

SOCIOLOGY OF MODERN MUSIC

Sociology - in our case the sociology of art - is a young branch of study: ^{Modern} music, since it is modern, is also a young art. Thinking of the sociology of modern music we must keep in mind the fact that both the object itself and the method of its inspection can by no means pretend to be "scientific"; completely different cognitive instruments are necessary here - and we shall try to find them. It is well to stress that art as a scientific object - and sociology is science - is far from perfect. No empirical examination applied to it / to art / can get to the crux of the matter - probably because the object itself is unstable, elusive, mysterious, inscrutable.

In order to realize the possibilities of finding cognitive tools, we must first consider in what times we live. Certainly not in times to which the earlier criteria apply, because they were formed ex post on the background of still earlier circumstances. And we know that sociology measures ~~xx~~ rather with the present day than with history, rather with what is than with what was. And thus for instance we know that for years we have lived in industrial age, but each new period of a few years changes completely our knowledge of the world measured with sociological tools. In order to find this true, it is enough to read again ~~what~~ was written on the sociology of contemporary music ten years ago, before all the later important aspects of social life, before the aberrations that not only accompanied the 60ies, but in fact modelled the period / I mean the changes in the spiritual, not material aspects, of course /. And so the sociologists' comments on the subject interest -

ing to us have nothing in common with what we already know today about man's spiritual and intellectual development.

The fall of educational authorities in the field of art; striking revaluation in the managers' minds, whose role nota bene declines today;

the spiritual rebellion of the young, the more vivid and ambiguous because lacking in a direction of action / the slogans are only a pretext to appear in public, they make "coming out " possible - for anybody in fact/;

the cult of short-lived, not lasting stardom / sociological answer to the question of value /;

the new function of the significance of quantity: if in former days quantity was overwhelming and determining, today this component has a different function - it appears in an equally expanded form, but on the other hand it has a gift unheard-of so far, to appear and vanish equally fast / like a fire-ball/;

"coming into force" of permanent artistic values, and thus a degrading causative function of art as entertainment / Raskolnikov - as a gangster /;

homogenization in culture of the sublime with the lowest / a new function of artistic failures : in the age of deterioration of criteria it is always possible to stand up for one's personal point of view, although it is useless and meaningless in the age of widespread replaceability of man/;

futile escape of people into the land of unaccomplished "events", which is commonly explained by a new kind of

prejudice against the function that man can take
in relation to art life, also social life;
further shifting of age border of persons participating
in social life / the extension of this diapason
should not be interpreted in the sense of greater
consumption share of older children and "younger youth"
but as taking over some at least outward causative
intentions by youth already grown up; hence eg. uni-
versity students, and not young workers serving their
apprenticeship/;

different because more mechanized and deprived of the
charm of adventure, consumer attitude-
all this makes it necessary to consider the modern sociology
of art in a basically different way.

The longer I am occupied with art, the more clearly I realize
that it depends on many outside factors, what is more, those out-
side factors can prevail even where we have to do with most
constant principles of behaviour, which - it would seem - nothing
can influence. As long as I work "on my field", that is only in
relation to art, keeping in mind its good, everything is all right:
things stand as they stand, it is clear what is what. The value
criteria, the role of work, inspiration, cognitive intentions, even
aspirations - all this is arranged according to a spiritual
"plan", which is adequate to what one is doing / if there was
no such harmony, creation would be impossible, or at least it would
suffer from its "inabilities"/. Once a work gets "outside" from
the inside, it appears not to be what it should be. It is as if
we left a small child in the street and "ordered" it to manage

by itself. Everybody knows: some good people will take care of the child and it will probably return to where it came from; in case of a work of art it will be different: it will wander about the streets of the world, ~~not~~ understanding neither the world nor how it got into it, but first of all - it will be very lonely. What distinguishes modern art from its previous forms lies in this particular sphere. I have long kept this word under my jacket but now talking of art understood differently than we, artists understand it / still in a traditional way / it can be uttered: art lives more and more on charity / most artists - probably not knowing it even - beg: both Niemen and Hono beg / and it is only due to the extreme gullibility of young students of art that there is still urge to art - against common sense ^{which} would make "mercenary" people take to anything more practical than art. / I personally think that art is for those who could not do without it, who would pursue it - for certain - disinterestedly, too.... / . Both Niemen and Hono have achieved some success, but they cannot reconcile themselves to what befalls them now; art whets appetites - even a success will seem incomplete, only gloomy simpletons do not know it; we daily meet with a lie whose name is self-reputation / an artist boasts of a success of which he knows it was not a success because one can never tell the whole truth, truth is always bitter and will never reach the limits of dreams, even when the thing goes off perfectly, because we know for instance that success is unique, it cannot be repeated. / This lie is necessary not only to improve one's poise, but also to "keep" what has already been achieved / if a singer tells everyone that his performance in La Scala was a complete failure, no one will want to talk to him: the society simply makes an artist lie. / .

The example I am quoting is a little drastic, but to me it seems to focus many other sociological problems. In art we have as it were, one layer of reality where everything happens as it really is / violinist X performed in Barcelona, composer Y wrote a composition, a philharmonic concert was held in town Z etc. / and a layer of illusion, generally according to aspirations and intentions of artists and institutions / each work composed by R arouses interest, each tournée of orchestra S was a series of successes of the conductor and the musicians, etc. / . Let us consider who and how informs us about the actual and imaginary facts / because such word should be introduced here, too / . The same sources and ... in the same fashion, although both these layers have not much in common. It seems that in modern art what matters is perfect^{at} blurring of the picture: this may be the reason why criticism gives way to information, and information gives way to illusions. This happens also because in our days art, multiplied to the limits of propriety, begins to encompass wider^e circles, thus losing much of its autonomy, when there was still something to talk about. The fact that a reproduction is available to everyone / popular: one used to play the piano, today one plays "the radio" / , tells x a lot about the place we are in now. Another typical example: in former years performances were usually pre-performances, today old or very old things are performed, the pre-performances are very rare indeed. It is strange then: music is still followed but not as art any longer.

