

ST. PETERSBURG INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC FORUM

JUNE 16–18, 2011

WHEN WILL A NEW BEATLES EMERGE ON THE MUSIC SCENE?

Expanding Technology Horizons

JUNE 17, 2011 — 17:30–18:45, Mercedes-Benz STARBAR

St. Petersburg, Russia

2011

Creative problems, music technology stagnation, problems of intellectual property rights protection, domination of producers over performers, marketing over creativity – these are just some of the problems impeding the development of a globalized and multi-polar music market.

Moderator:

Artemy Troitsky, Russian rock journalist and music critic

Panelists:

Peter Jenner, Producer, Music Manager, ex-Manager of Pink Floyd and The Clash, Visiting Professor in Music and Entertainment Industry Economics

Alexei Kozin, General Director, Navigator Records

Anastasia Kuriokhina, Artistic Director, the Modern Art Centre

Tim Renner, Managing Director, Motor Entertainment GmbH

Front row participant:

Kevin Lawrie, President, Europe & Africa, Sony Music

A. Troitsky:

Good evening, dear friends, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to one of today's 'dessert' sessions at the St. Petersburg Economic Forum. I think you have listened to a lot of serious subjects – now is the time to relax a little.

Welcome to the hippie, rock-&-roll edge of the Economic Forum. Now we can talk a little bit about things far more important than global energy and the oil industry.

The forum's motto is 'new leaders for a new age'. Today we will be talking not so much about new leaders as about new 'losers'. And it seems that one of those 'losers' in the new age is the apparently beautiful and glamorous pop music. Remember how it was twenty, thirty, forty years ago. Pop music was the absolute master of everything. It shaped the youth market, it dictated fashion. Records were sold in hundreds of millions. The owner of souls and the master of pockets – that was what pop music was in the second half of the 20th century.

The situation is now, unfortunately, somewhat different. Everybody who treats modern pop music seriously is dissatisfied with the situation in one way or another. The captains of industry, record labels in the first instance, distributors, and retailers complain about extremely low sales and their low income—to be more exact the high level of financial losses. Artists, particularly well-known artists, writers, and composers complain that pirates on the Internet are stealing their copyrights, so they are also losing out on large amounts of money. And finally, a huge number of those concerned with pop music, in particular us, the listeners, the fans, are also irritated and grumbling, saying that music is not what it used to be. Some like the 60s, some the 70s, others the 80s. Before we had Elvis, Led Zeppelin, the Beatles. Now there's nothing like them.

In general, the whole of popular music is in a state of permanent frustration. And the question is: can it get out of this 'loser' situation, and if so, how? Our discussion may help to resolve these problems and devise a new strategy for world pop music.

Before we talk about ways of getting out of this situation, I should like our experts to say a few words about what has led to the pitiful state in which pop music currently finds itself. I have personally come up with three scenarios.

The first scenario is that music will come to an end, just as history ended, according to the historian Fukuyama. I mean there are only seven notes, and those notes have already been arranged in all possible combinations. Everything there was to discover in music has already been discovered. Every style has been tried. All the sounds, all the arrangements, all the methods – it has all been done, and there is nothing new left. The innovational potential of music has been exhausted. An indirect confirmation of this thesis could be that if we actually look at pop music in the last fifteen years, we will not, on the whole, find anything that is really new. Perhaps the last really outstanding new departures were the radical trends in club music in the late 80s and early 90s: techno, house, drum 'n' bass, trance, and so on. After that there have been only retro styles, sheer repetition.

My second scenario is that it is not music that is at fault, but the policy of the recording companies and of show business in general. Why? Because record labels, producers and production centres, instead of investing in music and in talented artists—working with them and promoting new experimental trends—have gambled on one-hit wonders, who very quickly become stars through aggressive marketing, sell a large number of records to an extremely undemanding public, then disappear. As a result, in the last few decades, instead of really talented musicians we have had all sorts of 'Britney Spears', 'Dima Bilans' and suchlike. And we now have all these 'X Factors', 'Factories of Stars', etc. On one hand, this is ruining young peoples' taste, and to a catastrophic extent. On the other hand, it is actually undermining people's trust in good quality music as such. The reverent attitude to music, the cult of music that existed in the 50s, 60s and 70s, is disappearing, and music is becoming just another commercial business.

And finally, scenario number three, the largest-scale scenario, one which I would call civilizational. It may be that all types of art, including art as entertainment, go in a kind of rotation. Music was 'in the saddle' for several decades. It was incredibly important, and then, in the natural way of things, gave way to something else. To what, though, is not particularly clear. Is it computer games or multimedia, or extreme sports? I don't know. In fact, music simply faded into the background as a result of powerful civilizational changes, which may be related to something social, economic, cultural or psychological.

It may well be that there are other versions of the crisis in music. And it may be a combination of various scenarios. I should like our experts to say something on this subject. I should first like to call on Peter Jenner, a man of tremendous experience, one of the legendary band managers. Suffice it to say that he was the first manager of Pink Floyd, the greatest psychedelic group of all time, and the first manager of Clash, the greatest punk rock group of all time. Peter Jenner.

P. Jenner:

Hello, yeah. Yes, I met Artemy here 25 years ago in Leningrad when things were interesting.

A. Troitsky:

When we were still kids.

P. Jenner:

You mean when I was, since I was already old. OK. I have just written a few words and maybe they add up, or maybe they don't.

Number one is, I wrote down globalization. Number two, I wrote down marketing corporations, short-term profit. Number three was greed from artists and companies. Number four was pop music as a career rather than as a mad activity. Number five is that maybe like oil wells, with which you're familiar,

they're becoming exhausted and maybe we've exhausted the oil well. And fifth, the positive thing is that it brings back some sort of real underground. It's all just a bit too over-ground.

How will that do? It's short and to the point.

A. Troitsky:

Well, I suggest that you decipher all those.

P. Jenner:

You want me to do the deciphering?

A. Troitsky:

The interesting things that you've just briefly mentioned.

