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1. Introduction.

Ethnomusicology entered a distinctively, even radically, new phase of its history in the wake of World War II. Ethnomusicologists took pains to declare the disciplinary independence of their field, even when this meant placing distance between ethnomusicology and the several disciplines with which it had shared issues, methodologies and institutional structures, especially musicology, anthropology and folklore. Whereas ethnomusicological approaches remained more eclectic than unified during the second half of the 20th century, the discipline itself moved decisively in the direction of unity. It first challenged the role of comparison and the primacy of the musical object implicit in *Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft* (‘comparative musicology’, see §II, 2 (i) above) during the first half of the century, and then accorded greater significance to cultural materials gathered during ethnographic fieldwork and to the more quantitative and ‘scientific’ methods of the social and systematic sciences (Nettl, 1964; Schuursma, 1992).

Symbolizing the dramatic disciplinary realignment and the distinctive achievements of the discipline during the second half of the 20th century has been the name ‘ethnomusicology’ itself, adopted in the early 1950s because of its inclusiveness but increasingly called into question in the 1990s because of its exclusiveness (Kunst, 1950; Bohlman, 1992). The identity of ethnomusicology in the practices and products of its scholars and in its academic and pedagogical structures became increasingly canonized in the decades after World War II, while in the decades approaching the end of the 20th century disciplinary boundaries began to blur in new ways, especially in the 1990s, precisely at a historical moment in which ethnomusicology was enjoying its most influential presence among the humanities and social sciences (see Rice, 1987).

World War II and its aftermath unleashed entirely new processes of globalization that increased the availability of music on hitherto unimaginable levels. New forms of cultural
and economic contact replaced previous European colonial forms. Collecting projects were no longer carried out primarily as an extension of colonial intervention, with the concomitant aim of locating non-Western music in the comparative framework of Western, largely European, history. Armed with new recording technologies, ethnomusicologists of the post-World War II era were able to embark upon fieldwork untrammeled by the necessity of assessing a music culture’s historical stage of development. Synchronic observation quickly supplanted diachronic observation in importance, and at the same time linguistic and national musical boundaries were dismantled to make way for shifting and contested cultural landscapes.

Just as the places in which ethnomusicological field research took place shifted dramatically after World War II, so too did the global geography of its institutional practices. The historical centre of Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft prior to World War II, as its name suggests, was Central Europe, with many approaches to ethnomusicology outside Central Europe also influenced extensively by German and Austrian scholars (Bose, 1953). Post-World War II ethnomusicology shifted its centre to North America, receiving its initial impulse from immigrant students and scholars during and after the war, many of them with Central European intellectual roots, for example, Walter Kaufmann, Bruno Nettl and Klaus Wachsmann.

No less crucial for the growing influence of North American ethnomusicology was the conscious embrace of the disciplinary affinity with social and cultural anthropology (Merriam, 1964; Reinhard, 1968). Already in the late 19th century, North American scholars had drawn heavily upon anthropological methods, especially in their field studies of Native American music. In the 1950s, however, North American ethnomusicologists took their engagement with anthropology several steps further, insisting on the primacy of ethnography and fieldwork (A. Seeger, 1991; McAllester, 1954), and establishing the institutional basis of the Society for Ethnomusicology in the American Anthropological Association. Even in the 1990s, debates about the extent of anthropology’s influence on ethnomusicology continued to form on two sides of a global divide, with American ethnomusicology’s engagement with anthropology on one side and European and Asian trepidation about ethnographic approaches to the study of music on the other (Bohlman, 1992).
The radical new phase of ethnomusicology’s history that was well underway already within a decade after World War II resulted from the convergence of four paradigm shifts, each having its own revolutionary impact on the field (see Kuhn, 1970). Firstly, World War II itself brought about a sweeping reformulation of the nation-state on a global level, which in turn led to completely different instantiations of music and nationalism. The geographical, cultural, and musical boundaries of European and Asian empires were greatly reduced, in some cases necessitating the reformulation of ethnomusicological methods (for example, the concept of folksong as a representation of ‘speech islands’ in German musical folklore). The independence of former European colonies in the late 1940s, many of them crucial to pre-World War II canons of ethnomusicology (particularly India and Indonesia, which gained independence from the UK in 1947 and from the Netherlands by 1949 respectively) led to the reconfiguration of colonial structures as indigenous ontologies for research. The nation-state as a site for intensive and extensive musical research was a global phenomenon by the early 1950s, and the institutional and political practices of ethnomusicology were transformed to respond to this phenomenon.

Secondly, debates about the appropriate subjects and approaches of ethnomusicological research proliferated. By coining the name ‘ethno-musicology’ (later just ‘ethnomusicology’; see Kunst, 1950), Jaap Kunst made it possible to name and describe the paradigmatic shift away from musical comparison and toward social scientific methods (see Sturtevant, 1964). The prefix ‘ethno’ effectively replaced the adjective ‘comparative’, but more crucially it marked a shift from methods that relied on universals to forms of representation that emphasized local and individual distinctiveness (Merriam, 1977; C. Seeger, 1977).

As important as the term ‘ethnomusicology’ was to the post-World War II paradigm shift, it has not proved to be unassailable, and its appropriateness was increasingly called into question in the 1990s, when the Society for Ethnomusicology prompted a third shift, openly debating replacing the term with another, or even several others, that more appropriately described changing practices (see §7 below). The discursive debates of the 1990s did not produce an obvious replacement for ‘ethnomusicology’, but they did
continue to underscore the persistence and seriousness of the same discursive debates that had brought about the disciplinary revolution of the 1950s.

