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OVERVIEW OF AEC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES AND CONGRESS VENUES 1953-2003

1953 1ST CONGRESS BAD-AUSSEE (ÖSTERREICH), 15 JULY 1953
Initiator First Congress: Dr. Eberhard Preussner (Salzburg)
Founders: Renato Fasano (Venezia) and Walter Müller von Kulm (Basel)
Presidential honour: Dr. Bernhard Paumgarter (Österreich)

1956 2ND CONGRESS VENEZIA, 8-12 SEPTEMBER 1956
1st President: Renato Fasano (Venezia)

1960 3RD CONGRESS KÖLN, 21-25 OCTOBER 1960

1963 4TH CONGRESS COPENHAGEN, 9-12 OCTOBER 1963
New Presidents: Knudige Riisager (Kobenhavn) and Rudolf Wittelsbach (Zürich)
New General Secretary: Eberhard Preussner (Salzburg)

1966 5TH CONGRESS LONDON, 4-7 OCTOBER 1966
New Presidents: Sir Keith Falkner (London) and Heinz Schröter (Köln)
New General Secretary: Rudolf Wittelsbach (Zürich)

1969 6TH CONGRESS BERN, 16-19 SEPTEMBER 1969
New Presidents: Rudolf Fischer (Leipzig) and Taneli Kuusisto (Helsinki)
New General Secretary: Rudolf Wittelsbach (Zürich)

1970 7TH EXTRAORDINARY CONGRESS VIENNA, 6-9 OCTOBER 1970

1972 8TH CONGRESS LEIPZIG, 1-4 NOVEMBER 1972
New Presidents: Rudolf Fischer (Leipzig) and Poul Birkelund (Kobenhavn)
New Temporary General Secretary: Richard Sturzenegger (Bern)
New General Secretary: Claude Viala (Genève)

1974 9TH CONGRESS ROTTERDAM, 18-23 OCTOBER 1974
New Presidents: Zdenko Novacek (Bratislava) and Poul Birkelund (Kobenhavn)

1976 10TH CONGRESS WARSZAWA, 9-13 NOVEMBER 1976
New Presidents: Zdenko Novacek (Bratislava) and Johan van den Boogert (Utrecht)

New Presidents: Johan van den Boogert (Utrecht) and Boguslaw Madey (Warszawa)

1980 12TH CONGRESS KÖLN, 10-14 NOVEMBER 1980
New Presidents: Boguslaw Madey (Warszawa) and Franz Müller-Heuser (Köln)

1982 13TH CONGRESS PRAHA, 15-19 NOVEMBER 1982
New Presidents: Franz Müller-Heuser (Köln) and Boris I. Kulikov (Moskva)

1984 14TH CONGRESS STOCKHOLM, 12-16 NOVEMBER 1984

1986 15TH CONGRESS MOSKVA, 17-22 NOVEMBER 1986

1988 16TH CONGRESS BASEL, 21-25 NOVEMBER 1988
New Presidents: Sir John Manduell (Manchester) and Boris I. Kulikov (Moskva)
New General Secretary: Urs Frauchiger (Bern)
1990  17TH CONGRESS GLASGOW, 19-23 NOVEMBER 1990
New President: Sir John Manduell (Manchester)

1991  18TH EXTRAORDINARY CONGRESS WARSZAWA, 18-20 SEPTEMBER 1991
New Secretary General: Richard Lowry (Angers)

1992  19TH CONGRESS LYON, 16-21 NOVEMBER 1992
New Vice-presidents: Frans de Ruiter (Den Haag) and Franz Müller-Heuser (Köln)
New Administrator: Isabelle Replumaz
New AEC Office: Angers

1993  20TH CONGRESS TEL AVIV, 21-27 NOVEMBER 1993

1994  21ST CONGRESS LISBOA, 12-17 NOVEMBER 1994

1995  22ND CONGRESS LUXEMBOURG, 13-16 NOVEMBER 1995

1996  23RD CONGRESS KOBENHAVN, 15-19 NOVEMBER 1996
New President: Ian Horsbrugh (London)
New Vice-presidents: Petre Lefterescu (Bucuresti) and Erik Bach (Arhus)
New Secretary General: Marc-Olivier Dupin (Paris)
New AEC Office: Paris


1999  26TH CONGRESS BUCURESTI, 5-8 NOVEMBER 1999

2000  27TH CONGRESS VICENZA, 17-21 NOVEMBER 2000
New President: Ian Horsbrugh (London)
New Vice-presidents: Martin-Christoph Redel (Detmold) and Tuula Kotilainen (Helsinki)
New Secretary General: Johannes Johansson (Malmö)
New Chief Executive: Martin Prchal
New AEC Office: Utrecht

2001  28TH CONGRESS GRONINGEN, 16-19 NOVEMBER 2001
New Office Manager: Janneke Vrijland

2002  29TH CONGRESS VILNIUS, 15-17 NOVEMBER 2002
New Vice-presidents: Marie-Claude Ségard (Strasbourg) and Rineke Smilde (Groningen)
New Project Administrator: Sofie Truwant

2003  30TH CONGRESS KARLSRUHE, 7-10 NOVEMBER 2003
INTRODUCTION
IAN HORSBRUGH, AEC PRESIDENT

This is a momentous moment in the life of the AEC - our 50th anniversary.

In 1953, the European and musical world was so very different. Sibelius, Flagstad, Furtwängler, Gieseking, and Toscanini were representatives of the mature generation of musicians; while amongst the young firebrands, there were Boulez, Stockhausen, Bernstein.... Then there was the new excitement of vinyl discs, electronics were just around the corner and radio and TV were beginning to realise the potential of music broadcasts. But being able to pick up a Wagner opera and, as you walk along the street, play it on your small very portable container, tucked into your pocket, well, that was not even a dream!

What changes there have been in these years and how very different that life in music and in conservatoires seems, from the perspective of 2003. But while the political, social and economic changes have been tumultuous, at the core there is music, musicians and the education of young musicians. The pull between the traditions of music education and the influences of contemporary life have probably never been as extreme as they are now. The role of the conservatoires, and all those who serve in them, have to contend with significant and demanding issues.

Thus, the role of the AEC is so important. As 199 member institutions now indicate, the Association provides an invaluable service. This has been by undertaking exploration into various aspects of common interest, such as in violin training, multi-cultural issues, continuing professional development and pre-college training while the current activities arising from the Bologna Declaration are bringing a special awareness of the distinctiveness of national attitudes in music education.

Our Annual Congress provides a significant opportunity to meet, share, laugh and enjoy and learn from each other’s expertise, wisdom and company. In addition, the annual gathering of those who have responsibility for organising international exchanges increases in popularity each year. With the fine quality of our administrative staff, we are able to do all these things.

I am immensely proud to be the President in this momentous year. I salute all colleagues from the past as well as the present who have made the AEC what it is - a growing and formidable force in European cultural life. This excellent publication provides a fine spectrum on the AEC. We should also express our sincere gratitude to the European Cultural Foundation for their generous support of this important publication.

So, let us celebrate together - and continue to promote and defend the interests of the education of musicians.
This publication provides a brief summary of the development of AEC (Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen) over the past 50 years. It illustrates that changes that occurred over the period pose new demands on the leaders of these institutions. Most importantly, however, it points to the present and future of professional music education. Visions and solutions, fluctuating between reality and imagination, must above all else be perceived and realised by the leaders of the schools of higher education in music. Hence the present publication presents different views: Gottfried Scholz gives a condensed account of the historical development of AEC from its inception until the present. Tuula Kotilainen and Thüring Bräm interview students, teachers and rectors about their personal orientation and in a separate chapter ask four personalities, each well-known in his respective area, for their opinions. Martin Prchal provides the concrete connection to Europeanisation from the point of view of the European Community, which has strongly developed over the past ten years. From an American angle, Sam Hope elucidates the values of music education and making music in Europe.

In addition to portraying a particular though randomly chosen time in history – November 2003 as the 50th anniversary of the Association – this publication is meant to fulfil a concrete purpose:

• help cultural institutions to formulate guidelines in a regional, national and international framework, which will lead into the future.
• give orientation to political committees nationally and in the European context in reference to the specific characteristics and needs of music education in a wide-cut cultural context.
• inform the general public about our tasks and activities from various perspectives.

It is our goal that the present publication induces a deeper discussion on the subject of differentiated and reflected interaction with music and professional music education. ‘The greatest challenge for musical life at present’ says Esa-Pekka Salonen, chief conductor of Los Angeles, in his interview, ‘is to remain rooted in society’.

We would like to thank everybody who was involved in the making of this publication: the authors and interview partners, the rectors, students and teachers whom we approached and who answered our questions as well as all those who worked behind the scene. We like to express special thanks to the European Cultural Foundation in Amsterdam who made the publication of this brochure materially possible. Thank you all.

THE EDITORS: THÜRING BRÄM, IAN HORSBRUGH, TUULA KOTILAINEN, GOTTFRIED SCHOLZ, MARTIN PRCHAL

UTRECHT, SEPTEMBER 2003
European higher education policy is unimaginable without our Association, an affiliation of European schools of higher education in music, conservatoires and academies. Particularly in an alliance of states, which are still growing together, professional qualifications in the arts up to the highest level are seen by all as a major cultural issue. No nation can create its future independently of knowing what is happening beyond its own borders and without being influenced by the decisions of other institutions of the same kind. The fact that 50 years ago this was already basically recognized in the field of higher musical education and that our Association was founded with this objective in mind has over the following decades shown to be an important decision. Its impact has proven relevant in particular with regard to the currently on-going debate on education at university level.

