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Aim and scope of the book
In his lecture titled ‘The University without Condition’ (2002), Jacques Derrida puts forward the claim that the public university, and within it, the Humanities, must remain unconditional in their autonomy, free of any national, ideological or economic affiliations, able to profess, set free any thought. Rather than being understood as safeguarding a privilege or entitlement, this unconditionality is formulated as a pledge of responsibility, a status that is affirmed and maintained by a profession of faith. Derrida evokes in this essay three notions that are of central importance to the proposed book: the critical role of the Humanities in the organization of what he terms mondialisation or worldwide-ization; the performative, embodied nature of knowledge production, and the order of the ‘as if’, the training of the imagination to not only make sense of the present, but also to generate the ferment, from which knowledge that does not yet exist may emerge. This marks a characteristically theatrical perspective in as far as the objects of performance studies are critically tied to the lens through which these objects are constituted as performance. The mode of ‘as if’ shapes the inquiry in two directions: into new ways of thinking and knowing, and new things to think and know about.

In the spirit of Derrida’s plea of putting to work the unconditional sovereignty of the Humanities, the proposed volume focuses on the specific contribution of International Performance Research to knowledge production in the field. Concretely, this is addressed through essays reflecting on the experiences of a seven-year long collaborative pedagogical effort in the form of a joint international inter-university collaboration funded by the European Commission, namely, the Erasmus Mundus postgraduate programme in
International Performance Research (MAIPR). This MA Programme was organised in terms of three core modalities: academic scholarship, creative practice and curation. The essays in this volume reflect on the larger, pertinent question of the performative constitution of knowledge: what are the teaching and learning practices in Theatre and Performance Studies that constructively and critically unsettle the relation between subject, object and mode of study in the Humanities? How do pedagogical practices in the field consistently re-calibrate the relationship between theory and practice? Pedagogy in higher education, the dialogue between the work of teaching and the work of learning, forms a crucial axis around which these questions revolve. The volume specifically focuses on the challenges of teaching and studying a discipline that works with and through the performative, where embodied learning and the presence of students and faculty from around the world are crucial in determining the objects of research.

The volume brings together contributions by core faculty of the MAIPR programme, renowned guest scholar-practitioners who served as teachers and critical interlocutors, as well as jointly authored contributions by alumni. Rather than being an exercise in impact assessment, evaluation and measuring ‘performance outputs’ of one specific European-funded international inter-university collaboration, the volume meta-critically examines the politics of such educational incubator policies on higher education in the Humanities today, asking if International Performance Research, echoing Derrida, might be qualified as an unconditional discipline. What are the contributions of performance pedagogy to knowledge formation in the discipline?

We are fully aware of the high pretentions these questions raise. As European higher educational policies push forward a version of internationalisation that seeks to compete against US-American programmes and strives to gain profitable access to the growing ‘market’ of immaterial knowledge capital, the location of the MAIPR programme within the
framework of the neoliberal university and its specific economic and political conditions cannot be ignored. Indeed the MAIPR programme confronted us with these contradictions of the global university. The European initiative of financing joint and collaborative Erasmus Mundus Master programmes was in itself an outcome of harsh transformations in the European higher education system. These transformations form part of a burgeoning global market in cognitive capitalism, resulting in the commercialisation of knowledge as well as the immaterialisation of labour (Lazzarato 1996; Lorenz 2014). It is not surprising that these developments have had a drastic impact on teaching and research. In a sharp analysis of these developments, Bill Readings claimed as early as 1996 in his book *The University in Ruins*:

“The decline of the nation state and of culture as a national ideology is changing not only the traditional role of the university, but is also complicating the understanding of the categories which could help us to analyse these changes” (Readings 1996, p. 106). This book concurrently asks the question of what categories the field of International Theatre and Performance Research offers, in responding to and analysing the changes that so profoundly shape the current state of the discipline in universities across the world?