P. Jenner:

OK. Globalization, I think it's the tyranny of the multinational corporations which has driven out, in effect absorbed the entrepreneurs who backed their views as to who might be an interesting artist. So the Chris Blackhalls, Jack Holtzmanns, and all these people who brought through so many of the best acts and artists from the 60s, 70s and 80s.

Almost all of them got absorbed into large corporations and their creative originality was squeezed out by the need to get profit and loss accounts and accountants. Accountants and new MBAs, you know, with a Master of Business Administration. I think Masters of Business Administration, lawyers and

I think you have to go with music according to your spirit and according to your feel for the zeitgeist, the feelings of the time. And if you're a lawyer and if you're an accountant, you're going to go by an assessment of the bottom line and usually you get that wrong.

I mean, in more recent years, I've found that by and large the more keen the major labels are on signing an act, the quicker they sink into insignificance. And the less keen they are, the better chance you have of getting somewhere with them. It will be a much harder job, but you might actually get somewhere.

So all these predictably lead to more marketing from the corporations who have absorbed things, and the corporations are driven by their top management, who are driven by short-term profit and loss accounts and their bonuses. What matters is you get your quarterly figures in and then you get your big bonus. You're not interested in developing careers.

People who own record companies are interested in developing careers. People who work for major corporations are interested in the next quarter's results. So you get short term-ism and that's a big problem.

I think that the artists, the companies, the managers, people like me are also becoming very involved in the money game so that you go in and think of some ridiculous sum of money. And if you're lucky, they say yes. And if you're unlucky, you ask for a little bit less.

And generally speaking, people start going into the music business as a way to become famous, as a way to make money, rather than going into the music business because they're a bit stupid like me and think, you know, "Why not? Let's have a go. It's fun. It's about art. It's about creativity."

Those sorts of feelings don't really work when you're looking for a career, and you see that with the enormous growth in the U.K. of music business degrees. People get degrees in the music business. I wish there had been a few more of those in some ways when I was starting. But I think it's gone too far the other way.

I think that exhausting the mine, exhausting the oil well, I mean, I think really art is as we've already referred to – they're really playing the same old songs over and over and over again. I just heard on the radio a couple of days ago, just before I came to England, I was picked up by my son-in-law and he had this song

on. I heard the song. "Hey, that was Lola." "No, it wasn't. It was some song by somebody else." But it was exactly like Lola, by the Kinks.

A. Troitsky:

The Kinks.

P. Jenner:

Yes, exactly the same song. And I just heard about five bars. It was Lola. "No, no, no. It was a new song by a great new artist," whoever that was. And so, exhausting the mine, you know, how many more bands with two guitars, bass and drums does anybody want to listen to, with a lead singer, male or female, whingeing about their love life? I think the answer is no one. Well, a lot of people do obviously but not as many as used to.

So, that's why I said, quite seriously, bring back the rebellion, bring back the underground. Or maybe, as Russia gets more and more conformist and more and driven by the need to conform to the economic model of America and the West, generally, maybe we can, in reaction to that, maybe we can be a bit more underground, a bit more aggravation and a few more people might get arrested.

A. Troitsky:

I hope you understood all that. Peter is basically blaming the current situation in music on the music business, which favours quick income and musical 'fast food'. People have started out in music not out of a desire to express themselves, to embark on a great adventure or to do something else idealistic, but to make a career for themselves, earn money and so on. Of course, this kind of motivation is not really creative motivation, and that cannot help but affect the end result. I am sure there are opponents of this point of view, and, in particular, I should like to introduce Kevin Lawrie from Sony Music.

K. Lawrie:

Thank you, Art. Yeah, there is a lot to reflect on there and I have to agree with Peter about the all-too-often short-term interest of the people who count off numbers that has now led to a short-sighted view all too often about music.

I actually believe that the next Beatles—if that is the way to phrase it, because I think it is offensive to categorize the next big artist as being the next Beatles—it will be the next Russian kid who may be 16 right now who speaks to his generation in a way that the previous people didn't. And that young kid, boy or girl, needs to be supported, needs to have trustworthy people around him or her supporting his or her career.

And quite frankly, the major labels – and other labels perhaps, have not done a fantastic job over the last 50 years in instilling confidence and trust and transparent relationships. And because of those mistakes, those companies have been humbled and brought down to the cruel reality, which is that if you do not provide a transparent service in today's very democratic distribution of music, you will be put aside. You will be ignored. You will not have a business.

Major labels have no control virtually, no gatekeeping power, in today's Internet economy. And quite frankly, that should be liberating and refreshing to artists and people who create things. At the same time, there is an opening for everyone in this room and within major labels to reposition themselves not as perpetual controllers of everything about somebody's life. Rather, everyone should be service providers who will help that 16-year old Russian kid navigate the waters, protect him from people who would use his creation, his or her creation inappropriately, attach it to a Coca-Cola ad inappropriately on an Internet service that has not been licensed to use it.

That kid should also have the support of someone who is connected to people like Art, people that can critique the music, people that can listen, people that can recommend and connect to other Russians and other people around the world so that those Russian Beatles or that Russian Mozart becomes a reality.

So I think it's vital for all of us to take a step back and contemplate that service and what is real about it. But I certainly agree with Peter that in many cases we, the major labels, did not do ourselves any favours by the way we handled ourselves, the way we projected our service, and the arrogance with which we operated.

I can tell you that in my own little world in which I operate, that has completely changed. And we absolutely now will be out of business very, very quickly if we do not provide a relevant service to that future talent in the market place.

There are exciting things happening in the business. I personally believe we are at the beginning of the next Golden Era of music potentially. There are access services such as Spotify, Deezer and others that are providing incredibly compelling services that provide people access to almost every piece of music ever created almost instantly. So that future artist, those future Beatles, without the help perhaps of a major label but through those services, can essentially get their music out on a worldwide basis themselves.

Now, the question becomes how to get noticed in that sea of music, in that sea of potential commerce. Who are the people, who are the services that you are going to need to get connected to the people who can review your art, who can expose your art in a credible way and one that is consistent with what you want to do, not with what some Internet service or some TV show or some controlling manager would like you to do?

