Introduction

According to Reinhard Strohm, 'today, the question of a conceptual framework for a history of music that pays due attention to global relationships in music is often raised'. As he continues, such work should 'aim to promote post-European historical thinking [. . . and be] based on the idea that a global history of music cannot be one single, hegemonic history'.[1] Nowhere is this demand more evident than in modernist studies. There are two reasons for this. First, musical modernism – dated here to the period from around 1910 to the present day[2] – has been contemporaneous with a period of intensified global encounter, covering the heyday of empire, decolonisation and accelerated globalisation. Far from being accidental, this historical parallel has profoundly affected the nature and meaning of musical modernism. Specifically, I argue that the global diffusion of musical modernism and the ensuing encounters between modernist music and its various counterparts across the world transformed both. Second, despite or because of this explosive cultural and geographic expansion, many modernist composers, musicians and critics have embraced universalism. As a result, more even than earlier periods of the Western classical tradition, musical modernism appears placeless. Indeed, it was often defined as an 'international' or 'cosmopolitan' movement in opposition to supposedly rooted national or vernacular traditions.

This, at least, is the impression given by textbooks on modernist music, which overwhelmingly focus on 'genius' (and, more often than not, white male) composers and their masterworks, buttressed by notions of influence and technical innovation.[3] The cultural-geographic origin of the music is, if

[1] Reinhard Strohm, ed., *Studies on a Global History of Music: A Balzan Musicology Project*, SOAS Musicology (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2018), blurb.

[2] Björn Heile and Charles Wilson, 'Introduction', in *The Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music*, ed. Björn Heile and Charles Wilson (London: Routledge, 2019), 1–30.

[3] The examples, in ascending chronological order, are Robert P. Morgan, *Twentieth-Century Music: A History of Musical Style in Modern Europe and America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991); Glenn Watkins, *Soundings: Music in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Schirmer, 1995); Arnold Whittall, *Musical Composition in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Arnold Whittall, *Exploring Twentieth-Century Music: Tradition and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of*

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009491716.001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at all, reflected only in the earlier chapters, whereas, after the World War II watershed, music appears to become untethered from any specific places. Although centres, such as Darmstadt, Paris and New York, continue to loom large, the innovations associated with them are depicted as being of universal significance. Moreover, there is at best fleeting recognition of the world beyond Europe and North America, as if the remarkable flowering of modernist composition and performance in Latin America, East Asia, Australasia and parts of Africa and the Near and Middle East never happened or is of no particular significance.[4] While a topic such as 'globalisation' has had a profound impact on popular music studies, until recently, no comparable effect has been registered in modernist music studies.

In this book, I propose an alternative model according to which musical modernism *is constituted by* a global diasporic network of composers, musicians and institutions. While modernist music is embedded in specific places, the nodal points of the network, it is the manifold entanglements between those points that make it what it is. This network has similarities with the Deleuzian rhizome: there is no absolute centre, and the relations between points are dynamic and subject to constant change.[5] At the same time, not all points are necessarily equal: the network is the result of unequal power relations, many of which persist to this day. To sketch this network, I will be exploring some of the transnational connections and contact zones through which modernist music has been transmitted and where ideas about musical modernism have been negotiated.

It follows that 'musical modernism' as used here is a discursively constructed concept that is contingent on specific contexts. I will therefore not be providing a formal definition with a list of features, because the question is not how *I* define the term but how it has been understood in different places and at different times. This raises the question to what extent we can speak of 'this concept', given that the term itself is a recent coinage specific

Western Music (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), www.oxfordwesternmusic.com; Paul Griffiths, *Modern Music and After*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Joseph Auner, *Music in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2013). Cf. Björn Heile, 'Mapping Musical Modernism', in *Music History and Cosmopolitanism*, ed. Anastasia Belina, Kaarina Kilpiö, and Derek B. Scott (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 90–105.

[4] An exception to this is Martin Scherzinger's chapter on African composition in the *Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*: Martin Scherzinger, '"Art" Music in a Cross-Cultural Context: The Case of Africa', in *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*, ed. Nicholas Cook and Anthony Pople (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 584–613.

[5] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 3–25; cf. also, among others, Edward Campbell, *Music after Deleuze* (London: A&C Black, 2013), 35–66.

to Anglophone musicology.[6] It is therefore employed here as an umbrella for broadly equivalent terms in different languages. On one level, there is nothing new in this: we have long spoken of Béla Bartók, Heitor Villa-Lobos or Toshiro Mayuzumi, in addition to, say, Arnold Schönberg and Igor Stravinsky, as 'modernist' composers, and it is generally understood what is meant by that. More specifically, I am following the Global Musical Modernisms Forum that likewise employs the term for a wide range of composers across the world who were active at different times and who share certain qualities (although note the plural 'modernisms', which I am not adopting).[7]

Charles Wilson and I have previously described musical modernism as 'an artistic response to the social changes wrought by modernity', arguing further that, for modernists, 'the means of expression have to be adequate to the spirit of the age and to what is being expressed', which implies a 'highly self-reflective and critical approach towards style and technique', including viewing 'inherited tradition with suspicion' (which does not, however, necessarily mean discarding it).[8] While this characterisation was admittedly primarily informed by Western modernist music and Western theorists, it may serve a more global perspective too, once we accept that 'modernity' and 'tradition' can take different forms. We further advocated conceiving of 'musical modernism as a series of family resemblances, whereby different members of the family may share certain features but none is common to all of them, and where distant members may be connected by a chain of resemblances without sharing a single feature in common'.[9] This allows for a considerable diversity of expressions and styles across the network, while ensuring an underlying kinship and recognisability. Furthermore, what makes musical modernism *global* are transnational links. This is the key difference between a diasporic network as I have described it here and parallel national and regional histories. As will be outlined in more detail, globality, then, is not a question of comprehensiveness of coverage but attention to relationality and transnational entanglements.

Chapter 3, on the International Society of Contemporary Music (ISCM), will highlight some of these issues, since the ISCM was faced with precisely the problem of negotiating between different musical cultures and coming

[6] Arnold Whittall, 'Foundations and Fixations: Continuities in British Musical Modernism', in *The Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music*, ed. Charles Wilson and Björn Heile (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 354–57.

[7] https://globalmusicalmodernisms.hcommons.org/about/ (accessed 28 July 2022).

[8] Heile and Wilson, 'Introduction', 5–6. [9] Heile and Wilson, 'Introduction', 12.

to an agreement about what 'contemporary music', the operative term, might mean in different contexts. As a result, what we have come to know as musical modernism has been shaped by the ISCM and similar institutions like it. In this sense, musical modernism is defined by a transnational and transhistorical dialogue.

My approach builds on the 'spatial turn' that musicology has recently undergone and that has acted as a corrective to the blind spots in scholarship on musical modernism identified here. Among a diverse list of examples, important work by Brigid Cohen, Dana Gooley, Tamara Levitz, Sarah Collins and Amy Bauer as well as an edited collection on music and cosmopolitanism can be singled out.[10] In addition, there has been a novel focus on modernism in national and regional music history that often complements and occasionally challenges universalist accounts.[11]

[10] Brigid Cohen, *Stefan Wolpe and the Avant-Garde Diaspora*, New Perspectives in Music History and Criticism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Brigid Cohen, 'Limits of National History: Yoko Ono, Stefan Wolpe, and Dilemmas of Cosmopolitanism', *The Musical Quarterly* 97, no. 2 (17 October 2014): 181–237, https://doi.org/10.1093/musqtl/gdu008; Dana Gooley (convenor), 'Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Nationalism, 1848–1914', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 66, no. 2 (1 August 2013): 523–49, https://doi.org/10.1525/jams.2013.66.2.523; Tamara Levitz (convenor), 'Musicology Beyond Borders?', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 65, no. 3 (1 December 2012): 821–61, https://doi.org/10.1525/jams.2012.65.3.821; Sarah Collins and Dana Gooley, eds., 'Music and the New Cosmopolitanism: Problems and Possibilities', *The Musical Quarterly* 99, no. 2 (1 June 2017): 139–65, https://doi.org/10.1093/musqtl/gdx006; Sarah Collins, 'The Composer as "Good European": Musical Modernism, Amor Fati and the Cosmopolitanism of Frederick Delius', *Twentieth-Century Music* 12, no. 01 (March 2015): 97–123, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478572214000164; Amy Bauer, 'The Cosmopolitan Absurdity of Ligeti's Late Works', *Contemporary Music Review* 31, no. 2–3 (1 April 2012): 163–76, https://doi.org/10.1080/07494467.2012.717358; Anastasia Belina, Kaarina Kilpiö, and Derek B. Scott, eds., *Music History and Cosmopolitanism* (Routledge, 2019).

