

I. Introduction: Art Music, Identity, and Reflexive Globalization

1. Art Music in a Global Context

Simon Rattle's assessment that the future of "classical music" lies in China, made on the occasion of the Berlin Philharmonic's China tour in 2005 that Rattle conducted,¹ may be taken as a jumping-off-point for the re-examination of the now over one-hundred-year history of the reception of Western music in Japan, China, and Korea from new perspectives that can help answer obvious questions: how did this seemingly high esteem for European art music in East Asia come about? Against which historical, political, and social dynamics did this development take place? And can it really be assumed after critical examination that, in fifty or one hundred years, East Asian artists will dominate "classical music" globally?

Of course, the unquestioning reference to the concept of "classical music" already makes one suspicious: "The categories of autonomously oriented art have no applicability to the contemporary reception of music; not even for that of serious music, domesticated under the barbarous name of classical so as to enable one to turn away from it again in comfort."² It is probably not wholly unnecessary to point out the ongoing relevance of this statement from 1938 by Theodor W. Adorno. The trend to use the music industry label "Classical Music" as a seemingly neutral technical term in several recent music-sociological publications correlates with an unwillingness to allow for multifaceted interpretations of musical works, or to grant them the potential of provoking independent meaning.³ The codification of a canon of European and North American symphonic, opera, vocal, chamber, and solo repertoire (roughly from Bach to Mahler) is thus accepted without reservation, along with the exclusion of large parts of twentieth-century

¹ Rattle expressed this at a press conference in China as part of the tour. See Spahn, "Der lange Marsch zu Beethoven."

² Adorno, "On the Fetish-Character in Music and the Regression of Listening," 289. ("Die Kategorien der autonom intendierten Kunst sind für die gegenwärtige Rezeption von Musik außer Geltung: weithin auch für die der ernsten, die man unter dem barbarischen Namen des Klassischen umgänglich gemacht hat, um sich ihr weiter bequem entziehen zu können." Adorno, "Über den Fetischcharakter in der Musik," 15.)

³ See especially the review of the book Jungmann, *Sozialgeschichte der klassischen Musik*, in Zehentreiter, "Anatomie des Bildungsbürgertums." Michael Custodis gives a comprehensive history of the concept and its definitions. Yet, he also uses it over broad passages in a way that is (too) little differentiated. In particular, it is not sufficiently clarified that "classical music" has long been one of those "common buzzwords" that are based on "market strategies of the recorded music industry," which is how Custodis characterizes the term "crossover" (Custodis, *Klassische Musik heute*, 19). A nuanced discussion of the concept is presented in Kramer, *Why Classical Music Still Matters*.

art music.⁴ Even when more recent composers are considered for admission to this “Classical” canon, this inevitably happens within the relatively narrow framework of value criteria and listener expectations dominated by the canon. Music that deliberately challenges the conventions of such a canonized listening (or, in Helmut Lachenmann’s terminology, breaks away from the flow of habit-oriented “listening” [Zuhören] to an existential “hearing-in” [Hinhören])⁵ (→ IV.2) has no real place in this concept of musical future – even if such a fragility of listening may undoubtedly turn itself into an object of canonization, and thus be aesthetically tamed.

The discussion about the process of canonization for Classical-Romantic music and its effects on the present has indeed hardly been addressed at length by representatives and theorists of new music. Undoubtedly, there is also a tendency within new music discourse toward the canonization of certain composers or works arising from the desire to identify structures in the “new obscurity,” while at the same time – in all areas of contemporary music – we are confronted with an ever widening and intensifying fragmentation or diversification.⁶ If the deconstructive perspective of globalization is added to this complex situation, the implied problem of “canonicity” becomes particularly acute: Jim Samson aptly argues that “the authority of the canon as a measurement of quality in some absolute sense has proved increasingly difficult to sustain,” since “any notion of a single culture, of which the canon might be regarded as the finest expression, is no longer viable.”⁷ The sense of insecurity created by this situation has lately led to numerous attempts at re-canonicalization, including in the field of contemporary repertoires. Such attempts, however, are usually confined to Western protagonists. Consider, for example, the list of the “100 Classics of Modern Music” (100 Klassiker der modernen Musik) in which the editors of the German weekly *Die Zeit* did not rank a single Asian, African, or Latin American artist.⁸ Not only does the term “classical music” tend to exclude critical forms of new music, its use is usually implicitly ethnocentric and a priori prevents a substantial expansion and alteration of the repertoire through intercultural hybridization or elementary compositional interventions in tonal system, pitch structure, and musical syntax. That a concept of “classical music” or “classical style” also exists in other musical cultures is certainly not an ar-

4 On the genesis, theory, and critique of the Classical-Romantic musical canon, see, among others, Pietschmann and Wald-Fuhrmann, *Der Kanon der Musik*, Bergeron and Bohlman, *Disciplining Music*, Weber, “The History of Musical Canon,” Dorschel, “Über Kanonisierung.”