The fourth paradigm shift has accompanied technological revolutions. In part because of their reliance on field research and in part because of the widespread experimentation with systematic methodologies, ethnomusicologists have quickly responded to the technological changes that have multiplied the representational potential for the field. In the immediate wake of World War II, the use of portable magnetic tape recorders and the emergence of the long-playing record produced a change of technologies that enabled ethnomusicologists to collect, transport, analyze and disseminate musical information with relative ease and at moderate cost. Film and video technologies in the 1960s and 70s were no less sweeping in their impact on field research. The spread of new and inexpensive technologies to musicians, especially cassette, digital (CD) and internet, unleashed a massive globalization of musical production in the 1980s and 90s, and ethnomusicologists quickly responded to that globalization, documenting the concomitant paradigm shift in musical meaning and the mass consumption of musical culture.

The second and third paradigm shifts, in particular, lead to the representational revolution that constitutes the fourth paradigm shift (Bohlman, 1991). What ethnomusicologists collected, analyzed and documented underwent an enormous transformation from the 1950s to the 1990s. Whereas the sound recording technologies of the 1950s shaped the ethnographic practices at the time, ethnographic practices rarely relied only, or even primarily, on sound recording in the 1990s. The representational revolution during the second half of the 20th century made it possible to provide a much thicker description of musical soundscapes, the multiple levels of musical performance and consumption in society, and the multiple directions of musical change at local and global levels (Feld, 1990). With seemingly unlimited representational potential at their disposal, ethnomusicologists at the end of the 20th century were faced with the challenge of providing as complete a picture of the diverse phenomena constituting music as possible, a challenge almost diametrically opposed to the more focussed tasks of the 1950s, when ethnomusicologists were charged with the isolation and collection of as much musical data as possible.
The historical tension between ethnomusicology as a field that draws more and more musics into a canon for study, and ethnomusicology as a discipline whose methods, if not unified, are distinctive, had become even greater by the end of the 20th century (C. Seeger, 1970). Ethnomusicology was again undergoing an extensive discursive and methodological revolution. Many of the paradigm shifts that spawned the sweeping disciplinary changes of the 1950s were evident again in the 1990s, engendering sweeping change in the discipline. Nationalism, for example, reasserted itself in the 1990s, not only in the new nation-states of a post-communist Eastern Europe, but in post-colonial nation-states wishing to strengthen regional and international power in a fluid transnational political culture. Debates, too, raged again in the 1990s, and accordingly ethnomusicologists actively engaged in a process of realigning disciplinary borders and establishing new discursive alignments with disciplines as diverse as cultural studies and film studies. If technological revolution brought about a fourth paradigm shift already in the late 1940s, internet technologies are the cause of virtually unchecked shifts in the 1990s, ranging from the worldwide trafficking of digitalized sound to the transformation of traditional ethnographies through publication in internet journals, such as *Ethnomusicology On-Line* and *Music and Anthropology*. The representational revolution evident in the fourth paradigm shift, finally, stimulated an entirely new set of debates about the structures, methods, pedagogies and subjects of the field, stimulating a dizzying array of new disciplinary alignments, some perhaps ephemeral but others crucial to the reshaping of the discipline’s identity in the 21st century.

2. The discourses of science.

Ethnomusicology became a new and different kind of science after World War II. During the second half of the 20th century new forms of scientific inquiry broadened the range of objects available for investigation, while at the same time refining the procedures for study. Ethnomusicologists, especially in the 1950s and 60s, sought new forms of exact measurement, particularly those machines that would draw upon methods from the physics of sound to represent the cognitive parameters of music with objective detail, for example, the melograph employed by Charles Seeger at UCLA (C. Seeger, 1953). European systematic musicologists were among the first to adopt developing digital
technologies in the 1970s and 80s to propose new scientific procedures for the representation of musical sound (see Zannos, 1999). Although the history of ethnomusicology had always looked towards the physical and natural sciences for parallel procedures and models, the tendency toward scientism accelerated rapidly in the second half of the 20th century (see Bohlman, 1991). By the end of the 20th century, nonetheless, the larger questions ethnomusicologists faced were is ethnomusicology a science, and, what kind of science can and should ethnomusicology be?

Several distinctive shifts accompanied the endeavours of ethnomusicologists to strengthen the scientific foundations of their field. Firstly, the broadly historical framework of comparative musicology was replaced by an ethnographic framework. Secondly, procedures based on pre-existing collections of music, in which music was treated as an object, gave way to collecting through fieldwork, in which music’s subjective qualities were also investigated. Thirdly, the transcription of music using Western notation was severely scrutinized and it was supplanted by forms of representation that depended on technological reproducibility. Fourthly, psychological theories that treated music as the product of nature were replaced by theories from the cognitive sciences, which examined music as the product of human mental processes. Fifthly, musics that had been examined as self-referential symbol systems were transposed to contexts outside themselves, allowing music to be investigated as a component in a larger cultural complex. These shifts toward ‘scientific’ methods rarely followed similar paths and though proponents of all purported to redefine the scientific framework for ethnomusicology, they did so in ways that were scarcely comparable (see the different approaches in Zannos, 1999). By the closing decades of the 20th century, moreover, postmodern and post-colonial trends in ethnomusicology challenged the scientific impulse characterizing the first decades of ethnomusicology’s radical realignment after World War II.

The comparative focus of ethnomusicology prior to World War II depended on a broadly historical ontology of music, in which music, wherever it was found, fitted the models of an organic and linear history. Traditional and non-Western musics, therefore, were comparable throughout the world because they could be calibrated as fulfilling different stages of development. The teleology from which comparative musicology developed
depended on the Hegelian model of a universal history that moved ineluctably toward Europe as civilization developed ever higher levels. Accordingly, the comparativists ultimately constructed their own models of non-Western music as fulfilling an earlier stage of Western music history, or reflecting Western music history at a different stage of its development (see Schneider, 1976).

