II. Toward an Entangled History of Twentieth-Century Music in a Global Context

1. Preliminaries of an Intercultural Music Historiography

The methodological reflections in the first chapter result in two understandings: first, the necessity of recognizing the aesthetic, cultural, local, and individual particularity of specific artistic positions. Second, the need to develop categories for comparing forms of music that come about under different sociocultural and culture-historical conditions without smoothing over their differences or presupposing any speculative claims of "shared roots" – but also with the aim of moving beyond a mere statement of multiplicity. In the light of recent (and not so recent) developments in music research, it is a given that this cannot take the form of an "either/or" of aesthetics or history, of work history or social history, or of analytical or socioethnological methodology.[1] Admittedly, as heated discussions of the work concept[2] or historiographical methodology[3] have shown, many of these polarities are still alive and well. For example, we still debate how music historiography, despite all postmodern objections, can continue to be conceived of as a "grand narrative" following "mainstreams,"[4] or whether we should rather allow competing descriptions to exist alongside one another and increasingly seek out alternative sites, foregrounding once-neglected areas through a "micrology" of *pétit récits*.[5] Naturally such

1 See the polemic in Taruskin, "Introduction: The History of What?," XXVII–XXVIII against the polarities established in Dahlhaus, *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte*. This is discussed in Christensen, "Dahlhaus in Amerika," 135–136.

2 See Strohm, "Looking Back at Ourselves: The Problem with the Musical Work-Concept" and Goehr, "'On the Problems of Dating' or 'Looking Backward and Forward with Strohm,'" referring back to Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*.

3 See Taruskin, "Speed Bumps," Cook, "Alternative Realities." See also Janz, "Musikhistoriographie und Moderne" and Danielczyk et al., *Konstruktivität von Musikgeschichtsschreibung*.

4 "*CH20* degenerates before our eyes into a Babel of squabbling mainstreams, all clamoring for supremacy. That well exemplifies a salient feature of twentieth-century musical life, to be sure; but what a *history* of twentieth-century music ought to attempt is a realistic contextualization of it, and an explanation." (Taruskin, "Speed Bumps," 205.) "[…] the trouble is the way in which, as the difference between 'streams' and 'mainstreams' illustrates, that kind of approach tends to prioritize the historian's interpretation at the expense of communicating the experiences of historical subjects." (Cook, "Alternative Realities," 207.)

5 See Lyotard, *La condition postmoderne*, 107. "[…] it will be evident to all readers that this book devotes as much attention to a congeries of 'petits récits' – individual accounts of this and that – as it does to the epic sketched in the foregoing paragraphs. But the overarching trajectory of musical literacy is nevertheless part of all the stories, and a particularly revealing one." (Taruskin, "Introduction: The History of What?," XXIII.) See also Kogler, "Von der großen Erzählung zur Mikrologie?"

supposedly antagonistic positions need not remain mutually exclusive. A specifically intercultural historiography, however, would have to investigate the existing tensions between such opposing positions intensively. Especially when – as would seem almost indispensable for the actual repertoire and when reflecting on material, perceptual, and performative turns in musical scholarship – music breaks with the criterion of scripturality, or an exclusive orientation toward the *text* paradigm. It is clear that such a history can ultimately only be described, as Jürgen Osterhammel has done in his recent history of the nineteenth century,[6] as a "polylogue of different narratives, themes and theories" through a "consistent decentering of perspective […] no longer from Europe as the center, but from an ensemble of different centers."[7] Music historiography has, at best, only taken tentative steps in this direction.[8]

First of all, then, the analyses presented here presuppose a basic comparability of musical works from different cultural and historical contexts, though this by no means suggests a purely functionalist notion of structure (in the sense that "all music" is ultimately no more than a structured, and hence analyzable, organization of sounds). Rather, attempting to act with methodological rationality demands that we seek to avoid the pitfalls of both a rigorous culturalist relativism (that would rule out any possibility of comparability) and an emphatic, covertly ethnocentric universalism (that would view all individual phenomena as manifestations of a single reference concept).[9] Furthermore, it seems no less self-evident that one should assume a continued interplay of immanent and contextual factors in the production of musical "meaning" through composition, notation, interpretation and reception, and increasingly understand how these areas correlate and interweave. When combining individual "voices" in the complex of what "music" can mean in an interculturally expanded domain, however, we must be content to dispense with evolutionary or teleological models. Inevitably, we must respect discontinuity as a basic principle present even in the smallest cells of the individual articulations being examined: a fundamental "polyphony."

At the least, dispensing with the "grand narratives" must be a precondition when they refer to the orthodoxy of "techno-essentialism,"[10] a naïve concept of progress that reduces music-historical dynamics to an increase in structural complexity or gives absolute precedence to the structural paradigm as a whole:

> This orthodoxy, offering a headline story around which a range of more conservative or simply different traditions can be clustered, not only construes history as a quasi-evolutionary process

6 Osterhammel, *Die Verwandlung der Welt*.

7 Janz, "Musikhistoriographie und Moderne," 313–314 ("konsequente Dezentrierung der Perspektive […] nicht mehr vom Zentrum Europa, sondern von einem Ensemble unterschiedlicher Zentren aus erzählt").

8 See Gertich and Greve, "Neue Musik im postkolonialen Zeitalter," Utz, *Neue Musik und Interkulturalität*, Danuser, *Musikalische Lyrik*, vol. 2: *Vom 19. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart – außereuropäische Perspektiven*, Cook and Pople, *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*.

9 Such a method is in many respects akin to Michael Tenzer's approach to an "analysis and theory of musics of the world," though I do not share Tenzer's optimism that we are indeed heading toward a "world music theory" (Tenzer, "Introduction: Analysis, Categorization, and Theory of Musics of the World," 32–35). What I share is Tenzer's insight that "comparison across any boundary requires reconsidering basic assumptions so that clear descriptive language can emerge and lead not only to new categories of learning, but beyond them to new experiences and construals of music" (Tenzer, "Temporal Transformations in Cross-Cultural Perspective," 517). The universalistic project of a "Global Music Theory" in which, among others, scale systems are introduced as "qualified musical universals" (Hijleh, *Towards a Global Music Theory*, 9) must surely evoke considerable doubts.

