

Article received on 20th February 2011
Article accepted on 18th November 2011
UDK: 78(438)"1960/1970"

*Bogumila Mika**

University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland
Department of Fine Art and Music
Institute of Music

NOVELTY IN POLISH MUSIC AVANT-GARDE DISCUSSIONS IN THE LATE 1960s AND EARLY 1970s

Abstract: In this paper, I aim to describe the ongoing discussion in the late 1960s and early 1970s on the pages of the Polish musical press concerning the category of ‘novelty’. This appellation, the consequence of progress, together with experiments in the main value of modernity, lost its meaning with the passage of time, as a result of reintroducing, in newly composed pieces, the heritage and traditional values. Outstanding Polish critics, in their articles raised the issues of the function of avant-garde art, of its new relation to the listener, of creative experimentation, all of which constitute the category of ‘novelty’.

Key words: avant-garde in art, novelty, experiment, innovations, serialism, aleatorism, happening, relation between composer and listener

Апстракт: Циљ овог рада је да опише дискусију о категорији “новине” која се крајем 1960-их и почетком 1970-их година водила у пољској музичкој штампи.

Како је време пролазило, услед развоја у правцу поновног увођења наслеђа и традиционалних вредности у новонастајућа дела, ова одредница губила је своје

* Author contact information: mikabogumila@gmail.com

значење. Истакнути пољски критичари у својим радовима поставили су питања која су се тичала улоге авангардне уметности, њеног новог односа према слушаоцу, стваралачког експеримента, свега онога што је одређивало категорију “новине”.

Кључне речи: авангарда у уметности, новина, експеримент, иновације, серијализам, алеаторика, хепенинг, однос композитора и слушаоца

Introduction

The reception of the avant-garde in Poland began, it is commonly agreed, in 1956, with the first ‘Warsaw Autumn Festival’, and consisted of two phases. The first phase – lasting ten years, more or less until 1966 – was the most important, as during this phase Polish listeners became acquainted with such avant-garde innovations as punctualism, serialism, aleatory music from the Darmstadt and New-York theoretical (or compositional) schools, with concrete music (*Musique concrète*), and with electronic music from studios in Paris and Cologne.¹ For the first time in Poland, audiences heard music written by the masters of dodecaphony, by Edgar Varèse, Olivier Messiaen, Pierre Schaeffer, Pierre Boulez, Henri Pousseur, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Luigi Nono, Luciano Berio, Luigi Dallapiccola, Iannis Xenakis, and John Cage.

The second phase of avant-garde’s reception in Poland began in 1966 with the *St. Luke Passion* by Penderecki. In this piece, the composer recalled the heritage and values of traditional music and, at the same time, innovations from a synthesis of avant-garde experiments and values.² The end of avant-garde reception in Poland and the clear return to musical tradition was around 1976.³ In this highly symbolic year, as well, crucial works of the ‘generation’33’ composers were written: *First violin concerto* by Penderecki, *III Symphony* by Górecki and *Kościelec 1909* by Kilar, works in which critics see a turning away from the avant-garde.⁴

In articles published in the Polish musical press in the late 1960s and early 1970s, readers can also deduce signs of a turning point from the affirmative re-

¹ Zbigniew Skowron, ‘Recepcje postaw i programów awangardowych w powojennej muzyce polskiej’ [‘Reception of attitudes and avant-garde’s programs in Polish music composed after the Second World War’], in: Krzysztof Droba, Teresa Malecka, Krzysztof Szwa-jgier (ed.), *Muzyka polska 1945-1995* [*Polish Music 1945-1995*], Kraków, Akademia Muzyczna, 1996, 72.

² *Ibid.*, 76.

³ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁴ Zygmunt Mycielski, ‘Otwarcie XXI „Warszawskiej Jesieni” ’ [‘Opening of the 21st Warsaw Autumn Festival’], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1977, 22, 4.

ception of the avant-garde. The broad discussion on the pages of *'Ruch Muzyczny'*⁵ concerned the function of avant-garde art, its new relationship with the listener, creative experimentation, all of which constitute the category of 'novelty'. These issues were described by outstanding Polish critics like: Zygmunt Mycielski (1907-1987), Stefan Kisielewski (1911-1991), Bohdan Pocij (b. 1933), Marian Wallek-Walewski (1934-1988) and Krystyna Tarnawska-Kaczorowska (1933-2005). A few texts which I selected for this paper constitute a representative body of the published commentary.

Mycielski: New Function of Art

Let us start with Zygmunt Mycielski who in 1967 criticised the sizable body of pieces which were only nominally 'acoustic', using instead graphic construction, visual gestures and other 'objects musicaux'. They served to fan the flame of curiosity in listeners, not to create an aesthetic experience. "Maybe the function of art had shifted?"⁶ – the critic said, going on to suggest that the true reason for the change was a philosophy represented by the composer himself and not the philosophy of art, understood as the purpose of his creative activity. As long as the only aim is to resolve a technical or workshop problem, art will become a 'clanging cymbal',⁷ concluded Mycielski. The intention of the artist, but not the theme taken as a work of art, has fundamental value.

Four years later, in 1971, Mycielski wrote even more strongly: "There is nothing good coming from a composition in which sound prevails over music. The system is decidedly upside-down."⁸ The critic paid attention to the erosion of the fundamental ratios (elements) of the musical work, especially of the melody (the crisis in that aspect had already started in the 19th century). He pointed out the tendency to replace melody with, as a primary characteristic, texture (colour), especially in sonorism. Different orchestras, tuned and 'out of tune' instruments, percussion and things emitting strange tones being treated as musical building blocks meant it became difficult to identify the real source of the sound.

Musical modes and scales were enriched and the dynamic scale was extended to hitherto unknown extents. Still, Mycielski stressed, the most distinct change

⁵ *'Ruch Muzyczny'* is the most notable Polish music journal published fortnightly from 1945 in Warsaw.

⁶ Z. Mycielski, 'Pielgrzymując do stóp XXI "Warszawskiej Jesieni"' ['Pilgrimizing to the food of the 21st Warsaw Autumn Festival'], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1967, 21, 15.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁸ Z. Mycielski, 'Piętnaście międzynarodowych festiwali w Warszawie' ['Fifteen international festivals in Warsaw'], *Ruch Muzyczny* 1971, 22, 4.

took place in the function of art linked with the (composer's and performer's) creative fancy. In the avant-garde, both were considered of an equal weight.

The new answer to the question: "why should something be played?" at the time allowed unlimited space for experimentation, dictated solely to individual choice and ingenuity. Of paramount importance was that "whatever sb *can* do, sb is allowed to do; whatever sb *can* invent..."⁹ The composer's chosen and outlined plan dictated which instruments played, for how long, on (more or less) which pitches, how loudly, and the result was work that became a testimony to the talent of the composer or to the composer's lack of talent.

New pieces, aleatoric or written in 'open form' ('mobile' or 'polyvalent') quickly revealed their secrets; they informed the listener 'how they are done', they revealed their system. However, in that moment of revelation, these pieces' informational and inspirational facets cease. New pieces – often amazingly 'static' – were able to amaze connoisseurs, organizers, and the public¹⁰ – wrote Mycielski. Though he declared his distance from judging these phenomena, his descriptions attempted to persuade the reader that such new functions of the art (or functions of new art) were, for the critic, controversial matters.

Zieliński: Novelty at Any Price

In the columns of *Ruch Muzyczny* in 1969, Tadeusz A. Zieliński strongly criticised the phenomenon of the avant-garde and of "novelty at any price". In discussing the *Warsaw Autumn Festival* he took issue with rejecting tradition, convention, and craft as indispensable conditions and, instead, settled for an emerging 'new art'. He asked whether accepting a new and not banal concept should trump even the most perfect solutions in the range of tested existing concepts.

