

Music and Protest in 1968

Edited by BEATE KUTSCHKE AND
BARLEY NORTON



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

In lieu of an introduction

BEATE KUTSCHKE

Paradigm shifts

Books are like musical artworks. As Adorno stated in his *Philosophy of New Music*, not all musical works “are possible at all times”. The shape of a composition depends on the “tendency of the [musical] material” which changes over time.¹ Similarly, books – not always, but sometimes – emerge from research environments and zeitgeist. *Music and Protest in 1968* is such a book. It has become possible only now. What enabled it into existence are three paradigm shifts that have taken place most recently.

First, recent historical events, from the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 to Occupy Wall Street, the formation of flash mobs, the Arab Spring and the frequent protests during the G8 summits demonstrate that, like perhaps never before in human history, socio-political change has been effected largely through non-violent means. By the sheer quantity of its members and the use of *symbolic*, not physical ‘weapons’ – protest marches, discourse, posters, noise – protest movements enable peaceful revolutions and influence public opinion or government policy. Furthermore, what distinguishes them and their activities from other forms of social unrest and demands for socio-political change are their concerted actions without central

¹ What appears to be the tendency of the musical material, a kind of inherent law of development and change, is in fact the effect of the composer’s individual experiences of his/her socio-political and cultural environment that manifest themselves in the musical material as “sedimented spirit”. Adorno writes: “The meaning of musical material is not absorbed in the genesis of music, and yet this meaning cannot be separated from it. Music recognises no natural law; therefore, all psychology of music is questionable. Such psychology – in its efforts to establish an invariant ‘understanding’ of the music of all times – assumes a constancy of musical subject. Such an assumption is more closely related to the constancy of the material of nature than psychological differentiation might indicate. What this psychology inadequately and noncommittally describes is to be sought in the perception of the kinetic laws of matter. According to these laws, not all things are possible at all times [...] The demands made upon the subject by the [musical] material are conditioned [...] by the fact that the ‘material’ is itself [sedimented spirit] [...], an element socially predetermined through the consciousness of man. As a previous subjectivity – now forgetful of itself – such an [objective spirit] [...] has its own kinetic laws”, i.e. laws of change and development over time (Adorno 1973 [1948], pp. 32–3).

organisation.² While the old workers' movement, the Old Left, for instance, was heavily based on a top-down organisation, the protest movements of the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries are marked by a reduction of organisation. Most recent protest forms such as flash mobs and critical masses pop up from nowhere – with an initiator, but no 'director'. Therefore, the agents of those movements that emerge from self-organisation are *conscientious* protesters in the emphatic sense; Kantian *autonomous* subjects.³

During recent years, protest movements have increasingly attracted the attention of social scientists, historians and linguists. The intensified focus on the movements and their specific self-dynamic action modes presents a kind of paradigm shift from the study of states, organisations and institutions to that of self-organising socio-political processes. In line with the increased attention on the mechanisms and nature of protest movements, one of the earliest protest movements of this 'modern' type – the student and protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s – has become the focal point, of both scholarly interest and the public alike. The fascination for the 'movements of 1968' or the New Left, as these student and protest movements have been dubbed, manifested itself in numerous publications and mass media events – particularly in 2008 when the "year that rocked the world" turned forty – and in the revival of the musical styles and fashions of the 1960s and 1970s.⁴

Why, however, should the protest movements around 1968 matter to musicologists *right now*, and why could a volume on 'music and protest in 1968' not appear earlier than *now*? The naissance of rock music, the revival of folk and the Woodstock Festival did not need to wait for the shift in social sciences to be investigated by musicologists. The developments and changes of these pop music genres have ever been an integral part of music history.⁵ So, what is the point of musicologists focusing on protest movements? Connected with the 'movement-oriented turn' in social sciences, history and linguistics in the 1990s and 2000s, there has also been a reevaluation of

² Self-organisation and mass involvement in causes has been supported by new media – cell phones, internet and social networks.

³ In this light, Herfried Münkler's assertion that interstate wars – in which the states possess the monopoly on the use of force – have been replaced by new forms of conflict solution is certainly correct, but incomplete. The actors of the 'new wars' are not only warlords, modern mercenary soldier companies and guerrilla gangs (Münkler 2005 [2002]) but also protestors and grass roots movements.

⁴ *The Year That Rocked the World* is the title of Mark Kurlansky's monograph: Kurlansky 2004.

