

What Would Peggy Do?

14th Annual Peggy Glanville-Hicks Address 2012

Michael Kieran Harvey

The New Music Network established the Peggy Glanville-Hicks Address in 1999 in honour of one of Australia's great international composers. It is an annual forum for ideas relating to the creation and performance of Australian music. In the spirit of the great Australian composer Peggy Glanville-Hicks, an outstanding advocate of Australian music delivers the address each year, challenging the status quo and raising issues of importance in new music. In 2012, Michael Kieran Harvey was guest speaker presenting his Address entitled *What Would Peggy Do?* at the Sydney Conservatorium on 22 October and BMW Edge Fed Square in Melbourne on 2 November 2012. The transcripts are reproduced with permission by Michael Kieran Harvey and the New Music Network.

<http://www.newmusicnetwork.com.au/index.html>

Australian Journal of Music Education 2012:2,59-70

Just in case some of you are wondering about what to expect from the original blurb for this address: the pie-graphs didn't quite work out, and powerpoint is so boring, don't you agree?

For reasons of a rare dysfunctional condition I have called (quote) "industry allergy", and for everyone's sanity, I promise I will mention only one statistic, one... HORRIFYING ...statistic, during this entire speech.

What would Peggy do?

Before I properly begin, I must admit that I am at odds with many of my artmusic colleagues on a range of issues. I note also that many of them have far too much "common-sense" to agree to give this address, apart from those squealing for yet more cash for their grand opera of course, but that's hardly surprising. One need only read their opera plot summaries. [Circular finger-motion at temple].

I *did* read an absolutely awe-inspiring Peggy Glanville-Hicks Address by Jon Rose however, and I guess my views are known to the address organisers, so, therefore, I will proceed, certain in the knowledge that I will offend many and encourage, I hope, a valuable few.

In preparing this address I would like to acknowledge the indispensable help of the eminent poet and psychiatrist Professor Saxby Pridmore, the composer and my inspiring friend Dr Nigel Westlake, the imperturbable and dignified Sally Howland of APRA, the phenomenal CEO of the AMC John Davis and the virtuosic musicologist/mandolinist Dr Michael Hooper. I would like to especially thank the AMC Advisory Committee for putting up with my outrageous outbursts of outrage at their various meetings... when I found out the truth about AMC funding.

Now, what *would* Peggy say about the state of classical music in Australia? (Here I am referring

to notated music primarily, but the definition I'm sure can embrace all artmusic).

1. I think she would notice immediately how well women are doing as performers and composers - a quick glance through a wonderful recent publication, *Women of Note*, by Rosalind Appleby confirms this (and I strongly recommend this publication to you all); Peggy would then *wryly* observe how women are now just as equally ignored and discriminated against by our taxpayer-subsidised orchestras and opera companies as their male counterparts **WARNING: STATISTIC ALERT!!!** - only 7 percent – 7 percent - [show 7 fingers for photo opportunity!] of our orchestral programs and even less of our opera season is Australian music; (this includes old music by wannabe Poms such as Percy Grainger and wannabe Elgars, wannabe Ravels, wannabe Brahms, Poots and Parrys etc etc).
2. Peggy would rejoice that there is still an Australian Music Centre representing Australian composers, and performers, to the world. This, in spite of the efforts of certain hostile funding bodies to starve it of funds. Why, she would ask, is this amazing resource, under the dogged and inspired leadership of John Davis, not directly federally funded like the National Film and Sound Archives or indeed the National Library, such that its important work is not constantly impeded by endless funding applications and mystifying movements of the goalposts? Why is the AMC at a crisis point and facing *eviction*?! Peggy would wonder, as do I.
3. She would marvel at how well groups like ASTRA have done (a group I mention simply because I can speak from long experience with them; I know there are many others struggling to survive). The Astra Chamber music society, for those of you unfamiliar with our musical equivalent of La Mama Theatre, is based in Melbourne. Astra has managed for over 60 years to present new Australian compositions and nurture new performers despite capricious and insufficient funding, which recently has been cut to zero, I'm ashamed to say! In my reckoning, Astra's work under the extraordinary John McCaughey has premiered more Australian compositions than any other group, and many performers, myself included, continue to be developed by this wonderful, cash-strapped organisation. I would like to know who it was at the Australia Council who knocked back their meagre funding this year, and for what reason? This is especially galling in the light of the gluttonous triennial funding of the orchestras and opera which together produce the pathetic aforementioned statistic of Australian work. [Again show 7 fingers].
4. Peggy Glanville-Hicks would be astonished at the diversity of recordings of Australian art music by self-funded, independent labels like Tall Poppies and Move despite the unfair advantage of extravagantly taxpayer-funded labels which produce mainly old-fashioned pap in comparison; do we really need obscure French operas, another boxed set of dreary and expensive Mahler symphonies? Is this the apex of Australian culture? Or Wagner Spin cycles?? Gimme a break!
5. Peggy would be outraged that no Australian conductor laureates are leading our orchestras, or championing our composers, as Challender and Patrick Thomas briefly did with the SSO, giving left-field composers like Carl Vine an opportunity to develop their skills with orchestral music. In the case of Carl, I must also mention the support he received from the wonderful Graeme Murphy and the Sydney Dance Company, and ASTRA, particularly John McCaughey without whose house and bathroom accessories Carl's string quartet, the "Brunswick", would not have been written.

