

## Dialogue

### Grooving on Participation

SF: In "Motion and Feeling through Music" you contrast engendered feeling as a performative and improvised mode to embodied meaning as the compositional mode. But you also acknowledge that music which is composed is also performed, so but tell me more about some engendered feelings in the Western European art tradition.

CK: Even the most through-composed, penned-down, no improvisation, no cadenzas, nothing in the way of spontaneity piece, still has to be put into motion and given feeling. I love the example of the Casals' cello sonata because everybody thinks of that as a transformation of Beethoven, in which Beethoven disappears in the fury of Casals getting his feeling into those notes and transforming them. And that is what all the mystique of the conservatory is. Henry Kingsbury's book<sup>1</sup> is very good about getting us closer to revealing how, when you get right down to the nitty-gritty, somebody has got to inject feeling into those notes, and how out of the almost mystical awareness of whether a person has feeling or talent or the right touch at the keyboard and all that stuff which is impossible to objectively evaluate, the conservatory is separating out people who will become concert pianists from those who will be accompanists. All that sorting out at the conservatory is done around motion and feeling questions, performative issues. Do they have enough touch? Can they put enough legato and mist into the Chopin, enough fog into the Debussy? Is there enough moonlight in the Moonlight Sonata? All of that has got to be done by touch. So all musics must be evaluated processually, groovily. All that engendered feeling means is 'groove': engendering groove, creating groove. How are the touches on cymbals and string bass achieving lift-off, achieving some kind of groove that other musicians can interact with? And the same goes for any other style, including a ponderous symphony orchestra. Somebody has got to get that machinery cranked up in a tempo with some kind of tension.

SF: At the time you wrote this piece ethnomusicology as a field was quite different. Alan Merriam's *The Anthropology of Music*, in 1964, was a radical challenge in many ways but it wasn't addressing musicologists like this piece does; Merriam was proposing...

CK: ...better contexting - that's what was going to anthropologize the musical...

SF: ...but here you engage in a discussion not with Merriam and the functionalist, historical dimensions of an anthropology of music. Instead, you posit that analysis and evaluation have something to do with each other, a notion which is a much more radical challenge to ethnomusicology, and one that taps into the critical agenda of musicology. I find that interesting because you are saying that one can ethnomusicologically evaluate jazz in like ways to how the art music audiences and critics evaluate compositions. However, you're proposing that it can't be done from a text, that it must be based in performative, improvised, emergent, processual structure. And you're claiming that jazz players and audiences do it all the time. Looking back, that is one of the fascinating things about the article to me, how different it was compared to most of the ethnomusicological literature at that time. Why weren't other ethnomusicologists taking on Meyer, and in a larger sense, taking on the best of Western theory on its own turf and terms?

CK: Because most of them were inside the Western way of thinking. They were evaluating music syntactically. Merriam, when he's getting to the nitty-gritty of how to analyze music, is still back there with Kolinski,<sup>2</sup> transcribing and counting intervals, trying to tell you the ratio and significance of where the first note is in relation to the end note, and so forth. And these were very simple structural comparisons, such as counting the number of minor seconds. That was the methodology.

SF: But by then, performance ethnomusicology was already off the ground. Mantle Hood<sup>3</sup> was already doing his thing, had his students playing music. There was more going on than Kolinski or Herzog type interval analysis...

CK: ...but what Merriam said about the people who were playing it was right: they would get into playing it, without telling you *how* they got into it. The *how* of that, and what they had to do, what they had to unlearn in order to be a proficient *gamelan* player or whatever, was not getting articulated very clearly.

But to answer your question about why not bring in historicist, positivist, relativist, or any other anthropological schools of thought in relation to Meyer, I really wanted to 'broach the lion in its den', to go right to the heart and say that we were ignoring the most basic part of music. The only thing that I

didn't get in the article that I wish I had is the textural thing, the sound of massing strings, the sound qualities, textures, and timbres. To me the textures are as important as the processes.

SF: You get at that a little bit when you use words like "chunky" and "stringy" to describe the bass player. Those sort of ethno-textural concepts prefigure the participatory discrepancy paper, but is still more on the processual side...

CK: ...my final point was to go after the deferred gratification --I think of it as "deferred", taking the touch and feel out of it-- the Protestant ethic stiffness of the Meyer schemata, by counterposing a more Freud-like liberation psychology.<sup>4</sup> Playful, polymorphous, perverse. Be a child, be playful, let the grooves fall where they're going to fall. That was my final appeal: not to an anthropological corrective to musicology, but to a psychoanalytic one.

SF: Juxtaposing jazz rhythm sections with the canon's masterpieces was a particularly unique move in terms of both ethnomusicology and race and culture politics in the mid-sixties. There's a debunking in that which resonates much more with the contemporary critique now levelled at musicology by ethnomusicologists and some musicologists like Susan McClary and Gary Tomlinson. And you addressed the high culture crowd in their own *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* too, just as Judith Becker has now done in her 1986 piece, "Is Western Art Music Superior?" that appeared in *Musical Quarterly*, where her line is that musicology's contribution to colonialism is the notion that there are no musics which have degrees of achievement parallel to Western Art Music.<sup>5</sup>

CK: The way I try to put that, in the participatory discrepancy paper, is to ask if we will think, fifty years from now, of Kenny Clarke's tap or John Coltrane's tone as a process and a texture comparable to Beethoven's Ninth Symphony. This processual thing that Kenny Clarke had, and the sound that Coltrane had, are as magical to me as anything that has ever been structured or syntacted in music. But I don't think that particular aesthetic has really won through. I assumed when I wrote this article that it would blow the cover of Western musicology, show that the emperor has no clothes, take care of this whole music department obsession with syntax, order, sequencing, and deferred gratification. I thought it was a good theoretical statement against all that. But I didn't go and try to do the measurements to prove that these gaps exist, to prove that the "chunky", "stringy" thing is happening.

SF: Is that what Lenny wanted you to do?

CK: His response was that if these things are there, we can notate them in micro-micro-syntax, in dotted-dotted-dotted eighth notes. He argued that we can capture Kenny Clarke's tap with a notation system, but I don't think that's true. Some jazz musicians I've talked to perceive the gaps, perceive that people are fooling with the time, and can tell you, for example, that the bass player is ahead of the drummer with the pianist in between. Yet other perfectly accomplished jazz musicians hear it all as absolute time. The rhythm section gets better the tighter we are, and the more together we are, the better we get...<sup>6</sup>

SF: ...aren't they' using the term "together" as an encompassing metaphor to cover all their discrepancies, their differences in articulation...

CK: ...my point is that the engendered feeling skills and the articulation skills are variably perceived by the craftsmen inside the tradition...

SF: ...variably articulated verbally, as well...

CK: ...right... These things are out of awareness, or variably in awareness. It's a kind of liminal area. And now we've not just talked to jazz musicians, but have measured the participatory discrepancies and can say how many milliseconds this cymbal tap is ahead of the bass pluck. Olavo Alen in Cuba did some measurements in East Berlin where he shows how the different beats of the bells....

SF: ...wait a minute Charlie, why do you need the measurements? Aren't you doing an about face and taking Meyer's position? You're making such a strong claim that this is about feeling, that a feeling is a subjective inner state which is culturally constructed, that listening sophistication and awareness and involvement as part of a musical community all develop over time as part of people's involvement in the music, that there is this wonderfully complex, subjectively constructed dimension of what engendered feeling is. Isn't measurement just a way of microdotting those eighth notes? Why is it so important to measure all this stuff? Just to *prove* it?

CK: I think so. It has to be proved to the music schools of the world, and to all the people who are training little kids. This is about simply showing that, yes, things have to be in tension, that your touch on the piano has to be your own touch. . .<sup>7</sup>

SF: ...so you're arguing simultaneously that these things are so objectively real that they are measurable, and that they are so subjectively real that any musician socialized in these patterns of playing will intuitively recognize them...

CK: But do you see what the point is of proving it in different cultures, such as Olavo's measurements in Cuba? I think that having independent verification that all musics have to be out of time to groove *is* important. We don't have to do it many times, and we don't have to do it for all musical styles, although it would be interesting to see. Are all those notes behind the abstract pulse, or ahead of the abstract pulse? In which cultures? And so on. There's a lot to do there to demonstrate what the feel is, what the engendered feeling is. Is it some mystical thing? Yes, but it's also quite precise. This is certainly the beauty of Olavo's measurements. He shows that you have a lot of latitude on this one bell beat, maybe way ahead, or maybe as close as 20 milliseconds before, but never on it or behind. On this other bell beat, however, it has to be almost exactly on the pulse, with only a 20 or 30 millisecond margin of error. Certain notes have to be very accurate, others can be played almost anywhere as long as it comes before the abstract pulse. I think those are important things to know because they tell every single child, potentially, it's *yours*. It's not by some abstract rule out here. You've got to tune up to this performance tradition, and your time sense is crucial. It's going to be out of time, it's going to be out of tune. You don't have to have perfect pitch. Do you see how that liberates people? The notion that you're tone deaf disappears as a dismissal. The same motive animates this paper and the participatory discrepancy paper. I want to liberate the music-making from the strictures that say you must know how to read it, you must follow the score, you must be in absolute synchrony.

SF: But anybody who is well trained in Western European art music knows those strictures are baloney anyway. No musicians are really *just* following the score. And there's plenty of improvisation at earlier moments in Western Art Music...

CK: ...the further back you go, the more there is, but it really got squeezed out...

SF: But what about the person who accepts your analysis as right on for jazz, but insists that you don't need to denigrate the complexity of all Western art music just to prove it? We know that Western art music is harmonically more interesting and complicated than it is rhythmically. If you can count three or count four, you can play it. So is the key thing you've done here to insist that theorists can pay attention to jazz because...

CK: ...jazz is more like the rest of the world's musics than is Western art music.

