



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Pace, I. (2011). The Cold War in Germany as ideological weapon for anti-modernists. Paper presented at the Radical Music History Conference, 08-12-2011, Helsinki, Finland.

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/6482/>

Link to published version:

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

THE COLD WAR IN GERMANY AS IDEOLOGICAL WEAPON FOR ANTI-MODERNISTS

Ian Pace

Paper given at Radical Music History Conference, Sibelius Academy, Helsinki, December 8th, 2011, and in Graz and London, 2013.

The relationship of the Cold War to cultural life on both sides of the Iron Curtain has been the subject of journalistic and scholarly interest since at least the 1960s, with the publication in 1967 of the revelation that the Congress for Cultural Freedom had received money from the American Central Intelligence Agency. But it is really only more recently that its impact upon music and musical life it has begun to receive sustained scholarly attention. Whilst the growth of such a field of research is certainly something I welcome in principle, in this paper I wish to consider, specifically in the context of West Germany in the 1940s and 1950s, the ways in which I believe this paradigm has been employed in support of what remain essentially old and relatively conservative positions opposed to modernism and atonality, and question various of the assumptions and some of the research which underlies the arguments.

I would first like to show you on the slide some of the most important literature relating to this subject – these are not comprehensive lists, simply the principal writings.

General Literature on the Cold War and Culture

Barbara Mettler, *Demokratisierung und Kalter Krieg: Zur amerikanischen Informations- und Rundfunkpolitik in Westdeutschland 1945-1949* (Berlin: Verlag Volker Spiess, 1975).

Serge Guilbaut, *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom, and the Cold War*, translated Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1983)

Peter Coleman, *The Liberal Conspiracy: The Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Struggle for the Mind of Postwar Europe* (New York: The Free Press, 1989)

Pierre Grémion, *Intelligence de l'anticommunisme. Le congrès pour la liberté de la culture Paris 1950-1975* (Paris; Fayard, 1995)

Michael Hochgeschwender, *Freiheit in der Offensive? Der Kongreß für kulturelle Freiheit und die Deutschen* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998)

Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta, 1999) (American edition entitled *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters*)

Volker R. Berghahn, *American and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe: Shephard Stone between Philanthropy, Academy, and Diplomacy* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001).

Giles Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture: The United States, Western Europe* (New York and London: Routledge, 2002)

Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam (eds), *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe 1945-1960* (London and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2003)

David Cate, *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy during the Cold War* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)

Hugh Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2008).

Mention that there are also various studies on radio in Germany, from Barbara Mettler's book onwards, but many of these are mostly focused upon news control.

Many of the earlier works are either focused primarily upon France, or upon literature and the visual arts, rather than music. It is only really with Stonor Saunders' book that we start seeing a broadening of the subject, devoting more space to music, and making more of the links with occupied Germany. Hochgeschwender also only looks at music in passing; the same is true of Scott-Smith, though there are some interesting essays which deal in part with music in the collection he edited with Krabbendam.

Caute is a more broadly focused study which takes impressive account of divergent perspectives on the date and looks seriously at music, as to a lesser extent does Wilford.

On Music and the Cold War, and Related Areas

Ulrich Dibelius and Frank Schneider (eds), *Neue Musik im geteilten Deutschland*, four volumes (Berlin: Henschel, 1993-2000).

Martin Brody, 'Music for the Masses': Milton Babbitt's Cold War Music Theory', *The Musical Quarterly* 77 (1993), pp. 161-192.

Michele Alten, *Musiciens français dans la guerre froide: 1945-1956. L'indépendance artistique face au politique* (Paris: Harmattan, 2000).

Ian Wellens, *Music on the Frontline: Nicolas Nabokov's Struggle against Communism and Middlebrow Culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002)

Mark Carroll, *Music and Ideology in Cold War Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Anne C. Shreffler, 'Berlin Walls; Dahlhaus, Knepler, and Ideologies of Music History', *Journal of Musicology* No. 20 (2003), pp. 498-525.

Richard Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music: Volume Five: Music in the Late Twentieth Century* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

David Monod, *Settling Scores: German Music, Denazification, & the Americans, 1945-1953* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).

Elizabeth Janik, *Recomposing German Music: Politics and Musical Tradition in Cold War Berlin* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005)

Anne C. Shreffler, 'Ideologies of Serialism: Stravinsky's *Threni* and the Congress for Cultural Freedom', in Karol Berger and Anthony Newcomb (eds), *Music and the Aesthetics of Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).

Amy C. Beal, *New Music, New Allies: American Experimental Music in West Germany from the Zero Hour to Reunification* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2006).

Toby Thacker, *Music after Hitler, 1945-1955* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Danielle Fosler-Lussier, *Music Divided: Bartók's Legacy in Cold War Culture* (Berkeley, LA and London: University of California Press, 2007).

Rachel Beckles Willson, *Ligeti, Kurtág and Hungarian Music during the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Alex Ross, *The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007)

Peter Schmelz, *Such Freedom if only Musical: Unofficial Soviet Music during the Thaw* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Journal of Musicology, Vol. 26, Nos. 1 and 2 (2009). Two issues dedicated to Music and the Cold War. With articles by Peter Schmelz, Joy Calico, Laura Silverberg, Leslie A. Sprout, Stephen A. Crist, Robert Fallon, Lisa Jakelski, Phil Ford and Richard Taruskin.

Charles Rosen, 'Music and the Cold War', *The New York Review of Books*, April 7th, 2011.

There is of course much other literature dealing with music in the Soviet Union and related areas; I mention Schmelz's book simply because he has been involved in the wider debate. I have also not listed various articles (by Elizabeth Bergman, Jennifer DeLapp-Birkett, and others) dealing with the Cold War primarily in terms of American composers, nor those dealing with popular music (in particular Uta G. Poiger's important book *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2000)) nor those which examine the cultural cold war outside of Europe and North America.

