

**ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**POLITICS AND MUSIC:
MUSIC AS A MEANS TO POLITICS AND
POLITICS AS A MEANS TO MUSIC**

M.A. THESIS

Ece DENİZLİ

Department of Political Studies

Political Studies M.A. Programme

JUNE 2019

**ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**POLITICS AND MUSIC:
MUSIC AS A MEANS TO POLITICS AND
POLITICS AS A MEANS TO MUSIC**

M.A. THESIS

**Ece DENİZLİ
(419161002)**

Department of Political Studies

Political Studies M.A. Programme

Thesis Advisor: Prof. Dr. Gürcan KOÇAN

JUNE 2019

İSTANBUL TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ ★ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

**SİYASET VE MÜZİK:
SİYASETİN ARACI OLARAK MÜZİK VE
MÜZİĞİN ARACI OLARAK SİYASET**

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

**ECE DENİZLİ
(419161002)**

Siyaset Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı

Siyaset Çalışmaları Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Dr. Gürcan KOÇAN

HAZİRAN 2019

Ece DENİZLİ, a **M.A.** student of ITU Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences student ID **419161002**, successfully defended the thesis entitled “**POLITICS AND MUSIC: MUSIC AS A MEANS TO POLITICS AND POLITICS AS A MEANS TO POLITICS**”, which she prepared after fulfilling the requirements specified in the associated legislations, before the jury whose signatures are below.

Thesis Advisor : **Prof. Dr. Gürcan KOÇAN**
Istanbul Technical University

Jury Members : **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Belma OĞUL**
Istanbul Technical University

Asst. Prof. Dr. Ozan EREN
Maltepe University

Date of Submission : 3 May 2019
Date of Defense : 14 June 2019





To my family and friends,



FOREWORD

I would like to express first and foremost my sincere thanks to my advisor Prof. Dr. Gürcan Koçan for his precious guidance, never ending and uplifting support throughout my M.A. studies, and in particular this thesis. He made me noticed many different aspects which I can approach the subject-matter of this thesis with his multifaceted and precious way of thinking.

I would like to express my special thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Belma Oğul who has made valuable contributions and encouraged me to finish this work by filling with me self-esteem, as well as Asst. Prof. Dr. Ozan Eren who has made valuable criticism and suggestions by giving his precious time.

I would like to thank my family and friends, who have always cared me and my effort which I gave for this thesis. They have not refrained to support me any single moment.

May 2019

Ece DENİZLİ



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
SUMMARY	xiii
ÖZET	xv
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. WHAT IS MUSIC?.....	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2 Indefinableness of Music	10
2.3 Music in terms of its Properties	13
2.4 Music in terms of its Functions	14
2.5 Music as a Type of Art	18
2.6 Music as a Type of Imitation	18
2.7 Music as a Type of Expression	20
2.8 Music as a Type of Imagination	21
2.9 Conclusion	22
3. MUSIC AS A TYPE OF COMMUNICATION	25
3.1 Introduction.....	25
3.2 Music as a Communication.....	25
3.2.1 Music as symbolic communication	26
3.2.2 Music as communication between feelings	26
3.2.3 Music as communication between experiences	27
3.2.4 Music/Musicking as participation through communication	30
3.2.5 Music as collective action through communication	32
3.2.6 Complexity of musical communication	33
3.3 Music as a Constituent Element of Communities	37
3.4 Being Infected by Music.....	43
3.5 Conclusion	45
4. MUSIC AS A TYPE OF POWER PRACTICE.....	47
4.1 Introduction.....	47
4.2 Appeal of and Appeal to Music	48
4.3 Music as a Power.....	50
4.3.1 Music as observable power.....	50
4.3.2 Music as non-observable power.....	52
4.3.3 Music as invisible power	53
4.3.4 Music as potential power	54
4.3.5 Music as transformative power	55
4.3.6 Music as a source of conflict of power.....	57
4.4 Music as a Power, Thus Being Political	60
4.5 Politics as a Means of Power and as a Power Relation	60
4.6 Conclusion	62
5. POLITICS OF MUSIC: POWER RELATIONS WITHIN MUSIC.....	65
5.1 Introduction.....	65

5.2 Determining the Value of Music	66
5.3 Value of Music Determined by Groups	67
5.3.1 Music market	72
5.3.1.1 Music market as a part of culture industry	77
5.3.1.2 Popular/Mass music	81
5.3.1.3 Musical fetishism	82
5.3.2 State-based music institutions.....	83
5.4 Autonomous Music	86
5.5 Conclusion	88
6. MUSIC OF POLITICS: MUSIC AS A TYPE OF POLITICS	89
6.1 Introduction	89
6.2 Using Music for Power or against Power.....	90
6.2.1 Music as oppression	91
6.2.2 Music as resistance and protest.....	93
6.3 Censorship of Music in Terms of Moral Consequences	95
6.4 Music as a Source of Common Good	97
6.5 Music as a Source of Justice	98
6.6 Music and Democracy.....	99
6.7 Music as a Source of Freedom.....	100
6.8 Conclusion	100
7. CONCLUSION	103
REFERENCES	109
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	113

POLITICS AND MUSIC: MUSIC AS A MEANS TO POLITICS AND POLITICS AS A MEANS TO MUSIC

SUMMARY

This study seeks answers to the question of what makes music political, and aims to demonstrate the relationship between music and politics. The main argument of the thesis is that music is power in terms of influencing and orienting us both as an end in itself and a means to an end, and therefore it is political. Concordantly, the second argument is that since music always affects us, it should not serve for any other purpose due to having value in itself, and in this way, owing to its inherent characteristics it can help us to reach concepts such as justice, democracy, freedom and common good. This study propounds that since music is a power it is used by political actors and institutions in compliance with their aims and interests, and because of the mentioned point music always has a place within politics. Another underlined point in the thesis is that music's being political has two meanings since music is both inherently and in itself political. In other words, politics has a place in music as well because even if music is made only for the sake of making music, some groups determine the value of music and interfere it. When viewed from these two aspects, music is a means to politics because of its political nature, and politics is a means to music since music is political in itself. Therefore, music and politics are in an undeniable relationship in which both serve to each other.



SİYASET VE MÜZİK: SİYASETİN ARACI OLARAK MÜZİK VE MÜZİĞİN ARACI OLARAK SİYASET

ÖZET

Bu çalışma müziği siyasi yapan şey nedir sorusuna yanıt aramakta ve müzik ile siyasetin birbirleriyle olan ilişkisini göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Tezin ana savı müziğin hem kendi içinde bir amaç olduğu durumda hem de bir başka amaca araç olduğu durumda bizi etkileme ve yönlendirme potansiyeline sahip olmasından dolayı güç olması ve bu yüzden de siyasi olmasıdır. Bu savdan yola çıkarak ulaşılan diğer sav da bizi her zaman etkileme ve yönlendirme ihtimali olan müziğin, kendi içinde bir değeri olması sebebiyle başka bir amaca hizmet etmemesi gerektiği ve doğası gereği içinde bulundurduğu bazı özellikleri sayesinde adalet, demokrasi, özgürlük ve ortak iyi gibi kavramlara ulaşmamızda bize yardımcı olabileceğidir. Bu çalışma müziğin sahip olduğu bu nitelikleri açığa çıkarıp bu nitelikler sebebiyle siyasi aktör ve kurumlarca onların kendi amaç ve istekleri doğrultusunda kullanıldığını ortaya koymakta ve bu yüzden müziğin daima siyasetin içinde yer aldığını vurgulamaktır. Tezde altı çizilen bir diğer husus da müziğin siyasi olmasının iki anlam ifade ettiğidir. Çünkü müzik hem doğal olarak hem de kendi içerisinde siyasidir. Yani siyaset de müziğin içindedir çünkü müzik başka bir amaca araç olmayarak sadece kendisi için yapılsa bile müziğin değeri bir takım gruplar tarafından belirlenmektedir. Tüm bu açılardan bakıldığında müziğin kendi doğası gereği siyasi olması sebebiyle siyasete araç olması ve müziğin de kendi içinde siyasi olmasından kaynaklı siyasetin de müziğe araç olması söz konusudur. Bu yüzden müzik de siyaset de birbirlerine hizmet eden şeyler olarak yadsınamaz bir ilişki içerisindedir.



1. INTRODUCTION

My motivation which sparks me off writing this thesis originates in my desire to grasp the relation between music and politics, since politics always use music and music always use politics. They use each other since the very first societies, and Plato (Republic, 424c) is the one draws attention to this fact. In that sense, music has a political characteristic, so I asked the question of what makes music political as a research question of thesis.

We know that there is political music. Protest music, Women's music and patriotic, anti-war, political party, anarchist, neo-Nazi, political rap songs and many other songs and genres are in the category of political music. However, it might be doubtful and lacking what we characterize as political in music. What is emphasized here is that we can also questions whether all other songs which has no political content should be considered as non-political. A pop song sometimes turns into a political slogan, albeit it has no such content. Is it only its different usages that make it political? Moreover, some songs affect us so much that we avoid listening to them, they give us pain, and even it can be like a torture, and some others have boosting, invigorating or emboldening effect on us and they are used by for these aims. For these reasons, I want to question all of them to reveal political characteristics of music.

Either power holders or those who exposed to power always use music as an instrument for centuries to gain their ends. However, with the advancements in technology music has entered everywhere notably in politics by means of mass media. It acquired an interventionalist characteristic, it has started to be used more and more for numerous aims. Today, we listen to it irrespective of our desire and willingness, that is to say, we are exposed to it. It is used to make people unconsciously to do something. It is used to change people's behaviors and making act them act in compliance with any aim. It is used in supermarkets, advertisements, at work, in restaurants, in political campaigns, protests and rebellions etc. The military uses music to make soldiers to kill. Companies use music to sell their products, political figures

and parties use music to receive votes. That is why I want to indicate why there is so much appeal to music. What is more, politicians have started to even pay attention to the songs which we like to listen. What we listen on the online music applications are recorded and they are given to political groups, thus they use those songs, which we like, to influence us in a way that we vote for them. Namely, our music preferences, which our personal data, are given to them without our permission, besides those songs we like are submitted to us in a form of political campaign advertisements, and we are affected by them. On one hand, it is wielded as an instrument for exploitation, torture, propaganda, violence, manipulation, social control and oppression, namely, it became an instrument of power, it is used to harm people. Apparently, music has been pushed to out of morality. It is the source of injustice, and it makes people dependent.

Furthermore, with individualization of the society, music has also individualized. It separates people. It has turned towards individual aims. For instance, once poets in Anatolia sang their songs, whose themes were fraternity, unity, solidarity, love of nature, loudly in open areas where everyone could listen and share same affection. Nonetheless, today, musicians sing for merely making money or their personal interests or aims. Besides, listeners also listen to music for their individual aims. They have their own music and own singers, namely music has become exclusive, and it made individual more individual. Walkmans, CD players, iPod, MP3 players, phones have changed the way we listen music. Once families listen to music on radio together in their home, today people use headphones to listen to music even in their home, so music has started to sever our connections with society. It has started to separate us instead of integrating. There is apparent egoism in music.

Moreover, in today's world, there are problems not only caused by music but also with regard to music. As Walter Benjamin (1968) purports with mechanical reproduction music became reproducible, nevertheless since these days large capital groups control and govern mass media, music has lost its autonomy. It became dependent to these capital groups since they decide whose album is released and whose not, they decide whose songs are played on the radio, in this regard musicians became dependent on them, they lost their autonomy. Moreover, political authorities also decide what should we listen to. There are censorship, control and determination of who can and cannot make music and what kinds of songs can be composed and sung. All these changes are crucial points which I want to lay stress on.

Apparently, music has started to be used by politics as a means more and more, but at the same time, music also has started to use politics in the same way. Even if music and politics have always relation with each other, this relation was very simple. Now, music and politics have come to a position in which they become connected more than ever, and they have too complex relations, and that is why I analyze it.

For this reason, I discuss music in terms of two categories which are its aesthetic value and political value and I ask two main questions. The former is what constitutes aesthetic value of music, and the latter is what constitutes political value of music.

Examples given above demonstrate that its political value represents some anti-democratic cases, injustice, dependency and egocentrism. I claim that since music is always used by politics, it has a political feature, namely it is political. Firstly, I elaborate what makes music political in detail, and remark that music is both an end itself, which refers that it has an aesthetic value, and as a means to end, which means it is an instrument for other ends. Secondly, I underline that by being a communication music is a power. If it is a means to ends it is always a power, if it is an end in itself it can always be a power. In that sense, it is always political, since politics refers to power relations.

Hence, I assert that if it is always political either intentional or unintentional, then we might inspire from some of its characteristics which it has inherently. I do not claim that music should be used in politics, on the contrary, what I say is music should be autonomous from any other aim apart from itself, namely, I refer that it can be a guiding spirit for us owing to some of its characteristics, and it can also have political values such as common good, democracy, justice and freedom. When viewed from all these perspectives, music and politics are indisputably related to each other.

In order to seek an answer for my research question which is what makes music political, and to show the relation between music and politics, and to indicate possible positive political values of music this thesis is structured as follows. The first chapter is comprised of four parts. In the first section, some definitions from dictionaries and an objective definition are given and it is argued that because music is a multifaceted concept it cannot be defined objectively, and for this reason, it is highlighted that it is an open concept. While claiming this it is not implied that everything can fall under the concept of music. Hence, in the second section, a cluster, whose criteria are

explicated one by one in following chapters, is given by deploying using Berys Gaut (2005) cluster account to draw certain lines in order to separate music from other things. In the third part, it is argued that music cannot be defined by looking to for which functions it was used in the history for it has been changing perpetually. Besides, this section tackles music as craft to underline the instrumentalization of music. Nevertheless, this section also underscores that music as a type of art, which is the first criterion in the cluster, can also be a means to ends apart from being an end in itself. For music is generally accepted as a type of art the fourth section elaborates music as an imitation, as an expression and as an imagination. These last two also indicate that music is a communication which happens only inside an individual, yet this section also asserts that communication developed out of music can take place also between individuals, since music is a communication either as an end itself or as a means to ends.

The second chapter discusses music as a communication from the point of views of the ones holding this argument. There are fourth parts in this chapter. The first one involves the ideas of Nelson Goodman (1978), Leo Tolstoy (1995) and John Dewey (1980) who take music as a form of communication, and the questions of how and why music is communication, what it means in their eyes that music is communication, and also it accounts for music production as a communication by wielding Christopher Small's (1998) and Howard Becker's (1974), and it gives place to the question of between whom this communication occurs and gives place to complexity of communication by making use of Mikhail Bakhtin's (1984) term *polyphony*. In the third section, music as a constituent element of communities is elaborated by handling Tolstoy's (1995), Dewey's (1980), Small's (1998) and Becker's (1974, 1982) analyses in detail. The fourth part connects us to the conclusion of this chapter that music is not only communication but power too.

As explained in the second chapter, Tolstoy (1995) states that feelings must be transmitted from one side to another via music. This is a critical point as the message held in a music piece might change and transform into something else through its transmission to the other side. At this point, diffusion and infection refer to power because there is a power relation between two sides when a message is exchanged in between. In the general sense, power is among the important components of decision-making processes since it influences choices, preferences, and therefore, actions. One

cannot remain as same after being affected by power, and, in parallel to that, people change after listening to music as well. Existing as communication, music conveys messages that are capable of altering the listener's sentiments and ideas. Therefore, music is most likely to affect and re-orient people's decision-making processes, beliefs, ambitions, and the way they behave. Nevertheless, if the intention underlying music is not realized as it was anticipated, it can even become a pathway to an unintended rebellion or alike. For this reason, analyzing the concept of power itself is crucial to better understand music as a power and its possible consequences, also bearing the fact in mind that there are various types of power and power-related issues.

Accordingly, the third chapter mentions in the first part, music takes place in all spheres of life at every moment, and we both use music and are subjected to music creating effects in interaction. That is why music is and has power. Linked to that, this chapter addresses the question of how music affects people in moving them and leading them to certain actions. In the second part, the details of the concept of power will be examined in order to provide a better explanation of the power of music in its complexity and music as power. These analyses will be exemplified with frequently encountered indiscernible cases. Three types of power usage will be covered, along with the notions of *potentiality* and *transformation* of power. Followingly, it will be pointed out that both oppression and resistance can emerge from music and musical practices. In the third part, it is said that if music is power, then censoring music is a counterpower or resistance, and this generate a conflict of power. Moreover, it is shown that music censorship can be done by people, some private institutions, corporations and political authorities. In the last section, the power-politics relationship will be tackled in order to depict that music is political too. It is expressed that since music brings about power relations, it is political by its very nature. In addition, the chapter will mention two significant categories that are, firstly, how music is used within politics of the self and the people, and, secondly, politics of music and music of politics.

Politics of music, mainly referring to power relations, corresponds to the determination of what sort of music to be produced, circulated, and listened to. In this respect, administration of music politics can be another way to put it. Questions of whether there are certain criteria about which music to be composed, performed, and listened to, and whether any kind of music can be determined as valuable in any way are

important here. It is significant that assigning certain criteria is, in fact, an exercise of power. Instances such as deciding on which music is allowed to be played on the radio or performed in concert halls exemplify again the presence and exercise of power. Here we encounter with the second element which makes music political, and that is music's being able to generate power relations. Accordingly, it is stated that music is political firstly by its nature, and secondly within itself. Therefore, the non-negligible fact that there are power relations observed within music need to be discussed with the related disputes and classifications.

For this reason, the fourth chapter starts with explaining what politics of music and power relations within music imply, and it speaks of that even in the absence of instrumental use of music, there are power relations among groups sourced from the clashing views concerning the value of the music. To grasp which groups determine the value of music the second chapter elaborates the approaches of Arthur Danto (1964), George Dickie (2001), Howard Becker (1974, 1982) Pierre Bourdieu (1984) and Dick Hebdige (1979). In the third part, music market and state-based institutions is elucidated comprehensively. In music market section, Walter Benjamin's (1968) analysis of "Mechanical Reproduction", Theodor Adorno's and Max Horkheimer's (2002) analyses of "Culture Industry" are elaborated, and the question of musical fetishism is asked, and by mentioning Noël Carroll's (1997) remarks popular/mass music is explicated. In the fourth section, Theodor Adorno's (1980, 2002) remarks is deployed to explain what autonomous music stands for and it is asserted that instead of being committed music should be autonomous since it has a value intrinsically. After elaborating politics of music, music of politics is scrutinized in detailed, since politics has always used music. With aims like persuading people, political authority figures have made use of music to be able to impose their ideas to others. Ordering musicians to compose a song by which certain ideas, sentiments, etc. would be transmitted to people can be observed as a very common way of how politics use music. On the other hand, music is used in politics on the level of resistance too, such as the songs accompany slogans to deliver the demands of opponent people in protests. Besides, people always make music to reflect and express their problems relating to their lives at a societal and broader level. For showing all these, the fifth chapter starts with highlighting that politics and music are always related to each other, that they have a direct relation. Both power holders and the resistant ones who are subjected to

power by the former use music to express their desires. To this respect, this chapter divides music in politics into two: oppression and emancipation. In the second part, plenty of examples are given to observe the forms of oppressive and emancipatory use of music in politics. In the third section, it is claimed that since might have immoral content and negative consequences, there should be censorship, in this way, we can avert music to harm people. In the fourth part, by drawing on Tolstoy's (1995), Dewey's (1980), Small's (1998), Becker's (1982), Elaine Scarry's (2001) and Adorno's (2002) views it is argued that music might direct us to justice, democracy, freedom, and common good owing to some of its characteristics.





2. WHAT IS MUSIC?

2.1 Introduction

Within the pace of life, no one asks what music is all about, even if they listen to it. As a matter of fact, in general, no one questions what music explains or does it have any aim or why we make and listen to music. However, music is everywhere, in each phase our lives we confront with music. Besides parents make their unborn offspring listen to music before s/he is born, also in funerals or mournings people sing laments. These two indicate that even before we are born and after we die, there is music. Except of deaf people—maybe even they can experience it in different ways—we all are able to hear it; and mostly we listen to it, even though we do not know what the concept of music stands for; in other words, we do not know its definition or whether it has any and what music is all about. Music is a multifaceted concept for both in its creation and during its reception. We should consider it as it consists of three elements which a musician who creates it, the music per se, and the audience who hear it. However, these all signalize different crucial issues. People have been appealing music for ages, yet meanings attributed to music changes in the course of time, in other words, people make, listen and use music for different reasons in different contexts. Music is associated with many things like life, love, friendship, soul, morality, communication, freedom, resistance, obedience, dominance, power, money, interest, profit, shared emotions, the faith of God, expression, imagination, experience, creation, so on and so forth. It can give pleasure, it can beget social, political, moral consequences. It can be used in good faith or bad faith. It is obvious that music is of capital importance and it has many characteristics, and it is worthy of attention, and for these reasons it is deserving of analysis.

Accordingly, this chapter consist of four parts. Firstly, it will give some definitions from dictionaries and a certain definition of music with necessary and sufficient conditions; and it will underscore music cannot be defined since it is a multifaceted concept, and thus, it is an open concept. Nevertheless, it does not mean that every sound is music, for this reason, in the second part by using Berys Gaut's (2005) cluster

account it will be used a cluster to delineate music and 10 criteria, which will be elaborated step by step in following chapters, will be given. In the third part, the function of music will be tackled and it will be asserted that by looking history it is hard to define music since its function has been constantly changing. This part also will also include music as craft to instrumentalization of music. However, it will be purported that music as a type of art, which is the first criterion of the cluster, both is an end itself and as a means to end, thus, since there is a general view that music is a type of art the fourth section will explicate respectively, music as imitation, expression and imagination and these last to are the second and third criteria of the cluster. Moreover, since both expression and imagination imply communication which take place in one's own selves, it will be argued that this communication occurs also between people for music is a communication either as an end itself or as a means to ends.

2.2 Indefinableness of Music

Here I give definitions of music by well-known dictionaries. According to Cambridge Dictionary (music, 2019), music means that “ a pattern of sounds made by instruments or by singing or by a combination of both, or written symbols representing these sounds”. In addition, Oxford Dictionary (music, 2019) defines music as “ vocal or instrumental sounds (or both) combined in such a way as to produce beauty of form, harmony, and expression of emotion”. Moreover, to Merriam-Webster (music, 2019), it is “ the science or art of ordering tones or sounds in succession, in combination, and in temporal relationships to produce a composition having unity and continuity”, and “vocal, instrumental, or mechanical sounds having rhythm, melody, or harmony”.

Apart from these lexical meanings of music, it would be beneficial to resort an objective definition which is given by Andrew Kania (2011, p. 12). He undertakes to define music by giving necessary and sufficient conditions and he defines music as (1) any event intentionally produced or organized (2) to be heard, and (3) *either* (a) to have some basic musical feature, such as pitch or rhythm, *or* (b) to be listened to for such features. It should be noted that instead of using the word “sound” he deploys the phrase “anything intended to be heard” due to the fact that music also involves silence which is the absence of sound. Periods of silences contribute to the *rhythmic* organization of music. He classifies his definition as intentional by comparing with

other styles like subjective and intrinsic definitions which are deficient and implausible. For an intrinsic definition, he indicates that if we recognize sounds as necessary, they are not sufficient. It should be musical sounds not non-musical ones, but this is also too vague because even we can make music by playing an out-of-tune piano. For a subjective definition, he contends that basically, any kind of music can be regarded as music by a group of people, while others do not count it as music. Therefore, he resorts to an intentional definition in which he stresses the intention behind the music.

Obviously, it is made intentionally, that is to say, it is hard to claim that birds can sing because they want to make music. Even if they sing, they do not sing for making music, yet it does not mean that what they sing might be something different than music, in other words, even a bird call has a melody it might be difficult to refer that their music is same with music which made by people. Kania compels our attention to the fact that music can be intentionally produced. Namely, for him, anything can be regarded as music if it is made or submitted deliberately as music. He makes use of Yoko Ono's *Toilet Piece/Unknown* (1971) as an example to reinforce his view of the intention behind the music. This work is composed of sounds from a toilet like the voice of water when flush is used. Kania insists that even if this piece does not include a musical feature, it was released like any other musical album since Ono wanted people to listen to it like any other song.

