Micromusics of the West: A Comparative Approach

MARK SLOBIN   WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

By Way of Introduction

B y micromusics I mean the small musical units within big music-cultures. These have not disappeared, despite the dismal forecasts of earlier commentators. If anything, they are proliferating today as part of a great resurgence of regional and national feeling and with the rapid deterritorialization of large populations, particularly in the Euro-American sphere this essay is about. The central fact is that today music is at the heart of individual, group, and national identity, from the personal to the political, from the refugee mother's lullaby to the "Star-Spangled Banner" at the baseball game. I do not think any simple analytical system will capture the pathos and the power of music in today's shifting world of economic inequities, constant threat of terrorism or armed conflict, rapid shifts in political orientation, and simultaneity of marketing systems. Nor can I account for the diversity of local musical problems and solutions. I am simply trying to point out some general themes that might eventually lead to a comparative approach.[1]

The present attempt is a set of interlocked mini-essays, too long for the usual article, too short for a book. I have tried to be very concise—hence the brevity—but also as inclusive as possible; I hope to have avoided being elliptical, though doubtless much of interest will be left out. This is because

I'll proceed by both proposing and undercutting a set of terms as an exercise in defining a field of study which has seen many specialized contributions but little in the way of comparative thought. So let me first propose a trio of terms, all of which end with the same suffix: -culture. The dash stands for prefixes that modify that warhorse of a word, culture, producing *subculture, superculture,* and *interculture.* Once it was easy to say that a "culture" was the sum of the lived experience and stored knowledge of a discrete population that differed from neighboring groups. Now it seems that there is no one experience and knowledge that unifies everyone within a defined "cultural" boundary or if there is, it's not the total content of their lives. In the area these essays cover—North America, Europe/former USSR—at least for musical experience, people live at the intersection of three types of -cultures. English allows for a neat prefixing of such units, and my own style pushes me to use these nouns as temporary supports for a theory and method of current musical life that rests on a notion of overlaps, intersections, and nestings of the sort super-, sub-, and inter- represent.

Intuitively, I hope, super- should suggest an overarching category, sub- an embedded unit, and inter- a crosscutting trend, and that's mostly what I mean. In lived experience, of course, people don't necessarily divide up their musical lives into such groupings, but often enough, when asked to articulate or to defend tastes or activities, people do in fact point to linkages, subordinations, import-export traffic, and other factors which implicitly support the notion of a -cultural musical life. The on-the-ground existence of numerous typologies, from the labels on record store bins through the categories listed in ads for community music events and the names of courses offered in schools, suggests that people are quite aware of the varieties, values, and hierarchies of their musical -cultures. When a Cuban-American in a small New England city says to me "This is a dead town; no music," he is acknowledging the presence of a mainstream to which he feels he does not belong as well as lamenting the lack of a music he craves. When the people who give the Grammy Awards create a category for "polka," they are commenting on the interaction between smaller and overarching music systems. When Greek-Americans invite a band from Greece rather than hiring their own New York compatriots, they are putting their hard-earned money in service of a music-culture which knows no nation-state boundaries. In thousands of such small-scale comments and decisions, everyday musicians and consumers create and sustain an extremely complex, highly articulated music system in the "advanced capitalist" and "emerging capitalist" societies of North America and Europe. The point of the following essay is to suggest some frameworks for thinking about, and for analyzing, that complexity. I do not mean to offer closed categories, but rather to stress the importance of overlapping and intersecting planes and perspectives. I have coined some new terms and used some old ones in new ways to refresh the

intellectual palate, and I will not be free of my own paradoxes and contra-dictions.

Above all, *I do not mean to present a model, nor will I come up with one-sentence definitions of terms*. For me, terms are creatures of discourse, somewhere between stalking horses and red herrings. At best, the ones I'm offering here are what James Clifford calls "translation terms," each being "a word of apparently general application used for comparison in a strategic and contingent way," and he warns us that "all such translation terms used in global comparison—words like culture, art, society, peasant, modernity, ethnography,I could go on—all such translation terms get us some distance *and* fall apart" (1990:26). Like Clifford, what interests me is not a definition, but what goes on in your head when you match terms with reality.

