

Adorno Philosophy Of New Music

Adorno Philosophy Of New Music

Downloaded from www remodelicious.com by Choi & Blackburn

INTRODUCTION: THE ENDURING CHALLENGE OF ADORNO’S PHILOSOPHY OF NEW MUSIC

Few works of music philosophy have stirred as much debate, admiration, and outright hostility as Theodor W. Adorno’s **Philosophy of New Music**. Written during a period of profound social upheaval and aesthetic crisis, this text remains a landmark in critical theory and musicology. For anyone seeking to understand the radical transformations in Western classical music during the early twentieth century, grappling with the **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** is both an intellectual necessity and a formidable challenge. Adorno’s argument is not merely about music; it is a diagnosis of modernity itself, a meditation on the fate of art under the pressures of capitalism, industrialization, and mass culture.

This article explores the core ideas of Adorno’s seminal work, placing them within their historical context, unpacking their philosophical foundations, and assessing their relevance for contemporary listeners and scholars. Whether you are a seasoned musicologist, a student of philosophy, or a curious listener, Adorno’s provocative theses will force you to reconsider what music can mean in a damaged world.

WHO WAS THEODOR W. ADORNO?

Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno (1903–1969) was a German philosopher, sociologist, musicologist, and composer. He was a leading figure of the Frankfurt School of critical theory, alongside Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, and Walter Benjamin. Adorno’s intellectual formation was deeply musical: he studied composition with Alban Berg, a student of Arnold Schoenberg, and wrote extensively on modern music long before his major philosophical works gained international fame.

Adorno’s approach to music was never purely aesthetic. He believed that music, especially the most advanced music of its time, embodied social contradictions and historical truths that could not be expressed in any other medium. His **Philosophy of New Music** (first published in 1949) is arguably his most concentrated statement on music and society. It is a dense, polemical, and fiercely partisan work that takes sides in the great musical divide of the early twentieth century: the rivalry between the Second Viennese School and the neoclassicism of Igor Stravinsky.

UNDERSTANDING THE STRUCTURE OF “PHILOSOPHY OF NEW MUSIC”

Adorno’s book is divided into two parts. The first is titled “Schoenberg and Progress” and the second “Stravinsky and Reaction.” This binary structure is central to the **Adorno Philosophy of New Music**. It presents two opposing poles of musical modernism, each representing a different response to the crisis of traditional tonality.

For Adorno, Schoenberg’s atonal and twelve-tone music represented the path of **authentic progress**. It confronted the historical exhaustion of tonality head-on, refusing to pretend that the old forms still held meaning. Stravinsky’s music, by contrast, was for Adorno a **regression**. It adopted a posture of emotional detachment, borrowed archaic rhythms, and made peace with the very conditions of alienation that true art should resist.

It is impossible to understand the **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** without recognizing that his judgments are not merely musical but moral and social. He judges composers by the truth-content of their work—by how honestly they confront the historical situation.

The Historical Context of Musical Modernism

To grasp Adorno’s arguments, we must recall the state of music around 1910. Romanticism had stretched tonality to its breaking point. Composers like Wagner used chromaticism so extensively that the sense of key center became fragile. Schoenberg’s breakthrough into atonality was, in Adorno’s view, historically necessary. The musical material itself—the scales, chords, and forms available to composers—demanded a new approach.

Adorno borrowed from Karl Marx the idea that the forces of production in art, like those in the economy, develop in historical stages. The **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** argues that the musical material carries its own history. A composer cannot simply return to earlier styles without lying about the present. Stravinsky’s neoclassicism, with its borrowing of Baroque forms and gestures, was for Adorno a form of escapism, a refusal to acknowledge the irrevocable damage of modernity.

THE CORE ARGUMENT: THE DIALECTIC OF MUSICAL PROGRESS

The **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** is grounded in a Hegelian-Marxist dialectic. Adorno believes that art develops through contradictions. Each new stage negates the previous one, but also preserves something of it in a transformed state. For Adorno, Schoenberg’s twelve-tone method was the logical outcome of the dialectic of musical material.

However, Adorno was not uncritical of Schoenberg. He recognized that the twelve-tone system risked becoming a new kind of straitjacket. The method, while necessary, could lead to a mechanical organization of pitches that threatened the spontaneity and expressive freedom that had motivated the break with tonality in the first place. This internal tension—between necessity and freedom, construction and expression—is a central theme in the **Adorno Philosophy of New Music**.

Adorno saw this tension as a reflection of a broader social problem: the individual’s struggle to maintain autonomy within an increasingly rationalized and administered world. Music was not separate from society; it was society’s most sensitive seismograph.

