



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Cottrell, S.J. (2010). Ethnomusicology and the Music Industries: an overview. Ethnomusicology Forum, 19(1), pp. 3-25.

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/3938/>

Link to published version:

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Ethnomusicology and the Music Industries: An Overview

Stephen Cottrell

This paper functions as an introduction to this volume as a whole, and charts the relationship between ethnomusicology and the music industries, particularly record companies, over the course of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. It considers the changing relationship between these two sometimes antagonistic parties, and how this has informed or influenced other relationships with those musicians around the globe whose 'world music'¹ (broadly construed) each has engaged with for its own purposes. It also considers how the stance of ethnomusicologists towards record companies has changed, as the discipline itself has evolved over the past c. 120 years. Finally, it asks whether ethnomusicology can itself be considered a music industry.

Keywords: Ethnomusicology; Record Companies; Commodification; World Music; Music Technology

This volume has its roots in a conference organised by the British Forum for Ethnomusicology, held at Goldsmiths College, London, in November 2007. The title of that conference was 'Ethnomusicology and the Culture Industries', but the present title, 'Ethnomusicology and the Music Industries', reflects the rather more narrow focus of this collection. We are not dealing here with the film industries, broadcasting, video games and so forth, all of which might be embraced under the broader notion of the cultural industries. Instead the term 'music industries' is used here largely to denote the activities of record companies and similar,² whether large-scale multinational corporations with regional sub-divisions that span the globe, or smaller-scale operations servicing local markets that may be little more than a one-man band or a cottage

industry. The technologies they employ necessarily change according to context, but it is essentially their ability to reproduce musical sound, and the manner in which the musical commodities or texts they produce are circulated, exchanged and valorised, which provides the thread running through this volume, notwithstanding the inevitable intersections and overlaps between these music industries and others that frequently endow their products with additional meanings.

Ethnomusicology has long demonstrated a close relationship with various elements of music and sound technology. Indeed, it is generally accepted that the discipline—if that's what it is—is unlikely to have flourished so successfully in its early stages were it not for the development and rapid advance of recording technology from the 1880s onwards. Thus there has been a long but constantly evolving relationship between, on the one hand, ethnomusicologists and their forerunners,³ and on the other, those who have sought to harness and exploit mediated musical sound: the music industries. At times this relationship has been tenuous, with scholars only occasionally relying on commercial recordings to underpin their work. On other occasions it has been more symbiotic, with ethnomusicologists and record companies working in tandem to capture, promote, sustain or generate musical activity in particular contexts; partners in crime, as it were. The activities of the music industries have themselves occasionally provided contexts for ethnomusicological fieldwork, whether in the studios where they make their recordings or the offices where they make their decisions. But elsewhere ethnomusicologists have been more critical of such activities: for example, when complaining of the media's un-recompensed exploitation of local musical practice.

The papers in this volume can be seen as further contributions to this scholarly discourse. In 'Two Different Worlds' John Baily addresses the roles played by different recording technologies employed by Afghan music makers both at home and in the Afghan diaspora, and highlights the relative lack of crossover between recordings intended for a domestic audience

and those aimed at the world market; he also draws attention to the paradoxical relationship between music and technology in this instance, noting that while modern Afghan audiences are more interested in forms of Afghan music that rely heavily on modern technology such as electronic keyboards, World Music consumers are often seeking what might be construed as the more redemptive and 'authentic' qualities of traditional Afghan music. Two other papers provide specific case studies from Latin America. Morgan Luker's 'The Managers, The Managed, and the Unmanageable' takes a microhistorical view of the first Buenos Aires International Music Fair (BAFIM) in Argentina in 2006, organised in the aftermath of the severe economic crisis that had engulfed the country just after the turn of the century. Luker considers the diversity discourses surrounding the event, and what these reveal about local cultural and economic policies and their intersections with transnational cultural flows, particularly in relation to the US-based digital distribution company The Orchard. In 'Rampant Reproduction and Digital Democracy' Henry Stobart also considers transnational cultural flows, this time across the border between Bolivia and Peru. He demonstrates how the promotion of the Video Compact Disc format by Phillips and Sony in Latin America has led to a significant increase in local music duplication and dissemination in the Bolivian context, usually without the consent of the copyright owner. Even here, however, ever cheaper forms of digital duplication mean that a fragmented local distribution scene is in constant renewal, as vendors undercut each other in a bid to generate returns from decreasing profit margins.

The remaining item is an interview with Ben Mandelson, a co-founder of GlobeStyle records and a stalwart of the UK World Music scene. Mandelson was one of the participants in the series of meetings held in 1987 that devised the term 'World Music' as a marketing category. His work both as a musician—that is, somebody whose creative output has been sold and distributed to consumers interested in World Music—and as an industry insider—that is, a businessman who necessarily addresses ethical, legal, financial and aesthetic issues on a daily

basis—makes him an ideal subject for inclusion here. This wide-ranging interview touches on several themes found elsewhere in the volume: copyright and remuneration for performers, the creation of World Music records, ethical obligations for ethnomusicologists, and the role of the internet and other music technology in contemporary production and dissemination.

This overview provides a context for the other papers in the volume, by charting the relationship between ethnomusicology and the music industries over the course of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The ongoing association between ethnomusicology and recording technology itself has been well documented elsewhere, with both Shelemay (1991) and Malm (1992), for example, providing general summaries, while many other authors have offered specific studies of one kind or another. What follows focuses less on the technological developments—although it is inconceivable that any overview might be written without reference to these—and more on how the changing relationship between music scholars and the music industries illuminates the evolution of that part of the music studies field for which we use that wide-ranging and occasionally nebulous term, ethnomusicology.

The Early Years

Edison's invention of the phonograph in 1877 has become widely acknowledged as marking a seminal point in human music making, notwithstanding that the recording of music was only one of many, often more business-oriented, uses to which Edison felt his invention might be put. Edison's machine meant that a listener no longer needed to be physically present at a musical performance in order to hear something of it, and thus musical experience—by which I mean in this case an engagement with or response to particular patterns of musical sound—could be decoupled from participation in the musical event that gave rise to the sounds themselves.⁴ Exactly a century after Edison's invention this mediated disassociation of sound and source

would be described by R. Murray Schafer (1977, 90) as 'schizophonia', which he defined as 'the split between an original sound and its electroacoustical transmission or reproduction'.⁵

Edison's phonograph both created and replayed the rotating wax cylinders on which it depended, but it was some time before the cylinders themselves could be reproduced in sufficient quantities to provide real commercial opportunities. Meanwhile Edison was soon competing with a slightly different recording technology, the zinc-coated flat-disc system that Emile Berliner had developed in 1888 and which he described as a gramophone.⁶ The two significant differences of Berliner's system in the present context were that his flat discs could be reproduced in large numbers, and his machines were capable of playback only, and could not record musical sound. The latter feature arguably marks the origins of the commercialisation of recorded sound. Whereas a machine with dual capabilities might be used to replay one's own recordings, a playback-only machine relies on others to provide the source materials that enable it to function. From this point on the provision of these materials could be controlled, monetised and, eventually, industrialised. And although instrument manufacturing or the publication of musical scores and pedagogic texts, for example, could rightly be construed as having long constituted various types of music industries, the commodification of recorded musical sound offered a very different approach to the commercialisation of music, and one that, as we now know, was to have enormous global significance as the twentieth century unfolded.

