"We Are All Musicologists Now"; or, the End of Ethnomusicology

STEPHEN AMICO

Examinations of disciplines and disciplinarity are integral to the vitality of academic realms and their relations to broader sociocultural spheres. Some of the more recent and most visible contributions—often marked by a seriousness of tone and sense of urgency—have taken a wide view of the disciplinary landscape (the humanities versus STEM fields, for example) and, foregrounding economic variables, portend grim prognoses, especially in view of a progressively bottom-line-driven university system.[1] No less crucial have been

---

[1] Examples include Marc Bousquet, *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation* (New York: New York University Press, 2008); Frank Donoghue, *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008; reprinted in 2018 as a tenth anniversary edition); and Terry Eagleton, "The Slow Death of the University," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 6, 2015, www.chronicle.com/article/The-Slow-Death-of-the/228991. Discussions by both journalists and academics have also appeared frequently in the popular press; see, for example, David Brooks, "The Humanist Vocation," *New York Times*, June 20, 2013, www.nytimes.com/2013/06/21/opinion/brooks-the-humanist-vocation.html; Benjamin Schmidt, "The Humanities Are in Crisis," *The Atlantic*, August 23, 2018, www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2018/08/the-humanities-face-a-crisisof-confidence/567565/; and Leon Wieseltier, "Perhaps Culture Is Now the Counterculture: A Defense of the Humanities," *New Republic*, May 28, 2013, https://newrepublic.com/article/113299/leon-wieseltier-commencement-speech-brandeis-university-2013; as well as the *New York Times* debate, "The Fate of the Humanities," November 4, 2013, www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2013/11/04/the-fate-of-the-humanities, with contributions from six academics. The perceived importance of attention to humanistic disciplines may also be witnessed in the October 2015 Princeton Task Force on the Future of the Humanities (https://strategicplan.princeton.edu/taskforces/humanities); a report prepared by the Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, *The Heart of the Matter: The Humanities and Social Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts and Letters, 2013), deemed a "rescue plan" by Jordan Weissmann (see "Actually, the Humanities Aren't in Crisis," *The Atlantic*, June 2, 2013, www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/06/actually-the

---

those analyses engaging specific territories of humanistic study, exploring both historically and critically the ways that knowledge and practices may be constructed as residing in discrete epistemological locations; in many cases (as with academic studies of music) it is more accurate to speak not of a recent flourishing of interest but of a continuing exploration initiated decades ago.[2] While I do not want to ignore the profound effects of fiscal exigencies upon the production of academic work, it is essential to underscore the necessity of theoretical and critical interventions, which reveal inextricable links among epistemology, pedagogy, ideology, and ethics. This has certainly been the case with the now decades-long "discussion" about the status of ethnomusicology—a serious debate which, I believe, must be revived yet again.

Given the weight of the issues at stake, it may appear curious that I choose to begin with Paul Feig's 2013 "buddy cop" film, *The Heat*. For those not familiar with this action-comedy, a quick overview of the two paint-by-numbers protagonists will readily reveal the boilerplate plot in terms of both narrative and character "development": uptight, by-the-books, career-driven FBI agent Sarah Ashburn (Sandra Bullock) is forced to work with slovenly, foul-mouthed, rebellious Boston detective Shannon Mullins (Melissa McCarthy) to crack a major drug ring. The denouement is familiar, as are the general contents of the scenes leading to it:

-humanities-arent-in-crisis/277144/); as well as several conferences and plenaries (for example, the "Future of Humanities" conference held at Blackfriars, Oxford, November 2, 2018, and a plenary session at the American Historical Association's 2018 conference entitled "The State and Future of the Humanities in the United States"; see also Sarah Jones Weicksel, "Changing the Narrative: 'The State and Future of the Humanities in the United States'," *Historians.org*, January 16, 2018, www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/january-2018/changing-the-narrative-the-state-and-future-of-the-humanities-in-the-united-states). More generally optimistic assessments may be found in Helen Small, *The Value of the Humanities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Weissmann, "Actually."

[2] Representative publications include Katherine Bergeron and Philip Bohlman, eds., *Disciplining Music: Musicology and Its Canons* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Kevin Korsyn, *Decentering Music: A Critique of Contemporary Musical Research* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); David Schwarz, Anahid Kassabian, and Lawrence Siegel, eds., *Keeping Score: Music, Disciplinarity, Culture* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1997); and John Shepherd, "Music, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity: Reflections on Relationships," *Popular Music* 13 (1994): 127–41. A notable number of works on inter-, multi-, and transdisciplinarity within music studies focus on the question of artistic or practice-based research. See, for example, two special issues of academic journals—Henk Borgdorff and Marcel Cobussen, eds., *Tijdschrift voor Muziektheorie / Dutch Journal of Music Theory* 12 (2007, special issue, "Practice-Based Research in Music"); and Sverker Jullander, ed., *Svensk Tidskrift för Musikforskning / Swedish Journal of Music Research* 95 (2013, special issue on artistic research)—as well as Corina Caduff, Fiona Siegenthaler, and Tan Wälchli, eds., *Art and Artistic Research: Music, Visual Art, Design, Literature, Dance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010); Darla Crispin and Bob Gilmore, eds., *Artistic Experimentation in Music: An Anthology* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2014); and Jonathan Impett, ed., *Artistic Research in Music: Discipline and Resistance: Artists and Researchers at the Orpheus Institute* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2017).

Ashburn and Mullins initially loathe one another, continuously and amusingly butting heads, but through a series of trials ultimately bond, engendering a "dialectic" that is essential not only to their ability to vanquish the villain, but also to their emotional and psychological transformations. The viewer sees that without these subjective changes, wherein *both* characters admit to and learn from the acceptance of their faults (and their nemesis's unexpected virtues), good's triumph over evil would not be possible.

By happenstance, my viewings of *The Heat* coincided with my revisiting the various position statements and territorial claims in the continually redrawn and reenacted battle lines among the main "-ologies" and "studies" through which "humanly organized sound" might be approached in the current and previous centuries of Western academia.[3] As a consequence, an initially humorous, seemingly superficial assessment ensued: McCarthy was the prefix, the maverick, the "ethno-"; Bullock was the root, the establishment, the *sans*-prefix "musicology"; and the hard-won dialectical denouement was what some practitioners refer to as "cultural musicology," whose holistic catholicism arguably stands in stark contrast to the putative parochialism of the two more deeply institutionalized (sub)disciplines. Yet revisiting this enjoyable film in my head, and letting the aforementioned assessment ping against the claim (expressed in numerous readings) that the dynamic of border transgression is central to a renewed understanding of disciplinarity,[4] I became

3

---

[3] These readings included Nicholas Cook, "We Are All (Ethno)musicologists Now," in *The New (Ethno)musicologies*, ed. Henry Sobart (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008), 48–70; Kenneth Gourlay, "Toward a Reassessment of the Ethnomusicologist's Role in Research," *Ethnomusicology* 22 (1978): 1–35; Charles Keil, "Call and Response: Applied Sociomusicology and Performance Studies," *Ethnomusicology* 42 (1998): 303–12; Michelle Kisliuk, "A Response to Charles Keil," *Ethnomusicology* 42 (1998): 313–15; Henry Kingsbury, "Should Ethnomusicology be Abolished? (Reprise)," *Ethnomusicology* 41 (1997): 243–49; and Kingsbury, "Henry Kingsbury's Response," *Ethnomusicology* 41 (1997): 258–59; Fredric Lieberman, "Should Ethnomusicology be Abolished? Position Papers for the Ethnomusicology Research Group at the 19th Annual Meeting of the College Music Society, Washington D.C., November 1976," *College Music Symposium* 17, no. 2 (1977): 198–201; Richard Middleton, "Introduction: Music Studies and the Idea of Culture," in *The Cultural Study of Music: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Martin Clayton, Trevor Herbert, and Richard Middleton (New York: Routledge, 2003), 1–15; Anthony Seeger, "A Reply to Henry Kingsbury," *Ethnomusicology* 41 (1997): 250–52; Jeff Todd Titon, "Ethnomusicology and Values: A Reply to Henry Kingsbury," *Ethnomusicology* 41 (1997): 253–57; and Deborah Wong, "A Response to Charles Keil," *Ethnomusicology* 42 (1998): 317–21.

[4] This dynamic of border crossing is an implicit or explicit component of the contemporary literature on inter- and transdisciplinarity. See, for example, Andrew Barry and Georgina Born, eds., *Interdisciplinarity: Reconfigurations of the Social and Natural Sciences* (London: Routledge, 2013); Harvey Graff, *Undisciplining Knowledge: Interdisciplinarity in the Twentieth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015); Stefan Herbrechter, ed., *Cultural Studies, Interdisciplinarity, and Translation* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002); and Julie Thompson Klein, *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity: The Changing American Academy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005) and *Interdisciplining*

convinced that there are significant insights to be gained from viewing the scholarly through the popular.[5] I will return to this connection (or transgression) later in this essay; for now, provisionally accepting that *The Heat* may reveal (through both its use of tropes and stock devices, as well as its "cultural location" vis-à-vis academe) something important about disciplinary, methodological, and ideological clashes between ethnomusicology and musicology, and the possibility (or desirability) of a synthetic reformation, I want to focus on the essential element of anagnorisis: the protagonist's comprehension of her or his failings, without which synthetic transformation would not be possible. In this regard, speaking as a "lapsed ethnomusicologist," I will highlight some of the problematic aspects of the discipline—and the important elisions that have arisen from and, in a circular fashion, continue to feed them—in order to argue ultimately for the end of ethnomusicology.

My assessments of the field of ethnomusicology are certainly the products of the institutional and intellectual contours of the discipline (and its history) as I experienced them in a unique time and place (first in the United States and later in Northern Europe in the decades around the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries). I begin by highlighting alterity: a dynamic that Laudan Nooshin suggests has been a defining component of the ethnomusicologist's identity—in part, vis-à-vis musicology and "years of appropriated centre ground."[6] This "status of 'Other'," in her estimation, has served as "an important source of power";[7] ethnomusicologists' location on "the margins has attuned [them] to certain things and shaped the kinds of questions [they] ask."[8] I agree that an

Digital Humanities: Boundary Work in an Emerging Field (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015).

[5] Richard Middleton, in his important volume on popular music and subsequent publications, has argued and demonstrated convincingly the necessity of attention to the popular in relation to cultural analysis; see Middleton, *Studying Popular Music* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1990) and *Voicing the Popular: On the Subjects of Popular Music* (New York: Routledge, 2006). See also Slavoj Žižek's *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan through Popular Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991) for another classic example of the interrelations among the social, the theoretical, and the popular.

[6] Laudan Nooshin, "Ethnomusicology, Alterity, and Disciplinary Identity; or, 'Do We Still Need an *Ethno*?' 'Do We Still Need an *-ology*?'," in *The New (Ethno)musicologies*, ed. Henry Sobart (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008), 71–75, at 73.

