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Sonic History, or Why Music Matters in International History
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Call it Audiogeschichte, histoire du son, or “sonic history.” Historians of international relations have recently become quite fascinated with the history of sound and music, and the acoustic turn is well on its way to becoming the “next big thing.” For both historiographical and historical reasons, this development should come as no surprise. First, the history of sound is the business of musicology, and many musicologists have been doing that kind of “international” history in one way or another for more than sixty years. Second, since the 1980s and 1990s, music and political history have gone through a period of rapprochement that was controversial at the time in some circles but has now been accepted as one of the ways in which musicologists work. Third, and most importantly, universal attitudes embedded in the liaison between music and internationalism have historically been used to divorce aesthetics from political realities, with sometimes negative consequences (take, for example, Schopenhauer, Pfitzner, and Palestrina). Moreover, statements like these can be read in different ways, either as poetical romantic expressions of belief in the power of music as an expressive but nonverbal art form, or as suggesting a literal cure for the woes of international relations. But either way, they reflect the typical nineteenth-century belief in music as a remedy for any number of conflicts, ranging from domestic violence to battlefield slaughter. The fact that in tandem with he-
gemonic tensions and military conflicts in Europe, civil war in the Balkans and Americas, colonial uprisings in Asia, and numerous international interventions (mostly in the Ottoman Empire) Western contemporaries cited music as a political remedy should catch our attention.

This book reflects the attempt to introduce students and scholars interested in the study of international history to the study of music as a useful tool and category of analysis. The contributors of this volume argue that music can be used as a measuring stick for the quantity as well as for the quality of an international relation. Music may reflect a relation when other ties are severed, it can help us to understand the nature of a relation operating on different levels, and it can introduce us to an entirely new dimension of what we deem an “international relation.”

On the following pages, I will review the existing literature dedicated to music and international history, arguing that up to this point, musicologists have done far more for the advancement of our understanding of music as a force in international history than historians of international relations. Next, I shall outline the stories, strategies, and standpoints presented in this book. Five observations at the end of this chapter shall serve to define the most important methodological and historical findings of this book, along with recommendations for future research.

**Musicology and History**

Musicologists have long pondered the history of music. Working with material such as written sources (scores, reviews, memoirs) and approaches such as textual criticism, musical analysis, philology, and others, musicologists investigate, for example, a specific composer, the genesis of musical styles (for example, jazz), music’s social function in a given period, and the varieties of musical performances in a given location at a particular time. Scholarly results can encompass edited volumes documenting and commenting on scores (often including the development of a piece over time), biographies of one composer or a group of composers, discussions on the function of music in a specific society (such as a social class, a region, or a nation), and the interplay of musical styles, texts, and harmonies over time. Music history in this sense is closely wedded to the production, performance, reception, and criticism of music. The closely related field of ethnomusicology concentrates on music
as it is situated in social relations; historically, its focus has been on non-Western music. Another related field, music theory, is principally concerned with technical aspects of the style, notation, and creation of music.

In the past fifty years, and more so even in the past fifteen years, musicologists have produced a highly developed literature on musical change in the context of modernity. They have looked at traditional and folk music interacting with music from other localities, globalization, migration, and other transnational processes. In the same vein, many musicologists have turned to the political and social meanings of music. They have investigated issues of gender, class, and race as well as the hidden ideologies embedded in musical activity. Looking at the works of Johannes Brahms, including *Ein deutsches Requiem*, composed after the Austro-Prussian War, Daniel Beller-McKenna, for example, has shown how Brahms infused his compositions with a moral and spiritual intensity that reflected what Beller-McKenna characterizes as a nineteenth-century “tendency of Germans … to foresee the coming of a new Reich in millennial, apocalyptic terms.” Esteban Buch, in turn, has examined the international significance of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony over the course of nearly two hundred years. Buch argues that Beethoven became an important national symbol in Germany for the same reason that he appealed to other political and cultural groups: because his music embedded a universalism that made it accessible to people of all creeds. Romantics saw the “Ode to Joy” as the climax of their art, German nationalists as a symbol for heroism and “Germanness,” French republicans as the *Marseillaise de l’humanité*, communists as a prophecy for a world without class distinctions, Catholics as the Gospel, Adolf Hitler as his favorite birthday tune, Rhodesia as a national anthem, the European Union as a unifying hymn, UNESCO as part of the world heritage register, and so on.

