



21st Century Music: Aesthetics and Reception

Royal Musical Association Study Day
14 May 2005

Are we still caught up in the binary business of Modernism? Or are there other ways of thinking about contemporary musical practices?

Dare we admit the consequences of having entered a new age of musical practice, bounded on one side by historical events, such as the death of Stravinsky, the fall of the Berlin Wall, New Labour, the digital revolution and 9–11, and on the other side...by the future?

Does each globally available localised music demand its own listening strategy, its own micro-aesthetic? Is it possible to generalise about musical practices, languages, and styles? Or has the consumption of music become a matter of individual cases? What has become of the relation between / separation of life and music? Has life become expressly musical? (How) has music become the very core of everyday life?

What about the implications of the digital economy of music, now that with technology we can manipulate musical parameters more delicately than the ear can perceive? How should we understand the relations between music, sound, and noise? Do we (still) confront issues like beauty, form, taste, and judgement in a meaningful way? Or should we forget aesthetics and move on?

With such questions in mind, what might we make of the aesthetics of music today and tomorrow?

Royal Northern College of Music
124 Oxford Road
Manchester
M13 9RD
UK

Email: anthony.gritten@rncm.ac.uk

Web: <http://www.rncm.ac.uk/Place%20to%20Study/Research%20Events/>

Programme

- 9.30am **Registration**
- Session 1** chair: Anthony Gritten (RNCM)
- 10.00 Lois Fitch (Durham University)
 ‘Brian Ferneyhough the Postmodernist: Within and Against Modernism’
- 10.30 Andrew Infanti (Paris)
 ‘Censorship, Semiotics, Aesthetics: Michael Finnissy’s *History of Photography in Sound*’
- 11.00 **Coffee**
- Session 2** chair: Peter Johnson (Birmingham Conservatoire)
- 11.15 Martin Dixon (University of Glasgow)
 ‘The Self-Reflection of the Artist as a Path to Aesthetic Insight’
- 11.45 Edward Campbell (University of Edinburgh)
 ‘Staking the Territory: Philosophical Models of Thought and the Music Aesthetics of the Future’
- Keynote Address** chair: Martin Dixon
- 12.15pm Trevor Wishart
 ‘Music in the 21st Century: A State of Flux?’
- 1.15 **Lunch**
- Session 3** chair: Simon Clarke (RNCM)
- 2.15 Carl Humphries (Southampton University)
 ‘Music as 21st Century Human Performance’
- 2.45 Björn Heile (University of Sussex)
 ‘The Composer’s Voice? Critical Approaches to Subjectivity in Recent Music’
- 3.15 **Tea**
- Session 4** chair: Susan Bagust (Open University)
- 3.30 Martin Iddon (Bolton)
 ‘The Dissolution of the Avant-Garde’
- 4.00 Susanne Kogler (University of Graz)
 ‘From Perception to Recognition: Perspectives for Aesthetics in the 21st Century’
- Roundtable** chair: Anthony Gritten
- 4.30 ‘The Future of Music Aesthetics: What Remains for Thought?’
- 5.15 **Close**

Abstracts

‘Brian Ferneyhough the Postmodernist: Within and Against Modernism’ Lois Fitch

Throughout Brian Ferneyhough’s *Collected Writings*, frequent reference is made to musical tradition: he describes his own aim as a composer and thinker in terms of the ‘furtherance of the Modernist project’. His interest in the music of Arnold Schoenberg amongst others, and the theoretical arguments of Theodor Adorno and Walter Benjamin, suggest a particularly close identification with German aesthetics of the twentieth-century. For example, the shared concerns of Adorno’s ‘Vers une musique informelle’ (1961) and Ferneyhough’s ‘Form-Figure-Style: an Intermediate Assessment’ (1982) are striking: Ferneyhough’s conscious alignment with Adorno’s important critique of musical modernism is never more explicitly conveyed. Nevertheless, Ferneyhough’s own discussion is not only 20 years later than Adorno’s essay, but in the context of the composer’s critical-theoretical output it exists alongside other equally persuasive arguments that approach the issues of postmodernism, plurality and the disappearance of the subject from artistic and philosophical discourses (see for example ‘Parallel Universes’ (1977)).

These two phenomena – modernism and postmodernism – must not be understood as successive historical ‘periods’ or styles, the latter a critique of the former. Ferneyhough’s essay hints at two important points which follow on from this: first, the ‘modern’ is not necessarily an ordered sequence of events that can be situated historically and second, that the postmodern itself does not come *after* modernism chronologically; it is latent within it – critical, working against the perception of historical progress and rationality.

