



University
of Glasgow

Heile, B. (2009) Weltmusik and the globalization of new music. In: *The Modernist Legacy: Essays on New Music*. Ashgate, Farnham, UK, pp. 101-121. ISBN 9780754662600

Copyright © 2009 Ashgate

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

The content must not be changed in any way or reproduced in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder(s)

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details must be given

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/55054/>

Deposited on: 03 April 2013

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

CHAPTER SIX

Weltmusik and the Globalization of New Music*Björn Heile*

In the Introduction to *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music* the editors Nicholas Cook and the late Anthony Pople make the following claim:

[*The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music*] charts a transition between two quite different conceptions of ‘our’ music: on the one hand, the Western ‘art’ tradition that was accorded hegemonic status within an overly, or at least overtly, confident imperial culture centred on Europe at the turn of the twentieth century (a culture now distant enough to have become ‘their’ music rather than ‘ours’), and on the other hand, a global, post-colonial culture at the turn of the twenty-first, in which ‘world’ music from Africa, Asia, or South America is as much ‘our’ music as Beethoven, and in which Beethoven occupies as prominent a place in Japanese culture as in German, British, or American. To put it another way, the book charts a kind of diaspora: ‘Western’ music, clearly located around 1900 in the urban centres of Europe and North America, has become a global currency in the same way as the hamburger, and one sometimes has the impression that the ‘art’ tradition flourishes more in East Asia, Israel, and parts of South America than in its former heartlands. It is not so much that there has been a relocation from the centre to the periphery as that the distinction between centre and periphery has become increasingly fuzzy (except economically, since the transnational capital generated by ‘world’ music flows from the Third to the First World).¹

To my knowledge this is the most far-reaching account of the impact of globalization on what we used to consider ‘western’ music. Applying the statement to new music, we have to conclude that, although being of western origin, new music is a

¹ Nicholas Cook and Anthony Pople, ‘Introduction’, in *ibid.* (eds), *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 8-9; hereafter referred to as *CHTCM*.

global phenomenon. I further believe that the consequences of the global and globalized nature of new music haven't been fully thought through or conceptualized. We still too often assume that the new geography of music is something we can leave to ethnomusicologists to grapple with, and that hybridity is something that occurs on the margins of 'our' music – either geographically on the 'frontiers' of cultural encounters, far removed from the 'centres' of western culture, or conceptually in that we persuade ourselves that whatever influences western composers receive from non-western music are surface phenomena that leave the western 'essence' of their music intact.² In other words, behind the ostensible cosmopolitanism of the new music scene, the old thinking in terms of 'self' and 'other', 'centre' and 'periphery' seems to go on unabated. Although there is no lack of recognition of cross-cultural interactions in music, there is less awareness of the changes this implies for the whole ontology of music, and, accordingly, for our understanding of new music. The frankly arrogant complacency with which, for instance, Robin Holloway in his review of the *CHTCM* dismisses the work as a whole, and Martin Scherzinger's contribution on African art music in particular, demonstrates the resistance to the insight that the core and essence of new music have been affected by globalization, not only supposedly marginal aspects of it, and that that these kinds of

² For hybridity see Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994). Although hybridity is generally viewed positively in this article, the concept's limitations should not be overlooked. See, for example, John Hutnyk, 'Adorno at Womad: South Asian Crossovers and the Limits of Hybridity-Talk', in Tariq Modood and Pnina Werbner (eds), *Debating Cultural Hybridity* (London: Zed Books 1997), pp. 106-136.

distinctions between core and margin, centre and periphery can no longer be drawn with confidence.³

While the *CHTCM* thus deserves credit for reflecting the changed perceptions of music's historical and geographical location, it is arguably less successful in creating a historical and theoretical framework for conceptualizing these changes. Such a framework would need to conceive of geographical variation in similarly subtle ways as has been achieved for the understanding of historical change – or, rather, it would have to correlate the two. Whereas historical musicology (even within its traditional remit of western art music) tended to disregard synchronic variance in favour of diachronic change, the reverse was often the case in ethnomusicology. In order to think through the diverse processes of global homogenization and, as a counter-direction, new localization processes (sometimes fused together under the term 'glocalization')⁴ as well as various forms of hybridity occurring in new music we need to fuse the two perspectives. This is not to suggest that disciplinary boundaries and traditions can, or even should, be changed overnight, nor that the lacuna I have sketched has not been more widely recognized.⁵

³ Robin Holloway, 'Twentieth-Century (Light-)Blues', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 130/2 (2005), pp. 327-39, particularly 338; Martin Scherzinger, "'Art" Music in a Cross-Cultural Context: The Case of Africa', in Cook and Pople (eds.), *CHTCM*, pp. 583-613.

⁴ This term has been introduced mainly by Roland Robertson; see his 'Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity', in Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson (eds.), *Global Modernities* (London: Sage, 1995), pp. 25-44.

⁵ Apart from contributors to the *CHTCM*, Christian Utz is another scholar who at least implicitly critiques the blind spots of the traditional historiography of new music; see his *Neue Musik und Interkulturalität* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2002).

What this article intends to offer, then, is a contribution to the ongoing debate on, and formation of, a conceptual framework for issues of globalization in twentieth-century music. In particular, I want to discuss a historical case study that has been mostly overlooked in the by now burgeoning literature on cross-cultural musical interaction and sketch a theoretical model on the basis of the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari that could help us to integrate time and space in our understanding of twentieth-century music.

Stockhausen, McLuhan and the Idea of *Weltmusik*

What I want to draw attention to is the idea of *Weltmusik* which was one of the most influential concepts among the European avant-garde from the late 1960s to the early '80s. It can be literally translated as 'world music', but it is distinct from the general usage of the latter term as a form of popular music with more or less vital non-western ingredients (although, confusingly, the word *Weltmusik* is now mostly employed as a German translation of the English 'world music' in the latter definition). It is conspicuous that *Weltmusik* has been almost completely ignored in recent literature on the encounters between western and non-western musics even though the composers involved with it in one way or another – such as Karlheinz Stockhausen, Pierre Boulez, Luigi Nono, Henri Pousseur, Mauricio Kagel and Dieter Schnebel – are often said to have exerted hegemonic control. The ignorance regarding this crucial development in twentieth-century music is demonstrated, for instance, when Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh, in the introduction to their collection *New Music and Its Others*, speak of 'postwar musical modernism's attempts to create musical *autarchy* and self-enclosure,

through the negation or denial of reference to other musics or cultures'.⁶ Exactly the reverse was the case: as *Weltmusik* and its surrounding debates show, the post-war avant-garde was at the forefront of engaging with the world's musics – for better or worse – long before the widely publicized phenomenon of 'world music' and similar ventures. The neglect of *Weltmusik* in recent discourse is all the more unfortunate since many current arguments pro and contra forms of cross-cultural representation have already been foreshadowed during the *Weltmusik* debate. Therefore, one function of this article is to add a historical perspective to current debates on music and globalization which seems so often lacking.