So I will just make one more point before I finish and just say that in Sweden we forecast that because of Spotify and other services that exist in that market, by the year 2014 or 2015 we will most assuredly replace the industry value that existed a couple of years ago. And through that system, there has now become a new way of compensating creative people for what they do. And that has shed light on the future for us and made us absolutely believe that there is perhaps a bigger and better music business than we have ever seen before. I am personally convinced that is going to happen.

Now, whether major labels or independent labels will have anything to do with that will very much depend on the quality of service they provide, because in such a digital nirvana, it is a very democratic digital nirvana, and one where all the gates come down. So if you are irrelevant, you provide a cloudy, non-transparent service to your talent, you will be put aside; if you provide a credible, compelling, real service to real human beings, your service will grow.

A. Troitsky:

Thank you, Kevin. You see that Peter was critical and Kevin was self-critical. Peter was pessimistic, Kevin was more optimistic. But both of them agreed that music cannot be run in the old way; that the system is not transparent. What was especially nice to hear was that our foreign guests spoke highly of Russia and said that the next big thing in music could well come from Russia, if only because today's 'digital nirvana', as Kevin put it, gives everyone access to everything.

Now I should like to call on Alexey Kozin, a colleague of Kevin Lawrie from the Russian Navigator Records label, for his opinion on these problems.

A. Kozin:

I'm afraid I can't cover all the problems. But this is what I would like to stress: yes, there is a crisis in music, but the nature of the crisis in music in Russia and the nature of the world crisis are somewhat different, they just happened to occur at the same time. Russia has many issues in its music industry that the civilized world has already coped with. In actual fact, there has never been a fully-fledged recording industry in Russia. It's unfortunate, but that is the case. There are companies which manage rights, there are companies which publish music. Today the medium – what the pirates and the legal distributors of music lived and earned their money on – is dead. For example, Soyuz, a major music shop network, is now on the verge of bankruptcy. Today people are simply not buying music on physical media.

Does that mean that people have started listening to music less? No. On the contrary, they have possibly started listening to it more, because now everything is just a mouse click away. For example, I used to spend money, as a music-lover, to find this or that recording, but now it requires no effort at all. So naturally the behaviour is changing.

Most importantly, the listener's behaviour is changing, and all the other participants in the market have to adjust to that. Those who adjust, including the creators, will live on and create. I think people's motives for getting into the music business are the same today as they were ten years ago, twenty years ago, thirty years ago. They are the same motives for which people go into any profession. Some do it for the money, some because they love it, some because they have talent. All the rest – it's a matter of degree.

And as far as music is concerned. In my view, music is a kind of collective emotion. And these emotions are the same as we are. I mean it's a sort of diagnosis of what we imagine as a society, what is happening to us.

As to whether another Beatles could come from Russia or not, I have my own theory. It is not a comforting one. When the Beatles appeared, it was a very serious generation split. The World War was over. Britain actually had the first generation that had not seen the war, that wanted to enjoy life. There was a technological boom. Various media were appearing and proliferating. And the Beatles came along at just the right time, they became flag-bearers to a certain extent. And when people talked about the Beatles, the word 'protest' was heard. They were a cultural rebellion in form, but a protest in essence.

If we talk about Russian musical culture, it looks slightly different. We could say that in Russia there is no culture of protest, but there is a culture of rebellion. And in the 90s, when there was a surge in music, it was a rebellion in essence and a protest in form. That is my opinion as a listener.

Is it the companies' fault that music is in crisis, or not? In part yes, as participants in the process. It is also the fault of the media to quite a serious extent. We now

have the Internet, but nevertheless the main medium for the popularization of music has always been, and still remains, the radio. It is very difficult to get on a radio station's playlist. For an artist coming off the street it is virtually impossible. And this is one of the serious reasons why recording companies will continue to be needed. To contact the media. To deal with legal and accounting matters. So is all music in crisis? Not all of it by any means. The concert market in Russia is growing. Today Moscow is in a position to pay fees that sometimes exceed world fees for box-office concerts.

A. Troitsky:

Especially at corporate events.

A. Kozin:

Including at corporate events. But even if we talk about box-office concerts, the promoters' market in Moscow and St. Petersburg is impossibly overheated. There are more promoters than artists. The money they earn goes into price competition instead of towards development of the infrastructure. That's where the 'Klondike' is now, that's where the money is. Culture is becoming 'virtual' at great speed, and at the same time the value of direct physical contact, rather than the concerts themselves.

It is also quite difficult for young musicians in Russia today. Not as difficult as it was twenty or thirty years ago, but nevertheless, in order to get into the music business in Russia, unfortunately, it is necessary to have more than the others. And that is, to a certain extent, the death sentence on skill, the death sentence on performing standards, since at the time when people could be developing themselves they are dealing with other matters. Perhaps I am idealizing the West, but there, from my conversations with colleagues and musicians, in order to get into the music business it is sufficient simply to play music.

A. Troitsky:

Thank you, Alexey.

Alexey has touched on several very important subjects that the previous speakers had not mentioned. On one hand, there is the subject of the music media, and, on the other hand, the subject of concert activity,

On the subject of the music media, I'm afraid that the situation in Russia does actually differ very strongly from the rest of the world, because I think there are no worse music media than in our country anywhere in the world. In particular, I have never heard radio music anywhere that is worse than in Russia. It is so bad that it is even worse than music on TV. And that's bad. What is good is that I categorically disagree with Alexey that radio has some kind of importance these days. Radio is of no importance to a huge number of musicians. In our country in general – I'm not directing this at you so much, as you know all this, but to our foreign guests – music is extremely polarized. Our music actually has no mainstream, no middle class. We have either the Eurovision Song Contest, i.e. what is 'plugged' on the main TV channels – an enormous number of talentless artists singing songs by talentless composers – actually not singing, but miming to a soundtrack that has often been recorded by different artists. And this is what is officially considered to be our pop music, and it lives either on TV, or the money is made at private corporate parties, which are another absolutely unique feature of our music business. There is no longer anywhere else in the world where the whole pop elite receive most of their income not from normal sources (record sales, public concerts, merchandising) but from appearing before small groups of people who turn their backs on them and eat oysters. This is an incontrovertible fact.