Can novelty stand as an absolute value, beyond the good and the bad, or can it also be subjected to selection and evaluation?¹¹ Zieliński declared himself for selection and valuation with regard to innovation, asserting that an idea can only increase the value of a work of art, it cannot serve as 'the source' of its value.¹²

Kisielewski: New Clothes for Music

The next article I will consider was written by Stefan Kisielewski in 1970 and entitled „Avant-garde or helplessness”.¹³ This piece considered a wide spec-

⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹¹ Tadeusz A. Zieliński, 'Jesienne konfrontacje' ['Autumn's confrontations'], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1969, 23, 10.

¹² *Ibid.*, 12.

¹³ Stefan Kisielewski, 'Awangarda czy bezsilność' ['Avant-garde or helplessness'], *Ruch Muzyczny* 1970, 13, 10-13.

trum of avant-garde's phenomena. Among the issues which the author deals with was the notion that 'art' may be derived from the word 'artificial' in relation to such notions as convention or stereotype. He asked "why art should not be 'artificial', since such had been its preliminary assumption?"¹⁴ (*art stems etymologically from artificiel*). He further argued that 'artificiality' is a solely human attribute, not an attribute of nature, and that a human will never be free from all conventions, "because convention is man's way of perceiving the world, that is the world 'filtered' through the man."¹⁵ Convention gives, approves the man (human being),¹⁶ and every attempt to 'leave himself' – transcend one's humanity – "is outside our perception of the world and, thus, would be an illusion."¹⁷

Kisielewski also pointed out that the transition from serialism to aleatorism and from punctualistic precision to the indefinite liberty of happening was not an evolution at all, but simply "a jump into extreme dissimilarity in quality".¹⁸ Schoenberg's revolution (conservative) and Cage's revolution (anarchistic) stand separated by an abyss. Schoenberg, as a 'scrupulous legislator', wanted only to "replace the old code by a new one",¹⁹ but Cage rejected all codes – old and new – "in the name of liberty and natural truth, questioning the usefulness of all formal-sound codifications".²⁰

Kisielewski called the reader's attention to the new role of the composer and his lifestyle, especially "the lack of solitude from which 'greatness is born', and the substitution of spying, distrust, envy, the 'auction of ideas' instead"²¹, which did not promote personal creative greatness.²² Creative effort very often was limited to the idea of a 'conceptual nature' to initiative, and so limited creativity to a minimum.

Nowadays, the composer did not claim to say anything new that was uniquely his own, and did not guide or direct or focus the audience's concentration²³ – emphasised Kisielewski. Instead, the act of performing, and the listener's reaction, decide the significance of the musical work. Since the group of listeners very often is made up of 'long-hairs', which means the youth, who want to incite revolution but do not know against what and through what means to revolt.²⁴ The long-haired

¹⁴ Ibid., 10.

¹⁵ Ibid., 10.

¹⁶ Ibid., 10.

¹⁷ Ibid., 10.

¹⁸ Ibid., 11.

¹⁹ Ibid., 11.

²⁰ Ibid., 11.

²¹ Ibid., 11.

²² Ibid., 11.

²³ Ibid., 11.

²⁴ Ibid., 11.

youth is a group not necessarily ‘intellectually deeply prepared’, it is a group that easily absorbs shallow content, superficial generalities like ‘humanity’, ‘liberty’, ‘sex’, and ‘pacifism’, and ‘the demagogic or obscure’.²⁵

Kisielewski admitted that he had once supported the avant-garde. He had fought persistently for liberty in creative and multidimensional experiments, but had come to see a distinct crisis in the musical avant-garde, including, among other issues, the ‘confusion of the notions which characterize it and the fact that the avant-garde composer doesn’t want to stand out from his peers by saying something special or personal’.²⁶ Kisielewski regards the avant-garde as a manifestation of the helplessness of art, as a path leading nowhere, and asks whether the avant-garde may be only a short-lived fad that expresses itself in merely external gestures.