The wholeness of universal history was mirrored by the psychological models of music that emanated from the work of comparativists such as Carl Stumpf and Erich von Hornbostel, who were influenced by gestalt psychology (Schneider, 1999; Klotz, 1998). The question ethnomusicologists attempted to answer was, just how could the methods of the field perceive, measure and represent the parts that constituted that whole? The comparativists argued that wholeness largely cohered from a complex of systems with bases in both the physics of sound – hence, nature – and in musical and cultural practice. Javanese and Balinese traditional musics provided one of the most consistent sources of experimental material for investigating the natural and cultural domains of systemeticity. The instruments of the gamelan, particularly the idiophones, made it possible to investigate both the more or less fixed boundaries of tuning systems and the infinite variety within them that individual gamelan orchestras nonetheless demonstrated, theoretically tuned to themselves, and therefore demonstrated a complex of culturally bounded decisions (Hood, 1966; Rahn, 1979).

The historical rupture effected by World War II brought about a dramatic rejection of the historical framework upon which comparative musicology had depended. Whereas ethnomusicologists whose careers had been established prior to the war (e.g. Curt Sachs; see Sachs, 1962) sought ways to rejuvenate the field as an historical science, a new generation turned away from history and embraced the new scientific possibilities developing in the social and natural sciences. By recasting ethnomusicology as an ‘anthropology of music’, Alan Merriam was one of the first scholars to formulate a science of music that recognized music as only one of the subjects of ethnomusicology’s scientific investigation (Merriam, 1964). His tripartite model held that music was but one of three subjects of inquiry, the other two being ‘behaviour’ and the ‘conceptualization’ of music, thereby drawing upon both psychological and aesthetic trends in anthropology.
The British social anthropologist and ethnomusicologist, John Blacking, pushed the scientific turn in yet another direction, that is, into biology. Music-making, Blacking argued in a series of very influential works (for example 1979 and 1995), was based in the human body, in both its genetic and physical structures, rendering music, therefore, a species-specific practice within nature. Culture, therefore, was not primarily a context for music, rather a product of musical practices that combined with other fundamental human activities to yield society. Blacking’s provocative appeal to the biological sciences stimulated an interest in related musical phenomena with physical bases, notably dance, but he never fully theorized a set of biological parameters for ethnomusicological investigation before his death in 1990.

The attempts to introduce scientific discourse from the natural sciences were not without their detractors, and by the 1990s growing discontent, even outright resistance, countered scientism as emerging disciplines within the humanities, especially post-colonial studies and cultural studies, increasingly influenced ethnomusicology. Claiming that ethnomusicologists working in the natural sciences had neglected deeper social and historical problems – examining the biological structures of musical practice, for example, but ignoring the explicit presence of music in racial constructions and racism (see Radano and Bohlman, 2000) – new discourses of ethnomusicology endeavoured to be more broadly responsive to the culture and politics of modernity and the post-colonial world. Research methods turned towards problems arising, for example, from the globalization of the nation-state in the 1980s and 90s, yielding post-colonial forms of fieldwork that investigated the nationalization of music archives or the nationalization of music education. New methods, drawn from political science and sociology, were adapted to interpret the politicization of musical institutions and the commercialization of world-music consumption (for example Mitchell, 1993). At the end of the 20th century, the sharp tensions between methods adapted from cognitive and natural sciences and those drawn from cultural studies and the reflexive shift in the social sciences defined new faultlines in ethnomusicology’s engagement with science and scientific methods, revealing that it had become not a single scientific field in the second half of the 20th century, but a cluster of disciplines that continued to formulate scientific procedures in different ways.
3. Disciplinary revolutions.

As ethnomusicology spread across and embraced the methodologies of a growing number of disciplines during the second half of the 20th century, its history was subject to the changes within those disciplines. Ethnomusicology’s disciplinary revolutions were not primarily confined to developments within musical scholarship, but rather responded frequently to paradigm shifts in other disciplines. If, at mid-century, ethnomusicology turned away from the mainstream developments within musical scholarship, especially historical musicology, there was also a reintegration into the mainstream by century’s end, particularly during the 1990s as other areas of musical scholarship varied and strengthened their interaction with ideas and developments outside music. The disciplinary revolutions during the half-century following World War II fall into two distinctive periods: those from around 1950 to 1975 followed paths that placed distance between ethnomusicology and mainstream scholarship; those from around 1975 to the end of the century sought, however tentatively, to influence the mainstream by seeking integrative paths.

No intellectual history was more profoundly influential on ethnomusicology’s history in the second half of the 20th century than that of social and cultural anthropology. The collection and analysis of musical phenomena was already an important component of anthropology by the second half of the 19th century, particularly in North America, with the intense interest in Native American music, and in European traditions whose growth accompanied the spread of colonial empires (see Schneider, 1976). Anthropology provided ethnomusicologies not only with an impulse and framework for studying the cultures of ‘others’ deemed different, but a set of methods and technologies for appropriating their cultures. After World War II, however, it was not so much anthropology’s methods or the cultures investigated by anthropologists – Native American music retained its central role – that brought about ethnomusicology’s most sweeping paradigm shift in the 1950s but rather anthropology’s challenge to the object of study itself, music. Claiming that musical scholarship had far too little evidence for and knowledge of the vast variety of musical repertories, Alan P. Merriam and David P. McAllester in the USA and John Blacking in the UK argued that the comparative study
of music had been premature. More critical in the 1950s and 60s would be the expansion of fieldwork, the enrichment of basic collections and the refinement of ethnographic methods. Concomitantly, anthropologists called for a reconceptualization of music e.g. in Merriam’s tripartite model. The paradigms of anthropology are most evident in the shift of ethnomusicological focus from music to music cultures, in other words, music as inseparable from the entire complex of society and culture.

