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ABSTRACT

In this dissertation I argue that the Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales (CLAEM, 1962-1971) accurately exemplifies how the embrace of avant-garde art music by several young Latin American composers is crucial to understand the creation and consolidation of particular social groups often identified as elites. This dissertation is a concrete case study of how elites in a formation phase consolidate their status and achieve distinction by looking at the stories composers and patrons tell about themselves, their relation to the musical avant-garde, and discourses of Latin Americanism. By following, consuming, and rearticulating international musical models, the members of this art world—as patrons, composers, critics and listeners—engaged in a hegemonic process that resulted in their legitimization of new elites and the institutionalization of the avant-garde in Argentina.

There are three key questions that I want to answer with this dissertation. First, how was the avant-garde articulated in Latin America, and in which ways did it respond or not to theories of avant-garde movements and modernity in the rest of the world? Second, how were composers during the 1960s engaging with discourses of Latin Americanism as professional strategy, identification marker and musical style? Third, what is the role of art in the legitimation and construction of elite status and identity?

The case study of the CLAEM provides insight into three different aspects of music making, elite art worlds, and the embrace of the avant-garde in Argentina and Latin America during the second half of the twentieth century. These aspects become my main themes throughout the dissertation. The first theme involves the unique way in which composers at the CLAEM followed, consumed, and rearticulated international models of the avant-garde that were then embodied, resignified and institutionalized. The second theme explores how the CLAEM
was a formative social experience, where transnational connections between actors who are part of the same cultural formation—both from Latin America as well as Europe and the United States—created important networks of solidarity, communication and intellectual exchange and resulted in the adoption of Latin Americanism as a professional strategy and musical style. Finally, this work explores the consolidation of elite groups and the creation of elite art worlds as the result of philanthropic efforts led by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Di Tella family.
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INTRODUCTION

1. Goals, Significance and Themes

Goals

In this dissertation I argue that the Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales (CLAEM, 1962-1971) accurately exemplifies how the embrace of avant-garde art music by several young Latin American composers is crucial to understand the creation and consolidation of particular social groups often identified as elites. This dissertation is a concrete case study of how elites in a formation phase consolidate their status and achieve distinction by looking at the stories composers and patrons tell about themselves, their relation to the musical avant-garde, and discourses of Latinamericanism. By following, consuming, and rearticulating international musical models, the members of this art world—as patrons, composers, critics and listeners—engaged in a hegemonic process that resulted in their legitimization of new elites and the institutionalization of the avant-garde in Argentina.

There are three key questions that I want to answer with this dissertation. First, how was the avant-garde articulated in Latin America, and in which ways did it respond or not to theories of avant-garde movements and modernity in the rest of the world? Second, how were composers during the 1960s engaging with discourses of Latinamericanism as professional strategy, identification marker and musical style? Third, what is the role of art in the legitimation and construction of elite status and identity?
**Significance**

Four decades after its closing, there is no question that the CLAEM at the Di Tella Institute in Buenos Aires was the single most influential institution for Latin American classical music during the second half of the twentieth century. Its impact in generating pan-regional contact among Latin American composers is unique and vital for the understanding of contemporary trends of composition in the region. This is made evident by looking at how many of the fifty-four fellows of the Center became prominent composers in the transnational art world of classical music: Coriún Aharonián, Jorge Antunes, Blas Emilio Atehortúa, Cesar Bolaños, Gabriel Brnčić, Mariano Etkin, Alcides Lanza, Mesías Maiguashca, Marlos Nobre, Jacqueline Nova, Joaquín Orellana, Graciela Paraskevaidis, Edgar Valcárcel, and Alberto Villalpando among others. Moreover, and equally significant, is that a large number of the most promising composers today in Latin America are students of those who attended the CLAEM. Having studied at—or even with someone who attended—the CLAEM is invoked to confer artistic prestige, and implies an embrace of the avant-garde and the adoption of Latinamericanism as a professional strategy and musical style.

There is very little musicological historiography in the United States and Europe concerning the extensive, creative, and active classical musical life throughout Latin America. As part of the Western art music experience, the CLAEM seems to have been unthinkable from U.S. and European musicological perspectives, and its history has been truly silenced.\(^1\) Despite the Institution’s importance and the participation of major seminal figures such as Aaron Copland, Alberto Ginastera, Bruno Maderna, Riccardo Malipiero, Luigi Nono, and Iannis Xenakis, the CLAEM simply does not appear in canonical writing. Similar places where composers from many nationalities met and studied with important figures such as IRCAM in...

\(^1\) Trouillot 1995, 26.
Paris\textsuperscript{2} or the Darmstadt’s International Summer Courses for New Music\textsuperscript{3} have received much more attention, and the reasons are at least twofold. On one hand, studies by historical musicologists in Latin America have focused on a small number of composers that closely follow Euro-American cosmopolitan models and who were successful in Europe and the U.S. (e.g. Carlos Chávez, Heitor Villa-Lobos and Alberto Ginastera).\textsuperscript{4} On the other, while a few scholars have engaged in the study of Western classical music from and ethnomusicological perspective,\textsuperscript{5} only El-Ghadban and Gidal have looked at Latin America.\textsuperscript{6} Unfortunately as of 2012, Latin America classical music remains marginalized and understudied in U.S. and European musicology.\textsuperscript{7}

The contemporary music art world\textsuperscript{8} around the CLAEM was simultaneously shaping and being shaped by the people that participated in it as patrons, composers, critics, administrators, or audiences. Music, as Sugarman has pointed out, is an expressive form that “evokes a world of meanings located in other realms of experience” and at the same time it is “a form of


\textsuperscript{3} For instance, \textit{Contemporary Music Review} 26 (1) from 2007 was fully dedicated to the Darmstadt Summer Courses. See also Gianmario Borio and Hermann Danuser’s \textit{Im Zenit der Moderne. Die Internationalen Ferienkurse für Neue Musik Darmstadt 1946-1966} (1997).


\textsuperscript{5} See Largey 2006; Small 2006 and 1987; Nettl 1992; Kingsbury 1988; in sociology and anthropology, a necessary reference is Bourdieu 1984.

\textsuperscript{6} See El-Ghadban (2009) and Gidal (2010).

\textsuperscript{7} See Burkholder 2009 for a discussion about historical narratives of Western classical music and the absence of Latin America in academic production.

\textsuperscript{8} Howard Becker, in what is still the most complete sociological view of art as a product consequence of a collective action, looks at the art work as the outcome of a complex interaction between the artist and the complex networks of brokers, critics, performers dealers, consumers, performers, patrons, government, etc. In a purposefully tautological manner, he defines an art world as the “network of people whose cooperative activity, organized via their joint knowledge of conventional means of doing things, produces the kind of art works that art world is noted for.” Becker 1982, x.
representation that participates fundamentally in constituting those worlds.”\(^9\) It was precisely through music making and the promotion of avant-garde art in general that the power and status of an emerging elite in Buenos Aires was being both reproduced and actively transformed. This makes art music crucial to understand the creation and consolidation of elites. The significance of the adoption of the avant-garde at the CLAEM cannot be properly understood without referring to the two groups that benefited directly from this and look back at those years as a turning point. On one hand, the Di Tella family, a new industrial elite that emerged in opposition to a conservative agro-exporting elite. On the other, a young generation of Latin American composers that embraced avant-garde composition and rejected models of nationalist writing in classical music. Both elite groups were engaged in a power struggle with different generations and against more conservative and provincial elites. In the end, both groups benefited: the Di Tella as an economic elite gained prestige and consolidated political power lasting until today, while the artistic elite established strong transnational networks of solidarity and institutionalized avant-garde musical practices. This process of emerging hegemony of these elites is at the core of the significance of this project.

Themes

The case study of the CLAEM provides insight into three different aspects of music making, elite art worlds, and the embrace of the avant-garde in Argentina and Latin America during the second half of the twentieth century. These aspects become my main themes throughout the dissertation:

1. The unique way in which composers at the CLAEM followed, consumed, and rearticulated international models of the avant-garde that were then embodied, resignified and institutionalized.

2. The CLAEM as a formative social experience, where transnational connections between actors who are part of the same cultural formation—both from Latin America as well as Europe and the United States—create important networks of solidarity, communication and intellectual exchange and result in the adoption of Latinamericanism as a professional strategy and musical style.

3. The consolidation of elite groups and the creation of elite art worlds as the result of philanthropic efforts led by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Di Tella family.

2. Methodology: Oral History, Fieldwork and Archival Work

My investigation consisted of a combination of oral history, ethnographic fieldwork and archival research. During my trips to Argentina and Uruguay I was able to undertake formal interviews and engage in informal conversations with composers and musicians who were part of the music scene in Buenos Aires during the 1960s. At the same time I examined the writings that were significant at the time in this context, including program notes, essays written by composers and performers, music criticism texts, published interviews, articles in popular magazines and scholarly texts, as well as surviving material evidence of the CLAEM in archives and libraries. In particular I visited the archives of the Di Tella University in Buenos Aires, which were made available to the public only in 2004, the Rockefeller Archive Center in New York, the Paul Sacher Foundation in Basel, Switzerland and the Aharonián-Paraskevaidis private collection in Montevideo.

I did fieldwork and historical research in Buenos Aires and to some degree Montevideo over a period of five month; first for one month in 2005, then for three months in 2008, and finally for one month in 2011. During this time I took formal and informal composition, analysis and music history lessons, played and listened to music, went to concerts, ate, drank and partied
with several composers that attended the CLAEM. My objective during these visits was to gain insight into the everyday experience at the center by doing a series of interviews, spending time and establishing close contact with surviving members of the CLAEM, as well as other intellectuals, patrons of the arts, and academics who lived in Buenos Aires during the 1960s. I was able to contact over 75% of the composers who studied at the CLAEM, including those who did not continue their artistic endeavors after their tenure at the center.

During my time and interviews with composers residing in Buenos Aires and Montevideo, I also tried to understand composers’ intentions regarding their own compositions and their response to the music of their peers. Their commentaries about the style and intention behind specific compositions serve as a backdrop to my analysis of scores and performances at the CLAEM, keeping in mind that there is a strong belief among them in the autonomy of art. I had the opportunity to talk to only a few audience members outside the circle of composers involved in the CLAEM. Still, their feedback was useful for understanding the type of appeal the works had—almost none outside the initiated—and how in general the audience consisted of composers, artists and people associated with the CLAEM, forming a relatively small and tightly bound cohort, many of whom are still in contact through professional and personal ties. I decided to contact composers outside of Buenos Aires and Montevideo initially through email, and then follow up with telephone conversations. In 2011 I was invited to participate in the 50-year reunion of the founding of the center in Buenos Aires—once more proving my fears of the inaccurate histories surrounding the center, since it had only begun its activities in 1962 and not

---

10 I am particularly grateful to Graciela Paraskevaïdis, Coriúin Aharonián, Gerardo Gandini, Ariel Martínez, Mariano Etkin and Eduardo Kusnir who were my main collaborators during my stay. In Uruguay, Graciela and Coriúin where kind enough to open their house to me, hosted me for several weeks, and graciously allowed me to have a sense of “deep hanging out.” (See Geertz 1998, 69-72).
in 1961—and I had the opportunity to talk personally and enjoy the celebratory week-long gathering with the majority of the composers I had not met in person.

While doing fieldwork I also had the opportunity to spend some time and talk with members of the particular elite that at the time were patrons of this type of art. Torcuato S. Di Tella and his sister-in-law Nelly Di Tella, widow of Guido Di Tella, opened their doors to me and agreed to a series of interviews and visits to their living and work places. Nelly was particularly warm, and even in poor health welcomed my visits and inquires. Enrique Oteiza, who had been Executive Director of the Di Tella Institute and one of the key figures in the establishment of the art centers, was an excellent storyteller of the adventure that he and Guido Di Tella embarked upon when they were only in their late twenties. They invested their energy, intellect and most importantly, their economic capital to realize their dream of creating a center for avant-garde art. Finally, my conversations in Buenos Aires with Georgina Ginastera, daughter of Alberto Ginastera, and in Geneva, Switzerland, with Aurora Nátola, his widow, gave me a wonderful opportunity to understand the specific personal situation that Ginastera was going through at the time of the closing of the CLAEM, something that has not yet been considered as part of the story, but that I have found to be crucial to understanding this particular time period.

3. Studying the CLAEM

Literature on the CLAEM

In 1996 the Uruguayan composer Coriún Aharonián called attention to the surprising lack of accuracy and documentation regarding the CLAEM at the Di Tella Institute in his article “El Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales: En búsqueda de una documentación...”
escamoteada” (1996). In 2007 John King noticed that a musicological account of the CLAEM still remained to be written. King’s *El Di Tella, y el desarrollo cultural argentino en la década del sesenta* (1985), is the only comprehensive book to date on the Di Tella Institute art centers. For his initial research King claims to have had full access to the archives between 1978 and 1980, and at the end of his book he transcribes several interviews with administrators, artists and political figures at the time. King begins providing the socio-cultural context for the centers, emphasizing the cosmopolitan desires of Argentina in the Post-Perón era, the discourse of developmentalism among the elites at the time, and the break between a conservative elite and a liberal and modernizing elite. He divides the history of the centers between their creation (1958-1963), their development (1963-1966), a period marked by the political and economic crisis (1966-1970), and their closing. In each of his chapters, King gives a general overview of the three art centers at the Di Tella Institute, the Center for Visual Arts (CAV), the Center for Audiovisual Experimentation (CEA) and the CLAEM, and provides some inaccurate listings about some of the attendees and guest composers.

King’s book is far from being a complete resource about the CLAEM, or any of the other centers, and this was not his objective. When King wrote his book in the early 1980s, he was a

11 The two centers also connected to the Di Tella Institute, the Audiovisual Experimentation Center and the Visual Arts Center, have received somewhat more attention in the literature, most importantly by Andrea Giunta in her *Avant-Garde, Internationalism, and Politics: Argentine Art in the Sixties*. Other relevant works that complement Giunta’s are *Arte Visual en el Di Tella: Aventura Memorable en los Años 60* (Romero Brest, 1992), and *Instituto Di Tella: Experiencias ’68* (Rizzo, Terán and Fragasso, 1998).

12 King 2007, 33.

13 Most texts dedicated to Argentinean or Latin American classical music briefly mention the CLAEM basing their incomplete, and frequently inaccurate information on King. For instance see Arizaga-Camps (1990), Béhague (1979), Huseby (1999), Roldán (1996), or Veniard (2000). A similar situation occurs with works about Ginastera, where his role as director of the Center is treated lightly as part of his legacy as an educator. See for example Storni (1983) and Suárez Urtubey (1972, 2003).
young scholar who had met Guido Di Tella in Oxford. It was that relationship that led King to write about the art centers, even though his main interest was literature and the 1930s magazine *Sur*. My work adds much needed depth to King’s both in the general understanding of the philanthropy involved in the creation of the CLAEM and in the details about the participants in the center. I rarely cite King, having chosen to revisit all original sources, but his work is certainly considered an authoritative source in Argentina on the history of the Di Tella Institute as a whole.

Several Argentinean scholars have started to become interested in the CLAEM. Esteban Buch has had access to the CLAEM archive for his recent works focused on Alberto Ginastera’s relationship with Luigi Nono, Juan Carlos Paz, and the censorship of his opera *Bomarzo* (2002, 2003, 2007). However, Buch’s focus on Ginastera and the CLAEM is only peripheral to his research and repeats some of King’s factual mistakes. The epistolary work of Laura Novoa (2007 and 2011) has centered so far on the publication of original letters selected after a thorough examination of the archives. Her work makes these resources available to future researchers without physical access to the archives.

Hernán Gabriel Vázquez is another Argentinean scholar that has done some important musicological work on the CLAEM. Vázquez’s work, written in 2008, is a master’s thesis looking at the reception of both Ginastera’s work, and Contemporary Music Festivals and Fellows Seminar’s concerts between 1963 and 1966 in local Buenos Aires newspapers. Using Bourdieu’s notion of fields of cultural production, he argues that Buenos Aires musicians, music critics and connoisseurs at this time were divided between two camps: nationalists and twelve-tone composers. By exploring the reception of works presented at the CLAEM, he shows that the same work or aesthetic could be interpreted as avant-garde, conventional, retrograde or even
considered not music by some of the commentators, depending on the socio-musical framework from which they emerged, thus leading to a very uneven reception. His position regarding the reception of the CLAEM is well informed, and certainly gives perspective to the limited impact that the Center had outside a minority of local enthusiasts. Although it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to focus on reception history, some of my discussions about concerts and critics in the years after 1966 certainly add to the picture presented by Vázquez, and to a certain degree challenge the simplicity of a dual front of nationalists and universalists.

**Studying the CLAEM in Relation to Cold War Musicology and Cultural Studies**

Studies on music patronage and Cold War politics have focused almost uniquely on U.S. and European music making. In a recent volume of the *Journal of Musicology* dedicated to music and the Cold War, Peter Schmelz pointed out that “unfortunately, musicology is still generally lacking scholarship on non-European and non-American parts of the globe, slowing a full discussion of the global Cold War. This imbalance between North and South needs to be remedied.” Perspectives on the Cold War require us to take into account a multiplicity of international interactions, including apparently peripheral countries to the conflict such as Argentina. As Painter argues, “although Soviet-American rivalry was the dominant feature of the international system from 1945 to 1991, the Cold War encompassed much more than US-Soviet relations.”

How does the story of the CLAEM fit within broader narratives of classical music and the Cold War and of the patronage of musical production of the post World War II era? Frances

---

14 Vázquez, 2008: 32.  
15 Schmelz 2009, 8.  
16 Painter 1999, 2.
Stonor Saunders begins her book *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters* with the following passage:

During the height of the Cold War, the US government committed vast resources to a secret programme of cultural propaganda in Western Europe. A central feature of this programme was to advance the claim that it did not exist. It was managed, in great secrecy, by America’s espionage arm, the Central Intelligence Agency.\(^\text{17}\)

The lack of a secretary of culture or equivalent cabinet member in the U.S. government resulted in the surprising situation that the role of promoting cultural expressions aligned with the country’s interest ended up in the hands of its largest intelligence agency. The propaganda apparatus of the United States as leader of the free world in post-War Europe received heavy criticism and strong accusations of cultural imperialism, Americanization, and coca-colonialism.\(^\text{18}\) Saunders extensively examines how the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation “were conscious instruments of covert US foreign policy, with directors and officers who were closely connected to, or even members of American intelligence.”\(^\text{19}\) A key element that made this strategy effective was that the individual members of these institutions were in reality a small number of people and formed “a network of ‘private’ groups or ‘friends’ [systematically organized] into an unofficial consortium.”\(^\text{20}\) In this way, through their role in philanthropic foundations, business corporations and other institutions, they become a funding pipeline for covert operations in cultural affairs and thus, a weapon for the Cold War.\(^\text{21}\) These individuals simultaneously represented the interests of the U.S. economic elite and government.

\(^{17}\) Saunders 2000, 1.
\(^{18}\) Taylor 1999, 227; see also Wagnleitner 1994.
\(^{19}\) Saunders 2000, 138-139.
\(^{20}\) Ibid, 129.
\(^{21}\) Ibid.
In Europe, the “battle for the hearts and minds” of artists was concerned with opposing socialist realism. Among the best-known projects sponsored in U.S. campaigns of cultural propaganda was the Congress for Cultural Freedom, which ran from 1950 until 1967 under the direction of CIA agent Michael Josselson. Heading the music section of the Congress for Cultural Freedom was Nicolas Nabokov, a Russian-born music historian and composer.

However, the Cultural Cold War conditions in post-War Europe and Latin America were quite dissimilar. The issues and interests of the late 1940s and 1950s coming out of the Cold War were of a different nature to those of the 1960s, when Latin America becomes of interest for U.S. cultural diplomacy. The death of Stalin in 1953 and the reforms implemented by Nikita Khrushchev during the following years necessarily changed the policies of both East and West. While Eastern Europe, and Germany in particular, played a central role in the struggle between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., Latin America occupied a peripheral position, at least until the Cuban Revolution.

---

22 The ‘battle for the hearts and minds’ became a common way to refer to Western propaganda at least as early as the 1950s. See Timothy Lomperis’ From People's War to People's Rule: Insurgency, Intervention, and the Lessons of Vietnam, 1996, 217.

23 The Congress’ most direct attempts of propaganda in Latin America was the journal Cuadernos por la libertad de la cultura (or simply Cuadernos) in 1953, under the direction of Julian Gorkin. (Saunders 2000, 213). The Congress sponsored the publication of a variety of journals, funded by the CIA through front organizations. Although earlier Gorkin had been able to invite some interesting writers such as Gilberto Freyre, Raúl Haya de la Torre and even Fidel Castro before the revolution, very quickly the journal became quite unpopular among young writers who refused to collaborate within its pages, with a few significant—and perhaps uninformed—exceptions: Jorge Luis Borges, Octavio Paz. Gorkin, a profuse anti-communist. Cuadernos published, for example, essays that although critical, ultimately defended under the communist threat of Arbenz the Castillo Armas coup d’état in Guatemala. As Franco puts it, “Gorkin’s argument was symptomatic of the problems of defending unfreedom as freedom” (Franco 2002, 33). Cuadernos ceased publication in 1965 after the Colombian Germán Arciniegas replaced Gorkin. See Franco’s The decline and fall of the lettered city: Latin America in the Cold War (Franco 2002, 32-36).
Although the aesthetic preferences and tendencies at the CLAEM were indeed affected by the different sources of funding and the Cold War ideologies behind them, I would argue that these effects were in no manner comparable to the pre-conceived uses of art as propaganda that had been occurring in Europe in the earlier decades. The study of Cold War strategies in Latin America needs to take into consideration the specific conditions that made this region different from Europe. On one hand, the economic plans that were used had essentially different objectives. The Marshall plan (officially the European Recovery Program) was meant to recover the already ‘modern’ societies of Western Europe during the late 1940s and early 1950s, while the Alliance for Progress was meant to modernize the ‘traditional,’ that is, economically underdeveloped societies of Latin America during the 1960s. In a parallel way, support for programs in the arts in Europe had the preconceived assumption of an established tradition of composers, musicians, artists and audiences that could be used to showcase the intellectual and artistic success of the free world, while those for Latin America presupposed outdated aesthetics and the need for guidance and teachings. These assumptions underlie the reasoning in the following interview with Ginastera about the goals of the CLAEM:

With all the limitations there are in many of our Latin American countries for musical teaching, where what prevails is the concepts and techniques of old Italian band masters, we found that the average young student came with an interesting formation, but little evolved. Our job has been to update their technique and reinforce their basic knowledge.24

Latin America was not seen as a particularly threat in the aesthetic realm, and the main goal in supporting the arts was to promote its modernization and steer its intellectuals away from the appeal of the Cuban Revolution and into the U.S. sphere of influence. For composers with left-wing orientations during the 1960s like Coriún Aharonián, Mariano Etkin, Gabriel Brnčić or

Eduardo Kusnir, the direct enemy was U.S. imperialist capitalism. And in general it was Havana rather than in Moscow what caught their imagination. In actuality, several of the composers attending the CLAEM had already established close relationships to the music scene in Havana—Eduardo Kusnir, for instance had directed the Cuban National Ballet between 1962 and 1965 and had toured China and the USSR before becoming a fellow—or ended up visiting the island in the years to follow. At least during the first decade after the triumph of the Revolution on December 31, 1958, the Cuban socialist government supported the avant-garde in its most ultra-modern facets, mirroring similar conditions in the USSR.\(^\text{25}\) The ‘new revolutionary man’ needed a new art, and that was what the avant-garde offered. Composers like Juan Blanco, Leo Brouwer, Carlos Fariñas, Hector Angulo and Harold Gramatges developed a strong contemporary music scene in the island during that first decade, and this was an appealing notion for other musicians in the rest of Latin America.\(^\text{26}\)

The general artistic conditions and appeal of the events in Cuba were a clear concern in the United States. If one were to point out one main drive behind the cultural policies implemented in Latin America both by governmental and non-governmental agencies during the 1960s, it would have to be in one degree or another, the luring of Latin American intellectuals away from identifying with the Cuban Revolution. In that regard, my research stands closer to Giunta’s in that it shows that the interpretations that scholars have traditionally provided regarding the deployment of U.S. art and discourse about art in Europe are not translatable to Latin America.\(^\text{27}\) Responding mostly to the oft-cited arguments of Guilbaut in \textit{How New York...}

---

\(^{25}\) Discussions about art’s role as part of the Cuban revolutionary process were often printed in leftist intellectual magazines such as \textit{Casa de las Américas}, a common publication space for Latin American composers and musicologists. See Giunta 2007, 13.

\(^{26}\) See Century 1987.

Stole the Idea of Modern Art (1983), Giunta explains that “in contrast to Europe, abstract expressionism was not a ‘weapon of the Cold War’ in Latin America. Until the 1960s, Argentine art was influenced considerably more by Europe than by the United States.”

Although here the discussion refers mostly to painting, this was certainly the case for music too. Even though a composer like Ginastera spent extended periods of time in the United States, it was Europe that still captured the aesthetic imagination of most composers. By the 1960s, in the United States it seemed only New York had been able to gain a stature similar to that of Paris or Vienna.

Contrasting Cold War Strategies in Europe and Latin America

Most scholarly work on Cold War policies and elite art worlds covers in depth only the immediate post-war years. Cold War musicological studies have been particularly rich in looking into cultural diplomacy as deployed from the United States, not just with the avant-garde but also with other genres, most prominently jazz. The most studied sites have been the Congress for Cultural Freedom, radio broadcasts by the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty, and the various U.S. State Department musical tours.

Even with the emphasis on early post-war years, some of the existing literature provides interesting origins for several of the widespread notions about avant-garde music composition and its relationship to Cold War politics. In this respect, the studies focused on the Darmstadt International Summer Courses for

\[ \text{References:} \]

28 Giunta 2007, 11.


31 In the same vein, another recurring topic has been the notion of ‘reconstruction’ or de-Nazification of the country as it appears in the work of Janik’s Recomposing German Music (2005) and in Thaker’s Music After Hitler 1945-1955 (2007). Janik’s book brings together the concern with foreign influence and reconstruction as she examines the influence of both Germany’s U.S. and Soviet occupiers between 1945 and 1951. Janik’s work, like Beckles
New Music by Beal (2000) and Kordes (2002) provide valuable insights as they have parallels with the story of the CLAEM. Kordes argues that the Internationale Ferienkurse für Neue Musik Darmstadt, starting in 1946, was meant to “enable composers to exchange information with international colleagues and familiarize themselves with compositional techniques and works that had been forbidden by the totalitarian regimes in their respective countries.”

She also argues,

The search for a new, untainted musical tradition led inevitably to the Second Viennese School. A politically neutral musical style offering opportunities for further development was discovered in the works of Anton von Webern during the 1949 Darmstadt courses through a series of productive misreadings. This perception of political neutrality of certain musical styles—even considering the Austro-German origins of serialism—became widespread so that “both the German government and the occupying powers encouraged this trend toward abstract music with politically motivated cultural funding decisions.”

Beal’s research contributes to studies about the Darmstadt Courses by studying the relationships between German philanthropists, U.S. officers in charge of music in occupied Germany, and U.S. composers in Darmstadt in the context of postwar and Cold War politics. She makes a compelling case of how two officers in the Theater and Music Branch of the Office of Military Government of the United States (OMGUS)—Everett Helm and John Evarts—are key to understanding the increased interest in U.S. experimental composers in West Germany. Like Beal, I demonstrate the value of individual actors occupying specific positions of power from where they can enact policy in a manner that resonates with their own personal beliefs.

Willson’s Ligeti, Kurtág, and Hungarian Music during the Cold War (2007), covers the decades of the 1960s through the 1990s, but is not as in-depth.

Kordes 2002, 209.
Ibid, 211.
Ibid, 205.
Beal 2000, 106.
In recent years there have been several challenges to the oversimplified association of Western atonal aestheticist modernism with freedom versus Soviet tonal socialist realism with control. As Vázquez has pointed out, the situation might have actually been quite the opposite in the musical scene of Buenos Aires, since at least by the 1950s “composers that led in the creation and spread of twelve-tone techniques in Latin America were connected with political ideas close to left-wing socialism: Juan Carlos Paz in Argentina and, most importantly, Hans-Joachim Koellreutter in Brazil.” In general, it would be difficult to make the case that there was any type of direct pressure on the aesthetics of musical compositions that were created at the CLAEM, other than the tensions between nationalism and universalism and the belief that compositions should follow the newest cutting-edge trends in the art music composition world.

4. The CLAEM in Context

Beginning May 1, 1962, the Rockefeller Foundation, together with the Di Tella Foundation, provided major support for the creation of the Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales (CLAEM) at the Torcuato Di Tella Institute in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Between 1963 and 1971 the CLAEM had fifty-four fellows who worked with some of the most prominent figures of the Western classical music tradition under the direction of Alberto Ginastera.

Ideologically and artistically the CLAEM was immersed in multiple trends of music composition associated with the avant-garde. Part of the Center’s mission was to provide direct

36 More than any other composer, the music of Luigi Nono has been used to reconcile serialism or other modernist approaches with communism, socialist realism, and various nationalistic concerns. See Bruce Durazzi’s “Musical Poetics and Political Ideology in the Work of Luigi Nono” (2005).
contact with the compositional models generated from the international centers of power. Ginastera and most composers at the Center felt that composition followed a clear forward progression, and Latin American composers were behind. The composers at the CLAEM were consciously trying to be part of the avant-garde but they found themselves part of a marginal music tradition that appealed only to a very small minority of people and that was heavily attacked by music critics. International success was ultimately what would legitimate their efforts locally. Many of the fifty-four fellows of the Center became prominent composers in the transnational art world of classical music: Coriún Aharonián, Mariano Etkin, Alcides Lanza, Mesías Maiguashca, Jacqueline Nova, Joaquín Orellana, and Graciela Paraskevaidis, among others.

Throughout this work I will examine the history of the CLAEM from multiple vantage points. This story does not follow a clean, straight path. It is instead messy, has multiple overlapping folds, sometimes following trails that lead nowhere, and sometimes leaving unresolved issues along the way. The creation of the center was a process that took years and involved multiple people, sometimes moving in parallel with similar intentions. The cycles of two-year fellowships provided certain periodicity, but it would be wrong to consider them as tight or clear boundaries. In other words, this history is similar to many other histories: it is not restrained by imposed chronological boundaries and not teleological in most of its branches. However, for clarity, this section presents a short summary of the main socio-historical conditions that surrounded the creation, existence and final closing of the CLAEM. Some of these elements will be explored more carefully in the following chapters, but the picture provided here should be a guide for the reader who is encountering the CLAEM and the conditions in Argentina and Latin America during this period for the first time.
Latin America-U.S. Relations: The Cuban Revolution and the Alliance for Progress

When looking at philanthropy as a mediated implementation of foreign policy by a sector between the public and private spheres, there is little argument that the success of the Cuban Revolution was an ultimate if not proximate reason behind the Rockefeller Foundation’s interest in financing the CLAEM project. Ideologically, both the officers and trustees of the Foundation held the ECLA-derived\textsuperscript{38} notions of modernization theory and developmentalism, common at the time among cosmopolitans. Philanthropic and governmental organizations alike saw in modernization the democratic mechanism to promote advancement throughout the Third World, and an antidote to the spread of socialist or communist revolutions.

After the Second World War, Latin America occupied a low priority for U.S. economic assistance, particularly in comparison to Europe. However, to describe the situation as neglectful would be misleading since the interest of the United States in maintaining its influence over South America did not diminish in comparison to the years before the War. During the Eisenhower administration (1953-1961) aid towards Latin America almost tripled, from an average of .16 billion per year during the Truman years to 0.5 billion. Despite this significant economic investment, the United States foreign policy continued to oppose “any effort to establish a Latin American development fund, to stabilize the prices of raw materials, to strengthen national development corporations, to permit greater Latin American access to the United States market, and so on.”\textsuperscript{39} This hands-off policy towards Latin America surprisingly

\textsuperscript{38} ECLA was the Economic Commission for Latin America at the United Nations, now called ECLAC. From his position as secretary-general of ECLA, Raúl Prebisch was one of the main proponents of modernization theory and import substitution industrialization.

\textsuperscript{39} Baily 1976, 68.
remained the same until the end of the 1950s, and it led to the growth of unsympathetic attitudes towards the U.S. government across the region.

By 1958, particularly after the hostility showed to vice-President Nixon during his visit to Caracas, Lima, and Montevideo, the Eisenhower administration found the need to reformulate their position regarding the region. With the president’s brother, Milton Eisenhower, as adviser on Latin America, the U.S. began to support social development programs and to encourage an increased role for the government in economic development. Nonetheless, it was the triumph of the Cuban Revolution, on December 31, 1958, that forced a more radical change in direction. The revolutionary spirit in general—and Guevarismo in particular—became “obsessions of both politics of repression and of propaganda. [...] Guevarismo and the Cuban model caused insomnia [not only in the West] but also in the U.S.S.R. and its East European allies.”

The Cuban Revolution, the failed attack at the Bay of Pigs in 1961, and the missile crisis of 1962 brought Latin America to center stage of U.S. foreign policy. Castro’s success made it clear that communism was a true possibility for Latin American countries that were looking for structural changes to diminish inequality, achieve social and land reform, and improve living conditions.

Establishment and Failure of the Alliance for Progress

The Alliance for Progress emerged as a response to the fear of the spreading of revolutionary movements in the manner of the Cuban Revolution. Many authors agree that “had there been no Cuban Revolution, there is little evidence to suggest that there would have

---

40 Coriún Aharonián, email with the author, Montevideo, April 19, 2009.
41 The concept, implementation, and lessons from the Alliance for Progress regarding economic development have been carefully considered by Taffet 2007; Rabe 1989; Scheman 1988; Baily 1976; Michaels 1976; Schlesinger, 1975 and Levinson 1970
been an Alliance for Progress of such magnitude.” In 1962 a pamphlet published by Dean Rusk—former president of the Rockefeller Foundation—Fowler Hamilton from the Agency for International Development argues that the Alliance for Progress was the way in which we, working with our friends and neighbors in Latin America, are endeavoring to cooperate with them to help their societies face the very difficult political and economic stresses and strains that have been imposed upon them by economic conditions that have developed within the last few years [...] and most of all by the fact that the Communists are now coming into this hemisphere in an endeavor to exploit the problems that our friends in Latin America have, in the hope that they can produce chaos, as preliminary to Communist takeovers.

Engrained in the Alliance was the tension between a conservative post-McCarthyism that promoted any and all alliances to stop communism, and a liberal anti-communist agenda that advocated the need for social revolution within democratic principles. Arguably this tension would ultimately lead to what Taffet calls the Alliance’s “slow fade to irrelevance.”

Although the particular programs that were directly supported by the Alliance for Progress did not encompass the arts, what I find interesting here is the prevailing ideas about what a successful U.S. foreign policy towards Latin America looked like. Many of the individuals involved in the formulation of these policies and the general notions that they held were in contact and belonged to the same social networks as those in the philanthropic foundations that provided grants, such as those for the art centers at the Di Tella Institute. What I argue is not just that these ideas were the backdrop for the birth of projects like the CLAEM, but that the same groups of people, acting in different structural positions, also articulated the discourses of modernization in various sectors—many of which were open to them as a specific result of their economic capacity.

42 Baily 1976, 83; see also Levinson and Onis 1970; Michaels 1976; Perloff 1969; and Rabe 1989.
44 Taffet 2007, 175.
The Alliance for Progress was a ten-year Latin American economic and social development program that promised a decade of economic help in service of development and social reform.\textsuperscript{45} Being the largest foreign aid program to the region, the Alliance for Progress was based on the fundamental ideas of modernizing elites about what Latin America needed to do to escape its high levels of poverty, inequality, corruption and underdevelopment.\textsuperscript{46} Ideologically, the program was based on the principles of economic modernization theory, and its most important source was Walt W. Rostow’s 1960’s book \textit{The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto}.\textsuperscript{47} Rostow had been part of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS, the direct predecessor of the CIA), was presidential adviser to John F. Kennedy and heavily involved with foreign policy during his government. Rostow had also been dissertation advisor to Guido Di Tella during his PhD studies in economics.

As the 1960s advanced, the failure of the Alliance for Progress, together with the worsening of the economic, social, and political crises in the region showed that development in Latin America would not happen without some serious structural changes. With the possibility of communism looming on the horizon, the Johnson and Nixon administrations found they were equally determined to support governments, whether democratic or authoritarian, that would protect U.S. interests in the region, promote economic growth and stop communism.\textsuperscript{48} Already by 1964 the threat of Castro’s revolution had diminished and Vietnam had become a major issue.

\textsuperscript{45} The Alliance for Progress originated out of a 1958 plan entitled “Operation Pan America,” which President Kubitschek of Brazil developed in an effort to raise living standards in Latin America. The “Alliance for Progress” as such was first officially formulated in March 1961 by President John F. Kennedy and signed in August at the Inter-American Conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay (Baily 1976, 85).

\textsuperscript{46} For a detailed account of the specific goals of the Alliance for Progress see Feis 1964, 123.

\textsuperscript{47} The stages as proposed by Rostow in his highly structuralist model are 1) the traditional society, 2) the preconditions for the take-off, 2) the take-off, 3) the drive to maturity, 4) the age of high mass consumption (See Rostow 1960).

\textsuperscript{48} Baily 1976, 105-106. See also Michaels 1976, 88 and Levinson and Onis 1970, 77-78.
Perhaps the clearest demonstrations of these new postures were the immediate recognition of the military government in Brazil during 1964 and the financial support given to it, as well as the warm welcome offered to the military government in Argentina in 1966 with an increase in aid “from an annual average of $31 million in 1964-65 to $45 million in 1966-68.”

*The CLAEM, Foreign Policy, and the Rockefeller Foundation*

Who was formulating the U.S. foreign policy described above, and what if any was their relation with the private foundations that funded the CLAEM project? When talking about notions such as foreign policy, foundations, corporations, or the elite, there is a tendency to ignore power relations as they happen at the individual level. At the same time there is a concern that locating power in these instances is a lost cause and it is assumed that it might only be found inside a complex labyrinth of a bureaucratic system. To broadly look at the upper class becomes an oversimplification that does not clearly portray the particular manipulations of diverse interest groups.

In 1969 the sociologist William Domhoff’s examined the notion that foreign policy in the United States was “initiated, planned and carried out by the richest, most powerful, and most international-minded [sic] owners and managers of corporations and financial institutions.” Domhoff argues that much more than congress, the military or public opinion, the most important institutions involved in U.S. foreign policy decision-making “are large corporations, closely related charitable foundations, two or three discussion and research associations, the National Security Council of the federal government, and special committees appointed by the

---

49 Ibid, 108.
50 See Bell 1958 and Lears 1989.
51 Domhoff 1969, 25.
President.” In his examples he looks at how foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation were key participants and major contributors to so-called non-partisan research and discussion groups such as the Council on Foreign Relations. Domhoff quotes Dan Smoot’s *The Invisible Government* (1962) who showed that by the beginning of the 1960s, “12 of 20 Rockefeller Foundation trustees, 10 of 15 Ford Foundation trustees, and 10 of 14 Carnegie Corporation trustees were members of CFR [the Council on Foreign Relations].” The council functioned as a middle ground between large corporations and federal government, and as a type of school for statesmen since Council members were frequently brought to work on high posts in postwar administration at the United Nations. The most important aspect of the Council on Foreign Relations program for Domhoff is the organization of study groups that explore particular problems in foreign affairs, financed by Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller.

The role of the different private and public foundations in funding social science research and other types of intellectual production has been a frequently controversial topic. As Terence Ball points out:

One might suppose that here, as elsewhere, that old adage applies: He who pays the piper calls the tune. If so, it is not called consciously and directly but unconsciously and indirectly. That is, these agencies and foundations by no means predetermine the specific outcome or findings of social science research. They do, however, determine the sorts of questions that researchers ask and answer and the sorts of inquires and investigations deemed worthy of support…

Berman’s 1983 study on the influence of the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundation on U.S. foreign policy is the most significant scholarly attempt to critically analyze what “many people suspected” but had not been researched, “that the foundations’ influence extended beyond

---

52 Ibid, 29.
53 Smoot 1962 quoted on Domhoff 1969, 30; see also Berman 1983, 36.
54 Ball 1989, 83.
their acknowledged activities and numerous programs.” As Berman shows, these three large philanthropic foundations have always occupied a role as “silent partners in United States policy determination” and were vital part “in the ideological support system of state capitalism.” Berman’s main claim is that since the foundations represent the ruling class, therefore they are perpetuating and legitimizing the state capitalist system, therefore asserting that the foundations are instrumental in exerting a cultural hegemony of the ruling elite.

What I see as most significant to frame the discussion of the role of the Rockefeller Foundation’s officers in the story of the CLAEM is perhaps one of the points that Berman missed in his analysis. I would argue that more than the simple substitution of ‘benevolence’ for ‘hypocritical self-interest’ that Berman seems to impose on the foundation’s objectives, what is happening is that resonant ideas of a particular group of individuals are being supported in different realms of political life. A particular worldview, that of modernist capitalism as fueled by a Cold War imaginary, with an added commitment to social reform and the belief in developmentalism, was being deployed simultaneously, in many cases by the same people, in different areas of the public and private spheres.

Since at least 1949 the Rockefeller Foundation, the philanthropic arm of the Rockefeller family, had been considering different ways in which it “could systematically and advantageously consider support for organizations concerned with the performing arts, notably music…” During the 1950s, the Rockefeller Foundation began to sponsor specific artistic programs, all taking place inside the United States. The most important experiment in Latin America started to take shape by the end of the decade, when Cold War and anticommunist

55 Ibid, 2.
56 Ibid, 3.
policies had driven relations between the U.S. and Latin America to their lowest point in decades. On the evening of May 22, 1958, John Paul Harrison, Assistant Director for the Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation, had the first of several meetings with the Argentinean composer Alberto Ginastera to discuss the possibility of creating a study center for Latin American avant-garde composers supported with funds from the Foundation. With the implementation of the Alliance for Progress a couple of years later, the foundation had been laid for this project to succeed.

_The Di Tella Family_

The same year that Harrison and Ginastera first made contact, 1958, Guido and Torcuato Di Tella—brothers who were both under 30 years old and the sole heirs of the largest industrial corporation of Argentina—decided to push forth a plan to make Buenos Aires a center for the artistic avant-garde. The Di Tella brothers had different reasons for supporting the project: one had a sincere appreciation for the arts, the other a desire to increase the family’s prestige. Both agreed that the arts were part of a modernizing project for Argentina, something they had learned to appreciate during their graduate studies at MIT, Oxford and Columbia.

The initial plan was to create an Institute for research that would include cutting edge centers for visual arts (CAV) and theater (CEA). Alberto Ginastera, with the support of Harrison and the Rockefeller Foundation, convinced the Torcuato Di Tella Institute, through its executive director, Enrique Oteiza, and one of the Di Tella brothers, Guido, to act as the host institution for the _Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales_, a third center in their philanthropic adventure with the avant-garde.
The CLAEM and the Political Situation in Argentina during the 1960s

The history of the CLAEM is closely tied to national and international politics, from the Cold War policies and ideologies behind the two grants totaling $312,000 in funding provided by the Rockefeller Foundation towards its creation and upkeep—equivalent to close to $2 million dollars in 2012—, to its uneasy relation with the political turmoil that grew in Argentina throughout the 1960s and eventually led to the Center’s closing. The composers working at this institution, both as professors and as students, were directly and indirectly involved with the ongoing political struggle experienced in Argentina during those years. While the CLAEM was operational, the country underwent the toppling of presidents Arturo Frondizi and Arturo Umberto Illia by the military forces, and the de facto presidencies of Juan Carlos Onganía, Roberto Marcelo Levingston, and Alejandro Agustín Lanusse.

This political turmoil created a setting in which constant scrutiny and political subterfuge intersected with extraordinary moments of musical creativity. Governmental censorship heavily targeted theater and the visual arts—much more than music, especially classical—but composers still feared repression. On July 9, 1966, for instance, Juan Carlos Onganía—de facto president of the nation after a coup d’état twelve days before—presided over the celebration of the sesquicentennial of Argentina’s independence at the Teatro Colón. The highlight of the event was the National Symphonic Orchestra’s performance of the nationalist ballet Estancia, Opus 8 by Alberto Ginastera, director of the CLAEM, who was in the audience. The next year, in 1967, the Argentinean premiere of Ginastera’s opera Bomarzo was prohibited by Onganía’s government after being criticized for its “obsessive reference to sex, violence and hallucination.”58 This event, which would be later known as the “Bomarzo Affair,” a name given by the U.S. ambassador when reporting the news to Washington, highlighted the tense situation

58 Buch, 2003, 17.
for the Centers of the Di Tella Institute, and at the same time surprised the musicians who
assumed art to be autonomous. Onganía’s dictatorship was less violent when compared to those
that emerged in the mid-70s. It was, however, much more actively engaged in censorship and
elevating the moral standards of the population. The building on Florida Street where the
CLAEM was located was frequently closed after controversial theater presentations, visual arts
exhibits, concerts and happenings. If before the dictatorship the ambiguous political character of
the art Centers was a matter of controversy, with Onganía and the military in power, the
ambiguity disappeared and the Centers were immediately identified as a threat.

Students and professors, often emphatically neutral regarding the political implications of
their works, became the target of multiple and complex interpretations regarding their political
stance in an increasingly polarized Argentinean society. Here lies one of the fundamental
contradictions that permeate the history of the Center: those at the left of the political spectrum
thought that funding coming from the Rockefeller Foundation was upfront capitalist-
imperialistic infiltration and that the creations of the avant-garde musicians were at best
eccentricities for the elites like the Di Tella family, most certainly not music for the masses. On
the other hand, Argentinean right-wing factions and the military government—who saw
themselves as the last aristocracy and guardian of the Western, Christian way of life— took a
transnational anti-communist stance and lumped together those who opposed them, both
Peronists and more radical Marxist-Leninist groups, under the umbrella term communism.
Different groups that included the military, the dissident antidemocratic “carapintadas” and even
factions of the revolutionary Left accused the Di Tella Institute of promoting communist ideals,
attacking it both physically and in writing. A very prominent critique from the socialist Left

came in the 1968 documentary *La Hora de los Hornos* by Fernando Solanas and Osvaldo Getino, where Institute is juxtaposed against images of poverty, hunger, and violence and shown as “foreign-looking elites that work against popular values.”

Composer Mariano Etkin said, “we were commies for the right and elite for the left.”

The military dictatorship that had started in 1966 came to an end in 1973, but by 1971 the CLAEM had already closed its doors. The dictatorship and the change of economic conditions had put tremendous pressure on the Di Tella industrial conglomerate, which dramatically reduced its capacity to continue funding the arts. The economic crisis affecting Argentina, added to an overstretched budget in the Di Tella enterprises led to an economic debacle. At the same time, the increased oversight of the artistic activities at the different art centers by the military radically changed the conditions for artistic production. Ginastera, the driving force behind the creation of the CLAEM, was exhausted of his administrative duties, and ready for a life-change after his troublesome divorce. He wanted to focus on his compositions instead of lobbying for funding and decided to move to Switzerland with a newfound love, the harpist Aurora Nátola. The CLAEM came to an end.

5. Theoretical Considerations: Prelude to Studying Elite Art Worlds

A key element of this study is the understanding of the different elites involved in it: economic, political, intellectual and artistic elites that often functioned transnationally, actively participated in the story of the CLAEM. At the same time, the CLAEM was a central for the consolidation and establishing of several of these groups. In this section I examine some general theoretical considerations relevant to different chapters in this dissertation.

60 King 2007, 175.
61 Etkin, interview with the author, August 1, 2005.
Theories on Elites

The classic studies in analyzing the conditions, characteristics, and behaviors of elite groups are those of Mosca, Michels, and Pareto. After their models proposing a simplistic binary opposition elite/mass to study elite status were discredited, two ways of thinking about elites emerged in the middle of the twentieth century: functionalist elite theory and power elite theory. Functionalist elite theory challenges the model of a single unified elite and poses the notion of a series of competing sub-elites that restrict each other’s power, whereas power elite theory argues that there are coherent society-wide elite organizations which, although not unified, resemble the classic idea of a ‘ruling class’.

Perhaps the most influential theorist parting from functionalist elite theory is Suzanne Keller. Keller argues that modern industrial societies develop a series of multiple parallel elites given their large size and increased internal division of labor. In Beyond the Ruling Class she proposes that there is not a single elite—a chosen few on one side and the masses on the other—but that there are elites for different fields of activities and that the holders of the top positions in these sectors have a decisive influence among their peers. Keller differentiates field specific elites, such as virtuoso opera performers or world-class chess players, from what she calls strategic elites, such as the upper echelons in politics, administration, business, the judiciary, and to a lesser degree the media, intellectuals, and labor unions. Keller argues that the decisions and actions of these strategic elites have significant consequences for society as a whole, differentiating them from field specific elites. Finally, Keller proposes two principles behind the process of elite formation: selection by birth and selection by performance and merit.

62 See Mosca (1896), Michels (1911), and Pareto (1916).
63 Keller (1991 [1963])
In contrast, C. Wright Mills and William Domhoff, argue that most societies have elite
groups that simultaneously hold political, economic and military power, which they call power
elites.\footnote{See C. Wright Mills (1956) and William Domhoff (1969).} Both scholars agree that even though these power elites are directly connected to
corporate interests, they are not simply extensions of the corporate world, but rather complex
networks of members of a minority of power holders.

Around the same time Keller, Mills and Domhoff were posing their theories about elite
formations, the work of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu suggested that to study the elite—or
what he sometimes called the dominant class or ruling class\footnote{To refer to the elite, Bourdieu sometimes interchangeably uses the terms dominant class or ruling class. In his later work he stops using them and talks instead about the ‘field of power’.}—was to study the way they
reproduced and perpetuated themselves. To do so, Bourdieu distinguished four types of capital
that are exchanged for the creation and maintenance of elite status: social capital (group
membership, networks), cultural capital (education, forms of knowledge, skills), economic
capital (assets, possessions), and symbolic capital (prestige, recognition). The majority of
Bourdieu’s works look at the French elite, focusing on their selective social recruitment process
that can be observed within the elite, allowing for its own reproduction. Bourdieu, like Keller,
pays particular attention to the importance of socialization and the formation of class-specific
habitus\footnote{Habitus for Bourdieu consists of “a systems of durable, transposable \emph{dispositions},[that is] structured structures predisposed to function as \emph{structuring structures}” (Bourdieu 1977, 72).} and the capital acquired through education. The class-specific habitus then becomes
embodied class—e.g. a person dresses in a certain way, enjoys certain foods, enjoys some types
of music more than others, speaks in a particular way, eats in a specific manner—such that the
reproduction strategies include both origin—economic endowment, socialization, family—and
education—schooling, titles.
In his seminal work *Distinction*, Bourdieu addresses the theoretical problems of examining the French elite as if it was a unified, homogenous group.\(^67\) In contrast, his model presents a fractured elite: a dominant fraction of the ruling class, usually characterized by high economic capital—such as a rich banker—, a middle ground sector with a balance of cultural and economic capital—such as professionals, lawyers, doctors, and upper level state bureaucrats—and the dominated fraction of the ruling class, with mainly cultural capital, where he includes intellectuals and artists. Regarding this last point, he writes:

On the one side there is a predominantly economic capital (property, assets, titles to property, high income), which is also endowed with symbolic properties—this economic capital can be invested, for example in the realm of culture, where it is converted into symbolic capital by the purchase of art works, the creation of foundations, the financing of ‘civic’ activities, etc. On the other side, there is capital of the cultural kind, which can be empirically measured by the possession of educational credentials, the ownership of ‘high’ cultural goods such as paintings, and by practices which are so many titles to cultural nobility. […] At one pole of the field of power we find agents who are very well endowed in cultural capital and poorly in economic capital and, at the other pole, individuals, and families very rich in economic capital but poor in cultural capital.\(^68\)

Overall, Bourdieu’s point is well taken: exchanges of different types of capital can be used strategically to better one’s position in society, to provide social mobility, or to legitimize one’s current position. This was the case with the Di Tella in their philanthropic adventure, and this was also what Latin American composers were doing, as they gained prestige from studying with famous international composers.

Recently, Bourdieu and other scholars of the elite have been criticized for having thin ethnographic content.\(^69\) In anthropology, Laura Nader’s “Up the Anthropologist—Perspectives Gained From Studying Up” made one of the first calls in the discipline for research on “the colonizers rather than the colonized, the culture of power rather than the culture of the powerless,

\(^{67}\) See Bourdieu 1984.  
\(^{68}\) Bourdieu in Wacquant 1993, 23).  
the culture of affluence rather than the culture of poverty.”

As suggested by George E. Marcus—also an early proponent in the socio-cultural anthropology of elite studies—anthropologists, and therefore ethnomusicologists, can make a distinctive contribution to elite studies through ethnographic research. We can provide an analysis of the values and shared interests of elite groups. As Marcus points out, “much of elite research has been based on the presupposition that we already know what elites are about, and that priority attention should be given to their social impact.”

To these I would add that most elite studies have focused on governance among the political and the business elites, while intellectuals and artists have been widely neglected. Today there are only a handful of key studies of elites from an anthropological perspective, the most important of them compiled in only three texts: Marcus’s *Elites: Ethnographic Issues*; Pina-Cabral and Lima’s *Elites: Choice, Leadership, and Succession*; and Shore and Nugent *Elite Cultures: Anthropological Perspectives*.

The few elite studies in cultural anthropology using the participant observation strategy provide important insight into the worldviews and practices that define groups as elites and also the problems with ethnographic research on them. Cris Shore, in his introduction to *Elite Cultures* (2002), points out some of the problems in attempting ethnographic studies of elites and how “anthropology’s traditional methods of participant observation, personal involvement and long-term fieldwork does not lend itself easily to the task of analyzing elites, most of which are,

---

71 Marcus 1983, 3-4.
72 Ibid, 19.
73 See Marcus (1983); Pina-Cabral and Lima (2000); and Shore and Nugent (2002). Renato Rosaldo in 1989 observed that "full citizenship and cultural visibility appear to be inversely related.[…] Full citizens lack culture, and those most culturally endowed lack full citizenship." (1989, 198). Here Rosaldo is referencing the enormous attention anthropology has paid to the underprivileged and the subaltern, and not the dominant and privileged.
almost by definition, opaque or shielded from scrutiny by outsiders.” However difficult, Shore concludes, ethnographic research into elite spaces can provide a much-needed understanding of how elites achieve this status and how they maintain it and reproduce it. Much of what has been done regarding oral histories and ethnographic research examining elites has included mostly “recruitment, practices of boundary maintenance, and emblems of status that are embodied in elite life-styles.” It is in showing how the philanthropy towards the arts acts as a sign of status embodied in being elite that my research adds to contemporary discussions. My work with patrons is complemented by the fact that the CLAEM formed a whole generation of professional composers that became the elite in their field of cultural production. In addition, the hegemonic control of many facets of music education, administration and policy making by Western classical musicians gave these composers additional status in their societies.

**Ethnomusicology of Western classical music**

“Studying up” and “at home” as suggested Nader, are not new concepts in ethnomusicology, but research on Western classical music art worlds and the elite individuals and institutions who shape them still draws only a small fraction of ethnographic interest. I
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74 Shore 2002, 10.
75 A final word on the topic of relevant literature should be that the specific study of Latin American elites has emphasized the study of oligarchies mostly before 1930s and at the same time has neglected the studies of contemporary elites. Among the few exceptions to this are Whiteford’s *Two Cities of Latin America: A Comparative Description of Social Classes* (1960) where he compares social classes between Popayán, Colombia, and Querétaro, México as well as Lipset and Solari’s text *Elites in Latin America* (1967), and Strickon and Greenfield’s *Structure and Process in Latin America: Patronage, Clientage and Power Systems* (1972). More recently, the only addition has been the edited volume by Birle, Hofmeiser, Maihold and Potthast *Elites en América Latina* (2007). All of these works adhere either to the power elite or the functionalist elites models with little theoretical reflection, and they do not engage in traditional ethnographic accounts.
76 Marcus 1983, 12.
77 Nader 1969.
locate my work as part as the few but important efforts in musicology to contribute to the study of Western classical music from an anthropologically informed vantage point. In ethnomusicology the most important works in this regard are Bruno Nettl’s *Heartland Excursions: Ethnomusicological Reflections on Schools of Music* from 1995 and “Heartland Excursions: Exercises in Musical Ethnography” from 1992; Christopher Small’s *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening* published in 1998) and “The Social Character of Music, Performance as Ritual: Sketch for an Enquiry into the True Nature of a Symphony Concert” from 1987; and Henry Kingsbury’s *Music, Talent, and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System* published in 1988.78

Nettl’s *Heartland Excursions* is an ethnography of a general type of institution instead of a specific one, which he calls the Heartland University, and it is based on his experience in schools of music in U.S. Midwestern universities. The type of school that he looks at is an extension of the conservatory system, located in small college towns and large university settings. Nettl analyzes the people, architecture, classes and social interactions in the music buildings and how they shape and reinforce the legitimacy of Western art music and its canons. Central to Nettl’s argument is the examination of how prestige—symbolic capital—is given and maintained through practices that are frequently unspoken, but still structure the lives of students, professors and administrators in this social space. I owe to Nettl my interest in looking at the “flavor of the internal interrelationships of the groups of people” that constituted the

CLAEM as an institution, including secretaries, professors, and of course, the students. His second chapter in *Heartland Excursions*, titled “Society of Musicians,” was very influential in shaping my interest in studying classical Western music from an anthropological perspective and how to think about the social significance of music conceived as autonomous or absolute.

Like Kingsbury, my study is of one particular institution, but I tried to avoid the highly critical approach that Kingsbury took in his study of what he calls in his book the “Eastern Metropolitan Conservatory of Music” (most likely the New England Conservatory). Kingsbury’s book looks at the contexts within the U.S. conservatory where Western classical music is produced, experienced and evaluated. He gives particular importance to the relationship between faculty and students, and what he calls the “decentralized political organization of the conservatory institution.” He also explores a certain set of values at work in the conservatory as a cultural system, such as the idea of talent, recitals as ritual, and decisions about performances. The CLAEM was in many ways an anti-conservatory, so my case differs greatly from Kingsbury’s as far as institutional structure goes. At the CLAEM, what was being taught was the most recent and innovative techniques in classical music composition. The students were all composers—although many played instruments, this was not their main interest or identification—and there was a combination of permanent faculty and visiting lecturers who were the highlights of each academic year.

The objective of Small’s *Musicking* is to point out how music involves a broad spectrum of social action and participation in the creation of performance, what he calls musicking. Small’s book focuses on the mainstream of the classical music tradition of the United States and Europe. At the same time, he looks at the most conservative practices within that tradition. In
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80 Kingsbury 1988, 14.
this sense, my dissertation examines an opposite side of the spectrum, as it looks into an avant-garde that self-consciously positioned itself both at the fringe of this tradition and from a Latin American, albeit also cosmopolitan, perspective.

_A Working Understanding of Elites_

The concept of elites becomes useful in being much more specific and actor centered than broader concepts like class. There is, of course, a marked interdependence between certain elites in business, politics, administration and media, and the upper class. However, as I use it, an elite is a cohort that controls certain types of capital, functions of ruling, or has merit in specific fields of action, while I think of class as rooted and in relation to the degree of control over the means of production. It is important to signal that the concept of elites does not necessarily map as a nested group within the upper class, since, following functionalist descriptions, there might be elites—and this is mostly the case with composers, artists and musicians—that belong to the middle- or working class, as far as this concept refers to economic capital. This is precisely where Bourdieu’s concept of varying kinds of capital within fields of cultural production helps us give depth to what he otherwise generalizes as a fairly homogeneous cohort.

I find it helpful to use both notions of heterogeneous power elites and the idea of multiple functional elites. Power elites do emerge in certain situations, and with varying degrees of success—perhaps best exemplified in my case study of the Rockefeller family. At the same time, the possibility for such a power elite to exist seems to emerge from strategic power consolidations of field-specific elites. What I saw at work in Argentina around the Di Tella family shared characteristics of both kinds of elites. Specific individuals belonging to one or two

---

81 Today we find a good example of a power elite in the case of former Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, who has consolidated political, economic, media, and social power.
specific functional elites, for instance the business elite and the intellectual elite, might attempt during their lifetime to ‘cash in’ on different types of capital to consolidate their power and ultimately become part of a power elite.\textsuperscript{82}

As a final reflection about the usefulness of the concept of elites, it is important to notice that it helpfully complements the concept of cosmopolitanism, particularly as it has been used in ethnomusicology.\textsuperscript{83} I follow Turino in using the term cosmopolitan to refer to “objects, ideas, and cultural positions that are widely diffused throughout the world and yet are specific only to certain portions of the populations within given countries.”\textsuperscript{84} In this work, when I refer to an individual or group as cosmopolitan, I am saying that the individuals belongs to a specific type of transnational cultural formation who shares the habits of thought, practice and communication of the modernist-capitalist cosmopolitan formation.\textsuperscript{85}

Evidently, being cosmopolitan is not synonymous with being part of an elite, although different elites may be key players within cosmopolitan formations.\textsuperscript{86} This insight helps illuminate the trans-state connections and transnational social interactions that that bring together certain like-minded people; in this case study we see among them John Harrison, Alberto Ginastera, the Rockefeller brothers, Walt Rostow, the Di Tella brothers, and many of the composers, as they created trans-state networks of solidarity.

\textsuperscript{82} Like Bourdieu, Domhoff and Mills, I acknowledge through my research that economic capital is central if not at the root of all capitals in contemporary western cosmopolitan society—thus the prominent role that the business elite has over other elites.


\textsuperscript{84} Turino 2000, 7.

\textsuperscript{85} Turino points out that there are other example of cosmopolitan formations such as the modernist-socialist, or the Islamic formation. Turino 2008, 118-119.

\textsuperscript{86} See Waxer 2002 and Turino 2003.
The CLAEM was an important formative social experience, where transnational connections between actors create important networks of communication, solidarity, and intellectual exchange. Thinking in terms of Turino’s theory on cosmopolitanism, this case study brings forth an interesting situation: It exemplifies a particular experience of socialization that shows how people actually become more cosmopolitan in ways that are both reflexive and emotional.87 This socialization happened simultaneously through active learning as well as through the imitation, consumption, adoption, resignification and rearticulation of international models, the most important of which was the avant-garde. A particular characteristic of cosmopolitanism is that “The ideas, practices and technologies of a given cosmopolitan formation travel through communication loops, independently binding people together culturally who are not otherwise related by location or heritage.”88 I use the concept of loops not only to examine the binding that occurs among different people but also as a metaphorical space frequently desired by cosmopolitans in formation. In other words, access to these loops—spaces for cultural exchange among cosmopolitans—frequently signifies full acceptance into cosmopolitanism itself.

6. Chapter description

The dissertation consists of five chapters, and an epilogue that poses some conclusion. Chapter 1 explores the conditions that led the Rockefeller family and Foundation to be interested in cultural diplomacy in Latin America by the early 1960s and how these resulted in the creation of the CLAEM. The chapter follows the story of John Harrison, officer of the Rockefeller Foundation, in order to frame the creation of the CLAEM. Chapter 2 centers on the Di Tella

87 Nowicka, and Rovisco 2009, 6.
88 Turino 2003, 62.
family and how two young brothers used the arts to consolidate their status from a functional to a power elite. Chapter 3 provides a wide range description of the CLAEM, including its infrastructure, the professors and fellows that participated in it, and the activities that took place in it. Chapter 4 explores the notion of Latinamericanism as a professional strategy and musical style as it was understood differently by various composers at the CLAEM, and argues for the importance this Center had in generating solidarity networks among composers in Latin America. Chapter 5 examines how the trends of a cosmopolitan avant-garde were adopted and appropriated by certain composers at the CLAEM both in musical style and as a way of being. The dissertation ends with an epilogue that traces the closing of the CLAEM and a series of conclusions about its history, the adoption, embrace and embodiment of the avant-garde by an artistic elite, and the impact of philanthropy in the consolidation of an emerging industrial elite in Argentina.
CHAPTER 1

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION, JOHN P. HARRISON, AND THE FOUNDING OF THE CLAEM

Gray Mathers: “What in God’s name where you expecting from a Communist?”

Cradle Will Rock (1999), directed by Tim Robins

The Rockefeller Foundation is a private philanthropic organization representing the interests of one of the most powerful economic and political elites in the United States. Philanthropic organizations like the Rockefeller Foundation played an important mediating role between political society and civil society, acting as a “‘third’ force located somewhere between the ‘public’ and the ‘private’ sectors,” ¹ particularly in the mid-20th century. This is perhaps at its clearest when discussing the ways in which foreign aid provided by philanthropic organizations during this period reinforced foreign policy emerging from political society and/or the interests of the private sector. It is fair to say that the common interests shared by government and private corporations during the Cold War period led to a semi-privatization of American foreign policy. At crucial moments the anti-communist mission of the government was one and the same as that

¹ Fisher 1983, 224. Most of the work that has been done to examine the mediating role of the Rockefeller Foundation in intellectual production has focused on the social sciences (see for instance Beals 1969; Berman 1983; Fisher 1983; 1980; Blumer 1984; Ahmad 1991; Solovey 2001) and to a lesser extent in the arts (see Taylor and Barresi 1984; Saunders 2000; Prevots 2001; and Giunta 2007).
of the private sector, leaving philanthropy—that mediating third force—in a unique position to coordinate ideological and economic support by both the private and public spheres.  

An important aspect that needs to be taken into consideration in case studies on patrons of the arts has been the recognition that all these spheres—the public, the private, and the mediating philanthropic institutions—are peopled. And perhaps more importantly, the people involved—formulating foreign policy, pushing forward specific corporate interests, and deploying resources through grants, endowments and donations—are in several cases the same, or at least in close social contact and interaction with one another, forming important networks.

This chapter studies how the interests and ideas of the Rockefeller family and Foundation in cultural diplomacy in Latin America in the early 1960s resulted in the creation of the CLAEM. First I look at the ideological framework that broadly guided the directions of the Rockefeller family and Foundation around the time of the CLAEM grant. On one hand, I show how Nelson Rockefeller steered the family’s interest towards Latin America. On the other hand, his brother David became an important voice in the formulation of foreign policy in the region, including the Alliance for Progress, the development aid program that framed the historical moment in U.S.-Latin American relations at the time of the creation of the CLAEM. Both brothers included cultural diplomacy at the center of their strategies for strengthening ties with the region. Music—although not specifically the avant-garde—and other arts became crucial fields promoted by the two magnates and their philanthropic organization in their attempts to establish closer economic

2 This picture, as drawn by different sociologists, perhaps most significantly Blumer and Fisher, (Blumer 1983 and Fisher 1983), is reinforced by studies of specific patrons of the arts such as that of the National Endowment for the Arts (Taylor and Barresi 1984), the financing of the arts in England (Peacock 1993 and Baldry 1981), and more general studies of public and private support for the arts in what has been called the ‘economics of the arts,’ a term that Baumol and Bowen first coined in Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma (Baumol and Bowen 1966; Netzer 1978; Benedict 1991; Buchwalter 1992; Ginsburgh and Menger 1996).
relations with their neighbors in the south. Second, I focus on the specific story of the creation of the CLAEM, focusing on John P. Harrison, the Rockefeller Foundation officer that most supported the project, and Alberto Ginastera, the composer whose fame and international recognition facilitated the venture from the very beginning. The Rockefellers gave significant importance to the role of music in cultural diplomacy but while several positions and strategies for its support derived from the Rockefeller brother’s own interests and were present at the institutional level, it is at the personal level that we learn how these policies are implemented. In other words, throughout this chapter I will examine in parallel the institutional interests and socio-historical context of the Rockefeller family and Foundation together with the individual interactions between some of the main actors of this story. From this perspective we learn both the general and the specific conditions under which a foreign elite became interested in supporting a music program in Latin America and the extent to which this interest strengthened their position as elites.

1.1 The Rockefeller Brothers and the Rockefeller Foundation: Meeting points of Policy, Philanthropy, and Business

The five famous Rockefeller brothers, John D. III, Nelson, Laurance, Winthrop, and David were sons of the well-known philanthropist and businessman John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and together with their sister Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, they were the grandsons of John D. Rockefeller, Sr., Standard Oil’s industrialist billionaire. The oldest son, John D. Rockefeller III, was the most involved in the philanthropic endeavors of the family, serving in the Rockefeller

3 The one daughter from this same marriage, Abby Rockefeller, was much more reclusive and did not gain as much public attention as her brothers.
Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Population Council, the Asia Society, the Japan Society, the Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy and the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs. In fact, Rockefeller III was the chairman of the Board of Trustees when the CLAEM grant was approved at the Rockefeller Foundation. However, all the other brothers participated in different philanthropic organizations and actively steered the interests and foci of the Rockefeller Foundation. Of significance to the CLAEM story is that during the previous decades, both Nelson and David developed a sincere interest in Latin America, had conceived specific strategies to create cooperation with the U.S. that included the arts, and were key in various developmental aid programs directed at the region.

*Nelson Rockefeller and the Office of Inter-American Affairs*

Nelson Rockefeller (1908-1979) was the most visible Rockefeller brother in his career as a liberal leader of the Republican Party, opposing conservative figures like Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan. Although he failed to accomplish his dream of becoming president, he became the 41st Vice President of the United States (1974-1977) after having been Governor of New York from 1959 to 1973. Nelson’s early career at the Venezuelan subsidiary of Standard Oil fueled a strong interest in the development and modernization of Latin America, dating at least to the 1930s. At the same time, he became obsessed with changing the image of the United States in the region. Not surprisingly, Latin America became of special interest for the Rockefeller Foundation around 1935.4 Already in 1937, under the Good Neighbor Policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Rockefeller Foundation was contributing towards the financing of “a series of experimental short-wave broadcasts to Latin America initiated by the Pan American Union and
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4 An early reference to this can be found in “Latin America in the Humanities Program” March 1, 1938, folder 116, box 15, series 3003, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
produced in collaboration with the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation [...].”

The objective of these broadcasts was “to acquaint, listeners in one country with the interest and culture of the others,” and the music of Latin American composers was featured prominently.

That same year Irving A. Leonard, working for the program in the Humanities, wrote and distributed a report to officers and trustees in which he detailed some possible ways to do Foundation work in Latin America. Among the reasons he gave for this interest, he noted the recent closeness and good will towards the U.S. via the Good Neighbor policy, and the way it had triggered a specific awareness of diverse aspects of Latin American life—political, economic, social and cultural. Still, a more urgent reason was the need to react to the “strong economic and cultural penetration by fascist countries rapidly undermining existing good will toward U.S.A. and already taking large proportion of trade.” Cultural penetration was taking place actively “through [the] subsidizing [of] radio programs, cultural institutes, and lectures.”

What Leonard was pointing to, was the need for a counter-propaganda apparatus that would help maintain the important economic relations between the U.S. and the region.

After a South American tour in 1939 Nelson Rockefeller decided to contact the presidents of some of the biggest U.S. corporations with activities in Latin America in order “to form a committee with the idea that they would in a sense set standards for American business representatives’ conduct abroad.” After several meetings with Roosevelt’s high cabinet officials, and amidst World War II, Nelson Rockefeller made clear his ideas regarding the “type

6 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Nelson A. Rockefeller, “Notes by Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller: Latin America NAR’s Interest,” folder 403, box 48, series Countries, RG 4 (NAR), Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
of work that might be done in commercial and industrial development fields as well as in cultural fields.” 10 Because of these conversations, President Franklin D. Roosevelt asked Nelson if he was willing to take the job of Coordinator of the new and short-lived Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA 1940-1946). He was, and he held the post for the following four years. 11

Nelson’s OIAA has been described by Perloff as “originally set up to help create an atmosphere of cooperation in Allied efforts by strengthening U.S.-Latin American relations in cultural and economic matters.” 12 It is widely accepted that the United States’ lack of a Ministry of Culture or any equivalent institutionalized state branch during the beginning of the Cold War, led to other institutions like the CIA—with its undercover financing of apparently private initiatives like the Congress for Cultural Freedom—or smaller outfits like the OIAA, to undertake the creation of counter-propaganda efforts in different regions of the world. 13 The activities promoted by the OIAA were to achieve closer economic and cultural ties between the U.S. and Latin America. Part of this strategy was going to be implemented

by trying to reach the public through the media of radio, movies, newspapers and magazines to tell them the story of the United States—that we are friends, that we wanted to work with them, that we stood for the values in which they believed, that we had a common heritage in our colonial past [...]. I felt that it was very important to open up cultural channels of exchange, covering music, art, architecture, science and so forth, in order to let them know that we had a very active intellectual and cultural life in our country and that we wanted to share it with them and enjoy cultural exchange with them. 14

10 Ibid.
11 See Campbell 2009. The agency started in August 1940 as OCCCRBAR (Office for Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics), later became Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs in 1941, and was later renamed the Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA) in 1945.
12 Perloff 1969, 6.
13 These jobs were later taken over by the United States Information Agency (USIA), which existed from 1953 to 1999.
14 Nelson A. Rockefeller, “Notes by Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller: Latin America NAR’s Interest,” folder 403, box 48, series Countries, RG 4 (NAR), Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
The exchange of artistic creations was meant to accomplish at least two things. First, to show a face of the United States that was different from that of a money driven society or an interventionist neighbor ready to appear when business was not ‘as usual’. Second, to show an interest in Latin American countries past the exploitation of their raw materials and the business opportunities they presented. Artists and musicians could be informal ambassadors to and from the region that would strengthen the ties among the hemisphere:

We started sending down to Latin America exhibitions from this country of art, sculpture, architecture and related fields. These were prepared in special exhibition form[,] for circulation under contract with the [New York’s] Museum of Modern Art. [...] In the field of music, we did the same thing. We arranged for musicians, opera stars, concert artists, quartets, etc., to make tours in Latin America. In addition, we arranged for lecturers in various fields to go down and lecturers from down there to come up here.\(^\text{15}\)

As we will see below, almost simultaneously the Rockefeller Foundation began supporting projects that resonated with their public interest in cultural diplomacy. In fact, the Rockefeller Foundation established lines of communication and exchange between the Museum of Modern Art in New York, and Argentina in almost equal fashion to what the OIAA had done, further blurring private and public cultural diplomacy interests. The CLAEM is a quite successful example of fostering the exchanging of artists with Rockefeller Funding.

The last three decades of Nelson Rockefeller’s life—he died in 1979—were dedicated to his political career. Still, from his different political positions he kept an eye open both to the region and the arts. The effectiveness of the cooperation between foreign policy interests and successful entrepreneurial endeavors was clear for him. As part of the political and economic

\(^{15}\) Ibid.
elite of the United States, Rockefeller maintained a visible presence in social networks related to the arts and the history of the CLAEM.\textsuperscript{16}

\textit{David Rockefeller and his Latin American Ties}

Throughout his life David Rockefeller (1915), like his brother Nelson, has had strong overlapping links to Latin America, to the arts, to foreign politics, and most important of all to the business world. David received a doctorate in economics from the University of Chicago and had a short career as a public officer, after which he joined the army and served during World War II in France and North Africa.\textsuperscript{17} After he was discharged he joined Chase National Bank and began his lifelong career as a banker. In 1947, David Rockefeller asked to be transferred to the Latin American section of the foreign department of Chase Bank. His interest in this position reflected the influence of his brother Nelson, his curiosity in the region’s business opportunities and his increasing passion for the arts. In his autobiography, David says: “Latin America had become a more important area for Chase, just as my own interest in its business, culture, and art had grown. [...] Nelson’s visionary plans to assist Latin America’s economic development had also steered my imagination.”\textsuperscript{18}

Soon after his official immersion in Latin American business David made connections with several figures that years later would be behind the Alliance for Progress. During the late

\textsuperscript{16} He was, for instance, directly thanked by Eduardo Augusto García, Ambassador of Argentina and Chairman of the of the Council of OAS for the “successful holding of the First Inter-American Music Festival in Washington, D.C.” García praised the “high significance of this Festival, both as a cultural event and as a means of promoting closer relations and understanding among the peoples of the American republics.” Eduardo Augusto García, letter to Nelson A. Rockefeller, May 19, 1958, folder 1954, box 195, series Pan-American Union, Rockefeller Family Archives, RAC.
\textsuperscript{17} Rockefeller 2002, 123.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, 129-130.
1940s, for instance, he worked with Luis Muñoz Marín and Teodoro Moscoso. In 1962 Moscoso became the United States coordinator of the Alliance for Progress and David Rockefeller became part of its commerce committee. His particular view on the Alliance reflects both his belief in the need to respond to the triumph of the Cuban Revolution as well as his commitment to the ideas of modernization theory and developmentism.

I strongly supported the President’s initiative [for the Alliance for Progress], not least because it meant there would be an energetic response to the threat presented by Castro’s Marxist regime in Cuba and Communist subversion in other parts of the hemisphere. However, I felt the Alliance had to be a public-private partnership if it was to be successful, while its U.S. architects had a decided preference for state-directed economic development. They assumed the nations of Latin America had to reach the ‘takeoff’ stage of economic growth before anything else could happen, and the quickest way to get results was to put the government in charge.

Two points strike me as significant here. First, the naturalized use of “take off stage,” vocabulary that comes straight out of Walt Rostow’s 1960 publication, and second, Rockefeller’s acknowledgment that this development plan had to be a mix of private and public efforts. It is important not to underestimate the individual influence that David Rockefeller’s view might have brought to the table in the formulation of the Alliance. In 1949, he had been made director of the Council on Foreign Relations, an organization to which he would remain attached for the greater part of his life. This position made him a key figure in the mediation between private interest and public policy.

At the same time since his mother Abby and two other associates had established the Museum of Modern Art, David was the most involved brother with this institution, which as we saw earlier was key in U.S. cultural diplomacy. His ties with the museum led to frequent criticisms both home and away of ‘corrupting’ the arts with business and steering them

---

19 Ibid, 132.
20 Ibid, 425.
21 As we will see below, Rostow had directed Guido Di Tella’s thesis during his PhD, and later became advisor to the Kennedy administration.
politically. In 1962, for example, he was publicly criticized because “as chairman of the Museum of Modern Art [David] was promoting decadence in order to corrupt the population at large.” Another criticism said “under the Rockefellers’ tutelage, abstract art is summoned to play a definite political role, distract the attention of thinking Americans from real life and to make them stupid.” It should not be taken for granted that these accusations, most certainly already clichés at the time, were perhaps more easily applied to David than to any other brother. And what’s more, they were not entirely unfounded. As Taylor and Barresi suggest, David Rockefeller saw the arts as a necessary part of business, both to create a beneficial environment for it, and to allow business to give back to society.

Latin America was on David Rockefeller’s mind in more than one way. With the formulation of the Alliance for Progress he saw some of his interests taking shape at the governmental level. The different projects that David pushed forth were aimed at strengthening the relations between the U.S. and Latin America, and in many cases they were quite successful in uniting business and his interest in the arts. For example, the Center for Inter-American Relations was established in 1966, following “initiatives begun by the Council for Latin America (composed by politicians and businessmen, recently created and backed by David Rockefeller) and the IAFA [Inter-American Foundation for the Arts].” The Center’s main goal—with David Rockefeller presiding over the board of directors—was to “examine political and economic issues in inter-American relations and support achievements by Latin American writers, musicians, and artists.”

22 Ibid, 224.
23 Taylor and Barresi 1984, 23.
24 Giunta 2007, 231.
My interest in pointing out all these individual cases and connections is that these concerns were put forth during the 1960s, and they were especially important both for David Rockefeller’s plans of expansion for Chase Bank in Latin America and to different aspects of foreign policy formulation and philanthropy. Nelson and David’s interests in the arts, policy, and philanthropy overlapped constantly. However, it was through the Rockefeller Foundation, and not any of their private initiatives, that the most celebrated grants toward the arts and music came to fruition.