As Ingrid Fritsch has pointed out, the term *Weltmusik* is difficult to delineate precisely since it has been used with divergent meanings at different times.⁷ It was first evoked by Georg Cappellen at the dawn of the twentieth-century for his vision of a 'marriage of orient and occident' but it has subsequently been applied to the whole history of interactions between western music and its non-western others, from Lully's *Le bourgeois gentilhomme* to the present day.⁸ (Cappellen's work, incidentally, just as von

⁶ Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh, 'Introduction: On Difference, Appropriation and Representation in Music', in Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh (eds), *Western Music and Its Others: Difference, Representation, and Appropriation in Music* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), pp. 1-57: 16.

⁷ Ingrid Fritsch, 'Zur Idee der Weltmusik', in Peter Ausländer and Johannes Fritsch (eds), *Weltmusik* (Cologne: Feedback Papers Studio-Verlag, 1979), pp. 3-27.

⁸ Georg Capellen, *Ein neuer exotischer Musikstil and Notenbeispieln nachgewiesen* (Stuttgart: Grüninger, [1905]), p. 46. For a historical overview see, for example, Miriam K. Whaples, 'Early Exoticism Revisited', in Jonathan Bellman (ed.), *The Exotic in Western Music* (Northeastern University Press, 1997),

Hornbostel's or Strangways's, demonstrates that the academic reflection on cross-cultural interaction in music is not a recent phenomenon.)⁹ The more specific usage of the term, which primarily concerns me here, is more closely connected with the work of Karlheinz Stockhausen and others who reacted – whether positively or negatively – to his example. In this sense, *Weltmusik* is perhaps best understood as a distinct, albeit related, phenomenon to cross-cultural conceptions in American experimental music – in the work of Henry Cowell, Lou Harrison or Steve Reich, among others – or the fascination for the orient particularly in French music, from Claude Debussy through Maurice Delage and Albert Roussel to Olivier Messiaen (and, arguably, Boulez).¹⁰ But that is not to say that composers and theorists at the time drew distinctions along similar lines: some used the term more widely, whereas others, conversely, did not employ it in referring to the concepts discussed here.

The origin of *Weltmusik* in the sense I am using the term can be found in Stockhausen's electronic composition *Telemusik* (1966). The work was composed in the electronic studio of the NHK in Tokyo and is profoundly influenced by the deep

pp. 3-25; Peter W. Schatt, *Exotik in der Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Katzbichler, 1986) and Peter Gradenwitz, *Musik zwischen Orient und Okzident* (Wilhelmshaven: Heinrichshofen, 1977).

⁹ Erich von Hornbostel, 'Musikalischer Exotismus', *Melos*, 2 (1921), pp. 175-82; A. H. Fox Strangways, 'Exotic Music', *Music and Letters*, VI (1925): pp. 119-27.

¹⁰ For exoticism in Roussel and Delage see Jann Pasler, 'Reinterpreting Indian music: Albert Roussel and Maurice Delage', in Stephen Blum and Margaret J. Kartomi (eds), *Music-Cultures in Contact: Convergences and Collisions* (Sydney: Currency, 1994), pp. 122-57; for cross-cultural influences in American experimental music see David Nicholls, 'Transethnicism and the American Experimental Tradition', *Musical Quarterly*, 80 (1996), pp. 569-94.

impression the encounter with Japanese culture left on the composer.¹¹ In his comments to the work, Stockhausen wrote that in the piece he wanted to ‘get closer to realising an old and recurrent dream’, namely ‘not to write “my” music, but the music of the whole earth, of all countries and races’; in the following he lists some of the musics he used in the form of tape recordings, among them Japanese gagaku, music from the ‘happy island’ (!) of Bali, from the southern Sahara, from a Spanish village celebration, from Hungary, by the Shipibos from the Amazon, from the Omizutori ceremony in Nara, from China, from the Kohyasan temple, from the highlands of Vietnam, from the Buddhist priests of the Jakushiji temple, and from the Noh drama *Hô sho riu*.¹² These, Stockhausen stresses, are ‘not “integrated” by an administrative act, but genuinely linked in the free movement of their spirits’; furthermore he speaks of a ‘very open musical world’ in which the ‘various pluralist developments can find their place’ in a ‘polyphony of styles, times, and locales’.¹³ Rather tellingly (as we will see), in an insertion from 1969 into his original text from 1966, Stockhausen subtly changes his tone, claiming that *Telemusik* is ‘not a collage any more ... [but] achieves a higher unity: a universality of present, past and future, of countries and “spaces” that lie at a great distance from one another: *Telemusik*’.¹⁴ From an emphasis on ‘pluralist developments’ and a ‘polyphony of styles, times and locales’ in a ‘very open musical world’ – however this can be achieved by the one

¹¹ See Michael Kurtz, *Stockhausen: A Biography*, transl. Richard Toop (London: Faber, 1992), pp. 141-5.

¹² Karlheinz Stockhausen, ‘*Telemusik*’, in Stockhausen, *Texte zur Musik 1963-70: Einführungen und Projekte, Kurse, Sendungen, Standpunkte, Nebennoten*, vol. 3 (Cologne: DuMont, 1971), pp. 75-8.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 76

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

person in control of the technology – Stockhausen has, within the same text but written at different times, shifted to emphasizing ‘higher unity’ and ‘universality’.¹⁵

One possible reason for this change in emphasis can be found in an interview about the work from 1968.¹⁶ Here, Stockhausen points out that the new communication technologies have led to a simultaneity of styles that used to be geographically and historically distinct, remarking that ‘the whole globe [is] one village’. Stockhausen is clearly echoing Marshall McLuhan’s phrase of the ‘global village’ here, a parallel that can hardly be accidental, given that Stockhausen follows many of McLuhan’s ideas. It almost seems as if the shift in emphasis between 1966 and 1969 is due to Stockhausen’s reception of McLuhan’s ideas. For instance, in the interview, Stockhausen expresses his conviction that the world’s cultures will become more and more homogeneous and that electronic communication plays a chief role in that process. In some ways, *Telemusik*, with its electronic mixture of the world’s musics, seems like a demonstration of this homogenizing process (it may have been composed before Stockhausen’s encounter with McLuhan’s work, but there are obviously reasons why he should have been receptive to it in the first place).