Of these books, Wellens and to a lesser extent Carroll are relevant to the issues here, as naturally are the works of Monod, Janik, Beal and Thacker (much of the voluminous literature in German on musical life in that country after 1945, including the multi-volume series *Neue Musik im geteilten Deutschland*, does not engage the issue which I will raise in a particularly sustained manner, whilst the most important study of music in the French zone, Andreas Linsenmann's *Musik als politischer Faktor: Konzepte, Intentionen und Praxis französischer Umerziehungs- und Kulturpolitik in Deutschland 1945-1949/50* (Tübingen: Narr-Verlag, 2010), is deeply relevant to the wider issues of the occupying powers' musical policies, but has little which is Cold-War-specific). Taruskin in particular, and also Ross, use conclusions about the Cold War to underwrite often harsh or even dismissive views of much post-1945 radical music, especially in Germany. Fosler-Lussier and Beckles Willson are relevant because they consider the reception of their respective Hungarian composers outside of their home country.

The following are what I see as the key issues raised in much of this literature. Not all of the works argue all of these points, for sure, and some of them are more nuanced.

1. The role of the US in occupied Germany is of central importance, especially because of the fact that Nicolas Nabokov worked for a short period in the Information Control Unit in Berlin.
2. The American occupying authorities were decisive in the establishment of the first Summer Schools in Darmstadt in 1946, and later in sustaining the enterprise.

3. The fourth Zhdanov Decree, from February 1948, on music, played a decisive role in polarising positions with regard to abstract/experimentation/formalism on one hand, or socialist realism on the other.
4. The major catalyst in the musical Cold War was the *Congress for Cultural Freedom*, founded in West Berlin in June 1950, with headquarters moved to Paris later that year, with Nicolas Nabokov becoming General Secretary in 1951 and remaining in that position for most of its duration. This organisation soon received funding from the CIA, channelled through various front organisations.
5. The Congress's agenda was in diametric opposition to Soviet demands for socialist realism and attacks on formalism, and as such served an important propagandistic function in emphasising the possibilities of 'freedom' in the West, compared to restrictions and censorship in the East.
6. Key musical events for the Congress were the festival *L'Oeuvre du XXe siècle* in Paris in April-June 1952, and *La Musica nel XX Secolo* in Rome in April 1954. In the first of these, Pierre Boulez's integral serial *Structures Ia* received its world premiere, whilst at the second, there was a strong promotion of twelve-tone music. These two festivals served to add new power and legitimacy to this trend in music.
7. In West Germany, above all, musical serialism, abstraction and experimentation were viewed as the antithesis of the anti-formalist campaigns in the East, and as such themselves were enthusiastically promoted, often to the exclusion of most other musical tendencies. The German figurehead of this movement was Karlheinz Stockhausen.

8. Darmstadt was the centre and intellectual heart of this new movement. Some go as far as to argue that it was American support, perhaps via the CIA, that enabled Darmstadt to flourish as an institution.
9. Darmstadt, Donaueschingen and to some extent Cologne were the centres of new music in West Germany. There was also Karl Amadeus Hartmann's *Musica Viva* series in Munich, which had a somewhat more traditionalist approach, but this was exceptional.
10. Scientism was in the spirit of the age, in line with advanced technological developments occasioned by the military requirements of the Cold War. The quasi-scientific new approach to musical composition, and the language used to describe it, in stark, formalistic terms, was a reflection of this.
11. More traditionalist approaches, such as neo-classicism, were shunned and distrusted.
12. The leading intellectual advocate of these positions was Theodor Adorno, who became something of the high priest of the musical avant-garde in West Germany.
13. More traditionally-minded composers, in particular Hans Werner Henze, found themselves marginalised and ostracised; in Henze's case this would be a major factor in his decision to leave Germany and settle in Italy in 1953.
14. For the above reasons, atonal, serial and abstract music, despite having come to dominate modern music in Germany and been at the heart of a major establishment in place at least until the end of the Cold War, and possibly still to some extent today, is essentially the product of a particular type of high political subterfuge relevant only to a particular historical moment. The music concerned has never succeeded in generating a significant degree of public

attention, and is no longer really relevant. Those who continue to extol its merits are merely victims of a Cold War mentality.

Now by no means do I wish to dismiss all of these points, nor suggest that most of the writers and scholars take the more extreme interpretation, particularly with regard to the final point which I would associate in particular with the work of Richard Taruskin. However, many of these points need greater interrogation; having spent the last 10 years researching the emergence of new music and its infrastructure in West Germany during the 1940s and 1950s, I wish to attempt to do this.

Point 1: The role of the US in occupied Germany is of central importance, especially because of the fact that Nicolas Nabokov worked for a short period in the Information Control Unit in Berlin.

This is explored in the work of Stonor Saunders, Taruskin, Monod, Janik, Beal, Thacker. Of these, only Janik and Thacker (and other more specialised writers such as Andreas Lindemann) take more seriously the implications of the fact that there were two other occupying powers as well as the Americans and the Soviets – the British and the French. The British in particular controlled the largest Zone, covering the bulk of North-West Germany, made up of what are the present-day states of North-Rhine Westphalia, Lower Saxony and Schleswig-Holstein, including the cities of Cologne, Düsseldorf, Aachen, Dortmund, Essen, Hannover, and Braunschweig, as well as the city-state of Hamburg. The French had a smaller zone, containing what are today the states of Rheinland-Pfalz and the Saar, as well as what was then South Baden, and Württemberg Hohenzollern, both parts of present-day Baden-Württemberg (together

with the region of Württemberg-Baden, which was controlled by the Americans). Cities under French control included Baden-Baden, Freiburg, Konstanz, Tübingen, Mainz, Trier, Koblenz and Saarbrücken. The Americans controlled, as well as Württemberg-Baden, the modern states of Hesse and Bavaria. Cities under their control included Frankfurt, Darmstadt, Stuttgart, Karlsruhe, Heidelberg, Munich, and Nuremberg, as well as the city-state of Bremen. All four occupying powers controlled parts of Berlin.

