

The Defense of Unbiased Musicology in the wake of Modernization: The Soviet Example and the Corrosive power of Half-Truths

John David Vandevent

Paul H. Lang¹ says, in “*Musicology and Performance*,” that artists should not be censored, but allowed to create, regardless of their fundamental position. Through sovereignty of mind and spirit can the true artist materialize, as the ‘self’ cannot be mandated into existence from Big-Brother codifications or proscriptive reformations, “;there needs protection...against the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling, against the tendency of society to impose, by means other than civil penalties, its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them.” Soviet Musicology’s aim was, “*the search for universal laws that govern both the historical development of music...and music’s inner workings*,” this serving as the ‘Idée fixe’ for the entire system which tirelessly worked to engender manufactured ‘pride’ among supporters and apprehension among dissenters. By conjoining pseudo-scientificism and Musicological rigour, the Soviet’s attempted to hijack an intangible art-form, weaponizing it’s ephemerality for political gain. However, Paul H. Lang comments on the lack of a concrete Socialist artform, calling their attempts, “*imitation of the music of the good old bourgeois days.*” Their earnest attempts to scrap Golden/Silver Age Russia for a gilded substitute is comically tragic. This article seeks to provide a depiction of Soviet methodology, its lasting damage, and what must be avoided to prevent Soviet infatuation in Musicology, now and going forward. Scholars like Tamara Levitz and Phillip Ewell are among those who exhibit qualities akin to Soviet anti-formalism, leading the attack against classicism starting with the building blocks of Western music. Provocations which induce bipartisan dialogue is one conclusion, but to purposefully spread proselytism in Institutions of higher learning, contributing to the ongoing disintegration of objectivity is another choice entirely, one that brings harm wherever it goes.

Defining Soviet Musicology and the Musicological Climate (2010-2020)

Soviet Musicology sought to weaponize music for political gain, in turn transforming musical performance from leisure to labor. No longer were investigations on the nature of music conducted from a Sacchetian, universalist perspective, grounded in linear historicism and musical totality. Additionally, an Asafyevian humanistic perspective, where form, content, and essence are inextricably bound together, was terminologically altered, in the 1940s converting even the esteemed Boris Asafiev to renounce his own musical perspective.² ‘Contemporary music’ and historical compositions were to be judged, educated by ideological dogma, by utilizing three main conditions. Overall effect, music’s coercive nature in inducing certain emotions and sensibilities, democratic purpose, the ability to unify listeners around a common goal, and ability to answer questions regarding current ideology and its benefit to epochs it finds itself in, ‘does it help a man to live on this Earth?’³ The outcome heavily influenced what was listened to, produced, and studied in the public sphere. Pressure was on Musicologists to formally align with the Party, and in 1949, the study of ‘formalist’ music and respective theories, specifically Germanic in origin, were heavily criticized and staunchly condemned.⁴ This event, called the ‘Musicologist’s Affair’ was one of many fatal blows to Soviet Musicology, not only stifling scholarly growth, but promoting the avoidance of studying topics ‘outside’ Russia, and more importantly misaligned with Soviet Proletariat philosophy. As Olga Panteleeva states in, “How Soviet Musicology became Marxist,” this followed anti-formalist campaigns in 1948, where formalism was said to be absent of ‘political perspective,’ although this contradicts the Soviet’s focus on scientifism and the view of the score as the artist himself. This mirrors Asafiev’s position in his two-volume work, “Musical form as Process,” published in 1930, but pulled from circulation due to an ‘ideological cloud’⁵ of

Sovietism. Soviet ideology was rife with inconsistent messaging, one well-known stain being the treatment of Shostakovich, who was abused by the State and used as a talking point, political tool, and enslaved international pawn.

Towards the end of the 19th century, Positivism gained ground in conjunction with the rise in interest concerning scientific study. The young, hopeful Intelligentsia, the ‘realists,’ believed that through the Sciences, they could uplift and benefit all facets of Russian society. This noble pursuit ultimately turned sour when Romanticism was equated to bourgeois classism, and incidentalistic music with little emphasis on social change was thought to be promoting social prejudices, and thus advocating for anti-societal bourgeoification. The conglomeration of über-rationalism and scientific practicalism fed the revolt against the thought of music as a solely aesthetic artform, Hanslick’s metaphor of music as a ‘moving arabesque,’ capable of autonomy and self-sustained beauty, served as a clear example of what Soviet ideologists actively reviled.⁶ He was scorned for his belief of musical autonomy and perceptual independence, and this denial of music’s position outside imposed, artificial doctrines could be considered the mission statement of Russian Musicology, what is dictated is what you feel. As these ‘particular’ beliefs were being crafted, in the Western world, figures like Guido Adler were publishing commentaries more liberal in their analytical lens. Adlers, “*The Scope, Method, and Aim of Musicology*,” a lengthy article in the first issue of the first publication of Musicology Quarterly, delineated his philosophy on the pursuit of Musicology. He described Musicology’s goal as the, “discovery of the True and Advancement of the Beautiful,” proximally similar to the widely shared stance of Musicology being used for the “understanding of man.”⁷