_The Rockefeller Foundation and the Infusing of Cultural and Moral Values: Historical Context_

John D. Rockefeller Sr., his son John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and their philanthropic advisor Frederick T. Gates funded the Rockefeller Foundation in 1913. The original objective of Rockefeller’s philanthropic ventures was the understanding and elimination of social problems rather than just the treatment of their symptoms. In the 1962 annual report a new addition to the Foundation’s mission statement, supporting the creative arts was provided:

> The Rockefeller Foundation recognizes the need to infuse cultural and moral values much more pervasively through the intricate fabric of contemporary society. [...] It considers its main role [...] as helping to develop new patterns and institutions which will sustain creative work of high quality and at the same time bring the best in these arts to an increasing and varied public.

With this statement the Foundation declared that it was now also one of its objectives to infuse cultural and moral values, that is, it would also act as propaganda for a particular worldview of those who where being charitable. It is interesting to examine how different reports try to fit the novel enterprise of financing a Latin American center for advanced studies in composition into the recently changed mission of the Foundation.

---

26 Ibid. My emphasis.
During its first 50 years of existence the different programs of the Rockefeller Foundation had focused on funding specific projects within very particular fields. Initially there had been a focus on Medicine and Public Health programs, Natural Sciences, Agricultural Sciences, and Social Sciences. The Humanities program was established only in 1929 and its early grants included support for research in history, creative writing, the arts, linguistics, and selected aspects of education. It is important to note that most of the early funding provided was for projects based in the United States, frequently connected to work in universities, and mostly supporting the development of library science, and the creation of centers for the study of foreign languages, cultures and institutions. As it became widely recognized “the large private foundations—Carnegie, Rockefeller and Ford—together with national security agencies, pushed for and financed the development [...]and proliferation of area studies programmes [sic] throughout American higher education.” Asian studies was the first and most funded field in the initial years, but by 1962 funding had expanded to include both Latin America and Africa, and to a lesser degree, the Middle East. This proliferation of area studies programs is key to understanding the broad picture in which the CLAEM project appears.

As described in Shaplen’s 1964 book *Toward the Well-Being of Mankind: Fifty Years of the Rockefeller Foundation*, the history of the Rockefeller Foundation’s interest in the humanities and funding new artistic endeavors increased since the 1950s:

Beginning in 1952, an increased amount of aid was given for purposes of broadening the audience of the arts, with a view also towards stimulating wider support of them, encouraging new forms and new ventures and assisting creative work of high quality as in musical composition, choreography, fiction, the drama, and the fine arts." 

27 Ibid, 12.
29 Shaplen 1964, 167.
Despite these references to the ‘encouraging’ of ‘new forms and new ventures’ the CLAEM project in Argentina was in fact quite unique in the history of the Foundation. A general point that is recurrent throughout this and other celebratory texts—and that most certainly resonates with the spirit behind the funding of the CLAEM—was the desire to focus grants on the development of institutions, primarily universities, in less developed countries. The stated logic behind this ideal was that

In the past a number of countries have been able to acquire in part the top echelons of the educated personnel they needed by sending young people abroad for training, frequently with the help of foundations and other philanthropic agencies. Too often upon their return these highly competent people have been unable to contribute as much as they should because of the lack of supporting organizations and institutions and the dearth of competent teammates. The Foundation is dedicated to the principle that a gradual, steady shift to education at home is the solution toward which countries should progress. [...] The Foundation has never attempted to create or direct the process, but only to respond to the initiative and enterprise of local leadership subscribing to the same educational philosophy and trying to do something about it.³⁰

The case of the CLAEM supports this notion of responding to local initiatives while at the same time fitting in well within another scope of interest, that of modernizing the educational system in the host countries to further help in their development. The support of a native elite, the Di Tella family, provided the ‘local leadership’ that could ensure a long lasting effect for the short-term grants.

*The Rockefeller Foundation: Funding Musical Creation and Latin American Music*

For many years the largest Rockefeller Foundation grant favoring the creation of contemporary art music was the one for the Louisville Philharmonic Society to commission new

---

works. In this case, as in other smaller ones, commissioning was seen as the only road to promote the creation of contemporary music, but some officers felt there was a need to explore other paths. The CLAEM’s grant of $156,000—equivalent to roughly $1 million dollars in 2012—was a landmark project for the Rockefeller Foundation and seemed to be an important change of direction in the support that the Rockefeller Foundation had given to the arts up to that point.

The 1962 grant that allowed the creation of the CLAEM was a first with respect to both the large amount of money directed towards contemporary music, and the fact that it was a project abroad. The Rockefeller Foundation made four major grants to institutions in Argentina during 1962, two of which were for the development of medical education. The other two went to the Di Tella Institute, towards the creation of the CLAEM and the Center for Comparative Social Research, directed by Gino Germani. The grant for the creation of the CLAEM was by far the largest that the Foundation gave toward the performing arts in 1962 in any region of the world, an effort made more significant considering that a second grant was given for the same project three years later for the same value.

---

31 The most significant grants for the arts up to 1958, when John P. Harrison begins contemplating the idea of the CLAEM, had been one-time grants for the creation of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts ($10,050,000), the Louisville Philharmonic Society ($400,000) to commission and perform new works, the American Symphony Orchestra League ($291,850), the Berkshire Music Festival at Tanglewood ($60,000), the City Center of Music and Drama in New York ($200,000), the Young Audiences project in New York ($75,000), and the American International Music Fund ($27,000). See John Marshal, “Adventuring in the Arts: Music,” April, 1958, folder 47, box 5, series 911, RG 3.1, Rockefeller Foundation, RAC.
32 See Shaplen 1964, where he proudly writes that the Foundation is “also supporting projects of institutions overseas that are centers of activities for the stimulation and wider knowledge and appreciation of the arts” (173), most certainly referring to the CLAEM in Argentina.
Two of the three projects promoting artistic creation that the Foundation supported in 1962—a very small number considering the hundreds of yearly grants allocated—are directly connected to musical production in Latin America. The yearly report of the Foundation stated:

While the Foundation retains its concern for creative individuals, it is more and more seeking opportunities, particularly in the developing countries, to help with the building of institutions that will provide a sustaining environment in which cultural work may flourish. In 1962, for example, [...] [a] major grant went to the Torcuato Di Tella Institute in Buenos Aires, Argentina, which under the distinguished leadership of the composer Alberto Ginastera offers advanced training in musical composition. A third current grant is helping Indiana University, Bloomington, establish the first center in the United States for the study and performance of Latin American music.34

The logic behind backing the project for the Latin American Music Center at Indiana University—a venture also undertaken by John P. Harrison—was different to that of the CLAEM:

While rhythms of Latin American music are often heard in American popular music and a few works of outstanding Latin American composers are standard in orchestral repertoires, no systematic effort to study, distribute information about, and perform Latin American music existed in this country until Indiana University undertook the responsibility for these functions in 1961 [...] [establishing] a Latin American Music Center with Professor [Juan] Orrego-Salas as director. The Foundation has contributed $97,000 toward the costs of establishing the center [...]. Major emphasis will be put on cooperation with the Center for Advanced Music Composition of the Torcuato Di Tella Institute in Buenos Aires, Argentina.35

In a sense, the model stated that new musical production and education would take place in Argentina, while the methodic study of that production and the distribution of this information would take place in Indiana.36 The type of help that the CLAEM and the LAMC received was

36 Chilean Composer Juan Orrego-Salas was hired as the center’s first director, a position that would later be occupied by composer Ricardo Lorenz in 1987. The conductor Carmen Helena Tellez has held the post since 1992. John P. Harrison saw in Orrego-Salas a well-established composer who already had ties with the United States and was fluent in English. The grant to Indiana University’s center was for a period of five years, “on the basis of the latter’s gradual
not arbitrary. There had been institutional measures to evaluate the support of contemporary music creation during previous years. In April 1958, John Marshal who, like John P. Harrison, was an associate director for the Humanities program, wrote a noteworthy report titled “Adventuring in the Arts: Music,” which he submitted to the Rockefeller Foundation’s Board of Trustees. In this report he examined not only the ‘why’ but the ‘how’ to support musical creation beyond giving grants to individuals. Marshal’s comments were representative of a preoccupation that various Rockefeller officials had felt for over a decade: how to most efficiently provide support that promotes the composition of new music. The conclusion of this report would shape the future decisions directly affecting the CLAEM and the Latin American Music Center: the Foundation should give funds to institutions and not individuals, under the condition of gradual increased support by the private sector, so that after a certain number of years they would take over the costs initially covered by the Foundation, a model that was followed in the grants for both music centers.

1.2 The Founding of the CLAEM

So far this chapter has shown the conditions—both the family interests and the Foundation’s agenda—that made it possible for a project like the CLAEM to be awarded a grant by the Rockefeller Foundation. This second section reconstructs a story that begins with the early meetings of composers and Rockefeller foundation officials in 1958, and ends with the allocation of the Rockefeller Foundation grant that funded the CLAEM in 1962. With these, I place in counterpoint the abstract and the concrete in this philanthropic venture.

More often than not, the story of the creation of the CLAEM is remembered centered around Alberto Ginastera as the singular force behind it. Notwithstanding Ginastera’s importance, I have decided to privilege here the voice of John P. Harrison, the Rockefeller Foundation officer most closely connected to the project. Among the different people involved in the creation of the center for graduate composition studies in Latin America, Harrison is perhaps the least known. Alberto Ginastera, as director for the Center, Guido Di Tella, as president of the Institute, and Enrique Oteiza, as its executive director, all played important parts in the history of the CLAEM. But Harrison, who was heavily involved in the planning stages of the project, left the humanities office of the Rockefeller Foundation around the time that the funding of the CLAEM was approved, so his role in this history has been largely forgotten. Although Harrison deemed the creation of the CLAEM one of his most important accomplishments, the supervision of this project was left to subsequent Rockefeller officials.

John P. Harrison and the Founding of the CLAEM

John Harrison—Jack to his friends—was born in California in 1917, and received a B.A. from the University of California, Berkeley in 1939, where he also earned his M.A. and Ph.D. in Latin American history in 1950. Between 1956 and 1961, Harrison was Assistant Director for Humanities at the Rockefeller Foundation, and became Associate Director from 1961 to 1962. He resigned in 1962 to accept a position at the University of Texas as Professor of History and Director of the Institute of Latin American Studies. Between July 1965 and 1966 he was a part-time consultant for the Rockefeller Foundation, and member of the Humanities and Social Sciences special field staff in Santiago de Chile in the program for teaching and research. In 1967 Harrison returned once more to the Rockefeller Foundation as Associate Director for
Humanities and Social Sciences. Although I never met Harrison, he kept careful diaries of all his activities and travels like most Rockefeller Foundation officers. Among all the projects he was involved in, the creation of the CLAEM was one of particular pride. His personal correspondence, journals, and biographical files at the Rockefeller Archives fail to reveal the source of his particular interest in classical music, but he certainly made an effort in his various Latin American trips to attend concerts and to meet local musical figures. It was precisely in one of these meetings, when Harrison had planned to meet Alberto Ginastera, that the story of the CLAEM begins.

*Genesis of the Idea for the CLAEM: Early Encounters*

As he returned to his Buenos Aires hotel room on May 19, 1958, John P. Harrison, Assistant Director for Humanities at the Rockefeller Foundation found out that “plans for lunch and spending the rest of the day with Alberto Ginastera—visiting the Conservatory and talking with others concerned in the musical life of Buenos Aires—had been cancelled, due to the death of A[berto] G[inastera]’s father the night before.” Ginastera rescheduled to meet with Harrison on May 22. Nonetheless Ginastera was anxious to talk with the Rockefeller official, so he decided to wait for him at his hotel the night of the 20th. After sharing tea, Ginastera, his wife Mercedes, and Harrison went to the apartment of his friend and composer Julián Bautista (Spain, 1901-1961), for “a long evening of conversation over cocktails and dinner.” The main topic of discussion was how the Rockefeller Foundation could contribute to the musical life of Argentina. Harrison had talked previously to Juan José Castro (Argentina, 1895-1968) and the Swiss

37 “Harrison Will Again Be Foundation Officer” in *Rockefeller Foundation Staff Newsletter* (November 1966): 1, 8.
38 JPH (John P. Harrison), diary excerpt, May 19, 1958, folder ‘Interviews 1958’, box 19, series John P. Harrison, RG 12.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
conductor Ernst Ansermet (1883-1969), and both had agreed that emphasis should be made on supporting early musical training. Ginastera and Bautista disagreed:

Alberto Ginastera commented that in the scramble to earn a living practically all of the work he has done in the last ten years has been when he received a grant or commission from some North American organization. He said that apart from the time during which he was supported by such organizations as the Guggenheim Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation—indirectly as well as directly—the only time he has had for composition has been on Saturday afternoons and Sundays. If his music is of any importance to society, he continued, it would not exist if it had not been for support received after he was fully trained.39

As Harrison understood, Ginastera and Bautista felt that composers in Latin America were in a “rather intolerable” situation, where “all of the money is going for conductors and poorly-managed orchestras.”40 Harrison couldn’t agree more with the two composers, but did not see any immediate possibility of help, since any project possible at this point would need the Rockefeller Foundation to pay the full costs for an indefinite period. However, Harrison suggested that “if they could work out an arrangement whereby the local costs would be carried by Argentine sources, the Rockefeller Foundation might be able to consider paying the costs of the foreign instructors needed, for a limited and clearly-defined period of time.”41 As they unsuccessfully brainstormed ideas for possible sponsors for such an institution, it was clear to Harrison that Ginastera and Bautista felt that “any school would have to be completely divorced from Federal, Municipal, or State control, if it was to succeed in achieving its aims”42 in order to avoid political interference. Their goal was to find some type of private support for the arts among Buenos Aires’ elites.

40 Ibid.
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
Harrison returned to Buenos Aires more than a year later and once more met with
Ginastera and Bautista, on November 21, 1959. They all attended a performance of Joseph
Haydn’s *The Creation* at the Teatro Colón. During the intermission and at some length after the
concert they discussed their ideas for creating a program for the musical education of composers
in Latin America. Resonating with a conversation that Harrison had had in the previous months
with Mexican composers, Ginastera and Bautista

brought up the possibility of doing something in Buenos Aires almost identical in
concept with the program that had been under discussion in Mexico [that] summer, the only difference being that they conceived of the training facility for
composers as being open to young and talented composers from all over Latin
America from the start. They suggested a faculty of three, presumably Ginastera,
Bautista, and one other from some other country, and a student body of not more
than twelve to be selected by the faculty on application on the basis of scores
submitted by the applicant. They also thought that the time needed by the students
would probably average out at two years, but in some instances extending to three
years. They would like to have one of the three professorships always open for a
visiting professor so that of the regular staff of three only two would be in
residence at any one time.43

At this point Ginastera and Bautista did not have a precise proposal for this center, but
were sharing with Harrison what they had in mind. Harrison reiterated “the need of institutional
support and the impossibility of the R[ockefeller] F[oundation] doing more than giving an
impetus to something well supported locally.”44 Ginastera said they had not made any
approaches yet but they would discuss the matter with the new Catholic University and the
Municipality of Buenos Aires.

43 JPH (John P. Harrison), diary excerpt, November 21, 1959, folder 1959 II Vol. 7, box 19, series
John P. Harrison, RG 12.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
44 Ibid.
Bringing Together Ginastera and the Di Tella Institute

Six months later, on May 25, 1960, Harrison spent the early afternoon with Ginastera and listened to his brief description for a two-year course on musical composition for selected Latin American composers. Ginastera’s proposal depended on the commitment of the Catholic University, where he had recently organized and begun directing the College of Arts and Musical Sciences. The plan seemed to Harrison to be a “modest and apparently workable program depending on the extent of commitment on the part of the Catholic University and on the part of private contributors.”

The doubts that Harrison had about the possible participation of the Rockefeller Foundation in the project had to do with the “likelihood of Argentine sources being able to absorb gradually even the comparatively modest costs of the program outlined by Ginastera.”

Only two months after this particular meeting Harrison took a step that was to be crucial for the CLAEM. The Rockefeller Foundation had already established contact with the Di Tella family through Warren Weaver, Rockefeller Foundation’s Vice-President for the Natural and Medical Sciences. In 1958 Weaver had given feedback regarding the creation of the Di Tella Foundation, which was partly modeled after the Rockefeller family’s organization. Harrison decided to contact Di Tella. Harrison wrote,

My colleagues and I learned from Dr. Warren Weaver last year of the Instituto Torcuato Di Tella and your thoughts about establishing a Di Tella Foundation in Argentina. Dr. Weaver’s very favorable remarks had to do with your interest in economics, so I was unaware of your plans, apparently already well developed, for an Arts Center. I am indeed sorry not to have known of this earlier as I was recently in Buenos Aires and would have welcomed the opportunity of talking with you about possibilities in Argentina for both the visual and performing arts.

46 Ibid.
Actually, our own modest interests are for the present more in the latter than in the former.\textsuperscript{47}

Those ‘modest interests’ mentioned by Harrison, were indeed Ginastera’s plan for the CLAEM.

At least until January 1961 Ginastera thought that he might be able to make the project work within the structure of the Universidad Católica Argentina (UCA) even though he was not receiving the support he had anticipated. He wrote to Harrison that

If the Institute begins to work supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, we shall have time to interest private institutions or people to support this enterprise in the future. I think that four or six years will be enough to establish the Institute which will be able from then on to live without the Rockefeller’s support.\textsuperscript{48}

This response likely disappointed and worried Harrison, since he knew that the Board at the Rockefeller Foundation would not agree to sponsor the enterprise before a local organization promised to provide institutional support and continuity for the activities after the end of the Rockefeller aid.

In the first of a series of short visits to Argentina in 1961, Harrison asked Guido Di Tella to meet with him:

If you have any free time during this period I should appreciate talking with you about the activities of your Foundation in the arts, a concern I have in the field of Latin American composition, and hopefully better inform myself generally about the situation of the performing and visual arts in Buenos Aires.\textsuperscript{49}

Perhaps the most important meeting for the creation of CLAEM took place on May 22, 1961 between Harrison, Enrique Oteiza, Executive Director of the Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, and Guido Di Tella. Describing this meeting in his diary, Harrison writes that they “talked at some length about his several abortive attempts to cooperate with some Latin American

\textsuperscript{47} John P. Harrison, letter to Guido Di Tella, July 18, 1960, reel 35, series 301, RG 2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
\textsuperscript{48} Alberto Ginastera, letter to John P. Harrison, January 23, 1961, reel 35, series 301, RG 2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
\textsuperscript{49} John P. Harrison, letter to Guido Di Tella, April 27, 1961, reel 35, series 301, RG 2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
institutions in setting up an advanced-level training facility for composers, together with the reasons for thinking this is important.”

Both Oteiza and Di Tella expressed to Harrison a strong interest in the Di Tella Institute being “the home for such an operation and if an arrangement satisfactory to them and the [Rockefeller] Foundation could be reached they would give absolute assurances of maintaining it indefinitely after an original period of assistance which they would certainly require during the next two or three years.” Harrison must have been thrilled by the strong possibility of having finally found an institutional niche for the music center, and convened with Oteiza and Di Tella to talk to Ginastera after his return.

The participation of the Di Tella Institute in the project was confirmed three days later when Guido Di Tella called Harrison to say that “the possibility of the Instituto Torcuato Di Tella ultimately accepting full responsibility for an advance training facility in musical composition had been discussed further in the Institute and that they were deeply interested.” Di Tella did, however, mention that he had doubts that Ginastera could direct such a venture, spending half of his time at the Catholic University and half at the Institute. Di Tella and Oteiza “also tentatively felt that the second full-time Latin American composer-teacher should be selected by someone other than Ginastera to be certain that a different musical style and taste would be represented.” Although they never mentioned him in their correspondence, both Oteiza and Di Tella were well acquainted with the Argentine composer Juan Carlos Paz (1901-1972). Indeed, they had considered that if the Di Tella Institute was to include a music center,

50 JPH (John P. Harrison), diary excerpt, May 22, 1961, reel 35, series 301, RG 2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
51 Ibid.
52 JPH (John P. Harrison), diary excerpt, May 25, 1961, folder 73, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
53 Ibid.
Paz would be the appropriate figure to direct it. However, as would later become clear, Harrison and the Rockefeller Foundation Board members had made up their minds that Ginastera had to be the head of the project. Ginastera had become quite a successful artist in the United States and was known there as the foremost Latin American composer. Harrison used the fame that Ginastera had accumulated abroad and his status as a cultural ambassador for Argentina to convince Torcuato Di Tella and Oteiza that the composer should direct the center.

Harrison, however, did not rush to notify Ginastera about the advances in finding an institutional home for their project after his meeting with Di Tella and Oteiza. Harrison mentioned his contact with the Di Tellas to Ginastera only in a letter dated September 13, 1961. Harrison wrote:

While in Buenos Aires I also had the pleasure of talking with Dr. Guido Di Tella [...] and Sr. Enrique J. Oteiza [...]. We discussed at some length the possibility of the Fundación and the Instituto becoming actively concerned with music as they presently are with the visual arts. Dr. Di Tella appears to me to be an exceptionally intelligent and public-spirited executive. [...] May I suggest that you meet with Dr. Di Tella and Sr. Oteiza to discuss with them in a general way your own ideas as to the need and organization of an advanced center for the technical preparation of talented young composers? Possibly the formula for which we have been searching for the long-range support of preparation of composers with opportunities for performances of their work can be found by cooperation between The Rockefeller Foundation and the Fundación Torcuato Di Tella. 54

The suggested meeting took place promptly, and two weeks after this letter was sent, Oteiza wrote to Harrison telling him that after talking to Ginastera they had found the project extremely interesting and within our objectives and lines of activity. The Instituto Torcuato Di Tella can provide the necessary institutional and administrative framework for the Music Center and willingly would take over

54 John P. Harrison, letter to Alberto Ginastera with copy to Guido Di Tella and Enrique Oteiza, September 13, 1961, reel 35, series 301, RG 2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
the support of it after the original period of time, during which support would be provided by Rockefeller Foundation.\textsuperscript{55}

Edward Berman’s description of the basic ideas behind philanthropic participation in the tradition of the United States under the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations correctly characterizes what the situation for the CLAEM project would be. As Berman puts it,

Foundation officers believed that many Third-world developmental problems were susceptible to a combination of sustained economic growth, detailed planning and program evaluation, and the application of the appropriate technologies. The attack on these problems was to be led by indigenous leaders, whose education at home and abroad was designed to help them reach conclusions about the approaches to development that were congruent with the broad outlines of foundation sponsored developmental theory.\textsuperscript{56}

Those indigenous leaders in the case of the CLAEM would be on the one hand Ginastera, and on the other the Di Tella Institute under Guido Di Tella and Enrique Oteiza. It was precisely the cosmopolitanism of these figures, including their “education at home and abroad,” as we will see next chapter, that assured the congruence of ideals about the kind of art that was to be supported, for what purposes, and in which ways.

Ginastera finished the grant proposal requesting Rockefeller Funding in January of 1962, and suggested calling the new enterprise the “Latin American Center for Advanced Studies in Composition and Musical Research.”\textsuperscript{57} In his application Ginastera credits the Festivals of Washington in 1958 and 1961, as well as a 1957 article by the New York Times critic Howard Taubman titled “Academy Urgent Need,” as the initial inspirations for the creation of the center, a myth of origin that recurs in most of the writing produced at the CLAEM about its beginning and formation, as noted by Vazquez (2008: 11). Ginastera started by saying:

\textsuperscript{55} Enrique Oteiza, letter to John P. Harrison, September 29, 1961, folder 73, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
\textsuperscript{56} Berman 1983, 161. My emphasis.
\textsuperscript{57} Alberto Ginastera, letter to John P. Harrison, January 25, 1962, folder 73, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
Latin American music is now a reality. [...] With the only exception of Heitor VillaLobos [sic] latin american [sic] musicians were only known in the limited area of their own countries. Latin American Music Festivals of Washington in 1958 and 1961, unveiled the presence of composers who had acquired international stature. But these Festivals discovered too the lack of professional background in many musicians without sufficient technical skill to surpass a medium artistic level even [if] having real talent. [...] For these reasons the north american [sic] critic Howard Taubman published after the second Latin American Festival of Caracas an article in which he proclaimed the actual need of a musical institute in one of the latin american [sic] capitals. [...] [Taubman] insisted that some north american [sic] foundations should help to establish this institute, which was a vital necessity for the music of our Continent. The Rockefeller Foundation, conscious of its moral responsibility towards the cultural welfare of the Americas, gathered Mr. Taubman’s suggestions.\(^{58}\)

1.3 Decision Making: The CLAEM Project Evaluated, Argentina’s Political Situation

Under Consideration

Projects at the Rockefeller Foundation are ultimately accepted or rejected by the board of trustees—in which the Rockefeller family is always represented. However, those same projects are brought to the table by a large number of officers who supervise ongoing activities, evaluate the conditions for new incursions by the Foundation and, in some cases take special interest in new projects in diverse areas.

While considering the case for funding the CLAEM officers of the Rockefeller discussed what they called the ‘cultural conditions’ of Argentina, by which they meant activities in academia, the arts, and affiliated fields. This could include the support that the politicians in a particular moment could provide to the Foundation. Officers like John P. Harrison and other officials provided information about all these areas in order to evaluate the viability of different projects.

\(^{58}\) Project proposal for a “Latin American Center for Advanced Studies in Composition and Musical Research” as sent by Alberto Ginastera to John P. Harrison, January 25, 1962, folder 73, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
Harrison’s connections included both the intellectual and the political elite. His diaries and those of other officers were being systematically filed and cross-referenced and this enabled him to use each officer’s experience as a source of information across the Foundation to help determine the viability of Rockefeller Foundation projects. For instance, Warren Weaver, Vice-President for the Natural and Medical Sciences section of the Rockefeller Foundation, wrote a report to the president of the Foundation, Dean Rusk, in which he encouraged their projects in Argentina. Weaver recommended,

[As for Argentina’s] economic and political life [...] which is almost sure to have great influence—perhaps dominant and definitive influence—in the whole southern half of our western hemisphere. [...], I think we are justified in committing larger support, with a full realization that the risks are considerable.59

However, not everybody agreed that it was safe to commit to activities in Argentina. On March 18, 1962, just four weeks before the final decision was to be taken by the trustees in regards to the viability of the CLAEM project, Clifford (Charles) M. Hardin, had met with Gino Germani, and Torcuato S. Di Tella to discuss the sociology center supported by the Foundation at the Institute Di Tella. The meeting coincided with the elections for Congress and provincial governorships in Argentina, which were the focus of international attention. For the first time since the 1955 ousting of Perón from the presidency, Peronist candidates had been allowed to be on the ballot. Tension grew in the meeting as the results on television started to reveal that the Peronists had won important position both in congress, with 45 out of 86 seats, and a total of 10 out of 14 provinces, including Buenos Aires.60 In the report that was made available to the board of trustees as context to evaluate all projects related to Argentina, Harding recalled that

59 WW (Warren Weaver), memorandum reporting Argentina’s political and economical situation to DR [Dean Rusk] and JGH [J. George Harrar] folder 11, box 2, series 300, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Emphasis in the original.
60 Rein 1998, 131-133.
Germani […] was out of sorts and looked almost ill. On the other hand, Torcuato Di Tella was fairly optimistic and was not nearly so alarmed as Germani was about the implications of a Peronist victory. […] While there was much laughter and joking early in the evening on election night […] there was some air of increasing tension as the reports kept coming in and indicated more and more a Peronist victory. […] In retrospect, the anxiety got pretty thick at the Torcuato Di Tella, Jr., home, and one would certainly seem to have wait until the political situation there [in Argentina] clarifies somewhat before going in with massive support.61

The consequences of these elections were of enormous significance. On one hand they demonstrated that Peronism even without Perón was still the most important political force in the country, and on the other hand it proved that the resilient anti-Peronist military leaders and other members of ultraconservative factions would not allow the elections to be validated. The political struggle that lasted just over a week ended with the military overthrowing and arresting president Frondizi for refusing to invalidate the elections and a new interim puppet president, previous senate president José María Guido, was installed.62

These events did not go unnoticed at the Rockefeller Foundation but somehow, surprisingly, they did not affect the decision to support the CLAEM and a sociology center in Buenos Aires. The files on the Di Tella Institute at the Rockefeller Foundation contain a document received from Enrique Oteiza on February 23, 1962 marked “strictly confidential”. The title of the document was “Financial Report of the Fundación Torcuato Di Tella” and attached to it were several news clippings following the political turmoil from the months surrounding the election and the ousting. Most of these clipping came from unattributed U.S. press outlets and presented criticisms of the anti-democratic response from the military to the Peronist political victory in the elections. One in particular caught my attention since it had a hand-written note on the side: ”We have been so concerned with Left-Wing movements and

61 Charles M. Hardin, Diary excerpt, March 16, 1962, folder 87, box 10, series 301S, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
threats in Latin America (Peronism in Argentina’s case) that we forget revolt against democracy can also come from the Right. In fact, that is where it usually originates in Latin America.”

The conflicting political perception that the Di Tella Institute, especially its arts centers, generated in the troubled Argentinean political landscape is an aspect that is surprisingly not referenced much in Rockefeller documentation. Early in 1963 Guido Di Tella was already publicly commenting on the accusations of communist infiltration at the Institute:

A person’s ability to carry out a task has been the only consideration taken into account [to hire someone at the Institute]. This makes us vulnerable to what some media call ‘infiltration’. In the Institute there cannot be infiltration by definition, since there are no prohibited ideologies. We believe that ideological persecution, witch-hunts of all types, constitute an incompatible position with creative intellectual labor. Taking into account our experience we are willing to advise those groups and entities with a vocation towards construction and creation to only take into account intelligence, imagination and dedication.

In later reports among Rockefeller officers there was little reference to aspects of political perception. However, in 1967, William Olson, in a most insightful manner, pointed out that “the Institute is suspect to the extreme right, but inasmuch as the extreme right does not dominate the present machine, the Institute is tolerated by the government, although this can change at any time.”

The Approval of the Grant

After receiving the project proposal from Ginastera Harrison prepared a report to the Board of Trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation supporting the request for funding to support

64 [Guido Di Tella] “Discurso pronunciado con motivo de la inauguración del Premio Internacional y del festejo del 5º aniversario de la creación del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella,” [?] 1963, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
65 WCO (William C. Olson), diary except, November 20, 1967, folder 90, box 11, series 301s, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
the project. Harrison argued that the opportunity to work with Ginastera, as well as the ideal conditions available in Buenos Aires, were two of the project’s principal strengths. Ginastera, he wrote, was “widely considered to be Latin America’s leading living composer, at a time when he is in the most productive period of his life.[…] [and] a competent organizer and administrator.”

The city of Buenos Aires promised to be an ideal setting for such an enterprise. According to Harrison, it had, “after New York, the broadest and perhaps most sophisticated musical life of any American city, there being several musical societies, chamber music groups, opera, ballet, and four symphony orchestras.” Finally, Harrison pointed out the strong financial backing of the Di Tella Foundation as the necessary assurance that the project would have a long lasting impact even after the end of Rockefeller Foundation support. With promising figures in their books, the economic stability of the Institute in the near future seemed certain and the Board of Trustees had no problem authorizing the grant.

On April 12, 1962 Flora Rhind, Secretary of the Foundation, officially informed Enrique Oteiza, executive director of the Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, that

at the meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation on April 4, 1962, action was taken to provide up to $156,000 to the Torcuato Di Tella Institute toward the costs of establishing a Latin American Center for Advanced Music Composition […] This sum is available during the three-year period beginning May 1, 1962. […] Of the funds provided under this grant up to $10,800 is for use during the initial period of preparation for the purchase of musical instruments and recording equipment, and the balance is available until April 30, 1965, for allocation approximately as follows: $49,200 for salaries of the Director and three resident professors; $20,000 for travel and salaries for visiting foreign professors; $66,000 for stipends and travel for 12 fellows; and $10,000 for library accessions.

66 John P. Harrison, Report to the Board of Trustees, February 21, 1962, folder 74, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

67 Ibid.

68 Flora Rhind, letter to Enrique Oteiza announcing action of the Board of Trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation, April 12, 1962, folder 74, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller
The most important condition that the action had was the presence of Ginastera as coordinator of the project:

It is also understood that if at any time Professor Ginastera ceases to be in active direction of the Center, there shall be no commitment on the part of the Foundation for more than six months thereafter and the matter will be reviewed by the Foundation and the Institute.  

The motion approved that day by the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation had been formally presented by Chadbourne Gilpatric, Associate Director for the Humanities, in anticipation of John P. Harrison’s retirement from the Rockefeller Foundation. It emphasized the existence of local support for the Center, as well as the guidance of a ‘major musical figure’ such as Ginastera for its direction. It stated that

The creation in Latin America of an advanced-level training center for composers was recommended four years ago by leading Latin American composers and conductors, acting in unison, as a matter of first priority for the musical future of Spanish and Portuguese America. [...] Efforts were made to get this needed training facility established within the University of Chile and later as part of the National Conservatory in Mexico. Both failed because of political problems, lack of assured ongoing local support once the program was well established, and the absence of a major musical figure willing to commit himself to full-time direction of an advanced center for composition. None of these hindrances is present in the Center for Advanced Music Composition proposed by the Torcuato Di Tella Institute. The Director of the proposed Center would be [...] Alberto Ginastera, widely considered to be Latin America’s leading living composer. After the world premieres of his Cantata for Magic America and a piano concerto in Washington during April of 1961, he was described by the Washington music critics as ‘one of the really top creative figures at work today,’ and as ‘a profound musical intellect working on a level of intensity of overwhelming attraction.’

A surprising second aspect emphasized in that motion was the importance of having a local center for advanced studies that would not only address issues of contemporary music considered to be of central concern in Europe and the United States schools of music, but that

---

69 Ibid.
70 Motion presented at the Rockefeller Foundation’s Board of Trustees meeting, April 4, 1962, folder 73, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation, RAC.
would also stress the study of indigenous music from Latin America, something that the Center never did.

There is at present no music school in the area where a student of promise can obtain the training necessary for the full realization of his gift. He is therefore compelled to study abroad, an expensive process open to only a very few. Moreover music schools in Europe and the United States have no particular interest or competence in the indigenous music of Latin America, which has contributed so much to the work of composers like Villa-Lobos, Chavez, and Ginastera. The Center will be able to stress this indigenous music. Further it is expected that a collaboration will develop between the Center and the Center for Latin American Music at Indiana University with its unique collection of and interest in folk and primitive music [...]. It is expected that, in addition to substantially increasing the volume of acceptable musical composition in Latin America, these well-trained graduates would effect a genuine reformation in musical training throughout Latin America as they return to conservatories and music faculties in their own countries.71

It was true that there were no opportunities for graduate studies in music composition in Latin America at this time. However, the success of the CLAEM came from bringing composers together to share some of their concerns and knowledge, to establish networks among countries, but also to gain competence in the same avant-garde music that would have been studied in music schools in the U.S. and Europe. The idea that there would be a study of indigenous music, or “folk and primitive” music, was more a reflection of the expectations of the Rockefeller officials regarding what compositions from Latin America should incorporate rather than a result of the real concerns of Latin American students. In fact, at this particular time, most Latin American composers affiliated in one way or another with the avant-garde rejected the practice of incorporating “native” or “folkloric” themes into their music, which was seen by many as an exoticizing flaw of earlier composers. Ginastera himself had long abandoned any direct allusions

71 Ibid. The ‘stress on indigenous music’ was something that was also highlighted in the Rockefeller Foundation’s quarterly report when announcing the grant for the CLAEM. Cf. “Di Tella Institute Plans Advanced Music Center for Latin American Composers” Rockefeller Foundation Grants: Fourth Quarter 13 (1962): 6
to folkloric materials—although his early pieces, which did include such allusions, were still his most successful.

The journey to find funding for the Center came to an exciting end when, on June 7, 1962, Ginastera wrote to Harrison on the stationery of the Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales, announcing “the first letter we are writing from the Latin American Center of Advanced Musical Studies.” Ginastera sincerely thanked Harrison and invited him to the “inauguration of this child which is so much yours as mine.”

Harrison replied that he felt a personal thrill [...] to see the stationery in which it was written. [...] Unfortunately I will no longer be able to cooperate with the Center as this Foundation’s representative since I will be leaving New York at the end of this month to accept a position at the University of Texas.

Harrison had minimal contact with the CLAEM project from then on. He only reappeared in correspondence when the news of its closing was made public. However, his role in the creation of the Center and the particular perspectives and worldviews that he had brought to its birth give us a fascinating point of entry into the political and ideological concerns and interests that were being discussed among a particularly powerful elite in the United States.

1.4 Conclusion: Overlaps in Trans-State Foreign Policy and Philanthropy

Throughout this chapter we have seen multiple connections and social interactions that show the resonant worldviews of many of the actors that participated in the creation of CLAEM. While the first part of the chapter pointed out the large-scale context among Rockefeller family members and Rockefeller Foundation agenda towards Latin America, the second brought this

---

72 Alberto Ginastera, letter to John P. Harrison, June 7, 1962, folder 74, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
73 John P. Harrison, letter to Alberto Ginastera, June 15, 1962, folder 74, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
discourse down to the ground, as the specific actors of this story experienced it. The impact that these two levels—a seemingly abstract foreign policy position adopted by the Rockefellers and the US government, and the concrete manifestation of some of these interests in the work of Rockefeller official’s like Harrison—show both the structuring power of the first, and the agency and capacity for change and adaptation of the second. Researchers like Saunders insightfully point out that the “convergence between Rockefeller billions and the U.S. government exceeded even that of the Ford Foundation.” Saunders continues with the examples of John Foster Dulles and later Dean Rusk, who “both went from the presidency of the Rockefeller Foundation to become secretaries of state.” However, she continues with what is simply a blunt exaggeration: “Nelson Rockefeller’s central position in this foundation guaranteed a close relationship with U.S. intelligence circles: he had been in charge of all intelligence in Latin America during the Second World War.” As we saw earlier, Nelson Rockefeller did not have a particularly central position in the Foundation, and his role was much more subtle.

Multiple overlaps did exist and have direct relations with the story of the CLAEM. As we have seen already, Dean Rusk was one of these figures. He was Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern affairs in the early 1950s—and argued for a containment policy of the Soviet Union and China. From 1952 until 1961 he was the president of the Rockefeller Foundation, and in the meantime was one of the members of the panel on foreign policy for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. As Berman puts it,

The movement of America’s decision makers like Rusk between the government agencies, the corporate and financial centers, and the major foundations helps to explain how the ideology of the one was so often shared by others.  

74 Saunders 2000, 144.  
75 Ibid.  
76 Berman 1983, 65.
The direct connections between the elite circles in the United States and Argentina were also visible. Torcuato Di Tella Sr. met with Nelson Rockefeller at the Office of Inter-American Affairs in 1945 to discuss the rapid rise of Perón in Argentina. His son, Guido finished his PhD in 1958 under Walt Rostow. During those years, and before becoming advisor to the Kennedy administration, Rostow wrote *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* (1960), an important text to understand the Alliance for Progress. David Rockefeller and Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, worked together in 1948 on development plans for Puerto Rico and later David became part of the commerce committee of the Alliance for Progress. Two figures important to the approval of the grants at the CLAEM, Charles B. Fahs and John P. Harrison’s replacement as liaison with the Di Tella family, Chadbourne Gilpatric, were former officers of the Office of Strategic Services, the direct predecessor of the CIA. They both had been “the principal liaisons for the Congress for Cultural Freedom, and responsible for dispensing large Rockefeller subsidies to [it].”\(^77\) It would be of course naïve to think that they did not consider the importance and political relevance of supporting the arts in the context of Latin America and in the overall struggle against communism.\(^78\)

Several factors contributed to the optimal conditions for the project for the CLAEM to succeed. First, the Rockefeller brothers, particularly Nelson and David, had developed by 1960 a

\(^{77}\) Saunders 2000, 145.

\(^{78}\) Even in terms of personal relations, there was closeness between trustees and officers and the different members of the government and the diplomatic bodies in the countries they visited. John P. Harrison, for instance was a personal friend of Hewson A. Ryan, who was Assistant Director (Latin America) of the United States Information Agency in 1962. On January 8, 1962 he writes to Ryan to tell him that he has “hopes of arranging for an advanced training center in composition in Buenos Aires to be supported over the long haul by the Instituto Torcuato Di Tella with Ginastera as the director of the musical program within the Instituto.” John P. Harrison, letter to Hewson A. Ryan, January 8, 1962, reel 24, series 200, RG 2 1962, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
strong interest in Latin America that they had accompanied with endeavors in cultural diplomacy. Their participation and influence in the philanthropic organization of their family shaped the directions of the funding, and the implicit support of the arts as a means to further development and improve foreign relations. Second, the general belief that development funds—including those for the arts—promoted economic and social change and that these could be an alternative to the Marxist revolutionary dreams fueled by the triumph of the Cuban Revolution.

The beginning of the 1960s suggested that progressive and socially aware policies could promote the modernization of Latin America, and in the process, change some of the structural inequalities that were vestiges of a colonial past, and a complex post-coloniality. And last, but not least, the serendipitous situation by which John P. Harrison became involved in Ginastera’s project, which resonated with his own appreciation of classical music, and the arts in general.

The policies and worldviews that allowed a project like the CLAEM to be viable for a Foundation such as the Rockefeller in the early 1960s had disappeared or changed by the end of the decade. The Cold War notions that applied up to 1959 and the Cuban Revolution changed dramatically and new attention was paid to Latin America and its cultural ties with the United States. But just as sudden was the abandonment of the promotion of social and economic development and the embrace of right wing regimes that maintained the doctrine of national security. By the end of the 1960s, the mild success and the ultimate failure of the Alliance for Progress reflect these changes. The CLAEM initiative was one of the most successful cases of support towards the arts in the history of the Rockefeller Foundation, but as the organization moved in different directions, this lesson seems to have vanished—or at least it has been ignored until now. No other musical project supported by the Rockefeller Foundation has had such broad repercussions in the musical landscape of a whole region.
CHAPTER 2

PHILANTHROPY AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF ELITE ART WORLDS: THE DI TELLA FAMILY

The creation of the CLAEM is a particular case study of philanthropic funding for the arts where multiple interests of elite groups regarding Latin America meet. The objective of this chapter is to explain why the Di Tella brothers saw fit to support the creation of the CLAEM; in other words, to learn about the ways in which avant-garde music was relevant or significant for an elite group that was in the process of consolidating their position in Buenos Aires during the 1960s.

This chapter’s first section introduces the different positions the brothers had regarding the support of the arts. This is followed by a family biography, using both primary and secondary sources, as well as my experience working with the Di Tella family, one of the wealthiest families in Argentina and biggest patrons of avant-garde music. In this chapter I seek to demonstrate how oral history research can provide a better understanding of the process that leads to the consolidation of power in the hands of specific elite groups while still considering them dynamic and heterogeneous across different realms of social life. Specifically I want to show how the Di Tella brothers used the arts during this particular time to consolidate their status from a functional to a power elite, although each of them had different reasons to do so.

2.1 The Di Tella Family: Introduction to the Two Di Tella Brothers

In 1958 Guido Di Tella and his brother, Torcuato S., were only 27 and 28 years old, respectively, and that year they decided to place a significant part of their fortune in a project to
support the arts. Although they agreed on the worthiness of such an investment, they had very
different values and reasons for pursuing philanthropic endeavors in the arts. As Becker points
out, “the development of new art worlds frequently focuses on the creation of new organizations
and methods for distributing works.” ¹ This new art world that the art centers supported, almost
entirely consisting of avant-garde expressions, strongly resonated with the values that these
brothers embodied as part of an emerging economic and intellectual elite that stood against the
traditional Argentinean elites. Through their philanthropic contributions the Di Tella brothers
sparked the formation of a new elite art world that corresponded to the image they had of a
developed and progressive Argentina.

Guido and Nelly Di Tella

“Are you trying my fucking patience? You woke me up and reminded me of one
of the worst days of my life… go to hell”²

During my interviews with Nelly Di Tella—Guido Di Tella’s widow—I found myself
frequently mesmerized by her apartment, located in one of the most luxurious neighborhoods of
Buenos Aires—not coincidentally, just across the street from the Museo Nacional de Bellas
Artes and the Centro Cultural Recoleta. An impressive amount of art decorated the walls, floors,
and ceiling. A beautiful angel hung near the entrance, and paintings and statues decorated her
living room. We usually met in the study with a stunning red door designed by Clorindo Testa,
next to which a granite sculpture by Sesostris Vitullo was on display. The study also contained
several Mapuche statues, the chemamüll,³ used mostly in funerary rites. On the balcony

¹ Becker 1982, 129.
² Guido Di Tella to Federico Consiglieri on the closing of the art centers of the Di Tella Institute
in Consiglieri 2001, Desde el Di Tella. (Episode 1)
³ The word chemamüll or chemamull means “wooden person” in Mapudungun: (che, person; mamiull, wood)
overlooking a park was the bust of one of the famous Philosophers that watch silently on the Oxford University campus. It was an original: Guido bought it in the 1970s when it was being replaced due to heavy erosion. Renaissance music was often playing through a beautiful sound system connected to her iPod—a gadget I was surprised to see Nelly, close to 80, using. It was clear that art of all sorts was an important part of this couples’ life.

The epigraph to this section, taken from a televised interview, was a blunt confession of how Guido felt about the art centers closing. I knew that the art centers had been truly important to him. In my conversations with Nelly I wanted to understand why this particular enterprise was so meaningful for her husband. She told me without hesitation: “Guido did not do anything more important than the Di Tella [art centers]. When asked what he wanted to be remembered for, he would say: ‘The one thing I built with an enormous effort was the Di Tella. I would like to be remembered for that.’”

Nelly recognized that Guido had partially failed in continuing the industrial complex his father had left him and his brother, but had not felt completely frustrated by this lack of success. He had inherited, not selected, this project and although the failure troubled him, he felt that this had been something thrown at him. On the other hand, the art centers were fully his idea. His emotional investment in the art centers was much more profound. The arts had been his passion, one of the passions he and Nelly shared. This passion had been carried one step further when he convinced his family, his wife included, to financially support the artists creating it.

The Di Tella family was one of the most important patrons for the arts in Argentina, particularly for music, during the twentieth century. Nelly, who continued her patronage well after her husband’s death, reacted humbly, almost defensively when faced with this claim. She

---

5 Possibly surpassed only by Victoria Ocampo; see Corrado 2007.
would point out to me that they had given to the arts and the arts had given back to them, that it was a reciprocal relationship. “What has happened”—she said to me—“is that the contact with a movement that we liked drove us to try to be useful to it. It is something mutual. You receive…it is an exchange.”

One of the things that strike me the most about Guido and Nelly’s patronage of music is that it was focused on the avant-garde. After the end of the CLAEM they organized the philanthropic organization Fundación Música y Tecnología, which organizes competitions and commissions works mostly of electroacoustic music. I suspect the origin of this ongoing effort dated back to the CLAEM. I asked Nelly what was the nature of her relationship with electroacoustic music. She answered,

In all realms of human activities there are people that approach them passionately. Passionately. So, what happened with electroacoustic music and us? Well, I learned about it basically since the Di Tella years. Naturally, I was very young, but before that I did not know it even existed. […] At that point I just simply did not understand what it was about. I was curious about the unusual apparatuses that Fernando [Von Reichenbach] had invented, and played with. And I started slowly… almost one sound at a time. I was very confused by electroacoustic music when I was 28 or 30 years old. But I was always curious about those things I did not understand. And today I simply have some clear preferences. Some of these figures [composers] have really moved me, and still move me. […] I go, listen and enjoy some composers. It is not that I find value in all electroacoustic music, but I do listen to all of it with enormous interest. What in the world is [the composer] trying to tell me or give me with this? [7]

To Nelly their patronage was the result of a sincere passion for an area of human life. Not merely academic or intellectual, their interest was excited by the essential emotions stirred by the arts. Art was something capable of moving them, capable of touching them deeply and affecting some basic aspect of being human. Art in her life was also connected with her live story with Guido, a passion they shared for 51 years. And for her,

It is the contact I have with life. It is the grounding cable. I don’t know what else I could do that would fascinate me, that would interest me. […] I think one is wired in a certain way, and when you start looking around, there are places when you feel protected, accepted, and in that place you are like a kid who just got the toy he always wanted.\(^8\)

**Torcuato S. Di Tella**

In my first meeting with Torcuato S. we were joined by Patricia Chomnalez and Enrique Orsini. I was not sure why they were there, but then I realized their duty was to be sure that some of Torcuato’s blunt statements would not be misinterpreted or taken too literally. Perhaps they felt a mild distrust. Today I am still not sure if I ever got Torcuato S. to feel comfortable talking about the topics I proposed. One of the first questions I asked him was why he and Guido had supported the arts at that time. With no hint of remorse, and a direct tone that took some time to get used to, he said:

In theory [we gave funding to the arts] to move towards the happiness of humanity. In practice, to make it into history as benefactors, something we achieved. If my brother [Guido] who died, could hear me he would be mad at me: ‘No, we did this only to benefit humanity’ [he would say]. I say we did it to benefit humanity and also for our own benefit. Not economically but culturally. That is, like some say, we converted economic capital into cultural. But we overdid it; we crossed the line. So now we do not have economic capital after having spent too much in cultural activities.\(^9\)

I knew that next to the late Gino Germani (Italy 1911-1979, lived in Argentina beginning in 1934), Torcuato S. was one of the most important sociologists in Argentina. And here he was, making reference to two of the forms of capital as theorized by Pierre Bourdieu (1986) that I had originally planned to use as part of my theoretical framework.\(^10\) Even if the prestige gained by

\(^8\) Ibid.
\(^9\) Torcuato Di Tella, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, June 8, 2008.
\(^10\) In his works, Bourdieu has distinguished four types of capital: social (group membership, networks), cultural (education, forms of knowledge, skills), economic (assets, possessions), and later symbolic (prestige, recognition).
investing in philanthropy would perhaps be better considered as Bourdieu’s symbolic capital, Torcuato S. nonetheless underlined two seemingly contradictory motives behind the art centers. His brother Guido felt much more strongly that this was a contribution to humanity, that it was something noble and righteous to do. On the other hand Torcuato S., who at the time already had received a PhD and was becoming prestigious on his own, wanted to remove the association of his last name from refrigerators and home appliances, and connect it to high culture and elite arts. He claimed several times that he did not understand or care about the arts, but he did understand the ramifications that the project could have. It was a means to take power in an area that had not been available to the brothers. And he was aware of it, as he recognized in a television interview:

> What I do believe is that, in the end, what we wanted consciously or not, was to gain more prestige for ourselves, and for the company […] What it could be is that with [with the art centers] we were pretending immortality, and to become important people. That was a semi-conscious motivation. Ultimately, to take part of the power of the state... the power to educate and to do research that the state has. It was, of course, a very ambitious project.\(^\text{11}\)

The impetus behind the funding of the CLAEM and art centers in the Di Tella Institute was to include the arts in an overarching modernizing project. Clearly expressed in 1967, “the main purpose of the Institute is to promote the cultural modernization of the country, with the hope of untying the cultural knot that slows our development.”\(^\text{12}\) For both of the Di Tella brothers, the discourse of modernity was absolutely naturalized, often times taken for granted—it was *doxa* or something that went without saying because it came without saying.\(^\text{13}\) Having fully embraced contemporary cosmopolitan discourses on modernity, they often made comments on “development” as a strategy for the modernization of Argentina, that is, an evolutionary

\(^{\text{12}}\) Guido Di Tella and Oteiza 1967, unnumbered.  
transformation of the country from ‘pre-modern’ or ‘traditional’ into a ‘modern’ society. The modernizing spirit of the Di Tella, like other emerging elites in Argentina, was manifested best in the notion of developmentism.

In agreement with the worldviews of the Rockefeller Foundation, Torcuato S. Di Tella wrote in 1966 “the economic and social development of Latin America can only be the result of local leadership and creativity.” 14 Foreign aid, such as Rockefeller Foundation grants “can only be useful”—Torcuato S. wrote—“only to the extent that it supports local initiatives.” 15 And a contemporary art scene was part of the needed response to the “reality of modern societies,” 16 as the following quote from one of the Institute’s annual reports shows:

Regarding the arts, our country is not far in time or space from the important centers of creation. Even more, in the last decade we have found an increased development of vanguard artistic movements that are, even if keeping normal connections with movements in other places, reaching a level of autonomy and vitality never seen before. 17

Art was an important part of the modernizing project that the Di Tella Institute represented. If Torcuato S. personally did not care about the arts, and even showed a dislike for contemporary creations that did not matter. He had been socialized to believe in their importance as human expression. This he shared with Guido. He believed that a modernized society needed spaces for creativity, his tastes notwithstanding. The dramatic disdain Torcuato S. shows in the following excerpt from one of our interviews is faced with the belief in the importance of creativity for society.

The arts... the value of the art section was not all that dumb shit that they were showing there, because that is what that was, dumb shit. It was in my opinion

14 Torcuato S. Di Tella 1971, 315.
15 Ibid.
16 Guido Di Tella and Oteiza 1965, unnumbered.
17 Ibid.
80% pure shit. [...] Beginning with the electronic music. But, anyway, 80% of what they did in the art centers was worthless. However, I think we did well in creating an independent space, of free creativity. Well, if you are free, do whatever you want, but then I have the right to say ‘this is dumb shit’. Which is what I believe, that many things were shit. [...] But it is my personal opinion, which does not matter. We did not create the Institute to realize our own ideas, especially in the arts.\textsuperscript{18}

The value of the Centers for him, then, rests more in the way they represented the core values of freedom and innovation. In other words, he reserved his right to not like what was being done artistically in the centers, but he saw creativity and the arts as something crucial to the overall goals he and his brother had for the Institute. Torcuato disliked modern art in general, but when asked by his brother, he responded: “sure, OK, we need to do art, modern art, the art has to be an important part of this project.”\textsuperscript{19} Regardless of his disinterest, like Guido, Torcuato S. strongly believed in art being a necessary element in the Institute so that it could contribute to the “economic and social development” of Argentinean society. Modern art, despite his tastes, “has to be an important part of this.”

\textbf{2.2 The Di Tella Family: Monumentalizing a History}

To understand deeply how both Di Tella brothers can conceive the importance of art in such different ways, but at the same time share a deep rooted belief that it is a necessity for a desired modernized Argentina, one has to look into the emergence and establishment of the Di Tella family as one of the most powerful elite groups in Argentina. There are three main sources that trace the history of the Di Tella family in Argentina. The oldest is \textit{Entrepreneurship in Argentine Culture: Torcuato Di Tella and S.I.A.M} by Thomas Cochran and Ruben Reina (1962), followed by Torcuato S. Di Tella’s \textit{Torcuato Di Tella: Industria y política} (1993). These two

\textsuperscript{18} Torcuato S. interview with the author, Buenos Aires, June 8, 2008.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid. My emphasis.
books focus on the patriarch of the family, Torcuato Di Tella senior. The most recent book on the Di Tellas is Nicolás Cassese’s *Los Di Tella: Una familia un país* (2008). It covers the lives of both Torcuato Di Tella Sr. and his two sons, Guido and Torcuato S. All of these books show the powerful members of the family as significant actors in the history of Argentina. Especially in Cassese’s book, the legacy of the Di Tella family in the industrial sector, the arts, the social sciences, philanthropy and the political sphere, is used to retell the most significant moments of the country through the lives of the family members.

All three texts work together in constructing a legacy around the family’s history, an effort most likely led by Torcuato S., who is author of the second, and Cassese’s main source for his book. They each build on the previous one and contribute to the origin myth of the Di Tella family as an exemplary case of poor immigrants from Italy that come to Argentina and, after a series of hardships, achieve great success in the country’s industrial sector. Nelly Di Tella, who decided not to collaborate with Cassese for his book—most likely because Cassese was a journalist and not an academic—told me that she had just skimmed his book and found it ‘full of gossip’. However, these three texts, particularly Cassese’s are the main source for the historical information found in this chapter. Cassese’s book becomes a formal narrative shaped strongly by Torcuato S. about his family’s history. In this overview I keep in focus how the book’s sources, its ‘narratives,’ are part of a process of self-representation led principally by Torcuato S., in what Herzfeld has called “monumentalizing the past.”20

---

*Torcuato Di Tella: An Immigrant Creating a Fortune*

Torcuato di Tella—the ‘Di’ would become capitalized later—was born in Italy in 1892 and traveled to Argentina for the first time when he was only two years old. Between 1894 and 1913, his family lived in several towns in the Argentine province of Chaco before settling in the city of Córdoba, where Torcuato opened a shoe store.

20 Herzfeld 2000, 234.
1902 his father Amato Nicola di Tella and his uncle Salvatore di Tella had attempted and failed to make their fortune in the New World in the tobacco processing business and the making of cigarettes.\textsuperscript{21} Upon their return, they discovered that life back in Italy was not any easier, and their situation worsened with Amato Nicola’s death in 1905. Under the leadership of uncle Salvatore, Torcuato di Tella, now 13 years old, headed with his family for a second time to the prosperous Argentina to try once more to improve his economic situation. According to family stories, in Buenos Aires the young Torcuato demonstrated his tenacity and eagerness to prosper by changing the ‘di Tella’ to ‘Di Tella’ in order to be alphabetically first in his class when taking exams. He soon found a job in a toy store to which, “he would go walking to save on train tickets.”\textsuperscript{22} When Torcuato’s mother died only 3 years after their arrival, Salvatore took full responsibility of him and his two sisters.

When Di Tella turned 18 he became partners with Alfredo and Guido Allegrucci, manufacturing kneading machines for bread making.\textsuperscript{23} As Cochran and Reina report, Di Tella’s “technological insight and enthusiastic salesmanship” together with the Allegrucci brothers’ business connections and mechanical skills, led to a quickly fruitful enterprise.\textsuperscript{24} Their company, the \textit{Sociedad Italiana de Amasadoras Mecánicas}, or SIAM,\textsuperscript{25} became tremendously successful, as bakers throughout Argentina adopted their machine, which proved to be more efficient than imported ones. In 1915, happy with what he had earned, Alfredo Allegrucci decided to cash out his part of the company.

\textsuperscript{21} Cochran and Reina 1962, 38.
\textsuperscript{22} Cassese 2008, 21.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid, 22.
\textsuperscript{24} Cochran and Reina 1962, 41.
\textsuperscript{25} Cochran and Reina argue that the name stands for \textit{Sección Industrial de Amasadoras Mecánicas}, but Torcuato S. Di Tella argues that this is highly improbable.
During the 1920s Argentina’s economic growth measured in GDP was even larger than that of the United States, Canada and Australia. With that growth came the appearance of one of the clearest signs of ‘modernity’: the automobile. Di Tella quickly saw the opportunity to expand his company and in 1923 begun distributing and later manufacturing naphtha fuel dispensers. Scared that the company was taking tremendous risks in some of the investments, Guido Allegrucci retired from the company in 1927, having increased his capital much more than originally expected, and leaving Di Tella as sole proprietor of SIAM. By 1929 the new SIAM (now standing for Sociedad Industrial Americana de Maquinarias) became multinational, with branches in São Paulo, Montevideo, and Santiago de Chile.

The beginning of the 1930s, however, brought a harsh economic crisis that profoundly affected Di Tella’s company. The economic unrest caused by the worldwide depression of 1929 triggered a coup d’état in Argentina in 1930 that replaced Hipólito Yrigoyen with a conservative and reactionary government that wanted to go back to the years of agro-exporting oligarchic rule. New emerging industrial elites of recent immigrants like the Di Tella were seen with mistrust, and were the target of the new government’s harshest regulations. In very short time the political and economic conditions of Argentina had radically changed, and “the sales of [naphtha fuel] dispensers had reduced to half and those of bread-kneading machines to a third. […] By 1931, SIAM saw the possibility of bankruptcy.”

In the midst of the crisis, Torcuato Di Tella and his long time girlfriend and now wife Maria had two sons in short succession. Torcuato S. Di Tella was born January 4, 1930 while Guido Di Tella was born June 12, 1931.

The saturated market and new economic conditions seemed to point to the need for changes. Torcuato decided to focus the company’s efforts towards the production of mass

26 Cassese 2008, 45.
consumption goods. Among different ideas that the company experimented with, perhaps the most successful product, and the one that would earn SIAM a place in thousands of middle class homes was the electric fridge. As Cassese points out, with their “enormous and imposing whiteness, an unequivocal sign of modernity, the SIAM fridges became a mark of status among families.” By 1940, SIAM had significantly broadened the types of products it was offering: fridges remained the company’s main product, but the mass consumption line also included irons, floor buffers, fans, washing machines, electric motors, hydraulic pumps, magnetic switches, naphtha dispensers, and their original product, the kneading machines, and in the years following, scooters and even automobiles. The Di Tella name became synonymous with industry, it had become “the Argentinean Henry Ford.”

The military coup of 1943 brought a new actor into Di Tella’s story. Juan Domingo Perón, the young colonel who, together with his wife Eva, became the populist leader of a powerful working class movement, and who effectively use discourse to divide Argentinean “society between ‘the people’ and ‘the oligarchy’. “ Di Tella saw in Perón a caricature of Mussolini. However, with the democratic victory of Perón in 1946, Di Tella chose to remain silent for the following years regarding his aversion to Perón and Evita. As Cassese indicates, Di Tella “not only kept all his properties, but also became the industrialist that gained the most from the regime. No other government gave SIAM more than the Peronist.” The welfare state promoted by the Peronist government during its first years increased Argentineans’ consumption capacity, increasing therefore the sales of electric appliances and refrigerators. Between 1945

27 Ibid, 53.
28 Ibid, 54.
29 Romero 2001, 103.
30 Ibid, 80.
and 1948, SIAM’s refrigerator sales were eleven times higher.\textsuperscript{31} By 1947 Torcuato had decided to looked the other way and was collaborating with the government,

but he kept firm in his disdain for the regime. […] He did pass those ideas to his sons. Tucho [Torcuato S.] and Guido became adults and started their political militancy during the first years of Peronism and they joined the resistance youth groups.\textsuperscript{32}

Even if Guido and Torcuato S. began their political activism as strong anti-Peronists, this soon changed. In fact, the reevaluation of Peronism that a large sector of the intellectuals in Argentina underwent during the following years corresponded to the formation of a new elite identity, one that considered itself at the same time progressive and anti-status quo.

\textit{A New Industrial Bourgeoisie}

The fortune that Torcuato Di Tella created during the first decades of the twentieth century positioned him as a new type of elite in Buenos Aires. Since the beginning of the twentieth century the traditional economic elites of Argentina had derived their fortunes from agriculture and cattle ranching. Argentinean meat and wheat had a comparative international advantage, and large landowning aristocratic families were the main beneficiaries of an oligarchic state. This meant that Di Tella’s fortune was twice ostracized: first because he was an immigrant, and second, because it derived from a fairly recent phenomenon, the large scale industrial complex. “My father”—Torcuato S. recalled—“was seen by the traditional Argentinean elite as a recent immigrant, an immigrant that made a fortune. […] His [fortune] did not have any ties with the traditional aristocracy, the traditional agrarian oligarchy.”\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, 81.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid, 84.
\textsuperscript{33} Torcuato S. Di Tella, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, July 21, 2008.
The tensions between these two sectors played out in multiple realms of social life: among political parties, conflicting notions of national identity and particularly significant for our case study, disputes about taste. Di Tella was a “true bourgeois with expensive tastes. He spent on art, on travels, on designer’s clothes and on fancy food.” However, Di Tella saw in his kids the real possibility for his family to become fully accepted within the circles of power of Argentinean society. He wanted something very specific for their education. He wanted “a school that would assure that his sons would be in touch with high society from Buenos Aires, to which he belonged because of his money but not his origins. He wanted them to blend seamlessly with those in power.”

If Di Tella had the economic capital his children would be socialized to have all the cultural capital to fully embrace their role as elite. Educational institutions and early socialization both play an important role in the mechanisms of the social reproduction of the elites. The conflict between old and new wealth had to be resolved as the second generation of Di Tella emerged educated as part of the elite circles of Buenos Aires.

*The Time of the Brothers: Socialization, Education and Acquiring Capital*

Torcuato Di Tella was only 56 years when he died on July 22, 1948. His two sons, Torcuato S. and Guido, being just 18 and 17 years old, inherited the large SIAM corporation, now with more than four thousand employees. While they finished their studies, a board of directors took charge of the company. Over the next ten years the brothers’ role in the family legacy would be determined.

---

34 Cassese 2008, 54.
The Di Tella family saw Torcuato S., the firstborn, as the ‘natural heir’ of the industry. However, according to Torcuato S.’s accounts, while he was bored and uninterested, it was Guido who listened carefully to his father when he talked about them having to be in charge of the company. Apparently as a child, Torcuato S. “abhorred the factory.”\(^{36}\) In his own stories Torcuato S. presents himself as an academic-intellectual even from his early years, submerged in books and indifferent to material life. Torcuato S.’s life history is marked by his escape, at least for a while, from his destiny as heir of the Di Tella fortune, and instead becoming a successful academic. Today, having become the head of the family in the wake of his brother’s death, he jokes about how he eventually ended up doing what everybody thought he was ‘born to do’.

Pressure on Torcuato S. to take charge of the family industry led him to study engineering instead of history, philosophy or even law, areas that he admittedly found more appealing. He graduated with an engineering degree in 1951 and in 1952 began his master’s studies in sociology at Columbia University in New York. During the following years, Torcuato S.’s relationship with his family, particularly his mother, was strained by his conflictive relationship with Kamala Apparao, an Indian woman he had met on a trip to California, and whom he married in 1954, in a ceremony where no other Di Tella was present.\(^{37}\)

In a typical experience of a cosmopolitan abroad, Torcuato S.’s studies in sociology pushed him further in political reflection, and Latin America became a concern for the first time. Having been born in a rich family, he was familiar with the United States and Europe much more than he was with the rest of the countries in Latin America.

\(^{36}\) Ibid, 85.
\(^{37}\) Ibid, 124.
An important change happened to his political views: as he advanced toward his PhD, his conviction that Perón was just a caricature of Mussolini started to wane.\textsuperscript{38} Torcuato S.’s rethinking of Peronism was not unique at the time. Silvia Sigal in her \textit{Intelectuales y poder en Argentina} (2002) describes how during the post-Perón era (1955-1973), a large number of intellectuals became politicized and reevaluated their ideas about Peronism. Sigal points to the previously anti-Peronist intellectuals who were not affiliated with institutions. They were politically conscious but without a party, and began to reconsider their initial disdain for Peronism once they started to see it as a social movement.\textsuperscript{39} These intellectuals frequently questioned their role in society and, in particular, how they could help in the national social welfare, a description that fits well with Torcuato’s experiences.

Guido underwent a similar process. He had done his undergraduate work in industrial engineering at the Universidad de Buenos Aires. At that time he met Nelly Ruvira, an architecture student and they got married when he was only 23 years old and had just finished his degree. Soon after the wedding they moved to Boston so that Guido could get a master’s degree in management at MIT. Management turned out to be “something he found little interest in but that he deemed fundamental for his soon-to-be destiny as captain of SIAM.”\textsuperscript{40}

After graduating, Guido was accepted into the PhD program in economics, a subject that he found much more appealing. Di Tella and his friend Manuel Zymelman were, “captivated by Walt Whitman Rostow, a professor whose theory about the stages of development were the latest fashion in the Economics academy.”\textsuperscript{41} At the time of Guido’s studies, Rostow was finishing \textit{The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto} (1960), a key text for U.S.

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{39} Sigal 2002, 93.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid, 133.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, 133-134.
understanding of developmentalism and modernization theory. This was the same Rostow that David Rockefeller would reference in his use of the ‘takeoff stage’ of modernization, and that would closely collaborate with the Kennedy Administration. In his contact with Rostow, Guido incorporated ideas about modernization and development and they became a natural part of his discourse.

Appreciative of Rostow’s ideas, Di Tella and Zymelman proposed that their dissertation examine the economic development of Argentina. They shared a theoretical framework based on developmentalism, and they each looked at a different period of Argentina’s economic history. Zymelman looked at the years 1876-1913, while Di Tella wrote about the period 1913-1952. With his dissertation approved, Guido Di Tella received his PhD in 1959 and together with Zymelman published the book *Etapas del desarrollo económico argentino*. The book presented alternative views to that of one of the most prominent economist at the time in Argentina, Aldo Ferrer—himself a student of Raul Prebisch—, positioning Zymelman and Di Tella as key players in economy’s academic circles. Returning to Buenos Aires, Guido began teaching Theory of Economic Growth in the economics department of the UBA. That same year his brother Torcuato S. joined the faculty of Sociology at the invitation of Gino Germani. Both brothers, now with PhDs in hand, were back in Buenos Aires as heads of one of the richest families in the country. But with their very distinct personalities, and after having their political positions reshaped by academic life, only Guido was ready to assume the leadership of the SIAM conglomerate.

*Incursions in Culture: The Torcuato Di Tella Institute as a Path to Modernity*

While studying at MIT Guido Di Tella and his wife Nelly fell in love with the artistic life of New York. It was during those early years that Enrique Oteiza—who later became the
executive director of the Di Tella Institute—grew close to Guido. Their friendship dated back to their college years in Buenos Aires. Like Guido, Oteiza was politically active among progressive organizations opposed to the Perón regime, and these activities had led to some prison time early on, after which he decided to seek asylum in Uruguay. When Oteiza began working on a PhD at Columbia, he became Guido and Nelly’s frequent guide to the Guggenheim and the Museum of Modern Art—at the time presided over by David Rockefeller. Oteiza remembers: “When Guido was going to grad school in Boston and visited New York, I was doing my graduate studies in engineering at Columbia. And Guido would call me and ask me: ‘what is there to see?’ Nelly and Guido would come to New York and we would go together to museums, to exhibits.” As Oteiza, Guido and Nelly visited the museums of New York, the avant-garde became their main interest. Oteiza recalls: “We had a lot of interest in modern art […] and I was already in touch in Buenos Aires with the avant-garde of the time, a prelude to the strong avant-garde of the 1960s. In visual arts, but also in music, with Juan Carlos Paz.”

Of the three of them it was Enrique Oteiza who had the strongest interest in music. While studying engineering in college he had directed the Student Center’s cultural division. His musical knowledge was reinforced by his studies at the Collegium Musicum in Buenos Aires. Now in New York he found a new interest:

43 Cassese 2008, 140.
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45 Enrique Oteiza, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, August 10, 2008.
In New York I was in touch with all this [contemporary music]. When I was finishing my graduate studies they were establishing the Columbia-Princeton Electronic Music Center. Something amazing for me, as an engineer on one hand, and a twentieth century art and music aficionado on the other.47

The technological aspect of electroacoustic music was very appealing to a cohort that valued innovation and scienticity. Oteiza, with his double interest in engineering and music, later became a central link in promoting this particular aspect of the musical avant-garde inside the Institute. New York’s contemporary art scene had sparked a new side to Di Tella and Oteiza’s friendship and their conversations started taking an important turn. Guido’s family had an extensive collection of art, and they started to dream about what they could do with it. In their conversations they had already started reflecting on what type of philanthropy they could be doing. “Then we started talking about museums,” says Oteiza. “The idea was to do something new in philanthropic terms. A model not like charity, or enlightened philanthropy.”48

Oteiza himself has theorized about three categories of philanthropy: charity, enlightened philanthropy and foundation-based philanthropy. In charities, he says, there are people with fortunes that donate them to lay or religious non-profit organizations that look to serve the public interest. Then there are the enlightened philanthropists, rich patrons who directly supported those they knew best and that which appealed to their taste. Finally, he talks about the foundation-based philanthropy as a “more organic and long term” project.49 The idea of foundation work is that it has strong links to the community it belongs to, and develops specific strategies for localized problems.

47 Ibid.
When both Oteiza and Guido Di Tella were back in Argentina they were full of dreams and confidence in the future of the country. Di Tella had learned from Rostow that a country like his, with a good set of policies and government stability, could achieve development if it followed the right path to progress. In 1959 Guido came to Oteiza with the idea of starting an Institute. He wanted to create an organization that would promote the modernization of artistic and cultural production. His intention was to create a space that would help Argentina develop the two areas that they saw were lagging behind: social sciences and the arts. He wanted the Institute to have “academic rigor and creative freedom, [and become] a beacon of progress similar to the ones they had enjoyed while studying in MIT and Columbia”\(^{50}\). Oteiza accepted and began to organize the institute.

\textit{The Fundación Di Tella}

In 1958 SIAM and the Di Tella fortune looked stronger than ever and Guido convinced his mother and brother that they should organize a family philanthropic organization. Guido Di Tella had decided that he could model it after the Rockefeller Foundation. In fact, Guido Di Tella asked Warren Weaver, from the Rockefeller Foundation, “many questions about the R[ockefeller] F[oundation], because of [his] plan to form a Di Tella Foundation.”\(^{51}\)

The Torcuato Di Tella Foundation was created on July 22, 1958, 10 years after the death of Torcuato Sr.. The Rockefeller Foundation notice the creation of this philanthropic organization and its ideological connections to them, and kept in file that the Torcuato Di Tella Foundation was “a new and important institution, the closest thing to a major US foundation in

\(^{50}\) Ibid.

\(^{51}\) WW (Warren Weaver), diary excerpt, October 22, 1959, reel 32, series 301, RG 2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC
Latin America.” The money for the foundation came from a two-part donation from the family. On one hand was the art collection that Torcuato Sr. and María had acquired. Modern works chosen by Guido and Nelly expanded that collection, making it quite valuable. The second part was a thirteen million dollar donation in SIAM stocks. The reasons that Guido gave to convince his family to join him in the creation of the Foundation were threefold: first, the company was strong enough and could afford it; second, it was a way of honoring his father and contributing to the development of Argentina; and third, since the Foundation had to be directed by family members, the donation would assure that the majority of the stocks would remain among the family and not depend “on the good will of their inheritors who could fight or even sell their stocks to third parties.” The main goal of the Foundation, however, was to provide funds for the Institute that Guido, Torcuato S. and Oteiza were creating, to promote the social sciences and the arts, two areas that Guido and Oteiza felt were “more or less behind in Argentinean culture and scientific development.”

The Instituto Torcuato Di Tella: The Centro de Artes Visuales and the Centro de Experimentación Audiovisual

The Institute started promoting areas that interested each of the brothers. First was the Centro de Investigaciones Económicas (CIE, Center for Research in Economics), which began its activities in 1960, and later the Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (CIS, Center for Sociological Research), which was created in 1963. They were both housed in Di Tella family property in the mostly residential Belgrano neighborhood. The centers in Belgrano kept a relatively low profile, and, as Cassese points out, “economists and sociologists [at the Institute]

---
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were quite brilliant, but nobody knew about their existence past their small social circle. Their impact on public opinion was little." The public face of the Institute was going to be the art centers, located on the hippest block of the cosmopolitan city, the ‘manzana loca’ (the crazy block) in Florida Street.

At first the Institute’s art activities were supposed to be limited to an exhibit of the family’s art collection at the Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes. Their collection included European Renaissance art in addition to works by Picasso, Cézanne, Manet, Renoir, Pissarro, Rubens, Van Dyke and Degas that Torcuato Sr. had bought as his initial collection. Guido Di Tella followed his father’s appreciation and interest in collecting art and, on the advice of art critic Lionello Venturi, he had acquired several important modern works by Pollock, Picasso, and Henry Moore during trips to U.S. and Europe. But the idea of simply organizing exhibits was expanded as soon as Guido and Oteiza decided to include Jorge Romero Brest in the plans. Romero Brest was an art critic known for his radical positions and his support of recent avant-garde trends. He was also the director of the Museo. Romero Brest was called initially to be a judge for the Instituto Di Tella’s 1963 national and international prizes in visual arts. Soon, however, he left the museum and became the director of the Centro de Artes Visuales (CAV) at the Di Tella Institute.

The first Di Tella prizes awarded were an early confirmation that the Di Tella Institute was looking to promote the avant-garde. The winners that year were Rómulo Macció and Luis Felipe Noé. Both were part of the neo-figurative art scene that reacted against what it saw as the frivolity of abstract art by embracing a violent and representative aesthetic—not unlike earlier

---
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expressionism. The next wave of artists that Romero Brest and the Institute would embrace were the ‘pop artists’, among which were Marta Minujín, Dalila Puzzovio, Edgardo Giménez and Rubén Santantonín. The pop movement ultimately became widely associated with the Di Tella Institute. They were frequently in the public eye with their happenings and the ephemeral works that would be often dismantled if not destroyed after their presentation. They were also known for a general aesthetic that involved not only their visual works, but also a personal and somewhat scandalous way of acting, as well as their habit of wearing colorful and peculiar shirts, eccentric hats, and bell-bottom pants.

The most memorable exhibit organized by the CAV was perhaps La Menesunda (1965) by Ruben Santantonin and Marta Minujín. It was an installation that took up over two floors of the Florida Street building, where people walked through 16 different spaces, a labyrinth that included neon lights, a semi-naked couple in bed, and a make-up artist putting makeup on the visitors. Next to this piece in fame was Roberto Plate’s 1968 Los Baños, another installation, which consisted of two rooms with sinks, although not toilets, with the silhouette of a man and a woman on each door. Visitors started writing graffiti in the walls—several of them offensive to the military dictatorship in power at the time. On the third day of the exhibit the police arrived and closed down the show, effectively censoring Plate’s work. After this, all other artists in the exhibit decided to take out their works from the Institute to the streets and burn them in solidarity with Plate. The whole exhibit, titled Experiencias 1968, became the most visible sign for the outside that the different artistic avant-gardes had come to stay in Argentina. But it was also a sign that the dictatorship of Onganía was obsessed with the control of morality and tradition.

58 Minujín has taken most of the credit and publicity around it even though it was clearly a joint work.
Roberto Villanueva, a friend from Nelly Di Tella’s college days, had been called initially to direct the visual arts center, but with Romero Brest in charge, he was made director of the Centro de Experimentación Audiovisual (CEA). The Center produced plays, dance-theater performances, musical parodies, and experimental group performances. Early works from Griselda Gambaro such as “Los Siameses” were premiered at the Institute’s theater hall, and experimental actor groups like the Teatro Grupo Lobo did several collaborative works together with Villanueva. The now legendary comedic music group Les Luthiers started at the Di Tella with its earliest incarnation, called Il Musicisti. Like the visual art center, the CEA became a flagship of the Instituto Di Tella in its support of the new, the modern, and the radical.

Institutional support for avant-garde art was to some degree surprising in Buenos Aires. The business elite had historically supported more conservative art. However, the Di Tella were no longer just a business elite: they had fully included themselves in the intellectual elite of their country and, as such, had different demands and expectation of the arts. The support of this type of art was supposed to go hand in hand with the desire to lift Buenos Aires to the cosmopolitan status of New York or Paris. The reception of the Di Tella Institute’s unyielding support of the avant-garde were not always positive among artists. Ernesto Diera (Buenos Aires, 1928-1986), for instance, criticized it by saying “The ITDT served to hide and eventually set back a certain autonomous development. Those who did not do the latest fashion were not artists.” Later on, as we examine the way in which the musical avant-garde became institutionalized at the CLAEM, we will see that composers outside the circles that were formed at the Center had similar responses.

60 Ernesto Diera cited in Cassese 2008, 162.
The Latin American Center For Advanced Musical Studies

The Instituto Di Tella was supposed to have two art centers. Music was not in the original plans, at least for the first few years. Guido was primarily interested in the visual arts. However, the classical music he did like comprised early and renaissance music, and contemporary music in general. Guido and Enrique Oteiza had fantasized about expanding calling Juan Carlos Paz later in the future to organize something similar to the other centers, but for music. However, as Nelly told me:

Ginastera suddenly appeared with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation, and everything already put together, he already had the funding […] Since it was Ginastera, and since he had everything ready to go, it would have been a mistake for the Institute not to accept this proposal from the Rockefeller.

A ready-made opportunity was available for them, and they were eager to take it. Oteiza remembers the excitement he felt when he learned about the project:

Ginastera tells me: ‘I have a project.’ He shows it to me, the project for a music studies center. [And he says] ‘I see what you are doing here, and I believe this would fit well with it.’ When I saw his plan I went crazy with enthusiasm. I went to Guido and told him: ‘Listen, Ginastera came to us with this project, it is great!’