10 See Williams, "Of Canons and Context."

> but also locates that process in compositional technique: it is the same kind of approach that you might use in writing the history of, say, the internal combustion engine […].[11]

Nicholas Cook's and Anthony Pople's attempt to oppose this orthodoxy through the broad focus of the *Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*, however, proves problematic in some respects. While it seems fair that the chapter on serial music does not take up more space than that on the "moderate mainstream 1945–75," one of many things that remains unclear is why there is a chapter on art music in Africa, but none on art music in Asia or Latin America. In a strangely timid gesture, the explanation provided for this takes back the de-restriction aimed for directly beforehand:

> The rationale, in short, is that non-Western musics fall within the book's scope to the extent that they can be seen as integral to the historical development of Western music, "our" music. That can't to any great extent be said of Beijing opera between the wars, but it becomes more generally the case as the century progresses, with globalization replacing a pattern of sporadic encounters by one of sustained interaction. Indeed there is a sense in which, by the time you get to the end of the century, it is in principle impossible to justify leaving *any* music, anywhere, out of the book. […] "Western" music, clearly located around 1900 in the urban centers of Europe and North America, has become a global currency in the same way as the hamburger, and one sometimes has the impression that the "art" tradition flourishes more in East Asia, Israel, and parts of South America than in its former heartlands. It is not so much that there has been a relocation from the center to the periphery as that the distinction between center and periphery has become increasingly fuzzy […]. And so it is appropriate that the accumulating emphasis, as the book proceeds, on increasingly globalized and hybridized popular musics leads […] to a kind of reverse discourse: issues of musical modernism and autonomy, increasingly sidelined in the First World, ironically take on a new cultural significance when relocated to the Third.[12]

However instructive the insight may be that the discourses of Western music have to change in a globalized context and take on new qualities, I find that the seemingly helpless, albeit ironically understated, retention of the focus on "'our' music" is rather questionable. Björn Heile is therefore right in his criticism that "the consequences of the global and globalized nature of new music haven't been fully thought through or conceptualized. […] behind the ostensible cosmopolitanism of the new music scene, the old thinking in terms of 'self' and 'other,' 'center' and 'periphery' seems to go on unabated."[13] Admittedly, Cook himself did not stop at this unsatisfactory perspective; since 2002, he has worked continuously on a concept of "relational musicology,"[14] referring, among other things, to an approach outlined by Regula Burckhardt Qureshi,[15] a concept further pursued by Georgina Born.[16] Cook bases this perspective not only on an integration of music analysis, music historiography, and ethnomusicology, but also on a fundamentally *relational* understanding of musical "meaning":

---

11 Cook and Pople, "Introduction: Trajectories of Twentieth-Century Music," 4.

12 Ibid., 8–9.

13 Heile, "*Weltmusik* and the Globalization of New Music," 101–102.

14 See Cook's essays "'One Size Fits All'?," "We Are All (Ethno)musicologists Now," "Intercultural Analysis as Relational Musicology," and "Anatomy of the Encounter."

15 Qureshi, "Other Musicologies."

16 Born, "For a Relational Musicology."

> I think of meaning as something that emerges through the interaction between different texts or practices (between works and performances, between different media), and that is accordingly negotiated at the point of reception. In other words meaning is not intrinsic but arises from relationships, and that's why I speak of relational musicology.[17]

Models of Music Historiography and the Critique of Universal History

From the age of colonialism and historicism onward, a persistent dichotomy was established between the *history* ascribed to Western music, and how Asian, African or Latin American musical cultures have only been credited with musical *traditions* but no music-historical continuity. Such a dichotomy exists not least because scripturality has usually only played a secondary part in those cultures: in traditional music historiography, a basic model of continuity closely relates to scripturality. This view, stemming from the theories of history developed by Friedrich Schlegel and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel in the early nineteenth century, and the accompanying selectionist value judgments, have retained their influence to this day. In Taruskin's compendium, explicitly termed a history of *Western* music, the criterion of scripturality becomes the decisive key to an overarching narrative:

> it is the basic claim of this multivolumed narrative – its number-one postulate – that the literate tradition of Western music is coherent at least insofar as it has a completed shape. Its beginnings are known and explicable, and its end is now foreseeable (and also explicable). And just as the early chapters are dominated by the interplay of literate and preliterate modes of thinking and transmission (and the middle chapters try to cite enough examples to keep the interplay of literate and nonliterate alive in the reader's consciousness), so the concluding chapters are dominated by the interplay of literate and postliterate modes, which have been discernable at least since the middle of the twentieth century, and which sent the literate tradition (in the form of a backlash) into its culminating phase.[18]

In Taruskin's case, this delimitation of pre- and postliterate epochal boundaries has an undertone of cultural pessimism that foregrounds the prevalence of cursory, fragmented listening in the media age. His attitude connects with Jerrold Levinson's phenomenological theory of merely stringing together isolated events while listening to music – *concatenationism*.[19] In addition, Taruskin defends the restriction to the Western world (Europe and North America) with a clearly contestable argument: "The sheer abundance and the generic heterogeneity of the music so disseminated in 'the West' is a truly distinguishing feature – perhaps the West's signal musical distinction. It is deserving of critical study."[20] But this unique "abundance of the most varied styles and expressive forms"[21] in Western music, often celebrated even by "critical" voices, hardly stands up to objections from postcolonial theory or ethnomusicology, and could surely be claimed for traditions such as Indian or Korean art music with equal justification.

17 Cook, "Intercultural Analysis as Relational Musicology."

18 Taruskin, "Introduction: The History of What?," XXIII.

19 Taruskin, *Music in the Late Twentieth Century*, 510–514. See Levinson, *Music in the Moment*.

20 Taruskin, "Introduction: The History of What?," XXIII.

21 Helmut Lachenmann in Spahn, "Gegen die Vormacht der Oberflächlichkeit" ("Keine [andere Musiktradition außer der europäischen] hat sich so rasant fortentwickelt und einen solchen Reichtum an unterschiedlichsten Stilen und Ausdrucksformen hervorgebracht.")

Alternative approaches to music historiography have repeatedly been outlined, but rarely put into practice. A teleological principle of progress was already questioned in rudimentary manner during the 1920s, for example in the model of metamorphosis and fluctuation in Paul Bekker's *Musikgeschichte als Geschichte der musikalischen Formwandlungen* (Music History as the History of Changes in Musical Form, 1926),[22] in the cyclical model of Alfred Lorenz's *Abendländische Musikgeschichte im Rhythmus der Generationen* (Occidental Music History in the Rhythm of Generations, 1928),[23] and in sociohistorical approaches first pursued systematically since the 1920s.[24] To be sure, every one of these studies was limited to European music[25] and, in Lorenz's case, was even shaped by a deep cultural pessimism of a decaying "occidental" (or more specifically German) culture threatened by non-European cultural "forces" as outlined in proto-fascist writings such as Oswald Spengler's *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (The Decline of the West, 1918/22, first translated into English in 1926), of which the second volume in its subtitle claimed to provide "Perspectives of World History."[26]

While it is still the prevailing view that "everything presented as a line of development is simply an abstraction from progressions and regressions," and that "development has many threads and moves in several directions simultaneously,"[27] there is hardly a music-historical overview that has truly drawn out the necessary conclusions from this insight. A systematic discussion of methods would have to draw on something like Dahlhaus's "problem history of composition" against the backdrop of a combination of compositional history, history of ideas, and social history,[28] as well as its critique or refinement in the context of New Musicology.[29] Such a discussion would have to reflect especially on developments in other disciplines, for example the idea of an intercultural history of philosophy.[30] Ultimately, the models of "multiple modernities" and "entangled history," explored further below in this chapter, pursue the aim of weaving together at least some of these requirements.