6. Peggy would be further outraged that the very same operas by Bellini, Mozart, Verdi and Wagner which she heard as a girl are still being presented now at *Australian taxpayer's expense*, while her own operas and symphonic works are ignored. As are most other Australian composers. As an aside, these ancient Bellinis, Mozarts, Verdis and Wagners must inevitably be pale imitations of superior overseas productions. We could never hope to match overseas cultural budgets, and neither should we try. Personally I think the money's better spent on original work. Instead of spending 10 million on an individual sporting gold medal why not create a decent Australian opera or symphony with this amount? It would provide jobs for untold numbers of Australian musicians into the distant future, and maybe even give audiences some pleasure and self-respect. It would certainly justify the existence of these "gas-guzzling" organisations to the taxpayer more than their current programming.
7. Peggy would be deeply distressed at the Foxification (pron. Fuxification) of our culture, I refer here to the monopolisation of entertainment. I believe this would make Peggy *even more determined* to produce independent work, more determined to resist the awful competition philosophy triumphantly promoted by certain powerful local individuals.
8. Peggy would note that in the area of classical music the Australian cultural cringe definitely remains. There is no problem with the number or quality of Australian composers or performers; we punch well above our weight for such a population. There is a problem, however, and it is that Australian classical music audiences still regard Australian music and performers as inferior. I'm sure she would think the persistence of this false belief to indicate abject failure on the part of our arts administration and management cartels.
9. Peggy would wonder why there is *not* a magnificent Stuart and Sons piano in every concert hall and school in Australia - and bemoan the fact that once again Australian ingenuity and superior design, such as that of these NSW instrument makers are struggling to survive against the cultural cringe, and against monopolistic and reactionary foreign brands. And no, I am not a Stuart and Sons artist (although I wish I was, Wayne if you're listening!).
10. Despite the lack of funding encouragement, Peggy would be delighted at the emergence of young Australian advocates of new music such as Zubin Kanga, Clare Edwardes, Anthony Pateras, Aura Go, James Nightingale and all the folk at the New Music Network, Eugene Ughetti, Genevieve Lacey, Ian Grandage, Vanessa Tomlinson, Ekki Waldheim, The Australian Art Orchestra, Kate Neal, Ashley Smith, Natsuko Yoshimoto, Elliott Gyger, my siblings Dom, Bern and Rowan, Peter DeJager, the astonishing brothers Dean and Grigoryan, Annie Hsieh, Mathew Hindson, Jane Stanley and Damian Barbeler, to name but a few of the many who have flown through my narrow orbit.
11. Peggy would be frustrated by the failure of classical music around the globe to adapt to this new world full of technology. Everything is miniaturizing, and being made more efficient, smarter, doing more with less. And I believe it is in this light that she would carefully examine the current persisting arrangement of opera companies, orchestras and the conservatoria. I do not think she would be desperate to preserve the "golden age" of classical music, at least I don't believe she would want to preserve the "golden age" of classical music, AT ANY COST. There is a very good reason why the grand opera companies and orchestras worldwide are closing down. That is because their time is past, and no amount of taxpayer funding