Echoes of French post-structuralist theory are themselves latent in Ferneyhough’s arguments: his encounter with a specific, short critical monograph by Gilles Deleuze (on painting, phenomenology and art history – namely *Francis Bacon: Logique de la sensation* (1981)) and by extension (since Deleuze’s work is considerably indebted to it) Jean-François Lyotard’s earliest work in a post-structuralist vein, *Discours, figure*, leads to the possibility of the development of a musical theory of the ‘figure’. In Ferneyhough’s case, the ‘figure’ becomes a music-immanent agent with the capacity to disrupt the ordered sequence of events in a particular composition (perhaps the linear development of an abstract, perhaps even precomposed musical process). The ‘figure’, a destabilizing force, thus parallels in the musical work Lyotard’s notion of the historical ‘figure’ of postmodernism, which, he maintains, irrupts into sequential historical discourse, as an ‘event’. Such events register within ordered discourse (be it historical or musical) as a haemorrhage – as something too great, too sensuously impactful to be inscribed within that discourse, to be reduced to it and represented (signified) as part of its order. Lyotard concludes that far from being a historical successor to modernism, so-called postmodernism is a force acting within and against it. He gives the example of Auschwitz: too catastrophic and horrific an event to be reduced to the object of a signification, of knowledge, and represented to history (to ‘remember’), yet too momentous to ‘forget’ by not according it sufficient historical prominence and recording it as a defining moment of the last century.

Lyotard charges radical art with the responsibility of bringing the sensation of the ‘event’ (its physiological impact on society / audience) to notice, since art remains a valid domain for progress after events such as described above. Ferneyhough’s musical ‘figure’ can be interpreted as an abstraction of Lyotard’s historical reading: thus, what appears in the first instance to be an essay which pays tribute to modernism, rationality and historical progress (i.e. Form-Figure-Style) can, in fact, be read as a critique of tradition, of the modern, and a radical attempt to envisage and realise Lyotard’s ‘historically responsible artworks’.

**‘Censorship, semiotics, aesthetics: Michael Finnissy’s *History of Photography in Sound*’
Andrew Infanti**

The goal of this study is to reconsider the rhetoric and mechanics of censorship in a twentieth-first century context, underlining specific aesthetic strategies used by dissident musicians in their response to repressive politics and media-created false consensus. With the work of British composer Michael Finnissy as a case study, we shall explore ways that censorship, usually a mode of reception, can be integrated into the aesthetics of a work.

The analysis of censorship in music suffers from the ‘virtual’ nature of the repressive mechanisms involved. As a performing art not primarily transmitting messages using language and whose written trace is often secondary, music seems impervious to the violence so often deployed against literary texts. The physical act of censorship disappears behind a variety of parasitic discourses: some already operating within the music, others merging with critical reception of the work, many implicit in the politics of broadcasting musical expression and endowing it with a future as part of ‘history’.

The sign itself – language, image, sound – becomes an artistic site of struggle. The formalist system of pre-1960’s Modernism treated sound as a neutral entity, devoid of exterior reference. Opposing this attitude, many works of contemporary music use specific historical models (quotations, forms, techniques) which set up a semiotic field of reference for the artist and public. This aesthetic maneuver undertakes enormous risks faced with the supposition that behind a given arbitrary, historically-specific sign there is only another sign, and so forth: a potentially infinite regression.

Depending on the pessimism of the theorist, the result of this domino-like reaction is either a spiral towards ‘meaning’ (Peirce & Eco) or a total nihilistic ‘dissemination’ (Derrida & Baudrillard). The cycle of ‘infinite semiosis’, while resisting a unilateral approach to meaning, places control of the artistic message perilously out of reach. ‘Intertextual’ models thus introduce the possibility of a semiotic kind of censorship presented as immanent and automatic, stressing an internal ‘failure’ of the aesthetic system. Does this instability function in music? Could a dialogue with history thus block our ability to communicate?

Engaging an ever-broader (one could almost say ‘globalist’) set of references, Michael’s Finnissy’s five-and-a-half-hour piano cycle *The History of Photography in Sound* (1997-2002) challenges the structure of infinite semiosis and its relation to censorship. The ninth chapter of this work, the focus of our study, patiently “awaits the next outbreak of repression and censorship” (Finnissy’s title (in Flemish) is *Wachtend op de volgende uitbarsting van repressie en censuur*). The composer works with existing musical models (Wagner, Busoni) to make his analysis of the censorship process more transparent.

