

GUTES TUN 1,3: BRECHTIAN THEORY
AND CONTEMPORARY DIDACTIC THEATER

by

ERICA MARIE HAAS

(Under the Direction of Martin Kagel)

ABSTRACT

The play *Gutes Tun 1,3* (2005), written and performed by Anne Tismer and Rahel Savoldelli, lends to comparison to the works of Bertolt Brecht: Tismer and Savoldelli aim to educate the audience about social issues, using Brechtian performance techniques such as *Verfremdung* to relay their ideas. However, upon closer examination, it is clear that *Gutes Tun 1,3* ultimately diverges from Brechtian theory, especially with regard to the way that social messages are conveyed.

INDEX WORDS: *Gutes Tun*, Off-Theater, German theater, Modern theater, Anne Tismer, Rahel Savoldelli, Ballhaus Ost, Bertolt Brecht

GUTES TUN 1,3: BRECHTIAN THEORY
AND CONTEMPORARY DIDACTIC THEATER

by

ERICA MARIE HAAS

B.A., New College of Florida, 2005

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

©2009

Erica Marie Haas

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my friends, especially my best friend, Jessica, for all of her love, support, and silly text messages from across the miles.

Priya, Beau, Matt, Amy the Brit, Kristie, JP, Med School Amy, Mike, Alia, Fereshteh, Sam, Lea, and Sarah the Zwiebel are some of the best cheerleaders that a girl could ever hope for.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my friends from Joe Brown Hall, who have made the past two years in Athens so memorable. Life would not have been as much fun without the basement camaraderie and YouTube prowess of Will, Zachary, Carlos, Justin, Caskey, Monika, Hugh, Flo, Ulla, Boris, Keith, Janith, Antje, Marcie, Lena, Susa, Cassie, Sarah, Katie, and Paulina.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis could not have been produced without the help of others. First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis sponsor, Dr. Martin Kagel, whose support and proved to be invaluable throughout the thesis-writing process. I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. Max Reinhart and Dr. Alexander Sager, for their help.

Additional thanks is due to the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies, for helping to fund this project.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Dirk Pilz, Rahel Savoldelli, Anne Tismer, and Patrick Wildermann for their contribution of original material to the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 THE DIDACTIC THEATER OF ERWIN PISCATOR, BERTOLT BRECHT, AND HEINER MÜLLER.....	3
3 THE DEVELOPMENT OF GUTES TUN AND <i>GUTES TUN 1,3</i>	11
4 BRECHTIAN DIDACTIC THEATER VS. GUTES TUN.....	23
WORKS CITED AND CONSULTED.....	26
APPENDICES.....	30
A E-MAIL INTERVIEW WITH DR. DIRK PILZ, JULY 15, 2008.....	30
B E-MAIL INTERVIEW WITH PATRICK WILDERMANN, JULY 24, 2008.....	32
C E-MAIL INTERVIEW WITH RAHEL SAVOLDELLI, JULY 30, 2008.....	35
D E-MAIL INTERVIEW WITH ANNE TISMER, JULY 28, 2008.....	39

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the late 1920s and early 1930s, German playwright Bertolt Brecht, then dissatisfied with the state of German theater, began to create a new theory of didactic theater. Brecht's theory is notable because of the logical manner in which he presents his ideas, as well as for placing an emphasis on an individual's interaction with other people and with society. His work is one of the most influential theories of didactic theater in the twentieth century, and it remains influential, even today.

One modern work that incorporates a number of Brechtian elements is *Gutes Tun 1,3*, written and performed by Anne Tismer and Rahel Savoldelli of the Gutes Tun collective. On September 9, 2007, I had the opportunity to attend a performance of the play *Gutes Tun 1,3* at Seven Stages Theater in Atlanta, Georgia. Although this play is clearly a work of the 21st century, while watching the play, I was frequently reminded of Brechtian technique and theory from the 1930s, and it seemed interesting further to explore *Gutes Tun 1,3*'s similarities to – as well as differences from – Brechtian theater.

By analyzing the text and performances of *Gutes Tun 1,3* and applying theories developed by Brecht to them, I will demonstrate that *Gutes Tun 1,3* includes certain elements of Brechtian didactic theater. In the second chapter, I will provide some background information on twentieth-century German playwrights Erwin Piscator, Bertolt Brecht, and Heiner Müller, and discuss the differences between their approaches

to political theater. In chapter 3, I will discuss the background of the Gutes Tun collective and its artistic home, the Ballhaus Ost in Berlin and will provide background information on the play *Gutes Tun 1,3*. Finally, in chapter 4, I will closely examine one scene from the play, “Die Freundin,” and discuss its relationship to Brechtian didactic theater.

Before beginning my analysis, it is important to note that this play is not a traditional literary text. Not only has it undergone a number of significant changes since its original inception in 2005 but, aside from a printed version in a Programmheft at the Gutes Tun collective’s web site, gutestun.com, no actual publication exists. Because of this non-traditional format, information about *Gutes Tun 1,3* presented in this thesis is based on a number of sources. Whenever I refer to *Gutes Tun 1,3*, I am referring to the third edition of the Programmheft; promotional photos on the Gutes Tun collective web site and within the Programmheft; the production that I viewed at Seven Stages Theater; English language supertitles provided to me by Heidi Howard, the Education Director and Production Stage Manager at Seven Stages; and YouTube clips of a production of the play at the TAG-Theater in Vienna in December, 2007. Additionally, I will refer to personal interviews conducted with Tismer and Savoldelli, as well as critics Dr. Dirk Pilz of *Nachtkritik* and *Theater der Zeit* and Patrick Wildermann of *Der Tagesspiegel*, the text of which can be found in Appendices A - D.

CHAPTER 2
THE DIDACTIC THEATER OF ERWIN PISCATOR,
BERTOLT BRECHT, AND HEINER MÜLLER

In his 1920 essay *Proletarisches Theater*, Erwin Piscator wrote that he hoped to create a new, modern form of theater (Epskamp 47). He described this new type of theater, later known as Agit-Prop (a combination of the words “agitation” and “propaganda”) as one in which a variety of new technologies, such as film and projections, could be used to agitate the audience and inspire it to become politically involved (Völker 115). In his notes from his production *Trotz alledem!*, he wrote that it was important for the members of the audience to see their “own fate, their own tragedy being acted out before their eyes. Theatre had become reality, and soon it was not a case of the stage confronting the audience, but one big assembly, one big battlefield, one massive demonstration” (qtd. in Kleberg 109-110).

By 1927, Piscator had become the artistic director of Berlin’s *Theater am Nollendorfplatz*, where he was able to share his vision with others. At the time, a number of up-and-coming playwrights and directors worked in this theater, including Bertolt Brecht. Brecht was interested in Piscator’s work because he, like Piscator, wanted to incorporate socialist messages into theatrical works (Völker 115). However, Brecht soon became critical of the political views Piscator expressed in his productions and questioned his production values.

During the late 1920s, Piscator was becoming increasingly “dogmatic” about Marxism (Zipes 212), whereas Brecht was merely interested in using Marxism as a sort of “personal framework” (Jameson 24). While Piscator was interested in using technology such as film to help promote and inspire his theatrical visions, Brecht preferred to make his productions seem “old” (Völker 115), and believed that the use of technology was the least important aspect of a theatrical performance (Kerz 367). Brecht thought that only simple sets should be used, and that the actors should be able to create any necessary entertainment by themselves (Kerz 366). In his opinion, the incorporation of films and projections into productions actually weakened them. Moreover, Brecht thought that the use of technology in productions may actually lead to anti-revolutionary behavior, given film’s tendency to encourage passivity in its audience (Völker 116).