We have already said that the picture of art is blurred, indistinct. It is an interesting thing: a modern artist when asked why he follows art, would not be able to answer. Most

certainly the profession of artist treated stictly professionally is questionable, and especially the profession of artist - creator /because artist-performer or creator whom we could call a reproducer, does not count here; this kind of profession will exist as long as people are willing to perform art; notice that the artists of the East are exactly reproducers of tradition handed down for ages : it is possible that in the future art will be only reproduced - " departure" from creative path, which can be noticed today, is certainly a signal of such possibility!!

In our times modern music is doomed to self-reproduction. It duplicates itself and multiplies itself, since a recorded piece of music is not a single copy but from the very beginning it is thought of in the whole scale of its potential manifold increase and diffusion. Let us notice that diffusing music we devaluate it twice: we do not get the right receiver, secondly because we deprive it of a very important original atmosphere out of which it sprang / the composer's idea, the means he considered as his own, authentic, "usable" only once. X Someone makes money on duplication, but it is not art that profits! Art can only care for its own perfection. Here we touch on a point worth stressing. Let us consider what the artist was when the picture was the clearest, at the time not remote enough for the picture to become completely blurred, in short: in the romantic epoch. We mean of course the creating artist. In the romantic epoch the artist was the focus of attention of the society, making use of various archaic notions, through which the dignity and prestige that the artist usurped can be compared only with the dignity and prestige of a prophet, a mystic or a saint. The less he

was needed in the public life - it was the epoch of rulers, commanders, aristocracy and bankers - the more he "elbowed" the way for his own person and for what he contributed to the public life as someone indispensable. We realize now that it was an illusion, probably resulting from the already mentioned expansion of dreams and easy identification with /always untruthful/ ideal; maybe it was the wish to belong to the "better society" that justified the artist's aspirations/this is probably why artists hold other ^a artists in contempt even today, or why butlers hold their fellow-butlers in contempt/. And finally maybe - psychology is helpful here - the artist wanted revenge for his humiliation with which he was treated for so long./the readers will recall Joseph Haydn who not only wore livery but performed his quartets "behind the door" as well, with the accompaniment of loud conversations of the company at the table/. Whatever the reason ~~wh~~ of those insane usurpations of the artists, the fact remains that they managed to persuade the society to believe in their mission. This epoch is gone but the illusions have remained, even today there is an unpleasant smell of pretentiousness among artists - with no justification at all, since, as we have already said, the artist's position has decreased considerably and with one brink of its existence reaches down to the lowest humiliation / irrational "commissions, scholarships, foundations - all this is closer to social welfare activities than patronage/. It is true that the romantic artist could gain high esteem, what is more, it was based on the real value of what he created / Hugo, Zola, Thomas Mann/. That epoch is gone, in the present one the artist - either is not allowed

to speak, or speaks to himself, or what he says sinks in the flood of forgery and lies; the epoch of artist's importance is coming to an end and that is why we are less and less surprised to see the departure from idealism towards material temptation. The commercialization of art, resulting from this, is based on consumption procedures and the artist's role still decreases x and he becomes a small salesman. Belittled by the epoch, by sociological determinations, the artist mutters here and there about the eternal truths, striving to give some x significance to what he creates, the significance of a protest, even a modest one, - but who listens to that after all? Luigi Nono may appeal to our social and human feelings in each of his works but since he does it against payment, we stop being interested. It is disinterestedness of art that makes the person who wants to be considered an artist stop at this proper point, when he still has some prestige / eg. educational: teaching good artistic taste, developing his pupils' outlook on art / but no longer pretends to the prestige of a mission. Or perhaps the artist is today "one of many" among Riesman's "lonely mass"? The composers belonging to the Russian Great Five understood this perfectly, those meticulous officials, who still remained the greatest artists of their epoch. My image of a modern artist has a different form: it is a person concentrated on the work of art itself, staying within his own interior willingly, presenting to the outside only a part of what he really is absorbed in, acting in the outside world only mainly by his aesthetics, in the educational field or culture-developing, not interested at first in publishing his work, aware of the market well enough not to indulge in illusions as regards

the fact that even a light shade of commercialism can kill the most creative in the germ. In order to see the real image of a modern artist one should - it cannot be helped - adduce the modern philosophy of man. The modern man, one-dimensional man - as Marcuse says - lives in the world which determines him to such a degree that only a margin of freedom of action is left to him, no matter under what conditions he lives : in all cases it is not him that will decide about himself / and vice versa - it is not about him that will be decided/. The modern man suffers from the lack of possibility of crystallization. A considerable part of his spiritual substance escapes from the solid body; the man fails to keep anything, he can only catch certain "values", not longer than a card though, which someone else will - since such is the game - shuffle. The modern man, although occasionally an actor / usually in an unfortunate version of the performance/, one day popularity may comprise even criminals or victims/ is on the whole a spectator, more and more passive. He cannot be accused of insensibility because the world is insensible to him, and man is always the product of up-bringing. Then : what is of great consequence to him to others is of no consequence at all /this seems to explain the lack of a respectable hero in the modern novel, the heroes are always slightly below Leopold Bloom/. We have already said that the artist has lost much of his privileged and always illusory position and has become "a man from the crowd": if someone from the crowd calls something out, we shall simply say that he is his "spokesman", nobody will say that it was personality X that called out, anyway it will

be a voice similar to those mysterious voices /confirming or denying/ from the shorthand notes of a speech. We are confronted here with a basic question / it has always been important/ In what way can an artist attract people's attention to himself? It has been frequently said that the artist must / exactly this: must, he is forced by the conditions under which he happens to create/ find himself some role in art because creating in itself is not sufficient / why?-we ask, but there is no answer/. It may be the role of guardian of traditions, the role of an artist politically committed, the role of a popular or "recognized" artist, the role of unrecognized artist of genius of avant-garde-but keep to his role he must, like a comedian had to keep to his role emploi. The French authors of former generations taught us that roles may be changed like gloves / there is certainly something deplorable in this attitude, but it is also natural, like any ethical defects of man/, but the possibility itself of changing roles does not prove practically the possibility of constant changing clothes, because as a matter of fact only being an artist costs the artist so much, that he has not many opportunities to negotiate with the world. And thus the modern artist is a person who chooses his fate only according to his individual abilities and if he wants to accomplish something, he must remain loyal to himself. From the biographies of great modern masters we know that their lot -in spite of great satisfactions that art has got due to them- is terribly inhuman: evident record of the fact how the world laughs at its chosen ones.