[7] Nooshin, "Ethnomusicology, Alterity," 73.

[8] Laudan Nooshin, "Happy Families? Convergence, Antagonism, and Disciplinary Identities, or 'We're All God Knows What Now' (Cook 2016)," paper presented at the City Debate, "Are We All Ethnomusicologists Now?," City University, London, June 1, 2016, http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/14817/. We may also note, however, that "alterity" or difference—when taken as an identificatory locus (whether via self-definition or external ascription)—may be a site of both agency and marginalization. For an examination of the polyvalence of difference in relation to music scholarship and the in/salubrious ways it may be constructed or enacted, see Olivia Bloechl and Melanie Lowe, "Introduction: Rethinking Difference," in *Rethinking Difference in Music Scholarship*, ed. Olivia Bloechl,

ascribed or experienced alterity affects the optics one brings to analysis and contend that the rigor of any discipline is bound up in significant ways with an ability to approach a process, problem, or question from diverse vantage points. Alterity can never be a generic, stable position, however; it must always be approached intersectionally. And so, while ethnomusicology's welcome mat may have been imagined as a beckoning to "all" of musicology's "others" (an "us/them" binary), this welcome was experienced by some (myself included) as reachable only after the successful navigation of a highly policed gauntlet of velvet ropes. Alterity existed as a hierarchy, requiring a commitment to scholarly work exhibiting predetermined geographic, ideological, methodological, theoretical, and genre-related variables necessary for full card-carrying membership. A scholar of Soviet and post-Soviet Russia, for example, who explores "traditional" heterophony in ritual or rural settings, or the *roma*, or (at the very least) male rock bands or bards through the lens of politics, resistance, identity, and/or "power" (etc.) might be welcome with open arms. A scholar, such as myself, who strayed from the path, whose work was marked by attention to nonnormative sexualities, commercially mediated dance genres, and pop-music (gay) divas through the lens of gender, feminist, and queer theory, risked being seen as a puzzling interloper, one who might be—at best—"tolerated" in the name of "diversity." My square-peg-ness notwithstanding, my self-description as a "lapsed" ethnomusicologist indicates that, although I have found "homes" in other disciplines (musicology and media studies, to give only two examples) and now rarely use my "official," conferred-by-Ph.D identity, my past is something I cannot discard. My status as a lapsed ethnomusicologist is, in many ways, similar to my status as a lapsed Roman Catholic: although the former was chosen and the latter compelled, I ultimately came to question the rituals and ideologies, the strictures and dictates of both, and found them incompatible with my personal philosophies. But both continue to affect—sometimes in surprisingly positive ways—my engagement with the world, including my academic work.

This personal history is not meant to suggest an extrapolation from the individual to the universal. Rather my complex relationship to the discipline—a "double alterity" (or, to bastardize Mikhail Bakhtin, a "*vnevnutrinakhodimost'*" or "out-inside-ness"),[9] a dis/invested-ness,

Melanie Lowe, and Jeffrey Kallberg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 1–52; and Ruth Solie, "Introduction: On Difference," in *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship*, ed. Ruth Solie (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 1–20.
    [9] Bakhtin's neologism *vnenakhodimost'* (often translated as "excorporation," but more literally "located-outside-ness") highlights the extent to which position, both aesthetic and literary, is central to the narrative's and subject's apprehension.

experienced throughout decades of training, research, and teaching—allows for an analysis founded upon a mixture of respect, dismay, and critical suspicion. To be absolutely clear from the outset: I believe it is well past the time to retire the discipline of ethnomusicology as it is currently practiced, and ideologically and theoretically (self-)defined and positioned. My argument will ultimately open onto a broader discussion of disciplinarity in general; however, while it is true that no academic discipline in the modern, Western university system is free from biases and problematic relationships to asymmetrical power structures, it is perhaps an unflinching critique of ethnomusicology—as a discipline so committed to exposing and attacking the seats of exploitative power "out there," yet apparently not in its own house[10]—that may offer important insights into this broader discussion. At institutional, intellectual, and individual levels, the positive contributions of ethnomusicological work over the past several decades are without question; however, the continuation of a discipline which, owing in part to its theoretical insularity and methodological dogmatism, cannot but perpetuate a deeply problematic colonialist stance—in 2020—is untenable. Debates about the future of ethnomusicology (and musical disciplinarity in general) seem to appear and subsequently evaporate without significantly affecting the state of the art; hence, it is necessary to move beyond numbed acceptance of the status quo. And for these reasons I am not disheartened if some readers find what follows polemical. I would prefer "provocative," but to the extent that polemics engender affective response, perhaps so much the better. As Brian Massumi notes, affect is and evokes movement; it "enlivens" and "reinjects unpredictability into context."[11] It is time to make a move and to trade maintenance of the status quo for a productive unpredictability if critical research on music is to avoid the fate of irrelevance and ultimate obliteration within a troublingly neoliberalizing university environment.

* * *

[10] Jeff Todd Titon suggests that applied ethnomusicology, for example, is "guided by ethical principles of social responsibility, human rights, and cultural and musical equity"—although, he notes, the supposed dividing line between "applied" and "academic" work is not always hard-and-fast; see Titon, "Applied Ethnomusicology: A Descriptive and Historical Account," in *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Ethnomusicology*, ed. Svanibor Pettan and Jeff Todd Titon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 4–29, at 4. Additionally, Philip Bohlman highlights the "plurality" of activisms inherent in the field, considering ethnomusicology "historically and traditionally . . . an activist discipline"; see Bohlman, "Other Ethnomusicologies, Another Musicology: The Serious Play of Disciplinary Alterity," in *The New (Ethno)musicologies*, ed. Henry Sobart (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008), 95–114, at 111.

[11] Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), 220.

I begin this critique with an observation prompting a question that I will attempt to answer: over the course of the previous two decades I have regularly been made aware of the fact—through text and personal interaction—that although many ethnomusicologists have been and are "uncomfortable" with the prefix of the field's appellation, there has been little (if any) serious effort to address this significant issue. Why?

As a first step in formulating an answer, I quote Clifford Geertz on culture. Discussing the concept of "model" in relation to psychological and social systems, Geertz highlights a duality:

> The term "model" has . . . two senses—an "of" sense and a "for" sense. . . . Unlike genes, and other nonsymbolic information sources, which are only models *for*, not models *of*, culture patterns have an intrinsic double aspect: they give meaning, that is objective conceptual form, to social and psychological reality both by shaping themselves to it and shaping it to themselves.[12]

Even if we rule out the illusion of unmediated access, somewhere, to "objective reality," it is debatable whether "genes"—to use Geertz's example—understood in a holistic sense are "nonsymbolic," contained and understood, as all "objective" "scientific" data are, within layers of discursive systems. This is not my main concern; rather, my contention is that the past and present inability of some ethnomusicologists to see this "of"/ "for" distinction-interaction, and the ways that it has structured the field (understood in the broadest sense), has resulted in several of the discipline's problematic aspects.[13] The foundational importance and etiology of blurring "of" and "for" will become increasingly clear in my analysis; for now, I wish to highlight how this myopia has led to the formation of a discipline for which the centrality of the "ethn-"—audible and visible in the prefix "ethno-," with its de facto suggestions of and relations to both ethnicity (or race)[14] and ethnography—has been instrumental in an unfortunate intellectual circumscription that rivals the narrowness of straw-man constructions of musicology. We may rightly highlight ethnomusicology's role in giving voice and visibility to innumerable musics and musical practices all but erased in the academic literature for well over half a century by a Western-art-music-loving (or WAM-ophilic)

---

[12] Clifford Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System," in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 87–125, at 93.

[13] It is not incidental that Geertz's discussion takes place in the context of an analysis of religion, insofar as both supposedly "empirical" and "numinous" systems are in fact similar in terms of their reliance upon and recourse to foundational ideologies that must be accepted at the level of faith.

[14] While the prefix "ethno-" does not necessarily reference "ethnicity" and may more generally refer to "people," it is difficult, in daily usage and audition, to strip away "problematic" meanings and insist upon (or believe in) a reception that is only "objective."

musicology. Yet it is arguable that this newer discipline, over the ensuing decades, in part by mistakenly equating a one-dimensional understanding of "representation" with reparation, concomitantly erected its own set of exclusionary and ideologically motivated desiderata, which—owing to their genesis via a certain social group's chimerical and obsessive constructions of a specific type of "authenticity"—perpetuated both of the damaging aspects of this "ethn-."

* * *

First, the "ethnic." Some will argue that ethnicity or ethno-geopolitical location is no longer a foundational concern of ethnomusicology; John Blacking early on articulated the belief that it is methodology and not object of study that defines the field.[15] But the retention of what at least some within and outside of the discipline see as a colonialist, atavistic, and highly problematic appellation[16] has certainly been instrumental in the assumption by both laypersons and non-in-group academics alike that the focus of the discipline is indeed "ethnic music" (or, at the very least, "music of 'other' cultures"). It is certainly true that there exists ethnomusicological work that interrogates the very idea of stable, univocal "ethnic" identities—in relation to both local and global dynamics[17]—as well as research produced by scholars who share a similar geocultural location with their subjects.[18] Moreover, Nicholas Cook highlights the

---

[15] John Blacking, *"A Commonsense View of All Music": Reflections on Percy Grainger's Contribution to Ethnomusicology and Music Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

[16] Several authors in Henry Stobart's edited volume specifically note the connection between ethnomusicology and colonialism, with Nooshin, for example, characterizing the appellation itself as "a dinosaur of a name which ties us to a colonial past." Bohlman, additionally, notes the absence of a "criticism of ethnomusicology's willingness to overlook the political acts in its past, not least among them those carried out under the banner of colonialism." See Stobart, ed., *The New (Ethno)Musicologies* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008); Laudan Nooshin, "Ethnomusicology, Alterity," 72; and Bohlman, "Other Ethnomusicologies," 103.

[17] See, for example, Benjamin Krakauer, "The Ennobling of a 'Folk Tradition' and the Disempowerment of the Performers: Celebrations and Appropriations of Bāul-Fakir Identity in West Bengal," *Ethnomusicology* 59 (2015): 355–79; Richard Jones-Bamman, "From 'I'm a Lapp' to 'I am Saami': Popular Music and Changing Images of Indigenous Ethnicity in Scandinavia," *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 22 (2001): 189–210; Tina Ramnarine, "'In Our Foremothers' Arms': Goddesses, Feminism, and the Politics of Emotion in Sámi Songs," in *Performing Gender, Place, and Emotion in Music: Global Perspectives*, ed. Fiona Magowan and Louise Wrazen (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2013), 162–84; and Martin Stokes, "Introduction: Ethnicity, Identity, and Music," in *Ethnicity, Identity, and Music: The Musical Construction of Place*, ed. Martin Stokes (Oxford: Berg, 1994), 1–27.

