



**Proceedings of the Public conference  
of Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2004**

**Réseau Varèse:  
Ambition for cultural cooperation  
at european level**

Institut Français of Budapest  
Fö utca 17 - 1011 Budapest

As part of the Budapest Autumn Festival

(Proceedings reported by Malika Combes)

\*

Réseau Varèse

22, rue de l'Echiquier - F-75010 Paris

T +33 1 47 70 95 38 - F +33 1 47 70 88 30

[varese@theatre-music.com](mailto:varese@theatre-music.com) / [www.reseau-varese.com](http://www.reseau-varese.com)

**"Réseau Varèse: ambition for cultural cooperation at European level"**

## Table

### 5 Introduction to the Conference

#### Contributions:

- 7 Mme Zsófia ZIMÁNYI, Director of the Budapest Festival Center Kht.
- 9 Mme Erika Koncz, Deputy, Secretary of State representing Mr. Istvan Hiller, Minister of Culture of the Republic of Hungary
- 11 Mr. Antoine Gindt, President of the Réseau Varèse, director of T&M
- 15 Mme Elisabeth Schweeger, Treasurer of the Réseau Varèse, Director General of the schauspiel frankfurt
- 21 M. Krisztián Kolesár, Manager of production at the Budapest Autumn Festival
- 25 Mr. Pascal Dumay, Music consultant to the Direction de la Musique, de la Danse, du Theatre et des Spectacles of the Ministry of Culture and Communication (France)
- 29 Mme Hildegard Siess, Director of the Music department of the division of Cultural Affairs of the Federal Chancellery of Austria representing Mr. Franz Morak, Secretary of State for Arts and Communication (Austria)
- 31 Mme Anne-Marie Autissier, Sociologist, Lecturer at the Institut d'Etudes European of the University of Paris-VIII

#### Appendices

- 42 Members and officers of the Réseau Varèse
- 43 Programmes for 2003-2004-2005, Aid for 2000-2001-2002

## Introduction to the Conference

The circulation of works and ideas is without doubt what has made the most profound contribution to the foundation of Europe. The Europe of artists, the Europe of musicians: the example of the correspondence, travel notes, and journeys of composers help us to appreciate the need for movement and understand influences.

At the time when the Political Europe is under construction, the workings of cultural institutions - traditionally part of a national context - are being confronted with new realities: how to combine local stakes (national, or even regional) with legitimate European obligations.

The Réseau Varèse was founded in 1999 and, tries, in its own way to answer these questions in an original form. Thanks to the support of the Culture 2000 programme of the European Union, it helps its members in their common goal to circulate new musical works, thus stimulating cooperation, without taking over the artistic decisions of each member.

This operation reconciles two essential aspects of our activities: idealism which attempts to circulate works of our time to the greatest number of people and pragmatism which demands finance for such creations and their circulation.

The aim of the Budapest Conference is to review this form of operation, to express our expectations of it and to share this experience with personalities outside the Réseau Varèse, invited to set out their thoughts on matters of cultural cooperation in Europe.

**Zsófia Zimányi, Director of the Budapest festival Centre**

It is a great honour for us to host the first public conference of the Réseau Varèse as part of the Budapest Autumn Festival . Since Hungary joined the European Union, this is the first time that we have organised an event of this type and I would like to point out that Hungary is the only founder member of the Réseau Varèse from Eastern Europe.

During the Autumn Festival of 2003, we staged Jonathan Harvey's *Fourth String Quartet*, with the support of the Réseau Varèse. This year, we shall be presenting the Brice Pauset's *Third symphony, Anima Mundi*, performed by the Klangforum Wien, and *Italia Anno Zero* by Olga Neuwirth and Roberto Paci Dalò. To be perfectly honest, without the Réseau Varèse, we would never have been able to organise these programmes. During this conference, you will discover the way in which the seventeen members of the Réseau Varèse collaborate. I sincerely hope that we shall continue to forge new links for cooperation. I would like to thank the Institut Français for its help in organising the conference and all the other bodies which contributed to it.

**Erika Koncz, deputy and Secretary of State representing Mr. Istvan Hiller, Minister of Culture of the Republic of Hungary**

The title of this conference, "Ambition for cultural cooperation in Europe", is a fine visiting card. I think that such cooperation should apply to many fields and culture is a good example. It is a great honour for Hungary to host this event in collaboration with the Budapest Festival Centre, which has been an important institution in Hungary for many years.

Cooperation and openness are two of the main characteristics of the Réseau Varèse and its members, some of the most renowned cultural institutions in Europe and particularly active in contemporary music. Hungary also lives by these two values. Very early and well before its entry into the European Union, it maintained contacts with all Europe. These links now give it an important place on the cultural map of Europe. That is why I would like to ask each of you to consider the exemplary form of collaboration that the Réseau Varèse represents, to make a contribution to promoting Hungarian culture. Accordingly, I would also remind you with great enthusiasm that Budapest will be the European capital of culture in 2010!

**Antoine Gindt, President of the Réseau Varèse, director of T&M-Paris**

I would first like to underline two points which appear to me to have taken a special dimension: the first concerns the fact that the members of the Réseau Varèse are meeting in Budapest for the first time, and the second is that, again for the first time, we are publicly seeking an audience in order to promote our activities in a network, which is already five years old.

In the short history of the Réseau Varèse, this public conference is an innovation which, I trust will not be the last, for several reasons, one of which is essential: it enables us publicly to defend our European commitments in the field of culture. Even if many aspects appear obvious to us in our professions and, in particular communications or exchanges between different countries, I believe that it is always useful to stress how much Europe will be founded on a *se fondera* also on a public cultural commitment from us, who are players in cultural life.

Then, the fact that we are meeting in Budapest is clearly legitimate, because the Budapest Autumn Festival is a founder member of the Réseau Varèse. Six years ago, in September 1998, a first meeting organised by Jean-Dominique Marco, director of Musica, was held with extensive consultation between many participants, including Zsófia Zimányi, director of the Budapest festival Centre.

These initial meetings were relatively disorganised with specific aims and came up against trivial problems, such as translation, which could have left one to think that this initiative had failed but the opposite happened. Thanks, on the one hand, to the determination of Jean-Dominique Marco, to organise our gathering into an association under French law thus giving it the chance to exist in the long term; that is to create a

form of operation where various different cultural, musical and European approaches, as practised in our different countries, could blend together.

Furthermore, the fact that we are holding our first public meeting - five years after the creation of the network - enables us to make an initial statistical report. Since 2000, twenty five programmes, with twenty two composers of ten different nationalities, have been supported by the Réseau Varèse. All these programmes have been assisted, as will this evening, *Harmonia Mundi* by Brice Pauset, performed by the Klangforum of Vienna, or tomorrow *Italia Anno Zero* by Olga Neuwirth, not only because they call on artists of several nationalities, but above all because we can give them the chance to become more widely known in Europe. These two programmes shall be for example performed in Berlin, Vienna, Paris, Brussels, Strasbourg and Frankfurt between Autumn 2004 and Autumn 2005.