Brecht was dissatisfied with the state of German theater in general, which, as he saw it, theater had been transformed from a place of artistic expression to a place of business, focused on profits (Beer and De Schutter, qtd. in Epskamp 47). He felt that traditional dramatic theater and that the new system of method acting promoted by Russian actor Constantin Stanislavski were harmful to the art of theater. In his essay “Über das Stanislavski-System,” Brecht describes method acting as “schwach” and “ganz naiv.”¹ In addition, Brecht considered modern opera “an old, mismanaged,

¹ Despite these comments written in the 1930s, some fifteen years later, an art commission at a conference on Stanislavski asked if Brecht could explain the differences between his system and Stanislavski’s. Brecht’s response, and the end of the printed interview, is simply, “Ja, vermutlich” (Das >>kleine Organon<< und Stanislavskis System 214). Although there are no notes in the interview denoting Brecht’s tone with this statement, he is presumably being ironic; his early *Anmerkungen zur Stadt Mahagonny* from the 1920s already listed differences between Brecht’s new form of theater and all previously existing forms of theater. Despite this early criticism, he also admitted in his later series of studies on Stanislavski, written between 1948 and 1956, that Stanislavski’s work did have some worth. This is primarily discussed in “Was unter anderem vom Theater Stanislavskis gelernt werden kann.”

broken-down circus robbed of its magic, with effeminate tenors and masculine prima donnas” (qtd. in Schebera 93), needed to be modernized, yet also returned to its traditional roots.

The composer Kurt Weill, whom Brecht met sometime around March 1927, felt the same way. Soon after meeting, the two began to work on what they referred to as new forms of opera, such as plays centered around music, *Songspiels*, and pieces designed for music, all of which aimed to reach a new audience (Schebera 148). A fan of Brecht’s *Mahagonnygesänge*, a project about middle-class excesses that had been on Brecht’s back-burner since 1921, Weill proposed that they create a new operetta based on the songs. Weill had been asked to compose an “industrial opera” to draw Ruhr valley workers to the theater, and Brecht had already been recommended as a potential lyricist. Within two weeks, a draft of the *Songspiels* was completed and they were later debuted at the German Chamber Music Festival in Baden-Baden (Schebera 93-96).

As Brecht and Weill had anticipated, most of the wealthy audience members disapproved of the *Songspiel* version of the *Mahagonnygesänge*; accordingly, the initial reviews for the *Songspiel* were mixed (Schebera 99). However, some audience members, such as critic Heinrich Strobel, saw in it an entirely new form of musical theater had been presented: it, was, he said, “the sensation of the opera evening” (qtd. in Schebera 99). Brecht and Weill continued to develop the work into an operetta, a draft of which was finished by December 1927. Riots broke out in the audience at the end of a number of performances of the operetta, and a number of opera houses refused to even produce the work (Schebera 160-162). Despite the resistance to their work, Brecht and Weill continued to work together on a number of pieces, including *Die Dreigroschenoper*, *Das*

Berliner Requiem, *Der Jasager*, and *Der Lindberghflug* (later known as *Der Ozeanflug*), and *Happy End*.

As of the spring of 1930, Brecht and Weill's relationship began to dissolve, owing primarily to a personal dispute over a Berlin production of *Der Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny* (Schebera 179) as well as to the gradual diversion of their personal theoretical standpoints (Schebera 184).² While working on the operetta text for *Der Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*, Brecht had already begun to conceptualize his own philosophies for a new form of theater (Kesting 59).

Although Brecht's theories were considered revolutionary, many of these concepts did not originate with Brecht, but were derived or adopted from other theorists. For example, his concept of *Gestus* (defined on page 10) is borrowed from Chinese theater (*Über das Theater der Chinesen*). The name for Brecht's new type of theater is borrowed from Erwin Piscator (Epskamp 49). Initially called "didactic theater," it later became known as "epic theater" and "instructional theater."

In his *Anmerkungen zur Oper "Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny"*, Brecht outlines the differences between more traditional forms of theater and this new form. This early blueprint of Brechtian didactic theater is still the one most frequently referred to in discussions of his theory of theater; this includes Jan Knopf's seminal *Brecht*

² This diversion seems to be more to do with the use of music than anything else. Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt wrote that Weill's 1932 *Die Bürgschaft* (with text by Caspar Neher) is "pure opera" (qtd. in Schebera 188). Stuckenschmidt contrasts that with epic theater insofar as epic theater uses musical interjection "to give shape to its abstractions" (qtd. in Schebera 188). In Kurt Weill's "Introduction to the Prompt-Book of the Opera Mahagonny," he discusses this further, writing that the music (more specifically, the interruption of the plot caused by the music) causes a juxtaposition of situations, and that this juxtaposition of musical criteria leads to a heightened form of musical theater – an opera. (Weill 350).

Handbuch. Brecht distinguishes his form of didactic theater from more traditional dramatic theater as follows:

<i>Dramatische Form des Theaters</i>	<i>Epische Form des Theaters</i>
die Bühne verkörpert einen Vorgang	sie erzählt ihn
verwickelt den Zuschauer in eine Aktion und	macht ihn zum Betrachter, aber
verbraucht seine Aktivität	weckt seine Aktivität
ermöglicht ihm Gefühle	erzwingt von ihm Entscheidungen
vermittelt ihm Erlebnisse	vermittelt ihm Kenntnisse
der Zuschauer wird in eine Handlung hineinversetzt	er wird ihr gegenübergesetzt
es wird mit Suggestion gearbeitet	es wird mit Argumenten gearbeitet
die Empfindungen werden konserviert	bis zu Erkenntnissen getrieben
der Mensch wird als bekannt vorausgesetzt	der Mensch ist Gegenstand der Untersuchung
der unveränderliche Mensch	der veränderliche und verändernde Mensch
Spannung auf den Ausgang	Spannung auf den Gang
eine Szene für die andere	jede Szene für sich
die Geschehnisse verlaufen linear	in Kurven

Natura non facit saltus ³	Facit saltus ⁴
die Welt, wie sie ist	die Welt, wie sie wird
was der Mensch soll	was der Mensch muß
seine Triebe	seine Beweggründe
das Denken bestimmt das Sein	gesellschaftliche Sein bestimmt das Denken

In this contrastive table, Brecht differentiates epic from dramatic theater by naming distinguishing characteristics of both. Brecht understood that no single work could encompass all of these characteristics, hence the table emphasizes societal phenomena, in particular, man's behavior toward and interaction with others, resulting in personal change. The table also stresses Brecht's use of reason, which helps audience members form their own opinions about what has been presented in a particular performance.

This table emphasizes the intended non-Aristotelian format of the play, although it is nowhere near as important as Brecht's emphasis on characters' personal change. There are a number of other characteristics, such as Gestus⁵ and the Verfremdungseffekt⁶, which are often associated with epic theater, that are not included as part of the table. It can be inferred that the use of these techniques is vital in the use of epic theater because

³ Nature does not make sudden leaps

⁴ Nature makes sudden leaps

⁵ Gestus: a combination of gesture and action, that shows the essence of a character (Brecht, "Über das Theater")

⁶ Verfremdungseffekt (alienation effect): a technique used to help members of the audience to emotionally distance themselves from what is happening on stage. This can be done through Gestus, manner of speaking (especially the use of artificial language, the use of a chorus, and "breaking down the fourth wall," or directly addressing members of the audience from the stage), physical appearance, and stage design (Brecht Hervorbringen).

they so effectively aid the portrayal of a character and his change. These techniques help members of the audience to remain emotionally distanced from the characters and remind themselves that they are remaining static while the characters undergo change.

