

**Sonja Greiner:** Vienna, in the heart of Europe and usually well-connected to most major cities, turned out to be difficult to reach – as you all know by now, due to a volcano eruption in Iceland. This is a kind of globalisation we probably had not imagined before, that a **natural catastrophe so many kilometres away** could have an influence on our conference – and I can tell you that we have been lucky compared to other conferences this weekend since many of us already arrived on Thursday, before most airports closed down.

This situation gave a new perspective on the relationship between nature and culture, one of the topics of our conference – we like to think that we can control nature but again and again nature shows us that this is not true. Yesterday evening Ivor Davies told us that a similar volcano eruption in Iceland lasted 10 months in the 18<sup>th</sup> century – of course they had no airplanes at the time, but let's imagine for a moment what an impact such a long disturbance could have on business and culture in Europe – though we are optimistic that it will not last so long this time and that you will actually be able to get back home tomorrow, even if you have to be creative to find a way to do so.

**Peter Rantasa:** But imagine for a moment that you will have to stay, and all of a sudden experience the joy of an unexpected break in your usual hurry, and is beyond your control. For example, you could use this precious gift of extra time to explore this city, full of history, a bit deeper, and, if you find one of the slower places here, like a traditional coffeehouse, you could also take some “time to think” – one of our most scarce resources in these hectic times – to reflect upon the rich and diverse experiences of the last two days,

Exploring “Musical Diversity“ under the conference motto “Looking back, looking forward“, the presentations of the last two days stretched our minds in many directions – from the extreme abstract of political realities, to the very very concrete in detailed examples of daily musical practice; from the geographically remote to the closest neighbourhood and back and – how could it be different in this city – from the history and grand musical tradition of centuries to the chaotic plurality of the here and now.

One might be tempted to play a little on the words of the conference motto according to the “genius loci“ of the place as the autochthon literate Alfred Polgar once coined it: „*Die Österreicher sind ein Volk, das mit Zuversicht in die Vergangenheit blickt.*“ This could translate to “looking forward to looking back“.

Indeed, the dramatic changes throughout the world and their subsequent effect on the world of music; the need for action caused by the forces of globalization; commoditisation; digitization; the increasing pressures of the economic life on each individual “*bios*“ – as the old Greeks called the particular way of life - presents challenges for the EMC and its member organisations.

**Sonja Greiner:** Our **summary as observers** will try to answer the following questions: What did we hear and see during this conference (we will make a short summary mostly of what happened yesterday, hoping that your memory will be good enough to remember what was said this morning), how did it refer to our subject of “Musical Diversity”, and did we really look back and into the future in our discussions? What had we hoped to hear but did not hear? What should we take home as conclusions of the weekend? What can the European Music Council do and what **can** our organisations do or what **should** they do as a consequence of this conference?

Peter Rantasa: To inspire your reflections, your observers – rather than repeating each of the individual sessions - will try to identify some of the focal points that came up during these two days. Here is the first one:

## 1. The Role of music for every child and adult (as stated in the IMC 5 musical rights)

**Sonja Greiner:** Our keynote speaker, **Simron Jit Singh**, showed an example on how not the natural disaster itself, but the aid brought to the Nicobar Islands after the Tsunami heavily changed the **relationship between culture and nature**. The people on the islands went from the situation where they had limited wants and unlimited means to a situation where they had unlimited wants and limited means. To fulfil their new needs they needed to work eight hours (which may seem normal to us) instead of one hour (which was normal to them before the Tsunami, which left 6 hours of time for social activities, festivities, rituals etc.). Also cash was introduced, commerce was started, new needs were created, a new economical model was introduced, new leaders were needed etc.

When we turned to the subject of **Musical Diversity in the Urban Areas** Ursula Hemetek started with a picture showing Austrians doing a Turkish dance under the statue of Ludwig van Beethoven and reminding us that Beethoven (as well as Mozart, Strauss and others) was also an immigrant, though he probably did not suffer from the fact at the time since it was before the introduction of the myth of the national state. She explained in which spaces/contexts music in the cities is performed, for example in private ghettos, folkloristic presentations, public ghettos (in all these cases it is usually only music from one cultural minority), but also in creative exchange, especially, but not only, in the field of world music (where the cultural origin may play a role but is not necessarily in the focus) and mainstream concerts (jazz, classical music etc.)

