OPENINGS

Prof Stephanus Muller

May 2016

OPENINGS

Inaugural lecture delivered on 10 May 2016

Prof Stephanus Muller
Africa Open - Institute for Music, Research and Innovation
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Stellenbosch University

Editor: SU Language Centre
Printing: SUN MeDIA
ISBN: 978-0-7972-1608-2

BIOGRAPHY

Stephanus Muller received his undergraduate musical training at the University of Pretoria, South Africa. In 1993 he changed the focus of his music studies from piano performance to musicology, and he holds master's degrees in musicology from the University of South Africa and Oxford University. In 2001 he was awarded a DPhil from Oxford University before returning to South Africa in the same year. Elected as the chairperson of the Musicological Society of Southern Africa in 2004, he was instrumental in merging this society with the Ethnomusicology Symposium in 2006. After his appointment as lecturer at Stellenbosch University in 2005, he created the Documentation Centre for Music (DOMUS) as a research and music heritage conservation initiative. Since then, DOMUS has acquired some of the most important and valuable archives of individuals and institutions pertaining to South African music, making it a unique repository of recorded music, scores and archival documents on the African continent. Since his appointment at Stellenbosch University, Muller has supervised groundbreaking studies by a new generation of South African music scholars, many of whom have gone on to study at prestigious universities abroad or to occupy teaching positions at South African universities. He is currently the Director designate of the Andrew W. Mellon-funded Africa Open – Institute for Music, Research and Innovation, an ambitious institutional initiative that responds to the challenges and opportunities of music studies in South Africa. Muller is the recipient of the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Research, and his book on the composer Arnold van Wyk, *Nagmusiek*, was awarded a number of prestigious literary prizes for both fiction and nonfiction.

'I am open to you' can be recapitulated as 'I have the capacity to bear your investment' or 'I afford you'. This conservative voice is not associated with will or intention, but with the inevitability of affordance as a mesophilic bond, and with the survival economy and the logic of capacity. If you exceed the capacity by which you can be afforded, I will be cracked, lacerated and laid open.

Reza Negarestani, *Cyclonopedia: Complicity with Anonymous Materials*, Melbourne: re.press, 2008, 198.

To conclude is not merely erroneous, but ugly.

Nick Land, 'Art as Insurrection: The Question of Aesthetics in Kant, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche', *Fanged Noumena: Collected Writings 1987-2007*, Falmouth, UK: Urbanomic, 2011, 145-174, esp. 174.

A trill is a trill.

Werner Ansbach, 'Why the Lark Cannot See the Open', *Essays in Defense of Nitwits*, Pietermaritzburg: Kenotaphion Press, 2016, 656-678, esp. 666.

OPENINGS

Dedicated to my friend, Chris Walton

To be welcomed into the university community as a professor – in Afrikaans *hoogleraar* – is a point of arrival of sorts. It is, therefore, also a kind of death. I have been opened unto this death, to paraphrase Foucault, by "nameless voices, long preceding me, leaving me […] to enmesh myself in them, taking up their cadences".[1] In the introduction to this lecture, I should like to consider openings that have beckoned me to this moment; in the second part, my focus turns to openings newly enabled by this elevation, presuming that it is not a descent into darker places. In the process, I will pay tribute to predecessors and present some remarks on the tradition within which I work, followed by a broad overview of the music discipline in South Africa and the challenges and opportunities as I see them in the study and teaching of music in our country. Significantly, I will do so not only as the newest professor of music at Stellenbosch University but also as the first professor of music who will not occupy this position within the Music Department. This in itself represents an important crossing of a threshold in our discipline.

Music – not only institutionalised music – has a disciplinary character, not only in the sense of constituting a branch of knowledge but also in the sense that it demands from its practitioners training, obedience, deference to authority and respectful recognition of hierarchy, mindfulness of rules as a virtue, allegiance to tradition for being at least as important as innovation, dedication to craft and fierce competitive independence from other artistic or more academic university disciplines. My induction from an early age into this community of strangely beneficent authoritarianism happened through the individual teaching and tutorship of remarkable individuals, all of whom subscribed to this disciplinary ethos of music in some way or another. In naming Joseph Stanford, Stefanus Zondagh and Marian Friedman, I wish to acknowledge my debt and a connection to a musical genealogy represented by them.

