

# Timothy D. Taylor

---

## Stravinsky and Others

---

Avant : pismo awangardy filozoficzno-naukowej 4/3, 245-265

---

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.



## Stravinsky and Others

**Timothy D. Taylor**

Departments of Ethnomusicology and Musicology  
University of California, Los Angeles  
*tdtaylor@ucla.edu*

Received 20 October 2013; accepted and published Winter 2013/2014.

### Abstract

This paper revisits an old question that neither I nor anyone has been able to answer very well, namely, why is it that nineteenth century composers, who had fairly easy access to nonwestern musics in notation, rarely quoted them? But by the early twentieth century, such quotations became quite common. This article argues that the rise of finance capital, as theorized by Rudolf Hilferding in the early twentieth century, marked the ascendance of exchange value over use value. As a rise of the ideologies accompanying finance capital, composers, and everyone else, began to regard other musics, other sounds—other objects—as something that could be exchanged. This process is exceptionally clear in works by Igor Stravinsky such as *Le Sacre du printemps*, which, while drawing on nineteenth century nationalistic impulses, also shows a relationship to other musics, appropriated as raw material. The new ideology of exchangeability introduced by the rise of finance capital continued through *musique concrète* in the 1940s and into the rise of digital sampling in the 1980s and after.

**Keywords:** Stravinsky; music; composer; western; nonwestern; capitalism.

While no one today disputes the importance and influence of Igor Stravinsky's *Le Sacre du printemps*, it is nonetheless incontrovertible that the work appeared in a period of extraordinary artistic ferment and creativity in some European metropolises in the early twentieth century, particularly the capitals of Paris and Vienna. Both were not simply capitals, but seats of empire, serving as magnets for people around the world, including imperialized subjects from central and eastern Europe—the extent of the Austro-Hungarian Empire—and from North Africa, sub-Saharan Africa, the Pacific, and the Caribbean as parts of the French empire. Stravinsky's then-radical cultural production was by no means unique, and could only have happened when and where it did, a result of a particular confluence of social, cultural, and historical factors.

Despite the large amount of scholarship on musical modernism, and, more specifically, composers such as Stravinsky, Béla Bartók, Claude Debussy and Charles Ives, to name just a few—composers whose willingness to quote and manipulate folk or traditional or popular or other musics in their own music is well known and has been much studied—explanations for just why these composers made these engagements with other musics are inadequate.<sup>346</sup> Elsewhere, I have discussed these engagements in terms of changes in consumer capitalism and the decline of the importance of use value and the rise of exchange value in cultural production and consumption (Taylor 2007), but it seems to me now that these discussions did not go far enough. Composers in the nineteenth century had access to published examples of nonwestern musics in notation, yet they never quoted or engaged with nonwestern musics in any significant way. Why?

What I argue in this essay is that Stravinsky's relationship to other musics and the musics of Others was not unique, and in fact was part of a massive epistemological shift in the early twentieth century in which musics of Europe's Elsewheres, and its own past, became newly conceived as appropriable, exchangeable. This was in large part a result of an even larger shift in which the growth of the importance of finance capital in western countries and increasing urbanization ushered in a new relationship between subjects and how they constructed their objects, with profound ramifications for cultural production and consumption. Many western composers began to engage in wholesale quotations, emulations, and representations of musics from other cultures for the first time. I am building on an argument presented in Taylor (2007) on the music of Charles Ives, whose use of snippets of hymns and popular songs is well known, but now want to theorize more deeply and expand that argument to Stravinsky and other composers whose musics show an engagement with musics and sounds from other cultures, other social groups from their own culture, or the past.

In 1910, the Austrian-German economist and politician Rudolf Hilferding published *Finance Capital*, a book that explicated the importance of banks and the banking industry to capitalism, and in particular the capitalism of Hilferding's era. Finance capital in his thinking was globalized, helping to expand capitalism quickly, which in turn was aiding in perpetuating capitalist societies generally. This expansion united all of the wealthy in the service of finance capital (Hilferding 1981: 365). Hilferding defined "finance capital" this way:

---

<sup>346</sup> See, for example, Brown (2000) on Bartók; Morton (1979) and Taruskin (1980) on Stravinsky; Howat (1995) and Mueller (1986-7) on Debussy; and Burkholder (1995) and Taylor (2007) on Ives.

*An ever-increasing part of the capital of industry does not belong to the industrialists who use it. They are able to dispose over capital only through the banks, which represent the owners. On the other side, the banks have to invest an ever-increasing part of their capital in industry and in this way they become to a greater and greater extent industrial capitalists. I call bank capital, that is, capital in money form which is actually transformed in this way into industrial capital, finance capital. So far as its owners are concerned, it always retains the money form; it is invested by them in the form of money capital, interest-bearing capital, and can always be withdrawn by them as money capital. But in reality the greater part of the capital so invested with the banks is transformed into industrial, productive capital (means of production and labour power) and is invested in the productive process. An ever-increasing proportion of the capital used in industry is finance capital, capital at the disposition of the banks which is used by the industrialists (Hilferding 1981: 225).*

Finance capital is thus capital that is owned by the banks that can be used by industry, a situation that gave banks enormous leverage and power.

V. I. Lenin, drawing largely on Hilferding, elaborated on this conception of finance capital:

*It is characteristic of capitalism in general that the ownership of capital is separated from the application of capital to production, that money capital is separated from industrial or productive capital, and that the rentier, who lives entirely on income obtained from money capital, is separated from the entrepreneur and from all who are directly concerned in the management of capital. Imperialism, or the domination of finance capital, is that highest stage of capitalism in which this separation reaches vast proportions. The supremacy of finance capital over all other forms of capital means the predominance of the rentier and of the financial oligarchy; it means the crystallisation of a small number of financially "powerful" states from among the rest (Lenin 1939: 59).*

Hilferding observed that finance capital gave the control of "social production" to a small number of large capitalist firms, and had the effect of separating management of production from ownership and socializing production to a certain degree. This socialization was limited by the division of the world market into "national economic territories of individual states." This division could only be overcome, partially and with difficulty, through international cartelization. The struggles of cartels and trusts against each other are aided by state power (Hilferding 1981: 367).