**Sonja Greiner:** Yesterday afternoon, in the **parallel interactive sessions**, we found two more aspects which fit under this focal point:

In his presentation in the session on digitalisation Graham Dixon from BBC said that cultural diversity should be in the centre of our daily life and the media are only in the surrounding.

In the session on music education Michael Wimmer stressed the fact that music is not global and understood by everybody, since music is used to create identity and this implicitly means creating differences. Some groups do not WANT their music to be understood by others.

**Peter Rantasa:** Well, I perfectly remember from my own youth what Michael Wimmer was talking about: The adolescent need for differentiation led me to musics that were made in the spirit of a secret language for peers in the group. Underground, avant-garde – however one want to call it – as opposed to the mainstream, which was made for “everyone”, served as a pillar to form what, back then, I thought was my own identity. I am not sure if this pattern still exists for today’s youth, but it helped me to understand that culture is a “we” rather than an “I alone” thing (this we maybe could call a style), that creates a “we“ in differentiation to “them“, whoever “they” may be. I guess, even if Simon Singh told us that the Anthropologists can still not tell us today, what exactly culture means – in this aspect they agree.

After Simron’s presentation, several participants discussed in the coffee-break how his point about

the Tsunami relief effort related to music, and our less exotic lifestyles. But if we look closer at the example of the post-Tsunami Nikobar Islands, what it tells us is not at all remote: The pressures to “make a living”; to be available 24/7 for our employers; to be available even during the most private time via SmartPhone, e-mail etc., is eating away at our time in the same way as new practices of money-making do for the former coconut-farmers in the Nikobares. We have to earn and to consume, and our musical practice is dominated more and more by listening to an iPod (in the sound-quality these devices can deliver), whilst waiting for the bus rather than learning an instrument or engaging in the social practice of music making. In such a world there is no need for music education – and that is what we see in reality in school curricula all over the world. The remaining time and space for our social practice and emotional engagement is colonised by commodification and the needs of “stakeholders” in the “content value chain” for the creative industries. In this environment, music became “content”, that needs to be “monetised” via new “business models”. In the industrialised world of Europe, the changes described in the Nikobares might seem to be happening slowly, but they are happening.

Both aspects – differentiation for identity and commoditisation – also resonated through the presentations of Ursula Hemetek and Graham Dixon. The social exclusion of immigrants; the need to maintain a cultural identity vis-à-vis the pressures of integration; and assimilation, has resulted in a complex system of practices and media offers that foster, cater and commercially exploit the needs of “us” (or should I say “them“?) in this moment of our history, which is the so-called epoch of globalisation.

Taking the holistic understanding of culture as a “we“ thing as well as the interdependency of the exchanges between “the material and the symbolic worlds“ into account, as Simon Singh had phrased it (and as it is reflected in the understanding of UNESCO’s definition of culture), cultural policy – as well as the working issues of advocacy groups in the cultural field – might have to widen its perspective on the cultural impact of policies in a variety of other areas, if cultural diversity is to be sustainably promoted.

## 2. Cultural / Musical Diversity in the UNESCO Convention and the practice of cultural policies

**Sonja Greiner:** The representatives of the Austrian UNESCO Commission, Eva Nowotny and Yvonne Gimpel, introduced us to how the **UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity** changed the perspectives on cultural diversity. It was stated that the notion of “cultural diversity” has shifted from “one culture per nation” (leading to diversity at international events) to many cultures within one country. There was also one attempt in the presentation to define “cultural diversity”: “Cultural diversity is about building, balancing and managing capacities in the cultural world”. So it is about access, passive and active, to cultural expressions.”

Within the countries, contact points are supposed to be set up. Also, Artists have learned to stand up for their culture. However, since the convention does not force member states to any action, there is and must be political pressure on the states to show after some years what they have done to ensure that the objectives of the convention are achieved. States have an obligation to report, and we should remind them of this obligation.