As Wendy Brown writes in her *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution* (2015), the corporatization of higher education, which is sweeping around the world, has created a situation in which “knowledge, thought, and training are valued and desired almost exclusively for their contribution to capital enhancement” (2015, p. 177). In other words, under the restrictive model of rationality known as neoliberalism, knowledge is conceived almost exclusively as property, commodity, and a measurable commercial asset, rather than sought “for developing the capacities of citizens, sustaining culture, knowing the world, or envisioning and crafting different ways of life in common” (pp. 177-8). Writing about the US context, for instance, Brown points out that even though the post-war extension of liberal arts education to the many did not generate true educational or for that matter social equality, it
has still articulated equality as an ideal. Furthermore, while the acquisition of a college degree promised upward social and economic mobility for working-class or lower-middle-class students, college also enabled an expanded view of and encounter with the world. As Brown argues, “this ideal never ceased to be a classically liberal one, but it was a liberalism of profound egalitarian commitments, rich humanism, and a strong ethos of the public good” (2013, p. 187). The transformation wrought by the orientation of education towards neoliberal values and goals has created a climate in which students see education as an investment that should secure them a decent job upon graduation. Education is an expensive investment, and students are consumers who expect a good return on their investment. Such a conception of education’s role in society also has as one of its consequences the low prioritisation of the Humanities and Social Sciences, fields that are perceived as detrimental to the pursuit of economic success.

The price paid for falling prey to the pressure of increased economic efficiency and output is immense, leading to the technocratisation of the university on an international level (Spivak 2014, p. 4). If the function of higher education is increasingly defined by market values, what happens to the critical potential and cultural value of the university as a profession, one of the purposes of which is to serve the reflexive self-conception of societies? For Gayatri Spivak, the task of aesthetic education lies in nothing less than training the imagination for epistemological change (2014, p. 9).

These developments come with their own pedagogical challenges and dilemmas, such as how to deal with the relationship between a teaching environment that is accompanied by standardised uses of technology, so-called ‘traditional’ knowledge systems and the diversity of knowledge that every student brings to an international classroom. The internationalisation of higher education has been criticised for being a pursuit originating from the needs of Western societies in the age of globalisation, side-lining any discussions as to whether
globalisation and its consequences have been equally beneficial across the globe. Yet it is also possible to distinguish between different dimensions of internationalisation in higher education. Alongside the commodification of higher education and its attendant habits of consumerism lies the reality of a diverse, international, trans-cultural learning environment, which offers students, teachers and researchers the opportunity to transcend their geographical, historical and cultural confines.

In their book *Dispossession: The Performative in the Political* (2013), Judith Butler and Athena Athanasiou also point out to the need to “recover and reclaim the uncommodifiable unconditionality of the university” (p. 189), while at the same time reminding us that “universities have always been places of power, hierarchy, inequality, and asymmetrical political economy” (ibid.). Therefore, it comes as no surprise that in recent years we have witnessed students at universities around the world protesting against the cost of tuition, against regimes of university governance, and against the financialisation of higher education. As Athanasiou relates anecdotally, one of the most striking scenes from these protests was the “book bloc” – protestors claiming the streets of Rome, London, and other cities wearing book shields, defending public universities and libraries. The list of books that have taken part in the book bloc ranged from Adorno’s *Negative Dialectics* and Virginia Woolf’s *A Room of One’s Own*, to Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot*, Butler’s *Gender Trouble* and Derrida’s *Spectres of Marx*. An image of a policeman raising his baton against a protester carrying a placard shaped as the cover of Derrida’s *Spectres of Marx*, reminds us, writes Athanasiou, not only that “those recurring spectres still haunt capitalism,” but also that “sometimes we have to fight for our books, with our books” (p. 189, original emphasis). This leaves us with the pressing question of how to safeguard and sustain institutional sites where critical debates can be had or where students will have the opportunity to read and debate books such as Derrida’s.
Pointing to the future of the profession in a ‘university without condition’, Derrida’s essay drafts a space of a possibility for higher education contingent upon the Humanities. Employing the conditional clause, the essay points to the modus of the ‘as if’ as the performative force necessary to overcome the current neoliberal predicament of the university (2002, p. 202). Combining the term ‘professor’, linked to the notion of the labourer (le travailleur) with the verb ‘to profess something, to proclaim’, Derrida challenges us to think the future of the profession, the work of professing the Humanities in a university, in a performative way.