The modern artist must pay a high price for the illusions of his predecessors: the past world cannot be evoked even for art, only the present world remains, and it imposes its conditions irrevocably. Even the greatest artist must keep his claims to the world "to himself". If he demonstrates his unsatisfied needs and his disageement with the imposed conditions, he loses. There is of course a possibility of yielding to all the outside pressures in order to save oneself: this washing combined with wringing out of talent make a man clean on the outside, in fact the crumpling he underwent leaves imperishable trace of a caricature of an artist. Typical are the complaints of those well-off masochists, who dream about book heroism of someone completely devoted to art; it is typical too that they never make these simple dreams true.

But let us go back to our starting point. It is a fact that in our modern world there is no homogenous cultural layer against which one would know the sublime from the mean, the elegant from what is lower than the proper taste, the good from the bad, the aristic from the common. Today we lack /but do we really lack? probably not, otherwise we would act differently/ that recognized code, which we could safely call society code, and which lead us to a certain aesthetic artistic consciousness. We have no right then to dream of a modern style, because style springs up only where there is a code. We are doomed to not only chaos /some experts finish their observations at this/ but to complete depretiation of values. The more art adheres to life... the more vulgar products it creates. Art needs nobleness, disinterestedness and many other similar qualities, that

even to dry Kant seemed necessary and indispensable. These qualities are ~~subordinated~~ substituted by others : from as ~~x~~ innocent as popularity and simplicity down to /when shall we stop being shocked!/ famous of late marketability ~~and~~ the simplest solution: mixing value with price, the real art -it was art itself that taught us this- has no price, it is priceless/.

While in the time past a missionary character to each creative act was an illusion, today a great illusion is ascribing value /in the form of price/ to various objects of art /pictures will be an undeniable example of this strange mixture/. The modern works of art have no address, that is why they can wander sold and shifted about not according to purpose but like industrial products, etc. We feel that art lives through the past, that art is measured by time : that even an outstanding modern work of fine arts cannot be compared with a most common excavatory dish. Today more and more often the artists will try to create esoteric values because all real creative work will have to wait long. What the modern art lacks most is professional circles of great artistic taste. The epoch of disinterested expertness has gone, and today experts willingly serve -like commercial artists- the cause of homogenic, levelled to extremes "reception" of art /the question "who will buy this?" replaces triumphantly -the triumphant evil guffaws- the question "how good is this?"/. The pathological split of yesterday /"nothing-something"/ has become a rule in modern art. The modern world absorbs automatically so to say from force of habit, the most various ~~for~~ artistic products, both the works of great inspiration and all kind of artistic jokes /especially in fine arts

they are acceptable willingly, maybe because it is the most disautonomic and meaning little; music tells something, literature tells about something, fine arts have always been between the two/. We are at an important turning point -not other generations, but we- that is why it is worth writing about it /the artistic generation that does not give a thought to the problems of existence of art, is a generation, but certainly not an artistic one; the modern artist must be well aware of the conditions under which he lives and creates; it is difficult to be oneself here; it is only a madman that can be himself, but the point is that this unfortunate man just is not himself; this antynomy dominates also the artist and it is only his narrow-mindedness that explains his reluctance to understand things/x.

The modern art interpreted sociologically is screened by tens of cultural veils, existence of which destroys its ideal picture in the artist's eyes and creates situations, understanding of which must be based on various aspects having with art but loose connection in the past. Our epoch is an epoch of reproduction; our epoch keeps reproducing something, constraining itself to create something. We already know that lack of an aesthetical code /anything is permissible, so anything exists as art/ makes an ambiguous general situation, the primary quality of which is coexistence of the most contradictory principles. It is true that sociology of art tries to define what processes control it, but finds only those coming from the observations from the outside. Art, however, undergoes changes not in the way ascribed to it, not accidental changes sometimes reaching the absurd, like for instance all type of "revivals" of genres and types least valued at one time. Art develops not in a straight line and not even in a spiral, as some say, but in a tangled line; that is why various kind of recurrences

and affiliations are possible /some of these go beyond the "still acceptable" combinations/. Query: what things may still result from this chaos and agitation? The question will be answered only in the future. /Today we can only state devaluation of the standards of yesterday. Will the rules for what is practised today be found in the future? They surely will but they certainly will not be standards applicable to our current actions/.

The position of art in the modern ~~art~~ life is not easy to determine. We call /the reality proves this constantly/ our age an age of consumption. Works of art are treated as consumer goods too, but since their origin is different, there is a clear antinomy between the point of art's existence and its destination. A primitive outlook on life makes one consider works of art as "consumer goods", which is the basis of man's total consumption. The practical life however clearly denies these imaginary needs. Let us notice that artistic needs occurred particularly where the conditions of existence /we can use such phrase/ were luxurious, eg. in Renaissance, when art served the purpose of adding splendour to existence. It has become a habit now to persuade people that art is as necessary as goods serving the basic material existence; however, there is nothing in this statement that would prove it. What comes into play here is habits and intentions of "agents" of various types, who creating the myth of artistic needs artificially make the life of art longer in the modern world according to rules in force no longer, according to rules of traditional interpretation of the function of art. Most certainly in our

