

# Pandora's Bottle: Cultural Content in a Digital World

Andrew Taylor, Director  
Bolz Center for Arts Administration  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
School of Business  
975 University Avenue  
Madison, WI 53706  
(608) 263-4161  
<http://www.bolzcenter.org/>  
[ataylor@bus.wisc.edu](mailto:ataylor@bus.wisc.edu)

Chapter from *The Arts in a New Millennium: Research and the Arts Sector*  
Greenwood Press, scheduled for publication in May 2003

Current version in electronic format:  
<http://www.bolzcenter.org/taylor/>  
April 7, 2003

---

## COPYRIGHT NOTICE:

This work is licensed under a "some rights reserved" Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivs-NonCommercial License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd-nc/1.0> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 559 Nathan Abbott Way, Stanford, California 94305, USA.

## Key License Terms:

- **Attribution.** The licensor permits others to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work. In return, licensees must give the original author credit.
- **Noncommercial.** The licensor permits others to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work. In return, licensees may not use the work for commercial purposes -- unless they get the licensor's permission.
- **No Derivative Works.** The licensor permits others to copy, distribute, display and perform only unaltered copies of the work -- not derivative works based on it.

## **Pandora's Bottle: Cultural Content in a Digital World**

by Andrew Taylor, Director, Bolz Center for Arts Administration

“Something there is that doesn't love a wall, That wants it down...”  
–Robert Frost

For the past several centuries, formalized culture has been built upon the concept of containment. While the drives of creation, composition, inspiration, and insight have always been the source of cultural content, it has been the ‘containers’ that convey these drives that we recognize as art. The live theater performance, the printed novel, the sculpture, the painted canvas, the dance, the audio recording are all such containers – the actions and artifacts that carry the creative impulse into the physical world. The venues where these artifacts and actions exist – theaters, arts centers, museums, community centers, festivals – are also containers, providing the context for cultural experience.

If there is a central impact of digital communications and computer technology on traditional arts and culture, it is this: digital information technology doesn't love a wall, it wants it down. The containers we have used to define and distribute cultural content are becoming soft and permeable. For good or ill, that changes everything.

In his insightful 1994 article for *Wired* magazine, John Perry Barlow outlined the implications of this truth for patent and copyright law:

Thus, the rights of invention and authorship adhered to activities in the physical world. One didn't get paid for ideas, but for the ability to deliver them into reality. For all practical purposes, the value was in the conveyance and not in the thought conveyed. In other words, the bottle was protected, not the wine.<sup>1</sup>

Barlow goes on to suggest that the framework is being stretched to the limit.

This vessel, the accumulated canon of copyright and patent law, was developed to convey forms and methods of expression entirely different from the vaporous cargo it is now being asked to carry. It is leaking as much from within as from without.<sup>2</sup>

While copyright remains a core issue for arts and culture, this new truth of digital information has broad implications outside the legal arena, as well. All other controls secured by the containment of cultural product – on a canvas, in a concert hall, on a compact disc – are suddenly challenged. Creative control by the author or artist, the carefully crafted stewardship of great works by arts organizations, the context of a cultural work torn from its intended means of conveyance, the cultural integrity of ritual or celebratory expression, and the financial transactions such as event tickets, retail book sales, organization- or discipline-specific philanthropy, etc.), are all issues that lose their foothold in the information age.

Of course, these same challenges also provide outstanding opportunities to dissolve the less constructive barriers around arts and culture. Barriers of access – whether geographic, economic, physical, or educational – can be greatly reduced through digital information exchange. Works of art formerly available only to visitors of the Louvre are now available to the entire connected world (at least, digitized representations of the art are available, but more on this later). Educational materials supporting cultural understanding are available on-line to anyone, breaking the limits of physical document distribution.

Access barriers to the artists themselves have also begun to dissolve. What once was a connection twice or thrice removed between creator, commissioner, presenter, and audience is now often short-circuited, as in the direct e-mail interaction between middle school students and professional composers in Vermont’s public school Millennium Project.<sup>3</sup>

Access barriers to artists distributing their work have also become much lower. The intense filtering process of the American music industry, for example, involving a gauntlet of record producers, artist representatives, record company executives, marketing directors, and broadcast and retail distributors, can now be completely bypassed by posting a high-quality digital recording directly to any of a number of public web sites.