[11] See, among others, Philip Rupprecht, *British Musical Modernism: The Manchester Group and Their Contemporaries* (Cambridge University Press, 2015); Matthew Riley, ed., *British Music and Modernism, 1895–1960* (Routledge, 2017); Michael Hooper, *Australian Music and Modernism: 1960–1975* (London: Bloomsbury, 2019); Daniel M. Grimley, *Carl Nielsen and the Idea of Modernism* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010); Bonnie C. Wade, *Composing Japanese Musical Modernity* (University of Chicago Press, 2014); Luciana Galliano, *Yogaku: Japanese Music in the 20th Century* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2002); Omar Corrado, *Música y modernidad en Buenos Aires (1920–1940)* (Buenos Aires: Gourmet Musical, 2010); Daniela Fugellie, *'Musiker unserer Zeit': Internationale Avantgarde, Migration und Wiener Schule in Südamerika* (Edition Text + Kritik, 2018); Vera Wolkowicz, *Inca Music Reimagined: Indigenist Discourses in Latin American Art Music, 1910–1930* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2022); Pablo Palomino, *The Invention of Latin American Music: A Transnational History* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2020); Alejandro L. Madrid, *Sounds of the Modern Nation: Music, Culture, and Ideas in Post-Revolutionary Mexico* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008).

The inspiration for this book did not only come from music studies, however, and my approach is also influenced by discourses in neighbouring fields, such as critical cosmopolitanism, postcolonialism and decoloniality. In literary studies, in particular, the notion of 'global modernism(s)' has been common currency for many years.[12] For instance, in an influential article, Susan Stanford Friedman has spoken of 'polycentric modernities and modernisms at different points of time and in different locations', an idea that led to her concept of 'planetary modernisms'.[13] From another perspective, Franco Moretti's novel ways of depicting cultural transfer, such as 'graphs, maps and trees', hold hitherto unrealised promise for a reconceptualisation of the cultural geography of musical modernism.[14]

If it had been my intention to adopt this notion of global modernism for musicology, I was beaten to it, however. Largely while I was writing this book, there has been a spate of publications in global musical modernism, inaugurating it as a recognisable field. In most cases, however, the theoretical framework has been borrowed not from global (literary) modernism but global history, just like many of the contributions seem to be concerned more about music historiography than modernist studies. In any case, what was quite a fragmented area drawing on diverse disciplinary and theoretical traditions has started to coalesce into a couple of interrelated, widely held positions or overarching concepts, without however congealing into orthodoxy. If, in the following, I attempt to sketch a theoretical framework on this basis, it is important to bear in mind that this did not exist at the outset but is to a certain extent a retrospective imposition.

An important role is played by Christian Utz's *Musical Composition in the Context of Globalization* (the German original of which was published in 2014, although the enlarged English translation did not appear before 2021). Although it is situated more in the field of intercultural composition, this is arguably the first systematic and comprehensive attempt to conceptualise modernist composition on a global level (albeit with a strong emphasis on East Asia). The aforementioned Balzan

[12] See, within a vibrant and diverse field, Mark A. Wollaeger and Matt Eatough, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (New York, NY; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). It is characteristic of the presumptuousness of that field that 'modernism' here (as so often) refers to literature.

[13] Susan Stanford Friedman, 'Periodizing Modernism: Postcolonial Modernities and the Space/Time Borders of Modernist Studies', *Modernism/Modernity* 13, no. 3 (15 November 2006): 426, https://doi.org/10.1353/mod.2006.0059; Susan Stanford Friedman, *Planetary Modernisms: Provocations on Modernity Across Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015).

[14] Franco Moretti, *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History* (London: Verso, 2007).

Musicology Project on *A Global History of Music*, which has yielded three collected volumes as well as associated activities and publications, has also acted as a catalyst, not least through its challenge to traditional Eurocentric music historiography.[15] Having said that, due to the project's emphasis on 'traditions', very few contributions directly addressed modernism, which, as mentioned, has tended to have a complicated if not necessarily antagonistic relation to tradition.

Last but not least, there have been three collected volumes on aspects of East-Asian music in relation to (countries within) the West, adding to the focus already established by Utz.[16] Beyond the eye-opening nature of their contributions, what is significant about these books is that they bring together researchers from or working in Western and East-Asian countries. Thus, 'the West' has been decentred here also at the practical, disciplinary and institutional level, and it is the 'how' of knowledge production that is as innovative as the 'what' of the knowledge produced. While, by contrast, I have in this book acted as the 'lone wolf' that Daniel Chua has warned about and thus talk about different world regions from the perspective of the Western academy,[17] I will be guided as much as possible by local scholars.

Salutary though this activity in the study of the musical relations between East Asia and the West is, it raises the question of other world regions, such as Latin America or Africa. Although I make no claim to represent the world equally, all are covered in the book, so the theoretical framework should be applicable without the 'epistemic violence' of imposing alien paradigms. To the extent that I am able to judge, the work being

[15] Strohm, *Studies on a Global History of Music;* Reinhard Strohm, ed., *The Music Road: Coherence and Diversity in Music from the Mediterranean to India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019); Reinhard Strohm, ed., *Transcultural Music History: Global Participation and Regional Diversity in the Modern Age* (Berlin: VWB-Verlag, 2021); Reinhard Strohm, 'The Balzan Musicology Project towards a Global History of Music, the Study of Global Modernisation, and Open Questions for the Future', *Muzikologija*, no. 27 (2019): 15–29, https://doi.org/10.2298/MUZ1927015S.

[16] Hon-Lun Yang and Michael Saffle, eds., *China and the West: Music, Representation, and Reception* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017); Chien-Chang Yang and Tobias Janz, eds., *Decentering Musical Modernity: Perspectives on East Asian and European Music History* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2019); Joanne Miyang Cho, ed., *Musical Entanglements between Germany and East Asia: Transnational Affinity in the 20th and 21st Centuries* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021). Since this book was submitted in August 2022, more recent publications, such as the special issue on 'Global Musical Modernisms', in *Twentieth-century Music* 20/3 (2023), edited by Gavin S. K. Lee and Christopher J. Miller, could not be considered.

[17] Daniel K. L. Chua, 'Global Musicology: A Keynote without a Key', *Acta Musicologica* 94, no. 1 (2022): 122.

carried out in the study of Latin-American and African musical modernism(s) is no less important and innovative as that on East Asia and many contributions will be discussed in the following chapters, but it tends to at least ostensibly follow the tradition of regional or national music history, rather than global musicology. That said, events such as the online conference on 'Global Musicology – Global Music History', co-organised by Amanda Hsieh (Chinese University of Hong Kong) and Vera Wolkowicz (then based at the University of Buenos Aires), indicate a convergence between regional perspectives and traditions that had previously tended to act more in parallel than in dialogue.[18] One of my intentions is to further this process of connecting these disparate perspectives and insights to create a fuller picture of musical modernism(s) around the world. While I realise that this liberty to roam freely across countries and continents is a Western privilege, I can only hope that the results will benefit scholars more widely. Problematic though this position may be, it seems preferable to the alternative of focusing on the Western Self as if the Other and the long and often painful history of interactions between the two did not exist. Likewise, while there is no view from nowhere and I therefore write from the perspective of an academic born and bred in Germany and employed by a Scottish university, I seek to reflect on my own positionality.

