Robert Garfias was born in San Francisco in 1932, the child of Mexican-American parents. As a youngster he studied classical guitar and jazz saxophone. In high school he studied Western classical music composition, and he formed a jazz combo that played gigs for beatniks in the North Beach area of San Francisco, where he traveled in a circle of musicians that included Dave Brubeck, Vince Delgado, Vince Guaraldi, Harry Partch, and Bill Smith. During his career he founded the ethnomusicology program at the University of Washington; served as Dean of Arts at the University of California, Irvine, as a member of the Smithsonian Council, and as a presidential appointee to the U.S. National Council for the Arts; and conducted significant periods of fieldwork and language study in Japan, Okinawa, Korea, the Philippines, Mexico, Zimbabwe, Central America, Burma, Romania, Turkey, Spain, Portugal, and among Okinawans in the United States. His autobiographical reflections can be found in Robert Garfias, "Introduction: Reflections on the Formation of an Ethnomusicologist," in Ethnomusicological Encounters with Music and Musicians, Timothy Rice, ed. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 1-17. This interview was conducted in person, and retains its conversational character.

Robert Garfias
Interviewed by Timothy Rice

TR: You are well known for, among other things, your early studies of Japanese gagaku. When did you first encounter Asian music?

RG: I was still in high school when this happened. I used to listen to the radio. There were black stations and various ethnic stations. And late at night there was this Chinese music station at the end of the dial, in the high numbers. And it sounded absolutely awful to me. I think it’s significant that somewhere in there, I said, “somebody must be listening to this.” And I decided to listen to it, and I got really interested. So I started listening to Chinese music and started reading about Chinese music. There were some really interesting Chinese classical music groups playing in San Francisco. There was lots of Cantonese opera going on in San Francisco. So something weird was happening already when I was in high school.

TR: When did you first encounter Japanese culture?

RG: The big changing point was when I got a job on a ship working in the galley washing dishes, peeling potatoes, cleaning the bedrooms in 1951, the summer I graduated from high school. Other people in my family had been seamen, so it was part of the family lore. The ship was an astounding eye-opener, because suddenly you were going to the Orient. Japan in 1951. They were just picking up after the War. It was very powerful. There was one Japanese passenger who wore a kimono all the time. One night on the ship he did an impromptu folk dance with masks, where you bite inside the mask with your teeth and your hands are free. He did two or three of those light folk dances. It was very impressive. The ship landed in Yokohama. I was really struck by just seeing the inside of a house, the living quarters, the tatami with the little lamps on it and the paper screens. I was just astounded by the beauty of it. So when I got back I started reading all about everything. Finally I decided there’s got to be more to life than this and decided to go to college.

TR: What did you study at college [San Francisco State]?

RG: I tried music education but hated it. Anthropology was the most interesting course, and I just stayed there. And I kept taking composition. [continued on page 6]
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My term as SEM president ends at the gavel strike of our 2013 Annual Meeting in Indianapolis, and this is my last president’s column. Though my final annual report will appear in the next issue of this publication, such reports are meant to discuss the work that the president and the board did during the calendar year, not serve as a forum for the president’s ideas. As a result, this is my last opportunity to write as president and in this context about broad issues that impact the Society and our field. In my first president’s column, I said that the dialectics of theory and practice would be the theme that would guide these pieces, and it seems fitting to me that I should complete this series of writings by returning explicitly to this theme. Here, I will discuss what I see as the key intellectual and pragmatic issues in the life of the Society today, as well as the relationships between them. I will also talk about some of the main projects that the board and I have worked on over the last two years, and how they relate to the current state of affairs.

As a discipline, ethnomusicology faces a crucial intellectual juncture. When the Society was founded, the leading concept for ethnomusicology was “culture,” a notion as powerful and suggestive as it is slippery and prone to reified usages. Exploring the relationships between “music” and “culture” was one of the primary projects of scholars in our field during its formative years, and this work largely followed humanist ideals like seeking rational knowledge, fostering cross-cultural understanding, and lauding aesthetic achievement. With a functionalist emphasis on social stability or a romantic celebration of community, the political inflections of the first generations of ethnomusicology could skew conservative or liberal, but, as Deborah Wong has noted (2006), the dominant publications of our discipline bore few traces of critical scholarship until the 1990s. It was at this moment that ideas from cultural studies and allied fields and approaches (performance studies, Marxism, feminism, queer theory, and critical race theory) began to have a substantial effect on ethnomusicology. Today, critical approaches are no longer uncommon and exist cheek by jowl with older perspectives that do not attend to power or that see politics (in the broad sense) as a domain separable from or of only limited relevance to ethnomusicology. To my mind, one of the central projects for contemporary ethnomusicology is exploring the relationships between, on the one hand, the insights that critical scholarship has brought to our field and, on the other hand, ideas from the pre-critical humanism that informed the education of so many ethnomusicologists, both old and young.

This project is a work in progress. Acknowledging the pervasiveness of power does not mean interpreting every element of every social or cultural phenomenon as an expression of domination or resistance, becoming partisan polemists in every political conflict of our field site, or ignoring (or writing off as epiphenomenal) aesthetic pleasure or musical technique. Likewise, making this acknowledgement does not put us in the unenviable position of merely applying the ideas from other fields. Rather, it forces us to try to understand the nature and the meaning of musical interaction in a world fundamentally shaped by power, to see the diverse roles that musical form, musical action, and musical pleasure play in lives unavoidably fashioned by privilege, disadvantage, and their many complex admixtures. In this context, we have much to contribute to the disparate fields of critical scholarship because music is one of the domains in which politics in its diverse forms play out. Indeed, music is sometimes among its most important domains. In the Western academy, music has traditionally been cordoned off as a sphere of experience discrete from the rest of social life and comprehensible only to a talented (and professionally trained) elect. While early cultural studies scholars were well aware of these pernicious ideologies and responded by lavishing attention on Western popular music, doing music research is still a marginal act in the humanities and social sciences today. Further, when scholars from fields outside music studies do examine music, the ideologies of music’s autonomy and ineffability often allow the worst kinds of mystification and loose thinking to be tolerated. It is our ability as ethnomusicologists to engage music—and, more importantly, our ability to explore auditory and musical phenomena as they interpenetrate with other forms of practice—that gives us the unique opportunity to make profound contributions to the analysis of social life. Finding ways of bringing our traditional disciplinary commitments into harmony with contemporary critical perspectives and making our work speak in an interdisciplinary context are essential projects for our field today.

If, during our formative period, the idea of culture was understood as the focus of our intellectual work, the notion of experience was equally significant. For most of our history, though, it has operated as the implicit motivation for our research, rather than as part of our formal theoretical apparatus. This is true today as well. If asked casually by a student or someone outside the academy what ethnomusicologists do, many of us respond that our job is to understand the musical experiences of the people we study. Further, this interest in musical experience operates a dual project. Our stated aim is...
The Section for Religion, Music, and Sound

Monique Ingalls

The Section for Religion, Music, and Sound is SEM’s newest section, formally recognized by the Board in May 2013. It grows out of the Sacred & Religious Music Special Interest Group that Jennifer Ryan and I founded four years ago following an informal interest meeting at the 2009 Annual Meeting in Mexico City.

The mission of our section is to support the study of religious, devotional, ritual, ceremonial, and spiritual musics in their cultural and social contexts. Our purview includes music and sacred sound within organized religious traditions, as well as the sacred or spiritual dimensions of musics outside institutional religion. We have been fortunate to have formed with a ready-made contingent of enthusiastic scholars, since there is a long and rich history of ethnomusicological scholarship which explores the relationship between music, religion, and the sacred. We observed, however, that scholarly presentations at SEM on religious topics were frequently organized around a single religion or geographical region. We set out to encourage sustained dialogue among scholars studying differing religious traditions across geographical space, resulting in an enriched discussion of common issues and themes among these disparate communities.