Information technology is also bridging the barriers to creative collaboration between artists, revitalizing traditional art forms and creating entirely new ones. The Gertrude Stein Repertory Theatre, for example, is blending theatrical art forms such as Chinese opera and modern theater with cutting-edge information technology through its “UBU” project. The project was not only developed through long-distance collaborations, but also performed live by an international cast in the United States, Japan, and Russia.<sup>4</sup>

Further, the combination of communications technology and cultural content can be a powerful tool in bridging the ‘digital divide’ between society’s technology ‘haves’ and ‘have nots,’ as evidenced in a recent on-line forum of the Benton Foundation.<sup>5</sup>

To be sure, the evaporation of traditional barriers to cultural experience brings a wealth of positive opportunities. But on the cusp of this rapidly opening world view, it is essential for arts creators, presenters, curators, researchers, and archivists to understand both what is gained and what is lost in the transition.

## **Barriers Lost: An Overview**

The idea that digital and electronic communications technologies dissolve barriers on many levels has become a common assertion. However, the roots of that power are well worth exploring. In his study of the effect of communications technology on social structure, Ithiel de Sola Pool

outlined five aspects of electronic communications that are likely to change society as much as the printing press did five centuries ago:

1. Distance is ceasing to be a barrier to communication. As a result, the spatial organization of human activity will profoundly change.
2. Speech, text, and pictures are being represented and sent by the same kind of electrical impulses, a common digital stream. Separation of these modes is diminishing.
3. In this “information society,” a greatly expanded proportion of all work as well as leisure is being spent on communication. Information handling is a growing portion of all human activity.
4. Computing and communication are becoming one, which is to say that communicating and reasoning are being reunited. With messages converted into electronic bits, they may be not only electronically transmitted but also manipulated by logical devices and transformed.
5. The mass media revolution is being reversed; instead of identical messages being disseminated to millions of people, electronic technology permits the adaptation of electronic messages to the specialized or unique needs of individuals.<sup>6</sup>

For the purposes of this discussion, items one and two in de Sola Pool’s list strike closest to the issue. First, electronic communications technology eliminates the impact of distance on interaction – ten yards or ten thousand miles make no difference in the cost or quality of electronic data transfer. And, second, the emergence of a single format for the transfer of information (speech, text, still images, moving images) has created a new container that consolidates the fractured storage and distribution mechanisms of the past. As John Perry Barlow states:

With the advent of digitization, it is now possible to replace all previous information storage forms with one metabottle: complex and highly liquid patterns of ones and zeros.<sup>7</sup>

These two points impact our traditional conceptions of arts and culture in many ways. Most importantly, as the opening paragraph of this chapter suggests, they challenge the traditional ‘containers’ of cultural content.

## **Containment and Control**

“At a time like ours, in which mechanical skill has attained unsuspected perfection, the most famous works may be heard as easily as one may drink a glass of beer, and it only costs ten centimes, like the automatic weighing machines. Should we not fear this domestication of sound, this magic that anyone can bring from a disk at his will? Will it not bring to waste the mysterious force of an art which one might have thought indestructible?”  
–Claude Debussy, 1913<sup>8</sup>

We can view cultural content as being contained in two primary ways: contained within a physical space and time, and contained by its means of conveyance. Put more simply, to experience art and culture you traditionally ‘had to be there’ (in the theater, at the museum, in the jazz club), and you often needed people or decoding devices to bring the experience into being (the orchestra translating and interpreting musical notation into sound, the actors invoking the playwright’s script,

the dancers enacting the choreographer's instructions, the printing press manufacturing the bound novel, the compact disc player converting a digital bitstream into analog sound waves). Visual art and physical artifacts are notable exceptions to the need for decoders or mediators, but the need to 'be there' is arguably stronger.

Over the past century, audio recordings, high-volume color printing technology, broadcast radio, and television have provided alternatives (not direct replacements) to 'being there'. But fidelity and immediacy limited their impact on live attendance. In addition, most of these new technologies (except for print) added another decoding scheme to the mix. To hear a phonograph, you needed a phonograph player (78 rpm or 45 rpm or 33 rpm, etc.). To listen to broadcast radio, you needed a different device, or at least a device that contained a radio receiver component. While these reproductions shattered the time and space limitations of cultural content, they replaced that loss with new containers of physical product and information encoding.