First, however, steps toward an engagement with the tradition of universal-historical and culturally comparative research approaches will be sketched in contrast to two well-known studies, Walter Wiora's *Die vier Weltalter der Musik* (The Four Ages of Music, 1961) and John Blacking's *How Musical Is Man?* (1973). Despite Wiora's efforts to distance himself from Eurocentrism,

22 See Bekker, *Musikgeschichte als Geschichte der musikalischen Formwandlungen*, 5–15.

23 See Lorenz, *Abendländische Musikgeschichte im Rhythmus der Generationen*.

24 See Potter, *Most German of the Arts*.

25 Very few exceptions such as Jacques Handschin's essay "Réflexions dangereuses sur le renouveau de la musique ancienne" [Dangerous Reflections on the Revival of Early Music] (1938) were labeling non-European (here: Japanese) music consistently as "exotic," crediting it with a lack of immediacy. Handschin though questions the universal validity claim of music historiography based on these reflections. See Maier, *Jacques Handschins "Toncharakter"*, 50–59.

26 See Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*. Lorenz later became an enthusiastic supporter of the Nazi regime; see among others Kinderman, "Das Institut für Musikwissenschaft in der NS-Zeit."

27 Rienäcker and Rösing, "Epochendefinition und Geschichtsschreibung," 411 ("[…] alles, was als Entwicklungslinie dargestellt wird, [ist] nichts anderes als Abstraktion von Progressionen und Regressionen"; "Entwicklung ist […] vielsträngig und geht gleichzeitig in verschiedene Richtungen […].")

28 Dahlhaus, *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte*, 182–187, Dahlhaus, "Zur Problemgeschichte des Komponierens."

29 See Treitler, *Music and the Historical Imagination*, Tomlinson, *Music in Renaissance Magic*, Cook and Pople, *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*, and Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music*.

30 See for example Wimmer, *Interkulturelle Philosophie*, 89–117 and Kimmerle, *Interkulturelle Philosophie zur Einführung*.

his outline stands in the tradition of colonialist universal-historical concepts. He presupposes a "natural" foundation of music that he only believes to have been fully developed in "occidental music," and whose "naturalness" – as opposed to power-political factors, for example – is the chief cause for the global dissemination of Western musical forms:

> It was easy for occidental music to be appropriated by tribal cultures and basic classes of the Orient because its folk forms offered very simple, striking and therefore convincing shapes. One such simple shape is the straight eight-bar tune in a major key with a constant alternation between the tonic and dominant. This was encountered in all cultures by structures of varying kinship, and was thus easily assimilated, for example in national anthems. The "second primitivity" of rhythmically straight song types is in keeping with the original primitivity. The typical structure of marches or popular songs has a "striking" effect.[31]

In 1939, in a review of the volume *Zur Tonalität des deutschen Volksliedes* (On the Tonality of the German Folk Song), edited by Guido Waldmann and published in 1938 by the Nazi organization Reich Youth Leadership (Reichsjugendführung), Wiora had listed basic aims of folk music research, including calls to reconstruct what he considered a natural development of folk music toward tonality and emphasizing the ability of German folk song to assimilate foreign influences.[32] It is not difficult to recognize, then, how a blatantly nationalist and xenophobic emphasis can be reworked, without any changes to the substance of the argumentation, as a universal-historical concept. That concept, then, attempts to prove with great enthusiasm the special status of Western music in purely technical, seemingly non-ideological terms.

One could say that Blacking's study starts from a diametrically opposed position, namely the thesis that "all music is structurally, as well as functionally, folk music."[33] Hence his study attempts to examine all forms of music from a culture-sociological position through analyses "that explain how a musical system is part of other systems of relationships within a culture."[34] From this perspective one can understand Blacking's critique of world-historical approaches, especially when they have an evolutionist focus: "Musical styles cannot be heard as stages in the evolution of music, as judged in terms of one particular civilization's concepts of music."[35] Blacking calls for a precise examination of the sociocultural situation from which music emerges, the "cultural agreement"[36] through which alone it can communicate meaning, and the "sonic order"[37] that, as a music-specific principle of organization, enables this communication. Blacking's approach flattens out the differences between cultures as he tries to apply the same basic

31 Wiora, *Die vier Weltalter der Musik*, 146 ("Musik des Abendlandes konnte in Stammeskulturen und Grundschichten des Orients darum leicht angeeignet werden, weil sie in ihren volkstümlichen Formen überaus einfache, prägnante und darum einleuchtende Gestalten darbot. Eine solche einfache Gestalt ist der glatte Acht-Takter in Dur mit ständigem Wechsel von Tonika und Dominante. Er traf bei allen Völkern auf mehr oder weniger verwandte Strukturen und konnte sich leicht einbürgern, so in Nationalhymnen. Die 'zweite Primitivität' rhythmisch glatter Liedtypen kommt der ursprünglichen Primitivität entgegen. Die durchschnittliche Struktur von Märschen oder Schlagern hat 'schlagende' Wirkung.").

32 Wiora, "Die Tonarten im deutschen Volkslied." See also Potter, *Most German of the Arts*.

33 Blacking, *How Musical is Man?*, xi.

34 Ibid., 25.

35 Ibid., 56.

36 Ibid., 9–10.

37 Ibid., 11.

socioanalytical approach to all kinds of music – a goal that he barely achieves when, in contrast to structuralist analyses of the music of the South African Venda, in discussing works by Benjamin Britten or Gustav Mahler, he follows his own subjective feelings and strongly emphasizes that he has not drawn on any analyses by other authors.[38]

Blacking's approach has nonetheless been continued intensively in Anglo-American research in particular, one example of which is Stephen Blum's notable article "Composition" in *The New Grove*.[39] Blum defines composition primarily by the postulate of self-identity (music that remains identifiably the same in different performances can be termed "composition") and begins his account paradigmatically with examples of African and Latin American ritual music whose self-identity – as in many genres of European music – lies primarily in core models that can be augmented in a given performance with varyingly extensive variations. Indeed, as the following section shows, opening up the notion of composition is a preliminary when intercultural contexts of music history are approached, as narrow conceptualizations of this term would leave major gaps in the repertoire to be discussed in such a history. This implies that scripturality can by no means be the sole criterion to delineate what music should be included in an intercultural music history, but also that distinguishing between the connection to written and non-written components of the compositional process can assist in laying out the criteria for comparison sought here. What must also be found is a convincing combination of textual and contextual analysis that unifies hermeneutical, structural, music-aesthetic, and sociohistorical factors in order to grasp the fabric-like, network-like basic structures woven between compositional act, composer, society, politics, and historical "encyclopedia."

