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A very warm welcome to the second annual conference of the Critical Theory for Musicology Study Group!

Over the last twenty-five years, the premises of music analysis, notation, modernism and formalism have been subjected to a broad critique, resulting in an increased emphasis on performance analysis (Cook 2013), pluralist histories (Tomlinson 1993), and an interest in the range of subjective responses to music which cuts across previous divisions between high and low cultures (Solie 1993). This disciplinary conflict has become increasingly politicised, opening a debate on the precise nature of the relationship between specialist knowledge and social class. On the one hand, ‘traditional’ musicological approaches, and the repertories with which they were usually concerned, have been perceived as regressive (Born 2010), with the newer approaches generally considered politically progressive (Bohlman 1993). On the other hand, an opposing critique is now emerging, which interprets the move away from specialist theoretical training as a de-skilling of the musicological profession. This has led to accusations that such a move is complicit, intentionally or not, with the increasing commodification of higher education, and works opportunistically towards (capitalist) economic ends (e.g. Harper-Scott 2012). Viewed from this perspective, traditional approaches – or ‘musical conservatism’ – might paradoxically be construed as politically progressive, effectively reimagining the classic Adornian position for the twenty-first century.

But what is musical conservatism (or indeed musical progressivism), and is it inherently positive or negative? Are certain genres or sub-disciplines within musicology conservative whilst others are progressive? What effect might these assumptions have on the study of music? Is ‘traditional’ musicology, however that might be defined, outmoded? And is there an appropriate response to these questions?

This conference aims to address these questions in light of renewed concerns over the future of music studies in the academy. The greater public scrutiny that academia now attracts has direct ramifications in the allocation of funding and resources, as exemplified by the demands of REF and TEF. There is therefore a pressing need to examine the question of the discipline’s function in these broader socio-political terms, since the direction that musicology takes now will have an impact on the training of students and the research of academics for decades to come.

It has been a delight to see both the scope and high quality of the submissions which we have received in response to these ideas. The themes of this conference go right to the heart of what we as a study group have set out to contribute—a learning space in which to talk critically about music, always with a view to maintaining a connection...
to “the music itself”, whether defined as the musical performance, recordings, or deep structural concerns. This conference comes after the success of both Critical Theory for Musicology’s inaugural conference, ‘Musicology after Postmodernism’, and a panel session which the group hosted at the RMA Music and Philosophy Study Group Annual Conference, on the theme ‘Are we all philosophers now?’. We remain committed to fostering an inclusive dialogue between multiple disciplines, and hence have resisted the option of hosting parallel sessions. Instead, for our second annual conference, we have expanded the programme to span two days, including two keynote presentations, five themed sessions, and a roundtable discussion in which to revisit some of the themes arising from the conference.

We are acutely aware of the controversial nature of the conference theme, which has not been set lightly or naïvely. But if we are to be critical, then assumptions on all sides must be challenged. To that end, we welcome and thoroughly encourage a friendly and open dialogue both in response to papers and in the wider discussions to be had throughout the conference as a whole. Following an initially more structured discussion between panellists at the concluding roundtable session, we hope to open the floor to delegates and speakers alike to share their reflections on matters arising from both the conference itself as well as its broader context within contemporary musicology.

The committee would like to thank Music & Letters for sponsoring this event, and also the Institute of Musical Research, the School of Advanced Studies, and Nick Baker for their generous support. Thank you also to everyone who submitted abstracts to the conference, to the speakers of these two days, and of course to each of you for coming!

The CTFM Committee
Katie Cattell, Oliver Chandler, David Curran, Rebecca Day, Christopher Kimbell, Rachel McCarthy, Nathan Mercieca

www.criticaltheoryformusicology.wordpress.com www.the-imr.uk
https://academic.oup.com/ml
PROGRAMME

Friday 12 January

9:30-10:15  Registration

10:15-10:30  Introductory remarks

10:30-11:00  **Session 1: Philosophy**
Chair - David Curran

- Hanslick, Kant, and Wittgenstein: Re-evaluating Formalism
  Nicholas Cooper (University College Dublin)

11:00-11:30  Break

11:30-13:00  **Session 2: Modernism**
Chair - Oliver Chandler

- Richard Strauss’s “Beim Schlafengehen” and the space-time discontinuum
  Emily X. X. Tan (University of Oxford)

- Biko, Stockhausen, and the Emancipatory Potential of Musical Modernism in Post-Apartheid South Africa
  William Fourie (Royal Holloway, University of London)