Brecht's theories, too, continued to change. He further developed theories relating to epic theater continued while writing the Lehrstück, *Die Maßnahme*, in 1930 in collaboration with Hanns Eisler. Here, Brecht was attempting to create "die Form des Theaters der Zukunft" (qtd. in Knopf 37). At the same time, he began to differentiate the Lehrstück from a work of epic theater, indicating that the Lehrstück was more secular and materialistic (Krabiell 286). However, for Hans-Klaus Krabiell, differences between epic theater and Lehrstücke go beyond that. Krabiell states that, in comparison with a work of Brechtian epic theater, the Lehrstück is more political, more focused on the worker audience, and more focused on the Fabel, or link between character, behavior, and plot (286, 163).⁷ Rainer Steinweg points out that the Lehrstück was designed for workers to draw their own conclusions about a performance's message through agitation. In addition, Lehrstücke are designed to be educational experiences not just for audiences, but as "Übungsstücke," so that actors could hone their craft (Steinweg 477).

Although Brechtian characteristics of didacticism still largely define the genre, the work of other authors, such as Heiner Müller, have moved the concept of didactic theater above and beyond Brecht.⁸ Müller, a dramatist, dramaturg, and director who once

⁷ Brecht may disagree with Krabiell. By the time Brecht wrote his essay *Vergnügungstheater oder Lehrtheater?* in 1936, he his position on the Lehrstück had already changed somewhat: he wrote that "alles, was man Zeitstück oder Piscatorbühne oder Lehrstück nannte, gehört zum epischen Theater."

⁸ Some critics also argue that Brecht's form of didactic theater is not didactic theater at all, 'including Dr. Dirk Pilz of *Nachtkritik*. Pilz believes that Brecht's didactic theater is not really didactic theater, because to Pilz, "es hat zwar eine klare Wirkabsicht, aber keine eindeutige 'Botschaft'" (Pilz interview).

worked at Brecht's Berliner Ensemble, is considered an intellectual heir to Brecht. At one point, Müller referred to Brecht as his teacher (Vaßen 4) and wrote a number of plays based on Brechtian works, including *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui* and *Die Maßnahme*. Müller eventually suspected Brecht of being a "classicist," referring to his desire to create a perfect form. For Müller, Brechtian-style didactic theater had even become a "mole rather than teacher," causing harm to didactic theater rather than helping to further the concept (Case 97-99). Müller sought to re-define the concept of didactic theater, using Brecht's later work as a starting point.

David Barnett believes "the spirit of Brecht haunts" Müller's learning plays, but points out one major fundamental difference: Müller's learning plays are intended to be a significantly more passive experience for their audiences, which are more directly confronted with the messages that they are supposed to be receiving (55).

Müller intended for his learning plays to be educational experiences for actors, as well. Beginning in the late 1980s, he often wrote dialogue without attributing it to a particular character. In his own productions, he often refused to designate specific roles in the production, thereby conflating the roles of actor and director. This forces the actors to create their own structure for the play and develop certain characters by and for themselves (Barnett 52). These plays have been described as a combination of "[Samuel] Beckett's sense of the subjective self and its disintegration, the theater of images from Richard Foreman and Robert Wilson, and physical images of repression from Edward Bond" (Case 100).

There is not yet an intellectual heir to Heiner Müller, though his work has helped to pave the way for more modern didactic theater groups and movements. These

movements include GRIPS Theater (which aims to agitate all groups within society, but was initially designed for young people), Off-Theater (in which plays are written with social themes and characters frequently change roles within a given work), and performance art groups, such as Signa and She-She Pop, in which actors directly confront audience members during performances (Wildermann interview). One newer group that employs characteristics of GRIPS Theater, Off-Theater, and performance art is the Gutes Tun collective, based in Berlin's Ballhaus Ost.

CHAPTER 3

THE DEVELOPMENT OF GUTES TUN AND *GUTES TUN 1,3*

Berlin's Ballhaus Ost was conceived in November, 2005, when actors Uwe Moritz Eichler, Philipp Reuter, and Anne Tismer, and visual artist Bianca Schöning decided to create a space where artists of all artistic disciplines could interact and combine their talents to create new types of art.

The Ballhaus Ost, which includes a third-floor art gallery and balcony lounge and theater with approximately fifty-five seats, opened in the artist haven of Prenzlauer Berg in former East Berlin a few months later. Ballhaus Ost is perhaps best known for its productions of Off-Theater and movies-turned-plays. (The theater opened with a production of *Die Ehe der Maria Braun* with Anne Tismer in the title role and productions of *Trois Couleurs: Blanc* and *Leon: The Professional* will be included in the 2008-2009 season.) A wide variety of other activities have taken place there, including art exhibitions, lectures, children's workshops, film showings, concerts, and dance performances, totaling over two hundred events in its first season alone.

Tismer reports that event attendance to date at the Ballhaus Ost has been "mittelgut," but it is apparently strong enough to receive continued support from the Berlin government, as the Ballhaus recently secured a €100,000 grant from the Berlin Hauptstadtkulturfond. Contributing to the overall success is the work of the Gutes Tun collective, spearheaded by Tismer and Rahel Savoldelli, which is based at the theater. In

addition to performances in Berlin, the collective has performed throughout Europe as well as in Pakistan, Taiwan, and the United States, presenting various social messages to audiences throughout the world (Wildermann Anarchie).

The roots of *Gutes Tun* lie in the performance art collective dorkypark's 2004 production of *Big in Bombay*, when the actresses Anne Tismer and Rahel Savoldelli met for the first time and agreed that they should continue to work together. It was not until a 2005 Lubricat Theatre Company (coincidentally also based at the Ballhaus Ost) production of *Zornige Menschen* that Tismer and Savoldelli began to initiate their collaboration. They wrote fragments of a play together, talking back and forth while notating dialogue. Although the play that they hoped to produce was never completed, they were both pleased with the left-over scenes. Eventually, the two women combined these scenes into a play,⁹ performed with some additional improvisation, that became known as *Gutes Tun 1,3*. Savoldelli explains that she and Tismer came up with the name *Gutes Tun* in honor of Lubricat, because she and Tismer “wollten ihnen gutes tun... schenken... und seither traten wir generell unter diesem namen auf”¹⁰ (Tismer, Savoldelli).

Since founding the collective, Tismer and Savoldelli have expanded their group to about twelve members, who have helped create and perform two additional pieces: *No, He Was White* and *Bei mir*. Both Tismer and Savoldelli do not name any particular philosophical influences of their work. Yet both agree that they are trying better to comprehend the world's problems through their work. Tismer specifically cites that she is

⁹ Anne Tismer prefers to refer to *Gutes Tun 1,3* not as a play, but “aktion oder kunstaktion oder performance”

¹⁰ *Gutes Tun 1,0* is the collective

trying to better understand hunger and poverty, whereas Savoldelli mentions exploring the topic of abandoned children (Tismer, Savoldelli).

Both women also stated that they specifically design their plays to be performed in smaller spaces, such as Ballhaus Ost. Tismer indicated that it is less stressful to perform in a smaller space (Wildermann Anarchie) and Savoldelli prefers the intimacy of performing for a smaller audience (Savoldelli). As Tismer points out, “Es ist ja kein Fernsehen, wir müssen nicht Millionen erreichen” (Wildermann Anarchie); it seems that at this time, they do not intend to create versions of their works to be performed in larger theaters.

In July, 2008, *Gutes Tun 1,3* finally debuted at the Ballhaus Ost. It is an appropriate match for the Ballhaus’s eclectic repertoire. It is arguably a work of off-theater, in that it offers a number of social messages, and because Tismer and Savoldelli’s characters change roles within the play. The play also includes video projections at the beginning and at the end. This reflects Ballhaus’s goal of creating works of art that cross disciplinary boundaries. The piece is approximately seventy minutes long. The play, which is divided into an introductory sequence, scenes discussing five different social issues, and a chorus, puts forth a number of social issues for the audience to explore.