The **panel on Musical Diversity in the Urban Areas offered insight into three cities**, Ghent as UNESCO Creative City for Music, Tallinn as one of the Cultural Capitals of Europe 2011 and Vienna, our host town which often advertises for itself as “Music City” (though interestingly enough they do not seem to have applied for the UNESCO Creative City for Music). All these cities have a rich history and tradition, but as Peko Baxant said “Tradition is not a couch where you can relax”. Therefore the cities are trying to take up the challenge of the cultural diversity given through immigrants they have – mostly Turkish in Ghent while Vienna considers itself a melting pot and during the last decades mostly welcomed immigrants from the Balkan region, and in Estonia the Russian population represents the biggest challenge and Russian culture has been included in the programme of the Cultural Capital for culture. All cities **aim to bring the different cultures together**, often by organising concerts with famous musicians from a specific cultural minority and musicians (e.g. pop-groups, hip-hop or rap musicians) well-known all over the country or internationally.

So it would seem that musical diversity is working perfectly well in the city since the official representatives gave us such good examples. Or is the situation maybe not as positive as it was presented, Peter?

**Peter Rantasa:** It would be interesting to learn why Vienna is NOT one of the UNESCO Creative Cities for Music yet. Maybe there is no need to apply for such a label as everybody knows anyway that Vienna is not ‘a’ but THE music capital of the world (at least in its own perception). But again, if we look closer, a more diverse picture appears. The reputation of Vienna as a musical city was created intentionally in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century for political purposes. The aim was to compete with Berlin as the capital of German culture, while positioning Vienna as the fast growing capital of the multicultural Habsburg Empire. Exhibitions about the composers of the Classical Vienna, monuments, street names, events and of course the building of the State Opera,

Musikverein, etc., helped to create this picture. These developments were described in detail in a noteworthy study by Martina Nussbaumer a few years ago. Since Austria is now a much smaller country than in the Habsburg-era but still has to maintain this wonderful heritage, tradition is indeed not a sofa to sit on. Some even see it as a burden for the production and visibility of contemporary music.

The representatives from Ghent, as a UNESCO Creative City for Music, spoke in their presentation the balance of tradition, contemporary music life, and of classical, pop, jazz genres etc., and highlighted the integration of immigrants and minorities. Though the representative of the City of Vienna also focused on examples of the latter, he was reminded by Ursula Hemetek that Vienna has strong currents of xenophobia and racism. And the figures for the funding of the different musical sectors presented by Harald Huber in his ongoing study on musical diversity revealed that the main focus of public cultural spending is in the infrastructure of the rich tradition that Vienna stands for. Though no demographic analysis of audiences could be provided, it might be not too a risky guess to assume that public spending in Austria has an elitist and conservative notion.

These observations lead us to the question of what exactly indicators for cultural diversity could be. We have been reminded that no such indicators exist (as the definition of culture is already all but easy). Are we talking about the diversity of genres and repertoires as Harald Huber suggested with his model of “Style fields“? Or, do we talk about balanced access for active and passive participation in cultural and musical life, education, infrastructure, facilities, opportunities and funds? How do we measure success in the promotion of cultural diversity?

Let me here also say one word on the “dual character” of cultural goods and services. It is a big achievement that the UNESCO Convention acknowledges (*vis-à-vis* the trade agreements and negotiations) that cultural activities have intrinsic value, as they provide cultural identity, whilst the products of the cultural industries also represent economic value. But this also bears the danger that policy makers, who might see culture as a mere tool for economic growth and job creation in the aforementioned creative industries, and in the promotion of tourism, again use these limited funds for culture for these purposes alone. Maybe it is one of the missions of the EMC and its constituency to insist on cultural values in opposition to a “tool culture” for other purposes. We need the support of music that is not only made to sell, trade, or promote something else.

### 3. Ongoing quest for regulations (agenda 2020 – digitalisation)

**Sonja Greiner:** Concerning the presentation this morning, the **EU Agenda 2020** in 20 minutes, we heard that because of the subsidiary principle for culture not much is said about culture directly in the agenda, though a lot that touches on culture. Also there is a focus on creative industries that are seen as economical potential (like the Austrian green paper on creative industries with a focus on small and medium enterprises). Ivor Davies' conclusion was that there is a shift from advocacy centred around institutions to advocacy centred around topics -> this can be seen as a chance and we heard some positive examples on past and future advocacy initiatives in the following discussion.

Concerning **digitalisation** there would seem to be a contradiction between the better access to music and fair remuneration, two of the IMC Musical rights. The capitalistic influence devastates collective rights management. No clear answer was given in the session on how this situation can be solved. Peter, what should be the position of the EMC in this matter, then?