⁵ For popular music and counterculture, see Perone 2004 and Zimmerman 2008. For rock music: Grossman 1976; Hendler 1987; and Francese *et al.* 1995.

the student and protest movements. Scholars agree that the movements failed to attain their key objective: the abolition of the capitalist system. At the same time, however, the movements initiated a profound socio-cultural change. It is obvious that the new modes of living and behaviour which members had performatively realised in their personal life – sexual liberation, communal living, informal habits, in brief: a counterculture – have now filtered into the everyday life of many individuals who would not consider themselves typical '68ers. These are the external peculiarities. There is, however, also an internal, invisible side to it. A key factor that made the student and protest movements such a *fascinosum* is the specific spirit – the so-called 'spirit of the sixties' – or socio-cultural climate that is closely connected with '1968'. What a spirit or climate encompasses is generally difficult to define. The constituent elements are events, images, discourses and cultural products that contemporaries and later-born individuals assemble 'about' a time-period. These elements hint at the diverse attitudes, feelings and beliefs that shape mentalities. As for the 1960s and 1970s, the spirit of '1968' can be characterised as dissent, the rejection of heteronomy as well as intensified concern for and interest in the 'Other'.⁶

It is this spirit or climate of '1968' that constitutes the conceptual starting point of our volume. Socio-cultural climates, *zeitgeist*, have the ability to influence *every aspect* of socio-cultural life. This not only applies to modes of behaviour and styles of living, but also music. However, while music historiography related rock and folk – sometimes also (free) jazz – to the protests of '1968', it neglected the spirit's influence on the various other genres: classical, avant-garde and experimental music, and early music scenes. Thus, in music histories, the latter appeared to be entirely unaffected by '1968'. Only recently, various studies on avant-garde music, classical performance culture and historically informed performance (HIP) practice have revealed that 1968's impact on music is much wider than hitherto known. In recent monographs, journal articles and book chapters, various scholars such as Robert Adlington, David Bernstein, Gianmario Borio, Eric Drott, Kailan Rubinoff and myself have demonstrated that the avant-garde music in France, Italy, the Netherlands, North America and West Germany as well as the Dutch early music movement

⁶ There is a peculiarity about *zeitgeist* or socio-cultural climate. On the one hand, they incorporate the essence of a historical phenomenon such as the student and protest movements of '1968'; on the other hand, they constitute the breeding ground, i.e. condition that brings the phenomenon into existence. To put it paradoxically: for the movements of '1968', the 'spirit of the sixties' or the 1968 socio-cultural climate is the effect *and* origin of the movements simultaneously.

and classical music were not only affected by the climate of '1968'; they were *infected* and infiltrated by it.⁷

Investigating the impact of '1968' on music, however, also means a different approach to music history. Musicologists increasingly take a distance from determining music history by abstract decades ('the music of the 1960s and 1970s', for instance), but orient their temporal divisions on the contour of a socio-political and cultural era such as the student and protest movements of '1968' and its spirit. This methodological shift in music after 1945 also corresponds with the discussion on the 'nature' and 'essence' of the music of the Baroque era. Since there is no characteristic which can be found in all Baroque musical genres and styles between 1600 and 1750 and, thus, could serve as general criterion of Baroque music, the entries on this epoch in *Die Musik der Geschichte und Gegenwart* and *New Grove*, of 1994 and 2001 respectively, shift the focus from musical to cultural-historical and mental criteria ('mental' as referring to 'mentality' and the 'history of mentalities'). Silke Leopold suggests that what unifies (music) history between 1600 and 1750 are novel ways of presenting human beings through music,⁸ and Claude V. Palisca discerns that striving for "the expression of affective states" is a shared characteristic of all Baroque music.⁹ So, this is the second paradigm shift: the determinants of the borders of the period whose music is to be investigated are not the traditional criteria of music historical classification and division such as: styles, compositional techniques and genres; but socio-political and cultural situations, feelings, beliefs, attitudes and mentalities, ethical preferences etc.