Like in so many other fields in the humanities, the lines between musicology and other disciplines are becoming increasingly transparent. Traditionally, musicologists’ interest in music differs from that of other researchers in other fields in the sense that for musicologists, music as a sounding activity will often be at the center of their research. In his book *Nineteenth-Century Music*, Carl Dahlhaus warned musicologists to produce a history of *music*, not a *history* of music. Dahlhaus felt the need to state such a warning because musicologists crossed the traditional limitations of their field. Inspired by the work of sociologist Tia DeNora, for example, many musicologists now situate listening as part of everyday life. Ethnomusicology and
musicology both allow the foregrounding of detailed consideration of the social aspects of music.6

One might argue that scholars from other fields, including history, tend to use music as a sounding board, a reflector, a measuring device to find out about something that, on first sight, may have nothing to do with music at all: the nature of power relations, continuities and changes in political culture, inner social rivalries, the long-term quest for cultural identity, or the negotiation of economic positions. But in many cases one can actually argue—and some musicologists have done so—that such phenomena do relate to music because music helps constitute those phenomena. Leslie Sprout’s dissertation on music in Vichy France reveals that music was a key tool of the state, combining political power and musical style. The work of Beth Levy on music and the American frontier, the work of Peter Schmelz on music and dissent in the USSR—all these studies show that musical sound is not separate from other historical and social phenomena, but part of the fabric of history.7

Historians and Music

The musicological research on the sociopolitical meaning of music has intersected with the interests of social and cultural historians, many of whom originally had no or little background in the field. Similar to musicologists, historians are interested in studying music as a historical event or development, analyzing its change, form, development, and meaning over time. But unlike musicologists, who regard music as a sounding activity, their interests focus not on music as a process but as a “lens,” an instrument to analyze questions of power, political hegemony, and cultural change. They view music less as a subject of investigation and more as a tool to reconstruct the past by shedding light on groups, individuals, organizations, events, objects, actions, and phenomena.

Celia Applegate, for example, whose early works focused on issues of identity, has since published widely on the political meaning of and the ways in which the music of the romantics reflected the desire for German unity.8 Jürgen Osterhammel and Sven Oliver Müller’s article “Geschichtswissenschaft und Musik” calls on historians to consider music as a central facet shaping the process, if not progress, of history. Essays in the volume analyze the mutual perception of music lovers, the exchange between the musical artist and the public, and the public radius of such musical relations.9 The African stud-
ies scholar Kelly Askew has explored the close connection between music, economics, and political changes. Key to Tanzanian nation building, Askew argues, were musical and dance practices exhibited by everyone from government elites to participants in wedding ceremonies. Music and popular culture at large played a significant part in what Askew calls “performing the nation.”

From the investigation of music and nation building, it is only a short step to the investigation of music in the context of international history. Scholars of international history are typically interested in issues of domination and suppression, hegemonic rivalry, cultural exchange and affinity, consensus and confrontation—modes of relationships, that is. Musicologists, as we have seen above, have an interest in both the connecting power of music and its geographical and cultural peculiarity, as well as the social aspect and meaning of music and musical culture. Music thus constitutes one out of many devices by which individuals, regions, nations, and unions can be either united or driven apart. Similar to science, commerce, environmental interest, film, literature, and the performing arts, sound entails a form of communication and affiliation. While its language may strike the casual observer as more specialized than, say, the analysis of films, books, plays, and newspapers, and while to the political historian’s eye, a musical score may look less accessible than a cable in Record Group 59 of the National Archives, in essence music fulfills the same purpose: it is a tool of communication reflecting a relationship between a producer/performer and the audience, possibly conditioned by a mediator such as a moderator (for example, a conductor), or through mediation by performance, broadcast, or recording.

Recently historians have turned to sources and theories of musical creativity, performance, and audio records in the context of international relations. In this context, popular music—notably jazz, rock, and hip-hop—has received considerable attention. A number of scholars, such as Frederick Starr, have written on American jazz musicians’ visits to the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries during the 1920s and 1930s and discussed Stalin’s repression of popular music. Others have highlighted the potential of folk music in borderland areas, such as the US-Mexico border, to accentuate the go-between nature of culture among nations and the emergence of a transnational culture.

A considerable body of work has focused on the meaning of jazz in the context of the Cold War. Christian Schmidt-Rost’s *histoire croisée* of Poland and the German Democratic Republic reveals that
to many artists and consumers, jazz provided a space of interaction that was appealing precisely because it seemed to be removed from politics. Lisa Davenport’s study on the meaning of jazz exports, in turn, shows that US-funded jazz protagonists such as Louis Armstrong, Dave Brubeck, Duke Ellington, Dizzy Gillespie, and Benny Goodman shaped foreign perceptions of the United States and capitalism in the Cold War. In all of these cases, US intentions always focused on winning the Cold War, an intention that shaped the United States’ relationships with new postcolonial nations around the world.14