So one clan of our artists live in a universe bounded by these two coordinates: federal TV and commissioned corporate concerts. Then there is the second, larger, incomparably more interesting part of our music, which lives on the

Internet, in clubs, and which, thank God (thanks to people like Alexey), is heard on audio recordings.

Radio is not at all important for this second part. I work with many artists myself, and I have to say that they do not want radio or TV, because their audience, the audience of new Russian music, the Russian underground, does not watch TV – perhaps sometimes Channel A-One. They absolutely never listen to the radio. If there is something they want to listen to, they listen to Internet streaming, but none of our radio stations. And they are none the worse for it, since the concert scene in our country really is quite well developed. And when artists start complaining that the pirates are robbing them of a kopeck, you can always say to them: “Hey guys, come on, don’t be lazy, get out on the road, shake the dust off your guitars and earn yourself some money.” And now I’d like to call on Anastasia Kuryokhina, who is not just the only representative of the fair sex among us, but also the only one of us who is actively involved in concert promotion. She runs the Sergey Kuryokhin Contemporary Art Centre in St. Petersburg and regularly stages the famous SKIF festival and various concerts and festivals, mainly of alternative and non-commercial music.

A. Kuryokhina:

We are probably the underground that Peter Jenner was talking about, because it has to be, and we promote non-commercial music in all its varieties and manifestations. It’s not so much about concerts as festivals. In my opinion, producing and the search for new talent is currently the only effective form, because a great number of people come to a festival, and so do stars, who attract this audience, and the festival also includes young talented kids who are completely unknown. And many of them subsequently become popular. It is their first performance on a big stage, and a chance to be noticed, which is very important. With the opening of the Sergey Kuryokhin Centre we have expanded, we have already held six festivals in various regions. And it is not only rock

music. SKIF is a multicultural festival, which features world music, rock, improvised jazz and electronic music. Separate offshoots are the Electro-mechanica festival of electronic art and the Ethno-mechanica festival of ethnic music. For film fans we have staged the Metropolis festival, which involves an extensive selection process, the search for new talents in cinema. It is a festival of video art, to which people can bring their own works and curatorial programmes. In general, what we have is a sort of creative laboratory, with absolutely no links to recording companies or other show business magnates. It is simply a creative laboratory where talented people may eventually emerge and be seen.

Of course, with the introduction of the Internet and the development of digital technology, everything has improved from the point of view that the opportunities for talents to come to the fore have increased considerably. On one hand, it is great that there will be more works of art and masterpieces, but, on the other hand, there are so many of them, and someone has to digest them and make a selection. And it's a fairly chaotic stream in which the strongest swim to the top.

As regards artists setting out on their careers, I want to say that a purely financial motive in art is, in my view, totally wrong. Because people who are out just to make money are, as a rule, those very average pop stars who make it with the help of producers and various companies. But a really creative person, a genius, I mean one who is capable of creating genuine works of art, genuine tunes that will be sung all over the world, still has to be motivated by something else. He has to have an inner fire, a cosmic energy. In the initial stages there is no need to order a special studio, though that is now easy to arrange. In time, however, there has to be an agent to bring the idea to public attention. But really talented musicians, it seems to me, are prominent in any case and develop by themselves, independent of any programmes.

Besides that, recognition is very important for musicians. That is why we have organised a prize in the field of contemporary art in which there are two musical

categories: World Music and Electronic Art. Of course, for musicians this is an honour and pleasing. The results are published, the event is covered by the mass media, who do not particularly like our alternative art, if that is what it is formally called. We actually have big problems with TV and radio. The only TV company with whom we are on friendly terms is A-One. But radio – no. In this connection we have decided from autumn onwards to launch our own Internet-TV and our own radio station, because the radio we have at the moment is impossible to listen to.

I think a great deal is changing for the better thanks to technology. Though perhaps there is truth in the theory that the life has gone out of music altogether and now inhabits other spheres. Perhaps it is now in the sphere of science and in the world of new technologies, and it may be that the Beatles of our time is Steve Jobs or somebody else. We are practical people, we have centres, we have working programmes, we are supported by the Cultural Committee and by various European cultural foundations. And I think we are doing the right thing. There are groups that have become popular thanks to us, so I think we are on the right track.

A. Troitsky:

Anastasia Kuryokhina.

You see, even idealists from a contemporary art centre speak a great deal about modern technologies and intend to get onto the Internet. We have another opportunist here who once headed the excellent German label Motor Records. His name is Tim Renner. Now, as far as I understand, he has left the record label and has gone into new cloudy, digital spheres. And I would like him to tell us why he decided to leave the traditional music industry and embark on new digital adventures.

T. Renner:

Thank you. No, I didn't leave my classic industry to go over to the digital format. I left Universal and will now be working independently. For five years I headed Universal in Germany, which is the global leader in music, and I just got heartily sick of it. They don't understand anything, and just don't recognise any problems. So everything went out of control.

Kevin won't let me lie to you – seven years ago, when I left Universal, I realized that there was no control anymore. Major companies can do nothing different if others, say, allow themselves to do it. They cannot afford to lose control, and at the same time they are losing control over their audience. They want to release ten songs a month instead of perfecting three or four songs. We wanted to stay rich, we didn't want to give them freedom, as freedom costs money. We were fighting for that freedom. You in Russia know very well, as we do in Germany, that fighting against freedom is very bad, freedom has to be preserved.

We wanted to preserve our great old system, which allowed us to choose for ourselves what we wanted to listen to, read or watch. The result is the accumulation of a critical mass of expectation of the release of a new product, and everyone rushes and buys the same thing. This is wrong. So we began to work on the freedom of the artist, because producing music in the digital format is much easier than it used to be. And marketing is easier in digital, and it's easier to control copyright. Transmitting has also turned out to be simpler than before. You just put a tune on the Internet – and hey presto, it's reached the people. So the artist has been provided with a certain freedom, and we are continuing.

That's why I left the traditional industry – so that freedom could be preserved and, at the same time, so that an author could control his rights.