The introductory sequence, called the “Erforschung,” features Tismer and Savoldelli as Fr. Dr. T. and Fr. Dr. F. These two schizophrenic women¹¹ are made to appear to be traveling through the woods, as the images displayed on the projection

¹¹ Schizophrenia seems to be a recurring theme in the work of members of the Gutes Tun collective; collective member Cristin König recently completed a script called *Die Wohngemeinschaft*, about four schizophrenic women who live together and their struggle to pay rent. It is also important to note that the Programmheft text does not have any capitalization and there is little to no punctuation or stage direction. It is unclear if Tismer and Savoldelli chose to write in this style to help emphasize the characters’ schizophrenia or to emulate the work of Heiner Müller.

screen incorporated into the set are moving, although Fr. Dr. T. and Fr. Dr. F. are not. Fr. Dr. T. and Fr. Dr. F. are both interested in philosophy, and Fr. Dr. F. proudly tells Fr. Dr. T that she studied “in weimar bei goethe.” Throughout their travel, they bicker about their mental illnesses, hunger, horses, and their relationship with each other.

After the introductory sequence, at the beginning of the first scene (Frühstück), the identities of Fr. Dr. T. and Fr. Dr. F. have changed to that of “R” and “A,”¹² and the women are suddenly in a cottage in the woods. There is no clear transition between the introductory sequence and the rest of the scenes, so it is unclear who R and A really are. It is indefinite as to whether they are delusions of Fr. Dr. T. and Fr. Dr. F. or whether Fr. Dr. T. and Fr. Dr. F. are delusions of R and A. It is also possible that these women have no connection whatsoever.

Over the course of several loosely related scenes that are set in a cottage in the woods, R and A continue to bring up different social issues, including hunger (Frühstück), human destruction of nature (Die Marderfalle), agoraphobia (Die Freundin), domestic violence (Chor), and dependency on others (Wo warst du denn, Die Helme, Loch im Kopf, Die Freundin). Typically, the social issue is somehow incorporated into conversation by either R or A, the two women make a few general comments about it, and then the topic is dropped. However, this helps to develop the audience’s understanding of the characters (especially their weaknesses) and their relationship to each other.

¹² In the Programmheft’s pdf file, there is simply a handwritten note in the otherwise-typed text pointing out “zu *Gutes Tun* 1,3.” In the stage performance, there is no transition from Fr. Dr. T. to A and Fr. Dr. F. to R, so it seems most likely that Fr. Dr. T. and A are the same person, and Fr. Dr. F. and R are the same person.

During these scenes, A generally appears to be the weaker character. She frequently forgets what R tells her, begins to cry at random (Die Helme, Die Freundin). She appears to be afraid of people other than R, and is afraid of becoming permanently separated from her (Die Freundin). At another point, she fantasizes that she has a cut a hole in her head in order to let out all of the “scheiss kaka drin” (Loch im Kopf). In that same scene, in her mania, she also believes that she can create static electricity by rubbing rubber shoe soles on her arms (Loch im Kopf).

The character R still seems to be the more stable of the two. To a certain extent, she even acts as a mother figure to A. She frequently asks A what she is doing and reminds her to put out her cigarettes (Loch im Kopf). Even with these moments of lucidity, R appears to have problems of her own. In “Frühstück,” for example, she agrees to give A the business section of the newspaper, and even says that it is “da,” but when A questions her a second time, she admits that she actually has not found it yet. It is unclear if R is playing a trick on A, or if R is simply ignoring A.

Near the end of the play, R even directly tells A that “du gehst mir dermassen auf die nerven” (Die Freundin) yet continues to stay with A. Because of R’s maternal relationship with A, it is clear that A heavily relies on R for both emotional support and support in their daily lives. However, R appears to be functional enough to exist without A. In this setting, where they are isolated, it is important for the two women to rely on each other for support. Despite their reliance on each other, they still frequently miscommunicate with each other, which leads to a disconnect between A and R. Near the end of the play, A eventually agrees to try to find a place to live without R, although

it is unsure if A will ever find independence from R and build a life separate from hers, due to her emotional state (Die Freundin).

In the chorus at the end, the two women sing together, that

du fängst an, mich zu würgen oder zu
schlagen...

ich möchte nicht geschlagen werden weil

ich hab davor angst

ich bin dann einfach lädiert

mein hals ist geschwollen

weil du mich würgst

mein ohr ist taub...

da ist überhaupt keine basis

Just as Brecht was prone to the use of the chorus to present social issues, Tismer and Savoldelli do the same in this example. In this instance, it is unclear who “du” is, especially because R and A are singing together, but the text of the chorus implies that both women may be better off living by themselves, even though A does not believe that she is ready to live independently of R. Their isolation in the woods helps them to realize, if not accept, their need for independence.

With the exception of the introductory sequence, the play is set in the characters’ home in the woods, which appears to be an appropriate place to simultaneously show off and contain their madness. The two women, R and A, appear to live comfortably but

modestly in a small house in the woods. The set of the house is the only set used in the production, and it is about three meters long and two meters tall. It consists of a simple raised platform, on which an area that a kitchen and breakfast nook is built. This area is made up of a small table, two plastic benches, a small window that doubles as a projection screen, and containers for props. It looks like it is very rustic and homey, appropriate for a cabin in the woods.

The projection screen is used very sparingly; it is only used briefly, and then, to enhance the audience's perception of the setting. At the beginning and end of the production, projections of horses traveling both into and out of the woods are used to help show movement to and from the cottage (and as a transition into and out of the reality of the play) as well as show the isolation of the characters' location. The appearance of the horses symbolizes the beginning and end of the audience's relationship with R and A, as well as R and A's relationship with each other. In addition, the use of the horse-drawn carriage also lends the play a sense of fantasy, as horse-drawn carriages in the modern era are mostly connected with fairy tales.

Inside the cottage itself, prop-storage is self-contained within the kitchen. Some of the props include pieces of toast attached to the end of fishing poles, bicycle helmets, frying pans, empty soda bottles, plastic rain ponchos, clocks, spoons, desk lamps, band saws, shower heads, padlocks suspended from metal cords, and pancake flippers (gutestun.com). Even though there are very few stage directions in the play, and the text does not indicate that props can or should be used, Tismer and Savoldelli frequently utilize them throughout the production.

These props are used in a number of ways, and are an integral part of the play. The empty soda bottles and spoons are used by R and A as percussive instruments. While singing the chorus, R and A wear the plastic rain ponchos.

In addition, the use of props aids character development and in some ways functions as a plot device. During one scene, “Die Helme,” A insists that on the previous day, R stated that she owned at least two bicycle helmets. R denies having stated that she owned at least two bicycle helmets. While she says this, she wears multiple bicycle helmets stacked backwards on her head. A is oblivious to the fact that R is wearing the helmets while accusing R of having said that she owned multiple helmets. R, in an attempt to deny having said anything about the helmets, never refers to the helmets on her own head, either.

This scene emphasizes A’s lack of touch with reality. It also demonstrates A’s reliance on R and the expectation that R exclusively tells her the truth. It shows that R, the apparent stronger character, is willing to have some sort of fun at the expense of A. This scene proves that R is somewhat out of touch with reality herself, because it is unnecessary for her to own so many bicycle helmets and she is wearing them in an unorthodox manner.