It is difficult to judge when and in what form Stockhausen encountered McLuhan’s work. The idea of the global village first crops up in McLuhan’s *The Gutenberg Galaxy*

¹⁵ For a different interpretation of Stockhausen’s idea of universality see Robin Maconie, *Other Planets: The Music of Karlheinz Stockhausen* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow, 2005), pp. 206-7.

¹⁶ ‘Interview über Telemusik [with *Christ und Welt*, 7 June 1968]’, *Texte zur Musik*, vol. 3, pp. 79-84.

(1962) which was translated into German in 1968.¹⁷ From then it is a recurring, if never properly developed, feature in McLuhan's work, appearing in *Understanding Media* (1964), *The Medium is the Message* (1967) and *War and Peace in the Global Village* (1968) (even though it is mentioned in the title of the last-named work it is not a more central issue there than in the earlier books).¹⁸ McLuhan was of course one of the most influential theorists of the time, so Stockhausen may well have come across his theories in mediated form, such as journalism. One tempting explanation is that he encountered it in the United States where it was presumably more widely discussed than in Germany. After all he was guest professor of composition at the University of Pennsylvania in 1965 and at the University of California (Davis) in 1966-67.¹⁹ Particularly the latter date seems plausible, not least since California seems the obvious spiritual home for McLuhan's work, but also because Stockhausen's stay there falls between the composition of *Telemusik* and his original text on the one hand and the insertion into the text and the interview on the work on the other. Both the encounter with McLuhan's ideas and the Californian residency may explain the shift in emphasis in Stockhausen's thinking.

¹⁷ Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (London: Routledge, 1962), p. 31.

¹⁸ Marshall McLuhan., *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (London: Routledge, 1964), Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, co-ordinated by Jerome Agel, *The Medium is the Message* (London: Allen Lane, Penguin, 1967); Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, *War and Peace in the Global Village* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968).

¹⁹ See Kurtz, *Stockhausen*, pp. 147-50, and 'Official Bibliography of Karlheinz Stockhausen', pdf file, downloadable at <<http://www.stockhausen.org>>, pp. 2-3 (accessed 7 December 2006).

In the text on *Telemusik*, Stockhausen does not use the term *Weltmusik* – he is more inclined to speak of ‘universal music’ – but the former choice of word is suggested to him in the aforementioned interview on the work,²⁰ and Stockhausen adopts it as the title of an article from 1973 which is probably responsible for the propagation of the term (despite Schnebel’s earlier published usage, which may be connected to Stockhausen’s interview about *Telemusik*).²¹ Despite the problematic reference to ‘universality’ in the earlier article – given that universalism is a primarily western concept associated with the Enlightenment and has been used to justify colonialism – ‘Weltmusik’ is an arguably much more contentious text. It begins with a typically Stockhausenian utopian statement: ‘Every human being has all of humanity within himself. A European can experience Balinese music, a Japanese music from Mozambique, a Mexican Indian music.’²² This claim is almost uncannily reminiscent of a passage from McLuhan in which he states that

²⁰ ‘Interview über Telemusik’, p. 79.

²¹ Dieter Schnebel, ‘Neue Weltmusik’, in Siegfried Wichmann (ed.), *Weltkulturen und moderne Kunst: Die Begegnung der europäischen Kunst und Musik im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert mit Asien, Afrika, Ozeanien, Afro- und Indo-Amerika: Ausstellung veranstaltet vom Organisationskomitee für die Spiele der XX. Olympiade München 1972*, catalogue for the exhibition “Weltkulturen und moderne Kunst” on the occasion of the XX. Olympic Games in Munich 1972 (Munich: Bruckmann, 1972), pp. 586-8; Karlheinz Stockhausen, ‘Weltmusik’, in Stockhausen, *Texte zur Musik 1970-1977: Werk-Einführungen, Elektronische Musik, Weltmusik, Vorschläge und Standpunkte zum Werk anderer*, vol. 4 (Cologne: DuMont, 1978), pp. 468-76; retranslation by Tim Nevill, revised and edited by Suzanne Stephens downloadable as pdf file from <http://www.stockhausen.org/stockhausen_texts.html> (accessed 7 December 2006).

²² Stockhausen, ‘Weltmusik’, p. 468, my translation.

‘in the electric age ... our central nervous system is technologically extended to involve us in the whole of mankind and to incorporate the whole of mankind in us’.²³

Stockhausen’s reliance on McLuhan may go some way in explaining the problematic aspects of his ideas. For McLuhan’s idea of globalization is solely driven by technology and its impact on societies and human consciousness. His mono-causal determinism makes him blind to the power relations, economic structures and other social and historical factors that drive technological change in the first place; consequently he never even asks who initiates, controls and benefits from technological developments. Although he clearly saw himself as a leftist progressive and with his gnomic, faux-prophetic utterances in *The Media is the Message* and *War and Peace in the Global Village* successfully managed to become a guru of the student rebellions, McLuhan’s work is full of sweeping assumptions about China, Russia, Germany and, above all, Africa.

McLuhan’s influence seems to be detectable in Stockhausen’s ‘Weltmusik’ on many levels. There is a general slippage in Stockhausen’s thinking towards a more openly Eurocentric perspective. For example, in the passage already cited the emphasis on universalism obscures the negation of cultural identification. Although it is true that Mexicans may experience Indian music (whatever ‘experience’ means), the question is why they should necessarily want to. But the larger issue is whether they are prepared to give up their music for a universal synthesis that must by necessity be of western origin. That’s effectively what Stockhausen asks them to do. What he envisages is ‘a fast process of dissolution of individual cultures ... [which] all contribute to a more unified *global*

²³ McLuhan, *Understanding Media*, p. 4.

culture'.²⁴ While on the one hand he regrets the loss of cultural traditions and calls for a great effort of conservation (on tape, not as lived practice), on the other, he is convinced that 'cultures destroy themselves from the inside out' and that they are 'overripe and in the condition of degeneracy, destined to turn into something new'.²⁵ Likewise he declares it to be 'crucial that the creative forces of each culture transcend the limitations of their traditions and develop those aspects in themselves that are awakened when they look into the mirror of other cultures'.²⁶ What becomes obvious here is that Stockhausen, like McLuhan, regards globalization as a natural process without agency, and that he is incapable of imagining how it is experienced by those at the receiving end of processes of globalization, westernization and (neo)colonialist exploitation. In fact, Stockhausen answers the charge of cultural colonialism, but in doing so he demonstrates that he cannot comprehend it because he, again like McLuhan, does not see that the process of integration he describes is not necessarily fully self-generating and voluntary, but that it is driven by specific political and economic interests:

