

BIG AND SMALL CULTURE POLICIES

Lenka Dohnalová, Czech Music Council

ACCESS TO MUSIC, MAIN PERSPECTIVES

The topic of our conference is Access to music, its actual perspectives.

I see **two main perspectives** which we can use generally:

1. Impact of music /and arts/ on the individual and social life /positive such as refining of emotional and social abilities and individual concentration and cerebral functions especially by active playing music, music and sound therapy etc.; negative such as a political abusing of music as a political badge, long exposition to the load stereotype music, music and sound smog etc.
2. Impact of the actual conditions of the society on the music life /economical and political frame for working of organisations, new technologies, offer and market, situation at the labour market, taste's evolution etc./

ACTUAL POLITICAL FRAME FOR CULTURE, ARTS AND MUSIC

I would like to expose us some observations of the actual political agendas directly influencing the culture life in Europe:

1. **European Lisbon Strategy with Common European Objectives /2000-10/**,
2. **UNESCO Declaration on Diversity /2005/ accepted by EU /2007/**,
3. **the European Culture Agenda in the Age of Globalisation /May 2007/242/ with the Opinion of the Committee of the Regions /2008/C53/05/ to this Agenda.**
4. **Year of Intercultural Dialog /2008/**
5. **Year of Creativity and Innovation /2009/**

Let name some practical aspects and problems of understanding and implementation of them to the state and regional level.

What these materials forenamed above express? General perspectives

1. Specificity, culture tradition, dialogue, creativity and long-sustainable evolution

Europe would like to be appreciated as an interesting and specific continent with long and dynamic culture tradition with the accent on the value of social dialogue as such and cooperation of different special interest groups. The individual creativity has been appreciated especially since the time of Renaissance as a base of the long-sustainable evolution.

Comment: I see as very important an accent on the local and regional activities and policies in culture and arts with principle of subsidiarity and simplification of administration during the process of implementation expressed in the *Opinion of the Board of Regions to the European Culture Agenda*. We need it for healthy long-sustainable disposition of society.

2. Respect to Diversity/Intercultural dialogue - Political and monetary unification, globalisation

Politics: Building of “European state”

The EU is politically very active. It thrusts forward the legislative unification up to the specific level with their directives, it advances a monetary unitary system of EURO related to the big redistribution of money among rich and less rich countries, it thrusts forward the planning of policy, economy, frame of scientific research /strategies, goals, platforms/. In this context for receiving also some moneyed support for culture /in a narrower sense/ the administration uses also thematising /Years of..., calls and axis, agendas/. All steps to the “super-state” provoke not only the process of convergency but also antipathy to this strong administration and create real conflicts during the implementation to the state and regional level.

Demographic aspect:

Europe is actually diversified not only by its culture tradition /in a large sense/, but during the last years also by its demographic structure. Especially the states of West Europe /Germany, France, GB, Belgium../ have to be up to the quickly growing number of ethnic minorities, especially those of the other ethnics but born in Europe / 7-20% in the young generation, and the structure of natality is blowing up this relation because the natality of autochthons decline/. It will be not only the problem of these countries but all European Shengen area in future.

Mobility of artists and scientists partly constrained by the labour market situation contributes not only the positive consequences /to be more flexible and refined/ but also has its negative social consequences such a very low natality in this creative top of the European society.

Recapitulation:

The respect to the diversity is not only the continuation in the good aspects of the European tradition and reaction to the international context, but became a necessary as a compensation not only of the growing number of ethnic minorities and political integration with new states in Europe, but also as a compensation of the process of unification of building of European “nation”. The argument of stronger regions and interest groups serves further to the relatively inconspicuous building of European “super-state” and weakening of the states.

Comment: What produces a practical problem with the implementation of the UNESCO’s Declaration on Diversity /where is the term culture used in the most general sense of living style/ is not the general understanding of this need of human respect but the legislative implementation balanced respect to diversity with claim on the human rights included in the Charter of Human Rights at the state level. The diversity cannot be practised also without a similar economical a social level of the different social groups /S. Fraser/.

3. A better working of the culture and artistic institutions - Between economy and policy, between allocation of money and support of individual projects_/culture policies, Lisbon strategy/

Europe would like to rationalize the working of culture institutions, their management and marketing with keeping of the principle of subsidiarity /right to national and regional culture policies/ and minimize the risks but also using some fortes of globalization and creative industry, business and tourism /Lisbon strategy/.