- Miles and Coltrane… they messed up the music”: “progressive” vs. “traditional” models for jazz pedagogy
  Luca Stoll (University of Oxford)

13:00-14:00  Lunch (provided)
14:00-15:30 **Session 3: Meta-musicology**

Chair - Rachel McCarthy

The Auto-Ethnographical turn in Musicology and the Limits of Self-Knowledge
   Peter Tregear (University of Melbourne)

The Populist Turn in Musicological Scholarship and the Retreat from Social-Democratic Cultural Production
   Ian Pace (City, University of London)

Musicology, Value, and Emancipation
   Stephan Hammel (University of California, Irvine)

15:30-16:00 Tea and Coffee (provided)

16:00-17:30 **Keynote 1: David Clarke**
   (Newcastle University)
   Chair - Christopher Kimbell

18:00 Conference Dinner
Saturday 13 January

10:00-11:00  **Session 4: Opera**  
Chair - Daniel Elphick

- Reinhold Glière’s Transnational Opera Project: Towards a Progressive View of Soviet Musical Conservatism  
  Philip Robinson (University of Manchester)

- Berlin and the Building of an Operatic Canon  
  Eric Schneeman (Northeast Lakeview College)

11:00-11:30  Break

11:30-13:00  **Session 5: Pedagogy and Practice**  
Chair - Samuel Wilson

- A Performance of Jackson Mac Low’s *Thanks* (1960/1)  
  Nathan Mercieca (Guildhall School of Music and Drama)

- Analysis and Composition as Research  
  Dimitris Exarchos (Goldsmiths, University of London)

- Progressive or Regressive Musicology? The Struggle for Normative Authority  
  Michael Whitten (Queen’s University Belfast)

13:00-14:00  Lunch (provided)

14:00-15:30  **Keynote 2: J. P. E. Harper-Scott**  
(Royal Holloway, University of London)  
Chair - Nathan Mercieca
15:30-16:00  Tea and Coffee (provided)

16:00-17:30  **Roundtable Discussion: ‘The issue of diversity within progressive musicology’**

Oliver Chandler (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Rebecca Day (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Emily Doolittle (Royal Conservatoire of Scotland)
Rachel McCarthy (Royal Holloway, University of London)
Eva Moreda Rodriguez (University of Glasgow)
Musical formalism is the idea that instrumental music on its own does not represent or arouse emotions or external facets in the world. Rather, the aesthetic force of the work is a product of the sonic elements of the piece, nothing more, and nothing less. In its original statement by Eduard Hanslick, musical formalism relied heavily on the work of Immanuel Kant in his Critique of the Power of Judgement, the founding text of formalism in art. This underpinning is central to Hanslick’s project, and it has since been justifiably subjected to serious objections by modern musicology; the blinkered ontological and political assumptions of old music criticism and analysis have been undercut repeatedly. It is possible, however, to follow the thought of another thinker in assembling an argument in favour of musical formalism; that of Ludwig Wittgenstein. Wittgenstein drew on certain Kantian distinctions concerning necessity and contingency throughout his writings in articulating an account of how meaning emerges in collective social practice. I contend that it is possible to suggest a revised version of Hanslick’s formalist project, again via Kant’s thought, that takes account of our living musical practices, the challenges of modern musicology, and the fraught landscape of the philosophy of meaning. The advantage of this approach will become apparent when applied to improvised music, which has remained a critical blind spot of formalism as traditionally considered.
Richard Strauss’s “Beim Schlafengehen” and the space-time discontinuum

The reactive subject of musical modernism (Harper-Scott, 2012) denies the revolutionary present of musical language offered by the emancipation of dissonance, and continues to recognise the centrality of tonal structures in the formation of musical works. Despite this, the reactive subject still depends on a partial recognition of the revolutionary modernist event in order to create its own present, albeit one that is ‘extinguished’ (Badiou, 2009). Richard Strauss’s ‘Beim Schlafengehen’ TrV 296c, one such extinguished present, is the subject of this paper.