Comparably with the music of the Baroque era, the music of '1968' is not marked by one single criterion or a pool of criteria that can be considered as typical for all the music of this time-period. As the chapters of this volume demonstrate, however, the variety of heterogeneous musical characteristics that define 'music and protest' in the 1960s and 1970s emerge from the same zeitgeist: the spirit of '1968'. As criteria such as feelings and attitudes, however, are vague and 'soft', the attempt to determine an exact date for the beginning and end of '1968', in music as well as in politics, is doomed to failure. This is reflected in our volume by the focus on a temporal centre – the year 1968 – that operates as cipher for

⁷ Adlington 2007b and 2009b; Bernstein 2008, Borio 2007; Drott 2008 and 2011; Loy 2006; Rubinoff 2006 and 2011. See also the volumes of collected papers on music and '1968' by Jacobshagen and Leniger (eds.) 2007 and Kutschke (ed.) 2008. For a complete list of publications of Kutschke on this topic: see www.beatekutschke.de/Publikationen.htm.

⁸ Leopold 1994. ⁹ Palisca 2002.

a time-period, '1968' or the 'long 1968' (in single quotation marks) which roughly lasted from the end of the 1950s to the mid-1970s.

Transnationality and concernment

The third paradigm shift that enabled *Music and Protest in 1968* has taken place within scholarship on protest movements itself. In addition to self-organisation, another peculiarity of late-twentieth century protest movements such as the feminist movement and Occupy Wall Street is their 'independence' from state borders; their agents belong to a multitude of nations and their targets can be located in various global locations. This understanding of protest movements has also affected the view of the movements of the 1960s and 1970s. In the past, studies on '1968' tended to focus rather narrowly on Western Europe and North America because, until recently, '1968' was understood to have emerged only in the highly industrialised, consumer-culture countries of the Western world. Correspondingly, the above-mentioned studies on music and '1968' were limited to countries in Western Europe and North America. In contrast to this, the monographs of Christopher Dunn (2001) and Eric Zolov (1999) that study the 1960s and 1970s counterculture in Brazil and Mexico are two notably early exceptions.

It is clear today that, in focusing on Western Europe and North America, scholars neglected the much wider spread of the events of '1968'. During the past decade, however, historians and sociologists have not only assembled more and more countries and regions that were affected by '1968', but also investigated their cross-border activities and communication.¹⁰ Today, there is agreement that the student and protest movements of '1968' were a transnational phenomenon. This is evidenced in the striking simultaneity of events in 1968 in Europe, Africa, both Americas and Asia. To mention just a few events: in February 1968, student protests escalated in the Roman university district. Two months later, in April, the attempted murder of the West German student leader Rudi Dutschke led to violent student riots against the right-wing Springer press in West Berlin. In the same month, the protests at Columbia University in New York climaxed. The Parisian student protests erupted in May 1968 and, in the same month, students rose up in Senegal, which developed into a fully fledged opposition against

¹⁰ Davis *et al.* 2010; Gilcher-Holthey 2008; Harman 1988; Klimke 2010; Kurlansky 2004; Sievers 2004; and Wallerstein 1989.

the Senegalese regime.¹¹ In June, the student protests in Mexico started and culminated in the Tlatelolco massacre killing numerous students in early October.¹² In the Eastern Bloc, the Prague Spring, which started in January 1968, was finished off by the August invasion of Czechoslovakia by troops from the Warsaw Pact states. Throughout the whole year, Japanese students protested against a variety of grievances, first and foremost US-American imperialism and the Vietnam War.¹³ The established convention of using '1968' as synonym or cipher for the student and protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s reflects this cluster of events.

Drawing on these recent developments in the general scholarship on movements, our volume proposes an entirely new picture of music and protest in '1968'. Reflecting the recent emphasis on the movements' transnational character, the book has been conceived from a global perspective, investigating music scenes not only in Western Europe and North America, but also in Eastern Europe, Asia, Latin America and South Africa. It sheds light on the fact that, like the socio-political movements, the music scenes that have been stirred up by the spirit of '1968' occurred globally and share the striking temporal coordination with those socio-political movements. In the late 1960s, major events expressing the spirit of '1968' cumulated. In this volume, the chapters of Robert Adlington, Eric Drott, Jan Fairley, Sarah Hill, Beate Kutschke, Tôru Mitsui, Allan Moore and Carol Muller refer to the Cuban *Encuentro de canción protesta* in 1967; the West German Waldeck festivals dedicated to singer-songwriter activities from 1965 to 1969; the rock oriented West German first International Essener Songtage in 1968 and the Woodstock Music and Art Festival in 1969; the Political-Demonstrative Experimental Concert in Amsterdam in May 1968, the Folk camps in Kyôto (in 1967 and 1968) as well as the Underground Concert held at two places, Osaka and Kobe, in March 1968. Musical-political activities were complemented by *anti*-musical, political interventions. In May and June 1968, opera houses, conservatoires and other art institutions in Paris, Lyon and other French cities were occupied; in December 1968 and January 1969, New Leftist students and pupils intervened in concerts in Hamburg and Frankfurt.¹⁴

This simultaneity without central planning is, no doubt, an effect of the self-dynamic character of the movements: the political and the 'musical' movements alike. However, both temporal coordination and

¹¹ Stafford 2012 (or earlier).