Likewise, the history of rock music has inspired quite a few international historians. Eric Zolov has investigated the development of Mexican counterculture, especially in relation to the impact of rock music, US influences, and foreign hippies. Zolov stresses Mexican resistance to perceived “musical imperialism,” concerts, the crackdown on rock, and the activities of record companies in Mexico. In Mexico, Zolov contends, Elvis was “refried” to support the emergence of a new and young national identity.15 A very important book, and early in recognizing the role of music in Cold War politics, Uta Poiger’s *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels* analyzes the impact of jazz and rock in East Germany. As she shows, the perception of popular music genres differed tremendously in East and West; while the West German government understood popular music as a private affair, the East German government interpreted it, along with fashion and taste, as part of the class struggle threat to communism that needed to be repressed.16

Quite a few authors have investigated the instrumental character of jazz and rock music, that is, music as an instrument of political influence. Historians such as Penny Von Eschen, among others, have stressed the malleable character of particular genres of music, which made them perfect, if volatile, tools of cultural diplomacy in the propaganda between East and West. First, artists went off-message, such as Duke Ellington in 1963 in Baghdad, where he took a stroll with his unmarried companion and caused a storm of protest.17 Second, the political briefings musicians did receive were often so vague that there was no clear “message” in the first place.

By far the most recent international research has focused on hip-hop (notably rap), covered by students of musicology, ethnology, and media studies as well as cultural and regional studies, who investigate the global spread of this particular musical genre.18 Identifying the genre either as a form of protest against discrimination, a way to assert regional identity (particularly on the part of youth),
an avenue to hybrid cultural exchange, or all of the above, scholars have looked at specific regions of the world to retrace peculiarities and comparisons. For example, looking at the phenomenon of hip-hop in Germany, Osman Durrani asks why Turkish minorities in the state should take up an American musical form as a way of expressing their identity. Durrani’s essay addresses international relations within a postmodern society; hip-hop, he argues, offers a variety of senses of identity to an increasingly diverse group of citizens.19

Scholars of hip-hop “think” internationally and politically, but—similar to Uta Poiger’s interpretation of rock ‘n’ roll in East Germany—they see music as a tool of identification, demarcation, and protest, not state policy, and there is much that scholars of international history can learn from these analyses.20 For example, in crisis-ridden Sierra Leone, local idioms merged with West African hip-hop to create a music that presented young peoples’ “moral universe” as contrasting sharply with the world of their parents, teachers, and politicians.21 In South Africa, as the works of Albert Grundlingh and Daniel Künzler show, rap and Voëlvry music emerged as a means to give a voice to antiapartheid social protest.22

In Asia, transnational cultural flows, regionalism—a politically and economically powerful policy—and local identities likewise played a significant role in the development of popular music. Thus, Stefan Fiol explores the emergence of subnational regionalism in postindependence India; vernacular popular music, he argues, often mixes manifestations of local cultural identity in order to create a “space” for regional belonging and political change in a globalized world.23 Nationalism and regional self-identity articulated through the medium of popular music likewise play a tremendous role in Burma and South Korea, as Amporn Jirattikorn and Jeonsuk Joo have shown. Transnational and intense recognition of Korean pop, Joo finds, developed into a source of pride and distinctiveness for South Koreans, thus merging regional policy and national self-consciousness.24 The emergence of a vibrant pop music scene has also led to transcultural flows between Japanese and Korean musicians, after the South Korean government abandoned the ban on Japanese culture in 1998, affecting the public debate regarding how to go beyond postcolonial relations while at the same time remembering the country’s tragic history.25

Research on Latin American hip-hop has likewise focused on the context of identity and transnational/transcultural identities. In Brazil, hip-hop’s “black identity” connected the composition and themes of North and South American musicians,26 and quite a num-
ber of studies stress the genre’s significance in the context of protest and mobilization. Thus, Paul Almeida and Ruben Urbizagastegui have pointed to the growth of musical protest groups in small nations that they believe played a vital role in the development of revolutionary mobilization, while Hanna Klien, Tanya Saunders and others have delineated the role of hip-hop in Havana as a form of African American resistance against social discrimination, a sign of “Afro-diasporic activism,” and a tool for transnational identity.

Many historians and students of regional cultures have located the emergence and influences of hip-hop squarely in terms of “national rhythms”; in this tale, popular music represents forms of race mixture and transnational exchange between European, Latin American, African, and, recently, Asian compositions, giving way, in turn, to core symbols and expressions of national identity and local concerns over inequalities. Tony Mitchell’s review of Aboriginal hip-hop may thus apply to musicians around the world:

As an educational format, a vehicle to express anger at discrimination and marginalization and pride in one’s heritage, a way of binding communities together through dance and performance, a declamatory form of storytelling set to music, and a means of expressing oral history, hop hop’s affinities with aboriginal cultural forms make it an ideal means for youth to get in touch with their tribal identity, history and cultural background. It is also a vital means of articulating their place in today’s world.