Two strains of Musicological discourse were forming, one with its feet planted in humanism and mind in music, and the other with its feet planted in ideology and head filled with Panglossian, pseudo-scientificism. In the late 1910’s and early 1920’s, a myriad of Musicological, methodological ‘innovations’ were being formed, starting with Nikolai Kashkin’s memorandum upon Liveri Sacchetti’s death for the purgation of ‘decadent elements,’ alluding to Sacchetti’s efforts to use Western music as a tool for the universalizing of Musicology.⁸ It’s evident that he was intent on encouraging his students within Institutional musical life of the worthwhileness of Musicology and its physical benefits. In 1922, the first codified theory of the emotive potentiality of music was published, Russian opera serving as the primary conduit. Asafiev’s book, “*Symphonic Etudes*” served as the inaugural resource for study on music’s emotive capabilities, although in 1921, the first specifically Musicological research Institution was established and opened, “The Institute of Art History,” located in St. Petersburg, with Boris Asafiev at its head. The Musicological Institution was joined by the opening of another educational avenue, a Musicological department, this time within The Russian Academy of Artistic Sciences in 1925. Scholarship done by Ivan Martynov does, despite previous research indicating strong concern for Western influence in Russia’s musical life, point to the fact that in the 1920 to 1930’s, study on contemporary music of both Russian and foreign denomination was highly popular, alongside theoretical scholarship on intonation, rhythm, and metrotectonism.⁹ Martynov states in the 1988’s Issue of *Acta Musicologica*, “We prize contact with foreign colleagues, and strive for their expansion. -- The USSR Composers’ Union has shown great initiative in this area.” These words show that towards the end of the 20th century, Russia was returning to an international, Musicological self, un-explored since Sacchetti’s appointment, despite Martynov’s statement of explorational freedom in the 1920 and 30s. Due to heightened political nationalism, one plausible reason Sacchetti failed to achieve his inter-disciplinary Musicological dream could be the unfortunate fact that he was a foreigner, appointed to a position of Academic standings when Russian patriotism and fanatic nationalism were holding hands, thus making the support of

anything foreign was tantamount to treason. Although a possible oversimplification, one cannot help but speculate what Sacchetti's future would have looked like if he had stayed in Italy, went North to Germany or perhaps even to the United Kingdom as so many others had during this time.

The relationship between the Soviet's use of objectivity, subjectivity, and scientific analysis became merged, as deterministic propensities within the present composer, his predecessors, and those who they associated or didn't associate with formed the bulk of held Musicological assertions. Concepts like Neo-Lamarckism, Atavism, and Epigonism, along with study of individualistic hereditary transferring and genetic relationships, were used to demonstrate and legitimize unscientific positions, often overlooking ill conceived theories to push pre-formed narratives. Debussy's music caused 'degenerative anxiety' which could be passed down from generation to generation. An example of a salient theory, with real merit but tainted by ideological poison were the grafting of concepts and methodologies derived from Natural Sciences onto musical creation. In theory, this sounds plausible and did birth some astute suppositions, but as a whole it was doomed to self-immolation. Viewing the product of a composer as a simple conglomeration of immediate and secondary experiences which, when evaluated for social value through its psychological and biographical DNA with the goal of guessing the interpretations created by the 'masses,' turns a non-tangible auditory experience from an unbiased 'I,' to an falsely communistic 'We.' Music ceased to be a heterogeneously expressive habitat, where interpretationism is forged by personal narrative alone. It became instead the musical application of geological 'uniformitarianism,' the thought that the way natural processes behave have been, "more or less in the same way today as they have throughout the past, and will continue to do so in the future."¹⁰ If Soviet musical scientists could manufacture the masses' perspective into one, homogeneous collective, from then onwards, the musical arts would house boundless power. Against the backdrop of collective consciousness was the widely held notion that the composer's environmental position was reflected in their music, and thus the resolve or lack thereof to oppose 'bourgeois classism' was deemed a chief tenant in the composer's suitability for the Soviet canon.

The approved music's impression would perpetually deliver ideological results no matter the audience and develop over time into a perfected science that would, inevitably, birth Russia's own Proletariat compositional class, thus making foreign-born composers useless. Stalin's ready-made conduit for such change was Socialist Realism, the three leading principles being, classness (Klassovost), peopleness (Narodnost), and partyness (Partiinost), evidenced by the Soviets worship of folk music as the authentic root of Russia heritage.¹¹ The goal is not to outright rebuke the findings of Soviet Musicologists, as many, particularly the notion of genetically transferable traits from artist to artist, are indeed arousing, but it would be unwise to glorify Soviet scholarship as something to be emulated. On a lighter note, to offset the gravitas, an anonymous contributor to the R.A.P.M camp had proposed the theory of 'brain obesity,'¹² stating that any composition utilizing musical structures other than a simplistic melody with an accompanying diatonic structure was "typical bourgeois perversion of art, resulting in degeneration and gluttonous brain obesity."