However, there are some kinds of music which are not intended to be music. He gives an example which has "musical features, but produced without the intention that those features be attended to". His example is Muzak which is according to Collins Dictionary (muzak, n.d.) "recorded light music played in shops, restaurants, factories, etc, to entertain, increase sales or production, etc". Muzak has musical features even if they are not taken into consideration in its production process. Hence, he formulates a disjunctive definition in his music definition, so this definition includes both Muzak and Ono's piece.

These definitions are insufficient, narrow and limited as there is a wide variety of examples of music, in that sense, these are not enough to define music. Nevertheless, it is hard to declare that music has a definition, since it constantly changes in time and space, for this reason, music cannot be defined objectively for it includes many subjective categories. Therefore, giving a definition of music might be a death birth

from the very beginning. In this regard, it might be an “open concept” which is propounded by Morris Weitz (1956).

In order to grasp this approach for music it would be better to handle why Weitz claim this remark. Weitz basically argues that art is an open concept and for that reason, it cannot be defined. He claims this since he believes that, from a logical point of view, art does not have necessary and sufficient conditions which make it undefinable. therefore, it cannot be defined.

When a concept is “closed”, it is meant that the necessary and sufficient conditions concerning that concept can be designated as it is applied both in logic and mathematics (ibid, p. 31). On the other hand, he remarks (ibid, p. 31), that “a concept is open if its conditions of application are emendable and corrigible”. In line with this thought, he contends that art is an open concept. He insists that the question of “What is art?” should transform into “What sort of concept is ‘art?’”, since art is something which opposes to a definition which is made for itself. Thus, we may think music in this way too because when we define music as such, every other music-resembling things which are left out by the definition at stake cannot be regarded as music.

Weitz consolidates his idea by making use of Wittgenstein's concept of *family resemblance* (as cited in Weitz, 1956). He uses this model to show there is a resemblance between games and art in terms of their nature. Board games, ball games, card games, and Olympic games are games which have similarities and relationships, namely, they do not have “something that is common to all” (ibid, p. 31). Art has the same characteristic, that is to say, what we call art differs, so it is hard to mention common properties in different artworks, nevertheless, what we encounter is similarities which are shared by them like in the case of games. We can think of music in the same way. In different kinds of music types it is possible to face with the fact that they have the characteristics of having similarities and relationships either this way or that way. Children song's have similarities with bird calls, advertisement jingles resemble game music. What is more a sound like door knocking, tapping, turning the key, shouting, laughing, voice of engines and animals are used in songs as well because they are sounds, yet, they might not be music on their own.

Weitz (ibid, p. 31), asserts that knowing what art is does not mean being able to give its definition, “but being able to recognize, describe, and explain those things we call

‘art’ in virtue of these similarities”. Namely, in this way, we may recognize, describe and explain music in a more comprehensive way. While contending that “art is an open concept”, Weitz also underlines the fact that new art forms and movements emanate perpetually. Hence, though similarity conditions can be determined by aestheticians, sufficient and necessary ones cannot be specified (ibid, p. 32). In a similar vein, music is open to have novelties and it develops and its scope grows every passing day, it means that sufficient and necessary conditions for music might not be determined due to novelties and changes it constantly has.

2.3 Music in terms of its Properties

Nevertheless, its being open concept does not mean that we can put everything to the category of music. Namely, even though we cannot define music, we can determine its prominent features to demarcate it. In this regard, it would be better to move on to scrutinize Berys Gaut’s (2005) “cluster concept” which here is used to distinguish some properties of music. What he does is pivotally amelioration of family resemblance approach. Weitz’s account of art confronts with several refutations, nonetheless, for Gaut, Weitz opens a new door and it is noteworthy to develop.

Gaut (2005, p. 275), underscores that there are two forms of family resemblance which should be discerned and he appeals the second one to abstain from objections. The first version is the “resemblance-to-paradigm” which means that something is an art owing to “resembling paradigm art-works”. This account faces with standard objections since anything is able to resemble anything else somehow, and it was not mentioned what the paradigms are in the first place. Namely, everything can be art if it is an open concept. Similarly, any sound can have resemblance to music but not every sound is music. On the other hand, the second one is the “cluster account” which refers to that something is art due to fulfilling a range of criteria. He believes that art is a cluster concept, and underlines that his account offers a disjunctive form. He determines ten criteria to delineate art and with the help of these criteria. We can use also a cluster to delineate music, otherwise, everything can be music.

The use of the cluster to delineate art is described by Gaut (ibid, p. 274) in this way: an object can be a work of art if and only if it satisfies all ten criteria or it contains properties which consist of any sub-set from these ten criteria, so we must bear in mind that there should be a “jointly sufficient conditions”. Secondly, none of these criteria

is a necessary condition per se to make an object to fall under the concept of art, in other words, there is not any single property which all artworks have to possess. Thirdly, in relation to the second point, to classify an object as art there should be disjunctively necessary conditions. He (ibid, p. 274), emphasizes that “by the second point, it follows that if a concept’s meaning is given by a cluster account, one cannot define that concept, in the sense of fixing *individually necessary* and jointly sufficient conditions for it”.

After mentioning what cluster account means, now, we can delineate music with the help of it, and we can specify its the core criteria, accordingly, in this thesis music is regarded as a cluster concept which has 10 criteria are given, and in following chapters these criteria will be elucidated one by one. These criteria go as follows: Music can be a type of art, a type of expression, a type of imagination, a type of a communication, a type of experience, a type of participation, a type of collective action, a type of power practice, a type of political relation. Moreover, it can have a moral characteristic. These can be elements of music, yet it does not have to have all of them, namely, it can have some of them. However, it can have some core elements, and the core elements of the cluster are these: a type of communication, a type of power practice, a type of political relation.

2.4 Music in terms of its Functions

Apart from handling music with the cluster account, we can also ask what the function of music is. By considering this it is asked its *raison d’être* because there are causes such as reasons and motivations behind the music. Throughout history, the function and the meaning which are given to music by people have changed recurrently. There have been different usages and meanings of music in different contexts. For instance, in order to understand the cosmos, Pythagoras, who is a Pre-Socratic thinker, turned over harmony and unity and he invented an octave by dividing a twelve unit wire into two. He also found different spacing systems with wires of different lengths. These innovations in music transformed the relationship between music and society over time. Thus, the influence of music in the social structure was related to mathematical proportions as well (Eren, 2017, p. 18).

In Ancient Greece, music existed in all aspects of life such as religious and military ceremonies, deaths, weddings, harvest, theater and sport activities. It had important

functions covering social and private life. It was believed that singing “after dinner, at the beginning of a symposium, or in a wedding procession” bring good luck (West, 1992, p. 15). Apart from these, some occupational groups sang songs and played instruments, while they were working. In the case of exaltations like going into war, waging a war or coming back from war with victory, soldiers and sailors sang songs (ibid, p. 15). The reason behind is, as West states, that:

The Greeks well understood the value of music as an adjunct to work and bodily movement, especially to that which is of a repetitive or rhythmical character. It stimulates the spirits and it assists in maintaining the rate of achievement and, where necessary, in synchronizing everyone's efforts. (ibid, p. 28)

Both Plato and Aristotle accepted that music functions to educate people in a way that they live well, virtuously and in harmony, hence they believed that in order to maintain social order, secure the justice and to reach happiness music should be used as an instrument. To Plato, music is an indispensable part of the education by being influential on moral formation. Plato regarded music as a beneficial instrument in the education of characters. He postulated that music is something permeating soul and educating it towards virtue (Laws, 673a). Furthermore, Aristotle held that since music has cathartic effect on us our excessive feelings decrease to normal levels, and it makes contributions to our character by making it of high quality “by instilling the habits that enable us to enjoy ourselves in the right way” (Politics, 1339a). However, they both confined music, for instance, they favored certain kinds of musical modes to be used in order to make music bring along beneficial consequences which they expect.

In the Middle Ages, the church monopolized music, thus music and religion were intertwined. The meanings and values attributed to music during the Renaissance also prevented the aesthetic value of music to come to the forefront, and in periodical developments of this period shaped music. It is the period of the Enlightenment which music gained a relative autonomy owing to the relative independence which it acquired from political, social contexts and the structures, institutions and organizations in which it was born and shaped (Eren, 2017, p. 19).

With technological developments, music has been started to be reproduced mechanically, and this advancement bred music industry in 19th century, and after that time, music has turned into an element of amusement, it has been exposed to

standardization, it has become a commodity which has been consumed by masses within the industry, which all will be explained in fourth chapter extendedly.

As we have seen the function of music has been changing throughout history we might contend that it is hard to generate an unchangeable definition of music by looking to history. On the other hand, it is also important to discern that music might not have any other function aside from itself. In order to understand this it would be beneficial to resort to functionalist approach of art. Its core idea is that art is of service of a purpose, it is designed in this way, this remark alleges that something is regarded an work of art if and only if it accomplishes the objective in question, in addition, goals of art changes for functionalists, yet they have a common remark that art functions to procure a “pleasurable aesthetic experience” (Davies, 2001 p. 171). Likewise, we might think that music has the feature of giving “pleasurable aesthetic experience”, since there might not be an intention or aim while we are appealing music. In that sense, on one hand, one of its functions is only related to its own end, in other words, it is an end in itself, it has a value per se, it has the characteristic of giving aesthetic pleasure intrinsically. We do make and listen to music because it is music, put it differently, we do them without aiming nothing. We have only motivation to make and listen to it and we do not wield logical reasoning in this type, we sing or play music for music’s own sake.

However, music can have both the characteristics of giving aesthetic experience and having other functions, and what is more it can merely function for other purposes aside from providing an aesthetic experience. Namely, there are other goals which we want to attain through music. In this respect, music as a means to end arises out of logical reasoning. For instance, we play or compose music to make money. It can be used as an instrument in advertisements or in political meetings, and in return we earn money or gain political status. We can sing or play a song to entertain people. These all include reasoning and planning, our intention is explicitly apparent, and the aim of music is extrinsic, it is not intrinsic, and accordingly, the value of music depends on its contribution to these values or aims whichever is important.

It would be beneficial to resort an example from Middle Ages to understand different functions of music. According to Jacques Attali (1985, pp. 14-15), jongleurs were so common until Middle Ages. He (ibid, p. 14) underlines that “ the term *jongleur*,

derived from the Latin *joculare* ("to entertain"), designated both musicians (instrumentalists and vocalists) and other entertainers (mimes, acrobats, buffoons, etc.). At the time, these functions were inseparable". Namely, they are generally "nonprofessional musicians" (Attali, *ibid*, p. 15). However, this example demonstrates that music is used as a type of craft for the purpose of entertainment, namely it was used as an instrument. However, jongleurs were also employed during wartimes and they composed songs against the enemy. (Attali, *ibid*, p. 15). Moreover, he (*ibid*, p. 15) mentions that up to 16th century, "the musician had been a free craftsman at one with the people and worked indifferently at popular festivals or at the court of the lord", after that time, "he would have to sell himself entirely and exclusively to a single social class". In Middle Ages, jongleurs expelled from society because they were charged with paganism and doing magical practices by The Church (*ibid*, p. 14). Accordingly, there was a shift, the word *menestrel* or *menestrier* which refer to minstrel was started to use to denominate a musician, however, a minstrel was still a craftsperson for "nobles would buy musicians trained in church choirs and order them to play solemn songs to celebrate their victories, light songs for entertainment, orchestrated dances, etc." (Attali, *ibid*. p. 15).

Considering all these functional usages of music, we might apprehend the very instrumentalization of it, hence before scrutinizing music as an art which is accepted as a criterion in the cluster which was stated above, it would be beneficial to state the aim of craft by appealing Robin George Collingwood's (1958) view to see the instrumental use of music. According to him, it should be considered that all crafts aim at producing certain desired conditions and these desired conditions are planned in advance, and these desired conditions could be a certain state of mind, having an artifact, improving some non-human types of organisms, but these three actually can be reduced to one which is "bringing human beings into certain desired conditions" (*ibid*, p. 18). In that sense, there is an instrumental use of music since people appeal to music to attain desired conditions which they have in their minds, namely, music has a function of providing what people intent.

After having tackled the changing functions of music to reveal its instrumentalization, now its time to scrutinize music as art, which is the first criteria of the cluster given above, since there is a general opinion that music is a type of art, and it should not be forgotten that music as art can be both an end in itself and as a means to end.

2.5 Music as a Type of Art

Oskar Kristeller (1951) makes a historical analysis of art and argues that five major arts which are music, painting, poetry, architecture, and sculpture were taken shape and they gained their modern meaning in the eighteenth century, even though they have a resemblance to those other types which existed in classical, medieval and Renaissance eras. Kristeller (ibid, p. 498) discerns the mixed and overarching usage of the words *techne* in the Ancient Greek and *ars* in Latin since these two also includes art too, yet, he contends that these two words do not connote fine arts in the modern sense. These two were used to encompass crafts or sciences which means any kind of human activities, and also, there is an interwoven understanding of art. For instance, music and dance were components of poetry which means they were not considered as distinct arts as in today's sense. In addition, both in the Middle Ages and in Renaissance the term art embraces many other human activities too. All figures of those times approached these five activities differently than as they were treated in the eighteenth century, and some of these were associated them with other activities. For him (ibid, p. 498), the view that these five arts generate their own special area, and they have dissimilar characteristics from the crafts, the sciences, and other human activities are taken for granted by most figures in aesthetic from the time of Kant until today, and it is significant to notice that music is in this list. Herein, in order to grasp what music is as art, it would be beneficial to appeal several theories related to art.

2.6 Music as a Type of Imitation

According to Plato (1997), art must be something which tells the truth however for him it is not, for him, art is an imitation, and in compliance with this view he considers music as an imitation. He does not approach art for itself; he deals with it it functions both in terms of its epistemological relationship with truth and from a purely political and moral point of view with respect to its social consequences. Plato notices a very strong potential power for moral good and bad engendered by art. He blames artists including musicians as imitators and deceivers but in order to comprehend why Plato blame them in these ways we should first take a deeper look at the *theory of forms* which forms the basis of his all analysis. He formulates the presence of two kinds of worlds which are the world of forms, which is also called the world of ideas, and the phenomenal world. Forms are genuine truths and they are understood by only reason

whereas phenomena of the phenomenal world are perceived by senses. In the world of forms, ideas are universal, unchangeable, perpetual, eternal, endless, standard, perfect and flawless. Ideas are substance and original of what we see, hear or, in general sense, what we sense in a phenomenal world. Phenomena are defective copies of ideas and they are always in the state of being as they cannot reach an ending phase. For instance, he (Symposium, 211d), underscores that there are two kinds of beauty. The first one is the very idea of beauty, that is to say, it is the beauty by itself, and the other is used to express things which we find beautiful individually such as a flower, a dress, a song. It is the idea of beauty which makes us regard both some particular concrete things beautiful.

After briefly mentioning Plato's classification of the asunder worlds, we can touch upon his analysis about art and artists. Firstly, he makes comparison between art and artisanship, which is also called craft, to point out their relations with ideas of the world of forms; and he distinguishes artisanship from art in the sense that the former copies ideas from the world of forms and what they generate is not real ideas, and the latter copies what artisans generate, in other words, they copy copies of the ideas. Namely, what he means by the phrase "art is an imitation" basically is art is an imitation of imitated forms. In accordance with this, he stresses that artists are ignorant because they do not have the knowledge of ideas of the world of forms, additionally, they are deceivers for they detract people from the truth instead of bringing them to it. They see what artisan generates and they use them as a base to shape their own works. Furthermore, those who see artists' works also cannot construe truth by looking imitations as well, since there is always interrupting layers to block their comprehension. Plato thinks artisans know at least function and essence of what they produce even if they do not know idea.

Hitherto I undertook how Plato defines art by elucidating necessary terms in his theory, now, we can proceed with how he touches upon music. From his art definition, it can be inferred that music is an imitation. In fact, he (Laws, 668c), expresses that "...all musical compositions are matters of imitation and representation". However, while he accuses other art forms' artists, in specifically poets and painters, luckily, he endorses music and emplaces it in a different place, because he notices the potentiality of music in terms of its benefit in education of people, he believes that music steer people into virtue, and he highlights harmony and social organization which stem from music,

hence, it should be used as a tool. Nonetheless, he discerns possible dangers resulted from music too. For instance, music can direct people to vice, so he contends that it should be restricted. Plato principally treats music as an instrument to be used in the formation of his ideal society which he contemplates for he has a conviction concerning the close-knit relation between the society and music. He even expresses that “as Damon says, and I am convinced, the musical modes are never changed without change in the most important of a city’s laws” (Republic, 424c). From this statement, we might notice his conviction concerning the close-knit relation between the state and music. If we read this sentence in a reverse way, we might say musical modes are really powerful insomuch as they are able to alter the orders of the society and the city, besides he even claims that “songs are our laws” (Laws, 799e), that is why he wants to confine music and by doing this, he believes, music assists in the formation of a happy, just and virtuous society.

2.7 Music as a Type of Expression

Unlike Plato, Collingwood (1958) tackles art more like a thing in itself, namely, for him, art is for art sake, it cannot be an instrument for any purpose. In line with, this he regards music as something for its own sake. To him, art is an expression of artists’ emotions and imaginations, thus music is an expression. The very process or action of creating of an artwork is the expression of their feelings through imagination. When there is something which bothers us, we feel an annoying feeling and the expression of that bothering feeling inside us is in the form of creating an artwork. Namely, music burst owing to feeling inside us. If we consider a lament which is wailed after a death, it is an expression of our feelings. Of course, what is meant here the immediate, authentic and spontaneous laments are in this category, not those which are made intentionally and ponderingly for certain aims. We feel the very grief after someone’s death, and instantly a lament or even a moaning get out from our mouth, then, for him, this is the expression of that emotion. We become aware of that emotion by lamenting, in that sense, despite the fact that laments may appear like referring dead person’s characteristics or reminding him/her to us in a good way, they are substantially the very reactions of what is going on inside us emotionally, they are indicators of that we become conscious of our emotions. Emotion becomes embodied in our face, our voice, or in our entire body. He draws attention to this distinction if only a lament that makes

us informed our grief, then is *expression proper*. That is to say, it is not something like we feel the grief, then we lament. He names this as *betraying emotions*. He lays emphasis on the ability of expression making us conscious about our emotions, in fact, we can say also being conscious of ourselves. The expression makes genuine and authentic emotion individualized. He says becoming conscious of our anger is not merely understanding that emotion is an anger, but becoming conscious of peculiar anger, which not only we did not feel before but also, we are not going feel presumably (ibid, pp. 112-113). In that sense, art including music is a kind of communication which happens inside us, stated in other words, we can communicate with ourselves in virtue of music, since through music we not only listen or sing but also become aware of ourselves.

2.8 Music as a Type of Imagination

After elucidating the declaration that art is expressive, it is also beneficial to construe what Collingwood means by the statement that art including music is imaginative, however, to understand it we have to check the difference between feeling and thinking he made. Thinking operates with thoughts, whereas feeling happens through senses or what he calls *sensa*. *Sensa* are immediate and spontaneous occasions, on the other hand, thinking requires a process. Thoughts can be true or false, while *sensa* do not include this kind of contradiction. We feel or we do not feel. Trueness or falsity of sense are not related to their existence. Even we see or hear things which do not exist, we feel them even if they are illusions. He implies that it is imagination that we make sense out of a feeling and think it as thought. Imagination should not be considered as thoughts, but rather it is which makes the connection between feelings and thoughts (Collingwood, ibid, pp. 157-194). He states that:

Moreover (this is a point Kant has made), it is only so far as I imagine them that I am aware of the matchbox as a solid body at all. A person who could really see, but could not imagine, would see not a solid world of bodies, but merely (as Berkeley has it) 'various colors variously disposed'. Thus, as Kant says, imagination is an 'indispensable function' for our knowledge of the world around us. (Collingwood, ibid, p. 192)

Like expression, imagination both makes us discern that feeling and makes us realize that feeling is our feeling. By means of art, we reach our self-knowledge, in other words, we understand and learn ourselves. The crucial point he emphasizes is the idea

that “the work of art proper is something not seen or heard, but something imagined” (ibid, p. 142). What he means is that artists create actually their works in their minds through imagination. By the same token, music is an imagination too. A musician can write down on a paper his/her tune, what we see in that notation is not the tune on her/his mind. It is an “abstract” which is a resource or an instrument for those who try to reconstruct that tune in their mind while working on it. As a consequence, it is the very imaginative creation in minds of musician is the genuine tune, and when it is written, played and sung then it becomes public property. Nonetheless, the crucial point is through while imagining music we reach our consciousness. We understand that music in our mind belongs to us, in that sense, like in the case of expressing by means of imagining music we communicate with ourselves. Accordingly, music is a communication.

However, this communication does not merely take place inside us since one can communicate with others by means of music, since either it is an end itself or as a means to ends music is a communication, for this reason, it is time to elaborate music as a type of communication which is the second criteria in the cluster given above.

2.9 Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter firstly explained that music cannot be defined objectively because it is a complex concept, for this reason, it asserted that music is an open concept. However, this does not correspond that we can gather everything under the same roof of music. Hence, in the second section, it was formed a cluster for music by getting inspired from Berys Gaut (2005)’s analysis of cluster concept to demarcate music and some properties of music was given. In third section, functionality of music was questioned and it was found that function of music have been altering for centuries, and therefore, it was asserted that music cannot be defined by looking its usages in the history. In addition, to underscore instrumentalization of music, music as craft was handled, yet it was emphasized that music as art can also be an instrument. The fourth part was elaborated music as an art since there is a common idea that music is a type of art. This section mentioned that music as art can be an imitation, expression and imagination. These last two also refers that music is a communication which occurs in one’s own self. Nevertheless, it was expressed that communication trough music can take place between people too, because music is a communication whether

or not it is an instrument. Now, it would be illuminating to explore music as a communication.





3. MUSIC AS A TYPE OF COMMUNICATION

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, music will be discussed from a more specific point of view. Here music is regarded as communication, and in this communication, music can be both an end in itself and as a means to ends. This chapter is divided into four parts. In the first part, firstly, the lexical definitions of communication will be given since music might be regarded as a type of communication along with generally accepted communication forms, and secondly, the arguments of three significant figures who are Nelson Goodman (1978), Leo Tolstoy (1995), John Dewey (1980), will be scrutinized in detail to indicate that music as a type of communication. Thirdly, Christopher Small's (1998) and Howard Becker's (1974) remarks will be used to indicate music production as a communication and then, the question of among whom the communication resulted from music might take place will be handled, it will show that this can occur within the scope of an individual, and it will also be analyzed the complexity of the musical communication by deploying Mikhail Bakhtin's (1984) term *polyphony*. In the third section, music as a constituent element of communities was explained in detail by using Tolstoy's (1995), Dewey's (1990), Small's (1998) and Becker's (1974, 1982) analyses. Finally, with the fourth section, this chapter will arrive at a conclusion that if music is a communication, then it is also a power.

3.2 Music as a Communication

To begin with, in order to grip music as a communication, it would be helpful to appeal lexical meanings of communication. According to Oxford Dictionary communication amounts to "The imparting or exchanging of information by speaking, writing, or using some other medium" (communication, 2019). Furthermore, Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines communication as "a process by which information is exchanged between individuals through a common system of symbols, signs, or behavior" (communication, 2019). There are a sender, a receiver and a message in each

communication. Mediums used for communication are effective in the transfer of the message, and communication is generally conceived as verbal, written, non-verbal and visual. However, music is a communication and, in that sense, it is a medium, and for this reason, Goodman's (1978), Tolstoy's (1995) and Dewey's (1980), Christopher Small's (1998) and Becker's (1974) approaches are used here to indicate that music might be regarded as a type of communication.

3.2.1 Music as symbolic communication

To begin with, by taking definitions of communication into consideration we might regard music as a symbolic communication since symbols can also be audial apart from being written and visual. In order to understand this remark in detail, it would be helpful if we handle the approach of Goodman (1978) who believes that any artwork, either representational or abstract, symbolizes or refers something (ibid, p. 61). That is to say, not only representational ones but also abstract artistic works exemplify or symbolize properties that they have and it is clear that through representation, expression, and exemplification all works symbolize something which can be their properties or a cup of tea, a landscape, an emotion, love, freedom and democracy, etc. On that account, any kind of music including instrumental music, which might not have any alleged subject-matter, symbolizes "forms and feelings" (ibid, p. 12). Notes and beats can be symbols and they can communicate with listeners, they can transfer themes, thoughts, forms, ideas, emotions etc. Therefore, by conveying meanings from one side to other music might be a communication.