As a conservatist and traditionalist, he closed this article by postulating ‘new clothes for music’²⁷ as a restoration of musical form and a new constructivism. He proposed “remaining within the cultural traditions of our side of the world, joined, however, with a trial renewal of musical creativity”.²⁸ He proposed ‘a fight for a new form’.²⁹ He writes, finally: “We propose a motto: a form as a value, generally intellectual; the rehabilitation of conventions as a way of interpersonal agreement, with full rights in the domain called ‘art’ (Remember that „*art* came from *artificiel*).”³⁰

In the next article written in 1970, called “Many years later”, Kisielewski again raised the issue of the development or stagnation of music. He claimed to observe at that time the process of the death of music, which he regarded as a historical process, as a consequence of such long-lived processes as: the disintegration and reduction of melody, its replacement by differentiated and complicated rhythmic structures, the abolition of tonality, the accumulation of dissonance and the effacement of their mutual emotional effect. “There is history that builds, and there is history that destroys, in the ordinary course of things. So, this is the end, people!”³¹ – Kisielewski exclaimed. The activity of the avant-garde he described as a ‘huge building site’.³² In his conclusion, the critic prompted readers to consider what had been the main reason for interest in the avant-garde’s novelty: there

²⁵ Ibid., 11.

²⁶ Ibid., 11.

²⁷ Ibid., 13.

²⁸ Ibid., 13.

²⁹ Ibid., 13.

³⁰ Ibid., 13.

³¹ S. Kisielewski, ‘Po wielu latach’ [‘Many years later’], *Ruch Muzyczny* 1970, 22, 6.

³² Ibid., 7.

is an intellectual inducement given by avant-garde music; it is “a brain which orders interest in the avant-garde, because ideas and concepts are much more interesting for the brain than are sounds”.³³ The brain’s excitement, for example, with the ‘paradoxical ideas of Cage’³⁴ is opposed to the need to listen to good music.

Kisielewski also focused the reader’s attention on the confusion prevailing within the avant-garde itself, and to the lack of distinct leaders (coryphaeus) or ideological leaders for the movement. Even the program booklet of the *Warsaw Autumn Festival*, in which one can read different composers’ statements, did not resolve the confusion over this problem. Some of the composers declared that their pieces were based on mathematical, super-logical rules; others claimed quite the opposite, that their works were the result of accidental trial and performers’ invention. The result in both cases, he said, was similar: “quite insipid chaos diversified sometimes by extreme orchestral colour”.³⁵ Therefore, it was impossible to know what rules replaced the old stereotypes of the organization of sounds.³⁶ As a result, there was nothing possible in the old manner, and in the new manner nothing was known.³⁷ Chaos reigned on this ‘huge avant-garde building site’,³⁸ and “a common result of these divergent endeavors seems to be uncertain, and the renewal of musical art after the Great Crash of all traditions – illusory”.³⁹

The fad for avant-garde and the destruction of the old order led music to an impasse: “it is certain [...] that something that was destroyed is difficult and impossible to rebuild. There is no way back”⁴⁰ – said Kisielewski. By the end of the 1960s, the fashion of the avant-garde is:

the fashion of riot against musical form; of replacing sound with gesture; replacing discipline and order with a shapeless expressive lack of self-control; the fad for poetic haircuts, not-always-sightly beards; the fashion for unmatched clothes.⁴¹

These musical and cultural arguments stand against Kisielewski’s ideals. He admitted that he was well on in years, but his distance from the avant-garde has, undeniably, the value of ‘sharp vision’: “from the position of a ‘foreigner’, one often able to see more clearly and distinctly[...]”⁴². It must be remembered that

³³ Ibid., 7.

³⁴ Ibid., 7.

³⁵ Ibid., 7.

³⁶ Ibid., 7.

³⁷ Ibid., 7.