¹² The numbers of dead people comprised several hundreds (Poniatowska 1992 [1975], p. 207).

¹³ Anonymous 2012a. ¹⁴ Kutschke 2007a, p. 16.

self-organisation do not usually emerge without a strong motivational basis. The specific spirit of '1968', the synthesis of intensified concernment and interest for the 'Other', as I have defined above, seems to be a key factor in this context. The diverse responses to media reports of the Vietnam War operate as clear symptoms for what I dub the 'spirit of concernment and mutual interest'. Widely watched on television in the West,¹⁵ the Vietnam War, especially the Tet Offensive, stimulated many to participate in anti-Vietnam demonstrations all over the world. Strikingly, it did so especially in New Leftist camps; the majority of viewers were not provoked to protest against the so-called 'television war' that was virtually happening in their living rooms. Other socio-political hotspots – the civil rights movement in the US, the cultural revolution in China, the guerilla war in Latin America and the crushing of the Prague Spring – received hardly less attention and sympathy by the New Leftists; they became part of reflections on how to change not only their own society but the world as a whole.¹⁶

In addition to protests, the specific concernment and interest of dissenters of '1968' manifested themselves in increased communication, exchange and, therefore, travelling.¹⁷ New Leftist activists from different nations and continents met to confer about socio-political theories and techniques of protest.¹⁸ Likewise, politicised musicians travelled widely to pass on their

¹⁵ Not coincidentally, Marshal McLuhan coined his early-1960s metaphor of the world as "global village" in light of the contemporary advancements of information technology (McLuhan 1962, p. 36).

¹⁶ In the 1980s and 1990s, neo-conservative critics pejoratively dubbed this New Leftist mentality as a "cult of concernment" (Stephan 1993).

¹⁷ These international activities were prepared by a "world opening up" in the first postwar decades (Davis 2010). In other words, international exchange did not emerge from the open-mindedness of the New Leftist climate, but both slowly emerged and reinforced each other from the mid-1950s onwards culminating in what is recognisable from the present perspective as the spirit of '1968'. Being a globalised movement, the New Left was the *effect* and *agent* of globalisation at the same time. It was the *effect* of growing mobilisation and the worldwide media and information systems that brought glaring injustices happening in every part of the world to the politicised mind; it was the *agent* of cultural and intellectual transfer by shuttling socio-political theories and protest techniques between nations, continents and political systems divided by the Iron Curtain.

¹⁸ They mutually emulated protest techniques such as sit-ins and teach-ins and the ironic, playful subversion of codes (Scharloth 2010). In late August 1968, representatives from West Germany, France, Finland, Spain, Switzerland, Canada and the US met at a conference in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, to discuss the "anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggles and student revolts" and draft an international action programme. In September of the same year, Dietrich Wetzel visited a Latin American student conference in Merida, Venezuela, then acted as the delegate of the West German Socialist Student Association (SDS) at the "International Assembly of Revolutionary Student Movements" at Columbia University (Klimke 2010, pp. 100, 102–3). The lecture tour of Karl-Dietrich Wolff, leader of the West German SDS from 1967 to 1968, around the US in February/March 1969 has become famous.

music and learn about the practices and traditions of musicians from other cultures. This behaviour is certainly not new in musicians; they have always travelled and adopted styles from different cultures. The intensity of travel and exchange, however, seems to have significantly increased in the 1960s and 1970s. There is no chapter in *Music and Protest in 1968* in which transnational crosscurrents do not play a role at some point. According to our volume, the singer-songwriter scene was particularly vibrant: singer-songwriters from around the world met each other at regular events such as the East Berlin Festival des politischen Liedes (Political Song Festival),¹⁹ the Fête de la Humanité (Humanity Festival) in Paris, the Italian Festa de l'Unità (Union Festival) and the Chilean Festival de la Canción Comprometida (Festival of Committed Song). It is important to note that, in the late 1960s, international music festivals were not only forums for *musical* exchange in the way that the 'classical' Cold War West German avant-garde festivals in Darmstadt and Donaueschingen had been – they also served as platforms for the development and reconfirmation of socio-political ideas and values;²⁰ and, sometimes, aesthetic questions were entirely overruled by socio-political concerns.²¹