The rigorous musical training that I embarked upon as a small boy in 1978 was one of unquestioned devotion to Western art music. When, many years later, a combination of inclination and limitation guided my engagements with music towards scholarship, this did not change. The men from whom I received guidance as a university student were born in this country, but their musical concerns were located in Europe. My crucial discoveries about music as an academic discipline, discoveries that suggested the vast opportunities of music scholarship in South Africa, happened not in South Africa but in Oxford, where I worked under the supervision of the opera scholar Professor Roger Parker. How did it happen that Oxford and not my first alma mater, the University of Pretoria, or my second, the University of South Africa, was the place of my intellectual awakening to the riches of South African music? It certainly was not because Oxford as a place or institution, or indeed music scholars in Oxford, were particularly interested in or informed about music in South Africa. Perhaps it had something to do with the kind of intellectual world that Oxford represented and, inversely, the kind of intellectual world that my alma maters in Pretoria could not be. Oxford possessed such a confident sense of the academic project and its own centrality in it that it could be accommodating even of that in which it was not particularly interested. By comparison, the South Africa of my early youth was gripped by such insecurity and lack of confidence that it was brutally intolerant of thinking not perceived to be in its direct interest. It was, therefore, not a place characterised by curiosity, exploration, risk taking, intellectual adventurism, creative play, limitless possibility and empowered centeredness. Thinking back to that time, now 25 years ago, I understand that although the disciplinary openings that shape the horizons of our thinking may be ephemeral, they also date their subjects. I remain, in my own work, dedicated to these scholarly virtues that I found singularly lacking in what I now recognise as the heavily politically compromised university environment of my undergraduate and early postgraduate years. In my institutionality, I remain opened in a specific way by these experiences.

My professional academic career started in South Africa after the completion of my doctoral work in Oxford. Most of its modest achievements, not least this inauguration as a professor at Stellenbosch University, would have been inconceivable without the friendship and

collegial support of Professor Chris Walton, to whom I dedicate tonight's lecture. Born in the North-East of England, Oxbridge educated (Caius College, Cambridge, and Christ Church, Oxford), Swiss-German naturalised, Afrikaner domesticated, scholar and librarian, Walton worked at the University of Pretoria, first as Head of the Music Department from 2001 until 2005 and later as research professor until 2008, when he returned to Switzerland. I regard it as the single most fortuitous event in my postdoctoral scholarly career that Chris arrived in South Africa at the same time that I returned to it from England. Together we published two books, *Gender and Sexuality in South African Music* (2005) and *A Composer in Africa: Essays on the Life and Work of Stefans Grové* (2006), with Chris as the senior partner, and I was inducted into an unparalleled work ethic, awakened to an ambition for the potential of South African music and music scholarship and inspired by a scholarly devotion to a transformed discipline and society.

Chris nurtured my early career, not because I was his responsibility but because he believed that our discipline needed an invigorated, broadened, empowered new generation of scholars to ensure the sustainability of music as a university subject in South Africa. He led by example, publishing not only on his subject specialties of Wagner and late-Austro-German romanticism but also on South African music. Uniquely with regard to the latter, he did so in international journals, thus opening to a broad audience music that had been for too long merely of local concern. He was responsible for the first International Musicological Society Regional Conference on the African continent, here in Stellenbosch in 2010,[2] the first ever issue of the journal of the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centres, *Fontes Artis Musicae*, dedicated to South African music,[3] the expanded and reinvigorated connection of South African research with RILM (**Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale),** which has since his departure been based in Stellenbosch, the first conference on music and gender in South Africa in August 2003 and countless other initiatives and scholarly citizenship duties. His background and ideas as the former head of the music department in the central library in Zurich fed into my establishment of the Documentation Centre for Music (DOMUS) in 2005, and Chris tirelessly provided me with advice and support in my endeavours to make Stellenbosch University's music archive the richest and most attractive in the country and on the continent. Most significantly, his teaching at the University of Pretoria resulted in producing a generation of young music scholars, many of whom ended up in Stellenbosch as doctoral students or postdoctoral fellows and who are already assuming the mantle of a 21st-century generation of disciplinary leaders. In assuming the position of professor of music at Stellenbosch University, I want to acknowledge my debt to this remarkable man, whom I honour for his exceptionally brilliant mind, his courage, his generosity, his formidable scholarly qualities and his personal loyalty to students and colleagues and to our country.