epoch the needs are inspired artificially, they not come from the man's consciousness that all he needs to make his happiness complete is art, but rather from the conviction that art too belongs to resources of consumer goods, such as food, clothing, knowledge necessary in a given profession, etc. The growth of the so called cultural goods production connected with the process of inspiring needs carries along an important factor: art is multiplied by dilution of its previous substantial density, forming "atmosphere" rather than sphere of experience actually artistic. All types of products are considered as works of art, some of these do not even try to mean anything, ephemeral existence will do for them, coming into being itself as it were. It is in the interest of the "intermediary" producers to prevent the receiver of art from too great attachment to a given product. To this aim fashions for various kind of artistic work are ~~ex~~ changed rapidly, due to which everything dies very quickly, only the trade of mediation and "payments" are alive. Notice that the stage of assimilation of a work of art has become reduced to a minimum. A new book or a record may serve as example here. Modern technology makes it possible for the newly created work to reach the receiver in a few days; it is typical: in order to avoid the long process of assimilation, the consumption of a new artistic product is ~~made~~ made easier for the receiver by giving a summary of the work on the wrapping /eg. on the book's jacket/ so that the receiver, who too is reduced to the role of intermediary between the tradesman and himself, did not have to take great pains to make out what the given thing

is really about. The great speed of cultural assimilation lets one expect that each thing "offered" will be accepted, if the speed of the whole process is fast enough /today the intervention of criticism can be completely ignored because it sometimes happens that before any sensible views and opinions on the given subject appear, views based on the real knowledge of the work, the whole edition of the work may be safely distributed among the receivers/. In this situation amusing seem the demands of people connected with the cultural model of yesterday that art should express only the most complete and most profound values. The antinomy between our demands of yesterday and ~~the~~ possibilities of today is precipitous for other reasons as well. Among these the primary one is dismissing ethical norms from the range of vision: since every thing matters, choice is no longer important /cynics say that in the last resort "receiver can make a choice", but do not care for the fact that the receiver has often nothing to choose from because everything is in duplicated dilution/; and then, an object of art of great value - seen through the prism of unethical consumer attitude - placed in the vicinity of a worthless product gathers up its low features by this vicinity itself.

Sociology of art is today in an extremely unfavourable position: what might be ~~is~~ considered as an expression of some novel form, finally appears as unimportant - important are those indications that outline briefly and sharply the changes in modern art coming not from art itself but from the outside. The whole structure of institutionalized art prevailing so far, art as interpreted by dreams of yesterday, and in accord-

ance with our modern times, all this structure becomes shaken; it may defend itself for a long time still, however it will be difficult to rescue it. Opposing a small group of people concentrated on a musical phenomenon to a large crowd of consumers of various attitudes^{es}, it is easy to conclude that the latter form prevails over the former in many ranges. And here occurs the antynomy. The quantitative predominance of mass perception /which is not a perception really since it is rather yielding to coincidence/ over individual perception, which is of such great importance for art, creates a situation unknown so far. Art cannot find the proper receiver, it contents itself with any receiver, an anonymous receiver. We know that art wants a real perception. Even the least esoteric genre needs an active receiver, and art really esoteric can be based only on activity of receivers, no matter whether the response is favourable or not. Today the conflict between the value of art and the range of its influence is incompatible; this conflict explains the opinion which appears constantly in various views and comments of outstanding artists, the opinion that the present day makes it impossible for good art to exist, that the broadest influence is exercised by those objects of art that, meeting the artistic standards to a minimum degree -- standards which are relative anyway -- represent "something more", and this phrase should be understood as a kind of wrapping of a product which would not recommend itself by its artistic character. In perception of majority of products, which are distributed easily and in great number, it is sad that they are hidden behind a mask of presenting not value but contents. Here belongs the

"committed" art since in this case the quality of a product of art is still less important than in neutral works. It is obvious that all kind of inadequacy of idea, thought, invention, technique and emotional power can be easily covered by this "something else". As a result we have to do ^e either with art conforming to chaotic visions of inspirators of certain kind of art /"pop" is -as one of the experts has pointed out- ~~an~~ business first of all/, or with an unfair play for the outside label which supports the given work with the typical "forcing of priority" /this concerns both commercial light music, as well as -why not say it, commercial- the so called committed art/.

The question comes up, to what degree modern artists are responsible for this course of events. The observant reader has noticed that our arguments on sociology constantly refer to the problems of ethics. One does not need a deep knowledge of the world to know that people engaged in sales of objects of art and fixing their prices are relieved from accepting any ethical principles by virtue of their work as it were, by the simple fact of carrying on their unfair dealings. Why unfair? -someone can ask. If one knows better the market procedures, then it becomes obvious that anything is proper except unreserved honesty, because if even one competitor ^t lowered his principles of conduct the honest manager would find himself out. There is only one fine fact which excuses the managers: that value criteria are unstable, that gross mistakes have been made in evaluating works of art, that we never know what will become of what. In this situation only an artist can

be ethical, if he likes ~~it~~ it, if it matters to him. It is obvious that managers corrupt artists, making them renounce ethical principles which they learn from creative activity itself /we should remember that art "makes" an artist, that it teaches him ethical values, because at the first stage practising art is always disinterested, pure, ethical, wonderful/. Not allowed to be decisive of himself, the modern artist yields to pressures from the outside /the word "manager" may be understood here as not only that disgraceful individual under the firm of art salesman, the word may be understood in a much broader sense, together with the most apparent social determinants/, sometimes even willingly, since the ^Ptemptations are strong /être et avoir, to bring in the modern philosophy of man/.