In theory, all of Western music could be liberated from the Weberian rationalization, demystification, no more improvising, no more cadenzas, no more leeway, with everything in the hands of the conductor. Actually going back through the centuries to more improvisation, more of leaving the phrasing of fiddle parts to the fiddle sections, or of the concert master conducting instead of a conductor. You can re-trace Western art music's history. I think Chris Small's work of going back and showing how much leeway and *ad libitum* and cadenzas there was, the *bravura* piano style right up until the 1920s and '30s that had to be dismissed as flowery and romantic, all shows the steady diminution of engendered feeling in Western music historically, the effort to move it increasingly into the hands of the conductor or of the tradition.<sup>8</sup> Then you punch out the mistake, like Glenn Gould makes his recordings perfect by putting just the touch he wants on the piano note and punching that in. And once he's recorded those things just the way he wants them, he doesn't ever have to play them again. Isn't that the position he took after awhile, that the definitive version has been done?

SF: But so did Thelonius Monk. When you listen to the Orrin Keepnews' Riverside digital reconstruction of the *Thelonius Alone* session, you hear a half hour of Monk in the studio, at the piano, working out an arrangement of "Round Midnight." He plays four bars, eight bars, a phrase, gets into something and doesn't quite like it. So they stop rolling tape, call a new take, Monk takes it from the top of the phrase and goes on. So you hear the whole process, and then you hear the original release, which you come to realize was not improvised in one run, but was constructed from many phrases and sections spliced together from all the takes.

CK: But the ethic, aesthetic, moral, political, and all the larger value dimensions of Western through-composed music are towards the perfect performance ideal. Think of Raasaan Roland Kirk who, when he hears the question about what happens if the guy playing the nose flute gets a booger in it, yells down the bar, "It's all part of the music!" That part of the aesthetic is not there: a booger in the nose flute is not part of the Western aesthetic. You're trying to get perfection, abstract, clear, note-for-note perfection...

SF: ...lots of musicians in various places are into perfection....

CK: ...but not in that same sense of a crystalized, totally dead thing, never to be done again because it's been done so perfectly. My realization of Beethoven's ideal composition....

SF: ... Don't you think that Cecil Taylor or Anthony Braxton are interested in that? What about *gamelan*s? *koto* players?

CK: Cecil probably no. Anthony Braxton, maybe. *Koto* players, yes, because it's a civilization preoccupation to get the perfect performance. Might be Balinese religious *gamelan*, no and Javanese court *gamelan*, yes!! I'll bet that the Japanese have an aesthetic of 'that was the perfect rendering of three deer in the bamboo' on the *shakuhachi*. But it's a function of class society and hierarchy and perfectionism and only the talented can do this...

SF: ...but when every music in the world meets the recording studio and record producers, and when people gain some consciousness of the degrees of new and heightened control they have through recording technology, something else sets in. I don't want to do a 'West versus the rest' number on any of these issues...

CK: ...I do! I think the Western perfection preoccupation is embodied in the recording studios. And you are right, whenever a Western recording studio meets Sonny Adé, not such good things happen. Things that had been negotiated in a living tradition and in a public space are all of a sudden being negotiated in a recording studio with layers and tracks and dubs and splices and samples....

SF: ...I don't go for that at all...it just seems like an overdone version of cultural imperialism hypersensitivity...

CK: ...you put the two together, a Western perfectionism and the recording studio's capacity to give that to you, and it's a deadly one-two punch for a whole lot of 'spill drink' musical traditions, where spilling the drink was part of the sound.<sup>9</sup>

SF: I think you're making this too much into a game of absolutes. I think that the recording studios embody simultaneously the power to thin out *and* to augment a lot of musical potentials.

CK: But you see, I would argue that where ever that recording thing happens, perfectionist, classicizing, Apollonian dream realizations are creeping in. We listened to Abdullah Ibrahim's *African River* recording this morning, and it was like a classicized, ethereal adaptation...

SF: ...why shouldn't he be allowed to do that?

CK: No, no, that's all good. It's just that when I think of the honking saxophones of the '50s, and what was captured in those little tunes by The Big Heads and The Spidermen and so forth, that's so good, so powerful, so raw, so clear...

SF: ...but Abdullah Ibrahim's music is such a vital blend of South African tunes, gospel and vernacular harmonies, Ellington's horn section sound...

CK: ...but it's a classicized thing. It's been perfected, dreamified, it's a different world..

SF: Duke Ellington wanted a dreamified world too. And even the raucousness of Charles Mingus' bands could create that dreamified world, like the ballads on *Mingus Mingus Mingus Mingus*--"Celia" or "I X Love" or "Goodbye Porkpie Hat..."

CK: ...I agree. And that same Ellington could rock the live house with "The Hawk Talks" or "Jam with Sam" on the Seattle live concert LP. All I'm arguing is that we recognize it as a classicizing, perfecting, dream-world thing that happens in recording studios, and that takes it away from the dancers, which takes it away from public space...

SF: But to return to "Motion and Feeling," it's the only piece in the book that wasn't written in the 1980s. Here's Chuck, way out there, 20 years before critical cultural studies, saying that analysis and criticism *do* have something to do with each other, and that, contrary to the ethnomusicologists and cultural relativists who don't want to evaluate anything, there is a way to talk about what's a *good* groove completely apart from Meyer's deferred gratification. It's an article that could have been as seminal 20 or 25 years later ...

CK: ...to me, it is important that the statement is there in the middle-'60s, on the eve of big changes in the US. . . .

SF: ...and big changes in the music education world; this is the moment where both jazz and ethnomusicology are on the verge of some validation....

CK: ... so this is not coming totally out of left field at the time. John Coltrane's music is peaking at that time. He was in Chicago, and I was there every night for six nights listening to his music. That was the impetus to argue with Meyer, and to say this matters, to set it straight. It's not about syntax. It's about grooving. So in that sense, it's not some premonition of an '80s understanding of things. It's actually contemporary with Coltrane's music and the revolution of sensibilities that implies.

SF: Tell me about the response to it...

CK: ...the article went into a void. It was not cited that much, although it did get reprinted in Tom Kochman's anthology *Rappin' and Stylin' Out* as a manifestation or feeling-tone of black culture. But it didn't stimulate a lot of response in the academic music departments of the world, nor in ethnomusicology. Where it usually resurfaces is as a perfunctory footnote in most popular music rebuttals, starting with John Shepherd's pieces in the 1970s. People writing an article about popular music and how it is not understood and has its own aesthetics and so on might cite this article and Andrew Chester's "The Rock Aesthetic," where he talks about the "intensive" and "extensive." He was trying to get a handle on the same thing, that there's a whole other way of apprehending non-Western or non-high culture music.<sup>10</sup> But it's not like these popular music writers really took the article seriously either, to go out and investigate where the groove is really coming from. There is something about the popular music, mass mediated music, and cultural studies people that remains theoretical and outside of the actual music. They don't want to get into the music and figure out how it actually works. Which is again why I think that *some* amount of measuring and comparing of how participatory discrepancies work in different kinds of styles, of how engendered feeling gets engendered is important.

SF: But the difference, of course, is in the ethnographic grounding part, and that is what is so absent from cultural studies. That's one reason that it's surprising to me that in this article you never mentioned that you are both a bass player and a drummer, and that you have an experiential basis in lessons, in playing, and in listening to analyze the bass-drums grooves and interactions the way you do. Put a record on, and here is Chuck playing the air cymbal and getting the feel of the tap, or fingering the air bass and getting the pull or push of the pulse. You've played along with records. You've picked up the bass or sat at the drums, and grooved with these guys as they were grooving. Why is that personal and experiential knowledge base overtly absent from this piece?

CK: I assumed that to say that I know this from inside my head, from having plucked bases and tapped cymbals, wouldn't carry much validity in the world of either the social sciences or the humanities.

SF: But the article talks about the physical reality of engendered feelings, and about the dance and the motion, about how it's all in the body. Obviously that was a different time in which people were not writing as reflexively. But it is in *your* body, too, which is not talked about here.

CK: Right, and the real source of this understanding is in all the very problematic relationships that I've had over the years, as a drummer with bass players, and as a bass player with drummers. What's my relationship to Steve Swallow in the summer of 1959, and how were we not hearing the beat the same way? Or my relationship to a piano player not comping in a way that would help my tap? You try to solve problems in a rhythm section to make it groove at all tempos, and you've got to become aware of all these issues. But you're right, I didn't put that in the article.

CK: What prompted you to write "Communication, Music, Speech about Music" Steve?

\*\*\*

SF: Largely my affiliation with The Annenberg School of Communications at Penn in the early 1980's. I was constantly feeling a kind of tension around discursive uses of the communication concept there. It



songs of his youth that made him happy then, is now real sad. So it was perfectly clear to the Tiv that there were no emotional reference points that could be tied with any degree of reliability to the syntax or to the song itself. Everything was dependent upon the individual.

Then I come to a wonderful interview in the Music in Daily Life project that we did, with a couple hundred people talking about music in their lives. One woman, an oboeist being interviewed by her boyfriend, gets really pissed off at him in the course of the interview. She says "you're trying to tell me that I should hear music a certain way, and I'm telling you that when I listen to Bach cantatas, some mornings it makes me silly, laughing, giggly, giddy, and I just think it's the brightest, sunniest thing I've ever heard. The next morning, I can put the same Bach cantata on, and I am in tears, totally devastated. It's the saddest thing I've ever heard. And this is the same piece of music, and that's how it is for me, and you can't say how it should be." And her boyfriend argues that this is counter-intuitive, and they have this wonderful argument. So she is a Tiv, right? She is saying that the music is absolutely neutral. How does the oboist and the Tiv take, that the music is neutral and all the rest is in the ear of the 'beheader...' fit with your "interpretive moves."

SF: I don't think there's a necessity for a level of verbal articulation which goes with a level of perceptual reality. It's much more complex than that. The reason why the interpretive moves framework is kept as general and as vague as possible is because I think the most important thing about the metaphoric tendency, which is pan-human, is that our minds work in associational, categorical, and locational kinds of ways. So I'm trying to ask, How can we get a handle on some of those general intersubjective tendencies? I'm as concerned as you are with theorizing why we don't hear exactly the same thing. Social phenomenology reduces this simply: "You have your experience, and I have mine. I have my experience about your experience, and you have your experience about mine. But I don't have your experience and you don't have mine." But of course there is more...

CK: ...layers of overlap, of conjoining possibilities at any given moment...