Another memorable use of props is during the first scene with R and A, “Frühstück.” During this scene, Tismer and Savoldelli manipulate pieces of toast on fishing poles to make it seem as if the toast is flying into the toaster.¹³ This is incredibly important in helping to set the tone of the play. Because toast usually flies out of, and not into toasters, the reversal of the action helps to create a sense of fantasy. Additionally, if

¹³ This is one of the few stage directions in the text.

R and A are acting in such a strange manner so early in the day, one can only begin to imagine how they might act later in the day.

Even the appearance of the props appears to be symbolically significant. The set's materials and the props look old, as if someone has scavenged for them, and are symbolic of R and A: just like R and A, the materials have been discarded and deemed unusable by the remainder of society. Just like R and A have been able to create lives for themselves in this isolated location, they have managed to create a new life for the materials by using re-using them as a part of their antics.

The text portrays their shenanigans in an unreal fashion as well, and has been written in a child-like manner. For the most part, the text is printed in lower case, with very little punctuation.

The dialogue is also frequently disjointed, as is indicated in this portion of the opening sequence:

Fr. Dr. T: ja das hat mich auch erstaunt... da ist mir der gedanke gekommen

Fr. Dr. F: ja mir auch

Fr. Dr. T: ach sehen sie

Fr. Dr. F: na das ist ja auch ganz naheliegend

Fr. Dr. T eben! und deshalb muss ich die these aufstellen

Fr. Dr. F: bitte geben sie mir noch ein salatblatt

Fr. Dr. T: dann können wir das schriftlich fixieren

Fr. Dr. F: wie auf dem blatt

Fr. Dr. T: wie?

This exchange shows Fr. Dr. T. and Fr. Dr. F. talking to each other, but apparently not effectively communicating. Even as the characters transition into R and A, they continue to show a lack of communication skills.

At other times, character echoing and fragmented language is extensively used. This shows their need to repeat one another because of their lack of ability to communicate effectively with each other. In the scene “Die Marderfalle,” the expression “das ist doch” is used three times over the course of four lines of dialogue. At another point, in “Die Helme,” R exclaims, “so nu ist ma!” A ignores this and does not respond, though.

Passages such as these are difficult to read, but are vital to the work in terms of characterization and artistic expression. At the surface, the use of non-linear dialogue is interesting because it shows the characters’ relationship to each other. The two women often talk in a conversational manner, but seldom have a conversation with each other that makes any sense, either to each other or to the audience. This shows how disconnected they are from each other, as well as from reality.

Because there are no clues in the script pertaining to the execution of dialogue, the actors have to decide how to execute their lines and also decide where emphasis should be placed. This allows for a lot of variation from performance to performance, allowing for the work and characters within it to evolve. As the actresses become increasingly familiar with their roles, they are better able to understand how or why their characters execute particular lines of dialogue. This variation and evolution is also evident in the sections of the play that Tismer and Savoldelli improvise.

In one memorable scene improvised during the Atlanta production, R and A leave the confines of the set, walk through the rows of seats in the audience, and ask audience members if they can spare some change. R and A explain that they are trying to buy bus tickets to South Carolina so that they can visit a friend. In the Viennese production, Tismer and Savoldelli improvise a scene in which R and A simultaneously speak on disconnected telephones to a “Pupsi.” The ultimate effect of these scenes is that the audience becomes alienated in the traditional Brechtian sense. However, in the former scene, *Verfremdung* is used as a teaching device and in the latter, it is used primarily as a plot device and to add a comedic touch to the play.

One of the key elements of *Verfremdung* is that members of the audience initially have to be able to relate to the characters on some level before they can be alienated from the characters in the play. In the instance of the bus ticket scene, R and A’s request for money adds to the didactic experience in that it makes the scene much more relatable for an Atlanta audience. Given Atlanta’s proximity to South Carolina, many members of the audience can relate to the situation of wanting to visit a friend in South Carolina. In fact, even if R and A were not really headed towards South Carolina, it is common for pan handlers in the Atlanta area to ask for money, so that they can buy a bus ticket to go somewhere else. In either case, the Atlanta audience could identify with the situation.

During this aforementioned scene, members of the audience were confronted with a familiar dilemma: to give money or not. However, in this situation, the members of the audience were alienated by dealing with the reversal of a familiar situation. Usually, people have the option of walking past pan handlers. However, in this play, members of the audience remained seated and could not avoid the women, who were approaching

them and begging them for money. Because the audience members were essentially trapped in this situation, they were forced to deal with the uncomfortable experience of directly dealing with R and A.

The Atlanta scene provides a strong contrast to the scene in which R and A attempt to call “Pupsi” on the disconnected telephones. Rather than creating alienation by forcing an uncomfortable situation, members of the audience are alienated instead by the mere fact that they cannot relate to R and A. In this scene, the two women even trade phones in the middle of their conversations, yet continue to talk. While the audience laughed and found the incident amusing, the phone call advances the audience’s understanding of the characters’ state of mind. In this latter scene with the phone conversation, alienation is occurring in a more humorous manner, due to the characters’ mental illness.

By stating in the introduction that the characters have schizophrenia, Tismer and Savoldelli essentially have a free license to allow their characters to do whatever they want, whether it is having multiple personalities, connecting pieces of toast to fishing poles, or begging for money. An additional benefit is that Tismer and Savoldelli are then able to experiment with the work however they would like, including adapting certain elements of the play when performing it in different countries. This allows them to personally grow as actors, as they learn new ways to alienate the audience, as well as to increase the audience’s sense of character identification and alienation through the inclusion of region-specific information.

From a didactic standpoint, R and A’s speech pattern is significant for the use of alienation as well. People who suffer from untreated schizophrenia often have unusual

vocal patterns and are out-of-touch with reality. By the nature of schizophrenia, social issues and characters' attitudes toward them can be briefly presented and then ignored for the remainder of the play. Because of the characters' erratic behavior, it is acceptable or even expected that ideas are introduced and then suddenly forgotten, and it is acceptable to the audience. It also allows members of the audience to spend time developing their own opinions about the material and characters that have been presented, because they know that the characters cannot be trusted to tell them the truth.

.

Throughout the play, Tismer and Savoldelli have included scenes in which unique props, dialogue, and character development are presented to the audience, and they also present a final scene in which these aspects are greatly contrasted. These dissimilar scenes actually present the audience with an enhanced learning experience. In contrast to the earlier scenes, the final scene utilizes fewer techniques that lead to alienation of the audience. Despite the fact that it does not alienate the audience as much as previous scenes, this final scene may actually be more didactic than the others, because the social message of the scene is presented in an entirely different manner.

CHAPTER 4

BRECHTIAN DIDACTIC THEORY VS. GUTES TUN

“Die Freundin” is the final scene in the play, with the exception of the chorus. This scene deals with interpersonal relationships and interdependency of the characters. However, in this scene, the social message is conveyed in a different manner than in the other scenes.

In this scene, A decides that she wants to speak with R. R insists that A cannot be anywhere near her, because R insists that she has things she needs to do and finds A annoying. A insists then that she has been trying to improve herself, because R has asked her to improve her personality. A is also willing to wait until R is done with her tasks, before they talk. R begins to mimic A, but A tells R that she just wants to be around her, because when A is around R, she feels as if she is someone special. A begins to cry and offers to go someplace else to wait for R. By the end of the scene, R agrees to wait for A, until she returns from wherever it is that she is going.

From an artistic standpoint, this is probably the least Brechtian of all of the scenes in the play, and offers the least opportunity for improvisation. The scene only consists of dialogue, and, for the first time, none of the fanciful props are used. This also limits the actors' ability to improvise their characters' actions.