By now it should be clear that much of my way of thinking overlaps current intellectual trends not much adopted yet (early 1991) in ethnomusicology, most notably the British cultural studies tradition and its extensions and companions, such as postcolonial discourse, in the United States. For technical analysis, I have thought for many years that sociolinguistics offers those who study musical expression some acute insights. Of course, I will be unable to fill all the gaps in ethnomusicological discourse; my method is rather to make a number of proposals, sometimes in the form of schemes, typologies, headings. This does not mean each gambit is self-sufficient, comprehensive, or final. I feel strongly that this approach mirrors not only our current understanding, but the data themselves. I simply hope that the following mini-essays will set off new chains of associations in the mind of a reader who will modify, elaborate, or even discard my proposals in a spirit of dialogue.

The present work starts with a broad overview of "the big picture," what Arjun Appadurai calls "the global cultural economy" (1990), followed by a dance around the three "-culture" terms. Then I watch the terms at work as they might apply to selected musical scenes in places I have worked in or near or where I have located some relevant literature, some of which my students have produced. The coverage will be scattershot, since the available materials are scanty. I would simply have to wait too long for the necessary comprehensive survey work to be done for my perspectives still to be useful. This will not be my first comparative venture; alongside my work on particular sociomusical contexts I have spun off a few more theoretical pieces on issues that I find absorbing (code-switching in music; multilingual-ism as a global issue for music studies; the problem of "revival" movements), and some thoughts and perhaps paragraphs from those articles (1979, 1983, Frisbie 1986) will reappear here in different dress.

Finally, like everyone else writing about the "multicultural" mosaic/ stew/salad bowl/former melting pot we inhabit in Euro-America, I am acutely aware of the pitfalls of describing the musical experience of a variety

of communities I neither grew up in nor have close working ties with. I can only rely on flexibility and a lack of dogmatism, not so much to bridge the gap between those who live the experience and those who analyze it, but to suggest that while group histories and social forces separate us, our personal expressive lives are inextricably tied to similar networks and patterns of possibilities, however unevenly and even inequitably they may be applied. Lucy Lippard has pointed out that "we have not yet developed a theory of mutliplicity that is neither assimilative nor separative—one that is, above all, relational" (1990:21). My own attempt here is to be as relational as possible, to lay out the musical interplay—the cultural counterpoint—between individual, community, small group, state, and industry. It is a piece without a score for a collective without a conductor. I'm only working on the orchestration, the distribution of the many timbres and colors that are often stronger than the theme or the harmony, if either can be heard in this improvisation at century's end.

I've limited myself to Euro-America, including the former USSR as part of Gorbachev's "European home." Partly this is because ethnomusicology has been less attracted to this region than to Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Also, the region's supposedly "advanced" state makes it in some ways a bellwether, or at least trend-setter, for other regions, both in the evolution of new forms of capitalist democracy and for the collapse of the socialist system. I've been working on and traveling in Euro-America for nearly twenty years after rounding off the first phase of my research life, in Afghanistan/Central Asia (1967–72). I have found that many of the concerns I had in the earlier work—ethnic boundaries, music in urban settings, relationship of micro- to mainstream musics—kept following my path across the continents from East to West; this tends to happen to most people's intellectual trajectory. It seemed the time was right, both in terms of my own experience and of ethnomusicology's current concerns, to make a tightly-packed summary of approaches I evolved, views glimpsed, and voices heard.

The Global View

This section looks at the Big Picture, the overall context of world musical systems today, of which our Euro-American study is just one, if sometimes anomalous, case. Setting aside the "-cultures" approach for the moment, I plan a two-pronged grappling with the global. To begin with, I will introduce what I find a most useful recent representation of worldwide culture patterns, Arjun Appadurai's "-scape" system, suggesting its musical implications, then introduce another perspective, centered on the term "visibility," which comes at things from a different, yet overlapping plane of analysis.