Opening Up the Notion of Composition

The sociohistorical preconditions for artistic, and hence compositional, acts in the globalized context are undoubtedly closely linked to the problems accompanying the global dominance of the Western musical *discourse* (in the Foucauldian sense). So when one speaks of "new *composed* music," for example (or also "*composed* new music"), it is certainly worth questioning first of all how culturally-conditioned these concepts, or the historical processes to which they refer, in fact are.

If we direct our attention toward "new composed music" in East Asia, for example, we are confronted with a common two-phase model. The phase *before* the intensive encounter with Western culture through imperialism and colonialism since the nineteenth century essentially featured nothing analogous to the Western concept of "musical composition," which consequently appears as a "special path" of the West. *After* this confrontation with the West, however, the concept of composition experienced a gradual reception and assimilation in East Asia. The spectrum of this assimilation meanwhile extends from the imitation or flawless mastery of Western styles or compositional tendencies toward the rupturing of the cultural-aesthetic foundations underlying the concept of "composition." Leaving aside the problematic postcolonial perspective that presents music-historical movements as solely dependent on Western influence, this also denigrates (traditional) forms of composition in East Asia without further discussion by denying them the dignity of being considered "composition." Thus, in the article "Komposition" (1996) from the encyclopedia *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, non-Western contexts are consistently ignored, implying that their forms of musical creativity do not meet

38 Ibid., 60.

39 See Blum, "Composition."

the standard laid out, namely producing a "construct with artistic ambition (which is thus characterized by a particular quality of forms, expressive capacity, depth of meaning etc.)."[40]

In opposition to this rather dualistic view of Western composed music and non-Western traditionally (predominantly aurally and orally) transmitted music, I would like to propose a more complex model. My model will not dispute the cultural autonomy and largely independent historical development of both forms of musical creativity before the nineteenth century while adopting a less essentialist position. For now, let us continue to assess the concept of "musical composition" in the Western context.[41] No matter which point of time or period one chooses as the time of its birth – 1025, 1474, or 1537[42] – the criteria that justify "viewing composition as specific to the European cultural tradition"[43] and hence placing it in opposition to musical creativity in other cultures are far from self-evident.[44] Certainly there was a new development between the Notre Dame period and the Franco-Flemish school toward the separation and autonomy of the fixed text in relation to various practices of improvisation and extemporized performance, leading to the introduction of a functional and exact music notation. Together with a new hierarchy led by the creative *poeticus musicus*,[45] this situation laid the foundation for a new form of musical autonomy, reaching a first peak in the compositional procedures of the late fourteenth-century *ars subtilior*. These properties of musical composition remained crucial in Western music up to the twentieth century, in a complexity that only became possible through scripturality. The "New Complexity" associated with Brian Ferneyhough, for example, is only conceivable as the radicalized autonomy of written formulation in relation to musical practice, which it certainly enriches creatively at the same time, but without being limited by the possibilities of any established *res facta* (which may freely signify here both the means of standard notational practice as well as limitations of traditional musical perfor-

40 Sachs et al., "Komposition" ("ein Gebilde mit Kunstanspruch [das sich somit durch besondere Gestaltqualität, Ausdrucksfähigkeit, Sinntiefe u. ä. ausweist]").

41 See Cahn, "Zur Vorgeschichte des 'Opus perfectum et absolutum,'" Kaden, *Des Lebens wilder Kreis*, 64–103, Loesch, *Der Werkbegriff in der protestantischen Musiktheorie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, Strohm, "Opus: An Aspect of the Early History of the Musical Work-Concept," Strohm, "Der musikalische Werkbegriff: Dahlhaus und die Nachwelt," Flotzinger, "Glossen zum frühen abendländischen 'Kompositions'-Begriff," and Bandur, "Composition/Komposition," Sachs et al., "Komposition," Blum, "Composition," Möller, "Komposition."

42 One might understand this concept to have arisen in the early appearance of the term "componere" in Guido of Arezzo's *Micrologus de musica* (Chapter 15, 1025), indicating a significant paradigm shift toward a "reflective, thoroughly considered form of musical invention." (Kaden, *Des Lebens wilder Kreis*, 69; "reflektierte[], mehrfach überdachte[] Form musikalischen Erfindens.") Equally one might view the term *res facta* of Johannes Tinctoris (*Terminorum Musicae Diffinitorium*, 1472–74) or the definition of the *opus perfectum et absolutum* (and the *opus consumatum et effectum*) in Chapter I of Nikolaus Listenius's *Musica* (1537), that is to say, the German *musica poetica* of the Reformation, as a decisive step toward the establishment of the concept in Western music history.

43 Kaden, *Des Lebens wilder Kreis*, 65 ("Komposition als ein Spezifikum europäischer Kulturtradition zu erachten").

44 See Blum, "Composition."

45 See Cahn, "Zur Vorgeschichte des 'Opus perfectum et absolutum'" and the critical arguments in Loesch, *Der Werkbegriff in der protestantischen Musiktheorie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, rejected by Strohm, "Der musikalische Werkbegriff: Dahlhaus und die Nachwelt," 272: "Der Begriff des musikalischen *opus* […] war lange vor Listenius und der Wittenberger Schulreform im internationalen humanistischen Sprachgebrauch verbreitet und stellte bereits dieselben normativen Ansprüche wie derjenige des 19. Jahrhunderts, wenn er auch die Musikpraxis noch nicht in derselben Breite abdeckte wie in späteren Jahrhunderten." ("The concept of a musical *opus* […] was common long before Listenius and the Wittenberg educational reform in international humanistic usage and already placed the same normative demands as those of the nineteenth century, although it did not yet cover music practice to the same extent as in later centuries.")

mance). Yet Debussy's polemical comment, quoted in Chapter 1, that characterized Javanese gamelan music as "a counterpoint that makes Palestrina's seem like child's play"[46] shall remind us that complexity is by no means linearly dependent on scripturality. (This will be exemplified, among many other examples, by those African genres that served as György Ligeti's models in creating hyper-complex rhythmic-metrical structures in his later works, → V.2.)

Such practices as Ferneyhough's are undoubtedly deeply indebted to a specific feature in the Western conception of composition that emerged in the early phases of modernity around 1800: the "objectified spirit" of the musical work, in which the notated appears as a (culturally encoded) *text*.[47] The culture-sociological circumstances involving this topos were the emancipation of music from social functions, the development of concert and opera life, and above all a corresponding repertoire that enabled the intertwining of antiquity and modernity in which the paradoxical postulate of "originality" could be realized. This paradox is illustrated most clearly by the expectation that the "original genius" (*Originalgenie*) will keep creating new things while still respecting the limits of certain conventions.[48] In other words, the new and advanced was (or is) only acceptable if it could (or can) be related to the existing repertoire, even if only by slowly "seeping into" that repertoire through its repeated performance and gradual ascent to canonic status.