Finnissy’s use of the musical sign has nothing ‘fatalistic’ about it. Like photography, his model, he approaches the sound as a document, desiring his music to be heard ‘against’ the backdrop of six centuries of Western music, an entry into a vertiginous labyrinth of signs. The regressive series of infinite semiosis becomes a point of resistance for Finnissy, opposing deceptive images of progress and consensus while unmasking insidious forms of censorship.

‘The Self–reflection of the Artist as a Path to Aesthetic Insight’

Martin Dixon

This paper will examine a largely overlooked idea which is to be found in the ‘draft introduction’ of Adorno’s *Aesthetic Theory*. Much of this book is driven by Adorno’s attempt to rescue aesthetics as a pertinent cultural and critical force after a century or more of its decline (in a rather Hegelian gesture, for Adorno aesthetics only comes into its own once it is in decline) and central to his strategy is to produce a decisive shift in the locus of aesthetics thought away from the interests of reception to those of production. His aesthetics seems to be one which written not from the perspective of the spectator but one which sides with the artist and producer. By the same token, the addressee of such an aesthetics is not the professional philosopher, neither is it the art lover, the concert goer, or, least of all, the distracted and impatient consumer, but is ultimately the artist herself.

Certain traditional approaches to aesthetic thought fall by the wayside as a result. Firstly, highly systematic and abstract approaches are rejected because they are invariably over-general and experientially impoverished, especially when it comes to Adorno’s main concern, the highly recalcitrant contemporary artwork. Secondly, the approach of the dilettante, whose culinary and amateurish artistic dabbling rarely transcends a more or less eloquent attribution personal preference, is similarly dismissed. Further more, even though Adorno espouses an aesthetics of production, he does not rush to embrace the pre-reflective technical discourse – or ‘tricks of the trade’ – that is trafficked by artists and musicians, as being, in themselves, worthy substitutes for philosophical aesthetics.

A path through these equally unattractive possibilities is, however, forthcoming: namely, the idea is that if aesthetics could assume a close proximity to the work itself, it if could respect both the constitution of the aesthetic object qua object and its conceptual mediatedness, a genuinely insightful aesthetics might emerge. This proximity qualitatively transforms the status of the judgements that are forthcoming inasmuch as they register not only the affective movements the subject but something technically binding and objective: the ‘experiential force of the work’. The ontological thesis of the ‘priority of the object’, developed a few years earlier in his *Negative Dialectics*, is put to the test in the context of modern art.

My main concern here is to locate where such an aesthetic discourse might be found. For Adorno, such a discourse is latent in the self-reflections of the artist, in the diaries, essays and theories that invariably attend the production of serious works of art. One must use the word latent in this context because, due to a regrettable philosophical illiteracy, few artists can bring forth the full significance of their observations. A dangerous – one might say jealous – intimacy is thus established between the philosopher and the artist: the artist wins contact with the aesthetic material, the artist registers the objective demands of the work and the philosopher makes cogent the essence of this experience and, what is more, preserves its critical meaning and emboldens the artist in perhaps the last great set pieces of dialectics: the task of creating the aesthetically new in a totally administered, spiritually broken society.

But whither this vision of the artist? Such an aesthetic programme, probably unrealised in itself, pertains only when a certain conception of the artist as a productive, critical subjectivity is in its prime: that is to say, under modernism. Does such a conception – and the concomitant notion of aesthetic seriousness – prevail today?

‘Staking the Territory: Philosophical Models of thought and the Music Aesthetics of the Future’ Edward Campbell

The twentieth century witnessed the production of music embodying the most diverse and idiosyncratic aesthetics. The present paper focuses however on merely one aspect of aesthetic thinking, namely the range of philosophically-based models of thought which can be found in the writings and works of composers of the late twentieth century and the possibilities and limitations these present for music in the twenty-first century.