Appadurai proposes viewing the "global cultural economy" in five dimensions, as a "set of landscapes," which he terms ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, finanscapes, and ideoscapes (1990). In a way, the handy suffix "-scape" is somewhat misleading here, since it implies a rather fixed perspective, whereas Appadurai regards his dimensions and the people who inhabit them as fluid, overlapping, and disjunctive. For he feels that "the warp of stabilities is everywhere shot through with the woof of human motion" (7), and that "current global flows . . . occur in and through the growing disjunctures between" the five -scapes (11). It is a vision of a planet in flux, with a population that is creating "imagined worlds" based both on hard reality and on fantasy nourished by the shifting -scapes.

The -scapes themselves need fleshing out. Ethnoscape describes the viewpoint of "tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guestworkers, and other moving groups and persons" rather than of the more traditional stable populations ethnographers and economists use as standard units. This is because such groups are more visible and influential than they used to be; and even at home, "deterritorialization" of populations through economic, political, and cultural alienation means everyone has an active ethnoscape these days. The other -scapes are similarly skewed. The technoscape features an "odd distribution of technologies" and a quirky movement of money produces an unsettled finanscape, so that "the global relationship between ethnoscapes, technoscapes and finanscapes is deeply disjunctive and profoundly unpredictable, since each of these landscapes is subject to its own constraints and incentives . . . at the same time as each acts as a constraint and a parameter for movements in the others" (ibid.:8). Meanwhile, there are deeply significant mediascapes which, "whether produced by private or state interests, tend to be image-centered, narrative-based accounts of strips of reality" (9) from which people make their own life-scripts. Finally, ideoscapes represent a different conceptual domain, derived from Euro-American Enlightenment thought now unmoored throughout the world as floating images like "freedom, welfare, rights, sovereignty, representation and the master-term democracy" (10).

Appadurai's angle of vision is novel and refreshing. Seeing things globally is helpful, as is avoiding monolithic answers: there is no overall sense to the system, no hidden agency which controls the flow of culture. No one parameter is paramount—not populations, money, ideology, media or technology—and each factor is only partly dependent on the other. Things are highly kinetic and extremely volatile, not only because of economics, but also because the "imagined community" (that popular term taken from Anderson 1983) of an individual or group is itself an actor on the world stage. This residue of personal and cultural difference is not clearly explained by Appadurai, but is a major component of his scheme, for he

continually appeals to the resistance to homogenization and an insistence on local understandings.

The implications of this worldscape for a view of music are worth considering for an ethnomusicology that is itself unmoored from older ideologies, adrift in the movement of technologies and media, and confused by constant deterritorialization of music-makers. If nothing else, it is helpful to think of music as yet another wild card in a game for which there are no known rules, since music is woven into the cultural fabric Appadurai presents as one of the most scarlet of threads, created by ever-evolving technologies, transmitted by media, marketed through high and low finance, and expressive of private and public ideoscapes of autonomy and control for shifting populations. Even in the relatively middle-class worlds of the United States and Sweden, people polled cite music as one of the most satisfying components of their lives, and it may well have an even more profound connection to culture among much less crystallized or greatly deterritorialized nations. Even the depersonalized, grand industrial systems take music very seriously. By tuning into music, we can hear the play of the -scapes.

Take the example of Pepsico's decision in March of 1989 to present Madonna's new video simultaneously across the world as part of a commercial. This was itself preceded by a "softening-up" advertisement which showed an Australian Aboriginal trekking into an outback bar and watching the new release on television. The acknowledgement of music as the medium for a highly capitalized corporate moment is clear here. The attempt to create a unified media-, techno-, and finanscape is apparent, bringing to bear a seemingly unavoidable set of variables on the planet's population. Yet the ideoscape and ethnoscape deflected the thrust, decentered the momentum of this effort to control. The Madonna video in question was "Like a Prayer," a baroque and bizarre play on Catholic, erotic, and postcolonial imagery which demonstrated the singer's almost legendary drive to control her career and promote through provocation. The disjuncture between Pepsico's expectations and Madonna's presentation was disastrous: a fundamentalist Christian media watchdog organization threatened a product boycott, and Pepsico withdrew the commercial after only one showing in the U.S. The corporate spokesperson denied censorship was involved, saying the "consumers were confusing the message from the video with the message from the commercial, so 'why fuel that confusion? It was better to call it a day' " (Horovitz 1989). The costs to Pepsico were high. The worldwide moment was billed as "the largest one-day media buy in history" (Applegate 1989), and Pepsico was forced to honor its five-million-dollar contract with Madonna, all the result of the musician's intransigence at letting Pepsico preview her video.