This kind of self-reflexivity of music has been singled out as the decisive criterion for the definition of musical modernity by Tobias Janz,[49] who also stresses the extent to which progress-driven European modernity remained dependent on an anti-modernist "discomfort of modernity."[50] Examples of such a paradoxical linking of modernist and anti-modernist layers are the juxtaposition of authoritarian pre-modern art religion and high-modernist dramaturgy of sound in Richard Wagner' *Parsifal* (1877–82),[51] or the ambivalence between colonialist and postcolonialist readings in Charles Koechlin's and Percy Grainger's adaptations of Rudyard Kipling's *Jungle Book*, where the non-European Other as an idealized "counter model" of Western modernity is at once integrated and ostracized.[52]

The question still remains whether general autonomy from musical practice, involving the strong focus on scripturality, is sufficient to qualify composition as specific to Western culture. In recent musical performance studies, this assumption has been thoroughly challenged and countered by minimizing the impact of written musical notation to a mere "script," a secondary aid for the primary experience of musical performance or "*musicking*,"[53] positing a work concept which is inwardly based on "sounded writing" – the "work *as* performance."[54] Probably the most important intervention in this field has been Carolyn Abbate's essay "Music – Drastic or Gnostic?," which adopted Vladimir Jankélévitch's music philosophy for a much-discussed challenge of the long-lasting discourse of "great works as unperformed abstractions,"[55] in-

46 Debussy, *Monsieur Croche et autres écrits*, 223 (see Chapter 1, footnote 23).

47 Dahlhaus, "Der Werkbegriff als Paradigma," 94–95. See also Bürger, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, 47–54.

48 Dahlhaus, "Der Werkbegriff als Paradigma," 97–98.

49 Janz, *Genealogie der musikalischen Moderne*, 239–265.

50 Ibid., 513 ("Unbehagen an der Moderne" – a formulation which alludes to the title of the German translation of Charles Taylor's book *The Malaise of Modernity*, 1991)

51 Ibid., 448–456.

52 Ibid., 457–514.

53 See Small, *Musicking*.

54 See Cook, *Beyond the Score*, 237–248.

55 Abbate, "Music – Drastic or Gnostic?," 505.

stead demanding a new focus of musicology on "music not as a work but as an event"[56] and its "material presence and carnality."[57] It has been noted by several commentators that Abbate's intervention (via sources from Jankélévitch that extend back to the 1920s) can be traced to early twentieth-century vitalism, but also to music-specific approaches of prioritizing sounding performance as introduced by Paul Bekker or Alfred Schütz.[58] This substantiates the observation, made by many scholars today, that a critique of modernity is deeply ingrained in the process of modernity itself, a process which prominently and necessarily involves the decentering dynamics of globalization processes and intercultural conflict zones.

Even if this tradition of turns toward "material" or "performance" in music scholarship tends to retain a dualism of written and sounding dimensions of music, thus remaining indebted to a basic polarization they claim to transcend, each offers a highly necessary extension of focus when approaching the definition of composition in an intercultural context: not only is composition dependent on performative reproduction and aural perception, composition and listening can themselves be understood as performative acts and thus described as incommensurable and idiosyncratic.[59] This idea will become obvious in numerous analyses presented in the following chapters. There we will see how an interaction between composers, performers, and audiences may become completely reconceived and "reinvented," often on the basis of specific cultural preconditions. This concept will perhaps become clearest in the partly politically motivated ideas of José Maceda and Yūji Takahashi (→ III.4).

Of course, the idea that non-Western cultures would be based primarily (or even entirely) on performative and "material" (aural/oral) practices is equally one-dimensional. It should be acknowledged that non-Western musical cultures also have writing practices that emancipate themselves from musical realization and add speculative and autonomous dimensions to the functionality of musical notation.[60] Even in early phases, one can detect a creative self-awareness in this context – for example, in the scores of *ci* songs by the Chinese scholar Jiang Kui (1155–1221) from the southern Song Dynasty (1127–1279). Jiang not only termed these songs his "own compositions" (*ziduqu*), but also added prefaces to his scores explaining in detail how he had developed the text and music in close parallel.[61]

Therefore, it seems cogent to define the concept of "composition" in a "global" manner from the outset, as Stephen Blum has done.[62] Understanding the invention, notation, performance, and reception of music as sociocultural acts lets "composing" appear as the definition of an (inter)cultural position and thus offers insight into the composer's (and performer's or listener's) stance toward cultural, social, and societal conditions and realities. According to Theodor W. Adorno, we can trace these conditions to the tiniest details of a score,[63] even if the composer remains unaware of such connections. The complexity of thus defining a sociocultural position

56 Ibid., 533.

57 Ibid., 529.

58 See Bork, "Text versus Performance – zu einem Dualismus der Musikgeschichtsschreibung," 383, Jost, "Der 'performative turn' in der Musikforschung," 292, and Kabisch, "'Verschwindendes Erscheinen' als Prinzip einer Musik der Moderne," 39, summarized in Utz, "Carolyn Abbate. Music – Drastic or Gnostic?"

59 See Kramer, "From the Other to the Abject," 65–66 and Utz, "Vom adäquaten zum performativen Hören" for a theory of "performative listening."

60 See for example Liang, *Music of the Billion*, 186–202.

61 Lam, "Writing Music Biographies of Historical East Asian Musicians."

62 Blum, "Composition."

63 Adorno, "Zur gesellschaftlichen Lage der Musik," 731.

undoubtedly increases with the two opposing tendencies in cultural globalization: homogenization and diversification. Through this binary, one can understand the compositional process as the conceptual linking of historical location, social context, cultural context, and the composer's biographical "constellation" to the specific processing of problems immanent in tradition, genre, œuvre, and the individual work. In an interculturally accentuated approach to composition, the interplay between these factors becomes clear. As soon as composers operate between different cultural contexts, their historical location and the immediately relevant musical traditions begin to oscillate. Such oscillations should be the focus of an intercultural music historiography.

De-Nationalizing Music Historiography

Broadening our idea of musical composition, integrating dimensions of performed and perceived sound, and deconstructing the idea of authenticity are merely preliminary steps in an attempt at decentering and denationalizing the writing of music history. In order to outline a more comprehensive view of this challenge, the following chapters (II.2–II.6) develop ideas put forward by recent theories in historical studies such as "entangled history"[64] and "multiple" or "alternative modernities."[65] The focus is on "non-simultaneous" processes in music history of different nations or regions of the world during the first and the second half of the twentieth century, alluding to the notions of "relationality" and "synchronicity" as discussed in recent historical scholarship:[66] Whereas *relationality* signifies that in modernity no region or nation is the sole agent of its history, that the emergence of modern societies is deeply connected to an interactive process among regions, nations, or cultures,[67] *synchronicity* stresses the fact that "synchronous" (largely synonymous with "simultaneous") global processes in modern history have often engendered interdependent changes in different areas of the world.[68] While these approaches suggest a more emphatic perspective on the project of a "world history" by bringing local developments together into a common framework, my approach aims to confront this framework with those "non-synchronous" or "non-simultaneous" aspects of pre- and postwar (music) history of the twentieth century that *resist* the project of a unified "world (music) history." The precondition and challenge, therefore, is to understand any local, national, or regional music-historical processes not in isolation from global processes but as (frequently unconscious and/or unconsidered) consequences of inter- or transnational dynamics, including (but not limited to) political and social contexts such as political ideologies and postcolonial power structures, images, and mentalities. Local or national dynamics and processes that do not match an overarching historical narrative must still be acknowledged.