The combination of the 'cult of concernment' and mutual interest, on one hand, with the anti-authoritarian, participatory-democratic impetus of the '68ers on the other, effected an unusually liberated, creative artistic atmosphere. Musical exchange was stimulated between not only different musical nations and cultures, but also styles and genres. In this volume, Virginia Anderson draws attention to the concerts of the free improvisation ensemble AMM who performed with the rock groups Pink Floyd and Soft Machine. Drones from Indian music were emulated in free improvisation and psychedelic music. Gianmario Borio points to folk singers who amalgamated vernacular labour songs with political songs in the rather modern style of Hanns Eisler. In her chapter, Kailan Rubinoff gives various examples for cross-genre activities of early and popular music performers. Judy Collins, the Rolling Stones and the Beatles integrated period instruments

¹⁹ For lists of singer-songwriters from all over the world participating in these festivals, see: Anonymous 2012b (or earlier).

²⁰ One of the meetings that most overtly connected art with politics was the International Cultural Congress in Havana in January 1968. It is relatively well known that avant-gardists such as Luc Ferrari (France), Luigi Nono (Italy) and Peter Schat (Holland) as well as the folk, blues and jazz singer Barbara Dane (US) travelled to this conference. However, a comprehensive history on music and the cultural congress in Havana is still waiting to be written.

²¹ The Internationale Ferienkurse für Neue Musik (International Summer Courses for New Music) in Darmstadt and the Donaueschinger Musiktage (Donaueschingen Festival) did not remain unaffected by the 1968 spirit of protest and dissent. See regarding Darmstadt: Iddon 2008.

into their work; avant gardists such as Wendy Carlos performed early music on electronic instruments like synthesisers; and Frans Brüggen performed New Music on the recorder and commissioned pieces for period instruments. Thus, what – from the perspective of the 1980s and 1990s – would appear to be postmodern plurality and ‘anything goes’, was in fact closely related to New Leftist concerns and open-mindedness.²² Writers on postmodernity, however, have often overlooked the connection to the spirit of ‘1968’ due to the emphasis on theorizing the dichotomy between modernity and postmodernity.²³

In demonstrating that the impact of ‘1968’ on music was epochal as well as global, the significance of our volume’s subject matter ‘music and protest in 1968’ becomes visible. It defines a turning point: a period of music-aesthetical change that affected not only some, but, in fact, the majority of postwar musical genres and institutions.

The chapters

The outlined characteristics of music in the context of ‘1968’ – self-organisation, concernment, transnational exchange and cross-genre productions – are crucial for the structure of this volume. The intensive international activity eradicates traditional distinctions between centre and periphery. There is no clear linear, one-directional propagation of the spirit of ‘1968’ starting in one region and spreading like seismic waves from the epicentre over the whole world. Rather, dependent on the socio-political conditions, different regions or nations developed different kinds of ‘1968s’, which Timothy Brown has dubbed ‘small 1968s’.²⁴ This applies even more to the musical than to the socio-political ‘1968s’. In the 1960s and 1970s, various music scenes put out feelers to each other which resulted in a transnational and intercontinental network of interrelationships and influences. Similarly, musical activities – composition and performance – often defy easy classification as only ‘avant garde’ or ‘chanson/political song’ or ‘rock’.

For this volume, the specific character of ‘music and protest in 1968’ means that conventional types of chapter order – according to places or temporality

²² See Rubinoff (Chapter 14). For more information on the emergence of postmodernity from the spirit of ‘1968’, see: Hentschel 2008; Iddon 2008; and Brown and Kutschke 2008.

²³ For further information, see: Luckscheiter 2007. He points out that, in France and the US, the ‘68ers (of the 1960s) are considered to be the first postmodern generation (Luckscheiter 2007, p. 152).

²⁴ Brown 2009.

or genres – are inappropriate. Likewise, the grouping of chapters into sections would have generated the impression that ‘music and protest around 1968’ can be broken down into a couple of themes or issues, repressing the fact that the ‘phenomenology’ of music and protest around 1968 is much too diverse to subsume all chapters under four or five subheadings.