A grown organisation striving to attain goals in the future can only pursue this path actively and with self-confidence when bringing into today the ideas as well as support and justified criticism gained from the experience of the past and from the confidence acquired having come such a long way. Our association of the schools of higher education in music is not only a place of exchange for news, plans and accreditation procedures but – and this must not be underestimated – a place of encounter for those bearing responsibility who through private conversation in a friendly ambience where they can put their own projects up for discussion are able to gain new insights and re-orientation.

When an institution looks back to its founding phase more than five decades ago, it is possible to assess the event in two different ways. The official one relates to the written ideas, which made a major contribution to its foundation; the other one reviews in anecdotes the encounters of important individuals who found common intellectual ground and desired to expand these meetings and institutionalise them.

50 years ago, when the memories of the disaster of World War II were still fresh in the minds of the people, Europe was made up of many states that had after the tragic events joined - voluntarily or involuntarily - to form groupings. They ranged from the victorious powers of 1945 to those who were defeated, from nations who became Western democracies to those who largely lost their independent statehood under communist influence, to those states whose economies were so bad that governmental or private support of higher musical educational institutions could be considered only to a limited extent.

The period after 1950 was characterized by two important facts; on the one hand, the firm line of separation between the states in Western and Eastern Europe and, on the other hand, the limitations for people and ideas to cross states borders freely - a relic from the time of the Great War.
In 1945, Austria was divided into four occupation zones, which were controlled by the four Allies. Crossing these internal borders was difficult, travelling to other countries almost impossible. In 1950, a first opening after the long isolation took place in Europe when the Holy Year was celebrated in Rome and ecclesiastic organisations assisted pilgrims from various countries in gaining permits to enter Italy. Thus, a dream held for decades came true for at least a short period of time.

During one of these trips a meeting took place between the director of the conservatory in Venice Renato Fasano, the director of the Salzburg Conservatory Dr. Bernhard Paumgartner and his closest colleague Dr. Eberhard Preussner. The two conservatories initiated an exchange of ideas hoping that the foundation of a supra-national association of schools of higher education in music would at least make travelling possible and offer opportunities to get to know the institutions in other countries. This led to the idea of organising an initial meeting of all music schools offering professional training. The first meeting took place in summer 1953 in Austria and brought an important number of representatives from music schools as well as schools of higher education in music from 22 different countries to the beautiful alpine village of Bad Aussee. The conference was immediately afterwards continued in Salzburg. The directors of the schools of higher education in music from the Eastern European countries were still missing, however.

The matters of mutual concern known to the delegates from their own schools were openly put up for debate making this conference an occasion of genuine exchange of thought while bringing about a feeling of connectedness among participants. Topics discussed covered issues such as the training of singers, how to organise an orchestra for student conductors to practice with, didactic and methodological questions of teaching music, artistic activities, etc. At that time, the delegates still lacked the experience of how to organise an international conference and issues such as the evaluation of lectures, replying to questionnaires, cross-border preparation of future meetings were areas unknown to many of the participants. Thus, this meeting did not result in lasting implementations of ideas and resolutions – and this is certainly not only true for the early phase.

One of the first important decisions was not to let the young association, composed of the directors and presidents of the high schools of education in music, merge with the International Society of Musical Education (ISME) but to set it up independently. This shows the will not to be outvoted by the large and significant number of music teachers who meet at the ISME congresses, but rather to direct the questions, which are put up for debate, to the respective head of school and focus on the specific issues. In the first meetings after 1953 the new trends in education in particular were formulated and discussed, such as the introduction of using (expensive) electro acoustics in composition, special techniques and methods in music education, experience with the art agencies that seek engagements for the graduates. Renato Fasano played a decisive role in all this; he, who was accustomed as a conductor to hold the baton firmly, now directed the young Association with the same intensity,
which on occasion caused some difficulty. Eberhard Preussner, who in his position as Secretary General acted as mediator, unfortunately died in 1964.

In the same period, the first attempts were made to bring representatives from Eastern European countries into the Association while simultaneously trying to exclude the non-European states from real membership. When looking back to the period of foundation it seems noteworthy that the two institutions, which were the brain-fathers and first organisers of our Association, the conservatories of Venice and Salzburg, played only a marginal role in the following period.

From the very beginning, however, one issue was never raised: the question concerning the standard a music school must provide in order to become a member. Yet, in the field of art the maxim ‘professional musical training’ is hard to standardize. Eventually, every gifted artist may succeed in his professional life. For this reason, heterogeneity among the members of the Association was increasingly felt in the late 1970s.

The history of AEC clearly demonstrates that it is dangerous when countries, which adhere strongly to one cultural, linguistic or political grouping, want to exert too much influence on the community. The most difficult situation for our Association was the moment when its first President left the organisation in conflict and along with him all Italian members and the Conservatoire Paris cancelled their membership out of solidarity. The Austrian contribution also decreased due to the death of Preussner, which occurred at the same time, though the then Academy of Music in Vienna under its President Dr. Hans Sittner tried to collaborate on a new organisational set-up, which started off a new era thanks to Rudolf Wittelsbach from Zurich as Secretary General. In this era, an executive committee was carefully established composed of members from the various regions of Europe, thus hoping to attain balance among all European members while still in the preparation process for the congresses and when implementing its resolutions.

The big students’ riots at the universities in the year 1968 and over the following years did not halt at some of the conservatories and schools of higher education in music. In many places the students demanded participation in the decision-making processes while the teachers demanded co-determination. This in turn would lead to a cut in the decision-making powers of the presidents elected or appointed for lifetime.

Central and Northern Europe introduced constitutions for the rector’s position, which granted the elected rector only a limited term in office. The philosophy originating in the 19th century that an important personality was to shape the profile of a music conservatory was thus overthrown. Simultaneously, the denominations of the schools were changed and the traditional terms conservatory or academy were changed to school of higher education in music. In the last years of the close of the 20th century a further change took place by introducing the term University. This way, some countries wanted to document stronger orientation along the structures established by the universities of sciences and their objectives
of attaining the highest educational qualifications. In these turbulent times the directors, presidents and first rectors in particular found it very helpful to be given the opportunity to discuss openly their problems among friends and colleagues from other schools.

The internal organisation of the Association changed its presidential structure to a two-headed system with one elected President from a Western European country and the other, holding equal status, from an Eastern European country – which is from today’s point of view hard to understand. A Secretary General from a neutral country was placed at their side. This troika was meant to reflect the political situation in Europe. One must add, however, and I was able to observe this since 1972, that neither in the executive commission nor in the general assemblies has there ever occurred an open political controversy or inimical ideological debate, though each side tried to place in the foreground its philosophically founded education model by using convincing arguments as well as staging art performances. Claude Viala from Geneva as Secretary General has always guided AEC well in these political questions. After the completion of his term he wrote a historical overview: ‘History of AEC’.

Over the many years of continuous development of the music institutions it became clear that it was increasingly difficult for the directors and rectors to act as representatives at the general assemblies and to participate actively in the subject-related discussions. As long as they had in the old system the sole right of decision in their schools, they were able to shape them from their individual standpoints and their ability of asserting themselves. This was often highly beneficial for the school.

Along with the increasing specification, the rise in number of study subjects offered as well as the integration of new tasks and special fields the directors often became merely the executors who tried to implement what their senates or collegiums had concluded. This in turn changed the expectation of the members towards the Association, which lost to some extent the intimate atmosphere, which over many years had been enjoyed by the same honourable Presidents in their meetings. When in 1982 in the meeting of the executive committee in Prague the proposal was put up for discussion to create sub-groups for individual fields, who would perform the required preliminary brainwork for the following conference and would invite experts for the respective topic, one long-standing member remarked with a dismissive gesture: ‘Is this no longer like a good old English Club?’ This statement shows clearly the change that had occurred. For some, this was perhaps a painful experience but it was necessary.

The tasks of a school of higher education in music had changed. The practice of art and the necessary theoretical substantiation required specialisation and adequate research activities. The gap between art and science must be closed within the schools and the pursuit of science is impossible without research. Another area is pedagogy, which was originally not one of the main tasks of a conservatory. Yet especially in the difficult learning situation that the rising generation is facing, it no longer suffices that a teacher knows his instrument. The teacher must have learned how to put his or her knowledge to use in enhancing the skills
and determination of the students, and to arouse joy in them. Questions must be raised regarding future professional life, the general market situation, the jobs offered to our graduates. This field, which includes the media as among the most important employers for our students, will have to be covered by Sociology. The list could be continued further. I only like to state that the Association’s development over the past years well ensures its openness towards these new issues.

The pressing problems, which our schools are facing today, require a discussion forum, which should be permanently available to all requests. It must be seen as positive that the office of the Association today has become a management centre. The General Secretaries Claude Viala and later Marc-Olivier Dupin conducted the affairs largely with the assistance of their own secretarial offices. The rapid growth in tasks, however, made it increasingly necessary to establish a centre staffed with a team that handles all current agendas.

One of the agenda items is the exchange of teachers and students within the framework of the programmes, which were developed in Brussels. The required adjustment of the curricula, the introduction of the Bologna System, the recognition of the certificates, all this requires a carefully managed central cooperation office. We need the patronage of the Association, not only for the issues concerning all study-related legal matters, but we need its assistance to enable individual special departments to form, exchange ideas and thus unfold joint activities across the borders of countries and schools. In former years, it was the rule that a student who was admitted to a school of higher musical education was assigned to a particular teacher. He/she remained there for the entire course of studies and completed them with a diploma. This way of conducting one’s studies is today confronted with new demands as well as new possibilities. Changing the place of study, the teacher as well as the intellectual environment may provide some, yet not all, with a profound professional training. In order to make such a transfer possible and to solve the legal, pedagogic as well as human problems that ensue, the schools must know each other. This means that the teachers are willing to cooperate and build a base of confidence.

