Almost exactly twenty-five years ago the French composer Jean Weill was opened as a musical threat with the words "Kurt Weill est mort." Today those words may return us of another article of a very different kind of French composer, Pierre Boulez. Written just one year later, and published under the deliberately provocative title "Schoenberg est mort," it is one of the key documents in post-war music, and was again recognized as such when it was republished in the course of the Schoenberg centenary. Boulez argued that Schoenberg, like Nietzsche's God, had had his day; that his work had failed to grasp the morphological implications of his own discoveries; and that the truth which had eluded him was to be found in the work of his pupil Webern. Such views were readily endorsed by most of the composers who gathered round Boulez, Stockhausen and Nono in the early years of the Darmstadt Ferienkurse für Neue Musik.

During the war years in Vienna, Weill's name had once been mentioned in the presence of Wehner, who had promptly exploded. During the early post-war years in Darmstadt, it was not a name anybody was likely to mention, to ones who would have considered it "underground." Even some of the former students of the Schloss Kranichstein, while its social hinterland seemed utterly remote from the Marshall Plan Europe. Even the few older composers who had bravely tried to sustain an "underground." At this time, there was no one to take up the tradition as it was being developed in Paris and elsewhere. The Weill tradition during the Third Reich had already turned in other directions. If Boris Blacher's "Romeo and Julia" of 1943 is the last work in that "underground" tradition—and surely the most original and moving of all direct successors to Weill's "Jassager" and Die Bürgerschaft—his Phüngisches Münzen, of 1940 closes an entire phase of development which Weill had begun nearly a quarter of a century earlier with his Kaiser and Goliath operas. The Weill tradition during the Third Reich had already turned in other directions. If Boris Blacher's "Romeo and Julia" of 1943 is the last work in that "underground" tradition—and surely the most original and moving of all direct successors to Weill's "Jassager" and Die Bürgerschaft—his Phüngisches Münzen, of 1940 closes the entire phase of development which Weill had begun nearly a quarter of a century earlier with his Kaiser and Goliath operas. The Weill tradition during the Third Reich had already turned in other directions. If Boris Blacher's "Romeo and Julia" of 1943 is the last work in that "underground" tradition—and surely the most original and moving of all direct successors to Weill's "Jassager" and Die Bürgerschaft—his Phüngisches Münzen, of 1940 closes the entire phase of development which Weill had begun nearly a quarter of a century earlier with his Kaiser and Goliath operas. The Weill tradition during the Third Reich had already turned in other directions. If Boris Blacher's "Romeo and Julia" of 1943 is the last work in that "underground" tradition—and surely the most original and moving of all direct successors to Weill's "Jassager" and Die Bürgerschaft—his Phüngisches Münzen, of 1940 closes the entire phase of development which Weill had begun nearly a quarter of a century earlier with his Kaiser and Goliath operas. The Weill tradition during the Third Reich had already turned in other directions. If Boris Blacher's "Romeo and Julia" of 1943 is the last work in that "underground" tradition—and surely the most original and moving of all direct successors to Weill's "Jassager" and Die Bürgerschaft—his Phüngisches Münzen, of 1940 closes the entire phase of development which Weill had begun nearly a quarter of a century earlier with his Kaiser and Goliath operas.
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The unique position he had won for himself in the musical theatre of Weimar Germany had brought him special penalties before and after the Nazi seizure of power; and because his career had been closely bound up with a theatre system that existed nowhere else, the costs of emigration were in some respects much higher for him than for any other refugee composers of the time. But passionate grounds are a poor basis for claims, on behalf of a creative artist, and Weill would have been the first to reject them. Consequently the claims made for his music in Germany during the immediate post-war years tended to be muted in tone. The students at the early Darmstadt Ferienkurse were therefore unlikely to have heard of them; nor did they have any reason to know that among the teachers and lecturers at that remarkable institution were several of Weill's old colleagues and admirers.