The impact of recording technology on ethnographic study is well documented elsewhere, notably by Erika Brady (1999). Not all ethnographers immediately embraced the new technology; some rejected it on practical or economic grounds. Native Americans were particular targets of its early use, largely because they were geographically closest to the areas where the often cumbersome recording equipment was located. The 30 cylinders of Passamaquoddy music recorded by Walter Fewkes in 1890, as late as 13 years after Edison's original patent, are often thought of as being the first ethnographic recordings, notwithstanding that they were little

more than a trial of the new technology using a tribe reasonably close to Fewkes's Boston base. Although Fewkes was initially enthusiastic about recording technology he does not appear to have made any further recordings after 1891.⁷ But his pioneering efforts were soon followed by others, including A. C. Haddon's famous Torres Strait expedition of 1898, which resulted in some 100 recordings from the region, and Alice Cunningham Fletcher's and Frances Densmore's early recordings of Native Americans.⁸

There were felt to be two overarching reasons for making these early recordings: on the one hand to preserve traditions that were already felt to be disappearing, and on the other to provide materials that could be used for later study. In the eyes of many the first of these was felt to be more compelling. Fewkes himself wrote in 1890 that, 'when one considers the changes which yearly come to the Indians, and the probability that in a few years many of their customs will be greatly modified or disappear forever, the necessity for immediate preservation of their songs and rituals is imperative... Now is the time to collect material before all is lost... the scientific study of these records comes later, but now is the time for collection of them' (Fewkes 1890, 1095, 1098). Furthermore, early scholars also felt that these native customs offered a glimpse into some kind of fossilised cultural pre-history that supposedly allowed us to see what human culture was like in pre-industrialised times. In the early days, therefore, the preservation of recordings as cultural texts was prioritised and, as Jonathan Sterne (2003, 319) observes, 'the phonograph became a tool of embalming an already supposedly frozen native present for the future'.

Yet there are differences implicit in these two rather different stances, between cultural preservation and scientific enquiry. On the one hand the notion of recording music for posterity suggests pro-active intervention on the part of scholars in order to preserve particular music cultures, attended by an implicit valorisation that suggests such cultures need and deserve preservation and support; while on the other, the scientific study of such recordings implies a

more detached, observational mode, in which the scholar dispassionately endeavours to capture and/or analyse the musical information on the recording. While these two different perspectives are not entirely antithetical, the tensions that can inhere between them would later characterise at least some of the relationship between ethnomusicologists and the music industries, as will become clearer below.

While both the ‘preservative’ and ‘scientific’ approaches to recorded sound have resurfaced in a variety of ways during ethnomusicology’s history—for example, in recent work on the role of sound archives (Seeger 1986; 1996) or the interest in automatic transcription devices such as the melograph (Seeger 1957)—none of these early efforts can really be said to have involved the music industries *per se*, since few if any of these recordings were published or sold for profit. Their main purpose was to serve the scholarly community within which they most frequently circulated. In fact the true roots of ethnomusicology’s relationship with the music industries lie not in those field recordings made by early ethnographers intended to supplement or support their own research, they are instead located at a slightly different juncture, in a musical curiosity published a few years after Fewkes’s work.

During 1890-91 the Smithsonian Institution ethnographer James Mooney travelled to the Western Plains to study the Ghost Dance Religion; he published a report on his research a little later, in 1893.⁹ The following year, in July and August 1894, Mooney appears to have made a series of recordings for Emile Berliner in which he himself performed extracts from the Ghost Dance ceremonies in Berliner’s Washington DC studio. Two discs, each containing three melodies, appear on a list of recordings available for purchase from Berliner’s United States Gramophone Company, dated 1 November 1894, with a further disc added on a fuller list available from January 1895. Mooney’s 1893 report contains his transcriptions of both the melodies and song texts of these recordings, and comparing his performance of them relative to his transcriptions is an exercise as entertaining as it is revealing; neither the vocal timbre nor the

singer's approach to pitch and rhythm bear much resemblance to recordings made by Native Americans around the same time.¹⁰ Nevertheless, leaving aside the significance of these recordings as being possibly indicative of a very early instance of a performance-oriented research methodology, they are important because they appear to be the first example of music from beyond the Western classical and popular traditions to be recorded, reproduced, and issued for sale with a view to making a profit for the record company concerned. They represent, arguably, the starting point for the commodification of world music. Moreover, this apparent engagement of a Western performer with music from another tradition that is subsequently recycled in the recording studio for commercial purposes could in fact be seen as remarkably prescient of much later developments.

We can only speculate as to why Berliner thought such recordings might be marketable, particularly at a time when the numbers of discs he might hope to sell would have been small indeed. Obviously the growing interest in cultural exotica from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, increasingly manifested in world fairs, exhibitions and touring shows of one kind or another, may have provided one reason. Notwithstanding their relative geographic proximity, Native North Americans would still have seemed rather exotic to Berliner's affluent—and therefore most likely middle-class—disc-buying customers. Equally, the 1890s had seen an increased interest in Native American music among a range of white Americans, an interest that was reflected in contemporary debates about American nationalism, in musical character pieces that reworked Indian melodies, and, as Michael Pisani (2005, 213) puts it, in 'a quest for spiritual authenticity' that might be realised through the discovery of Native America. Whatever the reason, and in spite of any limitations the recordings themselves might now be seen to have, we may assign to Emile Berliner the credit for realising that music beyond the Euro-American traditions might provide a viable commercial opportunity, just as much as he felt would those musical styles more normally found among his Washingtonian friends and acquaintances.

The majority of recordings published by Berliner and others prior to 1900 were of Western light classical repertoire, reflecting not only the interests of those involved in the early record companies but also of those wealthy enough to be able to afford what was, initially, comparatively expensive reproduction equipment. Growth in the number of available recordings was slow but steady in the final years of the century. Gronow notes that in the mid 1890s Berliner was issuing a few dozen discs annually,¹¹ each of which would sell between a few hundred and a few thousand copies, and although Edison produced 151,000 of his phonographs in 1899, there was only a 'steady if limited' supply of cylinders to play on them (Gronow 1983, 54-5).

From the turn of the century, however, ethnographic recordings were quickly being added to record companies' catalogues. Some of the earliest recordings were of Indian music performed in London by visiting Indian musicians for the Gramophone and Typewriter Limited (GTL)—a forerunner of His Master's Voice (HMV)—in 1899. But the first obviously commercial recordings appear to have been made in India, for the same company, by the renowned Fred Gaisberg in 1902 (Farrell 1993, 33). By 1903 Gaisberg had made 1,700 recordings of Indian, Burmese, Siamese, Malay, Javanese, Chinese and Japanese music (Gronow 1981, 251). Other companies moved quickly to identify new markets in this musical gold rush. Columbia was recording in Mexico by 1903, and Victor and Edison swiftly followed suit (Gronow 1981, 253). Recordings soon covered many of the different musical traditions in disparate parts of the globe, and were made not only by larger companies but also by smaller regional concerns that evolved to service the demand in their own markets. Accurate figures during this period are hard to come by, but Gronow's (1981, 255) estimate of 14,000 recordings made in Asia and north Africa between 1900 and 1910 by the Gramophone Company alone looks plausible, when compared with a company directive issued as early as 1904 to expand their catalogue by 2,500 recordings to cater for different Indian language groups (Farrell 1993, 40), although whether these were in

fact made is a moot point. But these figures of recordings undertaken are dwarfed by actual sales of discs in the more developed markets only a few years later. By way of example, Gronow (1983, 59) estimates annual domestic record sales in Germany as being perhaps 10-12 million in 1907; US sales in the early 1910s as being at least 30 million records per annum; and Russian sales as being 20 million by 1915.