The formation of our section also corresponds with a renewed interest in religion, music, and sound among scholars in related fields, including religious studies, anthropology of religion, and sociology of religion. In the past decade, there has been rising scholarly interest across disciplines in the relationship of music and sound to religiously-framed cultural nationalism and “transnational transcendence” alike, as well as the ways musics of all kinds may take on ritual or liturgical functions and offer experiences of transcendence. Sensing the potential for mutual benefit, we set out to create a hub where scholars from other fields could come to interact with a contingent of similarly interested music scholars.

History

Our first official meeting as a special interest group took place in Los Angeles at SEM 2010, where the forty-eight scholars present approved Jennifer and me as Co-Chairs and Andrew Mall as Secretary. For our first few meetings as a special interest group, the leadership devised a three-pronged strategy to encourage attendance at our meetings. The first was to promise coffee and donuts to coax bleary-eyed scholars out for our assigned 7:00 AM meeting time. Our second strategy was to invite a colleague doing thought-provoking and foundational work in the area of religion, music and sound to give a short talk. Our three annual meetings have featured engaging and provocative addresses from Phil Bohlman, Jeffrey Summit, and Regula Qureshi. Third, we decided to set aside a designated time toward the end of our meetings for scholars to introduce themselves and engage in informal conversation. Group members have used this time to discuss possibilities for organized panels at the next year’s SEM and to enlist participants for edited volumes, invited talks, and conferences. We’ve been pleased to be able to see already some tangible results of these conversations: for instance, I’m aware of at least three edited volumes on religious music in press or under review whose contributors have used this forum to meet potential authors and discuss publication plans. We are currently averaging nearly forty scholars at our annual meetings, and we’re hopeful that our new status as a section will allow for further growth and development.

We have also seen a steady expansion of our network through our Google Group listserv (SRM-SIG@googlegroups.com), established in 2009. Over the past four years, our listserv has grown to nearly 230 scholars from more than fifteen countries, an increasing number of whom are from outside ethnomusicology. Connections we have forged with religion and music scholars across academic disciplines and around the world have the potential to benefit not only our section, but also the field of ethnomusicology as a whole. To give one recent example: over the past month, I have been contacted by two non-ethnomusicologist listserv members who wouldn’t normally attend SEM. These two individuals are planning to attend SEM this year—one of them for the first time—specifically to attend our section meeting and take advantage of the networking opportunities there. We are very pleased to be a forum that, despite our relatively short history, is already drawing scholars in and becoming known as a forum for discussion and networking.

Each year, members of our group have taken on additional roles and responsibilities. Since 2011, we have sponsored one or more organized panels for the annual meeting on topics from religion in the public sphere to religious popular music. In 2012, we appointed a three-person Transition Committee, comprised of Jonathan Dueck, Stephen Shearon, and Dorcinda Knauth, to facilitate our transition from special interest group to section. For our section meeting in November 2013, we have invited several prominent ethnomusicologists to participate in the roundtable discussion “On the Ethnomusicology of Religion: Past Contributions, Present Challenges, and Future Directions.” After the roundtable, we’ll elect officers for our section, discuss dues and the establishment of a paper groups.com), established in 2009. Over the past four years, our listserv has grown to nearly 230 scholars from more than fifteen countries, an increasing number of whom are from outside ethnomusicology. Connections we have forged with religion and music scholars across academic disciplines and around the world have the potential to benefit not only our section, but also the field of ethnomusicology as a whole. To give one recent example: over the past month, I have been contacted by two non-ethnomusicologist listserv members who wouldn’t normally attend SEM. These two individuals are planning to attend SEM this year—one of them for the first time—specifically to attend our section meeting and take advantage of the networking opportunities there. We are very pleased to be a forum that, despite our relatively short history, is already drawing scholars in and becoming known as a forum for discussion and networking.

Each year, members of our group have taken on additional roles and responsibilities. Since 2011, we have sponsored one or more organized panels for the annual meeting on topics from religion in the public sphere to religious popular music. In 2012, we appointed a three-person Transition Committee, comprised of Jonathan Dueck, Stephen Shearon, and Dorcinda Knauth, to facilitate our transition from special interest group to section. For our section meeting in November 2013, we have invited several prominent ethnomusicologists to participate in the roundtable discussion “On the Ethnomusicology of Religion: Past Contributions, Present Challenges, and Future Directions.” After the roundtable, we’ll elect officers for our section, discuss dues and the establishment of a paper prize, and close with a time for informal networking and the promotion of books and other materials.

Since the Religion, Music, and Sound Section was founded a mere four months ago, much of our history remains to be written. Looking ahead, we have many reasons to be optimistic about the future of our section: we have on board a dynamic group of scholars pursuing a topic that is both timely and time-honored in our field and that is generating increasing interest across academic fields. We hope many of you will join us for our first section meeting in November! §
to understand the social and musical experiences of our research participants, but most of us also seek to use those understandings to gain deeper insights into musical experience in general, including our own musical experience. These twin activities have been so central to us that, for much of the field’s history, the notion of experience was not theorized, and until the 1980s the tradition of Western academic thought that most richly examined the idea of experience—phenomenology—held only a marginal status in ethnomusicology. Since the 1980s, there has been growing interest in phenomenology, but the fundamental insights of this tradition have not yet been fully absorbed by scholars in our discipline. As I have argued elsewhere (i.e., Berger 1999, 2009), phenomenology offers profound ways of understanding all of the forms of experience that interest our field—music sound and music structure, the social interactions of musical practice, and the broader connections between situated music events and the rest of social life. With a clearer theoretical understanding of the nature of experience, we get closer to the lives of the people we work with and can interpret more richly the meanings of their music and the nature of their social practices. And because the questions of embodiment, epistemology, and sociality are at the very heart of the phenomenological tradition, it also offers us ways of dealing with the politics of representation that are central for any kind of research, writing, teaching, and public programing. Helping us to grapple with meaning, practice, and representation, phenomenological approaches thus offer tools for a more effective and responsible critical scholarship.

To my mind, politics and experience are the central intellectual issues of the field today, and it was because of this that I made them the focus of my president’s roundtables at our 2012 and 2013 annual meetings. Though operating in the discourse of theory, the themes that they address are connected to the pragmatic, institutional challenges that we face in our discipline everyday. One dimension of our institutional predicament is diversity. Despite the ethic of cross-cultural understanding that is foundational to our field and the humanistic values trumpeted more broadly throughout higher education, the academy in general and ethnomusicology in particular recapitulate the same forms of bias and exclusion that exist in the wider social worlds in which they are embedded. Sexism, racism, and homophobia remain pressing problems, and, as I suggested in an earlier column, we would be wrong if we thought that our commitment to a global view of music would make us immune to these ills.

Such forms of domination play out in the context of contemporary macro-economic conditions that have their own painful dynamics. Today, academic ethnomusicologists face a form of neo-liberal bureaucratic control that is often crushing. In North America and other parts of the world, the crisis of contingent labor and the broader dynamics of the academic job market are among the most significant expressions of this situation. In the last forty years, institutions of higher education here have increasingly staffed their classrooms with faculty hired on a contingent basis. The statistics describing this situation are disturbing. According to a report by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) on teaching and academic labor in the US, “As of 1970, roughly three-fourths of all faculty were in the tenure stream and 78 percent of all faculty were full-time.” Move forward to the present, and the situation is almost reversed: “By 2007, almost 70 percent of faculty members were employed off the tenure track;” the AAUP report observes (American Association of University Professors 2009). Holding titles such as “lecturer,” “adjunct,” “sessional faculty” or “in instructional faculty,” those hired on a contingent basis are given no opportunity to earn tenure and usually work semester-to-semester, often teach large course loads for poor salaries, and frequently do not receive the same benefits, academic freedom protections, access to university resources (such as grants, technology, or library use), and rewards for research or service that tenure-track faculty do. This is a fundamental problem for our field and the US academy as a whole. While dynamics differ in other countries, related problems can be found in many national academies, even those without a tenure system.