What this review should also reveal, is that in five years, all members of the Réseau Varèse, without exception, have had the benefit, at one time or another, of the financial aid provided by the European Commission's Culture 2000 programme. This may not be a surprise, but it must be remembered that sharing public funds implies commitment to action and, therefore a certain degree of voluntarism. The fact that all members have had access to these funds is confirmation, *a posteriori*, that there is joint commitment to action by the Réseau Varèse.

I would now like to return to what was at the origin of the creation of the Réseau Varèse. For, whilst it was common place - and it still is - to bank on the occasional will for cooperation, co-productions of the organisation of tours - all things which in our business, contribute both to fame and economic viability -, it was much less easy to bring together such will in lasting, regular structure. The artistic world is often, quite naturally attracted to the Other, in a blend of strong desire and necessity, but it must be recognised that the local, regional or national policies for which, in general we, as cultural operators are relays, sometimes contradict this initial impetus. It is a point which is no doubt paradoxical, but it is true that the criteria that bring us local or national grants, do not always match the objectives, which the international nature of our activities may have.

At the same time, we should remember the vital role that the European Commission's Culture 2000 programme has played.

When the idea for Culture 2000 emerged, five years ago, we all wondered how these programmes were going to be managed. Brussels was clearly more remote than our local contacts but, above all, the criteria we are asked to apply are no longer the same. But the prospect of European credits has forced us to format and develop aspects, such as communications between different structures, were natural to us. Above all, this forced us to organise and invent a way of cooperating, not only on a single project, as is generally the case for co-productions, but also on a programme which is supposed to combine freedom of action and the desire for coordination in time. This was the fundamental question raised on creation of the network, knowing how the network could bring together a period of operation which motivates sufficient numbers highly diverse members, to meet regularly and initiate a true, lasting dialogue.

I shall give you a very concrete example. With the creation of the pluriannual Culture 2000 programmes, a new criterion emerged which is very difficult for us to control, that of the five different European countries necessary. In our professional experience, that is virtually impossible! We might achieve it for a project, but not in time. The idea of the Réseau Varèse was therefore to meet these restrictions which were forcing us, to a certain extent, to include countries which did not fall within the natural geography of our developments.

These restrictions laid down by the European Commission finally enabled us, from the outset, to set up an association under French law which enabled us to both canvas for members and satisfy the administrative requirements of Brussels in technical terms.

This is how, in Rome in 1999, twelve members from eight countries, drafted the statutes of the Réseau Varèse and the internal rules that clearly define its workings and scope. Today, we have seventeen members, from eleven European countries, and nine of the founder members are still personally involved in the Réseau Varèse.

In my opinion, several aspects of this organisation are original and exemplary, which I would like to mention briefly.

First, the Réseau Varèse brings together institutions with very widely differing roles, formats, social and political positions, on common ground - that of the creation of music - and with shared aims - giving concrete help to the circulation of the works. We therefore find associations of specialised festivals and mainstream concert halls, but also more atypical structures, such as a drama theatre (schauspiel Frankfurt), a radio station (rai trade) or research or production bodies (IRCAM and T&M in France). This wide range of formats, resources and situations in the artistic field, is a guarantee of on-going reflection.

Then, the operation of the network attempts to preserve, within a framework programme, as much flexibility as possible and to satisfy very severe administrative criteria. Unlike the institutions for which we are responsible, the Réseau Varèse does not work vertically. Decisions are not taken by an artistic director, but are the result of prior trading between the members on proposals and concrete examples. All decisions of the Réseau Varèse, without exception, are then taken by the General Assembly where each member has a vote. There is therefore no centralisation, but a collegial decision.

To conclude, I would like to give a few guidelines for the future, which should not be ignored.

(Anne-Marie Autissier, in the absence of Pascal Brunet, director of Relais Culture Europe, will set out for us the prospects associated with the Culture 2000 programme and will give us a qualitative report of the activities of the network.)

First of all, my thoughts are, to a greater or lesser extent, detached from the strictly technical constraints of financing activities through a European or other programme but they come back to it quickly, of course!

The first question to be raised is that of duration of action. It is obvious that the validity and relevance of a network like the Réseau Varèse are depend directly on our own capacity for learning and implementation of the operation of a network. Above all, we must

neglect the question of finances. I know too well how much just the respectable lure of profit makes action in a network credible. In theory, if finance did not play its part, enabling us to support the artistic activities we defend, we would remain a group of people wanting to consult with each other and meeting not more than once a year. Therefore, the question is how to perpetuate such action within a network, remembering that we are also bound to satisfy the demands of the European administration, such as redrafting an activity project every three years. That is legitimate and consistent on the part of a public finance department. On the other hand, if it raises the question of alternation of networks, as was the case two years ago, it may cause problems, since it would mean that we, as players in the cultural life of the community, would have to change strategy to obtain such public credits. We must therefore put our stakes on duration.

In addition, how can we develop the network? This raises a marked, educational point. Bringing in a new member from a new country, possibly a future European country, does not necessarily have an immediate concrete function in our action and the distribution of finance, as was the case, for example, for the Budapest Autumn Festival . On the other hand, including new countries and cultures in our discussions and consultations implies an educational function. It is not only a debate internal to the Réseau Varèse; indeed a certain number of questions are raised as soon as we open the door: how can we control the enlargement of such an assembly and retain the quality of discussion which is possible with fifteen members, with a much greater number of members?

## **Élisabeth Schweeger, Director General of the schauspiel frankfurt**

### **"Art in the urban context. General thoughts"**

When the social system become purely economic, they change radically and demand flexibility in all aspects of life. Therefore traditional values, which are landmarks, structural models for society, are not only questioned, but actually eliminated. Overpopulation, on the one hand and ageing on the other, fundamentally alter the conception of distribution of space. Towns disappear or grow smaller whilst centralised urban structures become transit camps. On a global scale, migration driven by the globalisation of the labour market, accelerate this transformation.

The traditional bourgeoisie, which is mainly sedentary and used to play an essential role in the cultural development of a city or society, is becoming extinct. It is being replaced by rapid intervention, mobile commandos, made up of productive forces which, in very little time, exploit a city only to disappear as quickly as they appeared. The individual is everywhere, ubiquity is the need of the global village. Efficiency is the driving force and superficial working is the only possibility of balancing the cost/utility/thought ratio in the accounts. On the other hand, art, as an integral part of the urban context, expects and demands continuity - it is a long, drawn out process which needs "time". It also needs a vis-à-vis which also needs times, which takes time and which, in particular, sees the proposed discussions as part of its every day life and a way out. The temporary gathering of "workgroups" bound to be short-lived, that is sitting only in one place for a limited period, is not likely to identify itself with a creative artistic event which is part of a long term process. This is directed towards a rapid, temporary renewal, active stimulation and satisfaction.

All these phenomena result in the event and define its objectives with the interests and subject of art, which work with memory to develop vision. Between these two moments

lies the present as an object of perception and its differentiation. How may art be defined in this context? Does it change its attitude, content or forms, can it become faster whilst retaining the same intensity and what are the places, in which it is made, formulated and seeks out its public with whom it enters into conversation, like? Is it a question of repositioning or reorientation, redefinition, or dissolution of art and, thereby, of the places and artistic spaces, within the new context of a "mobile" society?