Kai Hammermeister, in a recent study, schematises ‘The German Aesthetic Tradition’ in terms of a number of aesthetic paradigms from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Kant, Schiller, Schelling and Hegel), a series of challenges to these paradigms in the nineteenth century (Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard and Nietzsche) and the ‘renewal’ of these paradigms in the twentieth century (Cassirer, Lukàcs, Heidegger, Gadamer and Adorno). In doing so, Hammermeister reveals the themes linking Cassirer with Kant; Lukàcs and Marcuse with Schiller as well as Heidegger and Adorno with Schelling. Hammermeister concludes that “despite some overlaps, repetitions ... and minor irregularities, the aesthetics of the twentieth century remains strikingly close to the order of paradigmatic positions as they were developed by Kant, Schiller, Schelling and Hegel” (Hammermeister 2002, 172). While Hammermeister’s study is limited to the Germanic tradition and does not deal specifically with music, his approach raises serious questions with regard to the possibilities and parameters within which genuinely innovative musical-aesthetic thinking can occur.

The present paper consequently considers the extent to which any future musical aesthetic, understood philosophically, may be circumscribed by a number of similarly paradigmatic models of thought. Focusing upon general philosophical approaches, an attempt will be made to show how empirical, axiomatic deductive, inductive, metaphorical, dialectical, structuralist and post-structuralist models of thought have been employed by a number of composers in the second half of the twentieth century in the construction of their music, as well as the attempt to by-pass any kind of musical logic by composers such as John Cage.

Asked to speak about the future of music at a conference in 1961 Ligeti responded as follows: “there is only one thing which is certain, and that is that the future will be something completely different from one’s prophecy. In order not to deliver untruths, I decided to say nothing” (cited in Steinitz 2003, 119). Ligeti’s silence in the face of the future can be contrasted with Adorno’s formulation of the dialectical concept of *musique informelle* at Darmstadt also in 1961. Adorno’s concept is an open one; its specific content is not definitively stipulated, nor can it be. While this has resulted at times in ridicule, composers such as Ferneyhough have found purpose within its openness as it perpetually calls the composer to reflect upon the dialectical unfolding of musical material and compels her / him to question what musical material can be today. It is in this spirit that the present paper will attempt to unfold something of the critical potential inherent within the range of models of thought which have been identified, exploring the speculative possibilities which they offer as well as the limitations which they may impose.

‘Music as 21st Century Human Performance’

Carl Humphries

I will argue that a proper understanding of what it means to experience music as a performed art can serve as a basis for an alternative aesthetic of contemporary musical practice to the approaches of the last century.

Firstly, I will claim that it is a necessary condition of hearing and responding to music as expressive that we hear it as if it were the audible correlate of a human body engaged in action and in possession of an intrinsically expressive physiognomy. Part of what this normally means is that we hear certain aspects of it as a manifestation of the behaviour of the human beings involved in performing it, and that we hear certain other expressive aspects as if they were this as well. I will then analyse what this means for our experience of music by drawing on ideas from contemporary action theory and from Wittgenstein’s insights into the nature of human expression and physiognomy.

In my view, the musical culture of the last century reflected two opposing aesthetic strategies, both motivated by intuitions about reality being reshaped by the instrumental exigencies of human existence to the point where our experience of it as suffused with human significance is frustrated, leading to ‘disenchantment’.

Late Romantic music, and some elements of musical modernism, sought compensation in music that mirrors the complexity of modern reality in the forms of musical language, while ensuring that these forms remain saturated with human expressive significance by resorting to extreme expressive means (expressionism, Romantic styles of performing). Popular music accomplished something similar through amplification of the physical aspects of tone production corresponding to physiognomically expressive aspects of music. In both cases, the resulting music lends itself to being taken as a surrogate for a critical engagement with reality.

On the other hand, postmodernism, and some elements of modernism, sought to make music into a gesture of negation – ironic or unironic – in which this same experience is deliberately withheld. The result is an artistic ‘gesture’ of negation (Adorno, Derrida) that has no significant bearing on actual human life at all, since it can only accomplish this negation by placing itself outside of the normative realm of comprehensibility minimally presupposed in all of our lives.

I will therefore propose an alternative strategy, based on my analysis of our experience of music as a performed art, which confronts the problematic character of our 21st century reality, but without negating the basis for arriving at meaningful implications for actual human life.

I claim that the structures we perceive in music as correlates or results of human action are, like equivalent practical actions in the real world, systematically embedded. They can therefore be subjected to a radical disembedding, until a point is reached where these structures are once more experienced as *saturated* by the physiognomically expressive human qualities that arise in music as a consequence of its being heard as a form of human performing. This saturation of the functional by the expressive recalls what is lost or threatened in our actual lives, but its essential dependence on a musical language only ever minimally elaborated means that it can never be taken as an affirmative indication of an equivalent reality in anything more than a minimal sense – one that is as much a critique of that reality as any negation would be.