When Chris assumed his duties at the University of Pretoria, he allegedly informed his staff that he would be the last white man to head up the department. Three heads of department later, all three white and all three men, he would be the first to acknowledge that he had gotten some things wrong. Chris's work in and eventual departure from South Africa showed something about the nature of openings in the field in which I teach and publish:

Openings are interventions.
Openings that happen from outside rupture.
Openings upscale.
Openings are fragile.

Depending on one's subdisciplinary point of departure, South African music scholarship has either an exceptionally modest or a rather distinguished history. Generally speaking, South Africa's popular and indigenous musics have not only been the most productive fields for research but scholarship in these fields has also been the most internationally visible and acknowledged. Methodologically and disciplinarily, this research historically set out from broad interdisciplinary inclusiveness, remained open to cultural and critical theory throughout its engagement with music, was in itself often theory building, recognised the local as the centre of the scholarly project, had an international readership, was unashamedly sociopolitically aware and responsive and maintained a vibrant dialogue between practice and research. In contrast, where university departments focused on the teaching of Western art music, research, or rather the lack of it, has born witness to resources overwhelmingly directed elsewhere, mostly to training performers in the traditions and performance practices of the Western canonical repertoire, to which local scholarship has been a modest appendage at best and from which general musicological awareness has been wholly absent at worst. Whereas the effects on scholarship have been undeniably dire nationally when considering the apartheid-era ideological overinvestment in such music departments, the commitment of most well-funded universities to being conservatory-like training institutions has produced over the years oft-

cited successes, mostly in the form of notable alumni who have embarked on important performance or teaching careers. The Music Department at Stellenbosch University has over many decades played a particularly important role in this regard and is currently arguably the most important institution nationally where this kind of focus and training is offered and vigorously supported.

Like many late-20th-century and early-21st-century political compromises that followed the demise of apartheid, the idea that at least one music department in South Africa should remain where Western art music dominates the agenda through its canons, conventions and curricula to the exclusion of all other musics seems increasingly superfluous. The undeniably close relationship between the study and practice of Western art music in South Africa and colonial and apartheid approaches to culture is not, as is often mistakenly assumed, located in the material manifestations of its forms only (its instruments, its works, its conventions, its spaces, its performance practices – for all of which an argument of 'universality' is commonly offered in defence) but resides more significantly in the anti-intellectualism of its South African versions. This has manifested variously in its indifference to the local, its overwhelming orientation towards the past, its deference towards geographically distant cultural centres, its isolation from art, its alienation from critical thinking and its resultant curious enchantment with what is derivative. Wherever music exists in the grip of these combined forces, *it is dead*. The demand for radical reform that we have heard articulated on South African campuses since 2015 under different banners of protest, will eventually move from statues and works of art to music. The question is not whether this will happen but when. Burning art and removing statues show an exteriority of force with no regard for the system's capacity to afford it. The fundamental incapacity of institutions to come to terms with the densely populated exterior of their disciplinary proclivities far exceed the necessary disputation about the relatively simple matters of performance content or even curricula. A future beckons in which enclaves of privilege constructed on an embrace of ignorance will become opened from the outside.

Openings are restitutive.
Openings reverse decline.
Openings embrace protest.
Openings lacerate.
Openings butcher.
Openings burn.