3.2.2 Music as communication between feelings

In addition, Tolstoy (1995, p. 156) believes that "art, like a speech, is a means of communication" too. In a similar way, to him, by being parallel with speech music is a type of communication which takes place between musicians and listeners. Musicians reflect their own feelings to their works, and by means of their songs, they convey them to listeners. However, he highlights that for the most part, art is diffused. (ibid, p. 51). The fact that it is diffused is very crucial in terms of the condition of its reciprocal effects. Namely, the feeling which is conveyed is felt by a musician at the outset, however, when a song is released, it is not only dispersed but also it permeates to the audience rather than staying on solely the musician's side. It refers to a condition of *infection* as Tolstoy underlines. Namely, he uses the term *infectiousness* to

underscore that listeners have to experience the same feelings with musicians. In other words, what both sides feel should be the same. Feeling at issue should be in a form of fusing. The perceiver has to feel the object he or she perceives is made by himself or herself, not by anyone else; and even this object expresses everything what he or she has been wanting to say for a long time (Tolstoy, *ibid*, p. 153).

When we interpret his view, we might express that music rests on listener's ability to experience the emotion, which causes and moves a musician to express it, by means of the sensation of hearing or seeing (*ibid*, p. 48). Likewise, we can conclude as he (*ibid*, p. 48) contends that if one who wants to transfer one's own feeling to others and reproduce the same feeling inside him or her, and exhibits it demonstratively by deploying music, then we can talk about music. This is resulted from sharing "common human nature" (*ibid*, p. xv). Any condition of emotion passes the other side, that is to say, if one cries, the other side also feels the sorrow. If one is excited, the other becomes also excited. "By his movements, or by the sounds of his voice, a man expresses courage and determination, or sadness and calmness, and this state of mind passes on to others" (*ibid*, p. 48). In that sense, it is sharing "a similar state of mind" (*ibid* p. 48), namely, it is a situation of empathy and sympathy among musicians and audience. Accordingly, while speech is a means to transfer thoughts and experiences, art including music is wielded to convey feelings (*ibid*, p.48).

Tolstoy (1995, p. 51), thinks that human life is full of artistic activities and work of arts. Thus, to him not only music which is performed and demonstrated in the concert halls, or all special performance areas, but also "cradle-songs", "church services", "triumphal processions" should be counted as musical activities and works which exist in real life, all life is consist of these aforementioned music types and musical activities which enables us to "communicate with each other" (*ibid*, p. 51). These all, to him, transfer feelings from those making music to listeners.

3.2.3 Music as communication between experiences

Like Tolstoy, Dewey (1980) admits that art is a type of communication, and music is too. However, while Tolstoy sees this communication as the communication between feelings, Dewey sees it as a communication between experiences. To understand his claim, firstly, it would be better to understand his assertion which is art including music is an experience.

First of all, he believes that we must recognize ourselves as *live creatures* which do not live purely under our skin, but which have organs as tools to communicate with things around ourselves (ibid, p. 13). Accordingly, while treating them, we have experience with them. Namely, experience stands for the very way we live our lives. We experience the environment, the world, objects and people around us; and these relations arise through experience.

Moreover, living is something ceaseless, it has lastingness, and people develop a way to act upon every new environment. This continuity, for Dewey, makes an experience “cumulative”, and again for the same reason, its subject matter acquires “expressiveness” (ibid, p.104). Despite things and events come and go, their meaning and value remain inside us, which means that they are an “integral part of the self”; and they both give shape and take shape in following experiences (ibid, p. 104).

Like other art forms music emerges also in this world, which means we experience music too. Dewey says that “... the actual work of art is what the product does with and in experience” (ibid, p. 3), and to him (ibid, p. 244), communication is “the process of creating participation”. By claiming these two he underlines that music also exists when we experience it. That is to say, when we participate and experience it transfers us the very experience of itself, in that sense, it also communicates with us. In addition, he (ibid, p. 106) thinks that owing to being expressive, objects of art are languages, yet they are many, and because each of them possesses their own mediums, they are consonant with a single type of communication. Accordingly, each art tells something that cannot be expressed in different languages (Dewey, ibid, p. 106). Namely, music conveys meanings which are unattainable by means of speech and into languages of other art forms. For instance, when we listen to a song and we are affected by it emotionally, it is hard to express ourselves with words what music does to us. It is obvious that words remain incapable in expressing what music says or conveys. It has only a single way of communication, which means that only it can do this by its own. However, the meaning which music conveys is the very experience of music, since it has this unique function.

Moreover, he points out that in communication, the experience both of the musicians and of the listeners is become definite and is materialized by transfer of meaning (Dewey, ibid, p. 244). In addition, to him (ibid, p. 104), art discloses the expressiveness of things which we experienced, it saves us from being torpid in the routine and renders

us to forget ourselves by the pleasure of experiencing the world with different qualities and shapes. That is why he holds the belief that “because the objects of art are expressive, they communicate” (Dewey, 1980 p. 104).

By interpreting his remark we can infer that the communication with others is not the prior purpose of a musician, on the contrary, it is the very consequence of music, because it merely lives in communication when operating in the experiences of people (ibid, p. 104).

In order to exemplify how music as a communication conveys the experience, it would be enlightening to make mention of a real case which was tackled by Njordur Sigurjonsson (2005) who makes use of Dewey’s (1980) analysis. That is why I find it beneficial to appeal Sigurjonsson’s article to understand music as a communication transfers the experience of itself in Deweyian sense, but before getting to example it would be enlightening to mention one another crucial view of Dewey.

Since to him (ibid.) art is an experience, he argues against “compartmental” or “museum” art, because these ways of presenting artworks impede people to have real experience. We might adapt his argument also for music, and claim that concert halls and opera houses have resemblance with museums and galleries in Dewey’s sense. It seems there are considerable similarities between those places, we buy tickets for concerts as we buy before entering museums. We watch musical performances at a certain distance without having permission to get closer to performers as we look at a painting or a sculpture without getting closer to them. There is a dichotomy between objects and audience in galleries, likewise, there is a certain duality in concert halls. On one hand, there are performers of music and on the other hand, there is an audience watching them. We cannot mention an inclusive experience for audience in these musical performances, by only spectating they remain passive instead of participating. All these factors affect the audience, and shape their perceptions in a definite way.

He (as cited in Sigurjonsson, 2005), gives Berliner Philharmoniker’s education and community programme as an example and he explains that this programme aims at bringing children and young people from different ages and making them participate in projects from which they obtain musical relationship and understanding. For example, a group of secondary school pupils experience “minimalist composition and xylophone playing” as performers under the orchestra’s music animators’ guidance

(ibid, p. 5). It is remarkable that, as Sigurjonsson remarks, this effort is really close to “music making” and “folk traditions of performance” instead of the ordinary relationship of “composer > work > performer > audience” (ibid, p. 5). Unlike normal concerts occurring in a way that audience remain passive by only observing and sit their numbered seats opposite the performers, in that sense, to him, this program accomplished to give a different kind of experience (ibid, p. 5). As a result, he underscores that if we acknowledge music as an experience then the definition of symphony orchestra alters from “someone who plays X music” to “someone who provides an experience of X music”; therewith, he remarks, the next question will be “what is the experience we are providing?” instead of the question “what are we playing?” (ibid, p. 5). In this example what we encounter is participating in music renders young people to feel and experience it. It communicates with them and gives the message that they are making music, in other words, they are experiencing making music. Apart from these, the experience became common not only for secondary school pupils, but also they happened to share this experience with musicians too.

3.2.4 Music/Musicking as participation through communication

Furthermore, there is one another approach which might make us to comprehend music as a communication by being experience and in order to understand this approach it might be useful to start with elaborating the concept of *Musicking* by which is put forward Christopher Small (1998) whose analysis have similarities with Dewey’s (1980). If we interpret his view, musicking basically stands for a “biological communication” in which we experience all relations or interactions, which constitute a musical performance, with our body by participating to it, and it refers to production of music through these experiences. He zeros in on symphony concerts which takes place in concerts hall and he makes critique of this experience by contending that in these concerts the audience remain as “passive” listeners, and he grounds his views on this experience. According to him, music is a not a noun but a verb, thus he uses musicking as “the present participle, or gerund, of the verb *to music*” (1998, p. 9). Thus, *musicking* is a noun derived from the verb music. The definition, which is not prescriptive but descriptive, he gives is: “To music is to take part, in any capacity, in a musical performance, whether by performing, by listening, by rehearsing or practicing, by providing material for performance (what is called composing), or by dancing” (Small, ibid, p. 9). Musicking is not different than is speaking and

understanding speech, in that sense, it is a natural endowment (ibid, p. 207). He expresses that we might broaden its meaning by adding those, who make sound checks, receive ticket in the entrance, carry the instruments, clean up the place after performance takes place, namely they have a hand in a musical performance (ibid, p. 9). These all indicates that the scope of participation widens and musicking hinges upon participating because anyone who participates in a music practice is one of the essential elements of it. His starts with accepting music as an activity instead of a things for he believes that music is a “bodily experience”, which includes bodily *gestures, signs* and *movements*, instead of an object per se. According to him (ibid, p. 54), in order to have communication and to give meaning to anything, any creature must be ready to get a raw stimuli and transform them for only this way it can build the context for the meaning of the message. Relating to this, he thinks that “the channels of communication between living beings and the processing of them into images are *physical* processes, and they require a physical sense organ” (ibid, p. 56). Hence, we need a body to experience and act in music, moreover, he denotes that the most significant information for any living creature is the one it obtains from the outside world which is about relationships because perceptions of living creatures differ (ibid, pp. 56-57). Namely, we as human beings also understand the World by means of relations. What he dwells on is that we all inhold the ability of giving meaning to world and the relationships it has in our own way. We are able to make a categorization of our experience with world, and we are able to classify relationships as valuable or worthless, accordingly, we forget them or recall. “None of these are god-given but are the result of an active engagement with the world outside us” (Small, ibid, p. 130).

Small states that musical activity is comprised kinds of relationships, and there are mainly two kinds of relationships during a musical performance. The first is the kind of relationship established between sounds which is sprung by the performance. The second is the type of relationship between all participants, and it includes all possibilities resulting from a musical performance, Small argues that these possibilities are not independent of the first kind of relationship (ibid, p. 184). The reason for this the fact that sounds contribute to all of those, put it differently, they make a contribution to “the nature and the meaning of the human encounter that is a musical performance” (ibid, p. 139). From his attitude, we might infer that these relations are

more comprehensive than the one only between performers and listeners for there are complex interactions. For example, there are many other relations arising from physical setting, environment and composer and they all give shape the experience of all participants including their relations with each other. In that sense, there are relations between relations and relations (ibid, p. 200). These demonstrate that communication is “Infinite” in music which we bring into existence through “a set of relationships”.

3.2.5 Music as collective action through communication

Moreover, if we handle Howard Becker’s (1974) analysis, which has similarities with Small’s (1998) and Dewey’s (1980), we can interpret music as a type of communication which take place in numerous interactions between participants in music in the production process.

To him, an art work is a “collective action” of many people who contribute that work by participating its production process to materialize it, so it is an experience in Deweyian sense, and this is also same in music, stated in other words, music can actualize if members who has a role in production of music take part in this production process collectively. In order to participate in this production, they all interact, or we can say, they communicate with each other, ergo, music is a type of communication; and in order to create music each material and condition it requires must be procured. He (1974, pp. 767-768) highlights that if a symphony orchestra gives a concert, there must be “an audience capable of listening to and in some way understanding and responding to the performance must have been recruited”, and there must be a “support personal” who does everything that the artist does not do. These all shows the very collectivity in a production of an art work. In the case of music, support personals are the ones who produce and maintain instrument, distribute albums, arrange concerts, or checks concert place conditions and solve the problems and fix out of order materials in that place for musicians. In this respect, music is contingent upon three different contributor groups which interact, and concordantly, communicate with each other.

3.2.6 Complexity of musical communication

After having been resorted to lexical meanings of communication and having been accounted for how and why music is a type of communication, and what it conveys according to the aforementioned theoreticians, now it would be beneficial to explain the complexity of communication in order to see the complexity of communication in music as well. However, before handling this issue, it would be useful to explore if we explore between whom communications are taken place in the case of music.

There are four groups concerning music and these are respectively composers, performers, listeners, and users. What is meant by users is those who do not merely listen to it but use it after music was recorded. For instance, a DJ uses music in a radio channel, advertisers also use music for the sale of products, politicians use music to catch the attention. It can be inferred that communications take shape among these four different types of group. If we look from this viewpoint, then there is a multi-communication which exist by means of music between these four groups. However, in addition to these, there is no need to have two parts in order to communicate, one can also communicate with himself or herself through communication. In that sense, there are two types of communications, and these are respectively communication between the people, and communication of oneself with one's own self. In the first type of communication which is communication between the people communications take shape between these four, it can come true only between composer and performer, it can take place between users and listeners, so on and so forth. In the second type of communication which is communication of oneself with one's own self communication takes place in a composer himself or herself, that is to say, he or she can communicate with himself or herself, his or her presence, emotions, and thoughts. Additionally, a performer might do the same. He or she gains insight about himself or herself by means of music. Further to these, not only performers and composers, but also listeners communicate with their own selves through music, and in this case, they are not only listeners but also they can be users of music. For instance, an individual can use music as a means to change or mobilize his or her mood and emotions, yet he or she can communicate with him/herself through music even if he/she does not aim to communicate and use music for this purpose. Namely, music is a communication by being both an end in itself and as a means to end.

In any communication, one side encodes the message and transfers it, and the other side decodes the message. Even if it appears like a simple issue, it is a very complicated issue. As it can be understood from its definitions given above, it is something more than transfer of information since the conveyance of the message needs to be accomplished, and the power of communication is contingent upon this achievement; and, at this point we face with its complexity because receivers might understand or decode the message in different ways, they might misunderstand the message, and they might also understand the message in an opposite way from sender's want to convey because the transmission of the message from the sender to the recipient can be affected by a variety of things such as values, culture, emotions, thoughts, location and the time. If one plays a song right now and here, it refers something, yet it can differ when it will be played after five years, and it can transmit another messages wherever it is played.

In the case of music, communication is one-sided, there is no exchange relation. That is to say, a message is transferred from one side to another, and there is no reply to the transferred message. One performs his or her song, then others merely receive the message by listening to it. However, we must acknowledge that music as communication has also complexity because any message which is wanted to convey might not be received as it is wanted to be, accordingly message can be autonomous.

To apprehend this complexity in a detailed way it would be beneficial to resort Mikhail Bakhtin's (1984) concept of *polyphony*. He comes up with this concept after analyzing Dostoyevsky's novels. Bakhtin draws attention to the different structure of Dostoyevsky's novels by comparing Dostoevsky's novels with the monologue novels which are shaped within the framework of author's ideology and which gives a single truth belonging to the author. What author suggests is indisputable, unquestionable and unchangeable.

On the other hand, Bakhtin thinks that the novels of Dostoyevsky are structured to reveal an interaction of many different perspectives among none of them is superior, their structure is not like something which reduces all different aspects to one, since he underlines that Dostoyevsky affirms someone else's consciousness "as autonomous subject not as an object" (ibid, p. 10). Consequently, what Dostoyevsky does is laying out the events in a variety of different and sometimes opposite perspectives, because

each of his characters has his or her own voice, these voices might be opposite or might confirm each other, but the crucial point is they are together, and this is the major characteristic of the polyphonic novel. Hence, due to different voices, we confront with polyphony, and accordingly a multiplicity of meanings rather than a single meaning. Taking into account all these it is obvious that the message becomes autonomous.

In music, there is polyphony as well, since meaning extracted from music cannot merely stick to those who make, perform and use music, even if they have an intention in the first place, and they want to convey a particular message, listeners may interpret it differently. Consequently, music might have an autonomous message, because listeners are autonomous; and music has an autonomous relation with listeners. In a word, the message transmitted through music can go in different directions than the performer, composer and user intends.

After a tune composed, a composer might not have control over it. Performers use it with different intentions, users use it for other different aims, listeners also interpret it again in a different way with their own intentions. Performers might not perform it as it was composed since they might not have such intention. For instance, a maestro make uses “The Four Seasons” of Vivaldi to compel attention to climate change in a concert concerning environmental changes, he or she wants to convey the fact that “once people had regular and problem-free seasons, now we are confronting with extraordinary climate events”. However, the reason for Vivaldi to generate his tunes might be merely flattery to obtain a concession; and knowing this fact makes that maestro’s value increase in the eye of the audience, and they appreciate the maestro, but again it is likely that they might not receive the maestro’s message directly, and they may interpret it differently.

To understand the autonomous message stemming from music clearly the case of mass murder happened in Norway can be considered as an example. A right-wing extremist Anders Behring Breivik was filled with hate and he massacred 77 people. The reason beneath his hate is multicultural structure of Norway and immigration, in specifically Muslim immigration, and in specifically a song was very influential with regard to making him slaughter those victims.

One of the elements of Norwegian multiculturalism that he cited as the object of his hatred was a song that is taught to children in schools, “Children of The Rainbow.” This song is a Norwegian version of folk singer Pete Seeger’s anti-war song “My Rainbow Race” and it

embodies for many Norwegians their shared social commitments to celebrating the diversity of human beings and to teaching their children a similar appreciation. (Tracey Nicholls, para. 14)

As we clearly see what Pete Seeger intends and what massacres Breivik intends different from each other since he what Breivik does is quite the opposite and had terrifying consequences. The song in question conveys the message of anti-war, whereas Breivik did not take on at all, and what he did is exactly the opposite.

On the other hand, people used the same song again to respond to Breivik's racist attitude. Thousands of people came together to sing two versions of that song to resist and refuse his "hate-fueled politics of racial purity", they intended to give an opposite message to him. "The larger point, though, was to reaffirm the values of peace and love that the song represents, to reaffirm the community's commitment to each other in the face of efforts to divide them and distance them from their values" (Tracey Nicholls, para. 15).

It is striking that even though that song might have caused the death of many people, its message is effective inasmuch as it could bring people together to even give reaction to the tragic event. The message of the song is understood directly by them, and they acted in compliance with that message of the song in question.

Besides, users of music use it inasmuch that it constantly changes in different conditions, in other words, when contexts changes, the message music gives and the meaning of it which are given by people alters because it is used by actors for different aims. For instance, there were changes in the usage of Beethoven's works, and were changes in attributing meanings to them in different contexts. Firat Kutluk expresses that according to David B. Dennis, German leaders have been choosing Beethoven as a symbol which they use as element supporting their ideologies, in that sense, everyone created his or her own Beethoven (as cited in Kutluk, 2018).

Before German Empire had collapsed that social democrats also used Beethoven for cultural infrastructure and to improve labor movement. Beethoven festivals were held, his works are played during the into celebrations of 1 May worker's day. The German left wing chose "The Symphony No. 9" in celebration of the 55th anniversary of the 1848 revolutions (Kutluk, *ibid*, p. 15). In the Weimar Republic, all parties included the name of Beethoven in their programmes. The left wing argues that Beethoven is not interested in aristocracy, on the contrary "he was a true democrat, an active

revolutionary” (ibid, p. 16). Dennis remarks that, Beethoven address to everyone, and this is sufficient to define music as democratic or revolutionary (as cited in Kutluk, ibid.). The year 1927 which was the hundredth anniversary of Beethoven’s death was unforgettable in terms of Beethoven myth in Germany. The right wing attacked these vies by publishing counter writings. They insist that most of the narratives about Beethoven are the product of the imagination of conservative democrats. According to them, he is a counter-revolutionary, an ultranationalist enemy of France and a military leader. (Kutluk, ibid, p. 16) After Nazis had come to power, they made Beethoven a symbol like other who did the same thing before. For instance, in Hitler’s birthdays Beethoven’s work was played on the radio (Kutluk, ibid, p. 6) In short, Beethoven was at that time a national socialist. Even during the peak periods of Second World War, Beethoven's anthems were revealed and often performed. Concerts which were given to bolster’s people’s and soldier’s morale were composed of Beethoven Symphonies. While Nazis were making their last meeting in the underground, “The Symphony No. 7” which bears the meaning oft the triumph of the Nazis was played on the radio. Nevertheless, at this time, it carried the melancholy and sadness of the defeat. In 30th April, radio again used “Eroica” by Beethoven to announce Hitler’s death, and this time this work functions as a *requiem* for Hitler (Kutluk, ibid, pp. 18-19). One another crucial issue is the fact that “The Symphony No. 9” was not paid attention by Nazis, and Dennis accounts for party ideologists did not embrace the idea of the “fraternity of the people” (as cited in Kutluk, ibid). These incidents indicate that in each context, music and musicians are used by political actors for their own purposes, and it also emphasizes that context is determinative in the sense that it causes people to attribute new meanings to music.

3.3 Music as a Constituent Element of Communities

After having explicated music as a communication, now it would be beneficial to show what it as a communication might serve for. We can derive Tolstoy’s (1995), Dewey’s (1980), Small’s (1998) and Becker’s (1974, 1982) reflections that music does a service in the formation of communities, but before moving on their claims it would also be enlightening if we dig out the concept of love or friendship in the Aristotelian sense in order to understand the importance of music in terms of putting people together. Aristotle believes that “for a human is a social being and his nature is to live in the

company of others” (NE, 1169b). Namely, since we love each other, we live together in a community. Aristotle thinks that any community is based on friendship for there is reciprocal relation in each community. In order to grasp friendship, it would be better to understand love at first. According to Aristotle, we only love loved things and people. Everything cannot be loved. Only worthwhile things and people are loved, they are “good”, “pleasant” and “useful”. However, he does not mean that what is worthy of love is not merely an instrument to attain the good and the pleasant. Loved things cannot be good and pleasant by only depending on people’s purpose. In order to distinguish two critical issues, he questions whether people love something because it is good in itself or it is good for themselves. He holds that in friendship we wish all the best for our friends as well, rather than remaining with them as friends for our own sake. What he focuses on is that it is a must to wish good things for our friend for his or her own sake as well as to love them for our own good, if we denominate our relationship type as friendship (ibid, 1156a).

In addition to this, there should be an affection, which has to be reciprocal, yet, this is not also enough if both sides do not recognize each other’s affections and feelings (ibid, 1156a). Then, there is no merely self-interest here, both sides love each other because they want to reveal a good. Moreover, friendship is not only related to the likeness (ibid, 1155b). If it is so, those who are not like cannot live together, but people live together.

Aristotle asserts that the community depends on friendship since it holds people together. People do not want to make a journey in common with their enemies. By any means, a city-state should be comprised of “equal and similar” people (Politics, 1295b). He (NE, 1161b), enumerates several friendship types such as “fellow-citizens, fellow-tribesmen, shipmates and the like are more like friendships in a community”; additionally, there is also a friendship between “host and guest”. These all rely on an “agreement”. These friendship types indicate that they are also types of community, and these communities form parts of a political community (ibid, 1160a). In other words, he believes that every friendship is found in a community (ibid, 1161b). Friendship exists naturally between people who belong to the same species and have relations with each other (ibid, 1155a). Even if there are different elements in various forms of friendship, the basic point is loving each other.

If we come back to our main topic, which is music, it is an indispensable element in striking up a friendship, and accordingly, in the formation of any political community. We can profess and indicate our love to others by means of music. We can reinforce our relationship through music.

In order to indicate the relation between music and the formation of communities, it will be beneficial to quote from Tolstoy (ibid, p. 50) who regards art as "...a means of union among men, joining them together in the same feelings, and indispensable for the life and progress towards the well-being of individuals and of humanity", thus, from his remark concerning art we can also infer that music is an instrument for the unification of people and for gathering them under same feelings, in that sense, it is a must for human life, and it is something peerless and irreplaceable in terms of improvement and continuity towards the prosperity of all human beings. He utters that when one confronts with an object which makes one united with the producer of that object and with the others who treat the same object as one does, then this object turns into "an object of art" (ibid, p. 152). By the same token, music makes the musician and the listener united. By passing on feelings through communicating with music, the one who makes music awakens a real feeling in the listener, and for Tolstoy, this incident is counted as the beginning of the relationship between them since the listener also feel same feelings, and accordingly, both the musician and the listener are joined.

