

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, phallogentrism, 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 diegetic³⁶ 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, scientific, 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 aftermath³⁹—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