- to prop them up will hide the fact of their cultural superfluousness, WHICH THEY HAVE BROUGHT UPON THEMSELVES. If the wealthy wish to have such entertainments free of “incomprehensible” new works then they can surely pay for them *in toto* without ransacking the taxpayer.
12. Peggy would be quizzical about the smugness of those musicians who have “made it”. “Made it” here refers to being parked in a salaried position with a classical music organization. This accepted and celebrated pinnacle of success... is a numbingly low level of aspiration for young musicians. It requires no creativity, no imagination, no originality or innovation on behalf of the musician, yet is still handsomely and artificially remunerated. In general these are the very sort of musicians most antagonistic to new music, possibly because it requires extra practise.
 13. She would be surprised at the dumber-down conservatism of the dribble of Australian and international contemporary music that is actually heard. Particularly that provided by public-subsidised public radio, which is peculiarly sensitive to the opinion of old fogeys like The Hecklers (a remarkably successful conservative pressure group in the 1990s).
 14. She would recoil at the failure of our major Arts Organizations to educate FULL STOP. In particular, she would be rankled by the failure of our major Arts Organizations to educate the wider community. It is this failure to educate and challenge the public which leaves new music struggling to be heard in this country.
 15. She would not tolerate the excuse by the accountants that we cannot perform new music because people are unfamiliar with it and don't come, and HORROR OF HORRORS, we lose money. Yes, we might lose a few subscribers in the early stages of the education reform, but they will be replaced by younger people, who will subscribe for longer, anyway.
 16. She would also ask, why is classical music so conservative in Australia? Where, she would want to know, is the Venice Biennale of Australian classical music? I note even in class-obsessed London the thriving figures for new music concerts and theatre at the expense of classical mainstream concerts and now even musicals, according to a *Guardian* article earlier this year.
 17. Peggy would see that the real action is no longer in grand opera, symphony orchestras or any of the standard dinosaur models which ape Old Europe, but in our brave independent artists and theatre and bands and she would be heavily involved with them, encouraging their content.
 18. And then she might ask me about some of my Australian favourites. So refreshing to be able to premiere, here tonight, Australian stuff that still sounds spiky, full of life, powerful, modern and interesting like Helen Gifford's *Siva*, written this year. It was not commissioned with funds from the Australia Council, but was a generous gift from Helen to me, and proves once again the unquenchable spirit of our independent musicians in the face of the poltroons who mismanage our classical music organisations.
 19. Peggy Glanville-Hicks would no doubt observe that in the arena of Artmusic we are still very much a nation of “followers”. We are still led by the tastes of the overseas market, particularly as dictated by the likes of Gramophone magazine and its pisspoo, inbred Australian cousins, who shamelessly promote the likes of André Rieu. I think Charlie Chaplin and Buster Keaton had it exactly right in their send-up of classical music in the film *Limelight*. Gramophone critics and their toadies are *still*

operating as arbiters of taste, even after being utterly exposed as pompous fakes by the Joyce Hatto affair.

Maybe the mag should be renamed Gramo-phony. Let me remind you of this Milli-Vanilli of the classical world. Joyce Hatto was a British pianist whose husband (Barry) kept up the pretence of her recording career by passing off other pianist's work as her own - Barry could do this as he owned a recording studio. Many prominent critics were fooled, most notably those working for Gramophone magazine - they praised Joyce's recordings with comments like "the greatest pianist noone's ever heard". The embarrassing fact was that Gramo-phony described the same recording (before it was stolen, and when played by the true pianist) as 'not being quite up to scratch' (forgive the pun).

It took the then new iTunes database *Gracenote* to unmask the fraud. No human music critic was clever enough apparently. By the time the hoax was exposed Joyce's recordings had covered most of the main virtuoso repertoire available on CD! (An impossible feat, which should have raised early questions, instead of which received fawning admiration.)

I'm sure Peggy would have cottoned on immediately! If for no other reason than the hilariously fictitious orchestras that Ms Hatto performed with!! René Köhler and the National Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra indeed!!