Elements of a Theory of Global Musical Modernism

At the risk of generalisation, the contributions named in the previous section and many others like them allow sketching a preliminary theoretical framework. One of the key problems of any such framework is how to conceptualise the relations between musical modernism(s) in different regions to one another and to 'the West'. According to traditional models focused on innovation such as the textbooks discussed at the outset, modernist music is necessarily Western, by implication rendering any instances from outside the West inauthentic imitations. Such historical models prioritise 'centres' (or 'cores'), where most of the innovations have been introduced, over 'peripheries' (or 'margins'), where they have been adopted after a certain time lag. As proponents of postcolonialism and decoloniality have argued, the spatiotemporal logic of this paradigm

[18] https://groups.google.com/g/musicology-announce-2/c/XqDgjvY8k1A (accessed 9 August 2022).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009491716.001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

replicates that of colonialism, in which the metropolis is both at the centre and 'more advanced' than the colony.[19] It is therefore not surprising that the centre–periphery model has been widely criticised as inherently Eurocentric.[20] It could be argued that even the apparently indisputable fact that musical modernism originated in the West is ultimately a consequence of the concept's (Western-derived) definition, which prioritises compositional techniques such as harmonic organisation or non-periodic rhythm associated with European and North-American composers such as Stravinsky, Schoenberg, Bartók, Scriabin and Ives, over, say, the expressive modulation of 'a note' (itself a Western concept) in performance or practices involving improvisation and communal music-making. Nevertheless, this argument has been rarely made. Instead, there has been an effort to decouple origin from primacy or essence: just because musical modernism may be of Western origin does not mean that it will necessarily always stay that way or that this is part of its innermost nature. Accordingly, instead of accepting a model of 'dissemination' or 'diffusion' that relies on imitation or passive adoption in 'the periphery', global music scholars have emphasised that 'cultural transfer' is an active process that requires musicians and composers to translate innovations in their specific contexts which involves a complex negotiation between local traditions and imported models. Furthermore, as the postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha has argued, what he calls 'mimicry' disrupts the authority of the colonial discourse by 'disclosing its ambivalence'.[21] In other words, imitation has the power to exceed and subvert the original. At the same time, Leonhard B. Meyer, for one, has criticised 'innovation history' as long ago as 1983, although this does not mean that it did not remain influential.[22]

The critique of ideas and concepts such as the centre–periphery model or diffusion does not necessarily make them entirely obsolete, however. It is difficult to deny that there have been centres of musical modernism and,

[19] Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, Routledge classics edition (London: Routledge, 2004), 145–74; Linda Martín Alcoff, 'Mignolo's Epistemology of Coloniality', *CR: The New Centennial Review* 7, no. 3 (2007): 79–101.

[20] See, among others, William Fourie, 'Musicology and Decolonial Analysis in the Age of Brexit', *Twentieth-Century Music*, 17/2 (2020), 1–15, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478572220000031; Yu-jun Choi, 'Modernity as Postcolonial Encounter in Korean Music', in *Decentering Musical Modernity: Perspectives on East Asian and European Musical Modernity*, ed. Tobias Janz and Chien-Chang Yang (Bielefeld: transcript, 2019), 41–62; Fumitaka Yamauchi, 'Contemplating East Asian Music History in Regional and Global Contexts: On Modernity, Nationalism, and Colonialism', in *Decentering Musical Modernity*, 313–36.

[21] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 127.

[22] Leonard B. Meyer, 'Innovation, Choice, and the History of Music', *Critical Inquiry* 9, no. 3 (1983): 517–44.

despite the negative connotations, this implies the existence of peripheries. Likewise, it has been more common for people, styles, techniques and ideas to travel from the centres to the peripheries than vice versa. The point is, though, that these relations are not fixed but dynamic. Alongside long-standing centres, such as Vienna, Paris, New York and Moscow, newer ones, such as Buenos Aires, Tokyo and Shanghai, have emerged, just as the status of these international metropoles is rivalled by provincial towns, such as Darmstadt (home of the International Summer Courses in New Music) or Tongyeong (birthplace of the composer Isang Yun and host of the Tongyeong International Music Festival). Likewise, the 'cultural flows' connecting these centres to peripheries, however defined, are not necessarily unidirectional. This is a complex issue to which I will return, but what defines centres is their ability to *attract* people and ideas, prior to transmitting them.

As has already become apparent, I have not been able to entirely avoid these terms despite their problematic nature, but this should not be equated with acceptance of unequal power relations or the belief that they are immutable. A similar point can be made about 'the West' and the 'non-Western world' (or 'the rest'). These terms imply an extraordinary degree of simplification, reducing what are extremely heterogeneous regions to monolithic entities and erecting an apparently impermeable border between them (which is why I feel compelled to use scare quotes, although they don't solve the problem). This nomenclature largely replaced an earlier and now widely discredited one that distinguished between the 'First' and the 'Third World' (the 'Second World' was represented by the now-defunct Warsaw Pact and allied countries), and it is now in turn often supplanted by the supposedly more value-free distinction between the 'Global North' and the 'Global South'.[23] These concepts are not exactly synonymous, and they all have specific histories and associations. Whatever terms we use, however, the real injustice consists of the division of the world and the power differential between its different parts. These facts must be acknowledged.

One theoretical paradigm that has been adopted by many theorists of global modernism is that of *Multiple* or *Alternative Modernities*, which gained traction in the social sciences around the turn of the millennium. According to the definition by Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, Jens Riedel and

[23] The reason I primarily use 'the West' and the 'non-Western world' here is because that distinction allows for cultural rather than economic criteria. Specifically, East-Asian countries such as Japan and South Korea can be considered 'non-Western' although they are part of the 'Global North'.

Dominic Sachsenmaier, '[t]he core of multiple modernities lies in assuming the existence of culturally specific forms of modernity shaped by distinct cultural heritages and sociopolitical conditions. These forms will continue to differ in their value systems, institutions, and other factors.'[24] Similarly, according to Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, '[t]he idea of "alternative modernities" holds that modernity always unfolds within specific cultures or civilizations and that different starting points of the transition to modernity lead to different outcomes'.[25] The attractiveness of these ideas appears obvious: if there are forms of modernity that differ from the Euro-American model, it follows that musical modernism is not necessarily a Western import and that it can emerge in different places and cultures and can take different forms. It is no surprise, then, that they have been embraced, for example, by Utz, Janz and in my own earlier work.[26] In response, Fumitaka Yamauchi has launched an 'argument for a *singularity* of global colonial modernity – with its different manifestations in divergent contexts fully acknowledged . . .'. As he continues:

> This should not be mistaken . . . as a reaffirmation of the singularity in a Eurocentric fashion; rather, it is a radical remolding of modernity into representation of a profoundly complicated and asymmetrical inter-subjective network that, while being triggered by the West, has involved a countless number of participants, regardless of being Western or non-Western, colonizing or colonized, or categorized otherwise, thereby fostering awareness of one *single* interconnected globe, or rather, our planet.[27]

Yamauchi is influenced by Dirlik, but the multiple modernities paradigm has had many critics, including Fredric Jameson and Walter Mignolo, who, although appearing to come from opposite ends of the spectrum, converge in the view that the notion of multiple or alternative modernities

[24] Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, Jens Riedel, and Dominic Sachsenmaier, 'The Context of the Multiple Modernities Paradigm', in *Reflections on Multiple Modernities: European, Chinese, and Other Interpretations*, ed. Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, Jens Riedel, and Dominic Sachsenmaier (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 1.

[25] Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, *Alternative Modernities* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), blurb.

[26] Christian Utz, *Musical Composition in the Context of Globalization: New Perspectives on Music History in the 20th and 21st Century* (transcript Verlag, 2021), 57; Tobias Janz, 'Multiple Musical Modernities? Dahlhaus, Eisenstadt, and the Case of Japan', in *Decentering Musical Modernity: Perspectives on East Asian and European Music History*, ed. Tobias Janz and Chien-Chang Yang (Bielefeld: transcript, 2019), 279–312; Björn Heile, 'Musical Modernism, Global: Comparative Observations', in *The Routledge Companion to Modernism in Music*, ed. Björn Heile and Charles Wilson (London: Routledge, 2019), 177.