This scenario already shows a sharp disjuncture between the corporate-controlled -scapes and Madonna's personal ideoscape. But even the most orthodox, mainstream ideoscape Pepsico might have picked for its message would have had no guarantee of commercial or cognitive success. For example, the very Australian Aboriginals they depicted as part of a target market are known to make the most diverse readings of mediated materials, particularly televised and musical programs, harvesting a bumper crop of sounds and images for their own pleasures and meanings.

Shift the kaleidoscope of -scapes and a different configuration defines the musical moment. Since Tanzania's topography does not allow for nationwide television broadcasting, in the 1980s the state provided video setups for towns, where collected viewers could watch approved programs (Krister Malm, conversation1988). It would appear that the media-, ideo-, techno-, and finanscapes merge here, except that the nature of the video technoscape is somewhat anarchic. Viewers quickly discovered they could produce or smuggle in materials of their own choosing, to the government's dismay. In a conflict of imagined worlds, the local ethno- and ideoscapes won out, aided by low-cost financing and a flexible, self-controllable technology.

Implicit in Appadurai's framework and in the two examples just cited are questions of control and evasion that shine through the translucent interplay of cultural forces. I will return to this crucial question, usually summed up by the keyword "hegemony," a bit later; at the moment, I want to propose a different scheme of relationships among global musics to provide a foil for Appadurai and another source for speculation.

Today's musicmakers tend not to care about the origins of items in their repertoire, domesticating a wide variety of sources to perform useful household tasks. The outcome of a long-planned multimillion-dollar advertising jingle is most often the enrichment of the schoolyard scene or a good tune for the shower. Omnivorous consumers, we take in any musical nourishment. To put our wide-ranging activities into some context, let me invent an analytical perspective based on the term "visibility." Viewed from a particular vantage point, the world musicscape today consists of just three types of musics. By a "music," I mean an easily recognizable style and practice complex of the sort we label and describe in scholarship, that stores organize into bin headings, or festivals use as criteria for inviting ensembles. Here, "visibility" means the quality of being known to an audience, and I suggest three types of visibility: local, regional, and transregional.

Local musics are known by certain small-scale bounded audiences, and only by them. This is the type of musical complex for which ethnomusicologists traditionally searched high and low. When I first went to Afghanistan in 1967, I thought my mission was to locate, identify, and describe such local musics,

and whenever I encountered musics of wider visibility, I was annoyed. For instance, I noticed that the existence of a national radio music interfered with these local styles, downgrading their status. At that time, it seemed there were many such local musics, a definitive collection of which would define our forthcoming map of the musical world. I was bolstered in this view by anthropology's belief in a numbered set of world cultures and by my own society's division of its population into "ethnic groups," each of which ought to have its own distinctive music. Such musics still exist. To take European examples, one can find them in valleys of Bosnia, villages of the Russian North, or among Norwegian fiddlers. There are probably increasingly fewer of such musics, but they play a vital role as potential additions to the pool of musical resources available to broader audiences, to which I now turn.

Regional musics are less easy to define, since I am using the term "region" in an offbeat way. If "local" can be bounded by a village or valley, then region, intuitively, is a somewhat larger zone of contiguous territory. However, I have in mind a much more flexible sense of region, partly as a result of the spread of broadcasting and recordings. Of course, there are still classic regions, as in the understanding I have of, say, Slovenia or Slovakia. Widening the focus, Scandinavia sometimes creates a region, as when it is unified by an interest in the dance/tune form called *polksa*. Or the German-speaking lands might form a region, if you look at the unified way four adjacent countries with different ideologies, politics and local musics domesticated Anglo-American rock from the 1950s through the 1970s (Larkey 1989). I might even want to label Europe as a whole a region, if we look at the Eurovision Song Contest, so visible internally, invisible elsewhere in the world.

