Introduction: On Difference, Representation, and Appropriation in Music

Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh

The music of Asia and India is to be admired because it has reached a stage of perfection, and it is this stage of perfection that interests me. But otherwise the music is dead.

PIERRE BOULEZ

The least interesting form of influence, to my mind, is that of imitating the sound of some non-Western music. . . . Instead of imitation, the influences of non-Western musical structures on the thinking of a Western composer is likely to produce something genuinely new.

STEVE REICH

I got interested in world music as a failed drummer; I was able to look for fresher rhythms. It just seemed fresh, wonderful, more live and spiritual than most pop.

PETER GABRIEL

The study of world musics moved out of what would nowadays be called an Orientalist stance only in the 1960s. Till then, few people seriously questioned the notion that beyond the Western classical tradition there were three kinds of music to be studied: Oriental, folk, and primitive. . . . "Oriental" of course referred to those Asian "high cultures" that had long-term, accessible internal histories and that could be "compared" with similar European systems. "Primitive" encompassed all the "preliterate" peoples of the world, who had to rely on oral tradition for transmission and who had no highly professionalized "art musicians" in their midst. The "folk" were the internal primitives of Euro-America.

MARK SLOBIN

How should we conceive of difference in music? The kind of difference invoked when music, that quintessentially nonrepresentational medium, is employed (paradoxically) so as to represent, through musical figures, another music, another culture, an other? What is implied by attending to the *boundaries* of musical-aesthetic discourses inherent in this notion of representing or appropriating another music or culture *in* music? Or in the notion that a music's construction of its own identity may involve the exclusion or repudiation of another music? Or in the concept of hybridity as

a process of mixing between erstwhile distinct and bounded musical cultures? How do we understand the differences embodied in the master meta-classification of music noted by Mark Slobin in the quotation above? Must all such classifications—that is, must the recognition of difference in music—necessarily be fictive and divisive, ideological and hierarchical? Or can it be allied to a reflexive, analytical project?

This book is an attempt to ask basic questions of this nature in relation to two related phenomena: musical borrowings or appropriations, and the way that music has been used to construct, evoke, or mark alterity of a musical or a sociocultural kind. The book begins on the theme, broadly, of the relationship between "Western" art music and "other" musics.[1] Focused primarily on the twentieth century, it examines the ways in which art musics have drawn upon, or repudiated, popular, non-Western, and ethnic musics, and what these relations mean in cultural and political terms. This requires an analysis of the particularity of musical constructions of alterity, of the techniques of the musical imaginary, whether in exoticist, Orientalist, or primitivist musics, and of how these musical signs come to bear meaning. This is to address the nature of specifically musical representation—a problem easily ignored given music's status as a nonrepresentational medium; given also the more obviously ideological propensities of denotative media, that is, the literary and visual arts.[2] The collection also pursues wider issues of representation through music: how other cultures are represented in music through the appropriation or imaginative figuration of their own music, and, conversely, how social and cultural identities and differences come to be constructed and articulated in music. In later essays, these issues are taken up in relation to mass-mediated and commercial popular musics: the representation of others in the narrative film music of Hollywood; how contemporary Third World musics come to be represented in the discourse of world music; and the politics of representation and appropriation in contemporary hybrid popular musics.

In some ways, this collection revisits the territory covered by a number of recent works addressing issues of musical exoticism and Orientalism,[3] the relations between Western musics and non-Western musics,[4] musicology and difference,[5] and world music.[6] Indeed, a common problematic across musicology, ethnomusicology, and popular music studies in recent years has been the theorization of music and identity and, by implication, difference.[7] But the aim of this book is to foster further conceptual development by thinking *across* a number of these questions, which have often been treated separately.[8] Importantly, it addresses them in relation to both art musics and popular musics, proposing that we may learn from the comparative exercise of tracing exoticism through the practices of early-twentieth-century French composers (see Pasler's essay) to those of late-twentieth-century world dance fusion groups (see Hesmondhalgh's essay).

The collection is also a departure in its attempt to think through these issues in relation to several music disciplines: musicology, ethnomusicology, popular music studies, and film music studies. Each discipline brings a characteristic focus and set of analytical tools to bear on the material, and together they offer a comparative sense of analytical possibilities. We intend this to be useful for scholars and students from each discipline who may want to become familiar with other approaches. From film music studies, Claudia Gorbman focuses on the relations between music and filmic and dramatic texts in the genre of the western. From popular music studies, Simon Frith and David Hesmondhalgh examine the political, industrial, organizational, and discursive dimensions of world music and dance fusion musics, with emphasis on how these dimensions condition musical representations. From ethnomusicology, Philip V. Bohlman and Martin Stokes examine, with reference to Jewish cantors in nineteenth-century Austria and arabesk popular music in late-twentieth-century Turkey, how musical representations are inserted into wider sociocultural processes, in particular the changing contours of collective cultural identities. From musicology, Julie Brown, Peter Franklin, Richard Middleton and Jann Pasler give composer-, music-, and text-centered accounts of the complexities of musical authorship and agency. This enables them to explore the ideologies and musical imaginaries of a range of composers, the nature of the hybrids resulting from their musical borrowings, and how certain musics are constituted through the purposive or ambivalent absenting or mastery of other musics and cultures. Yet many of the essays confound neat disciplinary divisions and attest to the increasing mutual influence and shared problematics between the disciplines. In the face of the historical fragmentation of music scholarship into its several disciplines, it is these kinds of intellectual and methodological crossovers that today yield some of the most interesting findings. But, emphatically, this book is not an exercise in methodological relativism. In this introduction, we attempt to show that it is precisely an interdisciplinary perspective that makes it possible to advance some central conceptual problems.

I. POSTCOLONIAL ANALYSIS AND MUSIC STUDIES

To examine musical borrowing and appropriation is necessarily to consider the relations between culture, power, ethnicity, and class; and these relations are always further entangled in the dynamics of gender and sexuality, as certain essays in this volume indicate. In recent years, the political importance and complexity of these matters has been argued for with great vigor in literary and cultural studies. An important subfield of literary studies focused particularly on the connections between culture, race, and empire has crystallized in the 1980s and 1990s around the theme of postcolonialism. We begin by pointing to some ways in which postcolonial analysis provides a start-

ing point for the consideration of musical appropriation in this collection. Productive aspects of postcolonial theory and criticism have been neglected in music studies; but, while we want to argue for their value here, we also want to suggest the need for qualification.

The attention paid by postcolonial analysis to the politics of culture and colonialism is not without precedent. According to Williams and Chrisman, the contributions of black nationalist intellectuals and liberation thinkers from the late nineteenth century and earlier twentieth century tend to be "overlooked by academics intent on identifying Frantz Fanon as the founding father of Third World liberationist discourse."[9] But aside from the work of Fanon, most commentators agree that, if there is a distinctive field of postcolonial analysis, it developed in the wake of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978).[10] Said employed the insights of French poststructuralism, in particular those of Foucault, to analyze nineteenth-century European writings on non-European cultures with the aim of illuminating the discursive operations of colonialism. By examining a range of representational practices—the work of geographers, historians, travellers, and early anthropologists, as well as literary high culture and memoirs—Said highlighted the forms of language and knowledge that were intimately connected to, and colluded with, the history of European colonialism, while granting these cultural forms a certain autonomy. In Foucauldian manner, Said portrayed the development of Orientalist colonial discourses and representational practices as resulting in a construction that determined both what could be said and what could count as truth. For Said, Orientalism was the academic study of "the East" (the original meaning of the term); it was also, more broadly, the attempt by various writers (including Aeschylus, Dante, Hugo, and Marx) to engage with and understand "Eastern" cultures. Above all it was a discourse, in the Foucauldian sense, which, through the complicity of knowledge systems, politics, and government, not only constructed but was instrumental in administering and subjugating "the Orient."

In the 1980s, as other writers took up Said's project, colonial discourse analysis became a burgeoning field of literary theory and criticism, and by the 1990s it was increasingly incorporated into the domain of postcolonial studies. As a whole, this field now subsumes a range of distinctive aims and methods: the analysis of literary works produced in colonizing countries and of how they treat, or ignore, the issue of colonization; the analysis of writing (and cultural production in general) about colonized countries, reflecting an increasing concern to expand the object of literary study beyond fiction, drama, and poetry; the analysis of writing that emerged from colonized countries during and after the formal colonial period; and scrutiny of the relations in the postcolonial period between Western theories, institutions, and intellectuals and those of the formerly colonized countries (including the implications of using poststructuralist critical method itself).[11]

Yet however internally heterogeneous it may be, postcolonial studies can be demarcated from other modes of cultural analysis, and its contribution to the project of developing the history and theory of "race," culture, and power are considerable.

An initial way that postcolonial studies is relevant for an analysis of the musical treatment of sociocultural difference, and of the power-imbued nature of musical appropriation, is that it refuses to treat culture as an autonomous and politically innocent domain of social life. Rather, there is a relentless insistence on the importance of culture and knowledge in understanding social power. As has been well-established by recent work in critical musicology, postwar music scholarship has been particularly prone to the view that an analysis of social and political processes is irrelevant for an understanding of culture.[12] It is true that much music scholarship has sought to avoid out-and-out formalism by addressing music's various "contexts"; paradoxically, the very treatment of these contexts as explanatory factors in understanding musical texts can reinforce the tendency to privilege the text itself. What is lost here is any sense of the dialectical relationship between acts of musical communication on the one hand and political, economic, and cultural power-relations on the other. Postcolonial analysis, then, sets a fruitful example for music studies in that it pays meticulous attention to textual detail, but always sees such analysis as subsidiary to the larger project of thinking through the implications of cultural expression for understanding asymmetrical power relations and concomitant processes of marginalization and denigration.

Like the poststructuralist thought to which it is often indebted, postcolonial analysis seeks to enhance the conceptualization of cultural politics. Much recent work has attempted to move beyond the neo-Gramscian concepts of hegemony and resistance, which have become reified into simplistic binaries. This means avoiding the racist conception of colonizers as civilizing agents and the colonized as beneficiaries; but equally, it means avoiding any anticolonialist reversal of these categories, which would homogenize the colonizing practice and conceive of the colonized as victims. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's work, for example, is marked by an insistence on heterogeneity and contradiction, stressing variations in the historical experience and expression of oppression and differences within the colonizing formations, and the impossibility of a process of subject-formation that can evade the effects of logocentrism, phallocentrism, and colonialism. In passing, Spivak has evoked the combined destructive and productive impacts of imperialism in the concept of an "enabling violence,"[13] a concept that summarizes beautifully the paradoxes of the material in the present book.

Postcolonial studies, like cultural studies as a whole, has been characterized by a marked interdisciplinarity. It has, for example, developed productive interfaces with historical studies of colonialism and the analysis of rep-

resentation in cultural anthropology.[14] One important nexus has focused on psychoanalysis following the work of Homi Bhabha. Bhabha attempts to understand the colonial encounter by bringing together the reading of Lacanian psychoanalysis with theories of ideology inaugurated by 1970s film theory, the earlier work of Fanon, and a Foucauldian theory of subjectification. His essay "The Other Question," for example, explicitly challenges functionalist and determinist accounts of colonialism by pointing to a lack that is central to the constitution of colonial subjectivity, a lack suggested by the necessity of repetition for the reproduction of discursive stereotypes.[15]

Postcolonial analysis is thus an ambitious field that foregrounds the racial and ethnic power dynamics of global cultural relations. It does so historically, through analysis of the discourses of colonialism; it attempts to understand the legacies and repercussions of colonialist culture in the contemporary world; and it strives also to reveal how identities and epistemologies characteristic of the West continue to be underpinned by the legacies of racism and colonialism. Some of the basic questions raised by the field are shared by the essays that follow, even where they address apparently noncolonialist forms of racism and class inequality, such as the treatment of "internal others" (Brown, Bohlman, Stokes) and "Low-others" (Middleton). The questions include: How is it possible to represent other cultures? What techniques are available for representation, and what implicit meanings do they bear? What is the relationship between political domination and cultural- and knowledge-production? What forms of subversion of dominant representational practices are possible? What role do Western and non-Western cultural producers and intellectuals play, wittingly and unwittingly, in various processes of representation?

In spite of its myriad strengths, however, postcolonial theory has been criticized for certain limitations as a mode of cultural analysis, even on its home terrain of culture and colonialism. While constantly alert to the racialized nature of cultural power, it tends to treat such power almost entirely in terms of textuality and epistemology. Material conditions and the possibility of political practices oriented toward changing material conditions are sidelined. This has been the cause of some bitter Marxist polemics against the field, but it is a point made also by sympathetic critics such as Benita Parry.[16] Indeed, a major debate concerns the degree to which the postcolonial project is compatible with epistemologies and accounts of agency characteristic of Marxism. Sociological, political, and economic issues tend to be unintegrated or neglected. Again, even sympathetic proponents have noted this feature. Stuart Hall, for example, has described the failure in postcolonial studies to consider the relationship between postcolonialism and global capitalism as "seriously damaging and disabling for everything positive which the postcolonial paradigm can, and has the ambition to, accomplish."[17] Moreover, postcolonial analysis has tended to concentrate on

"official" and high-art discourses at the expense of a systematic account of the prominent role of commercial popular culture within systems of colonialism and neocolonialism (as it can operate both to reinforce and, on occasion, to subvert these processes).[18]

More generally, perhaps under the influence of poststructuralism, postcolonial analysis has tended to avoid questions of agency. One response to this neglect has been formulated by the anthropologist Nicholas Thomas, who calls for a plural account of colonial formations and strategies adequate to the variety of their historical forms and, relatedly, for an analysis of agency and of the complexities of the "practical expression of discourse." Thomas's aim is to develop a "productive analytical tension, a reading that is stretched between regimes of [representation and] truth and their moments of mediation, reformulation and contestation in practice."[19] Later, in sections IV and V of the introduction, we advocate a more complex account of agency, one that addresses both its individual and collective modalities and that, in considering individual agency, can address the core problem of the interface between (collective) discourse and individual subjectivities. It is, nonetheless, the kind of perspective opened up by Thomas that allows for analyses such as we offer in this book: of specific moments and forms of musical representations of others, of their variability in context, of the complexities of authorial agency and practice in relation to wider discursive formations, and of the changing contours of discursive debate and conflict as they are projected into musical forms.

Given the productive example and the substantial cultural impact in recent years of postcolonial analysis, the relative lack of attention in music studies to the relationships between musical cultures, race, and colonialism is striking.[20] There are a number of possible reasons. First, there is music's apparent status as a nonrepresentational medium, referred to above and probed throughout this volume. There is the continuing reluctance in the core music disciplines to consider the political dimensions of musical cultures and of music scholarship. The last twenty years have seen attempts to alter this state of affairs by politicizing music scholarship in various ways. The delayed impacts of neo-Marxism, critical theory, and poststructuralism have inspired a number of studies that, whatever their differences, portray music as inextricably bound to the exercise and interrogation of power. These studies have been particularly successful in generating greater attention to issues of gender and sexuality, both in the analysis of musical cultures and as they affect musicology.[21] In this context, it is even more unfortunate that the new critical music scholarship has, on the whole, neglected to engage with the issues raised by postcolonial studies.

There are, of course, exceptions. As Martin Stokes points out in his contribution, ethnomusicology has always attended to questions of how music represents, and how music and musicians are represented. This has helped

to pave the way for a relatively swift response from ethnomusicology to the concern with practices of representation central to both postcolonial analysis and poststructuralism; and in section III of this introduction we trace how debates about appropriation, globalization, and hybridity have been configured in popular music studies and some recent ethnomusicology.[22] But in the study of Western art music, still the privileged domain of academic music scholarship, the impact of postcolonial analysis has as yet been minimal. There is no lack of studies of Western music's long history of borrowing from and evoking non-Western cultures and musics. Commonly, however, the main analytical issue has been the accuracy and authenticity of the appropriated material.[23] Elsewhere, the act of borrowing from other musical cultures has been portrayed as primarily an open-minded and empathic gesture of interest in and fascination with marginalized musics.[24] Such a perspective holds the danger of treating non-Western cultures purely as a resource for the reinvigoration of Western culture.

The present volume does not apply postcolonial theory to music, but it does take initial steps in the direction of exploring the relations between structured inequalities of race/class power and the history, theory, and analysis of music.[25] Its main predecessors are a number of valuable essays that took the lead from postcolonial studies, primarily through engagement with the legacy of Said.[26] Ralph P. Locke, for example, has assessed a group of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Orientalist operas in terms of recurring structures of plot and character, and the musical means employed by composers to carry out or "undercut" such characterization. In an essay on Saint-Saëns's *Samson et Dalila* (begun 1868), Locke identifies a prototypical narrative of Orientalist opera, which the Saint-Saëns work knowingly complexifies:

> Young, tolerant, brave, possibly naïve, white-European tenor-hero intrudes, at risk of disloyalty to his own people and colonialist ethic, into mysterious, dark-skinned, colonized territory represented by alluring dancing girls and deeply affectionate, sensitive lyric soprano, incurring wrath of brutal, intransigent tribal chieftain (bass or bass-baritone) and blindly obedient chorus of male savages.[27]

The Orientalist paradigm thus revolves around the gendered binary opposition of "a morally superior 'us' (or 'collective Self') and an appealing but dangerous 'them' ('collective other'),"[28] an eroticized encounter in which "they" come close to causing "our" downfall. The other is figured as a highly sexual female (Delilah in this opera) who is both desirable and desiring and represents both temptation and threat. Locke, exploring the wider context of Orientalism in nineteenth-century France, suggests that given the general silencing of women's sexuality in this period, Orientalist images of woman operated as an "exotic mask [whereby] much that was otherwise repressed could be smuggled into the art gallery and opera house."[29] In both

articles, Locke examines the way that pentatonicism and other unusual or purposefully constrained musical procedures are used in Orientalist operas to suggest "Easternness," in relation to both female and male characters. In the later essay, he stresses the importance of distinguishing representations of Easternness from the composers' and librettists' intentions to make allegorical statements about events closer to home.[30] Yet Locke's is no mechanistic reading; citing Saint-Saëns's anti-imperialist leanings, he argues that the characteristically Orientalist binarisms of *Samson et Dalila* are subverted in places by the music, and that the work remixes its own apparent ideological terms by portraying the Hebrews (the self, the West, the male) in a less enticing, less vital and animated way than the Philistines (the other, Delilah's tribe). In this way Locke brings a subtle hermeneutics, attentive to internal contradiction, to the textual reading of musical Orientalism.