By the way, Kevin spoke of a service company, that is a company that obtains the rights to reproduction. I actually thought seven years ago that the system was becoming obsolete. And after Universal decided to cut my budget for the search for new artists and my Internet activity by 50%, I realised that it would happen

only over my dead body. No thank you. Then they said: OK, let there be a dead body. And so as not to turn into a dead body I went away and started a new company, which was created and lives on, despite the current conditions of a transitional period.

We still need mass media such as light radio. It's an Internet radio: we reserve the rights for the creator, we obtain them only on a restricted scale. I won't be formatting them. We even physically produce goods if necessary in the creator's interest. We do this on behalf of major German creators, who earn much more as a result. I don't think they need a whole recording company which they will have to support at their own expense. We can do all this much more simply in the digital format. And it's more profitable for the artist, who retains his rights and his freedom. Some artists are rebels and want to promote some sort of content. Again though, pop music, whose popularity is now on the wane, sparks new rebellions. Imagine Led Zeppelin, Pink Floyd. Everything was better before than it is now. You listen to all kinds of trash.

A. Troitsky:

It seems to me that punk rock was better than anything else.

T. Renner:

I think so too. Punk rock was better than what young people listen to today, but that's not for us to decide. Today's youth also want to be independent, and they obviously like music that irritates us. My daughter, for example, deliberately tries to find music that will irritate me. She even tried country music, but I just smiled and didn't want to argue with her.

When I was young and a punk, I always had problems with my parents. They cursed me, didn't understand my music, but were then obliged to accept it. So it's not only about children, but about the fact that we were streetwise when it came to pop culture. So kids started running out of control into computer games. And

that's when problems arise. It's obviously stress. They turn to food as a therapy for stress. Stress from the fact that their parents won't let them go to rock concerts. Whether we need a new Beatles or not, I don't know. In their day the Beatles were also badly received by the older generation. Yes, we definitely need new rebellious music that we don't understand.

A. Troitsky:

That is, whereas before, we wanted to annoy our parents with any loud and chaotic music, now we annoy them by stopping eating. In fact, I agree with Tim, and with Kevin, that today's music is actually not that bad. I myself am a practising radio DJ and a TV presenter, so I listen to a great deal of new music. I have to tell you that there is, in fact, plenty of interesting creative music. It's not particularly innovative, I mean there are no breakthroughs like there were in previous decades, but it's talented music, and that's the most important thing. Consequently, the question is how to organise for this talented new music, for the new Beatles or new Mozarts, this "digital nirvana" that Kevin spoke of. How far is this possible?

So now I would like to move on from the critical, negative first part, to the utopian second part, and hear the opinions of our experts on what has to be done to help music. What has to be done to help young talents, what has to be done to help us, the listeners, to find our way better in this flood of new music?

In principle, the situation that existed before was, of course, much clearer. When there were records, music radio, and music magazines, the whole of musical life was like a town where there are streets with names and traffic lights. If you went to the left or the right, you found what you needed. Music on the Internet is a jungle – more than that, it is a jungle at night. It's very difficult to find your way around it. At the moment there is virtually no navigation. No world law and order on, say, compensation for artists, payment of royalties to authors, and so on, has yet been established. All this has to be brought to mind. I should like our experts

to come up, if possible, with specific suggestions concerning what needs to be done to usher in a new golden age of music. Peter?

P. Jenner:

Well, I was very well organized. I had my list. I've got another list. So I'm feeling very smart. I think that where the new Beatles will come from, I mean, forget where the new Beatles will come from, but where will the new music come from? And I think it will come from some combination of these factors because I think music comes from a social environment. Music comes from – great music comes from a deep social situation. So there's that great tradition you had at the end of the Soviet Era with people who were, sort of, revolting against the revolting.

So anyway, I think it will come from new technology and that means it subsequently comes from home recording and things that you can do with home recording. And I think a lot of it will come from 'cut and paste', which the record industry traditionally will fight like mad because they think that it doesn't fall in with the laws and institutions that come traditionally with music.

So I think we will need new laws and institutions which can relate to the new music. I think that also it will come from new music traditions. The people, these institutions had a lot to do with popularizing some music which was coming from America which we were not terribly into in the U.K.

So it was a lot of heavy R&B and heavy, sort of Motown and stuff like that. And I think from the point of view of places like Russia, it will come from folk music, it will come from people who are steeped in folk music who play it like with the attitude of the best of traditional rock music. That will be my bet.

And I think that with the new institutions and the new laws, we've got to find between us – and we have this problem in the West as well – new ways of distribution and new ways of finding money so that people can be rewarded for dedicating their lives to making music. You've got to be able to make a living out of what you are doing if you want to become professional. If you're happy with

amateur music, that's fine. But if you want professional music, you've got to find some way in which people can live for making their music.

Finally, two things. It may be a combination of sound or music with something else, with vision. Again, it's back to 'cut and paste'. It comes back to the vision; so sound and vision, or sound and cutting, sound and other things. Cutting and pasting will bring out new sorts of creativity, I think.

And finally, I think you mustn't worry about language. The best new music that comes out of Russia will be in Russian. I think if you sing in English and you come from Russia, you will have trouble. If you sing in Russian, you will sing in a different rhythm. Rock music was sung in English a lot because the natural rhythm of the language works with the rhythm of the music. And I think a lot of the best music that will come in the future will not be in English because it will bring with it non-English rhythms, non-English music, and will bring a freshness and a newness to the ears, which will excite a new generation. That's my list.

A. Troitsky:

That sounds very encouraging. Kevin, please.

K. Lawrie:

Yeah. I'll just add one more thing. I think Peter's points are pretty well thought out. But Anastasia mentioned something that I thought was perfect. I think when an artist taps into their cosmic force or their mystery and does not care much about anything else, but taps into that, and that speaks to their generation, then there is a possibility for them to be real for their audience.

The problem with our current environment is the Internet world – potentially, every aspect of that 18-year old Russian's life could be made available through the Internet because they Twitter every time they go to the bathroom or because someone else Twitters about every time they go to the bathroom.