There is still some use of *Verfremdung* in this scene in terms of dialogue and plot, although it is used less frequently than in other scenes. Here, it is mostly used to help

emphasize the tenuous mental states of A and R. Again in this scene, dialogue in the Programmheft is presented with very little punctuation and few stage directions, and there is some repetition of the main ideas. In particular, this is the case when A irritates R, but is willing to do anything for R, despite the fact that R makes her upset sometimes). Nevertheless, the dialogue is more structured than in previous scenes in that it actually follows a specific line of reasoning.

For the first time in the play, the intended messages of this scene are clear: no relationship is perfect, compromise is required to make relationships work, and we are all frightened of being left alone. These are also incredibly universal themes, and themes that are very important for people like A and R, who, like many of Brecht's characters, live outside the boundaries of society.

In previous scenes in the play, such as "Die Marderfalle," social issues are mentioned in passing, and somehow tied in to what is happening to A and R in their house in the woods. Members of the audience are informed that a particular problem is happening, and often see A and R worry about the issue for a moment before moving on to a totally different social issue, or a topic that has absolutely nothing to do with social issues.

In contrast to the other scenes, it is interesting that this scene is so simplistic. Over the previous four scenes, the audience has become accustomed to R and A's atypical use of language and rapid-fire introduction of a social topic before ignoring the idea for the remainder of the play. The more straightforward nature of this scene, fewer displays of erratic behavior, and more typical language usage arguably makes it more effective as a teaching device.

With the exception of “Die Freundin,” in *Gutes Tun 1,3*, the audience reaches their own conclusions in less structured, but no less intentional, ways. Similarly, Brecht tried to differentiate his works by having members of the audience reach their own conclusions. His works were developed in a more rigid manner, so that most of the audience would reach their own conclusions after viewing a performance, but arrived at their opinion, guided by Brecht. Scenes such as “Die Freundin” provide some didactic structure within *Gutes Tun 1,3*, but generally, the play’s messages are not presented with as much structure as Brecht included in his own works.

In addition, due to R and A’s fanciful dialogue and behavior, it might be easy for a member of the audience to miss one of many of their brief discussions of a social issue. Because of that, Tismer and Savoldelli’s intended meaning for a particular scene could easily be misconstrued. The audience is challenged to listen closely, analyze the messages put forth by R and A, and reach their own conclusions. Similarly, Brecht’s audiences were encouraged to do the same thing, but Brecht’s characters provided their ideas more concisely.

A number of Brechtian techniques are used by Tismer and Savoldelli during this play. In particular, Tismer and Savoldelli extensively use the concept of *Verfremdung*, and the authors have especially applied this concept to R and A’s choice of language. However, with the exception of the scene “Die Freundin,” there is only limited use of Brechtian methodology while conveying the play’s social messages.

In a small collective, Tismer and Savoldelli have managed to create a didactic play for the twenty-first century, while retaining the spirit and certain characteristics of Brecht’s didactic theater from the 1930’s. As it is, this play has been successfully

presented for various audiences throughout the world. In the future, it will be interesting to note if the Gutes Tun collective will continue to create new works that incorporate elements of Brecht's theory of didactic theater, especially because it is clear that it has international appeal.

WORKS CITED AND CONSULTED

- Barnett, David. "Heiner Müller as the End of Brechtian Dramaturgy: Müller on Brecht in Two Lesser-Known Fragments." Theater Research International 27.1 (2002): 49-57.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Anmerkungen zur Oper Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny." Schriften zum Theater 2. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. Collected Plays: Two. Cox & Wyman: Reading, 1994.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Der Film im epischen Theater." Schriften zum Theater 3. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Hervorbringen des V-Effekts." Schriften zum Theater 3. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Der Piscatorsche Versuch." Schriften zum Theater 1. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Piscatortheater." Schriften zum Theater 1. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Über das alte und neue Theater." Schriften zum Theater 1. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Über das Stanislawski-System." Schriften zum Theater 3. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.

- Brecht, Bertolt. "Über das Theater der Chinesen." Schriften zum Theater 4. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Der V-Effekt." Schriften zum Theater 3. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Über den Gestus." Schriften zum Theater 4. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Vergnügungstheater oder Lehrtheater?" Schriften zum Theater 3. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Zu den Lehrstücken." Schriften zum Theater 4. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Brecht, Bertolt. "Zur Ästhetik des Dramas." Schriften zum Theater 1. Ed. Werner Hecht. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Case, Sue-Ellen. "From Bertolt Brecht to Heiner Müller." Performing Arts Journal 7.1 (1983): 94-102. JSTOR. 24 July 2008
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3245301?origin=JSTOR-pdf>>.
- Epskamp, Kees. Theatre in Search of Social Change. CESO: The Hague, 1989.
- Hinck, Walter. Die Dramaturgie des späten Brecht. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1966.
- Jameson, Fredric. Brecht and Method. Verso: New York, 1998.
- Kerz, Leo. "Brecht and Piscator." Educational Theater Journal 20.3 (Oct 1968): 363-369. JSTOR. 24 July 2008 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3205177>>.
- Kesting, Marianne. Das epische Theater: Zur Struktur des modernen Dramas. W. Kohlhammer GmbH: Stuttgart, 1959.

- Kiebuszinska, Christine. Revolutionaries in the Theater: Meyerhold, Brecht, and Witkiewicz. UMI Research Press: Ann Arbor, MI, 1988.
- Kleberg, Lars. Theater as Action. Trans. Charles Rogle. Macmillan: London, 1993.
- Knopf, Jan. Brecht Handbuch in fünf Bänden. Metzler: Stuttgart, 2001.
- Krabiell, Klaus-Dieter. Brechts Lehrstücke: Entstehung und Entwicklung eines Spieltyps. Metzler: Stuttgart, 1993.
- Liégeois, Marie. "Anne Tismer tour à tour légère et grave." La Libre Belgique 26 Jan 2007. 24 July 2008 <<http://www.festivaldeliege.be/presse2.asp?id=25>>.
- Oskamp, Katja. "Anne Tismer probiert sich aus." Berliner Zeitung 12 May 2006. 24 July 2008
<<http://www.berlinonline.de/berlinerzeitung/archiv/.bin/dump.fcgi/2006/0512/feuilleton/0041/index.html>>.
- Pilz, Dirk. E-mail interview. 25 July 2008.
- Pilz, Dirk. "Einübung zur Anarchie." Zitty 25 July 2007. 24 July 2008:
<<http://buehne.zitty.de/2755/buehne---berichtportraet.html>>.
- Pilz, Dirk. "Der unwiderstehliche Charme des Aufbruchs: Anne Tismer und das Ballhaus Ost in Berlin." Neue Zürcher Zeitung 24 Feb 2006. 24 July 2008
<<http://www.nzz.ch/2006/02/24/fe/articleDLZ7P.html>>.
- Savoldelli, Rahel. E-mail interview. 30 July 2008.
- Schebera, Jürgen. Kurt Weill: An Illustrated Life. Trans. Caroline Murphy. Yale University Press: New Haven, CT, 1995.

Schmidt, Ingo and Florian Vaßen. Bibliographie Heiner Müller: 1948-1992. 24 July 2008

<http://www.germanistik.unihannover.de/organisation/publikationen/h_mueller.shtml>.

Steinweg, Rainer. Die Maßnahme: Kritische Ausgabe. Suhrkamp Verlag: Frankfurt am Main, 1972.

Tismer, Anne. E-mail interview. 28 July 2008.

Tismer, Anne and Rahel Savoldelli. Gutes Tun 1,3. 24 July 2008

<http://www.gutestun.com/downloads/gutestun_programm.pdf>

“Unter TAG – Gutes Tun 1,3.” 12 December 2007. 24 July 2008

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TM-2ULjs_IU>

Völker, Klaus. Brecht: A Biography. Trans. John Nowell. The Seabury Press: New York, 1978.