In a similarly rich essay stemming from debates around Borodin's *Prince Igor,* Richard Taruskin pursues the social, political, and intellectual contexts of nineteenth-century Russian musical Orientalism, noting the variations of the genre and yet also its semiotic coherence. Taruskin argues that this Orientalism can only be understood in the context of Russian imperialist ventures of the time. He charges *Prince Igor* with aggressive nationalism and with making overt Russian Orientalism's subtext: "The racially justified endorsement of Russia's militaristic expansion to the east." In support, he notes that both Borodin and Mussorgsky were enrolled to compose works for the celebration of Tsar Alexander II's silver jubilee in 1880, works intended "to glorify Alexander's expansionist policy."[31] Taruskin even asserts that Russian musical Orientalism can be periodized by reference to corresponding phases of Russian imperial adventure. His main concern, however, is to demonstrate the development of the particular set of musical tropes that came to be understood as connoting Easternness. Taruskin brings out the many paradoxes composing Russian Orientalism that reveal it as an essentially arbitrary musical sign, a set of conventions that developed through a lineage of composers, as he shows through the example of successive, increasingly Orientalist settings of a Pushkin lyric by Glinka, Balakirev, and Rachmaninov. These conventions, consolidated in *Prince Igor,* associate oriental cultures with an erotic and exotic languorous hedonism which serves to suggest the decadence and powerlessness of the East when faced by Russian might and efficiency. By the time Rachmaninov reworks the conventions, Taruskin comments, his Pushkin setting "speaks the sign language of Russian Orientalism in a highly developed form."[32] Condensed in the Orientalist trope of *nega*—"a flexible amalgam of ethnic verisimilitude, sensual iconicity, characteristic vocal or instrumental timbres and Glinka-esque harmony"—the other is represented as a degenerate counterpart to manly Russian virtues; *nega* "marked the other . . . for justified conquest."[33] As an ultimate irony, Taruskin notes

how Russian musical Orientalism's greatest conquest was perhaps that of artistic Paris, in the guise of Diaghilev's ballet company and its seduction of the audience by sex-drenched Eastern fantasy. Henceforth, for the French, and thence for the West, Russian musical Orientalism *was* Russian music, and Russia *was* the East. Diaghilev's ploy prevented him "from presenting to the West the musical artifacts of European Russia with which he personally identified."[34] Through Taruskin's analysis, the sheer relativity of Orientalist positioning becomes apparent.

Taruskin and Locke open up great vistas of interpretive possibility. As yet, there has been less attention to the twentieth-century musical practices that are the focus of this book. In the next section, we outline the essays that address issues of representation and appropriation in musical modernism and postmodernism. Other contributions extend the analysis of Orientalist, primitivist, and exoticist musical discourses beyond the realm of art music, revealing new problematics and calling for more adequate theorization of musical representation. Steven Feld addresses the remarkable variety of ways in which the musics of the equatorial forest peoples of Central Africa have been mediated by jazz, jazz-fusion, new age, and other Western popular musics over the last thirty years; while David Hesmondhalgh discusses the ethical and aesthetic problems raised by the use of digital sampling to appropriate non-Western and ethnic musics in the work of contemporary dance and fusion popular musicians with a commitment to internationalist politics (see section III below). John Corbett traces the legacy of the American experimental tradition's attitudes toward cultural borrowing in the work of a number of musicians and composers existing often on the boundaries of art-music institutions, including Asian composers who attempt to "answer back" to such appropriation. These authors are all concerned to extend a critical analysis of tropes of difference beyond the Western canon, or to question the boundedness of that canon.

Claudia Gorbman takes these issues to the analysis of representation in film music. In a previous study, Gorbman argued that the "unheard melodies" of movie soundtracks are particularly powerful disseminators of meaning because of the way they pervade the interpretive work of film audiences in a semiconscious way. Here, she extends these insights by examining a fraught area of cinematic representation: the portrayal of the native American in the western.[35] In that central genre of America's "mythic self-definition," we see exemplified the kinds of processes to which postcolonial criticism has directed attention: the formation of a hegemonic national identity through reiterated representations (in painting, drama, fiction, and television, as well as cinema) of a despised other—in the western genre, an other that was the subject of internal colonialism. Film studies have pointed out how, as American national identity became more provisional in the decades after the Second World War, Indians began to be represented in increas-

ingly complex and sometimes sympathetic ways. Gorbman traces corresponding shifts in the musical scores of key westerns and, in doing so, reveals the way that musical meaning is intensely bound up with visual and narrative texts. Yet Gorbman also points to disjunctures between events on screen and in the score; in particular, "the humanization of the Indian occurred more slowly in music than in on-screen characterization," suggesting a resilient racism at work in the film-musical subconscious that worked against changing narratives.

Gorbman analyzes some later scores to show how efforts to produce a more liberal, "progressive" representation of Indians brought contradictory results. The attempts of *A Man Called Horse* (directed by Elliot Silverstein, 1969) to convey the sense of "really being in an alien culture" are matched by the musical integration of diegetic[36] Sioux drumming within a (white) modernist, atonal score. As Gorbman puts it, the score "de-alienates the Indians," but this happens on white terms. The diegetic Sioux music is framed within the modernist score, and through this frame the viewing/listening subject is invited musically to "enter" the represented other. *Dances with Wolves* (directed by Kevin Costner, 1990), perhaps the most significant western of recent decades, continues the attempt to figure allegorically a process of "understanding" native American culture, and the narrative drive is reinforced by John Barry's score. The score even suggests that the U.S. army are the "real savages" by borrowing tropes from the traditional western's musical representation of Indians and using them to figure the army: a fascinating reversal of representational and ideological norms. Yet once the hero begins to associate with the Sioux, the Indians are assigned music that evades tom-tom clichés in favor of "Western-sounding themes," indicating that, in these liberal westerns, efforts at "understanding" result in nostalgic assimilation into the universal Western subject. Gorbman's essay thus explores the difficulties involved in humanist attempts to treat other cultures with sympathy, but it also indicates the potential representational gains that may derive from reflexive and imaginative film music.

This volume's relationship to postcolonial analysis can be summarized in terms of a shared lack and a contribution. Like postcolonial studies, and due no doubt to the magnitude of the challenge set by the material, the collection is perhaps susceptible to the charge of being insufficiently attentive to integrating analysis of the aesthetic and discursive with analysis of the social, political, and economic contexts of representation. But by addressing elements of popular music and culture in depth, the collection also makes an offering to postcolonial debate. As certain essays show, the centrality of discourses of race and ethnicity and the continuing prominence of Orientalist, primitivist, and exoticist tropes in popular music make music a particularly productive locus in the task of bringing postcolonial analysis to bear on popular culture per se.

II. MUSICAL MODERNISM, POSTMODERNISM, AND OTHERS

A second route into this book stems from consideration of musical modernism and postmodernism, and their contrasting relations with other musics. In modernism, the relationship of Western cultural forms to their others takes on a new significance. The development of modernism was simultaneous with the rise, from the mid–nineteenth century, of the commercial popular culture and entertainment industries, including new forms of commodified and urban popular musics. The early modernist period was also the height of the British and French empire; and in Europe it saw the continuation of a rural, agrarian peasant society alongside a small, increasingly cosmopolitan intelligentsia, among them the various artistic avant-gardes. With these coexistences in mind, we have a framework within which to theorize the relations between musical modernism and its several others: not just the musical and cultural influences that *have* been drawn upon but—as importantly—those that have rarely been referenced, and indeed those that have been neglected or denied.

Musical modernism emerged out of the expansion of tonality in late romanticism and the break into atonality in the early decades of the twentieth century. It took a number of forms. One of the most historically powerful was the serialism or twelve-tone technique of composers Schoenberg, Webern, and Berg—the Second Viennese School. Schoenberg conceived serialism as a new compositional technique based on the structural negation of the pitch hierarchies and forms associated with tonality. Schoenberg himself embodied the antinomies of modernism: wishing to encompass both rupture and continuity of tradition; employing both the rationalist methods of serialism and more expressionist and, occasionally, tonal idioms. Given that tonality and modality are the aesthetic bases of many popular musics, serialist principles prescribe an aesthetic that is completely antithetical to these other musics. Serialism thus stands as the musical equivalent of the negation of representation and figuration in modernist abstract visual art.

However, if we look at other developments in early-twentieth-century musical modernism, before and concurrent with Schoenberg's development of serialism, different aesthetic strategies become evident: not absolute and autonomous formal negation, but various attempts to draw upon other musics, to represent the other, to bring into the orbit of modernist music the sounds of the other. In literature and the visual arts as well as music, these strategies combined explorations in form with the representation of popular and everyday content or subject matter. The different aesthetic properties of non-Western and popular arts became sources of experiment and innovation. Picasso's admiration for African sculpture is well-known; Debussy's fascination with the music of Indonesia and Japan, and Ives's admiration for and emulation of New England popular musics, are musical counterparts.

These developments involved major composers who, unlike the serialists, failed to found a general technique or school. Among them, both the aesthetic form of reference to the other and the conception of the other differ in characteristic ways. Initially, we can note two related tendencies: the desire to reinvigorate the present by reference to principles of earlier musics, for example in the neo-classicisms of Stravinsky or Hindemith; and the turn to other musics—urban popular musics, Western and non-Western folk and ethnic musics—as sources of new sounds and rhythms, musical forms and ideas. The early decades of the century saw a reference to jazz on the part of Krenek, Poulenc, Milhaud, Copland, Antheil, and Gershwin. By contrast, in this same period a number of European composers, including Bartók, Kodály, Stravinsky, Falla, and Vaughan Williams, turned to the folk musics that were increasingly available from ethnographic studies and archives as influences on their distinctive nationalist modernisms.[37] Non-art musics were therefore conceived by these composers as others to be drawn in a variety of ways into their compositional practice.

It is the relationship of influence by or reference to other musics that is interrogated by Julie Brown and Jann Pasler in their analyses of modernist composers' attempts to renew their musical language, and that John Corbett illuminates in his discussion of composers from the postmodern experimental music tradition. Building on the studies of nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century musical Orientalism, Pasler analyzes the evolving varieties of Orientalism in French art music following France's Entente Cordiale with Britain in 1904, as composers came into increasing contact with Indian music and culture via field visits and early recordings. Pasler contrasts two composers, Albert Roussel and Maurice Delage, who engaged differently with Indian music following their travels to India in 1909 and 1912. She sets musical analysis within an account of the cultural and ideological milieux of the two, who came from rival French schools. Roussel, from the culturally and politically conservative Schola Cantorum, was drawn to the "simplicity" of Indian folk music, mediated through the Schola's association of *chansons populaires* (folk song) with nature, immutable racial qualities, national identity, and spirituality. On the basis of memory and sketches, Roussel used this music freely as a basis for his *Evocations* (1910). In the context of the Schola's conservative Catholicism and its base in the landowning aristocracy, Roussel's "empathic" rendering of Indian poverty and spirituality is a projection entirely consonant with the Schola's religious and racist ideological mission. Roussel's notebooks appear inattentive to the subtleties of Indian music, and his stance is that the Indian "impressions" should be subordinate to his own musical development, causing Pasler to cite Said: "The last traces of the particular have been rubbed out."[38] Yet, Pasler argues, sections of *Evocations* suggest a deeper engagement with the specificities of Indian music, such as its improvisatory qualities.

In contrast, Delage was an enthusiastic modernist who focused in his travels on Indian classical music. He idealized Indian music as audacious, authentic, pure, and as a means of transcending Western musical constraints. Mediated through the French modernist commitment to the primacy of sound color over syntax (the opposite of Scholist doctrine), Delage was enraptured by Indian music's timbral richness, its non-European tuning systems, improvised rhythms, and vocal and instrumental techniques. By studying these aesthetic components, Delage created an intercultural soundworld that, Pasler argues, went beyond a superficial impressionism and enabled him to subvert Western practices, while retaining elements of conventional Orientalism. Pasler stresses Delage's use, unlike Roussel, of early sound recordings, which gave him continuing aural access to Indian music's timbral and microtonal subtleties. Delage used almost unchanged transcriptions of certain recordings in sections of his *Quatre poèmes hindous* (1912–13) and *Ragamalika* (1912–22), thus raising issues of intellectual property in relation to such musical appropriations, as well as the irony whereby, while Delage valued Indian music's "purity" and "authenticity," he was precisely an agent of its subsumption by Western idioms. Pasler throws light here on the important role of technologies of sound reproduction in the burgeoning of twentieth-century practices of musical appropriation.

Like Pasler, Brown explores the complexities of authorial subjectivity and its influence by wider cultural and discursive forces. She examines the place of Bartók's evolving conceptions of gypsy and peasant musics in his Hungarian nationalist cultural project. Brown's analysis shows that they exhibit a classic instance of splitting between an idealized, pure, and authentic peasantry, conceived as the norm, and a degenerate, deviant, impure gypsy culture, a splitting imbued with racist fear of contamination by the gypsy "Orientals within" and their "foreign" cultural elements. Brown proposes that this ideological and psychic configuration, articulated in Bartók's writings and modified over the years, was inherent in Bartók's aesthetic project of founding a Hungarian modernism that was allied to a progressive Western modernity and progressive nationalist elements, and which must therefore be doubly purged of the putatively non-Western, antimodern, inauthentic marks of Hungarian gypsy music. The thrust of her case is that Bartók's idealizing aesthetic embrace of peasant musics must be understood as immanently linked with these negative racist projections and prohibitions, which themselves evidence Bartók's subjectification by the racist cultural and nationalist doctrines of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Brown traces the concept of "hybridity" through Bartók's later essays, noting that, as his understanding of peasant and gypsy musics developed, and as he began to accept that peasant music was not without its own syncretisms, so his classification shifted to center on an opposition between the "bad hybridity" of gypsy music versus the "good hybridity" of peasant music. In this opposi-

tion, influenced by the Left mass culture critique, the gypsies were associated with the taint of urban and commercial music-making, while the peasantry were emblematic of a rural, natural state of musical grace. By the early 1930s, the threat of Americanization brought a reconfiguration in which Bartók came to value gypsy music as a specifically *Hungarian* urban popular music. In this same period, Brown argues, Bartók would have been aware of the rise of ultranationalist fascist parties in central Europe, and would have seen the parallels between his own original views of the gypsies and the extreme racist rhetoric and acts of oppression being enacted in Germany. In his late writings, Bartók developed a discourse of deracialized nationalism and portrayed gypsy music as a product of social oppression; while, Brown proposes, his *Concerto for Orchestra* (1942) enacted a kind of psychocultural reconciliation through its integration of gypsy and peasant musical elements.

In the aftermath of the Second World War, aided by Schoenberg's substantial influence and pedagogic writings, it was the serialist lineage of musical modernism that became dominant in the institutions and the teaching of new music. The earlier modernist (or proto-postmodernist) experiments with representations of others—whether exotic, nationalistic, or populist—gave way to an increasingly abstract, scientistic, and rationalist formalism based still on the near or total negation of tonality. Postwar high modernist composition powerfully asserted musical autonomy, refusing the representation of ethnic or popular musics in the name of formal innovation and rigor; and the modernisms of Bartók and Stravinsky, which engaged with folk and ethnic musics, failed to achieve hegemony in the face of the systematic serialisms of Boulez, Stockhausen, and Babbitt. The lineage that became institutionally and ideologically dominant in musical modernism—serialism and its aftermath[39]—and which is defined as an absolute and autonomous aesthetic development, won out over the eclecticism of other early modernist experiments, including the various forms of aesthetic reference to other musics.[40] Despite the apparent freeing up of art music in the plural, postmodern environment of the late 1960s and 1970s, until recently serialism has remained the dominant technique in the academic training of many Western composers; and other, nonserialist forms of academic and institutionalized high modernism in music remain resolutely distant from tonality.

It is perhaps a truism to point out that those modernist and postmodernist composers who have drawn upon or made reference to other musics (non-Western, folk, or urban popular) are not producing that music but drawing upon it in order to enrich their own compositional frame. They are transforming that music through incorporation into their own aesthetic: appropriating and re-presenting it. Crucially, in doing so, they intend not only to evoke that other music, but to create a distance from it and transcend it. This raises an issue that informs many essays in this collection: whether the structure of representation of the other constructs an unequal relation between

aesthetic subject (the composer, and later the audience identifying with the composer) and object (the music or culture being represented); that is, the question of the extent to which this relation of musical representation must inevitably involve the attempt aesthetically and discursively to subsume and control the other.

