? Frage der Transparenz: Was geschieht in der Systematisierung institutionalisierten und Kuenstlerfoerderung, wann und warum?

-WICHTIG: der Runde Tisch Tanz und und Gutachter der Konzeptförderung müssen Argumente finden, um mehr Geld in den Topf Konzeptförderung und andere Töpfe zu bringen.  
Es scheint plötzlich wieder viele Möglichkeiten zu geben, z.B. mit dem Kauf dse Radialsystems, Gespräche mit Besitzer Ballhaus Ost, Programmmittel für Häuser  
Konzeptgutachter haben die Aufgabe, den realistischen Bedarf zu ermitteln.  
Es gilt festzuhalten: Die Aufgabe des Runden Tisches und speziell der AG Money and more sollte darin bestehen Argumente und Summen zu liefern, die positiven Wandel bewirken können.

About basis forderung

9 artist from context of dance and choreography get 660 000 euro out of basisforderung  
to have idea of how many or how few.

### **3. Presentation Tanzhonorar** (see annexe 1 for complete text)

By Gabi Beier, Benjamin Pohlig and Kareth Schaffer

A leading question of this sub group is: Do we want to support art products or artists? Departing from the idea we spent time imagining a scenario in which every dancer in Berlin would be supported.

The utopian aspect being problematic, we would rather speak about a Tanzhonorar.

We want to develop some instrument that compensates dance artist for all the work they do that is not paid. It should not be perceived as utopian, but just as basic fair work practice. It is not a scholarship, not bedigungslos, not a basic income because it is not basic, but rather compensates highly skilled professionals for their work. It should also not be related to the idea of a "social" fund.

The idea is to support dancers. The little data we have shows that most dancers in the city don't earn a livable wage. And they actually cannot, within the funding structures as they are right now.

Testimony from Kareth: she has funding, and considers herself one of the lucky ones, yet she never made anything close to minimum wage.

The proposition for this Tanzhonorar as a utopian idea so far is a dance fee close to 1000 euro a month for every dance artist in Berlin. With the numbers of the ZTB (3000 dancers + 300 choreographers), this would approximate a budget of 37 million euros/year.

Why do we need it and why do we deserve it? Even though this idea is very broad and ambitious, we want to take the initial need to think of concepts that support the artists and not the art as a point of departure. To look at systems of support in Norway and Sweden for example and find a palpable, “not utopian” way this could be applied in Berlin. Because there are already similar models that exist. Systems that support the artist and not just the art product is already existing in other places. How can this be tangible in Berlin? Could this be an effective way to improve the lives of the greatest amount of dance artist in Berlin, which would therefore lead to higher quality of the art, because this quality is mainly influenced by the conditions in which this art is being made.

(Benjamin reads statement. See annexe 1)

Some crucial questions are still to solve :

Who gets in?

How do we decide?

- idea of using the KSK

- idea of the ZTB decides/evaluates

How does an artist prove she is continuously doing something and to whom?

---break---

After the break, the group split into two smaller working groups. One working on the idea of the Tanzhonorar, and the other one on propositions for the current funding system. However, it is also raised that issues such as Rehearsal / Storage Spaces, funding volume, two deadlines for project funding, and a need for Premiere (might be take out soon) has not been addressed yet.

#### **4. Current funding system / continuing the discussion**

An initial proposition was to develop arguments around specific points in the Verwaltungsvorschriften und Anweisungen and why we would need more funding for these ones. The smaller group started with a presentation by Frank Schmid of the way the current jury system works, its problems and the work overload, The conversation then evolved mainly about Jury systems and the very high (too high for the current jury's capacity) number of applications.

##### 1. Applications

a) How to deal with the very high number of applications?

About 330-360 to go through in six weeks, over the summer.

- Possibility of more than one deadline in the year. Problem of people reapplying. Possibility of many deadlines but limiting to one application?