After the death of Stalin, Russian composers started to again move back to religious compositional themes, and the concert repertoire was only now slightly different than its Western counterpart, although Russia avoided Avant-Garde composers as much as possible.¹³ In the 1940s, Soviet theoretical scholarship startled to drastically change as emphasis on formal analysis and compositional attributes was scraped for a 'cognitive' and 'impersonal' approach, where the Musicologist had to perform as an ideological automaton, but also as a 'generalist,' utilizing musical scientifism with an unfeeling core, meanwhile wearing the hat of a critic and theorist, but not overstepping into the realm of personal opinion. The palpable feeling of 'walking on eggshells' is apparent throughout Dr. Carpenter's 1988 dissertation on the historical lineage of music theory

in post-Revolutionary Russia. As Dr. Carpenter remarks, the transition from 'hard theory' to 'soft theory' highlighted the failures of Music Science to sufficiently capitalize on its infantile ideology, and become a tool for national 'folk music culture,' one that could remove the poison of 'anti-artistic music,' and kill the 'musical body of capitalism.' Lev Mazel viewed Musicology as an all-encompassing discipline that organized theoretical findings into an historical, contextual framework, where musical properties were studied two ways, by its 'historical development,' and by its 'context,' labelled as the dialectical unity of objectivity and subjectivity.¹⁴ A clear distinction between pre-Stalinist Musicology and post-Stalinist Musicology can be inferred by the level in which the Musicologist was entrusted with the education of the Proletariat. The period of 1947-1950 is labelled as 'draconian' and 'excessively hard' by Dr. Carpenter, not only due to WW2's impact on written output, but various resolutions placed upon scholars which severely curtailed their available pool of accessible topics. 'The Composers' Union Resolution of 1947 held prominence for its ruling of the importance of folk studies within Musicological faculties. An excessive amount of meetings and published doctrines in a four year span all focused heavily on the lack of concise and succinct initiative on the part of the Musicologist and Theorist to accurately focus work to further Marxist-Leninst goals, as well as to instill Socialist Realism within the masses. Only one meeting mentioned by Dr. Carpenter was in support of Russian Musicologists during this time, the Meeting of the Composers and Musicologists of Moscow later in 1948. Only few comments made pertained to the support of and caution about the complete removal of 'formalist' music from scholastic study, as study of 'formalist' music housed 'strength-based knowledge,' the thought that the only way to know the enemies music was to study and contextualize its contents. Boris Jarustovsky, in 1975, depicted theoretical Musicology being inundated with 'young gifted Musicologists' who took on the analysis of composers dubbed 'formalist,' anti-Soviet,' and a 'bourgeois perversion,' He goes on to describe Soviet Musicological engagements, from research topics focused on Eastern localities like Central Asia, to conferences dedicated to modern and contemporary music with International colleagues in various localities.

Starting from pre-Revolutionary Russia to the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1990, Musicology had undergone drastic changes, in usage, functional make-up, and organized structure, starting from an unmethodical, purely theoretical perspective, only coming under academic control in the 19th century. In the early 20th century, Musicology entered into speculative regions of inquiry, concerning the nature of music and its accompanying architecture, in the mid-20th century being refined for political and ideological gain. In the last quarter of the 20th century during Soviet decline, Musicology started repairing broken International bridges and the study of 'formalist' composers and non-Russian music started incrementally returning. As Olga Panteleeva points out in, "Rimsky-Korsakov and his World," Russian Musicology was still suffering from the intramural assault of the 1930s to 1940s. She delineates the problem being, "the deep conceptual misunderstanding between Russian conservatory based musicology and the university-based musicological traditions elsewhere in the world."¹⁵ A vital question is whether there is lasting relevance in Soviet Musicology and their treatment of music, whether their approaches should be disregarded and deserted, and all fragments of their 'musical science' erased from modern methodological spheres of influence. This paper doesn't claim a cemented judgment, but rather provides reinforced hypotheses that can contribute to a discussion on whether subjective rigidity within research parameters serve the purpose of 'inclusivity' and 'diversity,' or if it actually renders ineffective its own premade tenants. Lawrence Veysey stated in his address at the 1977 Wingspread Conference on New Directions in Intellectual History, "Generalizations, in other words, to be credible must be extremely hard earned,"¹⁶ and it is precisely this avenue of thought that must be pushed to the Musicological forefront in order to secure a proper, democratic future.