Our world has been institutionalized so far, and it refuses considering these important new factors; it seems more convenient not to think about them ~~and~~ at all. Not embarking upon any arguments, the institutionalized world pretends everything is as it used to be /wishful thinking- reality interpreted according to wishes/, ~~which~~ while what matters more often is new economic forces that change the old system completely. This ^ecreates further antinomies, the picture of which is not easy to grasp yet -everything changes very fast and even deeper rooted symptoms are not permanent- in spite of this, some comments are already possible, which will probably help to understand the world in which we live. What I mean is first of all those processes which at the beginning are on the margin of known and accepted forms of social aspects.

of art and which by their spontaneity become significant, soon taking roots in the reality which they formerly opposed. This in-growing is natural in art, whereas arising of these processes has its source in a genuine novelty. Notice that even so popular phenomena in music like jazz, beat or pop invaded our life without asking the permission, without any preparations or announcement. We can of course determine the origin of the events against the background of their own tradition as well as "explain" them as a form of contrast, reaction, protest, etc., - but neither of these investigations answer the basic question: why "at the given time" did these events suddenly happen annoying everybody with their ruthless domination. In modern fine arts, which can be a model for music under many respects, a model of a set of actions and reactions, conversions and surprises, thus formulated changes are ordinary. In music we are accustomed to the necessity of some assimilation of what has occurred, and since we are never sure how things will be carried out /in practice at least the speed of changes is certain/ we do not really know with what we have to do. In music the diagnosis of situation is always difficult: this difficulty is intensified by the fact that it is an auditory kind^d of art, where assimilation is much more difficult than in fine arts; in the latter the eye easily adopts changes /it is a general statement - we must make it clear- because also in fine arts there are sometimes cases of extra -or super- visual presentation of artistic ideas/. Understanding the gist of some musical processes and influencing them is disturbed by the fact that the comprehensive

contents of music is outside the material, as it were /in fact, the musical material is needed only to make overmaterial ideas possible; music is not composed for the sake of sounds, but for the multitude of relations they may form: this was known to the great masters of music who exploring the material always went further than the whole lot of day-labourers of music/. And finally, not everything that matters in music can be understood because we deal here with means operating indirectly in the relation creation - product - receiver. An important fact here is that the contents of music are differently interpreted by the artist and the receiver. There are cases of complete discrepancy between the two poles: a composer can act in the sphere in no way assimilable to the receiver. It is true that in music there is no difficulty in understanding /what is there to understand? - music means music and that is that/, but there may be difficulty in receiver's identification of the idea of a composition. It is typical of our time that majority of people who understand anything of music use a historical understanding; it is for them that are written those pseudoavant-garde vocal and orchestral compositions which are acceptable only because the genre has been completely digested and "taken in". In this kind of music the composers use the whole chain of indirect acts /this chain belongs to tradition, too; first there is musical idea, then -still indefinite material, this material is passed indirectly by the performer to the receiver, the contact between the receiver and the idea is based on the transpositions of links of the chain/. Modern music creates the possibility of the most direct action from

the idea point to perception: in case of electronic music the composer who performs it himself becomes its first receiver without any intermediaries, for the first time the composer hears what he is composing, what is more, in each process of realization, using receiver's criteria, he can have influence on the created work. And thus, we have "mediated" art on one hand, on the other hand - art genuinely direct. It is striking that prompted by archais^c ~~not~~ ^{or} modern anyhow, understanding of art, the modern receivers are still apt to look for the chance of music not in the types of direct music /besides electronic music, concrete music, audio-visual music^s, happening, music of a action, etc./, but in indirect, the one that is based on already mentioned consecutive transformations /which in fact distort music/. In view of coming years this antinomy between receiver's understanding and ability to distinguish the genuine, because direct, from ~~then~~ what is based on false directness, will be incomprehensible. It will be difficult to understand why people stuck so long to the concept which in our times can depend on this sphere of realizational habit in some way only.

Antinomies of this kind are numerous. Together they make up a picture - why dis^gguise it - blurred, veiled with vagueness and ignorance, concealed behind superstitions and habits. It seems that we shall not learn anything interesting from art as long as this picture remains blurred. This art will keep producing its accidental /and incidental/ products, making fool of the artist who in this course of things has no influence on anything. This inability to form art in spite of constant efforts causes whole sets of complexes and inhibitions, which are so representative of modern artists /what a modern novelist writes about

most willingly is how he is not able to write/. That is probably why we can draw them out so little: when asked about the principles, ~~they~~ they jabber about the greatness of art, its significance, etc., melancholy ~~praffes~~ confessions about experiencing it, and asked about the details, they either become silent or try to carry on long arguments on technical questions, on engineering, for which nobody cares /if the radio set is out of order, I do not care for patterns or the conditions of the tubes, I only want it to w o r k/. In our times we are disciplined "not to ask about anything", accepting things with no protest, but neither with enthusiasm -or we are so well mannered. The result: we are surrounded by things of which we not only know nothing, but which we simply are unable to notice. In the field of art: we can only register certain phenomena but we cannot evaluate them, we can only watch them, instead of arranging them. This self-creational force is known to creators very well, because its ~~ix~~ origin is based on this particular ground /"something" makes us behave as we do, and the esthetic consciousness exists only on the pages of theorizing ^hp~~h~~ilosophers of art/. Art plays chess with itself and there is less and less /let us notice that at last!/ satisfaction from acting in the field of art. This is so ^rp~~r~~obably because we are entering slowly upon an age of disillusionment in art, an age of becoming aware of how little there is for us to do, becoming consciuos of the fact that our awareness of things is also an illusion. It is art, and within art music as the most independent^t of all types of art, makes an ideal counterpart of the world in which we live, and a perfect reflection of its antinomies; maybe studying

art will help us understand all the irrational facts, about the existence of which we learn too late to be able to influence them. Maybe music will create new fields of hearing what happens above and beyond us in the surrounding world. Perhaps we shall try to ask ourselves completely new questions about the role and function of music in our life, about the mode of existence of music, about man's existence in relation to art, and art in relation to man, about the possibility and sensebleness of man's activity in the field of artistic study, experiencing art and defining its foundations.

In sociology of music we must take into account two divisions: one - division into disinterested art and mercenary art, the second - division into three sections: productive, reproductive and consumer. Between these sections of phenomena there is a in new art, or more precisely not on art but in its perception, a kind of dependence, which was born out of itself, as it were, against the background of the interplay of two artistic worlds: the museum and the real. This causes conflicts at many points, similar to the situation of someone who is under the influence of many, often contradictory, pressures. Like the picture of man's situation in the world is ambiguous, blurred and vague, similarly the picture of art created and received by man is ambiguous, blurred and vague. Not long ago - about ten years back - it was possible to explain certain things by analysis of attitudes of artists and receivers, today however it is no longer possible. This happens because those spheres turn one into the other, most often prevailing in ranges other than their own.