[18] Examples include Joanna Bosse, *Becoming Beautiful: Ballroom Dance in the American Heartland* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2015); Eileen Hayes, *Songs in Black and Lavender: Race, Sexual Politics, and Women's Music* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2010); Kiri Miller, *Travelling Home: Sacred Harp Singing and American Pluralism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008) and *Playing Along: Digital Games, YouTube, and Virtual Performance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); and Mark Slobin, *American Klezmer: Its Roots and*

problematic nature (or impossibility) of defining relationships among researcher, subjects, and musical "traditions" in terms of insider/outsider status (owing to multiple technological and sociocultural variables),[19] and Bruno Nettl suggests it is no longer possible to conceive of "unchanging bodies of music that [maintain] their consistency," finding that "what Hornbostel feared—that the world's musics would become an unholy mix—has come to pass."[20]

Yet to suggest that there have not been and are not still contours that define ethnomusicological research over the past six-plus decades—and to suggest by implication that there exists *any* social structuring without divergences, contradictions, and incongruities—would be not only disingenuous but a further indication of the myopia I articulated above in relation to ethnomusicologists' understanding of (their place in) cultural production. Both casual glances at and careful perusals of the types of "study objects" most commonly represented in and at the discipline's journals, monograph series, and conferences (to say nothing of the images gracing the covers of textbooks, monographs, and edited volumes) bely the assertion that there are no hierarchies that govern a given music's suitability for inclusion within what is undeniably a generically, stylistically, socioculturally, and geographically defined canon. Additionally, failing to note the patterns that emerge (complexity notwithstanding) in the geo-sociocultural locations of researchers vis-à-vis their subjects/informants/consultants would clearly result in an erasure of the wildly asymmetrical structures of and access to power, privilege, capital, and representational space that underlie the very possibility of such relationships (and the very foundations of colonialist enterprises). Some may argue that the "cutting edge" is what defines a discipline, but the contours and concerns of a field are equally (or primarily) visible in supposedly "pragmatic," "unremarkable," or "utilitarian" actions or artifacts such as job searches ("seeking a scholar of music of the Indian subcontinent"), course syllabi or textbooks ("Music of Indonesia," or "Introduction to World Music" with modules/chapters arranged according to country/continent),[21] or undergraduate performance groups

9

Offshoots (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), *Chosen Voices: The Story of the American Cantorate* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), and "Improvising a Musical Metropolis: Detroit in the 1940s–1960s," *Ethnomusicology* 60 (2016): 1–21.

[19] Cook, "We Are All (Ethno)musicologists Now," 62–63.

[20] Bruno Nettl, "Contemplating Ethnomusicology: What Have We Learned?," *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 67 (2010): 173–86, at 185.

[21] Kingsbury, in his critique of ethnomusicology, notes with dismay what he characterizes as the simplistic writing characterizing some of the discipline's college-level textbooks, suggesting that there is a tendency in the field to "marry ourselves to outdated concepts rather uncritically" (see Kingsbury, "Should Ethnomusicology be Abolished," 244). In a response, Seeger maintains there is no cause to worry about the "sophomoric nature of some textbooks, if they successfully excite and draw students to learn and to

("small-liberal-arts-college African Drumming Ensemble"), all of which are intimately bound up with (creating) the discipline's very architecture. I am uneasy with suggestions that ethnomusicology—or any discipline—should claim to be known primarily by the intellectual and theoretical work (including artifacts) produced by a "vanguard," increasingly a "one-percent" defined by their relationships to elite institutions and structures.

This creation of an inherently racially spatialized auditory realm—"non-Western music"—is the petri dish in which the racial/ethnic Other grows in the ethnomusicological social "science" laboratory; it is this continually reenacted racial-spatial Other that is, in my estimation, a defining aspect of many ethnomusicological tracts. In light of the aforementioned contours, Henry Kingsbury's claim that the field is notable for its status as "guardian-protector of many of the ethnocentric biases it once worked to expose and eradicate,"[22] its "residual-yet-pervasive preoccupation with cultural 'other'-ness,"[23] appears as apt today as it was over two decades ago.[24] This preoccupation, I argue, is intimately bound up with the previously noted (and largely unacknowledged) obsession with authenticity and is related to a perceived anomie or loss engendered by "(post)modern" society, with "modernity"—manifest in any number of technological in(ter)ventions, extending from the gramophone to social media—constructed as a threat to the "real." In the realm of ethnomusicology, Alan Lomax, for example, in the introduction to his cantometrics volume, asserted that the then-modern media threatened to destroy this authentic experience, "the tribal, local, and neighborhood communication worlds." Entire generations, in his estimation, are lost, "left with a sense of belonging nowhere, and we, ourselves . . . become daily more alienated."[25]

Contemporary ethnomusicologists cannot fail to see the wistful romanticism in such a characterization, to say nothing of the "us" (privileged, white, Western academics) vs. "them" (not privileged, white, Western academics) binary construction in the "*and* we . . . ". An awareness of the malleable and constructed nature of authenticity is certainly

experiment with sounds as well as words for themselves. They will eventually learn or create a more precise language, if one is needed" (see Seeger, "A Reply," 252). In the context of the current discussion, I would maintain that any discipline that counts the complexities of representation (in relation to power structures, resources, etc.) as among its key foci cannot question the necessity of a "precise language," as well as the necessity of highlighting this to students from the moment their studies commence.

[22] Kingsbury, "Should Ethnomusicology be Abolished," 243.

[23] Ibid., 248

[24] On the proclivities of ethnomusicology to create other-ness, see also Kofi Agawu's widely read "Analyzing Music under the New Musicological Regime," *Journal of Musicology* 15 (1997): 297–307.

[25] See Alan Lomax, *Folk Song Style and Culture* (Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1968), 5.

evident in some ethnomusicological scholarship;[26] however, attention is most often focused on constructions surrounding and within the musical practices and discourses under consideration, rather than those inherent in the theoretical apparatus through which the practices and discourses are examined and which underlie—as silent ideologies—the discipline as a whole. There are not (to my knowledge), for example, any monograph-length works in ethnomusicology similar to Regina Bendix's "reflexive historiography" of the creation of folklore studies, a work which articulates a disciplinary genesis based upon "the continued craving for experiences of unmediated genuineness [seeking] to cut through what Rousseau called 'the wound of reflection,' a reaction to modernization's demythologization, detraditionalization, and disenchantment."[27] And it is not difficult to imagine the myriad ways such motivations might easily be implicated in relation to the actions of and artifacts produced by different generations of (authenticity fetishizing) ethnomusicologists—from the 1960s to the 2010s, from (academic-leaning) hippies to hipsters.[28] Nettl maintains that "one does not frequently encounter *the word* authenticity any more" in relation to ethnomusicological research, and many will no doubt argue that ethnomusicological research has ceased to be confined to those now-nonexistent "uncontaminated" practices and productions Erich Moritz von Hornbostel so highly prized, with current scholars engaging instead any number of syncretic, hybrid, and mediated contemporary musics.[29] But it is

11

---

[26] On authenticity in relation to musics of the Indian subcontinent, see, for example, Regula Burckhardt Qureshi, "Sufi Music and the Historicity of Oral Tradition," in *Ethnomusicology and Modern Music History*, ed. Stephen Blum, Philip V. Bohlman, and Daniel M. Neuman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 103–20; and Stephen M. Slawek, "Ravi Shankar as Mediator between a Traditional Music and Modernity," in *Ethnomusicology and Modern Music History*, ed. Stephen Blum, Philip V. Bohlman, and Daniel M. Neuman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 161–80. See also Marc Finch, "Experiencing Authenticity and Bluegrass Performance in Toronto," *Musicultures* 38 (2011): 191–204; and Christopher Witulski, "Contentious Spectacle: Negotiated Authenticity within Morocco's Gnawa Ritual," *Ethnomusicology* 62 (2018): 58–82.

[27] Regina Bendix, *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997), 8.

[28] See also Simone Krüger, *Experiencing Ethnomusicology: Teaching and Learning in European Universities* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), chap. 4; and Ricardo D. Trimillos, "Subject, Object, and the Ethnomusicology Ensemble: The Ethnomusicological 'We' and 'Them'," in *Performing Ethnomusicology: Teaching and Representation in World Music Ensembles*, ed. Ted Solis (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 23–46. Both examine how constructions and/or assumptions of "authenticity" continue to animate the academic study of "non-Western music" on numerous levels. Krüger, for instance, notes that students often took the cipher notation used in many universities in the context of gamelan rehearsals as a mark of authenticity, unaware of the fact that it was a Western invention. On the question of constructions of authenticity and otherness in relation to world music ensembles, see the other contributions to Solis's *Performing Ethnomusicology*, in which Trimillos's chapter is found.

[29] Nettl, "Contemplating Ethnomusicology," 179 (emphasis added).

imperative to remember that authenticity, as Allan Moore argues, is ascribed rather than inscribed. It develops in relation to temporally and culturally specific locations (of listeners as well as performers/composers): "the authentic" is never identifiable via transhistorical or transcultural "objective" characteristics exhibited by products and practices, and the researcher's position—as much as that of the "native participant"—is implicated in significant ways.[30] The "digital authentic" need not be taken as an oxymoron, as long as the music under consideration is amenable to the researcher's ascriptions of, for example (in the case of ethnomusicology), "subversion," "resistance," "subaltern provenance," or—once again—a connection to an (ethnic, classed) "Other."

Thus while musicology has been lambasted for its own supposed myopic preoccupation with "the text/music itself," for its claim on "universality" based upon a transcendent, ahistorical aesthetics, and for an elitism that contributes to a material and symbolic privileging based on both race and class, it is clear that ethnomusicology too has embraced its own universalizing discourses in a feverish attempt to find and examine (read: construct) the "real," and to build musical actors and actions that seem to embody a pre- or anticapitalist authenticity, an ideal that seems only to lie in the realm of the non-Western, the subaltern, and the "ethn-"ic.[31] Without question, many in the field have worked to give voice to those systematically silenced and to focus attention on how such symbolic erasure within academic disciplines can contribute to a continued disenfranchisement that also manifests itself materially. Yet the de facto ethnic/racial segregation that results from the material and symbolic bifurcation of researcher/researched (as well as Western/non-Western), with all the material/symbolic power differentials

12

---

[30] See Allan Moore, "Authenticity as Authentication," *Popular Music* 21 (2002): 209–23. Although Moore's examples draw chiefly on popular musics, his arguments are applicable to any number of musical styles or practices.