The Americans undoubtedly paid serious attention to the administration and licensing of culture, which a variety of archival documents demonstrate (as Stonor Saunders, Beal and others have investigated) a fear of German perceptions of America as a materialist, culture-free nation, which might make Germans distrust the cultural implications of accepting American-style democracy; they did also wish to match the Soviets in terms of hosting prestigious cultural events, but this seems to have been primarily centred upon Berlin. The French, for their part, saw the occupation as a means for wholesale promotion of French culture, particularly in order to combat any German assumptions of supremacy in this realm. The British paid less attention to culture, and in particular to music, despite pushing for some performances of British works by German musicians; they were more concerned with newspaper and radio policy and establishing the type of free political debate, in line with a form or parliamentary democracy, to be found in the UK.

The Americans did lend some support to the foundation of festivals, concert series and educational institutions in their zone, but this can easily be overestimated. Any such thing required a license from the Americans, and it was much more a case of

Germans looking to start up new events and institutions, who were able to gain American permission; when they would give some commitment to perform at least a few token American works, this was more likely to be granted, even when there were question marks hanging over the pasts of some of those involved. The first festival in the American Zone exclusively dedicated to new music, the *Zeitgenössische Musikwoche* in Bad Nauheim in July 1946 (which would shift the following year to Frankfurt and become the annual *Woche für neue Musik*) was run by Radio Frankfurt. The music officer for this station was Holger Hagen, a German-born actor now working for the US Army, but he did not organise the event; that was done by the pianist Heinz Schröter, who was given *carte blanche* by Hagen to go ahead with this so long as he included a few works of American music (which ended up being pieces of William Schuman and Quincy Porter).

But the French initiative, which was considerably more pro-active, is if anything more decisive. It was in the French Zone that the first ever new music festival after the war occurred, the *Trossinger Musiktage*, in September 1945, though this was mostly devoted to harmonica and accordion music, for which the town was a leading centre. Through the first year of occupation, the French helped support a relatively small art exhibition with associated new music mini-festival in Überlingen in October 1945, the major *Kulturwochen*, a two-week event of art, literature and music in Konstanz in June 1946 which drew thousands of visitors from all zones and featured a large amount of new music, including the first post-war performance in Germany of a work of Messiaen, and played a decisive role in establishing a degree of German-French cultural rapport and collaboration, and also the re-establishment of the festival in Donaueschingen and a new event (similar to those in Überlingen and Konstanz) in

Tübingen; all of the events in Trossingen, Donaueschingen and Tübingen were the work of important and now mostly forgotten figure of composer and conductor Hugo Herrmann, who had also run Donaueschingen in the 1930s and established a harmonica school in Trossingen.

Few of these French-backed festivals lasted – only Donaueschingen and Tübingen continued, and then after a hiatus of several years, but they were widely reported and attended, and set the scene for a flourishing new music world as much as almost anything else, in line with the Bad Nauheim event in the American zone. Furthermore, the French appointed Heinrich Strobel as head of music at the new radio station of Südwestfunk, with headquarters in Baden-Baden, the centre of their occupation zone. As various French documents make clear, there were serious doubts about Strobel on account of his work for newspapers and radio controlled by the German occupiers in Paris from 1940 to 1944, some of which was seriously nationalistic and propagandistic in nature; however, on the basis of testimonies given by Artur Honegger (himself deeply complicit with the Vichy regime) and Claude Delvincourt, director of the Paris Conservatoire, they became convinced that Strobel's real instincts were as a Francophile, and thus he was suitable to follow their cultural occupation policy. Baden-Baden thus became established as a leading centre for new music, with the radio orchestra (which was essentially a renamed and re-managed version of the city orchestra) giving a wider range of premieres and other performances of new music than any other in the Western Zones at that time.

As regards Nabokov, a minor composer himself, he certainly did play a role in musical life in Berlin after his posting to the city (for which, according to his

autobiography, his primary task was to find suitable Soviet cultural officers to work together with the Americans, British and French as part of a joint cultural wing of the Allied Control Commission), but at this stage his activities seem to have had a fair amount to do with simply promoting his own work – in all zones of the city. He received performances and broadcasts on Soviet-controlled Radio Berlin during his time there, and was able to have the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra perform his *Parade* in June 1946, which – quite amazingly in light of his later activities – was dedicated to the Soviet Red Army! It is a mistake to conflate the views of Nabokov in 1945-1946 with those from his assuming the mantle of the CCF in 1951, even though the first of his autobiographical works, *Old Friends and New Music*, published in 1951, is filtered through his later perceptions.

Point 2: The American occupying authorities were decisive in the establishment of the first Summer Schools in Darmstadt in 1946, and later in sustaining the enterprise.

At the most extreme, it is argued by Stonor Saunders and then later Taruskin that Darmstadt was a US government initiative. But no evidence has been provided for this. On the contrary, all evidence points to its being a local initiative of the cultural officer for the city of Darmstadt, Wolfgang Steinecke, with the backing of the mayor of Darmstadt, Ludwig Metzger. Steinecke had during the course of the first year after the war initiated a number of ventures in the city, in particular an exhibition of *Befreite Kunst* in December 1945 in association with the refounded *Darmstädter Sezession*, which included a few musical performances, including of Schoenberg and Berg. In American occupation files and local and state files there, there is only

passing mention of the first Ferienkurse, strongly suggesting that it was a last-minute initiative; the first mention of them in the American files located by Beal is from July 25th, 1946, just a month before the courses would begin, and I have not located anything earlier than this.