What does this mean for Performance Research? The question at hand is to which extent a field designated as Performance Research might be imagined as a privileged space of the New Humanities that Derrida envisions. Performance Research could ask itself to which extent it has the means to confront this challenge, especially if we work with Derrida’s claim that imagining new forms of knowledge should transcend the traditional separation between the arts and sciences. This comprises the ‘work’ of the ‘professor’, a work that is simultaneously a profession of faith, a pledge, a promise or a commitment to the Humanities, linking “faith to knowledge, faith in knowledge, (…) to articulate movements that could be called performative with constative, descriptive or theoretical movements” (2002, p. 208-9).

The performative politics of protest movements demanding the safeguarding of the public university in general, and of the Humanities in particular, invite us to rethink the ‘is performance and ‘as performance’ distinction in Richard Schechner’s approach to Performance Studies. As such Performance Studies offers a perspective on every day life actions and events, ‘as if’ they would matter as performance; while on the other hand every day life actions and events are brought into what is performance or theatre production. This multi-directional perspective opens up spaces for inclusive, embodied practices of making and creating knowledge in the domains of the Humanities. But if Derrida clearly locates his idea
of the New Humanities in the tradition of the enlightened, humanist, Western university, how might this call for a diversity of knowledge find its place in a university environment critical towards the legacies of the Enlightenment? In the sense of Derrida, the answer cannot lie merely in banishing (or attempting to banish) the spirits that haunt academic knowledge. We can deconstruct them, but not un-do them. Consequently he claims that the humanities of tomorrow should not only study their knotted histories, but also the concepts through which they were instituted. He stresses hereby the performative force, to put to work a certain ‘as if’ that would “(...) lead to practical and performative transformations and would not forbid the production of singular oeuvres” (2002, p. 231).

Walter Mignolo has argued that the decolonisation of knowledge occurs in acknowledging the sources of geopolitical locations of knowledge, while at the same time restituting knowledges and ways of knowing that have been silenced, suppressed, repressed or disavowed by the epistemological dominance of particular forms (2014, p. 589). This implies calling into question the naturalisation of the Western foundation of knowledge (theology, secular epistemology, and secular hermeneutics), as well as acknowledging the diversity of knowledge and Non-Western ways of knowing in the planet that were colonised and appropriated by Western languages, institutions, actors, and categories of thoughts based in Greek and Latin, not in Arabic, for example. Thus, according to Mignolo, a possibility of a new geopolitics of knowledge, points toward a planetary revival of “genealogies of thoughts, experiences and feelings, issues that cannot be confronted by expanding the social sciences to the non-Western world” (2014, p. 595). As Gurminder Bhambra further elaborates, following Mignolo, “this means deconstructing the standard narratives based upon the universalization of parochial European histories and reconstructing global narratives on the basis of the empirical connections forged through histories of colonialism, enslavement, dispossession and appropriation” (2014, p. 149).
In the spirit of Derrida’s ‘not-yet-known’, Mignolo’s plea for the decolonisation of knowledge, Spivak’s insistence on forging habits for epistemological change and Bhambra’s call for forging connections across histories of oppression, this book reflects on the pedagogical challenges of performance research in the struggle for international diversity and equality of knowledge.