This refers particularly to the production and consumer sections. The artist's identifying himself with the consumer and the receiver's common demand that the artist should provide him with "accurate" products according to his fancy, creates situations not only ambiguous from the point of view of art /why is everything called art, instead of products of artistic industry/, but also in respect of the conditions to which it becomes liable. The possibility of treating art according to material interests of people who try to make their living on it created a fatal general determinant, within which the work of art itself becomes neutral, indifferent. At this point sociology of art seems able to answer the basic question "how is it?" Not long ago there was an opinion that the fact of someone being interested in art materially proved its significance in modern life. Nothing more misleading! Today we know from the point of view of business subartistic products are as good as fully artistic ones. In this situation the quality of a work of art disappears from view completely, which one easily notices reading various opinions on a work, opinions in which its "success" is more important than the work itself. The destiny of a work of art can be arranged in such a way that with the minimum artistic values and maximum popularity, fame and significance can be achieved. Artists can only wonder that the works of little value are privileged to represent modern art. The public not informed or lead astray on purpose, its opinions can not be determinant, since today people demand what they are

fed with /or rather:staffed/.The simplest "Listeners' Choice" programmes,which in a way designate "what an average man wishes" are full of requests concerning works brought out anyway /in other words,modern consumption is based on frantic demands for what already is on the market,because the artistic industry managers know how to persuade people their needs no ~~mat~~ matter in what social system it is;the receiver has never so far been treated with such contempt:there is no doubt,the ~~re~~ receiver is needed only to receive.../.

All this creates a disastrous form of subordinating spiritual values to commercial laws;in the countries where the consumption attitude dominates the commercial laws will be modeled by individual financial interests in artistic and subartistic products ,what happens in institutionalized countries is a kind of mechanical imitation of above mentioned economic determinants /this explains the fact of analogous consumption process,and indirectly the production process in the countries of different social systems/.It is obvious that ideal models of art creating and receiving become more and more historical models,models formed according to the intentions of people who want to save what can be saved,they cannot however pretend to be models in force.Does art go down? -someone will ask.In a way art went down quite a while ago,probably when the growing industrialization took over the "leading" of art.It is true that art has not been monopolized yet,but in most aspects it is ruled not by its own standards but economic ones,or rather pseudo-economic#.This may be interpreted thus:the industrial

forces are interested in art only from the point of view of and to the point since and as long it is of trade value, outside this range it stops existing and consequently its role is reduced to the role of a trade good which is liable to spoil, destroy etc. But art does not become wasted! -we shall cry out. An explanation is needed here: museum pieces do not decay, but pieces produced today do. In modern music the newly created works force out the earlier compositions more and more frequently, similarly to industrial products which can be said to have been of real and selling value only at their own time. Only a certain kind of modern works are reproducible, multipliable, the majority however belongs to the class of works happening only once, having some function to fulfill only at the time when they are really fulfilling it. In turn, within this majority a large part is produced not because of man's inner creative need, but stimulated by from the outside / the material interests of both parties, the producing and intermediary, creates a rather unnatural encouragement to fast and perfunctory actions / tells us that this is where the disproportional surplus of works hanging in mid-air, because the works created in this way after their one and unique moment of coming into the outside has passed are worthless because they neither present a lasting economic value / this is the most difficult to achieve! / nor an absolute value which may appear only when the artist is concentrated exclusively on genuine creation of art. This range of problems comprises also the questions connected with an unnatural for

music expansion of the scale -imaginary^{to}- of consumer influence which in extreme cases manifests itself in appointing music the role of a ~~xxx~~ poster announcing -for one day- something that seems important to the artist acting under the ~~x~~ pressure of a social idea^a not in the fundamental sense, but in a most superficial one. The basic quality of music is the fact that it does not mean anything except, itself: music can be neither a scientific argument, nor a transmission of emotions or information, because it is much more effective to reach the receiver handling him directly and not through the mediation of music. Let us be ~~frank~~ frank: music is the least suited to instruct and inform, to stimulate thought and reflection. When treated as an ^aesthetic object it is beautiful in itself and any "function -alization" is simply making it repugnant to people who really need it. Music is notion-less and as such it should have nothing to do with the material and "thoughts" that do not come from it. Today, in the time of treating art commercially, there is a kind of prestige of the so called music of meaning. This kind of music forces, as it were, the listener to accept, which is by itself unethical and inaesthetical /here belongs also "political" music which I am forced to accept if I do not want to be a time-server; also "religious" music belongs here, which forces the listener's acceptance by the obligatory tolerance; notice that what we ^owould consider inaesthetical^h is rather distaste for thus prepared music than the process itself

practised by composers; the given examples are cases of the extreme because it is here that are focused the basic conflicts in response to music as art: music as propaganda and music as cult may be received favourably by many people because in our museum works of this kind have sometimes occupied a permanent position./

Modern commercialism then will negotiate with the artist and the receiver not in the sphere of purely aesthetical aspect, but in the sphere of subordinated values. In this situation composers being interested neither materially nor in respect of prestige in matters that their "agents" have at heart, will become outsiders /it is an outmoded word today, but why outmoded?: because almost all artists wear ^a a dog-collar of commercialism/. Today a composer retiring into the range of music -a talented man within the range of discipline in which he has much to say- will be treated by the public as esoteric aversion, behind ^w which less and less will be hidden, because the artist's mission mentioned at the beginning has been reduced to a plate which the humble artist will lick off, happy that at least that much has been left for him of that over-advertised art. However, it is still difficult for us to see an artist as a small manufacturer whom one "leaves an order" and he -wanting to manage on time- carries on his more and more gloomy craft hoping that in some years' time someone will discover in him a wonderful goldsmith -a Cellini. Poor artist, we shall say, but also poor society that so humiliates the artist, making him

beguile its time only, demanding him not to create art, but to supply it merely. A question comes up, to what degree can the genuine, real art resist all the pressures and demands, everything that influences it from the outside, and to what there is little art can oppose. It is obvious that one cannot possibly defy the conditions that make up the artist's existence today. The modern artist as a modern man could not, would not resign himself to Mozart's or Schubert's existence. We want the world to accept the activity in art as work, as production of spiritual goods, which are certainly not of any measurable value, but after some time they constitute what culture and society take pride in. A modern composer may not accept all the determinants that limit him, that make him look a parody of the artist of yesterday but he must recognize his situation as "final" if he still wants to practise his art.