How might we construe the relationship between comparative musicology and this explosion of audio capitalism over this period?

First, it is certainly tempting to see the work of early recordists such as Gaisberg as being in some way akin to that of later ethnomusicologists, particularly since they would often refer to their recording tours as 'expeditions', suggesting analogies with geographical or ethnographic journeys into little known or little understood territories; Gaisberg (1977, 49) himself later recalled that, at the beginning of his first trip to the Far East, 'as we steamed down the channel into the unknown I felt like Marco Polo starting out on his journeys'. Unlike many comparative musicologists of the time who, in many cases, waited either for 'non-Western' musicians to visit them in whatever city they happened to be in, or simply themselves worked from recordings made by others, many early commercial recordings were made by recordists in context, and thus might have been thought to be obtained by individuals who had some interest in these contexts and the music systems they were seeking to capture. But this would be a misreading of the situation, and accounts left to us suggest, at best, a disinterest in or ambivalence towards local musicians and music making on the part of those undertaking the recordings. Gaisberg (1977, 63) wrote that on his first day in Shanghai in 1903, 'after making ten records we had to stop. The din had so paralyzed my wits that I could not think... To me, the differences between the tunes of any two records were too slight for me to detect'. On another occasion in Kazan, Russia, he wrote that a local agent produced some Tartar artists for him to record: 'The first he brought in was a petrified, yellow-skinned accordeon [*sic*] player with a musty smell to him. Very

likely he did his best but his music haunts me still... Next came two vile-smelling creatures with little squeezed up eyes, broad fat faces... Their singing would bring tears to your eyes' (quoted in Gronow 1981, 273). Similarly a representative of the GTL company in India wrote that 'the native music is to me worse than Turkish but as long as it suits them and sells well what do we care?' (quoted in Farrell 1993, 33). Unsurprisingly, the motivating factor for these nascent music industries was the potential profits that might be made from these recordings; the companies certainly did not see themselves as being involved in some altruistic act of cultural preservation.

Second, the companies' interests were largely in making records that they might sell within those geographical areas wherein they were somehow meaningful. As Gronow (1983, 60) notes, 'by the early 1910s, Icelandic, Estonian, Welsh and Breton record buyers, the ethnic minorities of the Russian Empire, the largest immigrant groups in the United States and the most important ethnic groups of the Indian subcontinent were all supplied by recordings of their own musical traditions'. Discs were not intended or expected to appeal in any quantity to buyers in the West, and although comparative musicologists availed themselves of some of these commercially produced discs to aid their research, they were engaging with them largely as *objets trouvés*: cultural artefacts intended to be employed in one domain that were then recycled in another. Selling the discs also gave the companies the opportunity to sell into the same markets the equipment that was necessary to play them, and the significant profits that accrued from selling this playback apparatus were an important element of the companies' financial planning.

Third, paradoxically, while comparative musicologists were in part preserving musical traditions on record because they felt that musical change was happening so swiftly that such traditions, or details within them, were being lost, they were perhaps less aware that both the recording technology itself and the companies exploiting it were providing at least some of the acculturative influences that were frequently driving such change. This was true both of the

contexts within which musical performance occurred and the musical sounds themselves. Fewkes noted that some years after his earliest recording sessions one of the Hopi tribes he had visited had irreverently incorporated his fieldwork recording procedures within a piece of ritual clowning in celebration of the Basket Dance (Brady 1999, 31). Gaisberg (1977, 58) notes that when he returned to India some thirty years after his initial visit, musicians were in some instances learning their repertoire from gramophone records. This suggests not only that autodidactic practices were supplementing or replacing more traditional forms of musical training, but also that the creation of a recorded musical canon, and its dissemination by the recording companies concerned, might be leading to the increased influence of particular repertoires or styles, a development that can of course be noted in many other contexts. And just as the limited recording time of early cylinders and discs necessitated substantial changes to the performance of Western musical artworks (Day 2000, 6-12), so too were musical performances elsewhere similarly circumscribed. Peter Manuel (1993, 39) observes that certain Indian music genres were often unrecorded because they could not easily be adapted to conform to the 2-3 minutes of recording time available on early discs, while Farrell (1993, 47-51) goes into more detail on the differences between live and recorded performances of the *khyāl* genre, noting particularly the different proportions of extemporised material in the two different contexts. Thus, while early comparative musicologists may well have been keen to preserve for their own purposes what Sterne would later describe as a 'frozen native present', they were also to a degree unwittingly complicit in the thawing of that present to which the widespread dissemination of recorded musical performance inevitably contributed.

From Comparative Musicology to Ethnomusicology

As interest in world music cultures grew, and scholarly involvement with them mutated from the more or less laboratory-inflected observations of early comparative musicology through to the participant-observer paradigms of post-World War II ethnomusicology, so scholars became increasingly aware of the possibilities afforded by the (now) mass media conduits of dissemination that the recording industry could offer.

Erich M. von Hornbostel was at the vanguard of this approach. In 1922 he brought together what was described as a 'demonstration collection' of traditional music recordings from the Berlin Phonogramm-Archiv, intending it to be made available for institutional subscribers on 120 cylinders. However, cylinder technology was by then very much in decline, and although many other scholars used this as the basis for comparative work, it did not circulate as widely as Hornbostel might have hoped. More successful was *Musik des Orients*, a series of twelve 78rpm records released on the Odeon and Parlophone labels in 1931, and marketed towards a European public. Other labels (HMV, Decca, Folkways) released the same recordings in subsequent years, and this became the pre-eminent collection of world musics available until the 1950s. From this point on, however, collections of this type became increasingly common, often curated by ethnomusicologists who had institutional positions to support them, or who were drawing on their own fieldwork recordings. The Musée de l'Homme in Paris began issuing recordings from 1946, initially for other museums and sound archives, before making discs commercially available from 1948. Folkways Records, founded in 1948, would go on to become one of the most significant record companies releasing traditional music, eventually issuing 2,168 albums from more than 130 countries; it was taken over by the Smithsonian Institution in 1987. Alan Lomax edited *The Columbia World Library of Folk and Primitive Music*, which started issuing recordings from 1955. Ocora-Radio France began issuing recordings from 1957; the *UNESCO Collection of Traditional Music of the World* started in 1961 and ran until 2005; and so forth.¹²

These collaborations between ethnomusicologists, sound archives and record companies inevitably began to blur the lines between essentially not-for-profit scholarship and the commercial activities of those corporations whose guiding principles were diametrically opposite. Scholars were undoubtedly gratified that the fruits of their research might reach a wider audience than the community of other scholars wherein their work normally circulated, and they could also disseminate the actual musical sounds, which provided more depth to their otherwise largely paper-based descriptions and analyses. They enhanced their positions as gatekeepers for the distribution of cultural information, making editorial decisions about what recordings might be deemed most representative or appropriate in relation to the work of a particular culture group (as Ben Mandelson points out in this volume in relation to the work of Hugh Tracey). Their involvement added intellectual legitimacy to this particular aspect of record companies' work. Any tensions inhering between the two groups appear—with the benefit of hindsight—to have been largely well managed, probably because, to a very significant degree, the numbers of discs being made were small and thus so were any profits. In fact, profits were often hard to come by. Subsidies of one kind or another were frequently needed to entice record companies to become involved, and print runs and sales numbers could be very small.¹³ Just as the publishing of academic books was and frequently remains a niche market, so too was the publication of ethnographic recordings, and each of these areas of scholarly endeavour benefited from and reinforced the other.