[31] For examples of attention to authenticity's relationship to ethnomusicological research, experience, and interpretation, however, see Timothy J. Cooley, "Folk Festival as Modern Ritual in the Polish Tatra Mountains," *World of Music* 41 (1999): 31–55; Cooley, "Constructing an 'Authentic' Folk Music of the Polish Tatras," in *After Chopin: Essays in Polish Music*, ed. Maria Trochimczyk (Los Angeles: Polish Music Center, University of Southern California, 2000), 243–62; and Deborah Wong, "Moving: From Performance to Performative Ethnography and Back Again," in *Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives for Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology*, ed. Gregory Barz and Timothy J. Cooley, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 76–89. It is also notable that musicologist Richard Taruskin has engaged the concept of authenticity on numerous levels, including the extent to which the concept is constructed via musicological research itself; see Taruskin, "On Letting the Music Speak for Itself: Some Reflections on Musicology and Performance," *Journal of Musicology* 1 (1982): 338–49. See also Taruskin's *The Danger of Music and Other Anti-Utopian Essays* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), a collection of essays in which the concept of authenticity is frequently engaged in relation to, for example, the historically informed performance movement, or composers' embrace of "folk" music.

suggested and engendered by this split, cannot help but be—intentions notwithstanding—instrumental in the maintenance of what George Lipsitz has termed "the possessive investment in whiteness": the continuing institutional and individual support of those structures and ideologies that perpetuate privilege for one group over another.[32] If, as Veit Erlmann suggests, the world music phenomenon of the 1990s was marked by an attempt to "[coat] the sounds of the fully commodified present with the patina of use value in some other time and place,"[33] an enterprise that resulted in an asymmetrical distribution of profits and a racially based bifurcation,[34] I would further suggest that the "objective" "social science" of the same era (which continues into the present day), engaging some of the very same ethno-geographical sites and sounds, continues to be involved in enterprises that are not significantly different, albeit possibly more complex, circuitous, or opaque in terms of the routes through which such constructions ultimately manifested.[35]

The obsession with the authentic is also arguably responsible for another significant elision in the discipline, one supported by long-standing suspicions regarding the (il)legitimacy or (in)appropriateness of mass-mediated, capital-driven Western popular musics as objects of ethnomusicological inquiry. Ethnomusicologists have certainly not, especially in the past two decades, ignored popular music altogether,

13

---

[32] George Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998). Additionally, Charles Seeger has criticized the discipline—which he saw as obsessed with "purity or authenticity"—for exhibiting an "ethnocentrism in reverse"; see Seeger, *Studies in Musicology 1935–1975* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 51–52.

[33] Veit Erlmann, "The Aesthetics of the Global Imagination: Reflections on World Music in the 1990s," *Public Culture* 8 (1996): 467–87, at 483.

[34] On the asymmetries engendered by and underlying the world music phenomenon, see also Steven Feld, "A Sweet Lullaby for World Music," *Public Culture* 12 (2000): 145–71.

[35] See also Laurent Aubert who, cognizant of the structural asymmetry as well, notes that Western listeners demand a type of authenticity from non-Western performers that restricts them in ways that Western performers are not; Aubert, *The Music of the Other: New Challenges for Ethnomusicology in a Global Age*, trans. Carla Ribiero (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007). While there are numerous instances of Western musicians being constrained and defined by non-race-based hierarchies of authenticity as well (see, for example, Matthew Bannister, *White Boys, White Noise: Masculinities and 1980s Indie Guitar Rock* [Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006]; Elizabeth Eva Leach, "Vicars of 'Wannabe': Authenticity and the Spice Girl," *Popular Music* 20 [2001]: 143–67; and Richard Peterson, *Creating Country Music: Fabricating Authenticity* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997]), race—generally a distinction between white and African American styles and artists—is indeed often implicated in the construction of the authentic; see, for example, Edward Armstrong, "Eminem's Construction of Authenticity," *Popular Music and Society* 27 (2004): 335–55; and Kembrew McLeod, "Authenticity within Hip-Hop and Other Cultures Threatened with Assimilation," *Journal of Communication* 49, no. 4 (1999): 134–50. On authenticity in world music, see also Johannes Brusila, *"Local Music Not from Here": The Discourse of World Music Examined through Three Zimbabwean Case Studies: The Bhundu Boys, Virginia Mukwesha, and Sunduza* (Helsinki: Finnish Society for Ethnomusicology, 2003).

as a review of the literature demonstrates;[36] that the majority of the work focuses on music outside the "industrialized/modern" West is undeniably an important and necessary addition to research emanating from popular music studies, "popular musicology," or cultural studies (inter alia), marked as they often are by their own substantial elisions (of non-Western music). Yet this attention to the "popular" remains problematic on several grounds—the first of which is engendered by interactions and connections among (ideological conceptions of) the popular, the technological, and the "ethn-." If popular musics are, by their very nature, often reliant upon technical mediation on numerous levels, then it will be instructive to take note of the (historical) relationship of ethnomusicology to technology. René Lysloff and Leslie Gay pointed toward what they deemed, in 2003, a still-palpable suspicion of technological mediation within the field, partly owing to a fear of its ability to "contaminate" "authentic" musics and performances, despite the fact that such mediation has been integral to ethnomusicological research and practice from the discipline's inception.[37] Not only has recording technology enabled the production of material artifacts and spaces (i.e., sound recordings and the archives in which they are held), and been responsible for the re-creation and/or preservation of "traditional" music practices, it has also, often via these very artifacts and interventions, contributed to the construction of cultural narratives undergirded by structures of power.[38] Far from being authentic, unmediated, or objective records (of, for example, musical performances and practices), the

14

---

[36] See, for example, Timothy Rommen, *"Mek Some Noise": Gospel Music and the Ethics of Style in Trinidad* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), which examines the complexities of both indigenous and nonindigenous popular music styles and practices in relation to the Full Gospel community in Trinidad. Peter Manuel's influential volume *Popular Musics of the Non-Western World: An Introductory Survey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990) was arguably instrumental in opening up space within the discipline for a focus on popular musics from a wide range of geographic sites, although the focus is most often on arguably *non*commercial musics of "subaltern" groups. We may also note the Popular Music Section of the Society for Ethnomusicology (PMSSEM) that aims, according to its mission statement, to encourage "greater interactions between popular music scholars of different disciplines and the development of new approaches to popular music research beyond disciplinary boundaries" (http://pmssem.wikidot.com/about; accessed 10 November 2018). Additionally, UCLA's online *Ethnomusicology Review* (www.ethnomusicologyreview.ucla.edu; accessed 10 November 2018), with its "Sounding Board" and "Bring the Noise" sections, evidences a more catholic approach to ethnomusicological research than the discipline's most established journals.

[37] René T. A. Lysloff and Leslie C. Gay, Jr., "Ethnomusicology in the Twenty-First Century," in *Music and Technoculture*, ed. René T.A. Lysloff and Leslie C. Gay, Jr. (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2003), 1–22.

[38] See, for example, Caroline Bithell, "On the Playing Fields of the World (and Corsica): Politics, Power, Passion, and Polyphony," *British Journal of Ethnomusicology* 12, no. 2 (2003): 67–95, and "Musical Archaeologists: The Revival and Reconstruction of Polyphonic Settings of the Latin Mass in Corsica," *Ethnomusicology Forum* 15 (2006): 113–45.

archived "document," according to Paul Ricoeur, is not used in the service of its etymological function of teaching (from the Latin *docere*), but "on the support, the warrant a document provides for a history, a narrative, or an argument."[39]

In the case of ethnomusicology, the quality or purpose of this history/narrative/argument may be deduced in the context of a specific constellation of (colonialist) power relations between researcher/ researched, and an understanding of archive and document as referring to literal, material archival sites and their holdings (the Berliner Phonogramm-Archiv, the Bartók Archive, etc.), as well as the "archive" of ethnomusicological research contained in journals, libraries, databases, etc. Coupled with the de facto suggestion that the "non-Western" popular is most often the proper object of research is the manner in which technology has been approached and engaged within ethnomusicological literature. Specific counterexamples notwithstanding, when technology (in relation to the popular or musical) is recognized and duly noted, it often serves primarily as a backdrop for exploring traditional disciplinary concerns (e.g., identity and/or agency in the "modern" world). Absent is a theoretical engagement with technology *qua* technology and the ways in which the technological affects (our historical understandings of) the subjectivity of research "subjects"; it is rare, for example, to find references in the literature to (m)any of the central and/or influential figures from media or science and technology studies active during the past two-plus decades.[40] I agree with those who caution that explorations of culture(s) outside of the "global north," read through a theoretical apparatus produced within the (epistemological) context *of* that global north—products of a discourse on technology extending from Heidegger to the Frankfurt School to French semiotics to Paul Virilio (and the "accelerationists")[41]—must be undertaken with extreme sensitivity and reflexivity.[42] Yet there does not appear to be the

[39] Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 3:117.

[40] A very partial list might include scholars such as Manuel Castells, Henry Jenkins, Friedrich Kittler, Jussi Parikka, Claus Pias, Steven Shaviro, Bernard Stiegler, and Judy Wajcman, among others. A notable exception is Thomas Hilder, Henry Stobart, and Shzr Ee Tan, eds., *Music, Indigeneity, Digital Media* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2017).

[41] See Nicholas Cook, *Beyond the Score: Music as Performance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), chap. 6, for a discussion of the various (negative) ways the technological has been conceived of in relation to music by three Western thinkers (Adorno, Barthes, and Keller).

[42] See, for example, Stephen Amico, "How to Do Things with Theory: Cultural 'Transcription,' 'Queerness,' and Ukrainian Pop," in *The Oxford Handbook of Music and Queerness*, ed. Fred Maus and Sheila Whiteley, Oxford Handbooks Online, published online January 2019, https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199793525.013.75, on the use of "queerness" in relation to Ukrainian popular music.

same anxiety attached to the regular use in ethnomusicological literature of Western concepts that serve to privilege a Western understanding of an "authentic," "unmediated" Other. For example, the frequent use of the concept of "identity," without interrogation, suggests that this Western construction of subjectivity is transculturally legible. Thus a literature marked by this combination of geographic, theoretical, and epistemological mandates and prohibitions (only music outside the West; minimal use of certain theoretical literatures) serves, in part, as documentation of a certain narrative/history, one devoted (unwittingly or not) to the perpetuation of ethnic and geographical otherness. If my reference to Lomax appeared as naively atavistic or oblivious ("not the way ethnomusicology is today!"), I would suggest that his pronouncements and apprehensions are not entirely different than many of those marking the contemporary field.