The project was strong enough on its own, and the Rockefeller Foundation’s support through the figure of John P. Harrison gave Guido and Oteiza all they needed to accept it.

The Fall of the Industrial Emporium.

By 1964 Oteiza and Guido Di Tella were confident that Argentina had received recognition among the artistic vanguards of the world. They felt that the artistic scene in
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Argentina was moving away from copying foreign models and, as such, was art was an element to move away from dependence and position the country internationally. “From an imitative and dependent culture”—Oteiza and Guido Di Tella wrote—“we are moving to a creative and active position.”

But not everybody agreed that this was what the Di Tella Institute was achieving. From 1966 to until 1970, Juan Carlos Onganía became de facto president of Argentina. His dictatorship was mild in violence compared to the one that emerged in the mid-70s, but it was more actively engaged in censorship and elevating the moral standards of the population. For his 1985 book on the Di Tella Institute, John King interviewed Onganía briefly. In the following excerpt, Onganía revealed his views on what was going at the art centers while he was in power. He certainly opposed the view that the artistic production was showing any kind of growing autonomy from foreign models:

Argentinean culture always thought more about the means than the ends, and these means were not appropriate for a young country like ours. The national cultural education somewhat introduced foreign customs, not apt for our setting. Everything was centered on a cosmopolitan city. That provided a bad example. The country needed a culture that would come from elsewhere, not the capital. We tried to organize cultural trips through several associations to go beyond the frivolity of cosmopolitanism. Of course, in three years we couldn’t do much. We tried to build a different image from the interests of the intellectuals of the capital. […] These intellectuals [at the Di Tella Institute] were bringing culture from abroad. And it was a penetrating culture, fed by an exquisite intellectual cohort. To me, culture should be more a consequence of what happens in a country, a much softer process.

Onganía’s words reflect several recurring themes of Argentinean history. First, his playing with a historic opposition between Buenos Aires to the countryside. At the same time, he associates the capital with intellectuals and their “frivolous cosmopolitanism”—and the avant-garde aesthetics they uphold—and again implies an opposition between these and the more

---
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appropriate values that could have been found in the ‘cultural trips’ outside the capital. In every aspect, the Di Tella Institute stood for a sector of the new industrial bourgeoisie, an anti-status quo elite that challenged the conservative established elite of ranchers and grain producers and the more conservative industrialists. Avant-garde art and music embodied political and social values that encapsulated the essence of the new elites.

The political conditions were not the only change. With the new government came new economic conditions that affected the Di Tella consortium in an unpredictable way. When Guido Di Tella took over the direction of SIAM, it was one of Latin America’s foremost corporations. The number of SIAM employees gone from 4,000 when Torcuato Sr. died, to more than 16,000 employees now that the young Di Tella was taking over its leadership. At the moment of its maximum expansion, SIAM encompassed over a dozen companies that produced a variety of products. But perhaps more than any other product, it was the creation of an automobile line that became the tipping point for SIAM—a risky experiment that ended up being a crucial factor in the sudden fall of the corporate giant. The risk SIAM took to produce automobiles was backed by the support promised by the government of Arturo Frondizi, a committed developmentalist whose contact with figures from the left and lenience towards Peronism earned him the distrust of the military that ultimately led to his removal in a coup. Frondizi apparently pledged SIAM “high tariffs to restrict the appearance of competitors […] and] financial support from the State.”

In April of 1960 the company presented the SIAM Di Tella 1500, a car that became very popular among taxi drivers and middle class families, based on the British Motors Corporation’s Austin model. However, the restrictions did not last long. Three companies, ICA and FIAT as foreign, and SIAM as national, were supposed to be in competition for the national
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market of automobiles. “This was going to be, of course, a great business opportunity [for us].” Torcuato S. recalled. “What happened is that two years later there were 23 companies. […] That is when the company started to weaken, because we had made a huge commitment [to automobile manufacturing].”

Guido grew tremendously worried as he saw the possibility of the Institute’s collapse if SIAM went into bankruptcy. The debt acquired to continue SIAM’s expansion at the beginning of the decade was too large, and eventually it became impossible to pay due to the small demand for Di Tella cars and surprising high competition. The only solution that Guido saw was a bailout plan from the State that would save SIAM from total bankruptcy. The automobile section of SIAM was supposed to be the entry point for the company to join the great multinationals, but it ended being the trigger to the ruin of the conglomerate.

The situation in the Institute began to look grim even for the employees at the CLAEM as early as 1966. Josefina Schröder, Ginastera’s secretary at the music center recalled how the crisis of SIAM was affecting the CLAEM:

We started having trouble paying to rent instruments, the salaries of the performers, etc. They would call Maestro Ginastera on the phone and protest about the delay of payment. Then he would go to accounting and the specific salary of the person who had protested was paid immediately. The rest was delayed as much as possible. And then, the phone would ring with another complaint… It was like that with everything. It created a very unstable environment. I remember that on more than one occasion I used my own money to get some of the fellows out of financial trouble, because it was custom to announce only at the very last minute that there was going to be a delay in the payment of fellowships and salaries.
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Roberto Levingston Visits the Institute

The economic pressure together with the government’s widely known dislike of the activities at the art centers made Guido restless. In one of the few documented moments when Guido attempted to entice the government into supporting their activities, he invited General Roberto Marcelo Levingston to visit the centers in 1967. Levingston replaced Onganía as president in 1970 and at the time was gaining prominence in the government. Oteiza did not appreciate Levingston’s visit to the Center, which he considered a publicity stunt with the government. He thought that “there was no need to give any explanation to the government, and that do so was to accept preemptive censorship.”

In the following extended excerpt from one of our conversations, Nelly Di Tella remembers the visit of Levingston to the Institute and Guido’s reaction to the General’s approval of his house.

He took him to all the centers, not only the art ones. He took him downtown, to Florida. He told these Generals when they were leaving ‘you can’t talk this way about something you haven’t seen.’ […] That night there was a reception at Guido’s house—we lived with Guido’s mom—it was more of a social event. And Guido invited Levingston. Even though Levingston had been very aggressive throughout the day, he came in the house and saw that the house was very formal, very elegant. And he called [Guido] to the side and said ‘Di Tella, it is not possible that we don’t understand each other’ [as he looked around at the house]. And when Guido came up [to our room] I asked, ‘How did it go?’ and he tells me: ‘I don’t ever want to have the temptation of being able to invite a general to my house again’. I remember he said ‘As soon as [Levingston] stepped on the rugs he was transformed, because he saw a proper house, with all the paraphernalia…’ [Guido] was really upset by that.

We decided to build a new house, with Clorindo Testa, an architect that was a close friend. Guido called him and told him ‘I want a house that [by virtue of its modernity] removes the temptation to invite General Levingston over.’ At that time nobody knew who Levingston was. And I remember the day that it was announced that Levingston was named president [by the military junta in 1970, 71 Cassese 2008, 175.
replacing *de facto* president Juan Carlos Onganía. We were in the countryside, it was a Saturday, and ten minutes after [the announcement] the phone rung and it was Clorindo. Clorindo said ‘That one?’ and Guido answered ‘Yes, that is the General’. [Smiles] Our prospects in the country were totally closed, we had made a house so that General Levingston would not be comfortable.\(^{72}\)

From this story, what stands out is how the conservative aesthetics of the old house are a comfortable space for this figure that Guido despises so much. The aesthetics of the new house designed by Testa, an innovative and pioneer architect, resonated for the Di Tella with every aspect of their socio-political position and rejection of the old elites represented by Levingston. He was a new type of elite, he saw himself as a reformist, and his house, just like the aesthetic space he had created at the Di Tella Institute, needed to correspond to this new, modernizing vision. As this story exemplifies, interest in the arts ran through several trajectories simultaneously. Evidently, Guido and Nelly found in the arts an index to their student days in New York, which they likely associated with the beginning of their relationship. But taste in art was not only providing the class-based distinction that Bourdieu would later describe. In fact, as we saw with Torcuato S., taste had little to do with it. Avant-garde art and modern architecture was being actively used to create distinctions not just between elite and non-elite, but even among the different elite groups in Buenos Aires.

*The End of the Institute and the End of a Friendship*

By late 1969 Guido Di Tella invited the directors of the centers to his ranch in Navarro. Ginastera was out of the country and did not attend. However, with Oteiza, Romero Brest and Villanueva, Guido proposed that considering the imminent fall of SIAM, they had to figure out a way to save their projects by making them much cheaper. Guido and Oteiza’s friendship had become distant, particularly since Levingston’s visit. Guido suggested to Oteiza that it was time

\(^{72}\) Nelly Di Tella, interview with the author, June 21, 2008.
to separate the company and the Institute. Oteiza suspected that Guido wanted to “distance himself from the Institute for political convenience.” Oteiza felt that the government was using SIAM’s economic weakness to close the center and he felt betrayed by his friend.

The collapse of SIAM and the situation of the Institute put too much strain on their relationship. The art centers of the Di Tella Institute were fruit of the initial work of both men, and Oteiza felt just as attached to the project as Guido. But evidently, their position and ideas about its future were different. Oteiza recreated for Cassese’s book how he remembered his last conversation with Guido Di Tella. Guido told Oteiza that he needed his help as director to transition to a much-reduced operation. Oteiza responded angry “Find someone else. I don’t feel like staying to help you demolish what we built during these years.” Oteiza told Guido about his suspicions that he was trying to appease the military government. He said “If it is about the pressure of the Government, I think we need to do like the Bauhau during the Nazis: resist and let the military pay the political price of closing us. It is much more dignified than disappearing in silence.” The insinuation of Oteiza that the government was blackmailing Guido so that he would give up Florida in exchange for SIAM made Guido terribly angry:

“I wish you’d die,” he said to Oteiza, and that was the end of a friendship of more than 15 years. The fight distanced them forever. They never talked to each other again, and they wouldn’t even greet each other when they met in social events. They both suffered the loss, but neither could recover from the damage.

On April 24, 1970 Guido Di Tella announced to the public the closing of the Florida Street headquarters of the Di Tella Institute. With Oteiza gone Guido hired Roberto Cortés Conde to take over as director. He was new to the Institute, and Guido thought that he could
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manage the economic crisis and hopefully be more comfortable firing some of the researchers. Cortés Conde assumed the direction on May 8, 1970 and announced immediately that without radical changes the Institute would have no money in six months. By cutting the yearly budget from one million to 310 thousand dollars and after numerous firings, the social science centers of the Institute were able to survive but the art centers had to close. SIAM’s debt, which was insured by the Di Tella’s fortune, was eventually paid back with money that the family received as a result of the sale of its art collection (which had originally started the Institute) to the state for a sum of 2.1 million dollars. However, in November of 1971, after arduous attempts to save the company with loans and stocks given to the State, the Lanusse government nationalized SIAM and Guido Di Tella’s adventure as an industrialist came to an end.

2.3 The Results: Consequences of a Philanthropic Adventure in the Arts

It was not surprising that Guido, and later Torcuato S., would jump into the political public arena, as the arts and art philanthropy took a secondary and tangential role. A combination of their acquired cultural capital attained through academia, and the prestige gained from the philanthropic world had set them up for political careers. Although music and the arts became peripheral to both men, I argue that the prestige earned through the Di Tella Institute was just as important as the brothers’ wealth in establishing them as players among the new industrial elite. Moreover, the modernizing ideals that motivated them to start the art centers are the same as the ones that prompted them to enter the political scene.

During Isabel de Peron’s short time in government Guido was named secretary of programming and economic coordination—a right hand to the Secretary of Economics. The

\[\text{Ibid, 202.}\]
military coup on March 24, 1976 brought about what would be, in Argentina, the worst military dictatorship of the twentieth century. As a public figure loyal to Perón, Guido Di Tella, his wife Nelly and their five kids went into exile in Oxford, England, and didn’t return to Argentina until 1980. 78 When Carlos Menem was elected president of Argentina (1989-1999), Guido Di Tella reached the height of his political power. 79 Growing ever closer with the U.S. Guido played an important role in the government, first as ambassador to the U.S., then briefly Secretary of Defense, and ultimately as Minister of Foreign Relations. He lasted nine years in this position (1991-1999), the longest period for any chancellor of Argentina. On December 31st, 2001, Guido Di Tella died. After his brother’s death Torcuato S. joined the Peronist party, but unlike Guido, he joined its most left-wing fractions. Torcuato approved of the center-left Peronism proposed by Nestor Kirchner during his campaign for presidency in 2003. When Kirchner was elected, Torcuato was invited to be Minister of Culture, a position he held for one and a half years, all filled with controversy driven by his ironic sense of humor and his lack of political tact. Several declarations to the press sparked intense controversies, such as his famous “Culture is not a priority for the Government, just like it is not for me,” 80 a tough statement coming from someone in such a post. Today Torcuato S. continues his academic life, now as an emeritus professor, and he currently lives in Rome as Argentine ambassador to Italy for the government of Cristina Fernández de Kirchner.

78 For Guido’s position regarding Peronism during the years of the dictatorship see Guido Di Tella 1983, 24.
79 Joining the Menem administration, he played an important role in the radical neoliberal changes applied by Menem, which radically reversed most policies that the earlier Perón government had put together. They privatized industries such as telephones, roads, commercial airlines, oil companies, and railroads. The Menem government dismantled the state-based welfare system, pushed for an open border policy with reduced tariffs and no protection for local industries, and it reduced the size of government. With these political positions, Guido Di Tella’s ideas during the Menem years became strikingly similar to those of David Rockefeller.
80 Torcuato S. Di Tella cited from La Nación in Cassese 2008, 322.
Throughout this chapter I have presented a biography of a family as a means to understand the social meaning and value of the philanthropic practice for the Di Tella brothers as they transitioned from belonging to certain functional elite classes—in their case, the business and intellectual elites—to their consolidation as members of the power elite with access to the state, ultimately represented in their posts as ministers and ambassadors.

There were clear differences between the brothers regarding the value they gave to philanthropy for the arts. Guido Di Tella and his wife Nelly highly valued their support for the arts, and they had a sentimental investment in it. Art had been a central part of their socialization and their life story as a couple. It had a privileged space for them in both their everyday life, and in the legacy they felt they could leave to their country. On the other hand, Torcuato S. strategically set aside his distaste for contemporary art, and pragmatically saw in the Di Tella Institute project the opportunity to create new associations for his family’s name. By exchanging economic capital for the prestige brought by philanthropy, he took advantage of the legitimizing power of art, paralleling the way his academic titles empowered him with cultural capital.

Still, both brothers had been socialized to believe in the importance of art as part of human expression, and the aspects of freedom and innovation that it allowed resonated with their overall modernizing discourse. The belief in the legitimacy of art is so naturalized that supporting it, taste aside, seemed to them simply the right thing to do.

In the broader picture the Di Tella family is a good example of the process in which an elite in formative stages transitions from holding mostly one type of capital—in their case economic capital as a business elite—to increasing their overall status by acquiring cultural and symbolic capital, thus legitimizing their condition of privilege in the first place. An elite group’s
appreciation and appropriation of an art world becomes a circular situation since legitimacy is given to the practices associated with elite culture, therefore elite culture becomes legitimized.

Their fortune, coming from industry and not from the traditional agro-exporting sector, as well as their immigrant origins challenged the traditional elites that held the status quo. As a new elite space opened, a new art world became associated with it. The support of avant-garde art as opposed to more conservative trends was not a coincidence, but a congruent consequence of the cultural capital that the Di Tella brothers had acquired through their socialization and, more importantly, in their education in elite institutions locally and abroad. That they belonged to an intellectual elite also naturalized the belief in the importance of supporting new creative works, leaving taste and personal interest aside. In its social context, this new industrial bourgeoisie created a split between the more traditional elites. The Di Tella brothers’ ultimate arrival to political positions confirms at least the partial success of establishing this new elite.

The Di Tella family exemplifies why the elite has to be understood as a dynamic and not homogeneous social group. Perhaps, even more importantly, the idea of the elite should be understood as a multiplicity, that is, ‘elites’ in different realms of social life: political elites, intellectual elites, economic elites, etc., that sometimes come together in specific conditions and hold power over important sectors of society. However, once one type of elite status is achieved, transactions with the different types of capital available facilitate access to different elite circles. Once the Di Tella family had established themselves as an economic elite they had access to top educational institutions and were able to acquire artworks and perform philanthropic acts that would further open new elite spaces for them.
CHAPTER 3
THE CLAEM: PLACE, FELLOWS, TEACHERS, INFRASTRUCTURE AND RECEPTION

During the initial years of functioning of the CLAEM the Rockefeller Foundation funding paid for the salaries of the staff, local professors, the fellowships, honorariums for visiting professors, and equipment, while the Di Tella Institute provided the infrastructure and all of its services—graphic design, printing press, and administrative staff, among others. As the Rockefeller funding diminished in the inverted pyramid model that had been convened, some of these expenses were taken over by the Di Tella Institute. By April 1969, when the final Rockefeller grant expired, the Di Tella Institute found itself struggling to cover all the costs, the budget for visiting professors was seriously reduced, the activities were kept to a minimum, and Ginastera even had to look for external donors to pay for the biennial fellowships.

Five items used the majority of the budget assigned to the Center. First, fellowships to receive a graduate-level education in composition with for composers from Latin American countries. Second, permanent classes with a staff of well trained local professors led by Ginastera, and that included Gerardo Gandini, Francisco Kröpfl and Fernando von Reichenbach. Third, intensive work with visiting professors in periods that ranged from two weeks to six months. As a fourth item, the funds were also directed towards organizing concerts. They were either monographic concerts featuring works by the visiting professors, concerts with works by students of the Center, or also for the organization of the annual Contemporary Music Festivals (1962-1970). Finally, a large part of the money received was used for resources in CLAEM’s sound recordings and scores library, and most important, to pay for the equipment of the electronic music laboratory.
This chapter covers each of the these main aspects of the CLAEM and provides the reader with a broad overview of what the CLAEM was, its facilities, activities, and a sense of the reception that avant-garde music had at the time. First, I examine the significance of the CLAEM’s location in Buenos Aires, and the characteristics that made it a unique experience for the young Latin American composers that attended it. Second, I look at the five groups of fellows and describe the way the fellowship conditions changed over their 10 years of existence. Third, I examine the teachers, both permanent and visiting, and the way they shaped some of the experience of the different groups. Fourth, I briefly look at the electronic music laboratory, which by the end of the CLAEM became its staple feature. Finally, I look at the reception of the CLAEM’s most important outreach output, its nine Contemporary Music Festivals.

3.1 Place and Space:

Locating the CLAEM: Buenos Aires, the Manzana Loca and Internationalism

Buenos Aires was during the 1960s a city like no other in Latin America, next perhaps only to New York and Paris in the whole Western world. The bookstores had as bestsellers the works of Cortázar, García Márquez and Henry Miller for months in a row. The music of the Beatles was played while people read Quino through the smart and sharp words of his comic strip Mafalda. Like in New York, the Porteño artistic scene was experimenting with ‘happenings’ and pop art. The complete works of Ingmar Bergman were presented in local movie theaters, and recent contemporary music premieres were performed at the very active Teatro Colón. And in the middle of this most cosmopolitan port city was the manzana loca (the crazy block) on Florida street, the hippest, hippiest, and most chic spot in town. The manzana loca was not only known for its coffee shops, art galleries, bookstores, and bars. It was also
known for the new fashions sported by the people that spent their time there, with young long-haired men wearing psychedelic designs, and women in mini-skirts and platform heels. It was all surprisingly close to the Military Circle and the Plaza San Martin, the locus of power of the repressive and conservative military that would become such an important actor in the years to come. Guido Di Tella and Enrique Oteiza, executive director of the Institute, decided that the Di Tella art centers should be located right in the heart of the manzana loca, where Buenos Aires was most in touch with the rest of the world.

Figure 3-1: A map of the manzana loca, published in the magazine Claudia (November 1968) and reproduced in King 2007, 169. The Di Tella Institute was located on the right side of the map.

The place where the CLAEM would function in the years to follow was a key element that might be easily overlooked. After long discussions, hours composing inside their studios, or after an evening of concerts, the fellows and the visiting professors would often go out for a coffee at the Florida Garden, grab a beer at the Bar Moderno, or visit the Bonino and Guernica art galleries. These places became almost as crucial as the Center’s own facility.
It is not difficult to see what Oteiza and Guido Di Tella had in mind. They aimed to make the Di Tella Institute a driving force in positioning Buenos Aires as an artistic capital of the hemisphere. They believed it was possible to incorporate Buenos Aires into the group of great cities of the elite art world. In *Avant-Garde, Internationalism, and Politics: Argentine Art in the Sixties* (2007) the art historian Andrea Giunta shows how this particular elite group in Buenos Aires was using New York as model for cultural expansion. According to Giunta, this group’s goal was to make the city an avant-garde center and generate a new public that would appreciate modern art.¹ She calls this specific strategy internationalism and argues that this process went hand in hand with the idea of breaking out of the isolationism of the Peron years.²

In her analysis of the visual arts movements in Buenos Aires during the 1960s, Giunta points at specific strategies for this internationalization through networks of private and public institutions. These strategies include

the ‘importation’ of exhibitions of contemporary international artists; the sending of grant recipients abroad to study, to ‘improve;’ [organizing] competitions involving prestigious international art critics; and finally, the ‘exportation’ of exhibitions of Argentine art to Europe and, most importantly, to the United States.³

At the beginning of the 1960s the meaning of the term internationalism, changed from “forming part of the so-called modern art international and uniting with forces beyond national borders” to a “perceived project aligned with the official scene, as defined by the private sector and state institutions.”⁴ The Di Tella Institute is a good example of a project aligned with the official scene of the Frondizi years, in which the private sector leads the attempt to modernize and internationalize artistic practices. The discourse used to explain the strategies being used for

---

¹ Giunta 2007, 69.
² Ibid 74-75.
³ Ibid 8.
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this attempt all rely on broader modernizing discourses that see in technology and progress the path to development in all areas of social life. For example, in one of the early institutional memoirs of the Di Tella Institute, Di Tella and Oteiza write:

> Regarding the arts, our country is not far in time or space from the important centers of creation. Furthermore, in the last decade we have found an increased development of vanguard artistic movements that are [...] reaching a rarely seen level of autonomy and vitality. There is, however, a strong resistance to any evolution in the artistic realm that might go beyond the traditionally accepted. This culturally limiting attitude depends on outdated models that do not respond to the reality of modern societies or to the possibilities of the country.⁵

Di Tella and Oteiza saw the need for a correspondence between the modernizing of the industrial and economic sectors of society, and support for those contemporary arts that broke away from tradition. Similarly, in line with the discourse of modernity, they were also concerned with catching up “in time or space” with other more modern nations. For Oteiza and Di Tella, old or traditional artistic languages were too conventional and needed to be replaced. In 1963 they wrote in the mission statement of the newly formed Institute:

> We fear to fall back on the use of the [artistic] language that has been the commonplace among the influential spheres of the country. It is an old language that does not respond to our current reality, and even less to the needs for our future evolution in a world of rapid, creative modernization.⁶

It was under this modernizing thrust, that the CLAEM came to be the third of the art centers at the Di Tella Institute.

---

Space: The Florida Building of the Di Tella Institute

The executive director of the Di Tella Institute, Enrique Oteiza, was very pleased by the building they had rented on Florida Street between Charcas and Paraguay. According to Oteiza, since the project for the Institute had started without the music center in mind, the facilities for the CLAEM were a late addition to the renovation plan. He remembers that he had to call the architects working on the project, Clorindo Testa, Francisco Bullrich and Alicia Cazzaniga to let them know about the changes needed.

The renovations [to the building] were already halfway done without the CLAEM in mind. We told them “we have to add the CLAEM to this.” [...] There was a space that was destined for something else, but could be rearranged to be the CLAEM and it could be connected with wires to the hall we had planned to build for experimental shows, theater, avant-garde things, and it could also be connected with the exhibit hall.

Oteiza’s memory seems to be slightly incorrect, since the lease and the renovation of the Florida building started around January 4th, 1963. The Rockefeller grant for the CLAEM went into effect in May 1962, so by 1963 Oteiza knew that the CLAEM had to be part of the Florida building. However, this incongruence in his memory might stress the fact that the music center had not been part of Oteiza and Di Tella’s original plans.

---

7 Oteiza wrote to Charles Hardin from the Rockefeller Foundation, telling him that they had “found a very good place in Florida Street (like 5th Ave and 42nd Street) where the Center and a Museum for our Visual Arts activities will share the space.” Enrique Oteiza, letter to Charles Hardin, March 28, 1963, folder 75, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. In the 1920s the building had been a theater for the Asociación Wagneriana. Later it became a décor store, and then an automobile and motorcycle dealership.
9 Celia Wainberg, an administrative staff person at the Institute, kept a series of unofficial records that track these dates. According to them, the offices in Florida 936 began functioning in April 1963, with the CLAEM, the CAV, the museum, and the libraries for visual arts, music and graphic art. November 1963 saw the addition of the Center for Audiovisual Experimentation.
The space might have seemed limited for hosting all three centers, but this, in Oteiza’s words, “facilitated the interaction, because people that came from one discipline inevitably would run into what the artists in other areas were doing.” The spaces were open and inviting. There were four large halls: three on the first floor and another on the second, where the exhibits took place. The basement was used to house the artwork. In an architectural review, the corridors were described as “labyrinth-like” and the staircases as “twisted.” The whole building was praised as a “demonstration of a completely renewed conception of architecture.”

---

Figure 3-3: Comparison of the building at Florida Street in 2008 and in the mid-1960s.

The design of the building sought to avoid the monumentalism found in museums across the city. Instead, the architects aimed for something “that would have a very transparent entrance, with a welcoming hall, with bathrooms, public phones, and a board displaying the activities taking place around the city. We wanted people to have more than one reason to come in.”\(^{12}\) There is no doubt that the architects and Oteiza were successful on this front. People did come to the Di Tella in large numbers—for exhibits, concerts, and for theater. Concerts were usually sold out; several of the theater productions are still remembered for their tremendous success, and exhibitions, such as Julio LeParc’s in 1967, which explored unstable reflecting surfaces that engulfed the spectator, are recalled as some of the most important moments in Latin American art.

The space available for the CLAEM was located on the second floor where Ginastera had an office and there was space for the Center’s secretaries. There was a meeting room, and also a studio reserved for visiting professors, which when empty was used by Gerardo Gandini. A large space was reserved for the electronic music laboratory. There were two large classrooms, and six small practice rooms that were also used as offices by pairs of fellows. These rooms were soundproofed and each had an upright Baldwin piano.

---

14 At some point in 1967 during the economic crisis of SIAM-Di Tella, one of the practice rooms was reassigned to Cecilia Weinberg, an administrator.
Figure 3-5: View from the second floor of the Florida building. On the left, the meeting room with the composers Armando Krieger, Alcides Lanza, and Blas Atehortúa. On the right, three doors leading to the fellows’ study rooms. Also, there are study rooms behind the three composers.

Figure 3-6: Aula Villa-Lobos. It had a capacity of 20 people and was equipped with an LP player, a stereo amplifier, a grand piano, an upright piano, and a harpsichord.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} The room was described as having acoustic isolation. However, it must have not been very effective, since in 1966 Ginastera writes to Oteiza, telling him: “Next year I think that the Aula [Villa-Lobos] will be used only for class since the constant complaining by the neighbors might
Another room hosted the CLAEM Library. The library focused on contemporary music and music of the Americas. Despite the large number of important musical performances that took place in Buenos Aires during the 1960s, the availability of scores, recordings, and academic books on music was quite poor.\textsuperscript{16} The library that the CLAEM put together with some of the Rockefeller Foundation funds was meant to improve that situation. “The materials in the library were irreplaceable,” remembered Mariano Etkin. “There was a large number of recordings and scores that were impossible or very difficult to find here in Buenos Aires at that time!”\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{flushleft}
end up becoming an unpleasant situation.” Alberto Ginastera, internal memorandum to Enrique Oteiza, copy to Fernando von Reichenbach, November 17, 1966, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.\textsuperscript{16} Juan Carlos Paz’s book \textit{Introducción a la música de nuestro tiempo} (1955) had been a crucial text for introducing trends in avant-garde music to many Argentinean composers. However, despite the multiple presses, the excellent bookstores, and the availability of the U.S. embassy’s Lincoln Library right across the street from the Di Tella Institute, it was very difficult to find scores or recordings of contemporary music.\textsuperscript{17} Etkin, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, August 1, 2005.
\end{flushleft}
Impressed by Buenos Aires and what had been achieved at the Di Tella Institute, John P. Harrison proudly described the CLAEM in one of his diaries:

If there is going to develop in South America a true metropolis with its own pace and style in the sense of New York, London or Paris, it will surely be in Buenos Aires. […] The Art and Music Institutes are in a substantial building on Florida in the most central part of the city. The facilities for the Music Institute are excellent with separate soundproof rooms with pianos for students and staff, the library of musical scores and a laboratory for electronic music. These facilities occupy the second floor, the art gallery and offices are on the first floor, and at a sort of mezzanine level in the rear is a huge stage designed as a full experimental theater with lighting, sound and photographic effects available to meet any imaginative demand of director or choreographer. There are seats for an audience of about 300.18

The official inauguration of the Di Tella Institute’s building at 936 Florida Street took place on August 12, 1963, when classes with the fellows had already started. Although the main work adapting the building for the CLAEM and other Centers had been finished in April, some additional renovations were finished in August for the inauguration of the exhibition hall of the Center for Visual Arts. The magazine Primera Plana published a two-page article that praised the architectural fluidity and how the place “radiated culture that is not only accessible to everyone, but at the same time, introduced the public to the structures of the contemporary world as they are proposed by technique and art.”19 The article closed by declaring the importance of the Institute for Buenos Aires: “As of yesterday, at Florida Street, the modern world became available to everybody. You only need to enter it to realize that, with the same importance as politics and economics, the visual arts are an integral part of human life, and they give it meaning.”20 The modernist discourse that Guido Di Tella and Oteiza wanted to disseminate with their art centers was being embraced by Argentine society and one of its most

18 John P. Harrison, diary excerpt, unknown date, 1965, folder 1965 vol. 12, box unmarked, series John P. Harrison, RG 12.2 Diaries, Rockefeller Foundation archives, RAC.
20 Ibid.
important magazines. The writers in *Primera Plana* emphasized twice that the ‘modern world’ was now ‘available to everyone’, thanks to the Di Tella Institute.

*The importance of space and place*

The different exhibits, organized mostly by visual artists, often transformed the Florida Street space into a full display of the avant-garde. The composers were hence immersed in a workspace that was itself a type of artistic haven. To enter their studios or attend class they had to cross a threshold that differentiated common, everyday life and the sublime, artistic life. If we were to consider the Di Tella as a place of pilgrimage, where the composers would meet elders of great wisdom, then the Florida building was a perfect temple.

The CLAEM was a vibrant space for creation located in Latin America’s most cosmopolitan metropolis. The educated nose might have noticed the scent of Marta’s coffee shop mixed with fresh paint from the works being exhibited, and a hint of solder from the equipment constantly being put together at the electronic music laboratory. The noisy Florida Street outside would have been filled with people in miniskirts, bellbottomed jeans and tie-dyed shirts. And one might have caught a glimpse of Ginastera, in his dark suit, with his tie and pocket watch, looking more like a Swiss banker than a composer, walking the corridors, proudly overseeing his newest students.

3.2 The Fellowships

The central actors in the history of the CLAEM were the groups of students that every two years came from their different countries in Latin America. On average they were in their mid- to late-twenties and had already some reputation as young, up-and-coming composers. A large number of them continued a prolific and successful career in composition and education.

---

21 For complete listings of fellows and participants at the CLAEM see Appendices.
The fellowship they received included a 20-month scholarship, a two-way ticket to Buenos Aires, and a monthly stipend of $200 U.S. dollars. The fellowships were advertised in advanced in brochures and journal adds that were distributed across multiple—although not all—Latin American countries. The focal target of the brochures were large schools of music and well-established conservatories, most often than not in the capital cities around Latin America. Still, Ginastera also made an effort to directly contact many of his composer and conductor friends and get suggestions for possible recruits. In the first group there were several composers that were directly approached by Ginastera with a personal invitation to apply, most likely after having had their pieces performed in Tanglewood, Washington or Caracas during Latin American music festivals. Ginastera was also determined to find a balance of nationalities at the Center. In total there were twenty Argentineans, three Bolivians, three Brazilians, three Colombians, one Costa Rican, four Chileans, one Ecuadorian, two Guatemalans, one Mexican, four Peruvians, one Puerto Rican, five Uruguayans and two composers from the United States.

Fellowships during 1963-1964

The jury selecting the first group of twelve fellows for acceptance to the CLAEM consisted of the Uruguayan musicologist Lauro Ayestarán, the Chilean composer Alfonso Letelier and the director, Alberto Ginastera. The jury met on December 20, 1962 and the names of the recipients of the scholarship were released to the press on January 29, 1963. The selected fellows were Blas Emilio Atehortúa (Colombia ca.1933), Oscar Bazán (Argentina

---

22 Undated brochure for the Torcuato Di Tella Institute, 1963. In 1963 US$200 had the same buying power as approximately US$1,430 current dollars. All fellows I interviewed agreed that this was more than enough to live comfortably in Buenos Aires, and some of them managed even to save a little money for when they went back to their countries.

23 Vázquez 2008, 86.

24 The dates that Atehortúa has given for his birth range from 1933 to 1945. The documents he provided to the CLAEM in 1962 to become a fellow, including a photocopy of his Colombian
1936-2005), Cesar Bolaños (Peru 1931-2012), Armando Krieger (Argentina b.1940), Mario Kuri-Aldana (Mexico b.1932), Mesías Maiguashca (Ecuador b.1941), Alcides Lanza (Argentina b.1929), Marlos Nobre (Brazil b.1939), Miguel Angel Rondano (Argentina b.1934), Edgar Valcárcel (Peru 1932-2010), Marco Aurelio Vanegas (Colombia 1942-c.1984) and Alberto Villalpando (Bolivia b.1940). Ginastera had chosen 12 for the total number of fellows but in the end, none of the groups would ever be exactly that number. Marco Aurelio Vanegas, one of the two Colombians selected for the first set of scholarships, was the first composer to not finish his full fellowship. He had to return to Colombia after suffering what was described as a mental or nervous breakdown at some point in early November 1963—most likely some type of acute depression or anxiety disorder.

Ginastera was very involved with the students of this first group. They all met formally at least once a week and they would share with each other their works in progress. Gerardo ID, as well as biographical information he gave for concert program notes at the time point to October 5, 1933. In our interview, and many other public statements, the Colombian composer Blas Atehortúa claims that he was twenty years old by the time he was applying to the CLAEM. However, newspaper articles at the time described him as a 31 year old and all documentation kept today from the CLAEM indicates his birthday as 1933.

Since 1960, Alcides Lanza has used lowercase letters for his name as well as his compositions. To maintain clarity in this text however, I will keep the initial uppercases.

In a personal communication with the author, Mesías Maiguashca argues that his “problems of psychic instability were accentuated by alcohol” (Mesías Maiguashca, email with the author, November 11, 2008. This was later made public in Maiguashca’s personal website). In a letter from February 21, Vanegas was officially notified of the cancellation of his scholarship due to an “illness of psychological/psychiatric nature that impeded the normal performance of the fellow (Alberto Ginastera, letter to Carmen Vanegas, February 21, 1964, CLAEM Archives, ITDT). Information about Vanegas after this is very scarce. Apparently he was committed to a mental institution in 1970 and died—according to several fellows—years later due to further complications of his mental health in 1984.
Gandini would also attend these meetings, and would read the student’s works at the piano.

Maiguashca remembers Ginastera at the CLAEM as

Always genteel, discrete, fatherly but distant. He always hid his interior with a very polished exterior, his hands together in front of his waist and a proverbial smile. Likewise, his classes were very precise, informative, and objective within his aesthetic canon. I remember him as a benevolent and kind patriarch.  

Jones’s biography of Alcides Lanza maintains that Ginastera allowed the students to freely work on whatever type of composition they were interested in, and in any style. She argues

Ginastera’s contribution lay in the insights he had drawn from decades of hearing his music rehearsed and performed. His comments about notation and orchestration often helped students express their musical visions more efficiently and practically. Ginastera insisted that his students compose music that was well organized, professional, and creative, but the style was basically left up to them.

However, much more than any of the following, this first group had several composers that were close to Ginastera both aesthetically and personally—for example Atehortúa, Kuri-Aldana and Villalpando. This might not have to do with Ginastera directly guiding their aesthetic interests, but to a certain proximity that was already there both in age and in musical praxis. The formative years of many of the composers in this group had been shaped by the modernist yet relatively conservative style of Ginastera, heavily influenced by the European compositional models of Bartók, Debussy, Manuel de Falla and Stravinsky. On the other hand, many of them—Maiguashca, Lanza, Bazán among others—continued their production after the CLAEM fully championing an avant-garde style that went well beyond anything Ginastera did. With the exception perhaps of Rondano and Villegas, all of the fellows of this first group achieved a

---

28 Mesías Maiguashca, email with the author, November 11, 2008.
29 Jones 2007, 27
significant level of international recognition, and became important figures in their own countries for the advancement of classical music.

*Fellowships during 1965-1966*

The jury for the 1965-1966 fellowships consisted of Luigi Dallapiccola, León Schidlovsky and Ginastera. Once again, Ginastera wanted to have 12 fellows, but this time one of them, Bernal Flores (Costa Rica b.1937), decided to decline the scholarship on July 7, 1965, after only one week in Buenos Aires. Another fellow, Atiliano Auza León (Bolivia b.1930) stayed the first full year, but only stayed for a short part of the second. The fellows who did complete the two years were Rafael Aponte-Ledée (Puerto Rico b.1938), Jorge Arandia Navarro (Argentina b.1929), Gabriel Brnčić (Chile b.1942), Mariano Etkin (Argentina b.1943), Benjamin Gutierrez (Costa Rica b.1937), Miguel Letelier (Chile b.1939), Eduardo Mazzadi (Argentina 1935-1966), Graciela Paraskevaídis (Argentina b.1940), Enrique Rivera (Chile b.1941), and Jorge Sarmientos (Guatemala 1933-2012). Additionally, during 1966, Walter Ross (United States b.1936) attended the CLAEM with a scholarship from the Organization of American States. The works presented to the jury by some of the composers that received the fellowship varied widely. Among the most conservative were the works of Atiliano Auza León

30 Bernal Flores of Costa Rica was said initially to have been “unable to travel so far, owing to illness.” [See Alberto Ginastera, letter to Gerald Freund, April 28, 1965, folder 76, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.] However, Ginastera and Oteiza allowed Bernal Flores to arrive almost three months after the established date. On June 18, 1965 Bernal Flores wrote to Ginastera that he would arrive on July 1.[Bernal Flores, letter to Alberto Ginastera, June 18, 1965, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.] However, on July 7, after just one week in Buenos Aires, Bernal Flores wrote to Ginastera: “After having finished a doctorate (Ph.D.) in a well known U.S. institution, the Eastman School of Music in Rochester, New York […] I must say […] that the classes being taught are already known to me, which makes me feel I should give my spot to another young Latin American that might get more benefits from the scholarship.” [Bernal Flores, letter to Alberto Ginastera, July 7, 1965, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.] For more on the Costa Rican avant-garde music scene see Andrade 2008, 27-34.
and the Guatemalan Jorge Sarmientos. At the same time, the composers from Chile and Argentina, particularly those born after 1940, were notorious for being much more interested in sound explorations associated with the avant-garde. They shared an interest in the music of John Cage, Earl Brown, Iannis Xenakis, and Luigi Nono, and this differentiated them from their older peers, and distance them aesthetically from Ginastera, who saw them as rebellious.

Figure 3-8: Class of 1966 with Xenakis. From left to right: Pedro Calderón, Gerardo Gandini, Alberto Ginastera, Rafael Aponte-Ledée, Miguel Letelier (back), Benjamín Gutierrez (back), Jorge Arandia Navarro (back), Jorge Sarmientos, Iannis Xenakis, Josefina Schröder, Graciela Paraskevaidis, Enrique Rivera, Mariano Etkin, Gabriel Brnčić, Eduardo Mazzadi.

The 1965-1966 group developed strong ties of friendship and gained the affection of the staff at the CLAEM. Josefina Schröder, Ginastera’s secretary and his main assistant for staying in touch with the CLAEM during his trips, remembers this group fondly. She commented,

Everyone in this group of fellows showed distinct individual personalities, varied and clearly defined among them. However, they formed a cohort that was cohesive, joyful, witty, and a little rebellious. They surprised Maestro Ginastera
more than once, making him think that they thought the regulations of the CLAEM were antiquated and unnecessary for students at the graduate level.\textsuperscript{31}

From this group, Sarmientos had a successful career as conductor, with sporadic but effective incursions into composition, Miguel Letelier continued a career as organist while his compositions became quite conservative in style, and Enrique Rivera abandoned composition completely some years after the CLAEM. The rest of the fellows went on to become some of the most recognizable names of the Latin American avant-garde scene, and developed an important pedagogical work across the Americas and into Europe.

\textit{Fellowships during 1967-1968}

The group for the 1967-1968 biennial was the last group that received the originally planned scholarships. In some ways it was the last regular group at the CLAEM, and it was also the last that achieved some balance between Argentinean and foreign students. The juries for this biennial, Carlos Estrada, Alfonso Letelier, and Alberto Ginastera chose the Argentineans Luis Arias (Argentina 1943), Mario Perusso (Argentina 1936), Luis María Serra (Argentina 1942), and the foreigners Florencio Pozadas (Bolivia 1939-1968), Marlene Fernandes (Brazil 1932), Jacqueline Nova (Belgium/Colombia 1935-1975), Iris Sangüesa de Ichasso (Chile 1933),\textsuperscript{32} Joaquín Orellana (Guatemala 1930),\textsuperscript{33} and Oscar Cubillas (Peru, 1938).\textsuperscript{34} Bolaños, Brnčić and Atehortúa also participated in this group as OAS fellows in 1967; only Brnčić returned as a fellow in 1968. This group also had the Center’s first extraordinary student, Regina Benevento de Beresiarte, a student of Ginastera, who was given special permission to attend the

\textsuperscript{32} At the time married, later only Iris Sangüesa Hinestroza.
\textsuperscript{33} Orellana has insisted in recent years that he was born in 1937 but his application to the Di Tella fellowship clearly indicates 1930.
\textsuperscript{34} A final selected candidate for Brazil chose not to attend, Kilza Setti.
courses as a listener but not a participant.\textsuperscript{35} It is unclear how much of the ‘listening and not participating’ was enforced, but clearly it was not too strict since the works of Benavente were performed in the two cycles of Seminario de Composición concerts in 1967-1968. This case of attending courses at the CLAEM without having earned the position by competition would happen again in the next group as well.

This group of fellows was less engaged than the composers of previous generations. Josefina Schröder noted that the group was missing something to give it a better dynamic:

I deem your fellows need someone or something to give them a spirit of unity and cohesion. […] I see them all a little lonely and somewhat not integrated, and the truth is that none of the Argentinean fellows makes an effort to create a cozy environment for the foreigners.\textsuperscript{36}

The dynamics of the group appeared to Schröder to be a little off. Talking about the new fellows after about a month of classes, she writes, “I doubt that this group of fellows will reach the personality and push that the other two groups had. They are very calmed, and to my own opinion, almost dim. Makes me wonder a little about their quality.”\textsuperscript{37}

From this group, Jacqueline Nova—despite her unfortunate early death—and Joaquín Orellana achieved the highest levels of success in composition in the years to come, followed by Luis Arias, Luis María Serra and Mario Perusso. Pozadas died in a car accident when leaving Buenos Aires in 1968. The rest of the composers had only moderately successful careers at best.

\textit{Fellowships during 1969-1970}

The last group of regular fellows was severely affected by the economic problems that the Di Tella Institute and the CLAEM were experiencing at the time. As early as January 1968, 

\textsuperscript{35} In addition, the composer Ladislao Todoroff was allowed to use the electronic music laboratory.  
\textsuperscript{36} Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, June 6, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.  
\textsuperscript{37} Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, May 3, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
the impending economic crisis at the Di Tella Institute was evident. The CLAEM did not have the same budget it had in previous years, and this group would have to undertake their studies under vastly different circumstances. The foreign support was gone, and the funding from the local elite was waning. Oteiza warned Ginastera:

   We need to rethink how we are going to handle the scholarships for the next two years. My idea is that we could call a contest, choosing the top twelve composers. The first six we could give five of the ITDT-CLAEM scholarships and the scholarship you have obtained from the Center for Inter-American Relations. The other six candidates would be admitted for registration in the graduate courses of the Center, but they would have to apply to the OAS or other institutions to get scholarships (we could support their applications).  

In the call for applicants for the 1969-1970 fellowships, the term “becario” (fellow) was replaced by “compositor seleccionado” (selected composer), and it was determined that there was going to be a limited number of fellowships—and therefore a limited number of students receiving a monthly stipend, although all selected composers had their tuition waived. Since the Rockefeller Foundation grant had expired, and with very little funds coming from other sources, Ginastera had to make some hard decisions. First, the jury would reveal to the public the order of the selection of the students, and they would receive financial aid depending on their ranking—before this period the list of fellows was published alphabetically and all received the same financial aid. Second, both the number of students—traditionally twelve—and the number of Argentinean selected candidates increased notably.

   Gustavo Becerra, Héctor Tosar and Alberto Ginastera chose and ranked the candidates accepted as the fourth group of fellows.  

   The selected composers, in their ranked order, were:

   José Maranzano (Argentina 1940), Eduardo Kusnir (Argentina 1939), Pedro Caryevschi

---

38 Enrique Oteiza, letter to Alberto Ginastera, January 29, 1968, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
(Argentina 1942), Antonio Mastrogiovanni (Uruguay 1936-2010), Ariel Martínez (Uruguay-Argentina 1940), Coriún Aharonián (Uruguay 1940), Alfredo del Mónaco (Venezuela, 1938; did not attend), Alejandro Núñez Allauca (Peru 1943), Jorge Antunes (Brazil 1942), Juan Carlos Villegas (Chile 1941; did not attend), Federico Ibarra Groth (Mexico 1946; did not attend), Luis Zubillaga (Argentina 1929-1995), Jorge Blarduni (Argentina 1930), Bruno D’Astoli (Italia-Argentina, 1934), Salvador Ranieri (Argentina 1930), and Diego Feinstein (Argentina 1943). Among these, D’Astoli and Norman Dinnerstein (United States, 1937)—yet another U.S. fellow at the CLAEM—were selected to receive funding from the Center for InterAmerican Relations and the Di Tella Foundation by a jury that consisted of Vincent Persichetti, Robert Wart and Antonio Tauriello (representing Alberto Ginastera). Joining this group of fellows in 1969 and the beginning of 1970 was Rafael Aponte-Ledée, who returned to the CLAEM with a scholarship from the OAS.

Ginastera most likely expected that the last five selectees on the list of sixteen made by the jury (Zubillaga, Blarduni, D’Astoli, Feinstein and Ranieri), being Argentinean, could perhaps cover their own expenses and thus take advantage of the opportunities of working at the CLAEM. In his correspondence with this group, Ginastera began differentiating between “becas de estudio” (scholarships) and “becas de sustentamiento” (stipends). All these conditions made the attendance of the fellows much more irregular than ever before. D’Astoli, for example, had to keep his job at the Teatro Colón, and Zubillaga, Blarduni, Ranieri y Feinstein, without a

40 Caryevschi left Argentina at some point and moved to Israel. He changed his name to Yuval Karin.
41 Aharonián only went to the CLAEM from mid-June to October of 1969.
42 Did not present any works in concerts at the CLAEM.
43 Did not present any works in concerts at the CLAEM.
44 Did not present any works in concerts at the CLAEM.
45 Received a scholarship from the German Service for Academic Exchange (DAAD), in 1969.
stipend, were forced to maintain their usual positions and could only attend occasionally. As I mentioned, not everyone who was accepted was able to attend. For example, Federico Ibarra wrote from Mexico City on February 3, 1969, to tell Ginastera that he would gladly accept the admission to the CLAEM, but that his current economic situation did not allow him “to sustain studies in a foreign country, without the economic help derived from a scholarship [...].” In the end Ibarra, like several others, could not attend.

Continuing with the anomalies of this period Ginastera authorized the participation of the composers Beatriz Lockhart and León Biriotti. Both composers received what Ginastera called a study scholarship. These scholarships were completely independent from the contest that had been held with a jury to rank the composers. On one hand Biriotti could not participate in the competition because of his age—he had been born in 1929. On the other, Lockhart had presented her works for the contest of 1969 but was not accepted. Lockhart petitioned Ginastera in July 1969 to be allowed to audit the classes in her “capacity of wife of a foreign fellow [Antonio Mastrogiovanni]” and her “high interest in these courses and [her] capacity to follow them.” Héctor Tosar presented the case of Lockhart in June 1969, asking for her admission under extraordinary conditions, even though he as a jury had already rejected her application. Ginastera answered Lockhart on July 16, 1969, informing her that she had been admitted to all courses in the same conditions as the other fellows and that she would be granted “by the end of the cycle of studies the corresponding certificate.” Additionally, the document shows that she is “granted the scholarship for the Di Tella Institute that exempts her from

---

46 Federico Ibarra, letter to Alberto Ginastera, February 3, 1969, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
47 See Héctor Tosar, letter to Alberto Ginastera, June 14 or 19, 1969, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
48 Beatriz Lockhart, letter to Alberto Ginastera, July 14, 1969, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
49 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Beatriz Lockhart, Julio 16, 1969, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
paying tuition and taxes.” León Biriotti received the same type of ‘extraordinary fellowship’—as Ginastera called it at the time—when he requested permission to participate in the courses on September 3, 1969.\footnote{To my knowledge no student ever paid tuition or taxes during the CLAEM’s existence.}

From this group both Maranzano and Caryevschi abandoned composition at some point after leaving the CLAEM, while D’Astoli continued his career as conductor. However, the rest of the composers were quite successful in their careers as composers, and like the second group, became reference points in the history of avant-garde composition in Latin America.

\textit{The 1971 Group: A Final Effort}

In 1971 Alberto Ginastera moved to Switzerland while nominally still occupying the position of director of the CLAEM. That same year, and with very few funds available, a small group of previous fellows was invited to come back to the CLAEM for the year. Ginastera’s name was still used to invite the fellows, but the process of selection was very different, and Gerardo Gandini and Francisco Kröpfl were most certainly involved in the decision-making. Today, neither Kröpfl nor Gandini remembers who was it that approached certain ex-fellows, nor do they recall the criteria used to decide whom to invite back to the Center. Marlos Nobre, for instance, responded directly to Ginastera to thank him but decline his “invitation for a scholarship dedicated to ex-fellows of the CLAEM.”\footnote{León Biriotti, letter to Alberto Ginastera, July 14, 1969, CLAEM archives, ITDT.} From all the correspondence, it appears that even though he had already left Argentina (and unbeknownst to anyone had decided not to return), Ginastera still might have been interested in allowing former fellows access to the Center during its last moments of existence, so that the resources available would not go to waste. This seemed to have been his logic in the selection process for 1969-1970, and might \footnote{Marlos Nobre, letter to Alberto Ginastera, March 17, 1971, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.}
have still been a factor in this last year. The official offer made to several ex-fellows, and under Ginastera’s signature said:

During this year, between April 1st and November 30th, the Center I direct will be having a course on musical composition dedicated to ex-fellows of this Center. I am pleased to invite you to participate of it, requesting from you your prompt response. The invitation consists of a scholarship of $1,000 pesos [...] (equivalent approximately to U$S 250) per month. ⁵³

Aponte-Ledée was one of several composers who were invited—not selected by competition as in previous years—and could not or chose not to attend. As far as I have been able to document, in addition to Aponte-Ledée, the ex-fellows that were invited but did not attend during the 1971 period were Jorge Antunes, Marlos Nobre, Miguel Letelier and Antonio Mastrogiovanni. In the end, the extraordinary group of 1971 consisted of César Bolaños, Mariano Etkin, Alejandro Núñez Allauca, José Ramón Maranzano, Pedro Caryevschi and Ariel Martínez. ⁵⁴ During this period these composers did the majority of their work at the electronic music laboratory, which under the direction of Kröpfl and Von Reichenbach was at its absolute prime. They were able to take advantage until the very last minute of all the possibilities that the CLAEM offered.

---

⁵³ [Alberto Ginastera but document is not signed], letter to Rafael Aponte-Ledée, March 12, 1971, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
⁵⁴ Besides the oral history that I have been able to collect from composers, the only written source that I have found to verify the fellows for 1971 is a letter written to the executive director of the Di Tella institute, Roberto Cortés Conde. This letter is signed by Cesar Bolaños, Pedro Caryevschi, Mariano Etkin, Ariel Martínez, José Ramón Maranzano, y Alejandro Núñez Allauca, and it is dated September 15, 1971, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
3.3 The Local Teachers

The CLAEM had a set of local professors that provided the core courses that the students took during the two years of fellowship.\textsuperscript{55} Alberto Ginastera led the team, teaching composition seminars and a course on form and analysis of twentieth century music. In fact, the possibility to take lessons with Ginastera was an important aspect that attracted many young Latin American composers to apply to the CLAEM. After all, no other composer from the region at the time had gained as much international visibility as Ginastera. Gerardo Gandini acted as Ginastera’s assistant, and replaced him frequently when he traveled. In addition, Gandini taught about 20\textsuperscript{th} century musical analysis, and orchestration. Initially Horacio Raúl Bozzarelllo, and later on Fernando von Reichenbach and Francisco Kröpfl gave courses on electronic music composition. Gabriel Brnčić joined Reichenbach and Kröpfl in 1969, while Cesar Bolaños collaborated with them sporadically as well.\textsuperscript{56} The Argentinean composer Enrique Belloc (b.1936) also taught briefly at the CLAEM, starting on May 1, 1968. Belloc gave “a three-month course in ‘Introduction to the Analysis of Experimental Music’, based on the methods of [Pierre] Schaeffer”\textsuperscript{57} Other sporadic class were taught by different local professors, most notably Pola

\textsuperscript{55} For a full list of courses, see Appendix.
\textsuperscript{56} Bolaños’s role in the Laboratory has been frequently misrepresented in some of the accounts. The earliest letter that shows the degree of involvement he had at the laboratory date from 1969, when Bolaños writes to Kröpfl with copies to Ginastera, Gandini and Brnčić complaining after feeling like he’d been left out of some activities: Even though you are the ‘official composers’ of the CLAEM, and I am not ‘administratively’ associated with it, we cannot forget […] that I am an active musician, that I am a professor in the Institute for the Audiovisual Course, that I was a fellow, that I participated in the founding of the Laboratory as a musician and technician, and that I was professor of the Electronic Music Composition Seminar to which Brnčić, Aponte and Atehortúa attended. Cesar Bolaños, letter to Francisco Kröpfl with copies to Alberto Ginastera, Gerardo Gandini and Gabriel Brnčić, November 12, 1969, CLAEM Archives, ITDT. This evidence points to Bolaños as teacher for this particular year, something that has been questioned in the past.
\textsuperscript{57} Enrique Oteiza, report to Nils Westberg, May 15, 1968, folder 78, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
Suárez Urtubey, who taught full courses on music history several times, and Raquel Casinelli de Arias, who lectured on music theory and form.

From this list, Gandini and Kröpfl became central to the CLAEM, particularly after 1967, when Ginastera became more and more occupied with his compositions and his administrative duties in the Center. A short look at their trajectory explains the impact they had on the fellows during their tenure.

Gerardo Gandini

The three most important names that come to mind when talking about classical music composition in Argentina during the twentieth century are Juan Carlos Paz, Alberto Ginastera, and Gerardo Gandini (Argentina 1936). 58 Paraskevaïdis, Etkin, Brnčić, and many other fellows at the CLAEM found in Gandini, and not Ginastera, a guide in their search for the avant-garde. Paraskevaïdis remembers:

Some students basically worshiped [Ginastera]. [...] On the other hand us [Paraskevaïdis and Etkin from the second group], well we did not pay him much attention to put it bluntly [...], which by the way was reciprocal. He did not care much for us as students. Fortunately he left us to our own luck in a way that allowed Gerardo Gandini to be more efficient, effective, and solid in his lessons with us... 59

Gerardo Gandini studied piano with Pía Sebastiani, Roberto Caamaño and Yvonne Loriod and composition with Alberto Ginastera and Goffredo Petrassi. As a performer he became known for his piano performances of Schoenberg, Cage and Feldman. After having taught mostly analysis classes at the CLAEM, he went on to teach at the Cursos

58 Parts of this biographical note are derived from Paraskevaïdis 1996, 110-119.
As Paraskevaïdis notices, Gandini is more or less exceptional among Latin American composers of his generation, in that most of his music has been published. Among his most notable compositions are *Música Nocturna I* (1964), *Piagne e sospira* (1969), *A cow in a Mondrian Painting* (1975), *Arnold Strikes again* (1985), *Eusebius: Cuatro nocturnos para piano* (1984), *Eusebius: Cinco nocturnos para orquesta* (1986), *Música Ficción III* (1990), *Mozartvariationen* (1991), and the series *Anatomy of Melancholy* (2000s). Intertextuality seems to be at the core of Gandini’s compositions, putting his music into dialogue with quotes of music from Dufay, Lasso, Frescobaldi, Rameau, Bach, Scarlatti, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Verdi or Schoenberg. In the *Mozartvariationen*, for example, Gandini takes materials from the piano variations “Ah, vous dirai-je, maman” KV265 written by Mozart in 1778, using a chamber ensemble that mixes textual quotes and rigorous counterpunctal procedures. The appropriation of European repertoire as a Latin American composer is something that does not preoccupy Gandini. He defines himself as part of those who believe that this is a moment of synthesis [in the history of music]. A moment when composers have at their disposal the materials provided by all of music’s history, a history that is their own, of their generation and of their country, but also the history of the art they practice…[I am] part of those who think that music talks about itself and that musics talk among each other in an Imaginary Museum of Musical Works (making reference to Lydia Goehr)

In line with other art music composers, the autonomy of music composition is naturalized for Gandini to an extent that music is able to talk about itself and different musics can talk among each other. As noted by Paraskevaïdis, Gandini’s use of materials from the

---

60 Paraskevaïdis 1993, 1.
past—which he calls found objects—is presented through multiple filters: superposition, montage, contrast, multiplication, de-construction and re-construction, and his use of timbre through innovative orchestration becomes essential in transforming familiar tonal material into something fresh.\(^{62}\)

Gandini’s role in the CLAEM cannot be understated. Most of the fellows that I interviewed valued his role at the Center as an inspiring and helpful colleague and teacher whose knowledge of the avant-garde opened their ears to new and exciting sounds. Graciela Paraskevaídis says that thanks to Gandini, the students at the CLAEM ha the opportunity to “get a deeper insight into the main issues of new music, from the Second Viennese School to Bartók and Varèse and to the European and North American avant-garde of the sixties.”\(^{63}\)

Gandini’s lessons on new music were complemented by his active career as a composer. His pieces were frequently performed in concert at the CLAEM and the students were avid listeners. I found that Gandini’s pieces were often the ones remembered the most by the fellows, mostly I think, because of how they saw Gandini at the moment as a role model close to them in age and aesthetic interest. In 1964, a concert part of the Third Contemporary Music Festival organized at the CLAEM included the premiere of Gandini’s *Música Nocturna* (1964) for flute, string trio and piano. Among those present at the concert, *Música Nocturna* is widely remembered for its richness in timbre exploration and expressiveness. Orrego-Salas described the work as being pointillistic, “following Anton Webern's ideal of using a pre-arranged set of timbre changes to take place along with each pitch, known as the Klangfarbenmelodie (tone-color-melody).”\(^{64}\) In my interviews, I found that it was precisely that pointillism—dividing the

---

\(^{63}\) Paraskevaídis 1993, 1-2.
\(^{64}\) Orrego-Salas 1985,155
melodic line between different instruments and thus creating the impression in the audience that the melody changes timbre in each new pitch—and the fact that the piece is derived from a pitch series that likely made an important impression on the young composers attending the concert.

Figure 3-9: Fragment of Gerardo Gandini’s *Música Nocturna*. The way he diagrams the score shows his interest in pointillistic writing, with instruments appearing only when sounding.

Another piece by Gandini that was mentioned frequently by some of the fellows of the first and second group was the *Concertino III* (1963) for harpsichord and flute, oboe, bass clarinet, violin, viola, violoncello and percussion. It was performed in the Fourth Contemporary Music Festival, on August 26, 1965. Since Gandini was the only local composer featured in this concert, his piece gained particular attention from the critics in Buenos Aires. The piece has three movements: *Capricho, Interludio* and *Fantasia*. The harpsichord dominates the *Capricho* with improvisatory-like passages in a highly atonal language, with brief responses by the woodwinds, which, although energetic, never rise above a *mezzo forte*. The first movement ends quietly, almost ethereally with different instruments gently playing a B5. The *Interludio* is short and dominated by the woodwinds, but the entrances of the harpsichord are harsh, powerful and
on occasion include clusters and even one fast glissando over the keyboard. Finally, the *Fantasia* explores alternating gestures by the harpsichord, uses clusters or fast arpeggios to interrupt the attempts of the woodwinds to take prominence with, once again, pointillistic gestures articulated by different percussive strokes. In general the musical language seems influenced by the Second Viennese School, and the composition pays particular attention to timbre. Although several composers recognized Gandini’s *Música Nocturna* as an important influence during our interviews, his *Concertino* must have also created a good impression given its wide expressivity and attention to timbre and orchestration. A newspaper critic, unsympathetic to most new works in the festival, commented on the work:

> Its sound is similar to most [experimental works] being written today (and ignoring the fact that a great majority of them are just copying the work of the real experimentalists). This [copying] is not the case with Gandini’s work, whose score shows with certainty that the author can take his work beyond the basic premises that he establishes.\(^{65}\)

This anonymous critic voices what many described at the time: Gandini was well informed of contemporary trends in composition, and also had the capacity to absorb them and make them his own in a personal musical language. This capacity was what earned him Ginastera’s trust to act as his main collaborator in teaching the fellows, and the respect from the students at the Center.

*Francisco Kröpfl*

Gerardo Gandini could not teach at the CLAEM during the first part of 1967, having earned a scholarship from the Italian government to study in Rome during that period. Ginastera’s plan was to replace Gandini temporarily with Francisco Kröpfl, who had been asked...
to teach a course on electronic music technique between April and July. However, Kröpfl’s appointment ended up not being temporary. At least by April 11, 1967, Kröpfl was already a full time member of the team. Still, as late as June, Josefina Schröder was not clear if Kröpfl was to stay the whole year or just for the duration of the course.

Kröpfl seems very organized and capable—he has even come on Saturdays to help two or three of the students with things they did not get, in order to not slow down the rest during usual class time. [...] What I would like to know, in order to make the situation clear here, is if he will continue to give classes the whole year or not, since I have to clarify this with him, with Engineer Oteiza and with accounting.

Ginastera answered confirming Kröpfl’s stay: “I am happy that he has shown to be efficient. I was always struck by him as a serious and well-educated person, as well as very smart. According to what Engineer Oteiza and I had discussed, he will continue with the course the whole year.” Ginastera seems to have given up his hesitation in hiring Kröpfl, a student of Juan Carlos Paz, with whom Ginastera had a feud for many years. The great news for the CLAEM was that Kröpfl was the missing companion for Fernando von Reichenbach who had been hired as engineer and although a brilliant, was not a composer.

The frequent absences of Ginastera due to his busy international composition career often led to an administrative vacuum that needed to be filled for the everyday functioning of the CLAEM. Gerardo Gandini had absolutely no interest in administrative matters, so Josefina Schröder took that responsibility, and was the person who remained most in touch with Ginastera during his trips, sometime exchanging letters several times per week. However, Schröder—albeit knowledgeable—was not ideal for those decisions that required a mix of

66 Enrique Oteiza, report to John Greenfield, June 19, 1967, folder 78, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
67 Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, April 19, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
68 Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, June 13, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
69 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Josefina Schröder, June 17, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
artistic and administrative acuity. With the arrival of Francisco Kröpfl to the team, Ginastera found someone he could trust to take charge of those matters. In his correspondence with Schröder in April 1968 it is clear that Ginastera gave a lot of importance to Kröpfl during his absences. He tells Josefina that for organizing events at the CLAEM during his absence there should be two opinions to be taken into account, “Kröpfl’s from the artistic point of view, and yours [Josefina] from the administrative.”

The extent of Kröpfl’s position within the administrative structure of CLAEM has frequently been questioned, since the CLAEM rarely made official appointments of any kind. However, this was clarified in a letter from June May 23, 1968, functionaries from the Di Tella Institute wanted to discuss some issues with Ginastera. After being asked by Schröder about the person that to some degree is acting as substitute to Ginastera in his absence, Ginastera replies:

Professor Kröpfl is currently in charge of the Direction of the CLAEM. I thought this had been made sufficiently clear, especially considering the way that all the formalisms have been eliminated from these kind of procedures in the Institute. Written and sealed appointments are not common, and in fact I don’t think that you as a secretary or me as director have an official appointment.

---

70 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Josefina Schröder, April 22, 1968, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
71 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Josefina Schröder, June 1, 1968, CLAEM Archives, ITDT. After this personal communication with Josefina, it is not until 1970 when an official letter talks about Kröpfl’s role during Ginastera’s absences. In a letter to the new executive director of the Institute after Enrique Oteiza’s departure, Roberto Cortés Conde, Ginastera determines: “Since I will be absent for about a month and a half, I leave professor Kröpfl as Interim Director.” (Alberto Ginastera, letter to Roberto Cortés Conde, October 24, 1970, CLAEM Archives, ITDT). The draft of a report written in 1970 and originally in Spanish for the Rockefeller Foundation contains a section that significantly disappeared in the final English document that was submitted: “Professor Alberto Ginastera is in charge of the direction of the Center and he teaches the composition seminar. In the absence of Professor Ginastera, the interim director of the Center is Professor Francisco Kröpfl.” Most likely the figure of Ginastera was so key to the possible future funding that the decision was not to include a mention of this situation (“Informe CLAEM 1971 Versión en castellano Original,” dated 1971 but most likely written by the end of 1970, CLAEM Archives, ITDT).
3.4 Visiting Composers

A core part of the experience of attending the CLAEM had to do with the possibility of interacting on a personal basis with well established composers that would come as visiting professors for short but intense periods of time. Understandably, as the budget faded, so did the number of composers that were invited but even then, every group had a couple of notable people to work with. The professional prestige gained from adding the name of a recognized international figure to a curriculum functioned as symbolic capital that the composers could gain while doing their studies. Whether the lessons received affected significantly a composer’s production—as it was the case with Malipiero’s lessons on serialism and post-serial techniques—or not—for instance, as we will see next, Messiaen’s lessons on North Indian rhythmical practices which seem to have gone mostly unnoticed—, composers benefited from the added prestige in an art world that values academic lineage. At the same time, in one way or another, the visitors each group of fellows had, strongly shaped their experience.

Messiaen and Malipiero at the CLAEM

The first major visitors that Ginastera invited to teach at the Center were Olivier Messiaen (France, 1908-1992), Riccardo Malipiero (Italy, 1914-2003) and Aaron Copland (United States, 1900-1990). From these visits, the one least documented is that of Aaron Copland. A concert in his honor was organized on September 20 or 22, 1963, and Copland’s six lecture classes—most likely resembling those he had given in the past to other Latin American composers at the Berkshire Music Center in Tanglewood—were mostly a survey of music history with a final bow to music in the Americas. In my interviews, composers of this

For a full list of visiting professors see appendix.
generation had no significant memories or additional things to say about his visit. On the other hand, most composers were quite eager to share their memories of Messiaen and Malipiero.

On August 9, 1962 Ginastera wrote to Messiaen, after having last seen him in Rome in 1959, to tell him about the CLAEM and invite him to give a course that will have a duration of four weeks (eight to ten sessions in total) […] The course could be dedicated to the problems of rhythm through your work. The Center can offer you for a four weeks three thousand dollars ($3,000), the two-way ticket from and to France […] and your hotel expenses here.⁷³

The offer was by all means generous, since $3,000 dollars in 1963 had the approximate buying power of around $21,000 dollars in 2012. Messiaen promptly agreed, and convinced Ginastera to include his wife Yvonne Loriod (France 1924-2010) in the plans. Messiaen suggested that Loriod, a gifted pianist with a broad repertoire of contemporary music, could perform his pieces since several of them had, in fact, been written for her.⁷⁴ The theme of the course for the fellows, Messiaen commented, would include “Meter in Greece, the deçî-tâlas from India, the arsis and thesis in plain chant, accents in Mozart, rhythmic analysis of Debussy and Stravinsky, the use of irrational values of the modern [composers], and my own rhythmic theories.”⁷⁵ Also, he wanted to be sure that he would be in Argentina for the spring to be able to notate the songs of birds in the region and made several requests for information about local ornithological records. His visit was finally set for June 15 to July 8, 1963.⁷⁶ When he gave his “Theory of Rhythm” course, Loriod assisted him at the piano by playing musical examples.

⁷³ Alberto Ginastera, letter to Olivier Messiaen, August 9, 1962, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
⁷⁴ Olivier Messiaen letter to Alberto Ginastera, August 21, 1962, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
⁷⁵ Olivier Messiaen letter to Alberto Ginastera, November 23, 1962, CLAEM Archives, ITDT. See also letter from August 21, 1962, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
⁷⁶ Olivier Messiaen letter to Alberto Ginastera, April 26, 1962, CLAEM Archives, ITDT. The visit had to end in July 8 because Messiaen had to go back to a jury at the Paris Conservatory on July 11, contradicting Novoa’s given date of July 10, 1963 (Novoa 2007, 38).
Messiaen’s visit provoked a very strong impression in the Ecuadorian fellow Mesías Maiguashca. As an anecdote Maiguashca remembers that

Messiaen had a simple demeanor, with a quiet voice; I remember him vulnerable, and timid among people. His classes consisted of the endless writing of examples on the blackboard, with clear and precise calligraphy. I learned a lot from him. Messiaen radiated a serene energy. And more than anything, peace with himself and his work. Few times in my life have I perceived more unity between the ‘human self’ and the ‘artist self.’

A concert in homage to Messiaen was organized on June 24, with his wife Yvonne Loriod performing some of the movements of *Vingt regards sur l'Enfant-Jésus* (1944) and Messiaen and Loriod together performing *Visions de l'Amen* (1943). The press in Buenos Aires was captivated by the famous French composer. The capital city was aware of Messiaen’s works, and multiple newspapers and journals reviewed the concerts. Martín Müller in the magazine *Primera Plana* wrote: “This is the paradox: it is difficult to understand how such a

---

77 Mesías Maiguashca, email with the author, November 11, 2008.
cerebral musician, whose work is created with materials grasped only by the erudite, how can such a rational aesthetic create works so embedded in passion?"  

78 *The Buenos Aires Herald* called Messiaen “probably the most intriguing musical personality in France.”  

79 Rodolfo Arizaga, an Argentinean composer and music historian, used his column in the newspaper *Clarín* to give a backhanded compliment to the audience at the Mozarteum society of Buenos Aires:  

The public warmly received the work of the visitors [Messiaen and Loriod], and applauded with enthusiasm. That is good news and that is why I mention it here since it is not frequent to listen to contemporary works there [at the Mozarteum]. It is demonstrated that the [Mozarteum] audience is not afraid of dissonances, at least those that come from abroad…  

80 In contrast to Messiaen’s three-week visit, Malipiero’s stay in Buenos Aires lasted for seven months. This allowed him to work in depth with all the fellows in the two classes he took charge of: “Musical Texture in the Twentieth Century” and “New Orchestral Principles.” Two of Malipiero’s interests were present in his teachings and significantly affected the aesthetic concerns in the works produced by the first group of fellows. On the one hand, he had been a resolute advocate of twelve-tone composition—in fact, he had helped organize the First International Congress of Dodecaphonic Music in Milan in 1949. At the same time, his works from the 1960s, including his *Quartetto No.3*, which premiered during his visit, were focused on the exploration of timbre. These two aspects matched Gerardo Gandini’s own interests and both composers established an excellent friendship.  

Malipiero’s experience at the CLAEM was a success and he remembered it fondly. After returning to Italy, he writes in a very friendly tone to “all the Fellows at the Center for Musical Studies,” and jokingly says, “I have seen [Luigi] Dallapiccola on several occasion (and I will…  

79 Fred Mare, “Music in Buenos Aires: Olivier Messiaen,” *Buenos Aires Herald*, July 8, 1963  
see him much more in July), and he has asked me many times about Buenos Aires, the Institute and about all of you. I have told him all the bad things possible!“81 In his letter he remembers that it has been almost a year since they had met and begun to work together. Again, in a voice of solidarity and friendship, and with a joking but insightful tone he writes:

I don’t know if [working with me], has been of any good to you. Maybe it was a waste of time. I believe I did not teach anything. Writing music is such a difficult thing and I am not sure if it can even be taught. I think I didn’t teach you anything. Really, what I have strived for is making my experience available to you. Although I have also left you the freedom to not believe in the same things I believe […] Music! What a wonderful useless game. I think we are the last survivors of a truly sunken ship. There are few of us left, on a small raft, driven by the whims of wind and currents, adrift. Nobody waits for us anymore; they all think we are dead. But we continue to live and write music, like it was something indispensable. It was indispensable, perhaps, when men had time to believe in something, to stop and look at what was around them, but now82

Malipiero’s very romantic notion of the labor of composition—something that he is not sure can even be taught—and his pessimist perception of the worth of music making—a useless game—are striking. Although his classes involved mostly exploring twelve-tone techniques and serial procedures, his appreciation of composition as an activity done in a desperate context points to a different concern. He must have seen the importance of support offered by the other survivors of the sunken ship—the other composers—and must have emphasized the importance of solidarity among them. Malipiero was eager to point out the lack of knowledge among Latin American composers about their regional peers, and was likely an important factor in the integration among composers, as we will see in the following chapter.

81 Riccardo Malipiero, letter to Alberto Ginastera and all of the fellows at the CLAEM, May 29, 1964, CLAEM Archives, ITDT. He is referring here to the Italian composer Luigi Dallapiccola, who taught at the CLAEM in 1964.
82 Ibid. My emphasis.
Gilbert Chase, Bruno Maderna and Luigi Dallapiccola at the CLAEM

The first extended visit of 1964 was by the music historian Gilbert Chase (Cuba and U.S. 1906-1992), who gave a three-week course in August titled “Towards an American Aesthetic.” The course was an excellent fit with Ginastera’s Latinamericanist desires for the Center since Chase had been a long time advocate for a strengthening hemispheric ties among musicians. Overlapping with Chase’s visit was that of Italian conductor and composer Bruno Maderna (Italy, 1920-1973). He gave a series of lectures titled “My Experiences in Electronic Music.” Maderna was a leader among the European avant-garde and had founded, together with Luciano Berio, the Studio di Fonologia Musicale of the RAI in 1955. His *Musica su due dimensioni* (1952) was famous for being the first work to combine tape-recorded sounds and

---

83 For more on Latinamericanism and the CLAEM see chapter 4.
84 In some documents referred to as “Experimental Phonology”
live instruments. Maderna had studied with Malipiero, a previous visitor to the CLAEM, and was quite familiar with the works of his elder, Luigi Dallapiccola, the next teacher to arrive in Buenos Aires.

The visit of Luigi Dallapiccola, like that of Messiaen the previous year, was a major event in the musical scene of Buenos Aires. Many newspapers and magazines, among them Primera Plana, El Mundo, La Prensa, La Razón, Clarín, and El Siglo, published articles praising his works. La Prensa said that “Dallapiccola is not unknown among the Buenos Aires audience; you could even say that no other composer of his generation is better known here than him.” Dallapiccola (Italy 1904-1975) came to the CLAEM to give a one-month course on “Music and the Word” between September 22 and October 22. The focus of his talks was his opera Il prigioniero (1944-48), an open protest against fascism and Nazism built using three different 12-tone rows. Maiguashca described Dallapiccola and his class to me: “He was small, tidy, white hair, broad smile, loud voice, passionate, and full of humor. His description in class of Il prigioniero was itself a theatrical presentation. I will remember it forever.”

After the usual concert organized in honor of the visiting professors, Jorge D’Urbano, a recognized music critic in Buenos Aires, wrote:

For the young, Dallapiccola [sic] is already ‘old stuff.’ Since he has not yet stepped into the mysterious thresholds of concrete and electronic music, he is considered among the advanced circles as an academic. In retrograde circles he is appreciated as a revolutionary. And among the broader groups of people that are not blindly guided by aesthetical postures or in-vogue theories, Dallapiccola is considered to be the most important musician of the modern Italian school.

---

86 Maiguashca, email with the author, November 11, 2008.
Visit by Composers Affiliated to the Columbia-Princeton Studio

The first visitor scheduled for the 1965-66 group was Mario Davidovsky (Argentina, b.1934), who worked at Columbia-Princeton. For four months between May and September of 1965, Davidovsky shared his experiences in the studio and taught a course at the CLAEM on electronic music titled “Technique for the Composition of Electronic Music”. The visit of another composer affiliated with the Columbia-Princeton studio, Roger Sessions (U.S. 1896-1985), overlapped with Davidovsky’s. Sessions taught a course that he called “Music and Man” between July 25 and September 24. In addition, like most other composers that visited the CLAEM, Sessions offered master classes to individually discuss the works of the fellows. This interaction of the fellows with world-renowned composers of electroacoustic music triggered interest in electronic composition.

The Visit of Iannis Xenakis

Iannis Xenakis’s visit was the most anticipated of 1966. Between August 22 and September 3 he taught the fellows a course on “Stochastic, Strategic and Symbolic Music” and on August 31 he offered a public lecture titled “New Principles of Musical Composition.” The press gave particular attention to his visit given his renown in the European avant-garde music scene.

Xenakis’s visit was very influential for many of the composers I talked to. Even those who were not interested in the soundscapes proposed by the Greek composer recognized the significance of his visit. Brnčić, for instance, told me,

88 Alberto Ginastera and Enrique Oteiza, report to Gerald Freund (Associate Director for Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation), June 16, 1966, folder 77, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

89 See Iannis Xenakis, letter to Alberto Ginastera, September 30, 1966, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
Xenakis, Nono and Cage showed me artificial paradises [of possibilities for composition] to which I gave serious consideration. But given my nature, I could not have followed those paths without sincere and complete remorse. I decided not to do it. Despite how stimulating they were to me […] 90

For Graciela Paraskevaídís on the other hand, Xenakis’s visit was absolutely crucial.

Xenakis came in the year 1966 and coincided with my fellowship at the CLAEM. He was there, for 2 weeks, everyday […] It was a tremendous experience to have classes, confrontations, discussions, and to get to know the music and the ideas of a composer that I was very interested in at that moment. 91

Figure 3-12: Magma I (1965-67, mm.1-10). Notice that the ‘unison’ at the beginning is already widened by horn IV with a quarter tone sharp (indicated by the + sign) that in measure 5 becomes quarter tone flat (indicated by the ˚ sign) and the wide vibrato written for the Bb trumpet.

---

90 Gabriel Brnčić, email with the author, Barcelona, August 29, 2008.
One can see that in her work *Magma I* (1965-67)—the first of several works with this name—she adopted several characteristics of Xenakis’s compositions. From its abrasive beginning one can hear the importance given to timbre and texture, and the high density of sound that drives the piece. The first 10 measures of the score start with all nine brass instruments in $fff$ in an F# widened microtonally, with one of the trumpets using vibrato. The piece, like Xenakis’s *Metastasis*, *Pithoprakta* and other ‘sound mass’ or ‘textural’ compositions, uses glissandi frequently, as the instruments create clouds of sound where the importance of individual pitches is minimized and the perceptual effect is that of an overall single sound object created by the contour of the individual sounds with sporadic individual bursts of small melodic cells.

Paraskevaídis was particularly affected by the visit and felt connected with the composer given her Greek heritage.