Thus, hip-hop has been globalized but has also gone native since its emergence in Jamaica in the 1970s. From Greenland—where it has morphed English, Danish, and Greenlandic elements—to Australia, from New Zealand to South America, it has highlighted forms of regional expressions and subaltern discourses as much as transcultural flows and global protest. There are varieties in the forms and motivations of musicians and compositions, but specific characteristics never change, notably the wish to express identity and the readiness to seek transborder communication and exchange. This research’s emphasis on nonstate or even antistate identity provides a telling glimpse into the study of music in international relations at large that we shall get back to further on.

**Historians and Classical Music**

Classical music is a latecomer in the debates on international relations and international history. The productions of (mostly) dead,
white European males as well as concurrent notions of elitism and refinement did not lend themselves easily to the investigation of social and cultural history at a time when race, class, and gender had long ruled questions of how to analyze culture and how to interpret the past. Furthermore, the tradition of thinking of music as “apolitical,” which was strongly advocated after World War II, meant that these readings were underplayed for a long time. Even the new international history, which borrows heavily from neighboring fields and disciplines, has been slow to pick up the pertinence of classical music as an element of interaction beyond mere aestheticism.

One of the most enticing recent interpretations comes from Jürgen Osterhammel, who has delineated the emergence of a global music scene during the five decades prior to 1930. During this period, he argues, European classical (“serious”) and opera music thrived on all five continents, while early forms of mechanical music transmission “delocalized” the consumption of both European and non-European music all over the world, leading to an expansion but not a long-term mixture of both. Here, music emerges as a possibility of communication among territories that was, however, not always fully realized; while European composers like Claude Debussy and Antonin Dvorak briefly flirted with non-European forms of music for a few years, in the end such efforts remained just that, brief flirtations, never definitive characteristics of their work.

A number of musicologists and historians have studied the impact of Cold War politics, divisions, and anxieties on the composition of music. In her 2009 dissertation, Emily Abrams Ansari, one of the authors in this book, examined the work of US composers—“masters of the president”—during the Cold War with a particular eye on their cooperation with the federal government for the purposes of US propaganda abroad. As Ansari points out in a related 2012 essay, musical composers were not hapless pawns directed by a federal state in the name of containment; rather, they were granted unprecedented power to shape the music (serious classical music, but no serialism or experimentalism) and, with that, the image of the United States exported to audiences worldwide. Meanwhile, Danielle Fosler-Lussier has investigated the reception of the United States Information Agency’s musical programs in Asia and elsewhere, pointing to the decisive impact of local demands for specific kinds and calibers of musical programs. As Fosler-Lussier recounts, the chief commissioner and president of the Pakistan Arts Council, for example, demanded in 1958 “that the U.S. Embassy provide an ice show ‘or a really good jazz orchestra’ for a Pakistani arts festival” because
he had heard that the US government had favored India with an ice show. These are important findings because they shed light on three of the most tantalizing questions of cultural propaganda—the inner workings of the information machine, the politics of identity, and the unforeseen tensions between audiences, organizers, and US officials. Evidently, many countries tended to see a musical event (including a visit by a US orchestra) as a political phenomenon, adding to their own national and geopolitical status. Collectively, these studies show that musicologists have already moved into the field of international history, notably Cold War studies.

Yet, even among historians of the Cold War, the topic has typically been subordinated to power politics and cultural exchange. Thus, David Caute, Hugh Wilford, and Francis Stonor Saunders have highlighted the manipulative role of music as an art form in the hands of secret services and cultural propagandists. Even though snippets of information such as Van Cliburn’s triumph at the International Tchaikovsky Piano Competition in 1958 or Leonard Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic’s tour to the Soviet Union during the following year have been repeated endlessly in the respective scholarship dedicated to US cultural diplomacy, we have not spent much time making sense of such moments besides stereotypical explanations referring to the arts as instruments of political power.

“Ah swear to goodness, ah just can’t believe all this is happenin’ to li’l ole Van Cliburn from the piney woods of East Texas!,” Time magazine quoted the 23-year-old pianist on 19 May 1958, after he had received the stellar Russian award with the explicit approval of Nikita Khrushchev. Most Western observers at the time could not believe it either, and we need to begin to wonder what it meant that different forms of music, including classical music, played such a prominent role in the Cold War. What does it mean that Khrushchev did not seem to blink once before allowing the award to be presented to a US artist? Did national and geopolitical interests subside, if just for a moment? How did the engagement of soloists and entire orchestras change the nature and perception of the Cold War as a geostrategic and ideological battle? Was this a part of the Cold War we have not considered before?