In 2015, the very year when South African university campuses lit up in protest, DOMUS celebrated its 10-year anniversary. Continually advised by Chris Walton, who had tried unsuccessfully to create a similar institution at the University of Pretoria during his all too brief headship, I created DOMUS after my appointment at Stellenbosch University in 2005. Informed by my experience of researching the composer Arnold van Wyk's life and work (a project by then already underway for four years and one that would only be completed nine years later with the publication of my book *Nagmusiek* in 2014), I realised that the fate of Van Wyk's archive was probably the rule rather than the exception in South Africa. As a historical musicologist, I also knew that this was a state of affairs that affected the core of my discipline. Simply put: if every South African graduate student or researcher first had to spend as much time as I had done collecting, ordering and cataloguing the archive of his or her subject, provided that it was a subject constituted to some extent by an archive, research would either not happen (as has frequently been the case in South Africa) or would be discouragingly and unproductively slow. Furthermore, I had become acutely aware that South Africa, like many societies eager to move beyond a traumatic past, was less than meticulous in looking after the documentary legacy of its composers, performers and artists. The reasons were financial, to be sure, but also political and ideological. South Africa was keen to forget, and for the time being it seemed permissible to do so partly by erasing the past that we were trying to put behind us. Not only were archives not systematically collected and looked after; rumours abounded that they were being neglected and even actively destroyed across the country and in many institutions. DOMUS was therefore created from a diagnosis of institutional and disciplinary crisis.

DOMUS embarked on an ordering process of the 20 collections that the Music Library Special Collections had accrued in a haphazard way (including the internationally important collections of the bibliophile Michael Scott and the conductor Albert Coates), coupled with a proactive policy to acquire new collections. The first substantial new acquisition was that of the Johannesburg-based 12-tone composer Graham Newcater in 2007, followed by the manuscripts of Pretoria-based composer Stefans Grové. The fact that DOMUS was receiving collections from individuals unconnected to our university and within the geographical proximity of other universities and archives confirmed to us the indifference and/or incapacity of institutions nationwide with regard to recognising the urgent disciplinary imperatives driving DOMUS. Meanwhile, these imperatives, as I had viewed them in 2005, were fast expanding. When DOMUS negotiated the permanent loan agreement for the

EOAN Group archive in 2008, this set off an extended community engagement and oral history project. Our archival activities were becoming something more than document collection or the creation of catalogues. South African music history, we realised, could not be written without actively engaging and aiming to overcome the legacy of separation that would otherwise condemn all history emanating from Stellenbosch to the limitations of 'white history'. Archives such as those of EOAN could assist us in breaking through these white narratives, but that presupposed the reestablishment of a relationship of trust with the community to which this cultural capital belonged. The potential of the archive to make a difference could only be operationalised if we departed from a renewed social contract, and so DOMUS set about building the required trust as a precondition to obtaining the archive in order to preserve it. The resulting process became a book project[4] and film[5] that probed in significant ways core understandings of how music history is written.

It had by this time become abundantly clear that a vigorous engagement with South African music could not happen in isolation from the extended musical contexts of our time and place and that the archive had become a space of experimentation and renewal, responding to the institutional limbo between a vanishing past and a continually postponed future. DOMUS sponsored seminars, composer symposia, round tables and lectures, took the initiative in arranging activist musical events and supported important research and musical projects.[6] All the while new archives were being added to our collections: the Musicological Society of Southern Africa, NewMusicSA, Obelisk Music, the South African Jewish Music Centre and the Cape Philharmonic Orchestra, the collections and/or literary estates of George van der Spuy, Christopher James, John Simon, Lionel Bowman, Hanlie van Niekerk, Michael Blake, Nico Carstens, Surendran Reddy, Aryan Kaganof, Hubert du Plessis, Pieter de Villiers, Richard Behrens, Anton Goosen, David Marks's Hidden Years Music Archive, the Ben Segal Folk Music Archive and the Hennie Aucamp cabaret and Entartete Kunst collections, to name only some of the most important. By the time of our 10-year anniversary, DOMUS had added 50 collections to our starting tally of 20, not only increasing the size of our holdings multiple times over but also vastly expanding the range of musics and materials in our archive from Western art music to include film, jazz, popular music, folk music and traditional music.

