

**Timothy D. Taylor**

University of California, Los Angeles  
Departments of Ethnomusicology and Musicology  
Box 951657  
Los Angeles, CA 90095  
USA

tel.: (310) 825-8413  
fax: (310) 206-4738  
email: tdtaylor@ucla.edu

***BEYOND EXOTICISM: WESTERN MUSIC AND THE WORLD***

Durham: Duke University Press, 2007

**INTRODUCTION: BEYOND EXOTICISM I**

This is a book about power, about systems of domination and oppression, and about who has the power of representation of Others in music, from the seventeenth century to the present. Admittedly, this is a wide swath of time. But this book is not a survey. It is, rather, a study of the three main systems of domination and exploitation—colonialism, imperialism, and what we now call globalization—and the ideologies that they produce that foster appropriations of music and representations of nonwestern Others.

Given this orientation, there is a natural division in the book between feudal, state, and later corporate modes of domination and representation. Before the rise of mass culture in the late nineteenth-early twentieth centuries, it was social elites with court composers who possessed the power of commissioning, and who owned the vehicles of prestige; two of the musicians I will study in the following chapters worked for kings.

But after the advent of mass culture and its industrialization, this power shifts. Social elites still have money and influence, but their culture, high culture, loses prestige over the course of the twentieth century to popular culture, which is far more lucrative. Representations of otherness are still worked out in elite forms, though these have practically no audience today.

With this historical shift, from the dominance of feudal states to nation states to multinational corporations, the focus of this book, and its methodologies, also shifts; analysis goes where the power of representation is. The first few chapters are concerned with western European art music and are focused on composers and their music. Understanding how power and representation worked in this era with respect to music requires a mode of textual exegesis that will be familiar to musicologists, though it is combined in equal measure with analyses of society, culture, and history that will be less familiar but, I hope, instructive. With the rise of mass culture, the power of representation relocates largely to corporations, and so analysis will be of corporate practices, advertising, marketing and how these shape representations, and, of course, sounds. Again, significant attention will be paid to the underlying social, cultural, and historical issues surrounding musics and musical practices, relying on interviews, music industry publications, websites, internet newsgroups, and the popular press.

To be sure, some of the western European art music terrain has been covered before; questions of music and difference have become much more salient topics in musicology and ethnomusicology than they once were, with a spate of recent writings on the subject.<sup>2</sup> So far, however, globalization as a long-term process has received more

attention from ethnomusicologists than musicologists, though there is no reason why this should be the case, since composers of classical music are also subjects in social, cultural, and historical processes.

Musicology has, however, offered a fair number of writings that tackle the theme of “exoticism” in music—that is, manifestations of an awareness of racial/ethnic/cultural Others captured in sound. Many of these studies, it seems to me, suffer from a well-worn approach that tends to fetishize form and style. For example, in the leading English-language encyclopedia of music, the article on “exoticism,” by a well-known musicologist of the subject, ranges from the 16th century to the present, and includes figures such as Bob Dylan, whose interest in roots and African American musics is characterized as exotic.<sup>3</sup> This kind of work, while very learned, nonetheless shows some of the symptoms of what I would call the classical music ideology, which finds a home not only in music departments but also more generally in the concert-going public.

Let me spend some time with this concept, for it suffuses much of the prior work on the subjects in this book. I think it is important to deconstruct this ideology, for when one is studying works in which representations of peoples from other cultures are present, the stakes become higher. It is one thing to think and write and speak unquestioningly of geniuses and masterpieces in and of themselves, but quite another when these ideas, as well as, more importantly, conceptions of selfhood and otherness are at play, when one social group claims to own the power of representation while denying it to others, who are then represented.

By “the classical music ideology,” I refer to an ideology that has as its two foundational tenets the conceptions of “genius” and “masterpiece,” two concepts that arose in their present form in the first half of the nineteenth century.<sup>4</sup> They are neither “true” nor “false,” but culturally and historically located. That is, they are concepts that emerged in a particular place and time because of a complex of reasons that are social, technological, cultural, historical, and economic, though are nonetheless concepts that some people accept as being true. The situatedness of these and other ideas are well known to historians and students of culture, yet the “classical music ideology” remains dominant in most music departments.

