

EVENT DESCRIPTION SHEET

(To be filled in and uploaded as deliverable in the Portal Grant Management System, at the due date foreseen in the system.

 *Please provide one sheet per event (one event = one workpackage = one lump sum).*

PROJECT	
Participant:	STICHTING THEATERSCHIP (Teaterschip)
PIC number:	937084603
Project name and acronym:	RESISTANCE! - Youth Festival of Modern European History — RESISTANCE

EVENT DESCRIPTION	
Event number:	WP5, D8
Event name:	Past (im)perfect
Type:	Festival
In situ/online:	In-situ
Location:	Netherlands, Deventer
Date(s):	18.10.2024 – 20.10.2024
Website(s) (if any):	https://theaterschip.nl/agenda/past-imperfect/
Participants	
Female:	40
Male:	19
Non-binary:	/
From country 1 Netherlands:	191
From country 2 France:	5
From country 3 Italy:	7
From country 4 Slovenia:	6
From country 5 Czech Republic:	7
From country 6 Portugal:	5
From country 7 Serbia:	2
Total number of participants:	223
From total number of countries:	7
Description	
<i>Provide a short description of the event and its activities.</i>	
Participation disclaimer:	
<p>The performances and other activities related to the Resistance project the plays were performed at Ety Hillesum Lyceum het Vlier school in front of 150 students and 6 teachers and at Theaterschip with 67 attendees, including 45 participants from Resistance project.</p> <p>Gender-specific data were not collected for all audiences. This decision was made to respect student privacy and due to the sensitivity of the issue, which we recognized. We did not want to pressure young participants into disclosing or documenting their gender if they were not willing to do so. All student participation was approved by school authorities, with consent and supervision provided by headmasters or designated teachers.</p>	
Description:	
<p>On Friday 18 October we gathered together at Theaterschip. Here, we started with a general introduction to the festival weekend and had a look around the Theaterschip building. Next, we introduced the participants to structure of the school program of the afternoon. This entailed that the performers would lead the after talks after their performances in a specific way. In order to prepare them for this, Chris de Vries, a member of the artistic team of Theaterschip, gave a short workshop. This was based on a methodology that helps to structure debates and philosophical discussions with young people. The participants were introduced to this methodology and learned the ways in which they could structure their after talk in a way that would give the audience (high-school students) the freedom to form and express their own opinions without being influenced by the opinions of the performers. Each team worked on developing a general theme from their own performance and a few starting questions to open up the conversation. When the workshop was finished all participants cycled to the high school together and set up their performances in the classrooms.</p>	
School program	
<p>In the afternoon the school program started at Ety Hillesum Lyceum het Vlier, the high school in Deventer. Here, every performance played at the same time in a classroom for 1 class of high school</p>	

students from the fifth or sixth grade (16-18 years old). All the students received the historical context of the performance they were going to watch beforehand. In each classroom, one class of 25-30 students, a teacher from the school and a member of the Theaterschip team were present, besides the performers and mentors of the country. By performing in classrooms, the space that high school students spend most of their time in is transformed into a theatrical space. By doing this, we create an opportunity to reframe the space that the students relate to certain rules, behaviours and patterns into a new space with different rules. After each performance, the performers started their after talk with the students using the starting questions they came up with during the workshop. During the after talks, one member of the team made notes in order to keep an overview of the opinions that were expressed. At the end of the after talk, the class had to come up with a conclusive statement or question that summed up the conversation they just had and write them on a cardboard sign. Examples of these questions were: "Are you able to understand people better when you know their history?" and "It is our birthright to be free". When the after talk were finished, the students and the performers had a small break.

After the break, all 150 students and all performers gathered in the canteen. Here, Chris de Vries and Fiona Kelatow (mentor) lead an interactive debate for all students. As every student only watched one performance, the debate started with gathering knowledge about the other performances. Every student got 6 cards in one colour. The students then got 20 minutes to walk around the canteen and talk to each other about the Resistance performances. The goal was to talk to at least 5 people who saw a different performance than themselves. Every time a student talked to someone from another class, they exchanged information about the performances they saw, for example about the historical event of the performance and about remarkable elements of the performance (décor, costumes, style etc.). With this exchange of information, the students also exchanged the coloured cards, so they could keep track of how many performances they still had left to hear about. At the end of the 20 minutes, every student had 6 differently coloured cards, with information about all 6 performances. The students gathered in their classes again and Chris and Fiona asked 6 randomly picked students to tell something about a different performance than the one they saw themselves. During this exchange it became clear that the students were able to transfer the core information of each performance to each other. Now that they had this information, we moved on to the second part, sharing the after talks from each class. Every class held up their sign with the statement/question and explained what the discussion after their performance was about to the rest of the group. This allowed all the students to gain more insight into the different topics that the performances discussed and helped them to continue their thinking about history.