One frequently hears the argument that the Europeans have transformed their earlier territorial colonialism into cultural colonialism. ... What is overlooked is that, under the surface, humanity is moved by streams of development that occur in all cultures. ... The process of inner renewal sets in in all cultures more or less simultaneously, and even if there were no tourists, Bali would strive to catch up with the rest of the world. By doing so, it would bring its own culture to its conclusion, and would also have to partly go through all the complex and unfortunately destructive phases of industrial

²⁴ Stockhausen, 'Weltmusik', p. 469, italics in the original.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 469.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 472.

civilization through which it will go in any case. That is true for all countries in the world, and the next centuries will reveal these processes of assimilation and integration.²⁷

Yet, his often hair-raising amateur anthropology and history aside, the biggest problem in Stockhausen's theory is arguably of an aesthetic nature. Where in his earlier comments on *Telemusik*, he explicitly disavows the term 'synthesis', he is now quite happy to speak of 'symbiosis'. Furthermore, as we have seen, he regards the embeddedness within one culture as a 'limitation'; it follows that the new integrated universal culture will be at a higher level. The distinction made here is between the 'merely' particular and the 'higher' universal, a distinction that has been instrumental in underpinning the ideology of colonialism. It goes almost without saying that Stockhausen regards his own *Telemusik*, *Hymnen*, *Kurzwellen*, *Spiral*, *Mantra* and *Stimmung* as early examples of the symbiotic forms he is talking about (so one could argue that the process of integration is not self-perpetuating and without agency after all, although Stockhausen would presumably counter that he has not simply composed his own music but that he has reached a more universal, cosmic consciousness). While his frequent professions of respect vis-à-vis non-Western music are fully believable, there is no question that he believes his own music to have reached a higher level; hence that it is superior. In the following years, the earth became too small for Stockhausen's grand visions; thus, in retrospect, *Weltmusik* was only a stage in his project of writing a 'cosmic music', so that 'universal' now refers literally to the universe.²⁸ In this sense, all local musics are to be

²⁷ Ibid., p. 470.

²⁸ This is expressed already in the title of Tim Nevell's selection and translation of Stockhausen's essays published as *Towards a Cosmic Music* (Shaftesbury: Element, 1989).

understood as parts of that universal music and are accordingly incorporated in Stockhausen's music.

Postcolonialism and the Critique of Stockhausen's Universalism

Although the self-glorification and the liberal doses of new age spirituality in Stockhausen's thinking found few followers among serious composers and critics, the original idea of *Weltmusik* certainly struck a chord with many, not least due to the widespread disillusionment with western culture during the hippy era. It is hard to say to what extent Stockhausen instigated a new development or seized on something that was already 'in the air'. As I have already pointed out, there were certainly a number of earlier or simultaneous developments that Stockhausen characteristically did not name, such as the fascination for far-eastern music and philosophy among the American experimentalists, or direct precursors (to Stockhausen) such as Messiaen. As has also been mentioned, the term *Weltmusik* itself goes back to 1905, and Stockhausen's universalism, however spiritual it may present itself, owes a lot to Enlightenment ideas as well as to romantic idealism, notably Schlegel. Even the idea that cultural fusion must of necessity be superior to the particular can be found in Johann Joachim Quantz's justification for the *union des goûts* in his *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversière zu spielen* from 1752.²⁹ Nevertheless, there is no doubt that Stockhausen provided a vital impulse, apparent not least from the fact that many commentators refer to his example, frequently adopting the term associated mostly with him.

²⁹ See Ludwig Finscher, 'Die Entstehung nationaler Stile in der europäischen Musikgeschichte', in Hans Oesch, Wulf Arlt and Max Haas (eds), *Europäische Musik zwischen Nationalismus und Exotik* (Winterthur: Amadeus, 1984), pp. 33-56: 46.

A crucial focal point of *Weltmusik* ideas was provided by the exhibition ‘World Cultures and Modern Art’ which formed the cultural programme of the 1972 Olympic Games in Munich (thus predating Stockhausen’s ‘Weltmusik’ article). The musical part featured listening stations with examples of ‘authentic’ non-Western music and Western compositions based on the former. This may sound like a naively positivist comparison, but the intention was quite critical as the accompanying texts, published in the exhibition catalogue, reveal. Apart from comments on the individual examples, the catalogue contains a number of more general articles which rank among the most influential of the *Weltmusik* debate. Thus, Zofia Lissa critiques the concept of universalism since it does not take into account the specific cultural meanings of music and the diverse semiological systems of which musics form a part. Consequently, Lissa sees universalism as an expression of Eurocentrism, pointing out that musical universalism can only occur if the social and economic conditions in different cultures were to converge first (by which, as a Marxist, she apparently refers to world socialism).³⁰ Dieter Schnebel’s article ‘Neue Weltmusik’ provides a more neutral introduction into different approaches to cross-cultural composition – including Debussy, Cage, Riley, La Monte Young, Messiaen and Stockhausen; Schnebel had contributed to this field himself with *ki-no* (1963-67). However, he too closes on a note of caution, remarking that true *Weltmusik* in the sense of a new *harmonia mundi* would have to be founded on political and social equality and should not be based on a unison, but on an ‘incredible polyphony’.³¹ He is openly critical

³⁰ Zofia Lissa, ‘Vom Wesen des Universalismus in der Musik’, in Siegfried Wiechmann (ed.), *Weltkulturen und moderne Kunst*, pp. 22-26.

³¹ Schnebel, ‘Neue Weltmusik’, p. 588, my translation.

of Stockhausen, arguing that in *Telemusik* ‘the composition amalgamated the materials to such a degree that at times they became unidentifiable and that they could never fully come into their own. Within the piece, they act as nothing more than coloration.’³² In a later revision of the same article he is even more explicit; in an addition to the passage already quoted he notes:

It is as if old imperialist procedures gain symbolic efficacy in an all-embracing compositional technique...But in mere mixture everything is levelled and the foreign loses its specificity and that which one owns its strangeness. Instead of the amalgamation of all musics to a world music [*Weltmusik*] – of which Stockhausen used to dream – one should rather strive for the opposite: the salvation and preservation of the particular in one’s own and other music.³³

But the most remarkable contribution is by the curator of the musical part of the exhibition himself, Ramón Pelinski, who – possibly influenced by an earlier article by the radical musical anti-colonialist Alain Daniélou who spoke of ‘cultural genocides’ – points out that musical exoticism primarily acted as a legitimation of imperialism.³⁴ What becomes apparent here is a different set of values and ideological principles. Where Stockhausen was directly or indirectly influenced by McLuhan, Schnebel, a leftist by conviction and theologian by training, was steeped in anti-colonialist theories and thus approached the issue from a completely different perspective, that of a concern for the ‘third world’. Pelinski and Daniélou, for their part, belonged to a new generation of ethnomusicologists sympathetic to ideas associated with postcolonialism; it is plausible to

³² Schnebel, *ibid.*, p. 587, my translation.