A great deal is invested in these concepts. Composers, composing, and compositions are reified in the classic Marxist sense; works are likewise fetishized. Even though the composer is dead and their works texts, both composers and works are thought to speak directly to the listener. A work of music can evoke an extremely personal set of reactions, initiate an astonishingly personal interior journey. This is thought to be almost a magical process, so powerful—and mystified—that it is akin to a religion in which composers are gods, their works sacred texts, with performers and sometimes musicologists vying for the position of high priest, with the position of hagiographer the consolation prize.

Students of masterpieces focus on the twin pillars of form and style, as though these emanate solvelfy out of composers’ heads as the purest distillation of their individuality. Or Great Works—assumed to be full of Great Ideas (though these are seldom explicated)—are compared to thinkers contemporaneous with the composers as

though there is a *Zeitgeist* at work, without examining where these ideas come from, how they were shaped by the time and place of their origin, how they traveled.

Musicology is primarily based on the study of individuals and their works and thus tends to be dominated by a usually unacknowledged Enlightenment notion of the individual—and the later idea of genius—so that musicians are not usually viewed as subjects inhabiting a particular historical moment and a particular place, but instead are viewed unproblematically as total agents: things happen in a musical work because composers make them happen. Accordingly, biographical information on composers is sometimes used as a point of departure for musicological analyses, which can produce some useful insights; but other times, some writings run the risk of reductionism or essentialism by attributing how pieces sound to composers' psyches and biographies, rather than asking more complex questions about composers as social actors in particular times and places.

I would argue instead that we usually know too much about composers, and that if we knew less, we would be forced to learn more about their time and place, view them as social, cultural, and historical subjects rather than autonomous individuals with well known biographies. To the extent that it is used at all, the composer's biography ought to be the window into a time and place, the mediator between the "private" self of the composer and the wider world.

For the classical music ideology, and thus much musicology, what are seen as incidental or irrelevant matters—such as culture and history (in a particular sense that I will address in a moment)—are usually left unattended to, or presented as generally

inconsequential background to composers' lives and works. The absence of attention to history as a material force speaks to another of the foundational concepts of the classical music ideology, the idea of transcendence. Since artworks are thought to speak directly to their listeners or viewers, whatever history, culture, or social conditions that produced them are thought to be irrelevant. But, as Raymond Williams writes, "we have to break from the common procedure of isolating the object and then discovering its components. On the contrary we have to discover the nature of a practice and then its conditions."<sup>5</sup>

Its conditions, its history. The classical music ideology cherishes this idea of transcendence of the time and place in which a work was written, which means that most scholars of music tend not to cultivate a concept of history as, say, a historian does. History is not perceived as a dynamic force that shapes peoples' lives, shapes the way things were, and are. History, instead, is usually construed as a collection of facts that may or may not be relevant in studying a piece of music. As in ethnomusicology and anthropology where one speaks of the "culture concept," it is just as possible to talk about a "history concept" in the historical fields, though I take these two to be pretty much the same thing, the one in the past and the other in the present, with the understanding that the past is never wholly past and the present is never wholly present.

In English studies, there is some textual work being done today that is attentive to culture and history. The major figure is Stephen Greenblatt, who founded a new approach in literary studies called the New Historicism; it is no accident that Greenblatt frequently acknowledges his debt to anthropologist Clifford Geertz.<sup>6</sup> The new historicism is an approach that situates literary works in more than just their cultural/historical contexts; it

attempts to uncover meanings in works that were contemporary at the time. Why is this text the way it is? What were people thinking about, talking about, doing, in a particular moment, and how do all these things leave traces in texts? As Max Weber writes, the social sciences are primarily interested in knowing “on the one hand the relationships and the cultural significance of individual events in their contemporary manifestations and on the other the grounds of their being historically ‘so’ and not ‘otherwise.’”<sup>7</sup> There is no reason not to introduce this perspective to the humanities, as I will attempt to do in the following pages. Another guiding idea comes from Michel Foucault: “How is it that one particular statement appeared rather than another?”<sup>8</sup> That is, what are the historical, cultural (and other) reasons that resulted in a particular statement, defined broadly as any text?