- Possibility of giving production money to the houses, to take some pressure off of the funding system. Problem that this would only take down the number of applications from 330 to 310.

b) Making the funding system accessible

How to make sure the application system doesn't favour only one type of artist? Right now there is discrepancy between scholars, and university graduates, who are trained to write high quality text applications and those who haven't been trained to write. But the skill of text writing should not define your skills as an artist. Another example is the language barrier. More than 50% of the scene in Berlin happens in English or other languages, yet all of the funding system happens in German. Hiring a translator for applications is an economical load that should not be put on the artist. In both cases, being able to apply or not to funding should not be defined by economical capacities.

- Possibility of video applications or in person meeting
- Making it possible to apply in English. Have only the short version be translated in German, and the final report.
- Give jury members a diversity workshop (topic further developed in the Accessibility AG)

## 2. Jury work and composition

### a) Work conditions

We asked Frank to talk about how juries work

He described a lot of work between middle July/middle September, going through roughly 330 applications for both Einzel- and Basisförderung. This amounts to 6 weeks of preparation and 1 week of debate with all 7 jury members. He considers it a three month job, it is payed very little, and usually lasts for three years. At the moment, one huge problem is that nobody wants to be in this jury.

### b) Alternative Jury systems

discussing different models

- Viennese model: professional jury members for 3 years, employed full time. 3 people overlapping (one person changing every year) . Is there a problem of too much power?
- Dance specific juries vs performance juries. Should there be a clear distinction? No conclusion.
- Jury pool. Could there be a jury pool which is Part time payed? It is mentioned that Fonds DaKu works with a jury pool. This should be investigated further.

Further questions arose:

What about artists in the jury?

Dance experts vs judging by the peers. Should peers/fellow artists be in a jury pool? Problem of conflict of interest, if artists that are in the juries also want to apply to funding.

Could there be such a thing as jury duty? Could artists that work for a long time in Berlin, be asked to join the Jury? The diversity of the juries was also discussed in diversity/accessibility group. 1 suggestion : diversity workshops/training for the juries.

## 3. The power in which hands

The question of power both in relation to juries arose. Who is the gate keeper? Right now it is the jury. What if the houses could have money to give to artists? Would that create more options or only new gate keepers? Is it important that the artist can be separated from an institution?

The point was raised that if there was no need to a Spielstättenbestätigung, no need to have a settle premiere in a house before applying, then you would give the power to the artists. Because after receiving funding, they could choose the houses, rather the other way around.

Uferstudios as a way in. At the moment Uferstudios gives a Spielstättenbestätigung on a first come first served basis.

#### 4. Questions left open

The group didn't have time to talk about the actual changes/reorganisation happening in the system right now and where it is needed to pressure the Senat for more money.

#### **5. Tanzhonorar / continuing the discussion**

The group continued the discussion around concerns that we raised regarding the idea. It is clear that the term utopian is problematic for many and the group will not use it anymore. Furthermore, the group wants to come to a proposition of a model that is realistic and cannot be parried too easily by stating that it is just a dream. The main questions are:

How to communicate the concept?

How to situate it in other already existing models?, also in examples that are already existing  
how to communicate it to people and make it understandable, relatable?

What the group would like to come to is a proposition for a secondary/complementary funding branch (not in competition to the Einzel, etc. Funding), but that allows to support the artist rather than the art product.

The group discusses what kind of angle to take to communicate this convincingly and with urgency to politicians. To do so, the group would like to illustrate the costs of being an artists. The invisible costs and work with the body that is already done even before jobs or funding is secured. This extends from taking class to writing applications, etc. The idea would be to communicate a dancer's day and routine (perhaps we could even invite politicians to spend such a day with us?). In this regard the group also discussed that the invisible costs of being an artists necessarily limits who can be an artist in the first place. Not everyone can afford to work for free for a long time.

The idea remains to find a system that creates sustainability of already done, unpaid work. Even though Einstiegs and Research Scholarships are approaching these issues, they are not enough. A system that supports artist and enables them to do their work self-directedly might also cut down on bureaucracy. It looks like there is some changes in funding systems that recognise a similar need, to enable self-directed projects (Kareth mentions the Pina Bausch Fund in NRW).