And I think half the battle for people that want to be really supportive of those new cosmic forces – we have to assume that they really are a cosmic force; I mean ‘cosmic force’, not one invented on TV, but the real deal – it would be a shame if those are real deals, and let us say they are in the form of Paul McCartney and John Lennon and George Harrison and Ringo Starr, but every time those guys did something – sat on the sofa and ate potato chips – people in America or Russia knew about it the very next second. All you had back then with the Beatles was an album cover. All you had was an Ed Sullivan show and you had to watch it, you could not repeat it. You had to be there. You had to pay attention to that album cover and be obsessed about every detail that you were given.

So, we have given all access to our cosmic forces. And I think the future will need to handle that in a more mature way than we are doing right now. And I think it will be about pulling back from our ‘full’ access, to just enough access because quite frankly, if I had known everything about Jim Morrison that I know today, I probably wouldn’t have liked it. I probably wouldn’t listen any further because I might find out that he was lousy to his dog or didn’t – you know, something that demystified that cosmic force.

So, I think as people who want to be supportive of Russian talent, and we are here in this market, we are going to need to do a good job at being artistic about that, humane about it and help that artist project their mystery and protect it the right way.

A. Troitsky:

Thank you.

A. Kuryokhina:

In Russian that’s called ‘not letting talent go to waste’. I want to say that, of course, the whole point is, who is going to help this talent? I think a huge role

should be played by the state and various cultural institutions, which should deal with education, the material base, rehearsal and studio facilities; the educational and creative processes should be centralized.

I was in Sweden recently to talk about the creative industry, and I realized the only useful thing that is happening there – it is as if a large field is being sown and a large material history is being supported: education-wise and production-wise. And in this sown field, perhaps, just one shoot will come up, but it will be a star. Maybe this is the correct policy for the state. Or somebody chooses one star, grooms them and dresses them. But that, in my opinion, is the wrong way. In general, it seems to me that the crisis may be that money has begun to dominate everything to such an extent that it has already shut out that creative moment and that cosmic energy that there needs to be, because everything should not depend on profit. In the first instance, art should flourish by itself.

A. Troitsky:

Thank you. Alexey.

A. Kozin:

I have a recipe to sort out the world and to sort out Russia. Let's start with Russia. If we are talking about music, our music is a part of culture that receives no support. We have a state programme that supports theatres, and a state programme that supports the cinema—I won't say now whether that is good or bad. Music is not supported at all. There have never even been any attempts to do so. And in fact it would be very useful if, for instance, music stations were obliged to play a certain percentage of Russian music.

Now about music that cannot pay for itself. It is very important that a young name has a chance, and that the chance is given, or at least an attempt made to give it, by a radio station, so that a publisher gives him a chance. At least to record an album, a song. That's absolutely essential. And the problem is that there is

sometimes no chance whatsoever. It would not be difficult for a company to give a young performer a chance, it wouldn't stop it earning money on the names they already have. It wouldn't stop radio stations plugging the hits that people are guaranteed to want to hear. And it would be great for the listeners too – if they don't give a chance for bad music to be included on the playlists, it won't be heard on the radio. Then the media industry will have to change for the better to suit the listeners.

A. Troitsky:

And your recipe for the whole world?

A. Kozin:

The recipe for the whole world is the same – to give young people a chance.

A. Troitsky:

I see. It's interesting that my Russian colleagues – both Anastasia and Alexey – are, to all appearances, pinning very great hopes on the state, i.e. there is no hope. The uncontrolled capitalism in our music industry has, of course, played a fairly awful role, turning the good-quality, inspired music that we had in Russia in, say, the 80s into the scorched earth of the noughties. Consequently, the hope emerges that people with good taste and plenty of money will just appear, not weighed down with financial problems, and will help good musicians, will set up art councils of good radio stations, will throw money at centres of non-commercial progressive art, and so on. Personally I have no hope of that ever happening. I don't think anything will come of it – this recipe is all very fine and fair, but extremely unrealistic.

Moreover, the point is, it seems to me, that the current situation in this “digital nirvana” is such that recording and distributing music is actually very simple. The albums that are now being sold in huge numbers and churned out in millions, are

being recorded by kids at home in their bedrooms, not even in the garage. All these studios – Abbey Road and so on – are all very well, but that's now museum history. Let Mashina Vremeni record there for big money, but it's not at all necessary for new music. I think it's all much simpler. I think the initiative has to come from the musicians themselves, from the artists. The 'kind uncles' from the state won't help them. On the contrary, I think they will squeeze them out if they don't like, say, the content of a song, as has already happened more than once. We have to take all the power in music into our own hands.

That is my recipe, in spite of all the existing traditional institutions. If good helpers appear, if, say, all the record labels are transformed, mutate so that they go from being machines for exploiting artists, making money, and marketing, to being transparent and very altruistic organizations for which income is just a by-product, and, most importantly, if they provide this service to the listeners, the millions and billions of music-lovers, then the money, I'm sure, will come in by itself. It will be natural, the money will come in by natural means. The most important thing is that the service really is good, transparent and friendly, then everything will be fine. So all the initiative must come from the artists. That's my 100% conviction.

Tim still hasn't given his opinion.

T. Renner:

I totally agree. It's up to the musicians, which is the good and the bad news. It's good news because the musicians don't have to be political. They don't have to think about money in the first run, and they suddenly have got all the tools in hand to change.

I am totally with you. It is dangerous to ask for the politicians to help on this one because if you are saying that good music is about revolution, about being rebellious, you are then asking the system to support something that is taking on the system, which is difficult for both sides. Being supported as somebody who is

doing revolution by the one I am revolting against is tricky and also vice versa. So that's why normally it doesn't work.

I think it's up to the musicians. The musician has to play all the games cleverly. I'm not that afraid to balance the cosmic force as Kevin is. To be honest, the Beatles were the very first band I knew who made a lot of movies playing themselves. They were really very transparent. Paul McCartney, even with Linda McCartney, he married a photographer and published very private pictures of them.

There is nobody sitting on the back of somebody Twittering when he or she is going to the loo as long as she is not successful. It totally depends on media smartness. And with the younger generation they could solve the problem that Artemy has, losing himself in the Internet jungle. And when I look at my kids, I don't think they lose themselves too often, as they tend to focus on what they are doing there, and pretty much find what they are looking for.