Composed in a historical limbo between the Second World War and the Cold War, ‘Beim Schlafengehen’ also falls between the cultural dominants of modernism and postmodernism (Jameson, 1991). In my analysis of Strauss’s song, I examine how the underlying dysfunction of Strauss’s tonal form constitutes part of a broader struggle to grasp temporality both as the experience of the individual and as part of a broader, social consciousness. In particular, I assess the renewed relevance of the musical modernist event to the musical language of a cultural dominant that, in conceiving of the subject spatially, has no logic of progress. Reading ‘Beim Schlafengehen’ not only as an extinguished present of the modernist event, but also as a process of resistance against the postmodern impulse to annul historical truth; I argue that Strauss’s musical conservatism here presents a progressive stance against the encroaching ideology of postmodernism.

References

Emily X. X. Tan is a doctoral student and Clarendon Scholar at the University of Oxford where she is supervised by Laura Tunbridge and funded jointly by the Clarendon Fund and the Merton College Music Award. Her master’s degree was undertaken at Royal Holloway, University of London and her undergraduate degree was awarded by Exeter College, Oxford. Emily has spoken at a number of national and international conferences and her TAGS 2016 paper was awarded the SMA graduate student prize. Emily’s doctoral project addresses Richard Strauss’s late works, considering in particular the role of a conservative musical aesthetic in the modernist era.
Biko, Stockhausen, and the Emancipatory Potential of Musical Modernism in Post-Apartheid South Africa

Musical modernism occupied an ambivalent position in South Africa under the apartheid regime. On the one hand, it was idealised by state institutions such as the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) because it represented a form of cultural capital that whites were to accrue in forging a Eurocentric identity. On the other, the aesthetic found little traction among conservative white Afrikaner audiences. Karlheinz Stockhausen’s 1971 visit to South Africa illustrates this ambivalence: despite considerable costs, state-sponsored institutions felt that audience ‘should be exposed’ to his music and thus brought him out for a lengthy national tour. In disparaging counterpoint to this sentiment, an audience member present at a concert of Stockhausen’s acousmatic music in Pretoria, which the composer presented in darkness, recalls how after the auditorium lights were switched on again, half the audience had left and the concert was abruptly ended.

Beyond state idealisation and public disdain, there exists a third—and most veiled—aspect to Stockhausen’s 1971 trip to South Africa: his meeting with the leader of the Black Consciousness movement, Steve Biko, in Soweto. No records of this meeting exist, and since Stockhausen met with Biko in private, there were no witnesses to what was exchanged. Despite the absence of record and testimony, the meeting does prompt an interesting question, namely, might there be a point of convergence between musical modernism and Black Consciousness thought? While such a convergence is historical significant, I use Biko and Stockhausen’s meeting as an impetus for theorising the emancipatory potential of modernism in post-apartheid South Africa, where fault lines created by the previous dispensation still form and inform cultural production.

William Fourie is a postgraduate research student at Royal Holloway, University of London under the supervision of J. P. E. Harper-Scott. His work is concerned with decolonial analysis and musical modernism in post-apartheid South Africa.

Luca Stoll
University of Oxford

Miles and Coltrane… they messed up the music”: “progressive” vs. “traditional” models for jazz pedagogy

In recent years, bebop pianist and pedagogue Barry Harris (1929) has often made the comment quoted above during his weekly workshop in New York City. Although bebop is considered one of the most significant progressive breakthroughs in jazz history, teaching bebop in a ‘purist’ way as Harris does is considered reactionary in 2018: pianist Richie Beirach speaks of Barry Harris’s ‘dead flies’. By contrast, the stylistic changes pioneered by Miles Davis and John Coltrane, although only
a decade younger than bebop, are still held as valid progressive models by established jazz pedagogy worldwide.

Harris, an exact contemporary of Davis, is still performing and teaching music today, 60 years after Kind of Blue. For decades, he has fought institutionalized jazz pedagogy, with its main proviso that every student must find his own original voice and its insistence on Davis and Coltrane as ‘progressive’ models to be imitated. Harris’s stand, dismissed as conservative, is nevertheless firmly grounded pedagogically. Indeed, the procedures established by Davis and Coltrane, while they produced music of the highest esthetic and artistic importance, are problematic as pedagogical models: in many ways these procedures constitute a regression if compared to the high level of harmonic, melodic and rhythmic integration to be found in bebop. By teaching bebop, then, Barry Harris’s stance is not only one of vigorous anti-conformism, it is also, on the long run, progressive in its validation and transmission of advanced techniques that are exemplary open-ended due to their clarity and depth.