³⁸ Ibid., 7.

³⁹ Ibid., 7.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 8.

⁴¹ Ibid., 8.

⁴² Ibid., 8.

conflict with a constantly changing world and conflict with youth is as old as the world, belonging almost to humanity's ritual – Kisielewski emphasized. He further stressed: "However, I believe (*contra spem spero*), that the world will return to the norm and music – to the form."⁴³

Pociejj: Avant-garde and Revolution

Bohdan Pocij, in his article 'Sense of avant-garde',⁴⁴ published in 1970, directed readers' attention to the similarities between the avant-garde movement and a revolution. Both are born of fanatic faith in a 'new order', a 'new system', a 'new structure', a 'new reality', one which will emerge after the destruction of an old order. Therefore the avant-garde and a revolution have in common a strong faith in the redemptive sense of destruction. Whether or not one accepts this premise, from that very moment, revolutions are an organic (indispensable) component of history. Also of the history of art⁴⁵ – wrote Pocij.

In the same article, Pocij revealed his personal attitude towards the avant-garde: he ceased to be its defender. From that time, he called attention to both the positive and negative sides of the avant-garde, finding a preponderance of the latter. He admitted to finding more cause for fear than for joy in the contemporary avant-garde.⁴⁶ No longer an enthusiast of what in music was 'importantly new', Pocij was repelled by its inauthenticity, its bulk and anonymity. On the other hand, he found appealing everything in the avant-garde that was

a real impetus toward liberty [...], all authenticity and individuality, each manifestation of creative personality, [...], everything, in short, that is rare, elaborate, unusual, or in which [...] new values appeared.⁴⁷

Pocij distinguished between the *Warsaw-Autumn's* inclusion of two kinds of avant-garde works: 'black' and 'white'. To him, 'black avant-garde' seemed empty, poor, boring, droll battles with the 'old values' of music, works which exemplified a 'creative decline', whose authors were "musicians who composed as if they wanted to destroy music".⁴⁸ He wrote:

This decomposition of music could give joy only to the foolish, or to the crazy, or to somebody who generally hates art. This festival is embarrassed and illustrates a manifestation of pathology in contemporary art.⁴⁹

⁴³ Ibid., 8.

⁴⁴ Bohdan Pocij, 'Sens awangardy' ['Sense of avant-garde'], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1970, 22, 3-5.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 4.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 4.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 4.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 4.

Pociey classified as ‘white’ (positive) avant-garde those presentations that evidenced a kind of artistic provocation, that brought to light some kind of a parody, that kept the public amused. Such parody saves art from self-admiration, from narcissism. Each time, “it was the redemptive and animating ‘chuckle’, that brought us back to earth and gave us new energy”,⁵⁰ observed Pociey. Still in the same article, Pociey discussed the level of provocation music offered; he considered it a manifestation or symptom of a “serious illness which destroys our culture”,⁵¹ with deeply hidden sources. This propensity might even be “part of the ‘corrupted’ nature of man, of his inclination to go astray, in his despair, in his isolation, in his solitude⁵² – the critic mused.”

Tarnawska-Kaczorowska: The Label ‘Avant-garde’

Krystyna Tarnawska-Kaczorowska, in her article “Rearguard and avant-garde”,⁵³ published in 1972 pointed out that

not all novelty deserves the term “avant-garde”, in the same way that not all experiments with instruments make their creator a member of the vanguard (or literally *the advance guard* = the foremost part of an army)⁵⁴

The label ‘avant-garde’ can be a clever quibble in each case that music presents obvious difficulties in value and classification; but also, then, when historical perspective plays only an insignificant role in the composition.