Thus, Gramo-phony is not infallible, in fact far from it. Decisions by its critics regarding the quality and value of a piece of work are determined, clearly, NOT by any objective standard, but by 1) artist's name (and influence and ethnicity), 2) record label status, and 3) advertising revenue for the journal which must exert influence.

This hoax blew away the lie of "meritocracy" in classical music, which is sold to the young in the form of competitions, eisteddfods and exams. It also exposed the lie of "definitive interpretations" and any claims of "authenticity" in classical music recording, in spite of the precious justifications of

some early music apologists. One should simply not believe what one hears on recordings. Glenn Gould was far ahead of his time in this regard, as in so many other things.

20. THIS IS A MAJOR PLANK OF THIS ADDRESS

- The consequence of surrendering to a single authority (like Gramo-phony) is: homogenous interpretations and performances, that is, success depends on conformity. This is especially worrying for the influence such magazines still have on Australian classical music audiences, and therefore our composers and young musicians.

For example, look at recent programs presented by our *Youth Music* (German accent) organisations. I can't think of anything less inspiring as a young *Australian*, than to play Mendelssohn with an English conductor in a small recital hall in Melbourne. But hang on, yes, I can: about a year ago the Australian Youth Orchestra toured Germany, and what did they display of their home country? *German* repertoire with a *German* conductor. Next season, at the professional level, we have wall to wall Verdi courtesy of Opera Australia.

As an Australian tax-payer drowning in debt courtesy of the ATO's Pay-As-You-Go catastrophe, it is doubly frustrating to know that my tax is funding all this Dead White European Male Music for the diverting entertainment of the well-heeled (with inflated ticket prices excluding the poor), and so little of it is funding new Australian composition.

21. Classical music generally is becoming so conformist, that Disclavier music (i.e., pianos linked to computers) is indistinguishable from humanmade music. Thanks to the recording "industry", this conformity is present in opera, symphonic music and now especially the more popular forms of music.

22. It gets worse. So monochrome is the repertoire and interpretation required of

orchestras these days that, if you have the money, Sony is now able to provide you with a robot conductor.

23. Talking of robots, "SIPCA" ... "SIPCA" is an acronym which would sound to Peggy like a particularly nasty venereal disease involving death by hiccups. I'm sure she would refer to this as the Sydney Idiotic Piano Convulsion Association for its target audience and token support of decorative and safe Australian composition, mercifully kept well clear of contaminating the orchestral finals however. "SIPCA", Peggy would observe, appears to be having the same effect on Australian youth as the designation of some kids as potentially elite athletes i.e. turning all the other kids off (a) classical music and (b) exercise for life. Kids detect the futility of striving in such unfair and corrupt arenas. If you doubt this, check out the figures for childhood obesity, and the numbers for pianists admitted to our music academies (to say nothing of their level of competency).

Here's an idea - Why don't we just register Rachmaninov piano concertos as a Winter Olympic sport and forget any notions of the music as an artform? You could have the judges holding up scorecards and a world record timeline tickling the first violins to keep them awake. Might have the added bonus of killing off those piano concertos in one season.

24. The Hungarian film *Mephisto* deals with the Faustian bargain an actor makes by staying in Hitler's Germany for work as Adolf's favourite actor whilst his more conscience-stricken colleagues give up their careers and flee as penniless refugees. I think this film is a great allegory for the way the fanatical religion of capitalism has turned art music, which I think should be accessible for everyone, into a competition only for the elite and connected, totally corrupting them in the process.

25. On the topic of competitions – although I have been successful, I am opposed to

these events. I will now quote from my own chapter in Martin Comte's recent book *Australian Pianists*: "The competition industry is ubiquitous and is as fatally connected and indomitable as are the fossil-fuel industries. I feel I have earned the right to criticize the received wisdom by achieving significant success in competitions. But this does not mean I condone them..."

I CONTINUE: '... I (needed) an environment (outside Australia) where who I learned from didn't matter, and where I could neutrally judge my abilities...