Luca Stoll is a Swiss jazz saxophonist. From 2004 to 2014 he lived in New York City and studied with Branford Marsalis and Barry Harris. He has appeared in the USA, UK, Switzerland, France, Italy and Japan with musicians such as Kenny Washington, Alvin Queen, Steve Brown, Steve Fishwick, Colin Oxley, and Dave Green. Luca Stoll is currently pursuing a DPhil degree at the University of Oxford on the use of tonality in Coleman Hakwins’s solos of the 1940s under the supervision of Prof. Eric Clarke.

SESSION 3: META-MUSICOLOGY

Peter Tregear  
*University of Melbourne*

The Auto-Ethnographical turn in Musicology and the Limits of Self-Knowledge

There was a time, not so long ago, when we would strongly encourage undergraduates not to use the first-person pronoun in academic writing. While that was always at best imperfect advice, it was grounded in an idealistic notion that academic scholarship is not, or at least not principally, a matter of personal opinion or conviction but seeks to claim for itself a general validity though the application of the tools of disinterested reason. In 2015, however, the Times Higher Education Supplement published an article entitled “Self-reflective Study: The Rise of ‘Mesearch” (Emma Rees 2015) in which it was argued that it is now “narcissistic to leave out your own experience and to act all-knowing, as though you can stand apart, and that you are not subject to the same forces as those you write about.”
I argue that, far from opening up the frontiers of music research to areas formally forbidden, the auto-ethnographic turn in musicology risks not only promoting a view of what musical research is that tends towards solipsism, but perhaps also something much worse, the sotto voce elimination of scholarship’s wider critical potential. Our capacity to posit any notion of generalised musical value risks dissolving into a sea of local subjectivities.

Therein, however, lies an opportunity for the values and skills derived from more traditional forms of musical scholarship to reassert themselves. They can still offer us a critical potential that self-oriented scholarship cannot; the capacity to think beyond the limitations of everyday subjective experiences and consider not only how, but why, a scholar, a reader, and ultimately a listener, should be encouraged to think beyond them.

Peter Tregear is a former teaching fellow at Royal Holloway, and before that Professor and Head, School of Music, at the Australian National University and Fellow of Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge. Recent publications include ‘Enlightenment or Entitlement: Rethinking Tertiary Music Education’ (2014). He is also active as an operatic singer and conductor.

Ian Pace
City, University of London

The Populist Turn in Musicological Scholarship and the Retreat from Social-Democratic Cultural Production

Anglo-American musicology has shifted significantly since the mid-1980s, with new emphases upon commercial music, identity politics, so-called post-modernism and social context, with a concomitant decline in music analysis, study of non-Anglophone scholars, historical approaches and aesthetics. Commercial production is portrayed as providing agency for musicians (and the pejorative term ‘cultural industry’ transformed into the positive one of ‘creative industries’), while existing ‘elite’ state-funded cultural institutions have received much negative critique.

In this paper, following critiques of cultural studies from Todd Gitlin, Thomas Frank, Greg Philo, Fran Tonkiss and others, I argue against the ‘progressive’ credentials for this type of musicological politics and that it (i) promotes a market-oriented approach to culture, with corresponding disdain for alternatives supported through taxation and public spending; (ii) appropriates rhetoric of alterity to bolster Anglo-American nationalism; and (iii) is permeated by tropes and ideologies associated with populist rhetoric, as theorised by scholars of politics, with respect to ‘elites’ and experts.

Furthermore, adapting critiques by a range of thinkers from Naomi Klein to Kenan Malik, I argue that particular new musicological appeals to ‘diversity’ and reified multiculturalism equally bolster the commodification of musical cultures, much more than older forms of musicology. In response, I advocate emphasis upon the particularities of musical material and rigorous analysis, non-reductive approaches to music and context which recognise the possibility of dialectical tension, historicist approaches not predicated upon assumptions of linear progress, and a real internationalism that demonstrates an open-mindedness towards all world musics, languages and cultures.
Ian Pace is a pianist of international renown, and a musicologist working at City, University of London, where he is Head of Performance. In both fields, he specialises in the post-1945 avant-garde, especially in Germany, and more widely researches issues of critical musicology, practice-as-research, historical performance, and music and fascism. He has given over 250 world premiers and recorded over 35 CDs. In 2016-17 he gave an 11 concert series of the complete piano music of Michael Finnissy in London and Oxford.