The campaign of the BBK for Zeitstipendien is brought up. We should look at what they demanded, how they phrased that demand, and how we could learn from it. Why did they fail? It is mentioned that even though the BBK failed, the current Recherchestipendien are a response to their campaign. It is raised however that the Recherchestipendien are still very much in the mindset of production.

In general, there is a need to look at real world model such as Norway and Sweden to see what kind of support model this could be. What are the achievements and short comings of already existing models? The group wants to take the time to imagine totally new funding possibilities. While it recognises the need to discuss the already existing model and upcoming changes in order to pressure for more money, it is also important to learn from other models and perhaps find ways to support artists differently as currently is the way.

There is a further concern that focusing and phrasing the concepts as for dancers only will create separatism amongst the different art field. The counter to this is that we are a group representing dancers and that this could serve as an avant garde model for other art field.

## 6. Conclusion

At the end of the meeting, everybody rejoined to discuss the conclusion of the two groups, and decided on what direction to take for the next meeting.

The group decided to focus on these three topics for the next meeting:

-FUNDING

-JURY

-TANZHONORAR

For this it would be helpful if the following work / information could be done / gathered before the next meeting:

- How many artists are being funded right now? How much funding money is there?
- What kind of jury examples are there, jury pool, etc. What are the model in other countries (in the netherlands for example)? What are models to achieve a diverse jury?
- Find out how other already existing models work and how they could support the idea and concept of a Tanzhonorar (Norway, Sweden)

Anything that is being found, can be posted on the following pads online for everyone to see:

[https://pad.riseup.net/p/MONEY\\_and\\_FACTS](https://pad.riseup.net/p/MONEY_and_FACTS)

[https://pad.riseup.net/p/Jury\\_AG](https://pad.riseup.net/p/Jury_AG)

[https://pad.riseup.net/p/AG\\_Tanzhonorar](https://pad.riseup.net/p/AG_Tanzhonorar)

## Annexe 1

### Ongoing work from Sub AG Tanzhonorar

#### Round Table Working Group Money & More

*The "Utopia" of an artist's basic income (DANCE FEE - TANZHONORAR? TANZSTIPENDIUM? sustainability grant/support?)*

#### Intro

In the following text we will propose a possible approach to the problem of the chronically underfunded dance scene of Berlin and describe a vision of how to make artistic work in this city sustainable on a long term basis for all practising artists.

The following is also an exercise in utopian thinking. We assert here that dreaming is the key tool to make things better. This is as much a political as an artistic intervention that does not want to simply accept band-aids for the pressing issues that we as cultural workers all face today. Furthermore, we assert that any utopian projection is an opportunity to highlight problems and needs which can lead to finding actual and palpable solutions.

#### Statement

We firmly believe that we need to totally rethink the idea behind the current funding system. What we want is a system that supports the artist, not the art. We want to support the artistic work, the daily craft and practise of body and mind, which eventually leads to the dance work, the art. But the latter, the product, can only happen if we enable the first, the practising of curiosity through our bodies. Art is a social good, it is integral to the public culture of our democracy. We want to value it as a service to the public and in the same breath be valued as active participants of that social culture. We need to allow artists to nurture themselves in order to nurture the art. However, right now the artist is kept in perpetual precarity in which paid work is sparse and often not paid well enough, and free work is a constant and large part of our daily routines. We might even have to spend our own money to be able to work at all, in order to take class, see performances, or travel for work. We work regardless of these drawbacks, because we are highly motivated and passionate. However, we experience discrimination as our (low) economic position as freelance artists makes it easy to call us lazy or not interested in working at all. Our peristent presence within multiple national and international art markets, our resumes and the state of our minds and bodies prove that to be a false and biased opinion, that can be sustained only by the people that refuse to acknowledge and inform themselves that at the present moment of capitalist development, work and money can be well separated, and the distribution of wealth and social security of workers is in hands of the few who economically prevail at the expense of the working masses. We cannot envision the future of dance without engaging in the systemic critique of the complex network of working relations and production relations that make the artists the