Many of the decisions regarding European university policy are made at the EU central office. This is where one needs to be heard and to be represented. In fact, the particularity of a professional training in the arts cannot be equated with that of a university teaching science. One of the most important tasks of the moment AEC is facing is to make politicians understand this. Ian Horsbrugh as President has chosen this path; he does not walk it alone but is supported along the way by the determination of the members, who see themselves as a grown and active community.

50 years of AEC involved in the ups and downs of European history have provided experiences that allow us to look into the future of our Association full of good hope.
EITHER

OR
The four following contributions are ‘statements’ from distinguished individuals. If ‘research’ describes exploring new possibilities and solutions based on existing insights and experiences, all four of them are researchers in their own way: Peter Renshaw works in the area of Communication Sciences and Sociology, the neurologist Eckart Altenmüller conducts research on the brain in the area of learning and processing of music, the conductor Esa-Pekka Salonen one may say is an interpreter who communicates music while Wolfgang Rihm is a composer - thus an inventor of music.

Renshaw points out that the functional involvement of society is a fundamental precondition for all meaningful future activities of the musician. Altenmüller’s article demonstrates that the questions of cause and effect of music on the human brain may trigger a very interesting discussion about learning. Salonen and Rihm are less tangible when it comes to words; they gave an ‘occasional’ interview, which nevertheless made it clear that they like to accompany their thinking ‘in’ music by also thinking ‘about’ music. For conductor Salonen the method of how to communicate music plays an eminent role (‘Mozart never forgot his audience’). Composer Rihm does not like clear answers: Like music his answers always remain ‘multivocal’. His recommendation to the members of AEC: ‘Quite conservative: continue to foster talents. Quite revolutionary: foster those talents who not only replicate the existing talent model.’

This means: stay in the interplay - sending and receiving. Accept as meaningful both the linear developments and the chaos-theory based developments.
The art of conversation

In recent years the Association of European Conservatoires has strengthened dialogue between its member institutions through several key initiatives funded by the EU. Areas of focus have included the professional integration of musicians and continuing education, music education in a multicultural European society, the effects of the Bologna Declaration on professional music training, the use of technology and the Internet in the learning of music theory, identifying issues regarding transatlantic mobility, quality assurance and accreditation in music, and participating in a strategic study of cultural co-operation in Europe.

There is no doubt that the dialogue generated by such collaborative work benefits the institutions and individuals involved. It helps to broaden perspectives, to make new connections and to provide frameworks for the future. But how far do such trans-European projects penetrate to the heart of professional practice in conservatoires? How far do they inspire those deeper conversations that enlarge our world-view and transform the ways in which we act – as performers, composers, leaders and teachers?

Personally, I feel that the art of conversation is fundamental to the healthy development of any institution. Conservatoires are no exception! Both music-making and teaching share many of the qualities necessary for engaging in a conversation, for example trust, active listening, openness, humility, integrity and empathy. In a cultural world of growing diversity, the ability to reach out, to respect and accept different points of view is critical to any personal or institutional conversation. All staff and students need to be valued and feel that their voices are heard within an ethos of shared responsibility and mutual interdependence. This presents a tremendous challenge to the leadership and culture of an institution.

The place of conversation in a conservatoire

I would suggest that in the current climate ‘conversation’ is becoming increasingly fragile. Given the financial constraints confronting most institutions, conservatoires understandably are having to pay more attention to how they define and manage their knowledge. Quality control systems dominated by quantifiable performance indicators are often used to underpin higher education policies. No institution concerned with enhancing quality can fail to recognise the importance of public accountability and transparency, but the danger is that the present system can be too controlling and debilitating. Within this culture of compliance it is only too easy for arts organisations to become disconnected from the heart of their artistic life.

Knowledge, understanding, skills and professional attitudes form the bedrock of learning in any conservatoire, but the ways in which they are defined and acquired can easily be undermined by the perceived expectations of quality assurance and performance management.
An organic approach to development that depends partly on the fostering of an institutional conversation, does not fit comfortably within a mechanistic system of controlling and managing knowledge.

It seems crucial that in the central areas of performance, teaching, learning and assessing, conservatoires understand and respect the fundamental distinction between explicit knowledge, in which targets can be measured in quantifiable, mechanistic terms, and tacit knowledge which is more intuitive, reflexive and learned in very particular situations. Explicit knowledge can be clearly articulated, codified, quantified, replicated and transferred from one context to another. Tacit knowledge, on the other hand, is intangible, less observable, more complex and more difficult to detach from the person who created it or from the context in which it is located. The subtle nuances connected to tacit knowledge are more often caught and learned through a process of apprenticeship, through conversation, and are not readily transferable. Research in this domain is more likely to be qualitative in character, arising from reflective practice aimed at extending the boundaries of knowledge and experience.

In any conservatoire there is an inevitable tension between tacit and explicit knowledge. For instance, the demands of Quality Assurance necessitate that knowledge and procedures are formulated and conveyed explicitly in the public domain. Yet much of the energy, immediacy, spontaneity and creativity central to artistic processes are rooted in a form of life in which knowledge and awareness are more implicit than explicit. Finding ways of managing the apparent paradox between Quality and quality, and between explicit and tacit knowledge, is critical to the future work of conservatoires. Conversation plays a vital role in this process.

For example, in such central areas as one-to-one instrumental teaching, chamber music coaching, ensemble training, improvisation and creative work, there are times when students need to be given permission to be ‘selfish’. Part of their personal and artistic development must allow for a measure of introspection, but they also need to find the responsibility to come back out of this inner state in order to communicate their art to a public audience. Closed, tacit forms of teaching very easily lead to cosy, precious, self-absorbed behaviour that undermines effective performance. It is partly through reflective practice, with its critical third eye, that a middle way can be reached between didactic modes of transmitting explicit knowledge and those parasitic approaches to handing on tacit knowledge. This middle way, central to which is the art of conversation, provides that balance through which teacher and student can engage in an exciting shared journey of coming to know, to understand and to be. It is the responsibility of all conservatoires to nurture and strengthen this process of transformation.

The importance of connecting conversations

But this shared journey must not remain insular. There is a danger that many musicians and arts organisations suffer from a narrow tunnel vision that fails to embrace, challenge
and extend audiences from the widest constituency. Striving for excellence demands a sharp focus and discipline, but musicians will not become great artists if they are trapped in a cultural bubble. Their musical voice will only have resonance if it is felt to be connected to its creative source and to its audience. This is as true for soloists and orchestral players as it is for jazz, pop and world musicians. In order to make sense, their ‘conversations’ have to form part of an interconnected web of conversations that are rooted in the social, educational and cultural life of our rapidly changing world.

Perhaps the overarching principle for reordering priorities in a contemporary conservatoire is that of ‘connecting to context’. At present, conservatoires are delicately poised between conserving ‘classical’ heritage and acting as a catalyst within a dynamic living culture. These may be seen as uneasy bedfellows, but in my view, both perspectives are equally important and should command parity of recognition and resources. Without doubt, a belief in the integrity and transformative power of ‘classical’ traditions will continue to be seen as central to the philosophy of a conservatoire, but changing cultural values now require us to shape a vision that is more inclusive and outward-looking. This challenge has to be addressed. Too much is at stake for both the profession and the wider community. It is imperative that composers, performers, teachers and artistic leaders have the skills, confidence and imagination to create live, shared experiences which have something to say and make sense to audiences in different contexts.

Within the diversity of the AEC the response to this challenge will inevitably be influenced by the culture and traditions of particular institutions. But no conservatoire can ignore the fact that ‘classical’ music is undergoing an immense transition. Students and staff are having to reconsider the nature of performance and its relationship to composers and audiences. Collaborative forms of music-making are increasingly seen as central to engaging with a vernacular culture. Growing interest in the cross-fertilisation of music, technology, other creative arts and cultural traditions is developing an artistic language that has resonance with a wider public.

This shift in professional arts practice is both broadening the role of the musician and encouraging conservatoires to make new connections with their local communities. For example, many cultural institutions now see themselves as a potential creative resource for young people, third age, community groups, amateurs and professionals. To succeed, such initiatives have to be rooted within a coherent policy towards access, social inclusion, cultural diversity and lifelong learning. They are also dependent on wide-ranging partnerships and cross-sector collaborations. Connecting conversations are fundamental to this organic process of cultural change.

The 50th Anniversary of the AEC could be seen as a seminal moment for European conservatoires. Not only do they have to find ways of re-engaging the public’s imagination and commitment to its ‘classical’ heritage, but they also have to harness their creative energy, artistic and educational vision to become a vital force in a living culture. Transforming
conservatoires into dynamic cultural institutions with a contemporary voice is the ultimate challenge to leadership. My own view is that any shift in perspective towards training and development is best achieved through a shared process of honest, open, sustained dialogue. In the present climate, nurturing a ‘conversation’ that respects differences and crosses boundaries must be seen as a central guiding principle underlying institutional change.

... on his way home from seminar dealing with positive thinking
EFFECTS OF MUSIC EDUCATION ON THE CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM: MUSIC AS A NEUROSTIMULANT

ECKART ALTMÜLLER

There is general agreement that music is an important value ‘in itself’, providing joy, a sense for aesthetic values and a unique means to explore our feelings and to express emotions. During the last decade, however, music educators have become increasingly interested in another aspect of music, which is the effect that making music has on brain activation and cerebral cortex networking. New findings from neurobiological research demonstrating that music education leads to remarkable changes in the central nervous system have fuelled this interest. Making music seems to be a kind of behaviour, which induces most effectively short- and long-term adaptations of the brain, so-called central nervous plasticity.