While it is tempting to subordinate music to an instrumental function of power politics during the twentieth century, it is equally deceiving to echo nineteenth-century sentiments of musical internationalism. In a recent online comment dedicated to a roundtable on music in the Cold War featured in the journal Diplomatic History, Charles Maier argued that for all the classical topics of inter-
national relations—power, hegemonic drive, self-performance—the exchange of symphony orchestras in the Cold War may provide a glimpse of those “Dionysian fields” of universal harmony that humankind has aspired to since the beginning of time (or, one may add, has wanted to believe in for various, more worldly reasons). While it may be a consolation to believe that President Eisenhower, along with the chief organizers of US cultural and information programs, were driven by visions of peace in an age of statements, policies, and documents such as the National Security Council Report 68, we are hard-pressed to make such arguments based on more than speculation. The sources we know plead for mutual understanding, but not for compromise. Whether liberal or conservative, at the end of the day, the organizers of musical tours in the 1950s and 1960s were hoping to win the Cold War, not to abandon it. The question is: how do we make sense of the nexus of power and harmony, of politics and sound? Emphasizing one in disregard of the other will not get us any closer to understanding the link between the two.

Clearly, the time and the scholarship are ripe for addressing these and other questions linking the study of music to the study of international history. There is even a surging debate: on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, in France, Germany, and the United States, scholars are beginning to organize conferences, workshops, projects, and forums dedicated to the interplay of classical music and international history. But why and how is music and all that is attached to it—musicology, performance, reception theory, emotions, and psychology—an attractive avenue for scholars interested in foreign relations? What can music tell us about international history that we did not know before? And what can experts of international relations and musicologists learn from each other?

Understanding Music and International Relations

Much of the scholarship on music as a historical phenomenon originates in the understanding that media—any kind of media—play a significant role both in our understanding of the past and, even more so, in historical actors’ modes of self-perception and self-performance. Borrowing from communication studies, media theory, in particular, is concerned with the nature and impact of specific forms of communication tools—ranging from a show to a computer—on particular groups or societies. Media and communication scholars point to any form of communication, ranging from face-to-face
societies of the early modern type to online exchange, to ask how humans employ particular modes of communications—“symbols”—to create “meaning” and “messages” and how, then, these meanings meander into political, cultural, economic, and social dimensions of their respective societies. Music, in this sense, can be understood not merely as a “thing to bring” (such as in cultural diplomacy) but as a medium, a transmitter, and a symbol for a message as well as a reflector for identity and communication.42

In a thought-provoking dissertation, Lauren Erin Brown has looked at the interplay of US arts funding and the Cold War. Examining the introduction of Russian ballet to the United States and its successive evolution into a US art form, Brown, first, questions the existence of cultural hierarchy and status quo in the United States and, second, argues that ballet’s new consecration as a US art form legitimized what it meant to be an American both at home and overseas.43 Like ballet and like any form of media, music can be understood as a form of communication, either a reflection of social conditions (identity, racism, nationalism, unity, collective purpose, etc.) or an instrument of political and cultural aspirations (hegemonic power, quest for rapprochement, display of ideals). In both cases, historians are called upon to investigate music not simply as a tool but as a forum of values, customs, and ideas.

In this book, we do not propose one or the other understanding. Instead, we wish to highlight some of the most recent trends developing in the field. In accordance with these ideas, I asked the contributing authors to address the following queries in their essays: How have authors “used” music to understand and narrate the (hi)story they are telling? How does music help us to explain an international relation? More specifically, how does music highlight the nexus between culture and international history? What can music tell us about international history that other avenues of cultural inquiry cannot? And where do authors see avenues for future questions and investigations regarding the role of music in culture and international history? These are the questions addressed in the present book.

Contents of the Book

David Monod jump-starts the volume with an introduction to the Barrison Sisters, an American family troupe that achieved fame and notoriety in the 1890s. Dressed as children, the sisters sang about sex, using voices that spectators described as peculiarly impassive
Introduction

and uncomprehending. Monod’s article documents the divergent readings that the Barrisons received in Europe and the United States and uncovers a shared transatlantic belief that the voice served as a window to the soul. But as this chapter shows, while there was agreement on both sides of the Atlantic on the voice as a window to the soul, the wickedness of the Barrisons’ performances, and the artificiality of their singing, American and European critics drew very different moral lessons from that shared understanding. Monod’s study uses international comparisons to decipher what would be otherwise unintelligible: the moral principles that drove shared aesthetic sensibilities apart. In the end, the Barrisons functioned less as a highway of cultural exchange and more as a reflector of differing ethical codes.