Wildermann, Patrick. E-mail interview. 24 July 2008.

Wildermann, Patrick. “Wir haben absolute Anarchie!” Der Tagesspiegel 23 June

2007. 24 July 2008 <<http://www.tagesspiegel.de/kultur/Theater;art772,2327362>>.

Zipes, Jack. “Erwin Piscator’s Political Theatre.” The Modern Language Journal 58.4

(Apr 1974): 211-212.

APPENDIX A

E-MAIL INTERVIEW WITH DR. DIRK PILZ, JULY 15, 2008

HAAS: Was ist Ihre Definition von „didaktischem Theater?“

PILZ: Didaktisches Theater ist solches, das auf eine klar erkennbare, eindeutige inhaltliche Aussage hin ausgerichtet ist: es hat eine unverkennbare Botschaft mit einem eindeutigen Zweck – dem Zweck der Erziehung. Solches Theater ist für mich kein Gegenstand der Ästhetik, sondern der Pädagogik. (Brechts episches Theater ist kein didaktisches Theater: es hat zwar eine klare Wirkabsicht aber keine eindeutige „Botschaft“.)

HAAS: Sind Sie der Meinung, dass *Gutes Tun 1,3* didaktisches Theater ist? Warum/warum nicht?

PILZ: Nein, es ist kein didaktisches Theater weil ich eine eindeutige Botschaft nicht erkennen kann – es gibt einander widersprechende Aussagen, ästhetische Strategien, Figuren.

HAAS: Was sind [andere] Beispiele von modernem didaktischem Theater?

PILZ: Ich sehe sie vor allem in Kinder- und Jugendtheater (am Berliner Grips-Theater, wo Theater aus einem klaren Erziehungsabsicht heraus gemacht wird.) Vielleicht neigt nach Claus Peymann zu didaktischem Theater: Sein „Richard III.“ hat etwa eine

„belehrende“ Absicht – es soll den Mechanismus der Macht zeigen und zeigt tatsächlich nicht mehr als das.

HAAS: Wie würden Sie *Gutes Tun 1,3* mit traditionellen Stücken vergleichen? Anderen neuen Stücken? (Inhalt, Stil...)

PILZ: Das ist eine schwierige Frage – ich scheue solche Vergleiche immer, weil sie wenig aussagen. Aber am ehesten würde ich es mit dem frühen Brecht.

APPENDIX B

E-MAIL INTERVIEW WITH PATRICK WILDERMANN, JULY 24, 2008

HAAS: Was ist Ihre Definition von „didaktischem Theater“?

WILDERMANN: Didaktisches Theater ist, im Sinne des griechischen Ursprungs (didáskein = lehren), ein Theater, das eine Geschichte, bzw. einen Konflikt exemplarisch mit der Absicht verhandelt, dass der Zuschauer eine Lehre, eine Handlungsanweisung, eine moralische Botschaft daraus ableiten kann.

Beispielhaft dafür sind bis heute die Lehr- und Lernstücke Brechts, im weitesten Sinne also das epische Theater, das im Gegensatz zum aristotelischen das Mitdenken über das Mitfühlen stellt.

HAAS: Sind Sie der Meinung, dass *Gutes Tun 1,3* didaktisches Theater ist?

WILDERMANN: Sicherlich kann man *Gutes Tun 1,3* als didaktisches Theater bezeichnen, da die Stücke zumeist ein klar erkennbares Anliegen besitzen, Denkanstöße geben oder Missstände aufzeigen wollen.

Allerdings wäre der Begriff „sozial engagiertes Theater“ nicht weniger treffend. Der Didaktik zuwider läuft passagenweise der abstrakte, assoziative Charakter der Arbeiten – nicht immer leicht, eine Lehre daraus zu ziehen. Auch thematisiert das Kollektiv ja

durchaus eigene Unsicherheiten und Zweifel, bestimmte Standpunkte betreffend. Wie im Falle des Stücks „Gutes Tun“, das von der titelgebenden Problematik handelt, Gutes tun zu wollen, aber nicht zu wissen, was und wie – wodurch beim Zuschauer erstmal nur ein Wiedererkennungs-Effekt ausgelöst wird. Eine Botschaft hat das Ganze aber natürlich doch, nämlich: versuch's trotzdem.

Die Inszenierung „Bei mir“ erscheint im Vergleich noch didaktischer. Ein Missstand, nämlich die Situation allein gelassener Kinder, wird phantasievoll und metaphorisch überhöht, aber doch so deutlich benannt, dass das Publikum sich zum Hinschauen, zum Aufgerufen fühlen darf.

HAAS: Was sind [andere] Beispiele von modernem didaktischem Theater?

WILDERMANN: Andere Beispiele sind nahezu sämtliche Stücke, die in Berlin das (wirklich gute) GRIPS-Kinder- und Jugendtheater zeigt, deren Gründer ja im Zuge der 68er-Bewegung mit dem Anliegen angetreten ist, „alle Teile der Gesellschaft zu agitieren.“

Auch die Performance-Arbeiten der Gruppe SIGNA, die den Zuschauer derart ins Spiel einbeziehen, dass er direkt mit den Schauspielern interagiert und dadurch sein eigenes Theater „erfährt“, halte ich für didaktisch, was in ähnlicher Weise für bestimmte Inszenierungen von SHE SHE POP ebenso gilt wie für FORCED ENTERTAINMENT – eigentlich haben sämtliche Performance-Arbeiten, die den Zuschauer unmittelbar adressieren und ins Spiel einbeziehen einen didaktischen Charakter.

HAAS: Wie würden Sie *Gutes Tun 1,3* mit traditionellen Stücken vergleichen? Anderen neuen Stücken? (Inhalt, Stil...)

WILDERMANN: Im Vergleich zu traditionellen Stücken arbeitet „Gutes Tun 1,3“ nicht mit Figurenpsychologie und linearer Handlung – aber das macht im deutschen Theater kaum noch ein Regisseur. In vielen Punkten ist es typisches Off-Theater: Rollenwechsel, assoziative Handlungssprünge, soziale Thematik...

APPENDIX C

E-MAIL INTERVIEW WITH RAHEL SAVOLDELLI, JULY 30, 2008

HAAS: Warum wurde das Gutes Tun-Kollektiv gegründet?

SAVOLDELLI: 2004 haben anne und ich uns bei der produktion "big in bombay" von contsanza macras / dorkypark kennengelernt und schnell gemerkt, dass wir gut zusammen arbeiten und einen ähnlichen humor haben.

dann traten wir als gastduo in der produktion "zornige menschen " von dirk cieslak/lubricat auf. wir wollten dem ensemble (einen mix aus schauspielern und leihen, zum teil hatz 4 empfänger) gutes tun und ihnen brötchen , pullover, geschirr etc schenken. man musste sich aber dafür auf listen eintragen
danach wurde aus der szenen ein ganzes stück mit dem titel "gutestun 1.3" und seither traten wir generell unter diesem namen auf

HAAS: Was sind die Ziele des Kollektivs? (am Anfang, jetzt, in der Zukunft)

SAVOLDELLI: die produktionsweise kann nicht mehr von dem produkt getrennt werden. es besteht in der zusammenarbeit ein wichtiges ziel einer modernen gesellschaft.

HAAS: Wie viele Leute nehmen jetzt in dem Kollektiv teil?

SAVOLDELLI: in der letzten produktion "bei mir" waren wir 5 auf der bühne und 5 mitarbeiter : anne tismer, sylvia schwarz, niels bohrmann, okka hungerbühler,

andres castoldi, bukart ellinghaus, okka tismer, annalisa fischer, natascha zimmermann und ich.