What I want to focus on here is the expanded role played by exchange value in Hilferding's thinking and what that meant for cultural production in the early twentieth century. First, Hilferding rehearses Marx on the process of exchange value:

*A commodity enters the process of exchange as a use value, having proved that it can satisfy a need to the extent required by society. It then becomes an exchange value for all other commodities which fulfill the same condition. This symbolizes its conversion into money, as the expression of exchange value in general. In becoming money, it has become the exchange value for all other commodities (Hilferding 1981: 34).*

Then, he makes a case for the heightened importance of exchange value in the realm of finance capital:

*The distinctive feature of commodity exchange trading is that by standardizing the use value of a commodity it makes the commodity, for everyone, a pure embodiment of exchange value, a mere bearer of price. Any money capital is now in a position to be converted into such a commodity, with the result that people outside the circle of professional, expert merchants hitherto engaged in the trade can be drawn into buying and selling these commodities. The commodities are equivalent to money; the buyer is spared the trouble of investigating their use value, and they are subject only to slight fluctuations in price. Their marketability and hence their convertibility into money at any time is assured because they have a world market... (Hilferding 1981: 153).*

What Hilferding is saying here is that exchange value has come to dominate (a major theme in Theodor Adorno's work on the culture industries and more generally, e.g., Horkheimer and Adorno 1990 and Adorno 2007); use value no longer matters. Later, he is more explicit: "[F]or the capitalist only exchange value is essential" (Hilferding 1981: 167).

Following Hilferding, others have focused on the importance of finance capital, such as Lenin (1939), as we have seen, and, most recently, many scholars concerned with the neoliberal capitalism of the last few decades (e.g., Duménil and Lévy 2004 and 2011; Harvey 2005). But I want to spend some time considering Giovanni Arrighi's important book *The Long Twentieth Century* (Arrighi 1994), which, inspired by Fernand Braudel, offers a long view of the role played by finance capital in western culture. If for Marx the "law of the motion of history" as Engels put it in his preface to *The Eighteenth Brumaire* (Marx 1963: 14), was the struggles among the classes, for Arrighi, history was shaped by the long spirals of growth, expansion, and speculation. And it can be seen as anticipating the economic decline of the US and the beginning of another upward spiral, this time in China (see Arrighi 2009).

Arrighi takes Marx's famous formula—MCM', or "buying in order to sell dearer" (Marx 1990: 256)—and expands it. This formula does not simply characterize particular capitalist investments, but can be understood to describe the workings of capital as a historical pattern in the capitalist world system (Arrighi 1994: 6). "The central aspect of this pattern," he explains,

*is the alternation of epochs of material expansion. . .with phases of financial rebirth and expansion.... In phases of material expansion money capital "sets in motion" an increasing mass of commodities...; and in phases of financial expansion an increasing mass of money capital "sets itself free" from its commodity form, and accumulation proceeds through financial deals. Together, the two epochs or phase constitute a full systemic cycle of accumulation* (Arrighi 1994: 6; emphasis in original).

Arrighi examines several of these cycles in history in which finance capital has played an important role in the capitalism of that era: Genoa from the fifteenth to the early seventeenth centuries, Holland from the late sixteenth through most of the eighteenth centuries, Britain from the latter half of the eighteenth century into the early twentieth century, and the US beginning in the late nineteenth century and continuing to the present, though the US cycle is currently spiraling down; the recent financial crisis is evidence of this. Arrighi views the rise and fall of regimes of finance capital as occurring in a kind of spiral fashion historically. These spirals aren't necessarily discrete; there can be temporal overlaps, as in the British and American cases.

Britain's free trade imperialism, as Arrighi calls it, made London a natural financial center, out-competing other European capitals such as Amsterdam and Paris. London became the home of high finance (Arrighi 1994: 55). Britain's unilateral adoption of a free trade practice and ideology and the opening up of its domestic market meant that Britain created "world-wide networks of dependence on, and allegiance to, the expansion of wealth and power of the United Kingdom" (Arrighi 1994: 56). British imperial hegemony had created not just a world empire but a world economy. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, however, Britain began to lose control of the balance of power in Europe, and, later, the balance of power in the world, in part because of the development of Germany. And Britain was being surpassed by the US, which was greater in size and richer in resources.

The British and American phases of the influence of finance capital occurred in a historical moment of rapid urbanization in both Europe and the US, and I want to turn now to that question. Fredric Jameson (1997), in his study of finance capital and culture, notes that Georg Simmel's essay on the metropolitan experience, "The Metropolis and Mental Life," first published in 1903, contains, among other things, a diagnosis of the cultural effects of the rise of finance capital. Simmel's conception of the urban experience is in some sense an interpretation of how ideologies of finance capital entered the broader

culture. Simmel begins by noting the difficulties modern urban subjects have with maintaining conceptions of themselves as individuals, also noting how metropolitans react not emotionally but rationally to the myriad stimuli of the city. But Simmel quickly moves to recognizably marxian and (pre)-Hilferdingian discussion of the role played by capital in urban spaces, and in particular, process and ideologies of exchange. The city, as Marx pointed out long ago, is the center of capitalism, and it is no different with Simmel's metropolis. The "intellectualistic" (i.e., rational) ways that metropolitans interact with each other and, indeed, everything, is in a close relationship with the money economy. Simmel writes,

*They have in common a purely matter-of-fact attitude in the treatment of persons and things in which a formal justice is often combined with an unremitting hardness.... Money is concerned only with what is common to all, i.e., with the exchange value which reduces all quality and individuality to a purely quantitative level.... [I]ntellectual relationships deal with persons as with numbers, that is, as with elements which, in themselves, are indifferent, but which are of interest only insofar as they offer something objectively perceivable. It is in this very manner that the inhabitant of the metropolis reckons with his merchant, his customer and with his servant, and frequently with the persons with whom he is thrown into obligatory association (Simmel 1971: 326).*

In this rich passage, Simmel covers not only the nature of relationship between people and things but what these relationships owe to capitalism and, in particular, exchange in a capitalist market.