In the case of Xenakis, he had a peculiar story that in a certain sense brought us together, in a familial sense I would say. With my parents as well. He became friends with them, he came home several times, and we would talk in Greek, eat Greek food and all that. It was also a surprise for him, a small surprise. And in his classes too, to find myself and have to face a different world of ideas, a different worldview, and different things from the European things I knew. His theme was stochastics, the use of stochastics and math in his work, and his experiences working with IBM computers. He had already done the series of works that start with the letters ST-. And several electroacoustic works, including what he did with Varèse for the Philips Pavilion. It was a tremendously rich opportunity for me.

As we will see in chapter 5, this encounter with a “different world of ideas” and “different things from the European things” that were known in Buenos Aires at the time, opened a new door of development for avant-garde composers that wanted to find their own voice outside the common sites of classical music production.
Luigi Nono’s Visit

The Italian composer Luigi Nono was invited to lecture at the CLAEM between July 10 and August 10, 1967. Many newspapers reported his visit. The fact that he was openly a communist and his music was described as ‘committed’ as a way of indicating his interest in politics drew journalists to him and made their imaginations run wild.92

Nono’s lessons at the CLAEM reflected his interest in the relationship between music and text and his own experiences in an electronic music laboratory. To pay for his one-month visit Nono received $2000 dollars, the equivalent of about $13,000 in 2012, in addition to his expenses for food and lodging.

Ginastera, in his introductory words to Nono’s visit said

Nono is considered a political musician. I do not agree with that qualifier at all. I do believe that he is one of the most expressive composers of our time and within this position he does not betray the great line of Italian tradition over the last decades: Verdi – Dallapiccola – Nono. If at some point Nono is interested in fragments of a political speech and the words of a worker or a student, we cannot forget that García Lorca, Machado, Ungaretti or Pavase inspire some of his most eloquent pages as well. 93

At first sight Ginastera’s comment about Nono not being political seems completely disconnected from reality since it is precisely during this time period that Nono became most fully committed to the political connotations of his works. Pointing to this period of his compositional output, historian Gianmario Borio notes:

Fired by the conviction that all artistic activity must be motivated by ethical and political considerations, Nono considered that, for a piece to make an impact on reality, the composer must be familiar with the most advanced musical techniques of his age. The compositions in which Nono dealt explicitly with political issues thus became those in which he experimented most with electronic technology. In A floresta é jovem e cheja de vida, for example, the voices of a

92 See for example “Una extensa y comprometida obra del compositor Luigi Nono,” Clarín (Buenos Aires), August 18, 1967.  
93 Alberto Ginastera, introductory speech to Luigi Nono, August 2, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
soprano and several actors, the sound of sheets of copper being struck and the multiphonics of a clarinet are transformed in the studio by means of a set of modulators and filters; the same sound sources interact live with the tape, creating situations of tension and resolution which redefine on a new semantic level texts from Fidel Castro, Patrice Lumumba, an anonymous student from the University of California, a South Vietnamese soldier, an Angolan guerrilla and Italian manual workers.94

What is missing from to fully understand Ginastera’s introduction which seemingly contradicts Borio’s assessment, is taking into consideration Ginastera’s view on the political context at the time. With his words, perhaps a little overstated, Ginastera was trying to dissipate the attention that Nono’s visit was attracting at the time from the overzealous dictatorship that had begun in Argentina in 1966.

Nono’s talk on the use of voice and words in the work *A Floresta è jovem e cheja de vida* (1965-66) was preserved as a recording in the CLAEM archives.95 The piece is written for soprano, three reciters, clarinet, thunder sheets and 8-channel tape and performed by Carol Robinson (live clarinet), Voxnova (live voices), William O. Smith (recorded clarinet), Liliana Poli (recorded soprano voice), and members of The Living Theater (recorded reciters). *A floresta* is not unique in Nono’s treatment of live voice and its recorded counterpart. In one of his most important works, *La fabbrica illuminata* (1964) for female voice and tape, Nono uses a tape part comprising sounds recorded in a factory, workers’ voices, a choir and the soloist herself (originally Carla Henius) alternating with the live performer. Both works also share an interest in the diffusion of sound from different points in space, and the employment of texts that create an immediate association of the work to contemporary political issues.

95 The program for the two conference-concert events lists the work as being composed in 1967.
In the first public concert of his visit, Nono presented three electroacoustic works that he had realized in the Studio di Fonologia of the RAI in Milan. First, *Omaggio a Emilio Vedova* (1960), then *La fabbrica illuminata* (1964) and finally *Ricorè da cosa ti hanno fatto in Auschwitz* (1966). The second public conference-concert was one week later with the audition of a recording of *A floresta é jovem e cheja de vida* followed by a documentary about this piece that covered the creation of the work in Milan before its premiere at the “Biennale di Música, Venezia 1967” festival. Almost purposefully contradicting Ginastera’s presentation, Nono introduces *A floresta* using the following words:

> It was natural for me to dedicate this work to the National Front for the Liberation of [South] Vietnam. This dedication is important, because I truly believe everyone can choose his or her place in the world. It is a dedication that is also important for the knowledge, not only of the situation in Vietnam, but knowledge of our history. I think that here in Argentina this dedication […] may be a contribution to a different type of conscience. […] That is, a kind of knowledge, of decision making, of commitment, useful at a time when we look for the end of the censorship that has struck Ginastera, that has hit Antonioni and which has struck [unintelligible], and lots of others.\(^\text{96}\)

But Nono did not stop at pointing out the recent case of censorship against Ginastera’s *Bomarzo* opera. He went a step further and gave a surprising dedication to that particular concert:

> Given my way of being, the choices I make, it is simply natural for me here today to dedicate this evening, and this audience, to a son of Argentina whose great humanity reminds me of the great humanity and generosity of Giuseppe Garibaldi. I would like to dedicate this evening to Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara.

When Nono mentioned the nineteenth-century Italian hero Giuseppe Garibaldi—who fought for the unification of Italy, but also the civil war in Uruguay and the separatist Brazilian movement in Rio Grande do Sul—most in the audience must have expected him that he would compare him to José de San Martin (c. 1778-1850), the Argentine general that led the successful struggle

\(^{96}\) Luigi Nono, introductory speech to audition of *A floresta é jovem e cheja de vida*, August 9, 1967, Archivo Sonoro CLAEM, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
for independence from Spain in Argentina, Chile and Peru. However the dedication to a communist guerrilla fighter considering the political situation of Argentina at the time must have shocked many. In a joint interview with Graciela Paraskevaïdis and Mariano Etkin, Paraskevaïdis remembers,

I think Nono took revenge. He took revenge in the public conference afterwards. […] The show was full of people […] and it was full of cops and of ‘tiras’ [undercover infiltration police]. […] Everybody was expectant, Nono came, Ginastera dressed as usual like a Swiss banker, with vest, golden chain, a chained clock in the vest pocket—and he would compose like that, I don’t know how he did it, it is a mystery. […] Ginastera was sitting in the first row. Nono began his speech in his Italo-Porteño accent and said he wanted to dedicate this evening to a great son of Argentina. And Ginastera straightened up…

Etkin interrupted Paraskevaïdis, and laughing he says: “He thought he was going to say General San Martin.” Graciela smiles and continues:

No, no… He thought he was going to say it was him [Ginastera as the great son of Argentina]! And then suspense, pause, and he says “Ernesto Che Guevara.” I think Ginastera did not have a heart attack that time because it wasn’t time yet. But I thought he would die there. So there was electricity, a tension around everybody. Ginastera probably thought, “they are going to close the Institute, they are going to close the CLAEM, they are going to close everything.” Because it was already a target, it had been for a while. […] Nono knew perfectly about all of it [the political situation] and the Bomarzo censorship had just happened, ten days or two weeks earlier.

Ginastera had played his cards with the military by underplaying, perhaps to a fault, Nono’s political commitment. Nono, on the other hand, could have not been more explicit in his positions both in the general political spectrum and regarding the specific political situation in Argentina. But in the end, Nono was leaving the country soon, and it was Ginastera and all the rest at the CLAEM who had to stay and face a possible response from the Onganía dictatorship. A direct response never came. But the tension of these statements made Nono’s visit one of the most remarkable of the whole history of the CLAEM.

---

97 Graciela Paraskevaïdis and Mariano Etkin, interview with the author, June 25, 2008.
98 Ibid.
The Final Visitors to the CLAEM: De Pablo, Salzmann and Eco

In comparison with earlier visitors in the previous biennial courses, the 1969 choices for visiting composers already showed a difference in aesthetic preferences. The world of improvisation, open forms, graphic notation, and experimenting with the fringes of what was musical on the concert stage had become the main trend in cosmopolitan avant-garde music, and the composers at the CLAEM were not going to be left behind. The first visitor for that year was the Spanish composer Luis de Pablo (b.1930), and his course was called “Form in Contemporary Music.” It was taught using de Pablo’s own works. *Sinfonías* for brass (1954–66) was used to examine compositional problems with meter and aleatoric processes. His pieces *Polar* (1961–2) for 11 instruments and the orchestral *Tombeau* (1962–62) were used to present his ideas regarding the concept of density in composition. De Pablo also presented his pieces *Cesuras* (1963) for flute, oboe, clarinet, violin, viola, and violoncello, and *Módulos I* (1964–65) *III* (1967) *IV* (1965–67) *V* (1967). He used these pieces to exemplify variable density and aleatorism, and he shared with the students his notion of module units, musical fragments that “have a clear capacity for musical autonomy, and at the same time are capable of being combined with all the rest of the material.”

99 Finally, to talk about what he called his musical neo-baroque, he showed *Heterogéneo* (1967), *Protocolo* (1968) and *Quasi una fantasia* (1969).

The second visitor was Eric Salzman (United States, 1933), who came to teach at the CLAEM at some point between the end of August and the beginning of September 1969. Salzman was just discovering his lifelong interest in art and technology, and his seminar with

the fellows was titled “Music and Mixed Communication Media.” Salzman’s interest in interdisciplinary collaboration was highlighted in a concert featuring several of his works.

Ginastera’s absence and the lack of funds were evident in 1970 when looking at the classes and invited lectures for the year. The only foreign professor officially teaching during this year was Umberto Eco, who addressed three different topics with the fellows. As he described them to Ginastera, he covered:

1) The poetics of New Music in the context of the contemporary avant-garde’ (the problems I deal with in *The Open Work*); 2) ‘Structural thought and Serial thought’ (and a discussion on the criticism of Lévi-Strauss to Boulez which I deal with in *The Absent Structure*); 3) a talk with a title to be defined [“Problems of musical and artistic practice in the universe of protest”] about the problems of musical and artistic practice in general after *The Capture of Speech*; and therefore the problem of the general crisis of artistic poetics in the universe of protest.100

Overall, the intensity brought by the visiting professors to the CLAEM was one of the main driving forces behind each group of fellows. The direct contact with all of these figures was certainly inspiring, but it was also an investment in symbolic capital in the professional lives of the fellows. Including any of these names in their curriculum vitae increased the international prestige of the composers. Thought-provoking or not, all of the visitors facilitated the acceptance of Latin American composers in transnational professional networks that historically value academic lineage.

### 3.5 The Electronic Music Laboratory

The CLAEM initially included an electronic music laboratory as part of its facilities since it resonated with the pedagogical objectives of the center and the modernizing impetus of the Institute as a whole. If the center was to make Latin American composers truly up-to-date in

---

100 Umberto Eco, letter to Alberto Ginastera, June 7 [or July 6], 1970, CLAEM archives, ITDT.
the contemporary world of cosmopolitan classical music composition, it had to include hands-on experience in the latest innovations in electronic sound production and recording manipulation. After some time, and a necessary renovation, the laboratory became in its own right a successful pioneer electroacoustic music studio in Latin America, and eventually a central piece of the whole Florida building.

The electronic music laboratory functioned between 1963 until 1971. Prevailing perspectives of the time informed the ideas of how to put together a studio and the musical models seen as relevant for teaching and participating in a transnational practice. The aesthetics of electroacoustic music were being articulated elsewhere—the studios in Paris and Cologne, and to some degree the Tape Center at Columbia-Princeton and the Studio di Fonologia in Italy. But it was the local conditions and actors that ultimately shaped and allowed the partial success of the studio during the period that it was fully functional. This was due in part to the fact that international recognition of some of the works—not many—legitimated the efforts to create electroacoustic music locally. This recognition was particularly important because, as I will examine at the end of this chapter, electroacoustic music was still considered marginal and was heavily criticized in the local newspapers.

The history of the laboratory is divided into two parts. The first during the years 1963-1965, when the studio functioned intermittently, and the second during 1966-1971, after the arrival of the engineer Fernando von Reichenbach and Francisco Kröpfl, whose presence contributed to making the studio a productive compositional environment.

_The First Studio: 1963-1965_

When the CLAEM was approved to be part of the Di Tella Institute two people had a say in what was going to be the focus of the activities: Alberto Ginastera and Enrique Oteiza.
Ginastera was not interested personally in electronic music composition, but understood that this was an important direction in which music throughout the world was moving. Pedagogically, in the process of fully embracing contemporary trends, once more taste mattered less than the sincere belief in the classical music art world. In 1962, before classes had started, Ginastera wrote in the memoirs of the Di Tella Institute,

> It is a purpose of the Direction of the Center to organize the ‘Experimental Music Laboratory’ so that scholarship holders can learn and practice the modern musical techniques related to electronics. Specialized professors and technicians will be hired to develop the interests that the Direction proposes.\(^{101}\)

Ginastera found an unlikely ally in Oteiza, who was much more interested in creating an electronic studio. Oteiza’s interest both in contemporary music and in technology was crucial in pushing Ginastera to invest energy in the project. Electronic music, taste aside, signified the avant-garde and was a meeting point of technology and art. If other centers of importance in the cosmopolitan sphere valued it, it had to be included in order to push Buenos Aires to become itself a center of the avant-garde. Oteiza remembered,

> In New York, I was in touch with all this [contemporary music]. When I was finishing they were establishing the “Electronic Studio”. This was very interesting to me, as an engineer on one hand, and a twentieth century art and music aficionado on the other. […] [Ginastera.] he didn’t like it at all. He would tell me ‘Look Oteiza, in an orchestra a musician might make a mistake in a note, but when you have machines, a mistake means everything goes to hell!’ He looked for all sorts of excuses. And then, the only person in Buenos Aires to handle this was Kröpfl, who was part of [Juan Carlos] Paz’s group. And that was an obstacle. […] So there were two things that made it difficult. First, that Ginastera was not interested, did not like it. And second, that the person that we should bring was Kröpfl. We tried with Davidovsky, who was at Columbia. […] but that didn’t work.\(^{102}\)

According to Oteiza, Ginastera was at first not eager to bring Kröpfl onto the team, perhaps because of his closeness with Juan Carlos Paz. Kröpfl today denies this and argues that

---


\(^{102}\) Enrique Oteiza, interview with the author, June 19, 2008.
he was in fact contacted by Ginastera at the beginning of the project to offer an estimate for the studio, but that the choice was to move on with the older equipment suggested by Davidovsky. I have not found written evidence of Kröpfl’s early involvement, the early estimates for studio equipment, or Ginastera’s reservations about hiring Kröpfl, but oral accounts seem to confirm that Ginastera wanted to keep his distance from Paz’s student.

Under these conditions Oteiza decided to make an offer to Davidovsky to join the CLAEM. He was well aware of Davidovsky’s activities at Columbia, his alma mater, both of them having had a similar experience studying abroad. However, attempts to hire the talented Argentinean composer failed. Davidovsky had moved permanently to the United States by 1960 and was at a turning point in his career with his work at the Columbia-Princeton Electronic Music Center, of which he was eventually appointed associate director and much later director.

The offer at the time was simply not attractive to him. In Davidovsky’s words,

By 1962, I had become an established composer. When the New York Times wrote about avant-garde music, they included a picture of me. Even if they hated it, they reported it. I was played much more then than now. Things seemed to happen for me. [...] Things just happened. I was lucky.103

However, Davidovsky became an important contact when it came to decide how to equip the Electronic Music Laboratory. Most likely because of Ginastera’s unwillingness to contact Kröpfl, Davidovsky became the main source of information about what a studio for electronic music should have. Davidovsky remembered,

In 1963-1964, when Alberto Ginastera opened the Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, we spoke of establishing a studio there. They had an engineer. Some information was exchanged so that they could buy Ampex tape machines and some other good equipment, comparable to what we had at Columbia-Princeton. Ginastera wanted me to inaugurate the studio by working with the faculty. The timing was right since I also wanted my son to be born in Argentina, and so I was able to go

to teach there. My students were Alcides Lanza Antonio Tauriello, and a few other composers.\textsuperscript{104}

In 1963 some of the equipment that Davidovsky had suggested to Ginastera—based on the Columbia-Princeton model—began to arrive. However, an unexpected problem appeared with the different standards of voltage and frequency of electricity between the United States and Argentina, which might rank among the first reasons that it took so long to establish a functioning studio.\textsuperscript{105}

![Figure 3-13: Electronic Music Laboratory at the CLAEM ca.1963. On the left oscillators, noise generator, filters, at the center the original patch bay, on the right Ampex recorders.](image)

\textsuperscript{104} Davidovsky’s memory here is a little faulty since the events he recalls actually happened over the span of at least three years. Oteiza and Ginastera must have asked Davidovsky for his input on what equipment to buy with the Rockefeller Grant that became available in May 1962. That means that these suggestions took place most likely in the second half of 1962 and the first half of 1963. Davidovsky did come to teach at the Center, but not until 1965, between May 16 and September 10. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{105} The recording equipment coming from United States ran with electricity at 60hz, and everything in Argentina—like in Europe—uses 50hz. This meant that for a while the equipment was unusable.
**Bozzarello in the Electronic Music Laboratory**

The equipment that Davidovsky suggested at the time was based on what he knew from Columbia, which was already at least three years old. Most of it, as in all other early electronic music studios, consisted of testing equipment that had to be interconnected in order to make it useful for composers. This required hiring the engineer Horacio Raúl Bozzarello who started working at the CLAEM on April 21, 1964. With the absence of Davidovsky or another composer knowledgeable in electronic music composition, Bozzarello was put in charge of the Electronic Music Laboratory. Other than the individual efforts of some composers outside of class, the studio did not present any particular direction under Bozzarello and this clearly affected its early productivity (or lack thereof). In reality, Bozzarello was there to design the studio out of the multiple machines that the CLAEM had acquired with the money from the Rockefeller grant. However, he was not aware of the needs of the composers or their particular interests in this equipment, and both the way he set up the studio and the classes he gave did not promote much interest in creating electronic works.

After the first year of fellowships Oteiza continued to put pressure on Ginastera to find a composer, and not just an engineer, to run the studios. On April 1964, Oteiza wrote to Ginastera in an internal memorandum,

> the most convenient thing would be to incorporate a composer specializing in electronic music with a good basic music education, and with experience in one of the few important laboratories in existence [...]. Of course, if there was an Argentinean who had these qualifications we would prefer him to any other candidate. This is why I was excited when you mentioned the possibility of

---

106 Alberto Ginastera and Enrique Oteiza, report to Gerald Freund (Associate Director for Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation), June 16, 1966, folder 77, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
someone like Davidovsky, who has had a good experience at the Columbia-Princeton Laboratories, to advise us.\(^\text{107}\)

By explicitly mentioning “an Argentinean who had these qualifications,” there is no doubt that Oteiza is implying that Ginastera think about hiring Kröpfl, who was clearly the best qualified person in Buenos Aires to take the job. But Ginastera’s ability to get Davidovsky to teach a course in 1965 seems to have appeased Oteiza—at least for the time being.

Bozzarello’s set-up of the studio was less than ideal. The equipment was all placed against the walls, far away from each other, and in order to do simple tasks the composers needed at least one assistant to physically help them. Apparently, the studio also lacked in neatness, as Ginastera writes, criticizing the work of Bozzarello, “It is absolutely necessary for the Laboratory to look neat and orderly and since the arrival of the Engineer Bozzarello that space is a display of tangled cables and they make me feel inhibited in front of the many Argentinean and foreign visitors.”\(^\text{108}\) One cannot ignore the importance that the electronic music laboratory had as a vitrine for visitors to the CLAEM. Ginastera’s comment goes to the very heart of this point. One of the most visible spaces in which the contemporary world of music showed its ‘modern’ side to the outside was the studio, with its sound generators, filters, tape recorders and machinery.

The works produced during this first period were few and not the result of the courses offered by Bozzarello. Blas Emilio Atehortúa, for example, composed during this early period of the studios his piece *Syrigma* using a combination of electronically generated sounds (sinewaves, square-waves, sawtooth waves, and white noise) and recorded piano transformed

\(^{107}\) Enrique Oteiza, internal memorandum to Alberto Ginastera, April 14, 1964, CLAEM Archives, ITDT. My emphasis.

\(^{108}\) Alberto Ginastera, internal memorandum to Enrique Oteiza, copy to Fernando von Reichenbach, November 17, 1966, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
through filters and a ring modulator. In the piece one can hear how the speed of the tape is altered with a *variac*, a variable electrical autotransformer, that allowed the composer to lower the voltage and thus gradually change speed and frequency of the tape. However, as a result of the low productivity of the studios, the lack of knowledge about the needs of composers in the studio, and the lack of interest that students showed in his classes, Bozzarelo left in February 1966, thereby opening the door to a complete makeover led by the genius of Francisco von Reichenbach.

*The Second Studio 1966-1971: The Time of Invention and Innovation*

Ginastera was out of Buenos Aires when Reichenbach joined the CLAEM. As usual, he received a complete report from his secretary, Josefina Schröder,

> The new director of the laboratory has arrived: Engineer F[ernando] von Reichenbach, German, as his last name reveals. He looks efficient, but I would say that at any point he might die of starvation—I have never seen someone as thin and pale. So far we have had few exchanges, but he seems to be an easy-going person. He is very enthusiastic about the Institute, and appears to be very organized and methodical.

With the help of his assistants, Julio Manhart and Walter Guth, Reichenbach was put in charge of remodeling the electronic music laboratory in order to make it productive, efficient, and comfortable for the composers. With such a talented engineer running the technical aspects of the laboratory, Oteiza and Ginastera had to face once more the need to find an artistic coordinator for the project. Oteiza returned to dropping hints about Kröpfl as a candidate to Ginastera without ever really mentioning him. He writes,

---


110 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Norman Lloyd, October 27, 1966, folder 77, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

111 Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, February 4, 1966, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
Any eventual candidate to be considered to enter in our Centers has to be the best person available in Argentina for the job. This is one of my manias that makes me ask for advice from different specialists. [...] In this subject I would like to evaluate all the alternatives carefully.\textsuperscript{112}

At some point during his travels in end of 1966 and the beginning of 1967, Ginastera must have finally agreed with Oteiza to hire Kröpfl. The first documented mention I have found of Kröpfl’s activities at the CLAEM date from April 4, 1967.\textsuperscript{113} At the time he was offered a salary of about 30,000 Argentine pesos, close to the $85 dollars per month—significant in comparison to the $200 dollars that the fellows received.\textsuperscript{114} With Kröpfl as artistic director and Reichenbach in charge of the technical issues, the electronic music laboratory would be at its most productive during the following years.

\textit{The Remodeled Electronic Music Laboratory}

When Reichenbach and his team finished remodeling in November 1967, the laboratory immediately became a matter of pride, since several of its elements were considered breakthroughs in studio design. Oteiza was not shy in pointing out some of the new elements that Reichenbach had added to the place.

[... a highly elaborate unit for centralizing operations was constructed, which has lent the Laboratory great versatility. The present distribution of the instruments in the Laboratory, coupled with the installation of the new unit, entirely constructed by Laboratory personnel, is a marked improvement on earlier arrangements, and it should be noted that the new unit itself is Mr. von Reichenbach’s own design.\textsuperscript{115}]

\textsuperscript{112} Enrique Oteiza, internal memorandum to Alberto Ginastera, August 5, 1966, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
\textsuperscript{113} Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, April 4, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
\textsuperscript{114} Inflation had risen tremendously in Argentina. In 1962 the cost of one dollar was approximately 112 pesos, while in 1967 it was 348 pesos.
\textsuperscript{115} Enrique Oteiza, report to Nils Westberg, May 15, 1968, folder 78, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. My emphasis.
The “distribution of the instruments” that Oteiza points out can be seen in figure 3-14, particularly when compared to figure 3-13.

Figure 3-14: Electronic Music Laboratory ca.1968.

Reichenbach understood the Laboratory as a performance space for the composers, and as such he felt that the space needed to be thought of in an ergonomic way. He placed all the equipment at an easy reach of the user with the help of a swivel chair with casters. This simple but significant arrangement made an enormous difference in the efficiency and productivity of the laboratory.

The “highly elaborate unit for centralizing operations” that Oteiza mentions is Reichenbach’s original automatic patch bay (“panel de interconexión centralizado”).
Figure 3-15: Automatic Patch Bay

The patch bay was designed to allow fast interconnections between the equipment in the laboratory. Reichenbach recycled a telephone connection switchboard and reconfigured it to work with the audio signals from the studio. Each connection was made by touching the input/output buttons on the bottom of figure 3-15 (at the level of the index knuckle seen in the picture) with the cable that can be seen in the same picture. The connections are registered on the luminous panel above. In figure 3-15, for example, the generator on the far left is connected to the input of the first filter, the output of that filter is going to the input of a modulator. In this way all the connections that a composer has made during a working session can easily and promptly be restored by using the visual guides of the panel. This also prevents the need to use multiple cables to connect different equipment, preventing the cluttering of the studio space.
Finally, the “new unit, entirely constructed by Laboratory personnel,” that Oteiza mentions to Westberg must be the mixer unit seen in figure 3-16, connected to the two recorders and the patch bay.

![Figure 3-16: Front view of one side of the redesigned laboratory by Reichenbach.](image)

With the electronic music laboratory running at full speed under the artistic direction of Kröpfl and the ingenuity and inventiveness of Reichenbach, all the objectives that were initially expected of the laboratory were being accomplished. With the same freedom that the Di Tella Institute gave to its artists, Reichenbach peaked in his engineering creativity during the last years of the 1960s. His work both in the electronic music laboratory and in the audiovisual events organized by the CEA became a staple of the modernizing, technologically advanced Di Tella world. And he had begun to gain recognition locally and among the visiting professors. Schröder told Ginastera that after his visit “Professor Ussachevsky was really impressed with the abilities of Mr. von Reichenbach, and told me confidentially that he considers him a genius.
This is something I had suspected already for a couple of months.”116 By 1968 Reichenbach began receiving full support to further his research. In fact, his work was seen locally as one of the determining factors for the Laboratory to be considered one of the top electronic studios in the world.117

The Birth of Catalina

The greatest innovation that Reichenbach developed at the CLAEM was his Analog Graphic-to-Sound Converter which he announced proudly on April 19, 1968.118 Reichenbach’s idea was to use a video camera to read lines drawn on a roll of paper in a transport and then convert the signal into voltages that in turn would control sound generating and processing equipment. In other words, it would convert graphic-notation into sound by means of closed-circuit television equipment. The composer could draw melodic lines and variations in intensity and duration on a roll of paper. The image of the paper taken by the camera was reproduced through a conventional TV monitor and a second monitor displayed a processed image where the grays had been eliminated and only outlines were visible. Those outlines were then used as input signals in voltage controlled signal generators The name that he gave this machine was the “Convertidor Gráfico Analógico,”119 but everybody, Reichenbach included, called it “Catalina.”120

116 Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, July 4, 1968, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
117 “Informe CLAEM, versión en inglés (enviado a la Rockefeller Foundation, fines 1970),” [dated 1971] CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
118 Fernando von Reichenbach, internal memorandum to Enrique Oteiza with copies to M. Marzana, Alberto Ginastera and Francisco Kröpfl, April 19, 1968, CLAEM Archives, ITDT. Emphasis on the original.
119 Probably more accurately it should be called a Analog Graphic-Sound Converter.
120 When asked why he called it Catalina, Reichenbach simply said, “It is an homage to the old seaplanes from CAUSA,” a popular flying boat model originally called Consolidated PBY
Figure 3-17: Fernando von Reichenbach with his invention, the Analog Graphic Converter “Catalina”

Figure 3-18: Camera of the Analog Graphic-Sound Converter. The “Eye of Catalina” a TV camera mounted on top of a paper transport that would capture on grayscale the images that advanced through the paper transport (or in the case of figure 3-17, Reichenbach’s hand).

The converter, although quite successful, did not produce many works. In fact, to my knowledge there were only three full works composed with the Analog Graphic Converter at the CLAEM: *Analogías paraboloides* by Pedro Caryevschi, *Mnemon* by José Ramón Maranzano, and *La panadería* by Eduardo Kusnir all from 1970.\(^{121}\)

### 3.6 Reception of Contemporary Music in Buenos Aires: Concerts at the CLAEM

In 1966 the newspaper *Clarín* published a review of a concert at the Di Tella with an inflammatory title: “Works by Fellows at the Di Tella: Progress or disorientation?”\(^{122}\) The avant-garde aesthetics presented in the concert had produced a mostly negative reaction among the critics and the audience. Even among those convinced that breaking with tradition was necessary for the advancement of music were not particularly attracted to some of the pieces.

---

\(^{121}\) See chapter 4 for more information on these works.

\(^{122}\) Dayed [?], “Obras de Becarios del Di Tella: ¿Progreso o Desorientación?” *Clarín* (Buenos Aires), November 12, 1966.
and opted to criticize the works and not the overarching ideology behind avant-garde composition. The audiences seemed divided, with the ‘initiated’—composers, critics, performers—staying for the entirety of the concerts, while many others decided to walk out. Curiosity was probably the main source of any additional audience members, since the Di Tella Institute provided an important window for anybody that wanted to know what was going on in the world of the avant-garde in Buenos Aires. But that was often not enough, and when curiosity was exhausted, people would leave the concerts halfway through the program. Celia Weinberg, an administrator of the Institute was not a musician and knew next to nothing about contemporary music when the CLAEM started functioning. In a conversation we had about the music center she shared some of her thoughts with me,

My office was in the same building as the Music Center. So my head was always this big because of the noise! Because, you can’t imagine what those noises were. I had a hard time understanding that kind of music. Slowly I got used to it, but I had a lot of trouble because it was very modern, I would even say too modern. Even those who came, Messiaen, and all the teachers were people that wrote very strange things. Some of the concerts were just terrible […] And then there were the things that they were doing at the electronic music laboratory. Now that was really terrible. Those were some really terrible noises.

The objective of the CLAEM was mostly pedagogical. While the other art centers at the Di Tella focused on an extroverted agenda of promotion of the avant-garde, the CLAEM was by comparison reserved and introverted; its focus was the education of young composers. Nonetheless, the public concerts with pieces of the fellows, the monographic concerts in honor of visiting composers, and particularly the yearly Contemporary Music Festivals, showcased contemporary avant-garde musical production to the public in Buenos Aires. From the reception this concerts had we can asses the impact that the CLAEM was making in the local scene, and
the type of feedback that the composers were encountering. In this section I will focus on the Contemporary Music Festivals, since these were the events that received the most attention from the press, and frame the poor reception avant-garde music was receiving during the existence of the CLAEM.

The Contemporary Music Festivals

The Contemporary Music Festivals consisted of four concerts, scheduled at 6:30 pm. on consecutive days. They were the most visible outreach event organized by the music center of the Di Tella Institute and they were held for nine consecutive years. A notable aspect of the repertoire for the festival was that most pieces had been written in the years since the mid 1950s, that they included a mix of European, U.S. and Latin American composers—although European composers tended to dominate—and that they rarely featured composers from the CLAEM. Ginastera organized the festival, with very significant help from Gerardo Gandini and Antonio Tauriello (1931-2011). Tauriello, who like Gandini had also been a student of Ginastera, was often closely involved with the activities of the CLAEM. However, he was never a fellow or professor, but like Gandini, he actively participated in the festivals as pianist and conductor. The fellows eagerly attended the concerts, and in some occasions even

---

123 Today Buenos Aires has a rich contemporary music scene, even if it still encompasses only a small portion of the population. During my visits to Buenos Aires, I was surprised to find a calendar of contemporary music concerts that covered everyday of the week, sometime with overlap between events. The audience in these concerts was a mix of young, college educated, and older, upper-middle class and upper class people. Their reactions to the pieces varied to supportive to extreme enjoyment, and most were part or had personal connections through friendship or kinship with musicians in the classical music world.

124 For a list of all the works presented at the nine festivals organized by the CLAEM see Appendix. Also see Vázquez (2008) and report submitted to the Rockefeller Foundation: 1er. Festival de Música Contemporánea, August 3, 1962, folder 75, box 9, series 301R, RF 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

125 See appendix for a full list of the works performed.
performed. However, the performing of most of the works was left to professional full-time
performers of the highest level available in Buenos Aires. It was important for Ginastera and his
collaborators to show high quality performances of these works.

The First Contemporary Music Festival was the first public event organized by the
CLAEM. It took place August 9-12, 1962 in the Auditorium of the Museo Nacional de Bellas
Artes, in connection with the First International Sculpting Prize Instituto Torcuato di Tella. The
event received support from the Argentinean section of the International Society for
Contemporary Music (ISCM) and the Fondo Nacional de las Artes.

Buenos Aires was not short on music critics, most of them quite conservative. Several of
them, such as Eduardo García Belsunce, jumped to comment on the First Festival, with not very
kind words. In the following quote he gives his impressions of the first and second concerts of
the festival:

Stravinsky is a composer that completely dominates the art of writing and with
no lack of inventiveness […] but his works […] don’t always end in happy
results. Establishing problems, coming up with solutions, and having control of
the materials are necessary but not sufficient requirements to create a work of art,
there has to be something else, and that something is not always present in
Stravinsky. […] [In the second concert] Pierre Boulez’s Third Piano Sonata was
absolutely horrible; since the pianist, Armando Krieger is interested in all avant-
garde expressions, we must suppose that he played it with fidelity. 126

However, the third concert, dedicated to electroacoustic works, was the one that received
the harshest criticisms from García Belsunce, who even dismissed the relevance and validity of
electroacoustic music in general. He wrote:

[Concrète musique] is part of a movement close to industrial engineering that,
promptly exhausted and now vegetates without future next to its ugly sister,
electronic composition. Concrète and electronic composition […] have not
produced in many years of experiments a single work that can be considered
music and understood as art. […] The audience that attended this concert, in

126 Eduardo García Belsunce, “De música contemporánea” Buenos Aires Musical, p.1, August
16, 1962.
larger numbers than the previous events, enjoyed an informative and valuable experience. We, who have gone through this [experience] many times, once more feel the sad feeling of having meekly obliged to be the object of a jest.\textsuperscript{127}

Enzo Valenti Ferro, expert in opera and unforgiving critic of certain contemporary music wrote a review of the last concert, which he started by underhandedly diminishing the previous concert of electroacoustic music, implying that it had not been music:

In the fourth concert […] the festival returned once more to music. […] The \textit{Three compositions for piano} by the North American Milton Babbitt, twelve-tone composer and self-proclaimed champion of cerebral music, have very little interest. […] The performer, Armando Krieger did little in their benefit with a performance that lacked contrasts and attention to detail. We thought that the three pieces for piano by Carlos Chávez were very little attractive and at times vulgar. […] Finally, \textit{Zyklus}, an aleatoric entertainment for solo percussion by Karlheinz Stockhausen resulted in another negative experience that was good only to show once more what a good percussionist Antonio Yepes is.\textsuperscript{128}

In contrast to these hostile criticisms, there were also some positive reviews, particularly regarding the works of known composers of the European avant-garde. The journalist Odile Baron Supervielle in the journal \textit{Le Quotidien}, wrote that she appreciated the contemporary sensibility of the work \textit{Interpolaciones} by Roman Haubenstock-Ramati, while, she goes on to contradict Valenti Ferro’s assessment of the percussionist’s performance of Stockhausen’s \textit{Zyklus}, by saying that while the piece was interesting, he had given a “very mediocre performance.”\textsuperscript{129}

Despite the conflicting and often unkind criticisms of the music performed at the Festival, there was widespread appreciation for the organizing of the events. At the same time, the importance of the CLAEM, and the impact it would have in Argentinean and Latin American composers was rarely in doubt. For example, for the Second Contemporary Music

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid.
Festival in 1963, the critics from *Buenos Aires Musical* wrote that it was “comforting to know that these efforts have continuity in our country, and thus we look at this festival with satisfaction, and wish it continues to happen.”\(^{130}\) Different newspapers reported that the concerts had a “faithful audience, interested, and some times enthusiastic…”\(^{131}\) In general the critics gave mixed reviews but they shared that “it is comforting to see the continuity of this effort [organizing the yearly festival] in our country. In this sense we are pleased with this festival and hope for its survival.”\(^{132}\) Still, avant-garde aesthetics had perhaps more critics than it had adherents, and that polarization became evident.\(^{133}\) The audience at these concerts was often in the middle of the debate, praised by some for their support of new compositions, and attacked by others for their low standards. Months before the First Contemporary Music Festival, the critic Jorge D’Urbano had finished his commentary on a performance of Stockhausen’s *Gruppen* (1955-57) with the following words:

I don’t know, and I confess this without shyness, if the Municipal Orchestra played well or not. Others more capable could decide this. I don’t know either if *Gruppen* by Stockhausen will be considered in the future a masterwork. In any case […] the audience responded with clapping and even powerful bravos. Which points to one of two things: That the Argentinean public is at the avant-garde of the world in musical matters, or that it is so timid that it only knows one way to react, both to what it likes and to what it does not like. I would stay with the sincerity of those that, although wrong, whistled the premiere of the *Rite of Spring*.\(^{134}\)

In that climate, the first fellows of the CLAEM found in Buenos Aires a safe haven to explore the latest compositional trends but also a stronghold of conservative critics that had a

---


\(^{133}\) For a careful look into the reception of the concerts organized at the CLAEM see Vázquez 2008.

\(^{134}\) D’Urbano 1966, 37. Originally published on May 2, 1962
strong niche and enjoyed of significant presence in the media. The magazine Tribuna Musical seemed to be one of the platforms where the avant-garde received its few praises. For the Fourth Contemporary Music Festival, for example, Roque de Pedro wrote with excitement:

Last but not least the fascinating electronic music presented at the fourth and last concert. The two best works presented in our opinion were the already known Momenti by Luciano Berio, and the Third Synchronism by Mario Davidovsky, the only work in this concert where a traditional instrument, the cello, intervenes.

His enthusiasm does not get in the way of criticizing the works he did not appreciate, as was the case with Babbitt’s composition:

The Ensembles by Milton Babbitt, were without a doubt the poorest of the works for electronic sounds in this concert. It was made with a machine that only needs the information indicated on a perforated tape to produce sounds or desired sound complexes [probably referring to the RCA synthesizer at Columbia-Princeton that used perforated paper encoded in binary form]. This way [the composer] avoids the tedious work of montage in the laboratory. The piece is conceived without creative imagination, with formulas belonging to conventional music and that have been widely exploited, without any interest.¹³⁵

Recognizing good and bad works seemed like a step forward in the education of critics who might have otherwise discarded the whole concert in previous years. De Pedro was one of the critics—he was also a composer and pianist and this is significant—that was most enthusiastic about the new works produced. But the acceptance of the avant-garde was truly minimal, and its sphere of impact was very small. Even the positive commentaries of the press were frequently supportive of the events but critical of the works. For example, the Buenos Aires Musical wrote regarding the Fifth Contemporary Music Festival:

It is worth pointing out the educational importance of these concerts. They provide a broad overview of the field of musical creation. The fact that the artistic interest of these manifestations is usually much lower than their instructional value does not diminish the validity and need for these activities. It

¹³⁵ Roque de Pedro 1965a, 13.
[the low artistic interest] reflects the state of contemporary creation, infinitely richer and interesting at the theoretical level than in its artistic results. Roque de Pedro agrees with this view, and his commentary adds an interesting perspective on the state of the contemporary music scene in Buenos Aires in 1966. The following quote, although long, is worth looking at since it speaks to early criticisms of the CLAEM as having institutionalized the avant-garde and ostracized other aesthetic preferences in contemporary classical music.

The usefulness of organizing contemporary music festivals is indisputable. In this sense, any initiative to promote the dissemination [of contemporary works] is laudable, since today’s society cannot be indifferent to the evolution of the means of expression. But at any time period there has been music produced that is averagely or poorly realized. In our time it seems the proportion is greater than usual. Furthermore, the experiment for the simple pleasure of doing ‘something new’ is more and more a tendency. It is not difficult to do something that nobody has thought of before. Many composers are in the mindset of the ultra avant-garde and this ends up being identified as a snobbish Dadaism […] Others follow serialism, a school that at this time has produced clichés perfectly identifiable. There are few people with enough flexibility to avoid the monotonous and cerebral.

Apparently at the Di Tella Institute, music for concerts is chosen from these tendencies. They are not the only ones; neither are they the most solid, and that seriously limits the educational and artistic value of this sessions. At the Di Tella there is almost no space for orientations closer to tradition, such as polytonalism. They prefer to use musical instruments in a way that goes against their nature, as if wanting to make concrète musique; or they go directly to electronic and concrete music. After his more or less excited review of the electroacoustic music concert during the previous year’s Contemporary Music Festival, seen above, de Pedro complains this time about putting together concerts of just electroacoustic music. “Even if experimental music done in magnetic tape”—says de Pedro—“is no longer a novelty, it is excessive to ask of the audience,

---

137 Roque de Pedro 1966, 24.
in a public concert, the needed attention for successive pieces in this line.” Overall, however, the critics of *Tribuna Musical* valued the experimental nature of the concerts Fifth Contemporary Music Festival. They just felt that, in the end, the results failed to be musical:

> These concerts demonstrated that the bold and always inquiring creative essence of these young musicians is thriving in them. Their results, from a purely experimental point of view, are justified, since, right or wrong, they are opening new paths in the ways of expressive sound; still, we must remember that music—an essentially formal, pure and exquisite art—must be present in every enterprise of this nature. It is unfortunate that on this occasion [music] has only manifested briefly.  

The Ninth Contemporary Music Festival in 1970 was the final of the annual event. With only a modest budget available, there was a reduced number of stellar performers when compared to the previous years. As usual there were four concerts and the critics were harsh with their commentaries. But people kept filling the halls nonetheless. Going back to my opening story in this section, I followed up with Celia Wainberg trying to understand why she, or other members of the audience would go to concerts of a music they didn’t really like. She said:

> We would go to all the concerts, all the exhibits, all the theater works. The day of a premiere we would all go, the Institute was like a family […] So we all wanted things to work, and we all offered our support. […] I am not a musician, and my husband is not a musician, although he likes to listen to music. But we didn’t like it at all. On the one hand [we would go to the concerts] for support. We would all go just in case nobody else showed up to the concert [laughs]. But not only that. Like anything else experimental, there were some good things and many bad things. We couldn’t expect for everything to be great. So there were some things

---

138 Ibid, 23.  
139 Ibid.  
140 The Grupo de Experimentación Musical del CLAEM, for example, was the main performer for the last night, playing *Projection 2* by Morton Feldman, *Aria* by Antonio Tauriello and *Variations I* by John Cage. The composers listed as part of the group in this concert were Jorge Antunes, León Birioti, Gabriel Brmčić. Pedro Caryevschi, Eduardo Kusnir José Maranzano, Ariel Martinez, Antonio Mastrogiovanni, and Alejandro Nuñez Allauca.
that were a real drag. […] But everybody would go, us in administration, the people from graphic design, everybody.  

Two aspects come together in this quote. First, the importance of peer support in an environment that was highly critical of the avant-garde. And second, the repeated notion that the expectation with experimental works is that many of them will fail. This view appears to have been widespread and even Torcuato S. Di Tella on the previous chapter seems to believe in it.

This section has presented a brief look at the reception of avant-garde musical compositions in Buenos Aires. Just like the material conditions presented in the previous sections of this chapter, this environment framed the activities of the CLAEM as well. The relatively hostile reception of experimental works made it even more important for the composer to receive both peer approval, and international recognition, in order to validate their work at the Center.

Conclusions

In this chapter I have examined six different conditions that framed the history of the CLAEM. The availability of the particular space on Florida Street in a city like Buenos Aires, resulted in an unexpected but tremendously important experience for the composers at the CLAEM. It provided them with the unique opportunity to get to know each other personally and musically. It allowed those from outside Buenos Aires to get in touch—and sometimes clash—with the latest and most modern of fashions, artistic movements, and aesthetics. These factors were fundamental in granting the composers full access to the ranks of the avant-garde. The CLAEM was a transnational space dedicated to the exchange of ideas, materials, and the creation of friendships and networks of solidarity. Transnational because of the diverse origins

\[141\] Celia Wainberg, interview with the author, June 19, 2008.
of the people that met in there, and reflected in the building’s proximity to other transnational edifices like the U.S. Embassy across the street. Transnational because Florida street, even today, was a tourist destination where many languages were spoken at the same time. In this sense it was much like many other places of meeting—once more, one could think of it as a place of pilgrimage—for classical composers during the twentieth century, including the Darmstadt Summer Courses or the Warsaw Autumn and Donaueschingen Festivals. However, unlike them, the extended two-year duration and the regional focus of the study program at the CLAEM created a unique situation of profound exchange among some of the most talented composers of the entire region.

The material conditions allowed by the large initial budget—including infrastructure, salaries, fellowships, guests, library, and the electronic music laboratory—created an ideal space for creativity and experimentation. The local reception of this creativity and experimentation however, tended to be negative, a factor that made international recognition ever more important. The capital acquired through education with local and foreign in an institution that was prestigious even from its inception such as the CLAEM was fundamental in the establishing of many Latin American composers as elite in their specific field. Not only did they become elite as important composers emerging from the avant garde music scene but overall within the classical music art world, which already held a hegemonic control of music education and theory, and in many cases, political positions related to cultural policies. For example Edgar Valcárcel became director of the National Conservatory of Music in Peru, Marlos Nobre became musical director of the National Symphonic Orchestra of Brazil and President of UNESCO’s International Music Council, and Alberto Villalpando who became director of the
music department of the Ministry of Culture of Bolivia, and director of the National Conservatory in La Paz.
CHAPTER 4

LATINAMERICANISM: THE CLAEM AS BREEDING GROUND FOR SOLIDARITY NETWORKS AMONG LATIN AMERICAN COMPOSERS

One of the crucial characteristics of the CLAEM was its framing as a place for Latin American composers. While the Center could have been conceptualized simply as a graduate school for composition since the very inception of the idea Ginastera planned for it to encompass composers from all over the region. This chapter explores the ideological origins of this regional perspective, the way in which different composers of the CLAEM expressed Latinamericanism in musical style and professional strategy, and the short and long-term consequences that this had for the contemporary music scene in the region. The CLAEM succeeded in recruiting and fostering a whole generation of Latin American composers that became an elite in their art world. My research demonstrates that the generation of significant networks of solidarity among the composers, that were possible only because of the conditions offered by the CLAEM, was an important catalyst for this situation.

In this chapter I will first present a brief overview of Latinamericanism both as a professional strategy to create contacts and broaden performance possibilities across the region, and as discourse articulated in musical style using the trope of musical nationalism and musical universalism. Second, I will examine specific case studies to show the rich and varied ways in which composers at the CLAEM adopted ideas about Latinamericanism. In this section I include examples of works of CLAEM fellows Atehortúa and Nobre that were interpreted by the press as Latin American compositions. I also look at the different approaches taken by two CLAEM composers, Coriún Aharonián and Alberto Villalpando, to expressively identify as
Latin American in their compositions throughout their careers. Finally, in the last section of the chapter I address what I consider the most important and unique aspect that was generated by the CLAEM: the creation of networks of solidarity among Latin American composers in the regions to a degree that was hitherto unprecedented in art music circles.

4.1 Latinamericanism as Strategy and as Style

*Pan-Americanism as Professional Strategy: From Pan-Americanism to Latinamericanism*

Led by scholars such as Julio Ramos contemporary discussions of the discourse of Latinamericanism trace its origins to late nineteenth-century literature, and frequently point to the importance of José Martí’s emancipatory manifesto *Nuestra América* (1891) or José Enrique Rodó’s *Ariel* (1900). Discussions of Latinamericanism have examined the production and the articulation of this discourse in a way that emphasizes how it corresponds to an internally generated regionalism. The local generation of knowledge and tropes about continental unity in Latin America has often received more attention than those imposed by a European or occidental imaginary.¹ In other words, it is significant that the discourse of Latinamericanism has frequently emerged as a way to locally situate knowledge and artistic production in opposition to Western Euro-centric practices. In a way, what this accomplished was an emancipating production of knowledge from elites that surfaced from a colonial European past, reverting the colonizing role of discourse as a way of maintaining power over the colonized, and turning it into the way of subverting that situation. Thus knowledge production became a

¹ A contrasting example to Edward Said’s Orientalism (1978). See Ramos 2001. Ramos however, does not deny the important grey areas between what he calls the vernacular- and metropolitan-produced Latinamericanism.
powerful means for local elites to create distinction in a postcolonial situation; Latin America being constructed by Latin American thinking and not European thinking.

In the early twentieth century multiple Pan-American organizations and events that promoted music across the Americas began to emerge. An early example from 1921 is the short-lived International Composers Guild, which materialized under the leadership of Edgard Varèse and Carlos Salzedo (France/United States, 1885-1961) and with the participation of Mexican composer and conductor Carlos Chávez. Problems within the Guild led to the creation of the League of Composers (1923-54), another professional organization that provided loose connections between several composers, mostly from the United States, but focused on the performance of new works, both European and American. However, the most significant organization formed with a hemispheric perspective in mind was the Pan-American Association of Composers (1928-1934). Five of the eighteen members of the PAAC were Latin American—Carlos Chávez, Acario Cotapos, Eduardo Fabini, Silvestre Revueltas, and Amadeo Roldán. For six short but active years, and with the promotion of Nicolas Slonimsky as conductor, the PAAC organized “at least thirty-eight concerts over five seasons and performed works by thirty-nine composers of the Americas.” The objective of these concerts was to present North American works in South and Central America and vice-versa, but also, and perhaps most importantly, to showcase works from the Americas to European audiences.

---

3 See David Metzer’s “The League of Composers: The Initial Years” (Metzer 1997, 45-69).
4 Stallings 2009, 69.
5 Ibid., 62.
6 Besides Stallings 2009, see also Dean L. Root “The Pan American Association of Composers (1928-1934)” (Root 1972, 49-70).
A recent dissertation by Stephanie Stallings explores the strategies taken by the PAAC to promote a hemispheric musical front to counter the strong European presence in classical music. As Stalling shows,

The PAAC presented concerts of new music from the Americas between 1928 and 1934 in New York City, Havana, and Europe. Purposeful diversity, or “collective difference,” was the PAAC’s strategy for approaching European audiences by collaborative force. The principle of collective difference describes both the stylistic diversity present on PAAC concerts and also the ultimate goal of that diversity, which was to reverse the flow of musical culture from west to east.\(^7\)

As Stallings notes one defining characteristic of the compositions presented in the PAAC concerts was their wide range of modern musical styles. More than anything, the PAAC was a strategic professional organization for the promotion and diffusion of the works of its members. However, aesthetic concerns about the Americas were not beyond the aspirations of the composers. As Stallings argues, these PAAC members expressed a desire for a multivalent but unified intercontinental musical aesthetic. They transplanted and remodeled traits that marked French and Eastern European modernism, such as primitivism, the use of musical folk material, and a growing interest in novel musical resources. In both the United States and Latin America, the proliferation of these traits opened possibilities for expressing local flavor with a newly modernist conception of its value.\(^8\)

A different call for Pan-Americanism emerged in the mid-1930s. Beginning in 1934, the musicologist Francisco Curt Lange (Germany/Uruguay 1903-1997)—a student of Hornbostel, Curt Sachs, and several other important figures of German musicology—made frequent calls for a continental Americanism—an integration that would include South, Central and North America. In his *Americanismo Musical* (1934), Curt Lange argues that the basis of an

\(^7\) Stallings 2009, xii.
\(^8\) Ibid., 1.
Americanist movement still had to be European but must look attentively to the indigenous. He also pointed out the importance of contact among the artists of the hemisphere and a common awareness between them. Curt Lange published articles and musical scores that aimed to inform and connect composers transnationally in his serial publication, the *Boletín Latino-Americano de Música* (1935-41).

As Jennifer Campbell notes in her dissertation, “Shaping Solidarity: Music, Diplomacy, and Inter-American Relations, 1936-1946,” Pan-Americanism continued during World War II and flourished under the Rockefeller-driven and short lived Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA 1940-1946). A crucial moment for Pan-Americanism was the founding of the Music Division at the Pan American Union (later Organization of American States). The Pan American Union, an international organization that provided a diplomatic stage for the governments of the Americas formally started its Music Division in 1941 under the directorship first of Charles Seeger (1941-1953), and then of Guillermo Espinosa (1953-1975). The music division promoted performances, organized festivals of Latin American music, offered prizes and distributed and commissioned scholarship on music and musicians from the region. The 1958 Latin American Music Festival in Washington was the first of this type of event organized by the Inter-American Music Council under the auspices of the Pan American Union “to promote closer relations and understanding among the American republics by recognizing and

---

9 Significantly, his famous call for “música americana para los americanos” (Curt Lange 1934, 7) does not include any references to the legacy of the forced African heritage imposed in the hemisphere.
10 Haskins 1957, 43.
11 See Malena Kuss 1979 for Seeger’s position regarding art music and musicology in Latin America.
12 Efrain Paesky replaced Espinosa since his retirement in 1975.
13 See Malena Kuss 1979, 84.
14 Referenced in Chapter 1.
stimulating the development of music of the Americas.\textsuperscript{15} The aim of the concerts was to introduce the finest composers and performers from Latin America, the Caribbean, United States and Canada.

During the 1940s and 50s Latin American composers continued to receive significant attention in the United States, although a new rift seemed to separate U.S. composers from their Latin American peers after World War II. As Europe declined and the United States consolidated its hegemony as a world economic super power, American composers began to gain international recognition.\textsuperscript{16} As the impetus for hemispheric alliances receded, a new interest in fomenting Latin American—no longer Pan-American or Inter-American—solidarity rose. Individual figures, like Ginastera, still captured the attention of the critics and music aficionados from the United States. But as local U.S. composers found their place within the canon of Western classical music, Latin American composers were now on their own to form strategic associations to further their professional development. In this context, the creation of Indiana University’s Latin American Music center in 1961 and the CLAEM by 1962 was the culmination of the high visibility of Latin American art music in the United States and the belief in the possibilities that could emerge if professional composers were placed in direct contact with one another, although no longer at a Pan-American level. The eager support of the Rockefeller Foundation to both projects was the peak point of philanthropic contributions to music making in Latin America for the entire twentieth century.

\textsuperscript{16} North American composers became living examples of the trope of U.S. exceptionalism; isolated maverick composers who single-handedly conquered new frontiers and pioneered new techniques. See for instance Hicks 2002, Broyles 2004, and Magee 2008 for insightful views that reevaluate the construction of the American composer under this trope.
The relevance of being Latin American within the context of art music composition was an essential issue for composers of the region during the twentieth century. The creation of art music that was Latin American (or more specifically and often, a music that was Uruguayan, Colombian, Guatemalan, or any of the other nations) became a concern, consciously or unconsciously, for most composers. The question itself was one of finding a voice, one of positioning oneself in the global setting, gaining a place, but also, one of defending one’s place. The need for identification as Latin American\textsuperscript{17} arose from the belief that Latin America was a region under colonial and neo-colonial rule: from European empires since the sixteenth century, up to the United States' presence in the region today. During the wars of independence, for example, the local criollo elite—American-born descendants of Europeans—wanted to differentiate themselves from the peninsulares—European-born residents of the Americas. Different to the United States, place of birth, as opposed to ancestry tracing, became a defining identity marker.

Aspects of music’s instrumentality for creating and shaping local cultural identity had a significant trajectory in the history of Latin America from the years of independence through the beginning of the twentieth century. The Uruguayan musicologist, composer and fellow of the CLAEM, Coriún Aharonián, presents his view of Latin American classical music history in a few words:

The historical process in Latin America has generated a complex succession of generations. In broad terms, a generation of silence and resistance against the

---

\textsuperscript{17} Projects of forming a unified collective from the region have adopted different shapes during the past. Just as the identification \textit{Latin America} is currently used, terms that have also been used include \textit{Pan-América}, \textit{Ibero-América}, the \textit{Américas}, and \textit{Hispano-América}, all aiming to highlight different common denominators.
metropolitan models after the wars of independence… followed by a generation of ballroom musicians from and for the *criollo* oligarchies, and others that gradually tried to retake the European erudite models to fluently imitate them… It is only after 1920 that pioneer composers (the Uruguayan Eduardo Fabini, the Chilean Carlos Isamitt, the Brazilian Luciano Gallet, the Mexican Silvestre Revueltas, the Cubans Amadeo Roldán and Alejandro García Caturla, among the brave and accomplished; the Brazilian Heitor Villa-Lobos and the Mexican Carlos Chávez among the most indulgent towards the metropolis) put together that fluency with a rescue-like search of identity elements, or that (like the Chilean Acario Cotapos and the Argentinean Juan Carlos Paz) will fight indefatigably for a ‘universalism’ of their own and not merely imitational.18

Here, Aharonián points at the most important binary trope used by composers themselves to explain Latin America’s art music history during the twentieth century and even their own position regarding the convergence of music and identity: nationalism and universalism. Most descriptions of classical music in the region argue that different generations of composers, and even individual composers in the course of their lives, gravitated between what was called nationalist and universalist musical styles. The meaning of these two terms for Latin American composers can hardly be said to be univocal, but certain commonalities can shed some light on some of the stylistic debates that appeared in the first years of the CLAEM, particularly as anxiety rose from the music critics and connoisseurs over what was Latin American about these composers.

The discourse of nationalism had significant changes during the early years of the twentieth century in Latin America. During the nineteenth century, competing nationalist discourses in the region tended to exclude the masses and focus on a select elite with high economic capital, an effective oligarchy that ruled in different nations. Latin American peasants, the indigenous population, black population, and the lower classes in general, only became

18 Aharonián 1991, 9-10. The word *criollo* can mean somebody of European or mixed European descent born in the Americas. It is also commonly used to signify somebody or something originated in Hispanic America and to underline that it embeds some of the qualities of that country.
relevant to those elites in the event of a war, when their nationality was finally remembered.\textsuperscript{19} By the turn of the twentieth century the “dismal economic conditions of peasants and the working class... did not allow for the growth of a domestic consumer economy to support local industrial and economic growth, thus restricting wealth to the oligarchy.”\textsuperscript{20} Consequently the elites became interested in involving a larger portion of the population in the national economy and investing people in the very concept of nation. The elites realized that they needed a stronger foundation in society in order to continue their own growth.\textsuperscript{21} In a way, the economic elites had to re-interpret their vision of the masses in order to continue their own personal growth. It is in this context that musical nationalism as a kind of vindication or stylization of the music of the masses, takes place.

Musical nationalism manifested itself in different aspects of creation. In popular music, nationalism in Latin America led to the adoption of genres that represented the nation, such as samba in Brazil, the mariachi ensemble and ranchero music in Mexico, and the Cuban son.\textsuperscript{22} In art music circles, it meant the recognition of that which was not part of the cosmopolitan European heritage in Latin American cultural practices. With more or less degrees of success, composers started indexing the music from those social groups that had been neglected in the

\textsuperscript{19}It is not strange that after fighting in wars, several of those marginalized groups won their biggest social battles. Slaves were set free and peasants obtained land as prizes for having fought for their nation.
\textsuperscript{20}Turino 2003, 180.
\textsuperscript{21}As has been noted by Turino, “populist-nationalism in Latin America typically involved top-down, state-generated movements.” Ibid., 181.
\textsuperscript{22}All of these genres had characteristics that made them easily adopted as national, serving nationalist purposes generated by different social groups at the same time. Cf. Hermano Vianna, The Mystery of Samba: Popular Music and National Identity in Brazil (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); and Robin Moore, Nationalizing Blackness: Afrocubanismo and Artistic Revolutions in Havana, 1920-1940 (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh University Press, 1997).
The musical universe explored by composers expanded to include materials from the indigenous, from the peasantry, from the black population. The musicologist Gerard Béhague names three factors that he believes contributed to what he calls the golden period of musical nationalism in Latin America, referring to the beginning of the 20th century:

First, a dynamic and varied popular and folk culture allowed a wide range of national expressions. Second, there existed during this period talented art-music composers who not only had an obvious empathy for the popular and folk music of their respective countries but frequently had had firsthand exposure to it. Third, the establishment of institutions and organizations such as concert associations, orchestras and ballet groups, and support from governmental agencies, made it possible for these composers to be promoted nationally, sometimes internationally.24

Adopting nationalism within an art music composition almost by definition involved the inclusion of vernacular references of some sort within it. A few composers assumed this with responsibility, with respect for and acknowledgment of the otherness of these borrowed sources of inspiration. Many others did not and the use of these sources became an indiscriminate quoting of folkloric material, creating musical postcards from exotic places that emphasized the peripheral status of Latin American compositions. In a similar fashion to what Richard Taruskin has argued about composers in Russia, Latin American composers were able to gain acceptance within the Western classical music tradition as exotic representations of otherness, thus, as second-rate composers at best.25

23 The traditional use of the word folk to describe music from those neglected groups underlines its characteristic as a construction for nationalist or colonialist purposes. Folk as a category is part of the discourse of nationalism. Folkloric music is a new cultural product emerging from this discourse, mainly a presentational activity pointing to autochthonous groups, but overall, a different musical practice to the often participatory musical events from which they take inspiration.

24 Béhague 1979, 182.

25 See Taruskin 1997, 48. In the most common history of music survey books, Latin American composers (usually only Villa-Lobos, Chávez, and maybe Ginastera) appear as a side note to what happens in the rest of the Western world. For instance, Latin America occupied a total of
At least since the 1930s, several intellectuals and artists started to problematize this musical nationalism within art music, especially as it became increasingly associated with the broader socio-historical context of nationalist-populist movements connected to fascism. In Brazil, for example, when the group *Música Viva* was formed in 1939, it took a strong stance against all kinds of folkloristic nationalism. In what appears to be a strong response to Nazi fascism, the group, led by German composer Hans-Joachim Koellreutter (Germany-Brazil, b.1915), produced a Manifesto in 1946 where they argued that the composers of *Música Viva* should acknowledge the power of music as a substantial language, as a stage of the artistic evolution of the people, but fight, on the other hand, fake nationalisms in music, that is, the ones that exalt feelings of nationalist superiority from their essence and stimulate egocentric and individualistic tendencies that divide men, originating disruptive forces.²⁶

As a response to nationalist musical styles *Música Viva* musicians, like many other composers in Latin America, adopted what became called universalist approaches to musical composition. Composers that looked for universalism in their music were aiming to be aware of the latest tendencies in the cosmopolitan centers, and they purposefully avoided folkloric references of any kind. At this particular time this often meant following serial and post-serial trends in composition. Universalism—as Bhabha points out—does not only imply that there was a common meaning found in the work, but it also forms a listening subject that sees no connection between ideologies or historical processes in the work:

---

Universalism does not merely end with a view of immanent ‘spiritual’ meaning produced in the text. It also interpellates, for its reading, a subject positioned at the point where conflict and difference resolves and all ideology ends. It is not that the Transcendental subject cannot see historical conflict or colonial difference as mimetic structures or themes in the text. What it cannot conceive is how it is itself structured ideologically and discursively in relation to those processes of signification which do not then allow for the possibility of whole or universal meanings.27

As much as narratives about Latin American art music have tried to polarize nationalist and universalist compositions,28 they both are consequences of the same modernist desire to renovate the musical language. From this perspective the oscillations between these two particular modes, which one can hear as inconsistencies or insincerity from the same composer, have to be reevaluated as part of a broader struggle, contingent and contested to achieve modernity. Mariano Etkin, a fellow at the CLAEM, has suggested that the distinction between “neo-Bartokian ‘nationalist’ and the twelve-tone composers that called themselves ‘universalists’” in Argentina is much more complex than what has usually been described. In a key observation, he says,

Today it is clear that the nationalists were much more European than what they thought they were, while the universalists appear to be much more Argentinean—that is, original in relationship to Europe—that perhaps they would have desired.29

What Etkin is pointing at with this remark is that the elements that were novel and seen as uniquely Latin America in nationalist compositions were superficial in comparison to the musical aspects that were being reconfigured in universalist works. Nationalist compositions tended to provide native sources of melodic material—e.g. folk, or folk-inspired tunes often harmonized in art-music frameworks and characteristic cadential formulas —, and rhythmic

28 See Béhague 1979 for a survey book that gives the category of nationalist music a central place in the narratives of art music history of Latin America.
formulas and patterns of folk dances—sesquialtera, syncopated rhythms, 3 + 2 divisions, etc. However, these elements were used in compositions that closely imitated European models; many were stylistic synthesis of French impressionist techniques resulting in a Romantic stylization of folk elements, and in what Etkin refers to as neo-Bartokian. The imitation, and in some cases assimilation of European styles occurred within an aesthetic frame that did not allow much room for distancing the works from the original models.

On the other hand universalist compositions, although eclectic in nature and hard to group under a single rubric, questioned structural aspects of art music composition: tonality, form, pitch hierarchies, tuning, preferences in timbre, performance practices and sensibility of time. These compositions also followed European models, from abstract expressionism, dodecaphony, polytonality and microtonality to graphic notation and aleatorism. But the depth of these elements of musical language like a shorter and more concentrated sense of time, taking dynamic levels and frequency ranges to the fringes of perception, and freedom in tunings seem to speak about deeper social habits, everyday behaviors and soundscapes unique to Latin America.

I believe that in his comment Etkin was thinking primarily about Juan Carlos Paz, who vehemently defended universalist composition and was the first proponent of twelve-tone row compositions in Latin America. Paz’s international style is characterized by his use of flexible serial procedures and free atonality, and use of nontraditional forms. However, Paz’s work was an important reference point to Argentinean composers that adhered to the avant-garde because

---

30 See Aharonián 2000, 4. In this text, Aharonián comments that the Latin American sense of time “is apparently different from the European one. The statistical observation of pieces composed in past decades in the two continents allows us to conclude as a working hypothesis […] that the psychological time of the Latin American composer is shorter and more concentrated than that of his average European colleague.”
it signaled not only at the possibility of compositions that were original, without relying on superficial references to folklore, but at the same time were perceived to resonate with being from Argentina or even Latin America as opposed to Europe. These resonances appear almost unconsciously, in rhythmic accents and phrasings that could be compared to the sense of urgency and fortitude that one can hear in tango or experience while walking through the hectic downtown Buenos Aires, in the accentuation of large melodic leaps that might resemble the broad pitch range covered by the speech of an average Argentinean, or in the layering of musical ideas on independent planes, superimposing them, overlapping them, but maintaining their condition of individual lines, a chaotic polyphony that seems to be well engrained in the every day of life in Buenos Aires.

For the composers at the CLAEM the issue of nationalism and universalism continued to be an important concern that in many cases shaped their works and their most immediate reference in the refection between these two complementing paths was the work of their director, Alberto Ginastera.

4.2 CLAEM and Latinamericanism

Ginastera and Latinamericanism

As Deborah Schwartz-Kates has shown, Alberto Ginastera’s interest in Latinamericanism, at least in the years previous to the CLAEM, meant mostly experimentation with folkloric rhythms, particularly the Argentinean malambo, but also the zamba, the chacarera and the gato. It was predominantly the malambo rhythm that became a common presence in Ginastera’s music often as rhythmic basis for grandiose finales. Ginastera’s early compositions
frequently use the malambo’s rapid 6/8 meter and continuous eighth-note motion in addition to percussive ostinatos that accumulate at the ends of phrases and sections.

[The malambo] inspired some of his most memorable compositions, such as the “Danza final,” from his ballet Estancia, op. 8 (1941). Yet significantly, these malambos bear little resemblance to folkloric models. Rather they consist of imaginative recreations of the genre that employ faster tempos, more complex harmonies, and bolder dissonances.\(^{31}\)

Ginastera was very conscious of the characteristics and stylistic features usually associated with nationalist compositions in the art music world. He frequently argued that his compositions between 1937 and 1947 were part of an objective nationalist phase while those between 1948 and 1957 were part of a subjective nationalist one, where he did not exploit or develop folk tunes but rather assimilated their “symbolic and expressive value.”\(^{32}\) Interestingly, it was precisely in 1946 when Ginastera had his most direct experience with other Latin American composers. That year he attended the Berkshire Summer Music Festival in Tanglewood, came into daily contact with Copland and “formed part of a close-knit circle called the ‘1946 Latinamericanists,’ which included Roque Cordero, Julián Orbón, Hector Tosar, and Juan Orrego-Salas, with whom he formed a lifelong connection.”\(^{33}\) As Ginastera moved away from the direct quotation of folkloric materials in his compositions, he also developed a pan-regional awareness, most likely derived from his interaction with these composers. As Schwartz-Kates indicates:

> Before traveling to the United States [in 1946], many of Ginastera’s compositions drew heavily upon resources derived from the Argentine folk tradition. Now, however, his works increasingly called upon abstract expressive means to give voice to the transcendent spirit of the Americas. Ginastera had already begun to move in this direction in 1944 with his *Doce preludios americanos* (Twelve American Preludes), which he completed the year before he left for the United States. The title of the work no longer referred to the national

\(^{32}\) Béhague 1979, 218.
\(^{33}\) Schwartz-Kates 2010, 7.
music patrimony but reflected instead the composer’s emergent transcontinental consciousness.  

This shift becomes key in understanding Ginastera’s motivations behind the Latin American scope of the CLAEM. Ginastera’s move away from local sources of inspiration into what he perceived as an embrace of pan-regionalism in his compositions was accompanied by a similar move in professional terms. On one hand, he became much more active in the Argentine section of the International Society for Contemporary Music and—like most other important composers of the region—became an avid participant of the different Inter-American festivals that were emerging at the time. On the other, Ginastera began to expand his Pan-Americanist vision into the conservatories where he worked during the following years, providing important input into curricular changes, acquisitions for the libraries and expanding the programs based on his experience and knowledge of U.S. music institutions.

His compositions at the time of the CLAEM took yet another turn, and moved even further away from indexical associations to local or regional materials, and to a more abstract style associated with universalism. Ginastera “rejected the use of vernacular elements in his works and avoided native sources that would brand his music (and, by extension, that of his Latin American colleagues) as backward and provincial.” However, his works maintained the energetic, rhythmic style present in pre-1960s works. The most significant work that Ginastera wrote in the years right before the creation of the CLAEM was the Cantata para América mágica. Even in its abstraction, the Cantata emerges from a programmatic content that imagines the music of “pre-Columbian civilizations.” Using a large and varied palette of Latin

34 Ibid.
35 Ibid., 11.
36 Ibid., 10.
American percussion instruments, Ginastera looks “to evoke ancient indigenous characteristics.”

There is little doubt, however, that Ginastera was furthest from the use of folkloric references and indigenous themes during his years as director of the CLAEM. It is significant, for instance, that for his operas, Don Rodrigo (1964), Bomarzo (1966), and Beatrix Cenci (1971), he chooses librettos that deal with an ancient and European past. Once again, Schwartz-Kates has noticed that,

Ginastera believed that students should receive “a technique of the twentieth century,” which he considered fundamental. He further maintained that Latin American composers should receive this foundation before undertaking musical studies in Europe. Drawing upon his own experience, he expressed the belief that spending his formative years at home encouraged him to acquire a distinctive national voice, which he later learned how to blend with international perspectives. Developing Latin American composers, he urged, should do the same.

Ginastera felt once more a sense of Latinamericanism after he had left the CLAEM, and had moved to Geneva in 1971. In his 1975 work, Popol Vuh, Ginastera uses indigenous sources, and renews his pan-regional discourse:

Reinforced by his close friendships with Latin American expatriates living abroad, he developed a broad sense of pan-continental solidarity. As he revealed in a newspaper interview in Madrid: “I feel not only Argentine, but Hispano-American in the total sense of the word.” Such a strong resurgence of identity resulted in the renewal of Latin American musical elements in his works.

In the CLAEM project however, Ginastera did have an interest for the students to develop a distinctive national voice, nourished by the international perspectives brought by the visiting professors. He saw important that the education of Latin American composers would

37 Ibid.
38 Ibid., 11.
39 Ibid., 19.
take place in Latin America, in order to generate a local sensibility that assimilated international perspectives through study with international figures.

*The Beginnings of the CLAEM: Push for Nationalism?*

In general, the objectives of the CLAEM were much more akin to the universalist aesthetic that Ginastera was exploring in his own compositions during the 1960s. However the requirements for the first generation of students at the CLAEM (1963-1964) seem to have pointed elsewhere, perhaps much more in tone with Ginastera’s belief that students needed to “acquire a distinctive national voice.” Notwithstanding their studies that year with Copland, Messiaen or Malipiero, the students were required to complete two composition exercises using popular themes from their native countries: a carol for chorus and a short piano piece for children. In a report to the Rockefeller Foundation, the exercises are said to allow the composers to explore the “national character deriving from their subject-matter.”

On December 20th of 1963, the CLAEM organized a Christmas concert meant to include the premiere of the carols written by the fellows. The concert announced a series of *Villancicos Latinoamericanos: Composed on popular themes by the fellows of the CLAEM*. Eight of the fellows presented their carols: Valcárcel (*Ya viene el niñito*), Nobre (*Coral de natal*), Bolaños (*Imanispatak*), Maiguashca (*Ven, niño, ven*), Rondano (*Arre borriquito*), Villalpando (*Huachitorito*), Kuri-Aldana (*Peregrina agraciada*) and Atehortúa (*Brincan y balian*).

---

40 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Charles M. Hardin, February 6, 1964, folder 76, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
Figure 4-1: Choir Christmas concert with CLAEM fellows. This was the only group that agreed to perform Christmas carols.

Not everybody was excited about the mandatory participation in the choir, or the required writing of Christmas carols. Several of the fellows have told me they felt almost coerced to participate in the activity, since writing music directly based on folk melodies felt outdated, but they did so out of respect for Ginastera. In my discussions of this situation with Alcides Lanza, he remembers that the idea seemed very conservative to him.

I offered to compose an aleatoric piece for the choir. The title was ...let's stop the chorus... [1963-VI], for a mixed group of voices. Hmm... you can see where I was going [...] I imagined making a whole piece out of tongue twisters. First, the conductor had to say it clearly, and then the choir would repeat it. If the conductor made a mistake the piece had to start again. What I remember is that Ginastera prohibited us from doing this. It was too much for him. He thought the audience would think poorly of it and it would damage the prestige of the CLAEM. The piece was never performed.41

Although the majority of the first group of fellows agreed to write Christmas carols based on popular themes, the next generation of fellows refused entirely, proving to be much more rebellious than the first group. The idea of using popular themes and using a genre such as the carol, with enormous colonial baggage, was simply not aligned with the desires and expectations of the following groups. In the names of pieces by the fellows throughout the ten

---

41 Alcides Lanza, email with the author, Montreal, July 13, 2008.
years there is an obvious move away from reference to the national or regional, with the exception of *Variaciones sobre un coral indio* (Variations on an Indian Chorale, 1963) by Edgar Valcárcel, *Variaciones para piano y percusión típica brasileña* (Variations for piano and typical Brazilian Percussion, 1963) and *Ukrinmakrinkrín* (A lamentation in Xucuru language, 1964), both by Marlos Nobre, and *Quinsa Arawis* (Three Songs, 1967) by Florencio Pozadas. The majority of the works have abstract names such as *Sonata for Violin, Cuarteto, Trio*, or make references to mathematical terms, or to musical processes such as *Gradientes II* (1968) by Luis Arias, *Intensidad y Altura* (1964) by César Bolaños, *Parámetros* by Graciela Paraskevaidis, or *Trígono* (1967) by Luis María Serra. Scientificity and abstraction went hand in hand with universalist desires.

_Anxieties about Latinamericanism among the Press: The case with Atehortúa and Nobre_

Throughout the existence of the CLAEM there was anxiety among the music critics in the press to understand what was particularly “Latin American” about these composers and their music. The composers themselves frequently asked similar questions. For example, when discussing the key elements he thought he learned during his time at the CLAEM, Mesías Maiguashca immediately focused on the tension between musical nationalism and universalism:

> A question that I found central, always present, and many times discussed as a Latin-American composer: the “American” versus the “universal.” I understand now that the problem went beyond my capacity for synthesis at the time.  

It was important to consider how to be Latin American in a Center that, after all, was from its inception and name considered Latin American in nature but that adhered to avant-garde and universalist aesthetics. In a long news article from 1964 published in the journal *Visión*, this question was given public emphasis by the press for the first time:

---

42 Mesías Maiguashca, email with the author, November 11, 2008.
The secret, but transparent goal of Ginastera is to contribute to the creation of an authentic musical Latin American tradition through his teaching. “We are taught—he says—that we are nobody’s children, which is not true. We have behind us unimaginable treasures. There is an indigenous music lost and suffocated by conquest and civilization. There are hidden jewels of colonial art in temples and old archives. If there were good musicians in Europe, there were also excellent ones in America.”

Ginastera’s seems to underline in this interview, the importance of music heritage that he calls imaginable treasures behind us. In this case he points out to Native-American musical practices and the long tradition of classical music composition in the Americas. The journal went on to examine the issue of Latinamericanism by looking at the works being produced. Reviewing the first concert dedicated exclusively to works by the fellows, the journalists found two works worthy of extensive commentary: one by the Colombian Blas Emilio Atehortúa and another by Marlos Nobre. Atehortúa’s Camara musica for violin, horn, cello, piano and percussion was mentioned first:

The long, tall, and emotive Colombian Atehortúa (31 years old), in whose piece one seems to breath the Latin American landscape, confessed to Visión: “I write with a universalist vision. If there is some folklore in my music, I have not searched for it. It has come out only of a universalist intention. But I feel proud when the authentically Latin American flows from me naturally. I don’t try to hide it.

Atehortúa was perhaps one of the students that felt most comfortable learning from and following the advice of Ginastera, and in return he became a close favorite of Ginastera.

44 Not surprising for an Argentinean composer in the 20th century, the third heritage usually mentioned as part of the tri-ethnical origins of Latin American cultures—the African-American traditions—are nowhere to be seen. Argentina in general had received a much smaller number of forced African migrations during the previous centuries, and strong political and social forces after the mass European immigration that peaked in the 1910s have whitened the racial imagination of Argentina to the point of having made Afro-Argentineans invisible. However, it is estimated that 25% of Buenos Aires was Afro-American in the 1820s, and evidently musical styles as malambo and milonga have often been claimed to have African roots.
own views on universalism were not distant however, from the importance that Ginastera gave to Latinamericanism. He told me in an interview:

> When I joined the CLAEM, I felt a particularly warm welcome from Ginastera, who took me not as his student, but as his dear disciple. [...] He would talk about the importance of his Latinamericanist style. He was a man confident in what he did, and he would say that with this work [the *Cantata para América Mágica*] he found his style, his form, and the use of microtonalism in the soloist voice. All of these were definitive from my artistic conception.⁴⁶

*Camaræ musica*, very much like the *Cantata para América Mágica*, is highly atonal, methodically avoiding repetition of pitch classes, avoiding consonant intervals, and using fractured melodic lines with large intervallic leaps. The instruments, however, make no particular reference to native instruments of the Americas. The piece has an intense beginning with imitative figures among the instruments, followed by peaceful sustained notes in the strings with sporadic single notes on the piano and lyric declamations by the violin and the horn. After an ominous silence all instruments come back to augment the density and activity leading to a climax. The piece—at least for me—has little to indicate the composers’ interest in Latinamericanism. Even after the composer had said that the piece derives only from a universalist vision, the press felt otherwise and chose to emphasize the Latin American landscape they perceived in *Camaræ musica*. Almost defensively, Atehortúa assumes that the Latin Americanness felt in his piece might have come from folklore, as if it was the only marker of Latinamericanism. However, he immediately asserts that he feels proud when the authentically Latin American’ flows from him naturally. There was tension between Atehortúa’s universalist intention, and the perceived audible Latin Americaness that Atehortúa tried to resolve by saying that it was something that might be flowing from him naturally.