**Peter Rantasa:** Like I said already under Topic 1, the impact of policies in Directorate Generals (DG) of the European Commission other than Culture and Education makes it necessary to advocate across whole institutions. Regarding cultural diversity, some organisations have already made some efforts towards the DG Trade to protect cultural productions – mainly in the audiovisual sector – from the negative effects caused by trade agreements. But this approach adds an additional burden on small cultural organisations like ours: Even more expertise, contacts and networking is required. The question is: Who will fund the staff and required expertise? And, if there is a trend toward bigger organisations funded by the larger member states – in who's interest will they advocate and where will that leave the small countries or sectors with less commercial value than that of the audiovisual?

Concerning digitalisation, we observe that the focus has shifted away from the music sector towards books and newspapers. While on one hand, most of authors are not well remunerated, the digital paradigm shift is used to accustom readers to the idea that they get less for nearly the same money in the world of e-books. Still, new regulations for a single digital market in Europe, or changes in laws for authors/copyright, will again affect the music sector. For example, on a national level, the model “three strikes out“ or HADOPI, adopted in France, is a key focus for the advocacy work of industry groups in several countries. For the EMC and its members it will become more important to find a balanced and sound position between the needs of the professional and commercial part of the music world, and those of the listeners, amateurs, music education, music libraries etc. Maybe it would be a good idea to team up with organisations from the literary world, or invite some of the experts from this sector as speakers for one of the next music forums.

**Now, what are the conclusions and what can EMC and its members do as a consequence of this conference?**

- Cultural Impact Assessment of programs, measures, regulations

**Peter Rantasa:** 3 Points:

- ➔ We should introduce the concept of “culture impact assessment” parallel to environment impact assessment for new programmes, measures and regulations. The EMC can advocate for such a concept. For musical culture this can be based on the framework of the IMC’s 5 Musical Rights.
- ➔ Internet: Regulators shall prove that their measures have positive effects on the 5 Musical Rights (and not only that they have engineered support from single-interest pressure-groups)
- ➔ Reports on the UNESCO Convention shall include a focus on music (participation of audiences, amateur music, repertoire in circulation), analysis of the legal framework and its impact on cultural diversity (e.g., laws for immigration, work permits and the mobility of artists, authors/copyright laws, funding programme)

**Sonja Greiner:** I picked up a number of recommendations which were given during the different sessions and added some points to go further:

- ➔ Still in connection with the UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity: If there are no contact-points for the UNESCO convention in our countries, yet, we should advocate for the fact that they should be with NGOs and not state-dependent (inside the ministries)

From the discussion on Music Education:

- ➔ The members encourage EMC to continue having a focus on education since there is still much to do in this field
- ➔ EMC and its members should advocate with music universities to include training of “soft skills” in the curricula in order to train musicians for the new “multitasking” role they are facing
- ➔ EMC should collect facts and figures, existing research and new figures to be able to move to an evidence-based approach in the advocacy work for music education (a similar demand was formulated in the session about digitalisation ...)
- ➔ Concerning the UNESCO Roadmap for Arts Education – the current version has some problems and the EMC should play a role in revising the Roadmap. Here we can tell you that the chair of the EMC, Timo Klemettinen, is already working on the matter.

From this morning’s session:

- ➔ Concerning advocacy work - the EMC should learn from the positive examples on national levels, e.g. the Austrian Enquête, and try to join forces similarly on the European level. In a way we are doing this already with the conferences etc. but EMC could also think about a concrete advocacy action.
- ➔ Advocacy work on all levels should go beyond culture and education policies and beyond the ministries of culture and education

**Sonja Greiner:** As a final note we would like to congratulate the organisers of the conference. We have been thinking – after talking about diversity so much, was there **diversity at our conference?**

- We think that yes, there was
  - o diversity of presentations (PowerPoint, oral presentations, recordings)
  - o diversity of speakers (gender, nationalities etc.)
  - o diversity of working styles (keynotes, panel discussions, interactive discussion groups, interviews etc.)
  - o diversity of projects presented this afternoon, all in relation with the topics of the conference or the focus of the work of EMC
  - o diversity of musics in the concerts - A variety of styles was already presented at Porgy and Bess on Friday evening and tonight people can choose between classical music in the Wiener Musikverein and the Balkan Fieber Festival, something totally different

However, the question with which we want to finish this report is:

Is diversity in itself a positive value? Food for thought for your discussions in the next break.