Today, following the long-gone epoch of bourgeois society, the world is opening up thanks to the interconnection of networks and global agreements. This leads naturally to the massive displacement of structures within communities which cannot be active for themselves as individual units but which must joint all other units. This leads to the disappearance of classes which are sucked into and integrated into the "global mass".

Thanks to the openness of paths, whether commercial or political, not only the living spaces in which men exist are transformed. Modern nomads who, for simply technological and professional reasons, often have to abandon their sedentary life, also change urban structures, which in the bourgeois spirit was still relevant during the last two centuries; that is, having a museum, a theatre and concert hall in the town centre, which now appears to be archaic. It was precisely these institutions which concentrated on the production of art and senses which would now appear to have been "outsourced".

It could be said, sarcastically, that all this is the result of a misunderstood process of democratisation of the desegregation of elitist art. Democracy and populism work to cover each other. This also means that a large part of our democracy - namely the protection of minorities - is disappearing slowly but surely, in a totally democratic way.

On the other hand, there is a vast openness to new, varied forms of art or places in which it is made, which produce a surprising and grandiose effect, even if most of them have to be softened and trimmed to become full scale production products, not forgetting that differentiation, improved perception or inspiration involve profit and loss of wonder by the unit inventory of communication techniques. Know-how puts itself out of danger.

Artistic life appears to be playing the life of the long distance runner, but one of those who runs until he drops, like a hamster on this wheel that is the global network. Behind the successful artistic creations which follow each other "going nowhere fast": real life, though and feelings rich with experience no longer exist, just the dumping of the senses. What always used to be difficult is now impossible; that is, developing criteria and scales of values which could help in making a weighted judgement of art and works, whilst organising and setting up sovereign life projects.

"When knowledge is reduced to information, it is detached from relations experienced in history, the ability to judge and experience. The result is the illusion of a society of extensive knowledge and the reality of virtual knowledge. This means that knowledge is considered to be a medium for strictly controlled cyber exchanges, where the act of thinking is diseased and the disease is called information." (Arthur Kroker, *Electronic waste and X media*)

It follows that information is no longer used as a medium for experience which is anchored in you and on which something may be built. Human beings run the danger of

becoming a mere shell bereft of ideas and imagination, incapable of thinking - a heaven-sent object that is easy to manipulate.

Forty years ago, Adorno made the following observation: "It is not certain that art is still really possible, or only once it has been emancipated and had grieved its presuppositions and has lost them". Now does it merely change character to find itself in a state of transition? Must we reconsider the places and resources available to it to perform? Which in this case, raises the question of whether it is still made in a traditional manner.

The established artistic institutions are subject - like television rating scores - to considerable audience pressure, which can only be reduced by unwanted compromise. We study statistics and cost-utility reports, which we use to establish the artistic scale of values. At the same time, it is often the legal acquisitions of a previously comfortable social status which suffocate art and make it impossible to produce. Furthermore, we forget that art represents an ideal value which cannot and should not be measured in terms of figures.

It is clear that, due to loss of personal and collective memory, archiving on network is accelerating. This certainly makes memories evoked by the conscience available at any time, but without it being possible to experience and live it, so that a sedimentary layer is no longer formed in our memories and no fertile bed is created from which innovation may spring. Therefore, it would appear that, in practice, we are working towards our own cultural disappearance. But is it not out of this void that innovation can emerge. The depression which has invaded the Western world is due to the fact crisis is no longer seen to be a state of persecution, a transient state from one phase of life to another. Nevertheless, this conscience is based on the need for collective memory which, today appears to be able to be stopped by pressing a button. That is why the crisis appears to be such a dilemma or point of non-return and not as a necessary threshold or phase to get rid of that which is no longer required, to leave space for the new.

The principle remains that we have to create variants to establish criteria for making choices. To overcome this disappearance, we should perform classification tests. In this context, even art should accept the inevitable, even if that means calling itself into question. Even the present validity places and spaces to which it is attached should be called into question. Certain forms of subsidies which may be suffocate creative energy, may have to disappear in order to abandon the museum-driven administration of our heritage. This does not, nevertheless, relieve so-called democratic states of their duties and responsibilities in terms of cultural development. But even here; that is, in terms of politics and not only art, matters must be reviewed. We must also remember that art is not only a local economic factor but, quite simply, the sensitive, nervous vehicle of a society or community, and a civil one at that.

It could be possible to preserve bourgeois art as a "passé", but valuable souvenir of a previous social life with, at its centre, opera as the mascot, linking all the senses and addressing only emotional but not rational intelligence, as is the case in the theatre of the plastic arts and which is therefore easier to "consume" is more suited to representative ends. It could also be possible that art becomes an alternative form of politics, in a

clandestine way, to oppose this trend toward the culture of the superficial, that owing the speed of change and the power of the media, is difficult to stop. Perhaps the label "art" should be left to its popular variant, confident that the system will devour its own child, to look for other forms and methods and pursue the basic idea and tendency of the initial will of bourgeois art. Such art should, at the same time, behave like anti-matter covering an anti-terrain, which could remain in its topology so immanent to the system. By analogy with Heidegger, who wrote the work being in its improper meaning like the work "to be" and the work in its proper sense by crossing it out (~~to be~~), I would like to give this anti-terrain the name ~~art~~.

Whilst art once exerted critical functions and has finished today in the sales, this means first and foremost that the critical function is perishing. But for as long as the spirit of contradiction remains, which in my opinion is the force driving change, and it is difficult not to believe in it, we shall have to continue to find a field of action. In this fuzzy intermediate field, art should be able to devote itself again, with increased vigour, to its own anarchic potential, which is effectively a learning process for creative thought and action. Not entering the fray, even without being aggressive, but at least subversively, as a disturbing factor to produce productive chaos. Art stimulates the imagination and it is clear that that which does not have imagination destroys itself. Therefore, to this extent, ~~art~~ may be defined as a weapon, as the political instrument for the contradictory discourse and the pursuance of a programme which has officially become a primed grenade.

At the same time, the saying "Life is a serious business, which art should fill with happiness (ernst ist das Leben, heiter ist die Kunst)" should be overturned. Art should be serious to survive. If we start from a biological point of view, we could draw our attention to the fact that art is responsible for the creation of cells, meaning a living organism, each of which cannot be intelligent individually, but by merging with other cells forms a dynamic whole which organises itself in a sovereign manner.

When said that the quality of a society may be recognised in its superfluity: he meant that learning to recognise and respect differences and diversity, gives us the ability to take decisions ourselves. There can be no other goal but to man to affirm himself as sovereign among sovereigns, which probably brings us to another long march, which this time is clandestine, through institutions and institutes. Art becomes necessary in the true meaning of the term. Art still had to cultivate human communities and the result culture had a duty to unite, whereas art encourages resistance, trial and irritation.