---

⁴⁶ Blas Emilio Atehortúa, email with the author, Bucaramanga, May 27, 2010.
The second work mentioned in Visión was Marlos Nobre’s Ucrínmakrinkrín. The piece is scored for soprano, piccolo, oboe, horn and piano. The score only indicates that the text is written in an “indigenous dialect from the North of Brazil” without indicating that it is in the Xucuru language or that it is a text for magical incantation/supplication. When interviewed for the journal, Nobre begun by addressing the tension between nationalist and universalist positions:

They say my work has hints of folklore. *I did not search for this.* I feel, however, that *I must be on a good path then.* I think that Latin American musicians have to do their own music, we have to be different. We had a borrowed culture. We have to make our own traditions with our own hands. We have to work without sectarianism but on something that it is truly ours.

Like Atehortúa, Nobre pointed out that he did not search for the folkloric references. Both composers were proud, however, that these references were appearing and thought it was a positive trait of their music. It is significant that Nobre immediately responded that he did not search for folklore but made no reference to the press of his own choice of indigenous text. He rather aligned himself with Atehortúa in sustaining that sounding Latin American meant they were on a good path. Nobre’s work is a lamentation for the suffering of the Xucuru people as they see their homeland invaded by ranchers expanding in the state of Pernambuco. The piece is a mature piece that shows how the Brazilian composer was already in tune with serial European music at the time, and some of the aleatoric tendencies that had been in vogue for some years already at Darmstadt. The musical characteristics of the works easily align it with universalist tendencies. The vocal writing uses predominately minor seconds and major sevenths, with leaps of sevenths used frequently in a rapid rhythmic figure leading to a sustained note. The piano and

---

48 Paul Earls 1972: 179.
the winds in the first of three movements support the voice with secundal chords. The timbre created by the superimposing of seconds between winds and strings adds to the sense of lamentation. The middle movement is written with rhythmic freedom, a fixed pulse is avoided. Instead the conductor is asked to direct “Leggiero (Not strict time ‘a piaceré’ of the conductor)”\(^{50}\) and to give indications to the performers marked in the score using numbers under certain musical events (see Figure 4-2). The final movement is rhythmically incessant, with an underlying pulse of eighth notes and the piano marking the pulse from the beginning, playing clusters in both hands.

Again, like with Atehortúa’s piece, in my opinion there is no evident direct reference to folklore in the musical structure of *Ukrinmakrinkrin*. But the anxiety of the press—and likely the composers as well—created a need to perceive them. This anxiety emerged from a tension in presenting the works as distinct enough to be both original and autochthonous to Latin America—in other words, not simply a copy from European styles—but also to fit within the accepted soundscape of contemporary classical music. Both composers and critics in the press knew that there was something at stake in how a piece would be received depending on how strong it felt to be connected to Latin America, and that there was a fine line between copy and originality, and between universalism and nationalism.

Figure 4-2: Marlos Nobre’s *Ukrínmakrinkrin*, beginning of the second movement. Notice the writing looking to avoid establishing a steady pulse and asking the conductor indicate different entrances in a non strict time ‘to his/her fancy.’

Maiguashca mentioned at the beginning of this section that he felt that negotiating the tension between being a Latin American composer and universalism as a preferred aesthetic went beyond his capacity for synthesis at the time. In the next case studies I look at how two
composers approached this issue in different ways, going beyond their fellowship at the CLAEM into the next decades of their work. In both cases complex negotiations and reflection took place but resulted in an embrace of Latinamericanism in different ways. By no means are these examples from this section the only models followed by composers at the time, but they show the variety of results that this tension created.

*Embracing Latinamericanism: Coriún Aharonián*

I have described elsewhere how Aharonián’s own music since the CLAEM years until today embraces Latinamericanism in a critical and revisionist manner. Aharonián considers that in general, composers of art music in Latin America, commonly part of white or mestizo elites, are taught very little of Amerindian, African or even mestizo popular culture. The main teachings they receive involve the traditions of Europe, reinforcing the colonial ties of the classical musical tradition. He argues that “for the Latin American creator the non-official cultures (the native, the ones brought from Africa through slavery, and sometimes even the mestizo forms of *non-cultured* culture) are strange, foreign, unfamiliar and, many times, exotic.” Aharonián refers frequently to the narrative of a tri-ethnical heritage as the main and decisive source in the search for Latinamericanism and finds in composition and education an ideal medium for the reconciliation of these elements.

The musician is a particularly sensitive receptacle of those common [cultural] traits, and a reorganizer of them, by definition of the craft. Music is the expressive structuring of sounds and silences. But I can only structure that that which I know, that which I have known and recognized.

---

52 Aharonián 1979, 4.
53 Aharonián 2001, 78.
Thus, education regarding other musical traditions is central in his labor as composer, aiming to make them “known and recognized.” During the 1970s Aharonián immersed himself in the study of musical traditions of indigenous Aymara and Quechua speakers after having heard in 1971 the music used in the film *Yawar Mallku* (The Condor’s Blood) by Jorge Sanjines. Significantly, some of the music for the film was composed by Alberto Villalpando (a fellow from the CLAEM), Alfredo Dominguez, and Ignacio Quispe.  

54 Gilbert Favre, a Swiss musician and one of the founders of the Bolivian folkloric music venue Peña Naira and the popular folkloric group ‘Los Jairas’ performed the quena part with Ernesto Cavour and Julio Godoy.  

55 The discovery of a folkloric tradition that was already circulating within cosmopolitan circles in Buenos Aires, La Paz and Paris only encouraged Aharonián to further his understanding of the musical practices from which these styles had derived.

In 1974 Aharonián composed the work *Homenaje a la flecha clavada en el pecho de Don Juan Diaz de Solís* for solo electroacoustics. Aharonián relied on indigenous and mestizo aerophone instruments from the highlands as source materials for its creation, and unintentionally, the piece became the first classical composition done exclusively with instruments of the Highlands.  

56 In the composition, and in the liner notes he provides for its recording, Aharonián strives to avoid further exoticizing the instruments by using them with the type of articulations and similar gestures that are commonly heard among indigenous and mestizo performers. As he also points out, he consciously avoids all false references to

54 Aharonián points out “Villalpando is the author of the music that accompanies those of the dominant culture, while the indigenous peoples are described musically with indigenous music, something like the *Kantus de Charazani* [Bolivian panpipe bands].” Aharonián, personal communication with the author, March 30, 2013.

55 See Rios 2008.

56 Coriún Aharonián, notes to the recording: *Gran Tiempo: Composiciones Electroacústicas*, 8.
“pseudo-traditional pentaphonic [sic] fragments of melodies”\textsuperscript{57} that had in the past been erroneously associated to the indigenous traditions. His use of instruments with connections to Native American groups continued in the composition \textit{Esos silencios} (1978), in which Aharonián uses recorded material from instrumental sources, among them, some of the instruments built by the Guatemalan composer and CLAEM fellow Joaquín Orellana.\textsuperscript{58} Orellana had returned to Guatemala with a taste for electronic music, but not having the necessary infrastructure, he decided to develop a range of instruments based on Central American native organology, that would allow unexpected timbres and articulations, resulting in a type of live \textit{concrète musique}. In Aharonián’s piece, the instruments are used to produce the types of articulations, overlapped phrasings, and inexactness in the collective attacks, that brings to mind Aymara musical traditions in Bolivia and Peru.

A similar situation emerged with Aharonián’s relation to Latin American popular music. Aharonián has been an active participant of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music, has research and publications on the subject, and has participated in musical arrangements for different projects of well-known figures in Latin America like Daniel Vigglieti, Ruben Olivera and Los Olimareños. Starting in the 1980s, Aharonián began incorporating popular music references in several of his compositions with a similar avoidance of obvious melodic allusions or driving rhythmic patterns—such as the malambo for Ginastera. The ‘quotes’ that Aharonián uses are normally not in text but in gesture, that is, he does not

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{58} Orellana incorporates the strong indigenous tradition of his country in his work as a composer and a luthier. He has built a large amount of instruments, based on traditional Guatemalan instruments, principally the different type of marimbas believed to be associated with Mayan practices.
usually take fragments of a pre-existent pieces and re-contextualize them, but takes possible gestures used from a style and makes them innate to the composition.

In *Los cadadías* (1980) for small ensemble, for example, Aharonián uses the rhythmical, behind-the-bridge bow scratching often found in Piazzolla and post-Piazzolla tango orchestras to drive the violoncello part and the overall behavior of the rest of the instruments. In *Los cadadías*, the gestures emerge from a tango-milonga but one would struggle to hear tango in a composition that is fully engaged with avant-garde language. The austerity of the pieces is remarkable: in the entire six-and-a-half minute piece the clarinet only plays a D3 in its lowest register,\(^{59}\) the trombone plays that same D3 in a violent and disturbing manner, and the piano plays a very low cluster of three notes A#0, B0, C1. The tango gestures appear, but they are part of the vocabulary of the piece, and not just an exoticism pasted in, or a collage element that contrasts with the other elements.

Figure 4-3: Some tango derived rhythmical figures from *Los cadadías* (1980)

As part of his interest in presenting himself as a Latin American composer Aharonián integrated highly modern classical music characteristics with musical traits, performance

\(^{59}\) As a convention I use C4 as middle C (approximately 261.6 hertz).
practices and instruments from indigenous, folkloric and popular music traditions. This vision, essentially a revisionist take of earlier art music nationalisms, led to compositions that are constantly making references to indigenous materials, gestures and syntax, but avoid melodic and rhythmic patterns that suggest the connection too flagrantly. Avant-garde aesthetics seem to be the driving force behind his works, and his success in the transnational world of classical music both as an unmarked, and Latin American composer—seemingly a contradiction—ultimately point at characteristic of universalism that Etkin pointed out earlier in this chapter, that is, becoming quite original in relationship to Europe. Considering his role as one of the leading voices of the avant-garde in Latin America, students of Aharonián have often taken a serious interest in breaching the apparent divides between musical traditions in Latin America, and have continued producing works that bring together elements and aesthetic preferences from multiple sources, yet fully embracing contemporary models of art music composition.

*Embracing Latinamericanism: The case of Alberto Villalpando*

In their biography of Alberto Villalpando, Wiethüchter and Rosso argue that the year of 1964 was a breaking point in the history of music in Bolivia. That year, two scores submitted by Villalpando to the national composition prize *Luzmila Patiño*, created commotion among the jury.

They were a string quartet titled *Preludio, Pasacaglia y Postludio* and a second work called *Cuatro juegos fantásticos*. [...] The scores, written in an unmistakable avant-garde language [...] found an appreciative ear in one of the jurors: Mario Estenssoro. [...] Although the opposition was strong, Estenssoro had decided to not give up on the only submitted scores that were in dialogue with the music being done elsewhere in the world. And to everybody’s surprise the nominated string quartet, *Preludio, Pasacaglia y Postludio*, written in
dodecaphonic and atonal language, won the first prize. Contemporary music had arrived to Bolivia, and it did so triumphantly. Villalpando submitted that quartet while doing his fellowship at the Di Tella Institute.

Villalpando was born in La Paz (1940), but he lived Potosí since he was two months until he turned eighteen years old. His contact with contemporary music in Potosí was little and far between, although he managed to attend sporadic concerts organized on Friday nights by the owner of a local music store. When he moved to Buenos Aires in 1958, Villalpando enjoyed discovering the differences between the art music world of Potosí and the cosmopolitan center of Latin America. Accompanied by his friends, compatriots and composers Marvin Sandi and Florencio Posadas, Villalpando joined the Conservatorio Nacional Carlos López Buchardo and for the next four years they studied together under the supervision of Alberto Ginastera. In 1962 Ginastera announced that he was going to leave the conservatory to work full time at the CLAEM. Villalpando must have felt relieved when Ginastera asked him personally to apply for the newly created Center. Villalpando’s biographers describe the Bolivian composer’s experience at the CLAEM as central to the musical language that he would adopt the rest of his career:

The institute was a breeding ground of the new composers of Latin America. And it was under the light of a double freedom. First, the freedom from the traditional structures of music composition and a return to the prime material: sound. And the second, the freedom brought by breaking from a limitation that had haunted all Latin American artists since the beginning of the century: folklore in music, costumbrismo in literature, indigenismo in the plastic arts, etc. And conquering both liberties had a cost for every Latin American artist: to assume the responsibility of their cultural identity.

---

61 Ibid., 29
When Villalpando returned to Bolivia he worked diligently to improve the National Symphonic Orchestra and the National Music Conservatory. However, the series of military coups that plagued Bolivia beginning in 1964, and the general conservative attitude of many local musicians, caused the young composer to suffer many frustrations. Musically, Villalpando was also facing important questions. As Wiethücher and Rosso write,

>The Di Tella Institute had left among the students the concern to find a language capable of expressing a cultural identity. It was difficult, since one had to evade folklorisms and nationalisms that were no longer reputable. It is under that tension that Villalpando began his reflections about the Bolivian landscape.\(^6^3\)

Villalpando saw in his surrounding landscape, in the geography of the Andes, the solution to incorporate what he felt was intrinsically Bolivian, while avoiding the folkloric references that previous nationalist composers had used to signal the nation. He decided to redirect his focus of interest, away from folklore, and into geography:

\(^{62}\) Photograph from Wiethüchter and Rosso 2005, 24.
\(^{63}\) Wiethüchter and Rosso 2005, 49.
For now, my interest is to penetrate as deeply as possible the study of our geography, not of our folklore. It is in the context in which we live that our vital force emerges, as well as the most essential truths of our existence. I believe that it is from there—from the same well that nourishes the inspiration for our folklore—that the intuitions that nourish our classical music should come from.\textsuperscript{64}

Contrasting Aharonián’s case, Villalpando decided not to explore native, folkloric or popular music sources, but to find an initial point of departure for all musical practices that are connected to Bolivian identity. The frame he finds is the geography of the Andean Bolivia, the highlands as source of the intuition and thus, authenticity. Villalpando writes,

I have found in Bolivian geography the container that holds us all. A geography of sounds. It is not about being a landscape painter [\textit{paisajista}]. My intention is not to describe the landscape, but the internal states that geography suggests and that identify those of us who are Bolivian, because we are made out of that same soil.\textsuperscript{65}

The notion of “Geography Sounds”—also the title of his biography—became the most important source of inspiration for many of Villalpando’s works. Landscape and soundscape—rivers, birds, rain, wind—become the signs that associate the music to region, country, nation and provides the sense of authenticity that folkloric materials might have provided earlier pieces associated with nationalist aesthetics. Villalpando’s compositional output after the 1970s relies on an aesthetic that is not particularly avant-garde and is not very dissonant. He believes that using landscapes as inspiration for his compositions leads to these kind of sonorities, but also argues that the levels of local performers in Bolivia, both in ensembles and particularly in symphonic orchestras, forces composers to simplify their musical language so that the pieces are, first of all, performed, and second, performed well.

In 2011 I had the opportunity to listen to Villalpando’s \textit{Las Transformaciones del agua y del fuego en las montañas} (1991), which he has identified as one of the pieces inspired by

\textsuperscript{64} Villalpando 1976, quoted in Wiethüchter and Rosso 2005, 52. My emphasis.

Andean geography. The piece uses a very conservative musical language that reminds the listener of Charles Ives’s compositions during 1900-1910 and of Carlos Chávez’s *Sinfonía India*. Quite contrasting in comparison to the raw avant-garde of Aharonián, descriptions of the piece by Wiethücher and Rosso display the evident continuity Villalpando’s work has with earlier examples of nationalist art music composition. The evocative language of this description matches the overall sense of programmatic content and that the piece suggests.

In the quiet of the mountain, silence is broken by the arrival of a clarinet melody that announces, incites or calls for the ritual, thus setting up a magical space. The convocation emerges from the counterpoint between the flute and the oboe, which invade the atmosphere with the same melody. The counterpoint is interrupted or fractured by dissonant masses of sound that disintegrate the atmosphere simultaneously giving space to the chaos imposed by the percussion, which leads to an annunciation of sorts. […] In the second fragment, next to the metal one hears strange choral chants, like the awakening of secret underground forces conjuring ancient mysteries to which the strings provide a kind of enabling context.66

Villalpando’s central role in the history of Bolivian classical music in the second half of the twentieth century made him an important model for younger generation of Bolivian composers. These composers persisted in their interest on finding concrete ways of combining music and local identity and maintain a strong sense of heritage with earlier composers associated to nationalism.

By looking briefly at these two different composers, I wanted to exemplify the various and rich ways in which the idea of Latinamericanism was adopted by some of the people at the CLAEM. The fact that there was not really a stylistic unity that could be associated with the sound of the CLAEM raises the question: What was then the importance of the CLAEM for the Latin American musical scene? To answer that question, I close this chapter by looking at the networks of solidarity that were formed among composers during these years.

66 Wiethüchter and Rosso 2005, 55.
4.3 Latinamericanism and Solidarity Networks at the CLAEM

Tensions with the International Students

There were two types of students at the CLAEM: those who came from abroad and those who were already established in Buenos Aires and had family or at least had developed circles of friends and colleagues. There was initially a lack of integration between the local students and the foreign students. Trying to promote friendship, the Colombian fellow Atehortúa proposed a soccer match—locals against foreign students. The fellows thought this would be fun, and Atehortúa was made goalie.

The first match ended 23-0 against us […] I was doing it for fun, but my teammates got mad because I would move out of the way of the ball and of course, it would go in […] I would laugh, but they were worried because the loser was buying lunch. Mario Kuri-Aldana bought a set of impeccable shorts and shirt with white tennis shoes and socks for the match. The Argentineans grabbed him and dropped him in a pool of mud.67

After this match, personal tensions did dissipate and several fellows went on to become close friends. Atehortúa remembers his close friendship with Edgar Valcárcel and Alcides Lanza, “who used to say I was his younger brother.”68 But there was also a distance created by the differences in musical education and knowledge between those who had received their education in Buenos Aires and the rest. The very cosmopolitanism of the city and the significant amount of European music teachers that had immigrated since the Second World War, had allowed many Argentine students to have a high level of technical competence absent in many of the foreign students. This unfortunately created a sense of superiority among some of the Argentineans which was noticed by several fellows. The Peruvian fellow Edgar Valcárcel remembers how in Malipiero’s classes this tension rose to the surface:

67 Blas Emilio Atehortúa, email with author, Bucaramanga, May 29, 2010.
68 Ibid.
There was a confrontation between the Latin American group and the Argentines. It was hard for us, but we had to our advantage someone we will never forget, the Maestro Riccardo Malipiero, an Italian [composer] that came to teach us about serialism and twelve-tone composition techniques, something that I had not learned in Lima. There, in one of his talks, he said to all the fellows “You don’t know Latin America” to which one of the Argentinean fellows replied “Maestro, but we find that north of Argentina there is nothing.” Then, a huge fight started. Today those Argentineans are among my best friends, one of them, Alcides Lanza, lives in Canada and is in love with Latin America. They fell in love, surrendered to it. That was Malipiero’s work.69

The closing of the gap between Argentine and foreign composers, and the realization that Valcárcel points out in this quote, did not happen suddenly. And quite importantly, it involved the friendship and camaraderie that the long stay at the CLAEM allowed the fellows.

A similar example of this distance and the process of reducing it is found in the following anecdote about a local group of Argentinean composers and their faceoff with some of the foreign fellows. In the late 1950s Alcides Lanza and Armando Krieger had become friends and worked together with pianist-composer Gerardo Gandini, conductor Armando Tauriello and a very young Mariano Etkin. In 1959 they founded a contemporary music ensemble to perform their own compositions, and in some cases, works by established composers. They called the group Agrupación Música Viva—different from the earlier mentioned group with the same name from Brazil.70 Lanza and the others started gaining a name for themselves in the musical scene of Buenos Aires, since the performances of Agrupación Música Viva emphasized the works of local composers. By the time that the CLAEM started functioning, the group was well known, and even during their fellowships, they continued the performance of solely Argentine works. This did not bode well with foreign composers at the CLAEM, who felt that such narrowness in the repertoire missed the opportunity that was provided by having so many composers from the region living in the city. As expressed by Jones,

69 Luis Alvarado 2010, 80-100.
70 Jones 2007, 30.
Late in 1963, the eight student composers who were not Argentinean requested a meeting with the [Agrupación] Música Viva directors, namely Lanza, Gandini, and Krieger. The students complained about the bias of the group and asked that their music be included in future concerts. Maiguashca, an Ecuadorian who was the ringleader of the protesters, angrily said, “We are guests in your country. You invite us here and then ignore us!” Lanza and Gandini listened carefully to their objections and concluded that the students had a legitimate grievance. Thereafter the agenda of [Agrupación] Música Viva was consciously expanded to include contemporary music from all of Latin America.71

Although the activities of Agrupación Música Viva were not directly tied to the CLAEM, all of its members, were part of the Center in some manner at that moment: Lanza and Krieger—and soon after Etkin—as fellows, Gandini as teacher, and Tauriello as conductor in many of the concerts organized officially. This attitude reflected a rift between the conceived Latin Americanness of the CLAEM, and the habits that were prevalent among the Argentinean composers. The fact that this story comes out of biography of Lanza, one of the characters accused of neglect—highlights that the lack of interest in compositions from other parts of Latin America—driven most likely by ignorance and habit—was indeed a problem and that the experience at the CLAEM did change this situation and helped create new professional bonds in the region.

The Emergence of Networks of Solidarity

These new professional bonds among composers from Latin America unexpectedly emerged from a simple condition: the availability of a shared space in the CLAEM, which became tremendously important experience for the composers. It provided them a unique opportunity to meet each other personally and musically. The problem of not knowing each other was felt as real and important, as Coriún Aharonián, a fellow in 1969, points out:

71 Ibid., 40. Maiguashca’s quote appears as recalled by Lanza in an interview with Jones, April 5, 1997.
In reality, at that time [up to the 1960’s] all the young Latin American composers were isolated inside their own countries—frequently even inside their own cities—, as a consequence of colonialism. Imperialism had left a legacy of communication systems where contact with the imperial metropolis [Europe and the U.S.] was easy, but contact among the colonies was difficult or impossible.\textsuperscript{72}

Even for Buenos Aires the neocolonial condition that Aharonián refers to holds true, and to have dictated the availability of knowledge about composers and their music. Still today, Latin American classical composers have easier access to information coming from Europe and the United States than to information from neighboring countries. Exchanges in correspondence and some journals had started for several decades, but the circulation of music through scores, recordings and even performances, was meager at best. For the Ecuadorian fellow Mesías Maiguashca, the two-year period of sharing helped remove some differences that had kept Latin American composers apart. He writes:

The Di Tella Institute helped us understand that we did no have to live antagonizing each other. That, for me, is the greatest legacy of this institution, because it generated several generations of composers united by friendship, a type of solidarity new in our cultural history, that implied, naturally, aesthetic tolerance.\textsuperscript{73}

The antagonism referred to here by Maiguashca—nationalist and universalist aesthetics—was an added anxiety to that of the colonial legacy of disinformation, and both were reduced by personal contact, friendship and camaraderie. Most of the CLAEM composers I have spoken to, regard the emergence of networks of solidarity among composers as the most significant aspect of the Center. Mariano Etkin, told me:

The most important legacy [of the CLAEM] was the contact that remains even today with colleagues throughout Latin America. And I say this first, because it has been something crucial. To know that in other places of Latin America people were composing music very different to ours here. Sometimes surprisingly different! In the 1960s we knew very little of what was going on in

\textsuperscript{72} Aharonián 1991, 28.
other Latin American countries, what was going on in Guatemala, or even Chile, a bordering country to ours, and yet so different.74 The friendships generated and the multi national character of the CLAEM facilitated the adoption of a strategic regional identity for a Latin American avant-garde in an art world that was largely European and U.S.-centric. The discourse of Latinamericanism that emerged among these composers had similarities to the earlier work of Gilbert Chase, the International Composers Guild, the Pan-American Association of Composers and even to Ginastera’s personal Pan-American dream explored earlier this chapter.75 But there were two substantial differences to previous attempts at professional regional unity. First, these composers did not just know each other from music festivals and occasional meetings, but from an extended period of profound exchange and in many cases, sincere friendships. Second, I argue that the adoption of this identity is an example of what Spivak calls strategic essentialism. In other words, the essential attributes that the composers share are understood by them to be a social construct, but the notion of Latin American composer is still used as a political tool to gain agency within the avant-garde art world. Aharonián, a fellow during 1969, touches upon this topic in the following words: “Latin America does not exist. It does not exist but it should exist…. Latin-Americanness is then fundamentally a historical need for self-defense.”76 There was, in other words, a conscious effort to use the label Latin American to their own advantage.

In this way the essentialism behind the label of Latin American was used as a professional strategy for promoting a musical practice within cosmopolitan circles, earning the composers performance spaces, allowing the freedom to use certain materials as sources of

74 Mariano Etkin, interview with the author, August 1, 2005.
76 Coriún Aharonián 1992, 47. In Spanish he uses the word ‘Latinoamericanicidad,’ consciously avoiding using the word ‘Latinamericanismo.’
inspiration, and as a central aspect of self-representation among international peers. It paralleled earlier Pan-American and Inter-American calls for hemispheric collaboration. At the same time, it presented a reappropriation of a term that had been used to mark the otherness of Latin American composers to now signify a positive and distinctive quality that gave an originality desired within modernist aesthetics.

Many of those who went to the CLAEM as students or as professors, soon after opened the door to their colleagues from their positions as faculty, administrators or members of granting institutions. Riccardo Malipiero, Aaron Copland and Luigi Nono, for instance, established close and long lasting friendships with many fellows, and helped them with their European and American connections through the rest of their lives, facilitating further studies from many of the fellows. Nono shared not only his knowledge, but also many times his house with several Latin American composers after his Argentinean experience. Many of the European, U.S. and Latin American professors wrote important letters of recommendation in the following years and helped many of the fellows continue their work with the support of the Guggenheim Foundation, the OAS, and many foreign universities, as was the case with the fellows Atehortúa, Brnčić, Lanza, Núñez Allauca and Valcárcel.

Many of the fellows also became true ambassadors of Latin American composers around the world. They have in the last 50 years often lent support to younger Latin American composers, performers and researchers, creating an extension of the original ties formed during their youth. Some examples of these networks of solidarity in action include specific artists offering support to one another from their various posts around the world, including: Alcides Lanza, first from his post at Columbia-Princeton, and then from McGill University in Canada; Mesías Maiguashca from his exile in Germany, Gabriel Brnčić in Spain, Coriún Aharonián and
Graciela Paraskevaidis from Uruguay; Mariano Etkin and Gerardo Gandini in Argentina; Blas Atehortúa and Jacqueline Nova despite her untimely death in Colombia; Jorge Antunes and Marlos Nobre in Brazil; and Eduardo Kusnir, both during his time in Puerto Rico, and then later in Venezuela. Many more that are missing from this list, who, having been affected by their experience at the CLAEM decided to open their hearts, their houses, their studies, and offer help to other Latin American musicians in a manner that had not happened before in the region.

The implications of the networks created during this particular time at the CLAEM have strong repercussions even today. The networks of solidarity kept growing and became extended students of CLAEM fellows, who learned the importance of having strong professional ties with their peers in the region, and also had the opportunity to establish connections with some of the older generation of composers in conferences and international meetings. It would be hard to find a country in Latin America that has not attempted to organize some kind of Latin American music festival, often with the important input of some of the fellows. Although the disinflation that was symptomatic before the CLAEM has not fully disappeared, it has been at least significantly reduced by the efforts of many of these composers to teach classes on Latin American contemporary classical music, to require the analysis of works from the region in their lessons, abandoning, if only in part, the absolute focus on European and U.S. American compositions that was prevalent in music education during large part of the twentieth century.

Questions of local, national, and regional identity are in constant dialogue with identifications of race, class and ethnicity. And in the case of the composers at the CLAEM, they are also connected with professional identities in a classical music world that was frequently identified with Europe. But throughout all this, being from Latin America was the shared experience that prompted some of the most interesting answers to the questions of self-
presentation as Latin American composer. Some of these—such as the embrace of universalist aesthetics articulated through the comprehension of popular, traditional and folkloric musical practices, or the search for alternative sources of inspiration and reference to region and nation like geography and soundscape—became important orientations during the decades that closed the twentieth century. The strategic adoption of the identification as Latin American composer had a transcendent impact in the professional field, as these composers found an entry point to the avant-garde. The establishment of long-term solidarity networks had similar impact for Latin American music, since these connections became capital that solidified the position of these composers as elite in their profession. Ultimately, this made the experience of the CLAEM successful in establishing a number of composers at the cusp of the art world and creating a regional identification within the profession, albeit one that has been constantly challenged.
CHAPTER 5
THE AVANT-GARDE AT THE CLAEM: MUSICAL STYLE AND EMBODIMENT

The CLAEM—as a crucial breeding ground for a generation of Latin American musical creators—did not have the intention or objective to assume any historical or ideological responsibility as a continental avant-garde, either institutionally or as a group of people. It did not champion the defense of politically or aesthetically radical positions, at least not during its brief existence. But perhaps it did, as an after effect, through the work and actions of individual fellows, years later.

Graciela Paraskevaidis “De mitos y leyendas.” La música en el Di Tella: Resonancias de la modernidad.1

It would be inaccurate to think of the avant-garde only as a style of composition or a set of aesthetic preferences. The avant-garde as Latin American composers embraced it during the years of the CLAEM—a significant period of musical change, where there was a conscious transformation of emphasis on musical sound structures by composers—was also a particular positioning of an artist with respect to the field of cultural production in which he or she participated. On one level, for many of the composers that attended the CLAEM embracing the musical avant-garde was a subversive and emancipatory way to challenge previous ways of making music. Through avant-garde compositions they expressed their adherence to the feeling of nonconformity with the existing limits of what was considered mainstream classical music. On another level, it signified their successful incorporation into contemporary trends of composition. Writing avant-garde music was an indication that the composers were well informed and up-to-date, in other words, that they were truly cosmopolitan. A balance existed between personal committed beliefs in the liberating power of the 1960s avant-garde vis-à-vis a

1 Paraskevaidis 2011, 50.
field of production, and strategic professional tactics of adopting the most recent compositional trends.

The CLAEM opened the horizons for many Latin American composers about what the avant-garde could be in at least two broad fronts, which are the central foci of this chapter: musical style and social impact. First, on the most immediate professional level there were the different compositional trends of rupture and pushing musical structures to the fringes in the classical music world. Mariano Etkin—an example of a well informed young composer joining the CLAEM—acknowledged, for instance, how the visits of Xenakis, Nono, Brown, and others opened up new possibilities for composers at the Center regarding what being avant-garde could be:

It was then, at the Institute, that I had contact with a world that was incredibly different to that world of serialism, which was the world where we thought the avant-garde resided uniquely. I mean, when I was fifteen years old, the avant-garde was Nono, Boulez, Stockhausen. Varèse was known very little. Scelsi did not exist, but Cage did.²

This important realization that there was not just a single avant-garde but multiple trends articulating avant-garde desires at the time made the CLAEM experience invaluable. Part one of this chapter (sections one to four) deals with different broad approaches to composition that simultaneously appear to have been effective means of participation in the musical avant-garde for the composers at the Center. From the way these composers talk about the avant-garde, it is clear that at the time there were different ways of approaching composition, although one did not necessarily need to choose one or another. First there was the more mainstream and perhaps traditional understanding of avant-garde derived from twelve-tone and serial and post-serial compositional techniques, explored often in analysis of works by Boulez and Stockhausen, and taught by several of the visiting composers, such as Maderna, Dallapiccola, and Nono. Second,

² Etkin, interview with author, Buenos Aries, August 1, 2005.
there were composers who rejected the expected soundscapes from serial compositions, and
looked for an alternate, sound-centered aesthetic in the world of the electronic studio, often
called experimental in the press. Third, composing in the fringes of music making, including
graphic notations, improvisation and aleatoric methods, and the theatrical side of musical
performance in the manner of Cage and Kagel. Finally, the fourth option involved rejecting the
hegemony of Austro-German compositional models, rejected both the neoclassicisms of
Stravinsky, Hindemith and Bartók, and the serial and post-serial compositions associated with
Boulez and Stockhausen and found affinity with the music of mavericks of that tradition who
focused on timbre and texture more than harmonies and rhythms—particularly Varèse, Xenakis,
and Penderecki.

Part two of this chapter—sections five and six—deals with the second broad front that
opened for the composers apropos the avant-garde, one that went beyond musical style. Peter
Bürger’s *Theory of the Avant-Garde* (1984) argues that the two crucial aspect of the historical
avant-garde—mostly associated to European Dadaist and Surrealist—was to dismantle the
notion of autonomous art as an institution\(^3\) and to retake the social impact that the high
intensification of artistic autonomy had removed from aesthetic experience. In other words, the
avant-garde was meant to recognize “the *social inconsequentiality* of autonomous art and, as the
logical consequence of this recognition, […] attempt to lead art back into social praxis.”\(^4\)
Bürger’s often-cited work is most certainly a theory of *European* avant-garde of the 1920s and
1930s, something implied in his own introduction, but still absent from his unmarked title both
in German and in English. However, by the time the CLAEM composers were embracing the

\(^3\) By this he means “the productive and distributive apparatus and also to the ideas about art that
prevail at a given time and that determine the reception of works.” Bürger 1984, 22.

\(^4\) Schulte-Sasse in the forward to Bürger 1984, xiv. My emphasis.
musical avant-garde(s), they were providing new articulations to its objectives from postwar perspectives, which Bürgar, Foster (1994) and other art scholars have call the neo-avant-garde of the 1950s and 1960s, although this terminology has not found a niche in musicology. These perspectives had a deep-rooted belief in the autonomy of art, or art-for-art’s-sake, and thus generate a crucial question for the composers that contradicts Bürger’s model: How can artistic creation have social impact within a modernist discourse that proclaimed art for art’s sake? As we see in this section, the avant-garde became an embodied experience and a way of being that expanded the field of action of composers, allowing for both an autonomous art and for the desired social impact through what they called musical militancy. The focus here are the lives of Graciela Paraskevaïdis and Mariano Etkin, two composers and close friends that become committed to the avant-garde during the years at the CLAEM.

The sixth and final section follows a story of disenchantment from the avant-garde. I look at the life of Ariel Martinez as an example of a composer that fully embraced the avant-garde, was very productive and creative around the years of the CLAEM, faced several aesthetic and ethical dilemmas about the music he made, and in the end grew discouraged by avant-garde postures and aesthetics and abandoned it years later.

Since the CLAEM had a large number of composers from many Latin American countries, this chapter is significant in that it provides a frame for understanding how a whole generation became part of the avant-garde that dominated the Latin American classical music scene during the last decades of the twentieth century.
PART ONE: Avant Garde as Musical Style

5.1 Twelve-Tone Compositions at the CLAEM

In 1965 the critic Roque De Pedro, writing for the journal *Tribuna Musical* chose to divide the works in a concert dedicated to CLAEM fellows into two camps: those works that had an interest in “renovation, of revolutionary tendency, and were essentially experimental” and those that “without trying to be reactionary, rather unfold within basic principles of well recognized results.” By “basic principles of well recognized results” de Pedro is most likely referring to the twelve-tone techniques used in these works, tendency towards regularity and predictability in rhythm and meter. “Serialism,” de Pedro wrote later, “is a school that at this time has produced clichés perfectly identifiable. There are few people with enough flexibility to avoid the monotonous and cerebral.”

Works that both de Pedro and several composers associated with older sound worlds and that “without trying to be reactionary, rather unfold within basic principles of well recognized results” such as *Anfiblástula* by Atiliano Auza León or Blas Emilio Atehortúa’s *Relieves* for large ensemble, were compositions that were highly chromatic, and modern in their sound. However, and this might be key to understanding their position, they still emphasized pitch relations and the harmonic connotations of the sounds chosen in the works. Other parameters like dynamics or orchestration are subservient to motivic development. The works are constructed with a sense of traditional linear directionality, that is, motives and gestures presented at the beginning of the work are later expanded, contracted, and varied. In this sense, these compositions had an affinity both with neoclassicism, and with the works of Schoenberg and Berg, where one can find that motivic cells explain both the melodic and the harmonic

---

5 Roque de Pedro 1965b, 16
6 Roque de Pedro 1966, 24.
changes. They were considered part of the avant-garde, but certainly its most conservative faction.

Strict twelve-tone compositions at the CLAEM were often classroom exercises that sometimes were performed, but were not particularly significant in a composer’s output. Example of this style of composition are found in Marco Aurelio Vanegas’s *Sonata para viola y piano* from 1963 and Mesías Maiguashca’s *Variaciones* for wind quartet. Both compositions reveal some of the technical aspects that were being studied in the composition classes most likely with Malipiero and Ginastera, during the first years of the CLAEM. Vanegas’s *Sonata para viola y piano* (1963) is a very linear twelve-tone composition. Vanegas uses the row A-E-D##-B-D-C#-F#-Ab-Bb-C-F as pitch material in original form for the majority of the piece. Formally, the piece adheres to classical sonatas, with three movements. The first movement begins in tempo *Andante tranquilo* that accelerates to an *Allegro Moderato* and ends *Piu mosso*. The second movement is formally organized as a *Scherzo-Trio*, and finally the third movement, titled *Sviluppo* (development in Italian), has a fast-slow-fast organization. The conservative and restricted use of twelve-tone rows within the formal constraints of a classical piano sonata strongly suggests that the piece was a learning exercise for Vanegas.

![Figure 5-1: Measures 1-5 of the Scherzo from the Sonata para viola y piano by Marco Aurelio Vanegas. As in most of the rest of the piece the main pitch material is the twelve-tone row A-E-D##-B-D-C#-F#-Ab-Bb-C-F](image)
Like Vanegas’s *Sonata*, Maiguascha’s *Variaciones* explores twelve-tone techniques in a set of twenty-two continuous variations, but it does so in a much more refined and subtle way. In Figures 5-2 and 5-3 we see how the series C-A-Ab-G-E-Eb-D-Db-B-F-F-Bb is frequently divided into two groups: (a) C-A-Ab-E-Eb-B-F-Bb presented simultaneous to a counter melody with the remainder of the series (b) G-D-Db-F#.

Figure 5-2: Maiguascha’s *Variaciones* for wind quartet Movement I “Preludio” mm.1-11. Notice how the twelve-tone row is divided between two voices as melody/countermelody.
Figure 5-3: Maiguashca’s *Variaciones* for wind quartet Movement I “Preludio” mm.36-40. Same division of the row into melody/countermelody.

The use of serial procedures to generate pitch material for a composition was not particularly rare. In fact, many composers continue using serial techniques and what became known as free serialism even until today. What is unusual and was identified as more or less conservative by most of the people I interviewed were compositions that otherwise did not explore the limits and boundaries of musical materials in any other way. Most compositions in this style, as I said, were considered student pieces, exercises in developing an applied knowledge of Schoenberg and the Second Viennese School. But even under this context, there was some room for dissent. Miguel Angel Rondano had been Ginastera’s student at the National Conservatory before being accepted in the first group of fellows of the CLAEM. Sharing with me some of his memories about classes with Malipiero and working with twelve-tone techniques he points to some of the initial aesthetic divisions that would occur among the members of the CLAEM:

Riccardo Malipiero was giving us classes on twelve-tone composition, and he asked us to do some exercises, including a piece for solo clarinet. So I did a piece the way I felt it should sound… in a way that I considered to be musical. Still dodecaphonic, of course. And then I did a second piece that I knew sounded
more like what everybody would expect, with pronounced contrasts and things like that. But I did that to fulfill the requirements, not because I thought it was nice or that it would actually work. And I brought to class both examples, and as I expected, everybody was in favor of the daring piece, not the exercise that I had made trying to be musical.7

Often when talking with composers at the CLAEM I had to be careful with how I interpret statements that created a simple binary opposition between a conservative and beauty-oriented compositional style and a daring avant-garde experimental style. In fact, where Rondano found a space for his particular interest was within electroacoustic music, a sound world that was in fact deemed much more daring. In his words, what happened was that when he did not embrace the “instrumental avant-garde music, [he] turned towards doing musique concrète, that is, making music with noises, with sonic objects, leaving aside atonality and twelve-tone techniques.”8

5.2 Electronic Music at the CLAEM

By far, the CLAEM is today remembered mainly as a reference point in the history of electroacoustic music in Latin America. This, however, is rarely the story that the fellows tell. Electroacoustic composition was an important part for many, but the contemporary notion of a composer solely dedicated to the composition of electroacoustic works—a particularity of today’s contemporary music scene in Latin America—was an absolute rarity back in the 1960s. However, the experimental nature of electroacoustic composition in that decade—in fact, both composers and the Argentinean press became used to labeling concerts of electroacoustic music by 1965 as “Experimental Concerts”—made it a favorite medium to explore new sound possibilities for those who had affinities with the avant-garde.

-----------------------
8 Ibid.
Here I first look at two compositions made by César Bolaños and Miguel Ángel Rondano during the first few years of the studio, when the conditions and setup were less than optimal. With these pieces I show how composers were exploring techniques from *musique concrète* and electronic music, and compare the production value of the two works. A brief mention of Rondano’s work at the CLAEM also emphasizes the multidisciplinary of his oeuvre, which brought together the artistic, theatrical and musical avant-garde. Then I examine three pieces from the last period of the laboratory, when it was fully functional. By looking at works that came out from a similar setup with the unique analog graphic-to-sound converter, I show some of the crucial characteristics that differentiated a piece that was successful at an international level from works that remained only moderately known outside the original circle of composers.

*The First Electronic Work at the CLAEM and Differentiating Incidental and Autonomous Music*

In a letter dated February 1964, Ginastera says that “The Electronic Music Laboratory was founded [in 1963] with the donation of tape-recorders and other technical equipment, allowing Armando Krieger to compose the first electronical [sic] work in Argentina: ‘Contrasts for two pianos and tape.’”

Ginastera was trying hard to impress the Foundation officers, but *Contrastes* (the original title of the piece), which was premiered in 1963, was a work with tape and pianos (and not solo tape), not electronic, and by no means was it the first piece of its kind in Argentina. The tape had been put together with the help of Alcides Lanza, using Lanza’s
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9 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Charles M. Hardin, February 6, 1964, folder 76, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
10 Around 1954, Mauricio Kagel (Argentina, b. 1931) had composed a *montage* piece as incidental music for an industrial exhibition in Mendoza, Argentina. The piece, called *Música para la Torre* (also known as *Musique de Tour*), consisted of microphone-recorded sounds. Other composers like Francisco Kröpfl, Cesar Franchisena, and Horacio Vaggione had also
personal equipment, and although both were fellows at the time, Ginastera is stretching the facts to argue that it was composed in the electronic music laboratory. In fact, since the laboratory was still not functional, the first concerts at the CLAEM were recorded on Lanza’s own Grundig recorder and with his microphones.

Since its premiere *Intensidad y Altura* (1964) by César Bolaños has been considered the first solo electroacoustic composition from the CLAEM. The autonomy of *Intensidad y Altura* as a concert piece was considered a significant characteristic that increased its prestige over other incidental electroacoustic works. It was important, during the 1960s in Buenos Aires, to differentiate between the use that a tape piece was going to have. For instance, in 1967 a document describing the list of electroacoustic pieces made at the CLAEM, one parameter was reserved for “destino,” which can be translated as destiny or function. The options were “for concert,” “for a company’s showroom,” “for theater,” “for ballet,” or “for film.” Among these “destinos,” the ones considered more significant were those meant to be performed on their own in concert. In other words, the lack of autonomy of works meant to be incidental music was a significant qualifier when evaluating electronic works.

Before his scholarship at the CLAEM, Cesar Bolaños had studied composition with Andrés Sas in Peru, and in 1959 had attended the Manhattan School of Music in New York. Between 1960 and 1963 Bolaños studied electronics at the R.C.A. (Radio Corporation of America) and experimented with electronic composition at least as early as 1960. Furthermore, the electronic part for Krieger’s work was actually executed by Alcides Lanza, who used his own equipment since the electronic laboratory was not ready yet. *Contrastes*, the original title of the piece, was for two pianos accompanied with tape. It was not a solo electroacoustic piece, an important difference for the composers at the time. Coriún Aharonián, “La música la tecnología y nosotros los latinoamericanos,” *Bazar Americano: Lulu* 9 [journal on-line]; available from http://www.bazaramericano.com/musica/lulu9/aharonian_latinoamericanos.asp; Internet; accessed 12 May 2003.

Anonymous, letter to Experimental Music Studios, School of Music, University of Illinois, ca. February, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
America) Institute. In the Christmas concert of 1963 he premiered his piece *Imanispatak* for choir at the CLAEM. But it was in the electronic studios and working with electronic media that Bolaños was most successful and comfortable.

*Intensidad y Altura* is based on the poem of the same name by Peruvian writer César Vallejo. In this piece Bolaños has a clearly differentiated foreground and background soundscape—that is, certain elements are presented more distinctively, with crispness and a definite position in the stereo field that feels closer, while the background is composed of sound materials presented in a mode that is often softer, with duller equalization, sometimes reverbed, in a spatial position that is diffuse and feels farther away.\(^{12}\) The background uses *musique concrète* techniques to transform the whispered recitation of Vallejo’s poem by three voices, and the recording of “small sheets of metal, wood chimes, [and] a medium sized cymbal.”\(^{13}\) White noise shaped through a band-pass filter and with some reverberation added to it completes the background, giving a sense of depth to it. The program notes (most likely written by Bolaños himself), describe this background as a “*concrète* and electronic part,”\(^{14}\) making reference to the techniques associated in the 1950s with composers who were part of the *Groupe de Recherches Musicales* (GRM) of the French National Radio-Television (RTF) and the composers in Cologne at the *Studio für Elektronische Musik*, of the West German Radio (WDR).

\(^{12}\) As Erickson says regarding the perception of foreground and background in electroacoustic music: “the experience is undeniably spatial, and not entirely different from the visual space of everyday life” (Erickson 1975, 138-139).

\(^{13}\) Untitled and undated [ca.1967] program notes to “Intensidad y Altura,” CLAEM Archives, ITDT.

\(^{14}\) Ibid.
More important, however, is the foreground, which divides the work into two parts. For
the first part Bolaños recorded the first four lines of Vallejo’s poem read backwards. The words
to this section are:

Quiero escribir pero me sale espuma
quiero decir muchísimo y me atollo
no hay cifra hablada que no sea suma
no hay pirámide escrita sin cogollo

They were recorded phonetically in mirror image like this

oiogok nis atíkse edimarip ia on
amus aés on ek adalba arfís ia on
oióta em y omisichum riced oréik
amupse elas em orép ribirkse oréik

After having recorded the poem this way, Bolaños played the tape backwards so that the words
would sound intelligible but in a way in which “attack and breathing are inverted.”

For the second part the text is recorded normally, but only parts of it (underlined in the
example) are used. The work ends with an extended elaboration on the letter ‘a’ of the last word,
‘cuerva.’

Quiero escribir pero me siento puma
quiero laurearme pero me encebollo
no hay voz hablada que no llegue a bruma
no hay dios ni hijo de dios sin desarrollo

Vámonos pues pore so a comer yerba
carne de llanto fruta de gemido
nuestra alma melancólica en conserva.

Vámonos, vámonos estoy herido
vámonos a beber lo ya bebido
vámonos cuervo a fecundar tu cuerva

______________________________
15 Ibid.
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From all the electroacoustic compositions produced at the CLAEM *Intensidad y Altura* has been one of the most successful, both for it historical value, and for the technical proficiency that Bolaños displayed at a stage where the studio was far from being fully functional.

*Miguel Angel Rondano and Mixed Media Collaborations*

Miguel Ángel Rondano was one of the students at the CLAEM that took greatest advantage of the possibility of interdisciplinary work with visual artists and audio-visual experimentation. The more he collaborated with artists on mixed media projects, the more popular he became within that particular community. Rondano was frequently asked to compose soundtracks for works of many Di Tella students in the other two art centers. The irreverence of the pop artists—one of the most important artistic trends during those years—was a good fit with the humor that Rondano was not afraid to display in his music. Among the many projects Rondano did at the time there are the soundtracks he created for a series of projections by Carlos Squirru entitled *La Pirámide de Saturno* and for an event titled *La muerte* with works by several pop artists. He was also invited to write the music for the documentary film *Cuatro pintores hoy*. Rondano has lost the recordings and scores of most of these early works, but I have recovered recordings of his electronic *Orobouros* (1964), and *Móviles (historieta electrónica, para espectáculo del Di Tella)* (ca.1964) and two of his works for piano, *Collages* (1963) and the *Tres Piezas para piano (Preludio, Intermedio y Tocata)* (1966). *Orobouros* uses the mythological snake that devours its own tale as inspiration for an electronic composition that uses multiple tape loops following one another after repeating anywhere from 3 to 20 times. The darkness of the *concrète* sound used for the loops and the incessant use of repetition, albeit of constantly changing material, create a very effective sensation of a beginning that becomes an end. The circularity of the piece references, according to Rondano, the alchemic progression of
any matter into the state of nigredo, that is, putrefaction or decomposition. The circularity is fulfilled when the materials return again, as lapis philosophoum (philosopher’s stone). The electronic Móviles, composed to be used in a dance by Marilú Marini and Ana Kamian, uses a mix of recorded voice sounds and electronic sounds produced by voltage controlled generators. It is much more linear and discursive than the circular Ouroboros, but maintains an eerie environment created by the disembodied voice that seems to scream a name in between the fragments of electronic sounds. This piece, like Ouroboros, is rich in its use of the stereo sound field, by not limiting it to left and right, but having at least five discernible points of sound origin: left, left-center, center, right-center, and right. Both pieces lack depth of sound, that is, all sounds are felt close to the listener, located in one plane only, instead of creating a clear differentiation between foreground and background proximity. Compared to Bolaños’s composition, dating around the same period, Rondano’s work comes across as flat in that regard, but the richness of his production was in his ability to make it relatable to artists in other fields, something that opened new opportunities for him.

In 1965 Rondano worked together with the artist Edgardo Giménez, several of the pop artists at the CAV, and once more with the dancer Marilú Marini on a joint collaboration called Microsucesos, a work that “oscillated between happening and theater,”16 The work bordered on the absurd, parodying the mass media of the time. As Lopez Anaya describes

Among others, there was a scene with a festive tone, with catchy TV jingles on the background and oranges being thrown across stage, while Marini danced to ‘a esa lechugita no le falta nada,’ a parody of a TV commercial by Zulma Faiad. In the complex storyline, Giménez showed up dressed as a rooster and gave away bouillon cubes and colored sunglasses to the audience.17

17 Ibid.
Rondano became one of the few composers that were able to breach the inexplicable distance between the artists in the multiple Centers at the Di Tella Institute and created channels of communication and collaboration between avant-garde production in dance, theater, music and visual arts.

Figure 5-4: Rondano was the only musician invited to the photo (second from left to right) when some of the pop artists from the Di Tella Institute made it to the first page of the magazine Primera Plana in 1966, which at the time with around 60,000 subscribers.

Three Electroacoustic Compositions from Final Years of the CLAEM

As we saw in the previous chapter, the greatest innovation that Reichenbach developed at the CLAEM was his analog graphic-to-sound converter, Catalina. Only three fully finished pieces came out of this machine, and they show both a wide variety of success between them, and the turn that electroacoustic composition was taking by the end of the 1960s in Latin America.
The materials used by Pedro Caryevschi to assemble his composition *Analogias Paraboloides* (1970) were the result of tracing a hyperbolic paraboloid in graph paper, and feeding it to Catalina. The converter was set to control first sinewave and then sawtooth wave generators, thus providing Caryevschi with two different timbres to use for the tape assembly. The process that Caryevschi had in mind to control the generator required “a high level of precision”\(^{18}\) and was possible only because of the graphic-to-sound converter. The converter was used then to “develop a series of variations whose structure was at the same time determined by the incremental curves of the mentioned model. The technical realization of this piece, given the precision needed,” said Caryevschi “was very arduous.”\(^{19}\)

![Diagram of Original Structure](image)

**Figure 5-5**: Labeled “Original Structure” for *Analogias paraboloides*, the first composition finished using the Analog Graphic Converter.

The piece exploits the precision for controlling oscillators through voltage controllers using Catalina. For example, the spectrogram of the work around 2’10” (Figure 5-6) clearly
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18 Program notes drafts, dated December 10, 1970, Aharonián-Paraskevaidis Archive.
19 Ibid.
shows how different fragments of this ‘original structure’ plotted for Catalina, are used as materials previous to the climax of the first part of the piece. The climax, in fact, comes around 2’40” with the full presentation of the structure, which can be clearly seen in the same spectrogram, figure 5-6.

Figure 5-6: Spectrogram for Analogias paraboloides, approximately between 2’10” and 3’22”.

Figure 5-6 also illustrates one of the weaknesses of the piece. Formally the work has three sections, one roughly from the beginning to 3’20”, the second one from 3’20” to 9’ and then a final section, as a coda, from 9’ until the end in 10’40”. The material used in section 2 (starting at the right side of Figure 5-6), although all electronically generated, is dramatically different from the first part, and the tension created by this contrast is never explored in the piece. There is only one moment of material unity. It comes when the original structure returns, now varied and with a wider spectrum, as one can see in the graphic of the time between 7’26” and 9’. However, the timbre presented in the earlier sections never returns.
Figure 5-7: Materials from the second section are pointillistic, the gestures are sudden and fast and of a very different timbre from the first section.

Figure 5-8: Material unity seen in the spectrogram for *Analogías paraboloides*, approximately between 7’26” and 9’ with the return of the paraboloid shaped sinewaves. Nevertheless, the materials used before this section are quite contrasting and the form of the piece lacks continuity.

The coda of the work uses materials similar to this second section, but its build-up is so poor, and starts after such an unprepared silence that it has been my experience that often audiences will clap by the end of section two and be taken completely by surprise by the appearance of the coda.
The second piece of the three works produced using Catalina is *Mnemon*. In *Mnemon*, José Ramón Maranzano explores the different tones generated when two waves are played at high amplitude and in close frequency. The illusion for the ear is a third sound in the lower frequency range (usually next to the 20hz range). However, like Caryevschi’s works, *Mnemon* in the end is formally poor, and seems more like an exploration of a discovered effect than a structured composition. There are two electronic *Mnemon* pieces, two more for chamber ensemble and tape, and two versions for symphonic orchestra. One of the versions for ensemble and tape was performed in 1970, and is much more interesting than its solo electronics counterpart.

The third composition, *La panadería* by Eduardo Kusnir, is considered one of the first classics of Latin American electroacoustic music. *La panadería* is a wonderful example of how humor and music can go together.

![Figure 5-9: Fragment of score fed to the graphic analog converter for *La panadería* (1970).](image)

In this piece different sound gestures recur and become identifiable events that transform throughout the composition, making it very dramatic and also humorous. The gestures become like actors in a play, and the piece, which lasts a little over nine minutes. In the concerts I
attended where the piece was played, it seemed to maintain an audience’s attention much more than *Mnemon* or *Analogías paraboloides.*\(^{20}\) On one hand *Mnemon* is an exercise exploring a particular perceptual illusion, while *Analogías* exploits the very accurate controlling of oscillators to generate a sonic representation of a mathematical model. On the other hand, *La panadería* uses the electronic media to create a musical work rich in ideas, dramatic in nature, and where the technology becomes a backdrop for the composer’s work.

One of the main differences between *La panadería* and the other two works written with Catalina was that *La panadería* was coming from a very different model for designing an electronic composition. There had been a previous version of this work, all for acoustic instruments. Kusnir remembers,

*La panadería* is an electronic realization—with the electronic media of the time—of a previous instrumental work that was also titled *La panadería.* That version was written with graphic notation, it was premiered in Cuba, and then it was performed later, around 1968, in Uruguay, a little before I joined the Di Tella.\(^{21}\)

As Kusnir shared this, I was curious as to why he had decided to transform a work that already existed in instrumental form and re-make it as an electronic work. Kusnir answered:

I was not interested in experimenting with the musical language; I wanted to experiment with sounds and timbre. And from the structural and formal point of view, *La panadería* was already finished. […] Reichenbach had created Catalina—the graphic analog converter—and it could read drawings very similar to the ones I had used in the score and interpret them in sound as frequency and amplitude. So my work then was to create the timbre. I took a long time working on timbre, something I normally do in all my works, electronic or instrumental.\(^{22}\)

Here Kusnir points out two of the three main differences that this piece has with Caryevschi’s and Maranzano’s works. While their two works were using sine and square waves,
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\(^{20}\) Here I am referring mostly to the Festival “La Música en el Di Tella: Resonancias de la modernidad,” between June 17-24, 2011 in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where the same audience listened to the three works.


\(^{22}\) Ibid.
Kusnir also complemented his sound palette with *concrète* sounds—most notably using the recording of accordion in different parts of the work as well as transformed voices. Still, even in the purely electronically generated sounds, the richness of timbre in Kusnir’s work was much higher than in the works by Maranzano or Caryevschi. He had focused on creating multi-component timbres that were much more attractive than the naked sinewaves that the other two composers were using. The second difference lies in the piece’s form. The formal plan of *La panadería* was, as Kusnir says, already finished. The electronic composition was going to share its form with the instrumental version, while *Mnemon* and *Analogías paraboloides* struggled to bring together different contrasting sections without much relation. Finally, a third important difference was the type of musical thinking Kusnir was using to develop his work. He remembers,

> When I finished the first part of *La panadería* we did an audition, so we all went inside the studio. Gandini and Kröpfl were there. He [Kröpfl] was the director of the laboratory. They listened and were a little bit shocked. The first commentary came from Francisco [Kröpfl] who said in a dismissive manner—at least I thought this at the time, even though later I understood what he said differently—‘This is not electronic music.’ And in a way he is right, because the thoughts, the discourse, the texture, the gestures are all instrumental. Even though I was not working with instruments, those gestures, those articulations were coming from instrumental music. And Gandini said ‘It is the first time I hear electronic music with silences’ [laughs].

> Both the gestures and silences used in *La panadería* make it a more compelling composition than the other two. However, the piece’s power to captivate also came from ideas derived directly from orchestral instrumentation. In other words, Kusnir was thinking of the piece as a new version of a work with a new instrumentation, while in their pieces Caryevschi and Maranzano were treating electronic music making as a tabula rasa of creation, thus their musical ideas seem to be simply reflecting the technical procedures or exploring an effect of a

---

23 Ibid.
new technology. Kusnir’s *La panadería* is considered today to be the first classic of Latin American electroacoustic composition. In 1992 the piece was awarded the *Euphonic d’or* at Bourges as one of the twenty most noteworthy works from the previous twenty years of the International Competition for Electroacoustic Music of Bourges. The competition, which ran from 1973 to 2009, was one of the world’s most significant forums for electroacoustic music until the closing of its hosting organization, the *Institut International de Musique Electroacoustique de Bourges* (IMEB) in 2011.

5.3 Improvisation, Aleatorism and Graphic Notation at the CLAEM

When asked in 1969 if he believed that young composers were giving excessive importance to experimental procedures, Gandini answered:

Maybe. I would like to remind you of something that Varèse said and I find quite on target: He would say that all the experimental works he did he threw away, that is, he only kept the ones that he thought were well made and ceased to be experimental. What this means is that from a specific perspective experimental music does not exist. Experimental procedures do. They only work when they stop being experimental and become music. What might happen is that the less skilled composers are the ones that exaggerate with the experimental.  

In this section I introduce different practices that were considered part of an ongoing intellectual process of experimentation in composition: improvisation, aleatoric procedures, and using graphic notation. First I look at the improvisation group formed at the CLAEM, and then I follow the problems faced by two composers, Ariel Martínez and Gabriel Brnčić as they adopt graphic notation and include large amounts of indeterminacy in their compositions.

Only a few number of composers—for example Oscar Bazán—were really engaged with improvisation, aleatorism, or the use of alternative graphic notations at the CLAEM before

---

1969. The work of John Cage made a strong impression on many composers before that date, but it did so much more on the philosophical side than actual compositions. The works of composers from the so called New York School—John Cage, Earl Brown, Morton Feldman, Christian Wolff—was known, but had not really made it into the halls of the CLAEM. And the ideas of open forms and freedom in performance had already been showcased in a 1965 concert during the Contemporary Music Festival. One particular concert emphasized aleatoric procedures and open forms with the works Mobile (1962) by Heinz Holliger, Music of Changes IV by John Cage, and Mobile for Shakespeare (1961) by the Austrian composer of Polish origins Roman Haubenstock-Ramati.

Figure 5-10: Haubenstock-Ramati’s Mobile for Shakespeare, performed in the Fourth Contemporary Music Festival at the CLAEM.

The Mobile for Shakespeare exemplifies some of the new interests in graphic notations that many fellows at the CLAEM, in part inspired by Gerardo Gandini, would have in the following years. The score is divided into three parts, the first for soprano and one percussionist, the second for piano and celesta, and the third for two percussionists and vibraphone. However,
as we see in figure 5-10, the parts are all contained in nested rectangles on the same page of the score. The outer square corresponds to part one, the middle to part two, and the innermost area to part three. The internal areas within each concentric rectangle are to be performed in clockwise or counterclockwise order. In addition, the work has further instructions for the performers regarding varied readings for tempi and dynamics. However, it was really in concerts of the Eighth Contemporary Music Festival that there is evidence that the aesthetic interests of the CLAEM had shifted toward more experimental grounds. The presence of Larry Austin, and the two pieces by Tauriello and Gandini that required an improvisation group were indicators that improvisation and experimentalism had gained prominence.

*Grupo de Experimentación Musical at the CLAEM*

The embrace of improvisatory practices, particularly by the last group of fellows in 1969-1970, was somewhat serendipitous. The first year, the annual series of student concerts ran into its first major complication when the fellows, with the hopes of having their first-year works performed by top-notch musicians from Buenos Aires, were told that there was no money in the budget that year for such performances. Ariel Martínez vividly remembered how this was solved.

> We had a meeting to complain, a meeting with Enrique Oteiza, the director of the Institute and we said ‘look, all the previous groups have had the best performers to play their pieces.’ This was a dream for many of us. […] And he said ‘Yes, I understand, but there is no money’ […]Pedro Caryevschi our spokesperson […] offered very coolly that the fellows could help somehow, that maybe we could find a solution. […] We would play our own pieces. So we made our works to be played by us. We had to discard the usual process of production, which was to write the flute part for [virtuoso performers like] Alfredo Iannelli. If somebody wanted to write a flute part, they would have to write it for me!\(^{25}\)

---

\(^{25}\) Ariel Martínez, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, July 9, 2008.
Taking matters into their own hands the composers decided on a long-term plan. For that year they organized only one concert instead of the usual two, and it did not include pieces by each individual fellow, but five collective improvisations with titles but no composer indicated by a new ensemble they formed, the *Grupo de Experimentación Musical*. The following year they only played pieces that would be written for the ensemble and with their performance capacity in mind.

After Gandini returned from Italy in mid-1967 he had developed an interest in improvisation groups, having learned about the practices of the *Gruppo di Improvvisazione Nuova Consonanza* founded by the Italian composer Franco Evangelisti, and the *Musica Elettronica Viva* group that had started in Rome the year before with Alvin Curran, Richard Teitelbaum, Frederic Rzewski, Allen Bryant, Carol Plantamura, Ivan Vandor, and Jon Phetteplace. Improvisation had earned renewed attention in the contemporary music scene with the rise of aleatorism, graphic notation, and the visibility of other music traditions that valued improvisation, primarily jazz, but also West African drumming and Hindustani classical music. The classes at the CLAEM, together with the reduced budget to hire performers, led to

---

26 The *Grupo de Experimentación Musical* was called, on different occasions, *Grupo de Improvisación Musical*, and also *GEDI*, standing for *Grupo Experimental de Improvisación*. Still, it was more widely known as the *GEM* or *Grupo de Experimentación Musical*.

27 *Pianos* was for three pianos and 24 hands. *Tres* was for recorder, viola and zither, *Objetos* was meant for different objects, *Voces* was indicated to be for voices and instruments, while *Suma* was to be performed with voices and tape. A large number of the fellows played in the ensemble during that first year: Jorge Antunes, Rafael Aponte-Ledée, León Biriotti, Jorge Blarduni, Gabriel Brnčić, Pedro Caryevschi, Bruno D’Astoli, Eduardo Kusnir, Beatriz Lockhart, José Ramón Maranzano, Ariel Martínez, Antonio Mastrogiovanni, Alejandro Nuñez Allauca, and Luis Zubillaga, all under the direction of Gerardo Gandini (although Gandini would deny that he was the director; he would argue that they would take turns depending on the work). Missing from the original-attending fellows are Aharonián—who had left already for France—and D’Astoli, Ranieri and Feinstein.

28 See Beal 2009.
the organic formation of an improvisation group that became a staple of the CLAEM during the last biennial and that fit well with the desires of composers at that particular time.

According to Martínez and Kusnir, Ginastera agreed with Gandini that it was very useful to have a space—a type of workshop—where composers could experiment with instruments, try new sounds and techniques, and have a hands-on experience with each other’s music. But he was not convinced that these should be taken to the stage as an ensemble. Ginastera had a very hard time accepting the avant-garde aesthetics that came out of the group’s improvisations. Kusnir remembered Ginastera telling them, “Well, this whole free improvisation group is good so that you all practice and experiment among yourselves with different things. But it is not really something you would show in a concert, right?”

Gabriel Brnčić was an avid participant of the group, and decided to formally explain in written form to Ginastera what it was that the group was doing. In an interview he commented,

> I wrote an introductory text [for the group] and it was well received by Ginastera. Really, he had asked for it, as a legitimation of *an ancestral practice* that now suddenly was novel under the perspective of contemporary music. It was about formalizing in real time the coming and going of an imaginary of contemporary music, of electroacoustic music as well… for that *we had to dominate the instruments and the procedures. Not everybody could do that.*

Trying to understand what was troublesome for Ginastera about the group it is useful to see how Brnčić presented his argument, both today, and back then. Groups for improvisation such as the one forming at the CLAEM were braking away from some of the most traditional values of the classical music tradition: technical dexterity, talent, and virtuoso performance. The composers were playing some instruments that they knew as performers—although most of them not at a professional level—and others that they were exploring for the first time. Brnčić final point, that “not everybody could do that” is compensating for accusations that the

---

30 Gabriel Brnčić, email with the author, Barcelona, December 4, 2008. My emphasis.
composers did not know how to play the instruments. He says they “dominate the instruments and the procedures,” that is, to achieve the results they intended. And improvisation was, in his words, “an ancestral practice.” Thus, it was already part of the classical music tradition, even if it had been forgotten for some time. The text requested by Ginastera is dated December 1, 1969.

In it, Brnčić writes about the objectives and benefits that this group has for the composers.

The creation of an ensemble for musical experimentation—that through controlled improvisation and direct contact with the sound materials provides new sources to contemporary musicians—is an active answer from avant-garde composers to some of the general problems of contemporary music. [...] The search of new sources and new materials characteristic of the avant-garde is a process that demands from oneself—and its proponents—a consciousness, a coherent realization that cannot be ‘accepted’ because it is experimental, but because it is representative and because it clearly expresses an authentic evolution.  

Like a laboratory—in fact, very much like the electronic music laboratory—the group was a type of experimental playground. In that space the composers could find “realizations,”—sonic materials—that were an “authentic evolution,” that is, something novel and original. In other words the eventual sound results that could come out of the improvised creations in the group would be add to the repertoire of techniques and sonorities of the composers. It was a workshop to develop new ideas. But was this validation enough to have these ensembles present their work in the concert stage?

Brnčić thought so, and he continued to make his argument by showing an important similarity to other more conventional ensembles: “The Grupo de Experimentación of CLAEM has a regular training schedule in sessions of improvisation that cover diverse procedures and degrees of playing.” The fact that there had to be rehearsals where composers would explore

---

31 Gabriel Brnčić, “Grupo de Experimentación Musical del Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales,” December 1, 1969, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
32 Ibid.
different options showed once more that this was not something that everybody could do. And he continues by explaining what improvisation entails.

This modality of musical activity [improvisation] can range from total freedom, going through diverse canonic forms, all the way to becoming a very defined scored where the aleatoric is completely regulated and refers only to some parameters. Usually rhythm is the freest factor. […] Finally, as an experimental aspect attached to the new conceptions of spectacles (and the concert is a spectacle)—conceptions that also troubles the contemporary musician—we complement the experiences with theatrical actions: scenery, lighting and movement.33

Brnčić’s makes it clear that there are different levels of control over improvisation. He also points out that among composers at the CLAEM there was less preoccupation with the rhythmic aspects of different compositions, as graphic notations were more focused on providing indications of textures and pitch-centered gestures. At the end of his three-page statement, Brnčić underlines a single sentence to single out as the conclusion of his presentation: “Therefore it is possible [for the audience] to be present at the birth of a process, and conceive it as a sonic spectacle.”34 The improvisation was showing real-time composition, and given his previous arguments, it was also fit to be on stage, at the concert level.

By the beginning of 1970 at least one critic was able to find interest in the presentations of the improvisation group and provide good criticism in a local music journal. It is interesting that he points out the success is the result of a series of “public rehearsals.”

In our country the most serious attempts [in improvisation] appeared within the CLAEM, and today they have achieved results of undeniable maturity. The concert [of May 25, 1970][…] is the result and synthesis of a long phase of public rehearsals, and it might define a series of musical and aesthetical ideas and objectives of Gandini’s group. The whole presentation was done with great efficiency; otherwise the 45 minutes of continuous music would have seemed interminable.35

33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
However, as we will see, not all critics were favorable and some of the criticism raised honest questions among the composers about their activities.

*Graphic Notation and Aleatorism in Martinez and Brnčić*

Ariel Martínez, like several other composers at the CLAEM in 1969-1970, had embarked on the use of novel notations to indicate gestures and time flexibilities to performers that traditional notations would not allow. This interest was certainly related to his experience with the improvisation group. With the use of new notations, a new component of craftsmanship and artistry becomes valuable in the creation of the score, which becomes almost an artwork itself. In 1969 Martínez composed his *Manual de Geometría* for clarinet, double bass, harpsichord, oboe, bassoon, trombone, vibraphone, flute, horn, violoncello, piano and harp.

![Flute part for Pentágonos](image)

**Figure 5-11**: Flute part for *Pentágonos*, one of the three sections of Ariel Martínez’s *Manual de Geometría* (1969). Each page of the score is 52cms. x 52 cms.
The work is divided into three sections titled *Pentágonos, Cuadrados*, and *Triángulos* (Pentagons, Squares and Triangles). In *Pentágonos* the parts for each instrument are written inside five small pentagons contained in one of five medium pentagons inside a large pentagon (see figure 5-11). Similarly, each part of *Cuadrados* consists of a large square with four squares inside, each of them with four smaller squares containing musical indications for the performers. *Triángulos* is written in a similar fashion, as can be seen in figure 5-12.

Figure 5-12: Double bass part for *Triángulos*, one of the three sections of Ariel Martínez’s *Manual de Geometría* (1969).

When criticisms of the composers’ and performers’ musicality emerged after some of the concerts given by the *Grupo de Experimentación Musical*, Martínez embarked on a new work that reflected the concern he and other composers had about the relevance and truthfulness behind these critiques. Some of them said that the performers “seemed more concerned with
demonstrating how these instruments should not be played than with making music.”

It had not been the first time that this had been brought up to the public eye. “In Buenos Aires” said Martínez, “there were people that believed and those who didn’t believe that this was music, or that it was worth doing that as an artistic and musical exploration. So we have to divide the fields between ‘us’ who believe and ‘them’ who don’t. He decided to call the piece _Nosotros y ellos (Us and Them)._ Martínez remembers,

> There was a composer that wrote in a newspaper and made a criticism of a concert by the improvisation group, in which he said that composers that did not know how to play instruments would be better off doing something else. He was criticizing our ability with our instruments. Our ability was quite varied. If it was about playing accordion you could not find many accordion players in Buenos Aires better than Allauca. […] I was not a professional flute player, I was a professional bandoneón player, but I was the flute player of the Orchestra Juventud Musical. I played in a symphonic orchestra. […] I was not professional because it was not my objective to be a public officer in an orchestra the rest of my life. […] Now, there were people that played very well, I was not the best or the worst. I would play the double bass, for instance. I have never studied a string instrument, and I don’t know how to play it. But I will take any instrument and do something and make it sound. It depends on what you have to do, for these improvisations we were playing things that did not require us to do any ‘tibidi tibidi tibidi’ [fast sounding]. We might need to do a bwoooooooo [slow sounding] and that was it. The stupid critic was just focused on the fact that we were not great performers on the instruments.

In a musical tradition where virtuosic dominion over one’s instrument was praised, the fact that these composers would take to the concert stage and play instruments that they did not know very well resulted in a tension that not only troubled the critics but also the composers.

Could the musicality of Gandini on the piano, Biriotti on the oboe or Nuñez Allauca on the accordion be translated to new instruments? How could these works, relying so much on the individual decisions of the performer, be better played by people who did not have as much technical proficiency as professionals did?

---

37 Ariel Martínez, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, July 9, 2008.
If we were to bring great performers they might not be able to play this music. They have great skill, but they don’t have any imagination because they are like typists. They read whatever is written and they won’t come up with their own idea ever. And what was interesting about that music we were playing in the improvisation group was the fact that it was spontaneous. […] When you don’t know how to play an instrument you are not conditioned and you might actually do something more interesting […] at least in relation with our [avant-garde] aesthetics. It was a discussion we were having at the time.\(^{38}\)

Spontaneity and the capacity to improvise in the style became more important than technical skill and expertise. Still, Martínez saw the logic of the argument the critics were posing:

What was more complicated about the critic is that he was somewhat right. We didn’t know how to correctly play the instruments… some better, some worse. But that was not what mattered. But there was some truth to the criticism. So the question was, to what extent is that which the critic is saying valid and ruining what we were trying to do?\(^{39}\)

The composition *Nosotros y Ellos* dealt directly through its notation with the fact that most of the performers were not going to be highly trained on their particular instrument. The piece had three wind instruments so Martínez played the flute, Biriotti the oboe, and Brnčić the English horn. It also had three stringed instruments so Biriotti and Brnčić would also play the violin, and the viola. Allauca played the cello, Gandini conducted, and Maranzano was in charge of the electronic part.\(^{40}\) Although Martínez was very good on the flute, Brnčić was a gifted violist, and Biriotti was a professional oboe player, the rest of the instruments were relatively new to them. The notation of the score, resembling a tablature, was meant to tell the players how to position their fingers on the instrument, and the paths that their hands would follow from one place to the other. The notation of this piece has a small band on top a wider

\(^{38}\) Ariel Martínez, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, July 9, 2008.
\(^{39}\) Ibid.
\(^{40}\) Ibid.
band in the middle and a small one on the bottom. “A road, like a band made of parallel lines,” said Martinez. The road-like set of bands moved up and down a double page, the height implying durations. “For example,” told me Martinez, “something happening in the center was one event per second. But higher on the page it was faster, and lower was slower.” The wide center band indicated moments of playing, which depended on the instrument used. For the string instruments, for instance the cello in figure 5-13, it was a kind of tablature that indicated more or less how to place the hand on the neck. Arrows indicate if you had to arpeggiate or strum them all at once, with the speed for doing so corresponding to the height of the event on the page. The size of the picture for the events indicated intensity: smaller things were softer, bigger things were louder.

They were very difficult to play. [...] You could not rely on some of the automation that exists in traditional writing where you can sometimes act like an automat: you see the notes and you play them and you are so trained that you don’t even think, you play, right? You read almost irrationally, even complicated things you can sight-read through them. Not this, you have to think when you are playing

Figure 5-13: A page of the cello part of Nosotros y Ellos (1970) by Ariel Martínez. The positions on the neck are indicated as positions in the graphic,

41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
43 Ibid.
while the position on the Y-axis of the page indicates the speed of playing. The size of certain finger indications indicates dynamics.

This very autochthonous way of indicating the actions worked well at the time because of the direct communication that the composers/performers had with Martínez. The piece was certainly an experiment, and one of the next pieces by Martínez takes some of the aspects of this work to a trombone and tape piece titled *Tromboffolón* I (1971). This piece was later revised and two more trombones were added in a piece called *Tromboffolón* II (1971-1978). Since both pieces use the same tape made at the CLAEM, it is easy to compare them and notice that even though the piece contains a high level of aleatorism, the patterns that Martínez wants are very specific.

Figure 5-14: Score near minute 4’48” of *Tromboffolón* I by Ariel Martínez. The upper part is an analog representation of the tape part to help the performer synchronize his playing with the recording. The lower part is the trombone part with only some endpoints being actual determinate pitches while in general just a contour across the staves is used. The amplitude of the sound is indicated in the beam of the notes, the wider the beam the louder these fragments should be performed.
Figure 5-15: Around minute 4.48 of Tromboffolón II by Ariel Martínez. Notice both the tape part and the trombone part from Tromboffolón I are kept identical, but now there are two new trombone parts.

Figure 5-16: Quodlibet VIII (1968) by Gabriel Brnčić.
Gabriel Brnčić also made use of graphic notation and aleatorism into his pieces at this time. Figure 5-16 shows the complete score for his piece *Quodlibet VIII* (1968), which was written for two performers (one with clarinet and viola, the other with flute and double bass) and tape. Here the width of the graphics indicate dynamics, while there are written instructions about modes of production and changes of instruments. The graphics also suggest different types of textures.

There were multiple causes for the rise in interest in graphic notation, improvisation and experimental procedures. Some were unlikely ones, like the fellows’ need to perform their own pieces given the CLAEM’s paltry budget. Others were circumstantial, like Gandini’s experience in Italy and the visit of Luis de Pablo, Eric Salzman, and Larry Austin to the CLAEM, all composers within the same cosmopolitan milieu who were also interested in experimentation and pushing music to its limits. All of these resulted in some unexpected consequences, such as the birth of the *Grupo de Experimentación Musical*, the programming of the contemporary music festival leaning much more towards improvisation, and a new appreciation of the craftwork involved in the creation of scores with new types of notation.

The question about the legitimacy of composers performing on instruments they did not dominate, and even further, the value of pieces that had high aleatorism and free improvisation was a concern for many of the fellows. As I mentioned earlier, Ginastera himself did not feel comfortable with what the ensemble was publically performing. But with hindsight it is clear that these experiences were central to the development of personal musical styles for different composers like Martínez, Brnčić and others. At the same time, experimentation resulted in some unexpected consequences. There was a breaking of the ritual. Specifically, composers participating in live improvisations as a type of spontaneous composition replaced the tradition
of virtuoso performers. New questions emerged as composers were forced to reflect upon authorship as a result of collective compositions. Today basically all of these composers have abandoned the use of graphic notation and no longer give performers such a broad space for improvisation. But the path traveled by them in this experimentation was invaluable to their career, and the CLAEM was central in providing a supportive space for such avant-garde adventures.

5.4 Timbre, Texture, and Sound Mass Compositions

In contrast to the composers exploring serial organizations, electronic compositions, or improvisatory practices as their entry point to the avant-garde, other composers like Mariano Etkin and Graciela Paraskevaidis were becoming increasingly interested in extended sonorities where texture and timbre were more important. At the same time they were avoiding musical directionality in the conventional sense by avoiding motivic development, and incorporating much looser rhythmic figures that were not necessarily perceived in a steady beat.

In the first concert of CLAEM students for 1965, Mariano Etkin presented Entropías, a work that although used free serial and post-serial techniques in their motivic materials and graphic notation in some sections, was moving into a new direction of exploration of timbre and texture. The work is written for brass sextet (trumpet, two horns, two trombones and a tuba). The piece is divided into two sections. The first is rhythmically active and rich in chromatic pitch material. In fact, one of its characteristics is the superimposition of different irrational rhythmic figures adding movement and erraticism to the sound of the ensemble. The first part becomes faster and faster, and more and more irregular until Etkin begins using graphic notation
to indicate pitches, giving the approximate number of seconds that each part lasts and writing this number on top of each phrase.