Tarnawska-Kaczorowska described the artistic phenomena of the final years of the 1960s and the early 1970s as a ‘musical marketplace’.⁵⁵ The label ‘avant-garde’ was given to musical pieces of varying artistic value, to composers who wrote not only ‘works of art’ but also ‘sound tricks’.⁵⁶

Tarnawska-Kaczorowska also took up the issue of the relationship between avant-garde music and tradition. She noticed that such features as novelty, individualism, inventiveness, creative quests and worries were highly valued. But the listener – a connoisseur, hopefully – would not accept the superficial, but only fresh, unique, unrepeatable, ingenious references to tradition and to exemplars from past eras. The critic emphasised:

⁵⁰ Ibid., 5.

⁵¹ Ibid., 5.

⁵² Ibid., 5.

⁵³ Krystyna Tarnawska-Kaczorowska, ‘Ariergarda i awangarda’ [‘Rearguard and avant-garde’], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1972, 11, 7-8.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 7.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 7.

⁵⁶ There is a play on words in Polish: ‘sztuka = art’ and ‘sztuczka = sound trick

The values and uses to which the rearguard put them incite our respect, but only on condition that such a strategy will not become dull traditionalism.⁵⁷

Tarnawska-Kaczorowska also proposed to reserve the label ‘avant-garde’ exclusively for these composers who opened “wide horizons, fruitful perspectives and new worlds”.⁵⁸ The term should become an honorable distinction and not an ambiguous label.⁵⁹

Wallek-Walewski: Novelty and Progress

For our considerations, the article by Marian Wallek-Walewski “Novelty as a criterion of valuation of the work of art”⁶⁰ published in 1968, was especially important. In this text, the author analysed ‘novelty’ from a logical point of view and from the historical aspect of the work itself. Wallek-Walewski started with the problem of the twofold interpretation of the category of ‘novelty’: first, as something that did not previously exist; and second, as something different from what existed heretofore.⁶¹ He drew the reader’s attention to the fact that in everyday thinking ‘novelty’ is often connected with such categories as ‘progress’ and ‘originality’, or may even be synonymous with them.⁶²

He stressed the ambiguity of those terms, which makes it very difficult to decide, in each case, whether ‘progress’ or context determines ‘originality’.⁶³ The key point in Wallek-Walewski’s article was the consideration of ‘novelty’ in the context of the historical aspect of art. Here, the author asserted that the term ‘novelty’ is of little use, because it usually pertains to only a short period in the history of art, immediately after its emergence.⁶⁴ Novelty passes with time, with fashion, and the value of a work of art is historically adjudicated.⁶⁵ ‘Timeless values’ can be a form of camouflage to describe ‘static current values’.⁶⁶ Wallek-Walewski stressed that a criterion of ‘novelty’ plays no role in evaluating the connection of a given musical work within the era to which it belongs. These connections are

⁵⁷ K. Tarnawska-Kaczorowska, op. cit., 8.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 8.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 8.

⁶⁰ Marian Wallek-Walewski, ‘Nowość jako kryterium wartości dzieła sztuki’ [‘Novelty as a criterion of valuation of the work of art’], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1968, 23, 3-4.

⁶¹ Ibid., 3.

⁶² Ibid., 4.

⁶³ Ibid., 4.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 4.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 4.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 4.

linked with historically factually ambivalent criteria.⁶⁷ In conclusion, the critic pointed out that the term ‘novelty’, independently of what meaning we would give to this term, cannot be a criterion for evaluating a work of art.⁶⁸ He reflected, that designations of ‘novelty’ applied to avant-garde works were, simply, worthless labels.

Wallek-Walewski’s judgment and the theoretical reflections of the other Polish critics here described, evoke almost immediately the famous essay by Carl Dahlhaus “New Music” as a historical category...⁶⁹, first published 1969, where Dahlhaus wrote that:

The concept of “New Music”, which serves to pinpoint the difference between certain twentieth-century works and the mass of the remainder, seems to be one of these catch phrases which have precise meaning as long as they are used thoughtlessly, but which turn out to be vague or self-contradictory as soon as one begins to analyse them.⁷⁰