Today art is in a desperate situation, which requires it not only to fight but also to change posture. Therefore, when Baudrillard made the following announcement, during the strikes of the summer of 2003: "Culture unites, art disunites". Therefore eliminate culture and make more art". He was referring to the problem of culture today: the unification of cultural bases and the danger of a unique, global culture certainly unifies, but they encourage dogma and lead to intolerance. Contradiction, originality, multiplicity are not welcome. Baudrillard refers here to the need and possibilities of art, in the form of temporary devices and variants to oppose the apparent immobility - a light, devastating but unavoidable weapon. In the best of all cases, Art is therefore a mediator, a vector for communication, a means of establishing culture through intelligent debate. An alternative to aggressive form to impose itself

When we look at Europe today, which is looking to unite, political will which respects and specificities of these States of different peoples, their specific cultural acquisitions, live and let live, subsist and development, whilst accepting foreigners in the great corporation called Europe, must exist. That is, defining differences and their relations to better understand and respect them. Let us remember that Europe has always been the scene of migratory movements, which have upset all social principles and has led to new social value systems. Today, on the other hands, we have to face up to a new changed situation of purely economic migration, in which new values do not appear to be able to form.

Therefore in my opinion, the values of each group, person or peoples must have a protected space which enable to open out at the same time and continue to develop in contact with new, different cultural field.

This is the treatment of soil which has led to new impetus. Identify is no longer created beyond the culture in which I was born. At most, it may provide for "internal" classification. We must therefore take the step which consists in considering that identify is a question of sovereignty, which is only established in the ability to accept the "multiculturalism" of a global society and understand interaction as a "plus" and not as an aggression or attack against one's own identity.

## Kolesár Krysztján, Manager of production at the Budapest Autumn Festival

Although the Budapest Festival Centre is a founder member of the Réseau Varèse, it is only for the last two years that we have been taking an active part in cooperation work. At present, and with this evening's concert, we are only in our second project with the Réseau Varèse, but all the same, we have become familiar with its operation.

I have decided to present this operation using the example of a project we conducted in Budapest during the festival of 2003, the Jonathan Harvey's *Fourth String Quartet*.

The Réseau Varèse is an association which supports cooperation between cultural bodies which programme contemporary music, as part of the European Commission's Culture 2000 programme. The grants of the Culture 2000 programme can only be awarded to projects involving three partners from at least two different countries.

It is well known that applying for grants with the European Commission fairly complex procedure, even for the oldest members of the European Union. For us, it is even more difficult! Is it possible for a festival to take "zero risks", when it means creating an innovative project and gathering partners? The creation and circulation of such projects demand a support reliable. The Réseau Varèse applied to the European Commission in order to obtain a global European grant, to be redistributed internally between several institutions according to a democratic principle to encourage the creation, promotion and the circulation contemporary music works and events.

The main role of the Réseau Varèse is to encourage the exchange of ideas between the professional who draw up the programmes of the major European institutions (festivals and concert halls). For that, the members are called to the *General Assembly*, in different European cities, twice a year. The *General Assembly* is not only a formal gathering. It decides everything. For two days, everything concerning the activities of the network is discussed (report on the projects completed, vote on grants for future projects). The

Assembly is closed on the proposal of members of new projects likely to benefit from the support of the Network.

Let us now see according to which criteria a project is eligible within the Réseau Varèse.

First and foremost, the Réseau Varèse takes an interest in the project and its circulation. It includes the members producing the project (pilot members) and those hosting the project.

On the second day of their internal meeting, the representatives of the institutions stipulate their aims. They first indicate that they wish to take part in the creation as producers, which complies with the regulations of the network, on a project which, according to them, is likely to interest other festivals.

The General Assembly is therefore the place where members can share ideas on projects, whether in the embryonic stage or scarcely conceived and suggest including them in the working plan of the network.

It was in a similar assembly attended by Geir Johnson of Ultima Festival and Éric de Visscher of IRCAM with this a preconceived idea, I believe: the project for Jonathan Harvey's *Fourth String Quartet*, the *Première* of which First, should have been performed by the Arditti Quartet at the Ars Musica Festival in Brussels in March 2003.

According to the regulations of the Réseau Varèse and to ensure the highest level of transparency, the pilot member must present the project concerning him, stating the name of the composer and the title of the work or programme on which it is part, the list of performers or other artists, the planned date for the *Première* and the possible tour dates, the budget (making a distinction between that for the creation of the work and that for the tour), the name of the body responsible for the production, the name of the partners (the co-producers and those hosting the production).

To enable members to familiarise themselves with the project, it is also recommended to submit any additional documents (scores, recordings, videos, etc.)

The projects are assessed on the basis of the main criteria described above.

The proposed project should concern a contemporary composer, work or programme (this should be a thematic programme including several works).

The artists and performers should be known and recognised by at least one of the members of the Réseau Varèse.

At least three members of the network, from two different countries should take part to the project.

The proposal and body of the project should be clearly defined. The expenses incurred for the *Première* and the tour should be shared by the members of the network concerned by this production in accordance with their respective aims and restrictions.

Finally, the project should be an instrumental work or opera, a work for orchestra with or without a choir, a work of chamber music or for a choir, or a programme of rehearsals.

The financial aid provided by the Réseau Varèse covers the *Première* and a possible re-issue of existing works. It may therefore apply to production (if the project sponsors are of the members of the Réseau Varèse, direct material aid is granted) to circulation (with a

part of the aid also granted by members hosting production), to the commitment of a composer (provided that he takes parts in several Réseau Varèse programmes).

If the members are interested and vote for this project, thus recognising a certain interest in it; it is included in the network's working plan. In this case, the Réseau Varèse also takes into consideration the geographical distribution of the projects.

It is the first and most important step in life of an initiative in the Réseau Varèse. Nevertheless, this is not enough for the network to support its creations and ensure its existence. But, by starting here, the members are forced to look into the background of the production body and, therefore, take into consideration their performance. During the long period that follows (and which generally corresponds to the period between two general assemblies), the sponsor of the project attempts to "sell" his project, that is he communicates the details of the project, makes telephone calls and possibly organises individual meetings, to convince the members concerned of the importance of the project.

The decisive moment is during the second General Assembly. The project is officially adopted or rejected on the first day of the meeting. The decisive arguments lie in knowing whether enough members are interested in the staging of the project and whether the network is capable of covering the expenses planned by the producer or by the buyer members for the production

If these conditions are satisfied, the Chairman of the General Assembly prepares a budget abstract setting out the subsidies requested for production and circulation. This note is adopted by vote. In the event of acceptance, the initiative becomes of a Réseau Varèse project.

Jonathan Harvey's *Fourth String Quartet* was presented at the Ars Musica Festival in March 2003, with a grant of 5000 euros from the Réseau Varèse, which was the equivalent of 17 % of the grants in relation to the total budget required for the Première. In this particular case, IRCAM, Ars Musica and Ultima Festival shared the production costs.

In general, the grants awarded are between 15 and 50% of the total production costs. Of course, we must also take into account the fact that the cost of a production is much higher than that of a tour. The Réseau Varèse is aware of this, that is why, by guaranteeing the grants, it stipulates that the maximum sum is 50% for the largest projects.