³³ Dieter Schnebel, ‘Neue Weltmusik’, in *Europäische Musik*, pp. 115-28: 127, my translation.

³⁴ Ramón Pelinski, ‘Exotisches Kolorit in der Musik’, Siegfried Wichmann (ed.), *Weltkulturen und moderne Kunst*, 152-3; Alain Daniélou ‘Génocides culturels’, *The World of Music*, 11/1 (1969), pp. 6-16; see also Daniélou, ‘Außereuropäische Musik in der Weltkultur’, *The World of Music*, 15/3 (1973), pp. 3-20.

assume that they were directly or indirectly influenced by Frantz Fanon who was enormously influential at the time.³⁵

The cultural programme also featured a compositional contribution to the *Weltmusik* debate, which by its title alone must be ranked among the most controversial: Mauricio Kagel's *Exotica for extra-European Instruments*.³⁶ As Kagel explained in his commentary, his intention was to 'expose the rather relative term "exoticism"'.³⁷ In the piece, western musicians, who are seated on the floor, are to play an enormous number of non-western instruments which they do not master, while at the same time singing with affected accents. On a number of occasions, they are instructed to imitate 'authentic' field recordings played through speakers, and – not surprisingly – they fail dismally. Thus, the westerners behave as 'model savages', making riotous noise, and – a characteristic feature of imperialist literature – trying to imitate the 'superior' culture, but never getting close to it. This rhetorical manoeuvre of reversal is typical of Kagel's work. But there

³⁵ Fanon's most widely read work is *Les Damnés de la terre* (Paris: F. Maspero, 1961), translated into English as *The Wretched of the Earth*, transl. Constance Farrington (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1963) and into German as *Die Verdammten dieser Erde* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1966). Rather surprisingly, McLuhan quotes Fanon at length in his *War and Peace in the Global Village*, 101f.; yet his overall agenda shows preciously few traces of Fanon's influence.

³⁶ For *Exotica* see Werner Klüppelholz, *Mauricio Kagel: 1970 – 1980* (Cologne: DuMont, 1981), pp. 69-72; Claus Raab, 'Zum Problem authentischer Musik: Eine Interpretation von Mauricio Kagels *Exotica*', in Wilfried Gruhn (ed.), *Reflexionen über Musik heute: Texte und Analysen* (Mainz: Schott, 1981), pp. 290-316; Peter Niklas Wilson, 'Das andere als Fremdes und Eigenes: Die Neue Musik und ihr Zugriff auf die Musiken der Welt', *MusikTexte*, 26 (1988), pp. 3-6.

³⁷ Quoted from Klüppelholz, *Mauricio Kagel*, p. 71, my translation.

seems to be a bigger issue: doesn't the Babylonian mix of different cultures and the ludicrously inept imitations of them remind one of Stockhausen's concept of *Weltmusik*? Is it more than a coincidence that in practically all performances of *Exotica* the best music are the field recordings from tape, that is *specific musics with very distinct characteristics*, whereas the musicians play for a large part undifferentiated noise? Characteristically, Kagel remained silent on this issue, even though he was at least once approached to write an article in a volume on *Weltmusik*. *Exotica* was by no means Kagel's last contribution to cross-cultural composition: he chose 'extra-European music' as course topic of the 'Cologne courses for New Music' in 1974, and he has continued to compose pieces in the same vein, such as *Kantrimusik*, *Die Umkehrung Amerikas*, *Mare nostrum* and *Die Stücke der Windrose für Salonorchester*, many of which are similarly controversial as *Exotica*.³⁸

Kagel's wasn't the only critical voice on the part of composers: as early as in 1959 Luigi Nono has described John Cage's flirtations with Oriental elements thus: 'The collage method originates from colonialist thinking, and there is no functional difference between a hollow Indian incantation drum that is employed as a dustbin in a European household and the orientalisms which an occidental culture utilizes in order to make its aestheticist tinkering with material more attractive'.³⁹ In 1971 he similarly weighed into European composers:

³⁸ See Björn Heile, *The Music of Mauricio Kagel* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

³⁹ Luigi Nono, 'Geschichte und Gegenwart in der Musik von heute', in Nono, *Texte: Studien zu seiner Musik*, ed. Jürg Stenzl (Zürich: Atlantis, 1975), pp. 34-40: 36, my translation.

When in European history there have been contacts with the culture of the orient, [such as] India – I’m thinking of Debussy, Messiaen, or of elements used by composers such as Stockhausen – in my opinion this is still a Eurocentric manner of appropriating elements of language that in their own culture, their history, their country have a different cultural function that would first have to be studied. ... It is a typically colonialist approach to seize abstract models ... with the presumption that only a seemingly technologically more developed culture could express artistic connections, which are [in fact] derived from a domination from on high.⁴⁰

Perhaps more surprisingly, Pierre Boulez makes much the same point, when – in what appears to be a thinly veiled allusion to Stockhausen – he describes the attempt to ‘create a universal language encapsulating all local particularisms’ as ‘disguised colonialism’.⁴¹ It should be said, though, that a couple of years earlier, Boulez was less respectful of non-western cultures when he declared that ‘[apart from having reached a state of perfection], the music [of Asia and India] is dead’.⁴²

Given the term itself and its connection with Stockhausen, the concept of *Weltmusik* was most widespread in West Germany, not least, presumably, because German intellectuals tended to almost instinctively regard cosmopolitanism as an effective safeguard against the nationalism associated with the Nazis.⁴³ Nevertheless,

⁴⁰ Luigi Nono, ‘Seminar über die Funktion der Musik heute’, in Luigi Nono, *Texte*, pp. 263-77: 263, my translation.

⁴¹ Pierre Boulez, ‘Existe-il un conflit entre la pensée européenne et non-européenne?’, in *Europäische Musik*, pp. 129-45: 137.

⁴² Pierre Boulez, ‘Traditional Music – A Lost Paradise’, *The World of Music*, 9/2 (1967), pp. 3-10: 3.

⁴³ See Dietrich Thränhardt, *Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1949-1990*, erweiterte Neuausgabe (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996), 137-9 and Mary Fulbrook, *Fontana History of Germany 1918-1990: The Divided Nation* (London: Fontana, 1991), 304.