I GO ON: '... This appalling state of affairs, that one could only perform if one paid [an entry fee], I soon discovered pretty much summed up the entire classical music scene. (Just take a peek at the gigantic publication *Musical America*, where desperate performers pay unbelievable sums for ad space to be *totally ignored* by booking agents.) I quickly realized that in competitions there were no criteria apart from the obvious requirements for note-perfect readings ... and an ability to stay within an inoffensive interpretation...

AND ALSO, IN THAT CHAPTER, '... I think it is impossible to be engaged with society as an artist, if that's what one thinks one is, without a broader view of your artform. My broader view then is that when competition is the dominant philosophy of society, cheating, selfishness, greed, apathy, exploitation, stupidity and murderous conflict are inevitable.'

26. But, what does science have to tell us about competition? Darwin's *Origin of Species* and Dawkins's *Selfish Gene* lead logically to the conclusion that if the human species is to survive at all it must be intelligent enough to recognize that competitive and aggressive genes cause destruction in a civilized society, to say nothing of the insane vandalism inflicted on the irretrievable biosphere. Those who think a society uncivilised without its grand opera and expensive orchestras should carefully re-consider their embrace of a

philosophy “red in tooth and claw” such as competition philosophy and its demented handmaiden, growth economics. As musicians we should be smart enough to realize that perpetuating competition philosophy does not allow for diversity. As evidence your honour: Exhibit A: the piano [cover ears]. Exhibit B: the car [cover eyes]. Exhibit C: Fox News [cover mouth]. Instead, it makes us fellow travellers in this destruction, like the protagonist in the film *Mephisto*. I’m sure Peggy would be desperately sticking up for the planet and encouraging all her colleagues to do the same, rather than meekly accepting the fate engineered for us by the druids of competition philosophy.

Here I’m reminded of Frank Zappa’s paraphrase of science-fiction writer Harlan Ellison: “The most plentiful element in the universe is not hydrogen, but stupidity”.

27. What does history have to tell us about competition in music? Liszt was the instigator and populariser of the piano recital as THE experimental music arena in the 1840s. He drove the evolution of pianos because he kept busting the fragile little things. Apart from his astounding generosity, I like most of all his relishing of risk and lack of preciousness. On one occasion in 1856 he found himself presented with a gravity-fed-action monstrosity by the King of Bohemia. He calmly gave a two and a half hour recital on it without turning a hair (but turning plenty of hairs on the ladies present). Liszt completely rejected the fashion of the time of referring to “first-class” and “second-class” pianists. He thought it both too difficult and pointless to grade keyboard performers. Franz, along with Peggy I believe would be spinning in their graves every time there are play-offs between not just keyboard instruments, but even vastly differing instrument *species* in the ABC Young Performers Competition.
28. I delight in Liszt’s words, his desire to (quote) “hurl my lance into the boundless realms of the future” – here his lance was a metaphor for music, and he believed music should soar unimpeded into the future. While we are dealing with this visionary, I should mention his other famous quote that “musicians should stop being oarsmen and instead seize the rudder”. Not for him any simpering capitulation to the opinions of accountants, merchants, kings or clergy - and certainly not to “statistical callibrations of audience demographics”, “strategic outcomes”, “subscriber accessibility” or any of the inane “management-ese” spouted by our music “industry” guardians.
29. Further support for my position comes from another legendary musical figure, Béla Bartók. When asked about competitions, he famously dismissed them as (quote) “for horses”. We should remember that this genius was also a man of deep moral convictions. With the rise of Nazism, he left his lucrative career and escaped from his beloved Hungary for a “glorious” life of spectacular neglect in New York.
30. Due to competitions currently the piano recital apparently has nothing new to offer music and is therefore moribund (e.g., the complete lack of any modernist music in the 2010 Carnegie Hall piano series. I haven’t bothered to check recently, it’s far too depressing).
31. As an aside, so great is the need of performers to impress, one French pianist I came across - a veteran of over 70 international competitions, was capable of playing so loudly that in the words of one reviewer he could induce “nosebleed” (Daniel Cariaga, *LA Times* 1993). But he was so monomaniacally limited in repertoire that he had not even *heard* of Olivier Messiaen, perhaps the greatest French 20th Century composer. At

the 1993 Pogorelich competition he asked me, an Australian (!) for advice on where to start with Messiaen, simply because it looked like a good competition strategy. This is the default competition-winner type: a belting ignoramus. Within the competition circuit, and increasingly in the "profession", players with such a limited mindset and narrow band of music proliferate, altering the artform very much for the worse.