As for the Americans sustaining the Ferienkurse, this appears not to have occurred until 1948 and 1949, when much of Germany's cultural life was hit hard by currency reform. Between 1949 and 1951 the American High Commission for Occupied Germany (HICOG), the successor to OMGUS after the declaration of the Federal Republic, did supply 20% of the funding, which certainly helped in difficult times, but the bulk of the money came from city and state sources. Furthermore, during this period, as the Ferienkurse began to feature more dodecaphonic music, various accounts from American officers show their concern about such a development.

There is no particular reason to single out Darmstadt as a special instrument of American policy during this period (any more so than the lesser known *Internationales Musikinstitut*, devoted to the teaching of new music, which was founded in January 1946 in Berlin and ran for two years); they simply were prepared to grant it a license and provide some money, as one small part of their wider agenda of being seen to be supporters of a type of culture which Germans would respect. In compositional terms this was represented by the likes of Barber, Hanson, William Schuman, Quincy Porter, and others, hardly figures one would associate with an avant-garde.

Point 3: The fourth Zhdanov Decree, from February 1948, on music, played a decisive role in polarising positions with regard to abstract/experimentation/formalism on one hand, or socialist realism on the other.

The Zhdanov Decree was certainly viewed with considerable disdain by many in the West, again especially in Berlin. This was mostly on account of the fact that it seemed so strongly reminiscent of similar pronouncements during the Third Reich; from about this time the concept of a unifying concept 'totalitarianism', of which both communism and fascism are examples, began to emerge. This was rather convenient for many in Germany, as if this could be backdated to the early days of the Russian Revolution, then it preceded the advent of National Socialism (this type of perspective featured in the charged *Historikerstreit* of the 1980s). Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt was particularly outspoken in opposing Zhdanov, but I have seen little evidence to suggest that he or many others therefore concluded that the way to demonstrate this opposition was through simple negation of anti-formalism i.e. by actively promoting the most obviously 'formalistic' music there was. The position seems more akin to simple opposing censorship and rigid control of the type being experienced in the Eastern Bloc. Of course this could not be other than 'political' in the widest sense, but should not be interpreted as entailing any particularly active support of Western capitalism; many on the Marxist left who oppose Stalinism would have rejected Zhdanovism to the same degree.

Point 4: The major catalyst in the musical Cold War was the *Congress for Cultural Freedom*, founded in West Berlin in June 1950, with headquarters moved to Paris later that year, with Nicolas Nabokov becoming General Secretary in 1951 and remaining in that position for most of its duration. This organisation soon received funding from the CIA, channelled through various front organisations.

What has been most problematic in terms of scholarship on the CCF with respect to music is a too-great eagerness to simply assume that what has been established for literature and art can simply be mapped onto music as well, even when the available evidence is lacking. No serious evidence has been found to show that the CCF actively promoted the most 'abstract' music in the way that can be shown about the promotion of, say, American Abstract Expressionist painting; rather some of the writing simply assumes that support for one would naturally entail support for the other. But Ian Wellens, in the most comprehensive study of Nabokov's views and activities for music, has shown conclusively (through a thorough archival study of Nabokov's writings and correspondence) that with the Congress Nabokov definitely made no effort to promote serial rather than neo-classical music, the latter constituting much more of his preference, demonstrated through his championing of Stravinsky.

The CCF's musical activities in Germany were relatively minor and most concentrated in Berlin (where Boris Blacher was on the executive); the Congress itself would eventually have regional bureaus in Munich, Cologne, Hamburg and Berlin, but this did not come about until the late 1950s, and again their musical activities do not appear to have been considerable. The most important musical event in which the CCF and other American interests likely had some involvement was the *Berliner*

Festwochen, established in 1951. HICOG gave considerable support to the first such festivals but, as detailed by Monod, these were notable more for such things as a major production of Gershwin's *Porgy and Bess* as for any more abstract new music. Nono's ballet *Der rote Mantel* was premiered in the Festwochen in 1954, and his *Epitaph auf Lorca* in 1957 (under Scherchen) and Dallapiccola's *Der Gefangene* in 1955, but equally important were Henze's *König Hirsch* in 1956, Nabokov's ballet *Die letzte Blume* in 1958, or appearances by Duke Ellington and Kid Ory in 1959.

Heinrich Strobel and Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt, both of them friendly with Nabokov, were involved in reading panels for the CCF – Thacker asserts (in another article, rather than in his main book) that Stuckenschmidt was a member, on the basis of material in the Stuckenschmidt archive in the Akademie der Künste, Berlin, but having gone through the same collection, I find no evidence of a wider association. And as he points out with Stuckenschmidt, and I would do likewise with Strobel, there is no evidence to suggest they saw this task as about anything more than simply selecting the types of music they most favoured.

Point 5: The Congress's agenda was in diametric opposition to Soviet demands for socialist realism and attacks on formalism, and as such served an important propagandistic function in emphasising the possibilities of 'freedom' in the West, compared to restrictions and censorship in the East.

Certainly the Congress's agenda was strongly in opposition to the Soviet anti-formalist, socialist realist, agenda, and it served a propagandistic function, but this is

arguably most significant in raising the profiles of Shostakovich and Prokofiev in the West, viewed as oppressed figures whose work could be performed and promoted for such reasons.

Point 6: Key musical events for the Congress were the festival *L'Oeuvre du XXe siècle* in Paris in April-June 1952, and *La Musica nel XX Secolo* in Rome in April 1954. In the first of these, Pierre Boulez's integral serial *Structures Ia* received its world premiere, whilst at the second, there was a strong promotion of twelve-tone music. These two festivals served to add new power and legitimacy to this trend in music.