Central nervous plasticity permits the brain to adapt to environmental factors that were not anticipated by the genetic programmes. Neuronic changes of this kind display strong variations of time: the first adaptation processes begin already after a few minutes while long-term processes may last the entire lifetime of an individual. Many different neurobiological processes are responsible for these neuronic changes, which occur at different speeds. While long-term plasticity is accompanied by a change of the neuronic cell structure, increased growth, increase of nerve cells and synapses, as well as thickening of the dendrites, the quick changes are caused by improved synaptic transmission of signals between nerve cells and by inhibiting disturbing nerve-cell impulses.

Research into the plastic changes of the central nervous system caused by musical activities is still in its infancy, but important laws were discovered in studies on musicians. At the one end of the time scale only a few minutes of practising an instrument may cause an expansion of the neuronic activity fields in the area of the motor cortex segments as well as stable junctions between the auditory cortex and the sensory-motor areas of the cerebral cortex. At the other end, years of intense practice of a musical instrument lead to an increase in density of the nerve cells and in the thickness of nerve cell fibres in various regions of the brain, particularly, when musical training is started at an early age. Hence, professional violinists and pianists have a bigger corpus callosum, which is the most vital fibre connection between the two hemispheres, than non-musicians provided they began playing their instrument before the age of seven. Since both violinists and pianists rely on perfect coor- dination of their left and right hand, it is assumed that the enlarged corpus callosum reflects a special training-induced adaptation of the central nervous system. The necessity of exchanging information between the two hemispheres that is exact in time and space either leads to thickening of the fibres – which in turn become better transmitters – or to a reduction in the normal developmental loss of nerve cell fibres. A similar enlargement of brain areas in professional musicians has been demonstrated for the sensory-motor areas of the cortex.
and for the auditory area in the posterior portion of the temporal lobe as well as for the cerebellum, which is responsible for the fine coordination of movements.

These anatomical changes of the brain appear to be confined to a critical period before adolescence. The fact that some of the studies show a clear correlation between the extent of the anatomical change and the age at which musical training was started argues against the hypothesis that these differences are predisposed and the cause rather than the result of improved musical performance. Follow-up studies of children and young people learning to play an instrument will be able to answer the question of what came first. The above listed investigations convincingly demonstrate that musical training can be used as a model for studying neural plasticity. The area of research has thus been opened and a number of questions that are vital to research can be raised: which training method is most efficient for learning an instrument and for leading to adaptations of plasticity of the central nervous system? Can these discoveries be put to use in musical education, which is based on neuroscientific findings? Do the laws of musical learning apply to other areas of human skills? Which role do genes play in the development of changes in plasticity? Making music requires intense monitoring of one’s own performance and correction of one’s mistakes. Which kinds of adaptation of plasticity occur in the areas responsible for monitoring attention and doing?

Finally, one has to bear in mind that music can elicit the most powerful emotions. Such strong emotional responses are accompanied by reactions of the autonomous nervous system such as shivers down the spine and changes in the heart rate. Physiologically this is caused by brain activities in the area of the basal ganglia, amygdala, midbrain and the lower frontal lobe cortex - areas that are part of a network, which programmes self-reward, emotion and motivation. Further research will show to what extent the above-mentioned plastic changes of the nervous system are based on this self-reward and motivation system.

It seems plausible that expansion of certain brain centres, a higher density of nerve cells or a more efficient connection between the hemispheres and brain centres on one hemisphere principally improve the cognitive abilities. Many of the more sophisticated mental activities depend vitally on the speed of neuronic transmission and on the amount of neuronic resources available. Surprisingly, ‘hard data’ proving transfer effects of musical abilities on other cognitive domains are rare. Although there are several reports demonstrating a positive correlation between musical talent and learning performance in school in children and young people, it is still unclear whether musical children are better pupils because they make music or whether higher performance in school and higher musicality do not depend on other, very different common factors. Hence, it is thinkable that socio-economical conditions play an important part. Families with better financial resources usually give more attention to the intellectual training of their children and there is a higher probability that these children receive music lessons and own high-quality musical instruments. In my opinion, the most convincing transfer effects can be found in the areas belonging to the
‘emotional intelligence’. Thus, music education improves children’s ability to recognize the emotional content expressed in spoken language.

In summary, there is ample evidence that music education and making music effect brain development and networking to an extent, which cannot be found in any other human activity. Regarding the relative few transfer effects of music education on other skills I suspect that we have not yet found the right tests or investigation methods for proving validly the (probably enormous) long-term impact of music education on our thoughts and feelings.
Esa-Pekka Salonen was awarded an honorary doctorate from the Sibelius Academy at the ceremonial conferment of degrees on 7 June 2003. He conducted the Sibelius Academy Symphony Orchestra during the ceremony itself, and a concert by the Helsinki Philharmonic two nights before. These two concerts featured five Finnish premieres in all, three of them commissioned by Salonen from young Finnish composers. These commissions were financed out of a major national culture prize awarded to him two years ago. Rehearsing the concerts and premieres, with a week in Birmingham in between working on a programme of music by Magnus Lindberg and others, was no doubt nothing unusual in the life of a gifted conductor in constant demand.

The following discussion took place shortly before the gala dinner on the evening of the degree ceremony and was resumed during the dinner. Also, in between the main course and dessert was a performance of ‘Floof’ with the composer himself conducting. No signs of stress could be seen!

Where is musical life heading?
Esa-Pekka Salonen: ‘Music academies the world over are nowadays producing top-rate players. But at the same time classical music has come to assume a somewhat more peripheral role than it used to have in society. It’s distressing and worrying to see the emergence of a generation devoid of any contact with classical music. Unfortunately, we are faced with a paradoxical situation: in principle, the product is better than ever, but at the same time we are having to train the consumers of this product, as it were. The biggest challenge for musicians, or musical life, at the moment is making sure we remain rooted in society - in the sociological sense, on the map! In this respect Finland happens to be rather well off. Music counts for quite a lot in Finnish society, and it also carries political and economic weight. It is of great significance to the nation’s identity, but sad to say, this is by no means a universal state of affairs. So that’s the biggest challenge facing us musicians and indeed everyone professionally involved with music at the moment: teachers, administrators, composers. The time is irrevocably past when classical music was an absolute value in itself, when it was enough simply for it to exist.’

Whose job is it, then, to meet the challenge?
‘One of my hobbyhorses for a long time now has been educating adults. Over in Los Angeles we are already launching a pedagogical or didactic concert series in the hope of pulling in young adults. The concerts are specially planned to place all the works performed in a particular context – historical, cultural or social – and the actual concerts are slightly different in that we set out to analyse what the music meant in its day. What are the big, radical changes, the moments when some musical event altered the world so that it was never the same again? I think that by providing a context, we can show that classical music is not a peripheral, isolated phenomenon but part of living reality.’
‘I’m not so worried about youngsters; rather about young adults. Our primary targets over in Los Angeles are the 30-40 year-olds who have been through college and are beginning to feel a need for something more than the rubbish on MTV and the like. I would like to give people an opportunity to discover values beyond those force-fed us by the media.’

‘We need to see ourselves as part of a policy, as an element contributing to the quality of life, as healing forces. I believe, and we must all believe, in the power of experience. Ideally, we can offer something the power and depth of which go far beyond mass entertainment and mass production.’

What is to be done?

‘The musician must keep an open mind; accept the challenge that it is up to us not only to compose and perform music but also to pass the message on; we must possess the will and ability to communicate. We will have to devise methods of spreading the message beyond the traditional concert structure. Performance in the conventional sense is not enough.’

‘We must clear a path to the people whose minds are open to this, and there are plenty of them. Our institutions must make it clear that we are open houses, and reach out to those who have no previous musical routine. Elitism, exclusivity, emphasis on the spiritual at the expense of the physical are dangers to be avoided, because they’ve done a lot of damage. Take new music, for example: people look on it more as a cerebral than as a physical phenomenon.’

‘An example of what I have in mind is what I did at the Helsinki Philharmonic concert this week: I chatted in front of the audience to the three composers whose works we were premiering. In other words, the idea is to spotlight the person who wants to be understood. Communication. Not just someone in an ivory tower producing something fine on the principle of take it or leave it. These are just drops in the ocean, but you have to start somewhere.’

‘I once sat next to two girls at a concert in Stockholm. One asked the other who the young man was who went and bowed on the platform after the performance was over. The other one said it must be the composer, but her friend replied with conviction that it couldn’t be because composers are always dead!’

What does this mean for education?

‘Right from the start, education has to begin with the idea of the musician as a communicator sending a message to other people. To some extent people have sometimes failed to grasp this. After the Second World War, for example, two decades passed on the composition side in an active attempt to keep music apart from everything else. Composers told themselves they were doing something exclusive and lost all interest in communication. The worrying thing is that this introvert style met with approval. People have now woken up again to the need for communication. Just as in Mozart’s day; he never forgot the audience. There are many reasons for the post-war detachment, one of them being that there was money on offer.’
Where is the line between old and new?

‘New music no longer causes a stir. Just think of Strauss’s Salome or the performances of Stravinsky’s ballets! Oh to be back in a situation where new music matters so much! One of the great problems of classical music is that it is retrospective and repetitive; performance-oriented rather than creation-oriented. The secret of the vitality of rock music is, of course, that new pieces are being produced all the time.’

‘In the old days, all the music performed was new music. The standard repertoire phenomenon only emerged with the development of the concert institution. Training, too, aims at command of repertoire, and the repertoire is growing all the time. The trend in concert and training institutions has in a way led to set ideas that are reflected in attitudes to contemporary music.’

‘There must always be new works, but it’s wrong to complain because Beethoven’s fifth symphony is on the programme yet again. It will always be a new work for someone – a vast number of people in fact – and it may be a deeply stirring experience. But on the other hand we must also make sure that the music composed today gets a hearing alongside it, and that the umbilical cord never gets severed.’
1) Wo geht die Musik hin? Where does the music go?