Anne C. Shreffler then turns to the link between modern music and the Popular Front. Specifically, she investigates the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM) and its transnational political context in the mid-1930s. Like the League of Nations and the other international organizations conceived in its spirit after World War I, the ISCM found its very survival threatened by the political turbulence that arose between the Nazi seizure of power in 1933 and the outbreak of war in 1939. As the European new music scene was drawn into the political whirlwinds in the summer of 1935, groups whose squabbles had been mainly of the familiar, internal “artistic politics” kind were suddenly confronted with actual state politics. The exiled Austrian composer Hanns Eisler, representing the Soviet-led Popular Front, worked during the summer of 1935 to bring the ISCM into the fold, while the Nazi government set up its own alternative to the ISCM, the Permanent Council for the International Cooperation of Composers. The president of the ISCM, the English musicologist Edward Dent, fended off both sides and articulated a vision for the organization that uncannily anticipated later Cold War notions of a politically “neutral” art. Larger questions about whether music could express a “national spirit” and still have international validity, music’s role in creating social change, the link between contemporary music and its audience, and even the definition of “contemporary music” itself emerged from these confrontations. This moment of upheaval in the new music scene, Shreffler argues, provides an excellent opportunity to measure and evaluate the interactions between music and international affairs.

Toby Thacker casts new light on critical aspects of international relations in the occupation of Germany between 1945 and 1949. He argues that music—of different types—can highlight the tension
in this occupation between military coercion and cultural persuasion, and demonstrates how the balance between these two central modes of relationship between Allied occupiers and occupied Germans shifted between the end of World War II in May 1945 and the emergence of two nominally independent German states in 1949. The chapter then explores how music illuminates the competition that developed between the separate occupying powers as they sought to win over German hearts and minds in the embryonic Cold War. Finally, Thacker argues that a consideration of the role of music in this complex play of international relations enables us to reconsider the role of German agency in a situation in which control of the traditional structures of power—military, economic, and political—lay firmly with the occupying powers. The chapter concludes that an analysis of the role of music in this occupation does not lead to a fundamental reappraisal of the international relations involved, but to a much more nuanced understanding, one that recognizes the ways in which cultural phenomena can “develop a life of their own” in these relations.

Danielle Fosler-Lussier, in turn, considers music as an instrument of diplomacy. She argues that music should not necessarily be treated as a by-product that merely reflects political conditions, but as an integral part of the mix of human activity humans seek to describe when they write history. Her chapter offers evidence from the history of cultural diplomacy to demonstrate that Cold War musical activity as it was contested on the ground allows historians an important perspective on the history of Cold War propaganda. Viewed from the top down, US musical propaganda in the Third World appeared to be a project of imperial cultural transmission. Yet the recipients were far from passive participants. In many cases, US cultural programs were drawn into a local rivalry and conditioned by local demands. Because embassy staff served as mediators of information to the State Department, they were also vulnerable to advice that served the locals’ interests sometimes more than those of the United States. The outcomes of these cultural diplomacy events were not primarily about transmitting ideas; instead, these performances and the negotiations surrounding them built relationships in which demands could be made upon the United States and the connection with the United States could be deployed in local power relations. Understanding how cultural propaganda was contested on a local scale, among nonstate actors, Fosler-Lussier argues, admits a new perspective on Cold War propaganda as a global practice.

Jonathan Rosenberg sharpens our understanding of US symphony tours during the Cold War. His chapter explores the intersec-
tion between classical music and international politics during the Cold War; it probes the story of a key cultural export program initiated by the US government in the 1950s, which sent leading US symphony orchestras to perform around the world. The program's aim was to advance the political and ideological objectives of the United States during a time when the East-West competition dominated the attention of policy makers. More specifically, the chapter examines the practice of cultural diplomacy, in which the United States deployed symphony orchestras to Asia and Latin America to present American cultural achievements to allies in both regions in an effort to advance the idea that the United States was capable of impressive attainments in the realm of high culture. The chapter thus highlights three perspectives related to the nexus between music and international history: First, it considers the US government's reasons for initiating the program. Second, it considers the journeys from the perspectives of the performing musicians. And third, it assesses the reception of the tours by examining local press coverage. As Rosenberg shows, the tours by the Symphony of the Air in 1955 and the New York Philharmonic under Leonard Bernstein in 1958 showcased the accomplishments of liberal capitalism, which, it was argued, was not limited to producing Hollywood blockbusters, oversized automobiles, or nuclear weapons.

Emily Abrams Ansari likewise looks at musicians as rhetorical surrogates in US president Dwight Eisenhower's Cold War planning, this time for Iceland. Through an examination of US musical diplomacy to Iceland during the crisis in relations of the mid-1950s, she demonstrates that Eisenhower considered music and musicians a particularly potent tool of psychological warfare, capable of carrying clear messages to foreign nations without the need for words. In Iceland, Eisenhower and his staff used classical musicians in response to negative Icelandic reaction to perceived cultural imperialism occurring via the US Air Force base on the island. Eisenhower's use of music in Iceland demonstrates that his principle objective in that nation was to build prestige for the United States. He and his staff considered classical music an ideal vehicle for building such prestige while also, intriguingly, devoid of imperialistic features, and thus the ideal way to downplay perceptions of an American cultural invasion. In this case study, the story of a musical mission to win friends reveals new insights into Eisenhower's foreign policy and strategy toward this nation, a model that Ansari believes might usefully be employed in assessing US relations with other nations.