SF: ...yeah, that we talk or tap our foot or nod our head in the same way, or get together on the dance floor in a certain kind of way, or are in the music together without ever saying anything to each other, or that we can coordinate this conversation with a whole bunch of head nods and back-channel cues which keep saying to us that we're talking together, and in the same interlocking groove. Of course, all that is socialized and very cultural. What I'm saying here is that there is a kind of stylistics of listening that intersects and in a way completely neutralizes the false dichotomy of the musical versus the extra-musical..

CK: ...and gets away from this stupid referentialism that tries to tie it down...

SF: A generalized model of what constitutes a musical experience lets us ask if something like this intuitively happens to you. The distinction that needs to be drawn is between how people use music and how people perceive music. I'm not making any claims about the hard-wiring of the brain or the extent to which people perceive music auditorially in a model of sameness of difference. I'm interested here in the social process; that only begins with perception, but it centers in engagement..

CK: But I'm confused, because they all seem the same to me. To perceive it, to engage it, to hook into it?

SF: Lenny and the psychologists want to hook this ultimately to the physiological, perceptual apparatus of music. They want to tie these kinds of syntactic questions to a cognitive theory of what it means to hear and to perceive the music. But we are not just talking about ears hard-wired to brains here. We are not talking about any kind of physiological autonomy at all from the subjective processes of cultural construction. And simultaneously, we are saying that the discursive possibilities--how people talk about music--are as culturally constructed as the social dimensions of its perception. And that is why one kind of musical pattern might potentially be linked to a variety of emotional states, not just one.<sup>13</sup>

CK: Sure, and not just to an opposition such as I'm happy/I'm sad.

SF: "Interpretive moves" is just an attempt to throw as many cultural monkey wrenches as possible at any kind of more autonomous cognitive modeling of the musical perceptual process. It is not to say that those models are useless at all, but that we shouldn't assume that culture and experience will be modeled any better in cognitive theory than it has been in music theory.

CK: But you're not denying the physical basis of sound...

SF: ...the physical dimensions of the sound are undeniable. I just want to keep problematizing all of the ways in which researchers separate off the psychological, physiological, musicological, text-centric, syntax-centric forms of analysis, from what we are calling culture and experience. Cultural analysis, which is about experience, about what people hear and how people hear it, is worked through the socialized, biographized, historicized process of lives and of people living and relating.

CK: And we sure as hell don't know enough about that.

SF: Ironically I'm a devoted reader of all the music psychology journals. I find it stimulating to read research on musical memory, auditory illusions, perceptual universals, laboratory experiments. All of that is fascinating to me, but in a model of musical communication, we cannot privilege those perceptual things as autonomous from the complexity of culture, experience, interpretive moves.

CK: In the *My Music* interviews, I've heard it over and over again about people using music to match a particular mood or to help them get out of it. It is a standard Aristotelian catharsis. But nobody has the same music, and nobody has the same moods. It's hard work to get shared communication about how this music is doing its thing, to specify further, *how* is it working, what's at work there?

SF: I hope that the interpretive moves framework gives people a particular language for thinking about the necessarily vague, general, and nebulous dimensions of the experience of music. Like the groove. What I find fascinating is that you can find the locational, associational, and categorical--the range of interpretive moves--in talk which is utterly vague, nebulous, inarticulate, and inexplicit. We have to separate out the analytic ability to see interpretive moves from the notion of articulateness of speech. Vast amounts of discourse are not very articulate, yet they contain clues to interpretive moves.

CK: And we have got to be tolerant and curious about how it is that people can or cannot articulate their meaningful musical moments. I keep thinking about the talk last night with Greg Urban about music in his mind all the time, or other people who always have a soundtrack on. Talk about interpretive moves!<sup>14</sup> These are people who are doing a phenomenology of music all their waking hours. Something is on there, something is in their brains, and we didn't realize until a couple of years ago that this phenomenon even existed. We don't know if it works cross-culturally. Are there Kaluli hearing this all the time?

I wanted to ask you earlier, too, about emotional correlation. For the Kaluli, it must be that some of the songs that prompt the burning of the dancers are tied to an emotional state, right?

SF: Sure.

CK: Then there's some kind of fixity there between the musical process and an emotional flow? Whenever you hear that kind of song, you're tuned in to a whole range of references and missing people.

SF: Studying something like the *gisalo* ceremony<sup>15</sup> for what it indicates about the relationship between sadness and anger reveals many subtleties that will not be revealed directly in the variety of anger or sadness terms in the Bosavi language. Those feelings are embodied, formed, and performed through form, performed into feelings that are enacted. So for me, there is an aesthetics of emotion, and a presentationality or performativeness of emotion, which is a powerful cultural dimension that transcends the extent to which we can talk about emotion *vis-à-vis* consciousness, rationality, and the extent to which emotions are culturalized at that level. It's not the fixity of musical process that is the key here -- it's the staging of song performance as an arena for the aesthetics of emotional display, confirmation, circulation.

CK: It's an old cliché that music in some way codes the language of emotions. After re-evaluation counseling and studying that theory a little bit, about how does anger move to grief, then to laughter.<sup>16</sup> We know that there are sequences of emotions that people in a culture go through, and which are part of purging themselves of past hurts or past losses, or death and separation anxieties. I think we are just lifting the lid on all that. When we sit here and talk about this, I realize that there are thousands of studies undone in every culture in the world about these musical, emotional mixes and sequences. Why is soul music bittersweet, or blues bittersweet? People always talk about that. It is bitter and sweet. I think it is the truth. The truth is that it is about emotional mixes in people's minds. It's not just that the oboist hears the Bach cantata as sad on one day or happy the next. There is probably a happy/sad balancing act going on at any given moment. The happiness part is predominating at one moment, and all of a sudden the teeter-totter shifts and the nostalgia for home or family that comes up around that music takes over, like nostalgia for home and family takes over at certain moments in a Kaluli song. Jung said that you

build a unique self out of ego-stuff, and that your stay on the planet is really all about that emergent self. But music is an even better summarizer of all of that stuff...<sup>17</sup>

SF: ...That was the point I wanted to make too. Because music does this in directly feelingful ways. It is the physicality of being in the groove together that brings all this out. James Brown's point is great, that we are hearing it before we are seeing it, and that physically the sense of seeing is something apart, out there, whereas you feel the resonance of your voice inside of your head and chest. The sense of touch, the sense of feel, the sense of sound are so deeply and thoroughly integrated in our physical mechanism. James is onto it, the Kaluli are onto it, and we're just trying to get communicational and cultural theory onto it.

\*\*\*

SF: When did you write the "participatory discrepancies" piece?

CK: I wrote it right at the Bo Diddley moment that opens it and closes it, so to speak, and I just whacked it out in a few days. I got the urge to go down to talk to Bo when he was in Buffalo, playing New Year's Eve at the Tralfamadore Cafe. I talked to him backstage, and I thought the interview was so hilarious. I was busy being the scholar, trying to analyze this thing, and take the four-letter words out of there. It's a little bit bowdlerized. I was so amused by the fact that I thought we understood each other, and yet he was protecting his PD's pretty carefully, saying, "You really don't have a handle on my groove, buddy. That's my groove."

SF: How did you choose these two words, participatory discrepancies?

CK: In Latin, *discrepare* is to rattle, a sounding apart, a separation. It kind of captures this notion of sounding split-seconds apart, and that these discrepancies bring people into the sound, in a totemic or pre-symbolic mode.

SF: That they invite participation.

CK: Right, *discrepaae* describes pretty well those rattles and shakers and all the things that shamans are using in all those cultures. It's about rattling and shaking, and hissing high-hats that open and close.

SF: It's about a driving force in some sense. And 'participatory', that comes from Barfield?

CK: It especially comes from Levy-Bruhl, who is using *participation*, or the French word for participation, which I think is the one Barfield is going on, too. I could just as well be using 'deep identification', in terms of Arne Naess' 'deep ecology', where he talks about our need to return to a deep identification with the natural world.<sup>18</sup> It has been formulated a lot of different ways by a lot of different thinkers. Part of the problem of saying one is a participation theorist is that the field is rather diffuse. Nobody has ever consolidated it into one theory. Levy-Bruhl probably wrote the most about it, but he was ridiculed a fair amount of the time, or was seen as a lackey of imperialism because he was theorizing that there were different ways of thinking, interacting, participating. That was seen as a primitive, negative mode for most of the 20th century. Only now, with the ecological crisis, are we beginning to see that it is absolutely required to get some of that acknowledgement of diversity back if we want to live in balance with the natural world.

SF: You start off very simply by saying that the power of music is in its participatory discrepancies, and these are basically of two kinds, processual and textural. Twenty years before this, in the "Motion and Feeling" paper, you lay out the beginnings of the critical nature of the processual aspect. Why does it take twenty years to catch up with the textural aspect? What made you feel that out-of-tuneness is as important as out-of-timeness?

CK: I think it was meditating on Tibetan monk music, and trying to figure out why it is not groovy. It does not have a hell of a lot of process that is going to make you snap your fingers, or get up and shake your bootie. Syntactically, there are no compelling structures there that invite you to defer gratification or not. I began to wonder what was at stake with this music. These monks have been practicing up there for 800 years, every day, and this is what they have come up with. It is very timbral and textural, with an emphasis on harmonics and overtones. And I realized that the pairing of the conch shells, the pairing of the shin-bone trumpets, the pairing of the shawms, the pairing of the bass trumpets, that all those pairings of instruments were designed for one goal: to maximize overtones, harmonics, and "beats", or throbbing of pitches rubbing against each other. I thought that is one goal of music, to maximize timbres, textures,

overtones, and harmonics. It puts you into the spiritual or supra-natural, above the Himalayas, in a spatial head. If you wanted to account for what was powerful about Tibetan music, you would have to have a theory of texture and timbre that was just as powerful as any theory about process or syntax.

SF: Did this strike you as an instrumental issue only? Were you also thinking about the texture and timbre issues in relation to the voice?