Stephan Hammel  
*University of California, Irvine*

**Musicology, Value, and Emancipation**

Musicologists increasingly interpret what they do in political terms. The combined effect of the emergence of new social movements, recent electoral upsets and continuing economic disquiet has rapidly accelerated this tendency. Assumptions about the progressive potential of expanded visibility, representation, and methodological pluralism have undergone serious re-examination, especially by scholars who are concerned to locate the discipline in its capitalist economic context. It is increasingly difficult to come to a consensus that distinguishes progressivism from conservatism in academic work. With the topic of capital on the table and the stakes of progress ever higher, the time appears especially propitious for a fuller engagement with the core intellectual contributions of Marxism, a tradition virtually absent from the discipline except insofar as it informed Cold War critical theorists.

This paper outlines what such an engagement ought to consist in. I argue that understanding music making in terms of both the historical development of technologies (including instruments, notation, and organizational paradigms) and the expansion of social needs makes perspicuous how musical labor came to be subsumed in a process of self-valorizing value. Examining the consequences of subsumption under capital can lead to a concrete concept of an emancipated musicking, one that is non-analogically related to the emancipation of other domains of production and creativity. Finally I show that both the scientific seriousness and philological concern of “traditional” musicology are much closer to a historical materialist approach than more recent methods that have garnered progressive bona fides.

*Stephan Hammel is a Marxist agitator from Los Angeles, California. He is currently Assistant Professor of Music at the University of California, Irvine. In addition to his work on the intellectual history of Marxism and the historical materialist approach to musicology, he writes on Latin American musical modernism in the last century.*
KEYNOTE 1: David Clarke

Critical Thinking about Music in a Neoliberalist Age

Since political conservatism has achieved the very opposite of conservation (wreaking devastation locally, nationally and globally) while not dissociating itself from technical and even social advancement, the very notions of conservatism and progressivism have become tainted for the foreseeable future. Even opposition ‘to the forces of conservatism’ can land us in disreputable company. So how are critical thinkers – not least critical musicologists – to navigate what is increasingly recognised as a neoliberal age?

Although it would be hubris to venture any kind of definitive answer to this question, I will seek to argue – from both theoretical reflection and personal experience – for some principles that to me (still) seem salient. While probably disconnected or incompatible, these are based on the continuing need to affirm the critical, but, crucially, to remain open to all the places where we may find it, and to work through the contradictions that arise.

For example, practices such as western classical music and epistemologies associated with them may continue to hold critical power (despite attacks on many sides), precisely because of their autonomist aesthetic and their untimeliness (perhaps a more useful term than the c-word). At the same time, in a pluralist culture, a further critical mandate comes from the imperative to find an authentic relation with the Other. This has arisen for me personally, not only through working in a department whose curriculum has long included vernacular musics (hence ‘Elvis and Darmstadt’) but also through my own practical and scholarly engagement with North Indian classical music (hence ‘Different resistances’). Some further reflections come from a forum seeking to define the terms twentieth- and twenty-first century music, which I recently curated for the journal Twentieth-Century Music (and which with luck will be in print by the time of this conference). Such an undertaking brings to the fore the problematics of how we are to engage historiographically and critically with our contemporary musical and cultural conjuncture.

David Clarke is Professor of Music at Newcastle University. He is a music theorist with wide a range of research interests, encompassing analytical, philosophical, cultural and critical approaches to music. With Eric Clarke he is co-editor of and contributor to Music and Consciousness: Philosophical, Psychological, and Cultural Perspectives (OUP, 2011). He has published widely on the composer Michael Tippett, including a monograph, The Music and Thought of Michael Tippett (CUP, 2001). He has also written on Arvo Pärt, Eminem and John Cage, and on issues of modernism, postmodernism and cultural pluralism, most notably in articles on ‘Elvis and Darmstadt’ and Radio 3’s Late Junction. He also researches North Indian classical music, in both theory and practice.
Philip Robinson

*University of Manchester*

Reinhold Glière’s Transnational Opera Project: Towards a Progressive View of Soviet Musical Conservatism

Until recently, Soviet composers who worked within the sanctioned artistic practice of ‘socialist realism’ have been widely ignored in Western scholarship. This aesthetically conservative repertoire, despite its pervasive legacy throughout Soviet and post-Soviet culture, can be hard to navigate within a discourse that privileges modernism as the defining narrative of twentieth-century music. This paper, then, will seek to discuss the progressive social values that some of this repertoire embodied, taking Reinhold Glière’s attempts to write national operas in Azerbaijan and, particularly, Uzbekistan.