These related anxieties—about technology, or about music reliant upon technological mediation—are connected to a string of other associations leading from modernity to technology to popularization to a sphere of musical production and reception devalued owing to a perceived hyper-commodification that has often been coded as feminine. According to Andreas Huyssen this putatively feminine sphere was constructed in contradistinction to "authentic" culture, seen as masculine.[43] Anahid Kassabian suggests that within popular music studies, there is a hierarchy of values, with "ubiquitous musics" (mass-mediated musics heard most often but not consciously chosen) consistently ignored within the academy due to their perceived nonpopulist (thus apolitical) nature and an attendant lack of subcultural capital (or cultural cachet).[44] Such a dynamic certainly inheres within ethnomusicology as well and for many of the same reasons, although I would add, in light of the current argument, that the bases on which many types of music are consistently disregarded have as much to do with their perceived inability to engender resistance as their very (constructed) gendered natures, on both symbolic and material valences. It is notable, in this context, that the genre of mass-mediated popular music most frequently disseminated in the discipline's print and presentation channels—hip hop or rap[45]—is exactly that which

16

---

[43] Andreas Huyssen, "Mass Culture as Woman: Modernism's Other," in *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 44–62. On the feminization of mass culture in nineteenth-century United States culture, see also Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Avon Books, 1977).

[44] Anahid Kassabian, "Popular," in *Key Terms in Popular Music and Culture*, ed. Bruce Horner and Thomas Swiss (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999), 113–23.

[45] A partial listing includes Catherine Appert, *In Hip Hop Time: Music, Memory, and Social Change in Urban Senegal* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018); Elisabeth Betz, "Polynesian Youth Hip Hop: Intersubjectivity and Australia's Multicultural Audience,"

is often bound up with expressions and constructions of restive/resistant masculinity.[46] Why the high visibility and veneration of hip hop/rap, and the near-invisibility of disco and its house-trance-garage progenies, which are arguably as widespread throughout the world as the genre enjoying pride of place?[47] I pose this question not as a meaningless hypothetical but because I am certain that a considered answer would expose the discipline-specific de/valuing of certain musics and associated populations, practices, and sites as never random, accidental, or arbitrary, but always ideologically motivated.[48] (Moreover, any answer reliant upon recourse to "objective" musical, aesthetic, or cultural criteria—hip hop as more "rhythmically complex" and/or "socially relevant" than "simplistic," "hedonistic," "homogenized" popular dance music—would reveal a discipline driven by the same sorts of ideological constructions that were assumed by some to have undergirded the "bad, old" musicology.)

The gendered hierarchies of the discipline inhere not only in the processes whereby music coded as "authentic" (read: noncommodified = nonfeminine) is often studied largely by heterosexual, Western men, but also in the manifestation of a colonialist impulse to treat musical Others as those who are looked *at*, who are the object of the gaze, who submit to scrutiny and inscription in another's textual representations

17

Ethnomusicology Forum 23 (2014): 247–65; Adriana Helbig, *Hip Hop Ukraine: Music, Race, and African Migration* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014); and J. Griffith Rollefson, *Flip the Script: European Hip Hop and the Politics of Postcoloniality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017), among many others. Titles on rap/hip hop, whether or not by ethnomusicologists, also feature regularly among those reviewed in the discipline's main journals.

[46] It is notable that both Krin Gabbard and Miles White find race tightly bound up with gender—specifically, the use of black culture as a source of (constructed) masculinity for white boys and men; see Gabbard, *Black Magic: White Hollywood and African American Culture* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2004); and White, *From Jim Crow to Jay-Z: Race, Rap, and the Performance of Masculinity* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2011). See also Meredith Schweig, "'Young Soldiers, One Day We Will Change Taiwan': Masculinity Politics in the Taiwan Rap Scene," *Ethnomusicology* 60 (2016): 383–410, on masculinity in Taiwanese rap.

[47] Gavin Steingo's work on South African *kwaito* is notable for highlighting the assumed "apolitical" nature of "dance music," simultaneously interrogating (popular) music hierarchies that devalue such musics, while wishing to keep *kwaito* under a more nuanced understanding of the political (the "post-political" or "anti-political," for example); see Steingo, "South African Music after Apartheid: Kwaito, the 'Party Politic,' and the Appropriation of Gold as a Sign of Success," *Popular Music and Society* 28 (2005): 333–57; "The Politicization of *Kwaito*: From the 'Party Politic' to Party Politics," *Black Music Research Journal* 27 (2007): 23–44; and *Kwaito's Promise: Music and the Aesthetics of Freedom in South Africa* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).

[48] Both Richard Dyer and Walter Hughes, for example, argue that the virulent antipathy toward disco was motived not by aesthetic criteria, but by homophobia and charges of inauthenticity; see Dyer, "In Defense of Disco," *Gay Left* 8 (1979): 20–23; and Hughes, "In the Empire of the Beat: Discipline and Disco," in *Microphone Fiends: Youth Music and Youth Culture*, ed. Andrew Ross and Tricia Rose (New York: Routledge, 1994), 147–57.

(rather than take part as co-creators of their own exegesis)[49]—who are, within the realm of the symbolic logics that have structured the visual for centuries, feminized.[50]

* * *

This viewer/viewed distinction leads finally to the second problematic aspect of the "ethn-" foundational to the discipline: ethnography and ethnographic fieldwork, a methodology in which many of the same power dynamics arising from the foregoing "ethn-" are witnessed. Constructed, in the context of the fetishized authenticity so often encountered, as an enterprise that grants purchase on the "real" and is reliant upon relationships to "real" people in "real" places, fieldwork has become almost reified, to the extent that other more theoretical, more experimental methodologies are sometimes met with resistance or skepticism. Exhibiting similarities to the ethnomusicological literature in which technology is acknowledged yet not theoretically engaged, the discipline's frequent analyses of "identity," "place," and/or "global circuits" often leave "the subject/Other" as a perdurable, irreducible "fact" and generally ignore the vast literature on the posthuman (where the body, technology, and—quite often—gender interact in profound ways).[51] Also implicated here is the centuries-old construction of the binary: woman = body ("material/real") and male = mind ("transcendent/ideal").[52] Although Nettl suggests that "we [ethnomusicologists] haven't really figured out our intellectual contours, our essential goals as a profession, the central questions

---

[49] On this dynamic, see Thomas Solomon, "Where Is the Postcolonial in Ethnomusicology?," *Ethnomusicology in East Africa: Perspectives from Uganda and Beyond*, ed. Sylvia Nannyonga-Tamusuza and Thomas Solomon (Kampala: Fountain, 2012), 216–51.

[50] On the dynamic of scopic objectification/feminization, see, inter alia, John Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (London: BBC/Penguin Books, 1973); L. Stephanie Cobb, *Dying to Be Men: Gender and Language in Early Christian Martyr Texts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 110; Kathleen Coyne Kelly, *Performing Virginity and Testing Chastity in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 2000), chap. 4; Nicholas Mirzoeff, *An Introduction to Visual Culture* (London: Routledge, 1999), chap. 5; Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," *Screen* 16 (1975): 6–18; and Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1978). For an overview of the hierarchicalization of the senses in Western culture—with the visual placed in the position of ultimate power—see Elizabeth Edwards, Chris Gosden, and Ruth B. Phillips, "Introduction," in *Sensible Objects: Colonialism, Museums, and Material Culture*, ed. Elizabeth Edwards, Chris Gosden, and Ruth B. Phillips (New York: Berg, 2006), 1–31.

[51] The work of scholars whose theories have resonated across a wide array of disciplines—including Rosi Braidotti, J. Jack Halberstam, Donna Haraway, and N. Katherine Hayles—is rarely encountered in ethnomusicological writing. Also notable is the absence of cyber- or technofeminist researchers such as Radhika Gajjala and Susanna Paasonen, among others.

[52] See Stephen Amico, "Digital Voices, Other Rooms: Pussy Riot's Recalcitrant (In)Corporeality," *Popular Music and Society* 39 (2016): 423–47, in which I discuss this dynamic in relation to Pussy Riot's "disembodied" vocals.

we wish to ask or answer,"[53] in effect, both the de facto foci on race and ethnicity (continually revealed through signifying absences) and the vaunting of fieldwork with "real people"[54] as the conduit to "truth" paint a detailed picture of the stated and repressed goals of the discipline, as well as the methodologies through which such goals might be achieved. To be clear, I am not suggesting that fieldwork is of negligible value; rather, it is a fieldwork enterprise without continuous subjective *and* theoretical reflexivity that remains problematic.[55]

But how could a discipline so obsessed with (safeguarding) "real people" express its very identity, in part, via a representation bordering on offensive caricature? Nearing my (first, preliminary) denouement, and hoping to stave off accusations of straw-man characterizations of ethnomusicology, I recall my opening question—why, despite discomfiture, the continuation of the "ethn-" to the present day?—and turn to the image "lovingly" (or, better said, tellingly) referred to as "the little man." It is difficult to overstate the profound embarrassment and shame that some of us in the field continued to feel when, into the second decade of the twenty-first century, a primitivist and colonialist image continued to be used as an unofficial "logo/mascot" of the US-based Society for Ethnomusicology, gracing the cover of the society's official journal and appearing on conference posters, the official website, and numerous other locations.[56] Exactly how this image—a rendering of a sculpture of an ocarina-playing male figure from the Coclé people of Pre-Columbian Panama—came to appear on the first issue of the SEM newsletter in

---

[53] Bruno Nettl, *Nettl's Elephant: On the History of Ethnomusicology* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2010), 170.

[54] It is again notable that explorations of the intersections of subjectivity, affiliation, virtuality, and technology (for example, by Nancy Baym in *Personal Connections in the Digital Age* [Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010] and *Playing to the Crowd: Musicians, Audiences, and the Intimate Work of Connection* [New York: New York University Press, 2018]), including in the context of ethnographic fieldwork (cf. Tom Boellstorff, *Coming of Age in Second Life: An Anthropologist Explores the Virtually Human* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008]; Tom Boellstorff, Bonnie Nardi, Celia Pearce, and T.L. Taylor, eds., *Ethnography and Virtual Worlds: A Handbook of Method* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012]; Adi Kuntsman, "Cyberethnography as Home-Work," *Anthropology Matters* 6 [2004], www.anthropologymatters.com/index.php/anth_matters/article/view/97/190) are infrequently encountered.

[55] For an example of ethnomusicological analyses of fieldwork, see Gregory Barz and Timothy J. Cooley, eds., *Shadows in the Field: New Perspectives for Fieldwork in Ethnomusicology*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). See also Tim Ingold, "That's Enough about Ethnography!," *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4 (2014): 383–95, on the ways in which the casual and too-frequent use of the term "ethnography" has negatively impacted on the enterprise of anthropology.

[56] On the retention and retiring of the "mascot," see Ellen Koskoff, "SEM Soundbyte: Logoistics Revisited," *SEM Newsletter* 37, no. 3 (2003): 1–3; and J. Lawrence Witzleben, "From the Editor," *Ethnomusicology* 56 (2012): v–viii. The image ceased to appear on the cover of *Ethnomusicology* only in 2014, after decades of debate.