I will point to some informal precedents for such an approach in existing music, and explore practical methods for realising this aesthetic goal in creatively interesting ways, with particular reference to piano improvisation.

‘The Composer’s Voice? Critical Approaches to Subjectivity in Recent Music’ Bjorn Heile

At least since the early nineteenth century, music has been a privileged site for the negotiation of subjectivity. As recent authors, such as Schwarz and Kramer, and – in rather different ways – Burnham and Steinberg, have pointed out, music not only seemed to *express* bourgeois subjectivity in apparently unmediated fashion, but, through a complex transferral between an implicit authorial persona, different subject positions ‘embodied’ in the music, and their projection by the listeners, to fundamentally *construct* it.

In the twentieth century music’s seemingly ‘natural’ relation to subjectivity has been increasingly challenged. Stravinsky, for one, denied music’s capacity for subjective expression altogether, and both the European post-war avant-garde and American experimentalists such as Cage tended in different ways to repress subjectivity in favour of ‘objective’ structure. Pace Adorno, these stances can themselves be regarded as symptomatic of the threat to subjectivity in the ‘administered world’. Following these developments, postmodernist theorists (Lyotard, Derrida, Lacan, Foucault, Barthes, Rorty,...) often deny the very possibility of individual subjectivity.

As it seems to me, recent years have seen yet another renegotiation of musical subjectivity, again reflecting and to an extent constituting the wider debates surrounding subjectivity in ‘post-postmodernist’ culture and society (which is not least apparent in the flood of publications on historical constructions of musical subjectivity alluded to above). This reconceptualisation does not take the form of a ‘triumphant return’ of uncritiqued notions of unified, autonomous, self-knowing, and self-relating subjectivity (as arguably happens in neo-romanticism), but one that is aware of its own contingency and is inherently dialogic and relational: according to this view, subjectivity is necessarily intersubjective. This conception of subjectivity responds to the discourses surrounding racial, ethnic, and gender identities with their challenge to the kind of universality which is foundational for traditional constructions of subjectivity, without, however, abandoning the possibility of critical self-awareness.

Drawing primarily on my work on Mauricio Kagel, I will discuss examples of recent music which seem to strive for a kind of ‘second immediacy’ in the way subjectivity is mediated between different voices with their implied subject positions. What these musicians appear to be doing is preserving a modicum of subjectivity in a world of simulation by, perhaps paradoxically, knowingly partaking in the production of simulacra themselves – simulacra, however, which don’t pretend to be real.

'The Dissolution of the Avant-Garde' **Martin Iddon**

In this paper I examine a key shift in the cultural significance of musical endeavour between the late 1950s and the early 1980s. My primary argument is that during this time the primacy of the avant-garde was ended and replaced with a culture of postmodernity. This discussion is integrated into a broader cultural framework, and it is suggested that the rise of notions of a culture of postmodernity is directly related to the decline of the avant-garde. Indeed, I suggest that the one is in fact a key marker of the other. Throughout the paper, I make much reference to the views of the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman. Though not ordinarily regarded as a key theorist of postmodernity, Bauman's thought appears to me to represent a crucial synopsis of the passing between modernity and postmodernity. In many of the more well-known key texts on postmodernism, postmodernity and post-structuralism this moment of passage is often neglected in favour of binary oppositional play between modernism and postmodernism, or examinations of the condition of postmodernity with only negligible reference to its forebear. Though the shift from the 'one true church' of an avant-garde is starkly contrasted with the ecumenicalism of postmodernity, I hope to avoid the well-worn cliché of integral pluralism as representing a postmodern style. I focus throughout upon the integration of compositional modes of thinking and the culture that surrounds them.