The MA Programme in International Performance Research (MAIPR)

The volume of essays marks the completion of seven years of the MA Programme (2008-15) in International Performance Research (MAIPR), a programme initially run jointly by the universities of Warwick (UK), Amsterdam (Netherlands), Helsinki/Tampere (Finland) and later involving The University of Arts in Belgrade (Serbia), as well as Trinity College Dublin (TCD). This collaboration serves as a point of departure to interrogate broader pedagogical questions that are pertinent to the present and the future of the discipline of theatre and performance studies. All the contributors to this volume were involved in the MAIPR programme, as faculty, as members of the joint academic board, as international visiting scholars, or as former students. Since the volume features repeated references to this programme, a brief outline of its features is in order.

The MAIPR Programme was a partnership (or ‘consortium’, as it is called in Eurospeak) of four European universities that were successfully awarded a European Commission Erasmus Mundus grant. The joint bid for such an MA programme partly ensued from collegial relations between individual staff members of the partner universities, facilitated through umbrella associations such as the International Federation of Theatre Research (IFTR-FIRT) and its annual conferences. The Erasmus Mundus Masters programme, with its twin objectives of enhancing co-operation between higher education
institutions and promoting mobility between EU member countries, offered a promising and appropriate external funding opportunity.

In these seven years, the MAIPR Programme hosted approximately 130 postgraduate students from 49 countries, 48 internationally reputed guest scholar-practitioners and visiting faculty. Scholarships from the European Commission permitted a merit-based selection of talented students and also guaranteed cross-regional parity. It provided for an impressive range of visiting scholars and artists from five continents, an immense enrichment to the programme, which would not have been imaginable without such structural support. An annual weeklong summer school for all faculty and students, and an induction week jointly conducted by all participating universities were additional features that served to foster close collaboration and dialogue in curricular design between the universities.

Over the years, the MAIPR have actively collaborated with the culture and arts sector in the UK, the Netherlands, Finland, Serbia, and Ireland through its placement/internship components. The placements provided students with opportunities to experience a second culture and language situation in the professional arts or associated industry first hand, working in appropriate arts venues such as theatre companies, galleries, museums, festivals, on journals, or on web-based projects. At each university, placement projects focused on research questions that were investigated through a combination of one or more of what were referred to as the modalities: scholarship, curation, creative practice. Projects were designed to have a significant research value to both student and placement partner, benefiting the latter by bringing the students’ knowledge and expertise to bear on partner projects and topics that might otherwise not receive dedicated and close attention. Hence, students were assigned to undertake fieldwork in theatre and performance companies, cultural organisations, archives, or with artists.
The performing arts constitute one of the key disciplinary sites where scholarly and creative research methodologies designed for the challenges of the contemporary global context are rapidly developing. The field is fundamentally multi- and interdisciplinary, involving methodologies from anthropology, history, visual cultures, critical theory as well as a number of performing arts disciplines such as dance, theatre, and performance art. The MAIPR programme was created with a premise that students in the performing arts arenas of the future will need international performance literacies and practices, and special comparativist and immersion-based training in order to acquire the appropriate competencies not only for navigating the interdisciplinary character of contemporary performance, but also for doing so in increasingly transnational performance contexts.

While many performance scholars have expertise in more than one national performance tradition, no one alone can have comprehensive international knowledge that facilitates comparative and wide-ranging transnational perspectives on theatre and performance. Combining strengths, however, our European group featured a specifically European perspective and shared tradition while also developing a conceptual analysis of the global context in relation to performance creation and reception. The consortium institutions, each with a strong reputation for international research, worked together to conceptualise a philosophy and integrated programme for postgraduate training that provided international competencies for students of performance. The objective of the programme was to equip students with the kind of intellectual and creative skills that facilitate performance research beyond national frontiers, that cultivate international performance literacy, and enable them to operate as well-trained scholar-artist-curators in an international arena, not only in academic professions (leading on to doctoral work) but also as practitioners in performing arts careers or as leading professionals in careers in diverse sectors.
European theatre and performance systems share similar features and are predicated on models of national sponsorship and support, often tied into national and regional identities. At the same time, they are unique to their specific context, and offer both points of comparison and contrast to theatrical systems in the rest of the world, whether those theatrical systems are entrepreneurial, as in the North Americas, or community-based as in large parts of Africa. In this respect, there were a number of potential advantages to a course on international approaches to performance research that also builds on some knowledge of European perspectives and traditions. At the very least, it provided opportunities to consider commonalities and contrasts with other parts of the world. But it also provided the opportunity to interrogate the relationship of EU nations to their former/present colonies, and the performance traditions that have evolved in the postcolonial era.