In the late 1980s, the emergence of “new musicology” mounted a powerful challenge to many of the long-held assumptions of older musicologies that I have been critiquing here. I was in graduate school at the time, and the emergence of Richard Leppert and Susan McClary’s volume *Music and Society* was greeted with palpable excitement by many of us, opening our eyes to new approaches, and pointing to earlier publications such as Jacques Attali’s *Noise: The Political Economy of Music* that most of us hadn’t know of before. More new musicology works followed, influential books such as Rose Rosengard Subotnik’s *Developing Variations* and McClary’s *Feminine Endings*, both in 1991, as well as a spate of important writings on popular music, with Simon Frith’s *Sound Effects* and Robert Walser’s *Running with the Devil* two early and significant books.<sup>9</sup> These and other works offered powerful critiques of the

musicological business as usual in their theoretical sophistication and their engagement with fields beyond musicology such as literature, women's studies, philosophy, sociology, and anthropology.

Yet in some quarters the old musicology remains, the classical music ideology still operative, although sometimes with a veneer of the new musicology. The dominant musicological interest in "works" as self-contained entities and their form and style—apart from the conditions of their making and hearing—continues. History and culture continue to be ignored or minimized while composers and their works are still privileged, as is, increasingly, the critic/musicologist.

Due in part, I think, to the cultural studies boom, such approaches have become so hegemonic, so naturalized, that even outsiders to musicology have adopted them when they broach musical subjects. To pick just a recent example that also addresses some of the concerns of the present book, Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh write in the introduction to *Western Music and Its Others* that their edited volume attempts to "enhance the classification of different modes of appropriating and representing other musical cultures, different techniques of the musical imaginary."<sup>10</sup> While I might not disagree that there is such a thing as "the musical imaginary" (though, of course, it needs to be historicized and socially situated), I would take exception to the authors' apparent assumption that modes of appropriating and representing other musical cultures stem solely from this imaginary. The editors well know that musicians don't work in vacuums, but the momentum of decades of musicological scholarship that emphasizes style and form at the expense of everything else is very difficult to overcome, even for



musicological outsiders. The underlying reasons that a particular musician interacts with musics from another culture in a certain way are cultural, historical, and social—not to mention situational and contingent—and cannot be easily grouped into a- or transhistorical “modes.”

Likewise the editors’ attachment to “modernism” and “postmodernism” as style categories, which replicates musicological practices. While I suppose it is possible to group musicians into these broad classes (which grow vaguer daily through overuse), the editors’ use of these categories is based on what composers do:

We can now discern two basic, structural relations-of-difference to the musical Other at work in musical modernism and postmodernism. The first, as in those composers who drew on other musics, is one of recognition of difference yet attempted aesthetic incorporation or subsumption. The second, as with serialism and other high-modernist tendencies, is the attempt to construct a “relation” of absolute difference, nonrecognition, and nonreference.<sup>11</sup>

This kind of periodizing is common nowadays in musicology and beyond, standing in for more thorough examinations of particular histories. Apart from the murkiness of this passage (are they saying serialism is “postmodernist”?), there are enough counter-examples that one could offer that would put this formulation in doubt. Serialism, after all, is only the most rigid of stylistic modernisms—plural—and there were plenty of modernist composers (such as Igor Stravinsky) who freely made use of music of their Others and played with serial techniques in the course of their careers. Even if there were such examples, the underlying problem remains: the problem of

“music and difference” is seen as a musical problem first, perhaps solely. I would argue instead that there is no such thing as “the musical other,” that this is an essentialized concept. People in different historical situations have ways of constructing their Others in different ways, which they do in part with music; the music of the Other has not played much of a role in this process until comparatively recently.

Thus, despite a nod toward the new musicology, writers such as Born and Hesmondhalgh, who in other ways have much of value to offer, are trapped into simply continuing the trend of earlier musicologists (though the authors are, respectively, an anthropologist and sociologist) by tending to concentrate on composers, specific pieces, and/or style, rather than on broader ideological and cultural shifts that have left deep traces in musical processes and genres that might not be accessible, or even discernible, with such an approach. The result is that there tends to be a good deal of historical blindness, and concomitant absence of insight, on historical, cultural, and social questions in studies of music.