The third part of the debate was based around statements about history and history education. These statements were made in cooperation with history teachers from the school. Examples of statements are: Dutch history of Slavery is too long ago, there is no need for commemorating, History is a study of facts, There is no need for political discussion, There is not enough focus on the role of women in our history books and Our History books are, too much, written from a European perspective. For each statement, the students could move around the space to express whether they agreed (right side), disagreed (left side) or were somewhere in the middle. By creating this physical movement through the space it is easy to see whether opinions are polarized about a certain topic. When everyone moved to the space in the room that reflected their opinion, Chris and Fiona walked around with microphones to ask some follow-up questions. This gave the students the opportunity to express the nuances in their opinions which are not always expressed in just an 'agree' or 'disagree'. This part of the debate gave some interesting insights into the thoughts and opinions of these students about history and how they look at this from their perspective. Besides topics that were related to the historical themes of the Resistance performances like colonialization and guilt, the students also discussed current issues like the conflict in Gaza. This created an interesting bridge between historical events from the past and current events which will be the historical events of the future. To finish the debate, the students were divided into groups of 10. In these groups they were given the task to write down three things they wanted to change about their history education. As all these students have history as one of their courses and their history teachers were also present at the debate, this gave them to opportunity to express their thoughts on their own education. They wrote this down on forms that were then given to the history teachers of the school. Examples of the ideas were: More room for discussion during classes, more focus on different continents, less censoring; tell the full story, more references to the present in relation to history and more focus on the dark pages of Dutch history. After the debate in the school, all Resistance participants had free time to cycle around Deventer. In the evening we had dinner at PUNT, the restaurant next to Theaterschip and finished the first day of the festival.

Artistic program

On Saturday 19 October, the artistic program of the festival started. Because the Dutch festival was the fifth festival of the Resistance project, the participants already got to know each other and each others performances in the four previous festivals. Furthermore, they participated in numerous debates with each other after all the performances. During all these debates, they noticed some common themes that kept returning. To deepen the conversations about these overarching themes,

we decided to let the youngsters work on short performances together. In the morning, the youngsters got the opportunity to choose what theme they wanted to work on. The themes were, power, representation, guilt and time. Each group came together and started talking about their theme and the performance they wanted to create. This was an autonomous process for the participants. Mentors were present to give feedback or guidance when needed. At the end of Saturday, the four groups showed their performances to the group and received feedback on it.

Past (im)perfect

On Sunday 20 October, the youngsters got the opportunity to have the final and technical rehearsals of their performances. Here, they could incorporate the feedback they received the previous day. Then, after lunch the event 'Past (im)perfect' started. Besides the Resistance participants there were also other audiences present, who were mainly from older generations.

In the foyer, everyone got a coloured coin that fit the generation they belong to. Then, everyone went into the theatre where the floor was divided into three sections, past, present and future. Everyone joined the section that fit their age, the largest group being the future (12-30 years old) and the smallest being the past (50+ years old). Jasmine van Putten was the leader of the debate. The first section consisted of creating a rearrangement of the sections. Through questions about behaviours and knowledge, Jasmine helped the audience determine what generation they actually belonged to. An example of a question in this part was 'what is your main source of news?'. After this question the audience had to move to the section that fit their answer: a news(paper) app (present), a physical newspaper (past), television (present). In the section of their answer, everyone could grab another coin of the corresponding colour. At the end of this part, everyone had around 10 coins of varying colours. Jasmine asked everyone to look at what colour coins they had most of and to join that section. This was an interesting way to rearrange the generations. As there are prejudices about behaviours of each generation, it was interesting to see how after this section, the participants were more equally divided over the three sections. Furthermore, it made clear that your age does not necessarily determine your taste or opinions as there were people from the 'past' (50+) now in the present or future sections and vice versa. This set the atmosphere for the rest of the debate between different generations, to look further than prejudices.

Then we started the actual debate about the themes. Every theme was introduced by the performance from the youngsters. Every performance was concluded with a question raised in the discussions of the youngsters which in turn formed the starting point of the debate. The questions/statements were; Representation: History can be manipulated for someone to take the credit. Power: Who has the power to tell the story? Guilt: Distraction is the easiest coping mechanism for guilt. Time: How do we experience time?. The debates that followed the performances were very interesting. As the youngsters all took a very personal approach to the themes within their performances, they invited the audience to also think and talk about the topics from a personal perspective. This created interesting conversations where history was discussed from different perspectives, within a diverse group of people from different countries and generations. By using these overarching themes from derived from the after talks after the Resistance performances in previous festivals, we were able to take these conversations further and discuss new areas that interested the youngsters. By letting the youngsters create new performances together, we also added an element of artistic exchange besides exchanges that were already established during the after talks of the performances. This gave the youngsters the ability to learn from the artistic practices of youngsters from different countries as well as challenging them to express their thoughts on a subject into a performance. During the in-person evaluations with each group of participants, it became clear that the mixed approach was highly appreciated. Participants highlighted how this combination deepened their understanding and made the experience more engaging and meaningful. A similar sentiment was echoed during the partners' meeting, where an evaluation between producers and mentors was carried out. We finished the final day of the festival with a Indonesian/Moluccan dinner.

HISTORY OF CHANGES		
VERSION	PUBLICATION DATE	CHANGE
1.0	01.04.2022	Initial version (new MFF).