Regions also pop up in the linkages among diasporic communities, groups far from a perceived homeland and sharing a familiar music. In the U.S., the Polish polka exists in a region of population pockets stretched across five thousand kilometers in widely separated urban reas. Within this regional music, there are traditional local styles: for example, Chicago vs. East Coast. The fact that the former began to dominate the latter shows a move from local to regional visibility. In this case, the regional diasporic music is isolated: American polka bands do not affect Poland. Yet the increasing mobility of emigré groups means that local musics feed into regional styles as an isolated group becomes part of a network. For example, the music of Puerto Ricans in Hawaii remained local for decades due to the great distance between diaspora and homeland, but it will now slide into regionalism. Much quicker regionalization is common, as when Turks arrive in Berlin or Stockholm and make immediate musical linkages to the homeland. So inhabitants of my musical regions can be nearby or far way, united as members of an imagined world of taste and practice, linked by face-to-face or electronic interaction, moving at a rate of slow or rapid style shifts.

Transregional musics have a very high energy which spills across regional boundaries, perhaps even becoming global. This category of musics is increasing rapidly due to the mediascape, which at any moment can push a music forward so that a large number of audiences can make the choice of domesticating it. There are older examples of this, such as the opera or operetta aria, the waltz, the tango, or the Neapolitan song; all you need is a transmitting medium of great carrying power, like sheet music or the 78 rpm sound recording. Some transregional musics are more unevenly distributed than others: for example, Indian film songs compared to Anglo-American rock. There are other highly influential examples, such as the protest song with guitar. In Sweden, I heard a Saami (Lapp) song from Norway directed against an intrusive hydroelectric project, written in Latin American style. These examples of transregionalism concur with Appadurai's findings: the assorted -scapes which channel the music are rather independently variable. The concatenation of media, financial, and technological power which give commercial styles such transregional thrust are quite absent in the case of the protest song. There, the ideoscape of activism ("democracy," "sovereignty") and an ethnoscape of estrangement have proved their power in spreading a musical practice across all continents. Even a single item like "We Shall Overcome," never on a Top Forty, pushed by no disc jockey and not available in video format, pops up anyway wherever a people's imagined world conflicts with harsh reality. Yet even where mediated musics predominate, locals can choose from a wide variety of transregional styles and subtly modulate their preferences, also avoiding seemingly obvious ideoscape models like the leftist song. I have been told (E. Catani, conversation 1988) that at the moment when Uruguay's rulers eased political controls, allowing the local youth to choose from the full range of transregional styles, they selected neither the global hit parade nor the political song, perhaps feeling that each was a trap, but rather put their cash and commitment into New Wave groups like Siouxsie and the Banshees. The sophistication of audiences means that while visibility is the first filter for acceptance, knowledgeability might then select out only carefully chosen styles. Musics are important enough to evoke the most finely tuned of consumer sensitivities. Here the techno/media/finance investment pays off only for certain players, and in unanticipated ways. In a correlation of sensibilities, perhaps it was the vaguely nonconformist ideoscape of the British singers that invited the Urugayan audience to share an imagined world which was neither in Montevideo nor in London. I will return below more than once to this kind of unpredictability of choice, which may be based as much on an aesthetic as on a presumed politico- econo-ideological pattern.