Because each advancement in reproduction technology usually carried the requirement of a new and often incompatible decoding device, some level of content and access control was still feasible and, more importantly, still profitable. Phonographs, cassettes, compact discs, video cassettes, printed posters, and books were all fixed, physical products that could be counted and sold. Radio broadcasts of copyrighted materials, because centralized to licensed broadcast stations, could be regulated and charged for use of creative content (not with perfection, to be sure, but with some estimate of actual use). While these technologies were the first baby steps into the electronic age, they still fit fairly neatly into copyright law since they were physical manifestations of creative content. They were the bottle, not the wine.

But as Debussy's quote above shows, even these first steps challenged the traditional containers of cultural production. The quote suggests that, from Debussy's perspective, recordings of live performances disconnected the music from its intended context of time and place, cheapening it both literally (10 centimes) and philosophically (bringing to waste the mysterious force). Quality of reproduction was not a key issue in 1913. The separation of content and context, the breach of the intended container, were perceived as the true enemies of the art.

While recording and distribution technology were taking their first steps, advances in transportation technology and growth in personal income reduced the cost and effort barriers to actually 'being there'. But again, the container of the physical space allowed for careful control of content and context, as well as the means for a financial transaction. Arts consultant Steven Wolff often refers to the collection of live arts, entertainment, cultural, and sports activities as 'gated events,' recognizing the importance of the gate to the process and product of cultural consumption.<sup>9</sup>

In a world of high-bandwidth, high-fidelity digital information exchange, however, the traditional gates of physical walls, fixed time, physical distance, and multiple decoding technologies become locked doors in an open field. Imagine Debussy's reaction to a digital-quality, disconnected orchestral phrase used as a freely downloaded start-up sound to a desktop computer.

### **MP3, Napster, and the Freedom of Ideas**

"That ideas should freely spread from one to another over the globe, for the moral and mutual instruction of man, and improvement of his condition, seems to have been peculiarly and benevolently designed by nature, when she made them, like fire, expansible over all space, without lessening their density at any point, and like the air in which we breathe, move, and have our physical being, incapable of confinement or exclusive appropriation. Inventions then cannot, in nature, be a subject of property."

–Thomas Jefferson<sup>10</sup>

"Before Napster came about, people thought MP3s in themselves were a problem... But Napster, it's the most insidious application that I've ever seen."

–Marc Geiger, Chairman and CEO, ArtistDirect<sup>11</sup>

Minor breaches of the containers of cultural product have occurred throughout recent history, most notably in the piracy of audio and video recordings. But the world caught its first real glimpse of a containerless environment in late 1999 and early 2000. The litigation storm surrounding Napster and the audio file format MP3 could become known as the first salvo in this war about walls.

MP3 (or more specifically, ISO-MPEG Audio Layer-3) is a protocol for compressing digital audio content to reduce its file size while maintaining its fidelity. The MP3 format strikes a favorable balance between high audio quality and small file size, enabling a new class of audio devices, and a growing trend in storing libraries of audio content on personal computers.

Napster, a software program available for free on the Internet beginning in 1999, allowed anyone to share MP3 files with any other Napster user worldwide. If a user ran the program and transferred a favorite compact disc onto his or her computer hard drive, any other Napster user could then search for and access those sound files from anywhere in the world.

To use our earlier terms, MP3 was part of the 'metabottle' that can contain all previous storage formats (in this case, circumventing the compact disc), and Napster was the shared community space where distance is irrelevant.

When the combination is used to share materials with the copyright owner's consent, the system achieves the noble and open-community ideals of Jefferson's quote above. When unauthorized copyrighted materials find their way onto the system (which they did immediately), copyright holders became concerned.

In December 1999, only months after Napster's first public tests, the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA) filed suit against the program's developer for contributory copyright infringement.<sup>12</sup> By January 2000, major universities were banning the program from their networks since active use by students was clogging digital traffic.<sup>13</sup> By May 2000, under legal pressure from the rock band Metallica, Napster banned more than 317,000 users accused of trafficking Metallica's copyrighted music.<sup>14</sup> Since the company, by law, cannot attach personal information to its members' usernames, most of those banned could have quickly signed on again as new members.

Napster defended its software saying that it simply provided a means for a community to share with each other. No music files sat on the company's computers, nor did they pass through the company's network when transferring from one user to another. (Music files were stored and retrieved from the individual user's personal computer. Napster simply provided the index.)