The difficulties of academic life under conditions of neo-liberal capitalism are not limited to lecturers and do not end once a position has been secured. In the context of a reserve army of unemployed and underemployed scholars, assistant professors feel a sometimes overwhelming pressure to earn tenure, and those in higher ranks experience increasing stresses as well. According to another AAUP report (one of its annual studies of pay in the US academy), the present moment represents “a historic low period in faculty compensation” (Thornton and Curtis 2012:4). In this context, the means by which the ever-shrinking salary pie is doled out have become more and more pernicious, and the expectations for productivity have risen and risen. Guided by seemingly uncontroversial values like efficiency and accountability, institutions of higher education have begun to rely on review procedures (at the individual, program, department, and College levels) and means of measuring academic work that operate to disempower scholars, erode self-governance, concentrate power in the hands of middle and upper administration, and squeeze more and more work from faculty. Talk about “evidence-based decision making” and “metrics of productivity” is used by universities to give an aura of science and rationality to the management of scholars, but such procedures often operate as post-hoc rationales for social control and, at their worst, serve as little more than rhetorical support for the personal advancement of ambitious administrators. The managers of the academy are increasingly distanced from its scholars, and the disparities in pay between academic workers and those who oversee them has begun to approach that of the private sector. In recent years, for-profit universities have grown substantially in the US, but while most institutions of higher education are still formally incorporated as not-for-profit entities, the vast majority are deeply mired in the ideologies of neo-liberalism.
Robert Garfias by Timothy Rice [continued from page 1]

There was a great teacher in the music department. He was absolutely brilliant and eclectic, and he would play a Korean record and start to transcribe it on the board. And he taught a jazz class, and he taught a medieval music class, and he taught what he used to call an “exotic music” class. I took all his classes. As a matter of fact, we used Kurt Sachs’ book, The Rise of Music in the Ancient World, East and West, as a textbook for his class. Fantastic book. But I was reading everything I could find, which wasn’t much. Ten books, fifteen books, maybe: Jaap Kunst, Curt Sachs, Colin McPhee, A House in Bali, not much on Chinese music but van Aalst [J. A. van Aalst, Chinese Music, 1884], Piggott on Japanese music [Francis T. Piggott, The Music and Musical Instruments of Japan, 1909]. All this time that I was in college, I was interested in all these different avenues for Asian music, and one of them was Japanese music. And I found this old woman in San Francisco who played the koto. And I wanted to use the koto for my compositions. So I went to meet her, and of course she didn’t understand that. She just sat me down and started to teach, and before I knew it I was playing. I played the traditional Yamada school koto for about three years. So I was sort of an ethnomusicologist before [I knew] there was a field.

TR: So how did you find out about ethnomusicology as a field of study?

RG: Dick [Richard A.] Waterman was teaching at Northwestern. And I was interested, so I said, “Well, I’ll go to Northwestern.” So I wrote to Dick Waterman and the most amazing thing is that I got an answer like three days later, and he apologized for the delay. So I was going to go study with Waterman. [Then Jaap] Kunst came to San Francisco on a visit, a lecture tour. I had read his book [Music in Java, 1949], so I immediately went to see him. In his journal he refers to me as his little mexicanje, his little Mexican. I went to talk to him, and I asked, “You know, I’m always confused by, in Patet Nem, when you transpose to Patet Lima, I understand that you move up but does it sound different?” [He said] “Oh yes, it sounds quite different, you can tell.” So Kunst said, “Go to UCLA. My student Mantle Hood is there. He’s teaching courses in ethnomusicology.” It was the first time they had started to use the word. He said, “They have a gamelan, and the faculty and students all play together.” And I said, “My god, it’s like heaven.” So I wrote a letter to Mantle Hood, and I got this long, long letter from him. He offered me a TA-ship at UCLA. I was overwhelmed by this letter, so I came. Hazel [Mantle Hood’s wife] has always said that Mantle and I were very close, that he always felt a certain bond. The plan was for me to stay at UCLA with him. He got offered the job at the University of Washington, and of course he didn’t take it, but he sent me, and they hired me. He said, “I hate to lose you, but I think you need to go.”

TR: What were classes like at UCLA in the mid-1950s?

RG: We had a big lecture class, “Music Cultures of the World,” and a seminar. There were about forty people in there. We were all measuring instruments on the stroboconn and measuring tunings. Because that’s what it was all about then. It all started out with scales. It was all about tuning and scales. Hornbostel and all those guys, Kunst, they all started that. If you were going to be a scientist, you had to quantify and that was the important step. And I still think it’s an important step. But then you’ve got to go beyond that, and the next part is hard. Mantle had a very strong ideology, which he imposed on everybody. Everybody had to work on a music that was modal, because that’s what he was working on in Indonesia, in Javanese music. And of course it worked fine for me, because there was a [modal] system in Japan, and [modes] had a name and the music seemed to sound modal. But Mantle insisted, and that was so tough on some people.

TR: Once you were doing fieldwork in Japan, did you run into resistance? Working at the Imperial Court sounds amazing.

RG: [I ran into some resistance studying] the performance of the Mikagura. It is held on the fifteenth of December every year, in the Imperial Palace, at the Kashikodokoro, which is the Imperial shrine inside the Imperial shrine. The holy of holies. Kashikodokoro

means “the place where you tremble and obey.” Every fifteenth of December [the musicians] would go there and sing this thing all night. The Emperor is not allowed to go to sleep while they’re performing, because he’s supposed to be in there, he’s supposed to be the chief priest, he’s supposed to be present. Well, I really wanted to learn this. The Miko, the shrine maidens of the Imperial Palace were a group of very conservative older ladies – they objected violently to this. They said it should not be performed for foreigners. So there was this feeling that the Mikagura should be protected. So I couldn’t learn from [them], but a younger guy said, “Nobody ever told us we couldn’t teach you.” So they taught me. He actually asked Togi-sensai, Togi Masataro, who was both of our teachers, “Why don’t you want him to learn the Mikagura?” And he said, “I’m afraid if he learns it, he’ll say, ‘Oh, is that all it is?’” Because it’s, in fact, very simple. But it’s very sacred, and very old. Although the kagura practice is very old, the oldest text only goes back to the twelfth century.

TR: How were you able to start the ethnomusicology program at the University of Washington?

[continued next page]
RG: There were about five or six people at the University of Washington campus who had an interest in Japan: art history, ceramics, theater, and Japanese literature. They put this grant together to create the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Washington, and the Ford Foundation gave the grant on two conditions: one, that it be a center for Asian arts, not Japanese arts, and that they get an ethnomusicologist. Which was interesting, isn’t it? I owe a lot to Ford, don’t I? I mean, I had five years of grant [money]. They wanted Mantle [Hood]. This group invited [Shigeo] Kishibe, so he was there a year. He was starting these classes, and he brought his wife to teach koto. I went up for a job interview, and I played and demonstrated [gakaku music], and the music department was just delighted, and I got the job. Maybe they were influenced by [Kishibe], because Kishibe really thought of me as his protégé. So he started the program, [and] he made a place for me. He got them to buy the gagaku instruments even before I came. He also made an agreement with them that for the five years of the Ford Foundation grant, they would bring a different Yamada school koto teacher every year. I saw this as a step towards establishing an ethnomusicology program, learning from the mistakes that I thought existed at UCLA. So I wanted to create something that was different. At the end of five years, a pattern emerged. All of these five various professors made trips to Japan and invited visiting artists. It was wonderful, wonderful. So everybody got their share, but at the end of five years the only thing that stuck was the ethnomusicology program. We had students: there was a big undergraduate enrollment in the classes. Everybody wanted to know what was going on, and we had a few graduate students, so it looked like there was something here. So whatever remaining resources and commitment there was to the whole Center for Asian Arts went to ethnomusicology. So we had two visiting artist positions, and then my one faculty position.

TR: What were some of the differences you instituted between UCLA and your new program at Washington?