Under capitalism, according to Simmel, "the interests of each party acquire a relentless matter-of-factness, and its rationally calculated economic egoism need not fear any divergence from its set path because of the imponderability of personal relationships" (Simmel 1971: 327). The kind of rationality he describes is rather Weberian: "The modern mind has become more and more a calculating one" (Simmel 1971: 327). He continues, "It has been the money economy which has thus filled the daily life of so many people with weighing, calculating, enumerating and the reduction of qualitative values to quantitative terms" (Simmel 1971: 327-28). The rise of capitalism, coming to a form of maturity with the predominance of finance capital in the late nineteenth-early twentieth centuries, produced, for Simmel, a new kind of person, originating at the beginning of capitalism as we know from Weber, but taken to new extremes in this period and in these new urban environments and experiences.

Simmel also notes what he terms "the blasé attitude" that is prevalent among the metropolitan type, an attitude produced in part by the money economy: "The essence of the blasé attitude is an indifference toward the distinctions between things" (Simmel 1971: 329). Simmel writes that he does not mean that the difference between things goes unperceived, but that "the meaning and

the value of the distinctions between things, and therewith of the things themselves, are experienced as meaningless” (Simmel 1971: 330).

Money in Simmel’s view thus becomes the “frightful leveller,” hollowing out “the core of things, their peculiarities, their specific values and their uniqueness and incomparability in a way which is beyond repair. They all float with the same specific gravity in the constantly moving stream of money” (Simmel 1971: 330). Simmel also writes, “The development of modern culture is characterized by the predominance of what one can call the objective spirit over the subjective. . . .” The predominance of this objective spirit

*has been less and less satisfactory for the individual. Perhaps less conscious than in practical activity and in the obscure complex of feelings which flow from him, he is reduced to a negligible quantity. He becomes a single cog as over against the vast overwhelming organization of things and forces which gradually take out of his hands everything connected with progress, spirituality and value* (Simmel 1971: 337).

Simmel’s and Arrighi’s thinking on the importance of finance capital was taken up with respect to cultural production by Fredric Jameson (1997), who summarizes Arrighi’s argument before addressing what the rise of finance capital means for the production of culture, positing that it is a problem of abstraction, which in effect produced modernism

*Real abstractions in an older period—the effects of money and number in the big cities of nineteenth-century industrial capitalism, the very phenomena analyzed by Hilferding and culturally diagnosed by Georg Simmel in his pathbreaking essay....—had as one significant offshoot the emergence of what we call modernism in all the arts* (Jameson 1997: 252).

I am in agreement with Jameson on the question abstraction but only up to a point, for I think he overstates his case; abstraction in his thinking is too narrow a way of conceptualizing the modernist shift. Money produces equivalence, but equivalence doesn’t necessarily lead to abstraction. And when it does, it is not the only road to that particular destination. I would say that finance capital as money opened up this avenue but didn’t prescribe it, for, obviously, not all cultural production in the early twentieth century was abstract, not even all modernist cultural production. And abstraction can take many forms, not all of them manifesting as atonality in music or abstract expressionism in the visual arts. Abstraction in Jameson’s hands is too specific a way of conceptualizing what actually happened, and it strikes me as ahistorical, not paying enough attention to specific historical realities and aesthetic trends in the various arts.



For example, composers' embrace of dissonance, and, for many, an atonal musical language early in the twentieth century, was less a question of being motivated by a new ideology of abstraction ushered in by finance capital, but more of a technical response to their belief that tonality as a musical system had been used up, that nothing new could be done with it. And in several arts, technological advancements played a powerful role in creating a sense among some artists that abstraction needed to be pursued. For the Second Viennese School (Arnold Schoenberg, Alban Berg, Anton Webern, and others), the move to abstraction was a way to withstand the repeatability of music facilitated by new means of reproduction—player piano, phonograph, and radio—technological developments that many greeted with considerable consternation. Much the same occurred with painters, the course of whose art had been dramatically altered by the rise of photography in the mid-nineteenth century. Various reactions to these new technologies, whether fear, condemnation, or resignation that were evinced by major intellectuals such as Theodor Adorno and Walter Benjamin does not need to be rehearsed.

I would argue that what finance capital really wrought in the realm of cultural production was a new conceptualization of other cultural forms as exchangeable. Just as Hilferding's capitalism inculcated the ideology that everything was an exchangeable commodity, obliterating all differences between commodities other than their price, other musics (or modes of visual representation) could become reconceptualized as appropriable, suitable to be imported into one's own work. This is how I would explain certain trends in modernist cultural production in the twentieth century, whether composers borrowing from nonwestern musics or European folk musics, or visual artists such as Pablo Picasso and Georges Braque employing readymade objects such as newspaper fragments, bits of furniture, and wallpaper in their works around the same time as *Le Sacre*. Cultural forms in other realms, other fields, became thought of as appropriable, exchangeable, available to be used in one's own creation. Composers became willing to employ other music, and Others' musics, in their own creations. Relinquishing some time in music or space on a canvas to sounds or images other than your own became acceptable, even, in some circles, fashionable.