This is how the network promotes the creation process.

Another of the main activities of the Réseau Varèse is to assist with the circulation of subsidised projects. It is obvious that the life of each work only starts after its Première. Therefore, once the project becomes part of the network's working plan, several partners must express their will to join the project; this is also an essential condition for the Culture 2000 programme.

For Irvine Arditti and his quartet, the number of co-producers was, in itself insufficient for adoption of the project. In the Assembly, the festival of contemporary

music of Huddersfield, the Wien Modern and Budapest Autumn Festival expressed their intention to host the production. In this case, these festivals acted as tour bodies.

Anybody, with the exception of the sponsor of the project, may organise the tour, unless he does not have enough time to include it in his its programmes, or does not have enough funds to host the show. The tour should be self-financed to approximately 70 %. Since the size of a production can vary from a solo performance to an opera, the amount the grant varies greatly, but is rarely less than 3000 euros.

For the Budapest Autumn Festival, the budget for the Harvey project was approximately 17000 euros, of which the festival received a grant of 5000 euros. The network pays the grants in two phases: 50 % in advance, and the other 50 % once the performance has been given and the costs assessed in detail. Accordingly, the producers and the tour venues have to advance 50 % of the budget.

Nevertheless, someone could raise the question: which comes first; the chicken or the egg? A large number of European projects can only be developed through cooperation with the Réseau Varèse or other similar bodies. Nevertheless, this requires individual initiatives and such projects can only grow and become productive in fertile ground. We can therefore confirm that Réseau Varèse aid for the creation and circulation of works encourage both cooperation and the co-production of the universal European musical culture to develop, which has been the only route for survival in the cultural field, since the start of the new millennium.

**Pascal Dumay, music consultant to the Direction de la Music, de la Danse, du Theatre and des Spectacles of the Ministry of Culture and Communication**

The French Minister of the Culture, Mr. Renaud Donnedieu de Vabres, greatly regrets not being able to be with us today. This encounter was of great importance to him, in many ways and covers an essential subject for the Ministry of the Culture: the creation, distribution and circulation of works and ideas. It also concerns consultation between those involved in the creation of music and, more generally, the artistic stakes shared by several European countries. For all these reasons, the Minister of the Culture would have liked to have been here today. I am all the more impressed and honoured to represent him before you.

What I would like to say on his behalf and also for the Director of Music, Dance, Theatre and Entertainment of the Ministry of the Culture, to whom I am advisor, is basically the context and basis of our support to the Réseau Varèse. Let us briefly review the importance Ministry of Culture places in and the attention given to creation. This support for creation is specifically set out in the statutes governing the Ministry of Culture. In the field of music, this support takes different forms: first, State commissions give to composers - a venue undertakes to stage this work - support for composers in residences in venues, places of distribution, teaching institutions and also direct support for musical ensembles, which devote part of their activities to the creation of contemporary music. It also takes the form of finance for centres of creation where composers have access to the tools required for their research, work and distribution. The Ircam is familiar of course, but other centres of creation exist in France. Our support also takes the form of contributions to the financing of festivals and, in particular Musica in Strasbourg. There are also co-financed funds, such as those which used to help in the publication of recordings, which we support in partnership with Sacem and Radio France,

or those which support musical publishing. More generally, it consists of working on the specifications of bodies financed by the Ministry of Culture, that is, orchestras, opera houses and, wherever possible, on the specifications of public radio and television stations. Today, we can be proud to say that the creation of music is in good health in this country, in terms of artistic vitality and the diversity of what is produced.

Now, there are a certain number of concerns which, in my opinion, must be mentioned. The first of these subjects is distribution. Like all of you, we are concerned by the fact that following its creation, a work must be able to be distributed, live, so that it can be replayed. From this point of view, the French musical landscape poses a certain number of problems in places said to be general purpose; that is, those mainly, but not only, supported by the State, the role of which is to distribute music, theatre and dance. These establishments were founded André Malraux, more than forty years ago. They are national theatres and they play a multidisciplinary role. For music and particularly the creation of contemporary music, we observe the difficulty in existing within this network, which is the leading State network. Our second concern is the lack of sufficient venues appropriate for music, in terms of acoustics and those designed for the future requirements of music. France is probably less well organised than some of its European neighbours, particularly in the North and East. This is probably due to the fact that the tradition in France has tended to build theatres or opera houses, but not venues devoted exclusively to music. We are therefore concentrating on these two questions: the presence of music in general purpose venues and, in particular the creation and constitution of new venues, wherever possible designed for future distribution stakes. This is an important subject which we are dealing with firmly.

I thought this long description necessary to show to what extent we adhere to one of the roles, perhaps the main role of the Réseau Varèse, that of the distribution of works and the life of such works through their distribution.

For us, supporting the Réseau Varèse is due first to the fact that it is a European network. For several years now, the Ministry has opted to develop its support for networks for very simple reasons: to contribute to the grouping of players in a given sectors and, relying on what they do better than us; that is, creating events that artistically strong but which, at the same time can help promoting artists and works. We are fully aware of the relatively modest contribution of the support provided by the French Ministry of Culture for the Réseau Varèse, but this support enables us to show to what extent the Ministry is convinced by its activities and we hope, of course, that it can be developed. It is also a way of giving a sign to the European Commission that the French government adheres to the rationale of the Réseau Varèse and we trust that the French Ministry of Culture will be able to help it with other forms of support in the future for the various members of the European Union.

On behalf of the Minister of the Culture, I have to stress the importance that we place on the work carried out by the Réseau Varèse, to wish all the best for the future, which no doubt more than ever will have to give room to the circulation of ideas and work in a violent world. We are perfectly aware that militancy, connivance and debate must exist within the network. Whilst they are absolutely essential, they are not sufficient on their

own. There must be strong institutional support to enable this network to develop to become as permanent as possible.

**Hildegard Siess, director of the Music department of the division of the Cultural Affairs of the Federal Chancellery of Austria representing Mr. Franz Morak, the Austrian Secretary of State for the Arts and communication**

As Director of the Music department of the division of Arts of the Federal Chancellery of Austria, I represent Franz Morak, the Austrian Secretary of State for Arts and communication, who expresses his regret at not being able to attend this conference today. I am responsible for financing the artistic activities of the Austrian government. My division has approximately 50 % of the Austrian budget for culture and the Arts.

The Réseau Varèse, which I have the pleasure of meeting for the first time today, is without doubt an international initiative which is contributing to bringing European countries together. Offering contemporary music and musical theatre to the general public is a challenge in itself, both artistically and financially, for the composer's country. This is why the exchange of contemporary music projects beyond national boundaries, whatever for such cooperation takes, should be seen as a positive development from a European point of view. The support given to such programmes European finance within the framework of the Culture 2000 programme, is certainly an encouraging and motivating factor in realising European cooperation projects, using synergies for the benefit of contemporary composers. The cooperation effort of the different festivals which concentrate their activities in the field of contemporary music may be an advantage, for three reasons. First, it represents an advantage for the organisers. Because by using synergies in the right way, organisers can take advantage of a reduction in rehearsal, and equipment costs and, perhaps, in the cost of distribution. The second advantage is for composers, because they can distribute their works to a public outside their own country. A third group of people benefit of this type of cooperation; the public and European artists, who can extend the horizons of their experience and even their repertoire.