RG: One of them was, I wanted it to really be global. I didn’t mind the Asian connection, that was good, but I wanted it to be global. The second thing was that in the seminars, I concentrated on preparing people for fieldwork. They went out and did things locally; they found people to do sample documentation, recording, analysis, and so forth. So the first concentration was on actually doing fieldwork, instead of the ongoing think tank of Hood’s seminars. [Third,] gradually the performance thing started to wear on me – not the idea of performance, but [at UCLA] it was performance as show business. They were called performance groups instead of study groups. We had to put on a concert and we had to be physically available, visible to the public. That seemed to me like show biz. It’s a subversion of what the function was supposed to be. Then getting everybody to wear costumes and appear on stage. It was like, what are we doing? Something about it really bothered me. [Fourth,] one of the things that was different was that at UCLA, everybody had to be a music major to get into the ethnomusicology program. And then you had to take this whole battery of tests – performance, sight-singing and stuff. At University of Washington, I got rid of that. People could come in from anywhere, but they had to have some kind of musical background. You couldn’t come in without some kind of actual hands-on performance ability. [Fifth,] ethnomusicology was still fledgling, not clearly developed, but people were doing fieldwork, and the fieldwork was based on an understanding of the culture. Everybody was getting [musical knowledge] from inside the culture, which meant understanding the music in the cultural context. That’s anthropology. He wouldn’t let us take courses in anthropology at UCLA, but in my mind what Mantle was doing was anthropology too. So students at Washington had to take courses in anthropology and then linguistics, because linguistics seemed to be a tangible way of looking at musical structures that you didn’t know anything about. But back then it seemed that both the theoretical and the analytical side of linguistics was important, as well as the fundamental approaches of anthropology: making sure the subject was studied in its cultural context seemed to me very important to ethnomusicology. [Sixth,] the other problem was that ethnomusicologists’ bread and butter was not going to be their dissertation topic, but it was going to be what they could contribute to the general university. So I set up this requirement that one of the general exams for the ethnomusicology Ph.D. advancing to candidacy would be a general knowledge of world music.

TR: In those years, in the mid-sixties through to the late ’70s, when you were in it, and you were teaching, what did the field look like to you at that time, and what did you think about your own work in relation to whatever you thought of [the field]?

RG: At that time, it was more assumed that people were working on traditions or remote cultures that had been relatively isolated from the globalization, mass media that was going on. Some people ranked under that sort of definition of ethnomusicology. I used to always incorporate something about the current popular music in the lectures I taught, but later, when so many of my students seemed to devote themselves to the study of pop music, I felt like saying, “Well, yeah, but I didn’t think you were all going to go off and do that and leave everything else!” It’s about the fact that, like biological diversity, species are disappearing, languages are disappearing. And in a sense cultures are disappearing. Every few years somebody dies who was the last person who knew how to do something or other; the last person who did this or the last person who knew this tradition dies. And when that species dies, you can’t reconstruct it, you can’t bring it back. So I’m concerned about the things that are being lost forever. It’s okay to do all these other things. This is all good. But who’s looking out to make sure we don’t lose track of all these threads? It’s not that we have to go back and do the same old thing over and over again, but if we don’t remember what it was that was the richness of the heritage that we got, we continue to create things on a smaller and smaller understanding of what came before. And it becomes more and more superficial. That doesn’t mean you can’t create [continued next page]
something lasting and meaningful and significant out of whatever you have around you. But it’s terrible to lose something.

TR: What kind of influence do you think ethnomusicology has had on music studies in general?

RG: I could see the number of ethnomusicologists growing. And I could see a point, very soon, in which there would be an ethnomusicologist in every major institution of higher education across the country. I somehow thought we’d all be integrated into what’s going on in the university as a whole, and that didn’t happen. Even though there were ethnomusicologists all over, they tended to continue to be isolated from everybody around them. The university as a whole understands that it’s illogical to say, if we’re going to study geology, the best rocks in the world are in California and there’s no need to think about what the rocks are like anywhere else in the world. That’s absolutely absurd. But that’s what music departments do. Only one kind of music is worth studying. And that sort of heresy continues in spite of the fact that it’s antithetical to the way the university is structured. I never expected that that would continue for so long. I somehow thought in the sixties that we were going to bring the light of reason. And that didn’t happen, because we continued to be separate. But in part because the performance conservatory model does not belong in a university. They’re talking religion. They are absolute, and so it doesn’t fit in the university, and it’s been detrimental to the development of the field of ethnomusicology, to be under a system in which these are the people who are making decisions. I never expected that we’d get into that situation. Nor did I expect we would get into a situation in which so many ethnomusicologists would be complacent about that very thing. If you can’t find a place for the individual ethnomusicologist to thrive, the discipline is going to die.

TR: How do you see the field of ethnomusicology today?

RG: From my perspective, in the beginning we started off on the right foot, studying scales because they were measurable, and they showed clear cultural and historical differences between cultures. Everybody has a musical culture; that’s the universal: everybody has it, but the form it takes is arbitrary. And then, whether because of interests, or because it was simply so hard, people stopped talking about music. They started going further and further around it, until there was a long, dark period where nobody was writing anything about music in ethnomusicology. I’m delighted to see in some recent issues of the SEM journal, they have articles about music in them and Michael Tenzer’s first book, Analytical Studies in World Music and now it’s coming out with a second volume. I’m not saying everybody has to do musical analysis, but I think that there should be some who do. We can’t just be looking at the social context of it, but the whole thing itself is what the social context is trying to control. So I think we need to understand that. And I think it is very complicated, very technical, but we should not all shy away from it.

Berger: Theory and Practice [continued from page 5]

In this context, Marx’s insights into the dynamics of use value and exchange value apply as much to the contemporary university as they did to nineteenth century industry. Here, universities operate through a logic of profit, but with two currencies (money and status) in play, rather than just one. And it is not merely ideological forces that make universities look like corporations. In the United States, institutions of higher education are becoming increasingly tied to the private sector, funding cuts erode the university, and substantial political pressure is being brought to bear by groups that seek to diminish the critical potential of higher education and make it serve the needs of capital—inexpensively producing workers (not citizens or dissidents). Related stresses are felt in public ethnomusicology, with many government programs seeing reductions in funding and the emergence of non-governmental cultural organizations that manage their workers with the same exploitative techniques that corporations use.

Neo-liberal economics do not just shape the conditions of our employment, they also have a direct impact on the pragmatics of our teaching, research, publishing, and public programming; intellectual property, both in law and in practice, is often the fulcrum around which these issues turns. Many of the major journals in the humanities and social sciences are owned by for-profit publishers whose goal is to maximize profit, not expand the base of human knowledge, and funding limitations have, in the worst cases, forced some university presses to begin to operate like private concerns. The notion of fair use has eroded substantially, and great swaths of information that were once in the public domain are being digitized by massive conglomerates, converted into private property, and resold to libraries at exorbitant rates. As the information economy becomes a greater and greater focus in contemporary social life, both the cultural work that we as ethnomusicologists do and the information needs we have in our research, teaching, and public programming are seen by capital as resources or markets to be exploited.

As with the problems of diversity in the academy, the difficulties faced by ethnomusicologists in the neo-liberal era stem from pervasive and fundamental social and economic conditions. While we would be naïve to think that the efforts of a small scholarly society could eradicate these conditions, we would be abdicating our responsibilities as intellectuals if we simply ignored them. On a basic level, it is essential that we work to understand the dynamics of discrimination and the place of the university in the political economy of neo-liberalism, as it is hard to imagine how any useful work could come from a misunderstanding of the social conditions in which we operate.