Reflecting these tensions and the divergent preconditions of art music composition in the different areas of the world since 1900, the notion of a "non-simultaneity of the simultaneous" [*Ungleichzeitigkeit des Gleichzeitigen*] as coined by art historian Wilhelm Pinder during the 1920s and made famous by Ernst Bloch's in-depth Marxist analysis of rising fascism in the

64 See Werner and Zimmermann, "Beyond Comparison."

65 See Eisenstadt, *Multiple Modernities*, Gaonkar, *Alternative Modernities*, Conrad and Eckert, "Globalgeschichte, Globalisierung, multiple Modernen," and Janz, "Multiple Musical Modernities?" This concept is discussed more thoroughly toward the end of Chapter II.4.

66 See the summaries in Conrad, *What is Global History?*, 65–66, 150–156.

67 See Goody, *The East in the West*.

68 See Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*.

1930s springs to mind.[69] In Bloch's social theory, the "non-simultaneous" designated the "different times, the different 'nows'" of European societies during the first decades of the twentieth century, which Bloch determined "using the coordinates of age, class, and geography":[70] the unemployed youth, the peasantry, and the rising urban middle class all lived in different "nows" but shared a common impulse to reject the modernist present, making them susceptible to extremist ideas and movements. A literal transfer of this theory to music history is surely not viable and is not my principal aim. Rather, I am curious about how the "radical polyphony" of twentieth-century new music as described by Andreas Meyer[71] can be understood against the background of Bloch's theoretical framework. The challenge thus is not to resort to the common stereotype of a simple "stylistic pluralism" in music since 1945 or to the trope of non-Western areas experiencing an "asynchronous delay" to Western centers, connected to an implicit or explicit pressure to "catch up" with Western standards (though this was a common, if often shortsighted demand articulated by many non-Western reformers in early postcolonial periods[72]). Rather, the repeated emphasis on "non-simultaneity" points to the fact that twentieth-century music is much less subject to *one* linear historical narrative than has often been supposed.

That music history can only be adequately understood and written from an inter- or transnational perspective is neither a new nor, probably, a particularly provocative insight. Concert and opera companies of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries were characterized by continuous processes of migration and exchange, and their protagonists – composers, virtuosos, singers, impresarios – usually had correspondingly polyglot life stories.[73] Styles typically blended ingredients from diverse local, supra-regional, and "foreign" traditions, even and paradoxically where they claimed to produce "national styles."[74] Even in the nineteenth century, fueled by the "poison of nationalism," public recognition could only be gained on the basis of international success, and the musical biographies of Chopin, Liszt, Wagner, or Mahler are unimaginable without transnational journeys – in part forced by economic pressures.

In its turn, music historiography from Johann Nikolaus Forkel, François-Joseph Fétis, and August Wilhelm Ambros to Hugo Riemann has followed the model of a universal history, dating back to the Enlightenment – with the well-known problems associated with this concept in the context of a world marked by colonialism, imperialism, and militarism. In these universal music histories, international or intercontinental relations were by no means presented neutrally, but – since the mid-nineteenth century mostly under Hegelian influence – increasingly shaped teleologically or evolutionarily toward recent European art music as a kind of "optimized" state of global development. This viewpoint downgraded music of other cultures and earlier times to mere early or pre-history, if it was attributed a "historical capacity" at all. Even after 1900, when such Eurocentrism was criticized by comparative musicology, which aimed

69 Pinder, *Das Problem der Generation in der Kunstgeschichte Europas* and Bloch, *Erbschaft dieser Zeit*; see Schwartz, "Ernst Bloch and Wilhelm Pinder."

70 Schwartz, "Ernst Bloch and Wilhelm Pinder," 58.

71 "The music history of the twentieth century is radically polyphonic. It disintegrates into different cultures, and no *zeitgeist* can mediate between them." (Meyer, "Volkstümlich – primitiv – populär," 27. "Die Musikgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts ist radikal vielstimmig. Sie zerfällt in verschiedene Kulturen, die kein Zeitgeist miteinander vermittelt.")

72 Mishra, *From the Ruins of the Empire*, 7.

73 See, Calella, "Migration, Transfer und Gattungswandel."

74 See, among others, Bohlman, *Focus: Music, Nationalism, and the Making of the New Europe* and La Motte-Haber, *Nationaler Stil und europäische Dimension in der Musik der Jahrhundertwende*.

at a more context-sensitive understanding of musical cultures, little changed. Hugo Riemann, for example, reacting to early studies of non-Western tone and tuning systems in the foreword to the first volume of his *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte* (1904) insisted on the universal validity of the "division of the octave into twelve semitones" and declared this a "historical fact that a few poorly drilled pipes from Polynesia or questionable singing performances of colored females cannot upset."[75] In his late work *Folkloristische Tonalitätstudien* (1916), Riemann attempted to substantiate the alleged universality of the European major and minor scales by means of a developmental narrative of melodies and modes in various musical cultures. At that point, the influential nineteenth-century concept of a continuous evolution of cultures had already been challenged by new ideas of a relativity, equality, and multiplicity of cultures as put forward most prominently by Alexander Ellis's epochal comparative study on the "Musical Scales of Various Nations" (1885) and in writings by German-American anthropologist Franz Boas.[76] This cultural relativism, however, was *not* yet a well-established concept in early comparative musicology, as testified by Erich Moritz von Hornbostel's and Carl Stumpf's but also by Charles Seeger's basically evolutionary concepts of cultural history, which generally accredited low developmental stages to "primitive" non-Western musics.[77]

Despite the blatant isolationism brought about by totalitarian systems, especially in the first half of the twentieth century, and despite many neo-nationalist tendencies extending into the immediate present, the extent of the transnational network of interrelationships in both art and popular music grew in the twentieth century. At least toward the end of the century, these changing relationships made the need to revise the established music-historical methodologies increasingly clear. It can be said that, as a result of exile and extensive migratory movements, an increased transnational orientation in the arts has been a simple historical fact since the beginning of the twentieth century. This orientation also decisively influenced the aesthetics and reception of prominent émigré artists such as Edgard Varèse, Arnold Schoenberg, Igor Stravinsky, Béla Bartók, Isang Yun, or Tan Dun. The awareness of addressing a global audience shaped compositional aesthetic concepts on a particularly broad scale after 1945, even though initially only few composers defended an explicitly inter- or transculturally oriented universalism (→ II.2).