HAAS: Was sind Ihre Einflüsse? (Autoren, Stücke, Theorien...)

SAVOLDELLI: natürlich all die vergangenen arbeiten. bei mir u.a!! dorkypark und lubricat aber auch die eher dokumantarische arbeitsweise der "giessener schule". ich habe bei der produktion "wmf" von dem regieduo auftrag/lorey mitgewirkt und war von der arbeit sowie dem produkt begeistert. ganz private texte die aus intviews zusammenschnitten wurden , bekamen 12 schauspieler über kopfhörer zugesagt und die wurden dann möglichst zeitgleich den 12 zuschauern, (por zuschauer ein schauspieler) vorgetragen.

es ergab sich die möglichkeit ganz "klein" zu spielen, fast wie bei einer nahaufnahme. die texte waren keine bühnen texte sonder "wie man halt so spricht", grammatikalisch falsch, zum teill wirr, suchend, bis man den gedanken gefunden hat....das ganze aber präzise und zum teil im chor.

alles was begeistert beeinflusst. auch das was in der welt passiert. in dem stück "bei mir" ging es um alleingelassene kinder und um das bienenvölker sterben. beides hochaktuelle themen

HAAS: Wie schreiben Sie Ihre Stücke?

SAVOLDELLI: es gibt verschiedene methoden. man spricht zu zweit oder in der gruppe und einer schreibt gleichzeitig mit.

damit erzielt man auch genau diesen effekt, das sätze nicht zu "bühnewirksam" werden.

es wird oft gleichzeitig gesprochen und man konzentriert sich auf vieles gleichzeitig.
 wir schreiben aber auch zuhause texte. die werden dann auf die anderen aufgeteilt. man
 spricht nicht gezwungener massen seine eigenen texte. und kommt nicht in gefahr zu
 sehr an seine eigenen ideen oder was man „selber“ geschriebe hat zu hängen.

HAAS: Wie würden Sie *Gutes Tun 1,3* mit traditionellen Stücken vergleichen? (Inhalt, Stil...)

SAVOLDELLI: [no answer provided]

HAAS: würden Sie *Gutes Tun 1,3* mit anderen neuen Stücken vergleichen? (Inhalt, Stil...
 In Deutschland und auch überall)

SAVOLDELLI: vielleicht zeigt gutestun 1,3 auch den teil einer show die nicht
 funktioniert

wenn kinder eine zirkus show machen dann klappt immer etwas nicht, oder es passiert
 etwas, was nicht vorgesehen war, sie werden abgelenkt oder vergessen was sie machen
 wollten....

nach solchen dingen suchen wir. wie nehmen die themen die in der welt jetzt passieren

HAAS: Wie würden Sie *Gutes Tun 1,3* oder andere Stücke von dem Kollektiv mit Ihren
 Solo-Stücken vergleichen? (Inhalt, Au fführung...)

SAVOLDELLI: es geht um geistiges eigentum, copy right, die idee von open source, was ist der unteschied zwischen inspiration und diebstahl. in der musikwelt ist der remix ganz normal. im theater finde ich ist man sehr konservativ was das freigeben von ideen anbelang.

copyME ist eine auffordeung mich zu kopieren ,von mir zu stehlen.

tatjana saphir aus buenoas aires und tim habeger aus atlanta werden copyME kopieren und so werden neue versionen von copyMe´s entstehen.

ich werde auch mit ihnen an der entwicklung zusammen arbeiten. ende september fliege ich dafür nach atlanta.

APPENDIX D

E-MAIL INTERVIEW WITH ANNE TISMER, JULY 28, 2008

HAAS: Warum wurde das Gutes Tun-Kollektiv gegründet?

TISMER: rahel und ich haben eine arbeit zusammen mit jemand anderem gemacht und da blieb noch eine menge text übrig den wir zusammen geschrieben hatten und dieses material wollten wir benutzen da haben wir das kollektiv gegründet

HAAS: Was sind die Ziele des Kollektivs? (am Anfang, jetzt, in der Zukunft)

TISMER: wir wollten zusammen was so machen wie wir es gut finden und unsere eigenen ideen benutzen weil da so viel sich angesammelt hatte wir wollten auch in gleichberechtigter arbeit zusammen etwas entwickeln weil mehrere menschen mehr dimensionen eröffnen können denn jeder sieht die welt ja anderes und dann gibt es mehr vieldeutigkeit und viele seiten von einer sache so wie bei heraklit. das gefällt uns

HAAS: Wie viele Leute nehmen jetzt in dem Kollektiv teil?

TISMER: rahel savoldelli, burkart ellinghaus, okka tismer, okka hungerbühler, andres castoldi, annalisa fischer, sylvia schwarz, cristin könig, luise tismer, keno tismer, anne tismer, ich hab sicher noch welche vergessen (wie man sieht familienbetrieb)

HAAS: Was sind Ihre Einflüsse? (Autoren, Stücke, Theorien...)

TISMER: sachen - mathematik - zeitungartikel - das leben - dinge - menschen - tiere -
die uns begegnen heraklit - schwarze löcher - auch handarbeit wie häkeln – autos

HAAS: Wie schreiben Sie Ihre Stücke?

TISMER: manchmal indem wir aufschreiben wie wir miteinander reden über ein thema
oder was anderes manchmal jeder für sich manchmal indem wir aufschreiben was wir
improvisiert haben manchmal in dem wir aufschreiben was wir gelesen haben und was
wir denken oder erlebt haben - wir machen auch immer viel objekte - das ist gleich
wichtig wie text

HAAS: Was ist Ihre Definition von „didaktischem Theater“?

TISMER: weiß nicht

HAAS: Sind Sie der Meinung, dass Gutes Tun 1,3 didaktisches Theater ist? Warum/
warum nicht?

TISMER: gutestun ist nicht theater - gutestun ist aktion oder kunstaktion oder
performance

HAAS: Wie würden Sie Gutes Tun 1,3 mit traditionellen Stücken vergleichen? (Inhalt,
Stil...)

TISMER: gutestun ist aktion und performance - gutestun ist nicht theater

HAAS: Wie würden Sie Gutes Tun 1,3 mit anderen neuen Stücken vergleichen? (Inhalt, Stil... In Deutschland und auch überall)

TISMER: weiß nicht

HAAS: Wie würden Sie Gutes Tun 1,3 oder andere Stücke von dem Kollektiv mit Ihren Solo-Stücken vergleichen? (Inhalt, Aufführung...)

TISMER: die aktionen die ich alleine mache schreib ich alleine und ich baue die objekte alleine oder mit assistenten - es sind keine solostücke sondern kunstaktionen oder performances - sonst ist gleich - wenn ich mit den anderen zusammen arbeite dann sind wir mehrere die zusammen an einem thema arbeiten - so alleine ist so - ich versuche meistens zu verstehen wie die welt funktioniert und erstmal aber die erde - und warum dinge und sachen in anderen ländern anders oder gleich aussehen und warum in einigen ländern die menschen keine waschmaschinen haben und in anderen ländern mütter ihre kinder umbringen und wieder in anderen ganz viele menschen drogen nehmen usw... ich glaube nur wenn man versucht etwas zu verstehen dann kann man es ändern - ich will auch immer was ändern - so indem ich manches ganz deutlich übertrieben mache - wenn man bei jemand anders was sieht was man nicht gut findet dann kapiert man viel schneller daß es nicht gut ist als wenn man es selber macht - darum zeig ich viel so sachen -daß man das sehen kann - und ich bilde mir ein daß das was ändert - weiß ich aber nicht -kann auch das Gegenteil bewirken - wenn ich heraklit richtig verstanden habe