Soviet Musicology and its use of interdisciplinarianism was a prominent component in the minds of Musicologists, the question being, *how does this benefit or harm societies' malleable psyche?* The three rungs of Socialist Realism filled the air like a noxious gas, and thus, these three subsequent questions were imprinted onto all creators minds; How does it benefit the people, how does it represent the working class, and how can it be used as a political tool? Boris Asafiev, in his 1927 work plan for MUZO, the Musical Section of Narkompros, the Soviet Union's Ministry of Education, reprimanded his colleagues for positivist escapism, an "*ivory tower of historicism with its natural-scientific focus.*"¹⁷ He proposed five tenants for the Department, covering collegial ignorance of contemporary music, callous adventurism, neglectful stances towards music's societal poignancy, and other deviances from what Musicology ostensibly should be. Charles Seeger and Boris Asafiev would have gotten along, as Seeger's apparent consistent use of '*universe,*' a metonymy for '*world view*' according to his own account, pairs well with Asafiev's idea of Musicology being a sociologically conscious field. Dr. Michael Broyles, in his commenting on Seeger's nine-dimensional road a Musicologist can '*drive at his leisure,*' points out, albeit from a 1983 mindset but just as poignant in 2020, that the dangerous trend of Methodological narrowness, which has seeped into researcher's empirical reality and projected purpose, has caused a narrowing of scope, intention, and vision.¹⁸ *Musikwissenschaft:* A highly relevant word and a perfect embodiment of Musicological absolutism, ak.a sovereignty of word and deed.

The debate on content versus form and the amalgamation of both in the pursuit of 'dialectical unity of objective and subjective' took first position for Soviet Musicologists like Asafiev. But due to the cumbersome nature of Musicology during this time, no one concrete position can be easily ascertainable as relayed by Dr. Carpenter's research on Soviet Music Theory, "*Content thus becomes the object of analysis, because in art content determines sociological connections.*" This goes in direct opposition to Asafiev, who thought content and form were inseparable from each other, "*But I am accustomed to hear that content in a musical composition which has been organized by the composer, and not to 'listen to a symphony' under an idea, pre-determined for it from (the) outside--.*"¹⁹ When a listener hears a work, an immeasurable amount of conceptualizations could be chosen and an even greater amount of counterarguments can be formed. When Asafiev heard a symphony, he wasn't hearing 'a symphony,' but the soul in tangibility, thereby creating a linkage between the formation of elements and the product of the composer, as the breath of God comes through in music, and the composer puts it into form. Harkening back to Andre Gide's observation of 'only one option,' Lunacharsky makes the acknowledgment of the Marxist one-option only mentality, "*-then he turns to the form--from the point of view of explaining how this form fulfills its aims--serves to make the work as expressive and convincing as possible.*" Lunacharsky blatantly expresses a Soviet truth, content before form.

The 'Influential Evaluator' is to observe music's content in a hyper-colourized pseudo-Asafievan approach, where sociological merit is to be married to the advancement of Marxist-Leninism. Only from that point could form be considered, although it was subservient to the goals and aspiration of contents 'social essence.' Even Lev Mazel who, in 1940 had said the Musicologist's role was strictly objective and yet '*a special type of music-making,*' had admitted music's content as correlated to form.²⁰ Through the process of historical development, form has been shaped not only by the ever changing theoretical paradigm, but by successive composer's unique verbiage and sonic representational innovations. Mazel uses the words 'meaningful forms' as a way to explain the comprehensive impact of defined and undefined factors that develop and alter compositional structures, ultimately filled with content, which have equally distinct evolutionary factors plotting its evolution. The application of content vs. form can be seen in Jacques Rancière's comments²¹, as relayed by Tamara Levitz, concerning Academic curricular education, "it is by the very nature of the knowledge that it (content of the teaching) imparts to

students that the bourgeoisie exerts . . . the profoundest influence over them." Replace bourgeoisie with Soviet Musicologists, and them with the Proletariat, and the cockeyed power dynamic of the Soviet Musicological world, those who held authoritative control over scholars research, and the people to who read the 'polished,' disseminated literature, becomes clear. A troika of questions are present within Musicology, and they call for heightened scrutiny for scholarship's ultimate academic purpose; What is its ultimate purpose, how is it dealing with objectivity, and what is its potential audience? "Today it is insufficient to claim to be simply a Musicologist." Dr. Broyles is correct, generalism is the enemy of art, but it was the absolute antithesis of Soviet Musicology. The Musicologist was to be a Generalist, not a Specialist. When those three inquiries are compared to the principles of Socialist Realism mentioned previously, the differences between Soviet Musicologists and their colleagues in the West become grey at the seams. Soviet scholars were enslaved, intellectual henchmen of flawed ideology, while the West's alternative could be considered enslaved adherents to manufactured trivialities.