Yet even today, a critique of the national bias of music historiography is by no means obsolete. Certainly, Richard Taruskin has been accused of, in volume 5 of his *Oxford History of Western Music*, which deals with music since 1945, overemphasizing American tendencies[78] (and among them neotonal currents) and constructing a teleological music-historical narrative from the geopolitical tensions of the Cold War based on the supposed decline of the avant-garde. Taruskin unequivocally defends his narrative in the preface to the paperback edition of the volume:

75 Riemann, *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*, vol. 1, V–VI. ("Teilung der Oktave in zwölf Halbtöne," "historisches Faktum, das man mit ein paar mangelhaft gebohrten Pfeifen aus Polynesien oder mit fragwürdigen Gesangsleistungen farbiger Weiber nicht über den Haufen rennt.")

76 Ellis, "On the Musical Scales of Various Nations" and Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man*. See Taylor, *Beyond Exoticism*, 107–108.

77 See Stumpf, *Die Anfänge der Musik* and Hornbostel, "Die Probleme der vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft." On Seeger see Sharif, *Speech about Music*.

78 See among others the critique of Taruskin's "xenophobic essentialism" (Cook, "Alternative Realities," 208) and his "erstaunlichen Akt des Ethnozentrismus" ("amazing act of ethnocentrism") (Cox, "Richard Taruskins *The Oxford History of Western Music*," 103).

> The United States unquestionably inherited musical leadership during this period from Europe – at first by default, as a gift from Adolf Hitler, thanks to whom Schoenberg, Stravinsky, Bartók, Hindemith, Krenek, Korngold, Milhaud, and many others had, by 1945, joined Rachmaninoff, Varese, and Bloch in America, many of them remaining and becoming citizens. The conditions that stimulated the rise of the postwar European avant-garde were largely created by the Office of Military Government, United States (OMGUS), the American occupying force that, for one particularly telling example, financed and at first administered the Darmstädter Ferienkurse, at which total serialism, European-style, was born – in far more direct response to Soviet arts policy than has ever been publicly admitted. Thereafter, it was the music of the American avant-garde, chiefly represented by John Cage and Morton Feldman, and enthusiastically propagated by lavishly subsidized West German radio stations […], that set the tone for European experimentation.[79]

Despite all legitimate criticism and an unmistakable onesidedness, it can be conceded that Taruskin's arguments not only fulfill a general and basic requirement of cultural-scientific methodology by combining the ideological and institutional historical with aesthetic dimensions of recent music history, but in particular, his text places a finger on sore points and unresolved problems of historiographical methodology (it is no coincidence that Taruskin sees it as the historian's primary task "to disenchant auras and demystify discourses"[80]). What could a less polemically charged concretion of such a method look like that also ties in with recent considerations of a global music history as outlined above? The case studies in the following chapters (II.2–II.6) address this challenge by revisiting the situation of an increasingly interconnected world against the backdrop of music-historical situations in Europe, the USA, and East Asia. The focus will be placed on applying the model of entangled history, which, in contrast to models of national history, attempts to "systematically draw attention to the interlocking of the levels of investigation and their mutual conditionality."[81] This approach aims to explore "social, cultural, and political formation, generally at the national level, that are assumed to be one-to-one,"[82] with internationalized art production as a prime example of "areas of contact that are transformed through their mutual interaction."[83]

Transferred to the field of music, interdependencies between compositional decisions, conventions and innovations, institutional developments, and (cultural) political conditions can be considered at the transnational level. In the current subject discourse of musicology, such a model seems to encounter problems, above all, because the division of labor between subdisciplines of musicology is very advanced and sometimes seems irreversible: a "World Music" explored by ethnomusicology, encompassing traditional and popular music, is juxtaposed with globalized "Western Music," for which historical musicology is deemed responsible.[84] A high degree of differentiation and, certainly, the institutional separation of these two disciplines, seem to make linking them perennially difficult.

---

79 Taruskin, "Preface," XIX–XX.

80 Taruskin, "Afterword: *Nicht blutbefleckt*?," 280.

81 Werner and Zimmermann, "Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung," 630 ("die Aufmerksamkeit systematisch auf die Verschränkung der Untersuchungsebenen und auf ihre wechselseitige Bedingtheit [lenken]"). For the historical classification of this approach see among others Haupt, "Historische Komparatistik in der internationalen Geschichtsschreibung."

82 Werner and Zimmermann, "Beyond Comparison," 31.

83 Ibid., 35.

84 See Janz, "'Gibt es eine Weltgeschichte der Musik?,'" 148.

New music before and after 1945, however, is at odds with this division simply because in its development, the turn to forms of traditional (often non-European) musical practice, which were increasingly marginalized in the course of musical and social modernization, played a key part – at least since Bartók's and Stravinsky's doubly reflected and broken folklorism (→ II.3). What Andreas Meyer refers to as "musical anthropology"[85] sheds light on a specific area of tension in twentieth-century art music: between the integration of the marginalized, the "Other," into public discourse and the shift toward the allegedly "non-cultural," "pure" structures as they appear especially in the aesthetics of serial music after 1950, numerous facets of new music emerge in which modernist and anti-modernist motifs are interwoven. In other words, for new music – especially in the 1950s and 60s – there is a paradox that exists between a basic cultural relativism – an essentialism insisting on the uniqueness and incommensurability of local traditions – and an advanced structuralist universalism. Such aesthetic transformations cannot be adequately understood without the geopolitical context of the twentieth century.

Transnational Avant-gardes?

Understanding musical composition, performance, and reception as results of "non-simultaneous" entangled networks, does not, of course, imply the existence of a "transcultural avant-garde." As discussed earlier, a single person may always be conceived or conceive themselves as "transcultural," as not indebted to a specific national or regional cultural essence – perhaps, following Welsch or Han, transcending or even eliminating the very notion of clearly distinct, separate cultures (→ I.3). However, such an idealized definition of transculturality is ill-fitting with a historical analysis of the decades around 1900 and later periods in which cultural essentialism blossomed in both its hegemonic and its emancipatory forms. Of course, this polarity between authoritarian and relativist cultural essentialism did not stop at the frontiers of musical composition. The way in which composers (mis-)represented and appropriated non-Western musics in musical exoticism and orientalism is a well-studied area of postcolonial musicology. However, we can arguably detect traces of relativist thought in the ideas of some composers who turned to non-Western musical traditions with more dedication and enthusiasm. In such cases, the context of musical modernity, its rejection of established musical modes and practices, helped to overcome prejudice against an assumed low evolutionary stage of non-Western traditions.