Moreover, as he (ibid, p. 52), regards art as "one of the indispensable means of communication, without which mankind could not exist", he also thinks that without music no one can live, since it is an essential form of communication. Tolstoy holds that people can still be more "savage", and indeed, more "separate" from each other, and "hostile" to each other if they are not infected by art (ibid, p. 51). Similarly, he regards music as cement which holds people together and prevents them from being wild. Namely, it is a means to the formation of the community and it makes people civilized. It is hard to talk about any music of savage since it does not exist. If we consider animals, birds sing or dogs bark, yet they do not do these activities to make music, they have other aims. Similarly, savage do not make music just for making music. However, people make music owing to living in a community.

Music develops out of the community, but at the same time, it is also one of the constituent elements of the community. What Tolstoy emphasizes, indeed, is that like art music serves for uniting people by being both an end itself and a means to an end,

it has dual characteristics. Firstly, if it is the former, it gives only an aesthetic pleasure, and it helps people to join. We can interpret what Tolstoy emphasizes is that because we are joined or we establish a community, we make music. If people are detached or if everyone lives on their own without having any interaction with others, then there is no such thing as music. It cannot be conveyed, listened and made. Therefore, by being valuable only in itself music serves for human society, that is to say, since we are together we make music for just making music, in addition to this, it also brings us together to make music just for making music This indicates the second characteristic of music, by being a means to an end it as an instrument serves for forming a community. Music has this kind of function. After the moment when music had emerged, it has been served for a community since it has a hand in the formation of mutual love or friendship. The simplest example which might spring to our mind is that people declare their love to their beloved ones by means of music. Even in primitive tribes, there is music. In the most rudimentary sense, music is everywhere, when one comes with another. When one meets with his or her friends at home, they play, sing or listen to music. If we consider all marital affairs like engagements, wedding ceremonies, we notice that there is music. Namely, love and friendship are both accompanied by music and generated by music.

As Tolstoy determines the aim of music as union of people, we might see similar points also in Dewey's (1980) understanding. What we might basically derive from his view is that if people experience music together and with musicians, then what they do turn into a common experience which is shared by them, and this commonality pave the way for a community for music is a type of community experience. To understand this, it would be better to go step by step.

To begin with, according to him although anything in the world appears like as it exists on its own, everything is "potentially common" because being a part of the environment generates the likelihood of having interaction with "any living being", however, he believes that it is the art which makes everything "a conscious common possession" most comparing other means (ibid, p. 286). The reason for this is the fact that, to him, "isolated and singular" things can be turned into common ones via communication (ibid, p. 244). What Dewey basically draws attention is the commonalities established by art because it is a communication. If we consider this remark in terms of music, it can also give rise to commonalities because it as a

communication engenders participation, and when people participate in it, they happen to experience the music itself. However, what is more, they happen to possess the same experiences, that is to say, music is able to transform individual experiences into collective ones, since those experiences are shared, and this entails commonalities between people. What is more, Dewey underlines that art has a significant role in the formation of a community, because he thinks that works of art are not far away from “common life”, people quite enjoy them in their community, and they are indicators of “unified common life”, yet they also assist to create this common life. (ibid, p. 81). In a similar vein, music does not exist on its own, it takes place in common life, besides it has also the role in formation of this common life. Dewey believes that “the remaking of the material of experience in the act of expression is not an isolated event confined to the artist and to a person here and there who happens to enjoy the work”; what he stresses is that art serves for restructuring the experience of the community on the basis of “greater order and unity” (ibid, p. 81). Likewise, we can think of music in the same way, it does not merely serve for the musician and the listener, rather it is in service for the community on the whole.

Additionally, Dewey denotes that expression attacks the obstacles separating people from each other (ibid, p. 270). In this respect, like other art forms music by being expressive aids to the formation of common life. “The sense of communion” which is resulted from a work of art may carry divine feature, and throughout history unification of humanity is always the root of ceremonies and religious rituals which generally include music (Dewey, ibid, p. 271).

Being able to generate commonalities reveals that art is essential in experiences such as friendship and affection since they complete themselves “artistically” (ibid, p. 270). We can think that music also works in the same way. We feel that as if we come together with other people when we listen to a song. Any song might be more meaningful and valuable, if we sing it with our friends since it turns into our common song. Whenever we listen to it we possibly remind our friend and the time which we listened to it together in the past. It conveys us not only our experience of the melody and rhythm, but also the sense of friendship which we got from our pre-existing common experience. In that sense, the experience of music, on the whole, is something that reinforces a relationship.

Additionally, Small (1998) underscores that musicking generates communities too. To him, in a musical performance, which is denominated as “ritual” and which is a piece of greater “dramatic enactment”, there is a confirmation and celebration of “the identity of the community”, and there is a fulfillment of “relationships” and “mutual responsibilities” by members of community (ibid, p. 40). All these occurs by means of act of musicking. He (ibid, p. 95) regards music as a “ritual” which can be “Olympic games”, “symphony concerts”, “funerals”, “prostrating toward Mecca” etc., and which amounts to patterns of gesture through which people utter “their concepts of how the relationships of their world are structured, and thus of how humans ought to relate to one another”, moreover, they have the characteristic of “affirmation”, “exploration” and “celebration” of community, and that is why they are used by people. For instance, to him, “blues and jazz clubs”, and “groups of friends who meet to make music together” are communities in modern cities (ibid, p. 41). He underlines that:

in exploring we learn, from the sounds and from one another, the nature of the relationships; in affirming we teach one another about the relationships; and in celebrating we bring together the teaching and the learning in an act of social solidarity. (ibid, p. 218)

Apart from these remarks, if we recall Becker’s (1982) account, music requires participation, and accordingly, interaction of various contributors who are artists, the audience and “support personals” since it is a collective action. In that sense, they all are different members of this collective production, besides there are “cooperation” and “division of labor” which develop out of communication between these parts because in order to create music they interact with each other either this or that way by fulfilling their own duties. Further to these, we can construe Becker’s (1974, p. 770) view and claim that those who collectively produce music build “conventions” related to how to produce music, and all they mutually approve them, to him, these conventions refer to the “earlier agreements” which are now accustomed, namely, they do not decide over again to determine how to produce it. However, this does not mean that they make music always by following the same path. That is all to say, these conventions can alter for cooperation is everlasting. There are new cooperations all the time. In addition, by deploying his views we might articulate that music as collective action makes all contributors have the common idea that what they collectively produce is worth of doing, since he believes that:

The interaction of all the involved parties produces a shared sense of the worth of what they collectively produce. Their mutual appreciation of the conventions they share, and the support

they mutually afford one another, convince them that what they are doing is worth doing.
(Becker, 1982, p. 39)

We can infer that both Small's and Becker's views might demonstrate us that those who participate in music might have a kind of friendship through which they generate music collectively by doing their fair share of the work. Since if they are not friends, they refrain from doing their duties and they remain out of this production and the community as well, yet they all do their own part for both their own and others sake and form the community.

3.4 Being Infected by Music

To summarize the analyses expressed above, Tolstoy (1995) fundamentally acknowledges that music is a type of communication, those who resort music transfers their feelings to listeners, and to count this transference as a real communication it should be in a form of infection, that means listeners also feel and experience same feelings. Further to this, Dewey (1980) admits that music as a communication transmits the very experience. Moreover, we can imply that for both Small (1998) and Becker (1982) music as a type of communication which all parts to participate in a musical performance by making them to have interaction/relation, and since this participation is done collectively, this communication enwidens, namely, it can happen between all participants. Both Becker and Small accentuate on the collective participation to musical performance, they both give symphony concert as an example. However musical performance—we can also directly say music—can also take place within the scope of an individual. One can be composer, performer and audience at the same time while he/she composes a music, and even he/she can be a support personal by providing his or her own instruments, for example, one can thump out with his or her hand while singing a song. Hence, as it was stated above, one can also communicate with him/herself by means of music for it is a communication which can also occur between one's own different selves. Furthermore, owing to recording technology our understanding of music has changed since what we listen on the social media platforms, on the radio, on the street and at home, is not a live performance. When we listen to a song on the radio, it can also transfer a message to us, even though we physically participate in it. What is more, in some cases, we do not listen to music willingly, on the contrary, we are exposed to it. For instance, an owner of a restaurant

can make us listen to a song while we are walking down the street. Our participation here is different than participating in a concert. It might not be regarded as a intentional participation at all because it is hard to enunciate this for an unintentional participation like in this case. Nevertheless, this music is also a communication, since it can convey a message. All these indicate that the very music is a communication.

Further to these, it might also be lacking to assert merely that music conveys feelings as Tolstoy holds, and it might be enlightening to broaden enlarge the scope of the concept of experience. What it is referred here is that experience might also stand for all of the life experiences such as thoughts, feelings, perceptions, memories, ideals, apprehensions, so on and so forth. It includes everything that can be regarded as an experience. Accordingly, if music conveys an experience, then it conveys everything related to that person. Listeners might experience the experiences of musicians which are transferred by the medium of music. In other words, it might occasions listeners to behave in compliance with musicians' experiences, put it differently, listeners might act upon anything conveyed by musicians. It might cause listeners to see the world through the musicians' eyes. In this respect, it is really crucial. If one experience music, this might generate an emotional change one's inside, and emotions, feelings, thoughts, perceptions affect the behavior, thoughts, the attitude of listeners, and what they see and understand.

It should be kept in mind that the communication provided by music is of a wide variety. Any type of music which might be advertising music, lullabies, nocturnes, religious music, political music transfers something from one side to another, and to one from one's own self. Accordingly, music is able to transfer a message by being both a means to ends and as an end in itself. If it is the former the message which is conveyed has an aim or intention in advance. It is transferred with this aim by one side to other to make others do what is intended. If it is the latter, it might also give a message even if there is not any intention for conveying a message. Therefore, it is time to carry all aforementioned arguments a step further and to argue that music is a power by being a communication. Besides, if we reconsider what Tolstoy also means by wielding the phrases "infected" and "diffused" can be interpreted as a power for these two words might refer power in a tacit way.

Figures here which have been resorted do not directly claim that music is a power, and this might be deficient. They might have overlooked this point partly or completely,

but they do not dwell on this issue, and here it is contended that its very own characteristic which is being a type of communication makes music power, and the next chapter aims to vindicate this, so, now, it is time to inquire into the concept of power.

3.5 Conclusion

In the first section, firstly, in order to clarify what does it mean that music is a communication were explicated by making use of the lexical definitions of communication, and secondly, the analyses of Goodman (1978), Tolstoy (1995), Dewey (1980), were deployed indicate that music is a type of communication. How they conceptualized their argument was mapped out. Secondly, Small's (1998) and Becker's (1974) analyses were deployed to indicate music production as a communication. Thirdly, it was explained among whom the communication sourced from music takes shapes, and also it was mentioned that this kind of communication can happen also an individual within herself or himself. This part also elucidated the complexity of the communication, and to indicate this in terms of music Bakhtin's (1984) term *polyphony* was used, and the reflections of such complexity on music was elaborated. In the third section, music as a constituent element of communities, was explained by deploying Tolstoy's (1995), Dewey's (1980), Small's (1998) and Becker's (1974, 1982) views. In the fourth part, eventually, it was expressed that the points of all figures might spark us to complete and foster their arguments, because the way they handle music actually shows the power of music. Accordingly, it was asserted that by being a communication music is also a power.



4. MUSIC AS A TYPE OF POWER PRACTICE

4.1 Introduction

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Tolstoy underscores that feelings must be diffused or infected by one side to another by means of music. These terms are critical since, after any message transmitted to the other side, one may not remain same, one may change owing to the effect of the message. In that sense, both words of diffusion and infection make reference to power, since there is a power relation between two sides after any message is conveyed, thus, apart from being a communication, music is a power as well. Generally speaking, power is one of the influencers on decision-making process. It directs our choices, preferences, actions. It has an impact on us, we may not remain as same after being exposed to power. Likewise, after listening to music, we might not remain same. By being a communication it transfers a message which is able to change listener's feelings and thoughts, for this reason, music is wielded in order to affect people's decisions, believes, desires, way of behaviors; in effect, it is appealed to numbers of times. However, it sometimes cannot accomplish the intention behind it, and even it can make a way for a rebellion which is an unintended consequence. Therefore, making an inquiry concerning the concept of power is worthwhile in order to grip music as a power, and its consequences by being a power, since there are many different power forms and many other critical issues related to power.

Accordingly, the chapter is divided into four parts. In the first section, it will be shown that in every at every step and in all branches of life we confront with music, and it will be indicated that it is used by us to affect ourselves and used by others to affect us. In that sense, it is a power and it has power. This chapter will also include how music affects us, and how it makes us get into action. In the second part, in order to grasp the complexity of power of music and music as power the concept of power will be explicated by resorting many figures. Their analysis will be correlated with music, and they will be exemplified with many frequently encountered some unnoticeable

instances. This chapter will elaborate on three types of power over people, and the concepts of *potentiality*, the capacity of *transformation* of power. With the help of these, it will be highlighted that both oppression and resistance can result from music. In the third part, music censorship as a counterpower/resistance will be mentioned, and it will be underlined that this generates a conflict of power, besides it will be expressed that censorship can be done by people, some private institutions, corporations and political authorities. In the fourth section, the relation between power and politics will be underlined and scrutinized to manifest that music is also political. This chapter also will underline two important categorizations which are, firstly, usage music within politics of self and politics of people, and secondly, politics of music and music of politics.

4.2 Appeal of and Appeal to Music

The existence of music is an irrefutable fact and we come across with music each and every day. What I underline is we are all familiar with music, we not only hear but also listen to and make it. From our infant times until our death we are exposed to it, and even, we hear sounds, voices, and songs, when we are in our mother's uterus, and even, after our death, our body or soul is exposed to music in commemorative ceremonies. We confront with music either this or that way even we are not in life physically. What we listen in political election campaigns, in religious rituals, at work, at the gym, in the breaks of sports matches, in advertisements, at the restaurant, on the radio, at home, on the street, in bars, clubs and pubs, in the supermarket, in the car, in the wedding ceremonies, in the festivals, in the funerals, in the places for entertainment is music. Stores and supermarkets wield music to increase their incomes by making their customers act in a desired way. In sports halls and stadiums, it is used to embolden spectators, to keep them alive, to make them support their team or athlete. Music is also used as in schools for announcing the start and end of break time, and this makes children discipline in terms of not to arriving late to the classroom, church bells and the adhan are used for calling worshippers to prayer. For instance, each and every day the adhan is recited five times to remind worshippers that it is time to pray. People have been using music also in wars and sieges for ages. For example, West states that in Ancient Greet "it was frequently sung by soldiers or sailors at moments of

exaltation, whether going into battle, or during it, or returning from it in triumph” (1994, p. 15).

Music is something that has to do with our emotions, feelings, and desires. People always resort music to change their moods. Suddenly, we feel ourselves happy as a lark owing to a song even if a moment ago, we were suffering. Music has a direct influence upon us, it is able to change our state of mind, our mood, feelings, and emotions. We can also begin to pursue our pleasure after listening to music because it affects our desires as well. Moreover, it can also affect our thoughts. It has the ability to change our existing thoughts, and even awakens new thoughts which we never thought before. What is more, it affects not only individuals but also society as a whole. By arousing similar feelings, it has a collective impact on people who share and don't share the same background. They all are able to sing the same song abruptly without hesitation, even though they do not have a common history, thus music is able to conflate people.

Accordingly, music is generally considered as something which enhances, enriches and eases our lives. However, if we listen to sad songs while we are suffering the pangs of love, then it can have negative effects on us obviously. In line with these examples, we may argue that music has a significant role in our lives. We cannot think a daily life without music.

It is undeniable that music is and has power, but it would be enlightening if we ask what the power of music is, why and how music is powerful, what lies behind its power, what it means to say music is power. What makes it unsubstituted? Music has the ability and power to influence, steer and alter people's decisions, preferences, behaviors, motivations, and actions by affecting emotions, feelings, desires and thoughts. Therefore, it can put people into action. What one intends can be transferred to the other side by means of music, hereby the other side is imposed on in which ways s/he should behave, and s/he can start to act accordingly. Besides, music can transfer any message even if those who resort music do not have such intention as it was stated in the previous chapter. If it is used, then its power rises to the surface, since it exercises power over us. As we can discern, there are many crucial points related to the concept of power which should be examined to comprehend both the power of music and music as power.

4.3 Music as a Power

4.3.1 Music as observable power

To begin with, what he strives for in fact making an analysis of the term influence, we can deduce a power definition from Robert Dahl's (1984) approach. Since he (ibid, p.20), wants to elaborate the concepts of "power, influence, authority, control, persuasion, might, force, coercion", and by giving the name of "influence-terms" he merges these under this comprehensive term. However, I regard what he means by influence is actually power, and I use the word power rather than influence.

According to Robert Dahl, "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do" (1957, pp. 202-203). Namely, he defines power as making one act in a way which he or she does not do under normal conditions. One behaves because the other wants one to do so. He (1987, p. 23), insists that if there is power, then it must be an interaction or relation between two sides. This relation could be political, cultural, social, economic, etc. In the case of music, those who are exposed to listen to music act according to what was expected from them, since those who use or make music have a specific intention which necessitates listeners to act accordingly.

Moreover, those who resort to power has both an intention and an aim. First comes planning, and then they exercise power, and lastly, the one being exposed to power starts to behave in accordance with power holders. The reason why one behaves in that way is stemmed from the power and plan of power holders. Namely, the responsible of their actions is the power holders, hereat there is a cause and effect relation between two sides.

Dahl distinguishes two kinds of power which are manifest and implicit (ibid, pp. 24-26). The former corresponds to the condition in which A acts intentionally to make B to do x, and in return, A gets x, which is its own intended result, by virtue of the action of B. The latter refers to the case in which A gets x, which is wanted as an outcome, by acting without having an intention for making B to do x, but A's desires for x leads B to embark on to effectuate x.

One is opened to be influenced by the power of music because someone else intends to affect people through it. All election campaign songs belong to the category of manifest power. For instance, parties or politicians want to receive votes, and actually,

this is the only thing which is intended, and music transfers this message. People might vote for them after having being exposed to those songs. Similarly, the aim of religious music is to convey religious principles to which people must act according. Additionally, all advertisement songs have the intention of causing us to buy a product. Despite having no desire to buy any product, those songs are stuck on people's mind, since they are made for this purpose, in other words, those are "catchy jingles" which are composed and used designedly to make people purchase them. During shopping, automatically we might go towards the market shelf which carries those products. One another example is lullabies, it involves the intention of calming down and put a baby to sleep. Those singing a lullaby sing it for these aims. Hence, we can infer from Dahl's account that music makes one act in compliance with the intention of the other side because of being a type of power.

For implicit power, it can be said that one who is affected by music might not be affected by a result of an intention, put it differently, there is no need for the existence of a plan in the first place in order to be affected by music. To illustrate, one wishes to attain an intended outcome, and one can achieve this by appealing music which makes listeners bring about one's intended outcome. Yet, one happens to succeed this without having the intention of influencing listeners by means of music. While one listens to a song on one's own, others can be affected as well, and this brings about the result which is wanted by the one who listens to that song for oneself.

On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that one can also be affected by the music which is used, listened or made by someone else who wants to generate different outcomes than one's own. Namely, while passing by somewhere fortuitously, we are exposed to a song, which is listened there, and we might suddenly feel depressed or become happy, even if it is played in that place for some other reason. For instance, while we are walking on the street, we hear a love song which is played in a café and we can be affected by it, the owner of the café does not have the intention of making customers sad, yet, we as non-customer but as merely pedestrian can be affected in a negative way by the melody of that song.

Furthermore, Dahl gives importance to scope and domain of power too. In terms of music, scope refers to people such as citizens, minority and marginal groups, women, men, children, soldiers so on and so forth. If we consider all these various social groups, we might remember that there are particular songs which are made for them

and are made by them. Children songs, military cadences, songs which are related to womanhood and manhood, ethnic music would be examples concerning them. What Dahl means by domain corresponds to cultural, economic, social, and political fields. People are affected by power while making decisions with regard to all these fields. In the case of music, prementioned examples concerning music servers for economic, social and political fields too.

On the whole, Dahl demonstrates that power is something that influences people to act in a definite way, however, this analysis is merely based on observable power, and it overlooks other dimensions of power.

4.3.2 Music as non-observable power

On the other hand, power has more than one dimension, and Bachrach and Baratz (1962), draw attention to the second dimension of power, and accordingly, they introduce non-observable power, which stands for power behind ongoing visible power, and they introduce *nondecisionmaking* resulted from non-observable power. To them, power is not only related with participation in decision-making, since there is also “nondecision-making” stemming from power which manipulates “the dominant community values, myths, and political institutions and procedures” (Bachrach and Baratz, 1963, p. 632). It is also related to making people not to decide for their own good. What they basically refer is that people cannot have a place for themselves in the decision-making process, so, they cannot be allowed to bring up what disturbs them to the agenda owing to the prevention of power holders. By the way of non-observable power, people may be exposed to a kind of nondecision-making concerning their own problems and values. The reflections of the third face of power in music may be like this: James Garratt (2018, p. 38), states that music may work on people’s body and psyche without being notices “as seen earlier in the subliminal use of very low frequencies in political campaign ads.” Those subliminal songs make listeners unable to decide for their own good, put it differently, by manipulating them they to vote a political party which supports different ideas and seeks different interests which are opposed to listeners. Hence, even the listener’s values and interest exist they happen to be concealed.

4.3.3 Music as invisible power

Apart from first and second faces, the third face of power is suggested by Steven Lukes (2005), who highlights that even dissatisfactions and reactions of people, who are subjects of power, are prevented by power holders, because they alter and interfere people's preferences and perceptions inasmuch as they keep people silent by hiding what people's own real interests are. He calls out the concept of interest to probe power in a more comprehensive way. He alleges that there is a conflict too if there is an interest-based relation, but the third face of power refers to prevent any occurrence of conflict.

Lukes (ibid, p. 37), mentions that "I have defined the concept of power by saying that A exercises power over B when A affects B in a manner contrary to B's interests". Correspondingly, we might conceive power as making one perform an action or a behavior which is not one's benefit to. Namely, when B performs in a way that it does not have any self-interest in doing so, A has power over B, since it imposes B to act according to A's interests. On that account, those who are affected by power become unaware of their own interests, and accordingly they happen to act against their own interest. Basically, since alternatives are concealed from them by power holders, they do not have any other option, thus, they start to promote A's values and interests. This type of power is generally used by the majority to make minority groups subordinate, and these subordinate group resign themselves completely to power holders, by having no other alternatives they acknowledge or interiorize that they have no power against power holders.

Their powerlessness consolidated by means of music as well. If we consider music, many music genres, institutions concerning music, lyrics, musical practices, and even musical instruments do a service for power holders. However, a significant distinction should be made here. Usage of all these indicates the fact that there is an exercise of power over music, yet what it is wanted to be underscored is that these all transform music into a power which is used over people. Listeners might not be aware of their own interests and values all through their lives by means of music as well. For instance, a national anthem as a means is used to change people's preferences and perceptions, by doing so it conceals people's real identities. Those songs serve for assimilating people who come from different ethnic groups. They might not know, and even not question their real identity entire their lives because by memorizing and singing those

songs, people indigenize values and interests imposed by others rather than even searching their own's. Thus, dissatisfactions and reactions of people are averted, and there exists no conflict, which is intended by power holders. In a similar vein, we can think also religious songs in this way as well. One can be exposed to merely music of a particular religion owing to state institutions, media, traditional practices, and one can think that religious tenet is the one and only, and one can internalize it without thinking alternatives.

4.3.4 Music as potential power

In addition to these conceptualizations, Peter Morris (2002, pp. xviii-xxii, pp. xxix-xxx), dwells on the power's feature of *potentiality* which, for him, always exists within power. What he refers by potentiality corresponds to its usage, but this usage is not in a form of exercise, that is to say, even it is not exercised there can be power. When power is exercised, it means it is actualized. Actuality corresponds to a reality that comes into existence, whereas potentiality stands for a reality which can happen any time. Potentiality contains actualization within itself. This is *dispositional*, in other words, actualization is present in the structure of potentiality. Thus, even if power is not exercised, there is power; put it differently, where there seems no power there is power, so we must take not only exercising but also having power into account.

Before it is exercised, music contains the power within itself potentially. When it is exercised, its power becomes active. The invisible can become visible, the passive can become active, in this regard, it has always power even if it is not wielded.