We can now discern two basic, structural relations-of-difference to the musical other at work in musical modernism and postmodernism. The first, as in those composers who drew on other musics, is one of recognition of difference yet attempted aesthetic incorporation or subsumption. The second, as with serialism and other high-modernist tendencies, is the attempt to construct a "relation" of absolute difference, nonrecognition, and nonreference. With the coexistence of modernism and commercial, folk and non-Western musics in mind, it becomes apparent that a defining discursive and aesthetic characteristic of the dominant high modernist tradition has been its assertion, under the guise of a self-referential, formal autonomy, of its absolute difference from popular musics. This has the character of a defensive maneuver against the vitality of those popular forms, as though out of a fear of aesthetic and social contagion. The continuity of this tradition has, then, involved the sustained suppression or denial, under the ideology of formal autonomy, of the vagaries of its existence: competition with the market; the struggle for legitimacy and to gain cultural hegemony and an audience; and nonrecognition of other musics. This "nonrecognition" becomes less innocent in the hands of the major culture critics who were exegetes and apologists for formalist modernism: Adorno for music, and Greenberg for painting. Adorno's infamous attacks on the "primitive" and degraded nature of mass culture, and writings by Greenberg such as "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," reveal an underlying hostility to and repudiation of the culture of the "masses" that are latent in the claims of "absolute otherness."[41] This is a discourse that, far from being extinct, has continued to be reproduced in the writings of influential figures such as Boulez.[42] Thus, as others have argued,[43] mass culture is modernism's other in music as in the other arts, while reference to "authentic" folk and ethnic musics, primitive and exotic constructions, have remained more enduring and acceptable as forms of appropriation and projection in music.

Following the scholarship that has uncovered the immanent hybridity and syncretism, the aesthetic "impurity,"[44] of earlier Western high musics, one thing is now clear. It is postwar musical modernism's attempts to construct aesthetic *autarchy* and self-enclosure, through the negation or denial of reference to other musics and cultures, that is historically aberrant and that contrasts with the early eclectic modernisms and musical postmodernism, in both of which reference to other musics is a common defining trope. Serialist and analogous modernisms thus evince an intriguing omnipotent fantasy of aesthetic autarchy—the fantasy that one could invent a new musical

language without reference to other musics, without recourse to syncretism, stripped of representational intent, and through a process of pure conceptual invention.

In his essay "Modernism, Deception, and Musical Others," Peter Franklin examines the cultural historical conditions that gave rise to and supported this fantasy structure. Franklin sketches a history replete with denial, a history that has itself been denied in what he identifies as the "institutionalized history of twentieth century music." He focuses on a "network of contradictions" that ensnared a disparate group of composers—Rachmaninov, Stravinsky, Schoenberg, and Korngold—and a theorist—Adorno—who fetched up in close proximity as émigrés in Los Angeles in the 1930s and 1940s, representatives of a high culture on the defensive in the face of its increasingly significant other, the American entertainment industry. Franklin charts the different responses of the four composers to the uneasy coexistence of the art-music tradition alongside popular music and culture. The "deception" in his title refers both to the title of Korngold's last original film score (1946) and to the complexities of the composerly subject-positions, in particular the ambivalences and deceptions of the composers' discourses regarding their own music, as well as Adorno's thesis on Schoenberg. Rachmaninov, alienated from his Russian homeland and his compositional achievements and style, was haunted by a musical direction—the "new"—that he could not emulate. Chastised by antipopulist American music critics for epitomizing the "latent realist tendencies" of tonal music, posthumously absorbed into the film industry through the frequent imitation of his style in film scores, Rachmaninov had internalized his fellow Russian émigré Stravinsky's abhorrence of his own music; he felt it was inferior to the modernists'.

While Stravinsky denied that programmatic or representational elements existed in his music, and famously denied music's capacity to "express" anything, Franklin shows the strains of this position. He quotes Stravinsky's passing admission that his *Symphony in Three Movements* (1945) was "activated" by concrete, often cinematographic, impressions of war and contained the "genesis of a war plot." Stravinsky's denial of representation in his work was paralleled by his hostility to entertainment film—a hostility that speaks of his desire to repudiate and avoid contamination by the other of mass culture. Franklin similarly interprets Schoenberg's avowal of secret realist representational intent in his *String Trio* (1946). Against the entire thrust of Adorno's reading of Schoenberg, and of the discourse of autonomous music, Franklin highlights Schoenberg's repressed representational tendencies, arguing that the composer revealed on occasion "that his own music was indeed representing all the things [i.e., physical and mental pain, angst and insanity] with which an 'uninformed' popular audience might have associated it." Franklin points to Schoenberg's craving for reconciliation and stresses "the gap between discursive constructions of Schoen-

berg's compositional practice—particularly Adorno's—and his actual aesthetic and political views."

Korngold, meanwhile, achieved mass popular success with his film scores. Yet, like Rachmaninov, he was profoundly ambivalent about this success and considered the music "not serious," not "for himself," simply a way of earning money. Franklin reads these dynamics into the music and narrative of *Deception* (1946). Korngold's score, combining diegetic classical music, his own nondiegetic late romantic style, and the sounds of urban life, creates an "almost Ivesian montage" that attests to Korngold's ability to conjure with multiple musical subject-positions or identifications in the score. The film's musical climax is an "autonomous" cello concerto which, in the narrative, is the work of a European composer character, but which Korngold also published as his own work. The film culminates in Bette Davis's *femme fatale*—the feminine "other" of mass culture—murdering the patriarchal composer, signifying American mass culture's ascendance over a decaying European culture. Korngold here scores the murder of the "composer" with whom part of himself is powerfully identified. Franklin thus probes the "deceptions" of the dominant discourse of twentieth-century music history, which, he contends, has tended to occlude its own vicissitudes, ideological character, contradictions, and social elitism, all of which emerge when attending to its constructions of difference from its others, its founding ambivalences and denials.

From the early century, one tradition took on the role of musical and ideological antithesis to serialism. This was the experimental music movement, which grew from the work of American composers Ives, Cowell, and Cage, and which also engaged in different ways with musical and cultural others. Experimental music drew on vernacular, non-Western, "primitive," and "oriental" musics and philosophies to challenge and negate the complex abstractions of serialism and other high modernist approaches. The experimental music tradition branched in the postwar period into minimalism, systems, environmental, and ambient musics, and has existed in tense proximity with avant-garde developments in jazz and improvised musics. It has become a focus for practices of, and debates around, crossovers between art and popular musics, and thus for the analysis of postmodernism in music.

At the same time, postmodern cultural theory, with its assertion that the old divisions between high and low, art and popular culture, the "autonomous" and the commercial in culture, are now redundant and superseded, has commonly taken music as its exemplar. Certain experimental composers (John Cage, Philip Glass, Steve Reich, Michael Nyman) and rock artists (David Byrne, Elvis Costello) are often portrayed as emblematic of postmodernity and of the collapsing divisions. This deceptively simple assertion conflates several issues. The first is the notion that we are witnessing an end to the univocal hierarchies of musical value and authority characteristic of an earlier modernism, themselves rooted in the universalism of

post-Enlightenment Western aesthetic discourses. A related argument is that there is an ever less clear distinction to be found between the economic and institutional foundations of commercial and art musics. With the decline in public funding and subsidy for the arts, all musics have increasingly to find ways to survive on the basis of substantial markets; all are increasingly dependent on the dynamics of the recording and entertainment industries; and marketing and market-oriented thinking have become prevalent in concert organizations, music education, and new music institutions. A third, unifying proposition in this perspective is that we are witnessing unparalleled and intensifying aesthetic crossovers between popular, non-Western, and art musics, a relativizing and decentered "will to hybridity" evident in the transglobal movements of musicians and sounds. The implication is that these hybrid aesthetics and movements are free of the earlier hierarchical consciousness and practice, that there are no significant "core-periphery" structures at work, and thus that these aesthetics are free also of the asymmetrical relations of representation and the seductions of the exoticisms, primitivisms, and Orientalisms that paralleled colonial and neocolonial relations. In this view, then, "all the differences" are being levelled. Hybridity can rebound from its discursive origins in colonial fantasies and oppressions and can become instead a practical and creative means of cultural rearticulation and resurgence from the margins.[45]

The essays presented here open out aspects of this postmodern reasoning and reveal the complexity that may be obscured in these assertions. The institutional and economic assumptions are questionable; despite changes, the field of contemporary art music is still structured by divisions of status and discourses of differential value that are reproduced by subsidized, public, and authoritative institutions that continue to play a leading role in the legitimation and canonization of certain musics.[46] Moreover, the aesthetic analysis ignores the differences attendant on who is doing the hybridity, from which position and with what intention and result, and the astonishing resilience of exoticisms and primitivisms.

Indeed, John Corbett's essay demonstrates that while experimental and related postmodern musics have encompassed a range of forms of musical influence and representation, and have claimed to inhabit a plural and relativist musical universe, they have nonetheless made repeated returns to exoticist and primitivist aesthetic tropes. Corbett is concerned to uncover experimental music's discursive foundations, which have enabled these aesthetics to recur over the century in the output of musicians and composers from Henry Cowell and John Cage, through Steve Reich and Toru Takemitsu, to Brian Eno and John Zorn. Under the concept of "experimentation," with its scientistic connotations and its appeal to exploration, discovery of the new, and undetermined outcomes, Corbett finds a unifying evacuation of any potential political and ideological critique of musical or cultural appropriation.

Pointing to a mechanism central also to Richard Middleton's essay, and citing Said on Orientalism's dependence on a strategy of flexible positional superiority, Corbett argues that the essentialized Oriental object is represented in experimental music through a combined "projection of Western desires and anxieties and a reassertion of Western control." Corbett defines two basic forms of musical Orientalism in this tradition. The first, stemming from Cage and differently inflected by Steve Reich, is "conceptual Orientalism." Here, the music is obliquely, conceptually indebted to a non-Western inspiration, but the aim is not at all musical semblance or sounding non-Western. The second Corbett terms "decorative Orientalism." This more common strategy is exemplified by Cowell's *Persian Set*, which, Corbett argues, is a "contemporary chinoiserie" bordering on pastiche and "world-music kitsch."

Corbett traces these lines into a new phase in the 1980s and 1990s, and notes the move of experimental musicians such as Jon Hassell into early world-jazz fusion. Hassell in his *Possible Musics: Fourth World Vol. 1* (1980) inaugurates a "fantasy of new hybrid transculturation," a utopian imaginary universe (the "Fourth World") in which all musics and cultures "mingle freely without concern for authenticity or propriety." Corbett asks to what extent these "utopian" mergings should be seen as continuous with the imaginary forms of Orientalism, "as a mere extension of [Orientalism's] imperialist mapping of a fantasy space of otherness into the electronic telecommunications era?" He perceives an important potential space of difference in the work of some Asian experimentalist composers. For Corbett, a number of these composers—among them Toru Takemitsu and Tan Dun—collude in Cageian Orientalism and employ a musical idiom derived from Western modernism or late romanticism, sometimes even stooping to chinoiserie, even if these aesthetics are refracted through their own Asian identities. Yet Corbett notes exceptions, such as the Koreans Isang Yun and Younghi Pagh-Pann, arguing that the latter integrates Western postserialism with a distinctly Korean aesthetic, achieving a new aesthetic free of those definitive historical tropes and of pastiche. Corbett sums up the multiple refractions of the contemporary cultural condition with this comment on the music of Tan Dun: "An Asian composer in the West uses techniques devised by a Western composer [Cage] inspired by Asian philosophy; the work is played for an Asian audience which hears it as an artifact of the bizarre West. Orientalism is reflected back-and-forth like a music-cultural *mise-en-abyme*."

Corbett's essay indicates how exoticisms and Orientalisms continue to proliferate and mutate in the imaginaries and aesthetics of many contemporary art musics of West and East, and particularly in the now-global Cageian experimental movement. He argues that these remain characteristic of recent attempts to create interstitial aesthetic zones between art, popular, and non-Western musics, crossover musics that generally proliferate in the avant-gardist and specialist niches of the music industry. We must ask why it is that

these discourses remain so resilient and seductive. One point to note is that the apparent pluralism and relativism of Cage and his *confrères* never precluded quite conscious bids to establish an American/experimental counter- (or complementary) hegemony to European modernism, a hegemony that for Cage was predicated on the ideological conflation of "America" with "the world."[47] American cultural postmodernism, at least in the mid–twentieth century, as evidenced in its exemplary musical manifestations, has thus been founded on a curious "plural-universalism." We might also speculate whether similar mechanisms to those involved in reproducing the hegemony of post-serialist modernism—that is, the way that aesthetic movements lay down deep historical tracks through the cumulative momentum of their institutionalization, cultural authority, power, and, given the internationalization of twentieth-century avant-gardes, their wide geographical dispersal[48]—whether these mechanisms may not also have affected that rival and antagonist of modernism, experimental music. Through their negative mutuality and complementarity the two traditions effectively dominate twentieth-century art musics. Those seeking an alternative "universal" tradition to modernism with which to engage have been impelled toward, and subsumed by, the Cage tradition. The fact that globalization is not only a property of the music industry but is also a tendency of the institutional framework of contemporary art music means that a discursive universalism has for decades been central to the socialization of composers of both East and West. The global art music network thus risks "aesthetic (as opposed to epistemic) violence" through the tyrannies and closures of its universalizing discourses.

It is in the postmodern "resolution" of issues of appropriation into unproblematic notions of crossover and pluralism in both art and popular musics that we find the dominant expression today of the idea that cross-cultural empathy and its attendant aesthetic "reconciliation" equalizes musics of formerly unequal status and power, and erases erstwhile differences of legitimacy. As Born has argued elsewhere, pluralism is central to the way that postmodern intellectuals experience the aesthetic imaginatively as progressive; aesthetic pluralism is divorced from extant socioeconomic differences and held to be an autonomous and effective force for transforming those differences. The aesthetic is held to portend social change; it can stand in psychically for wider social change.[49] In this sense, cultural postmodernism can be seen as an ideology *tout court* in the classic sense of a cultural system that conceals domination and inequality.

III. OTHERING, HYBRIDITY, AND FUSION IN TRANSNATIONAL POPULAR MUSICS

A third way into the material in this book concerns a new relationship between popular music studies and ethnomusicology and how these disci-

plines have been inflected by postcolonial theory and black cultural studies, as well as by wider socioeconomic and cultural transformations associated with globalization.

Public debate about cultural appropriation has been particularly vigorous with regard to the African American expressive tradition. At the heart of debates about cultural identity, property, and belonging in popular music have been controversies over "black musics," largely because African American music (and other Afro-diasporic forms such as reggae) have been so popular and significant throughout much of the world. Charles Keil wrote in 1966 that "it is simply incontestable that year by year, American popular music has come to sound more and more like African popular music."[50] For Keil, each time an African American genre (such as ragtime, jazz, the blues, rhythm and blues) was appropriated into the mainstream of American musical life, African Americans responded by turning their creativity toward sounds and practices that showed even more clearly the African legacy of the descendants of the slaves. Whatever the merits of Keil's case, many other critics have noted that, in music, "African-Americans invert the expected relationship between hegemonic superculture and subculture."[51] Richard Middleton, for example, has written of the "astonishing confluence, in a twin triumph, of global capital circulation in the political economy, African musical diaspora in the sign economy."[52]

Do the worldwide popularity and significance of musics of black origin represent a triumph for African American culture? Or a cultural consolation for political suppression and economic inequality? Is the "borrowing" by white musicians of putatively black forms, and the vast profits generated by the recording industry on the basis of such traffic in sounds, merely another form of racist exploitation? The existing debates often take simplistic, polarized forms, reliant on overly bounded notions of the relation of musical form or style to social grouping. Nevertheless, they raise crucial issues about music, identity, and difference.

Some writers have seen black musics as cultural spaces in which intercultural dialogue between ethnic groups can take place. George Lipsitz, for example, interpreted the postwar history of rock and roll in this way in his *Time Passages* (1990). Studies by Dick Hebdige and Simon Jones celebrated the popularity of the Caribbean musical diaspora in Britain among white, working-class youth as a sign of opposition to popular racism and state nationalisms. Gregory Stephens has interpreted the popularity of rap among white American youth as showing that, at least culturally, black and white America are in contact.[53] Others, however, have detected exoticism and primitivism in the way that black musics and black musicians have been treated in the commercial popular music industry. Jazz, in particular, has provided the raw material for a critique of the attitudes of white musicians, critics, and listeners drawn to black music culture.[54] In his essay "Jazz and the White Critic," first

published in *Downbeat* in 1963, Amiri Baraka (then Leroi Jones) complained that the formalism of white critics prevented them from understanding the social conditions of jazz, resulting in two kinds of distortion: the treatment of jazz as an equivalent to European high culture, or as natural, untutored and "primitive."[55] In line with this interpretation, a number of writers have researched primitivist discourses about jazz.[56]

Other critiques of the treatment of black popular musics have revolved around the degree to which white musicians and listeners have brought about a "dilution" of black music, and the extent to which the recording industry (in general, white-owned) has exploited black culture and black musicians in particular. Again, jazz is a key genre here. While nearly all informed critics view it as an urban field of production that includes black and white sensibilities and practices, the greater rewards and prestige granted to white jazz musicians such as Paul Whiteman have often been the subject of bitter recriminations. Similarly, rock and roll's status as an urban fusion of black and white influences should not obscure the fact that its white stars have generally been paid much more attention than significant black innovators such as Chuck Berry. These debates are just as intense with regard to hip hop; the enormous popularity of rap among white American youth has been portrayed as the reason for its gradual diminution as a powerful public medium, and as a sign that white-owned labels have been out to exploit the latest black innovations in cultural expression.[57]

Richard Middleton's chapter builds on these debates and traditions of critique. Using Stallybrass and White's analysis in *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (1986),[58] Middleton identifies a twin strategy of assimilation and projection as characteristic of post-Renaissance Europe's way of confronting difference. With the rising popularity of African American styles during the 1920s, Middleton claims, the "Low-other" becomes conflated with blackness in music in new ways; and he offers an analysis of how George Gershwin's *Porgy and Bess* represents a particular version of assimilation/projection, "a New Yorker's Eden," in which Gershwin exerts a powerful monological control over his eclectic material via Wagnerian leitmotifs. In Gershwin's modernism, which takes seriously its encounter with urban black popular musics, despite the chromatic richness of some passages, black characters are commonly represented as "simple," either by folky pentatonics or the banjo tunes of "I Got Plenty o' Nuttin'." "Low-life" is figured through the picturesque; we see this world entirely through Gershwin's eyes, according to Middleton. Such strategies are not confined to the jazz age. Middleton also identifies them at work in Paul Simon's *Graceland* album: "The South African sound becomes a support for Simon's elliptical lyrics, and by the end it is swamped by the predominantly synthesized texture."