The growth in our archives and also our expanded research initiatives endowed DOMUS with a pivotal role in maintaining the intellectual integrity of music as an academic discipline on the one hand and stimulating radical disciplinary reform on the other. Acquisitions policy in DOMUS had a disciplinary dimension, but crucially it was a less fraught relationship with the discipline than the relationship between the curriculum and the discipline. Apart from disciplinary considerations, archives were accepted on considerations of funding, strategic positioning, kudos, need, redress, research opportunities and graduate interests, to name but a few. One can make two points about this balance of archival considerations that simultaneously maintain and push at the boundaries of the discipline. First, it serves to maintain the discipline almost by default because it develops from a continually expanding but uninterrupted notion of disciplinary consensus and material production. Second, this development does not threaten or undermine institutional disciplinarity because it has no direct relation to the curriculum, in other words that which is taught at an undergraduate level. Compared to the curriculum, the archive is neither an institutionally necessary nor a sufficient precondition for the existence and maintenance of the discipline. It is therefore potentially more disciplinarily strategic precisely because it is not perceived by either university managements or most practising academics as constituting an institutional imperative. Seen in this way, the contradiction between ostensible reactionary and progressive agendas embedded in the core of the archive is better explained as an insistence on what W.J.T. Mitchell has called "the right of the arts and the humanities to be just as experimental and rigorous as the sciences, just as open to the shifting character of archives of human history as the scientists are to new evidence and new methods of producing evidence".[7] Within the context of humanities and arts disciplines' penchant for canonisation as valedictory strategy of framing competing hermeneutics in the absence of more solid truth claims and the specific South African *angst* accompanying accelerated political and cultural transformation, the archive could give content to the right of which Mitchell speaks.

Renewal thus conceptualised (or 'experimentalism', using Mitchell's words, or 'transformation' or 'decolonization' in South African political speak) is premised not on destruction (often equated with 'deskilling' or 'abandonment') and subsequent replacement but on the disciplinary self-confidence emanating initially from a body of material containing exactly the kinds of properties necessary for the recognition of a discipline. In this way, the archive potentially becomes the one institutionally valid but not coopted space in which the so-called ideological contradiction between conservative and radical approaches dissolves. This is where the distinction between institutionality and

disciplinarity becomes meaningful. The disciplinary imperatives as I saw them in 2005 were better served by not being run together, in my mind at least, with institutional imperatives. DOMUS illustrated how a politically distorted *institutional* practice posing as disciplinary normativity is challenged and changed to the ultimate benefit of the *discipline*. The archive allows us to do this, but unlike the institution of which it can only be an incidental part, it refuses to do so *in the name of* the discipline. The ability of archives to function in this way, I hold, is uniquely important to countries like South Africa where so much of what masquerades as 'the discipline' is ossified mimicry protected by fallacious institutional identification between disciplinary and institutional interests. The archive propels the beautiful cacaphony of the postponed revolution.

Openings propel revolutions.
Openings cannot be afforded.
Openings are strategic.
Openings are messy.
Openings do not provide closure.
Openings are not domestic.
Openings are not voluntary.
Openings are not desired.