There are several answers to this question, such as:

a) I don't know. (Nobody knows.)
b) Where we wish it to go.
c) Where it wants to go itself.
d) Who would know?

2) What are the main tasks of a school of higher education in music today?

The main task of a school of higher education in music is the same as it always was: to teach the profession and nonetheless broaden the horizon. (provide criteria.)

3) One can promote musical styles or prevent them. One can use music to heal, seduce, manipulate. Slogans: World music, classical music, jazz, ethno-music, popular music, promotional music, military music, electro-acoustic music, improvised music, composed music, environmental music, rock music, school music.... What kind of music? Globalized music?

I cannot 'promote' styles nor can I 'prevent' them. And why should I?

4) Should one attempt to place a value regarding this quantity?

By all means! We place values in all areas of life by making choices. (It would be naive to believe that something is valuable because most people choose it. The problem is that the ignorant should not stand at the centre of a valuation structure as suggested by quota thinking, which is the perverted remnant of democratic values.)

5) Is music everything made of sound?

If the human being wants it to be, so it is. If the human being does not want it to be, it is not (music is human-made...). This depends on one's attitude.

6) How do you deal with this chaos as a composer?

Very well, since all is ordered through action. Only for those who do not act does the world grow into an intangible lot before which they remain in silent melancholy. And besides, existence at the edge of the abyss (‘edge of the gape’ – as the term chaos is translated) is the natural sojourn of the creative. This is nothing special and nothing to be vain about.
7) What recommendation would you give to the AEC (Association Européenne des Conservatoires et Musikhochschulen) for its future, an institution that is placed at the crossroads between artistic education, activities in music education and society?

'Quite conservative: continue to foster talents. Quite revolutionary: foster those talents who do not only replicate the existing talent model.'

Wolfgang Rihm June 9, 2003
WHAT WE HEAR FROM THEM
DISCUSSION OF TOPICAL ISSUES
TUULA KOTILAINEN

The discussion was conducted in writing. Thüring Bräm and the undersigned drew up a list of questions that were sent to rectors in fourteen countries, teachers in five and students in twelve. The replies have not been processed scientifically, the following being more in the nature of a summary.

The questionnaire directed at rectors aimed to discover their views on their role and primary duties. It also sought to establish a broad view of trends and the ongoing challenges to education in the rectors’ own countries. Their views were further invited on the AEC and its significance both to them personally and to their own institution.

What are the most important features of a rector? Could you mention the keywords or the areas of focusing of the strategy/vision of your school for the coming 5-10 year period? For what or/and for whom are your feelings most responsible?

The 13 replies to these questions show that the rector’s role and duties are felt to be both varied and demanding. The three features mentioned as being most important are inter-personal skills, the ability to make decisions, and artistic authority. The predominance of the first of these, inter-personal skills, i.e. the ability to listen, understand, support and inspire, proves that rectors look upon spiritual leadership as their duty. – In addition to these three features, the rector should be a factor of influence in music policy, be good at appearing in public, strong and determined. – ‘As a personality he/she should be felt both by teachers, students and the world outside as a natural leader.’ A career as an artist was regarded as enhancing the rector’s prestige and authority.

The primary key area reflecting the field in which rectors nowadays operate was internationalism in its various manifestations. However, rectors also rated attention to the national significance and status of their institution and the field this represented very high. Second on the list in degree of importance was development of the curriculum; among other things, this included the creation of a two-level degree. Other key areas were the inner renewal of the institution, the relationships between art and science, research, the challenges of working life and personal development, and building projects. Few replies mentioned attention to the institution’s financial resources. The only place where this was underlined was in the replies from countries struggling amid the transition from the system in the former Soviet bloc.

Rectors feel responsibility towards their students, their institution, their country, the field of the arts represented by them, and the relevant Ministry. The list is in order of priority and the replies pointed to the maintenance of a high standard and quality.
Questions on professional music education:

What kind of feelings do you have about the development of the educational system in your country? What should be globalized, what should be individualised within the professional music education? Do we need new profiles for artistic studies? What kind? What are the advantages and disadvantages of economic thinking in professional music education?

The rectors were relatively satisfied with recent trends in their countries. Some of the replies shrewdly expressed concern at the reduction in music education in schools. Networking and European cooperation were regarded as favourable trends. The post-socialist era with its economic and value threats was mentioned in the replies for the countries concerned.

Globalisation and individualisation were both regarded as necessary. ‘Exchanges and equivalences should be globalized, striving to artistic excellence should be the same everywhere but the structures should be more flexible to fit to individual talents and abilities.’

The question of a new profile elicited views on new aspects that should be allowed for in education, such as reaction to the demands of the media, multimedia, research, and new audiences. There is support for broader, versatile education across national borders. This also calls for the development of new methods and innovative tuition.

The replies to the question on economic thinking called to mind the words of Oscar Wilde: ‘Nowadays people know the price of everything and the value of nothing.’ The price-value axis is regarded as a good thing in that it means greater cost awareness, but people are afraid that it will smother the values of delicate artistic work in the process. ‘...economical thinking ... as in many areas, it is at its most effective where it is treated as a means to an end, not as an end in itself.’

And what about the AEC?

What are your experiences during the past 15 (or less) years as a member of the AEC? Did you personally get any profit out of the AEC? Did your school get any profit of the AEC?

The replies were favourable. The AEC has, it was felt, developed rapidly in a good direction; the congresses have been useful and rewarding in many ways. Meetings with colleagues, friendships, hearing about topical issues and what is happening in other countries are important. Exchange programmes, projects and communication have been made easier thanks to the AEC. In short: if the rector/vice rector benefits from the AEC, then so does his or her institution. Dealings are even more effective if the AEC approaches schools directly. ‘Now the AEC recently started to do research and to publish; this brings more direct knowledge, experience and expertise into the school.’

Teachers

The questionnaires aimed at teachers (4 replies) and students sought above all to find out views on how well the curricula corresponded to the demands of working life. The main
keywords mentioned by the teachers reflected traditional values and principles; a desire to strike a balance between skill, individuality, reason, emotion, the arousing of curiosity, etc. The questions about the correspondence between the curriculum, the student’s needs and the demands of society produced conflicting opinions, which suggests that curricula and their planning are major issues in the various countries.

How do you prepare your students to survive professionally in the future? The replies to this question were mainly of a general nature, such as, ‘J’essaye de leur faire le moins de mal possible’ – I try to harm them as little as possible (Henri Laborit), but there were also expressions of anxiety, reflecting an awareness of the growing demands of working life, and at the same time concern for the student’s acquisition of skills and maturity, which always take time.

Students

The students (12 replies) were asked whether, for example, they took an active part in the institution’s decision-making organs. It did not come as any surprise that almost all of them did, since questions are usually delegated to student organisations, and the respondent was in many cases the official student representative on one of the institution’s administrative organs.

The replies to the questions about the students’ own institutions were full of praise and satisfaction. The teachers and the standard of the teaching were praised. The physical premises and conditions for study are also important to students: the pleasant premises, communal spirit, opportunities for meeting others, concert arrangements, etc., often received favourable mentions. The big colleges where the administration was felt to be bureaucratic came in for censure in this respect.

The question on the adequacy of the present education produced varying comments. Some felt that the national mission and maintaining a high standard were important, and that the education provided well served this purpose, while others expressed a desire for international uniformity. ‘The international network of education at universities should be enlarged and really unified in an equal system of valuation.’

The question ‘What is your vision of yourself in 2013?’ was difficult for the young respondents. The majority hoped they would be good musicians working in some culturally active job; a few hoped to be able to combine performing with teaching, a couple would like to be teaching in their present institution, and a couple to be musicians also doing something else connected with music. ‘I have an active role as musician (maybe as a singer, as a choir conductor or as a general music educator, too) not only in my own country but also in other countries in Europe. The experiences within the Student Union have probably given me tools for managing or administrating culture projects as well.’

‘Do you feel that you will survive as a musician on the basis your education gives to you?’
produced many favourable replies, but, the students added, much would depend on themselves and on how hard they worked. It is also necessary to have a chance to update their skills and know-how as time goes by. One respondent hopes to specialise and work for a higher degree. Another has already put down roots in working life and has faith in this: ‘I already work quite a lot outside college and am building up a healthy group of contacts to gain work from. I think that college can be hugely helpful, but at the end of the day it is up to an individual to find the work and keep the work.’

Like the fields represented by the respondents, the replies cover a wide spectrum. At one extreme is the female student travelling the path, so far little trodden, of a composer: ‘Situation will not change until the idea of musician alone fighting against the rest of the world finish. Like a collective we can obtain rights in a political and economical level, those we deserve. – Concrete answer: I don’t – by now.’
50 years AEC! Reading through Gottfried Scholz’ fascinating article ‘Einst – Heute – Künftig’, one gets a wonderful sense of how the Association has changed from an informal and cosy ‘club’ of conservatoire directors to an organisation actively trying to respond to the current European developments. How did this change come about? In order to answer this question, one has to take a closer look at how the European co-operation between professional music training institutions (most of them AEC members) has emerged and how this has been influenced by the overall European political development.

European co-operation in professional music training

It would be unfair to say that no European collaboration existed between professional music training institutions before the current European co-operation programmes were established. Many institutions realised various European activities, but they were mostly of a highly informal and unstructured nature. This situation changed, as the co-operation on European level in professional music training was strongly promoted through various initiatives in relation to the European integration process. Although the European integration was originally an economic process - the three founding Treaties are the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC 1952), the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom 1957) and the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community (EEC) - the understanding grew at one point that the European integration would never be achieved through economic measures alone and that a greater understanding between the various peoples in Europe had to be developed. Initiatives for the exchanges of youth and students were developed in the early ‘80s. In higher education, a first exchange programme called ERASMUS (acronym for ‘European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students’) was established in 1987. It contained the possibility to receive funding for so-called ICPs (Inter University Co-operation Projects), which were subject-based networks that could initiate activities in the field of student exchanges, teacher exchanges, joint curriculum development and joint intensive programmes.

