

On rules which must be broken

It is not my intention to compete in organizational matters with our respective artistic directors; as some people said 'every master has his own style'. However, I cannot resist not overlooking the many defects in our present system which became - to my regret- rules which may not be broken!

For instance, if I were artistic director, I would have made sure that all composers, who did not rehearse their pieces with the musicians/ensembles/orchestras in question, attend the necessary number of rehearsals whether their pieces were world-premieres or not. The presence of composers in such cases is a *must* as much it is a must for an orchestra to have a conductor without whom a performance (if happening at all) would be lacking totality, intensity, drive, etc. Equally the presence of composers in rehearsals is as important as the presence of a flutist, clarinetist or any other musician in any chamber music combination without whom no performance could possibly take place.

Some people might complain about the expenses re. bringing composers to rehearsals. Fine; however, why are the many bureaucratic positions in festivals (secretaries and so on), writers of program-notes, in addition to journalists/critics – *who all will not improve, neither influence music/sound making*- more important to budget considerations than the presence of composers who will improve the music making being the primary creators of the featured pieces? Like it or not, composers' scores (especially the contemporary ones) are *the* raison-d'être of the whole music establishment including ensembles, orchestras, festivals, radio stations, even artistic directors and their retinues! When economy is so limited, why hiring writers of program notes instead of benefitting from the presence of the composer who shall be able to share directly with the public at no extra cost deeper insights about his/her own piece? When the budget is problematic, why inviting/paying journalists and critics whose articles will not influence music making before it takes place, neither will it improve ephemeral sound which has been already performed and disappeared? When the budget does not allow, why not prioritizing musical concerns on non-musical ones: Why not giving the priority of such budgets for inviting composers so that the latter could spend the necessary time of rehearsals with the musicians, and thus help improving the quality of music making? Even with the best performers ever, composers often have something to add re. refining the realization of "their" compositions. Furthermore, why filling festivals with dozens of pieces and then complaining about the smaller budget left which will not meet the expenses of inviting the large number of featured composers? I would humbly suggest performing a smaller number of compositions while assuring that the composers of those pieces are all present in the rehearsals, for it would be just silly to assume that the organization of bigger festivals will necessarily result in a better music making.

Kindly do not misunderstand, if your budget allows, hire whoever you wish. However, complains about finance while prioritizing non-musical matters on musical ones is simply sad. Being myself composer, if the budget of a certain festival has limitations, I would sincerely prefer sacrificing attending the concert on attending some rehearsals!

It is indeed perplexing to see often that the main concerns of our music establishments -albeit very few exceptions- are not about music! I wonder, what is more important for a *music* establishment: Assuring the happening of the best possible music quality or covering the lack of music quality by glamorous shows?