Ethnomusicology has been more sensitive to the question of situating particular practices in their cultural contexts than either musicology or cultural studies, but since its main methodology is ethnography it tends to be presentist in orientation, which means that history is rarely taken into account, though there are some notable exceptions such as Veit Erlmann and Ronald Radano, who know how to be deeply ethnographic while conducting historical research. Erlmann, for example, in writing what he calls a “historical ethnography,” conducted extensive archival and historical research on South African musics to make a compelling argument about modernity and globalization, while

Radano similarly makes extensive use of historical materials in writing a serious and much-needed deconstructive history of “black music” in America that calls into question many cherished clichés about this music and its practices.<sup>12</sup>

Ethnomusicological and anthropological models for my own work include Steven Feld, who was the first to put the problem of world music on the map for most of us in an early and prescient article entitled “Notes on World Beat.”<sup>13</sup> Later work by Louise Meintjes, among others, including a detailed and thoughtful ethnography of a recording studio in South Africa, has helped enrich and deepen our knowledge of the workings of the production of “world music” in an international market.<sup>14</sup> Another example is anthropologist Sunaina Maira’s ethnography of diasporic South Asians in New York City, *Desis in the House*, one of the best studies of music and identity I know.<sup>15</sup> These and other scholars are helping to blaze the trail of a new (ethno)musicology, to which I hope to contribute with *Music Power Difference*.

Following these and other scholars, it is clearly possible to take a more ethnomusicological/anthropological approach to the study of music in history, to attempt to understand the deeper social, cultural, and historical underpinnings of musics and musical practices. Colonialism, imperialism, and globalization have had far greater effects than offering composers inspiration, effects that have left deep marks in the cultures and practices of both colonializer and colonized.<sup>16</sup>

Like many existing (ethno)musicological works, *Music Power Difference* is also concerned with the surface manifestations of “exoticism,” and colonialism, imperialism, and globalization, but it attempts to explain them by examining the social, cultural, and

historical processes that gave rise to them, as well as to less obvious tracings of the Other in music. In doing so, the less evident residues of western music's encounters with other cultures can be unearthed. Thus, this book takes Weber, Foucault, and Williams seriously on their assertions quoted above. This book is not only about works, or style, or form, or composers: it is a book about history and culture—and music that attempts to be sensitive to historical periods and conceptions of difference in them.

While there are some discussions of premodern musicking and otherness, chapters in this book range mainly over musics from the early modern to the present, and consider the various ways that “the west”—including the U.S.—has confronted, represented, and appropriated those whom it has taken to be, or constructed as, its Others, at home and abroad, how these various interactions and practices sound musically, and how the people represented also attempt to represent themselves. What emerges is that while some of these representations and appropriations are heavy-handed and xenophobic, these and more subtle modes of musical interaction date back centuries. It is also clear that Europe's experiences with its colonized Others informed European attitudes to its internal Others and vice-versa, ideologies that also found their way to the U.S.

Following Marshall Berman, I place selfhood, the ability to narrate one's own life, at the center of modernity.<sup>17</sup> But western European modernity is predicated on a conception of selfhood that was made in large part in reaction Europe's Others, and is still strongly dependent on constructions and conceptions of otherness. The “discovery” of the New World was the discovery of new modes of difference, of new forms of otherness, and this discovery played an important, even constitutive, role in making

modern selfhood. A new conception of otherness was one result of the colonial encounter, and a crucial factor in the rise of modernity itself.<sup>18</sup> Others (gendered, racialized, and classed) were no longer construed as existing on some sort of continuum with western subjects, but were instead forced into the subordinate half of a pair of binaries. It has become fashionable in some theoretical camps in the last couple of decades to deconstruct binary oppositions, but people still live by them, still construct discourses and practices around them. I would argue that binary oppositions are by far the most salient means by which modern western bourgeois subjects made, and continue to make, conceptions of racial, ethnic, and cultural difference. Simply put, it is because of difference that modern western people can know who they are. As Stuart Hall writes in a memorable passage, “the English are racist not because they hate the Blacks but because they don’t know who they are without the Blacks.”<sup>19</sup>

To address these and other issues of difference, selfhood, and music, it is essential to move beyond the usual musicological rubric of “exoticism,” introduced above; it is pointless to talk about “exoticism” as a kind of singular practice—there are, now, exoticisms. The term “exoticism” in its standard musicological usage tends to cover up, gloss over, the varieties of treatments of otherness in the last few hundred years. The point of the chapters that follow is not only to historicize dominant conceptions of otherness, but also to historicize the many ways that otherness has been represented in music by Europeans and Americans.

*Music Power Difference* is thus organized around three clusters of the organized domination of other peoples by westerners—colonialism, imperialism, and

globalization—and the ways that these systems construct different forms of otherness, conceptualizations of modern European selfhoods, and music.