Anthropology and other social science disciplines also shaped ethnomusicology’s history, in some cases undergirding traditional areas of research, in others laying the groundwork for distinctively new directions. Folk-music research, for example, retained a large measure of its importance, but was redeployed from philological and textual to ethnographic and contextual approaches. In the USA Charles Seeger and Bruno Nettl theorized new approaches during the 1950s and 1960s. Folk music was no longer idealized as universal, but was investigated as a domain of cultural practice allowing local and regional groups to express uniqueness and difference. Ethnicity became the primary factor for North American folk-music scholars, while individuals as music-makers and small-group performance increasingly influenced scholarship in West and Central Europe, for example in the work of Ruth Finnegan (1989) and Ernst Klusen (1969). Previous emphases on text also underwent an anthropological turn, notably in the work of Steven Feld and Anthony Seeger, both of whom established new paradigms for musical anthropology by retheorizing the relation between music and language (Feld, 1990; A. Seeger, 1987).

Despite influences from the social sciences, ethnomusicology did not abandon its historical connections to humanistic and musicological study. Several emerging paradigms of the 1950s intensified the concern for the musical object. Ki Mantle Hood’s notion of ‘bi-musicality’ privileged the musical component in ethnomusicological participant-observation, arguing that the only way to know another culture’s music was to develop fluency as a skilled performer, a goal possible only after years of intensive study. Organological research in ethnomusicology, moreover, continued to emphasize the integrity of musical instruments, whose identities were circumscribed by the objects themselves and their positions within classificatory systems indebted to 19th-century philological methods. The organological methods adapted from Curt Sachs and Erich M.
von Hornbostel by scholars such as Klaus Wachsmann and Laurence Picken (1975) in the decades after World War II also gave way to new approaches to organology, such as those theorized by Erich Stockmann (for example in the series *Studia instrumentorum musicae popularis*) and Margaret Kartomi (1990), which responded to the distinctive forms and interrelations between instruments within each music culture. A similar shift of focus from discrete data to the complex interrelations within cultural systems characterized the revolution in systematic musicology. Systematists such as Oskár Elschek and Albrecht Schneider expanded melograph techniques by developing new computer applications, that allowed ethnomusicologists to read beyond the sound itself and to interpret the ways in which acoustic phenomena represent cultural context. Characterizing ethnomusicology’s disciplinary revolutions was a renewed concern for musical texts, a reinterpretation of culture and its meanings, and a reintroduction of historical methods. Theories from literary criticism, particularly the processes of music as a symbolic and signifying form of expression, drawn from the work of Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault, generated new analytical languages for talking about music. Popular music, both as the product of small groups or as globalized world music, increasingly became a postmodern object of ethnomusicological enquiry, with many scholars negotiating with the emerging theories of British and American cultural studies, from Stuart Hall to Arjun Appadurai. Ethnomusicologists also turned to ‘new historicism’ and other post-structural theories to find the new ways in which music contributed to the construction of history itself (see Blum, Bohlman and Neuman, 1991).

If ethnomusicology’s forays through the interdisciplinary terrains of the late 20th century produced quite different types of revolutions, some affording only short-term exchanges across disciplinary borders, others yielding long-term paradigm shifts, the sheer multitude of those forays reveals a dynamic history, one in which experimentation was valued as a means of questioning and challenging the mainstream of musical scholarship on an increasingly global level.

4. Political contexts.
The history of ethnomusicology has frequently formed along international ideological faultlines, articulating and, at times, politicizing them. Because scholarship prior to
World War II had participated quite fully in colonialism and its appropriation of culture for use and consumption in the West, the field was often unable to extricate itself from the post-colonial fissures forming as new nations achieved independence and distanced themselves from the control of Western nation-states. Colonialist alliances between Western ‘Selves’ and non-Western ‘Others’ underwent processes of radical realignment and ethnomusicology itself entered a phase in which it struggled toward institutional centralization when many of those previously studied were calling for resistance to disciplinary centralization according to Western intellectual and academic models. Attracted to the ideological and political issues of the post-colonial world, many ethnomusicologists also confronted the need to reexamine and recast the political motivations that they had inherited from the era of colonial expansion into and representation of the world’s cultures.

As post-colonial delineations shifted, so too did ethnomusicology’s paradigms. Within European ethnomusicology the fissure between East and West, already a product of the Enlightenment, deepened as the cultural implications of the Cold War became increasingly evident. Eastern European ethnomusicologists remapped musical folklore to reflect regional musical landscapes so that they would constitute new nationalist realities. Supported with resources from national academies of science, ethnomusicologists intensively collected at the local and regional level, assembling an image of the nation based on related, balanced parts (see Elschek, 1991; Nixon, 1998). Eastern European nations came to embody national musics – for example Romanian, Bulgarian or Yugoslav – and the new national musics contributed to the writing of new national histories, such as the ‘six centuries of democratic struggle’ undergirding the canon of ‘folk music’ in the German Democratic Republic (Steinitz, 1978). Western European ethnomusicologists, in contrast, frequently eschewed nationalism, albeit for no less ideologically motivated notions about the democracy of music-making. There was relatively little support of ethnomusicological research at the national level, with institutional frameworks both proliferating and fragmenting. The importance of the split between East and West in Cold War ethnomusicology is not to be underestimated, for it also shaped the institutionalization of ethnomusicology at a global professional level, particularly in the history of the International Council for Traditional Music, whose
activities, such as conferences in both East and West, sought to bridge the ideological divide separating the regions.