Stravinsky's *Le Sacre du printemps*, with its extensive use of Russian folk music (see Morton 1979 and Taruskin 1980) in many ways continues nineteenth century nationalistic musical treatments of folk musics. But since other works such as *Three Japanese Lyrics* (1913) and *Pribaoutki* (1914) composed around the same time, it becomes clear that Stravinsky was also engaging with sounds emanating from other cultures.<sup>347</sup> I would thus characterize *Le Sacre* not simply as case of the continuation of nineteenth century nationalism in music,

---

<sup>347</sup> See Funayama (1986) for a discussion of Stravinsky's *Three Japanese Lyrics*; see also Watkins (1994).

but complicatedly as an example—along with the other such works as *Three Japanese Lyrics* and *Pribaoutki*—of the new kind of exchangeability made possible by the rise in importance of finance capital in the west, which elevated the importance of exchange value over use value.

Stravinsky's music, of course, wasn't the only musical symptom of this shift, since, as I and others have written (Born and Hesmondhalgh 2000, Locke 2009, and Taylor 2007), many composers early in the twentieth century became fascinated with musics and sounds from other cultures and attempted to represent or emulate them in their music. But Stravinsky's representation of the Russian folk Other in *Le Sacre* using its own music—however modified—is perhaps the most salient example in the early twentieth century of this important shift in western culture.

Not viewing the influence of finance capital as simply a recourse to abstraction also helps explain Stravinsky's and others' later stylistic trends. I would argue that Stravinsky's later turn to a style that has been called neoclassical with works such as *Pulcinella* (1920) does not represent a break from his earlier, "Russian" stylistic period (in which *Le Sacre* is normally placed), but, rather, exemplifies the same sort of relationship with other music—this time musics from eighteenth century Europe rather than folk and traditional sounds from his native Russia. This, then, is another way in which I take issue with Jameson's thinking on abstraction (not to mention musicological stylistic periodizers): Stravinsky's turn toward musics from Europe's past was not, after all, a turn toward abstraction, but in fact an embrace of earlier musical languages, an embrace that could only be justified in a historical era when the predominance of finance capital and the ideologies accompanying it rendered such engagements with other cultural forms possible to artists and intelligible to viewers and listeners.

Let me now continue and expand the question of metropolitan life as advanced by Simmel and others. The condition of the individual, or, better, conceptions of the individual, constitutes another important set of social, cultural, and social factors at play in the early twentieth century. In an era when conceptions of the centered subject, an Enlightenment subject who believed he could control his own destiny, were being undermined by a number of ideas emanating from a number of directions—Freud on the unconscious, Saussure on the nature of language, Darwin on evolution, Marx on history, and the rise of mass culture (Hall 1989; Taylor 2007). The condition, the maintenance, of the individual in the early twentieth century was of great concern to a number of artists and intellectuals in this period, and they found various ways of reasserting their individuality or collective individualities in the face of the pressures just mentioned.

The nationalisms of the nineteenth century that gave rise to the collection of folk songs, some of which found their way into compositions in that century, were residual or (re-)emergent by this period of the early twentieth. The nationalisms of this later period that informed composers' and others' self-conceptions and cultural production, are part of this search for stability. Nationalism proved to be something to hold onto, something one could employ to help define oneself in a historical moment when everything seemed in disconcertingly and dangerously in flux. Even if nationalistic ideologies weren't that salient with respect to a particular individual, they were nonetheless circulating throughout Europe in this period, since some nations had only recently become nations—Italy for one, Germany for another. Stravinsky's interest in Russian folk music can be seen in this light.

Raymond Williams's thoughts on metropolitan artistic formations are especially useful here. He notes their proliferation in the late nineteenth-early twentieth centuries, observing that this is largely a metropolitan phenomenon and is strongly influenced by international members visiting European metropolises, a function of imperialism, and that immigrants play an important role as well (Williams 1981: 83-5). Williams writes elsewhere of the important role played by immigrants to the metropolis, many of whom played important roles in modernist cultural production, and how immigrants and others could form communities based on aesthetic affiliations (Williams 1989: 45). Immigration to the metropolis, in part because of some European countries' imperialist projects, helped fuel various modernist projects, while at the same time affording these immigrants to the metropolis a sense of community and belonging as parts of various aesthetic alliances.

There was also an efflorescence of aesthetic affiliations—frequently fluid and ephemeral—in which composers and other musicians could seek and find commonality with others with similar tastes and beliefs in cultural production. We thus find in Paris and Vienna in the late nineteenth-early twentieth centuries—the two capitals of musical modernism—a veritable explosion of groups organized along common aesthetic beliefs, groups whose ideas on cultural production usually took the form of some sort of -ism—impressionism, expressionism, cubism, fauvism, primitivism, and many more. Finding common aesthetic cause with others was another solution to the problem of everything solid melting into air.

In the Paris of Stravinsky and so many other artists and intellectuals, part of the synergy provided by new immigrants was augmented by the rise of international exhibitions, which put on display peoples, sights, sounds, and smells from other cultures, displays that were influential not just on everyday Parisians but artists as well. These international exhibitions helped bring musics from Europe's Elsewheres to the French public, which famously captured the attention of many musicians in the French capital, Debussy perhaps chief

among them, who heard in nonwestern sounds new melodies and textures that they attempted to emulate in their own music.

Peoples and objects were on display in a juxtaposed fashion, creating a jumble of sights, sounds, and smells. An account from the 1889 exposition describes the scene thus:

*A little further along is the Exposition of Colonies. It is composed of a main palace surrounded by pavilions where Indochina, Vietnam, Madagascar, Guyana, Guadeloupe, Gabon display their products. We can, if we wish, stop in a Tahitian, Senegalese, Cochinese, or New Caledonian village, and examine the indigenous peoples: the tour of the world, no longer in 80 days or 80 hours, but an hour or an hour-and-a-half, and without risk of being massacred or devoured—that is truly something (Grison 1889: 23).*

And historian Rosalind Williams quotes a French journalist, on the 1900 exhibition: “Hindu temples, savage huts, pagodas, souks, Algerian alleys, Chinese, Japanese, Sudanese, Senegalese, Siamese, Cambodian quarters . . . a bazaar of climates, architectural styles, smells, colors, cuisine, music” (Williams 1982: 61).