1956 (or who rendered it) is still unclear, but its endurance is highly significant.[57] Its continuation as the "trademark" of the SEM must be interrogated not only in the context of academic examinations of the politics of representation (especially *within* academia, with the Other serving as the "study object" for the Western observer),[58] but also in light of the continuing controversies surrounding the use of Native American "mascots" (or imagery) by professional, college, and high school sports teams throughout the United States.[59] It thus remains (at least to me, and to many of my colleagues) to be explained how, for nearly *six decades,* this image endured, summoning every highly problematic connotation of the "ethnic" while remaining the visual symbol of a discipline supposedly devoted to envoicing the musically muted. In light of the current argument—that is, the centrality of the "ethn-" *not* in the sense of "people" but in the sense of ethnicity, the construction of which is undergirded by ethnography—the retention of this image and its attendant symbolic and discursive centrality can be seen as "peripheral" or "inadvertent" or "innocuous" only in a realm of complete naiveté or blissful self-delusion (which veils the retention of the verbal "ethn-" as well). While it may seem easy for some to condemn pop culture figures like Miley Cyrus or Ariana Grande[60] for objectifying and "exploiting" the racialized Other, it seems to me that the "little man" himself might just as well have been twerking.

20

If this conflation of the popular and the academic realms is disconcerting, let us return finally to Hollywood film and Geertz, to pleasures

---

[57] For two accounts, see Bruno Nettl, *Encounters in Ethnomusicology: A Memoir* (Warren, MI: Harmonie Park Press, 2002), and Witzleben, "From the Editor."

[58] On the dynamic of the Western construction and control of the Other, see Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's oft-cited essay, "Can the Subaltern Speak?," in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 271–313.

[59] A few of the most widely publicized cases involved the Cleveland Indians' mascot "Chief Wahoo" (see Phil Helsel, "Native Groups Look to Retire the Cleveland Indians' Chief Wahoo," *NBCNews.com*, June 23, 2014, www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/native-groups-look-retire-cleveland-indians-chief-wahoo-n137176); the Washington Redskins (see Lauren Gambino, "US Patent Office Strips Washington Redskins of 'Offensive' Trademarks," *The Guardian*, June 18, 2014, www.theguardian.com/sport/2014/jun/18/washington-redskins-lose-trademark-team-us-patent-office; Jacob Gershman, Ashby Jones, and Kevin Clark, "U.S. Patent Office Cancels Washington Redskins Trademark," *Wall Street Journal* online, June 18, 2014, http://online.wsj.com/articles/u-s-patent-office-cancels-washington-redskins-trademarks-1403103213); and the Coachella Valley High School Arabs (see Philip J. Viktor, "California High School Drops Controversial 'Arab' Mascot," *Aljazeera America*, September 12, 2014, http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/9/12/arab-mascot-coachella.html). It is notable that the NAACP (in the previous century), as well as numerous religious, educational, and professional organizations (including the APA and the NEA), had called for their abolition.

[60] See Spencer Kornhaber, "How Ariana Grande Fell Off the Cultural-Appropriation Tightrope," *The Atlantic*, January 23, 2019, www.theatlantic.com/entertainment/archive/2019/01/ariana-grandes-7-rings-really-cultural-appropriation/580978/ for a recent critique of Grande's "cultural appropriation" in the popular press.

and webs, to the concept of "culture." In invoking a Weberian-Geertzian term and conceiving of (corporeally experiencing) culture as (making/making our way through) "webs of significance," it is the very stickiness of the spider's handiwork that becomes important. These tacky filaments through which we move, remain on us and pick up all sorts of in/organic shards, fragments, and dust, even the dangling detritus of other walked-through webs. And we too shed and transfer sticky things to others. Here "culture" is not a container holding atomistic processes and productions that exist apart from one another, but a maddeningly complex, mutually constituting convergence of innumerable collectively affecting "actors," each inevitably bearing traces of that with which s/he, they, or it has come into contact. With reference to my opening example: Did *The Heat*, in fact, animate something in me that allowed for the experience and understanding of, and engagement with academic production from outside a "scholarly" realm? Did the pleasure of viewing a simple binary (priggish/ratchet Ashburn/Mullins)—an anthropomorphized binary played out across the decades and across media (Laurel/Hardy, Kirk/Spock, Felix/Oscar, "2 Broke Girls," Thelma/Louise, Philip Jennings/Elizabeth Jennings [*The Americans*], Hart/Cohle [*True Detective*], Riggs/Murtaugh [*Lethal Weapon*])—allow me to understand the "pleasures" of constructions that attempt to institutionalize and corral the myriad complexities of studying sound and musical practice into yet other simple binaries (us/them, conservative/radical, bad/good, etc.)? In this case, the propinquity of the popular to the academic engendered a productive optics through the intertwining and animation of "inside" with/by "outside" (understanding, of course, the spatiality to be only conceptual); all cultural analysis benefits from occupying diverse locations. And while ethnomusicologists would probably agree with this statement in relation to the ways they approach the objects of their research, I suggest that many have failed to see it in relation to the very enterprise in which they are engaged, which is imagined to be doubly removed, somehow outside the culture they study and somehow outside the "quotidian, nonacademic, unscientific" culture in which they live.

Moreover, as concerns models, while it is not difficult to see the self-propulsive, circular kinesis occasioned by the "of"/"for" aspects of *The Heat*, or popular film, television, and music in general (insofar as they both reflect and influence symbolic constructions and social realities), I contend that ethnomusicology as a discipline has been imagined and constructed as an enterprise that is unidirectional and singular—that is, only as a model *of* and not a model *for*, with the "of" referencing only the "other" culture. Rather than understanding ethnomusicological products and practices *as* cultural products and practices just as malleably double-sided, embedded, and mutually constituted as any other, there

was (and remains) the mistaken idea that perspicacity, "scientific objectivity," and "ethical superiority"[61] have rendered the discipline and its practitioners immune from all of the ideological traps of "quotidian" (including popular) culture.[62] But this is illusory. By conceiving these webs and circular motilities in relation to Judith Butler's conceptions of performativity (another way of theorizing embodied, self-replicating process), and noting Kevin Korsyn's contention that the very constellation of past and present musical (sub)disciplines is made possible by an ideology which *precedes* them,[63] it becomes clear that any discipline's access to a site of unfettered agency, self-determination, and ethically pure objectivity is impossible.

Again highlighting the mania for authenticity, the urge to keep the Other's imagined bodily integrity intact, the centrality of the audible/visible "ethn-," and the longevity of the "little man," we see that those processes and artifacts scrutinized by ethnomusicologists lie not in the territory of "objective reality"—as if "non-Western music" or "the music of X" were "objective realities"—but as the most recent manifestation of the "savage slot," the long-standing Western model "of" that, according to Michel-Rolph Trouillot, has placed the "savage" in a tripartite discursive relationship to both utopia and (Western) order.[64] As such, ethnomusicology (and anthropology, Trouillot's focus) did not create this exoticist, exploitive structure, but the very possibility of the discipline itself is indebted to a construction already centuries old. Ethnomusicology has perpetuated a myth of a study object known via a "disinterested," "objective" practice that engenders a "model of," when in reality the enterprise's primary creation was the discursive continuation of the "savage." In step with any number of other Western cultural productions and practices—from *Black Panther* to Burning Man; from *Les Demoiselles d'Avignon* to the Dutch "*Zwarte Piet*" ("Black Pete")—ethnomusicology was and is one more means by which to maintain the Other to the West's "order," the necessary means by which the West self-defined.

---

[61] Martin Stokes, for example, suggests that ethnomusicology has fostered a "cosy moral stance" in differentiating itself from musicology; see Stokes, "Afterword," in *The New (Ethno)Musicologies*, ed. Henry Stobart (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008), 207–17, at 213.

[62] Gourlay notes that this supposed objective omniscience is accomplished through the "omission" or "obfuscation" of the ethnomusicologist, "postulating him as an abstraction existing only in attributes" in an attempt to "conceal his omission of the personal, even when, as one of the totality of variables, it cannot be omitted"; Gourlay, "Toward a Reassessment," 5.

[63] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990); Korsyn, *Decentering Music*.

[64] Michel-Rolph Trouillot, "Anthropology and the Savage Slot: The Poetics and Politics of Otherness," in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, ed. Richard G. Fox (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1991), 17–44.

Hence, the answer to an earlier question—why do the "ethn-"s remain?—may be seen to have a different genesis than simply ethnomusicologists' "respect for their ancestors."[65] "Respecting ancestors" is not an explanation but an action with myriad motivations, including the preservation of colonialist structures. These structures were allowed to continue owing to the lack of understanding of the very ontology of the disciplinary enterprise; as Kingsbury suggests, ethnomusicology—a discipline with a "residual-yet-pervasive preoccupation with cultural 'other'-ness"—has been responsible for the "institutionalization of an epistemological double standard" whereby critical optics are focused only on "other" musics and not on one's own musical—*and*, I maintain, theoretical—enterprises.[66] It should now be clear that the problem is not simply the name of a discipline but something far deeper. To deny the importance of dispensing with the problematic prefix owing to a belief that it will, organically, fade away when the time comes suggests a placid complicity.

But to maintain – by action, by silence, by complicity – that the appellation is not problematic is indicative of an even more troubling dynamic.

* * *

The discipline of ethnomusicology has been, over the course of the past few years, marked by work that, intentionally or not, troubles the very idea of a field defined by the racial/spatial connotations of the "ethn-." I am thinking of Elizabeth Wollman's historically informed research on the musical theater; Gavin Steingo's contributions to establishing a dialogue between (ethno)musicology and sound studies; Harris Berger's phenomenological analyses and engagement with performance studies; Thomas Hilder's work on indigeneity, digital media, and queerness;[67] and numerous others, including (inter alia) Beverly Diamond, Kiri Miller, Pirkko Moisala, Gillian Rodger, Eun-Young Jung, and Maria Sonevytsky. I cannot, of course, speak for individual scholars regarding their dis/comfort with

---

[65] See Bohlman, "Other Ethnomusicologies," 103. Similarly, Nettl suggests that the SEM members are (or were?) "a rather historically oriented bunch who love to hear the stories about the four founders, and think of [the 'little man'] as a banner flung in the faces of the Philistines of Western art music by the ancient heroes in the 1950s." See Bruno Nettl, *Encounters*, 208 (in Witzleben, "From the Editor," vi–vii).

[66] Kingsbury, "Should Ethnomusicology be Abolished," 248.

