



Dear participants of the ICCPR2024 in Warsaw,

I would like to say in advance that what Kiwon and I will say does not necessarily reflect the general opinion of the SC. Both are personal views and they are supposed to be.

Thank you very much to you all that shaped this ICCPR2024. Whatever we could criticize in detail, the fact that this community here came together and discussed urgent matters of cultural policy research is a big success. If it is in the presentations, roundtables and panels, or – sometimes even more important – between the sessions in different constellations. We should very much appreciate the fact that this is possible *again* and that this is *still* possible. This year's conference showed more than any conference before that there might be also other threats to independent cultural policy research and this kind of gatherings than a pandemic did.

And that is what I appreciated very much: that we had the chance in the last four days to hear more about Eastern European perspectives on cultural policy. Especially the Polish research approaches and conclusions were very much represented, but also from other places. And here I want to thank you the organizers for the general panels on War Cultural Policy in Ukraine and Crisis of Democracy and Artistic Freedom of Expression (involving Hungary, Slovakia and Poland cases), but also on Artists in Exile with the Belarussian perspective. It was the big chance to have these experts here with us as we are so close – not only geographically. And if I had a wish it would be only that we had more of that.

Our first task as researchers is to reflect on phenomena in the field of cultural policy – I would say we reached this goal in this conference. We covered somehow all around 30 sub-themes that were published with the call for papers. Some more, some less, but it was a show of the great diversity of cultural policy research. We had around 150 paper presentations and 25 panels/roundtables. We also talked in some sessions about the question if cultural policy (research) is unique. While I agree that it is not, I still see that we are here a very interdisciplinary community. That defines cultural policy research since the beginning. In this sense we are at least special. And how enriching is it to have the possibility to compare between different countries, local environments, and frameworks!

In connection to this: my general feelings about these days are very positive. In terms of what happened between the people that are here. However, we also have to acknowledge that not the whole international community of cultural policy research is here and could take part in this great opportunity of exchange and comparison, but also for future collaboration. It was not by accident that the first keynote topic was on decolonialisation. It is a reflection of today's discourses. And the composition of the participants here shows how much work we



still have to do to come not only to processes of *decolonialisation*, but to *decolonial* approaches in our research, in the way we produce knowledge, also how we share knowledge, that is the foremost aim of such an international conference. The papers and discussions showed that there is a growing understanding – that is what I have observed the last days – that we need broader concepts for common grounds and to understand the complexity of these broader concepts (e.g. decolonial) and integrate them into our work. This is one of the main tasks of research: to analyse complex terms and concepts, but also the processes that result from this. So why not go on with this task when it comes to our own work and action. And what if not such a conference is a place to reflect that – together.

It starts with the fact that I listen to the papers that are presented to me – and that I present my research in a way that people can understand it and connect to it. At first it is that basic. And I have to say that the paper sessions I participated in were mostly reaching this aim very well. I am really happy about the quality of the papers already in the reviewing phase, but also how the common discussions were fruitful and enriching. And yes, that might be different if you listened to other sessions that I did, but that is what I experienced in this conference. But! It does not stop at this point. It continues with the fact that we actively invite different research approaches.

This is also a kind of self-critique, because we could not manage yet to shape the conference in a way that it is standard that all regions of the world are gathering. I understand my role as a member of the SC as a representative of the community. And that I cannot only argue from my personal perspective. At least I can say that I representing a non-University research institute (EDUCULT in Vienna) am very thankful to be part of this community. We are not part of the global system of knowledge production. And there are more that are not, because this system is not inclusive. So, I take it also as a task into the SC to develop this conference further in this regard. With my deepest belief that this is an egoistic move as it will be fruitful for all of us.

I would like to end this short reflection with a great thank you to Prof. Przystek and team for the marvellous organisation. I – and I think here I can speak for a greater group of people – at least for all I have talked to about this – we felt very welcomed. Marcin Poprawski, our Polish colleague in the SC, said to us in the pre-meeting that he expects Polish hospitality. I didn't know exactly what that would mean, but if that stereotype had to be verified – it worked. But besides the environment in which we meet – the place where we meet and with whom we meet is also crucial. So perhaps in four years after being in North America we won't go back to Europe but to another place that offers new perspectives and a broadening of all our horizons – as this is the deepest claim of research.

Thank you for listening to this one personal view.