Furthermore, because of the growing diversity of European communities and the attendant issues of immigration and national identity, performances scholars are particularly interested in the politics and aesthetics of these questions, and also in the relationship of European performance traditions to those of former colonies or to present-day forms of neo-imperialism. Intercultural questions have been developed in the field for over two decades, yet a satisfactory articulation of European practices in contradistinction to post-colonial practices remains an unfinished project that the MAIPR programme was specifically equipped to address. The MAIPR helped to provide a focus and a method for approaching the distinction between and among European performance practices, and for understanding the relationship between global phenomena and the discrete performance traditions that underlie them. At the same time, it modelled a group of international scholars using their own backgrounds and cultures to forge a complex multi-perspectival approach to research and pedagogy. The founding staff at all three institutions shared a common set of assumptions about the need to rethink and re-conceptualise teaching in the field in a manner that would be responsive to the
history, contexts as well as the globally interconnected present of theatrical and cultural performance. Another shared desire was to introduce non-European performance research and performance histories into the curriculum, and thereby de-centre the predominance of Anglo-European scholarship in framing the field. Some of the guiding questions included: What does ‘international,’ ‘global,’ ‘transnational,’ or ‘cosmopolitan’ signify when coupled with performance or performance contexts? How are performances linked to global networks and transnational flows of capital? What are the roles of the theatre and performance curator in the new globalised economy? What is the responsibility of a European artist or scholar when commenting on performance traditions, history, or actual performances of former colonies or developing nations? How does theatrical communication function in response to issues of translation and transculturation?

The programme identified ‘scholarship’, ‘creative practice’ and ‘curation’ as the three core modalities of approaching these questions. Scholarship was here understood as traditional archival-based research or performance analyses, whose product is usually scholarly writing (essays, dissertations, case studies). Creative Practice covered studio-based explorations in time and space of subjunctive representations of reality. It could involve actual performances in university or public spaces, virtual performances on the web, workshops and rehearsal room explorations of topics or themes, or ethnographies of artistic practice as well as performing, designing, or directing such projects. An emergent focal area of the programme was curation in the performing arts in international contexts. Students were trained in developing critical and contextual approaches to curation, with a strong grounding in theoretical paradigms and exposure to a variety of curatorial practices. This referred to a range of activities including management, design, and documentation of exhibits, performances, festivals or other educational events. It could also involve website design, production documentation, gallery exhibit curation, or programme notes or critique.
Students interacted with theatrical systems in at least three different European cultures and studied many others; they thus operated cross-culturally in a comparativist mode, interacting with leading scholars in their field from around the world. This exposure prepared them for doctoral studies or for work among the growing international professional opportunities in curation, organisation, and communication concerning international performances.

**Pedagogical Concerns**

The essays in this volume take stock of the achievements, insights and challenges of what international performance research is or ought to be about. As one particular experiment in performance research pedagogy, the MAIPR Programme placed the ‘international’ at its core. It was influenced in part by the regulations and requirements of the European Erasmus Mundus Programme, by the specific institutional and geographical-cultural politics of each participating university, by invited guest scholars from outside of Europe, drawn from personal and professional networks such as the International Federation of Theatre Research (IFTR), and by the specific disciplinary formations and cultural backgrounds of students.