The objects on display and that were imitated and purchased by Parisians soon acquired forms of value that had nothing to do with where they were from, but made sense in a changing social system in which foreign objects were increasingly consumed, since they had been newly conceptualized as possessing value. Foreign objects were just objects of exchange, objects to be consumed, whether curios or musical sounds. Composers and other artists, with the changes brought by finance capital, sometimes reacted positively to these exotic sights and sounds and were not reluctant to employ or imitate them in their works (see Taylor 2007).

The path taken by Stravinsky and others wasn't the only one pursued by composers in the twentieth century. Stravinsky's (and others') practices—which were the result, as I have been arguing, of the rise of the importance of finance capital and changing conceptions of cultural production formerly seen as “other,” quickly became an aesthetic, a position to be taken in modernist fields of cultural production. This position made the quoting or imitating of nonwestern music and music from Europe's past possible, and was held by French composers in addition to Stravinsky. But this wasn't the dominant position of its time, however, though it was certainly a prominent one given Stravinsky's fame and influence.

The dominant composers in the other major imperial capital of culture, Vienna, chose another route, staking out a different position in the field of modernist musical production. The music of Schoenberg and the Second Viennese School was much more self-contained, even hermetic, emphasizing the lone individual's uncompromising creativity. Here one can find music that prac-

ticed Jameson's abstraction but, even here not only a result of the rise of financial capital, as I have said.

After World War II, there was a concerted effort by the champions of the Second Viennese School to ensure that group's aesthetic legitimacy and supremacy over Stravinsky and the French. Books by Adorno (Adorno 1973) and others (e.g., Leibowitz [1949] 1970, Newlin 1947), defended Schoenberg and his school as the wave of the future, the only true path for the advancement of music following the war. As part of this defensive way, some authors also attacked Stravinsky and the French, mainly along the lines that these composers were too willing to compromise their originality.

The Parisian position of exchangeability as the incorporation of other sounds, whether "exotic" or not, became so tainted in the first couple of decades after World War II that scarcely any composer dared to adopt it. Those few that did faced severe recriminations, even ostracism, and to this day have been largely relegated to the footnotes of mainstream music history, if they are mentioned in that history at all.<sup>348</sup>

Adorno in particular assailed Stravinsky. His ballet *Petrushka* (1910-11), for example, owed something to the cabaret, to which Stravinsky was somewhat faithful, according to Adorno, but he

*rebelled against the elements of narcissistic elation and harlequin-like animation and he succeeded in asserting, against the Bohemian atmosphere, the destruction of everything intrinsically inaugurated by the cabaret number. This tendency leads from commercial art—which readied the soul for sale as a commercial good—to the negation of the soul in protest against the character of consumer goods: to music's declaration of loyalty to its physical basis, to its reduction to the phenomenon, which assumes objective meaning in that it renounces, of its own accord, any claim to meaning* (Adorno 1973: 142).

Adorno writes that Stravinsky's music in *Petrushka* is like the intellectual's idea of the fairground, "analogous to the position of the intellectual who enjoys films and detective novels with well-mannered naiveté, thus preparing himself for his own function within mass culture" (Adorno 1973: 143). Stravinsky and French composers, and still others, were thus seen as capitulating to mass culture, too amenable to the incorporation of the products of mass culture into their own work.

This struggle for the legitimacy of this position in the postwar field of the cultural production of concert music was successful for decades. The dominant position after the War became a kind of hermetic twelve-tone method of composition that excluded virtually everything that could not be controlled or

---

<sup>348</sup> See Taylor (2007) on the *musique concrète* composers Pierre Schaeffer and Pierre Henry.

manipulated by the composer's use Schoenberg's method of composing with twelve tones, extended in the immediate postwar era to encompass virtually every musical parameter that could be controlled by the composer. This was a kind of technocratic music that was of a piece with postwar ideologies that valued science and rationality above all else. What couldn't be created by the composer in his hermetic system was excluded. And this music evidenced a kind of extreme conformity, which was also the cultural norm of the immediate postwar era. Everything had to be in its place. Everything was organized. Nothing was left to chance. Except chance music, but even John Cage became so enamored of his method of making indeterminate music that he believed himself to have much in common with the composers of total serialism, and his methods of employment of chance operations was extremely rigorous.

This Viennese-inspired formalist hegemony lasted into the 1960s when some members of the counterculture began to call into question the formalist compositional procedures of the most famous postwar composers such as Pierre Boulez in Europe and Milton Babbitt in the US, thus increasing the assault on the dominant position in this field of cultural production. Some composers once again began to allow themselves to be influenced by other musics, whether popular musics from their own cultures or nonwestern musics and ideas about music. The best-known examples are the minimalist composers, whose debts to nonwestern musics and ideas is well known (see Fink 2005 and Grimshaw 2011). Philip Glass (1937- ) described the Paris scene in which he had been immersed as a field that was "a wasteland, dominated by these maniacs, these creeps, who were trying to make everyone write this crazy creepy music..." (quoted by Rockwell 1983: 111). Glass, Terry Riley (1935- ), and La Monte Young (1935- ) became influenced by classical music from India, Steve Reich (1936- ) by African drumming (Reich 1974). Such influences were evident in popular culture as well, with perhaps the Beatles' interest in India and Indian musics as the best-known example (see Farrell 1997).