[Mention East-West Music Encounter, Tokyo, 1961; and European and Indian Music Traditions, New Delhi, 1963]

The full programme for the Paris festival is given in Carroll's book; I also have obtained a copy of the Rome booklet. Without looking at the totality of the programmes, it is easy to magnify out of all proportion the importance of some small components therein. Boulez's *Structures Ia* must be one of the most written-about and least heard works (that performances are relatively rare surely contradicts common claims about its centrality – I should declare an interest here as I have recorded both books of *Structures* together with the pianist Pi-Hsien Chen) – how often does one find discussion of *Ib* (a far longer piece which is the heart of the first book) or *Ic*? *Ia* is if anything a short prelude to the larger *Ib*, whose importance has been played up by both its proponents and detractors, from the 1950s onwards. Mark Carroll insists in holding this work up together with Stravinsky's *Symphony in C* as the two poles of the

festival, even writing about 'the potential of works such as *Structures Ia* to confront the Cold War cultural ideological status quo'. It appeared in the first of seven chamber music concerts, on May 7th, alongside works of Elsa Barraine, Dutilleux, Koechlin, Yves Baudrier, and Jolivet. More significant was surely Messiaen's *Visions de l'Amen* two days later. But otherwise, in 32 different concerts, those works which might be said to concur with an avant-garde agenda, excepting earlier works of Debussy and Stravinsky which were later favoured by avant-garde composers, would be the Messiaen, Jolivet and Boulez works, perhaps Dallapiccola's *Canti di prigionia*, Schoenberg's *Erwartung* and Second String Quartet, Berg's *Wozzeck*, Webern's Five Pieces for String Quartet, Ives's *Concord Sonata*, and Varèse's *Ionisation* – notably all of these except the Boulez. This is worth setting against the numerous works of Stravinsky (*L'oiseau de feu*, *Orphée*, *Oedipus Rex*, the *Symphony in C* and *Symphony in Three Movements*) Britten's *Billy Budd*, Hindemith's *Four Temperaments* and *Nobilissima visione*, and such things as Samuel Barber's Overture from *The School for Scandal* and Piano Sonata, Virgil Thomson's *Four Saints in Three Acts*, Vaughan Williams' *Fantasia on a Theme of Thomas Tallis*, and works of Richard Strauss, Respighi, Henri Sauget, Milhaud, William Schuman, William Walton, and Villa-Lobos.

For the Rome festival, 12 (moderately) younger figures were chosen for their works to be premiered: these were Yves Baudrier (France), Conrad Beck (Swiss), Bernd Bergel (Israel), Peter Racine Fricker (UK), Camargo M. Guarnieri (Brasil), Lou Harrison (US), Giseler Klebe (Germany), Jean Louis Martinet (France), Mario Peragallo (Italy), Camillo Togni (Italy), Wladimir Vogel (Russia-Germany), and Ben Weber (US). Also performed was Henze's *Boulevard Solitude*. Other concerts featured the

likes of Busoni, Ibert, Poulenc, Sauguet, Britten, Casella, Malipiero, Stravinsky, Prokofiev, Janacek, Hartmann, Blacher, Honegger, Copland, Barber, Virgil Thomson and Chavez. Somewhat more radical tendencies are only to be found in a few pieces, including Elliott Carter's First String Quartet, Schoenberg's Piano Pieces op. 19 and 25, Webern's *Das Augenlicht*, Varèse's *Octandre*, Nono's *Epitaffio per Garcia Lorca* No. 2, and a twelve-tone work of Josef Matthias Hauer (many of these in a single concert conducted by Scherchen), whilst the European premiere of Stravinsky's Septet constitutes a step along his road towards adopting 12-tone composition. Certainly these do not form significant enough a proportion of the festival so as to warrant the exaggerated claims made by Stonor Saunders (who writes of 'a heavy concentration on atonal, dodecaphonic composition') or Carroll; this view is reiterated in unmediated form by Cauter, but comprehensively critiqued by Wellens. There was marginally more dodecaphonic and atonal music than in Paris, but not enough to warrant describing this as a central feature. As in Berlin, Nono is the one figure who would come later to be associated with 'Darmstadt' who was played there and, in both Rome and Berlin, for some of his less abstract works.

In terms of the wider new music scene in Germany, I have seen no significant reason to conclude that the Paris and Rome festivals had any serious impact upon the more radical developments. Klebe at this time had an enviable reputation in Germany (much more so than Stockhausen), which would continue for a few years, though diminish when he began to concentrate his attention upon opera composition. Klebe did develop his own rather idiosyncratic approach to dodecaphony in some works, but this was a long way from the type of high abstraction to be found in works of Boulez

or Stockhausen, and can reasonably be situated within the realms of interwar modernism.

Point 7: In West Germany, above all, musical serialism, abstraction and experimentation were viewed as the antithesis of the anti-formalist campaigns in the East, and as such themselves were enthusiastically promoted, often to the exclusion of most other musical tendencies. The German figurehead of this movement was Karlheinz Stockhausen.

There is much I could say about this, but because of time I will stick to a few points.

To the first of these points, there is very little evidence of this, nor that serialism and abstraction were anything like as central in the 1950s as they have been portrayed.

The exception is to be found in Cologne, in large measure because of the somewhat technocratic and rationalist agendas of Herbert Eimert and Werner Meyer-Eppler, both pivotal influences upon Stockhausen and also on contemporaries such as Gottfried Michael Koenig. Eimert and Meyer-Eppler were driving forces in establishing the electronic music studio in Cologne, and Eimert would later found the journal *Die Reihe* in 1957. But otherwise, the impulse towards abstraction came from elsewhere – from Boulez, Leibowitz, Pousseur, Goeyvaerts, Maderna, Nono.