[27] Yamauchi, 'Contemplating East Asian Music History in Regional and Global Contexts: On Modernity, Nationalism, and Colonialism', 336. Italics in the original.

celebrates 'superficial variations' (Mignolo) but overlooks or obscures the extent to which Western colonialism (Mignolo) and capitalism (Jameson) have effectively fashioned the world in their image.[28] Conversely, though, Jameson and Mignolo can be accused of monocausal determinism that flattens the diversity among the world's cultures.

On reflection, I would now side with Yamauchi (although not with Jameson or Mignolo). Charles Wilson and I have previously argued against conceiving of musical modernisms in the plural, pointing out that '[t]he very fact that modernism can be recognized across . . . diverse terrains suggests that the concept retains sufficient coherence to be graspable in its essential impulses, even when its cultural manifestations differ'.[29] The 'terrains' we were thinking of were not only culturally or geographically defined, but, in the present context, it also seems crucial to me that, as Yamauchi proposes, we conceive of global musical modernism as a network of diverse but recognisably related – in terms of family resemblances – expressions of *one* underlying phenomenon. Although the connections between modern*ity* (the underlying social and cultural structures) and modernis*m* (specific artistic expressions) are complex, it seems most productive to consequently consider modernity to be an internally differentiated and manifold but singular phenomenon.

The most significant theoretical innovation, in my view, is the concept of *Entangled History* (or *Histories*). The concept is widely used and debated in historical studies and has been introduced to musicology by Jin-Ah Kim, Nicola Spakowski, Tobias Janz and Chien-chang Yang and myself, apparently independently of one another.[30] It has also been taken up by Utz, and

[28] Arif Dirlik, 'Thinking Modernity Historically: Is "Alternative Modernity" the Answer?', *Asian Review of World Histories* 1, no. 1 (2013): 5–44, https://doi.org/10.12773/arwh.2013.1.1.005; Walter Mignolo, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011), 109; Fredric Jameson, *A Singular Modernity* (New York: Verso, 2002), 12.

[29] Heile and Wilson, 'Introduction', 2.

[30] Jin-Ah Kim, '"European Music" Outside Europe? Musical Entangling and Intercrossing in the Case of Korea's Modern History', in Reinhard Strohm, Abingdon, Oxon; Nicola Spakowski, 'East Asia in a Global Historical Perspective – Approaches and Challenges', in *Studies on a Global History of Music: A Balzan Musicology Project*, ed. Reinhard Strohm (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018), 220–38; Janz, 'Multiple Musical Modernities? Dahlhaus, Eisenstadt, and the Case of Japan'; Chien-Chang Yang, 'Synchronizing Twentieth-Century Music: A Transnational Reflection', in *Decentering Musical Modernity: Perspectives on East Asian and European Music History*, ed. Tobias Janz and Chien-Chang Yang (Bielefeld: transcript, 2019), 247–78; Heile, 'Musical Modernism, Global: Comparative Observations'. It is no accident that the concept has been taken up by scholars with a connection to Germany or German-language research. Although Entangled History has been taken up across the world – there was a special issue in *The American Historical Review*, for instance – it has been particularly influential among German-speaking historians. See 'AHR Forum, "Entangled Empires in the Atlantic World" – Introduction', *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 3 (2007): 710–11.

a book edited by Joanne Miyang Cho has used it as a theoretical point of departure.[31] Kim provides a useful definition: '"Entangled histories" direct our attention to the inner multiple intertwinings, dependencies, and interferences between "European" and "non-European" societies and cultures, between empires and colonies, as well as between peripheries and centres, and so tend to transcend any Eurocentric perspective.'[32]

For my purposes, the significance of Entangled Histories lies in bridging the gap between supposedly universal (and implicitly Eurocentric) music history and national or regional accounts, the twin approaches that have hitherto dominated music historiography. Entanglement is a more specific concept than relationality, but it is worth noting that the latter is being seen as the distinguishing element of a *global* perspective by Daniel Chua and Sanela Nikolić. Here's Chua: 'With the *global*, Western music is defined *in its relation to* other cultures . . . The West is as much about the East (or the North about the South) as it is about itself.'[33] And here Nikolić:

> The appearance of the global history of music could be interpreted as following the already existing trend of writing global histories – ideas, philosophies, worlds. While traditional 'world histories' address individual civilizations and nations in their mutual comparison, 'global histories' imply a rejection of the comparative approach in favor of researching contacts and interactions between different civilizations. . . . Practicing global music history means promoting narratives of connections.[34]

This emphasis on relationality and connectivity, which also underpins my approach, may seem little more than commensensical, but this would overlook the largely unquestioned dominance of 'methodological nationalism' (and, to a lesser extent, regionalism) hitherto.[35] This is not to suggest

[31] Utz, *Musical Composition in the Context of Globalization*, 47ff.; Cho, *Musical Entanglements between Germany and East Asia*. This aspect of Utz's book was introduced in the extended translated version but was not present in the original German version.

[32] Jin-Ah Kim, '"European Music" Outside Europe?', 180. Kim also provides a particularly thorough introduction to the term and related concepts such as *histoires croisés*. See also Sönke Bauck and Thomas Maier, 'Entangled History', InterAmerican Wiki: Terms – Concepts – Critical Perspectives, 2015, www.uni-bielefeld.de/einrichtungen/cias/publikationen/wiki/e/; Hartmut Kaelble, 'Die Debatte über Vergleich und Transfer und was jetzt?', *H-Soz-Kult. Kommunikation und Fachinformation für die Geschichtswissenschaften* (blog) (Connections. A Journal for Historians and Area Specialists, 8 February 2005), www.connections.clio-online.net/article/id/artikel-574.

[33] Chua, 'Global Musicology', 114. Italics in the original.

[34] Sanela Nikolić, 'Five Claims for Global Musicology', *Acta Musicologica* 93, no. 2 (2021): 227–28.

[35] Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller, 'Methodological Nationalism and beyond: Nation–State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences', *Global Networks* 2, no. 4 (2002): 301–34, https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0374.00043.

that regional, national or local music histories are flawed or unimportant. Clearly, they make invaluable contributions, on which entangled or global music histories often rely, since they have to attend to and be grounded in the local. Yet, the normative nature of national and regional music histories and their institutionalisation as academic fields have arguably resulted in a disciplinary bias in favour of isolation and separation and against relationality.

By way of illustration, I will not mention examples of national or regional music history (which would be easy but self-defeating) but cases where an ostensible global dimension was undermined by an unreflected preference for national or regional perspectives. *The Modernist World* is a grand project encompassing sixty-one chapters that 'examines modernist histories and practices around the globe', covering all major regions and art forms.[36] It seems to have been largely overlooked in musicological discussions, but the music-related chapters have been written by some of the most renowned specialists on the respective regions. As one might expect, the contributions are generally informative and authoritative, although it is noticeable that the concept of modernism(s) applied by the authors is not simply diverse but also incompatible, ranging from variations of or responses to Western modernism in the case of Latin America or East Asia (not to mention Europe) to distinct local traditions in the cases of South Asia and Africa, although there have also been parallel developments to those in Latin-American and East Asia in these regions (and vice versa). The problem here is not that there are legitimate discrepancies but that they are not acknowledged or discussed, so that an unsuspecting reader may not be aware that the authors are not talking about the same or even similar things. But the wider issue is that no points of connection or means of comparison are offered between the different chapters on music or, for that matter, between the different art forms within one region. Thus, the *commonalities and specificities* of musical modernism in particular places around the world remain elusive. The results are *parallel* regional perspectives that fall short of a *global* dimension in the sense of relationality as established by Chua and Nikolić (I should stress that insofar as I blame anyone, it is the editors, not the authors).