Furthermore, since Napster dissolved political boundaries, as well, it was unclear which country has jurisdiction to prosecute which software users. For example, if a user in Sweden downloaded a copyrighted music file from a user in Egypt, without ever passing data over U.S. soil, whose crime was it anyway?

As more and more acts and images of cultural creation find their way into digital format, and as the quality of reproduction becomes exponentially better, the issues raised by Napster for the music industry will arise for all content providers. The challenge itself will become exponentially greater as more sophisticated and less centralized file sharing programs become available.

In early 2000, for example, a 21-year-old employee of America Online developed a new version of the Napster concept, called Gnutella, that removed all centralized indexing or processing from the mix. As the *Washington Post* described it:

Both the beauty and danger of Gnutella are that it is a more sophisticated version of Napster.... Napster's developers have recently been hit with a flurry of copyright-infringement lawsuits. But unlike users of Napster, Gnutella aficionados can trade files without going through a storage center, making it impossible to shut down the system without unplugging every computer on the network and difficult to control by laws because there's no central authority.<sup>15</sup>

Compounding the issue is the fact that the owners of compact discs or other recorded media have rights, too. Under the doctrine of "fair use," there are legitimate and legal uses of copyrighted materials, including quotes in a book review, musical parody, and copies for personal, noncommercial use (a tape of a CD you own for use in your car, for example). The new wrinkle of digital technology is that the copy is just as good as the original. In fact, in many ways, it is the original.

## What About the Rest of Us?

"I think in a broader cultural sense, the creation of content has become more interesting than the content itself."

–Michael Hirschorn, co-founder, inside.com<sup>16</sup>

While Napster ultimately lost the battle and closed its doors, the case of MP3, Napster, and Gnutella has clear implications for the recorded music industry and other purveyors of “soft content” (computer software vendors, video distributors, filmmakers, authors, etc.). In fact, Gnutella makes no distinction about the format of files it exchanges – it could be an MP3 file or a software program or a movie or a high-resolution impressionist image. But how does the story relate back to the traditional containers of cultural content mentioned at the opening of this chapter – the live theater performance, the sculpture, the painted canvas, the dance? How, also, does it challenge the physical venues of cultural presentation?

Part of the answer is that more individuals experience cultural content through broadcast and recorded media than by attending live events. The *1997 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts* showed participation rates via these media for jazz, classical music, and opera were more than twice the rates for live events.<sup>17</sup> But these statistics were not limited to musical performances.

Viewing presentations about the visual arts such as programs on museum exhibitions on television or video was the most popular activity among American adults, with 45% reporting they had watched visual arts programs during the previous 12 months. Although dance and visual art were seen primarily via television, the other art forms attracted large numbers of listeners on radio and recordings.<sup>18</sup>

To the extent that audience contact with cultural content is already experienced through electronic media, all content providers face the same challenges as the recording industry, especially as the fidelity and clarity of digital reproduction improve.

Beyond that obvious fact, however, there are other direct implications for live attendance at cultural presentations, or physical attendance at visual art exhibitions. Most striking is the redefinition of what unique services cultural organizations provide to their audiences.

## Product Redefined

In the world of cultural containers, mere access to content was considered the service. To experience a musical performance, for example, you either had to be there, or you had to purchase the right to hear how it sounded. In a digital age, this access is available in increasing quality at diminishing or zero cost. The same could be said for visual art, as digital imaging technology and reproduction continue their astounding progress. Debussy’s concern about the “domestication of sound” is a thriving reality for many expressions of creative thought (which many would claim as a

positive revolution). As a result, many cultural organizations find themselves in search of a service not co-opted by electronic media.

Of course, there is a thousand-pound gorilla in this discussion that has been sidestepped until now: a digitized reproduction of a performance or a tangible cultural product *is not the same* as the product itself. It would be foolish to suggest that watching a theatrical production on a television or computer monitor, even at the highest resolution, would be the same as experiencing it in a theater as part of an audience.<sup>19</sup> Yet it would also be foolish to suggest that the reproduction does not capture essential elements of its source. A viewer of the digitized theater piece still hears the dialog, still sees the actors, still experiences the arc of the dramatic line. But the result is obviously a different experience than a live attendance. Therein lies the point.

The elements of live attendance that are missing from the media experience – immediacy, immersion, fresh invention, physicality, ritual, social interaction, etc. – suggest a refined or redefined mission for arts and culture providers. As high-quality content becomes a decreasing component of the perceived unique value, the *context* of the experience becomes a defining element of consumption. Arts presenters and curators, therefore, move from being straight *content providers* to *context providers*, managing not only the art form itself, but the environment and experience surrounding it.