By the 1970s new schisms began to supplant the division between East and West. A palpable geographical shift between North and South, with major divisions between Europe and Africa, and between North and South America, increasingly replacing the divide between East and West. Those who had previously been studied asserted their intellectual right to represent themselves and to do so with methods of their own making and implementation. The power implicit in Western music history and anthropology was subjected to growing scrutiny and criticism. Scholars from Africa and South America, as well as from other areas of emerging economic and political power in the so-called Third World, continued to turn to European and North American ethnomusicology because of opportunities for advanced study, but they insisted on the necessity for new forms of dialogue and exchange that both highlighted the differences between North and South, and charted new, more international historical paths for ethnomusicology.

In the closing decades of the 20th century the explosion of Asian economic power and the implosion of European nationalism again shifted ethnomusicology’s paradigms along ideological faultlines. National schools and institutions of ethnomusicology developed in some Asian countries, such as China, Indonesia and Japan. Some Asian ethnomusicologists, such as those in Australia and Japan, drew upon and extended Western models, whereas others, such as those in China and India, turned toward distinctive models of their own, which often represented music history according to indigenous paradigms, often quite devoid of European teleological patterns (see Qureshi, 1991; Wong, 1991). South American and African ethnomusicological histories also took shape and followed distinctive directions in the 1980s and 90s, influenced more by post-colonial responses and even ideological rejection of the West than by the power accrued from global economic expansion.

During the 1990s, particularly in response to the end of the Cold War and periodic economic crises in Asia, the paths along which ethnomusicology’s history had formed entered new phases of destabilization and engendered new debates about and challenges to the ways in which the field could study, represent and appropriate world musics. At their core, most debates about who possessed the intellectual capital and political power
to study whom remained rooted in historical problems and persistent questions about music and identity. Native American musical scholarship, for example, deepened its stance toward the rights of any scholar to study Native American musical practices. Few questioned the claims that Native American should themselves largely control access to and the representation of their musical practices, but just how non-Native American might work together on ethnomusicological research remained open to question (see Herndon and McLeod, 1981; Diamond and others, 1994) and spawned new versions of older, historical questions, such as the gendered presence of ethnomusicologists in ethnographic research (Frisbie, 1991).

New ideological schisms, some ontologically more reactionary and others more intellectually radical, formed in the new ethnomusicologies emerging in the 1990s. Some scholars working in the Middle East and in Islamic traditions of the Mediterranean and Central and South Asia, for example, began to argue for approaches that would place musical repertories and practices in more appropriately Islamic categories, reflecting a larger tendency to view Islam as a determining factor in world history and culture. Islamic musics and Islamic ethnomusicology would therefore cut across and even negate the history and geography at the core of Western ethnomusicology, yielding histories of scholarship shaped entirely within their own religious traditions (see al-Faruqi, 1985; Qureshi, 1991).

The critique of African ethnomusicologists levels its attacks at the Western underpinnings of ethnomusicology. Rather than seeking to articulate an overarching category, such as ‘Islamic ethnomusicology’, African scholars deny the very possibility of an ‘African ethnomusicology’, decrying the damage such disciplinary categories have unleashed throughout the colonialist presence in Africa and the post-colonialist attempts to redress that presence (see Agawu, 1995; Appiah, 1992; Masolo, 2000). The challenge of the new ethnomusicologies at the end of the 20th century has been to expose old and new ideological faultlines, and to insist that ethnomusicologists recognize and address the politicized paradigms that shape the past, present and future of their field.
5. Institutional strands.

As ethnomusicology’s distinctiveness and independence as a discipline grew during the second half of the 20th century, educational and scholarly institutions increasingly defined, directed and, to some extent, limited the directions in which ethnomusicology developed. Two general historical directions asserted themselves, one inclusive, the other exclusive: institutions generating the inclusive impetus sought to open methodological boundaries, embrace scholarship from other disciplines and broaden the field of inquiry; more exclusive institutions stressed more rigorous methodological approaches, stressed ethnomusicology’s uniqueness and focussed on the growth of ethnomusicology from within. Exclusive institutions generally were more locally or nationally bounded than inclusive institutions.

The most common institutional sites for the development of ethnomusicology were governmental agencies and centres of learning and education. Broadly speaking, the governmental agency furthered research which begins with fieldwork in a field that hypothetically includes an entire population group, provides opportunities for archiving and processing of music from the group, and concludes with some kind of dissemination and return of research material to the group. Governmental agencies range from local arts and humanities councils to academies of science on the national level. These institutions dominate ethnomusicological research in many countries, notably in Central and Eastern Europe, in South America, and in many emerging nations of Africa and Asia, in which governmental agencies are charged with the institutional inculcation of national culture and cultural nationalism.

One of the primary institutional reasons for the international spread of ethnomusicology after World War II was its growing presence as an academic discipline in the university and other institutions of higher education. Teaching posts and research possibilities proliferated rapidly, particularly as the humanities and social sciences in universities throughout the world sought to attract students from other nations. University programmes in ethnomusicology drew a large – and crucial – percentage of their students from areas of the world whose musics were being taught. Especially in the USA, but to some degree also in the UK, Japan, Italy, Austria and West Germany, ethnomusicology became a primarily academic discipline in the 1950s and remained so until the end of the
20th century. During the 1980s and 1990s, university programmes offering advanced training and degrees in ethnomusicology spread to countries throughout the world, often founded by returning scholars, who had received graduate degrees in ethnomusicology from Western universities. Such institutions drew upon Western approaches and methods, but adapted these to local resources and concepts of music and music education.