One of the questions we have to solve here is whether such modernist approaches toward non-Western musics resulted in a transnational proliferation of compositional techniques and aesthetic ideas that were indeed shared by a "transcultural avant-garde." Even if we, as a first step, attempt here to replace "transcultural" with the more neutral term "transnational," and thus challenge the idea that composers actually created a hybrid aesthetic area beyond the spheres of distinct cultures, the question remains whether these composers formed transnational groups connected either by real networks or at least by shared ideas. My basic argument here will be that such transnational connections were quite loose, especially before the 1950s, but even during later periods.

Adopting Bloch's concept of the "non-simultaneity of the simultaneous" to music historiography may enable us to understand how composers and musicians developed similar ideas and approaches against radically different social backgrounds, and motivated by hardly comparable social and aesthetic agendas (→ II.4, II.5). Whether we highlight the entanglement (relationality, simultaneity) of these ideas (guided by the principle of an *entangled history*) or rather

85 Meyer, "Volkstümlich – primitiv – populär," 34–40.

their social, geographical, or conceptual distinction and independence (isolation, non-simultaneity; guided by the principle of *multiple modernities*) might not least be a question of our trust or skepticism toward the idea of a global music history in an emphatic sense. Though my focus on the "non-simultaneity of the simultaneous" may seem to place me in the camp of the skeptics, I must emphasize that I endorse the concept of global music historiography precisely because it makes us aware of such "non-simultaneities" or non-relations.

The other, even more complex issue to be tackled here is the definition of a musical avant-garde. One might argue that we must somehow live with the problem of "musical avant-garde" as an ill-defined term which turns out to be either too narrowly or too broadly defined. The key point for the discussion of a *transnational* avant-garde is, of course, that it compels us to redefine the notion of "musical avant-garde" in the context of a global dimension of (art) music making. But let us first remind ourselves that the definition of the term *avant-garde*, even within a Western discourse of new music, is far from evident. Recently, Pietro Cavallotti has insisted that Peter Bürger's standard definition of the term, which takes its cue from early twentieth-century avant-garde movements in visual arts and literature, is in many ways ill-fitting with twentieth-century *music* history.[86] In this sense, Gianmario Borio suggested earlier that an aesthetics of continuously *surpassing* the features of musical modernity must be considered a key concern of the *musical* avant-garde (without necessarily calling such procedures "progress" in a narrow sense).[87] Applying this definition consistently, however, provokes the paradoxical conclusion that the avant-garde concept must be opened up for large parts of twentieth-century music because innovation, the surpassing of previously "modern" musical features, the "remaking of the past," as Joseph N. Straus put it,[88] is a broad concern of musical poetics from the early to the late twentieth century in and beyond the West.

I believe that this situation prompts us to doubt seriously the usage of the term "avant-garde(s)" in music-historical writing. On the one hand, anti-traditionalist innovation, the critique of unconsidered convention in a contemporary society, has been described as a key feature of modernity in general, so that "avant-garde" and modernity seem to be inclusive or at least closely entangled in the field of music. On the other hand, giving up the term avant-garde enables intercultural music historiography to stress how closely musical modernity and the awareness of non-Western traditions are intertwined:

> The ethnographic fascination, from André Jolivet to Boulez, from Varèse to George Crumb, is not a relic of conventional exoticism. It marks a music that – under the condition of extreme self-alienation and a questionability of all established forms – is willing to discover expression and emotion in the encounter with the distinct Other of reason and conventional expression.[89]

The affection and solidarity which many composers of new music in the twentieth century developed toward non-Western "traditional music" arguably grew out of the observation that

86 Cavallotti, "Avantgarde," see Bürger, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*.

87 Borio, *Musikalische Avantgarde um 1960*.

88 See Straus, *The Remaking of the Past*.

89 Meyer, "Volkstümlich – primitiv – populär," 34. ("Die ethnographische Faszination, von André Jolivet bis Boulez, von Varèse bis George Crumb, ist kein Relikt des konventionellen Exotismus. Sie kennzeichnet eine Musik, die bereit ist, unter Bedingungen einer extremen Selbstentfremdung, einer Fraglichkeit aller überkommenen Formen, in der Begegnung mit dem ganz Anderen der Vernunft und des konventionellen Ausdrucks dennoch Ausdruck und Emotion wiederzufinden.")

both globalizing art music in the Western tradition and traditional non-Western musics were marginalized by the processes of canonization, commerce, and the abounding genres of popular music established since the advent of the recording industry. For emerging non-Western composers, the situation was even more complex, as traditional musics underwent accelerated and often radical transformations, usually closely linked to nationalist, pro- or anti-Western agendas. It is thus vital to see a connection between the modernist readings of traditional non-Western musics by Western-educated composers and these composers' social situation. I will therefore aim consistently to place emphasis on the social embeddedness of the musical works that serve as my case studies.

2. Internationalism and Universalism: Repercussions of Political and Cultural History

Both before and after 1945, "internationalism" and "universalism" have been the most prominent concepts of global entanglement; it therefore seems consistent to dedicate a closer reading to their changing meanings and implications in music-historical contexts. By attending to the controversial debates which arose from these ideas, this chapter demonstrates how the increasing awareness among composers (and, in turn, performers and audiences) of acting as "agents" in an international or global context substantially affected compositional technique and aesthetics. I also show how the "simultaneity" of such an increasingly globalized musical communication continued to imply many "non-simultaneities" between global and local, Western and non-Western music aesthetics or "realities." I suggest that these "non-simultaneities" in particular offer a key to understanding the music-historical dynamics of these periods. This will provide a framework for detailed case studies to follow in the subsequent chapters (II.3–6).

Internationalism

The dedication to internationalism in twentieth-century music predated the Cold War period by several decades, and resulted from both political-militarist confrontation and a certain social isolation of modernist music in European societies. The trend toward internationalization was in fact already a global characteristic of political movements in the second half of the nineteenth century, including the First International, founded by Karl Marx in 1864; the Second International, founded in Paris in 1889; the International Council of Women founded in Washington, D.C., in 1888; and international pacifism, emerging from the Universal Peace Congress in Paris (1889) and the Conventions of Geneva (1864) and The Hague (1899, 1907), as well as the first steps toward the establishment of international law. In general, the decades around 1900 saw a proliferation of international non-governmental organizations in many areas, particularly in the social and political domain, which became crucial sites of activity for the globalization process.[90] Not least, this tendency accelerated a normalizing universalization of economic, communicative, and technical standards such as standardized measures and weights – but it also led to an increasing internationalization of cultural events as marked by the revitalized Olympic Games in 1896.[91] World exhibitions in London (1851/62/86), Paris (1855/67/78/89, 1900), and elsewhere celebrated "world peace" and "social harmony" as

90 Osterhammel, *Die Verwandlung der Welt*, 723–735.

91 Ibid., 732.