For Austria, I am delighted to announce some figures: the Wien Modern festival had the benefit of finance of some 94500 euros from my division, and this festival takes an active part in the European networking process. I would also like to underline that the Klangforum Wien, the ensemble that you will be able to hear this evening in Budapest, has been granted 440 000 euros of the public artistic budget. Similarly, it contributes, through its many national and European performances and the extent of its repertoire, to the integration of contemporary music. In this respect, let us not forget the Wien Modern festival. There is a whole range of other initiatives in Austria in the field of contemporary music which could form part of cooperation projects. If you would like more information on any of these initiatives, I would be delighted to put you in contact with these organisations. For information, I brought with me the latest report on the arts, that is, the report for 2003, which could give you more information on such potential cooperation partners.

Finally, we should see whether the Réseau Varèse, a multinational programme which groups together a whole series of organisations, is eligible to join the programme of community activities which promotes bodies active in the field of Culture in Europe. This programme of community activities is intended to sustain the on-going activities of such networks. A public call for tenders will be published for 2006. Such a project could also be subject to assessment by the European Commission.

In conclusion, let me make a final remark. After making a detailed study of the documents sent to me for this conference; it would appear to me, in the field of male/female parity, that women composers are under represented and I am sure that this aspect of the question is worthy of all your attention and you should consider it carefully, in the future.

**Anne-Marie Autissier, sociologist and lecturer at the Institut d'Études Européennes of the University of Paris-VIII**

"Culture 2000 as seen by French professionals"

I shall be giving the main conclusions of a study commissioned from me in 2004 by Relais Culture Europe. It goes without saying that certain remarks arising out of these conclusions only concern the author and not the Relais. The idea of Pascal Brunet, the director of the Relais Culture Europe, was to review the way in which French professionals, who have taken part in the Culture 2000 programme, perceive it. Unfortunately, we do not have the resources to conduct a paneuropean survey. What was the purpose of such a survey in France? One of the main reasons lies in the fact that, Relais Culture Europe, the cultural point of contact, wanted a more detailed view of matters and to return certain conclusions to national and community institutions, for better advice for professionals. Furthermore, the word of individual professionals is still not heard as it should be. There are, of course, associations, networks and discussion groups, but we are never absolutely sure that they represent all opinions; especially in that it is the entire world of the arts, from the our heritage to street art, via contemporary music, current music and the visual arts, which is concerned by this programme, in an environment which is almost impossible to qualify. It is more appropriate to speak of highly fragmented artistic tribes which do not experience their status and professional integration in the same way.

This study is qualitative. To complete it, we selected seventy which we considered to be characteristic and sufficiently diverse and obtained answers from fifty operators. Several cases emerged: so-called annual projects, which come under action 1 of Culture 2000, pluriannual projects, organised over two or three years, such as Réseau Varèse initiatives which come under action 2 of the programme, projects with small budgets, others with large budgets, very well known operators or operators who are unknown, even in their own countries, etc.

### *An imaginary contemporary geography*

In general, I would like to make two or three remarks concerning the dynamics of the projects organised as part of Culture 2000.

Firstly, we can consider that since 1999, the preparatory year, up to 2003 inclusive, we have had an average of 150 projects supported by Culture 2000 every year. This implies a considerable number of professionals concerned. The effects of the programme are beginning to be felt, revealing certain trends. Without stressing the national dimension, I would like to note even so, that unlike what is often stated in France, the French are very well represented in Culture 2000, and are often at the origin of pluriannual projects. Other nations are well represented: Italy, Germany or the United Kingdom. In addition, several countries have shown themselves to be particularly dynamic when it comes to the number of project they take part in, when compared to their population, I am thinking of Austria or Belgium in particular.

As for the themes of these projects, it is interesting to note the "obsessions contemporary" of those working within Culture 2000. We can see a sort of reconstruction of an imaginary geography of Europe, with certain affinities. For example, the famous Nordic-Baltic axis is very dominant. Many projects are set up with this geo-cultural dimension of contacts between the countries of Northern Europe. But we also observe a Central European, or even Danube axis, which combines Hungarian partner with Solvenes, Italians, where Austria and Germany play an important role. With the Nordic and Baltic countries, it is particularly Sweden and Finland which form the pivot. Furthermore, certain professionals are highly mobile and work from North to South and from East to West. The Italians and the British, for example, are represented in almost all geo-cultural configurations.

This brief overview shows the construction of lines of force and the dynamics of each of the countries and cross-border regions. Of course, this does not exclude the dynamics of individuals. Far be it from me to limit professionals to their nationality. There is something else, constructing European projects together.

The predominant themes of these projects are, for example, the Mediterranean for Heritage. None or very few of these projects concern the influence of the Ottoman empire, that of the Omeyyades in Europe or our Byzantine heritage. Our ancient Greek and Roman heritage dominate. A very few projects take an interest in so-called nomad cultures and peoples without a nation: there a few project concerned with Rom culture, or *travellers*. Finally, the major themes also reflect what goes on in present day societies and the relationship of domination between community memories.

### *The beneficial effects of Culture 2000*

To come back to the sponsors of French projects and that which they draw from Culture 2000, I will start with the positive aspects; of which there are many.

First, this programme clearly mobilises the artistic community and has a symbolic power. The very idea of its existence and theoretical openness to all aspects of creation, has created a very interesting mobilising effect. The multidisciplinary nature of the programme - even if this concept of "multidisciplinary" should be analysed before hand - the idea of being able to cover everything with the support of Culture 2000 would appear to be most valuable for most professionals in the field of culture.

Then, thanks to Culture 2000, learning occurs at several levels, real contemporary European learning of a new type, covering different aspects. First of all, the fact of setting up a project together, which is an achievement in itself, which creates know-how. We have to learn to work with constraints and criteria which are not necessarily known to the operators, and take them on board. The second lesson, which would appear to be extremely important for everybody, is undoubtedly the most valuable and which professionals refer to as "meeting others". It may appear to be paradoxical that in Europe we can adopt such an idea of otherness. It is true that if one looks at Europe from Asia or Latin America, it is easier to see the common factors! But, in the end, Europeans do not know each other well. What all professionals discover is that this ignorance and the fact of becoming aware of it is already a form of knowledge. One also discovers the limits of one's own culture in Europe; that is setting up European projects, one has to listen to others. Each project must be subject to appropriation, discussions, and negotiations of a specific type, which include tests of strength, in the pacific meaning of the term and an intercultural dimension. We do not put the same meaning behind words, from one country to another. This otherness is absolutely fascinating for everybody and creates another vision of our own practices.