Where ethnomusicologists were less involved was in the larger and more lucrative market of recording local music for local consumption. Here the global corporations (the majors), frequently working through extensive regional operations, could decide what local artists to record and promote, and which particular manifestation of contemporary music making would have the greatest appeal to the local market. Such recordings of popular music operated in much the same way as decision making for Western pop music, in that the process both

identified and contributed to the creation of star names, in the expectation that widespread recognition of such names could be converted into commercial success and increased profits.

By the late 1960s and 1970s, however, the practices of the music industries had become of growing concern to ethnomusicologists. With the methodological conventions of ethnomusicology now firmly derived from participatory engagement as much as from detached observation, the schizophonic displacement offered by audio recordings was less central to scholarly endeavour, and the acculturative consequences of their widespread circulation was increasingly asserted as problematic. This anxiety was articulated explicitly by Alan Lomax (1968, 4), who cautioned against the developing ‘cultural grey-out’ that he felt was arising from ‘western mass-production and communication systems [which were] inadvertently destroying the languages, traditions, cuisines, and creative styles that once gave every people and every locality a distinctive character—indeed their principal reason for living’. What was seen as cultural imperialism on the part of the record companies, therefore, was increasingly at odds with a disciplinary emphasis on local engagement and a concern to understand musical meaning in its local context. Alan Merriam’s (1960, 109) definition of ethnomusicology as ‘the study of music in culture’, or Mantle Hood’s (1963, 217) observation that it was ‘the comprehension of music within the context of its society’, demonstrate the degree to which, at this point, the discipline was shaped by considerations of what was seen to be ‘local’ rather than ‘global’. Ethnomusicological approaches generally de-emphasised large-scale international perspectives in order to focus on local, named individuals who demonstrated close relationships with traditional music practice.¹⁴

Other definitions offered at the time indicate a perhaps subliminal but ongoing discomfort with the acculturative influences of recorded sound, and with the reification of musical practice that recordings inevitably represent. George List (1969, 195) observed that his preferred definition of the field was the study of ‘traditional music’ which had two specific characteristics,

that it was ‘transmitted and diffused by memory’ and that ‘it is music which is always in flux, in which a second performance of the same item differs from the first’, and Bruno Nettl (1975, 69) similarly asserted that ethnomusicology was ‘the study of all music from the point of view of its oral tradition’. By the late 1970s, therefore, within ethnomusicology’s heart of hearts an emphasis on the local, participatory experience of ‘people making music’ (Tilton 1992, xxi) was beating strongly, and secreted in the discipline’s collective memory was a hidden nostalgia for those traditional music practices of yore on which the discipline’s ancestors had cut their teeth.

Yet this focus on local music making was increasingly in contrast with the internationalist agendas of the record companies themselves. Territorialism—dividing the world into different markets exploited by subsections of any given corporation—appeared particularly anathema to ethnomusicologists. The fledgling music industries of the 1900s had been conscious of the need to establish themselves in nascent international markets as early as possible. The GTL agent John Watson Hawd noted as early as 1902 that in India there would be ‘big business [to be] done here when we have goods enough’, and that it was ‘best to own the territory then we know it is well worked’; he went on to assert both the importance and the difficulty of establishing a dealership network in the country (quoted in Farrell 1993, 33). Shortly afterwards GTL in London agreed with the Victor Company in New Jersey to divide the world between them, with the latter concentrating on the Americas and the Far East, and the former focussing on the rest of the world (Gronow 1983, 55). By the late 1970s this kind of territorialisation was intrinsic to the way in which record companies were organised, with an internationalist agenda often dictated by the company’s Head Office.¹⁵ This is not to suggest that regional offices were not able to promote local artists and popular genres for local markets, since they were, and did. But, rightly or wrongly, ethnomusicologists such as Lomax often viewed the major record companies as monolithic mega-corporations that disregarded the nuances of cultural difference by

disseminating largely Anglo-American music and musical values, inscribed particularly through the use of English as a lingua franca of popular music.

‘World Music’, Ethnomusicology and the Music Industries

By the mid 1980s the relationship between ethnomusicology and the record companies had become decidedly more complex. On the one hand, the diminishing costs of musical reproduction meant that scholars began to include recordings as part of their scholarly publications, leading, arguably, to a more integrated relationship between ethnographic print materials and ethnographic recordings. Elizabeth May’s collection *Musics of Many Cultures* (1980) may well have been the earliest example of this, since it included three thin vinyl discs of recordings that illustrated the music cultures considered in the text. Whereas ethnomusicologists had previously sometimes used the distribution networks of the recording companies to disseminate field recordings, now they also used other publishing networks to circulate such recordings, in order to supplement their ‘conventional’ outputs. On the other hand, increasing musical ‘transculturation’ (Malm 1992, 363)—the displacement and industrialisation of musical sound—was problematising conventional ethnomusicological methodology. In some cases this provoked quite strong reactions from ethnomusicologists. Charles Keil provides perhaps an extreme example of this trend:

I have nurtured a deep ambivalence, at times masking outright hostility, toward all media for many years. I treat records badly; they aren’t real music. I resent the accumulation of tapes I haven’t listened to since the day I recorded them. I dislike rock concerts, and ‘sound systems’ annoy me at any concert or performance. I’ve resisted the use of amplifiers in my own music making until the past decade or so. Once upon a time, I

trashed the family TV unilaterally, dropping it two stories off the back porch. Until a few years ago my position on all electronic media was basically Luddite, a desire to smash it all on the grounds that it substituted machines for people, replaced live music with canned, further alienated us from our already repressed sensoria, and enabled capitalists to sell us back our musical and emotional satisfactions at a profit. (Keil and Feld 1994, 248)

To suggest that such polemicism characterised ethnomusicology and its practitioners would be reductive and inaccurate; many ethnomusicologists embraced technological innovation and its acculturative consequences, not least because some of these processes, and the contexts in which they occurred, themselves provided material for further study.¹⁶ Nevertheless, Keil's polemics reinforce Simon Frith's (1986, 265-6) observation that the combination of technology with musical practice is too often seen as falsifying, alienating or unnatural.