Experience management is not a new concept for arts and culture providers. The Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis, for example, has a history of attention to environmental detail. From intensive training for ushers and front-of-house staff, to the trumpet fanfare announcing theater seating, to the synchronized closing of the theater's lobby doors at the beginning of a performance, the Guthrie clearly perceives its product as extending beyond the rise of the curtain.<sup>20</sup> More recently, the Minnesota Opera discovered through focus groups that audiences perceived the performance as only a component of their opera experience. Social activity, a night out, the sense of place in the hall and lobby, and even a sense of tradition were integral to the purchase decision, as well.<sup>21</sup>

Other organizations are more aggressively employing environment as a part of their artistic palette. London's Bubble Theatre Company, for example, is experimenting with "promenade performance" as a means to increase the intimacy between artist and audience. Using outdoor venues like parks, woods, and green spaces, Bubble Theatre presents performances where artists and audiences move through the environment. Early focus groups reinforced the impact of this integration. "...Audiences value the promenade experience, not only as a theatrical, but also as a communal experience," wrote Artistic Director Jonathan Petherbridge. "Focus groups talked enthusiastically and in detail about the audience, and the environment as part of the experience."<sup>22</sup>

The dynamics of the emerging “experience economy” only reinforce these implications. The growing category of experiential retail and restaurants (Nike Town, American Girl Place, Rain Forest Cafe) expose a trend in for-profit organizations to rethink the bundle of goods and services they provide consumers, and the environment in which they provide them.<sup>23</sup>

The authors of *The Experience Economy* suggest that “you are what you charge for,” implying that a true experience provider does not charge for products within an environment, but charges for the right to enter that environment.<sup>24</sup> Couple this suggestion with John Perry Barlow’s earlier quote about copyright law (“For all practical purposes, the value was in the conveyance and not in the thought conveyed”), and we may be closer to a redefined sense of place for arts and culture providers in the digital age.

In a world where traditionally contained cultural content becomes as fluid as thought, the broader conveyance of this content becomes the means to recapture value and creative control. In other words, the straight content of a performance or artifact may be the defining factor of a cultural arts attendance, but it is the broader experience surrounding that content that provides much of the unique value of the experience.

## **Conveyance and Access**

For artists and arts organizations, redefining the nature of cultural product can be an exercise filled with apprehension. If we aren’t in the business of art, what business are we in? If we seek to serve anything else, do we risk compromising or bringing to waste “the mysterious force of an art which one might have thought indestructible”?

Clearly, the process and product of artistic creation and achievement must remain the core values of any discussion. Without them, there is no distinction between art, culture, and commerce. However, without exploring the boundaries of that process and product, and the places at which individuals and groups connect to it, we would be ignoring the factors that help arts and culture thrive.

A 1998 study sponsored by the Heinz Endowments and the Pew Charitable Trusts sought to explore these issues, specifically focusing on “how members of the community related to the arts generally” and “how and whether they connected with it as a personal enterprise.”<sup>25</sup> Using a highly intensive, nonverbal, and image-based process (the Zaltman Metaphor Elicitation Technique, or ZMET), the study explored the mental images and relationships individuals associated with cultural activity. Among other things, the study developed four “thematic metaphors,” or underlying themes, that were common among participants.

#### The Arts as Transporter

Participants in the study viewed the arts as a way of acutely experiencing time and space – as the report puts it, “living in the moment and stepping away from daily reality.”

#### The Arts as Redeemer

Participants in the study described the arts as providing a means of recapturing – however temporarily – a lost or unrealized potential, such as to be a singer, an artist or an actor. “The arts are, in large part, about retrieving lost, buried, untapped desires and impulses and indulging them in safe, bounded places for temporary amounts of time.”

#### The Arts as Appropriator

Through this theme, participants described the ability of the arts to strip away layers of socialization and thus to carry them back to a more “pure” and “innocent” stage of development, namely childhood, when it was easier to shift from reality to fantasy. “Ironically,” the report finds, “while the arts seem to speak to the child within, they also help [participants] evolve themselves toward some higher state of being: becoming more mature, more confident.”