In the 1980s and 90s institutions within private and business sectors expanded their support of ethnomusicology, particularly as such institutions perceived the possibilities for the mass collection and dissemination of world musics. In the first decades after World War II recording companies, usually small and rarely subsidiaries of transnational conglomerates, sponsored collecting endeavours, among the most notable of which were the Moses Asch’s Folkways recordings (Cantwell, 1996; Goldsmith, 1998; McCulloh, 1982) and the UNESCO-sponsored anthologies from countries and regions throughout the world. With the entry into the market of Electra (Nonesuch), Ocora and other international recording companies in the 1960s and 70s, the possibility of marketing musics from the world as ‘world music’ became increasingly attractive to the private sector. In the 1980s and 90s other areas of the private sector, particularly publishing houses and concert organizers, provided a substantially new and powerful institutional infrastructure for ethnomusicology.

Academies of science, national sound archives and their related agencies transformed their production of sound recordings from formats dedicated to more limited archival and scientific uses to those making more public and commercial dissemination possible. The EU, for example, sponsored nationally-based recording projects among its members that were designed to make regional musics available on CD, thereby emphasizing the EU’s concern for regionalism. By the end of the 20th century, new recording technologies, not only CD, but also internet and CD-ROM, stimulated a turn toward historicism as historical recordings, among them the field recordings from the beginning of the 20th century, were rereleased and recontextualized for scholarly and public consumption. Virtually every type of institution, therefore, could sponsor and finance its own recording projects, expanding the availability of sound documents for historical and ethnographic research on local, national and international levels.
The proliferation of new forms of music publishing yielded new contexts for institutionalizing ethnomusicology after World War II. Rather than contributing mosaic pieces to larger histories of music as they had at the beginning of the century, ethnomusicological monographs became genres that reflected the new forms of research and institutionalization. Scholars used the monograph to represent a music culture as extensively and intensively as possible, with sections devoted to ethnographic detail, transcription, and biographical studies of musicians. The ethnomusicological monograph, therefore, responded to the enjoinder from the critics of comparative musicology to collect more empirical evidence from throughout the world and examine that evidence in greater detail. During the 1960s and 70s, publishing in ethnomusicology shifted focus from series emphasizing area studies to those attempting to embrace the integrity of ethnomusicology as a discipline unto itself. Journals provided venues for ethnomusicologists to present empirical studies, but even more important, the journals introduced a discursive venue for extensive debate about the nature of the discipline and for critical self-reflection about methodology, interdisciplinarity and ethics (for example Merriam, 1977; Gourlay, 1978; Shelemay, 1999). One measure of ethnomusicology’s expansion and diversification in the final decades of the 20th century was a parallel increase in the journals devoted primarily to ethnomusicology research (Etzkorn, 1988). In the 1980s and 90s, new publishing venues for reference works in ethnomusicology emerged, usually conceived as encompassing the musics of a nation or region (Stockmann, 1992) or providing encyclopedic coverage of many world musics, as with the *Garland Library of World Music*.

Soon after World War II ethnomusicology entered a phase of extensive professionalization, leading in turn to new possibilities for international contact and the exchange of information and resources. Two scholarly societies, the *Society for ethnomusicology* (SEM) and the *International council for traditional music* (ICTM), have dominated the field’s professionalization. The histories of the two societies reveal that they have been more different than alike, for they have responded to the changing nature of ethnomusicology in distinctive ways. The ICTM’s conceptualization of music was nationally, rather than internationally, bounded. Many articles in the early volumes of the ICTM’s journal were devoted to comprehensive definitions of the folk music in...
individual countries, replicating in many ways the template of comparative musicology. The term ‘folk music’ was retained as a designation of the ICTM’s official object of study until 1981, despite attempts to redefine that object (Elbourne, 1975). The ICTM has located music as an object at the centre of its discourse, reflecting a European disciplinary preference for musical folklore and the predilection of many scholars to write on their own musics rather than looking beyond their national borders for areas of study. National committees wishing to admit more methodological variety and breadth have occasionally struck out in independent directions, as in the UK and Ireland, with the British forum for ethnomusicology. ICTM conferences have moved from host country to host country, and attendance from all sides of international political conflicts has been facilitated, maintaining the ICTM’s emphasis on an international membership and disciplinary inclusivity.

The Society for Ethnomusicology, in contrast, has followed a path shaped by North American ethnomusicologists and institutions. The SEM has concerned itself less with the object of study than with the development of new methodologies and the encouragement of interdisciplinarity between the humanities and the social sciences. In part to redress the American domination of the SEM, European scholars formed the ESEM in the 1980s, which attracted growing numbers of participants to its conferences in the 1990s. The SEM and ICTM together occupied the professional activities of most ethnomusicologists until the end of the 20th century. Together, they heightened the potential of ethnomusicology to include a multitude of approaches to local and world musics, and to musicological and anthropological approaches, making it possible for ethnomusicologists to choose from a broad spectrum of disciplinary methods and institutional alignments.

6. Other ethnomusicologies.
Ethnomusicology as a discipline did not escape the post-colonial theories of the final decades of the 20th century, which increasingly criticized the Western intellectual engagement with and appropriation of music cultures elsewhere in the world. Whereas ethnomusicological research reached into more and more places, and a growing number of scholars from non-Western countries received formal ethnomusicological training,
directly or indirectly, in Western, especially American, universities, ethnomusicology’s virtually ubiquitous presence became the focus of a concern that indigenous traditions of scholarship were repressed or even failed to take shape because of the hegemony of Western ethnomusicology, its institutional structures and the power it wielded in the collection, dissemination and interpretation of the world’s music. At issue were questions of ownership: whose music was subjected to ethnomusicological study; by whom and for whom; whose musical resources could be appropriated; to what ends; and whose ethnomusicology should have the right to examine other musics?