Figure 5-17: Entropías (mm.20-21) by Mariano Etkin. Notice the superimposition of irrational rhythmic figures such as seven sixteenth-notes in the space of 6, or 5 in the space of 4.

The second part, in contrast, is quite static. Small, sometimes microtonal movements replace the broader melodic lines, and the instruments come in and out, softly adding to a mass texture. The irrational rhythmic figures of the first part reappear but in a much more calmed and subdued presentation, in slower rhythms and simpler presentations.
Figure 5-18: *Entropias* (fragment of measure 37) by Mariano Etkin.
Figure 5-19: *Entropías* (mm. 59-61) by Mariano Etkin. Observe how the voices move by quarter tones or half tones at different times.

The result is a piece that, particularly starting at measure 30, privileges above all sound masses, polyphonic texture and interaction, and the timbral results of the orchestration.

Etkin’s work the following year, *Estáticamóvil I* (1966) for four double basses, two trombones, harpsichord, harmonium, and percussion ensemble followed this path, but in a more dramatic way. Evidently noticing the unique organization of pitches and rhythms into blocks of sound the critics in *La Nación* gave the work a mixed review: “It gives the idea, by the way it accumulates effects, that it is trying to emulate the noise of an airplane engine. Nonetheless, some of its combinations are interesting.”

The piece, much more than *Entropías*, resembles Etkin’s mature works, with prolonged dissonant sonorities, an interest in static masses that develop soundscapes rich in overtones.

---

Etkin was not the only composer that had developed a sincere interest in the music of Xenakis, Varèse, and various Polish composers. The work *Elejia* (1966) by Rafael Aponte Ledée, for example, also explored sound mass compositions in the Polish vein of Serocki (Poland, 1922-1981) or Penderecki, and clearly reflected the influence of Xenakis as mentioned in Chapter 3. Xenakis’s visit probably influenced Graciela Paraskevaídis more than anybody else at the CLAEM.

Paraskevaídis’s first student piece at the CLAEM, *Parámetros* explored pointillistic writing, with simple rhythmic figures and often a steady pulse. The very disjunct but energetic melodic lines resemble more short bursts of energy that continuous streams. As one can guess from the title, Paraskevaídis explores different amount of control over various musical parameters in the ensemble. The intervalllic ordering is very rigorous and although not strictly a twelve-tone composition, one can see the interest of Paraskevaídis to avoid repeating pitch classes before they all appear. Contrasting this, her piece the following year, *Combinatoria II*, scored for trombone, piano, percussion and tape, is written without exact rhythmic notation, but with the time elapsed in minutes and seconds above the systems (Figure 5-20). The magnetic tape is indicated as a dark continuous line when sounding, and disappears just like any other instrument when it is not. Paraskevaídis continues her predilection of avoiding melodic continuity by presenting the melodic material with wide leaps, and in short spurts that prevent the listener from creating any continuity outside the sonic space. However, it is the overall sound mass result which seems to be her main concern in this composition. The individual events are subdued by the overarching textural fluctuation, while the appearance and disappearance of voices in the orchestration underlines the importance given to composite timbre of the piece. As we will see in the last two sections of this chapter, stylistically,
Paraskevaídis’s continued exploring these elements during the years that followed, but her embrace of the avant-garde, like that of Etkin, Martínez, and many others, went beyond simple compositional procedures.

Figure 5-20: *Combinatoria II* (minute 3’ to 3’30”) by Graciela Paraskevaídis.
Both Paraskevaídis and Etkin were successful in joining the avant-garde, and their own particular assimilation of the works of other composers coming from the fringes of this tradition—Varèse, Xenakis, Feldman, for example—gave them a particular voice that gained them recognition, particularly in Europe. Like many of the fellows coming from Buenos Aires, they had already begun their journey from an important cosmopolitan city, but it was crucial to them to find a way to avoid repeating the models that the previous generation had followed. As their compositions moved away from pitch and towards texture and timbre as central parameters, they provided a new local variant to an international trend.

PART TWO: Embodying the Avant-Garde, Avant-Garde as Way of Being

5.5 Embracing the Avant-Garde

So far this chapter has shown a couple of the stylistic characteristics associated with what the critics were calling music interested in “renovation, of revolutionary tendency, and essentially experimental.” However, I have suggested that the avant-garde was not simply a new compositional trend to be followed. It was a different positioning from which to face composition as a process. For many of the composers at the CLAEM, it was the only meaningful way of entering and embracing the classical music art world. To present my argument I have decided to provide two short biographical sketches—first of Paraskevaídis, and then of Etkin—that contextualize my discussion. After these, I will address the issue at hand by exploring how these two composers and good friends came to embrace the concept of avant-garde in both written and sonic discourse and how this was part of a larger critique to the concept of art that they were inheriting from previous generations, and their main entry point
into cosmopolitan discourses about music making. The final part of this section explores how the avant-garde became an embodied experience, how it was related to all other aspects of musical life, and how the concept of musical militancy became central in the stories these composers tell about themselves.

The argument that I am about to make here is twofold. First, Etkin and Paraskevaidis’s path to embrace the avant-garde involved critiquing artistic modernism as represented in the figure of the older and more established Argentinean composer, Alberto Ginastera. They worked to negotiate the contradictions of generating a critique of the dominant discourses imposed from Europe and the U.S., but did so from within the traditionally Eurocentric Western classical music art world to which they belonged.

Second, I argue here that the particular compositional trends that they both embrace—including their interest in the music of Xenakis, various Polish composers, Varèse, and in the case of Etkin, Feldman—made sense for them as artists from Latin America wanting to fully join the avant-garde. They perceived this music as outside of the great European tradition, and as such, they saw in it and example of how to gain a place in the avant-garde while coming from outside the usual places. And it was important that Xenakis, Varèse or any of these composers had done this by any type of self-exoticization, or by highlighting their otherness. Precisely the opposite, they exemplified a universalist way of gaining acceptance in the transnational world of music composition without following the models of the mainstream composers—mostly represented by the Darmstadt Summer Courses of the 1950s and early 1960s.
Biographical Sketch of Graciela Paraskevaïdis

Graciela Paraskevaïdis was born in Argentina in 1940, has lived in Uruguay since 1975, and since 1980 has held dual citizenship in Argentina and Uruguay.\textsuperscript{45} Even before becoming a fellow, Paraskevaïdis took advantage of the visiting scholars at the CLAEM and tried to attend as many events as possible during the years 1963-64. After her fellowship in 1965-66 she spent 1968-1971 in Germany on a scholarship to study with Wolfgang Fortner at the Freiburger Musikhochschule. Paraskevaïdis married Coriún Aharonián in 1975. When the military dictatorship prohibited Aharonián from teaching in Uruguay, Paraskevaïdis took different jobs outside academia to financially help her family, including work at a center for economic research and the Cinemateca Uruguaya, which helped her keep in close contact with art films, a passion that she developed in her youth in Buenos Aires.\textsuperscript{46} In the meantime, Aharonián kept teaching private lessons, writing, and traveling. In 1984 Paraskevaïdis spent a year in Berlin as part of the artists residency program of the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst. In 1985, as democracy returned to Uruguay, she joined the Escuela Universitaria de Música at the Universidad de la República, and for the next seven years tried to participate in the reform of the music program. Failure to achieve results after much hard work led her to frustration and she left the position in 1992. This was the last time that Paraskevaïdis would work in academia. As she told me “After that, my relationship with music institutions in general became nonexistent.”\textsuperscript{47} She went back to work at the Cinemateca Uruguaya in 1992. In the meantime, Paraskevaïdis maintained an intense work schedule, meeting with private students from all

\textsuperscript{45} For a full biography of Paraskevaïdis see: http://www.gp-magma.net/bio_ingles.html (accessed February 2, 2012).
\textsuperscript{46} The Center for Economic Research was a private organization that started with the economists that had decided to stay in Uruguay but worked outside the state University, since at the time the military had intervened in it. As the center betrayed its originally leftist orientation, Graciela left her position and focused on her work for the Cinemateca Uruguaya.
\textsuperscript{47} Paraskevaïdis, interview with the author, Montevideo, August 19, 2008.
across Latin America to instruct them both in composition and in the history of Latin American contemporary music. Her schedule grew even busier with her retirement in 1996.

She has more than sixty works in her catalog, all of them for ensemble or solo instrument. Often Paraskevaïdis makes reference to the poetry of Juan Gelman (Argentina, 1930) (for example in sendas (1992), libres en el sonido presos en el sonido (1997), algún sonido de la vida (1993) and ...a hombros del ruiseñor (1997) and the Uruguayan writer Idea Vilariño (1920-2009) (for example solos (1998) and No quiero oir más campanas (1995). In addition to these, her most significant works include the series of seven magma written between 1966 and 1984: todavía no (1979), huauqui (1975), contra la olvidacion (1998), un lado, otro lado (1984), "y allá andará según se dice" (2005) and álibi (2008). Her works have been performed across Latin America and in Europe by performers like the Ensemble Aventure, Ensemble SurPlus, the Orquesta Experimental de Instrumentos Nativos, Sonic Arts SaxophonQuartett, Freiburger Schlagzeugquartett, Beatriz Balzi, and the Núcleo Música Nueva de Montevideo.

The titles of her compositions are often short, and always leave something implicit, unsaid. They are usually fragments of poems or speeches (left leaders being her preference: e.g. Fidel Castro and Sub-Comandante Marcos). In her compositions Paraskevaïdis presents static or immobile contours with heavily dissonant and mobile interiors. Often her orchestration focuses on creating timbral and textural density, using intervals as building blocks for timbre, with strong overtones and differentials, using microtones, and extreme registers of the instruments involved. Important traits in her works include an overall austerity and self-restraint particularly reflected in the use of minimal materials and variations on them, instrumental gestures that are condensed, and instrumentation that is reduced. Her works have a tremendous energy and at the
same time often seem to be temporally immobile. She rarely speaks about her own works, preferring to comment on other composers from Latin America, but on the occasion of a self-portrait, she described them as showing two qualities: energy and resistance.

[...] When I talk about musical energy I don’t have any esoteric or mystical connotations in mind. I mean the energy in sounds (in the same sense given to them by Edgar Varèse and Silvestre Revueltas, for example): blocks of charges and discharges, diffusion and retraction, whose flow is moving, displacing and clashing against blocks of velocity, frequency, intensity, timbre, density, volume, space, and through structural silences that make all of them possible.

Here, she makes a point in signaling the scientificty of her use of the word energy and presents sound elements as grounded on ideas of physics. Paraskevaídis continues,

And when I say resistance, I mean the resistance that silence can create opposing sound and vice versa. [...] I also mean resistance as an internal strength that develops to ‘burn fears’ (like Juan Gelman would say) and is created to survive the fringe situations in which we are placed. I also mean the resistance we offer when we defend those things we believe in without a doubt.48

Paraskevaídis makes this double reference to resistance as an element present in musical sound—silence opposing sound and vice versa—and as its experience in real life—to situations and as a way of defending beliefs—in a way that she creates an association between the apparently autonomous music and everyday being. She emphasizes that her music does have a relation to her socio-historical space, and arguably, that her choice of musical voice is a sign standing for deeper values and principles. In fact, she maintains that there are two origins for this interest in energy and resistance. First, from belonging doubly to a minority—Greek ethnicity in Uruguay and Argentina, and being a composer as a minority49 and second, for having lived extreme situations, both “the after effects of a childhood illness and of several civil

49 She says: “on one hand ethnic minority and on the other a minority in compositional choice.” Ibid.
and military dictatorships.” Paraskevaídis, in her writing, recognizes the challenges presented by her decision to live in Uruguay and compose within the avant-garde art world. She says:

To be a composer (male or female) born under the imposed strong influence and inheritance of western European “white” Christian and bourgeois culture, and willingly living in a third world country, implies the assumption of the dangers and challenges of such a choice, a choice [of] willing defying culture and music models established by a dominating north centric first world.

Undoubtedly there is a tension here between the local resistance to the cultural practices and music models that were coming from Europe and the U.S., and the desire to participate in a cosmopolitan world to which Buenos Aires and Graciela’s early education, training and socialization had prepared her for.

Parallel to her work as a composer Paraskevaídis has had a significant career as a musicologist. She has written two books focused on the works and lives of Uruguayan composers Eduardo Fabini and Luis Campodónico. She is coeditor of the website Latinoamerica-musica.net. She has given courses in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Uruguay, as well as in Europe (Austria, Germany, Greece, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom). Her writings on Latin American music have appeared in the journals Pauta, Revista Musical Chilena and MusikTexte. Every time I go to Montevideo I ask Paraskevaídis to give me a lesson on contemporary Latin American classical music. I have yet to find someone with a better grasp of the multiple compositional tendencies, the relationship between older and younger generations of composers, and the institutional frames at work across the region.

---

50 Ibid. Paraskevaídis suffered poliomyelitis as a child, and has struggled since with physical movement in one side of her body.
51 Paraskevaídis 1996, 2.
Biographical Sketch of Mariano Etkin

Mariano Etkin was born in Argentina in 1943 and was the youngest student at the CLAEM. As a young piano student he felt the history of music ended “basically with Debussy. That is where it ended for my piano teacher. But one day”—he says—“I found a book brought home by my dad called Introducción a la música de nuestro tiempo by Juan Carlos Paz. So I started reading. It was an absolute discovery, and it changed my life. I was 13 or 14 years old.”

Interested in what he was discovering, Etkin started studying composition with Guillermo Grätzer. As an adolescent he was tremendously gifted and older composers in Buenos Aires like Alcides Lanza, Armando Krieger, Antonio Tauriello and Gerardo Gandini began spending time with him and including him in their discussions about music. After his 1965-66 fellowship at the CLAEM, Etkin studied composition with Luciano Berio at Julliard, took conducting courses with Pierre Boulez, in Basel, Switzerland, and worked in Utrecht with Gottfried Koenig. When he returned to Buenos Aires he had the opportunity once more to attend the CLAEM during its last year, in 1971.

Like Paraskevaidis in Uruguay, Etkin had to live through some of the harshest years in the history of Argentina. After the Di Tella Etkin began teaching at the Universidad de Tucumán (1972-1976) but those years were marked by the rise of the urban and rural guerillas as Argentina moved towards some of its most tense moments. Etkin resigned his post in Tucumán two weeks before the coup d’état in 1976, after the new department head of the Arts program—a retired army officer—called him to his office and told him

“Look professor, I wanted to talk to you, because I wanted to say that you shouldn’t get into strange things, because who knows, we don’t want you to

appear dead in a ditch.’” That day I told my wife: “It is time for us to leave here.”

In 1977 he started working at the University of Rio Cuarto which was one of the first universities taken over by the military dictatorship, and Etkin, like more than one hundred other professors of the University, was forced to quit. Left only with his job at the Universidad Nacional del Litoral in the city of Santa Fé, he had to deal with some of the restrictions of living under a military dictatorship:

I self-censored some words. For example, I was teaching music history and I would never say the word ‘bourgeoisie.’ That was a word that was immediately associated with the Marxist-Leninist vocabulary. […] Then there was a student I would not recognize and I would ask someone who I more or less trusted ‘Do you know who that is?’ and they said to me ‘Be careful.’ She was a tira [spy for the military]. […] And in 1978 they handed me this [He shows me a multi-page pamphlet in Figure 5-21]. We were made to sign a receipt for it, and share it with our colleagues.

The pamphlet that Etkin showed me, more than 50 pages long, was his own reminder of the fear that was being spread across the country during the 1976-1983 dictatorship. It explained different instances, since preschool and all the way to university level, where teachers could find the origins of Marxist thinking. He kept it close, so he would always remember how hard those years were. Working in Argentina, for those who decided to stay, left a permanent mark and became a constant shared referent for composers, performers and conductors.

In 1977 Etkin had been visiting lecturer for the spring semester at McGill University in Montreal, so when the situation in Santa Fé became unbearable he returned to McGill in 1980 for two years, and later found a job at the Wilfrid Laurier University in Ontario. When democracy returned to Argentina and as he was faced with the possibility of tenure in a Canadian university Etkin had to make a choice. He decided to go back to Argentina: “My friends in Canada told me I was crazy, and when I got back to Argentina my friends here told me I was crazy.” Luckily for Etkin, a new opportunity opened at the Universidad Nacional de La Plata, where he has worked for more than 25 years.

As a teacher Etkin has been a crucial figure in the formation of the current young generation of Argentinean composers like Maria Cecilia Villanueva (Argentina 1964) and Erik Oña (Argentina 1961). He has taught courses at many institutions, among them the Royal

---

54 Etkin, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, August 15, 2008.
Etkin’s music has been performed widely in Latin America, in several festivals of the ISCM (Toronto, Amsterdam, Oslo and Essen), as well as numerous venues in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. German audiences have been particularly receptive to Etkin’s works, and he has received commissions from Radio Bremen, Radio Deutschlandfunk, Ensemble Aventure and the Freiburger Schlagzeug Ensemble. Etkin has written articles about composition in Latin America, the music of Morton Feldman, John Cage, Gerardo Gandini and Charles Ives.

Like Paraskevaïdis, Etkin found inspiration in the works of composers that he deemed on the fringes of the classical music art world.

My generation, and more concretely, the generation that went to the Di Tella in the 1960s, was educated in a bipolar musical world. On one hand Stravinsky, neoclassicism, nationalism, and in general the world of tonic centers and of tonal functions, and on the other the Second Viennese School […] But both came from a musical ontology where pitch was the central parameter. […] When I realized, and well, Graciela too, that there was a world that was different… a world coming from Varèse, the world of Xenakis. When he came to the Di Tella it was earth shattering for us! And add to that that the library that the Rockefeller had donated to the Di Tella had a lot of scores from Feldman, Cage and Brown.!

Etkin’s attraction to the composers he lists is not surprising since his interest in moving away from pitch as a central parameter resonated with these New York composers and with Xenakis’s works. Etkin’s compositions give particular importance to silence, reiteration and timbral richness. His pieces usually evolve slowly, and there is a particular delight in sustained sounds interacting with one another. Pitch works often as a component of composite timbres achieved through unusual orchestrations and as part of delicate sound masses.

Among his most significant works are Soles (1967), Muriendo entonces (1969), Música Ritual (1974), Otros soles (1976), Caminos de cornisa (1985), Resplandores sombras (1986),

Recóndita Armonía (1987), Caminos de Caminos (1989), cifuncho (1992), Taltal (1993), La naturaleza de las cosas (2001), and Flores blancas (2006). Because of the temporal dilation in his works, and delicate use of dynamics, his works tend to create desolate and at the same time beautiful soundscapes.\(^{56}\)

*Etkin and Paraskevaídis Together*

I had spent a lot of time separately with Etkin and Paraskevaídis before the first time I was able to talk to them together. Paraskevaídis lives in Montevideo, and Etkin in Buenos Aires, and they both have very busy schedules, so I was thrilled to learn that we would be able to meet. As usual, I had decided to arrive fifteen minutes early to our appointment to be sure we could get a quiet spot, since coffee shops in Buenos Aires tend to be both busy and loud. I was surprised to see they were already there. They both laughed when they saw me and invited me to join them. “We decided to meet earlier and gossip for a little. You know, chit chat that a serious musicologist shouldn’t be concerned with,” Paraskevaídis said jokingly.\(^{57}\) Besides being a composer, she is a well-respected musicologist and we had discussed several times my particular approach to studying classical composers and my interests in the stories they tell about themselves. She had frequently said to me that details about their personal lives was just embellishment around the music; the music had to speak for itself.

When we started talking I soon realized that their ties went well beyond the professional. A story that surfaced rapidly was that of Etkin being the person who had introduced Paraskevaídis to Coriún Aharonián, her partner of more than thirty years. Like most old friends, they told stories and shared inside jokes. Their conversation included expressions in German—

\(^{56}\) Etkin only has one electroacoustic work, dating from his time at the Di Tella in 1971.  
they have both spent significant time in Europe—and words in Lunfardo, that curious dialect from Argentina and Uruguay that is almost unintelligible to any other Spanish speaker. It also surfaced that Paraskevaïdis and Etkin’s parents had been friends, and they had known each other for a while, but their friendship solidified during the two years they shared as fellows at the CLAEM during 1965-66. Their time at the Institute marks a key moment for both of them in their embrace of avant-garde music—that is, adopting its practices, reflecting upon its meaning, and understanding what it meant to them.

Figure 5-22: Coriún Aharonián, Mariano Etkin and Graciela Paraskevaïdis in Bremen, Germany, May 27, 1970. Courtesy of Aharonián-Paraskevaïdis.

Unlike many of the other Latin American composers who attended the Di Tella, most composers from Buenos Aires, precisely because of the cosmopolitanism of the city, had already been introduced to the most recent technical experiments of the European and North American composers. One of the stories that Paraskevaïdis and Etkin vividly recalled was about the day that they received their mail-order copies of *Silence*, a collection of John Cage’s
writings and lectures that must have read like a manifesto for the young composers. “Many artists and intellectuals [at the time]” said Etkin “believed that there could be an ‘avant-garde’ originated in Latin America to which the doors of the festivals and concerts organized in the countries of the ‘center’ would open.”\textsuperscript{58} Undoubtedly in his own group of fellows there were several, including Etkin, who held this belief.

Even though both Etkin and Paraskevaídís privilege in their own life stories their years at the Di Tella Institute they also look at the situation critically, and their critiques frequently return to the metaphors of center/periphery as they were used in the discourse of developmentalism. Their criticism of the Di Tella project also problematizes terms such as ‘modernize’ or ‘developed world’ by putting them in quotation marks. For instance, Etkin notes that “the main purpose of the [Di Tella music] Center was to ‘modernize’—‘civilize’—the Latin American composers following the models of development coming from the central countries.”\textsuperscript{59} Etkin and Paraskevaídís were not convinced of the validity of this particular model for the arts, and saw in the avant-garde worlds of Xenakis and Varèse a possibility for stepping outside the hegemonic ideas about art music as they were constructed from the metropolitan European centers.

A key aspect of Etkin and Paraskevaídís’s memories of the Di Tella Institute was the critical rejection of old models of how to be an art composer, something embodied more than anything perhaps in the figure of Ginastera. The rebelliousness against Ginastera that Schröder described earlier went deeper than graduation ceremonies. For them—like many other

\textsuperscript{58} Etkin 1989, 52-53.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid, 53. Just like the term ‘modernize’ Etkin usually puts the term ‘developed world’ within quotation marks, and he often incorporates in his writing the metaphors of center/periphery that point to broader ideas of dependency theory (although he probably does not use these terms as much as Paraskevaídís or Aharonián do).
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cosmopolitans around the world at the time—the modernism presented by Ginastera, based on the European models of Schoenberg, Bartók, Stravinsky and Berg, was outdated. For Ginastera it was quite the contrary; for example, he told Schröder that he was happy when critics mentioned him in connection to figure like Schoenberg and Berg.  

Etkin and Paraskevaïdis felt that Ginastera thought of the avant-garde as a style that could be learned, a technique like serialism that one could dominate and apply to compositions. Indeed, his works during the 1960s had attempted to incorporate some of the techniques of the European and American vanguard, and works such as the Cantata para América Mágica or the operas Don Rodrigo, and Bomarzo, included a mix of serialized pitches and rhythms, microtonality, and aleatoric rhythms. However, for Etkin and Paraskevaïdis, and many others at the time, the avant-garde was an attitude, a position from which they felt they could attack the reified structures of conservative art. It was both a way of thinking and of being that found an output in different musical styles. They criticized Ginastera’s works as opportunistic attempts to maintain relevance, and not a sincere commitment to writing music of his time.  

“[Ginastera] realized”—said Etkin in one of our interviews—“that there was a wave of avant-garde that he could not ignore if he wanted to continue to be a prestigious person. There was no way he would stay on the margins.” In a sense, Ginastera was not experimenting, but relying on techniques that had already been used successfully by other composers. He was proud to be standing next to Schoenberg and Berg. Ginastera must have felt that he was continuing their legacy, while what composers like Etkin and Paraskevaïdis wanted was to remove the weight of those legacies and have a fresh start, so to speak.  

---

60 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Josefina Schröder, March 7, 1966, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.  
61 See Pola Suarez Urtubey 1972.  
Embodiment of the Avant-Garde

Etkin, Paraskevaidis, and many other composers that went through the CLAEM easily adopted and embraced the musical avant-garde because it provided a desirable space for sonic production. It had the potential to both challenge the previous models followed by local composers like Ginastera and the ability to open for them a space among cosmopolitan composers who were deemed peripheral and had gained recognition by subverting certain parameters of musical composition. The composers saw the musical avant-garde as a strong, embodied experience, capable of affecting not only emotionally but physically as well. Mariano Etkin remembers that the more adventurous works could sometimes shock and generate surprising responses, even from composers inside the CLAEM:

When the fellowship term was just starting, that is in early 1965, there was a reunion ... with all the fellows. ...We were going to listen to each other’s music, to know each other musically...some of us started playing our music. And one of the fellows, and this I remember perfectly, he had such a shock when he heard our music... a shock of the brutal aesthetic contrast with what he did, which was more or less post-Schubert ... he felt physically sick. I remember him going to the bathroom [and all]. Some of them were never able to recover ... when they were faced with the reality of current music it caused them a tremendous emotional disequilibrium.63

Evidently, the physical reaction remembered by Etkin was a very tangible and bodily response to the music. The reaction also reinforced a notion that the avant-garde was somehow the correct path to be following at that time. The music clearly had the ability to shake the status-quo as embodied by conservative musical practices described as post-Schubert, meaning, rooted in the Romantic tradition of nineteenth-century Europe. The event described was an opportunity to “know each other musically,” that is, to listen and understand sonically each

63 Etkin, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, August 1, 2005.
other’s pieces and musical interests. With the visceral reaction to this moment of sharing, it became also a sign where avant-garde sound becomes interpreted as real, authentic and truthful.

Talking about aesthetics with Paraskevaídis one afternoon, I came to a better understanding of how music affected her, and how she related these aspects of authenticity and truth to her own bodily experience. I quote our interview extensively, since I feel that her answer to my question sheds important insight into the way the avant-garde is experienced and embodied:

Eduardo Herrera: You say that there are good works and bad works, and I wonder how these words are both used to denote aesthetics and at the same time ethics. We say there are good actions and bad actions, using the same words. What is something good and something bad in music today?

Graciela Paraskevaídis: Precisely, with ethics as the starting point, you can say that bad works are also lying to you. And good ones are truthful. Truthful in the sense that you feel the composer’s intention to communicate a truth, a rupture. Truthful are works that break codes, that establish a fringe situation, that go to the edge of the cliff, that are trying something radical, that are taking risks. There are works that are very well done, but you know they were made the way they were because it was going to work. Because the composer knew that what he or she was doing was going to work. And that is very comfortable. [...] And they might even be good pieces, but I am interested less in that than in the first option. That other option is for me a meeting place of ethics, of political and ethical commitment, by transmitting something risky and that breaks with something before it. It might be in the structure, in the use of time, in the material… something that not only causes in me a speculative and theoretical reflection, but that at the same time is sensible and visceral. If those three things happen, that is going to indicate that there was a true ethical, political and aesthetical commitment. And that work has a long lasting transcendence in me, I will want to hear it again, I will want to know it better, to share it. I think that if those three things happen here [points to her head], hear [points to her heart], and here [points to her gut area], then the work is good. 64

Successful musical composition for Paraskevaídis can threaten and challenge the order by “taking risks,” or may assert and preserve established musical codes. Her preference for the first corresponds to the usual avant-garde rhetoric of rupture. Her experience to interpret this

64 Paraskevaídis, interview with the author, Montevideo, August 19, 2008.
rupture passes through three places in her body, her head—the speculative and theoretical—, her heart—the sensible—, and her guts, the bowels, the entrails—the visceral. They are fully felt in the body, and they are also expressions of truth. She values the risk taken by exploring new possibilities in a way that those works that use well known procedures she associates with lying.

Having known Paraskevaídis for several years, I was not particularly surprised by how easy it was for her to point out her associations between aesthetics and ethics. What did surprise me was the association with her body; I was perhaps expecting the common binary opposition between the rational and the emotional, but instead she offered a three-part model that separated the sensible form the visceral. And I was particularly attracted to her association of viscerality with her stomach, since I immediately remembered Etkin’s description of the young fellow running to the bathroom, sick from aesthetic shock.

These two stories have other implications as well. Causing a physical reaction that was instinctual and visceral showed avant-garde aesthetics to be somewhat authentic, valid and truthful. It was “the reality of current music,” thus outdating works that did not share the ultra-modern musical practices. They were also truthful because they were “taking risks” thus diminishing the validity of other works. Etkin and Paraskevaídis have served here as specific examples, but one can generalize that during the 1960s in Buenos Aires, and because of the CLAEM, the adhesion to avant-garde musical practices and its ethos became a hegemonic discourse that dismissed other possible paths of music making. The avant-garde became institutionalized and was alienating those outside. The desire to be on the fringes of what art was, became, to some extent, the mainstream.

This points to a curious situation of an institutionalized avant-garde, which certainly does not correspond to Bürger’s theory of avant-garde—problematic if taken to be only one
theory to comprehend all avant-garde movements.\textsuperscript{65} For Bürger, the dismantling of productive and distributive apparatus and prevailing ideas about art is a crucial aspect of the avant-garde. On the other hand, we can take under consideration his negative evaluation of neo avant-gardes, which for Burger is only a repetition of the historical avant-garde, in which “the antiaesthetic into the artistic, the transgressive into the institutional,”\textsuperscript{66} but one can hardly make a case about this avant-garde being a repetition of a previous one, much less when compared to Bürger’s main example of neo-dada in the visual arts. Curious also, because, as Huyssen indicates, the avant-garde in general actively opposes the “bourgeois institutionalization of the arts in order to oppose the political and cultural power structure that art historically has been used to legitimate.”\textsuperscript{67} However, as much as this can apply to the avant-garde in Europe and the United States, the situation in Latin America was different, and this preconception is turned on its head. At this particular point it was precisely the building of institutions—sponsored by elite groups in the economic, academic and political world—that was considered avant-garde. That type of support to internationalize the local practice had not existed previously, and was precisely what was needed to fully enter into the art world of contemporary music creation.

\textit{Avant-Garde and Musical Militancy}

Another aspect in which this avant-garde differs from Bürger’s conceptualizations of avant-garde movements, is in the manner that its composers tried to cause an impact in their surroundings. In the case of most composers at the CLAEM, the belief in the autonomy of classical music was never challenged. Social change was not expected to happen through

\textsuperscript{65} However, Bürger himself makes some clarifications that he is writing about “historical avant-garde movements” in plural (Bürger 1984, 22).
\textsuperscript{66} Foster 1994, 13.
\textsuperscript{67} Huyssen 1986, 3-11, cited in Solis 2008, 192.
compositions. But this incongruity did not stop many composers from engaging in other activities where, through written discourse and organized activities, they attempted to politicize their music and make it engage social life as in more conventional instances of the avant-garde. The performative aspect of the texts, concerts, or lessons that these composers give is particularly important because of its capacity to produce powerful associations with their musical compositions.

The works of these avant-garde composers become both effective and affective in their societies through association with other facets of a their identity—composers as writers, as critics, or as cultural organizers. Thus, an individual’s writing, organizing concerts, and giving public talks, are primary modes of social interaction that become closely associated with the autonomous work of art as to appear inseparable from that work.68

It was during the CLAEM years that the notion of ‘musical militancy’—words I heard used frequently among composers in Uruguay and Argentina—became widespread across those interested in the musical avant-garde. It seems that the concept arrived with Luigi Nono during his visit to the CLAEM in 1967, and it is not a coincidence that it was adopted in two countries than went through harsh military dictatorships during the 1970s. What is often meant by ‘musical militancy’ is an aggressive and dedicated engagement with the transmission, diffusion, teaching, and learning of contemporary music that involves no economic remuneration; in fact, it usually results in economic loss. This militancy is driven by a sincere belief that music can be

68 In his application of Peircian semiotics to musical analysis, Thomas Turino uses the term semiotic chaining to refer to “a process through time in which the interpretant at one temporal stage becomes the sign for a new object at the next stage of semiosis, creating a new interpretant which becomes the next sin in the next instant, ad infinitum until that ‘train of thought’ is interrupted by another chain of thought or by arriving at a belief or conclusion.” (Turino 1999, 223). In other words, an individual may initially perceive the work of art itself, then subsequently in rapid succession recollect a series of associations that ultimately bring forth its social impact.
a changing factor in social life. While teaching at the CLAEM, Nono was able to go to
Montevideo, Uruguay, for two days. Coriún Aharonián and Conrado Silva (Uruguay/Brazil
1940) hosted him. Aharonián remembers:

Those 48 hours changed my life. […] My life was divided: before and after
meeting Luigi Nono. It was the most significant event in my life thus far. It was
all those things that he had to communicate: his vision of man and artist as an
integral wholesome. Of the ethical person, the person committed to life, to the
world, to other people. He knew how to pass that along in a powerful way […]
brutally committed, and very moving.  

Aharonián was not the only one to be profoundly impacted by Nono’s visit. His legacy
for several Latin American composers was tremendous: the certainty that despite the deep
seated belief in the autonomy of art, each work was a statement on politics and ethics, and it was
the responsibility of the composer to make this known. The paradox in this statement had
already been faced by Nono. Together with Boulez and Stockhausen, he had been a key figure
of the 1950s European avant-garde in Darmstadt, leading the most abstract and ultra-modern
serialism. But his personal involvement against “racial intolerance, fascist violence, exploitation
of the working classes,” and his support of “the struggle for freedom and independence in
developing countries” had led him to an important stylistic change in the 1960s: The
employment of text to express what music was unable to express. Without words, art music was
perceived as too abstract to communicate the political message that Nono felt need to be
transmitted. Borio argues that

It was not for him a question of reproducing in music the emotions of suffering,
scorn, anger, rebellion, desire and love of which the texts speak, or to which the
titles of instrumental compositions refer; rather, it was the idea of formulating on
a musical level, in the unshakable unity of sound, issues for which humanity
demands urgent resolution: ‘To listen is to know’.

69 Coriún Aharonián, interview with the author, August 17, 2008.
70 Gianmario Borio, "Nono, Luigi," Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online, URL:
http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/20044. (Accessed March 1,
2012).
What Borio misses from his explanation is the “integral wholesome” view that Nono had of the artist, as Aharonián pointed out. On-stage and off-stage, the composer was responsible for passing along his commitment to his/her causes. The composer’s role did not end with the written music, but had to be extended to his/her writings about music, his/her actions in disseminating contemporary music, and to every other level of his/her everyday life as composer and as human being. It was a lifestyle—one perceived as the embodiment of being avant-garde.

An example of this musical militancy can be seen in one of Nono’s students at the CLAEM, Jacqueline Nova, who made it her mission to spread knowledge about contemporary music and Latin American composers. In 1969-1970, after leaving the CLAEM, she held a radio cycle called Asimetrias where she included topics like the opera Bomarzo, contemporary Latin American Music, electronic music laboratories in South America and the works of many of the composers she had met in the southern hemisphere. Nova aimed to promote living composers, particularly Latin American composers, she started by organizing a conference-concert called La música electronica, which she presented in Bogotá and Medellin in 1970, and then by starting a group for the promotion of these composers called Agrupación Nueva Música—like the existing group in Buenos Aires. 71

Perhaps the most significant example of musical militancy were the Cursos Latinoamericanos de Música Contemporánea, organized from 1975 to 1989 by a team that prominently included Graciela Paraskevaidis and Coriún Aharonián. These Cursos were a series of itinerant, non-profit, non-institutionalized, free, intensive summer music courses that were among the most important events for contemporary music in the region during their existence.

71 Romano 2002, 30.
They offered, in a literal sense, the opportunity to step away from the institutionalized context that the Di Tella had provided and opened a true non-institutionalized space for the avant-garde. Although transportation and boarding was covered by the organization, the teachers were often asked to participate out of their own militant commitment to spreading the avant-garde. Among the people involved in the CLAEM that were later teachers in these Cursos were Aharonián, Bazán, Biriotti, Etkin, Fernandes, Kusnir, Maiguashca, Maranzano, Martínez, Orellana, Paraskevaidis and Villalpando.

A final example of this labor surrounding avant-garde composition is the Núcleo Música Nueva de Montevideo, an organization that started in 1966 by Conrado Silva, Daniel Viglietti, and two fellows of the CLAEM, Ariel Martínez and Coriún Aharonián. The Núcleo consists of an open assembly of composers, performers and musicologists who are organized in a quasi-anarchic manner, without any directors, but with multiple teams that share different responsibilities (programming, logistics, advertising, etc.). Graciela Paraskevaidis has also been actively involved with this organization, were most activities are done as musical militancy. León Biriotti has also participated at the Núcleo as a performer and premiered many pieces of Uruguayan, Latin American, and European composers. The Núcleo has been a platform for new composers, a meeting ground for musicians, and a vital part of the contemporary music scene in Uruguay.

5.6 Disillusionment of the Avant Garde: Embrace and Rejection

Not all composers who attended the Di Tella felt an affinity with the avant-garde. When I asked Gerardo Gandini if he thought there was some kind of aesthetic division between the fellows that they noticed at the time, he said
Yes, yes. There were some that posed more resistance than the others [to the avant-garde]. They were impervious to the teachings, not only mine, but of the guest teachers as well. For example, Miguel Letelier who continued writing the same way before and after the CLAEM. Going to the Di Tella did not seem to affect him. […] The CLAEM did not open possible paths to several of the composers because they had some kind of natural resistance to opening to those new sound worlds.  

Reflecting upon Gandini’s words that some composers had a “natural resistance” to new sound worlds, I decided to do an exercise and try to evaluate where I would place them in a broad spectrum ranging from conservative to fully experimental musical language. In the following table I have compiled the names of most of the composers who went to the CLAEM and continued to have an active compositional career (Figure 5-23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers who rejected the avant-garde and have a predominantly conservative musical language</th>
<th>Composers who partially embraced avant-garde techniques, but remain within a conservative modernism</th>
<th>Composers who embraced the avant-garde and have a predominantly experimental musical language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mario Kuri-Aldana (3)</td>
<td>Blas Atehortúa (14)</td>
<td>Alcides Lanza (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatriz Lockhart (9)</td>
<td>Alberto Villalpando (6)</td>
<td>Ariel Martínez (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno D’Astoli (3)</td>
<td>Alejandro Nuñez Allauca (3)</td>
<td>Cesar Bolaños (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Valcárcel (4)</td>
<td>Antonio Mastrogiovanni (15)</td>
<td>Coriún Aharonián (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Arandia Navarro (13)</td>
<td>Armando Krieger (3)</td>
<td>Eduardo Kusnir (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Sarmientos (2)</td>
<td>León Biriotti (6)</td>
<td>Gabriel Brnčić (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Letelier (11)</td>
<td>Marlos Nobre (5)</td>
<td>Graciela Paraskevaidis (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salvador Ranieri (7)</td>
<td>Jacqueline Nova (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5-23: Incomplete list of composers at the CLAEM organized by their rejection or embrace of the avant-garde. Here I take into consideration the whole career of the composer, and not just their years at the CLAEM.

---

Based on the approximate number of works of theirs that I have heard (in parenthesis), I have grouped them in one of three positions regarding the avant-garde, knowing fully well that these categories should be conceptualized as a spectrum, and that the same composers might have moved from one to another category with different works. What I wanted to establish from this table, was a general perception of how appealing and broad was the adoption of avant-garde musical trends among these generations of Latin American composers. As I suspected, the majority of the composers embraced the avant-garde and most of them did so fully adopting experimental musical language.

For some of these composers, the rejection of avant-garde aesthetics might have not taken place directly during their CLAEM years. The Uruguayan Beatriz Lockhart, for example, attended the CLAEM in 1969-70, and recalled in an interview that she had a ‘language crisis’:

> It was from 1972 to 1982. It was after being connected to the Torcuato di [sic] Tella Institute in Buenos Aires, that Alberto Ginastera directed back then. It was the school of ultra avant-garde, polish, Penderecki and such. I did not feel connected to it. I went with my husband who is also a composer. We studied there two years. I made a piece in that style in a moment of surrender. I was like that for ten years, in an absolute crisis, not knowing what I wanted to do.\(^73\)

In a different kind of shock from the one described earlier in this chapter, Lockhart felt she suffered a paralyzing creative block as a result of having adopted avant-garde techniques and then not knowing what to do. Today, Lockhart’s compositions are conservative, adopt many early twentieth-century musical nationalist techniques, and tend to rely on using rhythmical patterns and figures from popular and folkloric genres as structuring elements.

As I have mentioned earlier, avant-garde aesthetics covered a wide range of compositional trends and many composers fluctuated through them and would strategically select one over another at different points of their career. To close this chapter, I will now look

at the professional trajectory of one composer from the 1969-1970 group, who had embraced avant-garde aesthetics even before arriving to the CLAEM, and that becomes disillusioned with the results, or lack thereof, that it produced.

Ariel Martínez: Moving Away from Tango

During my fieldwork I spent many hours with Ariel Martínez, a composer from the last official group at the CLAEM, his wife Perla, and his son Joaquín. I found his life story to be particularly interesting since it involved interests in experimental and avant-garde practices in different musical traditions. I was also attracted to Martínez’s current bitterness towards the avant-garde, and the contemporary music scene in general.

Ariel Martínez was born in San José, Uruguay in 1940, a southern province relatively close to Montevideo. His interest in music started with tango, first as a connoisseur. His knowledge let him to lead his own radio show, and short after he decided to begin learning how to play the bandoneón with Nicolás Pepe. After spending the couple of years that it takes to become proficient in this highly complicated instrument, Ariel joined several ensembles and soon began to create his own arrangements. He became a bandoneón player and did some arranging for the Quinteto de la Guardia Nueva, a tango quintet that was playing modern tango in an iconic venue in Montevideo called El Club de la Guardia Nueva. The style Martínez embraced was the so-called Tango Nuevo that had emerged in the 1950s with Astor Piazzolla as its main representative. In this style the composition responded not to a pre-established binary form (verse and chorus) or ternary (two parts with a kind of trio between them), but to the

74 The rest of the group consisted of Manuel (Manolo) Guardia, (piano and arrangements), Sergio Furas (violin), Edunio Gelpi (electric guitar) and Roberto Capobianco (double bass).
elaboration of a rhythmic-melodic cell in a linear manner, something that Martínez found very attractive.

As Martínez became more interested in writing original songs and perfecting his arrangements, he decided to formally study composition. In 1966, after having studied with Angelo Turrizziani, he began to take group composition classes with the well-know Uruguayan composer Héctor Tosar. The other students in the group were Conrado Silva (Uruguay, 1940), Coriún Aharonián and, at least at the beginning, Daniel Viglietti (Uruguay, 1939). The richness of Tosar’s teachings together with the thought-provoking discussions of his group-mates made Martínez consider this his most valuable musical experience. Aharonián—who had been friends with Martínez since they were classmates in high school—remembers,

Each one of us represented a very different position regarding our formation and our focus. Conrado [Silva] was an engineer, in the sense that he was the most rational among us […] at the same time, with the counterpart of the glorification of everything irrational coming from the influence of [John] Cage.[…] Ariel, perhaps because of his formation in tango, was much closer to creating musical discourses, a vision that was more […] harmonic and melodic to put it in some way […].Daniel [Viglietti] was there for a short time […] he had training both in classical music […] and in popular […] and knew a lot about traditional ‘criollo’ musical traditions.  

Something very interesting happened with Martínez after he started studying with Tosar and his group. His tango arrangements and original compositions, which were already similar in style to the most daring compositions of Astor Piazzolla or Anibal Troilo, with heavy dissonances and rhythmic irregularities that hinted at Bartók and Stravinsky, began to become even more radical. In 1967, he recorded four tangos with his Trio Nuevo—Darwin Viscuso on the piano, Enrique del Puerto, double bass, and Martínez on the bandoneón. The names of the tangos in the LP are Homo sapiens, Homo faber, Homo ludens I and Homo ludens II.

75 Coriún Aharonián, interview with the author, Montevideo, August 17, 2008.
Figure 5-24: *Homo ludens II* (1966-1967) by Ariel Martínez.

Figure 5-25: *Homo ludens II* Part C, piano bandoneón part. The work ends when the bandoneón player decides to play the cell in red and blue brackets at the bottom right. Notice the middle cell is left free for the performer to improvise.
From the liner notes of the recording one can already sense there was a change under way, since the text resembles the program notes for a classical concert much more than a popular music recording. For example, the text begins,

_Homo ludens I_ and _Homo ludens II_ systematically use different operational possibilities that allow—and require—the performer to choose and arrange the proposed material by the composer [...]. The magnitude of the number of possible combinations derived from this mechanism is such that it minimizes any type of coincidence and assures the unique and unrepeatable character of each version. [...] This relationship originates open forms that, on the basis of the same elements, are recreated on each performance.\(^76\)

His explanation of the first two tangos in the liner notes is almost non-existent. The focus is on the last two, _Homo ludens I_ and _II_. The score of _Homo ludens II_ is divided into three parts, ABC. Each part contains sections for the bandoneón, piano and double bass. Each performer chooses from their parts which ones to play, in what order and how many times to repeat them. Some of the options have secondary versions written in red as possible variations. Two of the sections have a cell that is bracketed in red as a synchronizing cell. When the performer of the bandoneón plays this cell, the other performers know it is time to move to the next part, or to end the piece.

Needless to say, if the sounds of _Homo sapiens_ and _Homo faber_ in the 1967 recording were already considered at the vanguard of tango music at the time, what Martínez and the Trio Nuevo were doing in _Homo ludens I_ and _II_ was unheard of. However, something happened after this recording. Martínez stopped playing bandoneón and abandoned tango. In my second trip to Montevideo, in 2008, I learned that his son Joaquín, who was nearly thirty years old at the time, had never heard his father play bandoneón. It took a while, but after lunch I convinced Ariel to bring it downstairs and play. It was an exciting moment for all, and even though he had not

\(^76\) Ariel Martínez, liner notes to LP recording _Trio Nuevo: El Club de la Guardia Nueva_. GN 02, 33RPM, [Montevideo] 1967.
played in many years, he could still play the instrument well. After he played for a while, I asked him why he thought he had stopped playing tango. His answer necessarily went through the Trio Nuevo recording, and by explaining how he understood the aesthetic direction that his trio had taken:

There is a series of factors. In that recording, the one with *Homo Sapiens*, etc. there is already indeterminacy there. [I was using] the same procedures that you find in some of Stockhausen. […] The first tango *sapiens* means knowledge, and *faber*, means to fabricate, the creation of things. But [the third and fourth tangos, the] *ludens* mean to play. The two *Ludens* have something similar, to what Stockhausen does [in his *Klavierstück XI*], playing with combinations. There are little pieces of tango, and each performer organizes them at will. And it sounds like tango because the fragments are tango. They have rhythmic drive, nothing develops much—quite like the tangos from the melodic-cell driven tangos from the 1950s. But there is no narrative. […] It is completely atomized. […] It was a game; it was ‘to play.’

After all that mess the meeting point for all of us was to return to the basic truth of tango, which is to mark the four [as in 4/4 meter]. It means to play ‘chan, chan, chan, chan’ [he sings on the beat at 94 bpm doing staccato and sfz]. After all that mess we end up marking the four, each doing something different. One is playing quartal chords [chords made of stacking consecutive fourths], while the other is playing like a *safada*, like a traditional orchestra, like the Pugliese orchestra. […] All that was folly, and in the context of tango it was way ahead of even anything Piazzolla ever did.77

This description of a deconstructed tango put back together almost like a kaleidoscope and that in the end returns to its “basic truth” only to find that each instrument is still doing something different, allows Martínez to position himself already as a proponent of radical musical practices. He was doing something “way ahead of even anything Piazzolla ever did.” Martínez’s conclusion after doing this recording was that he had taken tango in a direction that was no longer in touch with what people wanted. But he also realized he was not interested in doing what people wanted anyway. He told me once that to be on the avant-garde of any movement meant to him that even though you are ahead, taking risks, trying new things, you

77 Ibid.
still knew that others were behind you. But with tango he felt that he was no longer on the verge of something, ahead of something. He said he felt alone, lost, and that nobody was taking the directions he was offering.

After attending the CLAEM, Martínez moved permanently to Argentina. For the next forty years he did not play tango. He became completely dedicated to composition, and over the years he became disillusioned with that music scene and what other composers were doing as well. Eventually he lost interest in having his pieces performed. He no longer advocates for any type of avant-garde aesthetics and, in fact, is very critical of what he and other composers did during the zenith of avant-garde composition. Many times he said to me in informal talks that the initial problem with the twentieth century had been that his generation came and destroyed everything; they took music and pushed it to its absolute fringes. But the real problem is that they did not provide a solution of how to put it back together, how to fix it. Today, Ariel is very frustrated with what the mass media values as music, has a very low opinion of most things happening in the classical music world, and has chosen to isolate himself from other composers in his adoptive Argentina and his native Uruguay.

I have always been curious as to why Ariel has spent so many hours talking to me. He is only somewhat interested in making his work known. He tends to be self-destructive and sabotages the few opportunities that cross his path. In 2011, I visited Buenos Aires and discovered that Martínez had decided to boycott the events organized by the Argentinean government to commemorate the CLAEM. After attending some of the initial meetings of organizers, he withdrew his works from the performance program and chose not to attend any event or meet with any of the fellows that came to Buenos Aires. When I visited him in his house he refused to explain why he was boycotting the event, but I was glad to learn that he had
kept playing the bandoneón for the last three years. He was playing some of the tango arrangements he had played in the 1960s. He told me he would never want to do it in public, but he had already once played with his son, a very fine guitar player, although he described it as a tremendous disaster. He is proud that his son plays jazz in his own band. But when in 2008 we talked about how Joaquín was playing in a rock band to make some money, he thought it was a waste of his talent. Back in 1985, Martínez had already described his feelings about rock,

Rock uses procedures that were codified by Jean Philippe Rameau more that two hundred years ago. They improve it rhythmically, but the rhythmic is infinitely poorer that that of jazz. And they don’t risk anything: all they do can be proved to exist in the music of ten, twenty, fifty or two hundred and fifty years ago. They are not creators.  

Martínez abandoned tango when he felt there was no more space for true novel creation, and even today remains skeptical of the revival that the genre has recently undergone. Similarly, he does not see much future in contemporary classical music.

5.7 Conclusions

The two parts that make up this chapter show how the avant-garde, as it was adopted at the CLAEM, consisted both of a series of musical styles that explored the fringes of different parameters of music composition, and a personal commitment and sincere belief in the impact that this music. While different trends—serialism, electroacoustic composition, sound mass composition, graphic notations, experimentalism and improvisation—articulated avant-garde desires, it was through a lived embodied experience of this avant-garde was felt as authentic, valid and truthful. In other words, participation in the musical avant-garde meant not only to be composing within certain aesthetic ideals, but also to extend these ideals to everyday practice, as

part of a fluid and rich identity as composer that went well beyond writing music and included militant organizing and promoting of works, musicological writing, and teaching.

The brief look at the lives of Graciela Paraskevaídis and Mariano Etkin serve to examine the stories many of these composers tell themselves and others about their adoption of the avant-garde, and open windows to understand how the avant-garde was experienced during and beyond the CLAEM. The story of Ariel Martínez, from his embrace of the avant-garde to his current disillusionment with that whole period of his life, is a contrasting example with the first two cases. These broad spectrums of reactions and experiences exemplify unique and individual ways to negotiate the experience of music making in the contemporary classical music art world.

In the epigraph to this chapter, Paraskevaídis acknowledges that perhaps the CLAEM did not intend to have generated a continental avant-garde, “either institutionally or as a group of people.” But as she suspects, it did, “as an after effect, through the work and actions of individual fellows, years later.”
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EPILOGUE

Argentine art lovers of all ages are mourning the demise of this city’s cultural temple. Due to lack of funds, the Di Tella Institute is closing its famous Florida center [...] home of South America’s most flourishing and original cultural presentations. The best-known tourist attraction [...] the center attracted all that is new and offbeat and even slightly crazy in Buenos Aires. Around it mushroomed a complex of swinging bars, avant-garde art shops and the city’s most lively gallery, known as the Crazy Block [...]. Alternately denounced as Communist-controlled and a tool of U.S. imperialism, the center in fact offered a unique opportunity to young artists from other South American countries as well as Argentina. [...] In an otherwise conservative cultural climate, the Florida center filled an enormous void. [...] A magnet for the young and the imaginative, the center was an oasis for the mini-skirt and long hair before both styles were accepted. Denounced as Communist by the more conservative, the institute regularly suffered stonings and broken windows. Its most vehement enemies have been members of the pro-fascist anti-Semitic organization called Tacura [sic, Tacuara]. The institute also came under fire from nationalists for being pro-American. The Ford Foundation has been a mainstay of the Institute for several years.1

The two causes behind the closing of the Di Tella art centers usually mentioned are on

one hand the lack of funds created by the difficult economic situation SIAM-Di Tella was going through, and on the other hand the pressure that the military dictatorship was putting on the art centers, particularly after some of the scandals of the visual artists, and to a lesser degree in the theater presentations of the audiovisual center. The first view was what Guido Di Tella claimed to be the sole reason for the closing, while Enrique Oteiza advocated for the second. As we saw earlier in Chapter 2, Oteiza left the direction of the Di Tella Institute and ended his long and close friendship with Guido Di Tella mostly because of their disagreement over how to handle the deteriorating economic and political situation of the Institute. Guido Di Tella’s decision to close the art centers but save the social sciences centers at the Institute felt to Oteiza like surrendering to the pressure of the state, while Guido saw it as a smart financial option to save

1 Attached article titled “Di Tella Culture Center Closes in Buenos Aires” in Times of the Americas, June 24, 1970 in letter from James M. Daniel (Rockefeller Foundation officer in Cali, Colombia) to William Olson, July 6, 1970, reel 36, series 301, RG 2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
the centers that dealt with what he and his brother were seriously interested in: economics and sociology. At the same time, blaming the political pressure, as Oteiza initially did, was perhaps only partially valid for the CAV and the CEA, but not the CLAEM. In 1970, John P. Harrison writes about Oteiza’s resignation from the Institution, and mentions what Oteiza thinks is going on:

Oteiza has resigned as Director of the Institute. [...] There was also, as Oteiza describes it, soft pressure from the Government and the bureaucracy of other large companies in Buenos Aries because of the freedom under which the Visual Arts Program had developed as a form of expression.²

If politics had been the only issue, one would assume that the CLAEM could have lasted longer as part of the Di Tella Institute. In fact, this was the case, at least for 1971, when the CLAEM functioned while the CAV and CEA had closed. However, in addition to the two general problems—lack of financial resources and a deteriorating political situation—the CLAEM suffered from the end of the financial cushion that the Rockefeller Foundation had provided for the first years of the Center’s existence. At the same time, Ginastera went through an important personal transition at the end of the decade that affected his productivity and his willingness to deal with administrative issues, something that has yet to be discussed in musicological writings.³ Between his increased activity abroad, his divorce, and his newfound love, Ginastera was absent more than usual, and this diminished notably the possibilities of the CLAEM to survive the political and economic crisis.

² John P. Harrison, memorandum to Norman Lloyd and Ralph K. Davidson, June 5, 1970, reel 36, series 301, RG 2 1970, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
1. The Decline of the Socio-Political Conditions

*Violence at the Di Tella Institute*

After General Juan Carlos Onganía took the presidency by force in 1966 the situation in Argentina had started to deteriorate. What before might have been hard words were starting to become real attacks, and the polarization of society was taking its toll in the corridors of the Florida Street building. On April 19, 1967 Josefina reports to Ginastera the first of many incidents of violence against the Di Tella Institute. The anxiety in her writing reflects the tension that was becoming common among people in Buenos Aires.

You probably have heard through the news that there was a violent incident the other night at the Di Tella Institute. People belonging to Tacuara entered the building right at the time when the audience for the play *Paseo de los domingos*—which has antinational tendencies—was leaving. These young people started to make a commotion in the entrance screaming; five or six entered and in a few minutes created chaos by tearing down posters and displays, and breaking windows. After that it is not clear what happened. The fact is that a woman that was shocked by the attitude of these young people went out and called the police across the street so that they would come and help. When she came back towards the Institute, the young guys, who had already broken the teeth of a spectator with a hard punch in the mouth, went outside and started touching her and insulting her. It seems that a cop dressed as a civilian took out his gun, and made some shots with the intention of scaring away the Tacuaristas. Between the pushing and the violence, he missed and ended up hitting the throat of one of the cops across the street, who were coming over to see what was happening... all of this happened at midnight. Cesar Bolaños, who was attending, said it was horrible, that the moment that people heard the shots everybody on the street went to the ground. ‘It was like war’ he said... The cop died a couple of minutes later, a police car came and took everybody to the 15th precinct, and the account has appeared in full detail on the news. Of course there are at least 10 different versions of the incident. [...] The night watchman and the unfortunate ticket booth people are scared and nervous now, and people are afraid that this could be the first of a series of incidents of the same type if the police does not take a firm stance.4

Tacuara was an extreme right movement with strong nationalist, anti-communist and Catholic ideals. The group had been established in 1957, and by 1967 had been in decline for a

---

4 Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, April 19, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
while. However, the fractured Argentinean society, and the increasingly contradictory Peronist party, with members on both the extreme right and the extreme left, were certainly on a path of radicalization, and the incident became, as predicted by Schröder, the first of many of the same type. But physical violence was not yet the main form of coercion in Argentina. The Onganía government had excelled in placing itself as a moral, catholic light in the context of an increasingly perverse and decaying society. And chance would have it that Ginastera was their next victim.

*Don Rodrigo and the Censorship of Bomarzo*

Ginastera produced his three operas while director of the CLAEM, although the third one—*Beatrix Cenci*—was finished when he was only nominally directing and had already moved to Switzerland. The first of the operas, *Don Rodrigo*, premiered in Argentina in 1964 quite successfully.\(^5\) For his second opera, *Bomarzo*, Ginastera must have been quite anxious. Ginastera started to complain that the activities at the CLAEM took a toll on his composition, and that he had less and less time to work when he had to deal with finding funding to continue the center. When the time had come for the premiere he was behind in his plans. Writing music did not come easily to Ginastera. In fact, as much as he loved it, it also stressed him, particularly when he had other responsibilities to attend to. He wrote to Schröder right before the premiere of *Bomarzo*, giving a little insight into his compositional process,

> This was for me a unique life-changing experience since I really worked full time during almost four months going to bed everyday around three in the morning and going back to work at nine. [...] The preparations for the premiere are sensational. [...] The choreography by the North American Jack Cole is fantastic, to such degree of eroticism that four of the dancers refused to continue rehearsing and

\(^5\) In 1966 a very young Plácido Domingo played the leading role of Rodrigo in the U.S. premiere of the opera. Its success contributed to the continuing fame of Ginastera as the foremost Latin American composer abroad.
left. The thing is that Bomarzo has all the sex and violence of our time, and as I said recently on a conference, Bomarzo is a man of our time.\(^6\)

Clearly at this point Ginastera is comfortable and one could say, almost proud of the high eroticism of the work. After the successful premiere of the opera, Ginastera reports back to the CLAEM,

Like the New York Times said, [the theme of Bomarzo is]‘sex, violence and hallucination’ [and it] is maintained throughout the piece, from the first note of the prelude until the curtain falls in the last scene. [...] I was afraid of the opening night, since the audience was not in my opinion an audience for contemporary music—starting with the Vice-President of the United States. A lot of diplomats, all the season-ticket holders, almost one hundred critics and members of the news and radio, a correspondent for the BBC London and the French Radio and Television, [...]. My point being that I was really afraid. [...] Finally, after all the effort and sleepless nights, the satisfaction remains that the piece resonated well with the audience.\(^7\)

The premiere of Bomarzo in Argentina was scheduled for the following year, in the 1967 season of the Teatro Colón. People at the CLAEM were excited. However, only two weeks before the first show, the Buenos Aires government prohibited the performance of the opera. The work was being banned for its “obsessive reference to sex, violence and hallucination.”

Ginastera in a personal letter, reports flabbergasted,

I just got back to Buenos Aires after the huge success of ‘Bomarzo’ in Washington. It was incredible: crazy enthusiasm by the audience, fabulous criticisms, regal receptions at the Argentinean Embassy, titles of Ambassadors for Mujica Láinez [librettist of Bomarzo] and myself, just sensational. And you know what happens when we get to Buenos Aires? The municipality prohibits the work, citing possible immorality. It is something so absurd, so incredible that I still cannot stop being astonished. All institutions in Argentina have raised their voice in protest, since that determination was taken based on an article on the ‘New York Times’, great otherwise, that said that ‘Bomarzo’ was sex, violence and hallucination. As if ‘Salome’ was not sex, ‘Tosca’ violence, or ‘Boris’ hallucination.\(^8\)

\(^6\) Alberto Ginastera, letter to Josefina Schröder, May 15, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
\(^7\) Alberto Ginastera, letter to Josefina Schröder, May 24, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
\(^8\) Alberto Ginastera, letter to Antonio Iglesias, July 24, 1967, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
Evidently there were different opinions going on in the government, or at least between the federal government, which had given the titles of Ambassador to the two authors, and now the local Buenos Aires government that was banning the work. It would later become common knowledge that the president’s wife pressed the decision.\(^9\)

Multiple sectors of society jumped at this public case of censorship, both to praise and to disparage the decision. The editors of Tribuna Musical criticized the decision as “based exclusively on commentaries and newspaper references about the premiere in Washington […] in other words, the mayor is condemning the work from what he has heard, without direct experience.”\(^10\) Others like Luis Alberto Murray praised the mayor for disallowing the performance of the work in a public theater using taxpayers money, “an opera that can be performed instead in any other [private] theater of our country.”\(^11\) Murray evidently ignored that this opera required an infrastructure that only the Colón could provide at that time.

Murray’s support for Bomarzo’s censorship goes further into criticisms of the art world that it represents,

---

\(^9\) Excerpts form the official decree 8276/67 from the municipality read: “Considering that it is the duty of the authorities at the Municipality to protect the moral standards […] and that this principle should apply to public spectacles offered by individuals, and to be equally reasonable to official halls […] it is unavoidable to have to face the problem given by the opera Bomarzo, […] the municipality become aware of the specific characteristics of such show, the fifteen scenes in which there is permanent and obsessive reference to sex, violence and hallucination accentuated by the way it is set on stage, the choral group, the decorations, the choreography, and all other elements that meet together, as it has been pointed out with crudeness the very authors and international critics […] the mayor of Buenos Aires decrees: […] Bomarzo will be excluded from the repertoire that will be presented at the Teatro Colón during this season.” Mayor’s office of Buenos Aires, Official Decree 8276/67, cited in “A Propósito de Bomarzo” Tribuna Musical 11 (1967): 39. Buenos Aires is considered an “Intendencia” within the administrative system of provinces of Argentina. Thus, the title mayor is a translation here for “intendente,” which is the accurate name of the position.


\(^11\) Luis Alberto Murray, “¡Bien Intendente!” La Hipotenusa (Buenos Aires), August 10, 1967.
The majority of the arguments aimed [against the ban] are based on an intolerable logic: Bomarzo should have been shown at the Colón because it had been shown previously and with success in the United States. We might as well propitiate the assassination of our President to follow the steps of Kennedy. […] Mujica Láinez is a negligible writer […] and whose private life we won’t discuss […]. The decision has shaken a little world as picturesque as it is powerful. […] It is clear, ‘THEY’ are Art. Only them, and their hardly manly way of understanding God, life, love, death and everything else. Also the liberal ‘intelligentsia’ more or less in alignment to the Communist party, expresses its unconditional solidarity to the ‘victims’ of this ‘attack’ by the mayor’s office.\(^\text{12}\)

The ultraconservative tone of this criticism is telling. Not only with the blunt reference to the Kennedy assassination, but the homophobic hints that start with “not discussing” Mujica Láinez’s private life—he was openly and flamboyantly gay—followed by the ‘hardly virile’ understanding of the supporters of Ginastera and Mujica Láinez. As a final blow, Murray groups them with the communists, who evidently show support for this ‘picturesque’ group of people. And once again, the hegemony that the avant-garde had in the Buenos Aires artistic scene was criticized: “They are Art!”

The fellows at the CLAEM were all shocked and upset by the censorship of the work. In letters and meetings they expressed their solidarity with Ginastera. It was not the first time a work had been censored under the Onganía government—the film Blow-up by Michelangelo Antonioni and based on a short story by the Argentinean Julio Cortázar was censored to a similar wide response at almost the same time. But the Bomarzo Affair was immensely publicized and in the end brought Ginastera unusual levels of attention.\(^\text{13}\)

\(^{12}\) Ibid.

\(^{13}\) The military dictatorship was not always negative towards Ginastera. Under the presidency of General Roberto Levingston, the decree no.2394 of 1970 was sent via telegram to Ginastera. After a grandiose introduction about Ginastera and explaining the importance for the government to highlight Argentine musical values, the telegram states “The President of the Argentine Nation decrees: Article 1. The sponsorship of Alberto Ginastera’s tour […] in which he will attend the performance of his works in the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, and Switzerland.” Luis María de Pablo Pardo, telegram to Alberto Ginastera,
It must have felt a small victory when finally in March 23, 1972 Ginastera received a telegram from the new mayor of Buenos Aires, Saturnino Montero Ruiz that said, “[The] Office of the Mayor of Buenos Aires invites you and Mrs. [to the] premiere [of] Bomarzo STOP [Teatro] Colón[,] April 28 STOP Government pays STOP Tickets available at travel agency STOP Please reply.”\textsuperscript{14} To which Ginastera answered, “Thanking you deeply and accepting with great honor invitation to attend with my wife the premiere of Bomarzo [at the] Teatro Colón.”\textsuperscript{15} The work was finally premiered in Argentina on April 29, 1972.

\textit{Attacks in the Following Years}

Although several minor disturbances occurred during the next few years, some stand out.

In Chapter 2, I described the case of Roberto Plate’s 1968 \textit{Los Baños}, an installation that resembled two bathrooms where visitors wrote graffiti. The exhibit was promptly closed by the police and became a widely advertised case of censorship of a Di Tella exhibit.

In June 6, 1969 another important incident occurred, as it showed that not only the right, but also left wing radicals saw the Di Tella Institute as a target as well:

Around 19:30 the Institute Torcuato Di Tella was attacked with bombs of nauseating gas with a powerful effect, thrown by members of a small group that simultaneously handed out pamphlets on Florida street that read ‘Students: the fatherland needs you. Fight with your ideas as a university student and not with arms like a guerrillero’ or ‘Comrade: the communists of the USA send us to fight. You are going to die with them’ signed with the acronym M.N.D.A. Once again the Di Tella Institute is victim of an aggression perpetrated with surprising impunity by a small number of people that cant stand the academic freedom and


\textsuperscript{15} Alberto Ginastera, telegram to Saturnino Montero Ruiz, March 27, 1972 Paul Sacher Stiftung: Mikrofilmregister: Ginastera, Alberto : Korrespondenz, 284.1-2532.
freedom of expression harbored in the activities of the Institute since its beginnings.\textsuperscript{16}

As shocking as these and other similar attacks must have felt, there was not a single situation that hit closer to home than the personal attacks on Gabriel Brnčić.

\textit{Brnčić and the Political Persecution of an Individual}

On February 21, 1969 before classes had started for the following group of fellows, Kröpfl wrote to Ginastera requesting that Brnčić be hired as auxiliary professor. One of the reasons why it was important for Brnčić to remain in Argentina is that he had left Chile feeling it was not safe for him.\textsuperscript{17} Brnčić was hired and he became a crucial element for the next group of fellows, since Kröpfl’s teachings were quite theoretical, and Reichenbach, besides his fabulous inventions, was not particularly adept at teaching. Brnčić on the other hand, taught many of the composers from the 1969-1970 group how to use the equipment in an efficient and productive way, such that the last CLAEM group may have benefited the most from the electronic music laboratory. However, Brnčić’s stay in Buenos Aires became more and more complicated. His first encounter with censorship took place with the work \textit{¡Volveremos a las montañas!} in 1969. Brnčić remembers,

In 1969 ‘somebody’ told the Teatro Colón ‘something.’ We might never know. Just hours before the premiere, after a phone call announcing that there was a bomb under the seats of the theater, the concert was cancelled. (Monday, September 22, 1969 at 7:30pm). The following Monday the concert took place, but without \textit{¡Volveremos a las montañas!} There was never a bomb, just a crooked way of censorship. […] Days later I got back the orchestral parts. The full score

\textsuperscript{16} Enrique Oteiza, quoted by José María Paolantonio, open communication to all personnel at the ITDT, June 9, 1969, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
\textsuperscript{17} See Francisco Kröpfl, letter to Alberto Ginastera, February 21, 1969, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
never appeared. The current version is an exact reconstruction of the original score, from those orchestral parts that came with me in exile.  

Brnčić had composed three different versions of ¡Volveremos a las montañas! (“We will return to the mountains!”): one for grand orchestra, one for flute, clarinet, vibraphone and piano, and a third for solo tape. The piece had been written only months after the death of Ernesto “Che” Guevara on October 9, 1967. The words “Volveremos a las montañas” were used as the motto for the recruitment of Chilean guerillas and groups of support for clandestine operations following the Bolivian forces of Guevara. The piece in its solo tape form has long movements of materials with a very marked stereo division. There are dense textures but it is relatively consonant, and the soundscape evokes large blocks of ice moving slowly, one on top of the other, creating with their friction a light but penetrating distortion. The orchestra piece parallels this image in an orchestration that gives prominence to slow moving masses of sounds led by the strings arranged in clusters that open and close in range and that attach both in extended non vibratos, col legno, tremolando and glissandi. Brass instruments and later woodwinds inconspicuously add their sonority to the texture as the intensity of the piece increases. Different from the tape version, the orchestral version includes many more silences between bursts of sounds, but just like in the tape, there is not a single recognizable melodic line. Both versions are constructed through blocks of sounds that gently mutate orchestration—electronic or instrumental—and produce a very similar sensation of a single sound revealing multiple facets of its harmonic spectrum. I had the opportunity to hear in Buenos Aires in 2011, the premiere of

---

18 Gabriel Brnčić, notes to ¡Volveremos a las montañas! in URL: http://lamusicaenelditella.cultura.gob.ar/?page_id=268 (accessed June 3, 2011). Jorge Sarmientos in Caracas, Venezuela in 2011 publically declared his certainty that the culprit of the call had been the controversial composer Alicia Terzián. Today in Buenos Aires, most composers, young and old, that I know, avoid saying Terzián’s name, instead calling her “the unnamable,” a superstition that not surprisingly has crossed borders and can be found in Uruguay, Brazil, Venezuela México and Colombia to my knowledge.
¡Volveremos a las montañas! more than forty years behind schedule. The occasion was beautiful, and Brnčić, deeply moved, cried during a standing ovation accompanied by hugs from some of his closest friends from his CLAEM years.

Although the situation with ¡Volveremos a las montañas! did not get anywhere near as much press as the Bomarzo affair, it was clear within the Institute that the regime of Onganía had begun a new era of repression where expressive practices that might show political discontent or support for leftist movements would be suppressed.

The following year, on March 15, 1970, Brnčić and his wife Teresa María Monosegur were taken by surprise when, before dawn, functionaries of the city police broke into their house. They were both taken to a local police department, where they were held all day while their backgrounds were investigated. At dawn the next day, Brnčić was released and was told that his wife would be joining him a couple of hours later. After hesitantly signing the prisoner’s release book, Brnčić decided to take the bus towards his mother-in-law’s house, trying to find out more about his wife’s fate. Two men dressed as civilians, but who claimed to be part of the police got on the bus as well and forced Brnčić out of the vehicle. He was dragged into an automobile parked next to the bus, blindfolded, handcuffed, and his feet were tied. He was driven to somewhere on the outskirts of the city and tossed out of the car, into what sounded to him to be a large hangar. With the barrel of a gun pressing against his head, Brnčić was subject to cigarette burns and electric shocks. They threatened if he did not—in the words of his captors—sing, a word that gained new meaning for him in that moment, and would resonate in his memory for years. It was probably thanks to the fast diplomatic intervention by the Chilean embassy and the
directives of the Di Tella Institute, that Brnčić was abandoned at 4 a.m. on March 17, in a barren
terrain close to the city of Garín.19

It was never clear to Brnčić what it was that the police wanted or what had triggered this
persecution: Was it his choice for topics in composition? The style of his compositions? Was it
his relationship to his brothers-in-law who were known—like Brnčić—for their leftist
orientation? Or was it that Brnčić had worked with Sergio Ortega—who was famous for
composing the anthem for popular resistance “El pueblo unido jamás sera vencido”—during the
1964 failed presidential campaign of Salvador Allende in Chile, where they “organized activities,
formed an orchestra and wrote music for the campaign”?20

Unfortunately, political persecution only grew worse during the following years. In 1975
Aponte Ledée writes from Puerto Rico to Ginastera, who was now living Switzerland, about the
unfortunate events that Brnčić had gone through.

Gabriel Brnčić has been forced to leave B[ueno}s.A[ire]s. together with his wife
and two daughters. Although he does not explain in detail, the situation has been
distressing. Fortunately—although in complete misery—he has made it to Spain.
He wrote to me from Portugal and then from Barcelona. I wrote to Halffter and
De Pablo to help him. If you can do anything to help him don’t forget him. […]
Gabriel’s situation saddens me and even shames me […] his terrible situation:
doubly exiled.21

Brnčić had come to Buenos Aires from Chile to avoid the increasing political tension of
his home country. Now he had been forced to leave Buenos Aires. Brnčić wrote to Ginastera and
explained the situation carefully,

In mid-November an armed group part of the Triple A [Argentine Anticommunist
Alliance] broke into our house in Tigre [a small town near Buenos Aires] and

19 Gabriel Brnčić, interview with the author, Barcelona, April 12, 2008. See also “Circular
Interna: Apremios Ilegales a un Miembro del CLAEM,” internal memo, March 1970, Di Tella
Institute, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
21 Rafael Aponte Ledée, letter to Alberto Ginastera, Puerto Rico, January 22, 1975. Paul Sacher
after searching everything they made me part of a mock execution by firing squad in my back yard and a couple of other beautiful things, and then they escaped, giving me a death warrant of 72 hours. That was a Sunday at noon, with complete impunity (they even left their vehicles blocking the road, and carried machine guns, and such a number of firearms as I have never seen). As you might have heard, this has be come the latest fashion, and always directed against artists and intellectuals that because of their notoriety or visibility in certain circles bother the regime [at the time Isabel Perón, widow of Juan Perón]. Old story, you might say, and you are right. The thing is that since they can’t catch the ones they really want because they escape or they can’t find them, then they go after people that they determine are connected to the left. You know that in 1970 I was about to disappear thanks to a witch-hunt against a family of political prisoners. Being Chilean, and working at the Di Tella Institute and the U. del Salvador made me one more suspect on their lists. [At the time] the consulate and the embassy intervened, and even Allende (who was my relative through my mother’s side). Well, I was barely saved, and I stayed there because I considered my own behavior as non-militant. […] Well, I would say that everything was going well, and I was ready to embrace composition full-time because since 1970 I had only written three or four works. It was the first time that I had gotten rid of urgent economic needs. Well, that same damn day we left with a few couple of things to Buenos Aires and we hid there until we were able to arrange the trip.22

Besides his personal history, Brnčić points out here that working at the CLAEM contributed to making him suspect. In general, being associated with the Di Tella, even if the composers were much more subdued than the artists of the other centers, brought a significant amount of attention, in a time when such attention was not all together desirable.

2. The Decline of Financial Conditions

Financial Problems Since 1966

Reports about financial troubles at the Institute affecting the CLAEM begin in 1966, the same year that Onganía assumes the presidency in Argentina. In one of her letters from February, 22 Gabriel Brnčić, letter to Alberto Ginastera, Barcelona, February 10, 1975. Paul Sacher Stiftung: Mikrofilmregister: Ginastera, Alberto : Korrespondenz,281.1-1848, 1848-1849
Josefina Schröder tells Ginastera that there was “fear that things might be quite bad for SIAM,” already noticing the waning financial situation of SIAM-Di Tella industrial conglomerate.

Different strategies were being shuffled to try to secure funding for the music center during those difficult years. In 1967, Oteiza began researching the possibility of obtaining “recognition from UNESCO for CLAEM as a Regional Latin-American Center. Such recognition implies receiving resources for scholarships and visiting professors, which are a significant part of CLAEM’s budget.” A thorough report was created for this purpose and was submitted in 1968. However, the distance that had emerged between Ginastera and the government since the Bomarzo affair did not help the Center gain any support from local politicians.

By 1968 the crisis seemed inevitable. The Institute simply could not continue to offer the same support it had given the art centers without the large local support that the Di Tella Foundation had been providing in previous years. Foreign grants were not enough to sustain the projects at the same level of funding. A large grant from the Ford Foundation was received for 1968 to help all the art centers, but it only managed to stabilize the situation, and not solve the underlying issues. Oteiza feared that although “The magnitude of the support that [The Ford Foundation] will provide, although noteworthy by Latin American standards, will simply help us to avoid institutional collapse starting March of the current year [1968].” For Ginastera this meant that there was an imminent reduction of budget for the CLAEM.

---

23 Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, February 4, 1966, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
24 Enrique Oteiza, internal memorandum to M.A. de Uribelarrea with copy to Guido Di Tella, Alberto Ginastera and M. Marzana, July 24, 1968, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
25 Enrique Oteiza, letter to Alberto Ginastera, January 29, 1968, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
The end of the funding provided by the Rockefeller was by no means a surprise. Since the very beginning of the negotiations between Harrison and Ginastera, it had been made clear that the Foundation could only support the project under the condition of gradual increased support by local industries, so that after a certain number of years they would take over the costs initially covered by the Foundation. Once the first Rockefeller grant was over (1962-1965) the intention, as far as the people at the Di Tella Institute knew, was to replace it with another similar and terminal grant for the same length (1965-1968). However, internal documentation at the Rockefeller Foundation suggests otherwise. In 1964, Gerald Freund, Associate Director of Humanities and Social Sciences at the Rockefeller Foundation, sent an internal memo to Kenneth Thomson, vice-president of the Foundation. In this memorandum, Freund reveals the long-term plans the Foundation had regarding funding for the CLAEM. “Oteiza’s letter of June 12 [1964] constitutes a new request on behalf of the Argentine music center for the period following the present R[ockefeller] F[oundation] assistance in 1965. The Trustees’ action foresaw continued assistance possibly until 1970.”