This remarkable analysis can make us question when music is an end in itself --we just listen to it for aesthetic appreciation—is it able to affect us. The answer is yes. For example, while we are sitting at home, we put on a piece of music just for appreciation, that is to say, we listen to music just for listening to music. This music might also be background music while we are lying on the sofa to have a rest, and meantime, we are not thinking ourselves and what we want, there is not any question about ourselves in our minds; yet music as an end in itself also might affect us in a moment which we do not know, since it can lead us to a point again which we do not know. After listening to that music we might have different feelings, and we might do different things. Moreover, this shows, in fact, music is able to disclose and activate potential emotions, thoughts, and even actions. An example can be melancholic songs, one can suddenly

have an emotional breakdown after listening to grievous song. That is why we sometimes do not listen to those songs which affected us in a sad way in the past. In order not to be affected sometimes we even do not listen to those songs which we did not listen before, yet we know or heard before that they have melancholic features. For the music's effect of action we can think of any song which is used with the objective to stage a protest might be very influential in terms of triggering people in terms of making them participate in it, so its power happens to actualize, and it makes people's potential emotions, thoughts and actions disclose.

However, music is used generally for making people to accustom an idea and rule, to consent, to reconcile themselves to the things which they do not want to do. For instance, In Turkey, before a man goes into the military service his friends celebrate his going, and they give him courage and uplift his morale by driving around with autocade, and they shout slogans with melody, they sing songs, and toot the horns in order to make him adapted to his new life conditions. The potential emotions in that man might suddenly blow up, he either might start crying when he gets in the bus which drives him to the city where he fulfils his duty, or he might feel abruptly as a real soldier and his state of mind and way of thinking might completely change by the motivation of people from which he gets. In addition to these, music gives that man a new role, since he turns into both soldier and warrior. These conceptualizations of power unfold that in general music as a power is a means for oppression.

4.3.5 Music as transformative power

Moreover, one another outstanding power analysis comes from Michel Foucault (1982), who asserts that power has many centers, and it resembles a chain. He urges upon that power is multi-relational rather than symmetrical. He contends that power should not be considered only as *A exercises power over B*, namely, it does not take shape in this linear way. What he focuses on the transformative characteristic of power along with and strengthening characteristic. Accordingly, not only intended but also unintended consequences might reveal. When A exercises power over B for making B to do C, B might do D instead of C. For instance, a political party makes voters listen to political campaign songs to take their votes, but people might not even go to the ballot box to vote, or they might vote for other parties. People might become indifferent and as well as they might react it. In this regard, he invites us to take both

resistance and *struggle* into account against power instead of overlooking them, since one also may not resign oneself to those who use power. That is to say, if one exercises power over other people, it is likely to happen that they undergo a change, however, they might transform in either positive or negative way, which means they might get stronger and weaker. According to him, both *resistance* and *struggle* should also be regarded as types of power too. If majority exposes minorities to listen to one and only type of music serving for its own interests and serve for assimilating them, then there is a power relation.

Nonetheless, minorities might embrace neither music as their own nor the interests mentioned in music. It might transform them, and even they may start using music as power too, in other words, they might make their own's as well to compel attention for their own interests; and their music might become a kind of resistance for those groups. In line with these remarks, we see that music as power is able to render people not only to be repressed but also to resist. Since resistance and struggle are a type of power, music can be also resistance and struggle as well.

For instance, there are many songs having leftist characteristics call for resistance, struggle, and rebellion. They embolden people to prompt a revolt and to protest. For instance, *Gün Doğdu* which is an anonymous song is mainly considered as revolution anthem in Turkey by left-oriented people, it is sung in almost all protests conducted by leftists, and in 1997, leftist music band Grup Yorum released an album including this song as well.

Similarly, a pop song might turn into a political symbol and might call people to resist and protest. For instance, the song *Sana Ne Kime Ne* (1975) by Ajda Pekkan has been used in the protests and celebrations in Turkey in March 8 international women's day. Women sing it out loud to make everyone know that women are free, and they underline that there should be no discrimination. They resort this song to transfer the message concerning women's rights which they expect and need. Basically, they resist patriarchal norms by deploying this song. Therefore, we see that at different times and contexts, different meanings may arise due to not only the very transformation which can take place in music but also the very transformative characteristic of music. It transformed because it gained different meanings. Once it was a pop song, now it has become a political song for resistance. Women sing it in the demonstrations, whereas Ajda Pekkan did not have such intention while she was producing her song and

releasing her album. We might again claim that it has been carrying the potentiality within itself, but when it was used in protests its power actualized.

Apart from these, Foucault also scrutinizes how and why power discourse emerges. He contends that there is a power relation even in a dialogue which takes place between two people. This power might have both positive and negative effects. By means of language, one can render another to become creative, productive, regardful, sensitive, skeptical, respectful and free, as well as controlled and repressed. From this point of view he sets forth that power generates the truth; he (1984, p. 73), explains this as “regime of truth” since this regime hinges on the power behind itself. In that vein, music as a power produces the truth too, and these truths affect people. For instance, in the military, soldiers are told that “they either kill or die for the sake of the country”. In line with this target, they are forced to listen and sing military songs to prepare themselves for this purpose. They are convinced this truth by means of those songs, and they brace themselves both physically and mentally with music until they kill or die. Consequently, music puts across this alleged truth to soldiers being able to generate the “regime of truth”.

All these seminal analyses of important figures were deployed to indicate what it means to say music is power. After having been compiled these accounts, in order to understand power and music as power more comprehensively I want to combine arguments of all figures and want to articulate that power is not only something which is able to affect people in an intended way even irrespective of its exercise but also it is open to having confrontations which are undesirable and unintended reactions and consequence.

4.3.6 Music as a source of conflict of power

Since music is a power, political authorities, which have the legitimacy of using power, they can also legitimize use of power such as music. In this regard, it allows some kind of music, and some others it does not. However, if it does not allow some of them by censoring there is a conflict between different powers. Namely, censorship of music which is a way of blocking the power of music is also power, because if music is power, then censorship of music is a counterpower, in other words, it is a form of resistance, hence it might be beneficial to elucidate censorship of music too. Some people resist to not to listen some songs, and also political authorities uses power over

music by doing censorship. Within this context, we might categorize it as informal and formal.

Firstly, people, some private institutions and corporations censor music due to several reasons which might be political, moral, religious, commercial, aesthetical etc. This type of censorship is in the category of informal censorship. For instance, one may not listen to a song because he or she cannot find it aesthetically pleasing, also one may not listen to a song which has a pro-war rhetoric, or one might not listen a song which was used in the past as a symbol of a political movement or event or which is used still a symbol of a political party or a political ideology. One may not listen to songs of a musician who provokes and champions fascism in his or her songs. Relating to this point giving one example from Israel might be enlightening since it purports that not only one person in or a group of people but also almost all people in a society might censor a song or a musician. As Edward Said (2008, p. 291) specifies that “Wagner’s music has been informally banned in Israel so far as public performance is concerned, although his music is sometimes played on the radio and recordings of his music are on sale in Israeli shops”. He states that for some reason many Israeli Jews Wagner’s music is a symbolic of “the horrors of German anti-semitism” even if his music is “rich, extraordinarily complex, extraordinarily influential in the musical world”. He also expresses that Wagner's music is hardly acceptable also for non-Jewish Europeans, especially in countries occupied by the Nazis in World War II (ibid, p. 291).

Further to these, some corporations and private institutions such as music companies might not allow some songs to be released and they might not allow musicians be in the music market by not distributing their songs. Moreover, a musician might censor his or her songs as well without obstruction of other people or of any political authority, private institution and cooperation. Self-censorship is done due to respecting the sensitivity of other people and to avoiding sanctions of those three groups aforementioned.

Secondly, there is formal censorship in music since political authorities also censors and bans music. In that sense, states censor and ban music in order to eliminate unintended consequences arising from songs to protect copy rights and personal rights. On the other hand, they censor music also for political aims, they silence politically opponent singers and ban songs having critical stands towards them.

For example, Turkey might be a pertinent example in terms of exemplifying formal censorship in music. In Turkey each song is controlled by RTÜK (Radio and Television Supreme Council) whether it is “right” or not, and due to this censorship, for instance, in 2018, Ezhel, Khontkar, Young Bego, Burry Soprano who all make rap music got arrested because of the lyrics of their songs have the characteristic of promoting use of drugs. Furthermore, TRT found the song “Arkadaşım Eşşek” (1981) by Barış Manço as inconvenient and suspect on the grounds that donkeys cannot be friends of human-beings, and TRT authorities offered Barış Manço to change the word donkey to lamb. Another song of him which is “Lambaya Püf De” (1973) was founded erotic and obscene. The song “Yolun Sonu” (1996) by Musa Eroğlu was founded is incentive for committing a suicide, it was banned too. Additionally, the song “Arkadaş” (1974) by Melike Demirağ and “Hayat Bayram Olsa” (1972) by Şenay were also forbidden on the pretext of making communist propaganda, even if they do not involve lyrics which have a direct relation with communism. Orhan Gencebay’s song of “Batsın Bu Dünya” (1973) was banned, since it was found as prejudicial on the grounds that it calls people to rise up existing societal order by distorting people’s psychological state.

Over and above these, aside from banning songs, the state bans musicians and singers as well. At one time left-oriented singers who are Zülfü Livaneli, Cem Karaca, Melike Demirağ, Ali Asker, Şanar Yurdatapan, Selda Bağcan, Erkin Koray, Edip Akbayram, Ferhat Tunç were banned by TRT. For instance, Selda Bağcan could not go on television from 1972 to 1992, because she mainly composed protest-music. The reason she banned in 1972 was the fact that she sang a unmetred folk song called “Mapushanelere Güneş Doğmuyor” (1988) because it was thought by TRT that she sang this song for Deniz Gezmiş, Yusuf Aslan and Hüseyin İnan who were also leftist political prisoners.

In addition to this, beyond censorship many musicians are exposed to sanctions and they get arrested, and these are also different types of counter power over music. For instance, Selda Bağcan was locked in jail three times due to her songs. There are many musicians singing Kurdish songs, for example, or supporting Kurdish Parties got arrested by the police. For instance, the soloist of the music band Koma Rosîda got arrested since it was found that she made propaganda of terror organization in the rally of HDP (Peoples’ Democratic Party) in which, she sang a song included the word

“Kürdistan”. There are also many singers such as Cem Karaca, Ahmet Kaya, Şivan Perwer who had to flee abroad and had to live an exile life due to their political stance and their political songs.

4.4 Music as a Power, Thus Being Political

After having been indicated major features of music as a power we can claim that since power has all characteristics which are stated above, music also reflects everything it has. When viewed from this aspect, music can be used for political aims, for entertainment, with the aim of marketing, and for innumerable aims, since it is a power and it has power. Those who hold power might use this power, or we can say also music, for their own interests and purposes, since they might want to impress listeners. Additionally, It is significant to overemphasize whether it carries the aim of affecting us or not music can always affect us. Although one does not want to influence listeners by means of music, listeners might be affected. Thus, music always has the potential to be a power, in other words, it is a potential power.

In addition, it should be noted music is a means for power, and also it is power. For the former, transferring a message makes it a means to bring about the intention behind that message. For the latter, being able to alter people by means of the message transforms it into power. Nonetheless, it is not only a bearer of any message belong to power, but also it embodies power. Almost all examples stated here music is both power and a means for power. Besides, in all of them, music generates a power relation.

Now, it is time to carry a step further and to manifest that by being power and by generating a power relation music is actually political by its very nature. Since as Heywood (2004, p. 121), underscores that “all politics is about power”. In order to understand music as political, we must grasp firstly what political means, and its relation with power and power relation.

4.5 Politics as a Means of Power and as a Power Relation

There is no consensus concerning what politics is, it has many definitions and one of them is that politics is the exercise of power (Heywood, *ibid*, p. 52). If we enlarge on this definition, what it is meant by politics is mainly refers to the condition that if one

or group of people to resort to power to make things alter, yet this alteration involves making people act in compliance with several aims which defined by those who exercise power. In that sense, power relation or power, in general, implies politics, because it is politics when people resort to power to move others in pursuit of their own benefits.

“The term ‘politics’ shall refer to power-structured relationship, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another” (Millett, 2000, p. 23). However, this definition is deficient since one as dictator or tyrant can exercise power and control the whole society which are his or her subjects; moreover, even between two people there exists politics. Since as Heywood (2004, p. 61), exemplifies that after two friends make a decision to go out but they cannot agree to the place where they should eat, then there is politics since what they do is a political activity. Here two different powers of these friends confront with each other’s power. Hence, we can expand this definition by adding that two other criteria which are firstly, politics can actualize between even two people, and secondly, when someone controls and exercise power others by oneself, there is politics. In this context, politics does not take place only between a state and its citizens or its refugees, or a tribe authority and members of that tribe, or between any group of people and others. In this context, we can assert that since there is a power relation between a woman and a man, a teacher and a student, a parent and children, elder and young, referee and sportsman/woman, a judge and perpetrator, perpetrator and victim, there is politics. Then, Heywood (ibid, p. 61), categorizes politics in two ways. The first one takes place within “personal, family and domestic life”, and the second one appears is “community level”; and the second one is seen small communities which can be “the workplace, public institutions and business corporations” and large communities which have a government or even “local or regional governments”. In that sense, politics is pervasive.

What is more, politics can take place within oneself too. One as a human being comprises of many selves which usually in conflict. Our selves inside us always disagree while deciding something. In the second chapter, it was also stated that communication resulted from music takes place not only between people but also an individual within herself or himself. As we have seen, politics can be divided two types, which are politics of self and politics of people, these two distinct communication amounts to two these different politics types. This implies that people

can resort wielding music as a power to influence others and themselves. From this point of view, music generates a power relation between not only people but also one's own different selves.

Accordingly, one may use music as a power over oneself, and his or her action becomes a political activity. For instance, one imposes the feeling of good to oneself via music. Sometimes we wake up in the morning with sadness, we do not feel well, and in order to continue our day in a standard way, we use music as power. We put a song which makes us happy or energetic. We communicate with ourselves through music, indeed, we exercise power over ourselves by means of music. Therefore, if we feel sad or tired, but want to get rid of from our mood, we may want to steer ourselves in some way, and we may appeal music for we know the fact that it is able to change our moods. In a word, music alters our emotions, and we change our mood with music by our own will. We as a human-beings consist of many selves, in other words, our entity is a struggle of many selves inside us. We have rationality and in compliance with this rationality we conduct our desires; and we use music for this end.

Before investigating music as a means for power and music as a creator of power relation in the politics of people, it will be enlightening to mention another classification. Namely, while we are saying that music is political, it has two different meanings. It is political firstly by its nature, and secondly within itself. As we have seen in the case of censorship forestated, there are some authorities which decide what kind of music should be listened to and some should not. Thus, the relation between politics and music has two types. The first one is politics within music, and the second one is, music within politics. In order to comprehend clearly, I call the former as politics of music/power relation within music, and the latter as music of politics.

The usage of music as and for power, and as a creator of power relation in politics of people also belongs to the category of the music of politics. Hence, it would be illuminating to elaborate these two categories by starting from politics of music/power relation within music.

4.6 Conclusion

To conclude, in this chapter it was shown that by being a communication music is also as a power. For this reason, the concept of power was explicated by appealing several

important accounts to demonstrate what kind of characteristics music has because of being power. Moreover, it was also put forward that since one attempts to decide on behalf of others by affecting and steering them through music, and since one can use music to change his or her mood—these two also means the exercise of power—then music is political. In the first part, it was underlined that we all are acquainted with music by any means since music always exists everywhere. Consequently, it was asked why it is indispensable and what lies beneath the power it has. In the second section, since power is a complicated issue, the concept of power reviewed under the guidance of crucial thinkers. It was indicated that features of the concept of power can also be seen in the music. In the third part, censorship was elaborated as a counterpower/resistance to music which is a power, and this chapter mentioned that censorship can be done by people, some private institutions, corporations and political authorities. The fourth section unveiled the subtle fact that music as power is also political since power is always in relation to politics. For this reason, this relation was explained; and because there are two major forms of politics, which are politics of self and politics of people, it was highlighted that use of music can take place in these two. Furthermore, one last classification was made to exhibit there are two kinds of relation between music and politics which are politics in music and music of politics. Now, it is time to discover the first one.



5. POLITICS OF MUSIC: POWER RELATIONS WITHIN MUSIC

5.1 Introduction

Politics of music mainly refers to power relation with regard to determination of what kind of music should be composed, played and listened to, in that sense, it can be also considered as administration of music politics. Are there really criteria which particularize a music type which can be composed, performed and listened to? Which provision can determine any music as right? Are there any? What does rightness and badness of music mean? Why are some songs subjected to censorship? Is there a need for censorship? If it is necessary, then why? It is a remarkable that deploying any criteria amounts to exercise of power in the sense that how music should be composed and made, and what kind of music should be listened. All the issues like which music should be played on the radio, which themes and topics should musical shows cover, what kind of music should be performed in the concert halls are determined by an authority. One cannot call any musician to perform any kind of music in a concert hall where “high-art” types of music are performed. Thus, we see a power which determines all these, and in this regard, there are power relations within music whether or not it is an end in itself or means to ends, hence it would be beneficial to reveal debates concerning this issue and their classifications related to music.

Accordingly, this chapter is divided into fourth part. In the first section, it will be explained that music involves power relations even if it is an end since there are struggles between groups to determine the value of music. In the second part, in order to understand power relation in music, the analyses of Arthur Danto (1964), George Dickie (2001), Howard Becker (1974, 1982) Pierre Bourdieu (1984) and Dick Hebdige (1979) will be elucidated and it will be shown that value of music is determined by the institutions, including art worlds, and social class and subcultures. In the third section, both music market and state-based institutions will be elaborated in detail. In music market part, to indicate the reproducibility of music the analysis of Walter Benjamin (1968) will be handled, Theodor Adorno’s and Max Horkheimer’s (2002) analysis of “Culture Industry” will be made use of, it will be questioned

whether there is musical fetishism or not, and also popular/mass music will be explained by stating Noël Carroll's (1997) remarks. In the fourth part, autonomous music, which is an end itself, will be explained by resorting Theodor Adorno's (1980, 2002) views and it will be claimed that music should be autonomous rather than being a means to ends for it has a value per se.

5.2 Determining the Value of Music

Which criteria do determine what kind of music is valuable. What kind of criteria can determine which music should be composed, performed and listened to? Are there objective categories or should there be subjective categories of some groups which determine all these? Since it is not easy to define aesthetics, which is not merely based on subjective categories but it does not have objective categories too, it is not easy to determine the value of music. If we are saying that there is a valuable music, then we demarcate music, namely, we confine valuable music which have certain characteristics that the ones do not have.

If there must be objective categories, then it should be found by common consent, but there is no such thing, since what people like and do not like differ. If there must be subjective categories, then values of these groups become determining factors. Additionally, it is indefinite that if there should be subjective categories, whose or which groups' categories should be used. If we decide to use those artists, then still there is a problem. Which artist from which genre we should choose is still a tough question. Should we chose one who makes classical music or arabesque or folk music? Giving an answer to this question is really difficult, since it is hard to find criteria to decide. Besides is there really such a thing as condition which makes a music genre better than others? How come jazz music is better than hip hop, arabesque is of low quality, folk music is banal, classical music is noble? In that sense there is a power relation in the determination of music, namely there are many authorities which decide which type of music is valuable.

Furthermore, a music genre speaks of on behalf of its listener, namely, when someone listens classical music, or jazz, or hip hop, or arabesque one falls into different categories. It is generally accepted if one listens to folk music then one is regarded as a member of low-class, whereas if one listens to classical music then one belongs to upper class. Hence, there are some rules which classifies both music genres and people

listening them as upper and lower. For instance, some elite groups might believe that classical music is the best kind of music, so they might claim that everyone should listen only classical music. If it is determined what kind of music should people listen to, what genres are better, then there is a power relation.

Apart from these, we might also question what teach conservatoires or what their roles are, because they impose these criteria too. Additionally, if we look at orchestras, there is also a visible power relation in them. When performers play a specific composer's tunes, there is a reason behind why they play that composer. They might add their own interpretation while playing those tunes or they might adhere strictly to composer's composition, or even they are obligated to do what their maestro wants from them. Again, there are reasons behind these. Orchestras are different than each other, since they play differently. Why do they play differently? What makes them to decide perform in a specific way? What it is wanted to attract notice here is the fact that there is an authority or behind all these decisions. Since the authority alleges that they know what is the good for them, it decides in which way they perform, which composer's tune is played, and also whether they are allowed to improvise during the performance. In this context, there are certain forms, styles, motives, and even harmonies which are allowed be used in music. Consequently even if music is made as an end in itself, there is a power relation or we can say there is a politics in music, since what kind of music is made and listen to is determined by authorities. In this context, in order to understand the power relation within music, it would be helpful to resort some remarks and discussions related to the issue of by whom rightness of music is specified.

5.3 Value of Music Determined by Groups

Music is contingent upon listeners, to put it more explicitly the value of music is depended on the aims of listeners. In that sense, it is subjective. We as listeners also determine the value of music, since we do listen to a song because we like it. If we consider who determines the value of music, we might think many different groups which might be institutions including Art World, class, subcultures, consumers so on and so forth. We can use many categories. Here, it is handled some of them.

To begin with, I find necessary to examine closely the concept of "the Artworld" alleged by Arthur Danto (1964) to indicate what kind of mechanisms lie beneath for

determining the value of music, and what makes music a work of art. He coined the term “the Artworld” to draw attention to the element which entitles something an artwork. Danto fundamentally believes that, being entangled in “the Artworld” is what constitutes the essence of all arts, put it differently, the Artworld determines characteristics of art.

When viewed from this aspect, music is also determined by the Artworld. Danto asks the question what makes a work a work of art even though some others which may resemble or may not resemble that work are not regarded as artworks. His answer is a presence of “an atmosphere of artistic theory, a knowledge of the history of art: an artworld”, which whole cannot be noticed by eye, but they all are able to make something an artwork (1964, p. 580). That is to say, a definite theory of art or an artworld converts certain objects to artworks. For instance, if we consider two different songs one of which counted as a work of art but the other does not. Danto purports that they are different, because there is something which is unseen but is able to designate one of them as non-artwork and the other as artwork; and in a point of fact, this is the context behind it. There are appropriate conditions which are determined by the Artworld, and they meet requirements for that song to be regarded as an artwork. Accordingly, the Artworld, which consists of for instance, conservatoires, radio, state-television or state-media in general, universities, music critics and music channels, decides who should give a concert in concert-halls where take place artistic performances, which songs famous philharmonic orchestras should perform, what forms should be used, which songs should be listened on the radio, and should be displayed on television, which themes should be deployed by performers, what kind of new compositions are needed, what rules musicians should obey, and what criteria they should refrain from wielding.

Besides, Howard Becker (1982, p. 226) also argues that the value of artworks is designated by Art World, in that sense, value of music is also bound up with it. He defines “Art world” as “the network of people whose cooperative activity, organized via their joint knowledge of conventional means of doing things, produce(s) the kind of art works that art world is noted for” (1982, p. x). According to his understanding, the conditions of appraisal of music goes together with its condition of production because if a work is permitted or has a chance to be released, then it means it would be listened as well. As it was stated in the second chapter that in Becker’s

understanding art, including music, is a “collective action”, this collectivity also betokens the mutual aesthetic values in determination of music since he believes that “if they act under the definition of “art, their interaction convinces them that what they produce is valid works of art” (Becker, *ibid*, p. 39). Namely, they are persuaded by their collective interaction in music that what they generate is valid music.

Moreover, in the second chapter, it was also expressed that there are “conventions” referring to “earlier agreements” which determines how music should be or should be produced. In art worlds, these “conventions” are determining factors of all works of art. Becker (1974, p. 772) says that “conventions place strong constraints on the artist”, yet they are not things which do not allow unconventional works totally. Accordingly, art worlds are open to change since people always develop new forms of actions and explore sources through which take action to produce (*ibid*, p. 775). Hence, we might conclude that, to Becker, even though there are conventions in art worlds, music is open to novelties, since art worlds constantly changes and develops new conventions since nobody can do the same thing twice, however, changes can take place if and only if the existing art world accepts new cooperations, in that sense, new artworlds appear when there are new cooperations (1982, pp. 301-310). For this reason, music changes when art worlds change.