Even the Balzan Musicology Project, which explicitly focused on transnational connections and undoubtedly achieved much to transform the discipline, did not always live up to the claim of a 'global history' (an admittedly all but impossible task). While some authors have clearly

[36] Allana Lindgren and Stephen Ross, eds., *The Modernist World* (Routledge, 2015), blurb.

taken the overall objectives to heart, others withdrew into the comfort zone of national or regional frameworks. This may be partly due to the nature of the project, which involved large numbers of individual contributors, making it difficult to enforce a coherent agenda even if that had been the aim.[37] But therein may have lain a problem too: as the publishing blurb to one of the volumes puts it: 'A global history of music . . . would be the sum total of musical histories, large and small, around the world.'[38] The sum of the parts may fall short of the whole if there is no process, such as a more explicit methodological or theoretical framework, through which the individual parts are integrated. Methodological nationalism is deeply ingrained, and, as in the geopolitical domain, competing national(ist) perspectives are unlikely to unite in a global vision without a direct challenge.

The final component of this theoretical toolset is *hybridity/hybridisation*. It has been coined by Bhabha for a form of cultural mixing that would undermine essentialist claims to 'purity' and, consequently, open up a 'Third Space' (also an 'in-between' or 'liminal' space) through which 'we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of our selves'.[39] It has since been a key concept in postcolonialism. Although Utz, for instance, discusses the concept's origin in some detail, it is often used fairly generally for all kinds of stylistic mixtures, fusions, amalgamations and syntheses, particularly between Western, modernist and local, traditional styles.[40] This fairly loose usage of the term characterises Cho's definition: 'Hybridity does not mean the erasure of tradition but instead the synthesis of the old and the new. In the context of transnational history, it aims at identifying a new way of analyzing historical relations between the West and the non-West, based upon mutual exchange, cooperation, and cross-cultural communication.'[41]

In this sense, the significance of the term is obvious: it is something like the counterpart at the microlevel of musical style for notions such as

[37] Strohm, *Studies on a Global History of Music*; Strohm, *The Music Road*; Strohm, *Transcultural Music History*; Strohm, 'The Balzan Musicology Project towards a Global History of Music, the Study of Global Modernisation, and Open Questions for the Future'.

[38] Strohm, *Transcultural Music History*, blurb.

[39] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 39.

[40] Utz, *Musical Composition in the Context of Globalization*, 43–46. Note, for instance, that the otherwise generally theoretically aware contributors to *Decentering Musical Modernity* use the term without explanation or citation: Yang and Janz, *Decentering Musical Modernity*.

[41] Joanne Miyang Cho, 'The Idea of Entanglement, Historiography, and Organization', in *Musical Entanglements between Germany and East Asia: Transnational Affinity in the 20th and 21st Centuries* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), 4. See also Peter Burke, *Cultural Hybridity* (Cambridge: Polity, 2014).

multiple modernities or modernisms on the macrolevel.[42] It has also been widely criticised however, for instance, by Jonathan Friedman, who argues that it results in new essentialisms.[43] In some of my earlier work, I applied the notion to new music as such, in the West as well as in other regions: 'New music is not universal . . . and it is not a synthesis of Orient and Occident, but it is a hybrid, and non-western composers took part in the process of hybridization every bit as much as their western counterparts.'[44] In my later publications, it continues to play a, generally positive, role.[45] I have since become more sceptical and my criticism now is related to Friedman's: the notion of hybridity is typically applied to non-Western composers, and it creates an almost normative expectation. It is assumed that their cultural origin will or *should be* perceptible in their music, something that is not applied to Western composers, thus creating an imbalance. Furthermore, all music is the result of cultural transfers, influences and mixtures, and is therefore hybrid. Kofi Agawu has expressed this brilliantly: unless we accept processes of transplantation and cultural appropriation as natural, he argues, 'we would have to insist, every time we hear the Beethoven Violin Concerto, that the violin originated in the Middle East, that strictly speaking, it is not a European instrument, and therefore that all compositions for violin by Europeans are hybrid at the core, always already marked as "oriental"'.[46] Of course, such a heightened

[42] For a detailed discussion of stylistic synthesis, see Yayoi Uno Everett, 'Intercultural Synthesis in Postwar Western Art Music: Historical Contexts, Perspectives, and Taxonomy', in *Locating East Asia in Western Art Music*, ed. Yayoi Uno Everett and Frederick Lau (Middletown, CO: Wesleyan University Press, 2004), 1–21.

[43] Jonathan Friedman, 'Global System, Globalization and the Parameters of Modernity', in *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson (London: SAGE, 1995), 69–90, https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446250563; Jonathan Friedman, 'Global Crises, the Struggle for Cultural Identity and Intellectual Porkbarrelling: Cosmopolitans Versus Locals, Ethnics and Nationals in an Era of De-Hegemonization', in *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*, ed. Pnina Werbner and Tariq Modood (London: Zed Books, 1997), 70–89; See also John Hutnyk, 'Adorno at Womad: South Asian Crossovers and the Limits of Hybridity-Talk', *Postcolonial Studies* 1 (1998): 401–26.

[44] Björn Heile, 'Weltmusik and the Globalization of New Music', in *The Modernist Legacy: Essays on New Music* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 116.

[45] Björn Heile, 'Erik Bergman, Cosmopolitanism and the Transformation of Musical Geography', in *Transformations of Musical Modernism*, ed. Julian Johnson and Erling E. Guldbransen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 74–96; Heile, 'Musical Modernism, Global: Comparative Observations'. If I discuss my own work in such detail, it is not to suggest that it has made particularly important contributions to the debate but to draw attention to the fact that the theoretical outline I am presenting here is not only my response to the existing literature but also the preliminary result of a long and ongoing process of reflection.

[46] V. Kofi Agawu, *Representing African Music: Postcolonial Notes, Queries, Positions* (London: Routledge, 2003), 148.

awareness of the inherent hybridity of the Western classical tradition might be a productive response to Bhabha, but this is not how the term 'hybridity' has primarily been used.

Although the theoretical framework as I have sketched it here makes no claim to comprehensiveness or universality, as previously mentioned, there is an apparent convergence and widespread agreement among recent publications. What is noticeable is a certain omnivorous eclecticism, borrowing terms and concepts from history, sociology, postcolonialism and cultural studies. This may not necessarily be a problem and has a long tradition in musicology, which has tended to rely on neighbouring disciplines. As a result, however, what I described as a 'framework' lacks the coherence of a theory or system, and there may be occasions when incompaticle terms are used in conjunction. Moreover, while, as outlined, there is a high degree of theoretical reflection in most scholarship, occasionally terms appear to be used without wider awareness of their theoretical context. There are also some areas of continued disagreement which are worth outlining.

Western Imposition versus Bidirectional Cultural Flows

Perhaps the most significant contested area concerns notions of agency and the direction of cultural transfer. In a classic account, Bruno Nettl has spoken of the 'intensive imposition of Western music and musical thought upon the rest of the world'.[47] Nicholas Cook similarly speaks of the 'Music of Hegemony' that is part and parcel of the 'expansion of Europe'.[48] I have previously largely followed these leads, arguing that '[a]ny study of the global dimension of musical modernism has to contend with the fact that it is inextricably connected with the history of Western hegemony'.[49] All these claims have been substantiated by a significant body of research. Having said that, Cook has also discussed examples in which 'music may embody resistance to political ideologies' and I have looked for 'reciprocity' in the ways musical cultures have been impacting one another, although I had to concede that this remained mostly elusive.[50] These views were

[47] Bruno Nettl, *The Western Impact on World Music: Change, Adaptation, and Survival* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1985), 3.

[48] Nicholas Cook, 'Western Music as World Music', in *The Cambridge History of World Music*, ed. Philip V. Bohlman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 75, https://doi.org/10.1017/CHO9781139029476.005.

[49] Heile, 'Musical Modernism, Global: Comparative Observations', 177.