CK: Well, another source of thought was from Goral music in southern Poland, where they sing in a deliberately out of tune way. It was also coming to me from the Epirus subtone clarinet. Once I got it into my head that timbres and textures were involved in the magical part of Tibetan music, I could hear the magic in a lot of musics. I noticed that the polka bands in Buffalo all had two trumpets, and I wondered why did two trumpets evolve as the preferred sound? In the Bay City Four, there are four guys: a drummer, an accordion, and two trumpets. You must have two trumpets in order to get polka happiness. To get that polka brightness in the sound, those two trumpets have to be rubbing together. So in my mind, I do see it as a mainly instrumental phenomenon.<sup>19</sup> But I hear what you're saying about the voice, like with Louis Armstrong or Billie Holliday. Is it in the growl, or in the whine, or in the grain?...

SF: ...in the fluidity, the liquidity, and the vibration recipes of the voice...

CK: It is very powerful, and it comes out of the voices first. Of course the monks in Tibet are chanting and playing instruments alternatingly, but they use the voice with the same purpose of maximizing the overtones and the harmonics. So it was becoming clear to me that texture deserved as great a place in the theory of how music involves people, and draws you into deep identification, total participation, and past the logical contradictions of separation of the other. I don't want to say that music "stands for," because I want to get past the symbolic. I think your iconicity idea does that, says that this identification is more than symbolic. You now *are* the other, or the other is *in* you. You are *in* the music. The music is *in* you. Clearly the textures are just as powerful for drawing you into music, and it into you, as are the processes. Probably some combination of the two is the most effective. That is why the Bo Diddley point at the end of the article is very important, that he uses that tremolo effect as both process and texture. In the end, all these analytic aspects of syntax, process, texture, lyric, and context are simply abstractions, the pulling apart of something that is really a unified whole. In its performance, in its on-going energy, it is a unified thing. Timbre becomes process, texture becomes groove, and syntax is shaped by both of them, or is used to hang both of those things out there.

SF: You have a rap in here about participation which involves a certain idealization, participation as the non-alienating, positive, anti-fascist, anti-dominating aspect of music...

CK: ...except that it is fascist. This is a point that I have trouble with whenever I'm lecturing in the classroom, whenever I'm arguing with people over the dinner table about why participation theory is so important to me. Participation is fascism. It becomes the bundle, all the rods, united for greater strength, with the sum of the parts being greater than that of the individuals. When it's done nation-state style, it is a horror. That is what the Holocaust was about, and every genocidal nationalism is about this false participation, if you will, of the nation-state, which turns solidarity into a state apparatus. So yes, you are playing with fire when talking about participation. My notion is that we have got to make the world safe for small-scale, decentralized, diversified participations, so that the big participation of uniforms, tanks, and kicking ass on the alien peoples never happens. People have to be satisfied in their localities, and feeling intense local involvement, participation, and deep identification, or else those energies will be channeled into statist nightmares. Everybody requires participatory consciousness. That is how we evolved, and we are tuned up to participate. The people who are not getting that, who are not involved in music and dance and trance locally, are susceptible to false identifications and participations, to all the non-solutions to their problems that the State offers.

SF: To pick up on an earlier issue, tell me about Olavo Alén's measurements and how you think they confirm the point you are driving at in this piece.

CK: The Olavo Alén measurements are discussed in his 1986 book *La Música de las Sociedades de Tumba Francesa en Cuba*. The importance of Olavo's measurements is they provide a certain confirmation completely independent from my theorizing. He measured the relationship between two or three drums in an ensemble and a bell pattern in different Cuban traditions. He took his tapes to Berlin and worked on them for a year and a half of micro measurement, using some strange machine that I still can't fathom the

nature of. He was able to get very precise measurements as to what degrees of latitude there were for each note in a repeating bell or drum pattern, where they are in relationship to each other, and where they are in relationship to some absolute sense of measured time.

SF: These are natural recordings, done in context?

CK: I think so. So he can determine that there is a great deal of latitude on the second bell beat, while there is not much at all on the middle bell beat. There is a kind of breathing in this phrase, some slack in the first third, some slack in the last third, but the middle has to be tight. Or in another style, the slackness is in the middle, and the ends have to be tightly in synch. A lot of subtle things that you can kind of feel, can be more firmly established by measurement. And again, for me the most important thing is that this all takes away the power of perfectionism, of addiction to perfection, and of the notion that music is absolute Platonic forms to be realized by mere performers. So it doesn't matter if you are tone deaf or have no sense of rhythm, because there is some confirmation that everything has to be out of time, everything has to be out of pitch, and approximation is fine. It reverses the whole aesthetic, the whole expectation of who is musical and who is not. It makes clear that everybody is musical, that every single child born on the planet has a physiological need to be tuned up in this loose tuning, loose timing way. None of this "You missed it by a quarter of a second!" The very life blood of music in all cultures has to do with discrepancies. And that is why I want to use the "negative" term. I want to keep that open, somewhat chaotic, somewhat diversified, differentiated, non-perfected, continually evolving, and emergent universe. A real basic world-view is at stake in the PD premise, that the PD's are where the life-blood, the juice, the groove, the funk, and the delights of music, and of life, are. It has to do with a world-view that says that the universe is open, imperfect, and subject to redefinition by every emergent self. Every individual on the planet has a different time feel, just like they have a different signature, and they dance differently. I will never forget bringing friends, two couples, to a polka dance. I figured they would have to get used to the dancing, that it would take awhile before they could get into the groove. The minute they stood up and started dancing, I could see that they had their styles. One guy had a hesitant, stutter-step going, while the other one had a big loose stride. And their wives had to keep up with this initiation. But after they had been out on the floor for a couple of minutes, I could see a style emerging, and that they had their own way of dancing. I think that every single person on the planet has this emergent, expressive self, and that notions of perfection, and of in-tune and in-time are part of a conspiracy to shut them up, to pacify them and leave them in a corner appreciating the "true" talents. That's all bullshit. I'm sick of it. So for me it is really important to insist that the discrepancies are discrepant, and that everybody can be allowed to find their own time feel, and their own sense of pitch, timbre, and voice. What is so beautiful about Billie and Louis is that they have their own voices, absolutely distinctive. There are no other voices quite like theirs. I could imitate them until I am blue in the face, but Billie is still Billie, and Louis is still Louis. Each of us has that same capacity to find our own voice. It is all about the emergent Self (with a big capital S), and these normative, perfectionist standards of what music is are in the way of the emergence that every single soul on the planet has a right to.

\*\*\*

CK: Steve, why do we have to have uptown? Why do I have to share you with Bob Armstrong? I want you all to myself, only downtown.

SF: You know, the uptown/downtown part got cut out of the title when the piece was published in the *Yearbook for Traditional Music* because the editor, Dieter Christensen, thought it was too mystifying for an international publication. Fine for the New York City slickers, not so hip in Eastern Europe.

CK: But that is the whole point of the article. Or is it? Why do you think having both versions of the groove is so important? Are you trying to reconcile idealism and materialism again.

SF: It's an attempt to reconcile scholarly and vernacular, theorized and the on-the-ground local grooves. It tries to position some heads on the high theory side-- Armstrong, Meyer, and Roman Jakobson<sup>20</sup> -- with "lift-up-over sounding" on the Kaluli side, mediated by the vernacular, the world of James Brown, Aretha Franklin, PDs, the dance floor, the rainforest, the feelingful sonic, the directly articulated, downtown.

CK: You say "aesthetics as iconicity of style." Style, iconicity, and aesthetics become overlapping abstractions by the end of the article, so that each has a bit of separation from the other, yet they are also the same at some level?

SF: Not quite. The idea is that aesthetics is more than the fineness of execution, virtuosity, beauty, or any type of evaluative judgement in the sense of holding your thumb up to a painting. By iconicity of style, I simply mean the multiple representations of one idea: how the visual, the verbal, the musical, the choreographic, the ritual, the ceremonial, the everyday, and the mythological are all interwoven and layered in Bosavi. They create a whole, a naturalized whole that is a centerpiece of Kaluli identity. So when you unpack the dense meanings of "lift-up-over sounding", you see how that one idea is the trope for Kaluli style.

CK: Why do you need the word 'iconicity' when you can just use 'trope' and 'base', and have the Armstrong terminology?

SF: I want to align the style concept with the important insight from semiotics that you can have several varieties of these very direct, very feelingful resemblance relationships between things which we might otherwise refer to as symbols.<sup>21</sup> There is a particular kind of symbolic realm where there are feelingful, interpenetrated relationships, felt resemblances, imaginative connections between the thing-out-there, and the feeling-in-here. What I want to capture in the discussion by iconicity is a bringing together of perception and feeling, the abstraction and the un-abstraction of it.

CK: So this does the job of Bateson's "ecology of mind", or Berman's "enchantment of the world", or any of these participation understandings of reality, that the sound and the sentiment, the music and the people, are consubstantial at some profound level which is not symbolic, not "standing for." So the title could also say "aesthetics as iconicity as style?"

SF: Yes, except that here I use style as the master notion for the expressive, like the way an anthropologist uses "culture" or the way a linguist uses the word "grammar." Style is to expression what grammar is to language, and what culture is to social behavior.

CK: One of the nice points that I like in here is that bringing the emotions and the cognitive back together is important - the emotional resonances and the cognitive grasp, carnal knowledge, body knowledge. This is a way of knowing, an emotional, musical way of knowing. Can you elaborate on that a bit more?

SF: "Lift-up-over sounding" is the most basic Kaluli idea about music but also an important general idea about nature, a general idea about talking, about interacting, about what a costume is, about what a dance is. It is as broad and profound as the idea of "harmony" in the West, and covers a lot of the same metaphoric space. What I like about this is that such a profoundly resonant and insightful concept is also, at the surface, vague and un-exegetical. That is why it is like the notions of "groove" or "beat" - say no more; what it is is what it is. Get in the groove and let the good times roll. And "lift-up over sounding" invites participation the way the groove does. And this is what leads to the idea of an emotion, a feeling state as a way of knowing, evaluating, understanding.

CK: But how is it a way of knowing? How is that like a cognitive mapping of reality as well?

SF: Because participation reinforces the feel of the groove, strengthens the naturalness of it, keeps it from the realm of abstraction, keeps it in practice. "Lift-up-over sounding" is only a metaphor, only an abstraction in its glossed, English manifestation. Out there in Bosavi, it's an attitude, a resource, a style, a predisposition, a stance, a posture, a tendency. This is the importance for me of the cognitive and the emotional, the way the feelingful dimensions are reinforced and experientially grounded, what you call engendered feeling, or what Bob Armstrong called "form incarnating feeling"...