5 “Hearing means, in contrast to co-enacting listening: to radically reorient oneself, to have to find new bearings; it means opening up hidden spaces within oneself in tackling unfamiliar structures.” (Lachenmann, “Accanto,” 169, “Hören heißt im Gegensatz zum mitvollziehenden Zuhören: sich radikal umorientieren, sich neu zurechtfinden müssen, heißt, im Erstasten ungewohnter Strukturen verborgene Räume in sich erschließen.”) See also Hamilton, *Aesthetics and Music*, 95–111.

6 Michael Custodis places this term at the center of his investigation (Custodis, *Klassische Musik heute*, 9–22).

7 Samson, “Canon [iii].”

8 This is stated laconically in episode 96 of the series: “95 musical classics have already been presented in this series but, as the series is coming to an end, no African (or Asian, New Zealand, Australian) recording has been included. Globalization has not yet led to a truly global view of the cultures of the world.” (Groß, “Aus dem Schrein.” “95 Musikklassiker wurden in dieser Rubrik bereits vorgestellt, die Serie geht auf ihr Ende zu, doch eine afrikanische [wahlweise auch: asiatische, neuseeländische, australische] Aufnahme war bislang nicht dabei. Die Globalisierung hat eben doch noch zu keinem wirklich globalen Blick auf die Kulturen der Welt geführt.”) Related examples abound, such as in Dietrich Schwanitz’s successful publication *Alles, was man wissen muß* (1999), which exclusively contains chapters on European history and art forms, or Dubal, *The Essential Canon of Classical Music* (2003), in which merely one Asian composer (Tōru Takemitsu) is featured. See Citron, *Gender and the Musical Canon* for an exclusion of female composers from the musical canon of Classical and Romantic music.

gument against the unambiguously ethnocentric idea of a “future of classical music in China.” There is no doubt here that the “classical” is considered exclusively European in the sense defined above. In addition, it would first be necessary to examine on a case-by-case basis whether designations such as “classical Indian music” or “classical Persian music” actually describe original concepts of canonization in the respective musical cultures or are, rather, premature transfers of (Western-oriented) research. Although there are certainly tendencies in the canonization of certain pieces of music or interpretive schools in virtually all art music traditions, they are usually associated with forms of cultural transmission that fundamentally differ from the Western process of canonization (in the Japanese context, for example, they can be described by the ambiguous binary *dentō/denshō*⁹).

Even more problematic in the context of Simon Rattle’s account of the future of “classical music” in China or Asia is the implied thesis that – if more is meant than just a new consumer market – future Asian performers will cultivate and maintain the core repertoire in more or less the same way as Western performers have in the past 200 years. Indeed, among contemporary Asian performers of (Western) art music, significant deviations from established paradigms of interpretation seem extremely rare. There are exceptions of course, such as Yūji Takahashi’s second recording of the Bach “Goldberg Variations” (2004). While the pianist here applies his decades-long compositional and practical experience with the performance practice of Japanese instruments (→ IV.4) to create an exceptionally free and flexible rhythmic representation of Bach’s work, such a recording is given little attention at the international level and is certainly too unspectacular on the surface to survive on the “Classical market.”¹⁰ The global concert audience, both in the West and in Asia, is usually fed by far more harmless varieties of a vaguely assumed “Asian identity,” such as those featuring star pianist Lang Lang – adorned with the stereotype of virtuoso dexterity – in a duo with his father, who played the Chinese two-stringed fiddle *erhu*, as an encore in his solo recitals.¹¹ From a compositional perspective, the Chinese-American composer Tan Dun hits the bull’s eye of this new pseudo-traditional Asian future music when, in his piano concerto for Lang Lang (with the additional title *The Fire*, 2008), he vaguely references the archaic Chinese philosophy of the five elements (*wu xing*). The composer makes use of simplified Chinese folk tunes cast in the style of Liszt’s *Liebesträume* and Bartók-esque motoric passages as central elements of the composition. In this way, he consciously accepts the association of these features with exotic clichés of Asian sensuality

9 See Ackermann, “Japan,” 110. Both terms vaguely signify what is meant by the term “tradition” in Western languages; while *dentō* implies the concepts of heritage, continuation, and handing-down, *denshō* additionally connotes the acts of receiving and inheriting traditions. As Ackermann explains, the terms can also be associated with a strong tendency in Japan’s traditional culture to preserve (musical) traditions down to the tiniest details in small groups of specialists, which, however, can also imply adapting them to changing circumstances or necessities.