*"In the days of my youth--we were recommended certain books and advised against others; and naturally it was to the latter that we were drawn. The great difference today is that the young people read only what they are recommended to read and have no desire to read anything else."*²² These are the words of an anonymous Soviet citizen as recorded by Andre Gide. This sentiment isn't new to the Russian people and their established culture, there have always been two, strongly oppositional sides to the Russian socio-political framework, two heads to the same eagle. One side, determined to condition its citizens no matter the cost, believing in the strength of a dictatorial power structure, capable of maintaining public harmony, no matter the human cost. However, the subjugated class never forfeited their retaliatory opportunity, consciously waiting with anticipation for an opening where they could 'strike.' It was first the Orthodox Church versus the Peasant's folk culture, then it was the Tsarship versus the Working class, then it was the Proletariat versus the foreign Bourgeoisie, and now it's Putin versus an advancement of Western modernization. In the West, innovation is able to flourish and gestate, in part due to exorbitant levels of freedom and unrestricted intellectual stretching room. The ability to publicly evaluate burgeoning and prevailing ideas for the indications of corruption or virtuousness, without concern of imprisonment or retribution, no matter if counteractions are waged or not, could help individuals accurately assess their societal locality and bypass their own Bolshevik Revolution. Mr. O'Connor, Director of the Healthy Communities Program circa 1998, aided by a colleague, pointed at the contrast between a society's ability to formulate conversation and produce results, and the infrastructure which supports such action. He used the terms *debate* and *deliberation*²³ to personify the varying approaches to community-based solutions, the former identifiable with Soviet Totalitarianism, and the latter with a Democratic push for commonality among citizens.

Moving Forward

At the dawn of the 21st century, two Musicologists had made observations about Italian professorship and its related insecurities stating, "...while the number of tenured university professors has remained more or less stable (just over a hundred), that of the non-tenured professors (about forty in 1992-93) has doubled, almost equalling that of the this situation (2000-2001)." ²⁴ Because of developments of what constitutes a 'historical source,' Musicologically this had materialized into a greater focus on the 'material culture of daily life,' i.e., opera house tax forms, music performance bills, librettos, and ticket office forms. The approach to studying cultural normalities was codified into, 'Direct, Indirect, and Archaeological,' 19th century opera was recorded to be the by-product of a 'complex global

system,’ and studies revolved around art’s ‘creation, production, and supply.’ What is being pointed out is synonymous with Charles Seeger’s three zones of space time and his questions: What can be communicated through music (musical space-time)? What can be communicated through speech (general space-time)? What in music can be communicated by speech (speech space-time)? The roots of his inquiries lied in an attempt to delineate what Musicology was for and explain the need for focus on the discussion of musical topics. What is Musicology actually studying, only the musical content or something greater and far more intangible? Charles Seeger understood music as the culmination of various ‘languages’ which, through his six-layered approach dubbed the ‘*Musicological Juncture*,’ could relay music’s ‘knowledge’ with greater effectiveness and clarity. It is between objective analysis and subjective comprehension where the Musicologist must tenuously tread and ultimately perch. K. F. E. Trahndorff’s term, *Gesamtkunstwerk* showcases its temporal pervasiveness and its multifarious quality.

Total-artistic independence and the right for total creative volition is a prerequisite for all consciously-crafted modes of expression. Dr. Lang describes, “*No form of "objective truth" or "ideology" can become the source of art, because art can be sublimated only from profound personal convictions and desire.*”²⁵ Anton Dianov, an insubstantial Muscovite composer around the 1920s (pre-1927), had postulated the reason Soviet composers have been so silent, “*In the end, this is understandable....And this is why it (music) can be born only after feelings have been poured into life in a more material way...*”²⁶ Both Dianov and Lang point to the fallibility of dogmatic persuasion in efforts to birth fanatical progeny which has the power to enter the public’s consciousness upon necessary birth. This mentality of ‘party first, person second’ is being reworked into modern culture by $2+2=5$. But $2+2$ has never equalled five and the more that we rationalize the latter answer’s existence, the more normalized deception becomes. This is not to say that five should not be an answer however, but one has to understand that it is technically wrong regardless of the rationalizations applied. Elina Vilyanen in, “The Problem of The Modern Tradition,” recalls an ideological facet held by Asafiev and collaborator Pyotr Suvchinsky in *Musical Thought*. Dr. Vilyanen relays a quote derived from The Russian State Archive for Literature and Art, “...two by two is four, but four in itself does not go back to the equation of two by two.” The view that the road to which one derives a result is not inherently and innately linked to the corresponding result was developed from Losski’s concept of organicity and multiplicity, a more psychological approach to the dichotomy of experience-based knowledge and visually tangible-based knowledge. However, blatant disregard for fact is not interpretationism, but kidology on the part of the scholar.