Peter J. Schmelz introduces us to what he and others call “intimate diplomacy.” He examines the unpublished correspondence of
Ukrainian conductor Igor Blazhkov and West German music writer Fred K. Prieberg. Their correspondence, carried out mainly from the 1960s into the 1970s, presents a new perspective on music and international relations during the Cold War, and, as Schmelz argues, the type of history it exemplifies: an intimate history. The author believes that the public side of Cold War exchanges has received much recent scrutiny, but the intimate side remains understudied. In particular, unofficial, personal transnational networks between the USSR and the West have received little examination. Yet, as the Blazhkov-Prieberg correspondence demonstrates, they formed a critical nexus for information exchange during the 1950s and 1960s, especially for music. Their exchange, independent of any official channels, preserves a snapshot of crucial moments from the 1960s, including the various freezes and thaws of official Soviet artistic policy, the politics of tamizdat, and the role of unofficial spaces (whether virtual or actual) within Soviet musical life. As Schmelz demonstrates, exchanges such as Blazhkov’s formed a significant type of international relation. They framed each side’s opinion of the other on a personal level, producing significant and tangible results, alongside more diffuse changes in perspective and behavior. For both historians and musicologists, intimate history promises discerning the enormous in the miniature by offering models for tracing similar dynamic intersections of music and society, both close and vast.

Andrea F. Bohlman investigates Polish-Belarusian musical relations shortly before the fall of the Berlin Wall. In 1987, the governments of the Soviet Union and the Polish People’s Republic issued a declaration urging Polish-Soviet cultural exchange. Building upon recent successes touring Moscow, Poland’s Department of Culture set out to connect the Polish stage with that of a neighboring Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) where the language barrier was minimal: Belarus. The Polish-Belarusian collaboration’s most ambitious endeavor, as Bohlman shows, was the staging of a popular song festival, itself modeled on the Festival of Soviet Song in Zielona Góra, a vital event on the landscape of Polish festival culture. The program of the July 1988 Festival of Polish Song in Vitebsk performed the constructive and reciprocal influences of Soviet and Polish popular music cultures upon each other through the twentieth century at its gala concert. An analysis of the performance of international history on the stage and through music, Bohlman contends, sheds new light on the diplomatic relations between Poland and its neighboring SSR. Stars of the Polish stage sang Soviet songs in Russian, and there was even a tribute to one of the great voices of Soviet estrada, Anna
German, who was Polish. Bohlman argues that the effort to connect Poland with the Soviet Union culturally interpreted popular music previously assumed to be national as hybrid. This musical party line provides an important and underexplored counterpoint to narratives of Polish postwar history because it emphasizes Poland’s divergence from other Warsaw Pact nations on both the musical and the political level.

**Concept and Theory**

There is much that a thoughtful inclusion of music into the repertory of international history can tell us. Stylistic choices can sometimes convey allegiances. Concert reviews can be as revealing as some government documents, depending on circumstantial factors such as the reviewer and the context. Musical contexts can provide political clues. Musicians and audiences are both national and international. Musical performances can have—and have had—political significance. Collectively, the chapters presented in this book highlight five points.

1. **Genres.** Much of this book is dedicated to what the Germans call *ernste Musik* (serious music). At the same time, “music” in this book covers a wide range of genres. While the focus is on classical music, it also includes gestures to burlesque, ballet, folk, new music and other genres. We deliberately opted for this diversity to stress that our remarks are not limited to art music or to the kind of music that educators once declared to be “educational,” “uplifting,” or “romantic.” Classical music has recently experienced a surge of interest among researchers, a movement that deserves attention. But the principal demands and convictions—music as a reflector, music as a transmitter, music as a sounding board—can easily be transferred to other sorts of music as well. Indeed, ethnomusicologists have done just that since the 1960s; here, historians and musicologists are presented with a stellar opportunity to cooperate.

2. **Cold War.** As musicologists such as Danielle Fosler-Lusier have argued, the impact of the Cold War on modern twentieth-century music was immense, but there remains a giant hole in the foreign relations literature on the role of music. Certain governments favored, pushed, and pulled specific kinds of music (like jazz and classical music) while others—such as experimentalism or modernism—were more selectively supported or even shunned by governments, universities, and cultural diplomats. The East-West conflict manipulated,
isolated, ridiculed, exiled, and channeled prewar musical trends. For composers, depending on their expertise and their standing, the bipolar conflict offered either opportunity or relentless discrimination. The freedom to compose left much time and room for creativity, but not necessarily an outlet for public performance, while state control often entailed the necessity to compromise artistic inspiration with popular appeal. Under communism, in particular, composers often had little time for creativity as they were frequently required to take on other work, such as conducting choirs or student ensembles and writing commissioned works in a state-approved style for grand public events. There is already a strong body of work on other aspects of cultural diplomacy, yet the component of music is a novel facet and should receive much more attention than it currently does.