By the end of the 20th century such questions had led to an extensive scrutiny of ethnomusicology as a global discipline and had spawned growing forms of intellectual challenge to Western ethnomusicology, chief among them the establishment of new programmes of study and research, which in turn responded to national and regional differences and spurred the emergence of other discourses (see Béhague, 1991; Perlman, 1994; I.K.F. Wong, 1991; Zhang, 1985).

Though many of the ‘other ethnomusicologies’ were genealogically and institutionally bound to Western ethnomusicology, they largely sought forms of scientific independence that allowed them to forge models for research and teaching appropriate to their own national and local needs. Were, for example, basic ethnomusicological assumptions about the ontology of music sufficient, and were the genres and typologies borrowed from the West productive? Emerging national discourses naturally emphasized the local and the ways in which diverse local traditions collectively represented the nation, usually referred to with categories that juxtaposed traditional music with the nation. Thai music, for example, was privileged in programmes in Thailand (D. Wong, forthcoming).

Whether or not ‘folk music’ in an Asian national history had meanings parallel to those in Europe was, nonetheless, a different question (Jones, 1995). European musical terminology was itself one of the greatest problems as scholars sought to broaden their scopes (Blum, 1991). Different traditions of pedagogy and concepts of music history and historiography were equally problematic (Qureshi, 1991). The models borrowed from the field of cultural studies, such as globalization and transnationalism, exacerbated rather than solved the need for intellectual independence, for these models, too, placed non-Western musical traditions in a position subservient to the hegemony of Western
economic and cultural power (Slobin, 1993). Articulate performers, such as Sumarsam and Ali Jihad Racy, channeled another type of response, translating indigenous music-making to ethnomusicological discourse.

The most sustained critiques of a global ethnomusicological hegemony have been those from East Asia, South Asia and Africa. Distinctive critiques from South American and Middle Eastern scholars began to crystallize in the 1990s as ethnomusicology established itself more securely in institutions of higher education. It would not be entirely correct to subsume all these critiques and the other scholarly traditions from which they are issuing under the single umbrella of post-colonial response, for they respond to the colonial presence of ethnomusicologists, be it as missionaries, government officials or scholars financed by transnational foundations, in different and distinctive ways. Indian critiques of Western views and methods, for example, take as their point of departure the *longue durée* of an intellectual history of Indian music.

If Indian scholars have been dismissive of Western ethnomusicology, particularly its terminology, scholars in African and China, in contrast, have been sharply oppositional, calling in their extreme forms for a break with Western scholarly approaches. African critiques have coalesced around various forms of post-colonial response, with African scholars consistently drawing attention to the ways in which the terminologies and discourses of African music have been imposed in such ways as to discipline African cultures and thereby to reduce them to a position of subservience (Masolo, 2000). African scholars have debunked commonly-held theories stated by comparative musicologists in the first half of the 20th century, as well as by Africans attempting to construct the pan-African aesthetic and ideology of *négritude*, that there was a larger field of practices that could be subsumed under the single rubric of ‘African music’. Whereas many Western concepts, foremost among them the insistence that the basis of African musics was rhythm, imposed primitiveness, thereby racializing African musics, new ethnomusicological voices emphasize the ways in which indigenous concepts challenge the very metaphysics of music on a global scale (Erlmann, 1999).

Chinese ethnomusicologies and ethnomusicologists have tended to be less post-colonial asserting that the ideologies and histories motivating the study of Chinese musics are distinct from those of the West in certain fundamental ways. The historical issues derive
not only from the distinctive character of Chinese political and cultural history, but also the nexus of 20th-century ideological conflicts within East Asia itself, such as the interrelations between mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong. Ideological and historical issues influence the ways in which, for example, minorities in China are recognized as part of a national culture, or the ways in which religious musical practices have survived in isolation or in highly politicized contexts, be they in mainland China or Taiwan, or even in the extensive Chinese diaspora (Chen, 1999). In a series of articles and internet exchanges, J. Lawrence Witzleben was particularly effective in focusing debates about the direction a Chinese ethnomusicology would need to proceed, so that by the end of the 20th century many new ethnomusicologies were turning to the critiques coming from Chinese scholars as touchstones for their own moves towards independence. The critique of Western ethnomusicological hegemony did not only have a regional basis in Asia and Africa, but rather it came to unleash new forms of ethnomusicological discourse in Europe and North America. In particular, popular-music studies were empowered to formulate approaches to the study of musics and cultural practices that many believed had been too long neglected by mainstream ethnomusicology. The rise of popular-music studies in the 1980s marked a turn from the privileging of élite non-Western musics, hence, also the colonialist stance of late 20th-century ethnomusicology towards the musical practices of working-class and powerless members of industrialized societies. ‘Popular music’ did not only assume a new set of ontological meanings, but rather it required substantially new theoretical and ideological approaches, which together informed the journal, Popular Music. Much scholarship devoted to popular music, therefore, took shape outside mainstream ethnomusicological discourse, and it came to challenge ethnomusicology through its more broadly based and inclusive methodologies that allowed scholars to investigate popular musics within the global context of late 20th-century transnationalism.

One of the most striking characteristics of ethnomusicology’s development in the closing decades of the 20th century is that ethnomusicologists took the challenges to their disciplinary hegemony seriously, seeking to address many of the issues raised by other ethnomusicologists. By responding to the critiques of the emerging other ethnomusicologies, the discipline maintained one of its fundamental tenets, that of
inclusivity. Indeed, if that inclusivity had historically also provided one of the components of the discipline’s hegemony and expansion together with colonial histories, it also opened ethnomusicology’s discursive borders at the end of the 20th century, stimulating many scholars to look outward and to attempt to grapple with the challenges to the discipline rather than looking inward to buttress the approaches and methodologies that the critiques were actively trying to dismantle.