On November 9, 1964, Alberto Ginastera wrote to Freund asking for “a grant […] from the Rockefeller Foundation, covering the period April 1, 1965 - March 31, 1971, for the Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales.” However, the unexpected organizational changes taking place at the Rockefeller Foundation must have hindered the request. The Humanities Program that had given the first grant became the “Humanities and Social Sciences Program” and no longer included arts. A new separate Arts Program was created, but its scope

---

26 Gerald Freund, internal communication to Kenneth Thomson, MB, and RXC, June 22, 1964, folder 76, box 7, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
27 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Gerald Freund, November 9, 1964, folder 76, box 9, series 301S, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
only covered activities in the United States. In March 1965, Norman Lloyd, at the time consultant for the Rockefeller Foundation and soon to be director of the arts program, wrote a letter to several high officials of the Foundation, worried about the implications those changes might have for the CLAEM:

The Instituto Torcuato di [sic] Tella grant was made under the old Humanities program, something that is now in the province of HSS [Humanities and Social Sciences]. The Arts Program is limited to things of the U.S.A., but I cannot help casting an eye or ear below the Rio Grande. What Ginastera is doing at the Institute is one of the most important projects in the arts in all of Latin America. I do hope that this program does not fall into a gap between HSS and Arts and disappear. It is worthwhile and I firmly believe it should be supported.28

The response to this letter must have been one of partial support. On May 12, 1965, Gerald Freund announced to Ginastera that “officers of both the Foundation’s Humanities and Social Sciences program and the Arts program discussed in detail the possibility of offering additional but terminal assistance for the Latin American Center for Advanced Musical Studies.”29 Later that year, on May 24, Kellum Smith Jr., as Secretary of the Foundation, informed Oteiza that the grant “represents the final contribution of The Rockefeller Foundation to the Institute for this purpose.”30

The funds of this grant were supposed to be used between 1965 and April 1969. Despite the clear language about how the grant would be terminal, Ginastera and Oteiza tried in multiple occasions to convince the Rockefeller Foundation to help them one last time. They began a

---

28 NL (probably Normal Lloyd, consultant to the Rockefeller Foundation), internal memo to KWT (Kenneth W. Thompson vice-president of the Rockefeller Foundation), JEB (Joseph E. Black, director of Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation), and RKD (Ralph K. Davidson, deputy director of Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation) March 16, 1965, folder 76, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Emphasis in the original.
30 Kellum Smith, letter to Enrique Oteiza announcing action of the Executive Committee of the Rockefeller Foundation, May 24, 1965, folder 76, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. My emphasis.
campaign that aimed to show that the conditions had improved, but that help was still needed. At this time they returned to the person who had been their closest ally at the Foundation in the early years: John P. Harrison. Harrison tried to help and sent a report on the centers to the Board of Directors of the Rockefeller foundation, praising the success of the CLAEM as a project. “As far as I can see,” wrote Harrison, “this is as close to an unqualified success as any educational-performing program in the arts could be.” Harrison wrote several letters in the next couple of months to the highest officer that could possibly help the project, Norman Lloyd, acting Director for Arts and Humanities of the Rockefeller Foundation. However, none of these efforts produced any results. The answer from Norman Lloyd, was definitive:

The Rockefeller Foundation cannot provide assistance for the Center. We are very much aware of the outstanding accomplishments of the Latin American Center for Advanced Musical Studies. Our inability to provide assistance in no way reflects the esteem we have for you and the activities of the Center. It does indicate program limitations of the Foundation that we must consider in responding to requests.

Without the financial support of the Rockefeller Foundation, the CLAEM simply could not continue to exist.

3. Ginastera’s Personal Situation

An important factor in understanding the end of the CLAEM that has not been discussed yet is Ginastera’s personal situation during these final years. He had married Mercedes de Toro “La Ñata” in 1941, but in 1968, his marriage was struggling. Mercedes had been Ginastera’s

31 John P. Harrison, report on visit of Enrique Oteiza, March 10 and 11, 1970, reel 36, series 301, RG 2 1970, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
33 Norman Lloyd, letter to Alberto Ginastera, March 19, 1971, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
right hand and she used her extroverted personality to act almost as an agent for the composer. They had two children, Georgina and Alejandro “Alex” Ginastera. Talking to Ginastera’s daughter, Georgina, she told me:

There was a rupture in my family, and I believe that rupture started at the Di Tella, at least symbolically. My father was a very homebody man. He did not like to have his working study outside the house […] He liked composing at home, like he later did in Geneva. But, what happened? He had to be at the Di Tella Institute; […] I think my mother suddenly felt an immense solitude. […] I think that was the origin of many problems. […] At the Di Tella, Josefina and Maria Luisa were doing all the secretarial duties that my mom used to do before: She was the one that would write conferences, copy scores, but suddenly within two or three years there was a rupture with that life style. […] He started becoming very independent from my mother.  

As the marriage disintegrated, people at the CLAEM started to see that Ginastera would sleep in his office, and it became impossible to avoid noticing Mercedes’s tantrums, during which she would rip apart his music and scream in the corridors of the center. After a very public jealous outburst at the Teatro Colón, the situation reached its limit. This resulted in the couple’s divorce early in 1969, something that was very difficult for Ginastera to accept. He was a devout Catholic, and breaking the sacrament of marriage depressed him. His productivity as a composers was seriously affected.

Yet, another factor had added to Ginastera’s troubles. Mercedes showed signs of mental instability, and unfortunately his son Alex was also showing signs of autism and some schizophrenia. Ginastera’s relationship with Alex was quite strange. Alex addressed him either as “Dear Alberto” or “Professor Alberto Ginastera.” Alex went through periods when he would only speak in German, and appeared to have not matured even though he was already a college-age adult. Without the support of Mercedes, Ginastera was not sure of how to handle Alex’s

---

34 Georgina Ginastera, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, June 8, 2008.
condition and decided to place him in the mental health institution Nuestra Señora de Luján in Buenos Aires.

Over the next couple of years the situation remained tense and Ginastera started dreading having to be in Buenos Aires. Alex would frequently write to his father using phrases that suggested suicidal thoughts like “I am in a place without any exit” or “my situation has no exit,” and he would ask for his father’s support and to be released from the mental institution. It would appear from Ginastera’s correspondence with his daughter Georgina and my conversations with her and some of his closest friends that Ginastera was never able to overcome the distance he had with his son.

With the dissolution of his marriage, his son in a mental health clinic, and the CLAEM’s funding struggles taking up the majority of his time, Ginastera started to think that it was time to move on and focus on his composing. In a letter to Jorge Sarmientos, Ginastera shared how he felt that his personal life and the lack of funding for the CLAEM were taking their toll on him. He tells him: “The last couple of months for me have been really crazy. With the beginning of classes [at the CLAEM], the search for scholarships since the Rockefeller funding ended, and my moving to another apartment, my life was a mess.” At the Di Tella Institute, Ginastera had become good friends with a playwright and outreach coordinator for the Institute named José María Paolantonio. In a letter to Paolantonio, Ginastera confides,

I recognize that during my sabbatical I was not very good at writing letters. You know well how my spirits have been in the last couple of years. You are perhaps one of the few people whom I trusted with this, given my strong introversion. My serious personal problems and the exhausting work at the Di Tella in order to find

37 Alberto Ginastera, letter to Jorge Sarmientos, June 10, 1969, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
money to sustain the budget undermined my creative will. Since the beginning of 1968 I had not written a single note. That was all terrible, since the crisis happened at the highpoint of my career.\textsuperscript{38}

However, an unexpected event happened at the end of 1970. Ginastera met and fell in love with the Argentinean cellist Aurora Nátola. Nátola was living in Switzerland and after only a couple of days, he decided to go with her to Europe. Talking with Aurora in Geneva, she confessed that from the very beginning they had no intentions of returning to Argentina:

He came here [to Switzerland] with the idea of getting married and staying here with me. We could have gone to the United States—he was already spending a lot of time in New York—or we could have come to Switzerland [as we did]. He knew perfectly well that I had no intention of going back to live in Argentina.\textsuperscript{39}

Ginastera described the love story to Paolantonio as a contrast to the difficult times he had experienced before Aurora:

Three days before returning to Europe she [Aurora] called to say that in her concerts she always played my \textit{Pampeana No.2} which I had written for her. I invited her to dinner with her husband, since I did not know of his death. She answered that she had been widowed, but accepted my invitation. Three days later we decided to get married. The rest is a true love story. I accepted her wish to wait for a year for the wedding, and in September, where we had gone for the premiere of \textit{Beatrix Cenci} we celebrated the wedding.\textsuperscript{40}

The unexpected love was the final trigger that pushed Ginastera to move away from Buenos Aires and all that he associated with the city. The trouble from Bomarzo, the financial problems of CLAEM, and the dictatorship were all behind in Switzerland. Ginastera interpreted the fact that his productivity as a composer had returned as a sign that he had done well going to Geneva.

“I had not written anything in three years,” Ginastera told Paolantonio “ and well, now in three

\begin{flushright}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{39} Aurora Nátola, interview with the author, Geneva, Switzerland, April 25, 2008.
\textsuperscript{40} Alberto Ginastera, letter to José María Paolantonio, [Geneva,] November 23, 1971, Paul Sacher Stiftung: Mikrofilmregister: Ginastera, Alberto: Korrespondenz, 284.1-2528; 2529.
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushright}
months I wrote an opera.” However, the CLAEM was left behind without his director and now was on its way to being closed. Ginastera’s final period at the CLAEM was marked by his problems at home, his success as a composer abroad, his stress to finish commissions, the unexpected romance with Aurora and subsequent move to Switzerland. This all manifested in one way or another as prolonged absences from the CLAEM.

4. Closing the CLAEM and the Transition

_Institutional Measures Taken to Confront the Economic Crisis_

By the beginning of 1970 the Di Tella Institute consisted of two broad branches: the scientific research centers and the art centers. The scientific research centers were the CIE (Center of Economic Research), CIS (Center for Social Research) and the CEUR (Center for Urbana and Regional Studies). Additionally other centers benefited from space and logistics provided by the Institute. These were the CIAP (Center for Research in Public Administration), the CICE (Center for Research in Educational Sciences) and the CIN (Center for Neurological Research). On the other hand, there were the three art centers (CLAEM, CAV and CAE), together with the department of photography and graphic design. Finally, the Institute also had an administrative office, secretaries, and an accounting office, plus an outreach office, a library and the Institute’s press. The duty of the new executive director replacing Oteiza, Roberto Cortés Conde, and the recently appointed administrative council of the Institute was to find ways to reduce the budget and decide the future of all these branches.

On April 19, 1970, an internal memo written by the administrative council of the Di Tella Institute reported the decisions that had been made so that the CLAEM would “continue its

___________________________

41 Ibid.
previous dimension, but with a reduction in its administrative body” ⁴² and would be relocated to a space in Superí 1502. The “CEA and CAV will finish their activities in their usual spaces on June 1. The CLAEM will continue its regular activities programmed for 1970, in an attempt that the move [to Superí 1502] will have the least possible effect on the Center’s internal agenda.” ⁴³

Five days later, Guido Di Tella called a press conference to announce the changes. He began by pointing out the modernizing role that the Institute had played up to that point.

For the last 10 years the Instituto Torcuato Di Tella has been operating actively in the country in the fields of social sciences and contemporary art. During this time fruitful results have been achieved in each one of these fields. Even though the job has not gone without mistakes, like any other human endeavor, we feel we have achieved a significant role in the promotion of creativity and the modernization of our national society. ⁴⁴

However, the conditions had changed and Guido had to announce radical modifications to the structure of the Institute: “Among these aspects, one of the decisions that will perhaps have the most public repercussion is the abandonment of our locale on Florida Street which has been the ‘showcase’ of the Institute’s activities in its totality.” ⁴⁵ On December 10, 1970 the Administrative Council of the Di Tella Institute decided that

On December 31 of this year [1970] the Centers for Audio Visual Experimentation and the Department of Graphic Design and Photography will close definitively. [...] The Latin-American Center for Advanced Musical Studies will finish its activities at the end of the academic year 1971. ⁴⁶

---

⁴² Consejo de Administración del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, “Resolución sobre redimensionamiento estructural y financiero del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella,” internal communication, April 19, 1970, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Guido Di Tella, press conference, April 24, 1970, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

The lack of funding was the immediate driving force behind the closing of the CLAEM. However, the picture has more complexities, as the political context and Ginastera’s own compositional career and troubles in his personal life affected the viability of continuing the project any longer. The Institute closed the CLAEM one year after it had closed the other two art centers, with Ginastera being absent for the full year. The people left behind took multiple measures to try to salvage some of the resources that had been accumulated over the last nine years of the CLAEM, and were only partially successful.

Transition After the Closing

With Ginastera in Switzerland, Francisco Kröpfl, Gerardo Gandini and Gabriel Brnčić felt particularly responsible for the continuity of the CLAEM after the institutional turmoil. In August 27, 1971, the three of them wrote to Ginastera to tell him that the Di Tella Institute would not be supporting the CLAEM starting December of that year. The continue explaining what was going to be their solution for this situation:

Since June, […] Paolantonio has been negotiating with the governmental municipality of Buenos Aires. Through his multiple contacts, […] he managed to interest the consultants of the mayor’s office to include everything in the CLAEM, plus the audiovisual projects into a broader cultural project that the mayor’s office already had in mind. […] Montero Ruiz [mayor of Buenos Aires] had approved the creation of the Instituto de Arte, Tecnología y Comunicación Masiva. This would mean that the CLAEM has been saved.  

The CICMAT, as it would be called, would be connected to the municipality and would receive in donation all the technical instruments and equipment from the CLAEM. “At the same time,” they told Ginastera, “the institute that will be created will have an autarchic government and its

directive and administrative structure will assure a maximum immunity regarding any changes of political order at the level of the municipality.” ⁴⁹

It is clear from all the communications and internal memos that the most important goal for the project was to achieve continuity, and to “get this institute to be autarchic enough so that it does not depend too closely on the enclaves of political power that are here both fluctuating and ephemeral.” ⁵⁰ Autonomy in decision-making and independence from the municipal political scene was a central desire evident in many of the letters sent during this period.

In the first months of 1972 the remains of the CLAEM, the laboratory and some new additions, were moved to the Centro Cultural San Martín. “We were given the whole fifth floor of the Centro Cultural San Martín (around Sarmiento Street),” told Reichenbach to Ginastera. “We are functioning there as C.I.C.M.A.T. (Centro de Investigación en Comunicación Masiva, Arte y Tecnología). Yes, a mouthful!” ⁵¹ In 1976, after some administrative restructuring, further changes occurred and the studio became part of the Centro de Estudios Acústicos Musicales (CEAM). ⁵² In 1982, the studio became the Laboratorio de Investigación y Producción Musical (LIPM) and was incorporated to the Centro Cultural Ciudad de Buenos Aires, under Francisco Kröpfl’s direction with two areas: experimental music under Gerardo Gandini’s supervision, and electronic music, under Fernando von Reichenbach and the musical direction of Gabriel Brnčić

---

⁴⁹ Ibid.
⁵² According to Aharonián, this center did not produce new works, and was absorbed over several years by bureaucratic requirements. See Aharonián 1992.
and later José Maranzano. This center is today the Centro Cultural Recoleta, located next to the famous cemetery in one of the nicest neighborhoods of Buenos Aires.

During my visit to Buenos Aires in 2011 for a festival commemorating the 50th anniversary of the CLAEM, not only the LIPM, but several other music programs of local universities claimed to be direct byproducts of the CLAEM. The Universidad Nacional de Quilmes, Universidad Nacional de Lanús, Departamento Artes Sonoras y Departamento de Multimedia del IUNA, the Universidad Católica Argentina, and the Universidad Tres de Febrero, all made and effort to demonstrate they were descendants of what began with the CLAEM at the local Argentinean level, even though there is no institutional heritage that one can trace. Perhaps most curious was their lack of knowledge about the history of the center. But nevertheless they associated importance and prestige with this mythical place. Also significant is that none of them considered its importance as a Latin American center, but rather focused on its impact inside Argentina. The CLAEM closed in December 1971, and any claims of continuity after that are up for debate. What is more important is the general legacy that the Center left.

The Closing of the CLAEM

Three important conclusions emerge of this epilogue. First, the reasons for the closing of the CLAEM involved a complex mix of economic problems, Ginastera’s personal crisis and the political pressure the Institute had from the repressive government of Onganía. Attempts to simplify these and attribute only one reason for the CLAEM’s demise fail to apprehend the multiple trajectories that had to converge for the project to function in the first place.

53 See Novoa 2011, 29.
Second, when the closing of the CLAEM became inevitable, probably around the time the CAE and CAV were closed, immediate efforts began to find some kind of continuity for the project. The composers who remained in Buenos Aires and had the opportunity to take advantage of the resources provided by the CLAEM attempted to establish a new center focused mostly around the equipment of the electronic music laboratory. Ultimately, these attempts crystallized in the CICMAT, the short-lived CEAM, and the LIPM, which still exist today.

Finally, the institutional and political experience of the CLAEM left its own legacies. The composers looking for continuity had a need for independence from the state, which they now distrusted. The freedom available at the Di Tella Institute and its independence from the public sector was valued above all as a central part of the creative experience.

5. Conclusions

The Chronicle of the CLAEM

Overall the history around the CLAEM as an institution for music making is much more dense and extensive at its beginning than its end. The processes of putting together the project did not only involve Ginastera, but many other actors who were crucial for its success. In this work I have emphasized the significance of John P. Harrison as officer of the Rockefeller Foundation. As granting agencies become humanized and personalized, it is easier to understand the investment different people have in philanthropy. Thus, it was significant as well to look at the perspectives of the Rockefeller family and the Di Tella family, as examples of elites involved in the promotion of the arts. The story of each of the biennial fellowships and the last year of returning fellows show a wide diversity of composers, with a decreasing amount of funds to bring important figures from abroad. Stylistically one can see that students were much more
interested in serialism and post-serial techniques during the initial years, while slowly the trend moved towards experimentalism, conceptual music, graphic notation and improvisation in the later years. The electronic music laboratory at the CLAEM reflected the pedagogical objectives of the center and the modernizing impetus of the Institute as a whole. Its success in the end as an early studio in Latin America also shows some of the shortcomings of adopting foreign models in Latin American situations.

The causes for the closing of the CLAEM have been the subject of frequent speculation, and the end was certainly much faster and abrupt than its creation. But at the same time, in hindsight, one can explain it as a complex process of fading away, as the local economic and political conditions deteriorated, foreign policy changed course, and its director Ginastera became more and more disenchanted with his situation in Buenos Aires.

*Philanthropy and Contemporary Music in Latin America*

The policies and worldviews that allowed a project like the CLAEM to be viable for a Foundation such as the Rockefeller changed between the 1960s and 1970s. The Cold War notions that applied up to the point of the Cuban Revolution changed dramatically and new attention was paid to Latin America and its cultural ties with the United States. But just as sudden was the abandonment of the promotion of social and economic development and the embrace of right wing regimes that maintained the doctrine of national security. The mild success and the ultimate failure of the Alliance for Progress reflect these changes and frame the story of the CLAEM. The CLAEM initiative was one of the most successful cases of support towards the arts in the history of the Rockefeller Foundation, but as the organization moved in different directions, this lesson seems to have vanished—or at least it has been ignored until
now. No other musical project supported by the Rockefeller Foundation has had such broad repercussions in the musical scene of a whole region.

In the case of the Di Tella family, the experience is quite the opposite. The objective of gaining prestige by exchanging economic capital for cultural and symbolic capital was an absolute success. Both Guido and Torcuato gained places of prominence in their countries, and the name Di Tella became associated with the world of highbrow arts. Even after the decline of the Di Tella fortune, and the closing of the CLAEM, the Di Tella family has continued to support the creation of electroacoustic music through the Fundación Música y Tecnología. This foundation has provided resources for scholarships, concerts, and commissions that have participated significantly in making Argentina one of the prime places for electroacoustic music in the world. Directors and highly esteemed composers at multiple electronic music laboratories around the world today are from Argentina, and most of them have benefitted directly or indirectly from the continuous help of the Di Tella family.

**The Impact of Philanthropy**

This work has shown that there were modernist-capitalist cosmopolitan interests fueling the drive for sponsoring the arts in Latin America. But it is important to point out that a combination of the particular ethics of ‘creative freedom’ sponsored at the CLAEM and the belief in the autonomy of art resulted in at least a partial, if not total disconnect between the intentions of the funding and the actual results on the ground. Composers did learn about recent international trend of contemporary music, but were in general doubtful of the political impact their music could have, with positions ranging from explicitly political—a minority—to emphatically neutral—the majority. Those who did worry about the impact of their production had to negotiate with how autonomous music could affect social life as they embraced the avant-
garde. In general, and once again after contact with composers elsewhere in the world, they developed parallel activities as composers who wrote, taught and organized events, to engage with their social surroundings in what became known as musical militancy.

**Embracing the Avant-Garde**

There was certainly no one style associated with composition at the CLAEM. Many composers tried very different things, more often than not following trends in the transnational art world of classical music in which they participated and that were brought to their attention through their own travels or as a result of visiting scholars. Avant-garde compositions—as broadly defined as they might be—expressed nonconformity with the existing mainstream ‘classical music.’ But they also indicated full acceptance into contemporary trends of composition. Knowledge and proficiency in the avant-garde meant that the composer was informed and up-to-date, and were a sign of being truly cosmopolitan.

This dissertation showed the multiple stylistic paths that composers took as they adapted and appropriated international styles of avant-garde composition. At the same time, it put in evidence how the rhetoric of rupture engrained in avant-garde discourses was not separated from the desire to make art relevant for society. The challenge that this created was resolved through the association of multiple modes of social interaction—writing, teaching, learning, promoting works, and organizing concerts—with the autonomous artwork. The performative aspect of the texts, concerts, or lessons that these composers gave became particularly important because of their capacity to produce powerful associations with their musical compositions. The autonomous work turns out to be effective and affective in their societies as it becomes meaningful through association with other facets of a composer’s identity—composer as writer,
composer as critic, composer as cultural mediator—part of the semiotic chain in which the autonomous work of art comes to signify.

Ultimately, the avant-garde at the CLAEM became a hegemonic position, institutionalized, and that ostracized other contemporary musical practices in its own art world. This peculiarity shows discrepancies with theories of avant-garde movements, and provides a counter-example where the institutionalization of musical practice—and creating an Institute to host it—was indeed what was considered avant-garde.

Pan-Americanism, Latin Americanism and the CLAEM

The two-year duration and the regional focus of the study program at the CLAEM led to a deep exchange of knowledge among some of the most talented young composers in Latin America. In the context of Pan-Americanism and other discourses aiming to create a hemispheric solidarity, the creation of the CLAEM was the culmination of the high visibility of Latin American art music in the United States. But Latin Americanism was more of a professional strategy than a unique musical style. In fact, most composers strived to sound universal and blend in with the world of the cosmopolitan avant-garde. Composers at the CLAEM had professional identities in a classical music world that was frequently identified with Europe. Latin Americanism was seen as an identity marker that did not correspond to specific musical or aesthetical choices. It was a conscious decision of foregrounding regional ties and communal interests as part of professional strategies to gain visibility, audiences, and relevance. However, few composers felt the need to localize their work by adding local styles, indigenisms, idioms or instruments. In general, what legitimated a composer’s work was international recognition and being in contact with the international musical community—although this did not go
unquestioned. And even though discursively there might have been a strong push for a Latin Americanist position, sonically the works in general—with few exceptions—maintained an emphatically neutral character. This, however, changed in the years to follow, as composers from this generation matured and found ways to expressively foreground this aspect of their identity.

Contemporary music was marginalized and heavily criticized at the local level. It appealed only to a small minority of local people, and for the composers, being Latin American was a second level of marginalization within the art world of contemporary music. The desire for cosmopolitanism (for some represented by serialist and post-serialist Europe, and for others represented by mavericks and composers in the peripheries such as Xenakis, Cage or Varèse) was a driving force for ‘unmarked’ Latin American compositions.

The CLAEM, Cosmopolitanism and Solidarity Networks

The CLAEM as a case study shows the relevance of understanding cosmopolitan social networks as they operate transnationally and across fields. In the creation of the CLAEM we saw the actual life relationships and meeting moments between the Di Tella and Rockefeller families, John Harrison, Enrique Oteiza, Ginastera, and many others, which explain why they found similarities in their worldviews and resonances in their discourses.

The CLAEM was a transnational space where composers were socialized as cosmopolitans—actually becoming more cosmopolitan. It gave the opportunity for composers to exchange ideas, materials, and created friendships and networks of solidarity. This networks had a crucial impact in the Latin American classical music scene, since these connections, like the

---

Aharonián, making reference to determining significant works produced in Latin America in the previous decades argues: “International recognition may be misleading, so there must be space left for other considerations, which should also be discussed.” See Aharonián 2002, 3.
transnational education received, became capital that solidified the position of these composers as elite in their profession.

Continuity of the CLAEM and Distance from Institutional Support

The CICMAT (Centro de Investigación en Comunicación Masiva, Arte y Tecnología) and later the LIPM (Laboratorio de Investigación y Producción Musical) as inheritors of the equipment and some of the original staff of the CLAEM, might be seen as a direct continuation of the work at the CLAEM. However, another important aspect emerged from this experience. The difficult political situations not only in Argentina but also in Latin America as a whole during the 1970s created a widespread distrust of institutional support. The impetus of generating solidarity networks among Latin American composers continued outside institutions in the Cursos Latinoamericanos de Música Contemporánea, which took place between 1971 and 1989. However, the differences with the CLAEM were important: the Cursos were itinerant, non-profit, non-institutionalized, militant, and the students, with the exceptions of those who received fellowships, “paid a small fee that when divided, helped to cover the costs of boarding of the teachers, who would give classes for free…” Five of these events took place in Uruguay, two in Argentina, six in Brazil, one in the Dominican Republic and one in Venezuela. The students who attended were mostly Latin American but despite the name of the Cursos included many other nationalities: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Dominican

56 The history of these courses remains to be told. It is worth pointing out that the organizing team for them consisted of Coriún Aharonián, Conrado Silva (Uruguay/Brazil), José María Neves (Brazil), Graciela Paraskevaidis (Argentina/Uruguay), Cergio Prudencio (Bolivia), Héctor Tosar (Uruguay), Miguel Marozzi (Uruguay), Emilio Mendoza (Venezuela), and María Teresa Sande (Uruguay). The extensive list of teachers who collaborated on this project can be found at http://www.latinoamerica-musica.net/informes/cursos.html, Accessed February 19, 2011. See also “Anexo II” in Coriún Aharonián, Educación, arte, música, 2004.
57 Graciela Paraskevaidis, email with the author, March 29, 2010.
Republic, Ecuador, France, Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Morocco, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Puerto Rico, United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

The CLAEM fellows who participated in the courses as teachers were Aharonián, Bazán, Biriotti, Etkin, Fernandes, Kusnir, Maiguashca, Maranzano, Martínez, Orellana, Paraskevaídis and Villalpando. These courses, as I mentioned in chapter 4, were the most important pedagogical activity of contemporary music in Latin America in the period immediately after the end of the CLAEM. Once more, like the CLAEM, they provided an answer to the isolation and disinformation that only this center had been able to break before.

As individuals, a large number of fellows became true ambassadors of each other’s music around the world. There are many who, after attending the CLAEM, decided to lend a hand to other musicians, composers and Latin American researchers. As an example we can mention Alcides Lanza, first from his post at Columbia-Princeton, and then from McGill University in Montreal; Mesías Maiguashca from within Germany; Gabriel Brnčić from Spain; Coriún Aharonián and Graciela Paraskevaídis from Uruguay; Mariano Etkin and Gerardo Gandini in Argentina; Blas Atehortúa and Jacqueline Nova, despite her early death in Colombia; Jorge Antunes and Marlos Nobre in Brazil; and Eduardo Kusnir, both during his years in Puerto Rico, and then in Venezuela. Many are missing from this list, since the majority of the more than fifty fellows returned to their countries and traveled the world promoting the works of Latin American composers. The networks of solidarity that were created at the CLAEM remained strong and have united composers across the continent and the world for the last five decades.

The CLAEM in Perspective

I argue that the CLAEM was successful in achieving its main objectives. It created a strong network of communication and information among composers in the region. It proved that
a combination of local and foreign support outside governmental institutions can provide fruitful artistic experiences. Finally, it was also able to launch the careers of multiple composers, many of them with very different stylistic characteristics. That is, there is no particular “CLAEM sound.” What was achieved was deeper than generating a school of composers that would follow Ginastera, Gandini or Kröpfl. It was a series of individuals with their own aesthetic interests that found each other and learned to appreciate and collaborate with one another.

The CLAEM was a unique experience, and to finish this survey of its history, I quote two of its fundamental actors during its ten years of existence, Alberto Ginastera and Gerardo Gandini:

The CLAEM was my most ambitious creation, and that which I think gave the most important fruits. We can see now to what extent it revolutionized the music of a whole continent. I believe that North Americans and Europeans might be even more aware of this phenomenon than we are.⁵⁸

At this particular time, for all of us who went through the Di Tella, it all just seems like an unrepeatable dream. Not only because since then there is less and less contemporary music in Buenos Aires, but fundamentally for what it meant at the human level for all of us, from the never ending discussion about music that we shared, to the fraternal coffees at the Florida Garden.⁵⁹

---
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APPENDIX A

FELLOWS AT THE CLAEM

Table A-1: Fellows for 1963-1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury for 1963-64</th>
<th>Fellows for 1963-1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lauro Ayestarán (Uruguay, 1913-1966), Alfonso Letelier (Chile, 1912-1994), Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>Blas Emilio Atehortúa,1 Oscar Bazán, Cesar Bolaños, Armando Krieger, Mario Kuri-Aldana, Mesías Maiguashca, Alcides Lanza,2 Marlos Nobre, Miguel Angel Rondano, Edgar Valcarcel, Marco Aurelio Vanegas (only first year) and Alberto Villalpando</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-2: Fellows for 1965-1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury for 1965-65</th>
<th>Fellows for 1965-1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luigi Dallapiccola, León Schidlovsky and Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>Rafael Aponte-Ledée, Jorge Arandia Navarro, Gabriel Brnčić, Mariano Etkin, Benjamin Gutierrez, Miguel Letelier, Eduardo Mazzadi, Graciela Paraskevaidis, Enrique Rivera, and Jorge Sarmientos. Additional fellow Walter Ross (1966, OAS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-3: Additional Composers for 1965-1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted Fellows Who Did Not Attend (1965-66)</th>
<th>Student Given Special Permission to have Access to the Studio</th>
<th>Returning Fellows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernal Flores</td>
<td>Ladislao Todoroff (probably since 1966)</td>
<td>Cesar Bolaños (1965-66), Blas Emilio Atehortúa (1966)3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The dates that Atehortúa has given for his birth range from 1933 to 1945. The documents he provided to the CLAEM in 1962 to become a fellow, including a photocopy of his Colombian ID, as well as biographical information he gave for concert program notes at the time point to October 5, 1933. In our interview, and many other public statements, the Colombian composer Blas Atehortúa claims that he was twenty years old by the time he was applying to the CLAEM. However, newspaper articles at the time described him as a 31 year old and all documentation kept today from the CLAEM indicates his birthday as 1933. |
2 Since 1960, Alcides Lanza has used lowercase letters for his name as well as his compositions. To maintain clarity in this text however, I will keep the initial upperscases. |
3 Cesar Bolaños continued his studies at the CLAEM with a scholarship from the OAS in 1965 and then from the Centro de Artes Visuales of the Di Tella Institute in 1966. In 1966 Blas Atehortúa also received a fellowship from the OAS to return to the CLAEM.
Table A-4: Fellows for 1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Estrada, Alfonso Letelier, and Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>Luis Arias, Oscar Cubillas, Marlene Fernandes, Jacqueline Nova, Joaquin Orellana, Mario Perusso, Florencio Pozadas, Iris Sangüesa de Ichasso, Luis María Serra.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-5: Additional Composers for 1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted Fellows that Did Not Attend (1967-68)</th>
<th>Student Given Special Permission to have Access to the Studio</th>
<th>Students Accepted but not Through Competition</th>
<th>Returning Fellows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kilza Setti (Brazil, 1932)</td>
<td>Ladislao Todoroff</td>
<td>Regina Benavente de Beresiarte</td>
<td>Cesar Bolaños (1967), Gabriel Brnčić (1967-1968) and Blas Emilio Atehortúa (1967)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-6: Fellows for 1969-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo Becerra (Chile, 1925-2010), Héctor Tosar (Uruguay, 1923-2002) and Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>Coriún Aharonián (only part of first year), Jorge Antunes, Jorge Blarduni, Pedro Caryevschi, Bruno D'Astoli, Diego Feinstein, Eduardo Kusnir, Antonio Mastrogiovanni, José Maranzano, Ariel Martinez, Alejandro Núñez Allauca, Salvador Ranieri, and Luis Zubillaga.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Blas Atehortúa finishes his studies and returns to Colombia January 1968.
5 Did not present any works in concerts at the CLAEM.
6 Did not present any works in concerts at the CLAEM.
7 Did not present any works in concerts at the CLAEM.
### Table A-7: Additional Composers for 1969-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted Fellows that Did Not Attend (1969-1970)</th>
<th>Students Accepted but not Through Competition</th>
<th>Returning Fellows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfredo del Mónaco (Venezuela, 1938), Juan Carlos Villegas (Chile 1941), Federico Ibarra Groth (Mexico 1946)</td>
<td>Beatriz Lockhart and León Biriotti</td>
<td>Rafael Aponte-Ledée (1969 and beginning of 1970)⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A-8: Additional composers for 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellows Offered a Return Fellowship that Accepted</th>
<th>Fellows Offered a Return Fellowship that Declined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>César Bolaños, Mariano Etkin, Alejandro Núñez Allauca, José Ramón Maranzano, Pedro Caryevschi and Ariel Martinez</td>
<td>Rafael Aponte-Ledée, Jorge Antunes, Marlos Nobre, Miguel Letelier and Antonio Mastrogiovanni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁸ OAS scholarship.
APPENDIX B

COURSES OFFERED AT THE CLAEM

The curriculum for the CLAEM followed a core set of courses by a local staff of professors, which would be complemented by the seminars given by the visiting professors. On several occasions the Di Tella Institute would also offer individual talks that the fellows were expected to attend. The following curricular description circulated internally in different versions and served as a template for all groups of fellows, with the exception of the 1971 group that did not receive any classes as such.¹

Contemporary Structures in Musical Composition: Formal and structural analysis of music, ranging from atonality to present-day music. Study of the different types of avant-garde music, together with an analysis of the form and structure of different parameters and forms of musical notation.

Composition Seminars I and II: a) Analysis, discussion and public performance of works composed during the course. These works cover different vocal, instrumental and electronic genres. [Starting in 1969 professors and students participate together in experimental group composition] b) Written analysis of contemporary works [...] The student will be expected to make an exposé on his subject to the rest of his fellows and group discussion will take place thereon, the object of the exercise being to develop teaching ability. c) Seminars in charge of research groups on matters related to present-day music.

Electronic Music Composition I and II: All the theoretical and practical problems faced by the composer unfamiliar with this medium are studied as follows: a) Problems of perception related to electronic music composition (psycho-acoustical and electro-acoustical relationships). b) Study of the relation between the qualities of sound normally used by the composer and available sources of sound and equipment for elaboration and assembly. c) General methodology for electronic composition (relationship between conception and musical production

¹ Perhaps the most complete descriptions of the core classes being offered at the CLAEM appear in a document dated 1971 but apparently sent to the Rockefeller Foundation towards the end of 1970, perhaps in hopes of receiving some sort of additional support. “Informe CLAEM 1971 Versión en castellano Original,” dated 1971 but probably from the end of 1970, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
media). This theoretical phase is complemented by listening to and analyzing electronic works of different composers of varying tendencies. Together with this theoretical study, practical group classes are held during the first year of study to enable students to learn how to handle the equipment available to them. These classes are supervised by an assistant professor. During the second year of study, the fellowship holders undertake personal research in the Laboratory, culminating in the creation of a work based on the use of electronics. [This really only becomes standardized in 1967]

The Technique of Electro-Acoustical Instruments: Analysis of the functional principles of the equipment to be found in an electronic music laboratory. Learning the basic uses and other possibilities afforded by said equipment. Practical experience in handling equipment in order to stimulate imaginative use of available technical media.

History and Aesthetics of Contemporary Music: Survey of general musical and aesthetic problems and their bearing on the attitude of the great composers of contemporary music.

Problems of Contemporary Musical Creation: An analysis of contemporary music both from an aesthetic point of view and from that of the problems of the composer faced with the social structures and the necessity of finding suitable means of communication within that context.

New Principles of Orchestration: By means of practical analysis to examine the evolution of the contemporary orchestra and the new concepts of timbre, ranging from atonality to the most recent forms of avant-garde music.

Musical Texture of the Twentieth Century: Examination of the different systems for organizing sound, starting with dodecaphonic music and following its successive and simultaneous developments. Analysis of serial and post-serial techniques and total chromatization. Introduction to microtonal theory and the use of the potential afforded by the sound spectrum. Practice of group improvisation in order to gain experience in the use of different musical textures. [The practice of improvisation became more common after 1965]

Introduction to the Analysis of Experimental Music: The technique of classifying and analyzing sound.

History and Aesthetics of American Music: The present state of music in the different countries of the Americas and the role of the composer within the context of his environment.²

The first group of fellows received the core classes defined by the curriculum with some small variations.  

Table B-1: Classes in 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition Seminar I</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Monday-Thursday 5:30-7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Structures in Musical Composition</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Monday-Thursday 3:00-4:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber choir (included students from the Catholic University)</td>
<td>María del Carmen Díaz, director</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wednesday 4:30-6:00 pm, Saturday 11:00-12:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Texture (remedial course)</td>
<td>Raquel Casinelli de Arias</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Wednesday 4-6, Saturday 9:30-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Texture in the 20th Century</td>
<td>Riccardo Malipiero</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Tuesday-Friday 3:00-4:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New principles of Orchestration</td>
<td>Riccardo Malipiero</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Tuesday-Friday 4:30-6:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Rhythm</td>
<td>Olivier Messiaen</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>June 18 – July 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics of Twentieth Century Music</td>
<td>Aaron Copland</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>September 18, 23, 27, 28, 30, and October 1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Compared to the general curriculum this group did not have the courses “History and Aesthetics of Contemporary Music,” “Problems of Contemporary Musical Creation” or “Technique of Electro-acoustical Instruments.”

4 Main source for this list comes from: Alberto Ginastera and Enrique Oteiza, report to Gerald Freund (Associate Director for Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation), June 16, 1966, folder 77, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

5 This is contrary to the common belief that Aaron Copland inaugurated the courses at the CLAEM. See for instance Valenti Ferro (1992, 335).
Table B-2: Classes in 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 6</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition Seminar II</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Monday-Thursday 5:30-7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Techniques in Composition7</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Acoustics and Electronics8</td>
<td>Horacio Raúl Bozarelo (starting April 21, 1964)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Tuesday-Friday 4:00-5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Texture (remedial course)</td>
<td>Raquel Casinelli de Arias</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Wednesday 4-6, Saturday 9:30-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensión cultural</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Wednesday 6:00-8:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of Music Theory9</td>
<td>Pola Suarez Urtubey (?)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Aesthetics of American Music</td>
<td>Maria del Carmen Díaz, director</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Wednesday 4:30-6:00 pm Saturday 11:00-12:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Word</td>
<td>Luigi Dallapiccola (Italy 1904-1975)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>September 22 - October 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique for the Composition of Electronic Music</td>
<td>Jose Vicente Asuar (Chile b.1933)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>October 26 -November 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Main source for this list comes from: Alberto Ginastera and Enrique Oteiza, report to Gerald Freund (Associate Director for Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation), June 16, 1966, folder 77, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
7 This last course was probably later renamed to “Introduction to the Analysis of Experimental Music.”
8 This course would later be called Electronic Music Composition I.
9 Most likely the course later called Problems of Contemporary Musical Creation.
10 As Vázquez points out, two other visitors were supposed to come to the CLAEM and had to cancel: first Heinrich Strobel and a course called “From present to the future of music” and another by Witold Lutoslawski titled “New basis of music theory” (2008, 84).
11 Elsewhere referred to as “Experimental Phonology”
The classes for the 1965-1966 biennial were not unlike those planned for the first generation. A new policy was implemented, requiring exams to determine levels in harmony and dictation, counterpoint and fugue, and math and physics.

Table B-3: Classes in 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition Seminar I</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Structures in Musical Composition</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Aesthetics of Contemporary Music</td>
<td>Pola Suárez Urtubey</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>It appears that Suárez Urtubey did not teach the whole course, but the documentation is not clear on when she left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Texture in the 20th Century</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Texture (remedial)</td>
<td>Raquel Casinelli de Arias</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Orchestra Ensemble (specialized in ancient and baroque music)</td>
<td>Filoctetes Martorella</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>I have not encountered any reference to this orchestra by fellows or professors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Acoustics and Electronics</td>
<td>Horacio Raúl Bozarello</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique for the Composition of Electronic Music</td>
<td>Mario Davidovsky (Argentina/United States, 1934)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Cinema</td>
<td>Maurice Le Roux (France 1923-1992)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Short course between August 26-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 See: Alberto Ginastera and Enrique Oteiza, report to Gerald Freund (Associate Director for Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation), June 16, 1966, folder 77, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

13 [Maria Luisa Branha], letter to Alberto Ginastera, March 15, 1965, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.

14 See Alberto Ginastera and Enrique Oteiza, report to Gerald Freund (Associate Director for Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation), June 16, 1966, folder 77, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

15 Le Roux had composed several works for film, particularly the score for Albert Lamorisse's *Ballon rouge* (1955) and other incidental works for the Renaud-Barrault theater company. He was at the time very well known as the musical director of the Orchestre National de l'ORTF where he conducted works by Messiaen, Xenakis, Varèse and the Second Viennese School. Cf.
Table B-4: Classes in 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition Seminar II</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of Contemporary</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Principles of Orchestration</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Aesthetics of</td>
<td>Pola Suárez Urtubey</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>It is once more possible that Suárez Urtubey did not teach the whole course, if she taught it at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin and North American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Texture (remedial course)</td>
<td>Raquel Casinelli de Arias</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques for the Composition of Electronic Music</td>
<td>Fernando von Reichenbach and Cesar Bolaños</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>The composers that worked most intensely in the laboratory were Rafael Aponte-Ledée, Gabriel Brnčić, Blas Atehortúa, Cesar Bolaños and Ladislao Todoroff, a non-fellow from Universidad de La Plata who received special permission to use the studios during 1966 and 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish America’s Baroque</td>
<td>Robert Stevenson</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>July 25, 29, August 2, and 5. Seminar was also open to the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stochastic, Strategic and</td>
<td>Iannis Xenakis</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>August 22- September 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Theory of</td>
<td>Earl Brown (United States,</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>October 19-November 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>1926-2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In theory the courses for 1967-1968 were to remain very similar to the two previous groups. Initially, during the first year Alberto Ginastera was to teach “Contemporary Structures in Musical Composition” and the “Composition Seminar,” and Gerardo Gandini would continue teaching “Musical Texture in the Twentieth Century.” However, neither composer was able to be at the CLAEM for the beginning of the academic year. With Gandini’s absence, a new teacher, Francisco Kröpfl, was asked to teach the course.

---

16 Alberto Ginastera and Enrique Oteiza, report to Gerald Freund (Associate Director for Humanities and Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation), June 16, 1966, folder 77, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

17 Enrique Oteiza, report to Nils Westberg, May 15, 1968, folder 78, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
Alberto Ginastera had been absent occasionally for the teaching of the last group—and had avoided working closely with some of the most rebellious students, leaving that work to Gandini. However, he was much more occupied with his compositional career in 1967, and he took extended leaves of absence.

Table B-5: Classes in 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS 18</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Structures in Musical Composition</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Ginastera was absent for the beginning of the academic year, and the course apparently took place irregularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition Seminar I</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Ginastera was absent for the beginning of the academic year, and the course apparently took place irregularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Texture in the Twentieth Century</td>
<td>Francisco Kröpfl (Initially Gerardo Gandini was going to teach the course)</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Thursdays 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Aesthetics of Contemporary Music</td>
<td>Pola Suárez Urtubey</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Fridays 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Introduction to Acoustics and Electronics</td>
<td>Fernando von Reichenbach</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Tuesdays 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique for the Composition of Electronic Music</td>
<td>Francisco Kröpfl</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Mondays 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical/Practical Course on Wind Instruments</td>
<td>Adolfo Stagno</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Wednesdays 4-6, between April and June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Words</td>
<td>Luigi Nono</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>July 10-August 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a Composer in an Electronic Music Laboratory</td>
<td>Luigi Nono</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>July 10-August 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Techniques of Musical Composition</td>
<td>Cristobal Halffter (Spain, 1930)</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>August 15-September 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Enrique Oteiza, report to Nils Westberg, May 15, 1968, folder 78, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.
### Table B-6: Classes in 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition Seminar II</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera (frequently absent, classes usually covered by Gandini and Kröpfl)</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of Contemporary Music Creation</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera (frequently absent, classes usually covered by Gandini and Kröpfl)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Introduction to Audiovisual Media</td>
<td>Fernando von Reichenbach</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Tuesdays 2:30-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Principles of Orchestration</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Tuesdays 4:30-6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Composition with Electronic Media</td>
<td>Francisco Kröpfl</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Thursdays 4:30-6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Aesthetics of American Music</td>
<td>Pola Suárez Urtubey</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Fridays 2:30-4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Linguistics and Poetic Analysis</td>
<td>Juan Carlos Indart</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>The course was scheduled, but I have no evidence that it took place. However it is indicated as mandatory for the fellows at the CLAEM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the Analysis of Experimental Music</td>
<td>Enrique Belloc (Argentina, 1936)</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Mondays 2:30-4:00pm, starting May 1st and for three months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Experience as a Composer in Electronic Music Laboratories</td>
<td>Vladimir Ussachevskey</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>June, visit ends June 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, ca. June 1968</td>
<td>Gilbert Amy (France, 1936)</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Three lectures titled: “Problems of form in musical creation” but also referred to as “Problems of form in contemporary music.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1968</td>
<td>Roman Haubenstock-Ramati (Austria, 1919-1994)</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Contemporary Music Notation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1969, budgetary pressures led classes to start much later than usual. The team of teachers would be very similar to previous years, with one important addition. Gabriel Brnčić was hired as auxiliary professor, not only for the benefit of the center, but also to help him continue to live in Argentina. The schedule for classes was less intense than in any previous

---

19 Josefina Schröder, letter to Alberto Ginastera, July 4, 1968, CLAEM Archives, ITDT.
20 There is an anecdote that Ariel Martínez remembered that is significant to see how some of the composers felt about Gabriel Brnčić and his importance in their education. He told me: “When we finished the two-year fellowship they gave us the diplomas, but there was a revolution! We looked at the signatures and we noticed that Brnčić was not there. So we did a meeting and I was
group. Probably taking into consideration how late the academic year had begun, the schedule was reorganized for September, October and November.

Table B-7: Classes in 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Techniques of Electroacoustic Instruments</td>
<td>Fernando von Reichenbach</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Tuesdays 2:30-4:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Structures in Musical Composition</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Tuesdays 4:30-6:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Texture in the Twentieth Century</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Thursdays 2:30-4:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Composition with Electronic Media</td>
<td>Francisco Kröpfl</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Thursdays 4:30-6:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice in Studio</td>
<td>Francisco Kröpfl</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>One hour/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>One hour/week, to be scheduled weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of Contemporary Music Composition</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Mondays 4:30-6:00 pm. There is no evidence that this class took place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Esthetics of Contemporary Music</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>There is no evidence this class took place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Principles of orchestration</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Tuesdays 4:30-6:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition Seminar</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Wednesdays 4:30-6:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form in Contemporary Music</td>
<td>Luis de Pablo (Spain, 1930)</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Four times a week, 4pm from June 2-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Mixed Communication Media</td>
<td>Eric Salzman (United States, 1933)</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>September (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Larry Austin (United States, 1930)</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>September (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 designated to go and tell Francisco [Kröpfl]—who was there since Ginastera was not—that we wanted Brnčić to sign the diploma. Yes, without any arguments, since as Kusnir points out, he was a helper. Yes, he was a helper, but he was more than that… So we met in a bar, and I said right away ‘Look, what we want is for Brnčić’s signature to be on the diploma because he was very important to us. Maranzano yelled at me for who knows how many days for my excessively direct style. [laughs] […] Anyway, Brnčić didn’t like it much because he thought it would look like it was a lie. […] We all recognized the importance he had in our formation. […] He was really important for the people that did electroacoustic music.” Ariel Martínez, interview with the author, Buenos Aires, July 9, 2008.
Table B-8: Classes in 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening and analysis of electronic works</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Tuesdays 1:30-2:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Principles of Orchestration</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Tuesdays 3:00-4:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary on Experimentation</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Thursdays 2:00-3:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition with Electronic Media</td>
<td>Francisco Kröpfl</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Thursdays 4:00-5:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal of the Grupo de Experimentación Musical</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Thursdays 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Lectures: 1) The poetics of New Music in the context of the contemporary avant-garde; 2) Structural thought and Serial thought; and 3) Problems of Musical and Artistic Practice in the Universe of Protest</td>
<td>Umberto Eco</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>August 7, 9, 11, 19, and 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX C**

**EVENTS AND VISITORS AT THE CLAEM**

Table C-1: Events in 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April-May 1962</td>
<td>With the approval of the Rockefeller Grant, the CLAEM begins functioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5, 1962</td>
<td>Press release announcing the creation of the CLAEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9-12, 1962</td>
<td>First Contemporary Music Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-2: Events, talks, and visiting scholars 1963.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 29, 1963</td>
<td>Press release announcing the first group of fellows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 1963</td>
<td>Reception to welcome the 12 fellows to the center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 1963</td>
<td>Edgar Willems (Belgium, 1890-1978) (music educator, Geneva Conservatory)</td>
<td>Talk on the psychological perception of rhythm titled “Introduction to Musical Rhythm”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5, 1963</td>
<td>Karl Andreas Wirtz (Director of the International Exchange Department of Programs of the Bavarian Broadcasting Corporation)</td>
<td>Talk “The Bayreuth Festivals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15 - July 8, 1963</td>
<td>Olivier Messiaen (France 1908-1992) and Yvonne Loriod (pianist)</td>
<td>Their visit included Messiaen’s course “Theory of Rhythm” and Loriod master classes with some of the fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 1963</td>
<td>Concert in homage to Messiaen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5, 1963</td>
<td>Public colloquium: Olivier Messiaen, Rodolfo Arizaga and Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 1963</td>
<td>Argentine premiere of Messiaen’s <em>Oiseaux exotiques</em> (1955-6) at the Teatro Colón</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Sources: Alberto Ginastera, letter to Charles M. Hardin, February 6, 1964, folder 76, box 9, series 301R, RG 1.2, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Also, see Vazquez (2008: 98).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 26, 1963</td>
<td>Odón Alonso Ordás (Spain, b.1925) (conductor)</td>
<td>Talk: “The Young Generation of Spanish Composers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12, 1963</td>
<td>Official inauguration of the Di Tella Institute’s building at 936 Florida Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20, 1963</td>
<td>Naming of the main lecture room of the CLAEM for Heitor Villa-Lobos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5-8, 1963</td>
<td>Second Contemporary Music Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20 or 22, 1963</td>
<td>Aaron Copland conducts the Buenos Aires Philharmonic with works of Bernstein and Copland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 1963</td>
<td>Concert in homage to Malipiero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 26 and 29, 1963</td>
<td>Student concerts: Seminario de Composición 1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 20, 1963</td>
<td>Christmas Concert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No date, 1963</td>
<td>Visits of Paul Decker and Maurice Le Roux (conductors), Guillermo Espinosa (Musical director of the Pan-American Union) and Charles Seeger (former musical director of the Pan-American Union, musicologist, UCLA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30, 1964</td>
<td>Lauro Ayestarán (Uruguay, 1913-1966)</td>
<td>Talk: “The Discovery of a Spanish-American Musical Baroque” accompanied by Spanish-American baroque composers including José de Orejón y Aparicio (Perú, 1706-1765, wrongly indicated in the concert as being 1703-1760), Juan de Araujo (Spain, based in Peru and Bolivia, 1646-1712, wrongly indicated in the program notes as being 1646-1714) and Tomás de Torrejón y Velasco (Spain, based in Peru 1644-1728)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28, 1964</td>
<td>Concert in homage to Dallapiccola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15-18, 1964</td>
<td>Third Contemporary Music Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20-21, 1964</td>
<td>Student concerts: Seminario de Composición 1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 21, 1964</td>
<td>Graduation ceremony fellows 1963-1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-4: Events, talks, and visiting scholars 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 1965</td>
<td>Reception to welcome the fellows to the center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21, 1965</td>
<td>Antonio Tauriello</td>
<td>Round Table: “Ambiguity and Imprecision in Contemporary Music.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5, 1965</td>
<td>Mario Davidovsky</td>
<td>Talk: “Relationship Between Instrumental and Electronic Music”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 4, 1965</td>
<td>Reception of Roger Sessions, Juan Orrego-Salas and Wilfred Bain (dean of Indiana University’s School of Music)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6, 1965</td>
<td>Juan Orrego-Salas (Chile/United States, 1919)</td>
<td>Talk: “Work Carried Out By the School of Music at Indiana University”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20, 1965</td>
<td>Concert in homage to Roger Sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 26-29, 1965</td>
<td>Fourth Contemporary Music Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28-29, 1965</td>
<td>Student concerts: Seminario de Composición 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23, 1965</td>
<td>Carla Hübner, pianist. Recital of 20th century works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 25, 1965</td>
<td>Reception in honor of John P. Harrison</td>
<td>No other information about this event is available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C-5: Events, talks, and visiting scholars 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 1966</td>
<td>Classes resume for the second group of fellows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31, 1966</td>
<td>Iannis Xenakis</td>
<td>Talk: “New Principles of Musical Composition”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14-17, 1966</td>
<td>Fifth Contemporary Music Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7-8, 1966</td>
<td>Student concerts: Seminario de Composición 1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 21, 1966</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>Talk: “Berlin: Musical City”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table C-6: Events and talks 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 1967</td>
<td>Reception to welcome the fellows to the Center</td>
<td>Ginastera was absent for the inauguration of the 1967-68 biennial courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 1967</td>
<td>Concert organized by the local chapter of the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 1967</td>
<td>Alcides Lanza</td>
<td>Talk on his music experience in the United States followed by a concert that included his Plectros I (1962-II) for two pianos, Plectros II (1966-I) for piano and electronic sounds, his Exercise I (1965-V) for tape, and a recording by the Manhattan Percussion Ensemble conducted by Paul Price of his Interferences II (1967-I) for percussion ensemble and tape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 1967</td>
<td>Luigi Nono</td>
<td>Conference-Concert on his work with electroacoustic music at the Studio di Fonologia of the RAI in Milan: Omaggio a Emilio Vedova (1960), La fabbrica illuminata (1964) and Ricorè da cosa ti hanno fatto in Auschwitz (1966).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9, 1967</td>
<td>Luigi Nono</td>
<td>Conference-Concert on the relationship of music and words: Audition of a recording of <em>A floresta é jovem e cheja de vida</em> followed by a documentary about this piece that covered the creation of the work in Milan until its premiere at the “Biennale di Música, Venezia 1967” festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4, 1967</td>
<td>Concert in homage to Cristobal Halffter</td>
<td>The pieces heard that night were <em>Formantes, Móvil para dos pianos</em> (1961) [first version], <em>Dos canciones tristes de primavera</em> (1959) for voice and piano, <em>Brecht lieder</em> (1966) for voice and two pianos, a second version of <em>Formantes</em>, and <em>Espejos</em> (1963).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3-6, 1967</td>
<td>Sixth Contemporary Music Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20-21, 1967</td>
<td>Student concerts: Seminario de Composición 1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 22, 1967</td>
<td>Official Inauguration of Renovated Electronic Music Laboratory</td>
<td>Ginastera, various members of the Di Tella Institute and the fellows celebrated the official ceremony inauguration of the renovated electronic music laboratory. Ginastera’s emotive speech was framed by the celebration of St. Cecilia’s day, patron saint of musicians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 *Formantes*, in the same tradition of Alexander Calder’s mobile sculptures and Earle Brown’s musical mobile forms, explored indeterminacy in certain aspects of musical composition. The piece is made up of eight ‘forming’ blocks of music. The first and the last are always played in that position, but the middle six can be played in any order the performers choose. This reference to open forms—precisely the topic that Umberto Eco would later address in his talk at the CLAEM in 1970—still happens within a post-serial pitch and rhythmic language that aimed to organize and predetermine sound spaces while leaving some liberties to the performer. See Casares 1980, 88-89.
### Table C-7: Events and talks 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 21, 1968</td>
<td>Piano recital by Antonio Tauriello and Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>Stockhausen’s <em>Klavierstücke I</em> and <em>II</em>, Cristobal Halffter’s <em>Formantes</em>, Maurice Ravel’s <em>Ma mere l’oye</em>, Debussy’s <em>En blanc et noir</em>, John Cage’s <em>Music of changes IV</em>, and Sylvano Bussotti’s <em>Tableaux vivants</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1st, 1968</td>
<td>Classes resume after end of the year break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 1968</td>
<td>Welcome reception for Vladimir Ussachevsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 23-26</td>
<td>Seventh Contemporary Music Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 26-27, 1968</td>
<td>Student concerts: Seminario de Composición 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, 1968</td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera</td>
<td>Course open to the general public titled “Introduction to Contemporary Music”³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, 1968</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, Francisco Kröpfl, and Fernando von Reichenbach</td>
<td>Course open to the general public titled “Three Manifestations of Experimental Music”⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ There is no further information about this course.  
⁴ There is no further information about this course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 1969</td>
<td>Classes start (much later than usual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 1969</td>
<td>Concert in homage to Luis de Pablo</td>
<td>Since the program for the event does not include performers it seems that on this occasion the pieces were presented through recordings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 1969</td>
<td>Concert in homage to Eric Salzman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25-26, 1969</td>
<td>Encuentro de Directores de Institutos Superiores de Música</td>
<td>Organized in order to consider a plan of coordinated action towards promoting graduate studies for the best Argentine students from outside Buenos Aires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 1969</td>
<td>University of West Virginia’s percussion ensemble</td>
<td>The ensemble, directed by Philip Faini, presented the <em>Percussion Suite</em> by William Kraft, <em>October Mountain</em> by Alan Hovhaness, <em>Canticle no.3</em> by Lou Harrison, a series of dances from Uganda arranged and transcribed for percussion ensemble by Faini, and <em>Ionisation</em> by Edgard Varèse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22-25, 1969</td>
<td>Eighth Contemporary Music Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No date, 1969</td>
<td>Premiere of Cesar Bolaños’s <em>Alfa-Omega</em> (1967)</td>
<td>Program has no date. Work for two reciters, theatrical mixed choir, electric guitar, double bass, two percussionists, two dancers, magnetic tape, projections and lights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No date, 1969</td>
<td>Student concerts: Seminario de Composición 1969</td>
<td>For the first time, because of low budget, there is only one concert as opposed to the usual two.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table C-9: Events in 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 1970</td>
<td>Roberto Cortés Conde replaced Enrique Oteiza as executive director of the Di Tella Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28-31</td>
<td>Ninth Contemporary Music Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9-11, 1970</td>
<td>Student concerts: Seminario de Composición 1970</td>
<td>Three concerts instead of the usual two to compensate for previous year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 or 1971</td>
<td>Visit of Pierre Schaeffer to Buenos Aires, including tour of the CLAEM and listening of works by the fellows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 In 1969 Josefina Schröder, a key figure as secretary of the center since its beginning, moved to Great Britain and a new secretary, Cristina Laje, took her place for 1970. Schröder had been Ginastera’s right hand, ears and voice during his trips, and this must have disturbed to some degree the daily functioning of the CLAEM. In addition—and perhaps also because of this—the documentation for the remaining year of the 1969-1970 biennial, as well as the 1971 special period is much sparser.
APPENDIX D
SHORT BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES OF CLAEM FELLOWS

Aharonián, Coriún
Born in Montevideo, Uruguay, 1940. Composer, musicologist and educator. Studied composition with Héctor Tosar and Luigi Nono among others, and musicology with Lauro Ayestarán. He received the CLAEM fellowship for 1968-1969, but stayed only until October 1968, when he left with a scholarship from the French and Italian governments to study in Paris and Venice. His works have been performed in more than 30 countries and has received multiple commissions. His personal activities and his artistic production are both guided by a sociopolitical commitment to Latin American resistance. He has been professor at the Universidad de la República in Uruguay. He has been a prolific writer of essays, books and articles on music and culture. He was one of the coordinators of the Cursos Latinoamericanos de Música Contemporánea, and has been a central member of the Núcleo Música Nueva de Montevideo. He was member of the board od the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM) and the executive committee of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music.

Antunes, Jorge
Born in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1942. Studied at the Escuela de Música de la Universidad do Brasil. He is considered one of the pioneers of electroacoustic music in Brazil. After his 1969-1970 fellowship at the CLAEM he went to Utrech with a scholarship from the Dutch government, and later to Paris, with a scholarship from the French government to work with Pierre Schaeffer. He has a doctorate in aesthetics from University of Paris VIII. His works have won multiple awards such as the Cittá di Trieste, Gaudeamus, and UNESCO’s International Tribune. In 2002 he was declared honorary citizen of Brazilian and received the title of Chevalier des Arts et des Lettres of the French government. He has lived in Brasilia since 1973 where he teaches composition at the Universidade ds Brasilia.

Aponte-Ledée, Rafael
Born in Guayama, Puerto Rico in 1938. In 1957 he went to Madrid to study composition with Cristóbal Halffter in the Real Conservatorio de Música y Declamación, where he graduated as composer in 1964. In 1965-1966 he went to the CLAEM and returned to Puerto Rico in 1968

1 The basis for all biographies in this Appendix are taken from the work of Hernán Vázquez for the website La música en el Di Tella [URL: http://lamusicaenelditella.cultura.gob.ar] (Accessed February 1, 2012). Vázquez generously has allowed me to use and translate this compilation of biographies provided by the composers for the festival “La Música en el Di Tella, el nacimiento de la modernidad,” an international gathering to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the foundation of the CLAEM in July 2011. I have made revisions and additions taken mostly from composer’s professional biographies available to the public in personal websites and published recordings.
to teach at in the composition and theory department of the Conservatorio de Música, from which he retired in 2003. He was also professor at the Departamento de Música of the Universidad de Puerto Rico. Since 1980 he has been the director of the Fundación Latinoamericana para la Música Contemporánea. His music has been played in festivals in Buenos Aires, Washington, Madrid, Bilbao, Maracaibo, Caracas, San Juan, Alicante, León, Nueva York, Baltimore, México and El Salvador. In 2003, he was Musical and Artistic Director of the Festival Interamericano de las Artes and since 2006, he is artistic director of the Fiesta Iberoamericana de las Artes.

**Arandia Navarro, Jorge**

Born in 1929 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Composer. Studied piano with Roberto Locatelli, harmony and counterpoint with Alejandro Szenkar and Roberto García Morillo and orchestration with Roberto Kinsky. He was a fellow at the CLAEM during the 1965-1966 biennial. He has received awards from the Dirección Nacional de Cultura for his Concierto para piano y orquesta, and the Premio Municipal for his piano work Playas rítmicas No.1.

**Arias, Luis**

Born in 1940 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Composer and educator. Started his music career as a clarinet performer and later focused solely on composition. Studied at the Universidad Católica Argentina with Alberto Ginastera and Gerardo Gandini. He received the CLAEM scholarship in 1967-1968. There he continued his exploration of techniques close to the aesthetics of Xenakis, Ligeti and Polish composers. Since 1966 he has taught at multiple institutions in the city and province of Buenos Aires. Among his awards are the BMI (Nueva York), Festivals of Montevideo (Uruguay) and Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), Casa de las Américas (Cuba), Royaumont Foundation (France), three municipal awards in Buenos Aires, and the second and third prize of the Premio Nacional de Música.

**Atehortúa, Blas Emilio**

Information about his date of birth ranges from 1933 to 1945. His most recent biography says he was born in 1943 in Santa Elena, Antioquia, Colombia. Composer, conductor and educator. He began his musical studies at the Conservatorio del Instituto de Bellas Artes de Medellín and then at the Conservatorio Nacional of the Universidad Nacional de Colombia in Bogotá. He have won scholarships from the OEI (Spain), the Organization of American States, the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. He studied at the CLAEM in 1966-1967 and 1968-1969 Among the awards he has received are the Rey Juan Carlos de España; the Béla Bartók Medal in Hungary, “Colombiano Ejemplar” and “Gran Excelencia” from the Instituto Distrital de Cultura in Bogota, Colombia and the "Cruz de Caballero", awarded by the congress of Colombia. He currently teaches in Venezuela and Colombia.

**Auza León, Atiliano**

Born in 1928 in Sucre, Bolivia. Composer, violinist and educator. He studied at the Conservatorio Nacional de La Paz with Erich Eismner, Juan Manuel Thorrez and Emilio Hochman. He was a fellow at the CLAEM in 1965-1966 but left during his second year. His interest later focused on Bolivian popular music, choral conducting and teaching. He has been composition professor at the Conservatorio Nacional de Música and National Director of Music Education.
**Bazán, Oscar**

Oscar Bazán (Argentina, 1936-2005) was born in Cruz del Eje, in the province of Cordoba, and thus, was an outsider to Buenos Aires when he became a fellow for the 1963-1964 period. He described his various and eclectic styles of compositions as including aleatoric, free, participatory, electroacoustic, musical theater, neotonal, microtonal, instrumental theater, serial, experience, ritual, idea, hypnomusic, gestual play, mixed, game, conceptual, twelve-tone, and musical action.

During his career as composer and educator, he was part of the composers who created the Experimental Music Center (Centro de Música Experimental) at the National University of Córdoba, Argentina, during the mid '60s. In 1973 he received a fellowship to study at the Centro de Investigaciones en Comunicación Masiva, Arte y Tecnología (CICMAT) in Buenos Aires.

He was professor at the Escuela de Artes of the Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, and taught in the Cursos Latinoamericanos de Música Contemporânea.

**Blarduni, Jorge Abel**

Born in 1930 in La Plata, Argentina. Composer and educator, who began teaching composition at the Conservatorio de Música Gilardo Gilardi in La Plata in 1968. Between 1970 and 1974 he taught at the Facultad de Bellas Artes de La Plata, and in 1974-1975 at the Escuela de Arte de Berisso where he also was assistant director of the school. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for the 1969-1970 year. In 1966 his work *Variaciones* for orchestra received the 2nd annual award from the Fondo Nacional de las Artes in Argentina. He was a member of the organization CULTRUN – Compositores Asociados presided by Luis Zubillaga. He also was an artistic consultant for the Teatro Argentino de La Plata. At the CLAEM he performed with the Grupo de Experimentación Musical although during his tenure at the center none of his works were performed.

**Bolaños, Cesar**

Born in 1931 in Lima, Peru. Musicologist and composer. He studied composition at the Conservatorio de Lima and in 1958 traveled to New York City to study at the Manhattan School of Music while also beginning to work with electronic music techniques at the RCA Institute of Electronic Technology.

In 1963 he moves to Buenos Aires, Argentina to begin his CLAEM fellowship, also funded by the OAS. At the CLAEM he also participated in the creation of the first electronic music laboratory, and also taught courses about the relationship between music, electronics, and visual imagery. A great number of his works date from this period where he was able to use his skills in electroacoustic music composition and computer knowledge, which he acquired both at the RCA Institute and the CLAEM.

In 1964 he composed the first electroacoustic composition produced at the CLAEM, *Intensidad y Altura*. His most recognized works are *Interpolaciones* (1966) for electric guitar and tape, *Alfa-Omega* 1967 for spoken word, choir, and orchestra, and *Ñancahuasu* (1970) for reciting choir and small orchestras using texts from Ernesto “Che” Guevara’s diary. He returned to Lima in 1973 where he focused on research and publication about pre-Hispanic organological studies, and music and dance traditions in Perú and other Andean countries while working at the Instituto Nacional de Cultura and the Museo Nacional de Arqueología y Antropología.
Brnčič Isaza, Gabriel
Born in Santiago de Chile on 1942. He studied composition with Gustavo Becerra-Schmidt, and violin and oboe at the Conservatorio de la Universidad de Chile. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1965-1966 and was able to continue for an additional period (1967-1968) sponsored by an OAS scholarship. Up until 1971 he worked as an instructor at the CLAEM laboratory and until 1974 he also worked at the electroacoustic music and sound laboratory at the Centro de Investigación en Comunicación Masiva, Arte y Tecnología (CICMAT) in Buenos Aires.
He is currently the artistic director at the Fundación Phonos in Barcelona, Spain, and professor at the Escola Superior de Música de Catalunya (ESMUC) y and the Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF) also in Barcelona. He was inducted to the Academia Chilena de Bellas Artes del Instituto de Chile in 1999 and has also been honored with different awards such as the Instituto de Extensión Musical de la Universidad de Chile (1967-68-69), Primer premio concurso Casa de las Américas, Cuba (1966), Guggenheim fellowship in composition (1976), first prize at the Concours International de Musique Electroacoustique, Bourges, France (1984), and the Premio Ciudad de Barcelona (1985).

Caryëvischi, Pedro
Born in 1942 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. He started his musical training in theory and oboe with Pedro Di Gregorio, piano with Horacio Azzárate and Margarita Fernández, and harmony and counterpoint with Teodoro Fuchs. He relocated to Santiago de Chile in 1966 where he studied composition at the Facultad de Ciencias y Artes Musicales de la Universidad de Chile with Gustavo Becerra Schmidt and León Schidlowsky. He was selected as a CLAEM fellow for 1969-1970.
Before studying at the CLAEM he already had established himself as a composer and performer in Chile and Argentina. Aside from conducting several of his works, he was also familiar with electroacoustic music techniques, and also composed several film soundtracks which he continued to do for several years. In 1970 while still at the CLAEM he composed Analogías Paraboloides, the first work that utilized the analog-graphics converter invented by Fernando Von Reichenbach. Caryevschi left Argentina at some point and moved to Israel. He changed his name to Yuval Karin.

Cubillas, Oscar
Born in 1938 in Lima, Perú. Cellist, composer, and educator. He began his musical training at the Conservatorio Nacional de Música and also studied theatre at the Instituto Superior de Arte Dramático in Lima. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship to continue studying composition and attended during 1967-1968. He also studied composition at the Institüt für Neue Music in Darmstadt, Germany; Shantiniketan Art College in Kolkata, India; and the Centro de Difusión de Música Contemporánea in Madrid, Spain. He also performed as a cellist with the Studente Orchestra Philarmonik – Tübingen. Upon his return to Peru he taught music and promoted the Shantiniketan Art College. He has composed works for orchestras, solo instruments, incidental music, and electroacoustic music.

D’Astoli, Bruno
Born in Termi, Italy in 1934, has lived in Argentina since 1950. Composer, pianist and conductor. Studied at the Accademia Nazionale di Santa Cecilia in Rome. He studied
composition in Buenos Aires with Julián Bautista and conducting with Roberto Kinsky. He studied conducting at the Accademia Musicale Chigiana in Sienna, Italy with László Somogyi. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1969-1970 and he also was awarded a scholarship by the Center for Inter-American Relations–Fundación Di Tella. Has worked extensively as conductor at the Teatro Colón in Buenos Aires.

**Dinerstein, Norman**
Born in Springfield, MA, USA, in 1937. Composer, conductor and educator. He earned a BM from Boston University, a MM from Hartt College of Music in Hartford, CT, and a PhD from Princeton University in 1970. He attended the Berlin Hochschule für Musik (1962–63), the summer courses at the Berkshire Music Center in Tanglewood (1962 and 1963), and was able to attend the Darmstadt summer courses (1964). He was dean of the College-Conservatory of Music at the University of Cincinnati, between 1982 and 1983.

He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship to attend during the 1969-1970 session. He was sponsored by the Center for Inter-American Relations and the Fundación Di Tella after winning the young composers contest with his work *Four settings on texts of Emily Dickinson* (1961) for soprano and string quartet, which was performed as part of the eighth Festival de Música Contemporánea.

**Etkin, Mariano**
Born in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 1943. He is a composer, educator, and writer. He began his musical training as a composer with Guillermo Graetzer. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 165-1966 and later 1971. He then had an OAS scholarship to attend the Juilliard School of Music in New York City where he studied with Luciano Berio. He then relocated to Utrecht where he studied conducting with Paul Hupperts, electronic music with Gottfried König. He also studied conducting with Pierre Boulez and Franco Ferrar.

He has received several awards including the 1975 "Juan Carlos Paz" Composition Prize of the Fondo Nacional de las Artes (Argentina) and the 1967 Composition Prize of the Municipality of Buenos Aires, as well as the Second Prize in the 6th International Seminar for Composers (Boswil, Switzerland, 1980). Several European ensembles and radio stations have commissioned works from Etkin, and his works a frequently performed in international festivals. As a writer, Etkin has published essays in periodicals like *MusikTexte, Dérives, Pauta, and Lulú*.

Etkin has taught at various universities in Argentina (Buenos Aires, Tucumán, Rio Cuarto, Littoral). In 1977, 1980 and 1981 was Visiting Professor at McGill University (Montréal, Canada) teaching Composition, Theory, Analysis and Contemporary Music Ensemble. From 1982 through 1985 was appointed as Professor of Composition, Theory, Analysis and Contemporary Music Ensemble at Wilfrid Laurier University (Waterloo, Ontario, Canada). He is currently Professor of Composition and Musical Analysis and Director of a Research Project on Analysis of New Music at the Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina.

**Feinstein, Diego Horacio**
Born in 1943 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Composer and educator. He earned degrees in piano and composition form the Conservatorio Nacional de Música Carlos Lopez Buchardo where he studied piano with Eugenio J. Bures and composition with Roberto García Morillo. He also studied choral and instrumental conducting at the Instituto Superior de Arte del Teatro Colón, and art history at the Universidad de Buenos Aires. He was awarded a CLAEM
fellowship for 1969-1970. According to the CLAEM archives, he wasn’t awarded a stipend although the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst did provide funding for him in 1969. In 1971 he relocated to Freiburg to study with Wolfgang Fortner at the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität where he later earned a doctorate. He taught composition and new music studies at the Musikakademie in Kassel. He was awarded the Premio de Composición Banda Sinfónica Municipal de Buenos Aires (1970), the Premio para Jóvenes Compositores de Stuttgart (1973) y the Kasseler Kunstpreis (2007).

Flores, Bernal

Born in San José, Costa Rica in 1937. He was a composer and musicologist. He studied piano in San José with Carlos Enrique Vargas. Between 1951 and 1964 he studied at the Eastman School of Music at the University of Rochester in New York, studying piano with José Echániz and composition with Wayne Barlow, Bernard Rogers, and Howard Hanson. He completed bachelor of music, master of music, and doctoral degrees in composition at the Eastman School of Music. After moving back to Costa Rica in 1965 he became a university professor while also doing musicological research. Most of his compositional output dates from his time as a student at the Eastman School of Music. He has published extensively about teaching music theory, and music production in Costa Rica. He is a three-time award winner of Costa Rica’s Premio Nacional de Música. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1965-1966, but he declined the spot at the Center after just one week due to the fact that he was already familiar with the material covered in the course offerings.

Gutiérrez, Benjamín

Born in San José, Costa Rica in 1937. He is a composer, pianist, conductor, and educator. He studied piano with Miguel Angel Quesada at the Conservatorio de Música de la Universidad de Costa Rica and in 1957 earned a scholarship to study piano and composition with Augusto Adenois at the Conservatorio Nacional de Música de Guatemala. He earned a Master of Music degree from the New England Conservatory of Music in Boston in 1960, and in 1961 he studied with Darius Milhaud and Ross Lee Finley. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for the 1965-1966 sessions where he reacquainted himself with contemporary Latin American compositional styles.

Upon his return to Costa Rica he was actively performing and composing while also teaching at the Universidad de Costa Rica where he now has Professor Emeritus status after many years of service, service which included a period as Director of the School of Music. He developed parallel careers as a composer and performer. Benjamín Gutiérrez has long been considered Costa Rica's leading composer in the latter part of the twentieth century. In 2000 he was honored as the Musician of the Century by the newspaper La Nación in Costa Rica, and in 2001 he received the Magón Lifetime Achievement Award.

Krieger, Armando

Born in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 1940. He studied music with John Montés, Alberto Ginastera, Roberto Kinsky, and Ernesto Epstein. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship and was part of the first cohort of fellows in 1963-1964. He continued his career as a composer and pianist, and was featured in several CLAEM-sponsored concerts as a performer often premiering other composers’ works. He has had an important career as a conductor, which earned him several awards including the Premio del Congreso por la Libertad de la Cultura, the Premio de la
Kuri-Aldana, Mario
Born in Tampico, Tamaulipas, Mexico in 1931. Composer and performer. He studied with Rodolfo Halffter and Luis Herrera de la Fuente at the Escuela Nacional de Música at the UNAM where he graduated as a composer in 1960. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship in 1963-1964. After his fellowship he studied music folklore and ethnology.
He has composed works for symphonic orchestras and chamber ensembles, as well as songs. He utilizes mixed serial techniques in his works also incorporating popular music elements and his style is described as a folkloristic neo-classicism. He has received several awards including the Concurso de Composición de la Escuela de Música at the UNAM (1958), the Concurso de Composición de la Sociedad de Autores y Compositores de México (1968), the Unión Nacional de Críticos de Teatro (1992)(México), and the Premio Nacional de Ciencias y Artes (1994) (México).

Kusnir, Eduardo
Born in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 1939. He is a composer, conductor and educator. He studied orchestral conducted in Bulgaria between 1956 and 1961 sponsored by a scholarship from the Bulgarian Ministry of Culture. He was the musical director of the Ballet Nacional de Cuba between 1962 and 1965. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for the 1969-1970 biennial and it was there where he composed the internationally acclaimed work La Panadería (1970) using the analog-graphic converter created by Fernando Von Reichenbach. He obtained a doctorate in aesthetics from the Université Paris 8 in 1974 sponsored by a scholarship from the French government. Between 1978 and 1995 he taught in Venezuela at the Universidad Central and founded the electroacoustic music course at the Conservatorio Landaeta. He then relocated to Puerto Rico where he was a professor at the Universidad de Puerto Rico.
His music contains elements from electroacoustic music techniques as well as elements from musical theater, where humor and irony are often used as recurring themes. Among his award-winning compositions are Lily y Brindis, Cuatro Marchas Heróicas (awarded the 1967 Casa de las Américas award), and Juegos I (Bourges award).
He currently resides in Argentina where he has been sponsored by the Fundación Antorchas and the Secretaría de Cultura de la Nación to restore and digitize sound recording collections at the Instituto Nacional de Musicología Carlos Vega.

lanza, alcides
Born in Rosario, Argentina in 1929. He is a composer, pianist, conductor, and educator. After his time as a CLAEM fellow in 1963-1964 he obtained a Guggenheim fellowship, which allowed him to relocate to New York City where he worked as a technical assistant at the Columbia-Princeton Electronic Music Center until 1971. He then traveled to Montreal, Canada, where he taught composition courses and worked as director of the electronic music studios at McGill University, where he was ultimately named director emeritus in 2003. He has been internationally recognized for his work both as a composer and performer. The awards include the OAS Honor Diploma, and the 2003 Victor Martyn Lynch-Staunton Award 2003 from the Canadian Arts Council.
Letelier, Miguel

Born in 1939 in San Miguel, Santiago de Chile. He is a composer, organist, and educator. He studied at the Conservatorio Nacional and the Facultad de Artes at the Universidad de Chile where he studied organ and composition with Julio Preeval. He attended the CLAEM during the 1965-1966 biennial. He also received a scholarship from the French government in 1968 to study organ with J. J. Grünenwald. He then moved to Hamburg in 1969 where he studied at the Hochschule für Musik und Theater with U. von Kameke (organ) and Diether de la Motte (composition). He has had a prolific career as an organist and also as a composer, writing works for different types of ensembles ranging from solo works to orchestral compositions, including incidental music. The Facultad de Artes at the Universidad de Chile awarded him the Premio Nacional de Arte en Música in 2008.

Maiguashca, Mesías

Born in Quito, Ecuador in 1938. He is a composer and educator. He studied at the Conservatorio de Quito, the Eastman School of Music at the University of Rochester in New York, the CLAEM(1963-1964) and the Hochschule für Musik in Köln, Germany. He has focused on electroacoustic music, computer music and experimental music, heavily influenced by the time he spent with Stockhausen between 1966 and 1976. He has created metal and wooden “sound objects” which became starting points for several of his compositions. He has produced several compositions at de WDR studios in Cologne, at the Centre Européen pour la Recherche Musicale in Metz, at the IRCAM in Paris, the Acroe in Grenoble, and the ZKM ins Karlsruhe. He has taught master classes in Metz, Stuttgart, Karlsruhe, Basel, Sofia, Quito, Cuenca, Buenos Aires, Bogotá, Madrid, Barcelona, Győr and Szombathely (Hungary), and Seoul (Korea). His works have been performed at the most important European festivals. He was a professor of electronic music at the Musikhochschule Freiburg from 1990 until his retirement in 2004, and he founded the K.O.Studio Freiburg in 1998 with Roland Breitenfeld, which is a private initiative for the practice of experimental music. Since 2008, he has been an advisor in the board of the Group for Experimental Music and Media Arts, in Hannover and member of the GEMART Ensemble.