From the mid 1930s, Soviet composers were encouraged to engage with more syntactically conservative musical styles such as folk music, which was couched as a favourable ideological remedy to the obfuscating language of Western modern music. Moreover, musicologists became constrained by an ever restrictive critical language which sought to interpret art within the critical framework of socialist realism, and eschewed the technicalized language of disciplines such as music analysis. After exploring these phenomena, this paper will consider Reinhold Glière’s Uzbek opera Gyulsara, which was written for the ten-day festival (*dekada*) of Uzbek art that occurred in Moscow in 1937. This work adopted an aesthetically conservative musical language, but details of the music and its critical reception demonstrates progressive social values. The discourse engaged with a subtle transnational cultural discourse that sought to overturn the colonial values to which many scholars have presumed it to embody. Moreover, the critical discourse in which the works came about demonstrate attempts to sensitively mediate the ethical issues surrounding transcultural exchange.

*Philip is a PhD candidate at the University of Manchester, having previously studied at the University of Bristol and Royal Holloway, University of London. His research focusses on socialist realist opera, transnationalism, and festival-making in the Soviet 1930s.*
Eric Schneeman  
*Northeast Lakeview College*

**Berlin and the Building of an Operatic Canon**

In current musicological discourse, many scholars are attempting to call into question the formation and perpetuation of a musical canon. To some degree, musicologists shy away from any discussion of “musical autonomy” or “composer intentionality” for fear of appearing antiquated. This paper, however, argues that the desire to build a canon of musical masterpieces, particularly in the realm of opera, belonged to a progressive movement among early 19th-century German intellectuals based in Berlin: Under the guise of musical criticism, writers appropriated and praised a select group of “great operatic works” in order to push for cultural and political reforms. Drawing upon the work of Celia Applegate, Katherine Hambridge, and Susan Crane, among others, my investigation seeks to trace the philosophical evolution of an operatic canon in Berlin around 1800. In particular, Crane’s monograph on intellectuals’ and politicians’ desire to preserve and protect historical objects in the wake of the Napoleonic Wars provides us with a new framework to examine the rhetoric and ideology surrounding the formation of an operatic canon — and its political implications — in Germany. To illustrate this point, my paper examines the critical reception surrounding the revivals of Gluck’s and Mozart’s operas at the Hofoper and Nationaltheater from 1800 to 1848. My analysis demonstrates critics’ attempts to transform the opera house into a museum in order to conserve these older operas for the progressive aim of defining and unifying some sense of German national identity.

*Eric is an adjunct professor of music at Northeast Lakeview College in San Antonio, Texas. His research on operatic culture has appeared in the Oxford Handbook Online, E. T. A. Hoffmann Jahrbuch, and Music in 18th-Culture. Eric has received a grant from the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst for 2018.*

**SESSION 5: PEDAGOGY AND PRACTICE**

Nathan Mercieca  
*Guildhall School of Music and Drama*

**A Performance of Jackson Mac Low’s *Thanks* (1960/1)**

Mac Low’s 1960/1 piece *Thanks* instructs any number of people in any room to make any utterance or group of utterances for any length of time. This is just one of several avant-garde pieces of performance art that take indeterminacy and openness to its extreme: indeed the entire Fluxus
performance movement is founded on the aestheticization of mundane activities, ostensibly with progressive, liberalizing motivations.

In contradistinction to the avowed aims of such works to resist the capitalist and elitist tendencies of twentieth-century art production, I argue that they effectively replicate the specific cultural logic of the neoliberal political and economic programmes with which they were contemporaneous. The conception of liberty these pieces enshrine is doggedly individualist, and the subsumption of indeterminate everyday activities into a series of artworks (many of which are copyrighted) effectively constitutes a form of privatisation. Meanwhile, the evacuation of any material element of composition in favour of the purely discursive circulation—‘outsourcing’ the act of production while retaining conceptual ownership, and reaping societal and economic benefits—foreshadows late capitalist modes of production most recently observed in companies such as Uber and AirBnB.

While it might be argued that Fluxus works represent an outmoded aberrance, by examining the type of subjective interaction these works imply I will show that less extreme (and more recent) compositions are implicated in similar political associations: it is the structure of their liberalism, not its extremity, that is significant. Thus I will show that what seems musically radicalism can, in fact, be regressive.