SCHOENBERG: THE PATH OF AUTHENTIC EXPRESSION

For Adorno, Arnold Schoenberg was a heroic figure. His music did not flatter the listener. It demanded effort, concentration, and a willingness to endure discomfort. The atonal works of Schoenberg and his students—Anton Webern and Alban Berg—expressed the anxiety, loneliness,

and fragmentation of modern existence without resorting to false consolation.

The **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** praises Schoenberg for his **uncompromising honesty**. Schoenberg did not pretend that the world was still whole. His music embodies the suffering of the individual in a society that crushes individuality. The dissonances of atonal music are not arbitrary; they are the sound of truth in a false world.

Adorno’s interpretation of Schoenberg’s twelve-tone technique is particularly insightful. He saw it as a rational system imposed on irrational material. The composer must navigate between the arbitrary and the necessary, using the method as a discipline while resisting its total domination. This dialectic within the compositional process mirrors the dialectic of enlightenment: reason, which was supposed to liberate humanity, can also become a new form of oppression.

STRAVINSKY: THE CRITIQUE OF REGRESSION

The second part of the **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** is far more polemical. Adorno’s critique of Igor Stravinsky is famous for its severity. He accused Stravinsky of **regression**, both technically and psychologically. In Adorno’s view, Stravinsky’s music abandons the subjective, expressive core of Western music and replaces it with a hollow, objective, even puppet-like quality.

Adorno points to the *Sacre du Printemps* (The Rite of Spring) as a key example. He interprets its violent, repetitive rhythms not as primitive energy, but as a celebration of sacrifice and submission. The famous scene of the sacrificial maiden dancing herself to death is, for Adorno, a premonition of fascism. The music demands that the individual be crushed by the collective. This is a deeply pessimistic reading, but it is central to Adorno’s thesis.

Adorno also attacked Stravinsky’s neoclassicism. For Adorno, the use of past forms was a form of **fetishization**. The composer treats historical styles as objects to be manipulated, rather than as living traditions with which to engage dialogically. The music becomes static, ritualistic, and ultimately indifferent to human suffering.

It is important to note that Adorno’s critique of Stravinsky is not merely about personal taste. It is a social diagnosis. The **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** argues that Stravinsky’s music anticipates and reinforces authoritarian social structures. The listener is invited not to participate emotionally, but to submit to the impersonal logic of the rhythm. This, for Adorno, is the musical equivalent of the culture industry.

KEY CONCEPTS IN ADORNO’S MUSICAL PHILOSOPHY

The Culture Industry and the Deterioration of Listening

While the **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** focuses on high modernism, it is inseparable from Adorno’s broader critique of the culture industry. In his earlier work with Horkheimer, Adorno had argued that mass culture turns art into a commodity. Music becomes background noise, entertainment, or a status symbol. The kind of concentrated, critical listening demanded by authentic new music is destroyed by the easy consumption of popular music and standardized classics.

Adorno saw the culture industry as a form of **social control**. It keeps people distracted, pacified, and incapable of genuine thought. The **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** can be read as a desperate attempt to defend the possibility of a music that resists this fate. Schoenberg’s difficulty is not a flaw; it is a form of resistance. It refuses to be consumed easily.

The Autonomy of Art

A key theme in the **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** is the autonomy of art. Adorno believes that art must be autonomous—detached from practical interests, commercial pressures, and political propaganda—in order to fulfill its critical function. Paradoxically, the more autonomous art becomes, the more it can reveal the truth about society.

But autonomy is fragile. The twelve-tone method, which began as a means of liberation, risked becoming a new convention. The market, too, threatens autonomy. When new music becomes a niche product for connoisseurs, it loses its power to challenge anyone. Adorno was acutely aware of this dilemma.

The Concept of Musical Material

One of Adorno’s most important contributions is his concept of **musical material**. This is not just the raw stuff of sound—notes, rhythms, timbres. For Adorno, musical material is historically sedimented. It carries within it the traces of previous uses, social conditions, and technical developments. A composer cannot simply use a triad or a fugue as if nothing had happened. The material resists certain treatments and demands others.

The **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** is a working out of this concept. Adorno argues that the tonal system was not a natural law but a historical formation. Its breakdown was not a matter of choice but of historical necessity. Schoenberg understood this; Stravinsky, in Adorno’s view, tried to ignore it.

THE RELEVANCE OF ADORNO’S PHILOSOPHY TODAY

Why should twenty-first-century readers engage with the **Adorno Philosophy of New Music**? The world of music has changed dramatically since 1949. Serialism gave way to indeterminacy, minimalism, spectral music, and countless other movements. The boundaries between high and low culture have blurred. Popular music now dominates the global soundscape.

And yet, Adorno’s questions remain urgent. How does music relate to social power? Can art resist commodification? What happens to listening in an age of distraction and data streams? The **Adorno Philosophy of New Music** offers no easy