32. So great is the need of these competition chairmen and juries to regard themselves as important to the careers of participants that in the case of "SIPCA" it was claimed a past prizewinner was making a lucrative South American career ... though he had been dead 10 years. This same unscrupulous competition accepted its start-up funding from a huge tobacco company, yet its spokesman at the time (1977 - 40 years after scientists had proved smoking caused cancer), its spokesman said its primary aim was to [clasp hands under chin, cherub face] "look after young pianists". Yeah right.
33. Many European piano competition judges hold "summer courses" specifically advertised as (very expensive) intensive training sessions on "how to win piano competitions". This must be the musical equivalent of painting by numbers! One shudders to think what favours desperate students must shower on such conceited reptiles.
34. One boastful pianist claimed for decades that he had won a leading international Chopin competition although there is no evidence he even entered one (and since the internet, I notice this has gradually been dropped from his biography). After my unexpected success in the 1993 Pogorelich competition he accosted me backstage in Sydney and thought it necessary to tell all within earshot that he too was the "1st prize winner in several international competitions". I was

rendered speechless at the tremendous insecurity lack of international competition success had wrought on this sad individual, as if such success was more important to him than music itself.

35. Similarly a notorious cherry-picker of promising young Australian talent was spreading the barefaced lie around New York that he was the teacher of the winner of this Pogorelich competition i.e. yours truly (this to cement his employment and reputation as a teacher of competition winners at a New York music school itself in competition with other New York music schools). The level of desperation is comical and reminds me of an Escher lithograph of futile staircases.
36. Do competitions do any good? Judging by the conservative state of classical music and the rapidly diminishing audiences, one would have to say, resoundingly, no. Unfortunately, the whole "industry" (the Newspeak of capitalism reduces *everything* to this crude input/output paradigm) the whole "industry" is built on this philosophy - audiences/music consumers/customers cannot seem to make up their minds about the quality of a performer without a list of competition wins and ditto for every level of middlemen.
37. The only winners in all this of course are the competitions themselves and their junketing juries. Check out the self-congratulatory SIPCA website for instance. Music itself I believe is lost in the histrionics of egotistical fops. Some of them now even travel the world spreading the «good news» about competitions, like brain-dead priests in some flaky cult. (You won't of course find *these* priests helping out the Occupy Movement!) In hindsight it is axiomatic that the truly innovative music of last century was served better by contemporary dance companies - the Rite of Spring, Billy the Kid and Vine's first piano sonata spring immediately to mind.

38. But what about *exams*? Surely kids need *goals*? Well, do they in an *artform*? What are they studying music *for*? Do exams foster more understanding of music than the guidance of an enlightened teacher? With kids now expected to live until age 120, what is the point of having to race through grades and competitions, *tiger moms and dads*? What is the end-point of this dubious and frankly creepy fascination with younger and younger performers? Foetuses with placental grands?? Surely we should be equipping kids instead with a *genuine* love of, and *curiosity* about music that will sustain them for this increased lifespan? How is this achieved through the competition and examination mentality and its stultifying conformity and conservatism, its mindless celebration of immaturity, superiority complexes and insensitivity?

Our education systems are designed to produce ideal *students*. But surely what we need are *thinking musicians*. How many people have you come across who lament the fact that they gave up music in their teens because they were not passing exams or winning prizes or pieces of paper? Their teachers were simply too unimaginative or harassed by finances to suggest alternatives to these cookie-cutter exams to keep their student's interest alive. Luckily for us, fantastic musicians like Paul Grabowsky, Judy Bailey, Tony Gould and Mike Nock struck enlightened teachers who encouraged their uniqueness. I wonder what society would look like if we adopted the same attitude to reading and writing? Does it matter how long it takes individuals to learn to speak or to read? Pity Einstein would not have made the grade!