Although the volume departs from the MAIPR programme as a case study in point, the essays address a range of questions and themes that are pertinent to students, teachers, researchers and practitioners with varying degrees of attachment to the discipline of Theatre and Performance Studies in vastly different contexts around the world.

The present volume is thematically structured according to four broad areas of concern. The first section ‘**INTERNATIONALISING THE DISCIPLINE**’ asks what the insertion of the ‘international’ dimension has productively achieved, in terms of the disciplinary and curricular decolonisation of Theatre and Performance Studies. The volume opens with an essay by one of the MAIPR Programme’s founding directors, Janelle Reinelt. Beginning with a personal reflection on various formative experiences that helped in cultivating a sensitivity
and alertness to subjugated performance histories around the world, Reinelt reflects on three philosophers, for whom a critical pedagogy is inseparable from the search for equality and justice. In her engagement with the relevance of Paulo Freire, Jacques Rancière and Raymond Williams to her own thinking on pedagogy, Reinelt is concerned with the values and principles underlying a pedagogy oriented towards de-centering the predominantly Western canon, and the challenges that arise in putting these values to work with a group of international students. Kati Röttger proposes a pedagogy of cultural translation as a conceptual guide in the complex process of navigating the diversity of knowledge in a classroom with students from around the world, as well as in understanding and responding to current global developments affecting universities worldwide. Röttger places the experience of strangeness at the heart of the practice of cultural translation. Drawing on the work of Rancière, W.J.T. Mitchell, Spivak and Bhabha, amongst others, and reading the implications of their thought on long-standing debates on interculturalism and hybridity in theatre and performance studies, Röttger pleads for an engagement with performance that embraces rather than seeks to overcome the anxiety and strangeness that is experienced in the process of encountering otherness. Sruti Bala’s essay similarly examines the pedagogical implications of internationalisation in performance research against the logic of financialisation in higher education on the one side, and the disenchantment with the frameworks of the national on the other. She calls for attention to the use of English as the language of internationalisation, and pleads for a pedagogical practice that combines embodiment, live experimentation and reflection, beyond the tired binary of theory and practice. Bala calls for an internationalisation of the discipline that does not merely tokenistically integrate the Global South into the existing canon, but rather involves students, faculty and university administrators stepping out of familiar territory, consciously working on undoing privileges.
The second section ‘**THE UNIVERSITY AS A PLATFORM**’ situates the internationalisation of performance research against the broader horizon of the transformation of universities under the aegis of globalisation. Milena Dragićević Šešić and Silvija Jestrović offer a passionate plea for nurturing the university as an autonomous public sphere, to resist the pressure to ‘perform’ and thereby conform to the commodification of higher education under the era of what has come to be known as new public management. Dragićević Šešić and Jestrović explore the possibilities that education in the arts and humanities specifically offer in shaping universities as platforms for critical thinking and debate. They encourage an engaged, activist approach in students, stretching beyond the limits of skill building and simultaneously re-imagining professional networks in experimental and risk-taking ways. Their plea extends to university professors to be critical public intellectuals contributing to the creation of new societal agendas. Juan Aldape and Lisa Skwirblies critically interrogate the category of the ‘global graduate’ as a product of the neoliberal university. Departing from their own trajectories of international student mobility and its implications for their comprehension of the discipline of Theatre and Performance Studies, Aldape and Skwirkblies plead for a re-appropriation of the possibilities offered by international student exchange, one which is sensitive to global inequalities and to the pressures of quantitative measurement of success and knowledge in the corporatized universities of today. Iman Ganji’s essay focuses on the threshold that separates the university from its outside, arguing that it is at this liminal juncture that radical experimentation and thought often takes place. The essay explores the paradigm of ‘militant research’ as a mode of liminal performativity, whereby militancy is associated with perseverance rather than with militarism. Ganji reflects on various examples from around the world wherein a critical performative pedagogy was not simply about changing the institutional relations between teachers and students, but about reconnecting the university with broader social movements and struggles for justice. The liminal positionality
of university researchers in relation to their subjects of research similarly forms a key concern in the essay by Michelle Nicholson and Teilhard Paradela. In this dialogical essay, they reflect on the challenges of belonging to and conducting research on the Global South whilst being affiliated to universities in the Global North. Ethnographic work in performance, particularly pertaining to communities subjected to domination and epistemic violence, the politics of giving voice, and the intricacies of trespassing borders: for Nicholson-Sanz and Paradela these are central pedagogical and epistemological concerns that speak to the university’s responsibility to society at large.