10 Avex AVCL-25026, 2004. Like Glenn Gould, Takahashi has recorded the work twice, for the first time in 1976 (newly edited as Denon COCQ-84162, 2006). The aforementioned “Asian” characteristics are much more radical in the second recording than in the first, and are a document of a decades-long examination of the body, instrumental practice, hearing, and sound aesthetics in an intercultural context. See, among others, Takahashi, “Bach as a Failure,” and Takahashi, “Two Statements on Music.” Takahashi also criticized both of Gould’s recordings as “an auto-repressive stoicism of North American intellectuals before the Vietnam War” and as “a projection of the Eastern American Puritanism” on Bach’s music (review, *On-Stage Shinbun*, 27/01/1995, translated by Junichi Miyazawa, http://glenngould.org/f_minor/msg01925.html).

11 See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fyJemf8hwkU>. This is a duo adaption of Huang Haihuai’s (1935–1967) virtuoso *erhu* solo *saima* (Horse Race, 1964). On the development of the *erhu* solo repertoire, see Stock “Contemporary Recital Solos for the Chinese Two-Stringed Fiddle *erhu*.”

or primitiveness. Otherwise, however, the Western genre type of the virtuoso solo concerto is not questioned for one second.

In this book, by considering this contemporary background and interpreting historical developments at the intersection between Asia and the West, I will address the question of what an alternative future of global art music might look like if less blatantly dominated by economic constraints. I consciously replace the concept of “classical music” with that of “art music.” In using this term, it must first be asked whether this implies a (too) strong tendency to exclusion, particularly toward forms of popular music. Indeed, it is often said that the future of “classical music” must open up more to contemporary popular music, and popular culture more generally.¹² Linked to this is an adoption of new forms of presentation and dissemination, allegedly pragmatically embodied in the YouTube Symphony Orchestra (for which Tan Dun composed a five-minute “Eroica” Symphony from Beethoven quotations).¹³ Even if one rejects too close a rapprochement of the “Classical” to popular culture, or believes that such an approach is already more than sufficiently well-established in many places (Beethoven’s construction as a star of popular culture is as old as the Beethoven myth itself¹⁴), the question of which concept of art one uses in the formulation “art music” is by no means trivial. For the time being, it may perhaps be stated that a basic conception of “music as an art form” does not *a priori* make a cultural confinement to a specific concept of art (such as the European one), nor does it necessarily require certain types of transmission (such as written notation) or presentation (such as the “concert”). The first two chapters of this book interrogate these issues (→ I.3, II.1).

So, what could an art music of the future look like in which Asian (or other non-Western) performers and composers are not merely vicarious agents of an unquestionable European art and music concept? Where they are not consumers of a museum-like “Classical” market, but where – from diverse perspectives (theories, concepts, or ways of making music as an art form) – traces of a *reflexive* globalization (more on this concept below) can be recognized? Countless composers from Asia, Oceania, the Arabic world, Africa, Latin America, but also North America and Europe have been seeking answers to such questions for more than a hundred years, though each has faced radically different sociopolitical conditions that have had a lasting effect on the answers.

¹² This demand is based on the 2009 study by the TNS Emnid Institute commissioned by the Bertelsmann Foundation: “Asked what needs to change so that more people are interested in classical music, nearly three-quarters of people respond that they want lower ticket prices for concerts and opera performances (72 %), closely followed by a wish for more events that combine classical and pop (71 %).” (“Danach gefragt, was sich ändern müsse, damit sich mehr Menschen für klassische Musik interessierten, antworten nahezu drei Viertel der Menschen, sie halten niedrige Eintrittspreise für Konzert- und Opernabende für wünschenswert (72 Prozent), dicht gefolgt (mit 71 Prozent) von mehr Veranstaltungsangeboten, die Klassik und Pop verbinden.” <https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/de/presse/pressemitteilungen/pressemitteilung/pid/klassik-und-oper-sind-unverzichtbar>)

¹³ <http://www.youtube.com/user/symphony>. The debut of the orchestra, which was put together through a selection process via video broadcasts, took place on 15 April 2009 at Carnegie Hall. Tan Dun’s *Internet Symphony Eroica* (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w47vsNIsg7Q>) was the first composition for this project and served as one of the two compulsory pieces in the selection process. The symphony was recorded in advance on 6 October 2008 by the London Symphony Orchestra conducted by the composer on video and released on 20 November 2008 on YouTube (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tqiro1kdRlw>). Thousands of video submissions to the orchestra were later made into a “mash-up” version of the symphony (“The Internet Symphony’ Global Mash Up,” <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oC4FAyg64O1>).

¹⁴ For an overview, see the articles “Mythos Beethoven,” “Popmusik,” and “Rezeption und Wirkung,” in Loesch and Raab, *Beethoven-Lexikon*.