39. What are the *alternatives* for performance training? Well, I would like to see the emphasis in teaching shift from the performer to the three elements necessary for satisfying music-making: the composer/ improviser, audience and player. I would also like to see the intelligent, inspired exploration of the

question of *interpretation* - in Indian classical music, for instance, it is the opening up of interpretation of the various jatis and ragas and the innovations in improvisation which are prized by Indian audiences. If western art music is to remain part of contemporary culture and not be simply relegated to the museum, then it must continuously re-invent and catalyze itself. Competitions and exams block this process by reinforcing the *status quo*. And we know where *that* ends - advertisements for supermarkets.

40. Even chamber music is now infected with competitions!! Chamber Music! It is called Chamber Music because it is intended for a chamber, that is, a small room. This small room is unable to seat a large audience, and for very good reason - chamber music is intended as an intimate exchange of the musical experience between friends. The notion that it should be heard in concert halls, and competitions, is simply absurd. This approach leads to the destruction of the intimate nature of the music as it is distorted for show.

I mean, perhaps we should admit defeat altogether and go even further with this competition mentality by setting various chamber groups against each other, playing simultaneously, exactly the same as a football game or a Rollerderby. I bet there would be no shortage of groups desperate and stupid enough to participate!

41. Thanks to the influence of competitions, the piano recital is, in most instances, a museum piece. It is more and more bereft of recent music, as is the symphony orchestra concert and opera. I'm certain Franz Liszt would be utterly appalled. This is a direct result of the timid capitulation of music management to audience pressure for the familiar (a.k.a. the blind leading the blind) and the vicious churn of uninspired competition musicians becoming jurors when they are too old to

compete at age 32 or whatever. Any modern operas and symphonies that do get up are carefully composed to mimic old familiar templates so that the musicians aren't too uncomfortable and the audiences aren't too terrified. So, I imagine Peggy Glanville-Hicks would have given up writing for these expiring mediums, as so many composers have already, to concentrate on the small screen, on film, on dance, or on smaller ensembles of enlightened and energised individuals like Astra and those part of the New Music Network such as IHOS opera (Oh whoops, sorry they've had their funding cut).

42. Finally, an important question for Peggy would be why, in this century of catastrophic global warming, why is the lifestyle of all musicians not being examined and modified accordingly? Why is globetrotting still accepted and even glorified as a responsible attitude to maintaining a career? Why is such activity not ridiculed as the profligate, selfish, and outmoded carbon footprint that it actually is? And, why are not more efforts being made to use technology to alleviate this problem? Why are we still impressed with, and why do we agree to pay for jetsetting conductors or bands of narcissistic musicians stuffing up the planet in the pursuit of their egomaniacal careers? Are classical musicians simply more bovine, immodest and thoughtless now than in Peggy's day? It certainly appears so, with the possible exception of her spectacularly self-seeking husband Stanley Bate.

Please allow me to summarise

1. Australia can be very proud of its musicians and composers.
2. Australian artmusic is not as healthy as it is claimed by some.
3. Classical music conformity is a major problem in Australia.

4. Competition philosophy is crippling Australian-made artmusic.
5. The major music organisations are not fulfilling their responsibilities towards Australian music.
6. There is blatant misdirection of funding, amounting to corruption of the funding process.
7. There is grossly inadequate musical education of the public.
8. If the young only learn to hear familiar artmusic they will only seek familiar artmusic... and if they only ever hear imported artmusic they will never truly value the artmusic of their own country.
9. Hypocrisy is rife, but is the glue that holds this mess together.

Solutions

What rehabilitation would Peggy recommend. I can't be certain, of course, but I am fairly sure she would endorse most of the following 11 points:

1. Only *Australians* to be appointed Conductor Laureates of *Australian* orchestras, with the responsibility of deciding repertoire. The current arrangement of imported conductors has resulted in an alarming decrease of Australian musical content.
2. Fifty percent Australian repertoire mandatory on radio, other media and in concerts.
3. Music education to form the core of the school curriculum so that everyone has a basic grasp of music fundamentals. Also, more importantly, so that kids will grow up with greater intelligence due to the indisputable, *scientifically supported* beneficial effects of acoustic musicmaking on the white matter of their brains.
4. Music education, particularly of the disadvantaged, to be a priority for all

music aligned bodies – there is a pressing need to expand the musical palate of all audiences.