[50] Cook, 'Western Music as World Music', 81; Heile, 'Musical Modernism, Global: Comparative Observations', 188–89.

informed by particular strands in postcolonial and decolonial thought. One influential example is Walter Mignolo's idea of modernity as the 'darker side' of coloniality and embodying the 'colonial matrix of power' (CMP): '"[M]odernity" is a complex narrative whose point of origination was Europe; a narrative that builds Western civilization by celebrating its achievements while hiding at the same time its darker side, "coloniality". Coloniality, in other words, is constitutive of modernity – there is no modernity without coloniality.'[51]

To my knowledge, Mignolo has not written about music, but the colonial matrix of power is all-encompassing and item number 9 among the historical nodes that sustain the CMP includes: 'An aesthetic hierarchy (art, literature, theater, opera) that through respective institutions . . . manages the senses and shapes sensibilities by establishing norms of the beautiful and the sublime, of what art is and what it is not, what shall be included and what shall be excluded, what shall be awarded and what shall be ignored.'[52]

There is little doubt that, for Mignolo, modernist music is part of the CMP. This perspective contrasts with a more Pollyannaish, rose-tinted view taken by some recent work. This is Cho: 'the concept of entanglement rejects the primacy of one-directional cultural flows from the center to the periphery and instead highlights the significance of bi-directional cultural flows'. As an example she mentions the history of Japan, where, after a period of Westernisation during the Meiji reforms, '[o]ver the subsequent 150 years, . . . the relationship between Japan and the West has become increasingly bi-directional'.[53] What is arguably a geohistorical exception – of a country that has never been formally colonised – is put forward as representative. It is doubtful that such a view would find any takers in South Asia, Africa, Latin America or, for that matter, Indonesia and the Philippines. Flows can only be bidirectional on an even terrain. The study of entangled histories and transnational exchange therefore has to proceed from an analysis of power relations. Indeed, the notion of *bi*directionality rather than *multi*-directionality is telling: as long as across the world the only comparator remains 'the West', the relation is unequal. Furthermore, it is worth unpicking what is meant by 'cultural flow'. The concept has been formulated by the Indian-American anthropologist Arjun Appadurai in the study of globalisation, so it comes from a different disciplinary tradition as entangled history. Appadurai distinguishes between 'ethnoscapes',

[51] Mignolo, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity*, 2–3.
[52] Mignolo, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity*, 19.
[53] Cho, 'The Idea of Entanglement, Historiography, and Organization', 5.

'technoscapes', 'financescapes', 'mediascapes' and 'ideoscapes', not least because 'culture' as such doesn't just flow.[54] If one considers these different scapes, it quickly becomes obvious that their associated flows are not always bidirectional, although in combination they may well be (e.g. migration flows may predominantly go in one direction and finance flows in another).

Clearly, though, while we should not assume that transnational cultural transfer travels only from 'the centre' to 'the peripheries', thus also depriving composers and musicians in the latter of any agency, in an unequal world, it would be foolish to expect the impacts to be remotely comparable on both sides. This is not what 'entanglement' means, and there is a difference between, on the one hand, arguing that the coloniser is also shaped by the colonial relation and, on the other, suggesting that the resulting transformation is as profound as for the colony. To be fair, this is not what Cho states, but there is a tendency towards an idealised view in her contribution and others like hers. For example, Cho also cites Janz and Yang's suggestion that 'modernist Western music since Arnold Schoenberg, Claude Debussy, and Igor Stravinsky developed its own kind of "otherness" distinct from the rationality of traditional European art music ... [which] contributed to the wide acceptance of "world music" by Western audiences in the twentieth century'.[55] They go on to claim that the 'in-migration of traditional music from all parts of the world' is the 'converse' of the 'migration of European classical music all over the globe'. There are some apparent legerdemains at work: from the equation of musical innovation and modernist rupture with cultural or indeed racial otherness, through the unsubstantiated claim that this aided the distribution of 'world music' to the dubious equivalence between generally anonymous traditional music and the work of named composers (a trade-off that can be compared to the one between raw materials and finished products in the wider economy). This is not to argue that Western modernist music and non-Western influence ('exoticism') are entirely unrelated, but some questions have to be asked. Above all: who controls and benefits from this exchange?, and, are the transfers and their impact on

[54] Arjun Appadurai, 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy', in *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 27–47.

[55] Tobias Janz and Chien-Chang Yang, 'Introduction: Musicology, Musical Modernity and the Challenges of Entangled History', in *Decentering Musical Modernity: Perspectives on East Asian and European Music History*, ed. Tobias Janz and Chien-Chang Yang (Bielefeld: transcript, 2019), 22.

both sides comparable? It appears as if the ideological assumption that 'exchange processes always occur in both directions' (by Thomas Adam, quoted approvingly by Cho)[56] is taken to mean that we no longer have to ask about the nature of the 'exchange processes', who or what is driving them and who benefits.

The answers to these questions may vary according to context and the position of the scholar – and there clearly cannot be an objective stance that is unaffected by the scholar's own subjective position. It may well be that earlier research, including my own, was relatively one-sided, but it seems imperative that we continue to ask these questions. For the reasons discussed, there cannot be a 'balanced' assessment, but Kuang-Hsing Chen at least outlines the spectrum with exceptional clarity (which is not to agree with his criticism of postcolonial or globalisation studies):

> If postcolonial studies is obsessed with the critique of the West and its transgressions, the discourses surrounding globalization tend to have shorter memories, thereby obscuring the relationships between globalization and the imperial and colonial past from which it emerged. . . . In my view, without the trajectories of imperialism and colonialism, one cannot properly map the formation and conditions of globalization.[57]

Short Case Studies

Some brief, recent examples may illustrate or occasionally problematise some of the ideas outlined so far.

The Orquesta Experimental de Instrumentos Nativos (Experimental Orchestra of Native Instruments, OEIN) calls itself 'a unique kind of contemporary music ensemble . . . [that] works with traditional Andean musical instruments, bringing the ancestral pre-Columbian Andean roots to the present'.[58] It was co-founded in La Paz (Bolivia) in 1980 by the composer and conductor Cergio Prudencio. Prudencio was classically trained but alienated by the National Conservatory and similar institutions,

[56] Cho, 'The Idea of Entanglement, Historiography, and Organization', 5.

[57] Kuan-Hsing Chen, 'Introduction: Globalization and Deimperialization', in *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2010), 1–16.

[58] From the OEIN's Facebook site: www.facebook.com/oeinbolivia/about_details (accessed 26 July 2022). There is also a YouTube video showing aspects of the OEIN's work: www.youtube.com/watch?v=OxqYdDgfvBA (accessed 26 July 2022).

seeing little connection between the music promoted by them and the wider culture.[59] Bolivia has one of the largest indigenous populations in South America, who increasingly make their voices heard. According to Ximena Soruco Sologuren, however, official high culture has traditionally been entirely Western, or, as she puts it, 'colonial'. She therefore celebrates what she regards as a 'decolonising' approach. This is exactly the wording chosen by Prudencio, who argues that this work has to be grounded in indigenous culture but point towards the future: 'In political discourse, decolonisation is found as a vindication of social, political structures, but in terms of culture, decolonisation is only a path of invention. . . . The OEIN not only recognises the indigenous world in its values, knowledge, wisdoms and elaborate ways of thinking, but – above all – effectively incorporates it into the living process of contemporary culture.'[60]

The Orchestra gives commissions to leading composers in Bolivia, the rest of Latin America but also Europe: for example, on its Soundcloud site, there are recordings of works by Miguel Llanque, Alejandro Cardona, Canela Palacios, Mesias Maiguashca, Beat Furrer, Mischa Käser, Tato Taborda, Daniel Calderón, Carlos Gutiérrez and Prudencio himself.[61] Accordingly, the orchestra perform both at home and in festivals all over the world. Many of these composers are associated with the modernist avant-garde, and they are generally exploiting the sonorities produced by the traditional instruments, both played conventionally and using extended techniques. In this way, the OEIN bypasses the tradition associated with Western classical music. The 'experimental' in the title can of course be related to the primarily Western tradition of 'experimental music', but it can also be understood literally, as adopting an experimental approach to the composition for and playing of traditional instruments, and there is nothing specifically Western about that. To be fair, the OEIN largely observes other Western conventions, such as the division between composer, performers and audience, the use of notation and the role of the conductor. In that sense, the work is clearly the result of a musical entanglement, but it would not be fair to speak of an 'imposition of Western music' or of a wholesale import that is only addressed at the urban, Westernised elites. Indeed, one can argue that in the work of Prudencio and the OEIN,

[59] Ximena Soruco Sologuren, 'A propósito de la Orquesta Experimental de Instrumentos Nativos: crear, enseñar y escuchar es descolonizar', *Revista Ciencia y Cultura* 17, no. 31 (December 2013): 42.