3. Manipulation. The impact of music on international relations is equally influential, and on this general level, at least three possibilities of cooperation between the two fields are obvious. First, the most evident approach is to treat music as an instrument of diplomacy. This is the story that Emily Abrams Ansari, Jonathan Rosenberg, Andrea F. Bohlman, Toby Thacker, and Danielle Fosler-Lussier tell. In international history, music can function as a transporter of ideas as much as messages of hegemony. Second, music can serve as a reflector of international debates, anxieties, strength, and resistance. Anne C. Shreffler’s and Peter J. Schmelz’s analyses of the political plight experienced by modern musicians in the face of totalitarianism demonstrate that in situations where musical production is heavily controlled and politicized, striving for freedom of expression takes on larger significance—standing in/substituting for freedoms absent in other areas of life. Third, as David Monod reminds us, music can be analyzed as a relation all by itself, a forum of shared experiences but also opposing assessments, and a canvas for mutual national perceptions. Combined, these three approaches underline that rational decision-making processes, power schemes, and grand strategy may or may not be at play in an international relation. Furthermore, incoming students to the field may start to think about the circumstances under which music as an international relation operates in a specific way.

4. Communication. In a similar vein, music can be a mode of communication, including conflict and consensus where emotions are being played out in a manner otherwise invisible. Jonathan Rosenberg, Emily Abrams Ansari, and Danielle Fosler-Lussier all show how, in different contexts, foreign audiences perceived US music performances as a measuring stick for emotional commitment and high ex-
pectations as well as cultural frustrations: if a prestigious musician or orchestra visited one country in a region, other countries also desired to have that honor to increase their national prestige. Their chapters highlight questions about the status of music as a historical document as well as the relation between music and language. Today, even in the Western world, musicologists admit multiple definitions of multimedia, and they also point out that sound influences and directs sight (for example, costumes, scenery), language (such as programs, words), and associations (genre definition, etc.). Future researchers should ask how specific musical choices were supposed to influence diplomacy. Even if we cannot retrace the political agenda for an individual musical program, we still need to make sense of the fact that government officials made or agreed to particular programs for particular audiences in particular settings—or not.45

5. The state. Most importantly, music can help us understand the extent to which the state assumes control of international cultural venues. Chronologically, nearly every chapter in this book shows how the state, from World War I on, developed an increasing interest in the use and manipulation of music for political means. As such, music becomes an indicator for both state and nonstate activities. This observation does not mean that the production, performance, and reception of music as such became exclusive instruments of state policy; Anne C. Shreffler and Peter J. Schmelz show, clearly, how musical activities constituted a realm designed to subvert or resist state policy. Schmelz even contends that an investigation of musical relations reveals a cultural link across the Iron Curtain at the height of the Cold War, when most such contacts were unpalatable.

There is something surprising, even paradoxical, in the fact that the state included music in its move toward “total diplomacy.” After all, such policy ran counter to ideas of increased formalism and apoliticism/internationalism, especially in “classical” and “contemporary” music. This paradox, it seems to me, is an issue worthy of investigation for future research.

In conclusion, in the twentieth century music seemingly became an effective instrument of state diplomacy precisely because it seemed apolitical. At the same time, nonstate actors and institutions, including some German conductors in the United States, had already perceived and used music as a tool of political power during the nineteenth century. When the administration of music as an instrument of diplomacy switched hands from nonstate promoters to diplomatic agencies after World War I, it was a change in structure, but not in thought.
These, it seems, are the most trying questions for students of music and international history in the twentieth century: How and why did this transformation of musical diplomacy from nonstate to state control happen? And how does it relate to ideas and perceptions of music as increasingly apolitical and international? When and how does the national, the geopolitical, and the international come into play? Do Asian audiences listening to a European concert consider themselves national beings? Or do they forget their regional identities during a musical experience? Do listeners, musicians, and organizers switch identities according to their actions, identifying themselves as national and at other times as nonnational? We need to examine to what extent music and musical events became targets of state control while, at the same time, contributing to the decentering of the state and the transformation of international relations since the 1970s.

This book urges scholars of international history to consider music—classical, folk, modern, popular, and other genres—as an instrument of hegemony and resistance; a reflection of identity and protest; a means of communication; a forum of encounter; but most of all, as a transporter for atmosphere, mood, and emotion in the making of international affairs. True, music cannot tell us precisely what people said, thought, or believed. It cannot address many of the traditional questions of international history such as those dealing with rational decision-making processes, power schemes, and grand strategy. Nor can we read scores and reviews like cables and government documents. But at the end of the day, geopolitics come and go on a much more rapid scale than cultural developments. In this sense, culture—including music—proves more enduring than power.
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