Final remarks

Ongoing discussions in the pages of the Polish musical press during the late 1960s and early 1970s are proof of the crisis in the reception of avant-garde music at that time. Critics noted that the function of art had changed. Art no longer served esthetical experience, but aimed to satisfy the curiosity of listeners. Works based on experiment, randomness or, quite the opposite, on mathematical logic, gratified the intellectual needs of an audience. The reason for composing had, in the main, become the solution of technical or music lab problems, to destroying music’s connection with tradition or with a stereotyped knowledge of musical elements. Composers aimed to create ‘something (entirely) new’. Meantime, such criteria as ‘novelty’, the related facet, innovation, and originality or experiment had little axiological usefulness. The label ‘novelty’ was connected with the time and bore signs of its own passing. This term is attractive, but as a matter of fact it is superficial and empty.

The sense of destruction and faith in a new order did not always prove true within the discipline of art, though certainly it was an irrevocable stage. Revolution, which in a certain sense drives the avant-garde, leads art to a stage aptly com-

⁶⁷ Ibid., 4.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 4.

⁶⁹ Carl Dahlhaus, “New Music” as historical category’, in: C. Dahlhaus: *Schoenberg and the New Music: Essays*, translated by Derrick Puffett and Alfred Clayton, Cambridge & New York, Cambridge University Press, 1987.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 1.

pared with the chaos of a 'huge building site', it meant that everything was possible. The problem appears to be how to evaluate this art. Apart from such labels as 'new', scholars also apply the terms 'novelty' and 'avant-garde'. It would be most accurate to reserve the last exclusively to composers who open 'new worlds and wider horizons' for music, following the rule that 'avant-garde' refers to the front section of an army on its way to battle, exploring the forward path, plotting a course to follow.

REFERENCES

- Dahlhaus, Carl, "'New Music" as historical category', in: C. Dahlhaus: *Schoenberg and the New Music: Essays*, translated by Derrick Puffett and Alfred Clayton, Cambridge & New York, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Kisielewski, Stefan, 'Awangarda czy bezsilność' ['Avant-garde or helplessness'], *Ruch Muzyczny* 1970, 13, 10-13. Kisielewski, Stefan, 'Po wielu latach' ['Many years later'], *Ruch Muzyczny* 1970, 22, 6-7.
- Mycielski, Zygmunt, 'Otwarcie XXI „Warszawskiej Jesieni”' ['Opening of the 21st Warsaw Autumn Festival'], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1977, 22, 4.
- Mycielski, Zygmunt 'Pielgrzymując do stóp XXI „Warszawskiej Jesieni”' ['Pilgrimage to the food of the 21st Warsaw Autumn Festival'], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1967, 21, 15.
- Mycielski, Zygmunt, 'Piętnaście międzynarodowych festiwali w Warszawie' [Fifteen international festivals in Warsaw], *Ruch Muzyczny* 1971, 22, 4-5.
- Pociej, Bohdan, 'Sens awangardy' ['Sense of avant-garde'], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1970, 22, 3-5.
- Tarnawska-Kaczorowska, Krystyna, 'Ariergarda i awangarda' ['Rearguard and avant-garde'], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1972, 11, 7-8.
- Wallek-Walewski, Marian, 'Nowość jako kryterium wartości dzieła sztuki' ['Novelty as a criterion of valuation of the work of art'], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1968, 23, 3-4.
- Skowron, Zbigniew, 'Recepcje postaw i programów awangardowych w powojennej muzyce polskiej' ['Reception of attitudes and avant-garde's programs in Polish music composed after the Second World War'], in: Krzysztof Droba, Teresa Malecka, Krzysztof Szwejgier (ed.), *Muzyka polska 1945-1995 [Polish Music 1945-1995]*, Kraków, Akademia Muzyczna, 1996, 72.
- Zieliński, Tadeusz A., 'Jesiennie konfrontacje' ['Autumn's confrontations'], *Ruch Muzyczny*, 1969, 23, 10-12.