least important aspect of art production. The improvement of the institutional situation is of course desirable, but only if it's based on the improvement of the situation of artists whose work is commodified at will by people that seem often to have very little understanding of what are the actual conditions faced by an artist at work. But we are also highly trained and skilled cultural workers who want to be able to do what they were trained for. We don't want to spend our energy on survival but on making art and contributing to society. We want to make art that isn't tainted by our daily experiences of precarity but by our curiosity for the many expressions and insights of the moving body. We want to support the dance artist and not the dance work. Thus, we propose to rethink the funding system, to add a second branch to the current project-oriented funding, one that aims to support the artistic work and life of Berlin's dance artists. What we propose is a DANCE FEE for all dance artists working and living in Berlin.

### **Concept / Idea / Implementation**

#### **Who can get it?**

Dance artists that have been working in the field of dance/choreography in Berlin for minimum 2 (1, 3???) years.

#### **How long can you get it?**

Depending on how long the dance artist has been working in the field of dance/choreography in Berlin one can get the Dance Fee for 1, 2 or 10 years.

#### **Who decides who gets it?**

model #1) KSK delivers all Berlin insured artists with numbers D01 and D16. Disadvantage: D01 contains also Musical and Show; D16 also contains Ballettmeister\*in

model #2) ztb decides. It would mean that everybody who starts working as a dance artist in Berlin must apply to get a member of ztb (strengthens the Verein!).

#### **How much is the dancers fee?**

Tanzbüro Berlin counts with 3.000 professional dance artists in Berlin. As a monthly fee we suggest 1.000,- Euro. I.e. 36 Mio Euro total.

#### **How to prove that recipients work as professional dance artists?**

Each recipient has a spot in a (ztb based?) database where she/he writes an annual report and the plan for the next year.

### **Best practice examples**

Sweden (long term grants (<https://www.konstnarsnamnden.se/Sve/PDFer/Application%20Working%20and%20Long%20term%20grant%20%202017.pdf>):

Long term grants are intended to provide professional artists with the opportunity to concentrate on and develop their artistic work. For example, the grants may be used to cover expenses related to work and subsistence during a period of focused activities, investments, further education or renting work spaces. The long term grant is awarded to an active artist with a documented artistic practice of a high quality for a sustained period of time.

The committee can also distribute the grant without application.

A long term grant holder can't at the same time have a permanent employment more than 50%.

Testimonies

Kareth Schaffer dancer/choreographer



Entrance into professional dance field: 2012

Graduated HZT Berlin 2013

Recipient of Einstiegsförderung 2013 (€5000)

Recipient "Tanzrecherche" (NRW) 2014 (€2400)

received co-production from Tanztage 2016 (€2000) for the piece "An Animal Went Out"

received Hauptstadtkulturfonds 2016 (€29000) for the piece "Unheard Of"

received Hauptstadtkulturfonds 2018 (€42000) for the piece "Cassandra Has Turned 2"

OBJECTIVELY, I am relatively successful (and lucky!) in navigating the Berlin municipal funding system. So far.

List of artists receiving cultural funding from Berlin or Bund that I have done PAID work for:

List of artists receiving cultural funding from Berlin or Bund that I have done UNPAID work for:

List of artists and other cultural workers I have PAID to work for with me:

List of artists and other cultural workers who have done UNPAID work for me:

Income for the years 2012-2017, as per my Einkommensteuerbescheid:

2012: €7570

2013: €4192

2014: €6639

2015: €9205

2016: €14570

2017: €8521

....I have also been lucky to be the recipient of various tax-free scholarships over the years (in total €7400 and had a mini-job in 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2017 that also does not count as taxable income)

Future amount of pension I will receive from the German government in 2054, if I paying in the average amount of the last 5 years: €348,51

NEVER HAVE I EVER: earned the equivalent salary of someone working a full-time minimum wage job, despite (obviously) working in capacities with a responsibilities well above a minimum-wage skill-set.

NEVER WILL I EVER:

SURVIVAL STRATEGIES: Hold on to your old rental contract. Get married.