CK: ...the schooling of the emotions, so to speak, the channeling, the controlling, the expression..

SF: ...as well as the presentationality of them, the aesthetics and expressive display of emotion...

CK: ...but "lift-up over sounding" is not simply super-serious either. With your Gadamer quote up front, and your downtown take on this, you are insisting that it's playing, basically; that people are playing with the participatory discrepancies, and playing with each other...

SF: ...well, play does work out the tensions, and is an important socializing force... the impulse to "lift-up-over" sound, to be interactive, is a highly social impulse, just as the impulse to play is a highly social

impulse, to overlap a little more, a little less, to fision, to fuse, to dip and bend a note a little more this minute, pull it back to center in the next...

CK: I was puzzled with these ratios of environment to sound, to social relations, to nature, to natural, to human nature, to sensate, to sensual, to sensibility. I kind of had the feel of what all that is about, though the word natural in quotes gives me a bit of a problem. But when I get to "in it" and "of it," I'm less sure. What does all that map?

SF: That diagram is just a structural summary that begins with three analytically separable things: the environment; sound; and social relations. These are the domains that are cognitively and emotionally integrated and united by this "lift-up-over sounding" trope. The environment is the experience of nature. Sound is the sensing of nature, of the natural, of what is there. Social relations are the conventionalization of human nature. So just as sound, environment, and social relations are related, so nature, the natural, and human nature are also brought together and integrated. Similarly, the environment is experienced sensately; sound is a sensual experience; and social relations are about the sensibility of experience. So what is sensate, what is sensual, and what is sensible are also brought together in this formulation. Sound is the centerpiece of a dual dialectic, on the one hand with the environment, on the other, with social relations. This dual dialectic articulates the relations between people and place, articulates the naturalization of place and experience, and the central position of the sense in that process.

CK: They are sharing sounds, so to speak.

SF: Right. So the dialectic between the sound and the social is the rationalizing of what it means to be *of* this place. Rationalization, in Weber's sense, involves a tension between consciousness and identity, between a performed idea and the formation of ideation or ideology. That is the dialectic of sound and the social world. On the other hand, there is a parallel kind of dialectic between the sound and the environment. The environment is the world of nature and of the sensate, but sound is always in a particular relationship to it, because sound is the perceptual means through which one experiences that natural sensuality, through which one is *in* it. What it means to be *in* it is the fluidity between what is nature and what is natural, between what is sensate and what is sensual. That is a process of adaptation, parallel to the process of rationalization. So people are adapting to their environment as they are rationalizing it. They are dealing with being *in* it, parallel to dealing with being *of* it. Identity formation is the rationalization, the notion that you are of this place. Adaptation embodies a fluidity of awareness and inspiration: the perception of a world becomes the appreciation of it...

CK: ...right...perception, appreciation, awareness.. .

SF: The sense of being *in* a place and the sense of being *of* a place is a meeting point for materialist ecological perspective and a symbolic aesthetic one.

CK: Using the Weberian concept of rationalization, you are arguing--which I think is bold and beautiful--that participation is rational, not like Lévi-Bruhl says pre-logical or not quite a conscious mode. You are arguing that the rational way to be of the world is to keep all these ratios in balance, and in one place. From that you could argue, like Bateson and Berman do, that everything else is schizoid, making divisions where there don't have to be divisions, making logical contradictions where there don't have to be. So you are arguing for the rationality of participatory consciousness, and for deep identification with sound.

SF: I am arguing that adaptation and rationalization are parallel and intersecting, and that every dimension of the dialectic of sound and the environment is parallel to the dialectic between sound and social relations. Sound is more than a mediator; it is oscillating the environment and social relations. Sound is the locus of the tension between what it means to be in a place and of it. That is what I see as the intersection, or the rub, the tension, between the Weberian notion of rationalization and the biological or evolutionary notion of adaptation.

CK: So if this is how it works for Kaluliland, then what the *hell* --and I use the word deliberately--do you do with our social relations/ sound/ environment connection? Do you think you can put this map on the West and then show the distortions?

SF: No, why should I?

CK: Because I want this for us...

SF:...and I want it for them!...

CK: ...I want to get us back in synch with the natural world and be hearing the birds and the waterflows of our place. We have so many screens between us and that kind of a balancing. What is the corrective? What do you learn from the Kaluli that we can apply here?

SF: Well, I'm interested in the potential of these ideas for critiques of civilization but...

CK: ...but once critiqued, what do we do to get some kind of measure...? But what about us?

SF: Well, the hell with you!

CK: Here we are back at hell!

SF: Let me put it this way: What's wrong with honestly acknowledging that this is just a passionate exploration of what it might mean to be a very different kind of human being than the one am? That is what I get off on. I don't want to *be* Kaluli, or anything other than what I am, I want to explore...

CK: ...but you *do* want to be as much a part of Kaluli culture as you can...

SF: I want to have an experience of that place and those people which challenges the ordering of my senses, the nature of my thinking, the logic of my musicality, the experience of just how profound cultural difference can be...

CK: ...so there is no Kantian categorical imperative, or a moral or political implication or generalization from your Kaluli work that you want to venture outside of your own understanding?

SF: Of course there is an imperative...

CK: There has to be, because the Kaluli have been changing dramatically over the years. All of a sudden, Chevron is there, a big money economy is plunged in there, and people have stopped doing the ceremonies. Even if it was not a question for what you tell us back here, it is a question for the Kaluli. How are they going to keep their capacity to shock you if they get culture-shocked by the incoming Western onslaught? Both directions--what is happening to the Kaluli, and what is happening to us--make it seem like you will have to extend your Kaluli understandings of things into our world, and into the world that they are being plunged into willy-nilly. I still believe in a future classless revolution or something. We have to break out of the civilization trip into something like a re-diversification of cultures in their bio-regions. That is on my mind all the time...

SF: ...mine too...let me clarify it this way: I would *love* to challenge people to be inspired by this, but I don't want to tell them *how* it should inspire them.

CK: Very often you start the day by listening to the birds conversing on *Voices of the Rainforest*, right?

SF: That gives me a lot of focus; if I concentrate and listen carefully, I can hear something new and different with each listening. I find that humbling and inspiring. And sure, it acts as some sort of corrective to the intellectual arrogance of business-as-always university life.

CK: But that brings me back to my basic question: why do you feel that you have to live uptown, in a world of high theory? I have kind of rejected that, thumbed my nose at it and said that I am going to be a philistine and a troglodyte, and sit here under a rock and snipe at it. Why do you have to be involved with that at all?

SF: What's so terrible about talking about Meyer, Sapir, Jakobson, Armstrong *and* James, Aretha, Miles, and Kaluli "lift-up-over sounding" in the same article, or, for that matter, the same sentence?

CK: You want to keep it one world?

SF: I want to force the issues about uptown and downtown, about "high" and "low" theory and ethnography, about academic and vernacular discourses--like what we're doing here in dialogue.<sup>22</sup> Theory provides one set of interpretive exercises that come out of a particular cultural and historical situation. Ethnography is a way of depicting a culture, the Kaluli world, as I experience it emerging from practices, ideas, history, biography, and all of that rooted stuff. So what is happening out there on the ground, in the trees, in the rainforest not only can that be part of a dialogue with our theoretical world, but it also has something to say it. It puts a spin on the concept of style, on the notion of aesthetics, on iconicity, on the groove. It talks back and puts a spin on all of those things, a spin which is uniquely and distinctively Kaluli, but at the same time speaks to us about the reality of all those theorizations of style.

CK: So there is no advocacy that I can tease out of you, no advocating that we do this or that we do that, or that more anthropologists do this, or musicologists do that. You simply do what you need to do to bring the Kaluli and the...

SF: ...this *isn't* advocacy ?! ...

CK: ...It could be taken that way, as a version of Kaluli/Western realities, and a reconciliation of the cultures...

SF: ...it is an interpretation of the Kaluli world which is permeated by who I am. Dig: I live in a world of listening to Miles Davis at home. I took the world of listening to Miles Davis out there to the rainforest, and when we hit the tenth chorus of "Nefertiti," some Kaluli said, "It's lift-up over sounding, right *there*," and our worlds collided in a whole new and special and wonderful way. I came back and re-read Meyer and Zuckerkandl and Bergson and then said, "Oh, it's lift-up over sounding, right *there*." Isn't that advocacy?-- to dissolve uptown and downtown, to read high theory ethnographically, through another language, through another set of tropes, through another set of lenses?

CK: You got to check it against somebody, against some culture's reality.

But those guys don't theorize about grooves as such. Do you find any of them, aside from your buddy across the table, theorizing about grooves? Sometimes I think you and I are a little mutual admiration society of two, grooving on each other, voices lifting-up-over each other, while the rest of the world could give less than a damn. We don't have a tribe, just a duet going here. Do you really think that grooving is part of the Gadamer play concept?

SF: I think you have more of a sense of mission in this than I do...

CK: ...and you don't have that sense...

SF: ...but this is a long, continuous ethnographic shock for me...

CK: ...but once shocked, you have a mission. You have a mission! Don't be coy with having no mission here! When you say "come on down to Austin and let's lift-up-over" you want to transform scholarship, you want to transform the whole way that high theory is authenticated and comes down from the mountain on the tablets. You want to cut through a lot of that to make it more Kaluli-like, the way knowledge gets perceived and generated. Let's get the emotions back into it, and let's get the whole picture here!!

SF: ...OK!!! Yes, I find it inspiring that in the Kaluli world multiple voices have to do with engagement. I like everybody telling their story at the same time. What other people might find to be the cacophony of this society is what I find to be the profound sociability of it, the thing that gives me a certain sense of how there can be a wonderfully intense pleasure verging on disorder. And scholarship for me is also about the humility of dealing with this level of disorder...

CK: ...discrepancy, disorder, difference. You value those things too...

SF: ...exactly...