Recent actions by the SEM board speak to these issues, if only in small ways. For example, the goal of the new diversity programs that I announced in my last column is to make the Society a more welcoming, just, and equitable organization for those from groups that have historically experienced discrimination. Beyond the practical effect of providing women,
faculty of color, LGBT ethnomusicologists, and others with publication, travel, and mentoring support, the new programs also seek to draw greater attention to diversity in the Society, encouraging us to think about the role of gender, race, sexuality, and other forms of power in our daily practice as ethnomusicologists. In discussing these projects, I have always emphasized that these are pilot programs that will change over time. My hope is that the Society will find creative ways of developing these initiatives in the future, and that the process of working on these programs will forge relationships among diversity activists in the Society that will lead to productive new approaches. The structure of our new blog, collaborative—ographies database, and podcast initiatives speak, in part, to the issue of intellectual property, as all three are open-source, freely available publications. Further, the blog and the podcast are geared to both scholarly and general audiences. Communicating social insights from ethnomusicology to the wider public serves the basic missions of our field, of course, but it also helps to strengthen ethnomusicology’s position in institutions and to fortify the academy and public sector, as anti-intellectualism, the instrumentalization of the university, and the gutting of public cultural work become less tenable when the wider society understands the value of what we do. Further, a large part of SEM’s longstanding strategic plan focuses on projects that get ethnomusicological knowledge to a broader audience, such as our new K-12 education initiatives and multi-media field report publications. Such work helps build support for ethnomusicology in the wider public.

As practical programs, these efforts will, I hope, yield direct and concrete benefits, but I have no illusions that they will achieve an immediate transformation for our discipline or the academy. I hope, however, that in making real the potential for change, fostering relationships among activist ethnomusicologists, and bringing greater attention to these issues in the Society, these programs will be part of a larger process and serve as sites for critique, the exercise of our social imagination, organizing, and action. While diversity has been an explicit focus of much of the Society’s work in the last two years, efforts on the problems of contingent labor and its related economic issues are just beginning. Recent communications from the membership to the board on this topic have initiated new discussions, and the board has requested that the SEM Council and other bodies provide input on this topic. It is hard to see that there are any actions that the board (or perhaps even the Society as whole) can take to eradicate these problems, as they stem from fundamental social and economic conditions and differ widely in varying national contexts. That said, I believe that we can work to find creative responses that will provide at least some relief, as well as opportunities for solidarity with other scholarly groups and new ways of organizing our practice together. Simply ignoring these issues is not an option, and I know that the crisis of contingent labor and related problems of ethnomusicology in the neo-liberal era will continue to be on the Board’s agenda for the coming years.

It is safe to say that music has been a powerful force in the lives of every member of the Society for Ethnomusicology and that we all believe that understanding its dynamics is a profoundly significant endeavor. We forward that project most effectively, I think, when we push hard at theory, engage deeply in practices that foster our intellectual institutions, and allow the two sides of this dialectic to nurture one another. It has been a great honor to serve as SEM president, and I look forward to serving in the post of past president and continuing to work with my colleagues in the Society to explore this dialectic together.

Notes
1. The path for phenomenological ethnomusicology was forged by Ruth Stone’s classic study Let the Inside Be Sweet (1982). For a recent discussion of key works in phenomenological ethnomusicology, see Berger (2009, n. 6, pp. 137–138).
2. For a rich discussion of this issue, see Gage Averill’s president’s column, “The Casualization of Ethnomusicalogical Labor” (2011).
3. Other important initiatives pursued in the last few years that speak to diversity and economic issues include our new “Guidelines for Annual Meeting Site Selection” (which gives preference to hotels and municipalities that are affordable for our members and support unions. LGBT rights, living wage ordinances, and ecological sustainability) and the passage of an SEM “Position Statement on Anti-Discrimination, Anti-Harassment, and Sexual Diversity.”
4. With the Crossroad Project reconstituted as a section, rather than a committee, I hope that more SEM members will get involved in this group and that it will become another place for ethnomusicologists to work together and think creatively about the challenges of diversity in our field.
5. The inspiration for my thinking here is André Gorz’s classic essay, “Reform and Revolution” (1968). There, Gorz argues that, rather than only serving as a kind of accommodation to power, liberal reforms of governmental institution can be harnessed to serve the ends of revolutionary change if radicals use the process of fighting for those reforms to serve larger ends: to organize workers, foster solidarity and class consciousness across sectional and political differences, show that social change is possible, introduce radical perspectives to those from the mainstream, and nurture new ways of imagining social relations. Of course, the kinds of changes that I am discussing here do not operate on Gorz’s grand historical level, and the comparison is, to say the least, far from direct. That acknowledged, there is a parallel of thinking, if not scale or broad aim, and I would be remiss here if I didn’t acknowledge my inspiration for these ideas.

It is worth noting that the tension between pre-critical humanistic perspectives and the more recent critical scholarship, which I mentioned in an earlier section of this essay, is related to the conflicting rationales that exist in contemporary discourse for support of higher education, and, in another essay, Gorz (1970) provides powerful insights into this topic. While I do not in any way advocate the destruction of the university, which Gorz supported here under very specific historical circumstances, his analysis of the tension between the liberal bourgeoisie rationale for universities (as a resource for upward mobility within the class system) and the radical vision of universities (as places for fomenting critical thinking and dissent) has powerful relevance to the situation faced by those in the contemporary academy.

[continued on next page]
Indianapolis, Indiana is the site for the 58th Annual Meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology, to be held on November 14-17 at the Indianapolis Marriott Downtown. This year’s conference is hosted by Indiana University Bloomington. Perhaps surprisingly, Indianapolis is often ranked as one of the best downtowns in the United States. Of particular interest will be the Indianapolis Art Museum, the world’s “biggest and best” Children’s Museum of Indianapolis, the Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art, the Rhythm Discovery Center, and the numerous jazz clubs in this city where jazz great Wes Montgomery was born.

The Preconference Symposium, held on Wednesday, November 13, is “Music and Global Health: Toward Collaborative Paradigms.” The Preconference addresses new and existing collaborative projects between ethnomusicologists and health researchers and will be held at the IUPUI Campus, Indianapolis.

The main conference program of papers, workshops, concerts, roundtables, film sessions, and poster sessions runs from Thursday, November 14 until Sunday, November 17. Also included are the President’s Roundtable, a “Music and Public Policy” session organized by the SEM Board, and numerous video-streamed sessions. Following up on the 57th Annual Conference last year, this year’s conference does not feature a central theme or themes and instead will represent the gamut of geographic, conceptual, and theoretical areas of Ethnomusicology.

The President’s Roundtable, video-streamed and held on mid-morning Friday, will focus on “Phenomenological Approaches to Ethnomusicology and the Study of Expressive Culture.” Participants invited by President Harris Berger are Deborah Justice, Deborah Kapchan, Matt Rahaim, Timothy Rice, Ruth Stone, and Jeff Todd Titon. The SEM Board’s “Music and Public Policy: The Political Economy of Musical Labor” session, held on Friday mid-afternoon, is chaired by Anne Rasmussen and will feature Ian McKay, Kristin Thomson, Michael Birenbaum Quintero, Jennifer Matsue, and Jeremy Wallach. The Seeger Lecturer for 2013 is Sherry Ortner of University of California, Los Angeles, who will present “The Cultural Production of a Field of Cultural Production” on Saturday afternoon.

This year’s program committee – David Harnish (University of San Diego), Amanda Villepastour (Cardiff University), Joanne Bosse (Michigan State University), Melvin Butler (University of Chicago), and J. Martin Daughtry (New York University) – invite you to participate personally or virtually in this year’s meeting, held in Indianapolis, so near the homeland of the Society. We expect you will find this to be a stimulating and exciting conference in the history of our lustrous organization.