On the other hand, it depends on us parents to teach them some ideals, some clever ways, how to show your personality because they will express themselves on the Internet. And of course, this is also a part of the business of musicians today.

We should not allow, as record companies of the old type, and also as the audience, things to get so perverted with the transparency we have now – not thanks to the Internet, but thanks to music companies who supported TV shows like Britain's Got Talent and all that kind. That actually harmed music in a big way because there, I think the cosmic force, the cosmic spirit was hurt.

Just to add one thing to Peter, I totally agree. The big chance of the music industry is suddenly music not being dominated only by the Anglo-American market. That was, for a good reason in the past, the case when we were under pressure when you were in Germany, heading a company whose first performance was an Anglo-American act and then your own stuff came and then

this stuff on music companies so the Russians would understand now. And that is totally changing, thanks to the Internet.

And I totally agree with Peter that it is very important that you contribute to the world of pop music, your styles, and sometimes even your language. One of the successful Motor bands is Rammstein. You may know Rammstein.

And I cannot tell you how often my international colleagues told me that Rammstein had to play in English; but they did not. That they had to become more radio-soundable; but they did not. They still sounded like harsh Germans in the German language. And that was also what the world was waiting for.

A. Troitsky:

Yes, everybody probably remembers Rammstein. Peter?

P. Jenner:

Well, just a couple of things about language. First of all, when I was very young, two of the biggest acts in the U.K. were Charles Trenet and Charles Aznavour singing in French. And everybody thinks it's impossible in an English speaking country to have foreign language hits. They were very, very big artists. And Juliette Gréco and various solo artists in French in the 50s were very, very big.

The other thing, what was the other thing? I had one other thing that I wanted to say which has probably gone now. Oh, yes. It is always worth remembering that the most important business people in the music business in the 60s were some of the most awful crooks you have ever known. They were greedy, they made rotten deals. They ripped off the artists. But they had an instinct for what would sell and what the people wanted.

I mean, people like Atlantic Records and all those guys; Brian Epstein, Alan Klein and Angelo Goldman. Some of these guys were serious crooks and do not forget it, so it may well be that we need some really great crooks to discover some really good naïve talent and rip them off and then they can go sue them and go

off on their own, and become the Beatles of tomorrow. The Beatles were ripped off.

A. Troitsky:

Not necessarily. It could also all be done more cleanly.

Well, friends, thank you very much. To be honest, I can't actually see any of the organizers. At my lectures I'm used to giving the opportunity for questions. Do we still have time? I wanted to say that in my opinion our discussion has been, on the whole, very optimistic.

My own impression is that the state of the music business is not at all as gloomy as may have been supposed when discussing it with music professionals. To all appearances, this digital revolution, which has, of course, created an absolutely new situation in music, has, in a sense, taken us back to prehistoric times, or at least to the 19th century, when the only contact people had with music was direct contact, i.e. at concerts.

We now have the same direct contact with music, only now not in a countess's salon or a town hall square, but through the Internet; but again, without intermediaries, but directly. This is an excellent and very honest situation, and we mustn't let it deteriorate but must help it in management and technological terms. I think that would be a good situation, and the "new Beatles" not far away. What I mean is that everything interesting in music is happening not in music itself, but around music. As soon as this digital storm blows over, I think the musicians themselves will be able to start developing this new field that has been formed. I'm told we have time for a couple of questions. We're at your service. Are there any questions?

T. Hamarin:

Hello, my name is Timo Hamarin and I have a question for Kevin and Alexei. There are some big Internet sites in Russia like Vkontakte where we can search,

upload, stream, and share music. And you might not always have the licenses from the rights holders.

So, while the users of those sites might be grateful, it is not so nice for the record companies or the artists who are not able to rely on the corporate parties that you have mentioned. So, what do your companies think about these kind of services?

K. Lawrie:

Alexei, would you like to start?

A. Kozin:

Thank you very much for the question. It's actually very topical. In the discussion about whether or not music should cost money there is no common position either among copyright holders or among listeners. In Russia it's very hard to make people pay for something. And my position regarding whether uploads should cost money and how this should be defined is as follows: it seems to me that there ought to be a situation where all possible models can be controlled, on one hand, by the copyright holders, so that they have the right to decide whether to sell the content or provide it for free access, and, on the other hand, where the creator can be involved directly in this decision.

A. Troitsky:

Thank you.

A. Kuryokhina:

There was an experiment when you could not only buy music on the Internet, but also simply download it. If you wanted, you could pay. If you didn't want, you didn't pay. In my opinion, this is perfectly right from a moral standpoint: the users make their choice as to whether the music is worth money or not. And some money comes in. I know this from personal experience. And whereas in Russia a

greater number of people pay, but not much, in America, for instance, fewer people pay, but they pay five or six times as much. Such mechanisms are also morally very correct, or so it seems to me.

A. Troitsky:

Thank you.

From the audience:

I have a question. A lot has been said today about the changing music industry, but what has happened to personalities in music? Have they grown smaller? After all, music is a product of personalities, and it somehow seems that, whereas before there were outstanding ones such as Mick Jagger or Paul McCartney, there are now no personalities of that stature in music. How would you comment on that? Am I right or not? Do you think the people who are creating modern music are as interesting as those who were creating classic music twenty, thirty, forty years ago?

A. Troitsky:

My opinion is – the view that there used to be giants and now there are people of medium height – is an optical illusion. I think that today's artists, including young artists, are also very talented, and the scale of their personalities is also quite impressive. The problem here is rather that the role of music at that time was monumental. And even as regards Jim Morrison, whom Kevin mentioned, we now, perhaps, realize that he was actually an average poet, a bad actor, and so on. But in the late 60s he was a god, as he was created by the mystique of that time. I think the same applies to the Beatles, the Rolling Stones and others. I don't want to belittle them at all. I just want to say that musicians have not become any worse since then.

K. Lawrie:

I would also refer to what Tim mentioned earlier, which is the anger and the angst and the conflict that kids need to have with the generation of their parents. And I think that has always driven music in a way. The Beatles actually began in my view as a pretty banal boy band, one that was created probably by, you know, an attempt to tap in to the mass media.