We have already said that at some time each work of art was a novelty work; let us add here that tradition seen through the prism of generalized concepts gives certainly a convenient view but a false one. For a modern composer Beethoven will never be a classic, he will always remain Beethoven, ~~as~~ an artist creating in spite of everything, an artist a tout prix, an artist who for himself was the first and the last instance /imagine, what would have become of him, had he been prompted by all the abominable "externals" as the modern artist is! /The modern artist knows perfectly well that he himself makes tradition, too!

He also knows that the old tradition will be of no avail to him, that from the point of view of tradition modern art must always^s seem distorted, and no genuine creator will consider himself a deformer. Every new art deserves respect since it contains the seed rich enough to work not only in breadth, in its own time, but also lengthwise - and so into the future. The modern artist is also ~~was~~ aware of the fact that the genuine creation springs up on the basis not of others' experience, but of the present experience. What is more, he knows that everything depends on the intensity of his experience of his own time, the intensity with which he penetrates the possibilities of the period in which he lives. Any reference to the great examples is not only megalomaniacⁿ but groundless as well. /who said that the great model would like to have anything to do with the present day small imitator; those were the great innovators whose activities cannot be compared to the play of present followers or those "smart" artists hardly managing creation; it is striking that a conscious^u ~~are~~ composer of today is able to compose a classical piece of considerable proportions, romantic or pseudomodern, in a very short time, which fact should be telling in our epoch of treating creation as work! /If we say then that the present time is not wh^ay it used to be, consequently the music must be different. It is difficult to give a precise name, but it is easy to notice that the majority of the so called modern music certainly does not "correspond" with our present possibilities, means within our reach, and which nobody tries

to obtain because they still lack their consumer-commercial causative factor. And further: the modern composer knows that in order to achieve something one must consider the whole tradition and all the links connecting us with it as unfavourable as are all the redundancies and aberrations seen from traditions. /The earlier music is then: non-dodecaphonic, non-serialist, non-pointilist, non-sonoristic, non-aleatoric, non-collage, consequently imperfect, deficient; only such view on everything done so far allows the modern composer to comprehend all the fields of new art that reach beyond modernity understand^{oo} unprofessionally and allows not only the artist but also the receiver to rise to other aesthetical regions, if we still talk about aesthetics in the future. /

Sociology of modern music is marked by exterior determinants, activity from the inside is hindered to a great degree as a result of disagreement about the essence of music. The matter will remain ambiguous as long as music in its aspect of perception remains split into two sections: aesthetic and entertainment, artistic and subartistic, ideal and material, real and falsified by fancied needs. In fact description of the sociological phenomena concerning music should be started from delimitations of music itself. Setting music as an art against apart from music as "something more" than art would possibly help to understand the place of music on the net of sociological dependencies, also it would possibly permit to save those values of music to which we have grown accustomed. /has it been worth

while growing accustomed to certain values?-this question may be asked by anybody, who doubts the value of value itself, and the number of the doubting ones will increase as dehumanization of life continues./It is clear that any substitute forms of art may compete with music as art the more surely the less it is differentiated from any subcultural aspects of art. In such situation calling for pure art cannot be treated as absurd, because it is merely claiming the right to exist for music as art!

Today we are at a very dangerous point of a particular split of art into art in use and useless, applied and inapplicable. Getting to know better the essence of art of music, we easily conclude that what is of greatest value are those works that are not used at the time of their creation, but which have the ability -how valuable!- to penetrate through time, to leave deeper traces. The works of greatest artistic value measured on the basis of consumption are of no value as long as they do not become a consumer good. But this is most difficult to achieve: more difficult in music than in other fields of art / a painting or sculpture gain in ~~use~~ value with time, whereas music must be discovered by each epoch for itself -eg. the music of Bach or Ives/.

The society of today cannot revere art since art does not present to it that original value which enabled one to rise above the everyday needs of spiritual life. It is clear that man's spiritual life depends on his attitudes towards all the cultural values which are within the range of his perception

abilities. Modern man is not inclined to respond to art as art: art begins to take over other functions, to the extreme cases where it is merely an aesthetic decoration — to anything man meets in his everyday life /it is reduced to the function of aesthetic wrapping of the contents which are not necessarily aesthetic/. We have a typical example of this in a field of art which is most similar to the position and state of modern art: I mean town planning, which in micro-details could be most aesthetically planned, but as a whole it will always be a product /and the resultant/ of a thousand actions separate, accidental and discordant. Modern art seen through the prism of the artist creating it seems a useless chaos of phenomena, which in details may be artistic, as a whole however they form a picture without any style whatsoever. It is the side by side existence of the museum and the actual values, mixing and revaluating them makes the artist feel a real loss, and in extreme cases may even make him give up working in art, for is it possible and worth while to build beautiful structures in such unfavourable surroundings after all? This causes the artists' basic aversion to conformity with the world of displaced values; this aversion sometimes expressed in destroying what could be saved of art.