Clifford Geertz chastises ideological discourse stating, “*as an entity in itself as an ordered system of cultural symbols rather than in the destination between its social and psychological contexts (has hindered) the perfection of a conceptual apparatus capable of dealing more adroitly with meaning.*”²⁷ When one is focused on implementation of ideology, the impact is neglected and the outcome is ignored. He says the field of ‘social science’ has been more occupied with researching, “the socio-psychological stresses that incite ideological attitudes” [than with] “the elaborate symbolic structures through which these attitudes are given a public existence.” The word ‘social science’ is not defined, but a correlation to Musicology could be deduced with relative linguistic accuracy. This provides a contrary example of Trahndorff’s term, the focus turning from the gross to the minute, causing the subject matter to be insufficient and unreflective of its temporality. The Musicologist must be not only a researcher, but a sleuth. The notion that four will never be five must be kept, but individual ways one gets to five must also be protected.

Dr. Broyles’s 1983 article quotes Alan Tormey’s observation²⁸ on music theory, “For example, just what is a music theory supposed to be a theory of?” For Tormey, a keen ear did not replace critical scholarship, simply having conceptions worthy of dissemination does not equate to

scholarship by career Academics. In the August 17th 2020 edition of The New Yorker²⁹ under the ‘Musical Events’ header, there was an article about the last song of Poulenc’s 1940 five song-cycle, “Banalités.” ‘Sanglots’ is described by Alex Ross as a, “descent into an inner world of memory and regret.” He explores three distinct areas, interpretive analysis, historical observations, and concludes with subjective impressions. However, this piece cannot be considered Musicological scholarship, but it can be given the title of historical journalism. There must be distinct lines between what is considered Music scholarship and lower forms of musical writing. Activist Journalism and unapologetical subjectivism do not fit the requirements for the Musicological label, as objectivity is still a presiding factor over the label’s contents. This evaluation is codified by Besutti and Ward-Perkins (2000), described as the, “relationship between the methodological rigour of professional musicology and the casualness of certain types of popular journalism.” A certain level of non-formality has been normalized, and what previously would have been subjective rationalizationism is now perceived as formalistic scholarship and even lauded as a, “must read.”

Roy Dickinson Welch, founder of Princeton University’s music department, had postulated that intellectual opinions have to be expertly handled, “*Criticism, however, is a function of the scholar, but only of such scholars as are more than erudite.*”³⁰ Echoing Dr. Welch, Dr. Boyle indicates the differences between the rigour of a Critic versus an Analyst, “The critic more readily admits the importance of intuition, whereas the analyst relies more heavily on objective observation and manipulation of data.” Although incorporating disparate terminology, the Critic (subjectivist) and the Analyst (objectivist) are essentially the same. Dr. Boyles acknowledges this, “In the broadest sense criticism is a perpetual necessity, an inherent reality, not a separate mode or endeavor.” The Soviets curated sensitivity towards phenomenological study was hampered because the Musicologist’s objective truth was born from factional subjectivity and not authenticity. The Party Doctrine was the Proletariat’s water and this would lead to utter destruction, “When the revolution is triumphant, installed, and established, art runs a terrible danger, a danger almost as great as under the worst fascist oppression-the danger of orthodoxy...” In the words of Sarah Silverman as quoted by America’s most famous Orthodox Jews, “*It’s like, if you’re not on board, if you say the wrong thing...everyone is...throwing the first stone... ‘Look how righteous I am and now I’m going to press refresh all day long to see how many likes I get in my righteousness.*”³¹ In a culture where ephemeral, purging points are societally awarded, there remains little room for Scholars to do their job as kowtowing becomes their focus. Scholars must rely on their ‘impartial spectator’ for praise and critique, thus strengthening their ability to not rely solely on the public endorsement. If a person is unable to represent their views in a public locality without fear of retribution, then it is feasible to assume group homogenizing will occur, further undermining objective declarations, and real acts of formal and informal discussion.

If Intellectualism progresses towards normalized subjectivity, then the purpose of Academia will be permanently corrupted. This is observable by the assaults on intellectual freedom within American educational Institutions, where the call for ‘safe-spaces,’ speech censorship, and fallacious claims of hate-speech have become ubiquitous, even universities of high educational standings. The controversial document released by University of Chicago in 2015, “Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression,” or, ‘The Chicago Statement,’ explicitly defined the University’s purpose. “*The University’s fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought...to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed.*”³² However logical, as of September 19th 2020, only around 60 Institutions have adopted the document’s principles as of yet. Not only are

American University's suffering due to Soviet positionism, but globally, concrete barriers defending 'fact first, opinion second' are at worst nonexistent, and at best underutilized.