Maranzano, José Ramón

Born in Santiago del Estero, Argentina in 1940. He is a composer and educator. He studied music in Santiago del Estero at the Conservatorio Gómez Carrillo and then moved to Buenos Aires to study composition at the Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina. He studied electroacoustic music composition at the Estudio de Fonología Musical at the Universidad de Buenos Aires guided by Francisco Kröpfl. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for the 1969-1970 biennial, and also 1971. He has received many awards including the Fondo Nacional de las Artes (1965, 1972, and 1973), the Festival Panamericano de Música de Guanabara (1970), the Società Italiana Musica Contemporanea (1972), and the Juan Carlos Paz award (1975). His works have been performed in prominent contemporary music festivals in Latin America, Europe, and the United States.

After the CLAEM closure he became the director of the Centro de Investigaciones en Comunicación Masiva, Arte y Tecnología (CICMAT), a post he held until 1980. He then went on to direct the Centro Cultural Ciudad de Buenos Aires (known today as the Centro Cultural
Recoleta) where he retired from in 1983. He also taught different classes at the Instituto Superior de Arte del Teatro Colón.

**Martínez, Ariel**

Born in San José, Uruguay in 1940. He is a composer and educator. He began his musical training in Montevideo where he studied bandoneon and flute with Angelo Turrizziani and composition with Héctor Tosar. He relocated to Buenos Aires in 1969 to join the 1969-1970 cohort of CLAEM fellows, continuing in 1971. He then went on to teach at several universities such as the Universidad de La República in Montevideo and several music courses en Río Cuarto, Córdoba, La Plata y Buenos Aires, in Argentina. He was head of the Laboratorio de Investigación y Producción Musical at the Centro Cultural Recoleta in Buenos Aires between 1982 and 1985.

**Mastrogiovanni, Antonio**

Born in 1936 in Montevideo, Uruguay, and died in 2010. He was a composer and educator. After completing pianos studies in 1958 he studied composition with Héctor Tosar. He graduated in 1972 from the Conservatorio Nacional de Música de la Universidad de la República where he studied with Tosar and Carlos Estrada. He was granted a CLAEM fellowship for the 1969-1970 sessions. He relocated to Mexico in 1973 to study with Rafael Pavón funded by an OAS scholarship. In 1974 he obtained a scholarship form the Italian government to study composition in Milan with Franco Donatoni and at the Studio di Fonologia Musicale at the RAI Internazionale Radio. He then relocated to Venezuela in 1975 where he taught at different higher education institutions and founded and directed the first Venezuelan music-publishing house at the Instituto Latinoamericano de Investigaciones y Estudios Musicales Vicente Emilio Sojo in Caracas. In 1988 he returned to Uruguay to teach and direct the Escuela de Música at the Universidad de la República. He earned several distinctions throughout his career including a Gaudeamus Foundation award, an award during the 50th anniversary of the Sociedad Orquesta Sinfónica de Venezuela, and an award from the Società Italiana Musica Contemporanea.

**Mazzadi, Eduardo David**

Born in 1935 in Junín, Argentina. He studied composition at the Conservatorio de La Plata with Luis Gianneo, harmony with Enrique Gerardo, and instrumentation and orchestration with Gerardo Gandini. He was awarded a scholarship by the Fondo Nacional de las Artes in 1963 and was selected as a fellow for the CLAEM for the 1965-1966 sessions. He died tragically in 1966 shortly after the CLAEM courses ended.

**Migliari Fernandes, Marlene**

Born in 1937 in Cambará, Brazil. She is a composer, pianist, and educator. She studied piano at the Instituto Musical in São Paulo where she studied composition and orchestration with Damiano Cozzella, Hans-Joachim Koellreutter, and Conrad Bernhard. She was an award-winning pianist and received a CLAEM scholarship to attend as part of the 1967-1968 biennial. Upon her return to Rio de Janeiro in 1969 she taught musical analysis and contemporary music appreciation at the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. She also ventured into music theory and in 1999 published a book titled *Processos de estruturação em Villa-Lobos: Erosão (poema sinfônico 1950)*
Nobre, Marlos
Born in 1939 in Recife, Brazil. He is a composer, pianist, and conductor. He studied piano and music theory at the Conservatório Pernambucano de Música in Pernambuco between 1948 and 1959. He relocated to São Paulo in 1960 where he studied composition with Hans-Joachim Koellreutter and Camargo Guarnieri. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship to join the 1968-1969 cohort, and in 1969 relocated to the United States to study at the Columbia-Princeton Electronic Music Center with Vladimir Ussachevsky, and at the Berkshire Music Center in Tanglewood with Alexander Goehr and Gunther Schuller.


His prolific career as a composer was accompanied by his active career as a performer. He earned several awards and distinctions including the Orden de Mérito (Brasilia, 1988), Orden de Rio Branco (1989), TRIMALCA (1979), the Tribuna Internacional de Compositores (1994); Orde d’Arts et Lettres (France, 1994) and the Premio Tomás Luis de Victoria (2005).

Nova Sondag, Jacqueline
Born in 1935 in Gante, Belgium, died in Bogotá, Colombia in 1975. After relocating to Colombia at an early age she began her musical training at the Conservatorio Nacional in 1958 where she studied piano, and in 1960 added harmony and counterpoint to her courses. She attended a course on contemporary music taught by Blas Emilio Atehortúa in 1965 and in 1967 earned a composition degree, and she then was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for the 1967-1968 sessions. After her CLAEM years, where she focused on composing electroacoustic music, she returned to Colombia and became an advocate for contemporary music both in the concert scene as well as the radio. She died in 1975.

Núñez Allauca, Alejandro
Born in 1943 in Moquegua, Perú. He is a composer and accordionist. After starting to play the accordion at an early age he began studying with Manuel Cabrera Guerra, organist at the Lima Cathedral. He also studied violoncello and music education at the Consevatorio Nacional. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1969-1970, and continued to attend classes until the Center’s closure in FECHA. In 1987 he relocated to Milan, Italy.

His early works show a definite tonal style, after which he made inroads into an atonal phase, which eventually led to an aleatoric period. After Argentina, his works moved towards pentatonism, with an emphasis in lyric vocal style.

Orellana, Joaquín
Born in 1937 in Guatemala. He is a composer, violinist, and educator. He studied composition with Franz Ippisch, José Castañeda, and Augusto Ardenois; and violin with Carlos Ciudad Real at the Conservatorio Nacional de Guatemala graduating in 1959. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for the 1967-1968 sessions, which led to a successful creative period where he incorporated new sounds into his compositions and experimented with building instruments. Upon his return to Guatemala he taught at the Dirección General de Cultura y Bellas Artes where he shared the knowledge acquired during his time at the CLAEM. He also joined the Orquesta
Sinfónica Nacional and in 1974 founded the Grupo de Experimentación Musical which premiered several of his works. Between 1977 and 1982 he developed a series of experimental music workshops. He has made a significant impact in the international sphere through his involvement in the Cursos Latinoamericanos de Música Contemporánea.

**Paraskevaidis, Graciela**

Born in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 1940. She is a composer, musicologist, and educator. She studied at the Conservatorio Nacional de Música in Buenos Aires, and received a CLAEM fellowship for the 1965-1966 sessions where she studied with Gerardo Gandini and Iannis Xenakis. From 1968 to 1971 she studied composition with Wolfgang Fortner at the Freiburger Musikhochschule on a scholarship from the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst. In 1984 Paraskevaidis lived in Berlin as a guest of the Berlin Artists' Programme of the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst. Her compositions have received awards in Argentina (from the Fondo Nacional de las Artes and the Municipalidad de Buenos Aires), Germany (from the Akademie der Künste in Berlin) and Uruguay (from the Juventudes Musicales) and have been performed in concerts and festivals in Asia, Europe and the Americas. She has taught extensively in private and at the Universidad Nacional in Montevideo from 1985-92. She has also given lectures and seminars and led workshops in summer and regular courses at higher music institutes in Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Uruguay), as well as in Europe (Austria, Germany, Greece, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom).

Since 1975 she has been writing essays on contemporary Latin American music, several of which have been published in specialized journals such as *Pauta*, *Revista Musical Chilena* and *MusikTexte*. From 1990 to 1999 she was co-editor of the World New Music Magazine, the yearbook of the International Society of Contemporary Music. Since 1992, she has been a collaborator to the dictionary *Komponisten der Gegenwart*. Paraskevaidis is also the author of two books, *La obra sinfónica de Eduardo Fabini* (1992) and *Luis Campodónico, compositor* (1999), and co-editor of *lationamerica-musica.net*. She was a member of the organizing collective of the Cursos Latinoamericanos de Música Contemporánea (CLAMC) from 1975 to 1989. She is also a member of the Núcleo Música Nueva de Montevideo and of the Sociedad Uruguaya de Música Contemporánea.

**Perusso, Mario**

Born in 1936 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Composer and conductor. He studied composition with Cayetano Marcolli and conducting with Mariano Drago and Roberto Kinsky. As a CLAEM fellow (1967-1968) he studied with Messiaen, Dallapiccola, and Xenakis.

His oeuvre has been said to have an inclination towards the aesthetics of contemporary Polish composers like Ligeti and Penderecki, in their most lyrical vein. His more recognized works include *Réquiem de los ángeles*, *Resurrexit*, and the opera *Guayaquil*. His *Symphony No. 1* earned the commemorative award of the 500th anniversary of the ‘discovery’ of the Americas, his work *Escorial* received an award from the Asociación Argentina de Críticos in 1989, and he another career award from the same organization in 1993.

He has also developed a successful career as an opera conductor. He was involved with the Teatro Colon in Buenos Aires since 1970 as “maestro interno” and director in 1982. He was also artistic director for the Teatro Argentino de La Plata, as well as principal conductor of many national orchestras. He was awarded the 1999 Premio Konex for his conducting work.

385
**Pozadas, Florencio**

Born in 1939 in Potosí, Bolivia and died in Buenos Aires in 1968. He was a composer and percussionist. He studied violin in Potosí and in 1959 relocated to Buenos Aires where he continued studying with Alberto Varady. He graduated from the Instituto Superior de Arte del Teatro Colón in 1965 as a percussionist where he studied with Antonio Yepes and Néstor Astutti. He also studied harmony with Armando Krieger and composition with Gerardo Gandini. He was a CLAEM fellow for the 1967-1968 sessions. He was a performer with the Ritmos Ensemble, directed by Antonio Yepes and also a percussionist with the Orquesta Filarmónica de Buenos Aires. His work *Tres coros bolivianos* earned the first prize in the Bolivian Luz Mila Patiño competition in 1965. He died in 1968.

**Ranieri, Salvador**

Born in Arena, Italy, in 1930. Composer and clarinetist. He began his musical training in Italy, studying clarinet and music theory. Upon relocating to Argentina he continued his training while also performing with important ensembles in La Plata, Avellaneda, and Buenos Aires. He studied piano with Dora Castro, music theory with Athos Palma, and composition with Juan Francisco Giacobbe. In 1972 he received a joint scholarship from the Italian government and the Fondo Nacional de las Artes that allowed him to study in Italy with Goffredo Petrassi and electroacoustic composition with Domenico Guaccero. His works have earned him several international awards, including three Premio Municipal de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires. He was accepted for the 1969-1970 sessions at the CLAEM although the Center couldn’t fund his participation so his attendance was sporadic.

**Rivera, Enrique**

Born in Providencia, Chile. He began his musical training in 1957 at the Escuela Moderna de Música where he trained as a pianist. In 1960 he enrolled at Universidad Católica de Chile where he studied with Juan Orrego-Salas. In 1962 he transferred to the Conservatorio Nacional de Música de la Universidad de Chile to study composition with Gustavo Becerra while also studying conducting.

He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1965-1966, and he made his Argentinean debut in Buenos Aires in 1964 with the work *Suite para piano Sine Nomine* at the third Festival de Música Contemporánea. His compositional output during the CLAEM years shows different applications of serialism, and an interest in controlling tempo patterns. Upon his return to Chile he worked assisting Gustavo Becerra’s composition courses at the Universidad de Chile.

**Rondano, Miguel Ángel**

Born in 1934 in Godoy Cruz, Mendoza, Argentina. He is a composer. He studied piano and composition at the Conservatorio Nacional Carlos Lopez Buchardo in Buenos Aires with Roberto García Morillo and Alberto Ginastera. As a CLAEM fellow (1963-1964) he got acquainted with contemporary techniques as well as electronic music. He was also awarded a scholarship to study with Nadia Boulanger and René Leibowitz in Paris, France. In 1974 he relocated to Granada, Spain to study composition with Rodolfo Halffter funded by an Instituto de Cultura Hispánica scholarship and to Santiago de Compostela to study with Alberto Ginastera.

He worked as “maestro interno” at the ballet company of the Teatro Colon de Buenos Aires. He wrote a variety of works, from instrumental music to electronic music and later on he
focused on stage works (opera and ballet), film and incidental music. Aside from using diverse technical and technological media his works also have a constant humorous element, especially in lyric works.

*Ross, Walter*

Walter Ross, (United States 1936) is perhaps best known for his compositions featuring brass and woodwinds. Composer and French horn player. Studied compositional with Robert Beadell. In 1966, while working on his doctoral degree at Cornell (where he studied under Robert Palmer and Karel Husa), he received an Organization of American States Fellowship to study composition privately under Alberto Ginastera in Argentina. He joined other fellows at the CLAEM during that year.

Ross has served as president of the Southeastern Composers League and has been a visiting composer at the Aspen Music Festival and a featured composer at several universities and forums and on national and international radio broadcasts. He is also a member of the board of the Capital Composers Alliance.

*Sangüesa Hinostroza, Iris*

Born in Osorno, Chile in 1933. She was a composer, pianist, and educator. She studied at the Conservatorio Carolina Klagges in Osorno and later at the Conservatorio Nacional de Música de la Universidad de Chile where she graduated in 1958 as a pianist and music educator. She taught in many institutions in Santiago de Chile. She also studied percussion, conducting, dance, and visual arts.

She studied composition with Gustavo Becerra and was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1967-1968 where she specialized in electroacoustic music. Her work *Cuarteto para madera* dates from her first year as a fellow. In 1968 she developed another work, *Integración para banda magnética, danza y proyección de diapositivas*, at the CLAEM’s Laboratorio de Música Electrónica. Her electroacoustic works include *Permanencia I*, *Permanencia II*, and *Oda a la Humanidad* (for magnetic tape, choir, instrumental ensemble, and music for a website); and her instrumental works include a cycle of 12 works based on the 12 tones, a song cycle, and choral works. She also developed teaching materials geared towards teaching piano to children focusing on creativity and improvisation workshops.

*Sarmientos, Jorge*

Born in 1931 in San Antonio Suchitepéquez, Guatemala. He is a composer and conductor. He graduated as a pianist, composer and conductor from the Conservatorio Nacional de Guatemala where he studied with Ricardo Castillo. He was awarded a scholarship to study at the École Normale Superieure de Musique in France in 1955-1956. He was a CLAEM fellow for 1965-66, where he took off in a new aesthetic direction towards neoclassicism while incorporating serial and aleatoric procedures, and greater sonic density.

He studied conducting with Pierre Boulez and Sergiu Celibidache, and conducted the Orquesta Sinfónica Nacional de Guatemala between 1971 and 1991 while also guest conducting orchestras in Latin America, France, the United States, and Japan. He was awarded the Orden del Quetzal in Guatemala, the Ordre des Palmes Académiques in France, and the el Emeritissimum at the Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala. He was on the faculty at the Conservatorio Nacional de Guatemala (1967), the Universidad Rafael Landívar (1968-1980), and the Universidad Francisco Marroquin (1982-1986).
Serra, Luis María

Born in 1942 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. He is a composer and a choral and orchestral conductor. He graduated as a composer from the Universidad Católica de Argentina (UCA) where he studied composition with Roberto Caamaño, Alberto Ginastera, and Gerardo Gandini. He also studied piano with Roberto Locatelli, and choral conducting with Jesus Segade. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1967-1968, and in 1969 he was also awarded scholarships from the French government and the Asociación Wagneriana de Buenos Aires to study with Pierre Schaeffer and François Bayle at the Groupe de Recherches Musicales from the Office de Radiodiffusion-Télévision Française and the Conservatoire de Paris.

He was a founding member, in 1973, of the Atelier de Realizaciones Técnico Electroacústicas Arte 11 in Buenos Aires. He was vice president and founding member of the Federación Argentina de Música Electroacústica. He was on the faculty at the UCA, the Conservatorio Nacional Carlos López Buchardo, and the Universidad de Lanús. He has spent his career writing electroacoustic and orchestral music both in academic realms and in theatre and motion picture shows. He has been awarded the Premio Promociones (1964), the Premio Municipal María Guerrero (1985 and 1988), the Caballero Granadero de los Antes (2000), and the Premio Argentores (2003).

Valcárcel, Edgar

Born in Puno, Perú in 1932, and died in 2010. He was a composer, pianist, researcher, and educator. He enrolled at the Conservatorio Nacional de Música de Lima where he studied composition with Andrés Sas and piano with Inés Pauta. He was awarded a scholarship at Hunger College in New York where he studied with Donald Lybbert. After his CLAEM fellowship (1963-1964) he worked with Vladimir Ussachevsky at the Columbia Princeton Electronic Music Center, and was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship (1966-1968). He also received several international awards and distinctions.

He taught composition in several Peruvian institutions including the Conservatorio Nacional de Lima where he eventually took the post of Director. In his works he has used his own sounds as well as musical elements from the Peruvian Andes, using serial and polytonal procedures. His most recognized works include Invención for tape, Zorro, zorrito for voices and orchestra, and Madre coraje for cello and orchestra. He also published extensively on music theory, musical aesthetics and musicological research.

Vanegas, Marco Aurelio

Born in 1942 in Bogotá, Colombia and died in 1984. He was a composer, educator, and music critic. He enrolled at the Conservatorio Nacional de Música de Bogotá in 1955 where he studied composition and band instrumentation. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1963-1964, and he composed the Sonata para viola y piano during his time in Buenos Aires. He left the CLAEM in December 1963 due to health problems.

Upon his return to Colombia he worked as a critic for the Revista del Conservatorio, as an arranger for different popular music ensembles, as a teacher and a composer. He received awards in the Concurso de Composición del Conservatorio (1960) and the Concurso de Composición del Festival de Arte de Cali (1964 and 1965).
**Villalpando, Alberto**

Born in 1940 in La Paz, Bolivia. He is a composer and educator. He began his musical training with Santiago Velásquez and Father José Díaz Gainza. He relocated to Buenos Aires in 1958 to study at the Conservatorio Nacional Carlos López Buchardo where he studied composition with Roberto García Morillo, Pedro Sáenz and Alberto Ginastera. He was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1963-1964.

He moved back to Bolivia in 1965 where he eventually became the director of the Departamento de Música at the Ministerio de Cultura. He incorporated national elements in a series of works, and then veered towards film music and producing documentaries. He was a professor of composition at the Conservatorio Nacional de La Paz and the Universidad Católica Boliviana. His works are frequently performed and earned the 1998 Premio Nacional de Cultura.

**Zubillaga, Luis**

Born in 1929 in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and died in October 1995. He was a composer and educator. He studied composition with Juan Carlos Paz and was awarded a CLAEM fellowship for 1969-1970. He left the program during his first year due to the lack of funding.

Later on he was artistic director of the Teatro Colón de Buenos Aires in 1973, and between 1976 and 1983 he was the director of the Departamento de Documentación at the Instituto Latinoamericano de Estudios en Investigaciones Musicales Vicente Emilio Sojo in Caracas, Venezuela. He relocated to Argentina where he worked for different government institutions such as the Secretaría de Cultura de la Nación, the Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, the Universidad de La Plata and other higher learning institutions in the Buenos Aires province. He was a founding member and president of the Asociación Cultrum de Compositores Asociados as well as founding member and vice-president of the Federación Argentina de Compositores.
APPENDIX E

FESTIVALS AND CONCERTS ORGANIZED BY THE CLAEM (1962-71)

E.1 Contemporary Music Festivals (1962-1971)
First Contemporary Music Festival, August 9–12, 1962 (1/2)
First Contemporary Music Festival, August 9–12, 1962 (2/2)
**Second Contemporary Music Festival (September 5–8, 1963) (1/2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartets *</th>
<th>Céspedes de la Vega</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Introduction</em></td>
<td>&quot;Cuarteto Acide&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scherzo</em></td>
<td>Eduardo Arceo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rondo</em></td>
<td>Luis Serrano, violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Finale</em></td>
<td>Andrés Varela, viola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Violins</em></td>
<td>Armando Cobelli, violin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trio *</th>
<th>Władzimir Kotonowski</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfredo Leonetti, Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augusto Marcellino, Guitar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Teves, percussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epigramme *</th>
<th>Gilbert Amy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Alcides Lanz, piano</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Double Cases *</th>
<th>Igor Strawinsky</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>&quot;Cuarteto Acide,&quot;</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cinco piezas breves sp. 71</th>
<th>Roberto Casasola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Scherzo&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Finale&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Primera Audición ** Extremo Mundial
Second Contemporary Music Festival (September 5–8, 1963) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concertino</th>
<th>Premiere</th>
<th>Performers</th>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inge Liethem</td>
<td>Nikos Skalkottas</td>
<td>Passacaglia*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exercises pour piano*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinco poemas</td>
<td>de Gasparino**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hieronymus Jakob</td>
<td>Fantasias**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Entflucht auf lichter Körnern...&quot; op. 5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaksh*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yanitane Matsudaia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dei gemischte chöre op. 81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riccardo Malipiero</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time cycle*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sei poesie di Dylan Thomas*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfredo Lammelli</td>
<td>Luis Gianneo</td>
<td>Lukas Foss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfredo Lammelli</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sofia Bandin, soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riccardo Malipiero</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariano Pregioni, clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alfredo Lammelli, flauta</td>
<td></td>
<td>José Puglisi, violinista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedro Di Gregorio, flauta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, pianocellista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aldo Moscoso, clarinete bajo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Yépez, percusión</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eduardo Acedo y Leonie Reim-Vilms, violines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Yépez, percusiones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrés Varell, violín</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Tautillo, director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ernesto Cobelli, violoncello</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Yépez, percusiones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Yépez, percusión</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Tautillo, director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates works by local composers. ** indicates works by international composers. 

Program notes:
- "Passacaglia" by Nikos Skalkottas
- "Exercises pour piano" by Hieronymus Jakob
- "Fantasias" by Dei gemischte chöre
- "Time cycle" by Sofia Bandin
- "Sinfonias" by Antonio Yépez
- "Cancion" by Luis Gianneo
- "Lusignos" by Roman Hausenstock-Ramati
- "Quarteto" by John Cage
Third Contemporary Music Festival (October 15–18, 1964) (1/2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evento</th>
<th>Orquesta o Combinación</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Instrumentación</th>
<th>Formación</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tercer concierto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sábado 17 de octubre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musica chilena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Música electrónica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Infantiluz</em></td>
<td>Alfdi Cimoln</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, clave,</td>
<td><em>Siete</em> &quot;Siete Nombres&quot;** **</td>
<td>Enrique Rivara,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Música Nocturna</em></td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>Alfredo Ianneli, flauta,</td>
<td><em>13 piezas</em> **</td>
<td>Eduardo Maturana,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernardo Sliman, norma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yolanda Caspe, violoncello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>José Puglisi, violinista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, piano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taurinello, director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Luzer tan Singbreite</em></td>
<td>Paul Hendon</td>
<td>Corno de cámara del Cello</td>
<td><em>La Luna</em></td>
<td>Dominguo Santa Cruz,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Líbano americano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>de Alto Estilo Musical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Luisa H. de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbamany, arpa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Biláma</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria del Carmen Diaz,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Violín, clave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>El Festival</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>El Alegre</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Luzeskie</em></td>
<td>Luigi Nonno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>música para los Pozzerschof*</td>
<td>Luigi Dallapiccola</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini y</td>
<td><em>Solista</em></td>
<td>Marnano Fergonini,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1953)**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Taurinello,</td>
<td></td>
<td>guitarra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>piano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Genesis II</em></td>
<td>Henryk Gornick</td>
<td>Consorto</td>
<td><em>15 integrantes</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Concerto</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>instrumental</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dirigido por</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Taurinello,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obras realizadas en los estudios de música electrónica. Acompañamiento de violinista y de violoncello.
Fourth Contemporary Music Festival (August 26-29, 1965) (1/2)
### Fourth Contemporary Music Festival (August 26-29, 1965) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concertino III</strong></td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, clave; Alfredo Iannelli, flauta; León Mames, violín; Aldo Moscoso, clarinete; Eduardo Acero, violín; Andrés Varela, violín; Antonio Yepes, percusión; Antonio Taurello, director.</td>
<td><strong>Sonata Nº 7, op. 105</strong></td>
<td>Jacobo Fisher</td>
<td>Haydeé Loustaunau, piano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petrar Lusario</strong> Melodrama op. 21</td>
<td>Arnold Schoenberg</td>
<td>Naomi Souza, violín; Gerardo Gandini, pianó; Alfredo Iannelli, flauta y flautín; Mariano Fraga, clarinete; Aldo Moscoso, clarinete; Eduardo Acero, violín; Andrés Varela, violín; José Pugliese, violín; Fernando Gutiérrez, violín; Antonio Taurello, director.</td>
<td><strong>Música de cambios IV</strong></td>
<td>John Cage</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, pianó.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile for Shakespeare</strong></td>
<td>Roman Haubenstock-Ramati</td>
<td>Minam Rosenblum, soprano; Gerardo Gandini, pianó; Alcides Lanza, caleo; Héctor Pietri, flauta; <em>Concertino Boliviano</em> de percusión: Antonió Varela, Nicolás Esteban, León A. Jacobson, Juan B. Cifuentes, Antonio Taurello, director.</td>
<td>&quot;Clamenc&quot; Settling *</td>
<td>Mol Powell</td>
<td>&quot;Clamenc&quot; Quartet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Sextet**

Aaron Copland
Seymour Bernstein, pianó;
Robert Listokin, clarinete;
"Clamenc Quartet."

**Quinteto op. 25**

Roberto Caamaño
Seymour Bernstein, pianó;
"Clamenc Quartet."

**Esto concierto cuenta con los auspicios del Servicio Cultural de la Embajada de los Estados Unidos.**
Fifth Contemporary Music Festival (September 14-17, 1966) (1/2)
### Fifth Contemporary Music Festival (September 14-17, 1966) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadril**</th>
<th>Autor</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
<td>Władysław Kulesza</td>
<td>Composiciones realizadas en el Laboratorio de Música Electrónica de la Radio Polaca de Varsovia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **C.** | Hans Ditte | Música N° 1 **
| **D.** | Edmar Aloss Zaanemoes | **
| **E.** | Alfredo Iannelli, Laura. | Combinaisiones realizadas en el Centre de Musica Electromecanica Columbia-Fricton de Nueva York. |
| **F.** | Kazuo Fujishima |ación de la **
| **G.** | Jacob Druckman | Comisiones para piano y banda magnética. |
| **H.** | Sylvette Busetti | Comisiones para piano y banda magnética. |
| **I.** | Krzysztof Penderecki | Comisiones realizadas en el Laboratorio de Música Electrónica de Buenos Aires. |
| **J.** | Leopold Teitel | Comisiones para guitarra acústica y banda magnética. |
| **K.** | Rafael Aporta-Ledon | Comisiones para guitarra eléctrica y banda magnética. |

---

**Note:**
- **A.** Hans Ditte
- **B.** Edmar Aloss Zaanemoes
- **C.** Alfredo Iannelli, Laura
- **D.** Jacob Druckman
- **E.** Sylvette Busetti
- **F.** Krzysztof Penderecki
- **G.** Rafael Aporta-Ledon

---

**Fifth Contemporary Music Festival (September 14-17, 1966) (2/2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadril**</th>
<th>Autor</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **A.** | Anton Weber | **
| **B.** | Władysław Kulesza | **
| **C.** | Hans Ditte | **
| **D.** | Edmar Aloss Zaanemoes | **
| **E.** | Alfredo Iannelli, Laura. | **
| **F.** | Kazuo Fujishima | **
| **G.** | Jacob Druckman | **
| **H.** | Sylvette Busetti | **
| **I.** | Krzysztof Penderecki | **
| **J.** | Rafael Aporta-Ledon | **
Sixth Contemporary Music Festival (October 3-6, 1967) (1/2)

- Cuarto concierto Viernes 6 de octubre a las 18.30 horas

**Perspectives**
- Luciano Berio

- **Scambi**
- Henri Pousseur

- **Composición Nº 9 B**
- Nelly Moreto

- **Preludio “La Noche” II**
- José Vicente Asuar

- **Epitaph für Aikichi Kuboyama**
- Herbert Eimert

- Sexto Festival de Música Contemporánea
  Alberto Ginastera Director
  Octubre 3, 4, 5 y 6 de 1967 a las 18.30 horas

- Sala del Centro Experimentación Audiovisual

- Comentarios a cargo de los profesores Gerardo Gandini y Francisco Kröpfl.

- Florida 936
  Buenos Aires

* Estreno mundial.
** Primera audición.
### Sixth Contemporary Music Festival (October 3-6, 1967) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.30 horas</td>
<td>First Concerto: Montages *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30 horas</td>
<td>Second Concerto: Sixth Contemporary Music Festival (October 3-6, 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30 horas</td>
<td>Third Concerto: Tensiones III, 1987 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### December 1952

**Earle Brown**

- Gerardo Gandini y Antonio Taurielo, pianos.

**Juan Carlos Zorzi**

- Domingo Ruiio, flute.
- Salvador Ramieri, clarinet.
- Carlos Gavironsky, viola.
- Luis Grinhaus, viola.
- Dleg Kotzarev, violoncello.
- Eno Rascelli de Ferraris, contrabasso.
- Bruno D'Anstoli, piano.
- Gerardo Gandini, clave.
- Antonio Yepes y Nestor Astulti, percusión.
- Juan Carlos Zorzi, director.

**Gerardo Gandini**

- Introducción: Música sonora
- Violestries II: Bernard Parmegiani

**Antonio Taurielo**

- Signes:
  - Domingo Ruiio, flauta.
  - Carlos Gavironsky, violín.
  - Eno Rascelli de Ferraris, contrabasso.
  - Gielo Nalli, corno.
  - Francisco Mazzoni, trompeta.
  - Gerardo Gandini, clave.
  - Bruno D'Anstoli, piano.
  - Antonio Yepes y Nestor Astulti, percusión.
  - Antonio Taurielo, director.

**Sylvano Busotti**

- Prima Música: Gerardo Gandini y Antonio Taurielo, pianos.

**Rounds**

- Luciano Berio, clave.

**Núcleos I-V**

- Juan Carlos Paz, piano.

**Tensiones III, 1987**

- Armando Krieger, soprano.
- Pablo Levin y Oscar Plusio, flautas.
- Eladio Fisica y Jorge Amato, trompetas.
- Hector Saladin, Rafael Toscano, trombones.
- Nestor Astulti, percusión.
- Gerardo Gandini, piano.
- Armando Krieger, director.

**Montaggio**

- Boguslaw Schaffer

- Antonio Yepes y Nestor Astulti, percusión.
- Mariano Erkín, director.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seventh Contemporary Music Festival</strong> (October 23-26, 1968)</td>
<td>(1/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarto concierto</strong> sábado 26 de octubre a las 19:45 h.</td>
<td><strong>Música para cinta magnética</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prélude I</strong></td>
<td>Ilian Mimaroğlu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El mundo en que vivimos</strong> (música para una película)</td>
<td>Mesías Maiguashca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I paipiti</strong></td>
<td>Edgardo Cantón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tema: Ginnagio a Joyce</strong> (Segunda versión)</td>
<td>Luciano Berio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Música para medios mixtos</strong></td>
<td>Jorge Rotter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solo</strong> para violín con microfónico de contacto</td>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Più minus</strong> (Segunda versión) para piano y medios electroacústicos</td>
<td>Renato Malidi, piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-13 AIFS (Rht-1)</strong> para coros, trompeta, guitarra eléctrica, percusión, luz, proyectores, voces y reproductor de radiotelefonía</td>
<td>César Bolanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Séptimo festival de música contemporánea</strong> con el apoyo del Fondo Nacional de las Artes</td>
<td><strong>Instituto Torcuato Di Tella</strong> Florida 938 Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octubre 23, 24, 25 y 26 de 1968 a las 19:45 horas</strong></td>
<td>Alberto Ginastera Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instituto Torcuato Di Tella</strong></td>
<td>Centro Latinoamericano de Artes Estudios Musicales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seventh Contemporary Music Festival (October 23-26, 1968) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer concierto</th>
<th>Homenaje a Claude Debussy</th>
<th>Mis recuerdos sobre Debussy por el Maestro Ferruccio Calasta</th>
<th>Segundo concierto</th>
<th>Música instrumental</th>
<th>Homenaje a Juan José Castro por Alberto Ginastera</th>
<th>Tercer concierto</th>
<th>Teatro musical</th>
<th>¿Música o teatro? por Gerardo Gandini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No mencionado</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>Juan José Castro</td>
<td>No mencionado</td>
<td>Eduardo Ferracane</td>
<td>No mencionado</td>
<td>No mencionado</td>
<td>No mencionado</td>
<td>John Cage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y Antonio Taurielo, pianos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guillermo Gallardo, Walter Maddalena y Víctor de Nárgez, bajos;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethel Gandini, Oscar Bazán, y público.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romana de Piaggio, Gerardo Gandini, piano, Antonio Taurielo, director.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, Diapositivas: Julita Memelsdorf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solistas de Música Contemporánea de Buenos Aires; Antonio Taurielo, director.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norberto Campos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Six épigraphes antiques**

Por invocar Pan, dios del viento.
Por un tombeau sans nom.
Por que la noche así propicio.
Por la danseuse aux cintales.
Por l'Egyptienne.
Por remembrar la pluie au matin.
Le promener des deux amants.

**Trois ballades de François Villon**

Ballade de Villon.

**Trois poèmes de Stéphane Mallarmé**

Souscr.

**Sonata**

Allegro vivace.

**En blanc et noir**

Carlos Gaivronsky, violin; Gerardo Gandini, piano.

**Conjunto "Ritmos" de percusión**

Antonio Yepes, Néstor Ashutti, Juan B. Cutrallo.

**Solistas de Música Contemporánea de Buenos Aires**

Jorge Silvain, Eno Góico y Jorge Carrechi, flautas; Eugeberto Tavella, oboe; Aldo Moscoso y Julio Rizzo, clarinetes; Alfredo Maricordia, trompeta; Rubén Ceraci, coros; Abel Larraga, trombones; Romana de Piaggio, arpa; Carlos Gaivronsky, violin; Miguel Steinbach, viola; Oscar López Echeverría, violoncello; Antonio Pagano, contrabajo; Gerardo Gandini, piano y clave.

**Due for pianists**

John Cage

**Pas de quoi**

Oscar Bazán

**Strobo I (1967)**

Alcides Lanza

**Antithése**

Mauricio Kagel

**Versión escénica**

Version escénica de la composición homónima para sonidos electrónicos y de público.

**La Dirección del Centro Latino-americano de Artes Estudios Musicales**

aprende a los señores Guillermo Gallardo, Walter Maddalena, Eduardo Ferracane y Víctor de Narcke, por su desinteresada colaboración en la obra de Juan José Castro al Sr. Jacobo Gnanzer y a la Empresa Lenard S.A.I. por el prestamo de la estructura metálica.
Eighth Contemporary Music Festival (September 22-25, 1969) (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signos de los tiempos</th>
<th>Antonio Taurelio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play *</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tres piezas del &quot;Chu-u&quot; **</td>
<td>Kasuo Fukusima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursivo **</td>
<td>Chou Wen-Chung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De muertes y resurrecciones, ii * para soprano, guitarra, bandoneón, piano, clave y percusión</td>
<td>Armando Krieger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* estreno mundial  
** primera audición  
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Eighth Contemporary Music Festival (September 22-25, 1969) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano piece I</td>
<td>David Bedford, Gerardo Gandini, Luciano Benjo, Luciano Benjo, Augusto Benjamín Rastenbach, piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence II</td>
<td>Nuerra Lynn, soprano, and &quot;Cuarteto Contemporáneo&quot; Norman Dinestein, director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variaciones para cuarteto de cuerdas</td>
<td>&quot;Espanoles&quot; by Roberto Sawicky and Bernardo Stalman, violins; Simón Zonnik, viola; Liborio Rosa, violoncello; Enrique Bellus, director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four settings on texts of Emily Dickinson (1961)</td>
<td>Norma Dinestein, Norman Dinestein, director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucesos en flor</td>
<td>Acción lúdica presentada por el Centro de Música Experimental de la Escuela de Arte de la Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, idea y obras de Oskar Bazán, Graciela Castillo, Carlos Pergozzi, Virgilio Tosco, Diapositivas: Oskar Bazán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;One-Man-Show&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Los mago (1968) para niños, bandas magnéticas, luz negra, televisión y film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Metales (1967)&quot;</td>
<td>para instrumentos de viento de metal amplificados y modificados, dia- positivas y film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidentes (1967)</td>
<td>por piano preparado electrónicamente, modulator de anillo, espejos, acciones, luz negra y proyecciones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass (1967)</td>
<td>para contrabajo, intérprete, banda magnética y film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmisión I (1968)</td>
<td>obra electrónica audio-visual para televisión en colores.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cinco piezas teatrales de Larry Austin
Coordinación de Larry Austin

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projection 2</td>
<td>Morton Feldman</td>
<td>Grupo de Experimentación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Musical del CLAEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...“E’pur suona”</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y Antonio Tauroli, pianos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constelaciones II</td>
<td>Armando Krieger</td>
<td>Armando Fernández Arroyo, órgano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julli organum</td>
<td>Sylvano Bussotti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria *</td>
<td>Antonio Tauroli</td>
<td>Jorge Caryevschi, flauta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grupo de Experimentación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Musical del CLAEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations I</td>
<td>John Cage</td>
<td>Grupo de Experimentación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Musical del CLAEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grupo de Experimentación Musical del CLAEM:</td>
<td>Jorge Antunes, León Brincot, Gabriel Brincot, Pedro Caryevschi, Eduardo Kuzinri, José Maranzano, Ariel Martínez Antonio Mastrogiovanni, Alejandro Núñez Allauca</td>
<td>Musico invitado: Gerardo Chiarelli, trompeta Gerardo Gandini, director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* estreno mundial
** primera audición
Ninth Contemporary Music Festival (October 28-31, 1970) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer concierto</th>
<th>Segundo concierto</th>
<th>Tercer concierto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homenaje</strong></td>
<td><strong>Música para medios electrónicos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variaciones op. 27</strong></td>
<td>**Morsima, Amorsima **</td>
<td><strong>Obras para cinta magnética</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béla Bartók</td>
<td>Carlos Galán y Antonio Tauriello, pianos</td>
<td><strong>Selección I (1958)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cuarteto op. 22</strong></td>
<td>**Endecha para Falla op 35 **</td>
<td><strong>Momenti (1964)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anton Webern</td>
<td>**Tres piezas **</td>
<td><strong>“Metóora” (1968)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II</strong></td>
<td>**Tres lienzos **</td>
<td>Joaquín Orellana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvisaciones op. 20</strong></td>
<td><strong>Musica ’66</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béla Bartók</td>
<td>**‘Sìlabeciti” (Esepeco II) **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonata para dos pianos y percusión</strong></td>
<td>**Soleas **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assai lento - Allegro molto</td>
<td><strong>César Bolaños M. Milchberg</strong></td>
<td>**Duoárbito VIII **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro non troppo</td>
<td><strong>Mariano Etkin</strong></td>
<td><strong>para oboe, corno inglés y banda magnética</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gabriel Brinc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gabriel Brinc, corno inglés</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bruno Maderna</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oscar Piuso, flauta</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E.2 “Seminario de Composición” Concerts (1963-71)

Seminario de Composición 1963 (November 25-26, 1963) (1/2)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Presidente: Maria Robiola de Di Tella
Vicepresidente: Guido Di Tella

Directores:
Guido Chattertuck
Mario Robiola
Torcuato Sabo
Torcuato S. Di Tella

Director Ejecutivo:
Enrique Otleza.

Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales
Director:
Alberto Ginastera

Profesores
Curso 1963
Maestro Aaron Copland:
"Estética de la Música del Siglo XX".

Maestro Alberto Ginastera:
"Las estructuras contemporáneas en la composición musical" y 
"Seminario de composición".

Maestro Riccardo Malipiero:
"La armonía musical en el Siglo XX" y 
"Nuevos principios de orquestación".

Maestro Olivier Messiaen:
"Teoría del ritmo".

Curso 1964
Dr. Gilbert Chase:
"Hacia una estética americana".

Maestro Luigi Dallapiccola:
"Música y palabra".

Maestro Alberto Ginastera:
"Técnicas experimentales de composición" y 
"Seminario de composición".

Maestro Witold Lutoslawski:
"Nuevas bases de la teoría musical".

Maestro Bruno Maderna:
"Fonología experimental".

Prof. Dr.
Heinrich Strebel:
"Del presente al futuro de la música".

Dos conciertos de cámara con obras de los Becarios escritas durante el curso 1963.


Museo de Artes Visuales
Florida 935
Buenos Aires
### Seminario de Composición 1963 (November 25-26, 1963) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer Concierto</th>
<th>Segundo Concierto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sinfonía para viola y piano</strong>&lt;br&gt;Esposiciones&lt;br&gt;Scherzo - Sutilagro - Adagio - Ripresa&lt;br&gt;e Coda. (Se ejecuta sin interrupción.)</td>
<td><strong>Variedades para cuarteto de vientos</strong>&lt;br&gt;Melías Maiguashca&lt;br&gt;(Ecuador)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Aurelio Vansagas&lt;br&gt;(Colombia)</td>
<td><strong>Ginoc coniciones sobre letras chinas</strong>&lt;br&gt;Oscar Bazín&lt;br&gt;(Argentina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Costa, viola; Armando Krieger, piano.</td>
<td><strong>Cinco coniciones sobre letras chinas</strong>&lt;br&gt;Retorno (Wang Wei)&lt;br&gt;El bambú en la ventana de Li&lt;br&gt;T'se Yun (Po Chu Yi)&lt;br&gt;Escribiendo solo&lt;br&gt;(del Shí King)&lt;br&gt; Kanye-Ton Pin&lt;br&gt;(Anónimo - época Tsin)&lt;br&gt;Sordera (Tu Fu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Valcarcel&lt;br&gt;(Perú)</td>
<td><strong>Formas Concretantes para dos pianos</strong>&lt;br&gt;Blas Atchortúa&lt;br&gt;(Colombia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>César Balaños&lt;br&gt;(Perú)</td>
<td><strong>Variedades timbricas para voz y conjunto de cámara</strong>&lt;br&gt;Alberto Villalpando&lt;br&gt;(Bolivia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collages</strong></td>
<td><strong>Krieger-Lanza, dúo de pianos.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variaciones para piano y percusión de cámara</strong>&lt;br&gt;Épica brasileña</td>
<td><strong>Miriam Rosenblum, canto; Alfredo Iannelli, flauta; Margarita Samek, arpa; Alcides Lanza, celesta; José Pugliesi, violoncello; Florencio Posadas, Luis Varela y Juan Ringer, “Conjunto Ritmus” de percusión; Blas Atchortúa, director.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Angel Roedano&lt;br&gt;(Argentina)</td>
<td><strong>Krieger-Lanza, dúo de pianos.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variaciones para piano y percusión de cámara</strong>&lt;br&gt;Épica brasileña</td>
<td><strong>Miriam Rosenblum, canto; Alfredo Iannelli, flauta; Margarita Samek, arpa; Alcides Lanza, celesta; José Pugliesi, violoncello; Florencio Posadas, Luis Varela y Juan Ringer, “Conjunto Ritmus” de percusión; Blas Atchortúa, director.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Xilófonias</strong>&lt;br&gt;Allegro scherzando&lt;br&gt;Andante&lt;br&gt;Allegro con brío</td>
<td><strong>Miriam Rosenblum, canto; Alfredo Iannelli, flauta; Margarita Samek, arpa; Alcides Lanza, celesta; José Pugliesi, violoncello; Florencio Posadas, Luis Varela y Juan Ringer, “Conjunto Ritmus” de percusión; Blas Atchortúa, director.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Kuri-Aldana&lt;br&gt;(México)</td>
<td><strong>Miriam Rosenblum, canto; Alfredo Iannelli, flauta; Margarita Samek, arpa; Alcides Lanza, celesta; José Pugliesi, violoncello; Florencio Posadas, Luis Varela y Juan Ringer, “Conjunto Ritmus” de percusión; Blas Atchortúa, director.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Krieger-Lanza, dúo de pianos.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Miriam Rosenblum, canto; Alfredo Iannelli, flauta; Margarita Samek, arpa; Alcides Lanza, celesta; José Pugliesi, violoncello; Florencio Posadas, Luis Varela y Juan Ringer, “Conjunto Ritmus” de percusión; Blas Atchortúa, director.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las obras de ambos conciertos se ejecutan en calidad de estreno absoluto.
Seminario de Composición 1964 (November 20-21, 1964) (1/2)

Acta de clausura del ciclo 1963-1964

Discurso del Director del Instituto, Ing. Enrique Oteiza.

Deseada a los Becarios por el Director del Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales, Maestro Alberto Ginastera.

Distribución de diplomas.

Diseño.
J. C. Distefano
Impresión:
Imprenta
Anzilotti S. R. L.

Dos conciertos de cámara con obras de los Becarios escritas durante el curso 1964.

Viernes 20 y Sábado 21 de noviembre a las 18.30 horas 1964.

Sala Audio-Visual
Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Florida 936
Buenos Aires
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## Seminario de Composición 1964 (November 20-21, 1964) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer concierto</th>
<th>Segundo concierto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viernes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sábado</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20 de noviembre a las 18.30 horas</strong></td>
<td><strong>21 de noviembre a las 18.30 horas</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Camarae musica**
- Preambulum et fujia sólita
- Insinuatio
- Festivos

**Blas Atzehortúa** (Colombia)
- Güelto Nalli, trompa
- Panagotis Kyrrkris, violín
- José Puglisi, violoncelo
- Gerardo Gandini, piano-celesta
- Antonio Yepes, percusión
- Blas Atzehortúa, director

**Ouroboros**
- Miguel Angel Rohdano (Argentina)
  - Música concreta

**Simbiosis**
- Oscar Bazán (Argentina)
  - Armando Krieger y Alices Lanza, órgano
  - Concierto “Ritmus” de percusión

**Estructuras para piano y percusión**
- Alberto Villapando (Bolivia)
  - Gerardo Gandini, piano
  - Concierto “Ritmus” de percusión
  - Armando Krieger, director

**Cinco nocturnales**
- Scherzoso
- Recitativo
- Elegía
- Cadenza
- Finale

**Armando Krieger** (Argentina)
- Alfredo Iannelli, flauta
- Gerardo Gandini, clave
- Alices Lanza, piano
- Enzo Raschetti de Ferraris, contrabajo
- Concierto “Ritmus” de percusión
  - Armando Krieger, director

**Susit para cuarteto de cuerdas**
- Preludio
- Estudio I
- Homenaje a Webern
- Estudio II
- Postudio

**Edgar Valcárcel** (Perú)
- Alfredo Iannelli, flauta
- Andrés Venceffle, viola
- Edgar Valcárcel, piano

**Espectros**
- Mario Kuri-Aldana (México)
  - Humberto Carfi, violin
  - Luis Grinchaux, viola
  - María Ester More de Carfi, arpa

**Cuarto cuarteto para trompas**
- Alices Lanza (Argentina)
  - Cuarteto de trompas
  - “Wagner”
  - Güelto Nalli, Sebastián Allotta, Rubén Cerací y Marcos A. More
  - Alices Lanza, director

**Ukrinnmakriekrin**
- I. Pailú-pañé
- II. Tapió
- III. Karé xukágo

**Sobre textos de la dialecto Xucanú**

**César Bolainnes** (Perú)
- Realizada en el Laboratorio de Música Electrónica del Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales

*Concierto “Ritmus” de percusión
- Antonio Yepes
- Néstor Asturri
- Juan Ringer, León
- Augusto Jacobson
- Florencio Posadas
- Juan Bautista Cultraro y Ernesto Ringer

**Las obras de ambos conciertos se ejecutan en calidad de estreno absoluto.**
Seminario de Composición 1965 (November 28-29, 1965) (1/2)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella

Presidente: Maria Robiola de Di Tella

Directores: Guido Clutterbuck
Mario Robiola
Torcuato Sojo

Vicepresidente: Guido Di Tella

Director Ejecutivo: Enrique Ofeiza

Subdirector Ejecutivo: Edgard Poyard

Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales

Director: Alberto Ginastera

Secretaria: Josefin Schröder

Profesores

Alberto Ginastera: "Las estructuras contemporáneas en la composición musical"
"Problematización de la creación musical contemporánea"
"Seminario de composición"

Gerardo Gandini:
"La textura musical en el siglo XX"
"Nuevos principios de orquestación"

Amalia Suárez Urtubey:
"Historia y estética de la música contemporánea y americana"

Horacio Raúl Rozamillo:
"Introducción a la acústica y a la electrónica"

Raquel C. de Arias:
"Textura tradicional"

Profesores invitados 1965-1966

Mario Davidovskey: "Técnica para la composición de la música electrónica"

Maurice Le Roux: "Música y cine"

Witold Lutoslawski: "Nuevas bases de la teoría musical"

Luigi Nono: "Música y palabra"

Roger Sessions: "La música y el hombre"

Tercera Serie de conciertos con obras de compositores americanos becados, en celebración del 92 aniversario del Instituto

Martes 28 y miércoles 29 de septiembre a las 18.30 horas
Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual
Florida 936
Buenos Aires
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Seminario de Composición 1965 (November 28-29, 1965) (2/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primer concierto</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trio</strong></td>
<td>Sonata Adagio con variaciones Scherzo-Rondo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atliano Azúa León (Bolivia)</td>
<td>Alfredo Lannelli, flauta; Mariano Frongoni, clarinete; Pedro Chiambaretta, fagot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passacaglia</strong></td>
<td>Gabriel Erneic (Chile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miguel Letelier, órgano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Música para siete instrumentistas</strong></td>
<td>Introduzione Scherzo Andante Finale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Gutiérrez (Costa Rica)</td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, piano; &quot;Quinteto de vientos de la OSN&quot;; Alfredo Lannelli, flauta; Pedro Di Gregorio, oboe; Mariano Frongoni, clarinete; Pedro Chiambaretta, fagot; Domingo Zullo, contralto; Antonio Yepes, percusión; Benjamin Gutiérrez, director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divertimento para conjunto de cámara</strong></td>
<td>Miguel Letelier (Chile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, clave; Alfredo Lannelli, flauta; Pedro Di Gregorio, oboe; Mariano Frongoni, clarinete; Aldo Mocossi, clarinete bajo; &quot;Cuarteto Acedo&quot;; Eduardo Acedo y LeMMI Rest-Wilm, violines; Andrés Vancollie, viola; Ernesto Cobelli, violoncello. Jorge Sarmientos, director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parámetros</strong></td>
<td>Graciela Paraskevaidis (Argentina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carla Hübner, piano; &quot;Ritmos&quot; de Percusión: Antonio Yepes, Néstor Asiffili, Leon Augusto Jacobson, Florencio Pozadas; Mariano Etkin, director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexteto</strong></td>
<td>Jorge Sarmientos (Guatemala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carla Hübner, piano; &quot;Quinteto de vientos de la OSN&quot;; Jorge Sarmientos, director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segundo concierto</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cuarteto</strong></td>
<td>Jorge Arandia Navarro (Argentina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Cuarteto Acedo&quot;; Eduardo Acedo y LeMMI Rest-Wilm, violines; Andrés Vancollie, viola; Ernesto Cobelli, violoncello.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialogantes</strong></td>
<td>Rafael Aponte-Ledée (Puerto Rico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfredo Lannelli, flauta; Andrés Vancollie, viola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poema I</strong></td>
<td>Eduardo Mazzati (Argentina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noemi Souza, mezzo-soprano; Alfredo Lannelli, flauta; Leon Mames, coro inglés; Andrés Vancollie, viola; Ernesto Cobelli, violoncello; Romana di Piaggi, arpa; Gerardo Gandini, celesta; Antonio Yepes, percusión; Jorge Sarmientos, director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Silent Firefly</strong> (Ocho canciones de la lirica japonesa)</td>
<td>Walter Ross (Becado por la OEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noemi Souza, mezzo-soprano; Andrés Vancollie, viola; Ernesto Cobelli, violoncello; Carla Hübner, piano; Benjamin Gutiérrez, celesta; Romana di Piaggi, arpa; Gerardo Gandini, clave; Walter Ross, director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonata II</strong></td>
<td>Enrique Rivera (Chile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carla Hübner, piano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entropías</strong></td>
<td>Mariano Etkin (Argentina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>César J. Alvarez, trompetas; Rubén Ceraci, Márquez Mozo, trombones; Gregorio Gobyński, Gaspar Liccardone, trombones; Rítmulo Angel Díaz, tuba; Mariano Etkin, director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las obras de ambos conciertos fueron escritas en Buenos Aires durante el presente año y se ejecutan en calidad de estreno absoluto.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seminario de Composición 1966 (November 7-8, 1966) (1/2)

Concerto "Ritmus" de percusión.
Antonio Yepes, Néstor Astutí, Constantino Avaranes, Carlos Benard (hijo), Juan B. Cultraro, Guillermo Díaz Bruno, Alberto Gómez, Florencio Gualda y Ernesto Ringer.

Las obras de ambos conciertos fueron escritas en Buenos Aires durante el presente año y se ejecutan en calidad de extrema absolución.

Las bandas magnéticas fueron realizadas en el Laboratorio de Música Electrónica del Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales.

Cuarta Serie de conciertos con obras de compositores latinoamericanos becados
Lunes 7 y martes 8 de noviembre a las 19:30 horas
Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual
Florida 936
R. Aires

Imprenta: Imprenta Aureliana

Alberto Ginastera
Director
1966
Seminario de Composición 1966 (November 7-8, 1966) (2/2)

Primer Concierto

Cuarteto
Jorge Sarmientos (Guatemala)
Cuarteto de la Orquesta Filarmónica de Buenos Aires, Luis A. Caracciolo y Carlos Galvínsky, violines; Luis Grinhaus, viola; Oleg Kotzarev, violoncelo.

Divertimento
César Bolívar (Perú)
Becario de la OEA
Alfredo Iannelli, flauta; Mariano Frongoni, clarinete; José Goldenách, trompeta; Aldo Moscoso, clarinete bajo; Miguel Letelier, clave; Enzo Raschelli de Ferraris, contrabajo; Gerardo Gandini, piano; Conjunto "Rítmus" de percusión; Antonio Taunieto, director.

Los refrenes
Refrenos populares españoles
Enrique Rivero (Chile)
Teresa Monseñor, Isabel Vivanco, Walter Baltarini, Hugo Midón, cuarteto vocal hablado; Augusto Marcelino, guitarra; Conjunto "Rítmus" de percusión; Mariano Etkin, director.

Estática móvil I
Mariano Etkin (Argentina)
Enzo Raschelli de Ferraris, António Mannuccia y Juan A. Vassallo, contrabajos; Gregorio Golyski y Gaspar Liccardone, trombones; Gerardo Gandini, clave y armonio; Conjunto "Rítmus" de percusión; Mariano Etkin, director.

Combinatoria II
Graciela Parasekwaždis (Argentina)
Gerardo Gandini, piano; Gregorio Golyski, trombones; Conjunto "Rítmus" de percusión; Banda magnética.

Dialéctica
Gabriel Brnic (Chile)
Conjunto "Rítmus" de percusión; Gerardo Gandini, piano; Benjamin Gutiérrez, celesta; Jorge Sarmientos, director; Banda magnética.

Segundo Concierto

Antífonas
Abelardo Arias León (Bolivia)
Gerardo Gandini, piano.

Playas rítmicas Nº 2
Jorge Arandia Navarro (Argentina)
Mariano Frongoni, clarinete; Luis Grinhaus, viola; Gerardo Gandini, clave.

Serenata
Eduardo Mazzadi (Argentina)
Carmen Luisa Letelier, contralto; Gerardo Gandini, piano; Mariano Frongoni, clarinete; Miguel Letelier, clave; Oleg Kotzarev, violoncelo; Jorge Sarmientos, director.

Nocturno
Miguel Letelier (Chile)

Concierto
Andante - Allegro silva breve
Cazaciones
Finale - Allegro scherzante
Benjamín Gutiérrez Sáenz (Costa Rica)

Relieves
 Improvisaciones
 Tiempo estático
 Variazioni
 Tiempo iríco
 Frecuencias
 Tiempo dinámico
Elegía
Blas Atahualpa (Colombia)
Becario de la OEA

Ritales Aponte-Ledes (Puerto Rico)

Miembros de la Orquesta Filarmónica de Buenos Aires: Gerardo Gandini, piano; Blas Atahualpa, director.

Miembros de la Orquesta Filarmónica de Buenos Aires: Gerardo Gandini, piano; Blas Atahualpa, director.
# Seminario de Composición 1967 (November 20-21, 1967) (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminario de Composición 1967</th>
<th>Quinta Serie de conciertos con obras de compositores latinoamericanos becados.</th>
<th>Lunes 20 y martes 21 de noviembre a las 18.30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Ginastera Director</td>
<td>Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual Florida 935 Buenos Aires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instituto "T. Di Telía" Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales
### Seminario de Composición 1967 (November 20-21, 1967) (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primer concierto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 de noviembre a las 18.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuarteto Dinámico Estático Desplazante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para flauta, oboe, clarinete y fagot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para violoncello solo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imagens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para flauta, contrabajo, clave y percusión.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuarteto N° 2 “Frater ignotus”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para dos violines, viola y violoncello.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigono</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para dos flautas y clave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divertimento III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para flauta, clarinete bajo, contrabajo y piano.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quinsa Arawis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para soprano, flauta, clarinete, violín, violoncello, celesta y percusión.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segundo concierto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 de noviembre a las 18.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fonosíntesis III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para flauta, trombón, dos charangos, dos guitarras, cuarteto de cuerdas, piano y percusión.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luis Arias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Argentina)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galaxias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para dos pianos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regina Benavente</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Argentina)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memento, mortus est!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para clarinete, violín y sonidos electrónicos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gabriel Brnicic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Chile) Beca de la OEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuarteto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para dos violines, viola y violoncello.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oscar Cubillas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Perú)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asimetrias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para flauta, timbales y tam-tams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jacqueline Nova</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Colombia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Himno de tierra, amor y vida (César Vallejo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>para soprano, dos pianos, percusión y banda magnética.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blas Alehertúa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Colombia) Beca de la OEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Las obras de ambos programas serán interpretadas por los “Solistas de Música Contemporánea” de Buenos Aires que integran los profesores.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Silvskin  (Flauta y flautín) Elhelberto Tavella (Oboe y coro inglés) Alido Moscoso (clarinete y clarinete bajo) Arvel Di Leo (Fagot y contrabajo) Rubén Ceracil (Coro) Alfredo Maricorda (Trompeta) Abel La Rosa (Trombón) Gerardo Candini (Piano y clave) Luis Caracciolo y Carlos Calvinovskiy (Violines)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Osvaldo Gurkinsis  (Contrabajo) Néstor Astutti  (Percusión) Armando Krieger  (Director Musical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las bandas magnéticas fueron realizadas en el Laboratorio de Música Electrónica del Centro. Colaboran además, las señoritas: Amália Bazán, Carmen Barbosa y Alicia Olivier (Himno de tierra, amor y vida). La señora Marta Carrizo y los señores Antonio Yepes (Asimetrias), y los señores Antonio Traves (Trigono): Antonio Tauriello (Galaxias); Oscar Cubillas, Joaquin Orellana, Florencio Pozadas y Luis María Serra (Fonosíntesis III). Intervienen también los profesores Luis Grimausi y Oleg Kotzarev en las partes de viola y violoncello respectivamente. La obra de Blas Alehertúa será dirigida por el autor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luis Grimausi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Argentina)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oleg Kotzarev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Exército de Perú)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Todas las obras se ejecutan en calidad de estreno. |
Seminario de Composición 1968 (November 26-27, 1968) (2/2)
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E.3 Other Concerts

Homage to Heitor Villa-Lobos (August 20, 1963)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Centro Latinoamericano
de Altos Estudios Musicales

Homenaje a Heitor Villa-Lobos
con motivo de la imposición de su nombre al Aula del
Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales.

Discurso de Su Excelencia el Señor A. Boulitreau Fragoso,
Embajador del Brasil.

Discurso del Profesor Alberto Ginastera, Director del Centro
Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales.

Obras de Heitor Villa-Lobos

Cinco Cirandas
O pintor de Cannahy...
A condessa
Olha o passarinho dominé...
A’procura de uma agulha
Passa passa gavião

Gerardo Gandini, piano.

Choros Nº 2

Alfredo Iannelli, flauta;
Mariano Fragioni, clarinete.

Cuarteto de cuerdas Nº 11

Allegro non troppo
Scherzo
Adagio
Poco animato

Quarteto Oficial de la Escuela
Nacional de Música de la
Universidad del Brasil: Santino
Parpinelli y Henrique
Morelenbaum, violines;
Jaques Nirenberg, viola;
Eugen Ranesvsky, violoncelo.

Martes 20 de agosto
a las 18:30 horas
1963.

Museo de Artes Visuales
Florida 936
Buenos Aires
Homage to Riccardo Malipiero (November 12 1963)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Centro Latinoamericano
de Altos Estudios Musicales

Homenaje a Riccardo Malipiero
Concierto de sus obras en primera audición.

Piccola Musica (1941)  Gerardo Gandini, piano.
Moderato
Lento
Mosso

Cinque Invenzioni (1949)
Deciso
Mosso
Lento
Allegamente
Veloce

Sonata per oboe e pianoforte
(1959)
Moderato
Veloce e grottesco
Deciso

Quartetto Nº 3 (1960)
Estatico
Gioioso
Molto lento
Allegro

"Cuarteto Acedo"
Eduardo Acedo y Lemni
Reel-Viims. violines; André
Vancoillie, viola; Ernesto Cobelli,
violoncello.

Martes 12 de noviembre
a las 18.45 horas
1963.

Museo de Artes Visuales
Florida 936
Buenos Aires
Christmas Concert (December 20, 1963) (1/2)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales

Concierto de Navidad

Viernes 20 de diciembre a las 10 horas 1963.

Museo de Artes Visuales
Florida 936
Buenos Aires
**Christmas Concert (December 20, 1963) (2/2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Noëls de France</th>
<th>Armonizados por Georges Aubanel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benceuse de Noël</td>
<td>Noël d’Alsace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entre le bœuf et l’âne gris</td>
<td>Noël des Pyrénées</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dans une pauvre étable</td>
<td>Noël Provençal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorsqu’en la saison qu’il gèle</td>
<td>Noël Bourguignon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voici la Noël</td>
<td>Noël de la región de l’Ouest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornez le hall</td>
<td>Vieux Noël de la région du Nord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alleluia</th>
<th>Coro de Cámara del Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales María del Carmen Díaz, directora.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Villancicos latinoamericanos*</td>
<td>Compuestos sobre temas populares por los becarios del C.L.A.E.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya viene el niño (Perú)</td>
<td>Edgar Valcárcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral de natal (Brasil)</td>
<td>Marlos Nobre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imanispatakk (Perú)</td>
<td>César Bolaños</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven, niño, ven (Ecuador)</td>
<td>Mesías Maiguashca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arre borriquito (Argentina)</td>
<td>Miguel A. Rondano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huachitorito (Bolivia)</td>
<td>Alberto Villaipando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrina agraciada (México)</td>
<td>Mario Kuri-Aldana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brincan y bailan (Colombia)</td>
<td>Blas Atehortúa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estreno
Music in American Universities (Conference followed by Concert with works by John Vincent) (July 20, 1964)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales

Música en las Universidades de los Estados Unidos
Conferencia del Profesor John Vincent de la Universidad de California -Los Angeles- y del programa para especialistas del Gobierno de los Estados Unidos.

Concierto de obras de
John Vincent

Madame aux doux yeux*
Miracle of the cherry tree*
Cindy Gal*

Víctor de Narké, barítono
Gerardo Gandini, piano.

Cuarteto de Cuerdas*
Allegro moderato
Andante cantabile con moto
Allegretto
Allegro energico

"Cuarteto Acedo"
Eduardo Acedo y Lemmi
Reet-Vilms, violines;
André Vancollie, viola;
Ernesto Cobelli, violoncelo.

*Primera Audición

Lunes 20 de Julio
a las 18.30 horas
1964

Centro de Artes Visuales
Florida 936
Buenos Aires
Colonial Music (Conference and Concert of Baroque Hispanic-American Music) (July 30, 1964) (1/2)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella

Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales

Música Colonial

Conferencia y concierto de música barroca hispano-americana Jueves 30 de julio a las 18.30 horas 1964

Centro de Artes Visuales Florida 936 Buenos Aires
### Colonial Music (Conference and Concert of Baroque Hispanic-American Music) (July 30, 1964) (2/2)

#### Música Colonial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;El hallazgo de un Barroco Musical Hispanoamericano&quot;</th>
<th>Conferencia por el Profesor Lauro Ayestarán, Director del Departamento de Musicología de la Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Universidad de Montevideo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Concierto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Dos naves que al cielo giran&quot; para dos sopranos, dos violines y continuo</th>
<th>Anónimo del siglo XVIII. Transcripción de Raquel C. de Arias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mariposa&quot; para soprano, dos violines y continuo</td>
<td>José de Crescón y Aparicio (1763-1767). Transcripción de Andrés Sastre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Para San Francisco de Paula&quot; Villancico para cuádruple coro a diez voces, tenor solista y continuo</td>
<td>Juan de Araújo (1646-1714). Transcripción de Carmen García Muñoz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| "La purpura de la rosa"  | Tomás de Torrejón y Velasco (Lima, 1701). Leitura de Pedro Calderón de la Barca. Transcripción de Lauro Ayestarán y realización instrumental de Alberto Ginastera |
| "Corred, corred cristales" (4 voces) | "¡Ay de aquél!" (4 voces) |
| "No puede amor" (doble coro) |  |

---
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Homage to Luigi Dallapiccola (September 28, 1964)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Centro Latinoamericano De Altos Estudios Musicales

Homenaje a Luigi Dallapiccola
Concierto de sus obras

Sala Audio-Visual Florida 936
Buenos Aires
Lunes 28 de setiembre a las 18.15 horas 1964
**Homenaje a Roger Sessions**

**Concierto de sus obras**

“Roger Sessions”
por el Director del Centro, Prof. Alberto Ginastera

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segunda Sonata</th>
<th>Allegro con fuoco Lento</th>
<th>Misurato e pesante</th>
<th>Alcides Lanza, piano.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salmos 140 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marta Benegas, soprano; Valdo Sciammarella y Alcides Lanza, piano a 4 manos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinteto *</td>
<td>Movimiento tranquilo Adagio ed espressivo Allegro appassionato</td>
<td>Eduardo Acedo y Lemni Reet-Vilms, violines; Andrés Vainoillie, y Ernesto Blum, violas; Ernesto Cobelli, violoncello.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Primera audición
20th Century Piano Music: Recital by Carla Hübner (November 23, 1965) (1/2)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales

Música del siglo XX para piano
Recital a cargo de Carla Hübner

Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual
Florida 936
Buenos Aires

Martes 23 de Noviembre a las 19 horas

1965
20th Century Piano Music: Recital by Carla Hübner (November 23, 1965) (2/2)
Homage to Earl Brown (Conference and Concert) (October 31, 1966)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales

Earl Brown por el Director de Centro, Prof. Alberto Ginastera

Conferencia de Earl Brown

Relaciones entre la música actual y las otras artes Conferencia de Earl Brown

Obras de Earl Brown

Available forms II para orquesta (grabación)


Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual Florida 936 Buenos Aires

Lunes 31 de octubre a las 18 horas 1966

Imprenta Anubis 319 - Bs. Aires
20th Century Chamber Music (April 17, 1967) (1/2)

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales

Concierto de Cámara con Música del Siglo XX

Organizado por la Sociedad Internacional de Música Contemporánea Sección Argentina

Lunes 17 de abril de 1967 a las 18.30 horas

Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual
Florida 936 Buenos Aires
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonatina para violin y piano **</td>
<td>Roberto Fallabella (Chile)</td>
<td>Luis Grinhaus, violin; Berta Rosenohl, piano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonatina para violin y piano **</td>
<td>Armando Krieger (Argentina)</td>
<td>Luis Grinhaus, violin; Armando Krieger, piano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Música para piano VI **</td>
<td>Regina Benavente (Argentina)</td>
<td>Armando Krieger, piano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inizio Di Movimento</td>
<td>Niccoló Castiglioni (Italia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variaciones I *</td>
<td>John Cage (Estados Unidos)</td>
<td>Mariano Etkin y Armando Krieger, piano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastes</td>
<td>Béla Bartók (Hungria)</td>
<td>Luis Grinhaus, violin; Alfredo Damiano, clarinet; Armando Krieger, piano.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Primera audición
** Estreno mundial
### Conference-Concert by Alcides Lanza (July 17, 1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferencia --</td>
<td>Alcides Lanza y</td>
<td>Alcides Lanza,</td>
<td>Música electrónica</td>
<td>Para conjunto de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concierto a cargo de</td>
<td>Antonio Taurello,</td>
<td>piano</td>
<td></td>
<td>percusión y sonidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcides Lanza</td>
<td>piano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>electrónicos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Primera Audición | Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual | Lunes 17 de julio de 1967 a las 17.45 horas
Florida 936 Buenos Aires
Two Concerts of Electronic Music by Luigi Nono (August 2 and 9, 1967) (1/2)
Programa

I° Concierto

Luigi Nono
por el Director del Centro Latinoamericano
de Altos Estudios Musicales, Profesor
Alberto Ginastera.

Introducción a mis obras electrónicas
por el compositor Luigi Nono.

Audición de obras electrónicas:

Omaggio a Emilio Vedova (1960).

La fabbrica illuminata (1964).

Ricorè da cosa ti hanno fatto in Auschwitz
(1966).

Coros para “Ermittlung” de Peter Weiss.

Bandas magnetofónicas realizadas en el
Estudio Electrónico de la RAI (Radio
Italiana) de Milán.

II° Concierto

A floresta è jovem e cheja de vida (1957).
Textos recopilados por Giovanni Pirelli.

Comentario por Luigi Nono.
Audición de la banda magnetofónica.

Exhibición del documental sobre esta
obra desde las experiencias previas en el
Estudio Electrónico de la RAI (Radio
Italiana) de Milán hasta su estreno en
el Festival “Biennale di Música, Venezia
1967”.

Director: Theo Gallehr.

Miércoles 2 y 9
de agosto 1967
a las 19.15 horas

Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual
del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Florida 936, Buenos Aires, Argentina
Concierto de homenaje a Cristóbal Halffter

Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Centro Latinoamericano
de Altos Estudios Musicales
**Homage to Cristóbal Halffter (September 4, 1967) (2/2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Concierto de homenaje a Cristóbal Halffter</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella Florida 936 Buenos Aires</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lunes 4 de septiembre a las 18:45 horas 1967</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Cristóbal Halffter**

por Alberto Ginastera, director del Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales

**Comentario a mis obras**

por Cristóbal Halffter

---

**Formantes (1961)**

Primera versión para dos pianos

**Dos canciones tristes de primavera (1959)**

Poemas de José Hierro

**Brecht lieder (1966)**

Epitaph Die maske des bösen Eisen

**Formantes**

Segunda versión

**Espejos (1963)**

para cuatro percusionistas y banda magnetofónica

**Intérpretes:**

Maria Luisa Anselmi, contralto; Gerardo Gandini y Antonio Taurielo, pianos; Conjunto “Ritmus” de percusión: Antonio Yepes, Néstor Astuti, Juan B. Cultiaro y Alberto Gómez; Cristóbal Halffter, director.

*Primera audición*
Summer at the Di Tella: Piano concert by Antonio Tauriello and Gerardo Gandini (February 21, 1968)

Verano en el Di Tella

Departamento de Adherentes a los Centros del Instituto T. Di Tella

21 de febrero a las 20 hs.
1968

Recital de los pianistas
Antonio Tauriello y Gerardo Gandini

I

Maurice Ravel
Ma mère l'oye
Karheinz Stockhausen
2 Klavier-Stücke (primera audición)
Cristóbal Halffter
Formantes

II

Claude Debussy
En blanc et noir
John Cage
Music of changes IV
Sylvano Bussotti
Tableaux vivants

Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual
Florida 936
Buenos Aires
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Summer at the Di Tella: Argentinean Contemporary Music (February 28, 1968)

Verano en el Di Tella

Departamento de Adherentes a los Centros del Instituto T. Di Tella

28 de febrero a las 19.15 hs. 1968

Concierto de música contemporánea argentina

I

Eduardo Bértola  
Las doradas manzanas del sol (1965) (estreno)

Alcides Lanza  
Trio concertante (1999)

Gerardo Gandini  
Soria Moria (B) (1ª audición)

II

Armando Krieger  
Nocturno (1965) (1ª audición)

Antonio Tauroello  
Out doors (B) (1968) (estreno)

Ruben Ceraci, corno  
Aldo Moscoso, clarinete bajo

Abel Larosa, trombón  
Oscar López Echeverría, cello

Jorge Slivskin, flauta  
Antonio Tauroello, Armando Krieger, Gerardo Gandini, piano

Antonio Pagano, contrabajo

Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual  
Florida 936  
Buenos Aires
Homage to Vladimir Ussachevsky (June 10, 1968) (1/2)
**Homage to Vladimir Ussachevsky (June 10, 1968) (2/2)**

| Vladimir Ussachevsky | Sala de Experimentación del Instituto  
|----------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Obras musicales electrónicas y música electrónica para una película | Lunes 10 de junio a las 19.45 horas  
|                      | Torcuato Di Tella Florida 936 Buenos Aires  

Comentarios a cargo de Vladimir Ussachevsky.

1. Of wood and brass (1965)*  
   Computer piece (1968)*** primera audición  
   Creation: Prologue (1961) * primera audición

2. Line of Apogee (1967) **

Película escrita, producida y dirigida por Lloyd Michael Williams. Banda sonora electrónica * de Vladimir Ussachevsky. Line of Apogee, filmada durante un período de cuatro años, registra lo visto y escuchado durante muchas noches de sueños, antes de que lo soñado se perdiera.

---

* Producida en el Centro de Música Electrónica de las Universidades de Columbia y Princeton.
** Estreno en Buenos Aires.
*** Preparada en Bell Telephone Laboratories, New Jersey, U.S.A. y producida en el Centro de Música Electrónica de las Universidades de Columbia y Princeton.
Homage to Roman Haubenstock-Ramati (September 18, 1968) (1/2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homage to Roman Haubenstock-Ramati (September 18, 1968) (2/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concierto</strong> Homenaje al Profesor Román Haubenstock-Ramati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella Florida 936 Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Román Haubenstock-Ramati</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miércoles 18 de septiembre de 1968 a las 19:45 horas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Klavierstücke</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerardo Gandini, piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpolación</strong> Mobile para flautas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfredo Iannelli, flauta y cinta magnética**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liasons</strong> para vibráfono, xilórimba y banda magnética</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunto “Ritmus” de Percusión: Antonio Yepes y Néstor Astuti**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comentarios sobre mi ópera Amerika</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Por el Profesor Román Haubenstock-Ramati. Fragmentos de la ópera “Amerika” sobre la novela de Franz Kafka grabados por la Orquesta Sinfónica Südwestfunk de Baden-Baden y por los coros de la Ópera Alemana de Berlín</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| al dorso: Jardín Botánico Dibujo de Paul Klee, 1926 |

*Primera audición
**Grabación ITDT
Concierto homenaje
al Profesor
Luis de Pablo
**Programa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luis de Pablo</th>
<th>Presentación por el Director del Centro Latinoamericano de Altos Estudios Musicales Maestro Alberto Ginastera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflexiones en torno a 10 años de trabajo</td>
<td>Disertación del Maestro Luis de Pablo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miércoles 18 de Junio de 1969 a las 18.30 horas** Sala de Centro de Experimentación Audiovisual del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella Florida 936, Buenos Aires
Homage to Eric Salzman (September 1, 1969) (1/2)
Homage to Eric Salzman (September 1, 1969) (2/2)

Eric Salzman

Obras con soprano, mezzo-soprano, coro, bandas magnéticas, amplificación electrónica y películas

Programa

Queens Collage

The 10 Qualities

from The Nude Paper Sermon ("Breath Death")

from Feedback ("Poem Field Nº 1")

Word Game from “The Peloponnesian War” ("Panels for the Walls of the World")

Larynx Music ("See Saw Seams" and "Will")

Maria Tuly, mezzo-soprano;
Myriam Rosembloom, soprano;
coro Grupo Lobo,
bandas magnéticas, amplificación electrónica; películas de Stan Vanderbeek.
Coordinación de Eric Salzman

Lunes 1º de Septiembre de 1969
19.45 horas
Sala de Experimentación Audiovisual del Instituto Torcuato Di Tella
Florida 935, Buenos Aires
El Conjunto de Instrumentos de Percusión de la Universidad de West Virginia

Instituto TORCUATO DI TELLA
CENTRO LATINOAMERICANO DE ALTOS ESTUDIOS MUSICALES
FLORIDA 936
SABADO 2 DE AGOSTO A LAS 17 HORAS
El Conjunto de Instrumentos de Percusión de la Universidad de West Virginia

El Conjunto de Instrumentos de Percusión de la Universidad de West Virginia se fundó en 1956. Originalmente constaba de tres miembros; hoy lo integran trece músicos, algunos de los cuales son principiantes y otros han alcanzado el nivel profesional al realizar giras artísticas. El crecimiento y desarrollo de este conjunto demuestran los cambios ocurridos en el papel que juegan los instrumentos de percusión; de meros acompañantes en las grandes agrupaciones musicales han pasado a ser solistas destacados en presentaciones escénicas.

El Conjunto está dirigido por Philip J. Fain, profesor auxiliar de música de la Universidad de West Virginia, uno de los miembros del grupo original. Integrado en su totalidad por alumnos que se especializan en el estudio de los instrumentos de percusión, el Conjunto se reúne en clases regulares por las cuales se concede reconocimiento académico. Los estudiantes reciben instrucción particular y adquieren experiencia en la música de cámara; se les requiere que aprendan a tocar todos los instrumentos de percusión. La finalidad de los miembros del Conjunto es llegar a la perfección mediante la práctica.

Los estudiantes también forman parte de otras agrupaciones musicales como la orquesta universitaria de instrumentos de viento, la banda de conciertos, la orquesta universitaria, la banda de desfiles, la orquesta de la ópera y el conjunto de "jazz".

La versatilidad es una de las características principales del Conjunto. Además de presentarse en números de música clásica de percusión, del tipo que con mayor frecuencia se escucha en conciertos, el grupo ofrece música popular, folklórica y de "jazz".

La Universidad de West Virginia, lugar de origen del Conjunto, fue fundada en 1867. Situada en Morgantown, ciudad que desde muchos años ha sido el principal centro docente de la región, la Universidad ha aumentado el número de su matrícula de seis a más de 18,500 estudiantes. La música y otras artes creativas han sido parte integral del programa y la vida estudiantil de la Universidad desde sus primeros años.

El año pasado se terminó de construir un nuevo Centro de las Artes Creativas donde se sigue un programa combinado de arte, teatro y música. El Centro, edificio de reconocida belleza arquitectónica, destaca por su sala de conciertos con cabida para 1,600 espectadores. Es el lugar donde suele presentarse el Conjunto de Instrumentos de Percusión y a las otras agrupaciones musicales universitarias.
Concert: Alfa-Omega; Cantata escénica by Cesar Bolaños (No date)