Moreover, George Dickie (2001), by enhancing Arthur Danto's remark in a certain way, puts forward the concept of “institutional theory of art”, and he makes us consider institutions, to which he adds also “the Artworld”, as decision makers in terms of the value of art. In this respect, we might take institutions into account in determination of the value of music. He elaborates “artworld” which is for him “...a cultural construction – something that members of society have collectively made into what it is over time” (2001, p. 60). To him, we learn anything concerning the artworld “at a tender age”, “and we learned them together as a set” (*ibid*, p. 61). In this regard, cultural roles are constituted from the early childhood. From primitive to more constructed and complicated societies cultural roles have been invented, and they are still being invented (*ibid*, pp. 61-62).

According to this approach, what makes music a work of art is not designated by itself per se, or how it appears, what kind of material it is made of, and how we experience it, rather it is specified “institutionally”. What should we conceive by this phrase is that music is specified socially. Namely, socially constructed institutions are decisive

in this determination. In this respect, if a song has a relation with an “institution”, then it is regarded as a work of art, since it happens to attain the opportunity of being appraised.

One another important element which determines value of music is social class. Here, Pierre Bourdieu’s (1984) analysis comes to assistance. Bourdieu observes social relations and he basically asserts that a social class put the pressure on other classes in terms of what kind of music other classes should make and listen to by generating right and bad music categories. Where there is a stratified social order the dominant class seeks to maintain its position through a distinction strategy by defining and imposing taste and *legitimate culture* for the rest of the society. To him, “legitimate culture of class societies” is “a product of domination predisposed to express or legitimate domination” (ibid, p. 228). By means of distinction dominant class affirms and legitimizes its status, and at the same time it imposes a certain social worldview on everyone through distinction. Namely, he insists that power of a class operates on the determination of another class’ tastes. In other words, a class, which is superior in a hierarchical order from economic, social and cultural aspects, imposes tastes to inferior ones. In that sense, there are restraints imposed upon lower-classes by upper, hence there is palpable domination, because one class prescribes others what to listen to, and accordingly, there is a power relation between them.

What makes a class superior is the types of *capitals* it owns. One’ belonging to upper, middle and lower class depends to one’s *economic, cultural and social capital* (Bourdieu, 1984). These capitals corresponds to respectively, what one have, what one know, who one know; and since these differ from person to person one’s statue in the society differs as well.

Consumption forms of music and types of musical activities betoken different classes and “class fractions”. For instance, Bourdieu (1984, p. 14), lists these practices which are “listening to the most 'highbrow' radio stations, France-Musique and France-Culture, and to musical or cultural broadcasts, owning a record-player, listening to records”. These all three capitals affect and steer people’s consumptions, and consequently class segregations are produced and reproduced. To illustrate, according to Bourdieu’s survey *Well-Tempered Clavier* by Bach is preferred mostly by higher-education teachers and art producers, and then by secondary teachers, but their difference from other occupational groups is quite a few in terms of percentage,

Rhapsody in Blue by George Gershwin is preferred mostly by technicians with the percentage 42, but there are no great differences in between other groups in terms of the percentage and the percentages are below 30%, *Blue Danube* by Johann Strauss II is mostly preferred by clerical and commercial employees, manual workers, craftsmen and shopkeepers and their percentage of the preferences are 52%, 50.5% and 49% respectively, apart from higher-education teachers and art producers, the rest of the occupational groups preferred it as well in between 4% and 35% (ibid, p. 17). On this basis, Bourdieu (ibid, p. 16), asserts that *Well-Tempered Clavier* is an indicator of *legitimate taste* which increases in accordance with the level of education, and it reaches to peak “in those fractions of the dominant class that are richest in educational capital”, in addition, he indicates that *Rhapsody in Blue* is fallen into the category of *middle-brow taste*, he mentions that this taste “is more common in the middle classes than in the working classes and the "intellectual" fractions of the dominant class”, further to these, to him *Blue Danube* is in the category of *popular taste* which is commonly held taste by working class and which changes inversely proportional with educational capital (ibid, p. 16).

Because of having no means and resources people having lack of these three capitals they are not are not able to attain to great amount of cultural capital, and again for the same reason they do not have a voice in determination of musical taste. The reason for this the fact that they have no autonomy, and because of domination the lower class cannot find a place to have a say in designation of *legitimate culture*.

Bourdieu alleges that it should be kept in mind that the working class 'aesthetic' is a dominated aesthetic type since it is defined from the point of the dominant aesthetics. Working class people can neither neglect the high-art aesthetic, which represents the denunciation of working class aesthetics, nor renounce their own socially conditioned dispositions (1984, p. 41). In line with these, Bourdieu states that “That is why art and cultural consumption are predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not, to fulfil a social function of legitimating social differences” (ibid, p. 7). For this reason, upper-class having no economic concerns is able to speak knowledgeably and authoritatively about everyone’s taste, whereas working-class expect any object to “fulfill a function” in the hierarchic class order (ibid, p. 41). In this context, lower-class becomes nondecision-maker in terms of the determination of the value of the music, they remain

dependent on prescriptions of upper-class; and, in this way social differences are reproduced on and on.

In addition to these, subcultures also determine value of music, yet the music they determine as valuable is identified with them. Stated in other words, that music belongs to them. If it is also listened by other groups, it belongs them firstly. Subcultures are subordinated cultures which are excluded by dominant or legitimate culture. By definition, subculture is a kind of differentiation from dominant culture. Subcultures might resist or they might not completely accept the values of dominant societal, political, cultural and economic order, in that sense, they generate their own cultures. In terms of music they favor their own music instead of the dominant ones.

It is significant to mention that historical context has a hand in the formation of subcultures. Dick Hebdige asserts that “both reggae and punk rock are created within the contexts of subcultures which are themselves produced in response to specific historical conditions” (1979, p. 132). Namely, British post-war working-class youth culture can be identified with punk. The reason for this is the fact that punk was reproduced them in ‘cut up’ shape by combining elements from different periods (Hebdige, *ibid*, p. 26). Namely, subcultures appraise their own music and they might consider it more valuable than other types. After having elaborated some groups who take part in determination of the value of music, now it is time to handle these in practice.

5.3.1 Music market

As we mentioned in the first chapter, formerly music was custom-made, that is to say, both the church and nobles employed musicians to make them compose music for their own aims. This had continued until the 18th century in which Mozart refused to work for nobles of the court anymore. Mozart was employed by the Archbishop of Salzburg and he worked as a servant, and he produced works which are not autonomous since it was told him what and how to compose by both Prince-Archbishop and court nobles. He strived for resigning from his office at the Archbishop of Salzburg for he wanted to compose freely. Even though his father told him not to resign and told him reconcile with this employer, he insisted on his demand until he was dismissed by the ruler of the Salzburg in 1781, and then, he started his new career in Wien to compose without interference. According to Elias (2000, p. 39), Mozart's choice to leave his office in

Salzburg meant, in short, that instead of being dependent to patron, he earned his living as a “free-lance artist”, and he as a musician sold his skills and works in the open market. In that sense, he was the first “free-lance composer” by refusing being a “court musician”. For this reason, Mozart represented an artist who was free and relied heavily on his personal inspirations (Elias, *ibid*, p. 41). Even though there was not total independency, Mozart’s struggle paved the way for independency in composition making for other composers to certain extent. However, with technological advancements and capitalism music became an open market which contains complex relations within itself, and this market confines the autonomy of musicians and made them more dependent.

If we consider music market in today’s world, we might regard it as an institution in because it determines which album is released, which musicians and singers find a place for themselves in the market. Further to that, in this market music is determined generally by a group which has economic capital since this market is seized by large capital groups which are owners of mass media; and in today’s world, music market operates by means of mass media, and, for this reason these groups have power over both musicians and listeners.

As a beginning, both making and listening music have altered drastically and eminently in the process of time due to emergence of technical-mechanical reproduction and all developments in technology. These changes tell many things about politics of music. It must be stated music market owes its existence to both of these since in the current climate, there are countless technical reproductions of songs and a great variety of use of technology in music production.

One of the remarkable consequents of use of technology in music is the fact that nature of music has changed. To tell the truth we have entered into era of digital-electronic reproduction from mechanical one, namely, in computers there are softwares which enable us to compose music, and they offer millions of instruments, which we are not able to attain in our life, they offer millions of effects for modification, and they have innumerable different versions of sounds. These all have altered and diversified music, it is hard to talk about the existence of music as it was in old times. Songs and sounds have become more electronic and digital based, beats and rhythms have come into the forefront, and they have been amplified to be heard more.

It is accurate that developing technology renders music to be composed and performed by everyone. In a similar way, owing to technology music has become accessible to everyone in which is actually considered as something beneficial by many people *prima facie*. At the present time, through mass media everyone can listen any kind of music. Once music was performed for once, and in order to listen it people had to be situated where it performed, but with the advancement of technology recording became possible, and music turned into something portable. In other words, we gained the chance to carry music with us to everywhere. Recording has given rise to reproducibility. There is no need to carry orchestras from one place to another. There is no need to go to other cities or countries to listen tunes of famous composers, or watch a performance of musicians or music bands. As Benjamin (1968, p. 4), expresses with the emanation of mechanical reproduction there has been no need to visit a cathedral since it can depart from where it stands by being listened “in the studio of a lover of art”; and a chorus work performed in a hall or in the open air can be listened in a room.

However, these advancements in technology produced a dependency relationship. Since large capital groups control mass media, music has become more and more dependent. If music is not listened through radio, television and internet, it is not possible to speak of its presence. They are the only mediums which enables us to listen to music, and what is more, for this reason what we listen is determined. For instance, there are weekly music charts which specified by Billboard and MTV. They put songs in order, and make list of top ten hit songs from them, or the hot 100 songs, and also top 20 and 40, so on and so forth. In a similar vein, certain songs are played on the radio, since radio channels have playlists which are prespecified. It appears that they all determined listeners choices. Nevertheless, large capital groups specify them from the very beginning for listeners preferences are predetermined by means of releasing only a certain type of music, in this regard, these all lists tell us what to listen to.

On the other hand, Internet, which has become the most influential medium of music due to very increase of its usage, seems like it has broken this dependency relationship. Even if musicians need it to release their songs, Internet render them release their songs anytime. If we google a song these days, then we confront with a channels such as YouTube, Spotify, Apple Music, Deezer, TuneIn which can offer us to listen that song, so people appeal them to listen whichever song they want to listen to and whenever

they want, rather than waiting it until radio or television broadcasts it. Nevertheless, there is still dependency even musicians release their song through these platforms because these platforms are companies, and their aim is making money, therefore, for instance, musicians have to give money to be at the forefront in them, or they work with music companies which makes them be at the forefront in these channels.

Besides with those music composing softwares we gradually have gained the opportunity of producing music without playing an instrument. One can compose a song with the help of those programs without knowing how to play an instrument. This gives chance to everyone to be a musician without practicing and having academic knowledge. Additionally, people had gained the possibility to be known with his/her songs in virtue of social media, and even there are many people who become famous all of sudden with their songs. At first blush, this seems acceptable by everyone, yet it generates an unjust condition in a sense that for those who make a tremendous effort and devote their time for music. However, music market does not work by taking this concern into consideration. If music companies believe that one of these new-comers make them earn a lot of money, they offer him/her a cooperation without considering whether s/he has academic musical knowledge, musical talent and beautiful voice or not, and they try to make him/her famous; so those, who take their chances by themselves to be known by their music in these platforms such as YouTube, rarely win fame. Accordingly, even Internet appears as if it broke the dependency relationship, musicians are still dependent to those channels and music companies to burst into prominence.

On the other hand, there is also counteraction to music market, namely, there are some street musicians who earn income mainly from playing and singing on the streets, plus, there are some musicians who try to sell their albums on the street without resorting music production companies. They record their songs and make small number of CD's on their own; and instead of placing an ad on the billboards, having no broad distribution network by means of those companies, and instead of giving money to them which are frankly speaking intermediaries by getting a commission from each sales of those CD's these musicians sell their albums alone. Nonetheless, these musicians are in the minority.

Thus, we see that there has been substantial changes in music. Formerly, the only way for musicians to perform their music is their performance in public. This was the only

way which people could listen them. Even some of them abided by political authorities, they were not under control by any group who has merely economic power and dominated musicians. In that sense, folk singers of earlier times were more independent than today's, since in our days, large capital groups decide whether an album can be released or not, they as decision-makers permit a musician to gain a seat in music market. This power relation actually pushes music into the background, since what musician creates is of secondary importance, whereas the expectations of large capital groups rank in priority. In fact, being a dependent amounts to the fact that music has lost its autonomy. Namely, the existence of music depends on those groups. Once musicians stood on their own feet, now they cannot be permanent without an endorsement.

Besides, reproduction of music might damage musicians and the original version of their songs too, because the authenticity of the original song disappears more and more every time it is reproduced. Benjamin explains this by asserting that:

The technique of reproduction detaches the reproduced object from the domain of tradition. By making many reproductions it substitutes a plurality of copies for a unique existence. And in permitting the reproduction to meet the beholder or listener in his own particular situation, it reactivates the object reproduced. These two processes lead to a tremendous shattering of tradition which is the obverse of the contemporary crisis and renewal of mankind. (ibid, p. 4)

He (ibid p. 4), uses the term "aura" and says that it is the "aura" of a work of art which is undermined and damaged by mechanical reproduction. To elaborate this he (ibid, p. 3), highlights that there is single element which is missing even in the flawless reproduction of an artwork, and that is "its presence in time and space". He (ibid, p. 3), underscores that "the presence of the original is the prerequisite to the concept of authenticity", so what is missing in the technically reproduced music is authenticity, since it is not something which can be reproduced. What he accentuates is that the work of art becomes meaningful and relevant in a particular historical context, yet meanings which we get from it can change because historical context changes, but its historical testimony always continues. Nevertheless, technical reproduction jeopardizes its historical testimony which is based upon its authenticity, and this also refers to shattering of "the authority of the object" (ibid, p. 4).

If we consider the authority of music in nowadays, we can claim that the authority has passed to the hands of large capital groups from musicians; they interfere and control

music, regulate music market, and therefore, they decide not only what musicians produce but also what listeners listen. Additionally, it might be crucial to note that with mechanical reproduction, which went hand in hand late capitalism, the process of mass production resulted in immense and intense commodification of art, and its mass consumption, thus, we can infer that songs have turned into commodities which addresses to masses and which can be bought and sold in the scope of market, and these commodities have to be in definite forms which were predetermined.

5.3.1.1 Music market as a part of culture industry

Here it would be necessary to handle the views of Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer (2002) to become aware of the profound commodification of music in detail in the late capitalism. They both set fourth the term “culture industry” which amounts, in a broad sense, to the phenomenon of industrialization of cultural products, and creation of them on the basis of making a profit, namely, it implies that commodification of culture and art products in late capitalism. Both Adorno and Horkheimer (ibid, p. 128) argue that:

Art becomes a species of commodity, worked up and adapted to industrial production, saleable and exchangeable: but art as the species of commodity which exists in order to be sold yet not for sale becomes something hypocritically unsaleable as soon as the business transaction is no longer merely its intention but its sole principle.

Adorno (1975 p. 14), says that the concept of the culture industry corresponds “the standardization” of cultural goods and “the rationalization of distribution techniques” rather than referring production process of the those goods. Namely, musicians, cannot compose a song in a way they want, but they do it by in conformity with “standard forms”. This standardization attracts a great deal of attention these days since even the structure and the duration of songs are limited and standardized. Hubert Léveillé Gauvin (2018, p. 11), underlines that “perhaps the most obvious example is the so-called ‘3-minutes rule,’ which stated that, in order to be commercially successful, a single had to have a maximum duration of 3 minutes”. Songs which are longer than 5 minutes are really are few in number.

Both Adorno and Horkheimer insist that film and radio do not have to make themselves look like art today, and in order to legitimize the trash they produce deliberately they use the fact that they are nothing but any business as an ideology (2002, p. 95). We might consider music in the same way, and in a similar vein, we can regard music

market as a part of culture industry. The system initiates a holistic “harmony” by means of sanctioning people’s demand for trash “artfully” (Adorno and Horkheimer, *ibid*, p. 106). They hold that those who resist can only exist by incorporating themselves into the order (*ibid*, p. 104).

They assert that “interested parties like to describe the cultural industry in technological terms” and, according to those figures, millions of people happen to be involved in the reproduction process by demanding it, for this reason it is inescapable to avert from producing standard products because only they can meet the same needs (Adorno and Horkheimer, 2002, p. 95). What culture industry does is to counterfeit its customers rather than adapting itself in the direction of their reactions. It pretends to be one of them, yet it shapes the attitudes of its customers. To him, it might be suspected that this adaptation is a kind of “ideology” (Adorno, 2005, pp. 200-201). Namely, music appears like as if it is shaped by listeners yet the preferences and needs of listeners are directed by music market in culture industry. He even asserts that “music does the listening for the listener” (*ibid*, p. 201). What Adorno highlights is the deceptive aspect of the culture industry because it dominates consciousness of individuals insomuch that individuals turn into object of the industry albeit they regard themselves as subjects of it, thus listeners are objects and they are passive consumers of songs which is offered by music industry, and what is more they have similar preferences due to “standardized forms” in this industry, because “culture today is infecting everything with sameness” (Adorno and Horkheimer, 2002, p.94). It is purported by interested parties that standardized forms originate from the alleged needs of consumers: “that is why they are accepted with so little resistance” (Adorno and Horkheimer, 2002, p. 95).

Nowadays, listening to music from any media tool is like any other indispensable activity in a daily life, in other words, this is the major way through which we reach music. We go to the concerts as well, but songs which are played in concerts are not the original ones, rather they are copies of the original version which is recorded in music studios. Accordingly, what we listen to through media tools are also copies, in this regard, they are reproduced again and again, and what is more there have been radical changes music in general. Hubert Léveillé Gauvin (2018, p. 12), who listens and analyzes 303 top ten singles from 1986 to 2015, finds that:

The number of words in song titles has decreased, the average tempo has increased, the time elapsed before the initial entry of the voice has shortened, and similarly the time before the title of a song is heard has also shortened.

These findings manifest that musicians have been exposed to interference and their music has been shaped due to certain expectations of music market, and we might notice that since rules and forms have been predetermined the creativity of musicians has become limited and their autonomy diminished gradually.

Here it would also be beneficial to state Pierre Bourdieu's (1993, p. 40) analysis of "two principles of hierarchisation" in the artistic field which are opposites of each other and which are "in struggle". He makes analysis of the conditions of cultural producers, who are in specifically writers and painters, of the 19th century in France, and underlines that they have an autonomy, yet there were different kinds of dependencies for them. We can adapt his analysis for music in culture industry and, in specifically music, in the scope of music market. The first one is heteronomy principle and the second is autonomy principle. The former is "favourable to those who dominate the field economically and politically (e.g. 'bourgeois art')", the latter whose defenders have at least a certain capital which is apt to be determined by the "degree of independence from the economy", and they regard "temporal failure" as an indicator of "election" and they count as "success" an indicator of "compromise", and this principle represents for example "art for art's sake" (Bourdieu, *ibid*, p. 40). In that sense, if we interpret his remark in terms of music which remains in the scope of the music market we can say that sales of music has the precedence than music's aesthetic value, since heteronomous principle is prevalent, namely, it is dominated by large capital groups economically, the highest priority is selling, and accordingly purchasing of music. It is hard to speak of autonomous principle in the music market. Gauvin's (2018) findings also prove this fact, since music is produced in compliance with the demands or we can say rules of those large capital groups.

Furthermore, he draws attention to the changes in terms of dependency between cultural produces and dominant class. He expresses in the 18th century, painters and also some writers were dependent on a "financial backer" or "patron" or "official protector of the arts", and this means there was a "direct dependency", however, in the 19th century, this dependency transformed into *structural subordination* which refers to the dependency on "sales figures", "numbers of tickets sold", "the market", and

“durable links” which bring writers together with certain segments of the high society, “and help to determine the direction of the generousities of state patronage” (Bourdieu, 1996, p. 49). Namely, formerly, these works had been made to order, however, in the 19th century, their existent became contingent upon more complex network of relations. If we interpret his views in point of music in culture industry, we might claim that formerly, music was made to order, there was direct dependency; nonetheless, right now, songs are produced within the logic of music market which looks for making a profit, and there are large scale production of music and its consumption by masses.

It should also be noted that music is consumed in the fastest way at the present time. It is something like ephemeral. What is underlined here is songs are temporary instead of being permanent. Namely, listeners’ behaviors have also changed, because the rules and forms determined by large capital groups have been affecting both listeners and music makers. For instance, while the average intro time was 20 seconds in the mid-1980’s, nowadays vocalists start to sing lyrics in 5 seconds in their songs, so there has been the decrease in the duration of intro parts of songs (Gauvin, *ibid*, p. 6). Namely, musicians start to sing lyrics earlier than they sung in the past, since people have ran out of patience, and they skip to other song.

Additionally, in a short span of time, many similar songs, which are far from being original, are released one after the other. We might assert that unlike complex compositions of yore, today, songs which all resemble each other are comprised of simple melodies upon simple rhythms because of standardization of music. We might allege that they are imitations or reproductions of each other, and what is more, a song is launched again after being furnished, stated in other words, a song can have many remixes nowadays. Innumerable songs are about to be obsolete, because people easily get bored with them, and this causes production of another bunch of innumerable songs, and this is like a vicious circle. It might be important say that, as it was mentioned above, to Becker (1974, 1982), conventions in the art worlds are open to change, so music is open to change. In this regard, when viewed from his perspective, we can say that there can be innovations in music, concordantly musicians does not lose their autonomy and do not create works which are from being authentic. However, even there is a change in the art worlds, we might not be able to even notice those changes since music channels and music companies have also a say in the art worlds,

and also we listen to music by means of mass media including social media, and actually as it was said several times, they are determiners because they are the owners of mass media. Even it is offered millions of song, which we can listen to through them, we cannot find those new works easily since music companies dominated music market by using several strategies and they release resembling songs constantly. Even musicians' creativity exist, even there are innovations in music, finding them is difficult. For instance, classical music is broadcasted by few radio channels; we can count the number of those channels on the fingers of one hand. On the other hand, channels which broadcast pop-music are beyond number. For this reason, some other music genres have begun to be regarded as indie, marginal and alternative. Besides, if any change happened, these groups have already allowed this innovation, namely, they monopolized the market and they seek to make profit, and they usually no or little attention to other music genres and usually allow and promote one kind of music which can be consumed by listeners who have turned into consumers.

5.3.1.2 Popular/Mass music

The music-genre which fits to this consumption form is popular music, which can even sometimes include some songs from other genres when they become popular, in other words, it was produced to be consumed. Pop-songs are released as hits; they are listened until people are bored with them. Every summer has its own hits, every pop-singer follow a trend and s/he changes his or her musical style with regard to those trends. For instance, pop-singers in Turkey imitates they styles of pop-singers from U.S.

One another important point is that popular music is, in fact, mass music, since it is in a form of mass consumption. Noël Carroll (1997, p. 187) uses the term mass art instead of popular art on purpose because he underscores that every culture has popular art somehow, since it is an "ahistorical" term (ibid, p. 188). He explains this by saying firstly every culture where class division exist has possessed popular art, if we consider it as it belongs to lower classes, and secondly, if we consider many people from different cultures who enjoy popular art, then in those cultures there are popular art (ibid, p. 188). For this reason, he asserts that "mass art" has not revealed until the advancements of mass technologies. Mass art belongs to industrial societies and it is designed for their aims (ibid, p. 188). He expresses "that mass art, in short, is designed

for mass consumption. It is designed to be consumed by large numbers of people”, because it makes us being able to consume same work by letting everyone, who are in completely different place, have it. Carroll wrote his article and assert his claim in 1997, now we are in 2019. If we consider today’s music consumption, we even may not be able compare it with the past’s, because technological developments have continued without ceasing. Since that time music consumption has increased incrementally after the Internet entered our lives, but, especially after social media and music listening applications have emerged, music began to be widely consumed than ever before. Today we consume not only same songs but also thousands of different songs at the same time. We are able to reach them any time. In this respect, today music is in a massified form even more than that time.