In order to locate historically the falling-away of the prevailing avant-gardism, an event that Robin Hartwell observes is "oddly difficult to pin-point" ('Postmodernism and art music', in *The Last Post: Music after Modernism*, 27), it is first necessary to consider the manners in which events which other writers have suggested presage a shift to a postmodern age fail to provide this decisive break with modernity. These events include Cage's 1958 visit to Darmstadt and various musical attacks on the institution of the avant-garde from the 1960s. Instead, they are early symptoms of the decline in the importance of avant-gardiste mentalities, which actually occurs in Europe during the 1970s. Secondly, I demonstrate the manner in which the European musico-cultural paradigms of the 1970s show the rise of an institutionalised culture of postmodernity, thus scattering any remaining avant-gardiste ideologies. Primarily, I consider modernity and postmodernity as if they were temporal strata rather than musical styles or, indeed, more clearly defined historical periods, following Timothy Taylor's salutary example in endeavouring to "sidestep the inevitable dead end that results when attempting to determine whether or not a particular piece or composer is 'postmodern'" ('Music and Musical Practices in Postmodernity', in *Postmodern Music, Postmodern Thought*, 103). Nonetheless, the common association of many prominent composers in the late 1970s with a postmodern aesthetic is evident, and I suggest that the approaches of the main figures in the European scene, Grisey, Lachenmann, Ferneyhough and Rihm, represent postmodern stances with regard to the compositional act.

‘From Perception to Recognition: Perspectives for Aesthetics in the 21st Century’
Susanne Kogler

“The kind of thought which dominates today is aesthetical thought.” What Wolfgang Iser stated in 1991 with respect to philosophy can also be regarded as true for art in the 21st century given that the term ‘aesthetical’ is understood in the original sense of the Greek word as “allied with perception – *aisthesis*”. For already in the last quarter of the 20th century in the field of art as well as in philosophy the phenomenon of perception continually moved to the centre of interest. This paper aims at analysing this novel dominance of perception in order to reflect its consequences for the scope of aesthetics.

First, the background of art’s development towards perception is investigated: on the one hand the new orientation can be explained as a consequent (and therefore critical) reaction to 20th century’s proclamation of the ‘end of grand narratives’ as well as to the continually increasing development of individuality observed since the 18th century disembodying in a rhizome-like plurality of aesthetical positions, materials and techniques of equal validity. On the other hand today’s focus on perception corresponds with a phenomenon aptly characterised by Christine Eichel as a “languishing of the avant-garde.” Though crossing borders has become the custom in nearly all fields nowadays, the dream of the historical avant-garde movements to transfer art into life is still nevertheless unredeemed. The sceptical reactions of composers confronted with terms such as ‘progress’, ‘being advanced’ or ‘avant-garde’, recently published in a German periodical, show that the dream of an avant-garde itself has grown old. Instead of fighting for the future, the present is newly explored.

Through an analysis of diverse artistic positions the second section of the paper examines the different ways in which perception is at the centre of art today: First, a novel attitude of the artist towards his findings can be observed; second, this perceptive attitude is transmitted to the audience, who, for their part, discover new modes of sensuous perception as well as a new kind of sensibility for the other, the strange; finally its perceptive attitude opens art to a critical perspective on itself including both, its presence and its traditions, what has led to numerous forms of integrating tradition into new music since the 1980s.

In the present situation the special challenge for art theory, the main task of which lies in the analysis and critical reflection of artistic positions, is to exclude inadequate premises by establishing sensibility and a high degree of differentiation. Theory’s ultimate aim, however, is to find new coherence, in order to make the world understandable in new ways through perspectives offered by art. Here, perception again is not to be understood exclusively as sensuous perception, but, following Iser once more, “in the larger sense of perceiving” designating a “perception of facts” which, “including a claim for truth”, is characterised by the process of recognition. In other words: thinking on art requires a transition from sensuous perception to recognition.

Future events

Dublin International Conference on Music Analysis
University College Dublin
23–25 June 2005

Email: julian.horton@ucd.ie or heneghaa@tcd.ie

WWW: <http://www.dublinmusicanalysis.com>

Fourth Biennial International Conference on Twentieth–Century Music
University of Sussex

25–28 August 2005

Email: c20conference@sussex.ac.uk

WWW: <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/music/1-4-1.html>

Methods and Perspectives of Musical Aesthetics: Theory and History
Université Marc-Bloch, Strasbourg

18–19 November 2005

Email: arbo@umb.u-strasbg.fr or villeneuve@umb.u-strasbg.fr

WWW: <http://umb.u-strasbg.fr/musique>

SMA Autumn Study Day on Pierre Boulez

Royal Holloway, University of London

19 November 2005

Email: celina.wood@rhul.ac.uk

‘Hung up on the number 64’: A conference on John Cage

University of Huddersfield

4 February 2006

Email: cagehuddersfield@yahoo.co.uk

WWW: <http://www.hud.ac.uk/mh/music/index.html>