French-speaking composers were similarly influenced by non-Western music, and, although they rarely employed the German term, they were to varying degrees influenced by the model of Stockhausen or his followers. This is most clearly to be seen in the work of Jean-Claude Eloy who had been invited by Stockhausen to work at the Electronic Studio at the WDR in Cologne in 1972-3.⁴⁴ His idea of intercultural improvization, which can be related to Stockhausen's idea of 'intuitive music', was also taken up by Georges Aperghis.⁴⁵ Perhaps the most far-reaching conception of a universal music that in principle incorporates all musical material near and far in terms of both historical and geographical distance has been developed by Henri Pousseur. To what extent Pousseur reacted to the German *Weltmusik* debate is hard to say, but he acknowledges exchanges with Stockhausen during the late 1960s, and describes their shared intention 'to open and articulate a sufficiently vast space so that all musics present in the contemporary world and in the collective consciousness can find their place therein'.⁴⁶ Yet in Pousseur's poetics this takes the form of a network of relationships stretching over time and space, rather than the subsumption under a monologic unity in Stockhausen's model. In that sense his ideas are more closely related to Stockhausen's *Telemusik* (or the ideas

⁴⁴ For Eloy's connection to Stockhausen see Ivanka Stoïanova, 'Eloy, Jean-Claude', *Grove Music Online*, ed. Laura Macy, <<http://www.grovemusic.com>> (accessed 8 December 2006).

⁴⁵ For Eloy's and Aperghis's cross-cultural conceptions see Philippe Albéra, 'Les leçons de l'exotisme', *Cahiers de musiques traditionnelles*, vol. 9, *Nouveaux Enjeux*, pp. 53-84.

⁴⁶ See Henri Pousseur, *Composer (avec) des identités culturelles* (Paris: Institut de pédagogie musicale et choéographique, 1989), p. 21, my translation, emphasis in the original. See also Pousseur's 'A Brief Appraisal of an Investigation as Obstinate as it is Meandering', in Michel Butor et al., *Inter Disciplinas Ars* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1998), pp. 41-78.

expressed in the article accompanying the piece) than to his later 'Weltmusik'. Furthermore, whereas Stockhausen is on the whole uninterested in the cultural meaning of the materials he appropriates, Pousseur is more sensitive to cultural identity and difference, as is not least implicit in the title of his publication *Composer (avec) des identités culturelles*. He realized his conceptions in pieces such as *La Rose des voix* (1982) and *At Moonlight, Dowland's Shadow Passes along Ginkaku-ju* (1989). Although he was instrumental in encouraging Pousseur to formulate his theory, Boulez's ideas concerning cross-cultural composition could hardly be more different. As his critique of musical universalism in general and of Stockhausen's position in particular may have suggested, Boulez presents himself as a staunch anti-colonialist. Hence, he describes non-western influences in his music as being of a conceptual rather than perceptual nature; in other words they concern musical thought rather than material, as for instance the concept of time in Japanese music, the notion of sonority in Balinese music or the practice of improvisation in India (whether these conceptual references are necessarily more ethical than overt borrowing is not a foregone conclusion however).⁴⁷ These referential practices are so covert that Boulez's claims regarding the profundity of the influences he received from non-western musics will come as a surprise to many. In fact, his detailed knowledge of non-western music and his nuanced theorizing of its impact on his own music are not generally appreciated. Whether Boulez's approach can be related directly to the *Weltmusik* idea is a moot point. On the one hand, we have seen that he seems to be reacting to Stockhausen, but on the other, his ideas seem indebted to Messiaen and the peculiarly French tradition of orientalism – albeit, in Boulez's case, seen from a critical,

⁴⁷ Boulez, 'Existe-il un conflit', 134-43.

anti-colonial, perspective. It would appear that in Pousseur's and Boulez's conception different traditions – the legacy of French exoticism, the more Germanic *Weltmusik* idea and an awareness of American experimentalism – merge and intertwine in different ways.

But not only composers took part in the debates surrounding *Weltmusik* and similar conceptions. Critics, too, had their say and their contributions likewise spanned the whole spectrum from old-fashioned influence and source studies through naive celebrations of unity in a kind of 'come together' ideology to a fundamental critique à la Nono. This was expressed most memorably by the Nono scholar Jürg Stenzl who spoke of the 'Führer Stockhausen who rules the world and wants to govern it in authoritarian fashion'.⁴⁸ Alain Daniélou made a similar point when he points out that 'we are about to water down all traces of our musical past everywhere on the world to a wrongly understood uniform rustic style [*Einheits-Rustikalstil*]' which he describes as an 'artistic sabotage beyond comparison'.⁴⁹ Of particular significance is the volume of articles entitled *Weltmusik* from 1981.⁵⁰ One of the editors, Johannes Fritsch, was a former member of the Stockhausen ensemble who remains committed to – a more critical formulation of – the *Weltmusik* idea; he has also organized conferences on *Weltmusik*.⁵¹ The book testifies to the importance of the concept; it is this volume, incidentally, that Kagel, following his

⁴⁸ Jürg Stenzl, 'Orientfahrten', in Dieter Rexroth (ed.), *Zwischen den Grenzen: Zum Aspekt des Nationalen in der Neuen Musik* (Mainz: Schott, 1979), pp. 122-7: 125.

⁴⁹ Daniélou, 'Außereuropäische Musik', 16.

⁵⁰ Ausländer and Fritsch, *Weltmusik*.

⁵¹ See Monika Lichtenfeld, 'Fritsch, Johannes', in *Grove Music Online*, ed. Laura Macy, <<http://www.grovemusic.com>> (accessed 8 December 2006).

Exotica and the course on non-European music organized by him, was asked to contribute to but declined. It would be of little use to present an account of the whole debate, with all the authors who contributed to it and the positions they took; suffice it to say, however, that this is a considerable body of work that is mostly ignored in Anglophone literature. In particular, the writings of Hans Oesch have the potential to move the debate on from the unproductive opposition between those who regard cross-cultural musical influence as a benign form of cultural exchange and those who see it as a form of neo-colonial exploitation. Oesch, who worked both as an ethnomusicologist and a specialist on (western) contemporary music (but started his academic career as a medievalist), attempted a conciliation between the two camps by describing Western approaches to non-western music as potentially ‘fruitful misunderstanding[s]’ and suggested that an ethical critique, though legitimate, does not have to negate valid artistic results.⁵²

The Influence of *Weltmusik* Ideas

As I suggested earlier, I regard it as more productive to use the term *Weltmusik* as a geographically and historically delineated concept, rather than as a general term for all forms of cross-cultural musical influence. Nevertheless, we have seen how ideas associated with the concept spread geographically and culturally; likewise, later postmodernist conceptions of cross-cultural influence which attained wide currency