Conclusion

A faulty ideology does not seemingly rectify itself by attributing noble causes. Sovietism, in its crudest form, was total adherence of body, mind, and soul to the Party's goals, aspiration, image, and even cruelty. Even if a person was ideologically committed, the Party could replace their support for anything that brought the ruling body closer to their goal, "the interest of the working class is only occasionally...tied to the aim of a democratic-bourgeois revolution...its "substitutive" function can be soon overcome in the further stages of its progress toward communism." Dr. Negri³³ articulates the harsh consequences for the individual, in this case 'organisms,' that find themselves at philosophical odds with 'revolution all the way.' The dissenting body is presented with two options, submission or destruction, "*either the liquidation of the Soviet as a reformist tool or its conquest of the movement as a moment of revolutionary organization.*" Through the analysis of Soviet Musicologic philosophy, the observation of those same dogmatic tendencies can be recognized in present, contemporary life. In the last four years, America has seen the epidemical rise of censorship in public life, both online and offline, from trigger warnings to borderline tyrannical technological measures, and even the contradictory war on 'hate speech.' The war on dialectical freedom has reached such a point that, according to reporting by Freedom House³⁴, in 2015 military courts in Thailand had issued both 56 and 60 year sentences, reduced to 28 and 30 respectively, for counter-monarchy Facebook posts. The list of cases is unfortunately manifold, for example, Andrey Bubeyev and Shady Habash being two other fitting examples. Just because it's not yielding personal consequence's presently, this is not to say it won't in the future, "Then they came for me—and there was no one left to speak for me."

As an academic collective with the goal of interdisciplinary conjecture, Musicology cannot become complacent to a newly packaged Soviet system, but rather maintain scholarly rigorousness with emphasis on undistorted accuracy. There must be attention on the purpose of scholarship and how it can bring about a higher-calibre future. Practicality is a cross-field prerequisite for success, but due to intense similarities with Soviet practicalism, i.e., Soviet Realism, methodical care must be taken to allow 'fluff' content its designated room. All realms of Academicism must look out for 'intellectual noise,' scholarship which does not supply any practical value, and although usable to an extent, does not provide productive direction towards any set goal other than to hear its own convictions. What is not being advocated for is neo-Futurism, but rather a refocus on who is the audience, how one is contributing to society, and how exactly the scholarship is topically relevant. "*The price of certainty is always reduction--reduction not only in meaning but in interest and value...The fact is, no one owns the meaning of this (Shostakovich's) music.*"³⁵ Richard Taruskin had it correct, no one owns a definition, society simply creates collective linguistic and epistemological patterns which, through the process of time, become codified into the fabric of mainstream consciousness. One must not be dissuaded from interpretative contributions, but conscious of their usefulness. Imprecise judgments breed imprecise scholars, who subsequently generate imprecise scholarship which is consumed, and from these events, a cyclical pattern emerges. Pseudo-Altruism has gripped society, and simply won't let go, "*Arguments and renunciations that can seem to safeguard the interests of the oppressed can and more often do serve the interests of their oppressors.*"³⁶ You are allowed to disagree with society, but just be sure to say why, because your accusers won't.

Resources

1. LANG, P. (1997). Marxist Theory and Music. In Mann A. & Buelow G. (Eds.), *Musicology and Performance* (pp. 113-123). Yale University Press. Retrieved September 2, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt32bdh.20>
2. Viljanen, E., 2016. The Problem Of The Modern And Tradition. Finland: Acta Semiotica Fennica
3. Jarustovsky, B. (1974). Soviet Musicology. *Acta Musicologica*, 46(1), 50-57. doi:10.2307/932477
Original Cover: N/A. (1974). *Acta Musicologica* [Volume XLVI (66)]. Retrieved 2020, from <https://www.acta-musicologica.net/pdfs/archive/acta1974.pdf>
4. Panteleeva, O. (2019). How Soviet Musicology became Marxist. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 97(1), 73-109. doi:10.5699/slaveasteurorev2.97.1.0073
5. James Robert Tull, "B. V. Asaf'ev's "Musical Form as a Process": Translation and Commentary. (Volumes I - III)" (Ph.D., The Ohio State University, 1977), 36.
6. Eduard Hanslick, On the Musically Beautiful, transl. by Geoffrey Payzant (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1986)
Secondary Source: Maus, F. (1992). Hanslick's Animism. *The Journal of Musicology*, 10(3), 273-292. doi:10.2307/763652
7. Broyles, M. (1983). Intersects in the Musicological Juncture: On the Relationship between History, Theory, and Criticism. *College Music Symposium*, 23(2), 177-192. Retrieved October 14, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40374344>
"There have been many statements to the effect that the ultimate purpose of musicology is the understanding of man."
8. FROLOVA-WALKER, M. (Ed.). (2018). *Rimsky-Korsakov and His World*, 242-243 PRINCETON; OXFORD: Princeton University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctv346rcf
9. Martynov, I. (1988). On Soviet Musicology. *Acta Musicologica*, 60(3), 306-310. doi:10.2307/932756
10. Spencer, D., n.d. Uniformitarianism: Definition, Principles & Examples. [online] Study.com. Available at: <<https://study.com/academy/lesson/uniformitarianism-definition-principles-examples.html>> [Accessed 14 October 2020].
11. Carpenter, Ellon DeGrief, "The theory of music in Russia and the Soviet Union, ca. 1650-1950" (1988). Dissertations available from ProQuest. AAI8824722. <https://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AI8824722>
12. Taylor, J. (2019). Revolutionaries or Delinquents: The Biopsychological Appraisals of Composers and Their Music in Early Soviet Russia. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 97(1), 39-72. doi:10.5699/slaveasteurorev2.97.1.0039
13. Pauline Fairclough. (2012). "Don't Sing It on a Feast Day": The Reception and Performance of Western Sacred Music in Soviet Russia, 1917–1953. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 65(1), 67-111. doi:10.1525/jams.2012.65.1.67
14. Ibid 3, pg. 84
15. Ibid 8, pg. 243
16. Agnew, J. and Rosenzweig, R., 2006. *A Companion To Post-1945 America*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., pp.143-144.
17. Panteleeva, O. (2019). How Soviet Musicology became Marxist. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 97(1), 73-109. doi:10.5699/slaveasteurorev2.97.1.0073