Minimalism, however, was controversial, attacked by defenders of the existing position in the concert music field as dull, "like listening to paint dry," as one of my music analysis professors once put it. The minimalist composers played an important role in beginning to destabilize the hegemony of the formalist position, however, helping to introduce modes of cultural production that have been called postmodern (though that term seems to have outlived its usefulness).<sup>349</sup>

---

<sup>349</sup> There were, of course, plenty of other European and American composers who were operating against the dominant formalist position, composers such as Henry Cowell (1897-1965), and Lou Harrison (1917-2003), famously influenced by gamelan music, and, in Europe, Darius Milhaud (1892-1974), among many others. The minimalists, however, were more influential because they were part of a group, however loosely affiliated.

Despite the assaults by composers associated with the counterculture against the dominant formalist position, it wasn't until the 1980s that this position began to lose traction. It was in this period that the next phase in the relationship between composers and other musics begins, with the rise of neoliberal capitalism, another important era in the history of finance capital. In the realm of concert music production in this decade, it became common, even fashionable, to engage with musics from other cultures. While I was writing my dissertation on this subject in the early 1990s, I described the topic to a composer friend, telling him that I was writing about composers who borrowed or appropriated nonwestern musics. He laughed and said, "Who doesn't?"

This interest occurred with the rise of the category of world music in the 1980s, when the western music industry decided to recognize world music as a "genre," spurred importantly by the success of Paul Simon's *Graceland* (1986). The music industry began to carve out a space for it in the music industry infrastructure: world music charts were begun at *Billboard* magazine in 1990, a Grammy award was created in 1992 (and another in 2003, which was later removed in 2012), spaces opened up in brick-and-mortar record stores and in virtual ones such as iTunes, and commercial musicians increasingly had to learn to "compose" and perform sounds that could pass as world music (see Taylor 1997 and 2012).

With all of these developments, exchange values for world music began to be created. This process has been described by R. Murray Schafer ([1977] 1994) and Steven Feld (1994) as "schizophonia," a process whereby sounds are split from their makers, but this is in fact the process of the creation of exchange value, in which the laborer is divorced from the product of her labor. Once the exchange value of world music began to be established, it was much more likely to be appropriated by composers.

And it is in this period that one begins to see musicians engaging with musics from far away. Unlike Stravinsky or Bartók, employing folk and regional musics for quasi-nationalistic purposes (among others), or Debussy, writing gamelan-inspired music that he encountered through colonial pathways and modes of display such as international exhibitions, the entrance of some of the world's musics into the commercial marketplace as commodities with exchange values made it possible for composers not only to conceive of employing those musics in their own work, but made it possible to do so.

In the initial flowering of interest in world music by western composers in the 1980s and 1990s, Meredith Monk's (1941- ) opera *Atlas* (1991) serves as an example. It employs traditional western instruments (violins, viola, cells, clarinet, bass clarinet, french horn, keyboards) with the sheng, a Chinese version of a kind of mouth organ found all over Asia and that gave rise to the European pipe organ, and a shawm, a medieval wind instrument, precursor to the

oboe. The borrowed sounds here, far from being used as local color, or as revitalizing agents, or as abstract material, have now become a regular part of the contemporary composer's palette of sounds and techniques.

Monk's heroine, Alexandra Daniels, is based on the life of Alexandra David-Néel, one of the first westerners to travel to the east and meet with holy people of various traditions, most prominently, Tibetan Buddhism. The French-Belgian David-Néel (1868-1969), adopted a Tibetan lama as her son, and authored and co-authored several books on Tibetan Buddhism, some of which are still in print. In *Atlas*, Monk transplants David-Néel into contemporary America. The plot, as such, consists of thirteen-year-old Alexandra Daniels dreaming of traveling, then as an adult realizing this dream with two companions, Cheng Qing, of Hunan, China, and Erik Magnussen, a Norwegian. Two more join the party along the way: Franco Hartmann, Italian, and Gwen St. Clair, born in Montserrat, West Indies. They travel all over the planet. Magnussen dies along the way, but the others attain a kind of spiritual enlightenment, the narrative of the journey becoming a metaphor for the journey of a soul. And a parable of the composer's own era thought to be best characterized by the term "globalization."

Engagement with musics from far away wasn't the only manifestation of the influence of finance capital in this period. The rise of the world music category, as well as interest in it, was accompanied by new digital technologies that made it possible to copy exactly recorded music, which one could copy and use in one's own music, composed solely at the computer. Elsewhere I have discussed the rise of sampling as a practice related to the heightening of the importance of consumption in American culture in the 1980s and after (Taylor n.d.), though would now cast it as in part another phase in the development of finance capital in which consumption becomes more urgent. What we now call sampling, in the sense that it is a copying of sounds external to one's own work, has been technologically possible since at least the advent of magnetic tape after World War II, but those few composers who engaged in some form of sampling was quite marginal. Sampling as a widespread practice didn't begin to catch on until the 1980s, with changing attitudes towards music marked in part by the increased emphasis on consumption, but also, the increased role played by finance capital. Musicians began to think of sampled musics—other musics—in even more atomized, abstract terms. The nationalist, imperialist, and self-grounding impulses that shaped modernist composers interactions with other musics have seen the addition of more abstract modes of relating to other musics aided by new technologies, and occurring in at the beginning of the downward spiral of finance capital in the west.