One of the very first large European projects in professional music training financed by a European programme was a project in the framework of the TEMPUS Programme, which was established by the EU in 1989 to help the development of higher education in the countries of the former Soviet bloc after the fall of the Iron Curtain. In 1990, a TEMPUS Joint European Project (JEP) was established by the Prague Music Academy with a small consortium of conservatoires in the UK, France, Denmark, Germany, Austria and the Netherlands. This project, which was coordinated by the Utrecht Conservatory, not only saw an active schedule of exchanges of students and teachers, but also was able to acquire recording equipment, books and recordings for the library and several instruments for the Prague Music Academy with substantial EU financial support for 3 years.
In 1992, professional music training institutions entered the ERASMUS programme, by establishing two ICPs in music: the Polyphonia Network, co-ordinated by the Utrecht Conservatory, and the Sibelius Network, co-ordinated by the Sibelius Academy in Helsinki. This rather late participation of music in ERASMUS was caused by the widespread opinion that ERASMUS (which indeed was strongly modelled to the University sector) was not suitable for music in view of its highly individual character of training. This opinion was contradicted by a strong development of activities in both networks during the years after their establishment. In fact, music turned out to be one of the strongest growing subject areas in ERASMUS in the early '90s. While the Polyphonia Network was active in several innovative projects in joint curriculum development and joint intensive programmes, the Sibelius Network established a busy schedule of exchanges of students and teachers. Through the participation in ERASMUS, professional music training institutions were able, for the first time, to formalize, structure and, above all, finance their European activities. Another active network called CHAIN, coordinated by the Conservatory in Enschede and which still exists today, realised similar initiatives supported by funds from the Dutch government.

In the meanwhile, the European Union had developed further as well. The Maastricht Treaty that was signed in 1992, and amended by the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997, included for the first time specific articles on European co-operation in education (article 149), training (article 150) and culture (article 151). These articles paved the way to a new generation of co-operation programmes, not only for education (SOCRATES), but also for training (LEONARDO) and culture (KALEIDOSCOPE). In education, a drastic change was realised by closing down the network-based approach in the ERASMUS programme, which now was moved into the new SOCRATES programme as the chapter for higher education, alongside other chapters such as COMENIUS for secondary education, MINERVA for open and distance learning and GRUNDTVIG for adult education. Although the multilateral network principle in ERASMUS was replaced by a bilateral approach in the SOCRATES programme, using direct bilateral contracts between the EU and the institutions themselves, and the ICPs were resolved with the funding now going directly to the institutions, the two networks in music kept together and continued their joint activities. During this period, the number of institutions active in the programmes increased, as well as the number of students and teachers being exchanged. The two networks continued their annual meetings and even started to organise joint meetings, when the need for separate meetings was found to be unnecessary.

Strangely enough, the AEC (still very much a director’s ‘club’) played a marginal role in these European activities. Somewhat surprised by the sudden explosion of activity in relation to European co-operation between conservatoires, initiated by the institutions themselves through the networks without any involvement of the AEC, the Association understood that it had to wake up to this new European reality and become more active with regard to the European programmes and the possibilities these programmes offered. The AEC came into the arena of European programmes in 1996, when a specific item in SOCRATES was developed for the creation of so-called Thematic Network’s Projects, giving large networks
of higher education institutions in specific subject areas the possibility to discuss issues of common interest on European level. The AEC has been involved with such Thematic Network’s Projects since 1996 and this has developed into one of the most important activities of the AEC. The Thematic Network also gave the AEC the possibility to start a close collaboration with the European League of Institutes for the Arts (ELIA): within the framework of the Thematic Network the AEC is responsible for all issues regarding music, while ELIA deals with fine arts, theatre and dance.

Apart from the important work being done in the framework of the Thematic Network, the AEC started to support the organisation of the meetings for international relations coordinators from the former ERASMUS networks, taking place in September each year. During this meeting, which has grown spectacularly in size and scope over the past few years, officials dealing with international relations in European conservatories discuss current and future projects. Recently, this active group of international relations coordinators started with the development of a ‘Code of good practice for European programme management in European conservatories’, which proposes a number of procedures in relation to European exchanges in professional music training and the use of standard forms for all institutions involved. To my knowledge, no other subject area has developed such a detailed framework for exchanges at European level, which is a compliment to the group of international relations coordinators that has been very committed to the promotion of European co-operation in professional music training.

Although much has been achieved through the use of European programmes, there are also indications that the professional music training sector in Europe is, in comparison to other subject areas, still lagging behind in terms of the participation of several music training institutions in the European programmes. In this context, it is important to mention the recent study executed by the AEC on the participation of its member institutions in European exchange and co-operation programmes. The result of this survey shows that the number of participating institutions in the European programmes is still limited and in some programmes practically non-existent, with the majority of the activities being initiated by a small number of active institutions. Particularly noticeable is the low participation rate in one particular form of participation: Joint Curriculum Development.

Several reasons for this situation could be mentioned. One important factor could be the individual character of music education, in which one-to-one teaching is still the most effective method of training, implying an unusually strong connection between teacher and student and making exchanges in professional music training a complicated matter in terms of practical arrangements. Other reasons could be problems with the eligibility of institutions for participation in ERASMUS (in some European countries professional music training institutions do not possess higher education status), problems related to the recognition of study abroad periods and a lack of information on or awareness of the benefits that participation in these programmes can bring.
The AEC also started to realise several large-scale European projects with specific themes that were supported by programmes of the European Union. Examples of these are the project ‘Promuse’ (1998-2001), which did research in professional integration of musicians and continuing education in music with funding from the LEONARDO Programme, ‘Music education in a multi-cultural European Society’ (1999-2001), which studied cultural diversity in music education with funding from the CONNECT Initiative and ‘MusicWeb’ (2001-2004), a project on the use of new technologies in music theory teaching supported by the eLearning Programme. These projects gave the AEC a renewed purpose as an organisation bringing people and institutions together to discuss specific themes of common interest on European level within a certain (and sometimes intense) project period supported by European funding, helping institutions to exchange valuable information with colleagues abroad. Many excellent publications were produced and new contacts established, which resulted in the development of new study programmes or the improvement of already existing study programmes. However, this impact seemed to limit itself to a small number of institutions, even despite the fact that the publications and project results were widely disseminated throughout the entire association.

‘Bologna’: European collaboration at the next level

Despite the strong development of European collaboration in professional music training, the institutions would have undoubtedly continued to develop within their own national environments with an incidental participation in European initiatives, had there not been one single development that would lift the European co-operation in higher education to a completely different level: the Bologna Declaration in 1999. The impact of this declaration, which was signed by European Ministers for Education from 29 European countries to establish a ‘European area for higher education’, has had an enormous impact on higher education in all European countries, including on professional music training institutions that form part of the national higher education structures. It must be clear that the Bologna Declaration was a commitment freely taken and in no way imposed by the European Union. In fact: originally it was not a European Union initiative and therefore also includes countries outside the European Union. The declaration was signed to counteract the chaotic diversity in higher education systems, which was causing problems with the recognition of studies and diplomas and a confusing picture of higher education in Europe to the outside world. This situation was reflected in music by the research done in 1997 by the AEC, comparing all the study programmes for violin in European conservatories and which resulted in a publication called ‘Caprice d’Europe’. This publication showed the enormous diversity in length of study programmes, curricular design, content, qualifications, etc.

It makes one wonder if the educational ministers were aware what kind of implications the declaration they were signing would cause! It seemed that it took the academic community as well quite a while to understand what had happened. The implications turned out to be huge. This is especially true for those countries without any tradition in some of the structural proposals of the Bologna Declaration, such as two-cycle structures, the use of credit points systems and quality assurance approaches. Professional music training institutions, being...
part of national higher education structures, suddenly understood that they too had to respond to this new European political reality. On one hand, this was done with some apprehension, as several technical and structural proposals of the declaration did seem to be somewhat alien to the highly artistic and individual character of music training, but on the other hand many institutions also saw unique opportunities for reform and the improvement of the recognition of their status.

At the same time, the AEC was trying to respond to these new developments as well. Suddenly it had the potential to move from an active but somewhat informal association with occasional European initiatives to a European organisation that served as a well-organised platform for institutions to discuss joint positions and reactions towards the Bologna developments. Fortunately, the AEC moved swiftly by taking a proactive position towards this situation within its limited financial and organisational capabilities. Already in 1999, AEC published its own Declaration, which is a reaction to the Bologna Declaration. It also established an AEC Bologna Working Group, a highly efficient, well-connected and motivated group of conservatoire officials from various regions in Europe that has produced an enormous amount of highly important work in relation to ‘Bologna’. The group saw among its main tasks not only to inform AEC members about the effects of the Bologna Declaration through newsletters, lists of frequently asked questions, glossaries and Congress presentations, but it also started the development of common descriptions of learning outcomes for the first and second study cycles in music, fully in line with one of the main Bologna objectives, called ‘convergence’ in ‘Bologna-speak’. The development of these discipline-based descriptions of learning outcomes, which might play an important role in relation to the recognition of diplomas and to quality assurance in the future, are currently high on the political
agenda on European level. By initiating this development, which could be seen as one of the most important initiatives in the history of the AEC, the Bologna Working Group put the AEC into the forefront of developments in the European higher education arena.