CK: When you came back last time from Kaluliland, you were in tears to me on the phone. You were choking, because things that you had assumed were the Kaluli style, were the way, non-unisons and so on, that the ukeleles were beginning to strum in unison, or that what had been cooperative basketball, let's all help each other put the ball in the basket, had begun to get a competitive edge. Or you could see everybody looking to Chevron for a salary in the future, and can we get everybody into a mission school fast enough to learn enough English to get jobs. You saw a lot of changes, yet you are saying to me that there is no nostalgia? You are going to have something corresponding to nostalgia or hurt or pain if you go back to Kaluliland next time and they strum the ukeleles like Freddy Green instead of like Kaluli.<sup>23</sup>

SF: Yes, there's pain, a new and different kind of chaos for me, a confusion about why people are making the choices that they are making now. How many of those choices are being imposed and how many don't Kaluli recognize as impositions? How much of it is choice making that they are doing themselves? How much of what I am about to experience in Bosavi will I not be ready for? After all, I have depicted the Kaluli as having a musically coherent kind of universe. And the question that you can throw at me is, if it's so damn coherent, why aren't they resisting and why aren't they out there blowing up the oil fields and doing their "lift-up over sounding"? Why isn't "lift-up over sounding" helping them stay strong? Why do they want to give up gardening and give up the forest, and buy tinned fish at the store? Why does everybody want cash? What does that have to do with this particular model of social relations and

sociability that you have given us? To what extent are people making choices now that are in any way adaptive? Or are we just seeing something which is an extremely profound pattern in Papua New Guinea, where people are extremely dramatic and expressive, and make a lot of quick changes, like dropping ceremonies, and reviving them?<sup>24</sup>

CK: The beauty of this fellowship<sup>25</sup> is that you are going to be able to be in and out of there at this absolutely crucial moment of the Kaluli dialectic with the West.

\*\*\*

#### Footnotes

1. Henry Kingsbury, *Music, Talent, and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988. [CK]

2. Mieczyslaw Kolinski (1901-1981) worked with Erich M. von Hornbostel from 1926-1933, completing the Ph.D. in 1930. Fleeing Nazism he moved from Prague and lived in Belgium from 1938-51, then settled in New York in 1951, working as a composer, pianist, music therapist, and educator, later moving to Canada and teaching at the University of Toronto there from 1966-76. Kolinski is best known for his voluminous transcriptions, and his rigorous methods for the description and analysis of scale, contour, tempo and meter. Some of Kolinski's best known methodological and analytic studies are found in *The Evaluation of Tempo*, *Ethnomusicology* 3: 45-57, 1959; *Consonance and Dissonance*, *Ethnomusicology* 6:66-74, 1962; *The Structure of Melodic Movement: a New Method of Analysis*, in M. Kolinski, ed., *Studies in Ethnomusicology*, New York: Oak Publications, 1965, pp. 95-120; *Recent Trends in Ethnomusicology*, *Ethnomusicology* 11:1-24, 1967; Barbara Allen: *Tonal vs. Melodic Structure*, *Ethnomusicology* 12(2):208-218, 1968 and 13(1):1-73, 1969; *A Cross-Cultural Approach to Metro-Rhythmic Patterns*, *Ethnomusicology* 17(3):494-506; 1973.

Further perspective on Kolinski's analytic work can be gleaned by reading contributions in the festschrift dedicated to him, *Cross-cultural Perspectives on Music*, Robert Falk and Timothy Rice, eds., Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982. Also see the obituary by Beverly Cavanaugh in *Ethnomusicology* 25(2):285-6, 1981. Alan P. Merriam's method of musical transcription and analysis was derived from Kolinski and mediated through his teacher Melville Herskovits, for whom Kolinski transcribed many African and Afro-American musical materials. Merriam's approach is most apparent in the analysis section of his *Ethnomusicology of The Flathead Indians*, Chicago: Aldine, 1967. See Kolinski's review in *Ethnomusicology* 14(1):77-99, 1970. Although they disagreed on many aspects of ethnomusicology, Merriam's defense of Kolinski's emphasis on comparison can be found in his "On objections to comparison in ethnomusicology", in Robert Falk and Timothy Rice, eds., *Cross-cultural Perspectives on Music*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 174-189, 1982.

Marcia Herndon's paper *Analysis: The Herding of Sacred Cows?*, *Ethnomusicology* 18(2):219-262, 1974, was a major critical re-assessment of Kolinski's approach. Kolinski replied in *Herndon's Verdict on Analysis: Tabula Rasa*, *Ethnomusicology* 20(1): 1-22, 1976. Herndon's response to this was, *Reply to Kolinski: Taurus Omicida*, *Ethnomusicology* 20(2): 217-231, 1976; then Kolinski responded again in *Final Reply to Herndon*, *Ethnomusicology* 21(1):75-83, 1977.

Related to Kolinski's approach is that of George Herzog (1901-1984). Herzog was an assistant to Erich M. von Hornbostel at the Berlin Phonogram-Archive and emigrated to the United States in 1925. He studied with Franz Boas at Columbia and was at the University of Chicago 1929-31 and Yale 1932-35. He received his Ph.D. from Columbia in 1937 with a dissertation on Pima and Pueblo Musical Styles and taught at Columbia until 1948 when he went to Indiana University, then establishing an anthropology department. At Indiana he established (from Berlin Phonogram Archiv materials he set up at Columbia in 1936) what became the Archives for Traditional Music. He continued to work on Southwestern American Indian music, as well as African and European musics, retiring from Indiana in 1962. Herzog's music

analytic approach developed in different directions from that of Kolinski owing to his fieldwork, his training as a linguist and anthropologist, and his interest in the relationships between melody and text, or language and music more broadly. Some of his influential analytic papers are: *The Yuman Musical Style*, *Journal of American Folklore*, 41(160): 183-231, 1928; *Speech Melody and Primitive Music*, *Musical Quarterly* 20:452-466, 1934; *A Comparison of Pueblo and Pima Musical Styles*, *Journal of American Folklore*, 49(194): 284-417, 1936; *Drum Signalling in a West African Tribe*, *Word* 1:217-238, 1945 reprinted in Dell Hymes, ed., *Language in Culture and Society*, NY: Harper and Row, Pp. 312-329, 1964; *Song* in M. Leach Ed., *Funk and Wagnall's Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend*, Volume 2, pp. 1032-1050, 1950. See also Bruno Nettl, *George Herzog: An 80th Birthday Appreciation*, *Ethnomusicology* 25(3):499-500, 1981 and David McAllester, *George Herzog: In Memoriam*, *Ethnomusicology* 29(1):86-87, 1985.

On the application of Herzog's analytic framework and transcription methods see the work of his students, especially Bruno Nettl, *Music in Primitive Culture*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956, and *Theory and Method in Ethnomusicology*, New York: Free Press, 1964; also the analysis in David P. McAllester, *Peyote Music*, Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, number 13, 1949; and, *Enemy Way Music: A study of social and esthetic values as seen in Navaho music*, Cambridge, MA: The Peabody Museum (= Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Volume 41, number 3. "Reports of the Rimrock Project Values Series No. 3"), 1954. [SF]

3. Mantle Hood, (b.1918- ) completed his Ph.D. in 1954 on Javanese modal practices. He taught at UCLA from 1954-1975 and initiated and directed its Institute of Ethnomusicology beginning in 1961. During this period he worked closely with Charles Seeger. Since 1976 he has taught at the University of Maryland. His approach to performance practice as a focus for ethnomusicological training, and to ethnomusicological institutes as international conservatory environments made a major impact on the field through the 1960's and 1970's.

Hood's perspectives on performance and on field and laboratory methods are expressed in a number of influential publications: *Training and Research Methods in Ethnomusicology*, *Ethnomusicology Newsletter* 11:2-8, 1957; *The Challenge of 'Bi-Musicality'*, *Ethnomusicology* 4(1):55-59, 1960; *Musical Significance*, *Ethnomusicology* 7(3):187-192, 1963; *Music the Unknown*, in F. Harrison, C. Palisca, and M. Hood, *Musiology*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, pp. 215-326, 1963; *Ethnomusicology*, in Willi Apel, ed. *Harvard Dictionary of Music*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2nd edition. pp. 298-300, 1969; *Universal Attributes of Music*, *World of Music* 19(1/2):63-69, 1977; and especially, *The Ethnomusicologist*, Kent State University Press, 2nd edition, 1981, (originally 1971, NY: Macmillan). [SF]

4. The liberation psychology I have in mind is the Norman O. Brown sequence from *Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History*, New York: Vintage 1959, through *Love's Body*, New York: Vintage 1968, to *Closing Time*, New York: Vintage, 1974. Dorothy Dinnerstein's *The Mermaid and the Minotaur: Sexual Arrangements and Human Malaise*, New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1976 is a great book to start your thinking about sexism, the nurturance of children across cultures and historical periods, and the importance of early musical learning in relation to patriarchy. [CK]