Another, very interesting point is learning at the politico-institutional level. It is possible, by reading certain works, to inform oneself of the cultural policies of European countries, although they are not numerous, and thereby various institutional relationships. This will not give us clear picture of how the authorities manage culture in different countries and, above all, how the users of such public authorities are positioned. There is a greater or lesser shift between the declarations of intent and the way in which things happen on a daily basis. The fact of belonging to a Pan European group and having decisions and financial commitments to make together, means one has to ask where the money comes from, how it is paid and what type of strategy should be developed. This is therefore a learning process which, in the long term, may also lead professionals in the field of culture to consider things better and improve their dialogue with different local and national bodies.

Then, there are of course, artistic encounters. It is obvious for most project sponsors and, above all for those who work with the artists. In some way, it is inevitable that at a given time, one seeks confrontation. We must overcome both mental and physical barriers, by trying to give the artists we accompany as many opportunities as possible to meet different publics. For me, beyond Culture 2000, this dimension is at the heart of the artistic and cultural world today in Europe, a world still looking for confrontation, which starts but is certainly not limited to Europe. "Europe is the exotic next door" said a professional, meaning: "Let's start with Europe and we'll see the other continents later. This insatiable curiosity is a fundamental character of cultural Europe. As Massimo Cacciari, the philosopher said; "she is never in bondage".

The other learning processes concern the culture of consensus, negotiations and going from the bilateral to the multilateral. Many project sponsors, especially those who worked with bilateral systems and which have then set up an annual project as part of action 1, find themselves to be three. What is interesting is the way in which professionals describe this change: it is not only an addition! It is a qualitative leap, another scale, another way of working and negotiating. As many revelations and contributions worthy of

study and in detail. Another point I consider to be important are the increased effects the European Commission calls "added value". Most professionals speak the increased effects of of European cooperation for artists, like what the Réseau Varèse does; they also mention tensions between the European dimension and the local level. Professionals who work with populations in difficulty or with handicapped people explain that with this proximity - which is still not easy - the European reference opens doors, relieves the situation and contributes to the idea that from one end of Europe to the other, the same problems arise and comparable solutions are implemented. In so far as projects to extend the population or with an educational dimensions in the widest meaning of the term, a new dialectic appears to be establishing itself between European and "local" level: not only is the European project not remote from the "local" level but, to a certain extent, it enables the local level to be perceived in another way, to be "reinvented". Most of the professionals surveyed do not cultivate a cosmopolitan attitude in the conventional sense; on the contrary, they feel part of somewhere and intend working in service of this "somewhere" the detour or the European path enables this base to be confronted in another way.

Finally, the positive effects of the programme include that of notoriety. I am thinking in particular of a dance company based in France, whose participation in European projects has changed the view of local and regional bodies of it. Let us also mention Pierre Sauvageot, director of "Lieux publics" in Marseille, which has set up a pluriannual programme of street art, called "In situ". This body awards grants to European creators and distributes their shows. Pierre Sauvageot takes this reasoning to the extreme: "The fact of being accepted for Culture 2000, gives us almost abusive reknown, we have become "heroes", people see us differently and ask for our opinion, etc.! That changes the situation with regards to local and national bodies."

#### *Expectations for Culture 2007*

Let us now discuss expectations. Certain project sponsors used Culture 2000 very well, in that they followed its laws whilst creating their own rules within their European partnership - this is particularly true of bodies operating on a pluriannual basis, such as Apollonia for the visual arts, the Réseau Varèse for contemporary opera, Théorem for theatre, or Dance Co-production Web, a European programme for contemporary dance. Antoine Gindt explained earlier: "To support a programme, there has to be three of us, from two countries". That means that another logic is introduced. To success, great experience is required, a certain force and, what is relatively easy for bodies such as yours, is much less so for smaller organisations which do not have the personnel required. Nevertheless, all agree in asking Culture 2000 to simplify its procedures and me more flexible in so far as dates of eligibility are concerned. They are a real problem: money is give at a given time T and no action must be taken before the date of the signature of the contract or, occasionally, the contract arrives six months later, causing serious complications.

Another request: a real extension of the artistic and cultural dimensions of Culture 2000. What does this means for professionals? For the candidature review process, it means more qualified juries, more specialised in the fields of publishing and heritage, in partuicular, juries with more time to work. These juries should actually meet. For several years now, we have not that experts give scores with are then pooled, with no discussion!

Furthermore, and whilst recognising the quality of relations with the people working in the European Commission, the operators criticise these contacts for being limited to technical/administrative considerations without ever discussing the fundamentals of the projects, as is the case with the cultural authorities of their country or certain local authorities - at least in France. Whether they are specialists in electronic art or heritage, many consider that, in particular for annual projects, if we do not review the artistic or scientific dimension of the project early, the acceleration imposed by participation in Culture 2000 does not allow it, which is a pity.

Furthermore and in general in France, professionals want more from Europe, a more detailed knowledge of European mechanisms! They feel isolated. They feel like acrobats in an environment in which one cannot make the most of experience. Therefore initiatives remain with no action taken. Most professionals raised the following question: How can we continue? Several suggestions are made. This first to better combine European finance with national, local, territorial or even private finance. There is a real demand to which the Laboratory for Cultural cooperation in Europe, set up by the European Foundation for Culture in Amsterdam, could answer: reviewing the mechanisms, understanding the responsibilities of each and any complementarity... Another problem concerns early links with Culture 2000. Pierre Hivernat (Grande Halle de la Villette) therefore proposes three phases. The first of the "artistic commando" type: two people need to get together urgently to design project, money must be give very quickly, but in small sums. This is the principle of the fund for personal mobility, such as those operated by the European Foundation or the IETM (Informal European Theatre Meeting with the Fonds Roberto Cimetta, for Euro-Mediterranean cooperation). Then an "annual" phase, which may be extened to a year and a half and finally, the pluriannual phase. Personal mobility funds for the preparation of project exist within other community programmes, such as Leonardo da Vinci (professional training) and Socrates (education). They are the responsibility of the national programme agencies. The Commission cannot manage such small sums but who should do? Should it be the cultural points of contact? Should this part of the aid be "nationalised" or "regionalised"?

Finally, the question of whether Culture 2000 encourages the operation of the networks is raised by many professionals. At present, there are about a hundred networks of all sizes and in all fields Europe; the Relais Culture Europe has identified 250 to 300 Pan-European associations of varying levels of speciality. As such and until now, these networks were not entitled to aid under Culture 2000, since the programme only co-finances projects. The initial philosophy of the networks created in the 1980s is that they are places for interpersonal relations, learning discussion, and not necessarily operational forums for setting up projects. Major networks, such as IETM for example, for matrices for smaller networks which wish to set up projects: Junge Hunde or DBM (Danse Bassin Mediterraneann). Since the 1980s, the European Commission takes too little account of the existing networks. Fortunately, discussions are making progress and in the next programme, Culture 2007, a small part of the finance may be devoted to the support for Pan-European organisations. For several years now, a line of credit, A 3042, has existed, with varying degrees of success, under the aegis of the European Parliament, which is well aware of the importance of cultural networks. This line of credit was controlled by the parliamentarians themselves, with no external juries. Two years ago, European Commission made an evaluation of this credit line and issued a communiqué on the subject, in which it concluded that this activity was illegal!

### *Prospects for 2007-2013*

I would like to conclude with prospects for 2007-2013.