In relation to quality assurance, one of the most dynamic components of the Bologna process, the AEC established a project in the framework of the EU/USA programme with its sister organisation in the United States, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). NASM has a different role than the AEC, as it is an accrediting organisation for professional music institutions in the entire United States with an enormous expertise in quality assurance and accreditation procedures in music. Although the AEC is not expected to have a similar role in Europe, the experience of NASM should help the AEC to confront some of the proposals in relation to quality assurance currently being developed and discussed at European level.

European collaboration in the field of culture

The developments described in this article so far, have been taking place in the field of education. The AEC, being an organisation active on the borders of education and culture, is also involved in European cultural co-operation activities. In culture, the co-operation at European level has developed on a much lower scale than in education. The reason for this fact is a strong emphasis on the subsidiarity principle in relation to culture by several member states, which believe that European cultural policy should not interfere with national cultural policies and only supplement the national policies by collaboration on European level. This position is reflected by the unanimous voting procedure for culture in the Council of Ministers, meaning that all decisions regarding culture must have the unanimous support of all EU member states. This situation has greatly complicated the decision-making process, especially in relation to the budget for culture, which is, compared to other EU policies, mere pocket money. It is disturbing to see the still predominantly economic emphasis of the European Union, which is reflected by the division of the EU budget: a recent report on the EU budget 2004 shows that the annual budget the EU spends on education and culture together is similar to the total amount available for subsidies to tobacco farmers.

It is clear that a unanimous voting procedure for culture would have a disastrous effect on decision-making after the accession of 10 new member states in 2004. Fortunately, the EU Convention, which has recently proposed a new ‘Constitution’ for the European Union with 25 member states, suggests majority voting procedures for culture, as is currently the case in education. But both education and culture are mentioned as ‘supporting measures’ in the Convention text and the subsidiarity principle is upheld in these areas, which shows that the strong economical dimension of the European Union will not change in the near future.

For the AEC and its members, the access to funding for European cultural co-operation is sometimes difficult, as the Culture 2000 programme often refers training institutions to the European educational programmes. The AEC has consistently argued that this
situation is not acceptable, simply because in the field of music the borders between training and the profession are not always clear. To complicate this even further, the EU educational programmes on their part sometimes refer music training institutions to the cultural programme. This way, the music training institutions often find themselves caught in between the priorities of the various funding programmes.

The current cultural co-operation programme Culture 2000 will end in 2006. It is hoped that the new generation of programmes will offer more flexibility to transversal issues such as education and training and will be backed by a greater political will of the member states, including a larger budget.

**Future challenges**

Overlooking this highly dynamic and complex European environment, the question arises how the AEC and its members should position themselves in this constantly developing European reality. The following points, describing more personal opinions rather than official AEC viewpoints, can be mentioned.

**Challenges arising from the Bologna Process**

The following issues could become relevant once the Bologna Process is implemented:

- There might be implications for the character of music studies. Students will have a much greater freedom to move around Europe. Ideally, future students in the new situation should be able to start their studies in Hamburg and end up in Barcelona within one study cycle without any difficulty with the recognition of their studies and therefore without unnecessarily losing time. The relationship with the individual teacher will be an issue in this situation that will need to be confronted and in the case of teacher training, programmes seem to need a close connection to the national primary general educational and music school systems. But while we do not know what impact greater mobility opportunities will have on students, it will be up to the future students to find out. This becomes even more relevant now that the educational ministers have started a debate in the framework of the Bologna Process on how to make national student funding ‘portable’, meaning that a student could study anywhere he/she wants within Europe while keeping his/her national funding or grant.

- There might be implications for the music profession. At the AEC Office we receive many emails from professionals with questions regarding problems with the recognition of their qualifications. This is especially relevant for teaching qualifications. Let us hope that the Bologna Process with its proposals for comparability and transparency will be able to solve some of these issues and therefore improve the mobility and employability of music graduates, as it will be easier for them to find employment in another European country. It is no longer realistic to say that qualifications are not important in music, that the only important thing is to pass an audition, during which qualifications are never asked for. As the employment situation is becoming more and more mixed with music professionals combining different kinds of performance, teaching, community work and
other types of obligations as part of their overall professional activity, these qualifications will become increasingly important.

- The Bologna Process also creates new possibilities in relation to Joint Curriculum Development for music training institutions. Already, through the development of convergent descriptions of learning outcomes, we see an increased interest in exchanging information about the content of study programmes. This is an important development because not only are AEC member institutions preparing students for an increasingly European profession, it also gives institutions a unique chance to improve their quality by making use of the rich diversity of musical traditions and teaching approaches that exist in Europe today. It is expected that with the opportunities offered for the development of Joint European Master courses in the framework of the new ERASMUS MUNDUS programme starting in 2004, this issue will be given a new impulse.

- Most of the discussions in relation to the Bologna process have revolved around the introduction of the two-cycle structure and the use of credit points systems. These tend to be heated debates, which usually, once implementation has taken place, tend to quieten down after students and teachers have learned to use these new tools and have found they are not really affecting the teaching in the classroom itself. However, serious implications could be expected in relation to the debate in the framework of the Bologna Process on quality assurance. This debate has been a rather ‘quiet’ one, but no less intense. As quality assurance agencies are being established in all Bologna countries and joined methodologies and approaches are being discussed at European level, the question immediately arises as to who will formulate the criteria and methodologies for the quality assurance agencies and, above all, how the special characteristics of professional music training will be taken into account. It will be up to the AEC to ensure that whenever methodologies and criteria will be discussed at the European level, descriptions of learning outcomes and quality assurance criteria for music studies must be provided that are developed by the professional music training sector itself in collaboration with the relevant authorities.

The European political arena: creating alliances

The AEC, although a fairly large European Association by now, represents a sector that is too small for being effective in the European political arena on its own. Whenever political pressure is necessary or issues need to be debated, it is important that the AEC knows where to find partner organisations with similar objectives. It will need to be connected to the recently re-established European Music Council (EMC) to make sure that the field of music is well represented at European level and that the challenges posed by the increasingly politically influential commercial music industry are met. It needs to have a strong connection to European Forum for Arts and Heritage (EFAH) and the European Cultural Foundation (ECF) to ensure that the interests of the cultural sector are heard within the overall development of the European integration. It needs to work together with the European League of Institutes for the Arts (ELIA) to make sure that the interests of training in the arts are not overseen in
the overall Bologna Process and that training in the arts has a firm place in both the cultural and educational programmes of the European Union. AEC must co-operate with organisations such as the European University Association (EUA), the European Network for Quality Assurance Agencies (ENQA) and the European Association of Institutions for Higher Education (EURASHE), the main discussion partners of the European Commission and governmental officials in the Bologna Process, to raise the awareness of the existence and needs of the professional music training sector. These alliances must, however, be based on mutual respect: the collaboration partners must understand that the AEC is the only European organisation with the membership, historical background and expertise to represent the professional music training sector.

But the AEC must also have the capacity to act on its own when necessary. Its active contribution to the various EU consultation processes over the past few months and the development of its own contacts with the European Parliament, the European Commission and national governments show that this is important and not unfeasible.

These are exciting times. The AEC is operating in a highly dynamic and complex environment, while being constantly under pressure by the limited means of an association receiving no structural funding. But one thing is clear: at a mature 50, AEC is fitter to face these challenges than ever before!
Introduction

One day, a European of great perception and intellect observed that: ‘The sun, with all those planets revolving around it and dependent upon it, can ripen a bunch of grapes as if it had nothing else in the universe to do.’ Galileo Galilei’s statement is at once beautiful and profound - characteristics it shares with much of the music that we love, study, create, and present. There are many interpretations, but as we consider the future of professional music education and training, it is useful to think of music as the sun and individual students as the grapes. Our discipline is a vast and radiant power; it enables and influences on so many levels that the human mind cannot comprehend it all. Many of its effects are visible and spectacular. At the same time, much that it does is hidden to casual view or even invisible altogether. Music has its complexities, and is connected to many agendas. Its powers depend on the labors of many, both heralded and unheralded. But for the time that individual students are enrolled in schools of music, our responsibility is to ensure that this bright sun nurtures them and develops them as if it had nothing else in the universe to do.

Of course, such responsibility has been and remains perennial. In principle, there is nothing new or different to be learned by applying Galileo’s observation to our work. But every perennial truth is pursued in conditions that change. The first decade of the twenty-first century presents a different set of conditions to music schools and their students than the fifth decade of the twentieth century. Some things have changed radically, some a little, and some not at all. For example, musicians and audiences alike are still profoundly moved by the Seventh Symphony of Beethoven. These facts lead us to many questions about decisions that will influence the ways in which students are nurtured and, to some extent, the ways in which they will grow. Our answers are important for them, but also important for the field because when they leave and join the profession, the future radiance and power of music will depend, in part, upon each of their efforts.

Four questions are considered here: ‘What changes and what does not?’, ‘What are the qualities of our aspirations?’, ‘What is the nature of strength?’, and ‘What is the scope of curricular action?’ Pondering these will not reveal what the future holds, but considering them carefully can help us understand the challenges we face in nurturing the next generation of musicians.

What Changes and What Does Not?

Music itself is a constant. Music is and musicians are. In every generation, a certain number of people are born with the talent and inclination to pursue music as a vocation. Over the centuries, the aspirations and labors of such musicians have led to great achievements. On occasion, these are transcendent and at the highest level of human thought and action. Aspirations to achieve such transcendence are always present.
The basic natures of artistry and its elements also seem to be constant. Artistry depends upon the acquisition of technique, but technique alone is not enough. Ability to create uniquely from a vast array of materials and techniques is required. Artistry focuses on a single best solution for each work, and thus requires finely honed sensibilities about the ordering and weight given to specific elements.