Many, perhaps even most, of today's composers don't always listen to music as music, but music as something that might be copied, sampled. When asked by an interviewer where he gets his samples or ideas for samples, Toby Marks, whose electronic "band" is called Banco de Gaia, replied,

*It varies. Sometimes I'll just come across something I think is amazing and I might be able to imagine a tune built around it. Other times I stockpile stuff and when I'm working on a tune if I need a male Arabic vocal to fit a section I'll see if I have anything which would be suitable (Marks n.d.).*

Clearly, a different aesthetic, a different relationship to music, is at work. It is not unusual, of course, for composers consciously to take musics and sounds from other places, as in the Stravinsky case, but to seek out these other sounds as, it seems, the foundation of one's own music, and to listen to them in this atomized fashion is new. In the 1990s, once sampling technologies had been widely adopted and questions of its legality were largely over (see Demers 2006 on this), musicians began to articulate how they approached sampled musical material, going beyond simple conceptions of homage or novelty. Listen to the way Prince Be (formerly Prince Be Softly, 1970- ) discusses his work with interviewer Terry Gross, for example. Gross asked, "Now, how much of the music on your new record is played by musicians and how much of it is sampled, and is that balance changing?" Prince Be responded,

*I would pretty much 35% of it is musicians and are rest are samples. I'm a sampling artist, what can I tell you? I love listening to records, I love feeling vibes from other people, I love being influenced by everything. I guess that's why music takes the turns that it does because there are no boundaries in who we want and who we listen to; we can take a Sly Stone sample we can take a Joni Mitchell sample, we can take a James Brown sample, we can take a Cal Tjader sample. It doesn't really make a difference, it's just all vibes and how everything feels and how everything emotes itself, you know (Prince Be 1995).*

Or composer Henry Gwiazda (1952- ): "What interests me is the juxtaposition of various sounds, which feels right for the world we live in." He continues

*I have my domestic sounds, my musical sounds, my outside/environmental sounds, and my percussion sounds. I introduce the sounds all at once, and as the piece progresses I spend time with each category, letting the listener understand where each sound comes from. And I spend some time with each sound because I like the sounds (Gann 1991).*

Others have come to hear commercial recordings and works as incomplete or unfinished, since they can now be easily manipulated in one's home studio or by computer. John Oswald (1953- ), known for what he calls "plunderphonics," described in 1994 his working process, which was to manipulate existing recordings.

*I approach these works as if I've adopted the role of a producer. I try to frame the artist in a way that is complimentary and interesting. But I work with source material which in all cases seems like it's not quite finished. Even though it's something I might admire to no end, there's something that's missing, something that my ears want to hear that I think can be supplied by coaxing this raw material along. So I help finish it up. I help with the arrangement or help with the vocals in order to make Dolly Parton, for instance, sound her best (Bowman 1994).*

Oswald thus conceptualizes recordings that have already been approved by artist and producers and released for sale as raw material, incomplete, ready to be finished by him.

These new digital technologies have thus brought about entirely new genres of music, as well as those genres that would not be what they are without the practice of sampling. Some types of musics are characterized or even defined by the kinds of music or other sounds that they sample. Goa trance, for example, is characterized in part by its samples from science fiction movies (see Taylor 2001). The jungle music of the 1990s was marked by its sampling of reggae. In that case, reggae samples served to mark jungle as jungle and not some other (sub)genre of techno music.

For Jameson, “postmodern” cultural production represents another stage of abstraction (Jameson 1997: 252). Finance capital during the historical period that produced modernist artworks was about exchange value and monetary equivalence, which “provoked a new interest in the properties of objects” (Jameson 1997: 258). But this newer period witnesses “a withdrawal from older notions of stable substances and their unifying identifications” (Jameson 1997:258). Jameson believes that if everything has become equivalent as a commodity, money having reduced their differences as individual things, then “both color and shape free themselves from their former vehicles and come to live independent existences as fields of perception and as artistic raw materials (Jameson 1997: 258).

Jameson also introduces Deleuze and Guattari on the subject of deterritorialization, which he interprets in a Hilferdingian/Simmelian fashion of implying “a new ontological and free-floating state” (Jameson 1997: 260-1). He continues his argument about abstraction into the present “postmodern” moment. “What is wanted,” he writes, “is an account of abstraction in which the new deterritorialized postmodern contents are to an older modernist autonomization as global financial speculation is to an older kind of banking and credit, or as the stock market frenzies of the eighties are to the Great Depression” (Jameson 1997: 260-1). Jameson’s symptom of this new form abstraction is the fragment (echoing an earlier argument about modernist collage giving way to postmodern pastiche in Jameson 1991), offering as one example the transformation of the structure of film previews, which have had to become more

comprehensive than before, so much so, he believes, that to view the film that the preview is a teaser for is no longer necessary. I suppose one could characterize digital samples of music as fragments, but this seems to me to put too much emphasis on the symptom rather than the cause.

Jameson concludes by again contrasting modernist cultural production with postmodern, describing a kind of Baudrillardian universe awash in signs, fragments, that profoundly influence cultural production and consumption (Jameson 1997: 264-65). Today, again, I would, like Jameson, continue to argue for the importance of finance capital, though no longer precisely as theorized by Hilferding, or, for that matter, like Jameson, at least with respect to his concern for abstraction as its main effect in cultural production. Finance capital, thanks to the development of powerful computers and communications devices that allow for split-second financial transactions anywhere on earth have ushered in a whole new era of the dominance of finance capital in the capitalisms of the so-called advanced countries in the last few decades. But I am less interested in stylistic categories (collage, pastiche, fragment) than what might call infrastructural shifts in the culture industries that affect modes of cultural production and fields of cultural production, and shifts that affect distribution of cultural forms and their consumption and interpretation (see Taylor n.d.).

Today's finance capital has been instrumental in creating these new attitudes, but I do not want to imply that older attitudes toward other musics, and Others' musics, have disappeared. Stravinsky's and other composers' relationships to other musics became, as I said, an identifiable position in the field of modernist musical production, and that position still exists; the new form of engagement via sampling has not supplanted to the old one. Both positions co-exist. There remain plenty of composers who continue to engage with other musics as did Stravinsky, Debussy, and others before World War II (see Locke 2009, Taylor 2007, and Tenzer 1994). But the field of the cultural production of postwar concert music has changed since the champions of Schoenberg and the Second Viennese School. There are more positions that are seen as legitimate, and more positions to be taken as the old hegemonies slowly break down.