18. Broyles, M. (1983). Intersects in the Musicological Juncture: On the Relationship between History, Theory, and Criticism. *College Music Symposium*, 23(2), 178. Retrieved September 2, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40374344>
19. Ibid 2
20. Zavlunov, D., 2020. Defining and Defending Music Analysis in the Soviet 1930s. *Music and Politics*, pg.12, 14(2).
21. Rancière, J. (n/a). *The Ignorant Schoolmaster, Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation* [Book]. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
22. Gide, A. and Bussy, D., 2013. Return From The USSR. Page 27. [United States]: Fabri Press.
23. Gates, C.T. and O'Connor, D. (2000), Toward a Healthy Democracy. *Nat Civic Rev*, 89: 161-168. doi:10.1002/ncr.89205
24. Besutti, P., & Ward-Perkins, H. (2000). HISTORY, MUSIC AND MUSICOLOGY IN ITALY IN THE AGE OF THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL 'REVOLUTION'. *Rivista Italiana Di Musicologia*, 35(1/2), 67-106. Retrieved October 14, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24323738>
25. Ibid 1, 115.
26. Frolova-Walker, M. and Walker, J., 2012. *Music And Soviet Power 1917-1932*. 1st ed, 32-34 Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
27. Blum, S. (1975). Towards a Social History of Musicological Technique. *Ethnomusicology*, 19(2), 215-216. doi:10.2307/850356
28. Broyles, M. (1983). Intersects in the Musicological Juncture: On the Relationship between History, Theory, and Criticism. *College Music Symposium*, 23(2), 177-192. Retrieved October 14, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40374344>
Primary Source: Front Matter. (1975). *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 33(3). Retrieved October 14, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/428350>
29. The, N., 2020. The New Yorker, [online] Available at:
<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/08/17> [Accessed 4 September 2020].
30. Welch, R. (1936). THE BEARING OF AESTHETICS AND CRITICISM ON MUSICOLOGY. Papers Read by Members of the American Musicological Society at the Annual Meeting, 24-28
31. Shapiro, B., 2020. *How To Destroy America In Three Easy Steps*. 1st ed. HarperCollins Publishers, p.66.
32. 2015. Report Of The Committee On Freedom Of Expression. [ebook] Chicago: The Committee on Freedom of Expression at the University of Chicago. Available at: <https://provost.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/documents/reports/FOECommitteeReport.pdf> [Accessed 14 October 2020].
33. NEGRI, A., & Bove, A. (2014). THE SOVIETS BETWEEN SPONTANEITY AND THEORY. In *Factory of Strategy: Thirty-Three Lessons on Lenin* (pp. 101-112). New York: Columbia University Press. doi:10.7312/negr14682.15
34. Kelly, S., Truong, M., Shahbaz, A. and Earp, M., 2016. Silencing The Messenger: Communication Apps Under Pressure. [online] Freedom House. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2016/silencing-messenger-communication-apps-under-pressure> [Accessed 4 September 2020].
35. Taruskin, R., 1995. [Https://Www.Oocities.Org/Kuala_Bear/Articles/Taruskin-AM.Html](https://Www.Oocities.Org/Kuala_Bear/Articles/Taruskin-AM.Html). [online] https://www.oocities.org/kuala_bear/articles/Taruskin-AM.html. Available at: https://www.oocities.org/kuala_bear/articles/Taruskin-AM.html [Accessed 14 October 2020].

36. Taruskin, R., 2001. Defining Russia Musically. 1st ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press.