Nathan Mercieca recently completed his PhD in Musicology at Royal Holloway, University of London; his thesis was entitled Music, Writing, and Subjectivity: The Ethics of Musicology. He is active as a countertenor, performing a wide range of music: future engagements include Peisander/Ulysses (ROH/Curwyn) (cover), Britten Canticles with Graham Johnson (Milton Court), and a showcase of new music at Wigmore Hall.

Dimitris Exarchos
Goldsmiths, University of London

Analysis and Composition as Research

This paper argues that the decline of Theory and Analysis as a discipline is a correlative of a receding of the study of composition within UK academia. One reason may relate to the dismissing of a scientific approach to music; another to the impact of new-musicological approaches to a (dead-)white-male’s discipline. Cro (2015) denies that composition can be research, drawing parallels to the counter-example of science. Lochhead (2016) argues that the scientific paradigm of musical high-modernism has come to a close. The former reacts to the current funding regime in UK HE and suggests doing away with composition-as-research towards other equivalences; the latter proposes a renewal of analysis—a discipline still active in the US—to paths recently opened up by compositional practices. Meanwhile, recent musicological work has largely developed ethnographic, sociological, or psychological methods, to the detriment of analysis traditionally conceived; an upshot of this is a neglect of composition and the musical ‘work’. Such tendency occasionally undermined composition as supposedly subjective and in able—or irrelevant to an idea of progress. I argue however that composition and its analysis remains an integral part of music research. I take composition to relate to the notion of intention as theorised by Cavell (1967) and the work as part of a musical configuration, a sequence of a virtually infinite complex of works, as put forward by Badiou (2005). Such conceptions help identify criteria for a productive analysis- of-
composition, in defence of a discipline that may both challenge the current funding regime and step up to the mark of critical research.

Dimitris Exarchos is a theorist and musicologist specialising in contemporary music. He has published in books and journals, organised international symposia at Goldsmiths and curated concerts and events (Southbank Centre; Goldsmiths). Recently he was Research Fellow at the State Institute for Music Research in Berlin, and is currently Visiting Research Fellow at Goldsmiths.

Michael Whitten
Queen’s University Belfast

Progressive or Regressive Musicology? The Struggle for Normative Authority

In recent decades, the commodification of higher education in the U.K. has raised important questions regarding the purpose of musicological training and research. Students are increasingly viewed as customers with academic staff playing the role of sales representative. In consequence, the myriad research practices which fall under the term musicology appear to be in tension with one another with some distancing themselves from ‘traditional’ research practices in favour of more ‘plural’ approaches. Is this move, however, progressive or regressive? This paper will argue that the idea of progressive needs to be understood as contribution towards the good and the struggle for normative authority within musicology, therefore, involves a debate regarding what the purpose and goals of the discipline are. Musical conservatism, loosely understood here as the continuation of ‘traditional’ research practices, may resist commodification by not adopting approaches which are perceived to be analogous to a neoliberal logic. What will be argued, rather, is that mediation between traditional and non-traditional research practices is a better means to critique neoliberalism and diminish existing or potential threats of domination. This will be achieved by exploring the recognize theories of Taylor and Honneth, as well as MacIntyre’s concept of tradition.

Michael Whitten is a PhD student at Queen’s University Belfast. Working within the fields of musicology and political philosophy, Michael’s research explores conceptions of authenticity, recognition, and narrative as a means to investigate ideas regarding social distinction and taste.
KEYNOTE 2: Professor J. P. E. Harper-Scott

‘Somewhere or Anywhere? The politics of Brexit, Britten, and the middlebrow’

By the late 1920s, the Conservative Party in the UK had come to see the ‘highbrow’ as a major threat to the British state and the capitalist world order. The highbrow’s strong association with socialist movements, and with the popular Left Book Club, seemed to point to the unlikely possibility that the working classes, through reading political theory and becoming acquainted with serious culture, could rise up and overturn the foundations of Western society. Under the leadership of Stanley Baldwin in particular, the Conservatives strengthened a ‘middlebrow’ movement whose aim (pursued through, among other things, a rival book club and a training college) was to promote an insular and identitarian view of English society and political economy, and to set up a barrier between the working classes and the dangerous isms (including modernism) of the Continent. This paper examines the fortunes of Britten’s music in relation to the ‘battle of the brows’, then and now, draws parallels between the ideological uses of culture and identity in the 1930s and the early twenty-first century, and asks what the long view of the struggle between middlebrow and modernism, conservatism and radicalism, has to say in respect of the traumas of our present.
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