5. A survey of the current critical musicology literature includes: Carolyn Abbate, *Unsung Voices: Opera and Musical Narrative in the 19th Century*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991; Jacques Attali, *Noise: the Political Economy of Music*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985; Christopher Ballantine, *Music and Its Social Meanings*, NY: Gordon and Breach, 1984; Judith Becker, *Is Western Art Music Superior?*, *Musical Quarterly* LXXII(3):341-359, 1986; Georgina Born, *The Ethnography of a Computer Music Research Institute: Modernism, Post-modernism, and New Technology in Contemporary Music Culture*, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation Dept. of Anthropology, University of London, 1989; Alice Cash, *Conference Report: Feminist Theory and Music: Toward a Common Language*, *Journal of Musicology* 9(4):521-532, 1991; Michael Chanan, *The Trajectory of Western Music*, or, as Mahler said,

the Music is Not in the Notes, *Media, Culture, and Society* 3:219-241, 1981; Marcia Citron, Gender, Professionalism, and the Musical Canon, *Journal of Musicology* 8(1):102-117, 1990; Catherine Clément, *Opera, or the Undoing of Women*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988; Richard Leppert, *Music and Image: Domesticity, Ideology and Socio-Cultural Formation in Eighteenth-Century England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1988; and *Music, Representation, and Social Order in Early-Modern Europe*, *Cultural Critique* 12:25-55, 1989; Richard Leppert and Susan McClary, eds., *Music and Society: the Politics of Composition and Performance*, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1987; Susan McClary, *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991; Christopher Norris, ed., *Music and the Politics of Culture*, New York: St. Martins Press, 1989; Charles Seeger, *Studies in Musicology 1935-1975*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977 ; John Shepherd, *Music as Social Text*, London: Polity Press, 1991; John Shepherd, Phil Virden, Graham Vulliamy, and Trevor Wishart, *Whose Music? A Sociology of Musical Languages*, New Brunswick: Transaction, 1977; Christopher Small, *Music-Society-Education*, London: John Calder, 1977; Ruth Solie, What do Feminists Want? A Reply to Peter van den Toorn, *Journal of Musicology* 9(4):399-411, 1991; Rose Subotnick, *Developing Variations: Style and Ideology in Western Music*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991; Richard Taruskin, The Pastness of the Present and the Presence of the Past, *in* N. Kenyon, ed., *Authenticity and Early Music*, London: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 137-210; Gary Tomlinson, The Web of Culture: a Context for Musicology, *19th Century Music* 7:350-362, 1982; The Historian, the Performer, and Aesthetic Meaning in Music, *in* N. Kenyon, ed., *Authenticity and Early Music*, London: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 115-136; Leo Treitler, *Music and the Historical Imagination*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989; The Power of Positivist Thinking, *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 42:375-402, 1989; Peter van den Toorn, Politics, Feminism, and Contemporary Music Theory, *Journal of Musicology*, 9(3):275-299, 1991. [SF]

6. I have been doing interviews over the past two or three years, mostly over the phone, with jazz rhythm section players (Jimmy McGriff, Jimmy Gomes, Steve Swallow, Red Mitchell, Milt Hinton, Donald Bailey, Vernell Fournier, Herb Ellis , Ray Bryant, Jackie Bayard, Joe Blum, Maurice Sinclair, Sabu Adeyola among others) and each person has a different version of where the groove comes from. [CK]

7. See Edward T. Hall's books for more on out-of-awareness culture, *The Silent Language*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1959; *The Hidden Dimension*, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co. See footnote 38. , dialogue 1 for Olavo Alen's work. [CK]

8. Max Weber, *The Rational and Social Foundations of Music* , Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1958, is largely about the history of tuning the piano to eliminate the participatory discrepancies. See also Hugo Zemp's film *Yutz and Yodel*, that carefully documents the decline of the wild Swiss "yutz" into tame choral yodeling, Roderic Knight's analysis of "Vibrato Octaves: Tunings and Modes of the Mande balo and kora" in *Progress Reports in Ethnomusicology* 3/4:1-49, Chris Small's discussion of William Billings and the open choral traditions of North America in *Music-Society - Education* , Chapter 6, "A Different Drummer". Wherever bourgeois values go, the effort to squeeze the life out of sounds and turn them into rational, controlled notes is sure to follow. [CK]

9. Chapter 5 "Milwaukee" in C. Keil, A. Keil and R. Blau, *Polka Happiness*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992, contains an analysis of why Slovenian style polkas in the smooth, streamlined Frankie Yankovic manner became hegemonic in that city. Too make a long story short, there is an Apollonian or "proletarian perfectionist" tendency in many people's music traditions that is highly intolerant of "false starts," "swooping glissandos," "broken strings" and "spilled drinks." Both the recording studios of mass culture and the bourgeois idealism of high culture can reinforce that perfectionist tendency in a variety of contexts. The Big Heads, Fast Drivers, The Snake Bites, The Zebra Boys are all on *Taxi Jive: Songs from the African Bush*, Mace Records, MXX 10-048. [CK]

10. John Shepherd, Graham Vulliamy, Trevor Wishart, *Whose Music? A Sociology of Musical Languages*, London: Latimer New Dimensions; reprinted by Transaction, 1980. Andrew Chester, "Second Thoughts on a Rock Aesthetic: The Band" in *New Left Review* 62: 75-82. [CK]

11. A good overview of the theories of communication that shaped the field in the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's can be found in John Fiske, *Introduction to Communication Studies*, New York: Routledge, 2nd ed., 1990. Good readers include Michael Gurevitch et. al. eds., *Culture, Society and the Media*, London: Methuen, 1982; Richard Collins, ed., *Media, Culture and Society: A Critical Reader*, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1986. Also see John Fiske, *Television Culture*, London: Routledge, 1989; Constance Penley and Andrew Ross, eds., *Technoculture*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991. For a more comprehensive overview see Erik Barnouw, ed., *Encyclopedia of Communications*, 4 volumes, New York: Oxford University Press, 1989; the journals *Media, Culture and Society* and *Journal of Communications* usually carry interesting debates and case studies.

On commodities and consumption, relevant perspectives include: G. McCracken, *Culture and Consumption: New Approaches to the Symbolic Character of Consumer Goods and Activities*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988; Daniel Miller, *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987; Arjun Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986; Wolfgang Fritz Haug, *Critique of Commodity Aesthetics*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986; *Commodity Aesthetics, Ideology and Culture*, New York: International General, 1987. [SF]

12. Erving Goffman (1922-1982) developed an approach to interactional dramaturgy that profoundly impacted the course of microsociology, ethology, and the anthropology of interaction. His most influential statements are: *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life*, Garden City: Doubleday, 1959; *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1963; *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*, NY: Doubleday, 1967; *Strategic Interaction*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1970; *Relations in Public*, New York: Harper and Row, 1971; *Frame Analysis: an Essay on the Organization of Experience*, NY: Harper and Row, 1974; *Gender Advertisements*, NY: Macmillan, 1979; *Forms of Talk*, 1981, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. For more on the literature on Shutz and phenomenological sociology see dialogue 1; footnote 29. [SF]

13. On the relationship of Leonard Meyer's framework for style analysis to its cognitive implications, see Bertram Rosner and Leonard B. Meyer, *The Perceptual Roles of Melodic Process, Contour and Form*, *Music Perception* 4:1-39, 1986; also Leonard B. Meyer and Bertram Rosner, *Melodic Processes and the Perception of Music*, in *The Psychology of Music*, Diana Deutsch, ed., NY: Academic Press, pp. 316-341, 1982.

The general literature on music cognition, psychology, and perception is vast, but some of the basic reading can be found in two journals, *Music Perception*, and *Psychology of Music*, and in these books: MacDonald Critchley and R.A. Henson, eds., *Music and the Brain*, London: William Heinemann Medical Books Ltd., 1977; John Booth Davies, *The Psychology of Music*, London: Hutchison, 1978; Diana Deutsch, ed., *Psychology of Music*, NY: Academic Press, 1982; Manfred Clynes, ed., *Music, Mind and Brain*, NY: Plenum, 1982; P. Howell, I. Cross, and R. West, eds., *Musical Structure and Cognition*, New York: Academic Press, 1985; Fred Lerdahl and Ray Jackendoff, *A Generative Grammar of Tonal Music*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983; Mary Louise Serafine, *Music as Cognition*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1988; Wayne Slawson, *Sound Color*, Los Angeles and Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985; John Sloboda ed., *Generative Processes in Music: The Psychology of Performance, Improvisation and Composition*, Oxford University Press, 1988; John Sloboda, *The Musical Mind: The Cognitive Science of Music*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1985; Carol Krumhansl, *The Cognitive Foundations of Musical Pitch*, NY: Oxford University Press, 1990; Albert Bregman, *Auditory Scene Analysis*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1990.

For a perspective which includes an explicit ethnomusicological slant, see Music Cognition, W. Jay Dowling and Dane Harwood, NY: Academic Press, 1986. Also see: Dane Harwood, Universals in Music: a Perspective from Cognitive Psychology, *Ethnomusicology* 20(3): 521-533, 1976; James Kippen, An Ethnomusicological Approach to the Analysis of Musical Cognition, *Music Perception* 5(2):173-196, 1987; Edward Kessler, Christa Hansen, and Roger Shepard, Tonal Schemata in the Perception of Music in Bali and the West, *Music Perception* 2(2):131-165, 1984. [SF]

14. During the Music in Daily Life Project research we came upon a few people who claimed to have music going on in their heads constantly: a young concert violinist (“May” in *My Music*, Sue Crafts, Dan Cavicchi, Charlie Keil, Eds. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1993), Andy Byron, drummer and student in one of the research seminars, and three or four others talked about it in a collection of almost 200 interviews. A number of other people, myself included, have a melody or “riff” of some kind going on almost all the time. I also whistle tunes a lot without being aware that I am whistling; people say hello to me from around corners as they hear me coming! I suspect that surveys and future research will show that “music in the head” or “on the brain,” a constant or close-to-constant “soundtrack”, accompanies a lot of normal, or indeed, very creative lives without getting in the way. It may be that we will need overlapping analytic vocabularies to talk about conscious and foregrounded as opposed to semi-conscious and backgrounded interpretive moves. [CK]

15. The Kaluli *gisalo* (alternate spelling *gisaro*) ceremony is described in Edward L. Schieffelin, *The Sorrow of the Lonely and the Burning of the Dancers*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976. Yasuko Ichioka's Japanese public television film, *Gisaro: the Sorrow and the Burning*, Tokyo: NAV, 1986, is staged from this book. A complementary musical analysis can be found in chapter 5, *Song that Moves Men to Tears*, of *my Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics and Song in Kaluli Expression*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2nd ed., 1990.