However, in black America and South Africa there is evidence of more complex negotiation between high and low, Europe and Africa, assimilation

and resistance. Here, Middleton draws on the growing emphasis in black cultural studies on an affirmative portrayal of black expressive culture as "a counterculture of modernity."[59] This has received its best-known expressions in African American literary criticism and black British cultural studies. James Snead, for example, has argued that the importance of repetition in black culture represents a challenge to the teleological thinking and logics of Western rationalism.[60] Henry Louis Gates's now-famous notion of "Signifyin(g)," derived from Houston Baker, also builds on the presence of repetition and difference in vernacular culture (the transformation of stock material in stories and songs) to build an aesthetic theory that sees black popular culture as a challenge to conventional aesthetics, with its overemphasis on both realism and innovation—on "the mimetic representation of novel content," as Gates puts it.[61]

Middleton adopts Houston Baker's concept of "deformation of mastery"[62] to suggest how the music of Duke Ellington (criticized by some Harlem Renaissance intellectuals for its primitivism) and the contemporary South African jazz musician Abdullah Ibrahim (formerly Dollar Brand) might contribute to a "politics of reappropriation," by "answering back" to the assimilation/projection evident in *Porgy and Bess* and *Graceland*. Much of Ellington's music demonstrates an acceptance of difference within black music, which contrasts with Gershwin's and Simon's monological mastery. In Ellington's work, says Middleton, we see a pluralist envisioning of new possibilities, a rejection of simple notions of authenticity. And in the work of Abdullah Ibrahim there is a double-conscious use of repetition, recalling the use of pitch cycles in rural South African musics but employing chord structures commonly used to suggest closure and resolution in European music. So "closure is rewritten as process, cadence as endless chain," in a musical space both South African and "European," and yet neither. Middleton's response to these productive theoretical developments in black cultural studies, and his concern with the ways in which black music culture can provide a critique of hegemonic forms of music, suggest important directions in recent popular music theory.

The movement of musical styles and instruments across the world is nothing new, as the diasporic nature of African American music itself suggests. This mobility has intensified in the twentieth century, in part because of the activity of transnational corporations seeking markets for musical reproduction equipment and for recordings abroad. One result has been a spectacular inequality in the economic rewards and prestige accorded to Western pop products outside the West when compared with how non-Western recordings are rewarded and viewed in the West. The dissemination of Western commercial popular music throughout the world has traditionally been a cause of great concern to ethnomusicologists and writers on cultural imperialism.[63]

Recent years have seen paradigm shifts in popular music studies and ethnomusicology away from a cultural imperialism approach to global cultural flows and toward theories of postcoloniality and globalization. Some researchers have produced impressive evidence that the export of Western sounds and technologies has not led to the kind of cultural "grey-out" and homogenization that some ethnomusicologists and cultural imperialism analysts feared.[64] With vast movements of peoples from the economic disaster zones of global capitalism to the cities of the North, new musical syncretisms have emerged from the encounter of North and South, East and West. The very complexity of global musical-cultural flows has meant the abandonment of what was the dominant paradigm in ethnomusicology and anthropology during the 1970s and 1980s: acculturation. This was an attempt to understand the nature of change in what were presumed to be otherwise discrete and relatively stable, authentic, and self-reproducing traditional cultures and musics. In music, the term implied processes of cultural contact between two or more distinct musical cultures that resulted in musical mixes or syncretisms. Just a decade ago, Manuel used this perspective with acuity and subtlety in the opening of his survey of mass-mediated popular musics of the non-Western world.[65] By the late 1990s, acculturation theory had been banished to the conceptual dark ages, for unacceptable essentialism and lack of sufficient attention to global-historical structures of power. Influenced by theories of globalization and by the emphasis on transnational cultural flows and deterritorialization in cultural theory, postcolonial studies, and anthropology, writers such as Slobin, Gilroy, and Lipsitz have ushered in a new, still-current discourse centered on notions of musical hybridity and interaction, and oriented toward new kinds of musical objects.[66] In contrast with ethnomusicology's former object of study—"traditional musics"—it is diasporic music that has moved to the center of attention.

Such complex interactions are not as recent a phenomenon as many commentators have implied. Throughout the twentieth century, even in the era when Anglo-American repertoire seemed to be dominating the world market, some non-Western popular musics have been successful in the West, whether in the guise of styles adopted by Western musicians, or in the importation by record companies and promoters of recordings and stars which could then be repackaged and sold on to consumers. A series of Latin dance musics have crossed the world, from the *habañera* popular in Bizet's France in the nineteenth century, to the tango in the first decades of the twentieth century, to the *lambada* in the 1980s. Country music, on the surface a musical form with deep roots in the southern United States, has a long history of borrowings, drawing on sources as diverse as Swiss yodelling and Hawaiian guitar. Famously, a number of British and American musicians incorporated Indian styles and instrumentation into their work in the 1960s, including the Beatles, the Kinks, and the Byrds.[67] In the 1970s, African Amer-

icans picked up ethnomusicological recordings of traditional African musics and the resulting fusions circulated the globe, as Steven Feld shows in his essay for this volume. There is little doubt, though, that the 1980s saw an increasing presence of non-Western popular musics (and, to some extent, non-Western "traditional" musics) in the West. The consequences of this new stage in the transnationalization of sound have been complex and ambiguous, and some of the most important recent debates concerning appropriation and difference in music center on this moment.

The increasing impact of non-Western popular forms and styles in the West was in part the result of well-meaning efforts on the part of independent entrepreneurs to promote and distribute these musics more widely, in an attempt to counter the ethnocentrism of the major Western markets. Record shops, magazines, independent labels and distributors sprang up devoted to the promotion of non-Western musics in Europe, North America, and Australia. The terms "world music" and "world beat" were coined in order to create a marketing niche in industry discourse for non-Western acts and genres.[68] At about the same time, certain Western pop stars, most notably Paul Simon, Peter Gabriel, and David Byrne, were making increasing use of non-Western sounds in their music, and this helped to popularize certain African and Latin styles. Ethnomusicologists and popular music scholars have, in general, been critical of the use of non-Western musics by Western superstars. Steven Feld, among others, has examined the politics of Paul Simon's *Graceland*, stressing Simon's genuinely respectful intentions, but drawing attention to questions of ownership:

> All of the performance styles, grooves, beats, sounds, and genres are South African in identity. . . . [But] the [South African] musicians fill the role of wage laborers. . . . That no significant ownership of the product is shared with them beyond base royalties and their wages for recording . . . reflects the rule of elite artistry. What statement does this make about the role of Paul Simon vis-à-vis the roles of the musicians without whom the record would have been impossible? It seems to draw the boundary line between participation and collaboration at *ownership*. Whose music? Paul Simon's music.[69]

George Lipsitz, meanwhile, writes disapprovingly of the unwillingness of Paul Simon and David Byrne to "examine their own relationship to power or to allow for reciprocal subjectivities between and among cultures."[70]

Popular music studies, in contrast to its critical treatment of the borrowing by Western pop superstars of non-Western styles, has tended to celebrate the proliferation of new musical forms based on the encounter of non-Western migrants with Western musical languages and technologies. Here the assumption is that globally, in recent decades at least, musical creativity has been marked by incessant and frenetic activities of musical dialogue and syncretism. The key words are "difference, diversity and dialogue."[71] George Lip-

sitz, in his compelling study *Dangerous Crossroads* (1994), provides a celebration of musical hybridity. The musics of a vast range of artists, united only by their provenance in "aggrieved communities," are interpreted by Lipsitz as illustrations of a new kind of politics which "takes commodity culture for granted," but which produces "an immanent critique of contemporary social relations" and has the power to illuminate "affinities, resemblances and potentials for alliances among a world population that now must be as dynamic and as mobile as the forces of capital."[72]

Lipsitz's optimism is, however, worryingly overdetermined by an insistent internationalist class politics, as though musical and cultural forms have no validity or meaning outside their signification of these other, now-global politics of class and race; and as though there are no problematic antagonisms, or essentialisms, or nationalisms being expressed in these musical forms. For another approach, we might turn to Martin Stokes's essay in this volume, in which he analyzes the upsurge of hybrid urban popular musics in Turkey and other Middle Eastern contexts in the 1980s as conditioned by three related forces: economic liberalization, the end of statist promotions of a unified national culture, and the increasing penetration of multinational capitalism, leading to a "proliferation of transnational information and images [and sounds] . . . [which are] impossible (or extremely difficult) to censor or control." Mark Slobin has offered a theoretical schema which may account for such a range of forces and which is irreducible to an external political function. It conceives of three levels—superculture, interculture, and subculture in relation to music—by which to analyze different spaces and forms of musical interaction.[73] This perspective, uniting ethnomusicology with popular music studies by way of cultural studies, is itself conceptually a fertile hybrid. And yet, in the desire to read these hybrid musics as embodiments of a new and effective cultural politics from the margins, as productive ways of "writing back" against the center, writers such as Lipsitz and Slobin perhaps overstate the relative cultural power and visibility of these musics, and neglect the extent to which they are structured by an increasingly global and flexible industrial complex. In our view, Paul Gilroy's work promises the richest reading of diasporic musics. Gilroy's careful tracing of the integrity, the historical structures and lineages of Black Atlantic expressive traditions, as well as his attention to new forms of hybridity, make conceptual allowance both for the fluidity of syncretisms and hybrids and for the continuing existence of bounded cultural traditions.[74] What emerges is an analysis of the *differential* permeability of the boundaries of various cultural lineages and forms.

Others have been less sanguine about the consequences of the intensified transnationalization of music. Veit Erlmann, for example, in a reading influenced by Luhmann's system theory and Baudrillard's postmodern pessimism, portrays world music not as a sign of resistance or opposition, but

as a "new aesthetic form of the global imagination."[75] For Erlmann, world music is a postmodern pastiche where distinctions between tradition, authenticity, and modernity dissolve, demonstrating the "loss of referentiality" and the triumph of the culture of the simulacrum. This is a stimulating interpretation, but it also risks functionalism. Erlmann treats "the market" as a homogeneous system and, by taking as an analytical category the industry's own notoriously vague term "world music," he fails adequately to differentiate the discourses and practices subsumed by this term.

The contributions to this book that deal with transnational popular musics probe the recent optimism about the flows of commodified musical sounds across the world in other ways, without assuming the end of history. Often, they suggest that there is a certain continuity in industrial practices, in spite of claims that we have entered a new era of transnationalization.[76] Steven Feld, for example, follows a seminal article on the discourses and commodification practices of world music[77] by undertaking a survey of the remarkable array of uses to which Western popular and postmodern musicians have put the music of the peoples of the equatorial forests of Central Africa, and especially the "pygmy music" of the Mbuti, Aka, and Binga peoples. Feld traces what we might call the social life (or life history) of pygmy musics:[78] a series of aesthetic appropriations and reappropriations or relays via evocation, mimesis, and concrete sampling. One such lineage, for example, connects the 1966 ethnomusicological recordings of Simha Arom and Geneviève Taurelle, through their imitation in the Herbie Hancock hit "Watermelon Man" of 1973, to Madonna's sampling of the Hancock copy in her song "Sanctuary" from the 1994 CD *Bedtime Stories*.

At the same time, Feld deploys the history of "pygmy pop" to understand what happens when sounds become split from their sources: a process that, following F. Murray Schaffer, he labels "schizophonia." The outcomes of this process cannot be condemned or praised in advance. But the escalating process of splitting-from-origins as musicians increasingly engage in intertextual borrowings, accompanied by an escalation of "difference, power, rights, control, ownership, authority[,] politicizes the schizophonic practices artists could once claim more innocently as matters of inspiration, or as a purely artistic dialogue of imitation and inspiration." Feld detects romanticism and anxious nostalgia behind these new patterns of mediation, and he insists on the importance of the asymmetrical power relations between the corporations who record and distribute Western jazz and pop, on the one hand, and the pygmy peoples, on the other. In the astonishing range of appropriations Feld collates, only a "caricatured image" survives the borrowings by popular musicians from ethnomusicological recordings, usually a "single untexted vocalization or falsetto yodel"—an aural analogue of the representational reductionism noted by Said. Ethnomusicologists, though thanked by Western musicians for providing raw materials for such appro-

priations, are lambasted by the music press and represented as purist voyeurs, while the fusion practices of groups like Zap Mama and Deep Forest are celebrated by the press as exciting hybrids which do creative justice to the original musics. Ethnomusicologists thus play an ambiguous and unwittingly enabling role in this drama of mimesis and alterity, splitting and escalation. Only a tiny fraction of the vast range of musical practices they record is lifted into popular commodity circulation.

Feld's analysis, like Corbett's, suggests that sampler technologies have added critical new dimensions to the politics of musical appropriation in an era when many writers are celebrating hybridity. This brings up to the present the question of the role of sound recording and simulation technologies in musical appropriation. David Hesmondhalgh's essay pursues the issue through an examination of the practices of a number of "diasporic" acts based at Nation Records. Nation is a successful British independent label committed to the kind of hybrid oppositional musical politics that Lipsitz praises throughout his book. Hesmondhalgh examines the politics and aesthetics of bands attached to Nation. He argues that those bands developing a multicultural dance fusion aesthetic indulge in questionable forms of exoticism and simulate ethnic hybridity both aurally—through sampling practices—and visually or iconographically in their performance practices and publicity. Hesmondhalgh contrasts this with those Nation bands deploying a range of black nationalist, African and Asian aesthetics and politics: from fundamentalist Islamic and Sikh nationalist politics married to hip hop sounds, to Asian bands producing experimental, cross-generic musical forms. However, it is the international success of one of its exoticist bands, Transglobal Underground, that has provided the label with secure financial foundations.

Hesmondhalgh explores the complex interplay between the reflexive ethical debates over sampling and the economic dynamics of sampling within the label. The debates rest on Nation musicians' opposed positions regarding the substitution of live non-Western and ethnic musicians' labor for digital samples as a way of mitigating the grosser exploitations of musical appropriation. This exploitation is amply demonstrated by the way Nation and Transglobal Underground were directly responsible, through a hit record, for the appropriation by Coca-Cola and its allies, the multinationals BMG and Warner-Chappell, of the singing of a Tahitian women's gospel choir as the core musical figure in a Coke advertisement. We see here enacted the global-corporate exploitation of non-Western others' intellectual and artistic property through the mediation of a Western multicultural label and band, with no recompense whatsoever going to the Tahitian musicians. One issue raised is the received view that it is impossible and/or futile to trace the origins of such a sample—a view sometimes enunciated in the Nation debates, as though the aim to find the origins of a sample is buying into an essentialist error about musical authorship. Indeed, certain multicultural Na-

tion acts espouse a quasi-poststructuralist discourse of the benefits of "getting rid of the authorial ego" as their own convenient variant of Barthes' philosophy of the "death of the author."[79] Ironically, a putatively "critical" discourse of the end of authorship here becomes an ideology of cultural practice and is used to legitimize acts of musical appropriation. Yet as Hesmondhalgh says, in cases like the Tahitian sample there are British agencies close at hand, such as the National Sound Archive, willing to work through the ethnomusicological archives to try to identify the original recording, the musicians or the culture from which samples have been taken. Thus it is not so much that the question of origins here takes the form of an essentialist ideology of the non-Western musician, but, on the contrary, that the myth of obscured or impossible or irrelevant origins is itself highly ideological: as in the Tahitian case, it can conceal and naturalize domination, both economic and aesthetic, in the cultural sphere.

Simon Frith's essay, finally, provides a wide-ranging overview of recent work on transnational popular musics. He too perceives a shift toward hybridity as a governing concept. If acculturation was the key term for a previous generation in ethnomusicology, in an earlier phase of popular music studies the buzzword was authenticity, and this has also been consigned to the intellectual dust-heap. Academics have been quick to point out that the focus on authenticity in world music discourse has served to exoticize non-Western musics; as Frith puts it, non-Western musicians are treated in the authenticity-talk of the world music industry "as raw materials to be processed into commodities for the West." Frith surveys a number of recent contributions, teasing out a range of attitudes toward globalization and postmodernity. Ironically, he suggests, hybridity has been reinflected by popular music scholars as a new form of authenticity: whether writing about Caribbean musicians' consciousness of their position within a global industry, or the way that non-Western musicians have been drawn to rock, that seemingly most Western of popular forms, these writers suggest that music in an era of globalization powerfully affirms the syncretic nature of contemporary cultural identity. Frith sets Erlmann's pessimistic reading of this situation against Timothy Taylor's more optimistic interpretation, which argues that world musicians provide an authentic expression of the most creative dimensions of the postmodern condition.[80] But Frith resists either pole, preferring particularistic analyses of the ways in which music articulates identity in specific local contexts. For, as recent studies of musical changes in Central and Eastern Europe show, such close readings reveal the enormous importance of music in constructing national and ethnic identities. For Frith, the significance of transnational popular music derives not from its potential use as a sign of a new era of globalization (whether read optimistically or pessimistically), but from the lives and practices of musicians and music-industry workers and their formations of networks of activity. In such microlevel practices, Frith

detects evidence of the negotiation of new cultural alliances, a kind of "globalization from below." His reading implies that much of the work carried out in this area is overambitious in its attempts to "read off" from musical forms the meaning of cultural practices. His own approach suggests instead the fruitfulness of attending to how understandings of transnational music are created through a set of intertwined vernacular and academic discourses.