First, following the recommendation from professionals, the European Parliament and certain member States; the number of objectives will be reduced from eight to three. There is no point in multiplying the number of criteria, which are often peripheral with respect to the fundamental artistic activities. Three aims therefore: trans-national distribution of works and cultural products, mobility for people working the field of culture, intercultural dialogue. This latter, includes both intra-European cultural dialogue and relations between the European Union and third countries. Culture 2007 should make it easier to set up projects with third countries. The budget proposed by the European Commission is 408 millions euros over seven years. 77 % of the funds will go to support cooperation activities, 10 % will be set aside to support Pan-European bodies in the field of culture and 5% for studies and the circulation of information in the field of culture.

For the moment, these are only proposals in a difficult budgetary climate. The European Commission has raised the possibility of delegating the management of the Culture 2000 programme (and other education and youth programmes) to an external agency. I would add that the French government had made some interesting proposals, none of which appear to have been adopted for the moment. Given the limited nature of Culture 2000 funds, the *Memorandum* from the French government on Cultural cooperation in Europe, which was issued in February 2004, proposed setting up joint calls for tenders; for example, "Culture 2000/Euromed, Mediterranean programme" or "Culture 2000/Structural funds". Finally, it proposed a MEDIA bis and ter programme for the literary and music publishing industries. The public commitment of professional at the European level is very important and many acquisitions are perceptible; many experiences and an emerging European professionalism exist. We must continue the dialogue with community bodies; because, sooner or later and no doubt too slowly, the message will eventually be received. Therefore the Culture clause (III-280) of the future Constitutional Treaty, will be governed by qualified majority voting and no longer by a unanimous vote. Let us therefore salute the symbolic and concrete role Culture 2000 has played in mobilising cultural professionals in Europe.

## Appendices

## RÉSEAU VARÈSE

### EUROPEAN NETWORK FOR THE CREATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF MUSIC

The Réseau Varèse was founded in Rome in 1999, at the initiative of the Festival Musica, brings together 17 partners from 11 different European countries. Since the year 2000 with the support of the European Commission's Culture 2000 programme, it has encouraged European exchanges and the distribution of contemporary music projects. The Réseau Varèse meets twice a year as a General Assembly - as part of an event organised by one of the members - to raise current questions, draft its support programme and discuss different points of view concerning the creation of music in Europe.

The Réseau Varèse, which is an association under French law, has the support of the European Union's Culture 2000 programme and aid from the French Ministry of Culture and Communication (DMDTS, DRAC Alsace)



Education and Culture

**Culture 2000**



Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité  
RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE



## Members of the Réseau Varèse

Germany	<b>Schauspiel Frankfurt</b> , Frankfurt (Elisabeth Schweeger) <b>Konzerthaus</b> , Berlin (Heike Hoffmann) <b>Berliner Festspiele</b> , Berlin (Matthias Osterwold, André Hebbelinck)
Austria	<b>Wien Modern</b> , Vienna (Berno Odo Polzer)
Belgium	<b>Ars Musica</b> , Brussels (Tino Haenen)
Finland	<b>Musica Nova</b> , Helsinki (Kimmo Hakola)
France	<b>T&amp;M</b> , Paris (Antoine Gindt) <b>Ircam</b> , Paris (Franck Madlener) <b>Festival Musica</b> , Strasbourg (Jean-Dominique Marco)
Greece	<b>Megaron</b> , Athènes, Athén, Athens (Nikos Tsouchlos)
Hungary	<b>Festival d' Autumn</b> , Budapest (Zsófia Zimányi)
Italy	<b>Romaeuropa</b> , Rome (Monique Veaute) <b>RAI Trade</b> , Milan (Mimma Guastoni)
Norway	<b>Festival Ultima</b> , Oslo (Geir Johnson)
Portugal	<b>Casa da Musica</b> , Porto, Oporto (Antonio Pacheco)
United Kingdom	<b>South Bank Centre</b> , London (Gillian Moore) <b>Contemporary Music Festival</b> , Huddersfield (Tom Service)

## **Officers of the Réseau Varèse**

Chairman	Antoine Gindt (T&M, Paris)
Vice-chairmen	Monique Veaute (Romaeuropa) Jean-Dominique Marco (Festival Musica, Strasbourg)
Treasurer	Elisabeth Schweeger (Schauspiel Frankfurt)
Secretary	Antonio Pacheco (Casa da Musica, Porto)

## Programme for 2003-2004-2005

Titles	Composers	Genres
Dos Coyotes	Magnus Lindberg	1
Momo / Jojo	Pascal Dusapin	2
Fourth String Quartet	Jonathan Harvey	1
Mare Nostrum	Mauricio Kagel	3
Theseus Game	Sir Harrison Birtwistle	1
Richter	Mario Lorenzo	3
La Frontière	Philippe Manoury	3
The Contemporary Hardanger Fiddle		1
Ob:scena	Georges Aperghis	5
Eraritjaritjaka	Heiner Goebbels	3
Philomela	James Dillon	3
Anima Mundi (Symphony III)	Brice Pauset	1
An Index of Metals	Fausto Romitelli	4
Two Interludes	Jonathan Harvey	1
String Quartet n°1	Hanspeter Kyburz	1
Italia Anno Zero	Olga Neuwirth	4
Avis de Tempête	Georges Aperghis	3
Portrait	Helmut Lachenmann	1

- 1 = concert
- 2 = the young
- 3 = musical theatre, opera
- 4 = concert/video
- 5 = dance

In 2000, 2001 and 2002, thanks to the Culture 2000 programme of the European Union, the Réseau Varèse contributed to the distribution of the works by:

- **Wolfgang Rihm** (Paris, Oslo, Strasbourg, Huddersfield, Brussels)
- **Georges Aperghis** (Strasbourg, Brussels, Paris)
- **Kaija Saariaho** (Oslo, London, Huddersfield)
- **Heiner Goebbels** (Rome, Berlin, Nanterre, Huddersfield, Frankfurt)
- **Salvatore Sciarrino** (Berlin, Brussels, Strasbourg, Huddersfield, Nanterre, Rome, Paris, Frankfurt)
- **Magnus Lindberg** (Helsinki, Brussels, Paris)
- **Martin Matalon** (Strasbourg, Huddersfield, Paris)
- **Morton Feldman** (Oslo, Huddersfield, Berlin, Paris)
- **Evan Parker** (Oslo, Huddersfield, Paris)
- **Steve Reich** (Strasbourg, Berlin, Paris)

The conference of the 22 October 2004 in Budapest (Institut Français) was organised by the Réseau Varèse in collaboration with the Budapest Autumn Festival and with the help of the Institut Français of Budapest.

Organisation:

Frédérique Payn, delegate of the Réseau Varèse

Debreczeni Melinda, Budapest Autumn Festival

Simultaneous translation of the speeches was provided by:

Tasmine Fernando

Anne-Christine Parr

János Salgó

Éva Gáldi

József Pozsgay

The transcription of the proceedings was produced by Malika Combes (March-avril 2005) from documents recorded during the conference and/or written documents provided by the speakers.