Stockhausen's most original contribution in the first half of the 1950s is, I would argue, through his two electronic music studies; it is with *Gesang der Jünglinge* (1955-56), through his bridging of French and German studio composition, and *Gruppen* (1955-57) where he can employ Meyer-Eppler's ideas on a grandiose scale,

that Stockhausen comes into his own. But until the very late 1950s, Stockhausen remains a relatively marginal figure in Germany, only played in a few places (principally Cologne and Darmstadt, with a few premieres in Hamburg and Baden-Baden) and, like many of the avant-garde, treated with suspicion by many. It is notable that in the 1955 edition of Hans Joachim Moser's *Musiklexikon*, there are entries for Henze and Klebe, but not for Stockhausen, Zimmermann, Schnebel, Koenig, nor Boulez or Nono. The entries on atonality and 12-tone music say little about any post-war developments in these respects.

Point 8: Darmstadt was the centre and intellectual heart of this new movement. Some go as far as to argue that it was American support, perhaps via the CIA, that enabled Darmstadt to flourish as an institution.

Other than the support already mentioned, there is no evidence of further American support for Darmstadt, and certainly not of any CIA funding. I and others have looked hard for this, and nothing at all is to be found in the correspondence. One hesitates before absolutely ruling something out purely on grounds of lack of evidence; but archival evidence exists aplenty for most other activities of the CCF and other front organisations. The accounts for the Darmstadt Ferienkurse show nothing amiss during the period.

Furthermore, constructions of 'Darmstadt' in the 1950s are not always borne out by the programming. The 1949 festival, given in conjunction with the Frankfurt *Woche*, did indeed feature a considerable amount of Schoenberg's music, in celebration of his

75th birthday (just as Hindemith's works had been generously programmed, all over Germany, at the time of his 50th birthday in 1945). But one could also hear Tippett's Concerto for Double String Orchestra, Werner Egk's *La tentation de Saint Antoine*, Copland's Violin Sonata, and works of Hindemith, Roussel, Stravinsky, Honegger, Prokofiev, Blacher, and others, not to mention the world premiere of Henze's *Apollo et Hyazinthus*. Maderna had an early outing in Darmstadt this year with his *Fantasia per due pianoforti*, but also played that year was Barber's *Adagio for Strings*. In 1945-1949 the most performed composer at Darmstadt was Hindemith; between 1950 and 1955 it was Bartók.

What was true of Darmstadt was that there were several teachers and lecturers there who were enthusiastic proponents of dodecaphony, from an early time. These included Hermann Heiss (whose 1949 *Elemente der musikalischen Komposition*, based upon some of his Darmstadt lectures, contains a whole 60-page section on twelve-tone technique, alongside three other sections on rhythm, melody and timbre), Josef Rufer, René Leibowitz, and also Wolfgang Fortner after his conversion to the technique with his Third String Quartet of 1947 – in a German context, arguably more significant than the later conversion of Stravinsky, since Fortner was involved in so many events in German new music at this point.

Through the course of the 1950s, however, radical serial and other developments remained in a minority in terms of performance at Darmstadt. 1951 hosted the International Twelve-Tone Congress, with which there were three associated concerts (including the premiere of the 'Tanz um das goldene Kalb' from Schoenberg's *Moses und Aron*), and major lectures from Robert Beyer, Meyer-Eppler, Friedrich Trautwein

and Adorno on electronic music and issues of music and technology, but the festival could open with Hartmann's Third Symphony and Orff's *Catulli Carmina*, whilst visitors to others of the 20 concerts within the courses, other than the three dedicated ones, would not have got any impression of a dominance of dodecaphony, only heard it in a few pieces scattered through the duration and a little more in one or two concerts, such as one featuring Nono's *Polifonica-Monodia-Rimtica* and Nigg's *Pour un poète captif*. 1953, which saw the celebration of what would have been Webern's 70th birthday, saw three concerts dedicated to Schoenberg, a whole concert of Webern, and a concert of 'Musik der jungen Generation' with works of Boulez, Stockhausen and Nono, but also five whole concerts of Bartók's piano works, Honegger's *Antigone*, and works of Barber, Milhaud and Casella; Milhaud had four performances, with the festival ending with his *La mort d'un tyran* (in the same programme as Maderna's *Quattro lettere (Kranichsteiner Kammerkantate)*). Similarly, Milhaud's *Die Orestie des Aischylos* would open the 1955 courses, whilst the 1956 ones would open with Orff's *Catulli Carmina* and Ravel's *L'enfant et les sortilèges*. In 1955 a combination of the Second Viennese School and some of the younger generation influenced by them might make up about half of the total programming, but no more; there was still plenty of opportunities to hear less radical figures past and present. 1956 and 1957 are arguably dodecaphonic heydays, with slightly over half of the works informed by this tradition; 1958 sees the first appearance of Cage and Tudor at Darmstadt, and the beginning of a rupture, with indeterminate and other elements starting to shift various new work in other directions.

Point 9: Darmstadt, Donaueschingen and to some extent Cologne were the centres of new music in West Germany. There was also Karl Amadeus Hartmann's *Musica Viva* series in Munich, which had a somewhat more traditionalist approach, but this was exceptional.

By 1949, or 1951 at the latest, a whole network of music festivals and concert series was in place in West Germany. Many histories concentrate almost exclusively upon Darmstadt, Donaueschingen, and to a lesser extent Munich, but more central, in my view, was the Bad Nauheim/Frankfurt *Woche*, which ran through until 1956, after which point it merged with Darmstadt, whilst other festivals in Stuttgart, Heidelberg, Braunschweig, Düsseldorf, Hamburg, and later Berlin, not to mention numerous smaller or occasional events, were also a prominent feature of new musical life. For the most part (with a few exceptions including Fortner's efforts in Heidelberg), these festivals tended to feature primarily interwar modernism of the type presented in Munich.