5.3.1.3 Musical fetishism

Besides, if music is a commodity, then we might also question whether there is musical fetishism. To scrutinize this we should firstly understand what commodity fetishism amounts to by resorting the analysis of Karl Marx (1982). To him (ibid, pp. 164-165) Commodity fetishism indicates the mysterious characteristics of commodities, and this corresponds that we see the social characteristics of our labor as objective nature of a product which is formed by our own labor. Marx continues:

Hence it also reflects the social relation of the producers to the sum total of labor as a social relation between objects, a relation which exists apart from and outside the producers. Through this substitution, the products of labor become commodities, sensuous things which are at the same time supra sensible or social. (ibid, p. 165)

Namely, commodities turn into subjects and they generate market by circulating continuously, and this market is the determining factor of our social relations. Since we act dependently to commodities we also become objects. Since music is also a commodity in the conditions of capitalist economy, it generates commodity fetishism too. Adorno shows the peak absurdity in musical fetishism by explaining the reactions of people when they listen the voices of violins from the brands Amati and Stradivarius whose voices can be distinguished only by an ear of specialist. They forget to listen composition and performance, but they go into raptures (1985, p. 277).

Like a dress or a perfume, music as commodity determines our personality and we adopt this as an irrevocable belief. In this respect, fetishism refers to one’s defining him/herself with other objects or subjects, in other words, it means loss of our freedom,

since we become an object of music or musicians. For instance, musical fetishism can often be seen in rock music listeners. They are mad about anything relating to rock. They identify themselves with rock stars, they wear what those musicians wear, for example, wearing black is very common in rock culture. They buy t-shirts on which their favorite rock groups name is written, they listen persistently rock music, and even they usually do not give themselves a chance to discover new songs, music genres and bands. They might even claim that best music in the world is what they listen. As a result, we see that their lifestyles alter by being affected by rock music. Moreover Adorno stresses that performances are also commodities by saying that “the consumer is really worshipping the money that he himself paid for the ticket to the Toscanini concert. He has literally ‘made’ the success which he reifies and accepts as an objective criterion, without recognizing himself in it” (ibid, pp. 278-279). Yet he “made” it by purchasing a ticket instead of liking concert (ibid, p. 279).

It is also important to express that performances have also changed because musicians have had to appeal attention-grabbing shows in their concerts and video clips to attract audience. To illustrate, it is very common that in their concerts, singers adopt dance shows to their songs and they use light shows. Besides they have started to give more concerts, and even they shoot video clips for their songs because people are able to listen their songs free of charge through a broad array of means with developing technical reproduction of music because people are able to listen their songs free of charge through a broad array of means with developing technical reproduction of music.

After having told all these interferences we can infer that music market as an institution has power over both listeners and musicians, and this power generates power relations both in composing and listening music. Besides, commodification of music represents its instrumentalization, and even music is a means to ends it is exposed to interference.

5.3.2 State-based music institutions

Political authorities also determine value of music. For instance, state makes this through its institutions such as state media and conservatoires. For instance, conservatoires determine which tone, musical note and instrument conservatoire students use, and also whether they play or sing softly or harshly. They prescribe them to use certain musical notes and forms. If a male student has a baritone voice, then it

is said to him that he should use his voice in between certain levels, and he should use in definite method. His other forms of usages of his voice might not be liked and allowed by the competent authority. In that sense, they have their own categories in determination of all these, since their categories are “right”. If we recall Foucault’s (1984) concept of regime of truth, we might infer that conservatories discipline students with regard to how to make music, namely, they use their power to engender valuable music. Similarly, state media might determine which kind of music should musicians compose and people listen to by giving place only certain kinds of music in broadcast.

We can question how much these categories of the state-based music institutions are objective. Do they turn their subjective categories into objective ones? By and large, does the state make these interference under the “right” aesthetic ideal it presumes that it has?

These questions betoken a very crucial point, and in order to comprehend this it would be beneficial to resort the analysis of Orhan Tekelioğlu (1996). He underlines that with the foundation of the Republic of Turkey, music was assigned with a substantial position in state policies in terms of its relation to culture and art. It was considered as a sort of ‘target’ because leaders of that time were in pursuit of designing a new kind of citizen and a new nation-state. Therefore, the political elite paid a special attention to music, and was keen on making reforms in music as a part of Westernization (ibid, p. 195). For instance, he shows that in 1934, it was banned to broadcast Turkish music from radios, despite the uncertainty that whether all types of Turkish music were to be banned or merely the ones having Ottoman origin. Instead of the undesired Turkish music, people were expected to learn how to enjoy polyphony, and thus “elegant light examples” of Western music were proclaimed. Those were played not only on the radio but also in all public spheres of daily life, such as “on the vessels of the Turkish Maritime Lines and at government-sponsored ballroom dances” (ibid, p. 195). Following the withdrawal of the radio ban concerning Turkish music, which lasted a year, Turkish Radio and Television (TRT) placed a more extended and durable control mechanism that is the system of censorship monitoring “both the musical form and the textual content of music played on TRT frequencies”, which is still in operation. In the meantime, while talented musicians were being sent abroad to get Western education, a state conservatoire as a national place where Western education could be obtained

was established. Moreover, the free of charge public programmes were offered to orchestras performing polyphonic pieces, and music classes as free of charge were facilitated at *Halkevleri* (People's Houses) too. The new musical elite of that period had an image of a "modern Western listener" in mind who knew how to appreciate polyphonic music, and it was their hope to re-shape the Turkish listener into that modern Western type of audiences. A West-East synthesis were sought and supported by the new cultural policies with an expectation that familiar and widely-loved Anatolian melodies could be recomposed by Turkish performers and composers who were educated abroad and could embed polyphony into Turkish music. The final product was to be "a modern polyphonic Turkish art music" spread along the country. With that ideal in mind, conservatories collected monophonic folk songs, and, most importantly, TRT played a significant role in the whole course of anticipated transformation by re-forging melodies in accordance with the rules of Western notation. Later in the 1960s, TRT 3 was set up which was a radio station held the only purpose to broadcast polyphonic classical, jazz, and Western pop music (ibid, pp. 195-196).

Accordingly, here we must discern there is a fine line between the rules for music determined by TRT. Namely, we have happened to confront with dual characteristics of the state, since the interference by authorities in the state at that time means two different things. Firstly, they had an aesthetic vision, namely they have their own aesthetic interpretation which should be transferred to the citizens, and secondly, they interfere music to reach their political goals such as transforming the citizens in a way they envisaged. Namely, these institutions both influence listener's music taste and their actions. Hence, they embarked on to infuse both valuable taste of music and modernization into the citizens. In this respect, the state determined Western music as valuable music, and it mainly allowed this kind of music for some time to be listened in order to form westernized citizens which is filled with modern nation-state ideology. It also attempted to make a mixed music which has both local and western musical characteristics. However, it banned and censored music, and by doing so it undertook to develop "valuable music taste" in the society, but at the same time, it forced people to abandon their own music taste, in that sense, it oppressed people. Moreover, albeit it underwent to enhance people's music taste and musicians' knowledge, it also made musicians adhere to specific forms in music by standardizing both music, that means

it forced people to abandon their creativity; and actually by doing so it made musicians standardized as well.

It should not be forgotten that even though it seems state based music institutions strive for developing valuable music taste in society, they might have also some other intentions by doing so as in the case took place in Turkey. In that sense, in those institutions music is conceived not only as an end in itself, which gives merely aesthetic pleasure, but also a means to ends which serves for the state's ideology and that is why they as state-based institutions interfere music and why they advocate specific kinds of music.

5.4 Autonomous Music

By both taking into account the previous two chapters we might face with the very instrumentalization of music, and we might ask as a general thing should there always be another purpose while creation and listening to music apart from just making or listening to it. If composers, performers, listeners are committed themselves to any other aim apart from making and listening to music just for making and listening to music, then they plan to accomplish objective whatever they have in their minds.

In order to find an explanatory answer to the question aforementioned, it might be illuminating to elaborate Adorno's (1980) views. Adorno attacks this remarks which is called political/committed art and claims that it "preaches for the converted", and to elude and disallow this he favors "autonomous art" which does not bear a political message explicitly, yet it has by any means, since he contends that even a work of art, which is autonomous by not serving for political purposes, seems having the characteristics of "apoliticism", it is something "deeply political", since it can always influence us even if it is an end in itself due to the fact that it has inherently the characteristic influencing. Therefore, the form of art he advocates is actually in between committed art and autonomous art. With regard to music what he lays emphasis on is that even music is an end in itself, even we listen it or compose it to have aesthetic pleasure it is political for it is able to influence us. What Adorno wants to touch upon is that committed music is merely a means to political ends, yet he believes that music has an aesthetic value on its own, since the aesthetic value of music is real, it cannot be ignored. Consequently, it is fundamentally and primarily an end in itself, which means its aim and existence merely based on itself.

From his account, we can conclude that even though music cannot be autonomous completely, and for this reason even though music has a political message, it does not have this for serving a political cause. It already carries this message by having inherently an aesthetic value. For this reason, it must be in between being committed and autonomous.

To him, that art, is social if and only if its opposition to society continues, and it keeps its seat only by being autonomous (2002, p. 225). Accordingly, committed music is a futile struggle. For example, to Adorno and Horkheimer (2002, pp. 108-109), in culture industry, two irreconcilable constituents of culture which are art and entertainment was combined under the concept of purpose, however, to them “entertainment is the prolongation of work under late capitalism”. In other words, music became a servant for amusement, and in this way it provides continuance of the capitalist ideology, thus it became a servant for capitalism.

Besides, Adorno (1980, pp. 184-185), also underlines that “for the sake of political commitment, political reality is trivialized: which then reduces the political effect” by reminding us Chaplin’s movies in which “the buffoonery of fascism” is displayed. In those movies, music was also used as to accompany to this absurdity. For instance, while these movies make critique of capitalist mode of production in a scene where Chaplin montages products quickly on the assembly line whose speed is fast, there is very cheerful music which is played out loud. Even if those movies want to draw attention to fascism and working conditions in capitalism, people just watch them listen those songs and laugh, and they do not take action to overthrow capitalism, rather they become depoliticized.

When music is committed, it becomes a power by being an instrument to influence and make people act in compliance with certain aims. Nonetheless, music can also be made freely from any other aim as Adorno expresses, since it has value per se. Hence, music should be autonomous in order not to affect anyone intentionally. However, this does not mean that there should not be any interference to music. When music has an immoral content and might do harm people, there should be censorship and this issue will be explicated in the fifth chapter in detail.

To conclude, as it was expressed before, music is a power, and for this reason, it is used as a means to attain any goal by people. Namely, people pay no or little intention

to aesthetic value of music, they appeal to committed music. Now it is time to examine how music used as an tool by people to influence others.

5.5 Conclusion

Accordingly, this chapter is divided to four parts. In the first section, it was shown that there are power relations in music, since there are some groups which determine the value of music. Hence, the second section resorts to analyses of Arthur Danto (1964), George Dickie (2001), Howard Becker (1974, 1982), Pierre Bourdieu (1984) and Dick Hebdige (1979) who elaborate those groups. In the third section, firstly, music market and secondly state-based institutions were scrutinized. In music market section, Walter Benjamin's (1968) analysis of "Mechanical Reproduction", Theodor Adorno's and Max Horkheimer's (2002) analyses of "Culture Industry" was deployed, and the question of musical fetishism was asked, and by using Noël Carroll's (1997) views popular/mass music was handled. The fourth part scrutinized the analysis of Theodor Adorno's (1980, 2002) remarks to open up autonomous music and it claimed that that music should be autonomous instead of being committed.

6. MUSIC OF POLITICS: MUSIC AS A TYPE OF POLITICS

6.1 Introduction

There is always relation between music and politics, since music is power and for this reason, those who have power use music for their political interests and they produce power relations through music, on the other hand, because of being power music is also used by those who resist power relations and domination; and that is why music is always used in politics. Politicians, leaders, political parties, political associations, political groups have been wielding music to persuade people by imposing their ideas to them and to other power holders. They order musicians to compose a song that manifests their ideals by aiming affecting people. For instance, before political elections, buses which have loudspeakers were sent to neighborhoods in order to make people listen to the songs of political parties. Again in TV channels, political parties give advertisements including music again to receive votes by influencing electorate. In protests, apart from shouting slogans people also sing songs in which they demand justice and claim their rights. Music is also used for and in resistance as well. To illustrate, in Turkey, during and after Gezi Park Resistance, many musicians composed songs to show their stance to the government. Aside from these, people make music in order to show their refusal to life conditions which imposed upon them. For example, rap songs are filled with critique of imposed norms, rules, and obligations; and they make mention of difficulties resulted from the oppressions of the state, political authorities and great powers which have economic power. As we see since music is political, it is used in politics for power and against power in politics. Thus, it is worth to investigate music of politics to grasp these two points in detail.

Accordingly, this chapter consists of four parts. In the first part, it will be stressed that politics and music are always in relation. Both power holders and those exposed to power used music to convey what they want. In this regard, this section will differentiate music which is used in politics in two ways, which are for oppression and emancipation. In the second part, many examples will be deployed to see music as a form of oppression and emancipation. In the third part, it will be explained that music

should be censored if it has immoral content that might do harm people. The fourth part will argue that some characteristics of music might lead us towards justice, democracy, freedom, common good by using Tolstoy's (1995) and Dewey's (1980), Small's (1998), Becker's (1982), Scarry's (2001) and Adorno's (2002) approaches.

6.2 Using Music for Power or against Power

Political authorities give very much importance to music, since it is a way of affecting and steering people's decisions. Similarly, people also use music to speak out their reactions to politicians, political parties, and ideologies. They use it to oppose imposed rules and norms, which only serve for power holders. That is why music and politics usually go hand in hand, since politics usually sets place for music.

It must be known that music, in general, reflects existing societal and political order. Namely, if music is democratic, then it owes to this to existing democratic regime. If existing power relation is oppressive, then music is also oppressive, and it works for oppression. For instance, the existence of military bands indicates the oppressive structure in military forces. Music is wielded in those institutions to oppress soldiers to act according to definite rules including making them grant themselves to the army, pushing them that they are no longer free and they are just soldiers, and making them do what military service requires. They are forced to kill or die, they are told what to do. In that sense, it generates a power relation between soldiers and high ranking officers.

Music is used to accustom people to societal rules, states' ideologies, political regimes, and to make them resign themselves to those who use music to have power or to maintain having power; and it is used by people to oppose and withstand all political impositions. It is used as an instrument for all this aims. Therefore, we see that music as a power can be seen in different forms, and we can enumerate how and in which forms music reflects itself as a power. These forms can be resistance, oppression, manipulation, social control, discipline, protest, propaganda, violence and even torture.

At this juncture, in general terms, we might categorize music as politics in two ways. The first one is use of music for oppression and the second one is use of music for emancipation. The former is for domination or for maintaining existing domination,

and the latter is for being freed from domination. We can make sub-categories which fall under these two main categories. Use of music for manipulation, social control, making propaganda, persuasion, violence and torture might be gathered under the same roof of oppression. On the other hand, under the category of emancipation there are use of music to protest and to resist.

6.2.1 Music as oppression

Here it will be given many examples which fall under these two main categories. Some of them have different sub-categories, which belong to same main category, at the same time; and some of them have the features of being in both main categories Now, it is time to begin with the first main category.

To begin with, Fackler (2007), indicates the usage of music for violence, oppression and propaganda by saying that in some concentration camps, music from radio or gramophones was played, and the loudspeakers were permanently installed. This was used especially in the Dachau camp in 1933 to educate and reshape the inmates who were against the political regime. Besides propaganda speeches, anti-Semitic German composer Wagner's music was played with this purpose, which was entitled as national music.

Dunaway (1987, p. 285), also reveals the usage of music for propaganda, he articulates that in the 1950s and 1960s, there appeared right-wing protest songs proclaiming racial supremacy in the sense of Ku-Klux-Klan's doctrines, reacting against civil-rights and labor-organizing campaigns, and advocating "satires of social protesters in a country-and-western vein (such as Merle Haggard's 'Okie from Muskogee')". This sort of right-wing activism through songs tried to imitate successful left-wing activism via folk-protest songs at times. 'Johnny Freedom', 'Be Careful of Communist Lies', and 'Jimmie Cracked Corn' are some of the examples given by Dunaway in the article.

Love (2016, p. 68), also gives an example which shows the usage of music as propaganda. Folk music genre is considered to reflect the cultural identities of regionally isolated social groups, and thus those identities are thought to have remained authentic in cultural and national sense. Linked to that, Neo-Nazi folk music uses this genre to express the racial purity of white culture and moves those social groups by recalling the past. It evokes the local practices of racial segregation of the past and reproduces them as a transnational movement of white supremacy. Prussian

Blue, a band formed by two teenagers who make Neo-Nazi music, can be given as an example for this. “As one commentator puts it, ‘their music isn’t teen-pop in the Britney Spears/Hilary Duff/ Jessica Simpson sense, but rather, folk-rock’”.

Moreover, Hirsch (2012, pp. 13-14), puts it throughout the English-speaking world in parks, railway stations, tube stations, classical music has been played by authorities to decrease “hooliganism” and to prohibit the entering “undesirables” such as “homeless” to those places. In that sense, it has become a crime deterrent. In this example, we encounter that music has a characteristic of maintaining social control.

Randall (2005, pp. 126-127) shows the use of music for political propaganda and the control which it is exposed to in North Korea. He denotes that whole artistic production, and thus including music, is controlled in North Korea as a state policy as a way of maintaining and consolidating power. For instance, song lyrics are considered to be more significant than the sonic characters of songs. Lyrics are expected and monitored to be “revolutionary, militant, inspirational, and should reflect party policy”. An example can be given in this respect that “in April 2000, a number of the songs performed and danced to was first recorded a decade or more before”. For instance, “Socialism is Ours” (“Sahoe chuøi uri koya”) was a Keith Howard song from 1992 which reacted towards the collapse of East Germany. Other songs were not included since they did not reflect the dominant ideology (ibid, pp. 126-127).

Randall (ibid, p. 234), also gives another example of providing control through music can be given from Iran’s modernization case, as the author puts it “westoxication”. That process had a substantial influence over all spheres of the music field at that time in Iran. A sort of Westernization with a “West is best” discourse, music education and music styles were used as a policy to re-designate Iranian society. Linked to that, since the ‘60s, “a new kind of commercial Iranian pop music emerged for the first time, with singers promoted by government-controlled broadcasting organization.” That style was an intended combination of Persian lyrics and Iranian melodies with components of Western pop music style. Googoosh, Haydeh, Mahasti, Ebi, and Dariush were among the most known “pop stars” of that period, who were constantly broadcasted and spread by the market.

Furthermore, Morag Josephine Grant’s article (2014) investigates music torture and introduces various pathways to it throughout the history of torture. In the beginning,

she gives the example of “sensory deprivation” used as a military strategy in the 1940s and 1950s (ibid, p. 1). This technique has a long history, she states, and definitely not reduced to the imposition of constant loud music playing on prisoners. Forced singing is another example used by Nazis in concentration camps. Not only in the Nazi Germany but also in Turkey, there are evidences of forced-singing as a mechanism of torturing (ibid, p. 9). An Amnesty International Report on torture that was published in 1985 in Turkey revealed, via the explanations of survivors, that the prisoners were obliged to sing marching songs when were taken outside before getting beaten. During those “airings” they were forced to sing for hours. Besides forced singing, linked to earlier traditions of military music-making, camp bands used to play during executions too. Moreover, in addition to the direct use of violence and discipline, humiliation and mockery were another pathway, such as “the flute of shame” used in the Medieval Era. It was:

a metal device with a hoop that is placed round the neck of the victim, whose hands are inserted into an opening in a long piece of metal protruding from it, much in the manner in which a musician would hold a clarinet, oboe, or recorder. The curved “bell” at the end of the instrument is only decoration: the instrument is not hollow and no sound is omitted from it. The screws the instrument features are not ornamental, however; presumably, they would be gradually tightened until the victim’s fingers were broken. (ibid, p. 11)

“Re-educative” method in which music was aimed to impose state ideology and doctrine to the resistant people until they were abused to the point where they could no longer exhibited any threat. Surely, there are other different examples and contexts in which various ways of using music as a torture operated in time. Yet these examples alone can give a strong idea how music and torture, and thus violence and discipline, can become intermingled in the hands of oppressive power mechanisms.

6.2.2 Music as resistance and protest

After having been mentioned many examples to show music as oppression, now I will give some other examples in the category of emancipation. Firstly, Love (2016, p. 40) speaks of rock Against Racism (RAR) and the Anti-Nazi League organized concerts in London, in 1976, and the prominent punk and reggae bands of that time played their songs. Those bands included the Clash too, and their song “White Riot” became a RAR anthem. RAR’s cause was to rebel against racism on working-class cultural, economic, and political level in Britain. She (ibid, p. 51) also tells that Racist skinhead musician

Ian Stuart referred to urban skinhead gangs' attitude and called them for vigilante violence and taking action against oppressive federal laws.

Besides, not only a song but also a whole music genre can symbolize resistance. For instance, According to Kurtiřođlu (2019, pp. 2-3):

Blues music from the United States was used to protest slavery in the United States. Reggae from Jamaica voiced resistance against the religious hegemony of the colonials, and rap and hip-hop from the United States continue to serve as forms of resistance against segregation in the urban sphere and to advocate for civil rights. Rap, reggae, and blues represent race-based forms of musical resistance.

Moreover, Fackler (2007), indicates that as opposite to the prescribed music playing in the camps, there occurred spontaneous singing among the prisoners. For instance, in an extermination camp called Majdanek, an inmate from the Operetta Theater in Vilna began to sing some arias, songs from operettas, and Ukrainian and Russian songs, which turned into a chorus with participation of others. Such spontaneous singing was easy, instant, and simple, and it did not draw attention. Yet the impact grown out of this practice was huge and diffusive in terms of creating a sense of being a community sticking together, particularly with the collective singing of familiar songs that everyone could identify themselves with. Moreover, local folk songs used to be sung as well, such as the Czech national anthem or the Jewish song "Hatikvah". The prisoners in Birkenau sang these songs while marching to the gas chamber.

Additionally, Dunaway (1987, p. 276), demonstrates that The American trade union movement were condensed in urban centers about the time of the Civil War, leading to the emergence of a labor culture that involved occupational protest songs addressing to wages, working conditions, and job accidents. 'The Mechanics Song', 'The Printers Song', and 'Fireman's Song' exemplify this trend. He (ibid, p. 275), also mentions when the widespread industrialization took place in New England in the early 1800s, child labor began to be an issue and some of the most well-known American factory ballads were made such as 'The Factory Girl'.

Another example is shown by Jamison (1998, p. 72), who indicates that in the '50s, folk song tradition gained a new character in mirroring the resistance raising from the Left in the US. It was rather hard for the folk song tradition to find its voice and impact, being challenged by the anti-communist front, especially until Joseph McCarthy died. Then, in the early 1950s, folk music began to find a space within popular culture with

the developments by Burl Ives and Harry Belafonte. However, most importantly, folk music became underground in college campuses and summer camps when, for instance, Pete Seeger was invited to perform while he was blacklisted by the mainstream media and the music industry. Out of that underground tradition, there emerged a new left-wing social formation with a sense of solidarity and common values. Later that tradition paved the way for new social movements of the 1950s and the 1960s.

6.3 Censorship of Music in Terms of Moral Consequences

After being mentioned different kinds of usages of music as power, now it is time to consider moral consequences of music in terms of its content. Even it was expressed that music should be autonomous in the fourth chapter, there must be an interference to music in minimum level. If we consider all kinds of music which is made and listened to under the name of freedom of expression, we might face with some songs which have immoral content and which might affect people negatively. That is to say, we must pose an ethical question to music and take harm caused by its moral content into consideration.

Some kinds of songs might influence people in a negative way in other words, we might allege that those songs having negative effects should be censored and banned, in that sense, censorship as a counterpower should be implemented to prevent harm which be in two different forms. The first one is happened if a composer compose a song and other people listen it. The second type of harm is the one we do on our own, in other words, our own existence can be harmed by us through music.

Some songs might cause to break off human relations. They also harm people's character; for example, they might make people selfish by having egocentric lyrics. Additionally, they might render people incline to commit a suicide, to harm themselves, to resort to violence. To illustrate, listeners of arabesque people in Turkey cut themselves with razor blade. Even if there is no such intention, listeners are affected in a way that they come to the point of harming themselves after listening it. Furthermore, there are some songs including condescending and humiliating phrases for women in their lyrics. Others have racist and discriminatory lyrics, or they might include hate speech which directly target someone or a group of people, and some others have anomalistic sexual content. For instance, if we ratify a song which praise

pedophilia, how can we be sure that this praise of sexual perversion will not affect children.