Eventually the temporary habitat of DOMUS, suspended from its inception between an academic department with narrowly defined institutional and disciplinary interests on the one hand and the Library and Information Services on the other, could not sustain the nomadic, deterritorialised character of DOMUS financially, nor could it afford its intellectual and musical ambitions. Under pressure to formalise DOMUS institutionally by the scale of its acquisitions and the energy of its intellectual and musical projects, I embarked on a process of establishing Africa Open – Institute for Music, Research and Innovation as an independent institute in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. It is from this development that this lecture takes its title because inasmuch as radical openness, 'to become open to' or 'being opened', indicates that process of the internal cut, openings are structural responses that operate against unitary or binary logics of inner and outer, inclusion and exclusion, spaces of intrinsic permeability that offer new activities to institutional surfaces where we interact. Music has been institutionalised at Stellenbosch University for well over a century, and, as has been pointed out, much of what has been achieved in the field of music by the university has been widely recognised as providing national benchmarks in Western art music performance. The restrictive normative assumptions of a music discipline that takes as its ideal the superbly smooth surfaces of disciplined craftsmanship constitute both a strength and a weakness: in creating normative conditions for Western art music practice, the university currently enables a degree of specialisation in this field that is unmatched nationally; in operating within such normative conditions, the anomalies contained within the practice do not evolve effectively into paradigm shifts, the interdisciplinary excitement of our time remains suspended and the radical optimism of the unknown remains checked. Evolving from its archival roots in DOMUS and the intensity of its intellectual and musical projects in integrated research through performance, composition, systems theory, intermediality, different orders of interdisciplinarity, radically exposed subject positions, rehabilitation of politically and aesthetically discarded musics, community involvement, invigorated forms of musical analysis and critical historiography – all descriptions of the research of my inspiring and brilliant students – Africa Open is founded on an understanding that knowledge generation in South Africa should not be bound by epistemologies, hierarchies and theoretical models that have created Western-dominated modernity. The institute is therefore committed to an artistic and scholarly agenda that challenges these ideas in the spirit of rigorous enquiry made possible by the university as a laboratory of new ideas and forms and the guarantor and provider of unhindered spaces for the advancement of creative, innovative and experimental thought. In time, Africa Open will provide the largest, safest, technologically most advanced open access music archive in Africa – DOMUS – while providing leading-edge, networked intellectual space for research, innovation and critical thinking focused on creative music projects in an African context.

If "[o]penness is not the anthropomorphic desire to be open" but a "being-opened eventuated by the act of opening itself",[8] it is in the openings to the outside, the 'calling here' by establishing lines of attraction for the outside (rather than travelling to destinations identified as 'outside'), that we must proceed. Africa Open will affiliate the kinds of thinking and creative work that cut deeply into our ability to 'accommodate'. The future development of music studies in South Africa depends on radical openness, on being opened as eventuated by the creation of openings. Young musicians and music scholars in the 21st century grow up not only with the art music of Western modernity in their ears but also with the rich recorded legacies of jazz and a bewildering spectrum of popular and world musics. With the wide delta of 20th-century musical expression behind us, any musical space that hopes to encourage interesting creative work must respect the richest varieties of musical

expression of all backgrounds, traditions and ontologies. From everywhere we must call here the musics of cultures and communities very different to those we are used to: musics of intimate ruminations, imagined traditions, musics of denial and resistance, musics tied to particular histories, musics of shocks or negotiation or insurrection, music inhabiting great national traditions, violent musical declarations of nonconformism, happenings, provocations, meditative religious musical trances, music ranging from strict processes to free choice, musics of silence and transfiguration – sound in all its kaleidoscopic magnificence.

Africa Open envisages vast new fields of academic and creative work in music, whether it be the jazz studies and the archive project with which we hope to address indefensible lacunae through the institutionalisation of a rich and internationally influential South African musical practice; the establishment of an interdisciplinary forum for popular musics aimed at ending the untenable divisions between 'high' and 'low' that our academic departments perpetuate; the creation of publication platforms for the academic publication of creative work on terms advanced by the necessities of such creative work rather than institutional or disciplinary dogma, using technological developments to present musical composition, performance and research in ways not thought possible even 10 years ago; 'laying the lines' for musicians as living archives to work and teach in our institutions and crack open our academic myopia; or the wielding of the sharpened tools of our discipline to attract musics and practices that we have hitherto marginalised and to understand better and appreciate more fully musics that we have mindlessly embraced. The institute will reconnect music to the arts so that composers and musicians are not culturally or intellectually invisible, honour performance events as lacerating openings from within, vigorously pursue the interdisciplinary reality of music in the world, celebrate the libidinous power of thinking in and through sound and intellectually engage the destructive internal politics and ideological disputation of South African music that are an inevitable result of the troubled South African past. Such are the challenges: engaging with complex questions not to settle disputes but to be opened by them.