And Donaueschingen was much more mainstream than often imagined. Strobel and the SWF took over the running of this in 1950. The first year featured works of Bartók, Genzmer, Milhaud, Otto E. Schilling, Dallapiccola, Herrmann, Hartmann, Klebe, Honegger, Fortner, Stravinsky. 1951 included Messiaen's *Harawi* and Boulez's *Polyphonie X*, but also Hermann Reutter's *Der himmlische Vagant*, Henze's Third Symphony and Honegger's Fifth. Similarly, 1952 included Stockhausen's *Spiel*, and B.A. Zimmermann's Oboe Concerto, but also works of Stravinsky, Fortner and Hindemith. And this pattern was continued through most of the 1950s – some radical works (e.g. Cage and Tudor in 1954, or Xenakis, Pousseur and Boulez in 1955, a year

with one of the greatest concentrations of such repertoire), but usually balanced by more standard fare. 1956 saw the whole of Book 1 of Boulez's *Structures*, but the previous evening had been dedicated exclusively to a concert of Honegger. Various reviews of the 1957 festival were sharply critical of the abstraction of Nono's *Varianti*, comparing it unfavourably with Henze's *Nachtstücke und Arien*, when both were premiered in the same programme (alongside works of Killmayer and Fortner, and following a jazz concert as part of the festival earlier that day). And as with Darmstadt, it is really when other equally radical but distinct types of music start to enter the picture, in the late 1950s, that it is possible to move away from the older or more traditional music and maintain diversity.

A similar pattern can be found in the important *Musik der Zeit* concert series in Cologne, hosted by NWDR (later WDR), from which events which have been remembered in avant-garde inclined histories (such as the premieres of Boulez's Third Piano Sonata and Stockhausen's *Gruppen*) only give a partial picture.

Also, when one moves outside of the realms of specialised new music festivals and concert series, towards the inclusion of new music in regular orchestral and opera series, then the picture becomes considerably more traditionalist. To look purely at the German orchestra most dedicated to new music – the SWF-Sinfonieorchester – an examination of the list of world given by the orchestra between 1947 and 1960 (many of them given at Donaueschingen) reveals 117 works. Of these around 30-35 pieces might be considered avant-garde: Boulez's *Polyphonie X*, *Le Marteau sans Maître*, Nono's *Y su sangre ya viene cantando*, *Due espressioni*, *Incontri*, Stockhausen's *Spiel*, Xenakis's *Metastaseis*, Berio's *12 Aspekte der Arie* and *Quaderni* works of Messiaen,

Marcel Mihalovici, Hans Ulrich Engelmann, Roman Haubenstock-Ramati (four works), Gilbert Amy, Bo Nillson, Krzysztof Penderecki, Yoritsuné Matsudaira, and perhaps B. A. Zimmermann's Violin and Oboe Concertos, and Rolf Liebermann's Concerto for Jazz Band and Orchestra. Equally prominent were five different works of Henze, including his *Concertino* for piano and wind orchestra, Violin Concerto and 3rd Symphony, seven premieres of Fortner, seven of Egk, four of Klebe, and much else. And this proportion of avant-garde works is exceptional amongst the programmes of other radio and wider orchestras, who are without exception much more traditionally minded.

Point 10: Scientism was in the spirit of the age, in line with advanced technological developments occasioned by the military requirements of the Cold War. The quasi-scientific new approach to musical composition, and the language used to describe it, in stark, formalistic terms, was a reflection of this.

There was certainly a scientism in the thinking of Eimert and Meyer-Eppler, some of which found its way into the pages of *Die Reihe*, but this can be over-estimated. Certainly the rhetoric was quite distinct from that to be found amongst the Columbia-Princeton School, with wider social, political, religious and mystical motivations found amongst the Germans and other Europeans. Stockhausen himself was never the same type of ideologue as Eimert or Meyer-Eppler (he eventually grew tired of the latter's teaching when working with him in Bonn), as witnessed by *Gesang der Jünglinge*, or the various more intuitive elements which enter into *Gruppen*.

Point 11: More traditionalist approaches, such as neo-classicism, were shunned and distrusted.

The high profile of Stravinsky's works, and the continuing profile accorded to Stravinskians such as Orff, Egk or Blacher (and some Fortner), as well as French composers associated with *Les Six*, and others from elsewhere, disprove this.

Point 12: The leading intellectual advocate of these positions was Theodor Adorno, who became something of the high priest of the musical avant-garde in West Germany.

This point is often made, and is only really tenable to those with the most cursory or superficial knowledge of Adorno's thought and writings. Carroll is better on this subject – he recognizes the extent to which Adorno, whilst definitively favouring Schoenberg's atonality over Stravinsky's neo-classicism, was lukewarm about dodecaphony, and became outright hostile to some of the more systematic experiments of the 1950s (especially that of Goeyvaerts), provoking his notorious lecture 'Das Altern der neuen Musik', first delivered in Stuttgart in 1954.

But anyone familiar with the *Dialektik der Aufklärung*, or the rest of Adorno's work, should be clear about the extent to which he was markedly set against forms of high rationalisation, seeing potentially totalitarian or fascist elements contained therein. Whilst Adorno came round to some of the post-war avant-garde, he was not a major

enthusiast, seemingly more struck by the work he heard of Cage, especially the *Concert for Piano and Orchestra*. Also, there is little evidence that many of the avant-garde concerned themselves much with his thought or writings. It was not until a second generation came along – that of Helmut Lachenmann, N.A. Huber, Mathias Spahlinger and others – that Adorno's ideas, particularly in terms of a critical attitude towards tradition and ossified aspects of music, would come to bear compositional fruit.