#### The Arts as Intermediary

Participants in the study viewed the arts as aggrandizing them by giving them the ability to see the world and themselves somewhat differently – they valued its power as a lens to give them a new perspective. They also appreciated how the arts “humanize and personalize the complexities of the world by putting a face on abstract issues.”<sup>26</sup>

Clearly, many of these thematic metaphors derive from the experience of cultural content, rather than solely from the content itself. Also, the results suggest that ticket buyers are purchasing more than merely the access rights to a performance or exhibition. Finally, these thematic metaphors allow a different perspective on the “product” of arts and cultural organizations, and suggest how they can differentiate content experienced via information media, and content experienced in person.

This chapter suggests two framing statements to help explore further the function and boundaries of arts and cultural organizations in an increasingly digital world:

1. The product of arts and cultural organizations is not cultural content in itself, but the conveyance of cultural content.
2. The transactions supporting that product take place at the myriad gates of access (physical and otherwise) created in the process.

The distinction in the first statement may seem overly semantic, but it seeks to define a fundamental difference. “Cultural content” is what’s on stage in the theater, what’s on the wall of the gallery, what’s encoded onto a compact disc – the traditional containers we have come to call art. “Conveyance” encompasses that content, but also the environment and medium in which it is experienced.

The second statement seeks to clarify the point-of-sale for any transactions supporting the process, from ticket sales to volunteer labor to discounted staff salaries to corporate, foundation,

and individual contributions. While the true value of cultural content remains within the actions and artifacts, the transaction value is captured at “the gate.” Tickets and memberships provide entry to the venue. Donations provide higher levels of access (early purchase, better seats, contact with the artists, perceived social status, thematic social events). Corporate sponsorships provide access to association with an organization’s brand identity, as well as direct access to a target audience. Even the purely philanthropic donors gain access to a sense of connection to a vision or mission resonant with their own beliefs.

In the information age, as earlier sections of this chapter suggest, an increasing proportion of these “gates” of transaction will be virtual rather than physical. Managers of arts and cultural organizations will increasingly focus on context as part of their strategic activity – not just tacking on events and frills to cultural attendance, but finding ways to magnify and inform the cultural experience. To balance the books, managers may also become more strategic in identifying points of access to their product, and assessing the perceived value of each gate they find.

This activity will no doubt raise a wealth of aesthetic and ethical issues regarding the privacy of the creative artists and the sanctity of the creative process (for example, what level of donor access to an artist begins to violate privacy and personal space?). However, in the digital age, identifying, defining, and leveraging these boundaries may become the new role of arts managers, whether they realize it or not.

## **Research Needs and Future Streams**

Given the scope of technology’s impact on arts and culture, this chapter intentionally narrows the range of discussion. There is a host of related issues demanding extensive research and analysis. Equity of access to technology – for artists, for under-served or rural communities, for schools, libraries, and cultural organizations – is a growing stream of study spearheaded by organizations such as the Benton Foundation and the Digital Divide project of the United States Government. Equity of understanding and ability is a parallel track, often forgotten, suggesting that not just tools are necessary, but the informed ability to use those tools. Preservation is an on-going area of essential study on many fronts, including the preservation of recorded media archives, the capture of arts and culture of the present, and the reinforcement of our collective cultural memory in a rapidly advancing information age. The role of public or community space in an on-line world is yet another road to follow.

For the purposes of this chapter, it seems clear that the nature of cultural experience could be much more clearly articulated through research. The elements that define cultural consumption through all media – video, text, computer, live interaction, etc. – must be teased apart (respectfully,

of course) through audience study, motivation analysis, and other means. More cognitive approaches, such as the ZMET system, may be required to balance the traditional research methods. A fascinating extension of this study could branch from earlier work by John Peters, Gabriel Tarde, Elihu Katz, Daniel Dayan, and Eric Rothenbuhler<sup>27</sup>, that explored the “public event” qualities captured through the separate but simultaneous experiences of live broadcasts (such as the televised Olympic Games). Currently, we can make fairly broad and unsupported guesses about how live cultural experience differs from mediated experience in the mind of the viewer. These assumptions must be tested, refined, and revisited in the face of digital communications technology.

It also appears reasonable to suggest that as the walls of cultural containment fall away, so too fall the walls of cultural categorization. The universe of artifacts and actions we have traditionally bundled as “arts and culture” has already expanded beyond the borders of “high art” and “popular culture” to include ritual, consumerism, informal creative expression, and other forms left off the list. Efforts to view the full spectrum of arts and cultural activity will grow in importance as this trend continues.