The structure of the organisations not only in culture change quickly. They reduce their stabile employees, stay more opened /system of co-operators, work in network/

The actual European system balances between the allocation of money and evaluation of individual work and projects. The situation is difficult especially for the countries with long tradition of culture institutions and performing arts, because they dispose of fixed network of stabile organisations and big offer of absolvents of artistic and culture schools; more difficult it is for countries which aren't so rich to offer enough of free independent moneyed sources /state funds with independent sources, private funds, sponsorship/ for independent arts and culture.

Other aspects of the situation:

Paradox of claim on free creativity and regulation of public service

It is more special aspect of the situation. Culture, especially performing arts, is working with *deep paradoxes*: Economist Ch. Handy in his *New Conception of Principles* writes that the working with paradoxes and uncertainty is typical for today's business situation /because we would like to serve simultaneously to the majority and to the individual/. He adds that few people know to do it well, and in culture, we can find it in concentrated form.

A claim on the free creativity and production independent of state has been established in the Charter of Human Rights, it makes a part of our tradition. Actual culture policies /including this European/ define culture including performing arts /relatively newly/ as a public service. The public service lies in by its definition axiologically at the opposite to the free artistic creativity /including staging/. Public service has to be planned, controlled and accessible to the majority. Artists claim on the right to realize their creative concepts preferably without any regulation. The budgets especially of stabile theatres /operas/ are growing not only due to the growing of energies and work prices /deformed by the system of stars/ but also due to the new technologies in staging and due to the pressure of show-business taste, in music especially via musicals in all Europe. It produces a logical also in sense of game theory conflict between artistic and economic managements, between management of public organisations and their granters. All granters balance among the claim of free creativity, costs of productions and demand on access to this production to the public majority.

Comment: We have no problem /also in liberal policy/ to understand libraries, museums, public media, public artistic schools as a public services, but why regulate prudently the public service in creative area in the time when the cultural values and evaluation of the outputs in arts have been deformed by mass media and show business and professionals /absolvents of artistic and management schools/ are working at booth sides – liberal and social-democratic, illuminated and fugitive outputs..?. It is a problem of large “grey zone” in creativity and network of artistic organisations in Europe.

Possible answers?

1. We need the continual culture policies not closely depending on the political changes especially at the state level and exclude quick solutions of administration and financing because good artistic organisations works in longer perspectives /minimally 2 years/.
2. We need good low of communities service in culture /including arts/. It isn't easy to find the criteria of limits of the law term “important service” for artistic institutions, if a large grey zone of good working artistic organisation makes a reality in many European countries, also by us.

Additional questions:

Studies in artistic schools are demanding and expensive. About statistics in European countries, only small percentage of absolvents is working in artistic area exclusively.

The liberal system regulates the labour market by payment in schools /requited by scholarships/. The question of more social state systems is framed – Has the state regulate and normalized the network of artistic schools, services in performing arts /number of stabile orchestras, operas, theatres? /, Why stratify all system of support /allocations, long term grants, short grants/ for stimulate the creativity and provide a continuous work for systematic culture /artistic/ service in regions?

SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION INTO MUSIC AND PERFORMING ARTS

1. Role of music in the respect on diversity and inter-culture dialogue:

1.1. Many Music Practices, Music as connecting instrument....

We all have an experience with positive role of common-active-playing /important attribute is this “active”/ of different ethnic groups or different kinds of music /two conception of diversity in many music practices/. Many good examples were here presented during years. UNESCO supports the protection of specific ethnic tradition. The diversity of folk tradition, styles of music /Indies editors/ makes the opposition to the press of globalisation.

1.2. Counter-example: Music as dividing instrument, Marks for global English singing top pop...

Last week I heard interesting interview about the project using positive role of global pop music /with RFM/ in the countries with the long ethnical conflicts /South Africa, Near East/, where the national authentic music can be taken also as a political, ethnic or national token and global English singing top pop / such Madonna, Williams, Rihanna, Aquillera etc./ as a common language of young people /with the watchword “music without borders”/.

1.3. Implementation of the Declarations into the special thematising and support culture programs.

Positive discrimination support programs:

Support programs /structural funds, national programs of Ministries etc./ with positive discriminations of minorities have an effect e.c. in language training, further special education.. But arts as well as sports are the best for real integrative work involving many different groups /in relation to social national, age specification/ in the common project.