5. At the moment, the orchestras and opera receive the lion's share of tax-payer dollars, leaving other artists in desperate straits. The solution is that tax payer funding to orchestras and the opera needs to be dependent on the percentage of Australian content. As that content is now only 7% that would free up 93% of the current triennial funding for distribution amongst the Australian composers and performers who are not connected with those "august" bodies, and who quite frankly offer far better "bang for the buck" as far as original, exportable content is concerned.
6. The Australian Music Centre is our main dedicated resource of Australian fine musical content and intellectual property. It should not have to go begging to the Australia Council for its funding along with the very artists it *represents*, but should be directly funded by the federal government.
7. We should all be aware that classical music competitions produce conformity and stultify innovation, so
8. Boycott all classical music competitions. We don't need them, they are an *unnecessary* evil. While we're at it:
9. Ban the use of Australian taxpayer's dollars to fund music and opera beloved of white supremacists.
10. Ban Australian tax dollars being used to fund International Artist Management Groups and their conservative artists who peddle such inegalitarian musical philosophy. Australia no longer has a White Australia Policy, in case some opera lovers haven't noticed.
11. Finally, garner from the Australian public enthusiastic support for Australian instrument makers using local reclaimed timbers, such as

Stuart and Sons - much as the Finns did with Nokia phones - and public ridicule for the naysayers and snobs!

In closing, I hope Peggy Glanville-Hicks would approve these observations.

From my personal perspective: I have chosen to spend my time encouraging especially Australian composers to continue to create new work for the piano. I do this not because I think that the piano is the cutting-edge technology it was in Liszt's day. I do this because I cannot see the point in agreeing to management pressure to perform a more and more limited repertoire of antique covers. I don't think classical music has stopped evolving, even if some older audiences do. More urgently, I want to limit my carbon footprint as much as possible by working with my *local* community of struggling artists. The days of travelling the globe to service a music career at the expense of our planet have come to an end.

The creation of original intellectual capital for export (via technological means preferably) and for our self-respect I see as the only way forward for Australian classical music. The one-way, so-called "free" market philosophy pursued by our major Arts Organizations has been a disaster for Australian Music. I cite the case of the Australian Music Centre and its current tenuous position. All that this free-market profiteering has achieved is to increase the global circuit (or should I say circus) of classical music snobbery and cultural imperialism to *exploit* Australian arts resources, but at the same time to *exclude* Australian performers and composers, (or in the case of one venue ghettoise them in a patronising series called "Local Heroes"). If you doubt this, take a swift survey of our Australian conductor laureates for starters. [make "zero" sign].

We have a new generation used to getting their music free of charge - what prospects are there for our young musicians, hoodwinked into learning orchestral excerpts and opera arias, to say nothing of our hapless pianists and composers?

I try to live up to the impossibly high standards of commitment and vision of Peggy Glanville-Hicks and her ilk and I know I fail miserably. But I cannot think of a greater cause to aspire to for my limited talents. I sincerely hope for the sake of our young people that Australian art music continues to attract our brightest minds and does not turn them off by slavishly promoting competition philosophy and, consequently, importing musicians who do not have any sense of responsibility to young Australian musicians

(to say nothing of the planet), and who do not respect Australian music, yet are given the power to dictate to Australian performers and composers how to spend our own tax money.

[For Sydney address only] I would like to end by performing a work by a composer I particularly admire, Nigel Westlake. It's his first piano sonata, written especially for the Stuart piano (though still possible to play on inferior instruments) and runs about 10 minutes. It was not commissioned with funds from the Australia Council.

Michael Kieran Harvey was born in Sydney and studied piano with Alan Jenkins, Gordon Watson, and at the Liszt Academy, Budapest, under Sándor Falvai. His career has been notable for its diversity and wide repertoire. Harvey's awards include the Grand Prix in the Pogorelich Competition, USA (1993), the Debussy Medal, Paris (1986), the Australian Government's Centenary Medal (2002), the 2009 APRA/AMC award for Distinguished Services to Australian Music, and the 2011 AMC Tasmanian state award for composition. The Michael Kieran Harvey Scholarship for Australian keyboard art music was established in 2006. He is currently Adjunct Professor at the Tasmanian Conservatorium.