[60] Quoted from Soruco Sologuren, 53–54.

[61] https://soundcloud.com/oein (accessed 26 July 2022).

there is a convergence between the decolonial and the avant-gardist critiques of the Western classical tradition.

The OEIN's motto 'from ancestral, pre-Columbian Andean roots to the present' chimes in with that of the Association for the Advancement of Creative Musicians (AACM) in Chicago: 'Great Black Music from the ancient music of Africa to the music of the future', and their ethos and educational programmes are in many ways similar.[62] As an orchestra of traditional instruments performing both traditional and newly composed music, it resembles more the orchestras of traditional instruments set up in East Asia from the 1920s onwards, however. This phenomenon is best-known in China, but there were parallel developments in neighbouring Korea. The modern Chinese orchestra typically divides the instruments into four sections – wind, plucked strings, bowed strings, and percussion – on the basis of the Western symphony orchestra, and it also adopts similar seating arrangements, with a conductor in front. The use of staff notation is likewise common.[63] The repertoire varies: while the original intention was to preserve or 'improve' traditional music, some orchestras also perform new compositions, popular music or arrangements of Western classical music. Chinese orchestras have also performed works by modernist composers; Tan Dun's *Xibei zuqu* (*Northwest Suite*, also *Yellow Earth Suite*, 1986, rev. 1990) is an early example.[64] As will be seen in Chapter 5, the National Orchestra of Korea likewise lays great emphasis on collaborations with composers; Younghi Pagh-Paan's *Das Universum atmet, es wächst und schwindet* for traditional Korean instruments (2007) was written for the ensemble.

What unites the cases is that it makes more sense to speak of 'modernisation' than of 'Westernisation'. These are primarily innovations undertaken within particular traditions, even if Western influence has played an important role. At the same time, however, this binary distinction, which has been influential at least from the work of Bruno Nettl to the recent Balzan Musicology Project, seems unsatisfactory in the present context.[65]

[62] See, for example, George E. Lewis, *A Power Stronger than Itself: The AACM and American Experimental Music* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

[63] Hannes Jedeck, 'Different Interpretations of Musical Modernity? Xiao Youmei's Studies in Leipzig and the Foundation of the Modern Chinese Folk Orchestra', in *Decentering Musical Modernity*, 123–44; Yingfai Tsui, 'The Modern Chinese Folk Orchestra: A Brief History', *Musical Performance* 2, no. 2 (1998): 19–32.

[64] Samuel Wong Shengmiao, 'Hua Yue: The Chinese Orchestra in Contemporary Singapore' (PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 2009), 40; see also Han Kuo-Huang and Judith Gray, 'The Modern Chinese Orchestra', *Asian Music* 11, no. 1 (1979): 20, https://doi.org/10.2307/833965.

[65] Nettl, *The Western Impact on World Music*, 20; cf. also Amnon Shiloah, 'Modernization and Westernization in Eastern Music', in *The Modernist World*, ed. Stephen Ross and Allana Lindgren (London: Routledge, 2015), 472–80. Reinhard Strohm's concluding article of

The history of musical entanglements between Latin America and East Asia on one side and the West on the other is so long and their results in the work of the OEIN or similar avant-garde compositions for East-Asian traditional orchestras so complex that it no longer makes sense to categorically distinguish between Western and local elements or influences.

A similar point can be made about the 'Bow Project', which was the brainchild of the South African composer Michael Blake and realised from 1999. Blake was fascinated by the performance of the legendary Xhosa *uhadi* (the Xhosa musical bow) player, Nofinishi Dywili (1928–2002). Under the auspices of NewMusicSA, the South-African section of the ISCM, of which he was President at the time (see Chapter 3), Blake asked a group of composers from a diverse range of musical traditions and ethnic communities to first transcribe one song each and, in a second step, write new compositions for string quartet on the basis of the material. The results were performed at NewMusicSA's Indabas, its regular meetings.[66] Over the years, more compositions were added, eventually totalling twelve. The resulting double-CD, produced through an exchange with the Faroese ISCM section (re-)unites the compositions with Dywili's original recordings.[67]

The process is reminiscent of the nationalisms of the early twentieth century, and, in his liner notes, Blake quotes Gwen Ansell stating that 'the bow should be South Africa's national instrument'.[68] But, while these earlier nationalisms were often exclusionary and treated folk songs and dances as anonymous material, the Bow Project clearly sought to be as diverse and inclusive as possible and celebrated Dywili's artistry. Furthermore, at the musical level, composers are inspired not only by tunes and rhythms but also by the unique sonorities of the bow and Dywili's extraordinary voice as well as the resulting polyrhythmic textures. In contrast to the preceding examples, these compositions are for string quartet, a Western classical ensemble, although the collaboratively composed contribution by Jürgen Bräuninger and Sazi Dlamini, *Jiwé*, adds an *ugubhu*, the Zulu musical bow. In this example too, then, Western and local elements and influences, traditions and modernities, are complexly

the Balzan Musicology Project is underpinned by the modernisation/Westernisation distinction: Strohm, 'The Balzan Musicology Project towards a Global History of Music, the Study of Global Modernisation, and Open Questions for the Future'.

[66] Denis Martin, *Sounding the Cape: Music, Identity and Politics in South Africa* (Cape Town: African Minds, 2013), 292.

[67] Nofinishi Dywili and Nightingale String Quartet, *The Bow Project*, CD album, vol. FKT044 (tutl), accessed 27 July 2022, www.tutlrecords.com/?s=bow+project.

[68] Michael Blake, 'The Origins and History of the Bow Project: A Chronology by Michael Blake' (CD liner notes, 2010), 3.

intertwined in ways that cannot easily be dis-entangled and that go beyond typical notions of hybridity.

My final example is also based on a specific local tradition. Uwalmassa are a trio of musicians, consisting of Harsya Wahono, Randy Pradipta and Pujangga Rahseta, who are part of the arts collective and label DIVISI62 in Jakarta, Indonesia. On their album *Malar*, they create what has been called 'deconstructed gamelan music' by recording themselves playing traditional gamelan instruments and technologically modifying and defamiliarising the recordings as well as subtly adding synthesised sounds.[69] The result is somewhere between *musique concrète*, electronica, trance and EDM. Once again, indigenous heritage is reclaimed through avant-garde approaches and using both traditional and technological means. While the importance of the gamelan for Western modernist composers has long been recognised, the modernising and avant-gardist tendencies *within* the tradition have attracted much less attention.[70] Like the other examples, this one speaks to a long history of entanglement, where the local and the Western can no longer be isolated.

The examples discussed share some commonalities. They have strong roots in local traditions, so it would make little sense to speak of a 'passive adoption' of Western techniques and materials or the 'diffusion' of Western modernism from its 'centres' to the respective 'peripheries' in La Paz, East Asia, South Africa and Jakarta. Nevertheless, the musicians employ techniques and approaches that we can recognise as modernist or avant-gardist. This aspect cannot be regarded as inherently Western either, although Western influences play more or less important roles. In the Bow Project, the string quartet is obviously a Western genre, and many of the compositions are recognisably Western in nature, whether in terms of the process (e.g. involving the use of staff notation) or sonic result (e.g. musical syntax based on recognisable models, such as melody and harmony or polyphony, in whatever form of modernist abstraction). This is less

[69] www.last.fm/music/Uwalmassa/+wiki (accessed 27 July 2022); https://divisi62.bandcamp.com/album/malar (accessed 27 July 2022). There seems to be no academic research or other reliable information on the group. DIVISI62 also have a soundcloud account, which features tracks by Uwalmassa and others: https://soundcloud.com/divisi62 (accessed 27 July 2022).