Example: We prepare project Špalíček /by Martinů’s music/, methodically inspired by *Rhythm is it*. The directors of basic schools cooperating in it said that they have more groups of children that need help with socialisation, not only Gipsy, e.c. group of children of single women which haven t enough of money and time. You have no support for these children; you cannot use the program for minorities, because they are in the support programs very strictly defined.

2. Thematising

/intercultural dialogue, creativity, axis of calls in structural funds etc./

The heads of Bruxelles administration evoke the philosophical perspectives; warn again the superficial understanding of the declarations. The argumentation for thematising of culture, arts and sciences lies often in better receiving of money in common European budget. We can understand it. But the specific experiences with procedural application of it are a few seriocomics. Special agencies and commissioned officers admonish to the summation of key words in project’s argumentation, mechanical excluding of words from another axis..

Comment: Thematising is sui generis political commission and we have to collect many examples of inorganic expensive political kitschs prepared by professional knowing European administration /especially in stage performing arts/ and on the other hand many spontaneous projects that cannot find the right “box” for to be supported. Yes, good managers can throw together activities “from ground” but the procedure in artistic projects start to be staying, not only in our country, per caput. Firstly: read the declarations, agendas, support programs, priorities, after their conditions, after WHAT we can do, WHAT we will do? We forgot the inner function and motivation of arts? It is also one of the consequences of the situation at the European /and also our/ labour market.

3. Better working of organisation.

Specific example:

The well balanced system of support of culture and especially artistic organisations is a problem of all big European cities /not only Prague/ where the competition of many artistic bodies is high, the artistic labour market is overflowing and the distinction of values is deformed by the media, systems of stars etc. Today’s specialists are working also for commercial projects and some projects needn’t to be of best quality by themselves as alternative and non-profit.

CR has also an abundant network of stable theatre’s, orchestral institutions with permanent employees and independent bodies, especially in Prague /50% of professional bodies/. The form of continuous allowances to the network of theatres and orchestras /by cities, regional and state programs/ has been essentially conserved. After 1989, many bodies started with aspiration to be continuously supported as well, and they have to live from project support only /during the last year enriched as a complementary system for more stabile organisations by 4 years grants e.c. in Prague/. We can say without hesitation that we have more theatre’s and instrumental bodies able to work at the same levels as today’s continuously granted bodies, but today they are limited e.c. by the condition of fixed employees /State program for support.../. From the other side, we can feel strong lobbying from the side of commercial pop culture and sub-culture especially to the administration of big cities /Prague/..

Recommendations /also for CR/?

All have to work in flukiness and changes. The risks can be bringing down by

1. a stabile law frame /public service in performing arts, diversified money sources and their management/,
2. a defined and well coordinated political administration resistant to permanent stressing from many interest groups,
3. a clear definition of expert’s groups and their competencies,
4. a qualified administration /supporting argument of Lisbon strategy about competent society/.
5. personal and financial changes have to be announced in time because the artistic organisation works in long perspective.
6. exchange of experiences, good examples for all – us, politics, granters, donators, public.

The claim o public allowance in performing arts institutions is legitimate. The administration has to be a service, not demonstration of the political power constantly changing its instruments.

No solution is definitely the best for all. The discussion and analyses, the bilateral personal contacts are obligatory.

SOME CONCLUSIONS FOR OUR COUNCILS:

1. We have to make /or know/ independent SWOT analyses of the key terms of the Declarations, Agendas etc. What they import to the practices, how sensitively they are implemented. The diversity, mobility etc. have their positive and negative aspects, opportunities and risks.
The non-governmental organisations have their capacity for understand the policy and also know well the practical situation.
2. We have to instrumentalize policy and their instruments, not policies and programs instrumentalized our projects. Use all good contacts and partners for it, not only from the area of arts and culture.
3. Be vigilant to all thematising and standardizing of arts production. It is a very sensitive zone of liberty for all us.
4. The existing paradoxes among the claim on free creativity – coasts – public service access have no simple solution need specific real cooperation and understanding of all.
5. The education has to inspire not only adapt itself to the actual interests of young people. We can use all technologies for attire their attention but the good ideas and inspiration lies in our hands.
6. We have firstly analyse, understand, inspire, coordinate and after produce and make a lobbying and policy.

Contribution to the conference Access to Music, EMC, 18.4.2008, Brno, JAMU