Interest from 'first world' countries in traditional music around the globe was also increasing exponentially in the late 1980s, leading to more extensive and high-profile engagements between the music industries and the world's traditional music makers. These engagements and interests—some of which were highly profitable for the record companies concerned—were manifested in a variety of ways, and although they have been explored in detail elsewhere, some brief examples are offered here to demonstrate both the range and complexity of the interactions between the music industries and traditional music making, and the intersections with ethnomusicologists they have sometimes provoked:

- *The use of musicians working in traditional genres contributing to the work of Western pop or rock stars.* Paul Simon's *Graceland* album, recorded in 1986, brought together a

number of South African township musicians, the a cappella chorus Ladysmith Black Mambazo, and assorted other contributors from the African continent, and melded these with Simon's pop-oriented songs and production values into a highly successful and profitable global enterprise. The disc provoked a significant amount of scholarly discourse in relation to issues of ownership, patronage, the implicit hegemony of Simon and the record company, and the pros and cons of the opportunities the disc afforded for those African musicians playing on it to gain a substantially increased international profile.¹⁷

- *Appropriating ethnomusicological field recordings for inclusion into widely disseminated popular music discs.* Hugo Zemp's recordings of traditional music of Fataleka and Baegu Music from the Solomon Islands released by UNESCO in 1973 were sampled by French musicians Michel Sanchez and Eric Mouquet, and used in part to create the disc *Deep Forest* in 1992. The disc was a worldwide success, selling more than 2 million copies by May 1995 and being profitably employed in a variety of adverts (Zemp 1996, 46). But its success raised profound questions about the commercial uses to which not-for-profit recordings might be put, and the means and mechanisms by which royalties accrued could or should be returned to the ethnomusicologist who made the recordings, the institution that may have paid for or contributed to the research, and most significantly, the musicians whose musical output was being used and thus profited from.¹⁸
- *Combining musicians from disparate parts of the world to create synthetic fusions between musical styles.* Peter Gabriel's creation of Real World records in 1989—following on from his annual World of Art, Music and Dance (WOMAD) festival—explicitly sought to bring together musicians from different parts of the world in order for them to

make records together. Gabriel, an internationally renowned rock star, was candid in his aspirations for the label, observing that ‘there are two jobs to be done... One is to protect and preserve the seed stock of as wide and varied a base as you can keep alive. The other is to try out as many hybrid possibilities as you can that will give you the most vibrant, pulsating new life forms’ (quoted in Taylor 1997, 51). While few ethnomusicologists might quibble with the former, it is the hybridity of much of Real World’s output that has proved most controversial, because of the way in which traditional musics and musicians were seen to have been rent from their natural locations in order to create synthetic musical concoctions for significant financial gain. To give one example, the group Afro Celt Sound System, which originally came together in 1995, comprises, according to the Real World website, ‘sean nós singer Iarla O’Lionaird and Uilleann pipers Davy Spillane and Ronan Browne; Pogue member James McNally on whistle, bodhran and accordion; Kenyan nyatiti player Ayub Ogada; Kauwding Cissokho and Masamba Diop, two members of Baaba Maal’s band; and an all-star ensemble of African and Celtic musicians.’¹⁹ What was perceived as a form of forced acculturation sat uncomfortably in ethnomusicology’s disciplinary mindset.

- *The creation of ‘World Music’ as an overarching descriptive category.* The various meetings of representatives from eleven independent record companies at a London pub in June and July 1987 marked the creation of ‘World Music’ as a marketing category for the music industries. The need for such a label was justified in an accompanying press release on the grounds that it would ‘make it easier to find that Malian Kora record, the music of Bulgaria, Zairean soukous or Indian Ghazals—the new WORLD MUSIC section will be the first place to look in the local record shop’. The launch was accompanied by the release of an anthology cassette titled *The World at One* in a British rock-oriented

newspaper *New Musical Express*.²⁰ Notwithstanding that the companies involved saw themselves to some degree as musical adventurers retrieving recorded gems to share with discerning like-minded buyers (Fairley 2001, 278), thus echoing the earlier expeditionary mindsets of Gaisberg and others noted above, ethnomusicologists have sometimes read this event as an indicator both of supposed Western difference—that is, the protection of Euro-American art or pop genres while simultaneously consigning the rest of the world’s music into a ‘shop display ghetto’ (Frith 2000, 306)—and of Western indifference, that is, a disinclination to acknowledge the diversity evident in the wide variety of musics subsumed under this one generic label.

These various interactions moved ethnomusicology into new territory in its dealings with the music industries. They brought to the fore questions of ownership, ethics, copyright, exploitation and issues relating to the local and the global in ways that scholars had not previously considered. The discipline ‘grew up’ very quickly, and as Steven Feld (2000, 166) would later observe, ‘the despair of seeing documentary projects transform from icons of musical diversity to “raw material” for industrialized neocolonialism surely marks the end of all ethnomusicological innocence’. Ethnomusicologists now needed to be as familiar with copyright law and sampling technologies as they were with ritual theory and kinship systems. As Anthony Seeger (1992, 346) put it, ‘no major figure in the field of ethnomusicology ever defined the object of our study in terms of rights and obligations, conflict, or adjudication. The issues simply were not raised by our “ancestors” and have rarely been part of our theoretical reflections since’.

Ethnomusicologists sometimes found themselves acting as advocates for and occasionally protectors of music cultures with which they identified, particularly when they had themselves made recordings which had been used by the music industries in ways not foreseen at the time of the recording. This form of applied ethnomusicology often necessitated taking a more

involved and engaged position in relation to particular music cultures whose work, it was felt, was being exploited without due recognition for those who created it. Zemp (1996, 50), for example, notes that he felt obliged 'to defend the rights of the people who created the music'. In some instances ethnomusicologists came to act as moral guardians of traditional culture, pricking the consciences of those who sought to exploit it without due consideration for the rights of the culture bearers themselves. Inevitably this recalls earlier attitudes towards the preservation of traditional musics, albeit that such attitudes were now informed by perceptions that cultural loss was being driven by the very apparatus that, nearly a century previously, had been seen as a prophylactic against such loss.

But ethnomusicologists were asking awkward questions of themselves as well as of others. What was—and is—the role of the scholar in such circumstances? If one aspect of their discomfort related to previous notions of preservation, of seeking to limit cultural loss, then another resonated with earlier positions on scholarly distance. How involved should they be in the relationships between musicians and record companies, and what stance might they take, particularly when large sums of money were involved? Zemp again captures the dilemma nicely, questioning whether ethnomusicologists were

entitled to debar the performers or their representatives from financial gain, on ethical grounds ('our aim is not to enter into the business of pop music industry and publicity')?... If it is true that... none of us has ever been charged by the performers to be their music agent... and to negotiate huge amounts of money on behalf of them, I could also add that none of us has been charged to deprive them and their community of money that eventually comes in thanks to our research. (Zemp 1996, 53)

A cynic might be tempted to observe that the ethical dilemmas ethnomusicologists have encountered in their dealings with musicians around the world have expanded in proportion to the size of the cheques the record companies have been willing to write in order to harness the activities of such musicians, particularly since the companies involved are seldom transparent about licensing, copyrights and contracts—‘the money flow’, as Frith puts it (2000, 309). But although the financial consequences of this activity were and remain significant for all concerned, in fact the issues went further than this and obliged ethnomusicologists to reconsider how they viewed the scope and aspirations of the discipline, and the methodologies and intellectual paradigms that had long shaped it.