There is a risk that in focusing on western modes of domination and representation, those whom the west constructs as its Others are homogenized. I hope this book is not read that way. I hope, rather, that deconstructing the workings of power and historicizing “exoticism” so that whatever utility it may have is forever qualified, is in itself a useful project.

Last in this section, I probably need to say a word about what is included, and what isn't. Like my earlier books, this one takes something of a case study approach, although there is at the same time a loose organizing chronology. Though my earlier books met with some criticism for employing such an approach, I make no apology for it. Musicology and ethnomusicology have plenty of detailed histories and ethnographies in print already, on which I will rely frequently in the following pages. What is more pressing now, I think, is to try to bring these fields not only into greater dialogue with each other, but into dialogue with other fields in the social sciences and humanities. There are big conversations going on in anthropology, sociology, history, literature, and other fields that this book hopes to partake in and contribute to, and I hope that fellow workers in my fields of ethnomusicology and musicology take this book as an entry in a common conversation across disciplinary boundaries on major intellectual questions.

*Music Power Difference* is divided into two sections, the first considering the historical systems of colonialism and imperialism, the second concerning globalization as

a cultural system. This division does not to imply that ideologies of colonialism and imperialism are gone (there is, for example, a substantial literature on neo-colonialism and imperialism). On the contrary, much of the second portion of the book demonstrates the ways that earlier conceptions of difference are alive and well in our own era and the recent past.

Following this introduction, the first chapter of the book examines the rise of European colonialism, especially the impact of the “discovery” of the New World, and changing conceptions of selfhood and how these are intertwined with origins of tonality (the musical system of functional harmony that is still used in popular music) that arose around the beginning of the seventeenth century; and opera, which arose around the same time. Most musicologists have examined these histories strictly from a musical/technical vantage point, overlooking other aspects of European history that might have shaped the rise of these important developments in western European music. Tonality as a musical language creates centers and margins, effecting a kind of spatializing musical system in which Others can be managed at a distance. Opera was a powerful new dramatic representational form. There is an extended discussion of a seventeenth century English masque by Williams Lawes (baptized 1602, d. 1645) that exemplifies new attitudes towards music and space that are the subject of this chapter.

The next chapter considers how musical signs signifying nonwestern Others, particularly peoples from Africa and the Middle East, entered the western European musical vocabulary. By the early eighteenth century musical representation practices are set in place that remained for the better part of a century: “misplaced” downbeats,

unexpected modulations, dissonances, disjunct melodies. In other words, musical innovations were smuggled into works through their representations of otherness. Works considered include Jean-Baptist Rameau's *opéra-ballet Les indes galantes* (1735), Mozart's *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* (1782) and Beethoven's Symphony no. 9 (1823).

The third chapter examines the "age of empire," roughly 1875-1914, in which Darwinian thought heavily influenced conceptions of difference. Other peoples were not seen as different, or even inferior as in the past, but further down the evolutionary scale, far behind their western counterparts in terms of cultural development. At the same time, urbanization and changes in consumption patterns gave rise to new forms of desire of the Other, with musicians and other artists writing of their fantasies of the exotic. The old category of the aesthetic, the notion of art for art's sake, found a new valence as a way to appropriate and represent Others while still keeping them at bay. The musical subjects of this chapter are Maurice Ravel and the American composers Charles Ives and Henry Cowell.

In some ways, *Music Power Difference* is a distant sequel to my *Global Pop: World Music, World Markets* in its concern for western treatments of otherness.<sup>20</sup> This kinship is clearest in Part II, which is broadly organized around today's global/corporate capitalism, and examines the acceleration of discourses of otherness and modes of representation of otherness since World War II, an acceleration that has come about as a result of new communication technologies, new regimes of consumerism, and new approaches in advertising and marketing. Now, modes of representation can change in an



instant, so quickly that it seems as though one day the music industry believes its Others to be one thing, and the next day, something else—but that something else may well be a representation dating back hundreds of years. The rate of change of representations today is in large part because there are so many tropes of Otherness now available. As the following chapters will show, newer ideas about Others did not eclipse older ones, but instead complicated the notions of the Other and otherness. So in the last few decades, the Other, the exotic, have become extremely complex and powerful tropes in western culture that can change on a dime.