[70] For Western modernist responses to the gamelan, see, among others, Mervyn Cooke, '"The East in the West": Evocations of the Gamelan in Western Music', in *The Exotic in Western Music*, ed. Jonathan Bellman (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), 258–80; Jonathan Goldman, 'The Balinese Moment in the Montreal New Music Scene as a Regional Modernism', in *The Routledge Research Companion to Modernism in Music*, ed. Charles Wilson and Björn Heile (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 379–99. For modernising approaches to, specifically, Balinese gamelan, see Wayne Vitale, 'Balinese Kebyar Music Breaks the Five-Tone Barrier: New Composition for Seven-Tone Gamelan', *Perspectives of New Music* 40, no. 1 (2002): 5–69.

obvious in the case of the OEIN, but, as we have seen, the way the ensemble operates is informed by Western models, and a similar point can be made about East-Asian orchestras of traditional instruments. The Western impact is perhaps least obvious in the Indonesian example, although the apparent influence of *musique concrète* and electronica, among others, was mentioned (to the extent that these are Western themselves). At the same time, it feels like searching for Western influence is asking the wrong question, or at least taking a one-sided perspective that overlooks the agency of the musicians involved. These musics are clearly the result of a complex and long history of entanglements, as virtually all musics are in an increasingly interconnected world, in the metropolitan West as much as in its former colonies.

This process started long before the musics themselves came into being. Another element they share is that they are responses to a threat or loss, caused by the encroachments of the West or modernity – which may or may not be the same in the respective cases. The OEIN's project consists at least partly of a recreation of indigenous music, which had been destroyed by the colonisers. Chinese and Korean orchestras were attempts to modernise traditional music in the face of Western competition. This is not directly articulated, but the same may well be true of the South African traditions of bow playing. A similar argument has been made about Uwalmassa: 'Instead of preservation, they take on the initiative of bringing Indonesian arts and culture into more explorative and imaginative sonic realms. Simultaneously, this opens up the path for more thorough research into the parts of Indonesia's musical knowledge and history that have been lost.'[71] The similarity to the approach taken by Cergio Prudencio and the OEIN is striking. In other words, the impacts of the West and of modernity are perceptible not only in the way the music is put together, but also in the motivations of the musicians.

Finally, all the examples are of a collective nature and, although individuals played significant roles, they primarily concern groups, institutions and larger projects. This may be partly coincidental, but the shift in emphasis from individual composers and their works as the embodiment of music history to larger groups and social forces is intentional.

Having said that, this book will also feature more conventional examples of diffusion from the centre to the peripheries, such as the dissemination of twelve-note technique. For one thing, it would be wrong to suggest that these processes have not occurred or that they are not in need of analysis,

[71] www.goethe.de/prj/nus/en/ats/21353507.html (accessed 27 July 2022).

but I also hope to show that they have less to do with passive adoption and are more complexly entangled than may at first be apparent. Likewise, I will analyse individual works by selected composers, to show how cultural and historical processes are reflected in musical details and how individuals respond creatively to the contexts in which they find themselves.

About This Book

Part I, 'Rethinking the Historiography of Musical Modernism', presents three case studies exemplifying some of the transnational connections and contact zones. Chapter 1, 'Echoes of *The Rite* in Latin-American Music and Literature', discusses the impact of Igor Stravinsky's *The Rite of Spring* on composers and critics in Latin America. While, in Europe and North America, the work's 'primitivism' was mostly regarded as a non-specific reference to the Other, in Latin America, Stravinsky's evocation of the pagan Scythians fed into *Indigenism*, the celebration of the Continent's pre-Columbian heritage (more than its existing Indigenous population). Stravinsky's work therefore seemed to suggest an alternative path to modernity based not on European but Indigenous models.

One of the primary transnational encounters through which modernist music has been disseminated is migration. In Chapter 2, 'Exile, Migration and Mobility', I therefore argue that modernist music is the music of exile. This argument takes many forms: from a discussion of philosophical approaches to exile that often depict migrants as an avant-garde through a statistical approach that reveals the migration of composers as a mass phenomenon that has engendered what Scott Malcolmson and Bruce Robbins call 'actually existing cosmopolitanism' to a study of the 'Dodecaphonic Diaspora', the transnational network of the twelve-note composers, many of whom were migrants and who established local schools on different continents which often corresponded with one another. Overall, musical modernism would not be what it has become without the experience of migration and exile that so many composers underwent.

Part I is concluded by Chapter 3: 'Institutionalised Internationalism: The International Society for Contemporary Music'. The ISCM was one of the most important agents in the globalisation of modernist (or contemporary) music. Its explosive growth from a small number of West and Central European countries to over fifty members on all continents except Antarctica can be seen to parallel the expansion of musical modernism itself.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009491716.001 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Furthermore, it is through the encounters between its far-flung members during the Annual Festivals and General Assemblies that relational notions of musical modernism had to be negotiated, and that initially monolithic, Eurocentric criteria were progressively supplanted by others that stressed relativity and diversity. As will be seen, however, the Society embodies the failures of global modernism as much as its successes. Although it played a more important role at its 'peripheries' than at the 'centre' (here the terminology is almost inescapable), in that entry into the Society and performances at its Annual Festival, not to mention hosting the Festival, are typically regarded as significant events in national music histories, non-Western members found it hard to make their voices heard. Similarly, while challenging Eurocentrism has become part of the Society's discourse, in practice, over 70 per cent of the membership is from 'the West', and this overwhelming dominance is reflected, with minor variations, at every level: from the Society's Executive Committee through the international juries of the Annual Festivals to its programmes. Like Chapter 2, this chapter uses mixed methods, combining an investigation of archival documents, such as reports from the Annual Festivals and General Assemblies, with a survey of the membership, interviews with key individuals and a statistical analysis of the representation of different countries and regions in terms of the membership, executive, juries and programming.

While Part I focused primarily on the macrolevel, such as wider historical developments, geopolitics and major institutions, and, consequently, relied primarily on historiographical tools, Part II is concerned with the microlevel of individual composers and their work, and, accordingly, is mostly situated within analysis and criticism. My hope is that the two approaches broadly complement one another, the first sketching the wider contexts and the second analysing in detail how creative individuals respond to these situations in their work. There is no way that two people can be representative of the vast spectrum of modernist composers around the world and across the time period covered in this book. At the same time, the choices are not arbitrary: both composers, Nigerian-born Akin Euba (1935–2020), the focus of Chapter 4, and Korean-born Younghi Pagh-Paan (b. 1945), featured in Chapter 5, migrated to the West – Euba successively to Britain, Germany and the USA, Pagh-Paan to Germany – so their personal biographies reflect some of the issues outlined in Chapter 2. They also experienced the conflicts between a deep attachment to their respective native traditions and their commitment to musical modernism which they perceived as 'Western'. They found different creative solutions. Euba pursued the ideas of 'African Art Music' and 'Intercultural

Composition', which he did not appear to see as contradictory. For her part, Pagh-Paan has sought to integrate Korean elements in an avant-garde language, pointing out, with Hölderlin and Kristeva, that 'one's own [culture or musical language] has to be learned as much as the foreign'.

In terms of the analytical methodology, just as in the short case studies earlier, I saw little need to employ the terminology of hybridity or, for that matter, that of fusion, synthesis and the like, and I remain concerned that they inadvertently essentialise Western modernist and Korean or African (Yoruba or Pan-African) traditional components, respectively. In different ways, both composers strove to undermine such binarisms, and their work implicitly illustrates the long history of mutual musical entanglements between the respective regions as a consequence of which Korean and African music are 'always already' Westernised or modernised, just like Western modernism has been inflected through its myriad interactions with world musics. This will become particularly apparent in the convergence between the reference to traditional Korean playing techniques and the Western avant-gardist preference for extended techniques and unusual sonorities – itself arguably at least partly the result of non-Western influence – in Pagh-Paan's work.

There are other connections to the chapters in Part I, such as the role of the ISCM or the dodecaphonic diaspora, but these will be for readers to explore.