For more information about the meeting, hotel accommodations, and online registration, select "http://www.indiana.edu/~semhome/2013/index.shtml."
and Health Studies Program and the IU Center for Global difference is co-sponsored by the IUPUI Medical Humanities Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute, the pre-con justice and global health. Underwritten by the Indiana cultural musical projects that intersect with issues of social Global Health Initiative and prominent leader of cross-University professor André de Quadros, an affiliate of the We welcome as the keynote speaker for this event Boston explores the emerging field of medical ethnomusicology. "Music and Global Health: Toward Collaborative Para- events for conference attendees. The pre-conference, completed in 1927 to honor the first African American the Madame C.J. Walker Theater Center, completed in 1927 to honor the first African American female millionaire, is also nearby. Fans of jazz and blues will want to check out the Slippery Noodle Inn downtown and the Jazz Kitchen in Broad Ripple, which offers excellent Cajun food, in addition to music. Indy is a common stop for all kinds of touring bands; weekly listings for music in the city can be found at www.nuvo.net. The LAC has planned a number of exciting special events for conference attendees. The pre-conference, "Music and Global Health: Toward Collaborative Paradigms," to be held on the campus of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) on November 13, explores the emerging field of medical ethnomusicology. We welcome as the keynote speaker for this event Boston University professor André de Quadros, an affiliate of the Global Health Initiative and prominent leader of cross-cultural musical projects that intersect with issues of social justice and global health. Underwritten by the Indiana University New Horizons/New Directions Fund and the IU Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute, the pre-conference is co-sponsored by the IUPUI Medical Humanities and Health Studies Program and the IU Center for Global Health. The cost to attend the pre-conference is a mere $5 for students and $10 for non-students. Musical highlights of the conference include a number of exciting performances and concert offerings. The Thursday night Welcome Reception will feature the Southern Indiana Pipes and Drums, a 30-member regimental corps in the Highland Bagpipe tradition. Make sure you catch the noonday concerts which include a Friday performance by JIRIDÔN, which features dance and drumming styles from Colombia and Ivory Coast, and a Saturday performance by the Wamadian World Music Ensemble of Wabash College, led by SEM LAC member James Makubuya, drawing on a wide variety of musics from Africa to East Asia and India to Ireland. An SEM first—a performance of gospel music by participants in the SEM Music Education Workshop—is slated for the noon hour on Saturday. The group will be directed by Sheri Garrison, gospel recording artist and Director of Worship of the dynamic 10,000 member Eastern Star Church in Indy. On Friday evening, Sogbety Diomande’s West African Drum and Dance Company will engage our musical sensibilities through traditional Côte d’Ivoire masked and stilt dances, while during the annual SEM Banquet on Saturday evening, we will be feted by world renowned Ghanaian gyil (xylophone) artist Bernard Woma, with accompanying dancers. On Saturday, we will be feted with a dance party featuring the Indiana University Soul Revue, a popular music ensemble founded in 1971 by SEM’s own Portia Maultsby, the 2012 Seeger Lecturer. The Soul Revue has a storied history as the “first and finest” college ensemble of its type, having performed alongside some of the biggest names in soul music. If you like the sounds of the 60s and beyond, and revel in the opportunity to hit the dance floor to get your groove on, then make sure to purchase your ticket for the Soul Revue when you register! Afterward, bring your own instruments to show “your stuff” and jam the night away during the open mic session which follows the Soul Revue. Guidelines for participating are posted on the conference website. Don’t forget to sign up for the SEM Banquet on Saturday evening beginning at 5:45 p.m. For this year’s “Reunion Banquet,” you can reserve a table for alumni from your university, or for any collective, large or small, interested in spending time together without the hassle of negotiating where and when. Varied menu options, including vegetarian, are available when you register.

Society for Ethnomusicology, 2013 Annual Meeting, Indianapolis

Local Arrangements Committee

The SEM Local Arrangements Committee and the Ethnomusicology Institute of the Indiana University Department of Folklore and Ethnomusicology, together with Wabash College and Indiana State University, welcome you to the 2013 Annual Meeting in Indianapolis. The conference is slated for November 14-17 at the Indianapolis Marriott Downtown. While many SEM members may recall fondly meeting in Bloomington for our 25th anniversary in 1980 and again in 1998, our most welcome increased conference attendance has necessitated the move to our state capital.

In the past few decades, downtown Indianapolis has undergone a period of great revitalization to become a vibrant and inviting community. Boasting a population of over 800,000, the city has a wide variety of excellent restaurants, world-class museums, cultural districts, jazz and blues clubs, and even a dueling piano bar. Both bike and pedestrian-friendly, Indianapolis has developed many miles of greenways and multi-use trails in recent years. SEM members should consider walking the recently-completed Indianapolis Cultural Trail, which connects the five downtown cultural districts.

Home of the world’s largest children’s museum and the famous Indianapolis Motor Speedway (which hosts the world’s largest one day sporting event, the Indianapolis 500), Indianapolis welcomed in 2012 over 150,000 visitors for Super Bowl XLVI. Forbes Magazine cited the city for its Hoosier hospitality and its “eminently walkable downtown.” The Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art as well as the Indiana State Museum and the Children’s Museum are located in the downtown area. The city’s Indiana Repertory Theater offers productions of the highest caliber and the Madame C.J. Walker Theater Center, completed in 1927 to honor the first African American female millionaire, is also nearby. Fans of jazz and blues will want to check out the Slippery Noodle Inn downtown and the Jazz Kitchen in Broad Ripple, which offers excellent Cajun food, in addition to music. Indy is a common stop for all kinds of touring bands; weekly listings for music in the city can be found at www.nuvo.net.

The LAC has planned a number of exciting special events for conference attendees. The pre-conference, “Music and Global Health: Toward Collaborative Paradigms,” to be held on the campus of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) on November 13, explores the emerging field of medical ethnomusicology. We welcome as the keynote speaker for this event Boston University professor André de Quadros, an affiliate of the Global Health Initiative and prominent leader of cross-cultural musical projects that intersect with issues of social justice and global health. Underwritten by the Indiana University New Horizons/New Directions Fund and the IU Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute, the pre-conference is co-sponsored by the IUPUI Medical Humanities and Health Studies Program and the IU Center for Global Health. The cost to attend the pre-conference is a mere $5 for students and $10 for non-students.

Musical highlights of the conference include a number of exciting performances and concert offerings. The Thursday night Welcome Reception will feature the Southern Indiana Pipes and Drums, a 30-member regimental corps in the Highland Bagpipe tradition. Make sure you catch the noonday concerts which include a Friday performance by JIRIDÔN, which features dance and drumming styles from Colombia and Ivory Coast, and a Saturday performance by the Wamadian World Music Ensemble of Wabash College, led by SEM LAC member James Makubuya, drawing on a wide variety of musics from Africa to East Asia and India to Ireland. An SEM first—a performance of gospel music by participants in the SEM Music Education Workshop—is slated for the noon hour on Saturday. The group will be directed by Sheri Garrison, gospel recording artist and Director of Worship of the dynamic 10,000 member Eastern Star Church in Indy.

On Friday evening, Sogbety Diomande’s West African Drum and Dance Company will engage our musical sensibilities through traditional Côte d’Ivoire masked and stilt dances, while during the annual SEM Banquet on Saturday evening, we will be feted by world renowned Ghanaian gyil (xylophone) artist Bernard Woma, with accompanying dancers.

On Saturday, we will be feted with a dance party featuring the Indiana University Soul Revue, a popular music ensemble founded in 1971 by SEM’s own Portia Maultsby, the 2012 Seeger Lecturer. The Soul Revue has a storied history as the “first and finest” college ensemble of its type, having performed alongside some of the biggest names in soul music. If you like the sounds of the 60s and beyond, and revel in the opportunity to hit the dance floor to get your groove on, then make sure to purchase your ticket for the Soul Revue when you register! Afterward, bring your own instruments to show “your stuff” and jam the night away during the open mic session which follows the Soul Revue. Guidelines for participating are posted on the conference website.

Don’t forget to sign up for the SEM Banquet on Saturday evening beginning at 5:45 p.m. For this year’s “Reunion Banquet,” you can reserve a table for alumni from your university, or for any collective, large or small, interested in spending time together without the hassle of negotiating where and when. Varied menu options, including vegetarian, are available when you register.
Renowned anthropologist Sherry Ortner will deliver the Charles Seeger Lecture at SEM 2013. A scholar of Sherpa communities in Nepal and more recently of class relations and late capitalism in the United States, she is also known for her contributions to feminist anthropology and her essays on anthropological theory. Prior to her appointment as Distinguished Professor of Anthropology at UCLA in 1996, Professor Ortner taught at Sarah Lawrence College, the University of Michigan, the University of California at Berkeley, and Columbia University. She has received awards from the National Science Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Ortner received her PhD in 1970, at a time when her teachers at the University of Chicago, including David Schneider and dissertation advisor Clifford Geertz, were doing much to define the field of symbolic anthropology. In subsequent years she would coin the phrase “practice anthropology” to characterize the mix of Geertzian approaches and the practice-oriented theories of Pierre Bourdieu and others that has characterized her work in recent decades. In a nod to Bourdieu, her lecture for SEM is entitled “The Cultural Production of a Field of Cultural Production.”