Ultimately, we must also come to realize that research has traditionally been based on containment, as well. To study something, we must define its limits and measure it over time. In the digital age, as this chapter suggests, limits become increasingly amorphous, and time is becoming a volatile random variable. The challenge, then, becomes not just continually rethinking the findings of past research, but rethinking the research process itself.

## ENDNOTES

---

- <sup>1</sup> Barlow, John Perry, "The Economy of Ideas: A framework for rethinking patents and copyrights in the Digital Age," *Wired* (March 1994): 85.
- <sup>2</sup> Barlow, 85
- <sup>3</sup> Druker, Donald, "E-Culture" (panel discussion hosted by the Center for Arts and Culture, Washington, DC, April 11, 2000).
- <sup>4</sup> For more information on the Gertrude Stein Repertory Theatre, visit <http://www.gertstein.org/>.
- <sup>5</sup> Le Blanc, Jamal and Victoria Bernal, "The Role of the Arts in Bridging the Digital Divide," Benton Foundation (April 28, 2000), available on web site <http://www.benton.org/>.
- <sup>6</sup> Pool, Ithiel de Sola, *Technologies without Boundaries: On Telecommunications in a Global Age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990, 8.
- <sup>7</sup> Barlow, 86
- <sup>8</sup> Debussy, Claude, *La Revue S.I.M.*, 1993, quoted in Kurzweil, Raymond, *The Age of Intelligent Machines*, Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1990, 351.
- <sup>9</sup> Wolff, Steven A., AMS Planning & Research Corp. (conversations with author).
- <sup>10</sup> quoted in Barlow, 85.
- <sup>11</sup> "Cross Talk," *Inter@ctive Week* (24 April 2000): 110
- <sup>12</sup> "RIAA Sues Napster, Claiming 'Music Piracy,'" SonicNet.com (7 December 1999), available on web site <http://www.sonicnet.com/>.
- <sup>13</sup> Guernsey, Lisa, "MP3-Trading Service Can Clog Networks on College Campuses," *The New York Times*, (20 January 2000), accessed on web site <http://www.nytimes.com/>.
- <sup>14</sup> Hammersley, Ben, "Out to Destroy Copyright Killers," *The Times*, London (15 May 2000).
- <sup>15</sup> Cha, Ariana Eunjung, "E-Power to the People," *Washington Post* (18 May 2000).
- <sup>16</sup> Rakoff, David, "The Way We Live Now: 4-16-00: Questions for Michael Hirschorn and Kurt Andersen," *New York Times Magazine* (16 April 2000): 14.
- <sup>17</sup> National Endowment for the Arts, "Research Division Note #70" (September 1998): 2.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid, 2.
- <sup>19</sup> For more on this part of the discussion, see Taylor, E. Andrew, "Rethinking the Performing Arts for the Media Age," *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 25, no. 3 (Fall 1995): 206-224.
- <sup>20</sup> Northington, Glyn, Marketing Director, Minnesota Opera (former staff of Guthrie Theatre), interview, July 20, 2000.
- <sup>21</sup> Northington interview
- <sup>22</sup> Petherbridge, Jonathan, "Escape from the Black Box," *artsbusiness*, April 24, 2000, 5-6.
- <sup>23</sup> For a more detailed exploration of the experience economy and its impact on arts and culture, see Taylor, Andrew, "The Experience Brokers: The New Role for Arts Administrators in the Information Age,"

---

*Looking Ahead: A collection of papers from the International Social Theory, Politics & the Arts Conference*, ed. Cecelia Fitzgibbon, Philadelphia, PA: Drexel University Press, 1999, 66-71.

<sup>24</sup> Pine II, B. Joseph and James H. Gilmore, "Welcome to the Experience Economy," *Harvard Business Review* 76, No. 4 (July-August 1998): 99.

<sup>25</sup> Heinz Endowments, "Bringing the Arts to Life," Pittsburgh, PA, 1999, 3.

<sup>26</sup> Heinz Endowments, 9, summarizing Zaltman, Gerald, "Thoughts and Feelings about the Arts," Harvard Business School, 1998.

<sup>27</sup> For an overview of the issues, see Rothenbuhler, Eric W., "Live Broadcasting, Media Events, Telecommunication, and Social Form," *Information, Communication and Social Structure*, ed. David R. Maines and Carl Couch, Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1988, 231-243.