⁵² Hans Oesch, ‘Was bedeutet asiatische Musik heute in westlichen Stilkreisen?’, in Rexroth (ed.), *Zwischen den Grenzen*, pp. 128-39 and ‘Ausereuropäische Musik: Fruchtbar missverstandene Innovationsquelle der Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts?’, in Petr Macek (ed.), *Innovationsquellen der Musik des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Brno: no publ., 1984), pp. 198-209.

during a new wave of globalization at the turn of the twenty-first century are, specifically in the German context, often informed by the earlier *Weltmusik* ideas. This sense of historical continuity was also expressed in the motto for the ISCM World New Music Days in Stuttgart 2006: ‘grenzenlos’ (‘without borders’).⁵³ It is certainly noteworthy that issues of cross-cultural influence seem to play an even greater role in the German new music scene than internationally.⁵⁴ The most noticeable difference between the *Weltmusik* concept of the 1960s and 70s and later ideas surrounding identity, hybridity and trans-cultural processes is that migration and multiculturalism meant that globalization was no longer a fanciful utopia, and not only happening in distant lands about which one could philosophize at leisure, but that it was becoming a social reality ‘at home’, one, moreover, that created a lot of problems. Furthermore, as part of these developments the voices of non-western composers could no longer be ignored, and people who were only ever spoken *about* suddenly answered back. Among those who took part in the – German-centred – debate were Niaixiong Liao, Mosunmola A. Omibiyi-Obidike and, more recently, Sandeep Bhagwati – not to mention those who engaged with the discourse by compositional means.⁵⁵ Whereas for many of today’s composers and critics the

⁵³ See <<http://www.wnmf2006.de/index.php?PageID=43>> (accessed 28 November 2006) for the festival’s conception, particularly as regards its relation to globalization.

⁵⁴ To give just one indication it is conspicuous that three recent issues of *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* were entirely devoted to such issues: 161/4 (2000), ‘Transkultur’; 164/2, ‘Orient & Okzident’ (2003) and 167/3, ‘Globalisierung und Identität’ (2006).

⁵⁵ Niaixiong Liao, ‘Im Prozeß des Ineinanderfließens: Nationale Musiktradition und Weltmusik’, in Detlef Gojowy (ed.), *Quo vadis musica? Bericht über das Symposium der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung Bonn – Bad Godesberg 1988* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1990), pp. 18-24; Mosunmola A. Omibiyi-Obidike, ‘Africa in

original *Weltmusik* ideas are but a distant memory, the Brazilian composer Flo Menezes, for instance, reacts consciously to Stockhausen's model.⁵⁶

Conclusion: Hybridity and the Deterritorialization of New Music

What this account has demonstrated is that, rather than insulating itself in a small self-constructed universe, the post-war avant-garde was deeply interested in the 'world outside' and many composers strove to reflect the changing reality brought about by globalization. Nor is it fair to suggest that composers were only interested in exploiting un-tapped musical resources in neo-colonial fashion. As we have seen, the positions adopted during the *Weltmusik* debate ranged from Stockhausen's problematic, McLuhan-inspired universalism to more critical approaches influenced by postcolonial thought in the tradition of Fanon. Later conceptions were characterized by an appreciation of syncretism and hybridity, implicit for instance in Mauricio Kagel's *Die Stücke der Windrose für Salonorchester* (1989-94).⁵⁷ What has also become clear is that *Weltmusik* and surrounding debates form an important part of the history of new music, alongside better known examples of western composition with non-western influences, such as the far-eastern inspirations of such different composers as Debussy, Messiaen, Britten or Cage. Whether the influences thus received are of marginal or crucial importance is a

World Music', in Gojowy (ed.), *Quo vadis musica?*, pp. 39-45; Sandeep Bhagwati, 'Musik – eine Weltsprache? Eine Polemik', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 161/4 (2000), 'Transkultur', pp. 10-13; and Bhagwati, 'Sein Zuhause komponieren...: Illusionen aus Lärm und Stille', *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 167/3 (2006), 'Globalisierung und Identität', pp. 24-5.

⁵⁶ Menezes was the subject of a programme in the series 'Atelier neue Musik' on Deutschlandfunk in 2003.

⁵⁷ See Björn Heile, "'Transcending Quotation: Cross-cultural Musical Representation in Mauricio Kagel's *Die Stücke der Windrose für Salonorchester*', *Music Analysis*, 23/1 (2004), pp. 57-85.

difficult question; yet it is hardly the sign of a critical intelligence to dismiss cross-cultural influence per se as superficial exoticism: even where non-western music was misunderstood and where the motives for its appropriation were questionable, the consequences were far-reaching. In his account of the impact of non-western music on Boulez and Stockhausen, Philippe Albéra goes so far as to speak of a synthesis between Orient and Occident:

In the case of the two composers [Boulez and Stockhausen] who have dominated musical production and reflection during the post-war years, all the dimensions of the work are profoundly marked by the discovery of extra-European music: the conceptions of rhythm and timbre, those of vocal writing, the choice of instrumentation, the notion of the work itself, the attempt to efface creative subjectivity in an autonomous and transcendent form, the disposition of the musicians in the hall, the ritual of the concert, the relation between composer and performers... etc. Boulez and Stockhausen have tried, each in their own ways, to realize a synthesis between Orient and Occident.⁵⁸

While I find that Albéra's conclusions overshoot their target and although I do not have much time for the idea of 'synthesis', the observations as such are clearly valid. New music is not universal – thank God for that! – 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. There simply is no 'core' or 'essence' to new music which is 'authentically' or 'purely' western, untouched by influence from outside.

But where does this leave us; how can we conceptualize the impact of globalization on twentieth-century music? The problem, as it seems to me, is that we still tend to understand music history in terms of linear, mutually exclusive, traditions. The operative

⁵⁸ Albéra, 'Les leçons', p. 73, my translation.

conceptual model is the hierarchical tree structure, with traditions forming branches which divide into smaller twigs. Underpinning the tree structure are simple binarisms, and despite the fundamental critique of binary logic throughout the humanities, such binarisms seem alive and well in music historiography – if perhaps more implicitly than explicitly. According to the binary logic, composers are either western or non-western, conservative or progressive, avant-gardist or experimental, modernist or postmodernist etc. pp. (and where composers seem to fall between the stools, this is more often seen as an exception proving the rule, rather than an indication of the limitation of the underlying conceptual model). I am unsure as to whether this arborescent, binary model ever was adequate for music historiography, but it certainly fails dismally in the present climate in which composers draw from a bewildering variety of sources close and distant in terms of history, geography and social identification. Going back to Albéra's example, one could of course argue that Boulez and Stockhausen are European avant-garde composers in the tradition of Webern and everything else is merely supplementary to this. But what makes us so sure? And what about Toshio Hosokawa or Akin Euba? If we want to avoid the pitfalls of identity politics, we need to be wary of creating hierarchies of identities for other people.

