

Szymanowski, Bloch, and other too-late-Rachmaninoffs, or occupied with the impotent literature, schoolgirl idealism, and forms of the young Central Europe composers, who centered themselves more or less about the impotent Schönberg, who, like Mahler, created only a literature.

Strawinsky at least dared to write the music that was born hard and indistructable in his ears.

It is first necessary to come back to music, even if it is only that of a modern Rossini. That is at least something in this age of literature.

We must first go to the new musical nuclei, and then to the inner machinery which is to give it life, which is certainly not a technical matter for gifted but lazy people. But of highest importance is the metaphysic of the new age . . . . the sheer physical synthesis of new matter.

For Strawinsky and Rossini were positives, and we again need positives and practicalities. But in attaining them we find that we are all with too much animality.

We must come back to music, but we must also come out of the Strawinsky nursery.

Literature cannot be music, but music can be metaphysic. Mahler was impotent. Schönberg was a surgeon.

And music can only be practical when it is universal, as hard as stone, organised of indistructable musical fragments, banalities and rhythms . . . . a rhythmic and physical part of the race. It is not an affair of concert halls.

Neofism embraces only that which is indistructable, a rhythmic and metaphysical part of the human organism.

Neofism embraces only that which is practical and which functions directly musically without a literature.

Neofism creates anew all of its inner mechanisms because its entire organization comes from a new need, and a new metaphysic that has found its sensitiveness in the bruised sense of spaces occupied by skyscrapers.

Neofism is tomorrow in music . . . . a hard, simple ethic that rejects as new creative music all music which simply superimposes upon older propelling mechanism new harmonic and tonal systems. The young men of today fail completely because they have no necessity to create a new locomotion, and consequentially rely upon those already invented, betraying us with superficial newness such as new melodic, harmonic, and contrapuntal style . . . . upon old structures.