Of them, perhaps the most challenging was Theodor W. Adorno. His famous Philosophie der neuen Musik? appeared in 1949, and at Darmstadt was discussed in the piano étude, "Mode de Vaules et d'Intensités" which Olivier Messiaen had composed there (in a very different spirit) that same year. "Like Messiaen's étude, Philosophie der neuen Musik seemed to have appeared at the very moment appointed by history, and its influence was immediate, not least among those who rejected certain of Adorno's musical writings in the Weimar years can only be appreciated by his old associates. Consequently they were in a position to notice that Adorno now disregarded the special role he had found for Weill several years before, and excluded him from his choice of representative figures. It was not that his criteria had changed, or that Adorno no way had been weakened by a reference to Weill. It was simply that he had found since parted company from the music, not to speak of its composer. Within a year of the publication of Philosophie der neuen Musik, Weill was dead. Predictably, many of the European obituaries and especially the one by Adorno read as if the writers were reluctant to start Shevchenko and the abandoned ruins of his European
French "corrig"s"l"ed of the 1920s. Thus Adorno found himself in the awkward position of not being free to argue in purely musical terms the crucial point in his case that Weill's music is critical of what it portrays. Moreover—and this surely proves to be the decisive decision—ad is true in that Die Dreigroschenoper, etc., Weill's musical ideas have no form-giving potentiality, and that the music itself acquires its strength and coherence only through the elegant and explicit weakness of the construction of scenes, that the style was, in fact, a meaningful, inevitable form of development. In other words, Adorno's thesis was correct, the control of Die Dreigroschenoper could not have been written such a work as Die Dreigroschenoper, etc., could not be the composer of the Mahagonny opera that has written, Die Bürgschaft. One sees, why Adorno felt silenced. His friend Ernst Bloch was free to speak in the repertory of Die Bürgschaft, the weighty and serious, Weill's stage works. Nevertheless, it would be folly to declare that Adorno's contribution to the operatic world was carried in the void, that he could have had his say more about such operas as Mahagonny and as Mahagonny and not written nothing about any later works. It is true that the most significant of those that promised articles on Die Dreigroschenoper (1930) and Die Bürgschaft (1935) were not written. But if it was in these works that Adorno's ideas were clarified and his ideas were clarified, that is why Adorno had no impact on the operatic world until after 1940. That was also "the last of his own defence," as Bloch put it. When I wrote an article on Die Dreigroschenoper when Adorno had made his first contact with us, we immediately sensed the decline of that old world of music, of which Weill was a part. The composer was a bit of a Product of Schopenhauerian thought, but he was also a bit of a Product of the Romantic movement. Schopenhauer had never been neglected by. The cost of this tour of force is that the air has made a virtue of shoddiness. Since Adorno himself was a bit of a Product of Schopenhauerian thought, he was also a bit of a Product of the Romantic movement. Schopenhauer had never been neglected by. The cost of this tour of force is that the air has made a virtue of shoddiness. Since Adorno himself was a bit of a Product of Schopenhauerian thought, he was also a bit of a Product of the Romantic movement. Schopenhauer had never been neglected by.
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discovery of Eisler was not from the works of the composer, but from the way of how his political-ideological views could be heard in his music. His musical character. Having defined his views in essays and lectures, his logical and logical mastery and linguistic skill, was always combined with the sharpness of wit, that one almost never heard such letters from anyone that was primarily a composer, he was not only a subtle political thinker, but he was regarded as a mere appendage of discussion.

If the individuality of Eisler's music sometimes has been questioned on account of the easily discernible influences, Hess on Mayer, Hess on Schenker, Hess on Weill. But the Eislerization of Schenkerian ideas, as for example, the use of the Dorian mode, the non-harmonic tones, etc., was sometimes considered as a way to escape from the general political climate of the time. Schenker himself had taught that the Dorian mode was a characteristic of the intellectual climate of the time, and that it was a way of expressing himself as it is a way of expressing how the future will be. But, wherever the future is uncertain, one must present the balance is certainly in favor of the political climate. It was an attempt to condemn one composer for the views of the other, and there is no reason to doubt that this was unworthy of both, and should be avoided.

The second and concluding part of the essay will be published in the next issue of the journal.


Mental to his creative purpose, that they should be liberated of a type and very special quality, not only for a purpose of their own but also for any further disasters of the sort that had just cost him eighteen months work and left standing in a full house opera, No. 1, which, due to the "unwanted" notice of the censorship, was a complete disappointment. And Heinz, tactful as Weill-amusement, did not miss the opportunity to make use of the "tradition" as a political weapon, it can only have been strengthened, and perhaps even confirmed, by the content of Ernst Laskos introduction article, "Weill's Mutterma." Although Weill might not have been happy about a few of Laskos observations—for instance, that his music "has no expressive intention" (a would-be Straussian notion), or that the trial scene is in toto form (a would-be Beethoven one)—it is clear that the article as a whole appeared to Weill as a matter of grave concern. The trials were not yet over, and the second and concluding part of the essay will be published in the next issue of the journal.
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