During the course of his argument to theorise 'The Open' through a consideration of the relationship between man and animal, Giorgio Agamben pauses at the importance of the great 20th-century zoologist Jakob von Uexküll's work *en route* to considering Heidegger's grappling with profound boredom.[9] In a short chapter, Agamben spends some time considering Uexküll's description of the notions of 'Umwelt' (which he translates as "environment-world") and 'Umgebung' (which he translates as "the objective space in which we see a living being moving"). Within these two contexts, writes Agamben, "a unitary world does not exist, just as a space and a time that are equal for all living things do not exist".[10] Uexküll supposes "an infinite variety of perceptual worlds that, though they are uncommunicating and reciprocally exclusive, are all equally perfect and linked together as if in a gigantic musical score".[11] The functional relationship between these worlds is, for Uexküll, a "musical unity" between heterogeneous elements, "perfectly in tune" and expressive of "the paradoxical coincidence of […] reciprocal blindness".[12] The movement between perceptual worlds becomes for Agamben a problem of "defining the border – at once the separation and proximity – between animal and man".[13] In his recognition that habitation of animal worlds through the quality of animal captivation can be a "more spellbinding and intense openness than any kind of human knowledge" while simultaneously concluding that this kind of unmatched vehemence of captivation in a singular world is "closed in a total opacity" because it is open in a nondisconcealment or open to a closedness,[14] Agamben provides not only reflection on the human condition but also a metaphor for the openness of institutions and disciplines. In this sense, Africa Open stands on the threshold of an emergence not so much from neither-open-nor-closed structures that cannot afford radical openness as from the profound boredom of those reciprocally exclusive structures with the inactive, empty, abandoned, held-in-suspense contexts by which they are not historically or ideologically captivated. Africa Open telescopes out from the intensity of our captivation with our special musical disinhibitors to bring into focus a gigantic musical score luring us into becoming a target for the outside. Writ large under the title, *Openings*, are the performance indications:

Openings are always HERE.
Openings are always NOW.

[1]Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*, tr. A.M. Sheridan Smith, Pantheon Books: New York, 1972, p. 215.

[2]The conference with the theme 'Echoes of Empires: Musical Encounters after Hegemony' was held jointly with the South African Society for Research in Music (SASRIM) from 14 to 17 July 2010 at the Department of Music, Stellenbosch University.

[3]*Fontes Artis Musicae* 54:3, 2007.

[4]Eoan Group Project. *Eoan – Our Story*, ed. Hilde Roos and Wayne Muller, Johannesburg: Fourthwall, 2013.

[5]*An Inconsolable Memory* by Aryan Kaganof, 2014.

[6]For a more comprehensive account of DOMUS's first 10 years, see Santie de Jongh, 'Armed with a Light Bulb at the End of a Chord: The Ten-Year Journey of DOMUS', *Fontes Artis Musicae* 62:3, July-September 2015, 212-21.

[7]'Art, Fate, and the Disciplines: Some Indicators', in: *Critical Inquiry* 35:4, Summer 2009, 1031.

[8]Reza Negarestani, *Cyclonopedia: Complicity with Anonymous Materials*, Melbourne: re.press, 2008, 199.

[9]Giorgio Agamben, *The Open: Man and Animal*, tr. Kevin Attell, Stanford: Stanford UP, 2004; Original edn.: *L'aperto: L'uomo e l'animale*, Bollati Boringhieri, 2002.

[10]*Ibid*., 40.

[11]*Ibid*., 40.

[12]*Ibid*., 41-42.

[13]*Ibid*., 59.

[14]*Ibid*., 59.