It seems that the editors of the *CHTCM* felt a similar unease concerning traditional ways of understanding music history, but, as I suggested before, they did not have a properly reflected model to replace the old one. Some of the most fruitful impulses could be found in the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. This is not the place to develop a comprehensive Deleuzo-Guattarian theory and historiography of music, nor am I the person to do that; moreover their thought is by its nature opposed to the kind of

systematization that would be required.⁵⁹ What follows, then, are some suggestions as to what Deleuze and Guattari have to offer to a ‘musicology of globalization’. One element has already been invoked: the critique of tree structures and binarisms above is based on a more general engagement with these models in the first, and most widely read, chapter of Deleuze and Guattari’s *Mille plateaux*.⁶⁰ What they propose to put in place of the old models is the rhizome, understood, like all their concepts, not as metaphor, but by way of isomorphism. Rhizomes have no proper centres and no immanent hierarchy; they don’t grow in one direction through binary divisions but in a chaotic proliferation in all manner of directions. The first two principles of rhizomes in Deleuze and Gattari’s work are ‘connection’ and ‘heterogeneity’, whereby any ‘point of a rhizome can be connected to any other, and has to be’.⁶¹ What follows from these principles is the third principle of ‘multiplicity’, understood as *genuine* multiplicity and not simply as the sum of several two-way or three-way splits (multiplicity is a recurring theme in their thought, notably in their critique of Freud).⁶² This idea of rhizomatic growth seems a much more adequate

⁵⁹ Among applications of Deleuze and Guattari’s work to music are Ronald Bogue, *Deleuze on Music, Painting and the Arts* (London: Routledge, 2003), Ian Buchanan and Marcel Swiboda (eds), *Deleuze and Music* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004) and Edward Campbell, *Boulez and Expression: A Deleuzoguattarian Approach*, PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2000; also cf. Lois Fitch, ‘Gilles Deleuze and Theodor Adorno in the Music and Thought of Brian Ferneyhough’ in this volume .

⁶⁰ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Capitalisme et schizophrénie*, vol. 2: *Mille plateaux* (Paris: Minuit, 1980), chapter 1, ‘Introduction: Rhizome’, pp. 9-37; English translation *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (London: Athlone, 1988).

⁶¹ Deleuze and Guattari, *Mille plateaux*, p. 13, my translation.

⁶² *Ibid.*, chapter 2, ‘1914 – Un seul ou plusieurs loups?’, pp. 38-52.

model for music history than the implicit metaphor of tree structures, since it allows us to appreciate the genuine multiplicity and non-hierarchical nature of connections between different musicians and traditions which, according to conventional thinking, are wide apart. In a rhizomatic model, it is more the rule than an exception that a composer such as Messiaen (a favourite of Deleuze and Guattari) would be influenced by plain chant, bird song and Indian rhythm, just as much as by his immediate predecessors in a linear tradition. It is one of the commonplaces in writings on twentieth-century composers that they cannot be categorized. While there is a lot of sales-talk and lazy thinking involved in such statements, the larger issue may be that categorization as a conceptual technique is not well suited to understanding twentieth-century music – and there are other ways.

But perhaps more significant is Deleuze and Guattari's radical re-conceptualization of space and territory, which might complement the attention paid to time in historical musicology. For instance, they were fascinated by modes of territorialization, such as 'deterritorialization' and 'reterritorialization'.⁶³ Famously, they define music as 'a creative, active operation that consists in deterritorializing the *ritournelle* [usually translated as "refrain"]'.⁶⁴ Like most of their ideas, this has to be understood both in a very literal and an extremely abstract sense. What they show is that music demarcates space (on the micro and macro levels); hence, cross-cultural interaction would in that sense be in the very nature of music. This does by no means imply that they have a naive or idealistic understanding of inter-cultural encounters; on the contrary, their conception of space is highly political. This can be seen, for instance, in their championing of

⁶³ Ibid., passim.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 369.

nomads who, since they do not lay claim to territory and do not accept boundaries, are seen as undermining the authority of the state (as an aggressively territorialized entity), leading the authors to coin the term ‘nomadology’.⁶⁵

In this sense, *Weltmusik* is an attempt to reterritorialize music that has first been deterritorialized. In the process, the notion of new music itself is progressively deterritorialized, in that it does not seem to be intrinsically connected to a specific terrain; Stockhausen’s concept of ‘cosmic music’ would represent the most radical form of deterritorialization: leaving behind the planet altogether. Whether new music can, or should be, reterritorialized is an open question. Furthermore, *Weltmusik*, like new music as a whole, is best understood rhizomatically, in that, although it can be pinned to a more or less specific time and place, it seems connected to a multiplicity of elements both near and far, historically, geographically and conceptually. Finally, Deleuze and Guattari’s work could present an approach to the ethics of cross-cultural interaction. As I have briefly sketched, there is a seemingly irresolvable paradox: while the refusal to engage with other musics seems exclusionary and potentially elitist, cross-cultural references are by their nature problematic, given the reality of unequal power relations. What might prove productive in this context is Deleuze and Guattari’s idea of a process of ‘becoming’ (*devenir*), such as ‘becoming-woman’, ‘becoming-child’ etc.⁶⁶ This involves undermining one’s own claim to power and privilege and consistently seeking a minoritarian perspective (it is important that this is a constant process: for instance, one cannot arrive

⁶⁵ Ibid., chapter 12, ‘1227 – Traité de nomadologie : la machine de guerre’, pp. 434-527.

⁶⁶ Ibid., in particular, chapter 10, ‘1730 – Devenir-intense, devenir-animal, devenir-imperceptible’, pp. 284-380.

at the goal of ‘having become woman’ – and that holds true for biological men and women alike). In connection to literature, they have described a ‘minor’ literature, which they find in Kafka.⁶⁷ ‘Minor’, in this sense, has nothing to do with ‘of little importance’ (on the contrary!) but with a mode of writing that eschews all claims to a dominant position (for instance, Kafka, according to Deleuze and Guattari, undermined the function of German as the national language of a powerful empire). In a similar way, one can conceive of a ‘minor music’, a music that interrogates the politics of identity and representation, music that does not make claims to territory (perhaps the music of Mahler, in many ways comparable to the literature of Kafka, would be an example). In these ways, Deleuze and Guattari’s work may provide models for better understanding the globalized and deterritorialized nature of new music.

⁶⁷ Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Pour une littérature mineure* (Paris: Minuit, 1975); English transl., *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986).