Therefore, the order of chapters is based on rather loose connections. The first two chapters by Robert Adlington and Gianmario Borio reconstruct the relationship between music and protest in the Netherlands and Italy. Adlington’s chapter on the Dutch Provo scenes addresses various lines of conflict typical for music and protest in ‘1968’: especially capitalist commercialisation of popular protest music and the incomprehensibility of politically engaged avant-gardist protest music. Borio’s chapter reconstructs musical ‘workerism’, that is how the New Leftist musicians’ interest and concernment for the lower social classes filtered into Italian folk, film and avant-garde music. The third chapter by Sarah Hill sheds new light on popular music in the US and especially investigates how the civil rights movement and the murder of Martin Luther King affected various US-American music scenes. The fourth chapter by Carol Muller draws attention to another region of the world which was similarly shaken by racism and segregation: South Africa. Just as in the US, free jazz served to articulate the quest for freedom in South Africa. Unlike American free jazz musicians, however, South African musicians developed other, individual modes of expression. The fifth and sixth chapters by Tôru Mitsui and Barley Norton explore how music served to express the Asian protests against the Vietnam War. Whereas, in Japan, popular music amalgamated the protests against the Vietnam War with those against educational pressures in postwar Japanese achievement-oriented society, in Vietnam, ‘paradoxical’ protest songs emerged: North-Vietnamese *pro-war* songs that were adopted as ‘protest songs’ by the *anti-war* movement in the US and *sentimental* songs about lost love and human fate, that the South-Vietnamese singer-songwriter Trịnh Công Sơn wrote in order to express the suffering of the Vietnamese people and their yearning for peace.

In her chapter on music and protest in Latin America (Chapter 7), Jan Fairley presents another kind of paradoxical or improper protest song. Her subject matter is the *nueva trova* and *nueva canción* (both ‘new song’), a musical genre whose musicians strongly rejected its classification as protest music. They did so because the term not only falsely suggested a close relationship to the US-American, oppositional ‘protest song’, but also was too limiting. In his chapter on music and protest in Sweden, Denmark and Norway (Chapter 8), Alf Björnberg points to a rather absurd situation: the spirit of

'1968' manifested itself in the musical culture *even though* the socio-political climate was by no means marked by extreme dissent or heavy protests.

The ninth and tenth chapters focus on music and protest in Great Britain. Allan Moore's contribution on progressive rock makes visible the relationship between musical means, on the one hand, and utopian and dystopic 'world views' that the lyrics of progressive songs articulate, on the other. Virginia Anderson points to a specific strand of avant-garde and experimental music, which can also be found in countries other than England. New Leftist, politicised composers of this strand articulate their socio-political dissent as refusal and ridicule. Their music is marked by a ludic attitude and the tendency towards nonsense.

Beate Kutschke (Chapter 11) investigates the diverse music scenes of East and West Germany in the context of what particularly characterised both German states in the 1960s and 1970s: the struggle against authoritarianism. The comparison between the different economic-political environments – capitalist vs. socialist-communist – reveals a decisive difference between music and protest in the West and East. Whereas in West Germany, anti-authoritarian protest succeeded in initiating the transformation of music as well as musical institutions, in East Germany, protest – as well as its potential for creativity – was stunted and ended in resignation. Rüdiger Ritter (Chapter 12) further explores the picture of '1968' in the Eastern Bloc. He shows that the popular music cultures, in each of the countries he focuses on – Hungary, Poland and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (ČSSR) – responded individually to the 'politicisation from above' that the socialist-communist cultural administrations of those countries imposed on music.

It is well known that the second feminist movement that developed throughout the 1970s was inspired by the youth upheaval and student protests of the 1960s. Hon-Lun Yang (Chapter 13) sheds light on how two popular music genres – Chinese model operas and Hong Kong movie musicals – reflected the transformation of gender relationships in the context of the 'small 1968s' in the People's Republic of China and Hong Kong.

Investigating the Early Music movement in the Netherlands and Great Britain in the 1960s (Chapter 14), Kailan Rubinoff analyses and explains an apparent paradox. Historically informed performance practice was, in essence, retrospective in terms of repertoire, but, as a result, became a 'revolutionary', reformist movement like the student and protest movements that had influenced it. The fifteenth and final chapter by Eric Drott explores the way French musicians – especially singer-songwriters and avant gardists – responded to and, thus, interpreted the events of May 1968 in France.