IV. MUSIC AND THE REPRESENTATION/ ARTICULATION OF SOCIOCULTURAL IDENTITIES

Where the papers just discussed center primarily on interpreting appropriation and hybridity in contemporary popular musics, those by Philip V. Bohlman and Martin Stokes pursue the analysis of subaltern musics within larger social and cultural formations, examining how these musics come to represent changing collective identities. The problematic being addressed here and by other papers in the volume is how particular social and cultural identities may be evoked, articulated, and represented in music, whether in processes of composition, performance, or consumption.

The theorization of music and sociocultural identity is presently a major preoccupation. An older model, given new life in certain versions of subculture theory, argues that music reflects or enunciates underlying social relations and structures. The problem is to trace the links between a musical form or practice and its production or consumption by particular social groups. This "homology" model has often been discredited for a mechanical, deterministic mapping of the relation between social base and cultural superstructure, whether in Marxian or Durkheimian formulations. It is accused of reifying and hypostatizing what are more accurately conceived as fluid and processual dynamics in the formation and change of social and cultural identities. A new model has emerged based on these criticisms, which amounts to a current orthodoxy. It proposes that music "reflects" nothing; rather, music has a formative role in the construction, negotiation, and transformation of sociocultural identities.[81] In this view, music engenders communities or "scenes";[82] it allows a play with, a performance of, and an imaginary exploration of identities. Its aesthetic pleasure has much to do with this vicarious exploration of identities.

How do we reconcile these contending models? In its rejection of the essentialist "dangers" of the homology model, the process model introduces new dangers of reductionism; processual analysis, as it currently exists, cannot generate the conceptual complexity adequate to the challenge of theorizing music and sociocultural identity. Rather than seeing these explanatory schemes as mutually exclusive, it bears pointing out that each brings insight in relation to different sociomusical phenomena. There is a need to acknowledge that music can variably *both* construct new identities *and* reflect

existing ones. Sociocultural identities are not simply constructed in music; there are "prior" identities that come to be embodied dynamically in musical cultures, which then also *form* the reproduction of those identities—no passive process of reflection. We cannot afford to jettison completely a reflectionist model when, for example, as Stokes has shown in relation to the role of marching bands in Northern Ireland, or Parkes for song performance among the Kalasha of northwest Pakistan, or Mach for the role of Chopin's music in the changing face of Polish nationalisms,[83] in certain circumstances music does function primarily and powerfully to articulate the boundaries defining the collective identities or mutual antagonisms of pre-existing sociocultural groups, groups defined by shared cultural systems quite distinct from music. In his important discussion of ethnicity, identity, and music, Stokes mentions in passing the discomfort of thinking music and violence together;[84] and yet, as he agrees, music has often played a leading role in the disciplinary socialization and ideological conditioning fostered by extremely repressive regimes.[85] This capacity of music tends itself to be suppressed under the sunny terms of postmodern cultural theory. Thus, against prevailing views that music is primarily a means for the imagining of emergent and labile identities, we stress that music is equally at times a medium for marking and reinforcing the boundaries of existing sociocultural categories and groups. Again as Stokes has argued, "Music is intensely involved in the propagation of dominant classifications" of ethnicity, class, and gender, and notably, too, in the cultural articulation of nationalism.[86] Indeed, "the violence which enforces dominant classifications is seldom far away from musical performances in many situations."[87]

But the point is that the two perspectives are not contradictory. It is precisely music's extraordinary powers of imaginary evocation of identity and of cross-cultural and intersubjective empathy that render it a primary means of both marking and transforming individual and collective identities. As Born has argued previously, it is because music lacks denotative meaning, in contrast with the visual and literary arts, that it has particular powers of connotation.[88] Music's *hyperconnotative* character, its intense cognitive, cultural, and emotional associations, and its abstraction, are perhaps what give it a unique role in the imaginary constitution of cross-cultural and intersubjective desire, of exotic/erotic charge for the other culture or music in social fantasy.[89] But these qualities are also means for *self*-idealization and, through repetition of the existing tropes and genres of identity-in-music (national anthems, patriotic songs), for the reinforcement of extant collective identities.

How, then, can we account for movement across and between identities? Here it becomes critically important to distinguish between individual self-identity and collective identity in relation to music. Because of the ubiquity of music in the mass-mediated world, and individuals' subjectification and

socialization by a number of different musics, each bearing different dimensions of both their existing and desired, potential identities, rather than musical subjectivity being fixed and unitary, several musical "identities" may inhabit the same individual. These are expressed in different musical tastes and practices, some of them in tension with each other or in contradiction with other parts of the self. Thus states of both "authentic," "essential" musical identity and more playful, postmodern relations of desire and protoidentification through music coexist in many individuals, producing a state of fragmentary and multiple imaginary musical identification. Rather than conceiving of individual subjectivities as fully self-transparent and coherent, then, and in contrast to the apparent "unities" of collective experience, we should adopt the insights of poststructuralism and psychoanalysis and develop an awareness of the multiple musical identifications or subject positions to which individuals are susceptible as producers and consumers.[90] This conception allows an understanding of the complexities of mobile, conflicting, and changing musical identifications. Without such a distinction between individual and collective forms of musical identity, we cannot understand individual agency on the part of musicians and composers as it bears on wider musical-cultural changes. Above all, we cannot address the potential disjunctures and conflicts between individual and collective musical identities, the way that cultural expectations and norms, or dominant musical discourses, may be in tension with individual identities and may exert powerful pressures of musical subjectification.[91] Indeed, as Hall has argued, the problem of conceiving the relationship between individual subjectivities and discursive formations or dominant cultural systems remains the main challenge to theories of identity in general.[92] Certain essays in this collection respond to these challenges by developing a more complex account of musical subjectivity than is common in music scholarship. For example, Brown on Bartók, Franklin on Rachmaninov, Schoenberg, and Korngold, and Hesmondhalgh on the dilemmas of some Nation musicians offer close readings of authorial subjectivities that reveal the intrasubjective conflicts and fragmentations manifest in dynamics of idealization and denigration, splitting, ambivalence, and denial, as they are experienced in relation to different musical selves or projected onto musical others.

The process model of musical identity tends to focus on the microsociality of musical performance, practice, and bodily gesture, and how these condense the signification of identity. In this view, musical practice and bodily experience are microcosmic and effective of identity formation.[93] Yet this emphasis on the microsocial, while fruitful, risks evacuating a sense of how individual and collective musical identifications may be powerfully formed and influenced by larger discursive, ideological, social, and generic forces—as Brown suggests in relation to Bartók's susceptibility to contemporary racist and nationalist discourses; as Pasler indicates for Roussel and Delage through

their subjectification by rival French compositional and cultural philosophies; as Corbett shows regarding the post-Cageian turn to Eastern philosophies; and as Feld indicates for the influence of pan-Africanist discourses on African American musicians. It is, however, Stokes's paper that develops this approach most fully, through an analysis of the contesting discourses struggling for interpretive primacy around Turkish arabesk. Stokes's insistence on the "openness" of arabesk musical culture as a space of profuse discursive projections of identity thus makes more complex our understanding of music and identity, difference and appropriation. Here, the appropriation at issue is emphatically *discursive:* the apparent need of the Turkish statist and Left intelligentsia, through interpretation and critique, to subsume and master this socially and culturally pervasive musical other.[94]

But arabesk represents more than just a musical other. Both Stokes's and Bohlman's essays concern centrally the changing boundaries between a dominant national culture, its representatives and guardians, and internal subalterns, as manifest in the successes and incursions of the subalterns' musical culture. For some Turkish intellectuals, arabesk is associated with a peasant underclass that inhabits the squatter settlements on the peripheries of the major cities, an underclass that is the unwelcome, disowned, and yet inevitable social by-product of Turkish modernization. Arabesk is also associated with the insurgent Kurdish people, the focus of Turkey's crisis of internal insurrection. Musically and textually, arabesk is a hybrid cosmopolitan genre incorporating Arabic (especially Egyptian) influences with profane elements of Western popular culture. Its sentimental lyrics center on disorder, despair, and pain. Arabesk's formal and musical character is thus highly problematic for the guardians and proponents of a modern, Western-leaning national culture; it connotes for its critics a subversive internal orient, a subaltern eastern Turkey resistant to secularized modernity. For some years the genre was banned from state radio and television. Arabesk's role in drawing the fire of state-identified intellectuals must be understood in the context of the state project, from the 1930s to the present, to foster an authentic Anatolian folk music purged of any urban, Ottoman, or foreign influences, a project in which Bartók played a part. This musical state-planning resulted in a music unpopular among peasants and urbanites, in contrast to the messily hybrid and massively popular arabesk. Significantly, the denigration by Turkish state and intellectuals of arabesk and its constituency, complemented by their invention of an idealized authentic folk tradition, replicates Bartók's own splitting between an impure, degenerate gypsy music and folk music, its idealized other.

Stokes traces the discursive lines into recent decades, showing how the 1980s brought economic liberalization and political populism under a Center-Right Turkish government and their attempted co-option of arabesk. In response, the Left produced in the early 1990s a new, counterhegemonic

reading of this powerful, interstitial popular cultural form. In this discourse, indebted to the cultural theory of Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall, arabesk is seen to represent opposition and resistance, a utopian element in popular culture. In sum, for Stokes, all the prominent discourses around arabesk exhibit "reverse essentialism," an internal Orientalism in which the genre represents an "east" within to be either expelled or reintegrated. And yet, through a reading of a song by the major arabesk star, Orhan Gencebay, Stokes shows how arabesk's music and lyrics, its "dissonant multitextuality," can themselves work through internal contradiction to ironize and undermine the simplistic east/west binaries they are supposed to encode. Arabesk's hybridity thus resiliently insists on the genre's own sociocultural complexity, its foundation in processes of cultural hybridity and social change, in the face of highly politicized discursive reductions.

To account for the range of musical representations of identity, we can initially make an ideal-typical distinction between musical constructions of identity and difference that are *primarily* experiences of the cultural imaginary, what Born has termed "musically-imagined communities,"[95] and music that is driven by sociocultural identities that are *ontologically and sociologically prior;* even if their enhancement and enactment in musical practice and performance produces effects on those identity formations. But we can develop further this simple polarity by conceiving of music's articulation of sociocultural identity in terms of a *quasi-temporality,* a series of distinct potential moments or forms. We would distinguish four such structural articulations:

(1) When music works to create a *purely imaginary identification,* an imaginary figuration of sociocultural identities, with no intent to actualize those identities: a kind of psychic tourism through music. This is an identification that only ever exists in collective or individual fantasy, and thus acts surreptitiously but powerfully to inscribe and reinscribe existing boundaries of self and other, as well as the hierarchies and stratifications between those categories. This moment may be a precondition for the emergence or negotiation of new identities (as in 2, below); but it also commonly operates as a *substitute* for such real identifications. Much of the scholarship and most of the papers in this volume dealing with musical primitivism, exoticism, and Orientalism address these kinds of purely imaginary projections that are fantasy-imbued, act primarily as imaginary extensions of the subject, and are never enacted in real cultural transformations of individual or collective self.

(2) When the musical imaginary works to *prefigure,* crystallize or potentialize *emergent, real* forms of sociocultural identity or alliance; and thus how labile or emergent sociocultural identities come to be prefigured, negotiated, and constructed in music, so *re-forming* (or reconstructing) the boundaries between social categories, between self and other. This is the moment encapsulated by the process model.

(3) When the musical imaginary works to *reproduce,* reinforce, actualize,

or memorialize *extant* sociocultural identities, in some cases also forcefully *repressing* both transformation and alternatives. Here, musical representations may potentially be hypostatized by such a "burden of representation"; they may be strongly bounded, highly redundant, prevented from engaging in the "promiscuity" of hybridity. This is the moment summed up by the homology model.

(4) When the musical representations of sociocultural identity come, *after the fact,* to be reinterpreted and debated discursively and, out of this process, "reinserted" as representations into the changing social-cultural formation (as Stokes shows for arabesk, and Brown for Bartók's reading of gypsy musics). This form also sums up the primary *macrohistorical,* transformative dynamic to which all musics are subject: that is, how musics become subject to inevitable historical processes of reinterpretation and then reinsertion into the changing sociocultural formation—a kind of discursive and practical reflexivity around music.

Our intention here is to expand theoretically on the dictum that identification is always imaginary,[96] as well as the assumption of a metaphorical and substantive equation between identity and music per se,[97] by clarifying that not all forms of musically articulated "identity" are the same. Instead, we should distinguish these four kinds of imaginary identification or discursive subjectification through music, their distinctive articulations and effects. Bohlman's paper, which explores the dynamics surrounding the music of one of Europe's foremost "internal others," the Jews, in some ways exemplifies a temporal conception of the (trans)formation of collective identities through music. In his study of the place of Jewish cantors in Viennese society from the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries, Bohlman portrays the cantors' musical culture both as embedded in a preexistent Jewish community and tradition, and as coming to play a significant role in forming the new boundaries and contours of an inclusive Viennese public sphere. He shows how, in this period, profound cultural differences within the Jewish community (as Vienna experienced waves of immigration of eastern European Jews), and between the Jews and Austrian society, were met by changes in musical culture. These involved a professionalization and popularization of the cantor's role and an expansion of the practices of Jewish musics, first within the Jewish community and then into the public spaces of the host society.

The development of print media, enabling the wide dissemination of the cantors' repertoires and of Jewish popular broadsides, was one condition for the changes. Another was the passing in nineteenth-century Austria of increasingly liberal laws, which allowed Jews to enter for the first time the "free professions" of Austrian society. Changes of aesthetic and of language made the music more attractive and "open" to the Viennese public. Bohlman stresses the collective and individual agency of the Jewish community and

of particular cantors in these transformations of Viennese public culture. Through music, difference was composed, performed, and enacted; and yet, through music's powers of pleasing and unifying, differences were also lessened, effecting, through cultural practice, a rapprochement with the Jewish other within. Bohlman shows how historically vulnerable were these processes, for by the 1930s absolute boundaries between Jewish and Austrian societies were reasserted with ever more persecutory intent, as the internal other became a target for annihilation. Bohlman thus confirms music's powers to articulate and transform the contours of collective sociocultural identity. But he suggests too that, under conditions of internal otherness and when driven by the subaltern group, what might appear as musical "appropriation" can be a conscious practice *by* that group of musical integration and merging, with the aim of effecting sociocultural integration.

V. TECHNIQUES OF THE MUSICAL IMAGINARY

How should we think the *specificity of music* in the various processes outlined? Far from forcing the various arguments in play into a spurious unity, we want in this last section simply to gather thoughts on significant issues that arise.

A first comment is methodological and ontological: it concerns the multitextuality of music as culture and the irreducible complexity of musical signification. Music exists and generates meaning in a number of different, simultaneous forms: as musical sound, and this as mediated by notations, by technological and visual forms, by the practices and sociality of performance, by social institutions and socioeconomic arrangements, by language in different guises (lyrics and dramatic narratives, theoretical and critical exegeses, and other discourses) and, relatedly, by conceptual and knowledge systems. The essays demonstrate repeatedly how the key questions raised by this book can only be addressed by attending to music's mediations as well as to the musical sound, often by reading a number of different levels or forms of musical signification as a—sometimes contradictory—constellation. As Born has proposed, this requires a social semiotics of music adequate to the analysis of music as culture, as a complex multitextual object in history.[98]

Gorbman's revelation of the ideological tensions generated between film narrative and music in the evolution of the western genre; Brown's focus on Bartók's positioning by wider discourses of nationalism and race as evidenced through his writings; Franklin's reading of the contradictory and ambivalent presentations of self of émigré European composers in Los Angeles in the face of the dominance of American mass culture as revealed in their public and private statements, his analysis of the disjunctures between discursive accounts of Schoenberg and the composer's actual aesthetics and politics, and his account of Korngold's split musical subjectivity through the allegory of the film *Deception;* Feld's and Hesmondhalgh's analyses of how contem-

porary primitivisms and exoticisms are augmented by the visual iconography, marketing, and lyrics of world and fusion music acts; the prime place accorded by Pasler, Bohlman, Stokes, Hesmondhalgh, and Feld to technologies of sound reproduction (early recordings, print media, cassettes, samplers) in appropriative and representational strategies: all of these speak to the methodological necessity of attending to music's mediations and their complex juxtapositions and disjunctures. That this is more than a dry analytical proposal and can inflect an urgent politics is shown by Hesmondhalgh's account of critique circulating between the Nation bands. Reflecting on what would mitigate the objectionable exoticism of the multicultural act Transglobal Underground, a musician from the more experimental Asian Dub Foundation explained that, if TGU will not change their music and visuals, they might at least temper the exoticism by dialoguing with their audience on antiracist politics in a new performance practice. Here we see how musicians' awareness of the complexities of musical signification forms a calculus that can inform agency. Stokes's and Brown's essays, which center on tracing discursive fields around music, confirm another core methodological precept: music's extraordinary capacity to generate commentary and to absorb theoretical and other discursive projections, and the need to analyze these for their parallel, sometimes autonomous effects, as well as for their influence on the musicians' agency.