This is neither to praise finance capital nor simply condemn it. Appropriations of Others' music, particularly Others who are historically disadvantaged such as ethnic minorities or formerly colonized subjects, raises complex questions of ethnics (if not legality, since now most digital samples are cleared with copyright holders). But, if Arrighi was right and hegemony and the influence of finance capital do rise and fall in spiral form, we can only wait with impotent interest to see what the declining hegemony in the west will bring with respect to cultural production while we watch what happens as China rises.

## References

### Unpublished Materials

Prince Be. 1995. Interview by Terry Gross. *Fresh Air*, 29 November.

### Books and Articles

Adorno, T. 1973. *Philosophy of Modern Music*. Translated by Anne G. Mitchell and Wesley V. Blomster. London: Sheed and Ward.

Arrighi, G. 1994. *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times*. New York: Verso.

Arrighi, G. 2009. *Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the 21st Century*. New York: Verso.

Bourdieu, P. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Edited by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press.

Brown, J. 2000. Bartók, the Gypsies, and Hybridity in Music. In *Western Music and Its Others: Difference, Representation, and Appropriation in Music*, edited by Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bowman, R. 1994. Oswald's Sonic Boom. *Globe and Mail*, 17 December.

Burkholder, J. P. 1995. *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Demers, J. 2006. *Steal This Music: How Intellectual Property Law Affects Musical Creativity*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Duménil, G., and D. Lévy. 2004. *Capital Resurgent: Roots of the Neoliberal Revolution*. Translated by Derek Jeffers. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Duménil, G., and D. Lévy. 2011. *The Crisis of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Farrell, G. 1997. *Indian Music and the West*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Feld, S. 1994. From Schizophonia to Schismogenesis: On the Discourses and Commodification Practices of "World Music" and "World Beat." In Charles Keil and Steven Feld, *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fink, R. 2005. *Repeating Ourselves: American Minimal Music as Cultural Practice*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gann, K. 1991. Music Notes: Sampler in a Sea of Sounds. *Chicago Reader*, 7 February, <http://www.chicagoreader.com/chicago/field--street/Content?oid=877061>.

Grimshaw, J. 2011. *Draw a Straight Line and Follow It: The Music and Mysticism of La Monte Young*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grison, G. 1889. A travers l'exposition. In *Figaro-Exposition*. Paris: Goupil, 14-23.

Hall, S. 1989. Ethnicity: Identity and Difference. *Radical America* 23 (October-December): 9-20.

Harvey, D. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Hilferding, R. 1981. *Finance Capital: A Study of the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development*. Edited by Tom Bottomore. Translated by Morris Watnick and Sam Gordon. London: Routledge.
- Howat, R. 1995. Debussy and the Orient. In *Recovering the Orient: Artists, Scholars, Appropriations*. Edited by Andrew Gerstle and Anthony Milner. London: Harwood.
- Jameson, F. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Jameson, F. 1997. Culture and Finance Capital. *Critical Inquiry* 24(1): 246-65.
- Leibowitz, R. [1949] 1970. *Schoenberg and His School*. Translated by Dika Newlin. New York: Da Capo.
- Lenin, V. I. 1939. *Imperialism, or the Highest Stage of Capitalism: A Popular Outline*. New York: International.
- Locke, R. 2009. *Musical Exoticism: Images and Reflections*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marks, T. n.d. Banco de Gaia interview. [www.chaoscontrol.com/archive2/banco/bancosamples.html](http://www.chaoscontrol.com/archive2/banco/bancosamples.html). This URL is no longer active.
- Marx, K. 1963. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. New York: International.
- Marx, K. 1990. *Capital*. Vol. 1. Translated by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin.
- Morton, L. 1979. Footnotes to Stravinsky Studies: *Le Sacre du Printemps*. *Tempo* 128 (March): 9-16.
- Newlin, D. 1947. *Bruckner, Mahler, Schoenberg*. New York: King's Crown.
- Reich, S. 1974. *Writings about Music*. Halifax: Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design.
- Rockwell, J. 1983. *All American Music: Composition in the Late Twentieth Century*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Schafer, R. M. [1977] 1994. *The Soundscape: Our Sonic Environment and the Tuning of the World*. Rochester, VT: Destiny.
- Simmel, G. 1971. The Metropolis and Mental Life. In *Georg Simmel: On Individuality and Social Forms: Selected Writings*. Edited by Donald N. Levine. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Taruskin, R. Russian Folk Melodies in *The Rite of Spring*. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 33 (fall 1980): 501-43.
- Taylor, T. D. 1997. *Global Pop: World Music, World Markets*. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, T. D. 2001. *Strange Sounds: Music, Technology and Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, T. D. 2007. *Beyond Exoticism: Western Music and the World*. Durham: Duke University Press.

- Taylor, T. D. 2012. World Music Today. In *Music and Globalization: Critical Encounters*. Edited by Bob W. White. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Taylor, T. D. n.d.a. *Commercializing Culture: Capitalism, Social Theory, and Music after Adorno*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, forthcoming.
- Taylor, T. D. n.d.b. Sampling and Consumption. In *The Auditory Culture Reader*, edited by Michael Bull and Les Back. 2d World Music New York: Berg.
- Tenzer, M. Western Music in the Context of World Music. In *Modern Times: From World War I to the Present*, edited by Robert P. Morgan. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Watkins, G. 1994. *Pyramids at the Louvre: Music, Culture, and Collage from Stravinsky to the Postmodernists*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Williams, R. 1981. *Culture*. Glasgow: William Collins Sons.
- Williams, R. 1989. *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists*. New York: Verso.
- Williams, R. H. 1982. *Dream Worlds: Mass Consumption in Late Nineteenth-Century France*. Berkeley: University of California Press.