One of Professor Ortner’s most notable attributes has been her ability to identify, respond to, and often initiate shifts in themes and paradigms within anthropological research. Such shifts are apparent in her series of monographs on Sherpa society that spans three decades. In the 1960s, when symbolic anthropology was at its height, she conducted dissertation research on ritual life in Sherpa villages, published as Sherpas through Their Rituals (1978). As synchronic studies became integrated with historical methods and concerns, she published High Religion: A Cultural and Political History of Sherpa Buddhism (1988), an account of the founding of Sherpa monasteries. Finally, she examined the fraught relationships between international mountain climbers and their Sherpa guides in Life and Death on Mount Everest: Sherpas and Himalayan Mountaineering (1999), which was awarded the J. I. Staley Prize in 2004. In the 2000s, Professor Ortner then turned to a very different field site: graduates of her own New Jersey high school class. In New Jersey Dreaming: Capital, Culture, and the Class of ’58 (2003) and a host of articles, she scrutinized class relations in the United States and the ways that they have often been refracted through ethnicity, race, and gender. Her most recent book, Not Hollywood: Independent Film at the Twilight of the American Dream (2013), examines the role of independent filmmakers in critiquing current American society.

Outside anthropology, Professor Ortner has perhaps been best known for her writings on gender relations. Her first published article, provocatively titled “Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?” (1972), sought to explain what she viewed as the universality of female subordinate. Republished in the seminal collection Woman, Culture and Society (1974), the article became a classic of feminist anthropology. Shortly thereafter, she set aside universalist arguments in her introduction and contribution to the co-edited volume, Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality (1981), one of the most influential texts for a generation of scholars in the anthropology of gender. Several of her essays on gender, addressing societies as varied as those of the Middle East and West Asia (“The Virgin and the State”) and indigenous Hawai’i (“Gender Hegemonies”), were later reprinted in Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture (1997).

At various points throughout her career, Professor Ortner has also paused to explicate, assess, and rework prominent concepts and trends in essays that have placed her at the center of anthropological thought and practice. In one of her most important articles, “Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties” (1984), she reviewed major anthropological paradigms of the 1960s and 1970s, from cultural ecology to structural Marxism and political economy to symbolic anthropology, before advocating strongly for an approach more attentive both to individual agency and to social asymmetries. Examining the writings of Raymond Williams, Anthony Giddens, Marshall Sahlins, and Pierre Bourdieu, she dubbed what she viewed as a new synthesis in the field “practice anthropology,” a term that was quickly adopted by other prominent researchers. In “Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal” (1995), she took on the often romantic propensity of scholars to locate “resistance” in various realms of everyday life, arguing instead for more nuanced readings of the complex and often ambivalent ways that socially situated actors respond to oppression and exploitation. Most recently, in “Subjectivity and Cultural Critique” (2005), she has reworked the notion of subjectivity through a revisiting of both Geertz and practice theorists as a means of assessing the particular “structure of feeling” of late capitalism. These and other recent essays are brought together in Anthropology and Social Theory: Culture, Power, and the Acting Subject (2006). Finally I would mention a short review essay, “On Neoliberalism,” that appeared in the inaugural issue of the online journal Anthropology of This Century (2011). As in her previous writings, Professor Ortner takes the pulse of anthropology and pinpoints the historical moment in a way that is useful to all of us within ethnomusicology.

§
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SEM Publications
Romani DVD
On July 5, 2013, an agreement was finalized with Dr. Svanibor Pettan for the Society for Ethnomusicology’s exclusive worldwide distribution of a powerful DVD with study guide about the music of Romani musicians reaching across conflicting ethnic boundaries. *Kosovo through the Eyes of the Local Romani (Gypsy) Musicians* offers a view of a Balkan region in which Romani people reach across conflicting ethnic boundaries with their musicianship. Intended primarily for undergraduate introductory world music courses, cultural studies, political science, folklore and anthropology, but suitable for a wide variety of audiences, this documentary and study guide present Romani ensembles, the repertoire, their creative adaptations of “Lambada,” and their response to political tensions in the early 1990s in Kosovo. The videographer and primary author of the study guide, Svanibor Pettan, is Professor of Ethnomusicology at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, and a prolific writer on the region. Royalties from the sales will benefit Romani musicians from Kosovo and their descendants. **DVD with Study Guide. $24.95 for members / $34.95 for non-members. [In pre-production]**

“From the Field”
The Society for Ethnomusicology and Smithsonian Folkways are pleased to announce the launch of “From the Field,” a series of multimedia reports for the online *Smithsonian Folkways Magazine*. Co-produced by Smithsonian Folkways and SEM, this series presents recent ethnomusicological field research to a general audience. Reports combine audio and video recordings, photographs, and narrative to explore music-making and social issues at locales around the world.


“From the Field” is peer reviewed by the SEM-Smithsonian Folkways Editorial Committee, including James Cowdery (Répertoire International de Littérature Musicale – RILM), J. Martin Daughtry (New York University), Jean Kidula (University of Georgia), Joseph Lam (University of Michigan), John Murphy (University of North Texas), and Janet Sturman (University of Arizona). SEM and Smithsonian Folkways welcome proposals for “From the Field.”

Editor’s Note
To increase the SEM Newsletter’s readability and balance, I ask individuals to keep announcements to about 100 words and memorials to 500 words. In addition to renaming the “People and Places” section “Member News,” with this issue, I have started an “Other Announcements” section for chapters, sections, special interest groups, academic programs, and ancillary organizations announcements. Regrettably, this publication is unable to include complete conference programs; however, we can include links from announcements. For these announcements, please keep your word counts to no more than 150 words. Similarly, program announcements should be within 150 words.

Member News
Salwa El-Shawan Castelo-Branco (Director and Professor, Department of Ethnomusicology, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal) will receive the Swiss Musicological Society’s Glarean Award for musical research presented by in in Bern on 5 December 2013. The Glarean award, endowed with 10,000 francs, has been awarded every two years since 2007 to researchers having distinguished themselves through exceptional historiographical contributions and a due consideration of questions concerning music publication and distribution.

Glenda Goodman’s article, “But They Differ from Us in Sound”: Indian Psalmody and the Soundscape of Colonialism, 1651-75” received the Richard L. Morton Award from the *William and Mary Quarterly* (Vol. 69, No. 4, Fall 2012). The award is for exceptional achievement by a Quarterly author who was a graduate student at the time of first submission.

Sydney Hutchinson (Syracuse University) has been awarded an American Fellowship from the American Association of University Women for 2013-2014. The fellowship will support her writing project entitled *Tígueres and tigueras: Performing Gender in Dominican Music.*

Alejandro L. Madrid and Robin Moore have written a new book entitled *Danzón: Circum-Caribbean Dialogues in Music and Dance*, scheduled for release in November of 2013 with Oxford University Press. The danzón is a fascinating Afro-diasporic form that has strongly influenced the Gulf of Mexico region for a century and a half. This book focuses on the danzón’s popularization in Cuba, Mexico, and the United States, its ties to early jazz, its influence on musical forms such as the mambo and cha cha chá, and its links to broader discourses involving race, nostalgia, and desire.

David Novak (University of California, Santa Barbara) has had *Japanoise: Music at the Edge of Circulation* published by Duke University Press; a companion website for the book can be found at www.japanoise.com.

Colin Quigley (University of Limerick, UCLA) has recently edited the second volume of Ethnomusicology Ireland, and his recording of a fanfara New Year’s suite from Moldova is included in the CD Fieldwork, both available from the ICTM Ireland at www.ictm.ie.
Suvarnalata Rao (National Centre for Performing Arts, Mumbai) and Wim van der Meer (University of Amsterdam) are pleased to announce the launching of their website, *Music in Motion*, a sequel to the *Raga Guide*. This site includes information on 85 ragas, 110 compositions performed by 11 top raking Indian artistes.