[67] Hilder is co-editor, along with Henry Stobart and Shzr Ee Tan, of the welcome collection *Music, Indigeneity, and Digital Media*—a work marked, in part, by an engagement with technology and media as central issues. It is notable that Stobart is also editor of the volume *The New (Ethno)Musicologies*, another book whose various contributors challenged, through their work, simple definitions of the field. See also Jennifer Post's edited collections—*Ethnomusicology: A Contemporary Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2006), with a second volume published in 2017—for examples of work that appears to broaden the definition of ethnomusicology.

a disciplinary appellation or affiliation, and it is possible that all of them support maintaining ethnomusicology as a discipline, although perhaps one that is more theoretically and methodologically diverse and/or places a greater emphasis on "applied" work.[68] Yet taking into account and concurring with Nooshin's belief that "scholarly identities should be liberating, not confining,"[69] I am skeptical that the retention of a disciplinary marker and method so steeped in colonialism can ever be anything but oppressive. To be clear: although I am wholly in support of ending the enterprise currently named ethnomusicology, I am not speaking of the constituent parts but the specific "matrix" (with deliberate allusions to Butler)[70] of methodology, ideology, and geography, which maintains at material and symbolic levels a colonialist othering (despite intentions otherwise). Such a matrix can only, I believe, stifle the productivity of current and future prefix-defying scholars. Moreover, rather than cling to a "home" that is so deeply problematic, an important and selfless move would be to encourage a "postmortem," a robust critical analysis (not history) of the discipline not only (or even primarily) by ethnomusicologists but also by those outside the field (e.g., scholars from comparative literature, cultural, queer, and postcolonial studies, psychology, political science, or numerous others).[71] If this makes ethnomusicologists somehow nervous—"How could *their* methodological or theoretical apparatuses make sense of *our* discipline? We'll be misrepresented!"—imagine the position of all those musical Others whose representations have served as the bases for countless researchers' careers. It was Trouillot's estimation, nearly three decades ago, that "the time is ripe for substantive propositions [in anthropology] that aim explicitly at the destabilization and eventual destruction of the Savage slot."[72] In 2020, the time has turned from ripe to rotting.

But wouldn't the end of ethnomusicology leave a gaping hole, a vacuum threatening to be filled by yet more ethnocentric, universalizing Westernness? Perhaps a "replacement" for ethnomusicology is in order?

---

[68] On the importance of applied work, see Klisala Harrison, "The Second Wave of Applied Ethnomusicology," *Musicultures* 41 (2014): 15–33; and Svanibor Pettan and Jeff Todd Titon, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Ethnomusicology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015). See also Charles Keil's widely discussed essay on applied sociomusicology, "Call and Response: Applied Sociomusicology and Performance Studies," *Ethnomusicology* 42 (1998): 303–12.

[69] Nooshin, "Ethnomusicology, Alterity," 74.

[70] Butler, *Gender Trouble*.

[71] Marianna Torgovnick's analysis of anthropology and its relationship to constructions of the "primitive" stands as one example of how "outsiders" might critique the field; see Torgovnick, *Primitive Passions: Men, Women, and the Quest for Ecstasy* (New York: Knopf, 1997).

[72] Trouillot, "Anthropology," 40.

Given the centrality of culture and cultural situation in relation to expressive process and practice, and the ways in which many of its practitioners' works show numerous sympathies with that of the aforementioned "genre-defying" ethnomusicologists, it may seem a propitious time to embrace a "cultural musicology." Judging by the work and foci of many of my European contemporaries operating under this moniker, "cultural musicology" is a discipline that exhibits a willingness to explore a breadth of methodological, intellectual, aesthetic, and theoretical practices and possibilities. Moreover, in addition to the ethnomusicologists I have referenced above, there are numerous musicologists (and music theorists)—Bonnie Gibson, Melle Kromhout, Justin Burton, Gavin Lee, Denise Von Glahn, Tim Taylor, Nina Sun Eidsheim, Mark Butler, Kate Guthrie, James Currie, and Stephan Pennington, as only a few examples—whose work is similarly discipline-defying, and who may, like their post-ethnomusicology colleagues, find a productive disciplinary home in just such an intellectual space. Yet such a move is problematic on two grounds, both of which center on the interrelated symbolic and ideological aspects of the word "cultural."

First, this word, and its burdened nature and history, gives pause—the worry that it too might soon appear as dated and problematic as the prefix "ethno-" does to many of us today. We would do well to note that the concept of culture has proven resistant to a stable or mutually agreed definition, even within the field of anthropology (one in which it is arguably the central concept);[73] to understand that the term continues to be interrogated, with new, rapidly appearing formulations (each necessarily geopolitically and historically contingent, and none ideologically disinterested); and to dispense with fantasies that we have reached a perfect understanding of the term and will never again encounter the type of seismic shifts witnessed in the past—from "culture" as something only the "civilized" had (e.g., Matthew Arnold)[74] to "culture" as a "universal" concept (in the Boasian tradition). Second—and of fundamental importance—we must consider the status of the word *as* qualifier, one arguably gesturing toward a stultifying equilibrium, something anathema to intellectual inquiry. Alain Badiou, for example, finds the use of qualifiers (e.g., "national adjective + people," "popular") intrinsically problematic, owing in part to the multiple ways they refer the subject back to the

[73] Surveying the field, one is struck not only by the shifts between conceptualizations of the term, but also by the sheer numbers of definitions; in 1952, for example, anthropologists A. L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn compiled a list of such definitions that totaled 164, one that could arguably be categorized as incomplete even with such a tally; see Kroeber and Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum, 1952).

[74] Matthew Arnold, *Culture and Anarchy*, ed. Jane Garnett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, [1869] 2006).

State—a stolid, exploitive construction that stands in direct opposition to the potentiating dynamism of "the event." According to both Badiou and Jacques Rancière, the very basis of the group, the "people" (always already political) is to be found not in consensus and stability, but in difference and differentiation;[75] Badiou's "event" is found at the sites of cleavage from the quotidian or status quo, while Rancière suggests that the "particular attribute [of the people] is to be different from itself, internally divided," not as "a scandal to be deplored" but as "the primary condition of the exercise of politics."[76]

Returning one last time to *The Heat* and noting specifically the not entirely sating "pleasures" it engendered over multiple viewings, I add to the insights of "high theory" some specifically musical understandings. True, the film was great fun to watch (twice), and it helped illuminate (or "model") concerns and conflicts in supposedly weightier milieus. Yet its known-in-advance trajectory and denouement arguably foreclose the possibility of exploring new paths or the productiveness of valued difference. The "dialectic compromise" ultimately robs both Mullins and Ashburn of their idiosyncratic dispositions; they eliminate volatility and embrace peaceful stability (a "happy ending"). To approach music from such a stance of "stability" (in relation to the theories used, the [musical] product and process itself, and the matrix that binds methodology, geography, and ideology) is entirely anathema; as Birgit Abels argues, given the very ontology of that which we study (music, musicking, sound, process, relation), it is necessary to let go of the illusion of authority and engage a "restlessness."[77] Korsyn evinces a similar desire to embrace the productivity of the peripatetic, advocating for an "antimethod" that "[works] against *itself* as much as against other methods, resisting its own closure." He urges us to conceive of our exploration of music as "an incomplete activity, making critique an ongoing process, rather than a stage that will be superseded by arriving at a new orthodoxy or consensus."[78]

I thus maintain that it is well past the time—for epistemological, intellectual, ideological, and ethical reasons—to retire not only ethnomusicology but *all* the subdisciplines known by isolating and enervating

---

[75] See Alain Badiou, *Being and Event*, trans. Oliver Feltham (New York: Continuum, [1988] 2005); Badiou, "24 Notes on the Uses of the Word 'People'," in Alain Badiou et al., *What Is a People?*, trans. Jody Gladding (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), 21–31; and Jacques Rancière, *Dis-agreement: Politics and Philosophy*, trans. Julie Rose (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, [1995] 1999).

[76] Rancière, *Dis-agreement*, 87.

[77] See Birgit Abels, ed., *Embracing Restlessness: Cultural Musicology* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2016). The relinquishment of power in relation to music is a theme also explored by Suzanne Cusick in her essay "On a Lesbian Relationship with Music: A Serious Effort Not to Think Straight," in *Queering the Pitch: The New Gay and Lesbian Musicology*, ed. Philip Brett, Elizabeth Wood, and Gary C. Thomas (New York: Routledge, 1994), 67–83.

[78] Korsyn, *Decentering Music*, 50.

qualifiers (ethno-, cultural, popular, critical, comparative, cognitive, eco-, etc.), adjectives operating in the service of a monologic insularity that breeds stasis. Yet there should likewise be no support for a convergence based on grudging compromise and genteel tolerance. To continue thinking musically (and to return to my undergraduate days): Tim Rice's explorations of multipart vocal music from the Shop region in Western Bulgaria, where the singers strive to create intervallic relationships that result in a "clash" of overtones and a sonority that "[rings] like bells,"[79] provide an example of a *desire* for, rather than *avoidance* of, productive, intersubjectively produced (sonic, material) tension. And in addition to understanding the pleasure in producing and experiencing this literally tactile, pulsating sonorousness engendered *by* tension (in the throat, among the vibrations), it is important also to highlight the culturally and historically contingent and ideologically loaded meanings of "dissonance." If, as Korsyn suggests, the academic landscape is currently marked by a compulsion to "abstract" one's work—meaning, in part, to reduce it to its most easily quotable, quantifiable form and to conform it to previously "successful" work, resulting in a (model of/ model for) succession of replicas[80]—the motivations for this are not only the "professionalization" of the university (and the monetization of one's intellectual labor) but also the overwhelmingly negative ways that "conflict" and "tension" have been figured. Yet the singers with whom Rice worked, via their terminologies, actions, and desires, reveal alternate ways of arranging the constituent parts of a neoliberal vs. academic binary that manifests as dissonance/tension/negative vs. consonance/ stasis/positive.

27

Understanding the very tension which undergirds music's ontology, a constant (inter)play between the material and immaterial, as well as the affective tension that is so often the marker and "medium" of the sonic's relation to human sensoria and cultural space, contemporary research must likewise be founded upon a productive and constant agitation. Rather than the business-as-usual continuation of parochial, provincial subdisciplines marked by a "radical nonengagement with competing approaches,"[81] the mandate for the future must be the creation of an interdiscipline (one perhaps invigorated by and ultimately moving toward transdisciplinarity),[82] the "primary condition" of which is

[79] Timothy Rice, "Aspects of Bulgarian Musical Thought," *Yearbook of the International Folk Music Council* 12 (1980): 43–66, at 57, 60.

[80] Korsyn, *Decentering Music* (especially Part I, 3–56).

[81] Korsyn, *Decentering Music*, 15.

[82] Basarab Nicolescu defines multidisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity, and transdisciplinarity as, respectively, (a) "studying a research topic in not just one discipline only, but in several at the same time; (b) "the transfer of methods from one discipline to another"; and (c) "that which is at once *between* the disciplines, *across* the different disciplines, and *beyond*

a hyperacuity (focused on both research and researching self) engendered by, as Korsyn suggests, a constant confrontation with radically different points of view originating from *within* one's sphere of production. Rice suggests that ethnomusicologists' failure to engage with theoretical constructs occurring both within the discipline and in cognate disciplines outside of it—manifesting as a solipsistic approach to production and publication of research—has impoverished the discipline and prevented the field's work from becoming an integral and vital part of humanistic research in general.[83] Conversely, our yet-to-be-created interdiscipline would be marked by a commitment to the necessity of mutual critique, theoretical engagement, and methodological breadth, understanding that music—offering extraordinary possibilities for the exploration of questions related to inter/subjectivity, affect, embodiment, environment/space, ideology, aesthetics, perception, (bio)technology, and, indeed, ontology/being (among innumerable others)—is one of the richest spheres of human production and interaction.