In the third section, ‘PEDAGOGY IN ACTION’, essays by eminent scholar-practitioners in Theatre and Performance Research investigate the status and potentials of embodied practice in teaching performance research in an international environment. All four essays depart from the premise that in theatre and performance studies, a productive notion of mondialisation, as Derrida termed it, precipitates the need for embodied, face-to-face encounters, for an awareness of cultural specificity and of spatiality. They each chart different directions and possibilities in answering how such embodied practices might be accommodated into the actual work of teaching and studying. Mark Fleishman suggests that it is incorrect to assume that any embodied exercise geared towards making theatrical performances will self-evidently suffice to impart skills in using embodied practice as a means of research. He argues that a more considered approach is required in shaping the pedagogy of practice as research methodology. The concepts of ‘situated learning’, ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ and ‘communities of practice’, drawn from the work of Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger, are propounded as elements of a framework allowing students to participate in PaR exercises, simultaneously contextualise what they are doing and reading in relation to the broader community of practice of PaR, as well as to extract methodological principles and observations from a clearly grounded environment. Urmimala Sarkar Munsi explores the
question of the relationship between practice and pedagogy in an international context in terms of ‘cultural unlearning’. Sarkar Munsi shows how teaching PaR can be an exercise in the pedagogy of the unlearning of implicit assumptions, stereotypes or common sense notions in any cross-cultural encounter. She investigates the role of experiential, practice-informed processes in group activities, elaborating on ways to encourage a self-reflexive approach through insisting on both cultural specificity as well as on the importance of intersubjectivity. She also compares the experiences of teaching in two different culturally diverse university environments, in Delhi, India and in Warwick, UK during the MAIPR programme, highlighting different modes of unlearning in each context. Peta Tait critiques the pedagogical practice of separating body-based practices from analytical processes, arguing that the analysis of performance is profoundly influenced not only by discursive frameworks, but equally also by physical and theatrical performance training. The analysis of bodies in performance is shaped by the way spectators’ bodies have been performatively constituted. She elaborates on a module on ‘the body as performance’ using a phenomenological approach, inviting students to pay attention to visceral, emotional and experiential responses, asking how embodied sensory reception and liveness contribute to understanding bodies in performance, as well as to making sense of cultural and other differences in society. Joanne Tompkins’ essay offers a detailed reflection on site-specificity in relation to teaching performance research. Site-specificity refers broadly to an awareness of spatiality in pedagogical processes, as well as to the strict theatrical sense of the convergence of a site and its (theatrical) events. By innovatively conducting every session with a group of students in a different space, including but not limited to theatre spaces, Tompkins introduces visceral and collective experience into the analysis of performance spaces. Such a pedagogy integrates theory, architecture, theatrical and non-theatrical venues as a means of interpreting spatiality in performance in a grounded and carefully historicised fashion.
The fourth section of the volume, ‘Curatorial Practices’, relates to the growing significance of curation and curatorial work in the teaching of Theatre and Performance Research, particularly in an international setting. The essays in this section adopt diverse interpretations of curation, ranging from performance curation as a subject of study, to curation as a means of conducting research in performance, to a blending of the relationship between process, product, artist, teacher, and participant, student or spectator. Common to all these interpretations of curation is the recognition of its investment in pedagogy. Will Peterson’s essay inter-connects the practices of performance curation with pedagogical processes that offer students a systematic and experiential framework to understand the possibilities of curation in performance. This connection is not incidental, as Peterson unfolds in his observations, showing how the educational turn in performance curation has led to the learning situation assuming centre stage in many performance practices. The