Let us now consider the "receiver" of the modern artist. What is he like? What is he? What does he live on? These are questions that each artist must set himself, even the one who, following his conscience voice decides to have nothing to do with the receiver. The receiver is a person completely determined socially at the points that might concern his individual attitude towards works of art. Today we have to do with consumer society and the "society of leisure". The today receiver cannot

be measured with the renaissance scale of art patron, for he is ~~x~~ not that after all. It is true that he deals with art even in his everyday life, but this acquaintance is of no deeper consequence. The reduced working ^hours created a great chance for man's contact with art. This chance however must not be over^eestimated. Let us first notice that working hours reduction corresponds^s today with longer hours of man's being busy. In case of the younger part of the society this results from the necessity of further learning, reeducation, specialization; and afterwards more time is spent on eking out the financial readiness. And thus the modern man has -and has not- time at his disposal. On the whole we can say that he has enough time for cultural needs, and if only they sprang in him in a more natural way, he certainly could satisfy them. It is a clear fact: the greater amount of free time is accessible to wider and wider circles of society; and now the society -in the broad sense- has the right and opportunity to be the receiver of cultural goods, among which art occupies the most significant place. The more free time a man has, the greater are his possibilities and consumer demands. The man of today confirms more and more his social consciousness by the participation in material and spiritual comforts of civilization /this comfort should not be inter^epreted in the sense of a complete contact with high material standards, it may be interpreted in the sense of widely accessible contact with all the forms of technical civilization which ensure the participation in the cultural consumption

total at least/. In the future -sociologists threaten us with this -further lengthening of free time will cause further possibilities and enlarge the consumer's demands, which will be satisfied to ^a greater extent. At present we have to do with a state which can be given Riesman's famous term: consumer attitude. This modern consumer attitude has introduced into culture the phenomena of free time, sport, politics and even education /the typical consumer attitude of the young generation/. In other words, the consumers' possibilities and demands become more and more the basis of social consciousness /the American model is a basic model, primary, though not a standard one, still a "portend" one/. Even social significance of man or social groups begins to depend on its consumer potential, its ability of absorption of what the industrialized world offers it obligingly. This is what it looks like from the point of view of modern sociology. The author's comment would be limited in this case to the statement that only leisure time can be measured culturally, that the "occupied" time is of no consequence for man's contact with cultural goods, and then, much depends on the model of disposing of free time which in most cases -such are social conditions in different systems- is a kind of reflection of "occupied" time /typical of our time "copying" occupations in one's free time, shifting the thoughts and activities characteristic of not-occupied time over to free time, inability of rest, reflection, psychic recreation, etc./.

The results of socio-psychical and civilizational progress

can be startling in the nearest future: if the mechanical production of goods comes into full use on a really large scale, it will soon produce so high a result that it will become necessary to raise ^asimilarly the demands for and consumption of these goods at all costs. The needs will be created. It is obvious that then demands and consumption will depend in a straight economic line on reserve, labour, material or capital. Even today we can notice that material goods ~~are~~ are produced in greater amount than needed; in order to provide the economic demand it is not enough to produce goods, but also the needs. It is obvious that those needs will be created more and more artificially, on principles completely irrational in relation to man's real needs /already "others" know better than we do ourselves ^{why} we need - it is not far to educational determination of man in the broadest sense: man is a product of needs to which others condemn him !/. In this situation completely unjustified ^d -romantic but how absurd is the idea that free time is to be devoted to cultural activities, to experiencing art, to contacts with the greatest works of human spirit. This trust in man's needs is groundless since we already know that man can satisfy his cultural needs on the shallowest level, to which he is dragged down by the industry concerned with his needs. There is no doubt that the man of the epoch of wide industrialization of spirit is under the influence of this industry, what is more - he even becomes its slave. It is true that within a certain narrow range he can make his choice, but in general, statistically

taken, he limits himself to the consumption of values imposed on him. The typical of the modern man depersonalization and uniformization of works called artistic perfectly fits the picture of thus violated man. There is nothing more for the receiver to do than to receive, consume, devour everything that is assigned him; there is nothing he can oppose to that principle of programming his needs because they are formed outside his knowledge and without his participation, - although it is said to be for his profit. In this respect the modern man is in a fix, he is locked in with the frames formed by industrial development. In our time it is with difficulty that we can save all the values to which significance and existence we have attached such great importance. In respect to history, this process of depersonalization and uniformization of social life is irrevocable. Only assuming some abstract and metaphysical starting point of reasoning allows one to ponder on how interesting possibilities the future will develop, on what great scale the man will be able to find an outlet for his energy and express himself. The art of today /art has always been ahead of its time/ is a striking evidence of helplessness of artistic facts and superiority of sociological facts. For some years we have been reading in diaries of outstanding writers and thinkers their comments on the lack of more complete emotional and reflective attitudes in life: modern man feels and thinks differently to how he has felt and thought so far. Both the emotional and reflective world reach the lowest regions of feeling

and thinking, and man more often than not resigns himself to what befalls him not bothering to search for ethical motivations for his activities, the search that has been so important so far. In the sphere of spirit, however, these ethical motivations have always been prominent; enough to remember that both thinkers and scientists as well as artists were capable of doing their best, even of self-annihilation, to persuade people of justness of an opinion or value of art. In our time we lose irrevocably the point of grand actions, making do with activities measured according to the present time, which is by no means sufficient for man's cultural development. In art more and more frequent are those products whose value is limited to the common forms of communication, based on the patterns not reaching beyond the established frames, which are not eternal~~ly~~ after all. Treated as one of the consumer goods, art negates ethical and axiological achievements and orders man to care for it exclusively /notice how the^e whole scale of values is arranged in the consumer epoch: what matters first is the supply of products, their value appears only in the background; in extreme cases this background serves only to disguise the fact that what is expected is not an aesthetical attitude but a consumer one /.

The development of modern man's personality, in our case the personality of the artist and the receiver connected with him, depends on ... independence the modern man will achieve in relation to "comfort" of civilization and industrial con-

sumption. If he wants to rescue himself, the modern man will have to bring himself to keep the distance from the needs /both "natural" and forced/ and in this way only he may hope to mean anything. On the other hand, any acceptance of the consumption-planned world, any acceptance of the new form of slavery /spiritual in this case/ can only help to annihilate his personality and individuality, can reduce him to a simple statistic numerical determinant, and thus to the function of a small particle of an enormous, violated human mass, which -innocent after all, since an individual being can do hardly anything- will be plunged in spiritual darkness, delighted with its existence, destroyed by the dark forces of forlornness, straining its ears for the end of its life on earth.

AUTOR: B. SCHAFER