The Music Industries and Contemporary Ethnomusicological Discourse

Over the last two decades ethnomusicological discourse in relation to the music industries has become ever more sophisticated, in response to the more fragmented and complex global musical landscape that the discipline must now confront. The diversity of musical styles increasingly mediated and disseminated around the globe, and the range of interactions between many of these different styles, has meant that, as Erlmann (1993, 4) observes, ‘the heuristic value of older conceptual models such as Westernization, syncretism, acculturation, or urbanization has dwindled considerably’. In part perhaps because of overlaps with popular music scholars who took different views on the role of the music industries in the dissemination of popular music, and also because of a growing realisation that hegemonic theories of cultural imperialism were being undermined by the evidence of how musicians were thinking and behaving *in situ*, ethnomusicologists have become increasingly interested in, for example, how local and regional practices have intersected with transnational corporate priorities, how

musicians have appropriated both Westernised musical forms and recording technology and put them to the service of their own creative needs, and how they have gone on to develop their own music industries which may or may not intersect with those run from head offices in New York or Tokyo. Inevitably, the language of ethnomusicological discourse has changed, and even terms as fundamental as 'local' and 'global' have been problematised, and shown to be more complex and less easily contrasted than had previously been the case (Guilbault 1993).

Perhaps the roots of this can be traced back to Simon Frith's (1989) edited volume *World Music, Politics and Social Change*, which brought together writers on a variety of popular musics around the world to consider points such as these. In the 1980s popular music studies was itself still a relatively new academic area, and scholars working in it often came from sociology or media studies backgrounds, and thus took different approaches from those ethnomusicologists whose professional roots lay more in music or anthropology. Charles Hamm (1989, 213) observed in his afterword to Frith's volume that much popular music research of the time was 'in general closer to the social sciences than to the humanities, more European than American, more theoretical than empirical, more synchronic than historical, more political than descriptive', and while some of these generalisations would also have been true of ethnomusicology, many of them were not. Inevitably, therefore, there were occasional disagreements between scholars covering the same fields. Bernard J. Broere's (1989, 104) claim that at that time there was 'still no systematic study of popular music by ethnomusicologists' rather depends on what one defines as popular music. But it is reasonable to observe that in the early 1990s academic discourse on the relationship between world music and the music industries was being generated not only by scholars who might feel comfortable describing themselves as ethnomusicologists, but also by many who would not.²¹

Whether one chooses to take Frith's volume as a starting point or not, there is now a substantial body of work on the music industries and their interactions with 'people making

music' in a range of contexts around the globe. Some of this work, such as Peter Manuel's *Popular Musics of the Non-Western World* (1988) or Timothy Taylor's *Global Pop* (1997), has endeavoured to take a broader view across many countries. Certain individual studies have already been mentioned, and particular note might also be made of the 1993 collection of articles in *The World of Music* (Vol. 35/2), published under the title of 'The Politics and Aesthetics of "World Music"', which draws together a range of theoretical reflections and empirically grounded papers to provide an overview of ethnomusicological thinking in the early 1990s. The scope of ethnomusicological enquiry is increasingly broad, as the legalities and ethics of appropriation, representation and compensation become ever more complex, perhaps particularly since sampling technology has become central to many different forms of music making; David Hesmondhalgh's (2006) paper on Moby's use of samples taken from field recordings by Alan Lomax provides just one example of ongoing scholarly work in this area. But it is perhaps indicative of the rapid growth of interest in this subject that a comprehensive bibliography of relevant material is now well beyond the reach of a relatively short introduction such as this. It is also indicative of both the currency of the term 'World Music' (notwithstanding its slippery nature) and the importance attached to it, that the mediated popular musical genres to which it often refers are now seen as significant central concerns for musical scholarship, and are thus included in series of introductory texts for students; Richard O. Nidel's (2004) *World Music: the Basics* is just one example of this trend.

Furthermore, as the first decade of the twenty-first century draws to a close, it is clear that the internet is revolutionising the global production and consumption of all musics. Sites such as YouTube, Facebook and MySpace—the new majors, as Ben Mandelson describes them in this volume—now act often as the principal conduits through which musicians interact with each other and their audiences. As a space in which musicians, listeners, and businesses large and small engage in the creation of virtual networks that facilitate reciprocal acts of identity

construction, alongside their more obvious activities in producing and consuming music, the internet has allowed individuals and small companies to circumvent the control over mediated music traditionally exerted by the larger record companies; it has also obliged the latter to rethink their business models, and to devise different ways of developing and profiting from their catalogues. If early figures such as Gaisberg saw themselves as pioneers opening up newly discovered territories, now any individual with access to the internet can chart their own expeditionary route through cyberspace, encountering different forms of musical 'exotica' along the way. The internet also allows swifter and more direct contact (via email, blogs, wikis, etc.) between musicians and those keen to learn more about them and their music. The traditional middlemen are becoming increasingly marginalised, as musicians in many instances gain more control over their work and how it is disseminated. And just as this ability to speak/sell directly to the consumer has to some degree changed the role of the major record companies, so too has it impacted upon the role of those critics, commentators and other observers, such as ethnomusicologists, whose heuristic activities have long constituted part of the international framework within which musical commodities around the globe have traditionally circulated.

Ethnomusicology as a Music Industry

The wide range of scholarly discourse related to the work of the music industries represents only one small part of ethnomusicological endeavour, and the discipline as a whole has expanded significantly over the last 25 years. More books, journal articles, audio recordings and videos are being circulated than ever before. Increasing numbers of academic institutions now have at least one scholar who could reasonably be described as an ethnomusicologist, and many have several. More undergraduates are choosing world music courses and then pursuing these interests at graduate level, or so it seems. Inevitably then, we must also ask whether

ethnomusicology can itself be considered a music industry, and to what extent its disciplinary behaviour follows that of other music industries.²²

While the circumstances are different, there would appear to be parallels. If, to use Bourdieu's terminology, the accrual of knowledge in the academic field leads to the accumulation of symbolic capital, as demonstrated through positions of influence and prestige,²³ then the appropriation and recycling of the musical knowledge of others by ethnomusicologists and institutions around the globe bears some similarity to the recycling of musical knowledge by other music industries for the purposes of generating economic capital. Perhaps, on the face of it, there would appear to be no obvious monetary profit, since few of the activities of scholars and institutions yield a significant cash surplus, and many require some kind of subsidy. But the ethnomusicological conversion of this knowledge into both economic capital and other forms of symbolic power can be seen in other, more subtle, ways: for example, in the career-building activities of individuals who benefit economically within institutional networks from their ability to enhance their salaries on the basis of increasing publication records, and their acknowledged position as experts on the culture group in question. We may acknowledge the input of our musical co-workers in the books and articles we produce and the liner notes we write, but they do not usually benefit from them as we do (nor indeed from the royalties we receive for such publications, however small they may be).

Institutions also benefit from this conversion of symbolic capital into economic capital through the capacity they have to advertise to prospective applicants the opportunity to play the gamelan, or learn overtone singing, or participate in a West African drum ensemble, thus using the skills and knowledge of individuals within that institution to attract students and their fees—fees which are used in part to sustain the activities of these ensembles and the institutions in which they are housed, and to pay the salary increases of those experts who feel deserving of them. And this is not to mention those other occasional ways in which ethnomusicologists get to

trade on the symbolic capital they accrue: in contributions to television, radio or other media, for which they may sometimes receive a fee; or in the consultancy work they occasionally undertake for other institutions or companies. Even the scholarly networks with which we surround ourselves—The Society for Ethnomusicology, The British Forum for Ethnomusicology, etc.—are important parts of the framework within which we trade upon our symbolic capital, not unlike those often unseen but important distribution networks through which commodified musical knowledge is made available to the public by other music industries.