However, this sort of misconception of Adorno has led to him being held up (including by Taruskin) as a leading protagonist in the Cold War, on the Western side – which is an absurd statement when one considers his scathing critiques of American and Western capitalist society, finding in its smallest things (such as automated window mechanisms) elements of a lurking fascism. But for those of a mindset which cannot think beyond dichotomies, this is not so surprising. In a way not dissimilar to the 'with us or against us' rhetoric propagated by George W. Bush at the outset of the 'War on Terror', simplistic dichotomists will not allow for any position other than either supporting Soviet socialist realism, or backing Western 'freedom'; or at the very least, only points along a spectrum connecting these two extremes. But this is very limited – it affords no place either for ultra-leftists such as Adorno, hostile practically in equal measure to Western capitalism, fascism and Stalinism, or for more traditionalist conservatives who are equally sceptical about major social change and also the more adventurous directions in music.

Point 13: More traditionally-minded composers, in particular Hans Werner Henze, found themselves marginalised and ostracised; in Henze's case this would be a major factor in his decision to leave Germany and settle in Italy in 1953.

Many writings on this rely almost entirely upon Henze's own rather self-righteous and self-pitying accounts of these times. Yet inspection of programming through the 1940s and 1950s demonstrate clearly that Henze's work was regularly played at all the major festivals, as was that of Klebe, in both cases much more so than Stockhausen, or Boulez, Maderna, Nono, Pousseur and others. And much correspondence shows how friendly he was with many figures he would later denigrate in print – Wolfgang Steinecke, Heinrich Strobel, Herbert Hübner, and others – who commissioned his music and performed it regularly at their events and radio stations. Henze maintained a regular musical presence at Darmstadt for around 10 years; it seems mostly to have been his own refusal to engage in arenas in which the centrality of his own work might not be absolutely *guaranteed* that led him to storm off and later write self-justificatory polemics.

Point 14: For the above reasons, atonal, serial and abstract music, despite having come to dominate modern music in Germany and been at the heart of a major establishment in place at least until the end of the Cold War, and possibly still to some extent today, is essentially the product of a particular type of high political subterfuge relevant only to a particular historical moment. The music concerned has never succeeded in generating a significant degree of public attention, and is no longer

really relevant. Those who continue to extol its merits are merely victims of a Cold War mentality.

Hopefully all I have said should give reason to think again about this sort of paradigm. It is false to assert that abstract serialism was dominant in West Germany in the 1950s, except perhaps very briefly in a few places in conjunction with the Second Viennese School; the musical world was far more pluralist than often suggested, and driven by multiple individuals – both administrators and musicians – with varying agendas. And there was a marked degree of decentralisation in the musical world, in part a product of the federal system and the aftermath of the occupation, enabling distinct musical centres to emerge all over the country.

The Cold War paradigm of new music in West Germany is not in my opinion appropriate in the form it has often been presented, though elements of the associated research can certainly fruitfully inform our understanding of the period, if taken in a less dogmatic fashion. In the crudest form, this paradigm can paradoxically resemble a type of McCarthyite paranoia, in which the very existence of certain types of music is taken to be part of a much wider conspiracy to destroy the musical civilisation upon which those threatened depend. Even Boulez or Leibowitz at their most fervent did not propose international conspiracies to deny their music any hearing whatsoever.

This paradigm has however been gaining ground, coming to replace an earlier one which became prominent from some point in the 1970s, the *Stunde Null* theory of new music. This maintained that after the destruction of Germany (and much of Europe) in 1945, music had no choice but to entirely turn its back on 'tradition' and start again

from a 'zero hour', building from first principles. This was only possible within the context of a highly selective history which excluded or at least marginalised all developments except for those associated with the most radical avant-garde. Plenty of subsequent research has demonstrated that 1945 was far from a clear break, that much music being played regularly in Germany before 1945 continued to be played often after 1945, and as I hope to have argued convincingly, the avant-garde was much less central than often assumed.

But a paradigm which can find much support from early post-war writings, correspondence and other documents, and which is dealt with sympathetically by Fosler-Lussier in particular, is that of music's needing to 'catch up'. This is something to be found in the publicity and propaganda associated with many of the early festivals and concert series: German musical life had existed in a void for the previous 12 years, utterly cut off from modern and international developments, all disdained as *Entartete Musik* and censored. Thus there was a need for lots of events in order to enable German listeners to 'catch up'. This theory was itself propaganda or at least ignorant – German musical life during the Third Reich was more international than often thought, in line with shifting alliances and the expansion of the Empire. After Franco's victory one could find series of concerts of Spanish music, and similarly for Italian music; various works of Hungarian and Romanian composers when those countries' fascist governments were allied to Germany, and even, during the time of the Nazi-Soviet pact, a sympathetic hearing for various Russian music, which was regularly programmed by the Gürzenich Orchestra in Cologne. And as is well-known, composers associated with Stravinskian modernism such as Orff, Fortner or Egk – all of them featuring prominently in 'catch up' festivals – had significant careers during

the Third Reich, as did 'light' dodecaphonists such as Winfried Zillig or Paul von Klenau. But this ideology nonetheless did much to legitimise the growth of new music events in the early post-war years; I would not wish to posit a monocausal explanation, but when combined with the nationalistic agenda of the French occupiers, the need on the part of Americans to prove themselves as a nation of high culture, and later a certain convenient or 'naïve' 'amnesia' with respect to musical tradition in the 1950s (quite distinct from Adorno's critical perspective), I believe this provides more satisfactory foundations for the historical explanation of this period in music.