Here it is instructive to revisit the question of *authorial agency,* retheorized after the poststructuralist critique of authorship. In this introduction we have suggested the need to integrate an account of discursive formations, cultural and ideological systems, including those systems specific to music history, with an analysis of musicians' subjectivities.[99] Most of the essays adopt this perspective: Pasler depicts Delage and Roussel as conditioned by their cultural contexts, but artistically as relatively autonomous; Corbett and Feld portray musicians and composers as caught up in the ongoing momentum of dominant discursive fields, though with the possibility of variation and of resisting that momentum; while Hesmondhalgh examines agency by attending to the play of position-taking by Nation musicians. We have employed psychoanalytic concepts to elucidate the material, arguing that psychic dynamics, notably splitting and denial, are immanently at work in processes of the musical imaginary. We have noted the projection onto others and into the self of combined extremes of idealization and denigration, an emotional binarism encapsulated in the concept of splitting; the coexistence in the musical self of contradictory states and multiple subject positions, invoking the concept of intrasubjective fragmentation; and the attempt to absent or exclude an other aesthetic or music, which amounts to denial in musical subjectivity or cultural system. We are not alone in turning to psychoanalysis; as we have mentioned, historians of colonialism and postcolonial theorists engaged in the analysis of representation and appropriation have also shown

how these processes may be imbued with projection and splitting.[100] This is no call for a return to humanist conceptions of sovereign agency or intentionality. We propose instead a theoretical hybrid, combining Foucauldian concepts of the production of subjectivity in discourse and psychoanalytic perspectives on the psychic forms immanent in individual subjectivity and cultural processes. Nor does such a hybrid commit us to abandoning all possibility of conscious agency. We would differ, for example, from Judith Butler's recent attempt to combine Foucauldian and psychoanalytic perspectives, in which she theorizes agency as a form of iteration, "an uneasy practice of repetition and its risks."[101] Butler's resolution of the agency problem risks, in its excessive structuralism, being insufficiently attuned to historical differences in the expression and outcome of agency.

Another aim of this introduction is to enhance the classification of different modes of appropriating and representing other musical cultures, different techniques of the musical imaginary. Earlier writers have developed their own classifications, partly in order to legitimize certain techniques. Bartók, expounding on his and Kodály's compositional practices, outlined three ways in which peasant musics may be "transmuted into" modern art music: by taking over a folk melody unchanged and writing an accompaniment, the closest to direct quotation; by simulating folk music, to produce an imaginative musical imitation or extension; and by absorbing completely the idiom of peasant music or using it as a basis for analysis, the results of which are used in original ways and incorporated into the composer's own style.[102] Leonard Meyer, writing on the crisis of teleological models of progress in music history, offers a classification for what he considers productive uses of past musics in a "radically pluralistic" present.[103] He distinguishes paraphrase, borrowing, allusion, simulation, and modelling, ranged along a spectrum between more and less freely modelled or imitative, and more and less formal-structural or thematic uses. He writes cannily of these techniques as "aesthetically self-reflective,"[104] yet apart from noting allusion's quality of "reminiscence," his interpretation focuses on formal qualities and eschews the techniques' different self-reflective cultural, psychological, and affective properties.

For an improved semiotics adequate to the complexities of musical practice, these earlier classifications need augmenting. Additional techniques that demand to be theorized include pastiche, parody, juxtaposition, and montage in music; and because of their rich extramusical implications, these techniques require analysis in more than formal terms. We might explore pastiche as an apparently affectionate and humorous mimesis, a mode of musical obeisance to the "original"; parody, by contrast, as a satirical, darkly humorous imitation that produces a critical distanciation from the original; and juxtaposition as a musical collage that creates perspectival distance, fragmentation, and relativism between each musical object alluded to.[105]

There is the question of whether it is possible for musical imitation to function as an aural analogue of stereotype or caricature, a question to which Feld responds with a resounding "yes" by arguing that musical caricature is definitive of the entire repertoire of popular appropriations of pygmy musics. The earlier schemes also require modernizing in order to address the now-ubiquitous techniques of electronic and computer music media, notably the varieties of technologically mediated sound montage and simulation. In principle, an adequate classification would address also the aural and aesthetic complexity of film, television, and advertising soundtracks, which combine music with diegetic dialogue, nondiegetic voice-over, and ambient sound, and thus require analysis of the aural effect of the complex simultaneity and shifting hierarchical interrelations of these different tracks.

There exists in addition a distinct species of reference involving nonmusical or extramusical discursive, cultural, and social associations derived from other musics and cultures, which replace, override, or determine musical reference. Corbett, for example, exemplifies this with the Eastern philosophical imperatives, unaccompanied by direct musical influence, of Cageian "conceptual Orientalism." But there are equally appropriations that derive their impetus from the ideological connotations or political identifications attached to particular musical cultures, for example when reference to popular music or song is made for its political associations, as in nationalists' uses of folk music, or in the appropriation of socialist songs for their revolutionary affiliation. Reference is also sometimes made to other musics through the imitation of their social forms or performance modes. Experimental and improvised musics have been particularly susceptible to these kinds of extramusical associations, for example in their mimicry of the collectivism of non-Western musical cultures or jazz.[106]

Perhaps the most theoretically challenging mode of musical representation is the kind of concrete quotation or "objectification" of another music found in forms such as musical montage, juxtaposition, pastiche, and parody. Here, representation of the other music is set within the bounded "identity" of the encompassing style; this is always a knowing (and in this sense self-reflective) allusion, a purely musical representation of another, distinct musical style or culture. These are forms which, through musical figuration of other musics, paradoxically defy music's status as essentially nonrepresentational. It is as though, while in music's abstract and asemantic first order of signification there is an absence of denotation or literal representation, and while profuse, ramifying fields of connotation and association constitute music's second, semantic order of signification, we need to conceive of a semantic third order consisting of *intermusical representations figured intramusically*, and thus a return of "denotation" of a purely intermusical kind, as it were, after the detour through connotation.[107] This technique is simply

one concrete end of the spectrum of potential modes of subsumption of different musical styles within a musical "identity."

We must leave the further pursuit of the classificatory project for another time. Nonetheless, interesting questions arise. We might ask, first, whether there is a significant gulf between "realist" musical representations of other musics, those that intend "faithfully" to represent some aspect of another musical culture, and representations that are conceived purely imaginatively, set within the boundaries of existing genres and tropes, and thus have little concern for "faithfulness." Does the different degree of engagement with the other exhibited in these strategies matter? Is the latter—being less grounded, less researched, more purely fantasized, more an intrasubjective and intracultural phenomenon of projection/assimilation, and so likely more exoticist, Orientalist, primitivist—is it thus less defensible? This would provide a grounds for evaluating between, say, Roussel, whose representations of Indian music were more projective and self-oriented, and Delage, whose music contained moments of "realist" accuracy and who transcribed the details of Indian music's difference perceptively and with empathy. It would make plausible a cultural politics attuned to the difference between Madonna's careless invocation of pygmy musical sound bites via Herbie Hancock, and those artists—Zap Mama, Francis Bebey, Martin Cradick—who attempt to approach very close to the subtleties of pygmy techniques and musics. However it is Feld, on the multiple appropriations of pygmy musics, who voices strong cynicism on the politics of empathy: "Everyone—no matter how exoticizing, how patronizing, how romanticizing, how essentializing in their rhetoric or packaging—declares their fundamental respect, even affection, for the original music and its makers. Concern for the future of the rainforests and their inhabitants is now central to the genre." Moreover, the conditions for a politics of empathy have surely changed when "faithful" representations of other musics are a mere flick of a button away through the instant cut-and-paste of sampler technologies. This may explain the emphasis in recent political debate among musicians, as evidenced by Feld and Hesmondhalgh, on developing relatively unmediated and social engagements with the "musical other" through attention to modes of performance and practice, and even to playing with those musicians, as opposed to sheer musical results and sound surfaces.

Yet, resisting the tendency to read domination and subsumption into any and all musical appropriation, we should surely also ask whether, or under what conditions, musical otherness can be simple aesthetic difference? Is it possible to discern intramusical constructions of otherness that are intended as "pure" aesthetic play with other sounds and are thus, crucially, unburdened by ideological associations and the psychic dynamics of projection and splitting? Hesmondhalgh, for example, describes this as the position of

Nation band Loop Guru, who defend the notion that their non-Western and ethnic samples amount to an apolitical, nonappropriative engagement backed up by contacts with musicians through their travels. Despite musicians' intentions, can this hold? In a similar spirit of skepticism, following the earlier critique of serialist modernism's strategy of aesthetic autarchy,[108] we might reverse that critique and consider whether there is value in the attempt to shore up the boundaries and differences between distinct musical systems and aesthetic traditions, not in the cause of some questionable ideological embrace of, or nostalgia for, musical autonomy, authenticity, or essentialism, but as a productive tactic of "strategic essentialism" in music to stimulate cultural diversity and mark distinct social identities.[109] Where the current trend is toward the celebration of hybridities without end, and in the face of the global circulation of the entire archive of music history promised by the internet, a "postpostmodern" interest in musical boundaries, embeddedness, and location may have increasing creative salience.[110]

The classification of techniques of the musical imaginary can become an overly formalistic project that evades the analysis of power. But that is not a necessary property of all formal analysis. One potentially fruitful approach is to follow the lead of cultural theorists engaged in analyzing the discursive hierarchies at work in narrative structures, so as to theorize, by analogy, intramusical subsumptions of musical difference and how they articulate power and its subversion. An influential model is provided by MacCabe, who, in the Brechtian tradition of critique, has analyzed the existence of a hierarchy of discourses at work in the "classic realist text."[111] In this hierarchy, the framing narrative prose acts as a metalanguage which, in its transparency, denies its own discursivity and assumes the status of the "real" (or subject speaking truth). At the same time, the metalanguage subsumes a number of other narratives or object languages, which are perceived *as* discourses, *as* representations, while the identity of the metalanguage is obscured. For MacCabe, the ideological truth-effect produced by the discursive hierarchy is definitive of classic realism in both the novel and film.[112] This approach is similar to that pioneered by Susan McClary in her deconstructive studies of the narrative and social-discursive structures immanent in certain canonic Western musical works.[113] Her essay on Bach, for example, analyzes Bach's appropriations and juxtapositions of the then-dominant, "widely divergent, ideologically antagonistic" Italian and French styles in the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto. McClary argues that he incorporates them within a discursive hierarchy in which the Germanic Lutheran tradition remains "musical king"[114]—that is, acts as a metalanguage that finally subsumes the Italian and French idioms.

McClary's approach appears more open than MacCabe's on the question of whether such narrative forms must inevitably be ideologically reactionary. Her thesis is that Bach was working from the margins and was uncomfort-

able in any one lingua franca, preferring to effect dynamic syntheses of all musical languages at hand. Nonetheless, in her analysis of Cantata 140, *Wachet auf*, McClary argues that "the cantata enacts a synthesis of all available national styles in such a way as to appropriate them all and put them in the service of an expressly Lutheran agenda. The monad that contains the whole world is located, significantly, on German soil."[115] She equates this musical-narrative hierarchy, at least in its nineteenth-century reinterpretation in the service of Bach's canonization as inaugurator of "absolute music," with claims to the music's universalism and "extra-human truth."[116] McClary ends by herself equating Bach with "the postmodern eclectic . . . the ideologically marginalized artist empowering himself to appropriate, reinterpret, and manipulate to his own ends the signs and forms of dominant culture."[117] Here Bach appears almost as the prophet of "Signifyin(g)," and McClary's call for a careful elucidation of sociohistorical context risks being compromised by her desire to claim him for today's cultural politics of hybridity.[118]

Hirschkop has developed a similar perspective by introducing social context into linguistic theories of music through Mikhail Bakhtin's politicized sociolinguistics. The Bakhtinian concept of the poetic text, which Hirschkop treats as analogous to dominant forms of classical and popular music, is defined, again, by a hierarchy of discourses, a universalizing strategy that Bakhtin termed monological: "Poetic texts 'erase any sense of the boundedness, the historicity, the social determination and specificity of one's own language.'"[119] Against this, citing Bakhtin's concept of dialogism, Hirschkop poses those musical forms that re-use and recontextualize diverse musical languages without bringing them under the closure of a hierarchy of "truth" and universality. "External dialogism," found in Beethoven's late style and Mahler's symphonic work, is a form in which there is estrangement from dominant musical conventions through "the work's inability to 'take itself seriously'. . . . The music refers implicitly to its own historical limits." By contrast, "internal dialogism" stages a confrontation between different musics; other, "socially alien languages"—in classical music, popular or folk musics—are cited in the body of the work and thereby produce distanciation. But Hirschkop argues from music's immanent sociality that "to really dialogize music [it is necessary] to bring in not just musical language from popular social contexts but actual institutional elements of those social contexts themselves: forms of performance, reception and composition."[120] A different productive use of Bakhtin is Brown's analysis of parody, play, and the grotesque in a number of Bartók's works that synthesize modernism and folk musics.[121] These include dramatic pieces (*The Miraculous Mandarin, The Wooden Prince,* and *Bluebeard's Castle*), but also the supposedly nonreferential *Third String Quartet.* Drawing on Bakhtin's and Wolfgang Kayser's theories of the grotesque, Brown argues that Bartók does not merely assimilate other musical voices but, by emphasizing their difference, uses them to challenge prevailing national

(Habsburg) canons through "lively dialogue." She draws connections between the "elemental vitality" of the indestructible mandarin and the mechanical wooden prince in the dramas, whose hybrid bodies challenge "life/death" binarisms, and the Third String Quartet's affront to the genre's exalted status as the epitome of absolute music, and hence to its social exclusivity, through Bartók's use of folk musics and of "grotesque," extreme instrumental techniques.

Yet for all the fruitful examination of intramusical forms of power and subversion, there remains a danger of formalism unless they are thought ultimately in relation to the macro-socioeconomic processes within which techniques of representation and appropriation take place. Here we might recall Taruskin's uncompromising linking of Russian musical Orientalism with Russian imperialism. It is Feld who pursues this question most fully in this volume, summing up his essay on the exponential expansion of the pygmy pop industry:

> The primary circulation of small-scale, low-budget, and largely nonprofit ethnomusicological records is now directly linked to a secondary circulation of several million dollars' worth of contemporary record sales, copyrights, royalties and ownership claims, many of them held by the largest music entertainment conglomerates in the world. Hardly any of this money circulation returns to or benefits the originators of the cultural and intellectual property in question. It is this basic inequity, coupled with the reproduction of negative caricature, that creates the current ethnomusicological reality: discourses on world music are inseparable from discourses on indigeneity and domination.

Feld stresses, after Adorno and Derrida, the need to theorize the mimesis (or imitation/appropriation) that forms the basis of the world music industry from a perspective

> at the double-edge of affirmation and critique. . . . [Thus, in Adorno's aesthetic theory,] mimesis makes a theatrical appearance cloaked as the warped logic of domination, [yet] dialectically unleashing repressed desire, a longing for the other. . . . Adorno repeatedly insists that as distance, separation, and isolation are illuminated as the products of domination, so too do they glow as signals of a desire to reach out of subjection and into connection.

What is distinctive, then, about the political-economy of musical globalization as it is fuelled by the twin motors of capital accumulation and desire, as Feld and Hesmondhalgh imply, is that the economic and cultural correlates of aesthetic appropriation through commodification are very highly developed in music in comparison with such fields as postcolonial literature or the globalization of ethnic visual arts. Given music's suitability to mass, global commodification, and given the profitability of the music industry, the stakes in the exploitation of indigenous and marginalized groups' cultural property are very high. At the same time, due to commodified music's

boundless capacity to create and corral desire, the capacity of these other musics to generate new aesthetic forms of identification, new modes of the global musical imaginary, are also great.[122] Taken as a whole, Feld's material suggests that, speeded on by ever more efficient technologies of appropriation and objectification of music and by the profit-augmenting imperatives of the multinational conglomerates, we are witnessing a new phase of neocolonial relations in culture, *definitively extractive* in their economic dynamics whatever the complex and two-way flows of aesthetic hybridity. The stark question arises: was musical appropriation *before* expanded commodification really a form of domination? The essays by Pasler, Brown, Franklin, and Middleton indicate that early twentieth-century musical appropriations and repudiations, while they may have been economically extractive in less developed ways, were imbued with the psychic dynamics of projection/assimilation, splitting, and subsumption that inhere in the social and discursive asymmetries of colonialism. Characterized by a dialectic of repression/denigration and desire/empathy, whatever the spaces of individual agency carved out from these dynamics, the musical subsumptions and splittings of the earlier twentieth century resonate with colonialist cultural domination. It is when the combined dynamics of commodification and technological objectification gain pace, as it becomes possible for enormously profitable uses to be made out of "original sources," that musical appropriation tips over into an expanded, dual economic-and-cultural extraction. While this may be no revolutionary conclusion, it yields a temporary closure.

Yet finally, there remain a series of questions concerning reception and history that demand attention. We should ask: is there some special way that, because of its lack of denotation, and compared with the visual and literary arts, music hides the traces of its appropriations, hybridities, and representations, so that they come over time to be *naturalized and aestheticized?* Does this make these structures of representation historically evanescent, and does this in turn render them unproblematic? If musical representation is entirely conventional and coded—again, because of the absence of denotative meaning—does this make the anchoring of meaning dependent only on reception? Similarly, whatever the intentions of the composer, aren't the original conditions of and connotations attached to musical appropriations erased—don't they disappear eventually—in reception? Aren't such influences also commonly misrecognized in reception? What does this imply for the original appropriation? Does it matter, then, that relatively powerless and immobile musical cultures have historically been appropriated in order to revitalize Western art and popular music traditions? These questions touch on the wider debate in cultural theory regarding the relations between reception, production, and the text. In music, these issues are particularly critical.