Because of these we must question the freedom of expression in music, namely, we must ask whether there should be a music including every subject and theme, in other words, we must question whether music should be free from interference. For example, if we say yes, then we pave the way for hate speech in music, or for example, we might even confront with songs having lyrics which ridicule Jewish, Romany, gay, disabled victims of the holocaust, people who exposed to violence, torture, rape, sexual harassment.

Moreover, as Posner (2006, p. 330) says, abstaining from *any* governmental interference cannot evade from subjectivity; and even this pushes us to the question whether a song which is obscene is an artwork or not. Nonetheless, it is open that if courts do whatever they want, then they raise doubts; yet, if we think that law is objective, then we can affirm that courts do not allow any governmental interference to music, that is to say, it cannot do those which are done in compliance with political purposes by it as well. However, everyone should bear in mind that laws cannot be considered without social norms and reality, it is unthinkable to separate them. On the other hand, we need laws to prevent harm caused by music too. We must acknowledge that even though courts' decisions are subjective, they can be a result of good judgement, if they are based on moral concerns. Accordingly, courts must ban those having immoral content that do harm people. However, we must consider that each incident has its own peculiar features, and courts must try to find the best moral way to overcome offensiveness and harm by placing importance to moral sensitivities, but at the same time they must pay attention to freedom of expression in music.

After having stated what kind of censorship should be implemented, now it is time to propound a new argument to indicate how music might provide guidance for politics. As far as we have seen, music is political by having always the ability of leading us, but this leading can be intentional or unintentional. If we look at the unintentional one, it is caused by the music itself. Even if music influence us by itself, it should steer us towards welfare, namely, it should serve for our own good and for our well-being. Hence, by looking some characteristics of music we might find which direction music might direct us. Now, I it is time to explicate these characteristics of music.

6.4 Music as a Source of Common Good

As is was mentioned before, according to Tolstoy's (1995) and Dewey's (1980), Small's (1998) and Becker's (1982) analyses, music is collective action and it generates communities, commonalities, agreements, cooperation and social solidarity. We might contend that these characteristics of music might represents the sense of common good which refers the good of all people who come together for same end.

In order to grip, how music symbolizes the sense of common good, it might be beneficial to state Aristotle's reflections. Although he does not use the phrase "common good" directly, we can interpret his understanding in this way, since he argues that common good precedes the good of an individual. Aristotle (Politics 1253b) claims that:

... a city-state is among the things that exist by nature, that a human being is by nature a political animal, and that anyone who is without a city-state, not by luck but by nature, is either a poor specimen or else superhuman.

What he tells is human beings are social animals by their very nature, they live together rather than living in isolation. They form associations, in that sense, communities are not comprised of people who aggregated for no reason. In other words, people does not come together arbitrarily and irrelevantly. In that sense, communities have aims. Moreover, he (Politics, 1253a) express that "the city-state is also PRIOR in nature to the household and to each of us individually, since the whole is necessarily prior to the part", a foot and a hand cannot function when they are separated from the body, so human beings function merely in a state, because they are only parts of the whole as a foot and a hand. Aristotle thinks that the good of the city is "greater and more complete" in terms of preserving and attaining, even if it is same both for a city and an individual. "For while the good of an individual is a desirable thing, what is good for a people or for cities is a nobler and more godlike thing" (NE, 1094b). What he stresses is that, all parts of the community function for the whole of the community in which people intentionally partake in and whose function is better for all its constituent members, and this function is serve for common good of these members.

At this juncture, we might ask how music symbolizes the sense of common good. We might assert some characteristics of music might betokens it because music is able to bring people together by itself by and being an instrument, it is a collective action, it

results from people's participation and when they participate they communicate, interact and have relations with other participants, and through participating collectively they become members of that community. In addition, it makes people to have commonalities since they share common experiences even though they do their own parts to generate it. Namely, as Becker (1982) implies for art, although there is "division of labor", "cooperation" always exist in music too, since they aim same end which is making music, by extension they work together for this common end. In this regard, the community it creates is not something pointless, since everyone does the same thing, which is participating in music. Additionally, as Small (1998, p. 218) underlines, there is "social solidarity" in music, since all participants aim is performing it. Furthermore, music constantly make participants to agree on "conventions", which they can also change together. These agreements also represents the characteristic of commonality of the community.

In the light of all these, we can assert that music might indicate us to attain the sense of common good by by being an collective action, cooperation and social solidarity, by requiring participation and agreements/conventions, and by generating relations, interactions, communications, common experiences and commonalities.

6.5 Music as a Source of Justice

Elaine Scarry (2001) touches upon the significance of the link between beauty as "fairness" and justice as "fairness" by deploying John Rawls' definition of fairness which is "symmetry of everyone's relations to each other" (as cited by Scarry, *ibid.*). She asserts that there is a causal relation between aesthetics and ethics, even she says that what they share is more than "analogy" because by pointing out the nature of beauty she remarks that beauty might pave the way for establishing justice.

Firstly, she points out some characteristics of beauty which are "symmetry", being "uneven", "equality", "self-sameness", and claims that we can perceive them through senses, and by means of perceiving we can build justice which cannot be perceived by senses. Namely, beauty brings it to life, "it presses on us to bring its counterpart into existence" (Scarry, *ibid.*, pp. 100).

Secondly, she underlines that justice is always produced by us, while beauty is "either natural or artifactual", this means, to her, beauty reminds us our power to create, "we

know where and how to locate those powers when a situation of injustice calls on us to create without itself guiding us, through pleasure, to our destination” (ibid, p. 115).

By gaining inspiration from her views, we might use a similar way and demonstrate some features of music to indicate that music can be a guidance for justice since it might also be perceived by senses and it might evoke us that we have power to create. We might claim that since music has harmony, by looking its harmony we might build harmony in society, and we might hinder conflicts, then we might establish justice. Firstly, we can perceive harmony in music and even in the singing of birds which sounds like music since it has a harmony by having same melody. Secondly, music can remind us that we can create justice since we are able to compose music and in nature, there are birdcalls.

In addition to these, apart from harmony which music has, there is also equality between musical notes. Namely, if we look at the musical notes, there is also no hierarchy between them. Notes are just sounds, and none of them are superior than others. They are equal. There is no valuation to make some of them superior and others inferior. In nature, there is no valuation, however, after people had started to live in a society, social stratification started as well. There has been inferior-superior relations with respect to race, ethnicity, religion, age, gender, and economic, social, educational levels. People make separations in terms of these and while they regard some people as inferior, they give more value to some others. If we remove such valuations for people, then everyone becomes equal. In that sense, we might consider musical notes as source of inspiration to eliminate inequality and bring equality, and thus, we can see it as a guiding light.

6.6 Music and Democracy

The characteristic of participation in music also means equal participation, in this regard, making music is a democratic action. Since democracy in music results in contribution of all parts by making them doing their full share of work. In a democratic governance, each members has a say in decision makings concerning all of them, they have equal rights to from these decisions. Here, we might consider music as a form of democracy because anyone as a support personal, a listener or a musician, who all make different kinds of contribution, has a right to produce music by participating in it equally. There is no hierarchy. As Small (1998, p. 207) denotes that “... all normally

endowed human beings are born with the gift of musicking, no less than they are born with the gift of speaking and understanding speech”.

6.7 Music as a Source of Freedom

If we remind Adorno’s (2002) view, art, including music has a value per se, and for this reason it has critical function inherently. For art, he claims “by crystallizing in itself as something unique to itself, rather than complying with existing social norms and qualifying as "socially useful," it criticizes society by merely existing”(*ibid*, pp. 225-226). He believes that the autonomy of art referring to its independence from society is in fact a “function of the bourgeois consciousness of freedom”, yet this does not mean that it is separated from society, it is contingent upon society (*ibid*, p.225). Therefore, autonomous music also amounts to the freedom in his understanding. By making use of Adorno’s analysis we can claim that music might be a source of freedom, but it does not mean that it should be used in politics to liberate. It can show this by its very nature, since it is itself critical and “deeply political” as it was mentioned in the previous chapter.

6.8 Conclusion

Under the guidance of Scarry’s, Tolstoy’s, Dewey’s, Small’s, Becker’s and Adorno’s views we may claim that by means of some characteristics of music might to direct us towards justice, freedom, democracy and common good. Since music has harmony as inherently, it might show us the way to build harmony in society, and prevent conflicts. Its characteristics might make us removed from egoism. It might make us to produce more dialog, deliberation and it might make us to participate in politics to have a democracy. It might render us unified.

To conclude, this chapter firstly emphasized that music is wielded by both those who hold power and those who exposed to power for political aims, therefore, it stressed that music is hand in and glove with politics. In line with its usage in politics, it was categorized as oppressive and emancipatory, and to show this in the second part many examples were given. In the third part, it was stated that to prevent harm there must be a censorship for those songs which have immoral content and which might influence people negatively. In the fourth section, by being wielded Scarry’s (2001), Tolstoy’s

(1995) and Dewey's (1980), Small's (1998), Becker's (1982), Adorno's (2002) thoughts it was accounted for justice, freedom, democracy and common good can be reached by means of several characteristics of music.





7. CONCLUSION

This thesis was replied the question of my research question of what makes music political, and it revealed the complex relations between music and politics, and also to indicated possible positive political values of music, so the first chapter firstly started with stating that lexical meanings, and giving necessary and sufficient conditions of music are not sufficient alone to define music, since it is indefinable, and therefore, it is an open concept. Since it does amount to an idea that everything can be music, in the second part, a cluster was wielded to demarcate it from other things and 10 criteria were given. In the third part, the function of music was questioned and alleged that by looking to history we cannot acquire a definition for music because its function have been changing for centuries. This part also showed the instrumentalization of music by handling music as a craft, and it denoted that music as a type of art can be both a means to ends and an end itself. The fourth part analyzed music as a type of art since there is a general inclination of accepting music as an art, and it tackled music as an imitation, as an expression and as an imagination respectively. Moreover, it was stated that because both music as an expression and as an imagination also refer communication which occurs in one's own selves this communication can also take place between individuals because by both being an end itself or as a means to ends music is a communication.

For this purpose, the second chapter indicated five different views in showing how music is a form of communication. Besides that, this chapter also underlined that those arguments were inadequate. That is why it was proposed and tried to strengthen the arguments that music is a power also by being a communication. In the first section, lexical meanings of communication was shown and approaches of Nelson Goodman (1978), Leo Tolstoy (1995) and John Dewey (1980) were used to demonstrate that music is a type of communication. Their conceptualizations and argumentations were analyzed, and it was emphasized that music as communication circulated and conveyed not only feelings but also experiences, moreover Christopher Small's (1998)

and Howard Becker's (1974) remarks were used to explain music production as a communication. It also discussed among whom the communication originates in music might occur, how it can take place within an individual too, and also it elaborated the complexity of the musical communication by wielding Bakhtin's (1984) term *polyphony*. In the third section, music as a constituent element of communities was elucidated by expressing Tolstoy's (1995), Dewey's (1980), Small's (1998) and Becker's (1974, 1982) analyses. Lastly, in the fourth part, it was asserted that music is a power due to being a communication, which might have been overlooked by those thinkers. Hence, the concept of power should be clarified to understand what is meant by saying that music is a power.

By extension the third chapter pointed out that music is a power because it was a communication, and thus the concept of power was analyzed by deploying various figures' views in order to understand what sort of characteristics music possessed due to being a form of power. It was also brought about that if somebody attempted to influence and manipulate another's decisions through music by affecting their mood, then music necessarily was political. In the first part, the ever-presence of music was mentioned. Linked to that, the reason behind its indispensability and the basis of its power were interrogated. In the second part, concerning the complexity of power, the concept of power was analyzed in detail by making use of prominent thinkers related to the issue. It was demonstrated that the properties of the notion of power could be observed in music too in terms of generating both oppression and resistance. In the third part, it was stated that censoring music which can be done by people, some private institutions, corporations and political authorities, is a counterpower or resistance to music. The fourth and final part was aimed to disclose the fact that music as a power causes power relations, and for this reason it is political by its very nature, mainly because power and power relation are necessarily related to politics. This relationship was described. Since there are two main forms of politics, of the self and the people, it was emphasized that the way music used could work at these two levels as well. Finally, another classification was made that there were two types of relationships between music and politics, that is the politics in music and music in politics.

Correspondingly the fourth chapter firstly, explained what is meant by politics of music and power relation within music, and it demonstrated that even if music is an end in itself, there is power relation embedded in music as some groups determine the

value of music. Linked to that, the second part tackled those groups. Therefore, the second part called upon the analyses of Arthur Danto (1964), George Dickie (2001), Howard Becker (1974, 1982), Pierre Bourdieu (1984) and Dick Hebdige (1979). In the third part, firstly, music market, and then, the state-based institutions were discussed. In music market section, the analysis of Walter Benjamin (1968) was used to show the reproducibility of music, and Theodor Adorno's and Max Horkheimer's (2002) analysis of "Culture Industry" was wielded, and it was asked whether there is musical fetishism or not, and also popular/mass music was mentioned by wielding Noël Carroll's (1997) remarks. Lastly, Theodor Adorno's (1980, 2002) analysis was deployed to clarify autonomous music and it was asserted that music should be autonomous rather than being committed for it has a value in itself.

The fifth chapter at first underlined that both the power-holders and the ones who were subjected to that power used music, and thus music and politics were inseparable. Regarding this double-sided use of music within politics, it mentioned two types of usage that are oppressive and emancipatory. Secondly, and related to the two usages of music in politics, it gave various examples of oppressive and emancipatory cases. In the third part, the necessity of censorship in music based on moral consequences was underlined because by having immoral content music might harm people. In the fourth section, Tolstoy's (1995) and Dewey's (1980), Small's (1998), Becker's (1982), Scarry's (2001) and Adorno's (2002) ideas were benefited in arguing that justice, freedom, democracy, and common good might be achieved through some characteristics of music. However, it does not mean that music should be used in politics by making people to listen to it. On the contrary, it should be autonomous rather than being committed. What it is claimed is that since it has several characteristics inherently, by looking them we might find a way to reach those concepts stated above.

After having told all these, we can say that music has begun to be used as an instrument more than ever since after it had started to be reproduced music has become more and committed, and it has turned into something that we listen to irrespective of our desire. We are listened to music without our permission through mass media. Today we come across with music everywhere, yet we are compelled to listen music by without being asked to whether we give consent to listen it. It is not up to our choice. Accordingly we have become a society of listeners, this claim here asserted by making use of the

term “the society of spectacle” coined by Guy Debord (1995), since in modern capitalist society we are being mediated by not only images, but also music. Like images/spectacle, music is also disseminated, and it produce incorrect realities, so what we listen is the reflection of the society which is erroneous and which shapes our mind in distortive way. It demands “passive acceptance” in which there is no “reply” (ibid, p. 15). Likewise, our exposure to music takes shape in similar way, it is presented to us and we just listen it instead of rejecting or even questioning. It is used to affect people’s actions, behaviors, thoughts. We can assert that the power of music is, in fact, symbolic since using music for steering people towards certain directions is a “symbolic power”, and even we can call it is a “symbolic violence” in Bourdieu’s (1991, 1984) sense. Since there is no difference between use of physical force and making one to listen music, which impose a message, to do something. It means we do what they want by force. Moreover, it is already a real physical and psychological violence, and also, it is used to oppress, control, to manipulate, etc. As a result, this thesis argued against committed music, which is used for other ends, and it defends autonomous music. If music’s aesthetic value is defended, then listening to music only depends on one’s willingness and effort, since no one uses music as a means to influence people.

In the beginning of the thesis, it was asked that what makes music political, and this thesis responded this question by claiming since even by being an end itself music can be a power, therefore it is political. However, it is already a power by being an instrument, and it is used by everyone to influence others. Moreover, it was asked also two more questions which are what constitute political value of music, and what constitute aesthetic value of music. Since music is used as an instrument, its value changes when the aims it serves for changes. We can say that when music is used as oppression, manipulation, social control, discipline, propaganda, violence and torture then it represents some anti-democratic cases, injustice, dependency and egocentrism which constitute its negative political values. However, as it was explained music is social by its very nature, and it generates communities, commonalities, conventions, cooperation, social solidarity. These all might steer us to the sense of common good. Moreover, there is harmony in music, so by looking to it we can construct harmony in the society, we might prevent conflicts. In addition, there are no hierarchy between musical notes, they are equal, hence, we can benefit from this characteristics of music

to bring equality to the society. Music also can be guide us to bring democracy, since there is equal participation off all parts in music, and also music might lead us to freedom by being an end itself. Hence, we can assert that common good, justice, democracy and freedom might be positive political values of music.

We might claim that while music contributes politics, politics also contributes music, when we reconsider democracy-participation relation stated above, moreover, by looking justice-harmony relation and participation-democracy relation between music and politics we might make new definitions. Hence, there might be further researches concerning new definitions for democracy and justice under the guidance of aforementioned characteristics of music.





REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., & Rabinbach, A. G.** (1975). Culture industry reconsidered. *New German Critique*, (6), 12-19.
- Adorno, T., Benjamin, W., Bloch, E., Brecht, B., & Lukács, G.** (1980). *Aesthetics and politics*. Verso Books.
- Adorno, T. W.** (1985). On the Fetish Character in Music. In A. Arato & E. Gebhardt (Eds.), *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader* (pp. 270-299). Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Adorno, T. W.** (2002). Society. In G. Adorno & R. Tiedemann (Eds.) & R. Hullot-Kentor (Trans.), *Aesthetic Theory (Athlone contemporary European thinkers)* (pp. 225-261). Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Adorno, T. W.** (2005). *Minima moralia: Reflections on a damaged life*. Verso.
- Aristotle.** (2004). *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*. R. Crisp (Ed.). Cambridge University Press
- Aristotle, ., & Reeve, C. D. C.** (1998). *Politics*. Indianapolis, Ind: Hackett Pub.
- Attali, J.** (1985). Noise: The Political Economy of Music, trans. *Brian Massumi*, *University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis*, 191-3.
- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S.** (1962). Two faces of power. *American political science review*, 56(4), 947-952.
- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S.** (1963). Decisions and nondecisions: An analytical framework. *American political science review*, 57(3), 632-642.
- Bakhtin, M.,** (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed&Trans. Emerson, C. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota
- Becker, H. S.** (1974). Art As Collective Action. *American Sociological Review*, 767-776.
- Becker H. S.** (1982). *Art worlds. Berkeley et Los Angeles, California UP.*
- Benjamin, W.** (1968). *Illuminations*. edited by hannah arendt. translated by h. Zohn. *new york: schocken*.
- Bourdieu, P.** (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* R. Nice, Trans. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P.** (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P.** (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*. Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P.** (1996). *The rules of art: Genesis and structure of the literary field*. Stanford University Press.

- Carroll, N.** (1997). The ontology of mass art. *The journal of aesthetics and art criticism*, 55(2), 187-199.
- Chiang, T. J., & Posner, R. A.** (2006). Censorship versus Freedom of Expression in the Arts. *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, 1, 309-335.
- Collingwood, R. G.** (1958). *The principles of art* (Vol. 11). Oxford University Press.
- Dahl, R. A.** (1957). The concept of power. *Behavioral science*, 2(3), 201-215.
- Danto, A.** (1964). The artworld. *The journal of philosophy*, 61(19), 571-584.
- Davies, S.** (2001). Definitions of art. *The Routledge companion to aesthetics*, 169-179.
- Davies, S.** (2001). Definitions of Art. In B. Gaut & D. M. Lopes (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Aesthetics* (pp. 169-179).
- Dewey, J.**, (1980). *Art as Experience*. New York: Perigee Books.
- Dickie, G.** (2001), *Art and Value*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dunaway, D. K.** (1987). Music and politics in the United States. *Folk Music Journal*, 5(3), 268-294.
- Elias, N.** (2000). *Mozart: Bir Dahinin Sosyolojisi Üzerine* (Y.Tükel, trans.). İstanbul: Kabalıcı Yayınevi.
- Eren, O.** (2017). *Türkiye’de Protest Müzik Alt Alanı – Kardeş Türküler Örneği* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Eyerman, R., & Jamison, A.** (1998). *Music and social movements: Mobilizing traditions in the twentieth century*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fackler, G.** (2007). *Music in concentration camps 1933-1945*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Publishing, University of Michigan Library.
- Kania, A.** (2011). Definition. In T. Gracyk & A. Kania (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy and Music* (pp. 4-13).
- Kurtişoğlu, B.** (2019). Resistance. In J. Sturman (Ed.), *The SAGE International Encyclopedia of Music and Culture* (pp. 2-3). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483317731.n606>
- Kutluk, F.** (2018). *Müzik ve Politika*. İstanbul: H2O Kitap
- Léveillé Gauvin, H.** (2018). Drawing listener attention in popular music: Testing five musical features arising from the theory of attention economy. *Musicae Scientiae*, 22(3), 291-304.
- Foucault, M.** (1982). The subject and power. *Critical inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Foucault, M., & Rabinow, P.** (1984). *The Foucault Reader*.
- Garratt, J.** (2018). *Music and Politics: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781139505963

- Gaut, B.** (2005). The cluster account of art defended. *The British Journal of Aesthetics*, 45(3), 273-288.
- Goodman, N.** (1978). *Ways of worldmaking* (Vol. 51). Hackett Publishing.
- Grant, M. J.** (2014). Pathways to music torture. *Transposition. Musique et Sciences Sociales*, (4).
- Hebdige, D.** (1979). *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. New York: Methuen.
- Heywood, A.** (2004). *Political Theory an Introduction* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hirsch, L. E. (2012).** *Music in American crime prevention and punishment*. University of Michigan Press.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W.** (2002). The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception. In G. S. Noerr (Ed.), *Dialectic Of Enlightenment* (pp. 94-136).
- Kristeller, P. O.** (1951). The modern system of the arts: A study in the history of aesthetics part I. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 496-527.
- Love, N. S.** (2016). *Trendy fascism: White power music and the future of democracy*. SUNY Press.
- Lukes, S.** (2005). *Power: A radical view*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marx, K.** (1982). *Capital Vol. I "Section "The Fetishism of the Commodity and its Secret."* pp. London: Penguin Press. 125-178.
- Millett, K.** (2000). *Sexual Politics*. University of Illinois Press.
- Morriss, P.** (2002). *Power: a philosophical analysis*. Manchester University Press.
- Plato.** (1997). Laws. In Plato, *Complete Works* (pp. 1318-1616). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Plato.** (1997). Republic. In Plato, *Complete Works* (pp. 971-1223). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Plato.** (1997). Symposium. In Plato, *Complete Works* (pp. 457-505). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Randall, A. J.** (Ed.). (2005). *Music, power, and politics*. Routledge.
- Said, E. W.** (2008). *Music at the Limits*. Columbia University Press.
- Scarry, E.** (2001). *On Beauty and Being Just*. Princeton University Press.
- Sigurjonsson, N.** (2005, July). Young Audience Development and Aesthetics: John Dewey's Pragmatist Philosophy and its Implications for Orchestra Management. In 8th International Conference on Arts and Cultural Management, Montréal, Canada.
- Small, C.** (1998). *Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening*. Wesleyan University Press.

- Tekelioğlu, O.** (1996). The rise of a spontaneous synthesis: the historical background of Turkish popular music. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 32(2), 194-215.
- Tracey, N.** (n.d.). Music and Social Justice. In *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Illinois: Lewis University
- Tolstoy, Leo.** 1995. [1897]. What is Art? Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (trans).
- URL-1** Music. (2019). In Cambridge Dictionary. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/music>
- URL-2** Music. (2019). In Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/music>
- URL-3** Music. (2019). In Merriam-Webster's online dictionary. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/music>
- URL-4** Muzak. (n.d.). In Collins English Dictionary. Retrieved from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/muzak>
- URL-5** Communication. (2019). In Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/communication>
- URL-6** Communication. (2019). In Merriam-Webster's online dictionary. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/communication>
- Weitz, M.** (1956). The role of theory in aesthetics. *The Journal of aesthetics and art criticism*, 15(1), 27-35
- West, M. L.** (1992). *Ancient greek music*. Clarendon Press.

CURRICULUM VITAE



Name Surname : Ece Denizli

Place and Date of Birth : İstanbul, 21.08.1990

E-Mail : denizli.ece@gmail.com

EDUCATION :

- **B.Sc.** : 2015, Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Arts and Science, Sociology Department

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND REWARDS:

- July- August 2009 DHMİ Research Planning and Coordination Department