Eva Reich completed her senior project on “Making Tradition Our Own: Contemporary Contra Dance Music in the Pacific Northwest” and begins an internship at Smithsonian Folkways in September. She is the first graduate of the new BA program in Ethnomusicology at the University of Washington.

### Other Announcements

**The Analysis of World Music** special interest group (Lawrence Shuster and David Racanelli, Co-Chairs) announce for the 2013 SEM Annual Meeting a special presentation by Richard Widdess (SOAS) and Martin Rohrmeier (MIT; SOAS) entitled “Can Western Listeners Learn Raga Grammar Incidentally?”

**The ARSC (Association for Recorded Sound Collections) Grants Committee** is pleased to announce the recipients of the 2013 Research Grants. *Evelyn Osborne* (Ph.D. [Ethnomusicology], Memorial University of Newfoundland): $1000 for travel to New York University to study the recordings of the McNulty Family and their influence on Newfoundland traditional music. *Parker Fishel* (Master’s student at the University of Texas School of Information): $700 to support travel to Massachusetts and Connecticut to pursue his project “Georgia Griot: A Bio-Discography of Free Jazz Saxophonist Marion Brown.” *Christa Anne Bentley* (Ph.D. candidate at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): $300 to support her travel to conduct research in the archives of A&M Records at UCLA, for a dissertation on the role of the recording industry in the singer-songwriter movement.

**The Society for Asian Music** announces the “Martin Hatch Award” for the best student paper on Asian music presented at the annual Society for Ethnomusicology national meeting. Recognition of the most outstanding student paper will include a $200 cash prize and a five-year subscription to the journal Asian Music. Any full- or part-time student is eligible for the prize. Students who wish to be considered for the prize should submit their papers to the chair of the Martin Hatch Award Committee, *David Harnish* by 21 December 2013.

**The ARSC Research Grants Program** supports scholarship and publication in the fields of sound recording research and audio preservation. (This program is separate from the ARSC Preservation Grants Program, which encourages and supports the preservation of historically significant sound recordings of Western Art Music.) Project categories eligible for consideration include: discography, bibliography, historical studies of the sound recording industry and its products, and any other subject likely to increase the public’s understanding and appreciation of the lasting importance of recorded sound. **Applications** for the next grant cycle must be received by February 28, 2014. Questions about the Research Grants Program should be directed to Grants Committee Chair, *Suzanne Flandreau*.

**The University of Texas at Austin Butler School of Music and South Asia Institute to partner with Pakistani arts academy.** Beginning in spring, 2014, faculty members at the UT-Austin Butler School of Music will mentor visiting musicians from Pakistan’s National Academy of Performing Arts (NAPA) under a new three-year partnership. The South Asia Institute (SAI) at UT-Austin will facilitate the exchange of scholars as well as a series of lectures, training sessions, and performances planned under the program. A total of 12 scholars from NAPA will visit the BSoM during the duration of the partnership to work with the school’s faculty members and students. Butler School faculty members will also travel to Pakistan in three groups. The partnership was made possible by a grant of $1 million from the US Department of State/United States Embassy in Islamabad, Pakistan that will be administered by the UT-Austin South Asia Institute.

**The Center for World Music** is pleased to announce its Programs Abroad 2014: cultural tours and hands-on workshops with distinguished master musicians in Indonesia, Africa, and Latin America. *Indonesian Encounters 2014* (June 23 – July 13): a two-week hands-on workshop in Bali and a one-week Performing Arts Tour of Central Java (director: Dr. Lewis Peterman). *African Encounters 2014* (July 27 – August 17): a two-week hands-on workshop in Ho, Ghana and a five-day tour of Southern Ghana (directors: Seyram Degbor and John Gabriel). *Andes and Beyond 2014* (July 12 – July 23): a 10-day cultural tour of Peru, meeting local performers and visiting major Incan ruin sites (director: Dr. Holly Wissler). *Mexican Encounters 2013-14* (December 27 – January 6): a 10-day hands-on workshop in Veracruz and visits to local cultural sites (director: Dr. Ric Alviso). For additional information, please visit the Center’s website or contact *Lewis Peterman*.

---

**Member News [continued from previous page]**

Boden Sandstrom (University of Maryland) has announced her retirement. Her career has spanned several different, but related fields—librarian, sound engineer and teacher. She has been Co-Chair of the SEM’s Gender and Sexualities Task Force, Treasurer of IASPM-U.S., and owner/engineer of Woman Sound. She also co-produced the documentary *Radical Harmonies*, for which she won The Philip Brett Award from AMS. Boden looks forward to working on her women’s music cultural network archives, which will be housed in the Sophia Smith Collection: Women’s History Archives, Smith College, MA. Her professional archives are housed at the Performing Arts Library, University of Maryland. §
Conference Calendar, 2013


• The American Folklife Society’s 2013 annual meeting, the Omni Hotel in Providence, Rhode Island, 16-19 October 2013.


• The Society for Music Theory’s annual meeting, Charlotte, North Carolina, 31 October - 3 November 2013.

• "International Seminar and Festival of Indonesian Music," the Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC, 31 October–3 November 2013. Email to gamelan@embassyofindonesia.org on or before September 15, 2013.

• “Atlantic Sounds: Ships and Sailortowns.” The British Forum for Ethnomusicology and the AHRC Research Networking Project sy the School of Music, Cardiff University, 19 October, 2013. To attend the colloquium without offering a paper, please email BFECardiff@cf.ac.uk.


• The Congress on Research in Dance (CORD) joint conference with the Society of Dance History Scholars, Riverside Mission Inn and Spa in Riverside, California, 14-17 November 2013.

• The 112th AAA Annual meeting, the Chicago Hilton, Chicago, Illinois, 20-24 November 2013.


• Ecomusicologies 2013: Ecosystems and Ecocriticism, Queensland Conservatorium, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia, 22 November 2013.

• “Thinking through Music with... Nicholas Cook." Georg-August-University Göttingen, 22 November 2013. Contact Eva-Maria van Straaten.

• “Hip Hop and Punk Feminisms: Theory, Genealogy, Performance.” University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 5-6 December 2013.


Ethnomusicology Internet Resources

The SEM Website

SEM-L and SEMNotices-L Electronic Mailing Lists. Moderated by Hope Munro Smith, Assistant Professor, Department of Music, CSU Chico, 400 West First Street, Chico, CA 95929-0805, Phone: 530-898-6128, Email: hmsmith@csuchico.edu

SEM Chapter Websites
Mid-Atlantic Chapter
Midwest Chapter
Niagara Chapter
Northeast Chapter
Northern California Chapter
Northwest Chapter
Southeast-Caribbean Chapter
Southern California & Hawai`i Chapter
Southern Plains Chapter
Southwest Chapter

SEM Section Websites
Applied Ethnomusicology Section
Education Section
Gender and Sexualities Taskforce
Popular Music Section
South Asia Performing Arts Section

Ethnomusicology Websites
American Folklife Center
Association for Chinese Music Research
British Forum for Ethnomusicology
British Library, World and Traditional Music
Christian Musicological Society
Comparative Musicology
Ethnomusicology OnLine (EOL), (home site)
Ethnomusicology Review
Mediterranean Music Studies - ICTM Study Group
International Council for Traditional Music
Iranian Musicology Group
Music & Anthropology
Smithsonian Institution: Folkways, Festivals, & Folklife
Society for American Music
Society for Asian Music
UCLA Ethnomusicology Archive
University of Washington Ethnomusicology Archive
Fondazione Casa di Oriani, Ravenna

Society for Ethnomusicology
2013 Annual Meeting

14-17 November 2013
Indianapolis, Indiana

Hosted by Indiana University Bloomington

Pre-conference Symposium
“Music and Global Health: Toward Collaborative Paradigms”
13 November 2013, Indianapolis

More Information