Ethnomusicologists have also long indulged in a type of territorialisation, with certain scholars becoming renowned for their expertise in relation to particular music cultures; consider whose ethnomusicological work comes to mind when one thinks of the Kaluli people of Papua New Guinea, the Suyá of Brazil, or the Venda of South Africa. Furthermore, such territorialisation is underpinned by the specialist sections of our various scholarly networks, with study groups on Latin American or Middle Eastern or Irish musics. Are younger scholars coming into the field sometimes influenced in their choice of subject by significant work already undertaken in that area? If Professor Eminence has already built a reputation for him or herself in relation to a given music culture, does he or she not then exert sometimes considerable power in relation to the work of other scholars dealing with that same music culture, through reviews of books, articles or funding applications?²⁴

None of this is in any way intended to denigrate the work of any scholar alluded to above, it is simply to observe that it is difficult to avoid concluding that ethnomusicology is itself a global music industry, one that is similarly enmeshed in transnational cultural flows that are somehow capitalised upon by both individuals and organisations of one kind or another, in ways that, notwithstanding our best efforts, do not always lead to the full recompense of those individuals and groups whose musical knowledge we have traded in. The discipline is not as heavily reliant on sound reproduction technology as many other music industries, but it is certainly reliant on a

range of other technology to sustain it. And this is perhaps increasingly the case as scholarship itself becomes ever more commoditised, with digital downloading of books and articles via publishers or gateways such as JSTOR leading to wider dissemination and increased profits (if not always for the authors themselves).

But there are, of course, important differences, the major one being that of scale. The total sum of monies deployed within the academic ethnomusicological field pales by comparison with the multi-billion pound earnings of the world's record companies, even if only a proportion of the latter is related to commercial transactions involving those musics in which ethnomusicologists have historically been most interested. Scholars have become increasingly aware of the ethical considerations that accrue to the research they undertake, and the manner in which they present it, whereas many record companies, especially the multinationals, have seldom acknowledged any obligation to cultures based on oral tradition; and the rights of musicians in oral cultures are still only tenuously inscribed in international law, if at all. Few such musicians have had the opportunity, or perhaps the financial wherewithal, to demand recompense from a major record company for the commercial exploitation of their cultural heritage. And whereas ethnomusicologists are frequently dealing with known, named individuals, and are increasingly scrupulous about noting the details of their contributions, the appropriation of popular and traditional musics by others has too often been on the basis of the presumption that the lack of a named composer/creator means the music is in the public domain, and therefore owned by everybody (or nobody).

Nevertheless, by no means are all of the intersections between global music makers and the music industries derived from the top-down, hegemonic strategies developed in boardrooms around the world; the overall picture is far more complex than that simple model indicates, as I hope both the foregoing and the following pages demonstrate. Ethnomusicology is increasingly confronted by music making and sharing on a scale that existing disciplinary paradigms struggle

to accommodate, and the agents of much of that change, or so it often seems, are continuing developments in audio technology and the work of those individuals and companies—large and small—who seek to utilise them. The discipline is finding a new voice for itself in the twenty-first century, as it becomes more active and applied on a variety of fronts, one of which is to continue to adopt a critical stance—when necessary—towards record companies *vis-à-vis* their treatment of traditional musics. Would we wish to see the creation of a parallel organisation that is in some way akin to a musical version of the Fairtrade Foundation, labelling CDs and websites with an appropriate logo to indicate that those who contributed to them have been both adequately credited and recompensed for their work, so that the buyer who acquires them may do so in good conscience? And if so, should we be prepared to submit our own practices of cultural engagement, appropriation, and textual production to the same scrutiny?

¹ I make a typographic distinction here between ‘world music’ as a convenient shorthand to describe a wide variety of (often traditional) music cultures around the globe, and ‘World Music’ to refer to those frequently synthetic and commodified musical styles subsumed under that description by various music industries since the late 1980s.

² It might reasonably be observed that the work of the record companies is usually subsumed under the singular ‘music industry’ rather than ‘industries’. However, there are references both in this paper and others in this volume to new forms of mediation—particularly via the internet—which challenge the implicit homogeneity of a singular ‘industry’, and so I have chosen to retain the pluralised form throughout.

³ I have used the terms ‘comparative musicology’ and ‘ethnomusicology’ interchangeably here, according to the period under consideration at any given point. I trust that most readers of this of this publication will be familiar with the differences between them without need for further explanation.

⁴ Edison himself claimed as early as 1878, somewhat optimistically given the technical constraints of the machine at the time, that 'a song sung on the phonograph is reproduced with marvellous accuracy and power'. But he also alluded to the separation of performer and audience it facilitated by further observing that 'a friend may in a morning-call sing us a song which shall delight an evening company'. See Edison 1878, 533.

⁵ Notwithstanding the importance of the phonograph in separating musical experience from musical performance, it might be noted that the player piano had already similarly facilitated a split between any given performance and its later re-creation. Early models, however, were entirely mechanical, and did not, therefore, rely on that 'electroacoustical transmission' by which they might be seen as schizophonic in Schafer's terms. For more on the role of the player piano in musical commodification see Taylor 2007.

⁶ In fact Berliner had patented a gramophone in 1887, but the vertical system he employed was not so very different from Edison's system.

⁷ See Brady 1999, 55-7. Brady also notes that Frank Hamilton Cushing (1857-1900) may have preceded Fewkes in his use of the phonograph for ethnographic purposes.

⁸ For more on the recording activities of early pioneers such as Fletcher and Densmore, see Brady 1999, 89-118. Some of the Torres Strait cylinder recordings can be streamed from the British Library Sound Archive collection of wax cylinders:

<http://sounds.bl.uk/Browse.aspx?collection=Ethnographic-wax-cylinders> (last accessed 18 March 2010)

⁹ Mooney's report, *The Ghost Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890*, appeared in the Smithsonian's fourteenth *Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology* in 1892-93, part 2, pp. 641-1104.

¹⁰ Mooney's recordings can be streamed from the Library of Congress website (<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/berlhtml/berlreco.html> [last accessed 18 March 2010]) where

many of the relevant transcriptions are also given. The provenance of the recordings is unclear, and we cannot be completely sure that the voice is Mooney himself, although it appears highly likely. Given that the singer was almost certainly working from the transcriptions it could conceivably have been somebody else. Whatever the truth of the matter, judging by the performances, the singer does not appear to have been Native American.

¹¹ However, both Berliner's 1894 and 1895 lists of available recordings assert somewhat optimistically that 'between 25 and 50 New Pieces will be added every month'. See URL given in previous note.

¹² Robert Reigle (2008, 191-4) has brought together a useful timeline of commercial ethnomusicological recordings, from which some of these details are taken.

¹³ Hugo Zemp notes that some of the recordings issued by Musée de l'Homme would barely sell 1,500 copies over their life span, while others would achieve sales of less than 50 per annum (Zemp 1996, 42, 54n9).

¹⁴ Lomax's own *Cantometrics* project was of course one exception to this general principle.

¹⁵ For a more detailed explanation of the importance of international repertoire and territorial marketing in the music industries, see Negus 1999, 152-72.

¹⁶ See the various contributors to Greene and Porcello 2005 for many examples of this trend.