Following an introductory chapter that introduces globalization and other key themes of the second section, chapter 4 examines the rise of the discourse of multiculturalism, signifying a new attitude toward difference. This attitude is explored in the music and discourse of the American bassist and producer Bill Laswell, who thoughtfully collaborates with musicians and attempts to minimize the exploitative role that a western musician can play in relation to nonwestern musicians. This chapter argues that “collaboration” has become an important trope to signify how western and nonwestern musicians work together, but at the same time market pressures force musicians to emphasize their individuality. Laswell provides a good example of how a musician manages these two ideologies.

Chapter 5 fleshes out the question of hybridity in world music; if “collaboration” is the key sign of interpersonal relations in world music, then the key metaphor of the resulting sound is hybridity, a term applied both to musical sound and to the diasporic peoples who make such sounds, caught between their ancestral cultures and the dominant

culture where they live. The success of the discourses of hybridity has meant that older discourses of authenticity are no longer the only ways that western listeners apprehend musics from other places. Listeners to world music are now less likely to criticize music that doesn't seem to be authentic, and are more likely to welcome it as a hybrid. This chapter traces the success of the hybridity concept and the ways that hybridity as a marketing term and as a productive category all too frequently mean that musics by Others that are labeled as hybrid collapses these musics—and peoples—into merely new forms of difference. As such, these musics continue to occupy the subordinate slot in global cultural politics. It is also the case that hybridity is occasionally constructed as simply another kind of authenticity, demonstrating the always-shifting nature of regimes of authenticity around what is commonly called “world music.”

Chapter 6 addresses the music industry's policing of the “World Music” category and why this label permits the inclusion of many different genres of music from elsewhere, rock in particular, but almost never country music. Central to this categorizing is the anthropological concept of culture, which became a well-known idea in post-World War II America. This chapter includes an extensive examination of what is to my knowledge the only album of country music that has been treated as world music, *Songs of the Hawaiian Cowboy*, a recording that has been marketed and received (in reviews and in Internet newsgroup discussions) as world music through a complicated and overlapping set of discourses that construct this music as “cultural” (in the anthropological sense) and “historical” (rather than commercial, as country music is usually viewed). There will also be an examination of the different class locations of the

audiences of these musics, as country music is associated with working and lower middle class audiences, whereas world music is much more of a middle class phenomenon.

The final chapter examines what is perhaps the most ubiquitous mode of representation in the U.S.—advertising—and the rise of what sounds like world music being employed in television commercials. These sounds are increasingly used to try to sell something, whether a flight on an airplane, a cruise, an automobile, or a trip. More often than not, however, these musics are in no way related to any indigenous or traditional practices, but are instead entirely composed, fabricated, either by performing musicians or those who work in advertising. These musics often make use of what sound like choruses of children and of untexted vocal lines (usually sung by a solo woman vocalist); sometimes, as in the case of the English group called Adiemus, the language heard is wholly invented. This chapter examines these musics and those who make them (composers, music production companies, and advertising agencies), and the uses to which these musics are put. The argument is that these musics tap into old western notions of escaping the ordinary, of the voyage by signifying “the world,” but that they do this for new reasons. The myriad public discourses of globalization, transnationalism, the information age and the information economy are reconfiguring conceptions of prestige and the kinds of capital one needs to survive in the contemporary moment. As the concluding chapter also emphasizes, world music has been reduced to a single “style” that is used in these ads to signify “globalization,” marking the most recent triumph of the capitalist market over this music.

---

## INTRODUCTION

1 Part of this introduction is modified from “Old and New (Ethno)musicologies” invited presentation, 11th International Seminar in Ethnomusicology, Intercultural Institute of Comparative Music Studies, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice, Italy, January 27, 2005. I would like to thank Giovanni Giuriati for inviting me to participate.