essay reflects on ways in which students are encouraged to develop curatorial principles and put them into practice, with the safe space of a classroom allowing for experimentation free of judgement. The essay by Hanna Korsberg and Outi Lahtinen asks what happens to a university department such as Theatre Studies in Helsinki, which has traditionally accommodated a homogenous and mono-cultural body of students and pursued a predominantly nationally or at best Europe-oriented curriculum, when it takes on the task of hosting and teaching International Performance Research to students from around the world? In this unique situation, they demonstrate how, on the one hand, it enables the creation of a nuanced, layered understanding of what constitutes ‘Western’ knowledge, through valuing the relatively marginalised position of Finnish theatre/performance history within the European canon. On the other hand, it pushed the faculty to critically extend their pedagogical vistas. Korsberg and Lahtinen review recent academic scholarship from educational studies, including much-debated concepts such as ‘blended learning’ and the ‘flipped classroom’. They examine how
such concepts were curated into their own classroom experiences in the MAIPR Programme, and in what ways they met with resistance. Gargi Bharadwaj and Lonneke van Heugten explore curation in terms of the politics of curriculum in performance research. Their essay highlights how the design of a course by a teacher reflects implicit or explicit curatorial choices, as well as how curation involves curricular choices. The main concern however lies in demonstrating how students might actively and creatively participate in co-curating the curriculum and stretching their learning processes beyond curricular confines. They reflect on their own curatorial initiatives as students, by way of jointly organising a performance festival, by interpreting assignments in a non-conventional way using collective, corporeal responses. They further offer a challenging suggestion that the curriculum need not end within the limits of a university degree, with an example of how they extended a curatorial perspective into the encounter with artworks. Barbara Orel’s essay is invested in a conception of curation in the performing arts that stretches beyond national or communitarian frameworks, art disciplines and institutions and is responsive to the needs of a globalised world. Using the work of Boris Buden, Orel summons a concept of curation as mediation between the art world and the world of knowledge formation, historicising the function and profession of the curator in the Western art world, asking how it can be re-functioned as a critical task committed to social justice and equality, rather than one that reinforces the terms of capitalism and consumerism. Rather than being a neutral transmitter between artworks and institutional practices, Orel describes how she worked with students to make them sensitive to questions of historicisation and evaluation, thus making the work of the curator more transparent and answerable to the publics they serve.

The volume of essays attempts to make sense of the deep connections between the field of performance research and its pedagogies, particularly when prefixed with the category of the ‘international’. The foreword by Baz Kershaw, another founding member of the MAIPR
Programme, alerts us to the planetary dimensions of performance pedagogies, urging us to be circumspect towards the anthropocentrism underlying the ‘international’, calling for an ecologically sane pedagogy of performance. We hope the volume will resonate with the questions that many readers will ask of themselves in their own teaching and learning environments, whether as faculty in a postgraduate university programme in Theatre and Performance Studies, as researchers involved in international publishing platforms, or as students attempting to carve out a place for themselves within the discipline. In his essay “The University Without Condition”, Derrida derives the idea of the modern university from a European Enlightenment model. We recognise that this model is by no means exemplary, not even to itself, nor do we wish to suggest it ought to serve as a vanguard for the rest of the world. On the contrary, our quests around performance, research and pedagogy have called upon us to be circumspect of the privileges and powers accorded to the European university or to European, indeed to human-centred sites of knowledge formation in performance. The contributors to this book may hold significantly different ideas of the university, or of the constitutive features of the discipline of Theatre and Performance Studies. What they all however share is an unconditional profession of faith in the travails of performance pedagogy on the terrains of the international.