¹⁷ This particular album has been much discussed in the ethnomusicological literature. See for example Erlmann 1989; Feld 1994; Hamm 1988; Meintjes 1990.

¹⁸ For more extensive discussions on *Deep Forest* see Zemp 1996; Feld 1996; 2000.

¹⁹ www.realworldrecords.com/catalogue/volume-1-sound-magic (last accessed 5 November 2009).

²⁰ See also Anderson 2000; Fairley 2001, 276-79; Frith 2000 (from which the press quote is taken), and 'An Interview with Ben Mandelson' in this volume.

²¹ One simple indicator of this is to observe that much of the academic discourse at this time was being published in journals such as *Socialist Review* or *Media, Culture and Society*, rather than those journals more normally associated with ethnomusicological work.

²² Keith Negus asked this question at the original conference from which this volume is drawn. I'm grateful for his permission to develop the idea here, without wishing to tar him with any responsibility for the consequences.

²³ As Bourdieu (1986, 245) himself puts it, 'any given cultural competence... derives a scarcity value from its position in the distribution of cultural capital and yields profits of distinction for its owner'.

²⁴ Bourdieu (1988, 84-90) refers to this exercise of power on the part of senior scholars as the 'reproduction of the corps'.

References

Anderson, Ian. 2000. World wars. *Folk Roots* 201: 36-9.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The forms of capital. In *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, edited by John G. Richardson, 241-58. New York: Greenwood.

_____. 1988. *Homo academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brady, Erika. 1999. *A spiral way: How the phonograph changed ethnography*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Broere, Bernard J. 1989. El chambú: A study of popular musics in Nariño, south Columbia. In *World music, politics and social change*, edited by Simon Frith, 103-21. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Day, Timothy. 2000. *A century of recorded music: Listening to musical history*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

-
- Edison, Thomas A. 1878. The phonograph and its future. *The North American Review* 126 (262): 527-37.
- Erlmann, Veit. 1989. A conversation with Joseph Shabalala of Ladysmith Black Mambazo: Aspects of African performers' lifestories. *World of Music* 31 (1): 31-58.
- _____. 1993. The politics and aesthetics of transnational musics. *World of Music* 35 (2): 16-32.
- Fairley, Jan. 2001. The 'local' and 'global' in popular music. In *The Cambridge companion to pop and rock*, edited by Simon Frith, Will Straw and John Street, 272-89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, Gerry. 1993. The early days of the gramophone industry in India: Historical, social and musical perspectives. *British Journal of Ethnomusicology* 2: 31-53.
- Feld, Steven. 1994. Notes on 'world beat'. In *Music grooves: Essays and dialogues*, by Charles Keil and Steven Feld, 238-46. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1996. Pygmy pop: a genealogy of schizophonic mimesis. *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 28: 1-35.
- _____. 2000. A sweet lullaby for world music. *Public Culture* 12 (1): 145-171.
- Fewkes, Jesse Walter. 1890. Additional studies of Zuni songs and rituals with the phonograph. *American Naturalist* 24: 1094-98.
- Frith, Simon. 1986. Art versus technology: The strange case of popular music. *Media, Culture and Society* 8 (3): 263-79.
- _____, ed. 1989. *World music, politics and social change*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- _____. 2000. The discourse of world music. In *Western music and its others: Difference, representation, and appropriation in music*, edited by Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh, 305-22. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gaisberg, Frederick. 1977. *The music goes round*. New York: Arno Press.

-
- Greene, Paul D. and Thomas Porcello, eds. 2005. *Wired for sound: Engineering and technologies in sonic cultures*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Gronow, Pekka. 1981. The record industry comes to the Orient. *Ethnomusicology* 25 (2): 251-84.
- _____. 1983. The record industry: The growth of a mass medium. *Popular Music and Society* 3: 53-75.
- Guilbault, Jocelyne. 1993. On redefining the 'local' through world music. *World of Music* 35 (2): 33-47.
- Hamm, Charles. 1988. Graceland revisited. *Popular Music* 8 (3): 299-304.
- _____. 1989. Afterword. In *World music, politics and social change*, edited by Simon Frith, 210-16. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hesmondhalgh, David. 2006. Digital sampling and cultural inequality. *Social and Legal Studies* 15 (1): 53-75.
- Hood, Mantle. 1963. Music, the unknown. In *Musicology*, by Frank LI Harrison, Mantle Hood and Claude V. Palisca, 215-326. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Keil, Charles and Steven Feld. 1994. *Music grooves: Essays and dialogues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- List, George. 1969. Discussion of K. P. Wachsmann's paper. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 6: 192-99.
- Lomax, Alan. 1968. *Folk song style and culture*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- Malm, Krister. 1992. The music industry. In *Ethnomusicology: An introduction*, edited by Helen Myers, 349-64. London: Macmillan.
- Manuel, Peter. 1988. *Popular musics of the non-western world: An introductory survey*. New York: Oxford University Press.

-
- _____. 1993. *Cassette culture: Popular music and technology in north India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- May, Elizabeth, ed. 1980. *Musics of many cultures: An introduction*. Berkeley and London: University of California Press.
- Meintjes, Louise. 1990. Paul Simon's *Graceland*, South Africa, and the mediation of musical meaning. *Ethnomusicology* 34 (1): 37-73.
- Merriam, Alan P. 1960. Ethnomusicology: Discussion and definition of the field. *Ethnomusicology* 4: 107-14.
- Negus, Keith. 1999. *Music genres and corporate cultures*. London: Routledge.
- Nettl, Bruno. 1975. The state of research in ethnomusicology, and recent developments. *Current Musicology* 20: 67-78.
- Nidel, Richard O. 2004. *World music: The basics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pisani, Michael. 2005. *Imagining native America in music*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Reigle, Robert. 2008. Humanistic motivations in ethnomusicological recordings. In *Recorded music: Philosophical and critical reflections*, edited by Mine Dogantan-Dack, 189-212. London: Middlesex University Press.
- Schafer, R. Murray. 1977. *The tuning of the world*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Seeger, Anthony. 1986. The role of sound archives in ethnomusicology today. *Ethnomusicology* 30 (2): 261-276.
- _____. 1992. Ethnomusicology and music law. *Ethnomusicology* 36 (3): 345-9.
- _____. 1996. Ethnomusicologists, archives, professional organisations, and the shifting ethics of intellectual property. *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 28: 87-105.
- Seeger, Charles. 1957. Toward a universal music sound-writing for musicology. *Journal of the International Folk Music Council* 9: 63-6.

-
- Shelemay, Kay Kaufman. 1991. Recording technology, the record industry, and ethnomusicological scholarship. In *Comparative musicology and the anthropology of music*, edited by Bruno Nettl and Philip V. Bohlman, 277-92. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sterne, Jonathan. 2003. *The audible past : Cultural origins of sound reproduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Taylor, Timothy. 1997. *Global pop: World music, world markets*. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2007. The commodification of music at the dawn of the era of 'mechanical music'. *Ethnomusicology* 51 (2): 281-305.
- Titon, Jeff Todd. 1992. Preface. In *Worlds of music: An introduction to the music of the world's peoples*, edited by Jeff Todd Titon, xxi-xxiv. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Zemp, Hugo. 1996. The/an ethnomusicologist and the record business. *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 28: 36-56.