2 Some of these recent works include Jonathan Bellman, ed., *The Exotic in Western Music* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998); Georgina Born and David Hesmondhalgh, eds., *Western Music and Its Others: Difference, Representation, and Appropriation in Music* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); Yayoi Uno Everett and Frederick Lau, eds., *Locating East Asia in Western Art Music* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 2004); and Glenn Watkins, *Pyramids at the Louvre: Music, Culture, and Collage from Stravinsky to the Postmodernists* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1994). And many recent articles, including: Philip Brett, “Eros and Orientalism in Britten’s Operas,” in *Queering the Pitch: The New Gay and Lesbian Musicology*, ed. Philip Brett, Elizabeth Wood, and Gary C. Thomas (New York: Routledge, 1994); Victor Anand Coelho, “Kapsberger’s *Apotheosis* . . . of Francis Xavier (1622) and the Conquering of India,” in *The Work of Opera: Genre, Nationhood, and Sexual Difference*, ed. Richard Dellamora and Daniel Fischlin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997); Ralph Locke, “Constructing the Oriental ‘Other’: Saint-Saëns’s *Samson et Dalila*,” in *The Work of Opera*, and “Exoticism and Orientalism in Music: Problems for the Worldly Critic,” in *Edward Said and the Work of the Critic: Speaking*

---

*Truth to Power*, ed. Paul Bové (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2000); Paul Robinson, "Is *Aida* an Orientalist Opera?" *Cambridge Opera Journal* 5 (July 1993): 133-40; and W. Anthony Sheppard, "An Exotic Enemy: Anti-Japanese Musical Propaganda in World War II Hollywood," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 54 (summer 2001): 303-51.

3 Ralph P. Locke, "Exoticism," *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy (accessed 8/22/2005), <http://www.grovemusic.com>.

4 On genius, a favorite source is Christine Battersby, *Gender and Genius: Towards a Feminist Aesthetics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989). For a musicological account, see Edward Lowinsky, "Musical Genius—Evolution and Origins of a Concept," *Musical Quarterly* 50 (July 1964): 321-340 and "Musical Genius—Evolution and Origins of a Concept—II," *Musical Quarterly* 50 (October 1964): 476-95.

5 Raymond Williams, "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory," in *Problems in Materialism and Culture* (London: Verso, 1980), 47.

6 Much of Greenblatt's work makes his debt to Geertz explicit. For a recent homage, see Greenblatt's "The Touch of the Real," in *The Fate of Culture: Geertz and Beyond*, ed. Sherry B. Ortner (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

7 Max Weber, *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, 72, as quoted by Anthony Giddens, *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 138.

---

8 Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon, 1972), 27.

9 Richard Leppert and Susan McClary, eds., *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance, and Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Jacques Attali, *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985); Rose Rosengard Subotnik, *Developing Variations: Style and Ideology in Western Music* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991); Susan McClary, *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991); Simon Frith, *Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, Politics and Rock 'n' Roll* (London: Constable, 1983); and Robert Walser, *Running with the Devil: Power, Gender, and Madness in Heavy Metal Music* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1993).

10 Born and Hesmondhalgh, "Introduction: On Difference, Representation, and Appropriation in Music," in Born and Hesmondhalgh, eds., *Western Music and Its Others*, 39.

11 Born and Hesmondhalgh, "Introduction," in Born and Hesmondhalgh, eds., *Western Music and Its Others*, 16.

12 See Veit Erlmann, *Music, Modernity, and the Global Imagination: South Africa and the West* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), and Ronald Radano, *Lying up a Nation: Race and Black Music* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

---

<sup>13</sup> Steven Feld, “Notes on ‘World Beat,’ ” in Charles Keil and Steven Feld, *Music Grooves: Essays and Dialogues* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994). Feld has continued work in this area in many subsequent writings, some of which I will draw upon in what follows.

<sup>14</sup> Louise Meintjes, *Sound of Africa! Making Music Zulu in a South African Studio* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003).

<sup>15</sup> Sunaina Marr Maira, *Desis in the House: Indian American Youth Culture in New York City* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002).

<sup>16</sup> On this point, see Fredric Jameson, “Modernism and Imperialism,” in Terry Eagleton, Fredric Jameson, and Edward W. Said, *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990).

<sup>17</sup> Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Penguin, 1988), 5.

<sup>18</sup> Race and skin color, though they may seem “natural” determinants of otherness today (particularly in America), were inconsequential to the premoderns as Nancy Stepan submits, arguing that racism didn’t arise until the slave trade (Nancy Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain 1800-1960* [London: Macmillan, 1982]); see also Frank M. Snowden, *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of the Blacks* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983).

<sup>19</sup> Stuart Hall, “Ethnicity: Identity and Difference,” *Radical America* 23 (October-December 1989), 16.

---

<sup>20</sup> Timothy D. Taylor, *Global Pop: World Music, World Markets* (New York: Routledge, 1997).