The development of artistic capability always means gaining vast amounts of knowledge and skills and learning to apply them. This takes time - time that cannot be shortened appreciably, even for the most gifted.

Among musicians, talents, gifts, and opportunities are not evenly distributed. This condition contributes to both the challenge and the richness of the field. There is virtually no chance that this condition will change.

Overall, the natures and types of careers in music change over time. It is not yet clear the extent to which current and evolving technologies will speed the evolution of career types and choices, and thus the nature of music study. But, it is useful to remember a constant: in art, unlike science, the new does not drive away the old; it just adds to what was there before.

The constants just presented and many others work their effects in an evolving context. Changes range in speed from glacial evolutions to rapid advances or reversals. Changes can be driven in part by things that people fear. For example, in one era, people can be afraid to be ignorant about classical music; in another era, the opposite, because the association has been devalued.

Schools of music in the twenty-first century are working in a world extremely knowledgeable about the techniques of cultural manipulation. Advertising and propaganda techniques are ubiquitously applied. One result is vitiation and inanition hidden by constant barrages of superficial stimulation. Manipulation techniques often destroy clarity while purporting to produce it; messages and slogans often obscure the truth about what changes and what does not. In such circumstances, the cultivation of discernment is more important than ever.

Leaders of music schools come to understand the power of change forces and change mechanisms. ‘Change, or die’ is heard constantly. Another equally powerful truth is too rarely considered: it is possible to change and die because the change was destructive. The operational health of schools of music and their ability to bring nurturing light to their students is dependent upon values that are under assault from intellectual theorists, commercial exploiters, and political manipulators. Although these come and go, they can do damage while they are going. The natures and contents of such assaults can change rapidly. In present circumstances, the cultivation of strategic sensibility is more important than ever.

What should students be learning about what changes and what does not? Some essential lessons will be obvious given the natures of music study and of life in specific professional
worlds. But given the natures of the changes we face, and the extent of their direct opposition to that which does not change in the nature and practice of our art form, it may be important to help students think more formally about what changes and what does not. Perhaps even more important are the questions, what can change and what must not if the essences of possibility, advance, and operational health are to be preserved for music at the highest artistic and intellectual levels.

As we leave this topic, consider the thoughts of American writer and technologist, Michael Hawley: ‘Recently, I played an obscure little piece, a chorale prelude by Bach, Ich Ruf zu Dir (I Cry to Thee Lord Jesus Christ). You cannot listen to this music to the end without tears. It made me marvel: here is a piece of software, some basic instructions, that is 300 years old. And it still works. The cultural context is gone…. The Steinway concert grand I play it on is something Bach never dreamed of. But it still runs. Will any software today still work in three centuries?’

What Are the Qualities of Our Aspirations?

The nature of music and music study focuses aspirations wonderfully. Musicians are unable to hide behind words; what they do is judged against the best of similar efforts, publicly and constantly. These characteristics raise already high individual aspirations and impose a certain discipline. Today, the validity of such high cultural aspiration is being challenged as never before. Other aspirations are said to have greater priorities: music as a branch of mass marketing, or of politics, a means of psychological engineering, or fodder for arcane sociological analyses. These ideas join and often reinforce the older problematic value that music is nothing more than entertainment.

Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard, once said, ‘The most dangerous mental faults are laziness and impatience.’ According to English poet and historian Robert Conquest: for Kierkegaard, ‘Laziness of mind meant unwillingness to face unfamiliar, complex, and refractory realities. Impatience led to infatuation with supposedly all-explanatory theories in lieu of thought and judgment.’ We appear to be living in an age where the kind of laziness and impatience that Kierkegaard and Conquest warned about are on the rise. In many circumstances, serious and complex musical endeavour no longer has allies among intellectuals in other fields. Charges of elitism confront us everywhere, usually as a part of conscious efforts to denigrate excellence and to pretend that no distinctions are possible among levels of achievement.

To the extent that schools of music are funded by people and entities greatly influenced by the cultural fad of the moment, or by current intellectual and bureaucratic fashions, a great challenge for the future is monitoring and protecting the continuity and quality of aspiration in each of our schools.

Given these conditions, it may be important to introduce music students to the concept of aspirational quality so that its relationship to musical quality is understood intellectually
and culturally - aspiration is more than pursuit of individual excellence. Such an approach has a chance of better preparing our students to nurture conditions for the highest practice of our art form as the future unfolds.

What Is the Nature of Strength?

Any great school of music exhibits certain basic characteristics: outstanding students and faculty; effective curricula; facilities and resources; and a record of accomplishment sufficient for institution and graduates to reflect glory on each other. These characteristics are observable and tangible. But a great school also relies on the presence of many intangibles: commitment to values that nurture artistry, intellect, and their relationship to teaching; the will and commitment of visionaries; the dedication and patience to sustain effort and promote growth in capacities for depth; faith that hard work will realize potential; and as we have just discussed, fidelity to high musical and cultural aspirations. Clearly, the tangibles can be bought; most often, the intangibles cannot. The tangibles are easy to assess; the intangibles are not. The tangibles may be the engine, but the intangibles are the fuel.

The words of the English critic, John Ruskin, are instructive: ‘The highest regard for a person’s toil is not what they get for it, but what they become by it.’ What they get is tangible; what they become is intangible. In the current age, with its manic focus on the tangible, the countable, and the assessable, the ability to nurture students depends on sustaining and deepening the intangible elements of art-making and individual spirit so essential to the nature of strength in our field. It is the application of the tangibles and intangibles together that enable schools to do their work, as if they had nothing else in the world to do but ripen students to their fullness.

What should students learn about the nature of strength during their time in the conservatoire? Students come to learn about the nature of musical strength and to acquire the competence that enables it. But musical strength, too, has its tangible and intangible elements. What role does nurturing the intangible play in preparing our students to create the future?

What Is the Scope of Curricular Action?

The American dancer and choreographer, Martha Graham, once spoke to a group of young artists: ‘There is a vitality, a life force, an energy, a quickening that is translated through you into action, and because there is only one of you in all of time, your expression is unique. And if you block it, it will never exist through any other medium and it will be lost. The world will not have it. It is not your business to determine how good it is, nor how valuable, nor how it compares with other expressions. It is your business to keep it yours clearly and directly, to keep the channel open.’

Every student entering each school of music is unique and has a singular contribution to make. This is something that does not change. The school’s responsibility is to nurture each uniqueness toward its potential, but in ways that enable the holder of that uniqueness
to keep the channel open. Traditionally, music schools are very good at the former. Often, they are not at their best at the latter. A way to think about this issue is to consider the scope of action necessary to nurture individuals to the fullest, to ensure that there is ripening culturally as well as musically.

Accomplishing this goal presents a serious challenge because clearly, knowledge, repertory, complexity, and technical means are all expanding, but time is not. Music schools have 100 years more of music history to teach than they did in 1900. They are dealing with a field impacted by a vast array of forces that are difficult and challenging, and they must prepare students at higher levels of technical proficiency than ever before.

Scope of action is easier to contemplate if one thinks about teaching through both curricular and noncurricular means. It also helps to think about what is taught by the tangibles and intangibles that are obvious and felt, and thus lived in and through a school. The future of professional music education and training will be decided by the aggregate of choices among many schools in Europe, the United States, and throughout the world, about what is nurtured and what is not, what is nurtured a great deal and what is nurtured a little.

In considering scope of action, there are many pressures to think institutionally, but institutions create the future only through the actions of individuals. Individuals responsible for operational aspects of our schools and those now students who accept such responsibilities in years to come are all creating the future. Although scope of action is defined to a great degree by fundamental demands of the discipline, a curriculum should always include more than music as a craft. The challenge for each school is to decide content and nature of that ‘more.’ How are students prepared to work in various contexts, some of which are unforeseen?

The words of American investor Warren Buffett illuminate what is at stake: ‘In evaluating people, you look for three qualities: integrity, intelligence, and energy. And if you don’t have the first, the other two will kill you.’ A school’s decisions about scope of curricular action are directly tied to future capacities for integrity held by their graduates - not just musical integrity but integrity as a musician, as an actor in the world of music and culture, and as a teacher, for in one way or another, all artists teach.

Such developmental concerns have always been present, but in the immediate future, it appears they will have a new level of urgency. The values surrounding what European and American schools of music and their worldwide counterparts have accomplished and continue to aspire to have changed and are changing. Curricular and other educational decisions made by schools of music will influence choices made by graduates. In his novel, The Man Without Qualities, Austrian writer Robert Musil shows, with searing power, what happens when wrong choices are made about what changes and what does not, the qualities of aspirations, the nature of strength, and the scope of action. In such powerful phrases as, ‘a peaceful common on which pretentions are indistinguishable from vocation,’ he lays bare the emptiness that can grow in surroundings full of achievement and promise. One is
reminded of Spanish philosopher, José Ortega y Gassett: ‘The simple process of preserving our present civilization is supremely complex and demands incalculably subtle powers.’

Conclusion

The future of musical endeavour at the highest levels and the professional music training that supports it can be at its brightest and most nurturing to the extent that current pressures toward emptiness and superficiality are understood and resisted in the minds and souls of many thousands of musicians, and to the extent that schools are able to develop in their students the incalculably subtle powers necessary for success both in and for music - wherever they are, whatever they do, and whatever questions they face. All means, both tangible and intangible, must be used to achieve these musical and cultural goals. Past achievements, even in the face of problematic conditions, should give us the inspiration and the will to ensure that schools nurture their students to complete ripeness in and for this time, as if they had nothing else to do. Clearly, the future artistic, intellectual, and spiritual radiance of the highest musical art and its priority in culture depends in large part on the educational successes of professional schools in Europe, the United States, and throughout the world. May all use their powers wisely, cooperatively, and effectively so that the next fifty years are glorious for music.
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