The questions appear to throw doubt on the need to be concerned at all with the historical moments of composition and production as they form

the text. However, we suggest that there is an ontological argument to be made concerning the movement of the musical object (or text) through a series of states: imagination, composition, and production; dissemination and performance; reception. Each has a role in conditioning subsequent states. In this view, the characteristics of production, including authorial intention or compositional agency, themselves have a historical specificity and require understanding. Moreover, they come to be immanent in the text and set limits to the text, which, in turn, because of its finitude, sets certain limits to and forms reception.[123] Rather than the traces of musical appropriation simply being erased in time and in reception, they become, as with all musical elements, the object of changing discursive projections and interpretations, reinterpretations that in turn may become productive of new musical possibilities. Whatever the original sociocultural and ideological connotations such borrowings may have carried will fade in due course, unless they are reproduced as a projection into the musical object by other, nonmusical forces. In this sense, music's representational meanings, lacking any denotative "back-up," need always to be established, buttressed, through other sociocultural dynamics. The connotations attached to musical representations and appropriations are potentially more labile and unfixed, and perhaps at the same time more aesthetically and discursively fertile, than those of the visual and literary arts. Thus, a stress on reception as the final phase in the production of meaning does not wipe out the need to pursue the history of musical representations, but rather opens up the need to trace the "social life of sounds" through their several states ever more attentively. We might refer to Norris's paraphrase of Ernst Bloch, who wrote of the need for a constant effort of demystification of "nature" in music: "For Bloch . . . music is allegorical through and through . . . Musical works take on their significance through time in a history of successive re-encounters whose meaning can never be exhausted."[124] It is, we suggest, another naturalistic fallacy to believe that the musical object arrives fully formed in the world without the mediation of the author/musician/composer and the corresponding state/stage of production.

If, in this volume, greater attention has been paid to the semiotic character of musical representations of difference, to the forms of appropriation, and to the complexities of authorial subjectivities and production agencies than to their material and social contexts, this indicates what we acknowledge are the limitations of our project rather than a lack of commitment to the importance of analyzing the relations between those forms, agencies, and contexts. It bears repeating that our aim has not been to conduct an exercise in cultural relativism but to contribute to a reflexive critique of Western music and music history. Others are now writing analyses of musics and hybridities that are *not* dominant forms or centered in the West, sketching the outlines of a history that traces different roots/routes and spaces and in this

way answers back to Western dominance.[125] While the present book does not contribute much to that project, this does not imply a view on our part that only the stories told here matter. We accept that writing even a self-critical account focused on the West might tend to reproduce the very hegemony, the very binary oppositions, it sets out to deconstruct. But we believe that developing greater critical acuity about the techniques and forms through which power is deployed in Western music contributes in a complementary way to the larger project of questioning and unsettling those modes of power. The limits remain; this volume indubitably raises questions for further research. It is a call awaiting a response.

NOTES

The epigraphs to this introduction are to be found in Pierre Boulez, "Oriental Music: A Lost Paradise?" in *Orientations* (London: Faber, 1986), 421; Steve Reich, *Writings about Music* (Halifax, Nova Scotia: Nove Scotia College of Art and Design, 1974), 40; Peter Gabriel, quoted in Timothy D. Taylor, *Global Pop: World Music, World Markets* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 50; Mark Slobin, *Subcultural Sounds: Micromusics of the West* (Hanover, N.H.: Wesleyan University Press, 1993), 4.

1. We want to signal our difficulties with the terms "Western" and "other" while arguing for their retention. We use "Western" to denote Europe and North America. Many people now prefer the divisions "North" and "South" as a means of referring to the division between relatively rich and poor areas of the world. But, given that this is a book about music, we need to refer to the longstanding concept of "Western music" while distancing ourselves from those traditions of analysis which have taken such a category for granted, or which have privileged it, or both. This means also using the even more unfortunate but still widely used term "non-Western," which makes it sound as though the rest of the world is a kind of residue of the West. As we have worked on this book, "Euro-American" has emerged as a more accurate term for the geographical area that has dominated so much of the world's politics and culture. The term "other," meanwhile, has been widely used in a number of critical fields, especially feminism and postcolonial studies, to denote those groups of people that white Western heterosexual men have usually defined themselves against, and whose selfhood they have tended to deny. Unlike many writers, however, we have chosen not to capitalize the word "other." Given that our critical intentions are hopefully evident, scare quotation marks have not been used after the initial appearance of "Western" and "other" in each chapter.

2. By denotative media we refer to Barthes's distinction between denotation and connotation as two forms of signification comprising the "imitative" arts. See Roland Barthes, "The Photographic Message" and "Rhetoric of the Image," in *Image-Music-Text,* trans. Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977). Music, in its immanent abstraction, is different from these arts in lacking a level of denotation, or literal, analogical representation.

3. See Ralph P. Locke, "Constructing the Oriental 'Other': Saint-Saëns's *Samson et Dalila,*" *Cambridge Opera Journal* 3, no. 3 (1991): 261–302; Ralph P. Locke, "Reflec-

tions on Orientalism in Opera and Musical Theatre," *Opera Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (1993): 49–73; Susan McClary, *Georges Bizet: Carmen* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Richard Taruskin, "'Entoiling the Falconet': Russian Musical Orientalism in Context," *Cambridge Opera Journal* 4 (1992): 253–80; Jonathan Bellman, ed., *The Exotic in Western Music* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998); and Philip Hayward, ed., *Widening the Horizon: Exoticism in Post-War Popular Music* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999). Miriam K. Whaples, "Early Exoticism Revisited," in *The Exotic in Western Music,* ed. Bellman, 3–4, provides a useful survey of major works in orthodox musicology on the subject of exoticism, including an important German tradition of research.

4. See, for example, Gerry Farrell, *Indian Music and the West* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

5. See Ruth Solie, ed., *Musicology and Difference: Gender and Sexuality in Music Scholarship* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Lawrence Kramer, *Classical Music and Postmodern Knowledge* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); and Richard Dellamora and Daniel Fischlin, eds., *The Work of Opera: Genre, Nationhood, and Sexual Difference* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997). The work of Gary Tomlinson has also been influential in this area. In *Music in Renaissance Magic: Toward a Historiography of Others* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993) and "Musical Pasts and Postmodern Musicologies: A Response to Lawrence Kramer," *Current Musicology* 53 (summer 1994): 18–24, Tomlinson applies poststructuralist concerns with representation to questions of music history, asking, "How can we construct ways of seeing others that do not aggressively familiarize (colonize, terrorize) them?" (ibid., 23).

6. See Simon Frith, ed., *World Music, Politics, and Social Change* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989); Tony Mitchell, *Popular Music and Local Identity: Rock, Pop and Rap in Europe and Oceania* (London: Leicester University Press, 1996); and Timothy D. Taylor, *Global Pop: World Music, World Markets* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

7. See Will Straw, "Systems of Articulation, Logics of Change: Communities and Scenes in Popular Music," *Cultural Studies* 5, no. 3 (1991): 368–88; Will Straw et al., eds., *Popular Music—Style and Identity* (Montreal: International Association for the Study of Popular Music, 1995); Martin Stokes, ed., *Ethnicity, Identity and Music* (Oxford: Berg, 1994); Simon Frith, "Music and Identity," in *Questions of Cultural Identity,* ed. Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (London: Sage, 1996); and Simon Frith, *Performing Rites: On the Value of Popular Music* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996).

8. Line Grenier, in "From 'Diversity' to 'Difference': The Case of Socio-Cultural Studies of Music," *New Formations* 9 (winter 1989): 125–42, traces the historical development of discourses on music and difference, and argues for the importance of this history to cultural studies in general. Grenier's study is an innovative precursor to this essay and this collection.

9. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, eds., *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader* (Hemel Hempstead, U.K.: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993), 15. Similarly, the early postcolonial criticism of writers such as Wilson Harris, Chinua Achebe, and Wole Soyinka has often been disregarded in the attention paid in recent years to postcolonial theory. Bart Moore-Gilbert has argued eloquently for the reintegration of these two major strands of postcolonial analysis (i.e., criticism and theory). See Bart Moore-Gilbert, *Postcolonial Theory* (London: Verso, 1997): 169–84.

10. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth,* trans. Constance Farrington (1961;

reprint, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983); Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon, 1978).

11. These ramifying concerns have been conjoined with attempts to understand racial dynamics in other contexts that can only be called "postcolonial" in very loose or metaphorical ways, such as the work of African American cultural critics. Moreover, some of the work that might most comfortably be brought under the rubric "postcolonial," in the sense that it aims at a poststructuralist, antifoundational analysis of colonial and postcolonial discourses, argues that the term "postcolonial" is itself problematic due to its assumption of a radical break between the colonial period and the era that followed. See, for example, Ella Shohat, "Notes on 'The Post-Colonial,'" *Social Text* 31/32 (1992): 99–113, and Anne McClintock, "The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls in the Term 'Post-Colonialism,'" *Social Text* 31/32 (1992): 1–15.

12. See, for example, Richard Leppert and Susan McClary, eds., *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Philip V. Bohlman, "Musicology as a Political Act," *Journal of Musicology* 11, no. 4 (1993): 411–36; and Kramer, *Classical Music and Postmodern Knowledge*.

13. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *The Spivak Reader* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 19. The general arguments are evident throughout Spivak's work; see, among many examples, Spivak, "Negotiating the Structures of Violence," in *The Post Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues,* ed. Sarah Harasym (New York: Routledge, 1990); and Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

14. See, for example, Timothy Mitchell, *Colonizing Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), and James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Ethnography, Art, and Literature in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989).

15. Homi Bhabha, "The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism," in *The Location of Culture* (1983; New York: Routledge, 1994).

16. Benita Parry, "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse," *Oxford Literary Review* 9 (1987): 27–58. Marxist criticism of postcolonial studies includes Aijaz Ahmad, *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures* (London: Verso, 1992), and Arif Dirlik, "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism," *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1994): 329–56.

17. See Stuart Hall, "When Was 'The Post-Colonial'? Thinking at the Limit," in *The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons,* ed. Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti (New York: Routledge, 1996), 257.

There have, however, been robust replies to these critiques of postcolonial studies. Robert Young, for example, answers persuasively that "the investigation of the discursive construction of colonialism does not seek to replace or exclude other forms of analysis, whether they be historical, geographical, economic, military or political." Moreover, in this view, the importance of colonial discourse analysis lies in the way it emphasizes how "colonialism involved not just a military or economic activity, but permeated forms of knowledge which, if unchallenged, may continue to be the very ones through which we try to understand colonialism itself." See Robert Young, *Colonial Desire* (London: Routledge, 1995), 163.

18. Exceptions to the lack of consideration of popular culture are writers such

as Paul Gilroy and bell hooks, who are generally considered more marginal than the three central figures of postcolonial studies, Said, Spivak, and Bhabha. See, for example, Paul Gilroy, *Small Acts: Thoughts on the Politics of Black Cultures* (London: Serpent's Tail, 1993), and bell hooks, *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics* (London: Turnaround, 1991). The neglect of popular culture in the work of the three central writers mentioned is almost total.

19. Both quotations from Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government* (Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1994), 58. In theorizing agency and practice, Thomas draws on Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

20. Art history, for example, has been considerably more responsive to these issues. See Susan Hiller, ed., *The Myth of Primitivism* (London: Routledge, 1991), and Hal Foster, "Primitive Scenes," *Critical Inquiry* 20, no. 1 (1993): 69–102.

21. See, for example, Susan McClary, *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender and Sexuality* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), and Solie, ed., *Musicology and Difference.*

22. Recent decades have seen an expanding literature focused on ethnomusicology's growing self-critical reflexivity about its historical role in positioning the relations between Western music and its others. Studies include Bruno Nettl, *The Western Impact on World Music* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1985); Bruno Nettl and Philip V. Bohlman, eds., *Comparative Musicology and Anthropology of Music* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); and Stephen Blum, Philip V. Bohlman, and Daniel Neuman, eds., *Ethnomusicology and Modern Music History* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991). Given the difficulty of including so many areas of scholarship in this introduction, and despite the importance of this development within ethnomusicology (to which some of our contributors attest—see the essays by Bohlman and Stokes), we have not pursued the ethnomusicological perspective as a central theme in this essay and we acknowledge this as a limitation.

23. Locke, in "Reflections on Orientalism in Opera and Musical Theatre," 62–63, lists a large number of such works. See section V of this introduction for a critical reflection on the implications of the "accuracy" or otherwise of appropriated materials in relation to their sources.

24. See, for example, Neil Sorrell, *The Gamelan* (London: Faber, 1990), for a discussion of Western composers' (such as Debussy's) borrowings from gamelan music.

25. Other recent attempts to address issues of race, ethnicity, and music/musicology are Ronald Radano and Philip V. Bohlman, eds., *Music and the Racial Imagination* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, forthcoming); and Stokes, ed., *Ethnicity, Identity and Music.*

26. Said himself discusses Verdi's *Aida* in his *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1993): 133–59, although his analysis has been subject to critique. See, for instance, Bart Moore-Gilbert, *Postcolonial Theory* (London: Verso, 1997), 68–69. It is interesting, in relation to the concerns of this book, that in his main work of music criticism, *Musical Elaborations* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1991), Said applies his critical armory to music only very schematically, which suggests that music has the status of a significant lacuna in his work. While he writes appreciatively of new directions in the sociocultural study of music, and raises issues of difference and representation, ideology and authority, orthodoxy and its others, and so on, his think-

ing almost exclusively concerns Western classical music. In a telling late passage, Said remembers his first concert as a small boy growing up in Egypt, a concert by Umm Kalthoum of classical Arabic song. He reflects that the music seemed "puzzling" with its aesthetic of repetition and "almost total absence of development"; and adds that, because of his "preponderantly Western education (both musical and academic), the kind of art practiced by Umm Kalthoum receded in importance for me" (98). Here we sense, through this intimate anecdote, Said's awareness of the hierarchical ordering and jostling for place between different musical traditions, how this is affected by large-scale cultural historical processes, and its embodiment in the most private and "local" musical experiences. His own cultural biography speaks to these central issues. Yet rather than interpret in this way, Said returns to classical music as unquestioned norm: "But of course it [i.e., music such as Umm Kalthoum's] only went beneath the surface of my conscious awareness until, in recent years, I returned to an interest in Arabic culture, where I rediscovered her, and was able to associate what she did musically with some features of Western classical music" (98).

27. Locke, "Constructing the Oriental 'Other,'" 263. Locke's wider analysis of Orientalist operas is given in his "Reflections on Orientalism."

28. Locke, "Constructing the Oriental 'Other,'" 263.

29. Ibid., 271.

30. Locke, "Reflections on Orientalism," 61–2. See also Paul Robinson, "Is *Aida* an Orientalist Opera?" *Cambridge Opera Journal* 5 (1993): 133–40.

31. Both quotations, Taruskin, "'Entoiling the Falconet,'" 255.

32. Ibid., 259.

33. Both quotations, ibid., 279.

34. Ibid., 280.

35. Claudia Gorbman, *Unheard Melodies: Narrative Film Music* (London and Bloomington, Indiana: British Film Institute/Indiana University Press, 1987). Gorbman clearly took literally our request for a paper about *Western* music and its others.

36. In film, diegesis is the "narratively implied spatiotemporal world of the actions and characters" (Gorbman, *Unheard Melodies*, 21); it is the universe of the narrated story. Diegetic music is that which appears to issue from or belong to this narrative world. By contrast, nondiegetic music is all that which does *not* belong to the story and exists apart from it, commenting on it. For a fuller discussion of diegesis as well as diegetic and nondiegetic film music, see Gorbman, *Unheard Melodies*, 20–30.

37. See Georgina Born, *Rationalizing Culture: IRCAM, Boulez, and the Institutionalization of the Musical Avant-Garde* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 49, for an analysis of the eclectic early modernist tendencies that drew on "other" musics as "'proto' postmodern."

38. Said, *Orientalism*, 179.

39. For an account of aspects of the later development of serialist modernism, see Born, *Rationalizing Culture*.

40. This analysis has interesting analogies with Crow on modernist visual art. See Thomas Crow, "Modernism and Mass Culture in the Visual Arts," in *Modernism and Modernity*, ed. Benjamin Buchloh et al. (Halifax, Canada: 1983).

41. See, for instance, Theodor Adorno, "On the Fetish Character in Music and the Regression of Listening" and "Culture Industry Reconsidered," in *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. Jay Bernstein (New York: Routledge, 1991),

26–52, 85–92; Clement Greenberg, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch," in *Pollock and After: The Critical Debate,* ed. Francis Frascina (1939; London: Harper and Row, 1985).

42. Pierre Boulez, "On New Music," *New York Review of Books,* 28 June 1984, 14–15; Pierre Boulez and Michel Foucault, "Contemporary Music and the Public," *Perspectives of New Music* 24, no. 1 (1985): 6–12.

43. Crow, "Modernism and Mass Culture"; Andreas Huyssen, *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1986).

44. Guy Scarpetta, *L'Impureté* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1985).

45. See, for example, Robert Young, *Colonial Desire* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

46. See Born, *Rationalizing Culture,* for a detailed account of exactly these processes in the international circuits of contemporary art music.

47. See John Cage, *Silence* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1969): 74–75, in which Cage argues that American experimentalism will supersede the European modernist avant-garde, and then equates American developments with the universal—with "the world."

48. For an analysis of these processes in relation to postserialism see Born, *Rationalizing Culture,* chapters 2, 10, and 11.

49. Born, *Rationalizing Culture,* especially 305–6.

50. Charles Keil, *Urban Blues* (1966; reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 45.

51. Ingrid Monson, "Doubleness and Jazz Improvisation: Irony, Parody and Ethnomusicology," *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1994): 286.

52. Richard Middleton, "Repeat Performance," in *Music on Show: Issues of Performance,* ed. Tarja Hautamäki and Helmi Järviluoma (Tampere, Finland: Department of Folk Tradition, 1998), 211. A debate persists about whether it is possible to talk about a distinctive set of musical practices that can be labelled "black music" or "African American" music: see David Hatch and Stephen Millward, *From Blues to Rock* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987): 116–29; Philip Tagg, "Open Letter: Black Music, Afro-American Music and European Music," *Popular Music* 8 (1989): 285–98; and see David Brackett, *Interpreting Popular Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 108–19 for an impressive defense of the concept.