7. Unitary field or cluster of disciplines?.

In the mid-1990s, at the moment of its most extensive presence in the global study of music and of its greatest influence on the shaping of an interdisciplinary musical scholarship, ethnomusicology became the focus of a chorus of criticism calling for a renaming of the discipline. There was no single motivation for the call to rename the discipline, but rather the call itself signalled that a crucial historiographic juncture had been reached, a shift in paradigms, if not a moment of disciplinary rupture and revolution, paradoxically following on the heels of the discipline’s most widely acknowledged successes. There was also no single term that won overwhelming support, or that really solved the problems that the call for renaming the discipline identified. A younger generation of North American ethnomusicologists claimed that ‘ethnomusicology’ misrepresented their own disciplinary training, suggesting that the discipline was merely a subdiscipline of a larger musicology. The methods employed in new studies of popular music or drawn from cultural studies were not, so they claimed, primarily musicological. There was a further argument that ethnomusicology, as the discipline devoted to ‘ethnic groups’ and all musical cultures and subcultures, should be charged with the brief of studying all musics – folk, popular, classical, Western, non-Western, etc. In contrast, other critics claimed that ethnomusicology had increasingly turned inward because of its successes, making it more exclusive and deflecting the reflexive turn that had inspired the generations after World War II. Feminist and post-colonial theories, so this critique held, have slipped to only secondary significance as ethnomusicology strove to strengthen its institutional and political structures. The most arresting call for renaming the field came from traditions that had taken shape outside Europe and North America, in economically developing countries and in the
emerging discourses and academic traditions of the so-called Third World. The name ‘ethnomusicology’, so these critics decried, had too long represented a skewed distribution of power between Western musical scholarship and the cultures whose music it studied and appropriated. By retaining the name of their discipline, ethnomusicologists had also failed to question the historical split between Europe and its others, between industrialized nations and economically disadvantaged nations, and between music cultures formed by history and the people who had been denied history.

Various names were proposed as replacements for ‘ethnomusicology’, for example, ‘cultural musicology’ or ‘musical anthropology’ or, in the spirit of Charles Seeger, simply ‘musicology’, but there was virtually no agreement that any of these solved the range of problems cited in the critique levelled against ‘ethnomusicology’. In the late 1990s the debate intensified, and it unleashed a new and productive discourse about the nature of ethnomusicology’s methods and its goals as a discipline and field. The debates clustered around the question: was ethnomusicology a unitary field, or was it a cluster of disciplines? On the one hand, ethnomusicology at century’s end increasingly claimed the disciplinary structures of a unitary field, a canon of theory and methods, and publications and programmes of advanced study that undergirded these. National and international scholarly societies and a palpable presence in public debates about globalization and transnational cultural capital also lent ethnomusicology strength as a unified and central field. On the other hand, the more centralized the field became, the more difficult it had become to embrace diverse ontologies of music and methodologies of musical scholarship. As a centralized field, ethnomusicology was only tentatively dealing with the political and cultural realignments following the end of the Cold War in 1989. It was left to local and national efforts to deal with many of the challenges of a post-Cold War, postmodern world, such as continuing civil strife in Eastern Europe and South and Southeast Asia. To the more politically progressive scholars of the 1990s, ethnomusicology seemed too encumbered by its growth and successes to engage critically and actively with the presence of music in the rising tide of racism and nationalism.

By the end of the 20th century the question remained open as to whether the new – or renewed – debates about the discipline’s name were symptomatic of a change in the central core of the discipline. Whereas the debates might have been contradicted by the
growth of ethnomusicology in institutions internationally, there were more fundamental historiographical questions than the challenge to the name itself. Did ‘music’ really remain the central object of ethnomusicological study, especially given the challenges of ethnomusicology to the limits of representation in a postmodern age? Would the institutional structures that supported the sea changes in the second half of the 20th century be those that provided the basis of ethnomusicology in the 21st? Would the cluster of scientific discourses embraced by ethnomusicologists change in fundamental ways? Would ethnomusicology really expand into new public spheres with the potential to bring about a major change in its language and political responsibilities, for instance, with the growth of the ‘world music industry’?

The period in ethnomusicology’s intellectual history from 1945 to the end of the 20th century began with the challenge posed by renaming the discipline so that it would best represent a group of disciplines and scientific practices in the humanities and social sciences, and it concluded with the same challenge. Among the debates that generated responses to that challenge, few were characterized by a hardened stance that ethnomusicology was a single discipline whose defenses needed to be strengthened to fend off those malcontents who would strike at its very heart, symbolized by the name ethnomusicology. The persistence and vitality of the challenge to the discipline’s names, be they ‘comparative musicology’, ‘the anthropology of music’ or ‘ethnomusicology’, revealed that ethnomusicology did not locate a single object at its centre, nor did it rely on a core of tools that all ethnomusicologists needed to acquire in order to command a common body of knowledge.

At the end of the 20th century, ethnomusicology remained a discipline openly willing to pose new questions, to embrace different and diverse methodologies, and to break with tradition when required by the empirical evidence. The paradigm shifts and radical reformulation of ethnomusicology in the decade after World War II had become normative by the end of the century, empowering ethnomusicology as a cluster of disciplines, discourses and scholars, challenged rather than fettered by the symbolic baggage of a name, to respond to the ever-changing meaning and presence of music on the world’s contested cultural landscapes at the turn of the century.
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