I mean the song "I Wanna Hold Your Hand" cannot be considered, I think, as mind-bending lyrics by any stretch. And I think that what they wanted to do was to make a living, to get a break, be able to eat, and get by. And as they evolved, they were probably getting ripped off as Peter mentioned and the like.

But they evolved into this rebellious voice of their generation. And then, they began to get power and they used that power to raise their middle finger to their parents and to that generation, and that is what they chose to do. And I think that is why they evolved over that period and had that level of success, so that is extremely, I think, important to get that depth and to go back to that.

There is a little girl, again going back to Tim's point. Her name is Zaz. She is French, a very small, tiny little girl. She sings in French and she became a massive star in Germany just last year and has sold almost 200 thousand units, old-fashion physical units and is now breaking through here in Russia. She is a small diminutive girl who used to sing on the street in Marseilles. And if you listen to her, you might think of Edith Piaf and people might make those comparisons.

But she is raising her middle finger to the TV format. She is saying there are more important things than "hold my hand". There are women walking the streets who should not be walking the streets. If you listen to the lyrical content of that music, it speaks to that emotion and it should give you goose bumps and it should bring a tear to your eye.

And I think that is what she is speaking to and that is why for the French and the Germans, and perhaps some Russians, she will have something to say. I sincerely hope that the next Beatles come from this wonderful country of 140

million creative and emotionally charged Russians. It can and should happen, absolutely.

In Russian, in English, in French or whatever other language they choose to perform in.

A. Troitsky:

Oleg Rummyantsev.

O. Rummyantsev:

Firstly, I'd like to thank you, Artemy, and all the members of the panel for an absolutely brilliant round table discussion. It's a fresh stream at this Forum, and God grant that this stream should become wider. Secondly, I'd like to refer to music: we are talking about pop and rock music not as part of state procurement and not as part of the product of our uncontrolled capitalism, from which nothing good can be expected, but as part of civil culture.

At one time, when you and I in the 80s were part of this culture, political nonconformists, civil initiatives and musical initiatives coincided with Pyotr Mamonov, the Leningrad Rock Club and Kuryokhin. The result was a change in the system. Today I enjoy listening to your broadcasts and those of Kolya Arutyunov and Boris Grebenshchikov on the radio. But all this is simply lost against the background of this absolutely overwhelming pop muzak, which is leading to barbarity. There is a process of social interdependence turning into biological interdependence. Into a mad consumer society. And my question follows on from that: what can music do as a part of a citizen's culture in the struggle against this barbarity, what can it do to ensure that peoples' feelings come to the fore? 'You may not be a poet, but you are obliged to be a citizen'.

You said that the music on the Internet was good, and people vote for it. Today I saw an opinion poll published by RBK: 'Who would you vote for as President?' 20% of the Internet community voted for Navalny, the other candidates were way

behind. These matters are connected, as you can see. So my question is, of course, mainly to the two revolutionaries: to you and Tim Renner, whose brilliant speeches I agree with. What do you think can be done so that music as a part of civil culture leads to a revival of a civil spirit?

A. Troitsky:

Thank you. For those who don't know, Oleg Rummyantsev is one of the three authors of the constitution by which our country now lives. In my opinion, musicians, in principle, are not obliged to be anything. They should not be politicised, but they should also not be apolitical. They should just be themselves. They should be honest and sincere, talented in their statements, in their music, in their lyrics. I don't think any more should be required from artists, musicians. They are not politicians, they are not executives, but as citizens they undoubtedly have the right to adopt any civil position. The only advice I would give musicians is that they should not be afraid of anything. Unfortunately, in our country all cultural figures – musicians, actors and directors – are too economically dependent on the state, on corporations, on state procurement, on financing, on theatre refurbishment, etc., etc. They are very dependent. So nearly all of them, with fairly rare exceptions, tug their forelocks and indulge in permanent self-censorship, "so that we don't get onto some black list". I think this is the main problem. They shouldn't be afraid of this. They have to be honest, and I think the state is not actually that dreadful. And if they really do put you on a black list, there will subsequently be a huge number of white lists that will welcome you with open arms. And much nicer people.

T. Renner:

I think what musicians have to do is to not think about money. They are already pretty much confronted with people who only think about money.

When you talk about the old times, the St. Petersburg rock scene in the 70s, whoever was a rock club owner or somebody who did a concert definitely did not do it in the 70s for the money. It was a person who had a mission that had something to do with music. The same even applies to the "crooks" in the West mentioned by Peter. They, of course, were also doing it for the money, but they had a big, big passion for music and that was what was driving them.

When I was working at Universal, one of my bosses was a former car retailer and the other one was from an advertising agency. They were not too much into music; they were into business optimization. And I often had to deal with artists, where I was enlightened when I was listening to a demo and suddenly you were in the studio and listening to the final track and you were saying, "Hey, wait a minute, where's the great guitar solo that was in there?" And they were happily looking at you saying, "We took it out because otherwise it won't be played on the radio."

So a lot of artists already put their own art down because they want to compromise with the system. And pop music is not about compromising with the system. Pop music is about fighting the system. Please understand that.

P. Jenner:

I think if young people are angry or they want to change things or they feel that they need to express themselves, it will come through in the music. And if you're lucky, the music will be a great expression of that. I think that there will also always be musicians who just want to play music and have to make a living and do whatever they have to do to make a living.

But social movements are what drive the great changes in music. I mean, people were talking about the Beatles coming from an era which was a post-war era. The Floyd came out of a psychedelic era. And all these things. The punks came out of an angry era. And I think that's what will happen.

Now there's a lot going on here and I think, at some point, from some part of Russia, they will come from something which is probably pretty angry and pretty pissed off with what is not happening for them. And that will probably be some really great music. And they will probably get given a really hard time. But the people will probably, possibly, hopefully rally to them. But maybe that's too optimistic.

A. Troitsky:

Spasibo. Thank you very much. Well, I think we have had a wonderful session. It is all thanks to you. And I would also like to thank the interpreters because, well, of course the kinds of things we have been talking about, it is not as boring and formal and repetitive as the other stuff at the Forum. Spasibo.