53. George Lipsitz, *Time Passages: Collective Memory and American Popular Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990); Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London: Methuen, 1979); Simon Jones, *Black Youth, White Culture: The Reggae Tradition from JA to UK* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988); and Gregory Stephens, "Rap Music's Double-Voiced Discourse: A Crossroads for Inter-Racial Communication," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 15, no. 2 (1991): 100–115.

54. There are important resonances between such black music criticism and postcolonial theory. Ben Sidran is one writer who makes explicit such links in his *Black Talk* (1971; reprint, Edinburgh: Payback Press, 1995), when he cites that key progenitor of postcolonial analysis, Frantz Fanon. The contribution of black writers on music such as Sidran and Leroi Jones/Amiri Baraka is rarely acknowledged in postcolonial studies.

55. Leroi Jones/Amiri Baraka, "Jazz and the White Critic," in *Black Music* (New York: William Morrow, 1967): 11–20. Baraka often directs his criticisms at the "black elite" as well as at white folk. The dangers and difficulties associated with construct-

ing a jazz canon in parallel to those in existence for European music are discussed eloquently by Gary Tomlinson, "Cultural Dialogics and Jazz: A White Historian Signifies," in *Disciplining Music: Musicology and Its Canons,* ed. Katherine Bergeron and Philip V. Bohlman (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992): 64–94.

56. Ted Gioia, *The Imperfect Art: Reflections on Jazz and Modern Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); Bernard Gendron, "Jamming at La Boeuf: Jazz and the Paris Avant-Garde," *Discourse* 12, no. 1 (1989/90).

57. S. H. Fernando Jr., *The New Beats: Exploring the Music, Culture and Attitudes of Hip-Hop* (New York: Doubleday, 1994): xx–xxiii.

58. Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (London: Methuen, 1986).

59. Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (London: Verso, 1993).

60. James Snead, "Repetition as a Figure of Black Culture," in *Black Literature and Literary Theory,* ed. Henry Louis Gates (New York: Routledge, 1984), 59–80.

61. Henry Louis Gates, *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 79.

62. See Houston A. Baker Jr., *Modernism and the Harlem Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

63. See, for example, Alan Lomax, *Folk Song: Style and Structure* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1978); Cees J. Hamelink, *Cultural Autonomy in Global Communication* (New York: Longmans, 1983).

64. For example, Martin Hatch, "Popular Music in Indonesia," in *World Music, Politics and Social Change,* ed. Simon Frith (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), and Peter Manuel, *Popular Musics of the Non-Western World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

65. Manuel, *Popular Musics of the Non-Western World,* 19–23.

66. Mark Slobin, *Subcultural Sounds: Micromusics of the West* (Hanover, N.H.: Wesleyan University Press, 1993); Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic;* George Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads: Popular Music, Postmodernism, and the Poetics of Place* (London: Verso, 1994).

67. See Jonathan Bellman, "Indian Resonances in the British Invasion, 1965–1968," in *The Exotic in Western Music,* ed. Bellman, 292–306.

68. The terms "world music" and "world beat" are very confusing and have shifting meanings. In Britain, the term "world beat" is not used, and "world music" is generally used to mean:

(a) The music of Western stars who have shown an interest in non-Western pop;
(b) Non-Western and/or nonrock popular musics distributed in the West, especially commercial, hybrid forms such as salsa, zydeco, rai, soca, highlife, jújù, etc.;
(c) Supposedly "traditional" musical forms such as Balkan a capella choirs.

In the United States, on the other hand, "world beat" is used to mean (a) and (b) in this classification, while "world music" has tended to denote (c). As is so often the case with generic terms, things have gotten more complicated still. According to Feld the two terms are merging—perhaps as the success of the marketing term "world music" gains popularity outside the U.K.; see Steven Feld, "From Schizophonia to Schismogenesis: On the Discourses and Commodification Practices of 'World Music' and 'World Beat,'" in Charles Keil and Steven Feld, *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994): 265–68.

69. Steven Feld, "Notes on 'World Beat,'" in Keil and Feld, *Music Grooves*, 242. Other critical commentaries on Simon's *Graceland* include Charles Hamm, "*Graceland* Revisited," *Popular Music* 8, no. 3 (1989): 299–304; Charles Hamm, "African-American Music, South Africa and Apartheid," in *Putting Popular Music in Its Place* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 167–209; and Louise Meintjes, "Paul Simon's *Graceland*, South Africa, and the Mediation of Musical Meaning," *Ethnomusicology* 34 (1990): 37–73. Hesmondhalgh, in his essay for this collection, also examines the politics of ownership in music.

70. Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads*, 63.

71. Ibid., 132.

72. Ibid., 7, 12, and 17.

73. Slobin, *Subcultural Sounds*.

74. Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic*.

75. Veit Erlmann, "The Aesthetics of the Global Imagination: Reflections on World Music in the 1990s," *Public Culture* 8 (1996): 467.

76. Simon Frith, "Anglo-America and Its Discontents," *Cultural Studies* 5, no. 3 (1991).

77. Feld, "From Schizophonia to Schismogenesis."

78. The reference is to Arjun Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

79. Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author," in *Image-Music-Text* (London: Fontana, 1977).

80. Erlmann, "The Aesthetics of the Global Imagination"; Taylor, *Global Pop*.

81. See Martin Stokes, "Introduction: Ethnicity, Identity and Music," in *Ethnicity, Identity and Music*, ed. Stokes; and Frith, "Music and Identity."

82. See Straw, "Systems of Articulation, Logics of Change."

83. Stokes, "Introduction," 8–10; Peter Parkes, "Personal and Collective Identity in Kalasha Song Performance: The Significance of Music-Making in a Minority Enclave," in *Ethnicity, Identity and Music*, ed. Stokes; Zdzislaw Mach, "National Anthems: The Case of Chopin as a National Composer," in *Ethnicity, Identity and Music*, ed. Stokes.

84. Stokes, "Introduction," 8.

85. Erik Levi, "Music and National Socialism: The Politicisation of Criticism, Composition and Performance," in *The Nazification of Art*, ed. Brandon Taylor and Wilfried van der Will (Winchester, England: Winchester Press, 1990); Sabine Meier, "A Generation Led Astray: Community Singing as a Means of National Socialist Indoctrination of the Youth" (Ph.D. thesis, Goldsmiths' College, University of London, 1992).

86. Stokes, "Introduction," 10. Recent scholarship on music and nationalism includes Jane Fulcher, *The Nation's Image: French Grand Opera as Politics and Politicised Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Anthony Arblaster, *Viva la Libertà! Politics in Opera* (London: Verso, 1992); and Dellamora and Fischlin, *The Work of Opera: Genre, Nationhood and Sexual Difference*. Arblaster puts a convincing and productive case for the relationship between music, specifically opera, and nationalism, arguing that "It is impossible to think of any other ideological force or creed that has had a more profound and lasting impact on music in the past two centuries than nationalism. From Weber to Vaughan Williams, from Berlioz to Bartok, from Chopin

to Shostakovitch, there is a long list of composers whose musical achievement is bound up with their involvement with nationalism [and who] in discovering their nation and its music discovered their musical selves. . . . Often, because explicitly political activities were prohibited, the opera house became a forum for the expression of subversive political sentiments [and for] political demonstration" (64).

87. Stokes, "Introduction," 8.

88. Georgina Born, "Understanding Music as Culture: Contributions from Popular Music Studies to a Social Semiotics of Music," in *Tendenze e metodi nella ricerca musicologica,* ed. Raffaele Pozzi (Florence: Olschki, 1993); Born, *Rationalizing Culture,* chapter 1. There are of course occasional (primarily modernist) exceptions to the denotational character of the visual and literary arts, such as abstract painting and dadaistic verse.

89. On the place of social fantasy in colonial and postcolonial cultures, see Robert Young, *Colonial Desire* (and see note 100 below).

90. See also Stokes, "Introduction," 3–4.

91. See Born, *Rationalizing Culture,* chapters 4, 5, 6, and 10; Georgina Born, "Modernist Discourse, Psychic Forms, and Agency: Aesthetic Subjectivities at IRCAM," *Cultural Anthropology* 12, no. 4 (1997); and Georgina Born, "Anthropology, Kleinian Psychoanalysis, and the Subject in Discourse," *American Anthropologist* 100 (summer 1998).

92. Stuart Hall, "Introduction: Who Needs Identity?" in *Questions of Cultural Identity,* ed. Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (London: Sage, 1996).

93. Frith, "Music and Identity," 123–24, exemplifies this principle by reference to Paul Gilroy, "Sounds Authentic: Black Music, Ethnicity, and the Challenge of a *Changing* Same," *Black Music Research Journal* 10, no. 2 (1990). Gilroy (127) argues that black identity formation "remains the outcome of practical activity: language, gesture, bodily significations, desires. . . . These significations are condensed in musical performance, although it does not, of course, monopolise them. In this context, they produce the imaginary effect of an internal racial core or essence by acting on the body through the specific mechanisms of identification and recognition that are produced in the intimate interaction of performer and crowd."

94. The discursive subsumption of other musics, as an attempt to exert control, parallels the more commonly noted subsumption of other musics by Western notation as a key historical technique of reduction and attempted mastery. See, for example, Farrell, *Indian Music and the West,* chapter 2, on the place of notation in European encounters with Indian musics.

95. Georgina Born, "Afterword: Music Policy, Aesthetic and Social Difference," in *Rock and Popular Music: Politics, Policies, Institutions,* ed. Tony Bennett et al. (New York: Routledge, 1993), 286.

96. Hall, "Introduction: Who Needs Identity?" 16, cites Judith Butler on identification, who in her own way introduces a kind of temporality into the concept: "Identifications belong to the imaginary; they are phantasmic efforts of alignment, loyalty, ambiguous and cross-corporeal cohabitations. . . . Identifications are never fully and finally made; they are incessantly reconstituted. . . . They are that which is constantly marshalled, consolidated, retrenched, contested and, on occasion, compelled to give way." Quotation from Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter* (London: Routledge, 1993), 105.

97. See Frith, "Music and Identity," 108–10.

98. Georgina Born, "Music, Modernism, and Signification," in *Thinking Art: Beyond Traditional Aesthetics,* ed. Andrew Benjamin and Peter Osborne (London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 1991); Born, "Understanding Music as Culture"; Born, *Rationalizing Culture.*

99. On the necessity of theorizing agency in cultural production, specifically in relation to music and musicians' subjectivities, see Born, "Afterword: Music Policy, Aesthetic and Social Difference," especially 271–83.

100. The central place of the psychoanalytic concept of ambivalence in Bhabha's work resonates with our use of splitting; indeed, Bhabha also continually has recourse to the concept of splitting. See Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994). Robert Young in *Colonial Desire,* for another example, develops from the work of Deleuze and Guattari the notion of group fantasy (169), or social or collective fantasy (98), in his attempt to delineate a "social theory of desire." He uses this to understand racism as the core dynamic of colonialism: "Racism is perhaps the best example through which we can immediately grasp the form of desire, and its antithesis, repulsion, as a social production, [a] *group fantasy*" (169). Young's idea of the mutuality of desire and repulsion echoes with the concept of splitting.

101. Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 30. For a fuller argument concerning the retheorization of agency within a combined Foucauldian and Kleinian psychoanalytic framework, see Born, "Modernist Discourse, Psychic Forms, and Agency" and Born, "Anthropology, Kleinian Psychoanalysis, and the Subject in Discourse."

102. Bela Bartók, "The Influence of Peasant Music on Modern Music," in *Bela Bartok Essays,* ed. Benjamin Suchoff (1931; reprint, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976).

103. Leonard B. Meyer, *Music, The Arts, and Ideas* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 208.

104. Ibid., 194.

105. This technique of juxtaposition is exemplified by some of Ives's major orchestral works, such as *Central Park in the Dark* (1906) and *Decoration Day* (1912), in which the floating musical objects also have the quality of affectionate pastiche. But it is equally a quality of the collage-techniques central to hip-hop–influenced forms; listen, for example, to the music of DJ Shadow.

106. The groups fostered by the British experimental composer Cornelius Cardew were particularly interesting in this regard. Cardew's Scratch Orchestra was driven essentially by a social philosophy of music-making, summarized by Nyman as "a regularly meeting large experimental ensemble, a flexible social unit with written and unwritten 'laws' of community and musical behavior." See Michael Nyman, *Experimental Music: Cage and Beyond* (New York: Schirmer, 1974), 115. Initially motivated by the principles of Confucius, the Scratch Orchestra moved towards revolutionary Maoist politics. People's Liberation Music, Cardew's last band, self-consciously took as its social and performative model the "rock group" in a blatant attempt to engage a youth audience in revolutionary Marxism through the knowing simulation of a popular musical form to which they would readily relate.

107. The term "detour" here is ironic since, as we have stressed, connotation is undoubtedly the dominant mode of musical signification. There may be parallels, in this idea of a third, denotative level of musical signification, with aspects of John

Shepherd and Peter Wicke's attempt, in *Music and Cultural Theory* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997), to produce an encompassing theory of musical signification; see for example their Figure 1 (157).

108. As evidence of high musical modernism's aesthetic autarchy we might refer to Robert Samuels, "The Other of Invention: Modernist and Postmodernist Moments in the Works of Harrison Birtwistle" (unpublished ms., 1996). Samuels argues that the British postserialist composer Birtwistle, rather than evoking alterity in his music through reference to other musics, sets out to produce figures of alterity as a core component of his own aesthetic. Samuels portrays this as central to Birtwistle's larger project of constructing an autonomous musical imaginary that is without predecessors or kinship to other musical systems.

109. On the concept of "strategic essentialism," its qualifications and problems, see Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine,* 3–4; Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic,* 31–40; and on related issues of essentialism and antiessentialism in relation to music, Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic,* chapter 3, and Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads,* chapter 3.

110. For a fuller discussion of these issues, see Georgina Born, "Music and the Internet: Globalization or Pluralisation?" *New Media and Society* (forthcoming).

111. Colin MacCabe, "Realism and the Cinema: Notes on Some Brechtian Theses," *Screen* 15, no. 2 (1974).

112. For a debate concerning MacCabe's theory of classic realism, see Colin McArthur, "*Days of Hope,*" *Screen* 16, no. 4 (1975/6), and MacCabe's response, "*Days of Hope:* A Response to Colin McArthur," *Screen* 17, no. 1 (1976), collected in *Popular Television and Film,* ed. Tony Bennett et al. (London: BFI, 1985).

113. See Susan McClary, "The Blasphemy of Talking Politics During Bach Year," in *Music and Society,* ed. Leppert and McClary; McClary, *Feminine Endings;* and Susan McClary, "Narrative Agendas in 'Absolute' Music: Identity and Difference in Brahms's Third Symphony," in *Musicology and Difference,* ed. Solie.

114. McClary, "The Blasphemy of Talking Politics During Bach Year," 47.

115. Ibid., 51.

116. Ibid., 57.

117. Ibid., 62.

118. A similar problem is raised by McClary's insistent return in her oeuvre to gender as it is coded in musical signification. The question is whether she is sufficiently attuned to cultural and historical differences in gender discourses as they are coded in musical texts. Relatedly, there is a sense of contemporary political overdetermination in her work which prompts one to question whether she is privileging gender vis-à-vis other classificatory, ideological, and narrative structures in music, so that gender risks coming to stand for any and all intramusical forms of difference. If gender becomes a metaphor for theorizing all kinds of difference, its specificity is lost. McClary's own recognition of these problems is hinted at in "Narrative Agendas in 'Absolute' Music," her essay on narrative structures in Brahms's Third Symphony (1993). First she introduces gender as a way of analyzing the ideological dimensions of narrative organization (330–34). Then she proceeds to analyze the symphony (334–40), admitting finally, however, that "in a sense, the 'feminine' Other here is gratuitous, a mere narrative pretext. For the principal dilemma in the symphony is finally oedipal: the archetypal struggle of the rebellious son against the conventional Law of the Father" (340). Later still she portrays the main semiotic conflicts

within the piece as stemming from the restrictions of nineteenth-century tonal and formal conventions (342), and in this way she returns to standard, formalistic musicological ground. The detour through gender seems unnecessary and unconvincing in light of this quite convincing denouement.

119. Ken Hirschkop, "The Classical and the Popular: Musical Form and Social Context," in *Music and the Politics of Culture,* ed. Christopher Norris (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1989), 286, quoting Mikhail Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," in *The Dialogical Imagination* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 291.

120. All quotations from Hirschkop, "The Classical and the Popular," 294–95.

121. Julie Brown, *Bartok's Third String Quartet: Interpretative Perspectives* (Royal Musical Association Monographs, forthcoming).

122. For an analysis of the dynamics of identification, pleasure, and desire, but also omnipotence and tyranny, immanent in a global imaginary in music, see Born, "Afterword: Music Policy, Aesthetic and Social Difference," 281–83, 286.

123. For a quite different perspective on composers' intentionality, a perspective, however, in accord with the argument made here that there are definite "marks" of composers' intentionality and experience in the musical text (as score and as performance), see John Butt, "Rewriting Intention in the Historical Performance of Music" (forthcoming).

124. Christopher Norris, "Utopian Deconstruction: Ernst Bloch, Paul de Man and the Politics of Music," in *Music and the Politics of Culture,* ed. Norris, 341.

125. Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic;* Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads.* Another argument for this kind of approach, one "that [would dispute] the very nature of centre-periphery distinctions," is given abstractly in Iain Chambers, "Travelling Sounds: Whose Centre, Whose Periphery?" in *Otherness and the Media: The Ethnography of the Imagined and the Imaged,* ed. Hamid Naficy and Teshome H. Gabriel (Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic, 1993).