Such a space, an interdiscipline extraordinaire (the contours of which might be glimpsed in the work of several of the scholars noted previously or initiatives such as the *Analytic Approaches to World Music* journal and the Society for Interdisciplinary Musicology),[84] could, through its diversity and vigor, attract researchers and practitioners currently operating outside of and reluctant to enter (what are often seen as) the more "conservative" disciplines of ethno/musicology,[85] including

---

all disciplines," the goal of which is "the understanding of the present world, of which one of the imperatives is the unity of knowledge"; Nicolescu, "Methodology of Transdisciplinarity," *World Futures: The Journal of New Paradigm Research* 70 (2014): 186–99, at 187. Nicolescu's definitions are not universally acknowledged, however; for example, in his introduction to *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, Robert Frodeman notes that both interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity accrue different meanings in different geographical locations (e.g., the United States vs. Europe); see Frodeman, "Introduction," in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, ed. Robert Frodeman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), xxxn1.

[83] See Timothy Rice, "Call and Response: Disciplining *Ethnomusicology*: A Call for a New Approach," *Ethnomusicology* 54 (2010): 310–25. This insularity, often in conjunction with an extreme conservatism, has been remarked on by others as well. Bohlman, for example, questions the equation of ethnomusicology with "newness," finding the discipline to be overly invested in its historical (anthropological) pedigree; see Bohlman, "Other Ethnomusicologies." Additionally, Michelle Bigenho contends that the discipline has lost its critical edge (see Bigenho, "Why I'm Not an Ethnomusicologist: A View from Anthropology," in *The New (Ethno)Musicologies*, ed. Henry Stobart [Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2008], 29–40), and Kingsbury maintains that the field "has become excessively autonomous, virtually immune to developments in related disciplines" (see Kingsbury, "Should Ethnomusicology be Abolished," 243).

[84] The society, which fosters "collaboration between sciences and the humanities in musicology" (www.idmusicology.com/cim/), has hosted annual conferences since 2004 and also publishes the *Journal of Interdisciplinary Music Studies* (http://musicstudies.org/).

[85] As only a few examples, I think of Tok Thompson and Amanda Weidman (from the field of anthropology), as well as Gretchen Jude and Elias Krell (both from performance

those engaged in expanding the very idea of "research" through artistic or practice-based inquiries and projects.[86] The polar opposite of a "safe space," such an interdiscipline must value the frissons of continual shocks, and operationalize collegiality and respect *as* shock and critique, rather than the debilitating narcotic of the undying "mutual admiration society." There is, of course, no guarantee (or possibility) of escaping ideologies and occlusions—but as a fast-moving target, constantly shape-shifting via innumerable permutations of theory/method/action (not one endless Deleuze-a-palooza; not a continued reification of fieldwork; not an unquestioning obeisance to big data), intellectual stasis might be kept at bay. Moreover, this fleet-footed and recombinant nature, coupled with a commitment to individual *and* collaborative research, via new media and channels (offering innovative possibilities for the creation and dissemination of co-/multi-authored scholarship),[87] would also serve as a bulwark against the possibility of an interdiscipline marked by dilettantism or superficial engagement with complex theory and methodology (e.g., "fieldwork light").

It is difficult to believe that more than four decades have passed since Kenneth Gourlay's incisive critique, wherein he argued that ethnomusicology's deficiencies were inextricably linked to the discipline's problematic embrace of "science": first, insofar as disciplinary identity was framed as a simple either-or choice ("science or solipsism"); and second, insofar as "science" was implicitly defined as a generic, "one-size-fits-all" enterprise.[88] Given Nooshin's related concerns—that the "scientific" suffix, the "-ology," is in some ways as problematic as the prefix[89]—it may appear problematic that I am obviously suggesting that this reimagined interdiscipline of the future move forward with a name from the past: musicology. It is a suggestion I assume may be met with both skepticism and hostility—as was Cook's original claim that "we are all musicologists now," to which my title refers.[90] I obviously agree with Cook, Nooshin, and

---

studies) and Robin James (philosophy). We must also include scholars working in the fields of cognitive psychology and neuroscience, although some of these researchers currently operate in a music-defined sphere (e.g., cognitive musicology).

[86] For examples of work devoted to questions of artistic or practice-based research, see note 2 above.

[87] Sander Gilman highlights the interaction between process and (dissemination of) production in an interdisciplinary realm, suggesting that "we need to think more intensely how our wider theoretical expertise can, indeed must mesh with alternative forms for the presentation of humanistic knowledge and experience"; see Gilman, "Collaboration, the Economy, and the Future of the Humanities," *Critical Inquiry* 30 (2004): 384–90, at 387.

[88] Kenneth Gourlay, "Toward a Reassessment."

[89] Nooshin, "Ethnomusicology, Alterity."

[90] At the 2001 Royal Holloway conference, Cook's original proclamation was met with resistance by many in attendance. Upon publication of a version of the conference paper in Stobart's 2008 volume, the (sub)discipline replaced the no-prefix discipline as the

Korsyn (among others), who have highlighted the need for a comprehensive reconceptualization of the current musical-academic terrain. In Nooshin's view, ethnomusicologists "have 'Othered' and '-ologied' ourselves as a means of empowerment, and now we need to find a way out," perhaps via an escape from both prefix and suffix, with the moniker "music studies."[91] Korsyn advocates an even more radical shift: a move not to *inter*disciplinarity (as I have suggested) but to *post*disciplinarity.[92] It is arguable that a complete break from any reference to any of the historical "disciplines," musical or otherwise, is exactly what is needed: an "event" that culminates in a radical cleavage from state/institution/discipline. Yet while I believe that we have indeed reached the point where ethnomusicology has come to an end, I am less convinced that the complete eradication of its "root(s)" is desirable (or possible) at the present time, at least at the level of appellation. Perhaps this signals my doubts about certain formulations of a metaphysical version of "truth" (suggested by Badiou's philosophy), which again may suggest a position outside the circular modeling of culture. Additionally, and on a more pragmatic level, it appears that the term "musicology" still carries some utility in bringing together scholars and practitioners from diverse intellectual, geographical, and linguistic locations. If what is desired is increased and productive dialogue, then the eradication of an "international" term might render the "new" discipline illegible to all but the cognoscenti. It is, admittedly, a term that will probably be dumped in the future, for good reason—but if the possibility of a radically reimagined, post-disciplinary (post-?)university sphere of critical studies of music may be decades away, it is arguably more desirable to exploit the moniker in the present to ensure that as many voices and views as possible can attend the party. It is time to value inclusivity, to foster work that benefits the research community, the public, and our shared geocultural ecologies, and to refuse putatively "academic" enterprises motivated in large part by the settling of historical grievances, the protection of wounded egos, and the production of disciplinary turf—often via the exploitation of Others.

But beyond pragmatism, coming together under this "scientific" and symbolically, historically laden moniker would be an act with profound significance. First, to create an interdiscipline marked by a multiplicity of rigorous approaches is to move in fact toward what Gourlay suggested: an understanding and enactment of "science" *as* complex and multifaceted.[93] Moreover, uniting under the mantle of musicology is not to signal

---

suggested site of disciplinary convergence (see Cook, "We Are All (Ethno)musicologists Now"; Nooshin, "Ethnomusicology, Alterity," and "Happy Families").

    [91] Nooshin, "Ethnomusicology, Alterity," 74.

    [92] Korsyn, "Decentering Music," 40ff.

    [93] Gourlay, "Toward a Reassessment."

any sort of "capitulation," any "loss" on the "battlefield," any opportunity for the "victors" to gloat ("you see, Bruckner *is* better!"); the very coming together under one mantle *is* the victory, an unambiguous sign of cessation of partisanship. To utter the constative/performative declaration, "we are all musicologists now" (or better, "we are all musicologists *for* now"), is not to signal acquiescence to what musicology was (or was assumed to have been) but *(re)appropriation.* This is not a (re)appropriation in the way the word "queer" has been turned from an epithet to a (proud) self-definition, reclaimed from the homophobe and thus defused; rather, when the moniker "musicology" necessarily encompasses an incalculable number of constellations of foci and methodologies, when "musicology" is understood not as a potential *component* of interdisciplinary work, but as, quintessentially, an interdisciplinary (or, ultimately, trans- or post-disciplinary) undertaking, it cannot but have been changed. A prefix-defying musicology (defying even temporal markers such as "new") and the term musicologist will come to signify and comprise the previously excluded disciplinary others: the "peasants" can storm "the Bastille," the "geeks" can invade the "invitation-only underground club," and scholars who research everything from community choirs to YouTube cover versions to Shostakovich's late works (in Beirut, Berlin, Beijing, or Boise) can say, "I am a musicologist." The day when music researchers previously identified adjectivally are all known unqualifiedly by nouns (musicology, musicologist) is a day when suzerainty of one—*any*—type of disciplinary chauvinism is deemed untenable. Rather than capitulating to the seemingly intractable exigencies of the present or allowing "the anxiety of the future [to push] us back into models of the past,"[94] it is time to trade prefixes of fixity and exclusion for those of motion and fusion (inter-, trans-, multi-), to accept and embrace the excitement of the friction, the heat, produced by all our fantastically conflicting voices.

ABSTRACT

Situated in the context of current examinations of academic disciplinarity, this article contributes to the decades-long discussions (or debates) regarding the status of ethnomusicology, arguing forcefully for the (sub-)discipline's cessation. A focus on ethnomusicology's very prefix, "ethn-", exposes the field's historical and continuing reliance upon colonialist ideology, continually reproduced in relation to both ethnicity (constructed in relation to interrelated discourses of authenticity,

---

[94] Gilman, "Collaboration," 389.

technology, and gender) and ethnography. Highlighting the extent to which a field-defining ideological-methodological matrix has led to the production of a theoretical narrowness predicated upon and engendering the construction of "Others," it is commitment to inter-, trans-, or post-disciplinarity (rather than disciplinary dogmatism) that is shown to promise a vital and relevant space for explorations of sound and music within current and future university spaces. Ultimately, given the inherent restrictions and limitations suggested by prefixes or qualifiers of any sort, it is the appellation musicology that may best serve as a (provisional) marker for interdisciplinary inquiry, its very re-appropriation (from its own historical circumscriptions) serving as an act rife with symbolic significance.

Keywords: ethnomusicology, ethnicity, ethnography, musicology, disciplinarity, interdisciplinarity