Additional information about Kaluli emotion, especially the social construction of Kaluli anger, can be found in: Bambi B. Schieffelin, *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990; Edward L. Schieffelin, *Anger, Grief and Shame: towards a Kaluli Ethnopsychology*, in G. White and J. Kirkpatrick, eds., *Person, Self, and Experience: Exploring Pacific Ethnopsychologies*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp.168-182, 1985. [SF]

16. Reevaluation Counseling is a peer counseling self help movement that has developed an impressive body of theory about discharging feelings to free thinking and behavior from the rigidities of past hurts. For more information write to Rational Island Publishers, P. O. Box 2081, Main Office Station, Seattle, Washington 98111.[CK]

17. See references to Carl Jung in Morris Berman, *The Reenchantment of the World*, New York: Bantam, 1984. [CK]

18. Is it just a coincidence that an improvising musician with an ear for grooves, David Rothenberg, is the person to translate Arne Naess into English? *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle: Outline of an Ecosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. [CK]

19. For more on polkas see C. Keil, A. Keil and R. Blau, *Polka Happiness*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992; Victor Green, *The Passion for Polkas*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992; Charles Frank Emmons, *Economic and Political leadership in Chicago's Polonia: Sources of Ethnic Persistence and Mobility*, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois Chicago Circle, 1971; Robert Dolgan, *The Polka King: The Life of Frankie Yankovic*, Cleveland: Dillon/Liederbach, 1977;

James Leary, Polka music, ethnic music: a report on Wisconsin's Polka Traditions, Bulletin 1, Wisconsin Folk Museum, 1991; James P. Leary and Richard March, Dutchman Bands: Genre, Ethnicity, and Pluralism in the Upper Midwest, in Stephen Stern and John Allan Cicala, eds., *Creative Ethnicity*, Logan: Utah State University Press, 1991, pp. 21-43; Robert Walser, The Polish-American Polka Mass: Music of Postmodern Ethnicity, paper presented at the Sonneck Society 16th annual conference, Toronto, 1990; Janice Ellen Kleeman, The Origins and Stylistic Development of Polish-American Polka Music, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Music, University of California at Berkeley, 1982; Mary Spaulding, The Irene Olszewski Orchestra: A Connecticut Band, unpublished M.M. thesis, Department of Music, Wesleyan University, 1986. [CK]

20. Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) came to the United States in 1941 and taught at Columbia University from 1944-49, at Harvard 1949-66, and at MIT 1957-1982. His impact on the development of linguistics and semiotics continues to be extraordinary and his enormous corpus of writings have been gathered and republished in a multivolume series, *Selected Writings*, appearing in stages from 1962-1987. In the context of the development of poetics especially see his: *Selected Writings, Volume 5, On Verse, its Masters and Explorers*, The Hague: Mouton, 1979, and *Volume 3; Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry*, The Hague: Mouton, 1981. These volumes include his classic papers on the autoreferentiality of poetics, and on the pervasiveness of grammatical parallelism.

Comprehensive reviews of Jakobson's contributions to anthropological and linguistic concerns in poetics can be found in James Fox, Roman Jakobson and the Comparative Study of Parallelism, in D. Armstrong and C. H. van Schooneveld, eds., *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of his Scholarship*, Lisse: Peter de Ridder, pp. 59-90, 1977; and Steven Caton, Contributions of Roman Jakobson, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 16:223-260, 1987. On significant extensions in linguistic anthropology see Michael Silverstein, Shifters, Linguistic Categories, and Cultural Description, in Keith Basso and Henry Selby, eds., *Meaning in Anthropology*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1976, pp. 11-55; On the Pragmatic Poetry of Prose: Parallelism, Repetition, and Cohesive Structure in the Time Course of Dyadic Conversation, in Deborah Schiffrin, ed., *Meaning, Form and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*, Georgetown: Georgetown University Press, pp. 181-199, 1984. Also see Dell Hymes, *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974. [SF]

21. Semiotics, the study of sign phenomena, encompasses two intellectual strands, one deriving from the linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, whose *Course in General Linguistics*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1959, (1916) proposes a dyadic signification process relating signifier (sign vehicle) and signified (its meaning); and from the philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce, whose *Collected Papers*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931-1958, proposes a triadic relationship of representatmen (sign vehicle) and object to which it points, as perceived by interpretant.

On the Saussurean stream, especially its literary and critical as well as anthropological deployment, see Roland Barthes, *Elements of Semiology*, London: Cape, 1968; Jonathan Culler, *Saussure*, London: Fontana, 1976; Pierre Guiraud, *Semiology*, London: Routledge, Kegan Paul, 1975; T. Hawkes, *Structuralism and Semiotics*, London: Methuen, 1977; Edmund Leach, *Lévi-Strauss*, London: Fontana, 1974; J. Woollacott, *Messages and Meanings*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1977.

On the Piercian stream, and particularly emphases on the variety and diversity of iconic (physical resemblance) and indexical (spatial-temporal contiguity) signs throughout language and other cultural forms, see Thomas Sebeok, ed., *A Perfusion of Signs*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977; Sight, Sound and Sense, Bloomington: Indiana University Press; Elizabeth Mertz and Richard Parmentier, eds., *Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives*, New York: Academic Press, 1985; Greg Urban, *A Discourse-Centered Approach to Culture*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991; Semiotics, *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* 3:406-412, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 406-412, 1991.

For broader overviews see Umberto Eco, *A Theory of Semiotics*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979; Thomas A. Sebeok, ed., *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Semiotics*, 3 volumes, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986; *The Tell-Tale Sign: A Survey of Semiotics*, Lisse: Peter de Ridder, 1975; *Semiotics in the United States*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991; Winfried Noth, *Handbook of Semiotics*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990; Victorio Tejera, *Semiotics from Pierce to Barthes: a Conceptual Introduction*, New York: E.J. Brill, 1988; Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress, *Social Semiotics*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.

On semiotics of art and aesthetics see: Paul Garvin, ed., *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics*, Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1964; Ladislav Matejka & Irwin Titunik, *Semiotics of Art*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1976; Wendy Steiner, ed., *The Sign in Music and Literature*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Some significant musicological and ethnomusicological excursions into semiology and semiotics include Jean-Jacques Nattiez, *The Contribution of Musical Semiotics to the Semiotic Discussion in general*, in T.A. Sebeok, ed., *A Perfusion of Signs*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press Pp. 121-142, 1977; *Music and Discourse: A Semiology of Music*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990; David Lidov, *Nattiez's Semiotics of Music*, *Canadian Journal of Research in Semiotics* 5(2):13-54, 1977; Charles Boiles, *Processes of Musical Semiosis*, *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 14:24-44, 1982; John Blacking, *The Problem of Ethnic Perceptions in the Semiotics of Music*, in Wendy Steiner, ed., *The Sign in Music and Literature*, Austin: University of Texas Press, Pp. 203-215, 1981. [SF]

22. See: Lawrence Levine, *Highbrow-Lowbrow: the Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988; Andrew Ross, *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture*, New York: Routledge, 1989; Jon Weiner, *Professors, Politics and Pop*, New York: Verso, 1991. [SF]

23. The Kaluli will be probably be doing the “Hawaian strum” or the “pacific rim strum” long before they tune into the Basie band. Near the very beginning of a wonderful interview with the bassist Red Mitchell (June 14, 1992) he told me this great story about talking to Count Basie’s guitarist, Freddy Green...coming...[CK]

24. An overview of mining from an anthropological viewpoint is: R. Godoy, *Mining: Anthropological Perspectives*, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 14:199-217, 1985.

On troubles between mining companies and indigenous peoples in Papua New Guinea and Irian Jaya, see: Sean Dorney, *Papua New Guinea: People, Politics, and History Since 1975*, Sydney: Random House Australia; Peter Ryan, *Black Bonanza: A Landslide of Gold*, Melbourne: Hyland House, 1991; John Connell and Richard Howitt, eds., *Mining and Indigenous Peoples in Australasia*, Sydney: University of Sydney Press, 1992; George Monbiot, *Poisoned Arrows*, London: Sphere, 1989; David Hyndeman, *Mining, Modernization, and Movements of Social Protest in Papua New Guinea*, *Social Analysis* 21(3): 33-41, 1987; also his *Melanesian Resistance to Ecocide and Ethnocide: Transnational Mining Projects and the Fourth World on the Island of New Guinea*, in John H. Bodley, ed., *Tribal Peoples and Development Issues: A Global Overview*, Mountain View, CA: Mayfield, pp. 281-298, 1988; Richard Jackson, *Ok Tedi: The Pot of Gold*, Port Moresby: World Publishing, 1982; C. O’Faircheallaigh, *Mining and Development*, London: Croon Helm, 1984; Hank Nelson, *Black, White and Gold: Goldmining in Papua New Guinea 1878-1930*, Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1976; R.J. May and Matthew Spriggs, eds., *The Bougainville Crisis*, Bathurst: Crawford House Press, 1990; M. Howard, *The Impact of the International Mining Industry on Native Peoples*, Sydney: University of Sydney, Transnational Corporations Research Project, 1988; Colin Filer, *The Bougainville Rebellion, the Mining*

Industry, and the Process of Social Disintegration in Papua New Guinea, *Canberra Anthropologist* 13:1-40, 1990.

The situation in Australia concerning mining and Aboriginal human and land rights is taken up in several papers in the Connell and Howitt volume above, and in: D. Cousins and J. Nieuwenhuysen, *Aboriginals and the Mining Industry*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1984; T. Libby, *Hawke's Law: The Politics of Mining and Aboriginal Land Rights in Australia*, Perth: University of Western Australia Press, 1989; Dixon, R.A. and M.C. Dillon, eds., *Aborigines and Diamond Mining*, Perth: University of Western Australia Press, 1990.

Some of the important Amazonian and South American literature includes: Catherine Caulfield, *In the Rainforest*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984; Susanna Hecht and Alexander Cockburn, *The Fate of the Forest: Developers, Defenders and Destroyers of the Amazon*, London: Verso, 1989; Adrian Cowell, *The Decade of Destruction: the Crusade to Save the Amazon Rainforest*, New York: Holt, 1990; David Cleary, *Anatomy of the Amazon Gold Rush*, Oxford: Basingstoke, 1990; Jill Nash, *We Eat the Mines and The Mines Eat Us*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1979; Michael Taussig, *The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

A regular flow of information about mining projects, indigenous peoples and rainforest destruction may be obtained through the publications of Cultural Survival and Rainforest Action Network. [SF]

Bernard Nietschmann, *Militarization and Indigenous Peoples: The Third World War*, *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 11(3);1-16. I have xeroxed and distributed dozens of copies of this article over the past few years; seems like the most basic information every person should have but does not. Maybe the Rio conference, the Maybury-Lewis "Millenium" programs, are just the beginning of a profound shift away from the statist-quo. [CK]

25. The reference is to a five-year fellowship from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation awarded to Feld on the morning we recorded this dialogue. [CK]