Isolating visibility as a factor in today's musicscape matches Appadurai's keen interest in principles of global flow. Viewed this way, world music

looks like a fluid, interlocking set of styles, repertoires, and practices which can expand or contract across wide or narrow stretches of the landscape. It no longer appears to be a catalogue of bounded entities of single, solid historical and geographical origins, and the dynamics of visibility are just as shifting as the play of the -scapes. To flesh out the scope of visibility in music-cultural flow, it might just be possible to identify a few common processes. Shifts of profile are very common nowadays; some are self-generated, others just happen. Like falling into the fourth dimension, a music can suddenly move beyond all its natural boundaries and take on a new existence. The most glaring of recent examples must be the fate of the Bulgarian State Radio Women's Chorus. Available through all the -scapes to the Euro-American world for decades, this manufactured, post-peasant singing style lay dormant on record shelves until the late 1980s. Suddenly, an accidental concatenation of the sort ever more present in the arbitrary play of global cultural forces foregrounded the style so thoroughly that by 1990 it was awarded a Grammy, the zenith of visibility in the commercial music world. The Bulgarian women went from local to transregional in no time flat. The disjuncture of -scapes is particularly prominent here, since the Western 1990 ideoscape of Eastern Europe as an ever more democratic and free-market corner of the world is completely contradictory to the philosophy of the creators of the Women's Chorus: state control of the national heritage. Just as Bulgarians were turning their backs on this approach, the rock-pop community and Hollywood were embracing it; sometimes the mediascape doesn't know what the ideoscape is up to. The difference between local and transregional consumption is very pronounced in this case, showing how varied planes of analysis need to be brought to bear on one and the same music. It is unlikely that the Grammy has caused Bulgarians to accept the old Women's Radio Chorus as the proud emblem of upward musical mobility.

At the other end of the spectrum, we find visibility shifting through self-conscious creation and promotion. Jocelyne Guilbault has detailed the rise of *zouk* music of Guadeloupe as just such an effort on the part of a small, local music culture (1990). In her account, the sparkplug of the band Kassav deliberately set out to invent a local style that would attract more attention to an overlooked island, and he succeded wildly. *Zouk* became a transregional success through manipulation of the elaborate media- and technoscapes available today, and apparently because it tickled the ideoscape—or just the aesthetic sensibilities, or both?—of a broad audience of Caribbean, European, and African listeners. When this phenomenon registered back on the island, *zouk* became the basis for a new Guadeloupean cultural conscious-ness. At the moment, the more traditional local pop style, *gwoka*, recently featured in the *New York Times* Sunday travel section, is poised to become the next product to vault the local boundaries. Guilbault frames her study as a gauntlet flung down before economists, who tend to use the term

"development" in limited ways; music, she finds, can be a form of development in the -scapes of Guadeloupe.

Between the Bulgarian and the Antillean situation lie dozens of examples of level-shifting. Many follow a path I call validation through visibility. This happens when a higher profile causes a local or regional population to reconsider its own traditions, and the occasion for this moment is usually outside prompting. To return to the example of Afghanistan cited above, where national radio damaged local musics through neglect, in the early 1970s a changed political landscape caused the government to suddenly begin broadcasting local musics (Uzbek, Turkmen, Baluchi, Pushai) hitherto ignored in the quest for regionalization of a synthetic popular style. Local audiences in the North, struck by hearing their musicians on the air for the first time, re-evaluated performers they had overlooked for years. Until then, if they wanted to hear their own musics, they had to tune into the versions of Central Asian sounds emanating from the neighboring Soviet republics. These were in the same general language/style complex, but featured a different ideoscape and regional musical dialect. As cassette recorders became available, people suddenly had an opportunity to record their own towns' musicians for private use, evading—but stimulated by— both the Afghan and Soviet broadcast systems. So nomads in winter quarters could enjoy their favorite players and styles, a fine example of the selective use of the available combination of technoscape, ethnoscape, and ideoscape. The point here is that the impetus came from outside, but provoked an unexpected response. Whereas Kabul hoped for greater allegiance by providing local musics, it merely triggered greater alienation from Radio Afghanistan among those listeners who had the technical means to extend their enjoyment beyond the one hour a week the capital allotted ethnic styles. Again, a fragmented mediascape allows for a lot of mischief.

The Soviet situation provides a huge range of intentional and unintentional shifting of visibility. Take one esoteric example, the impact of the Yakut jew's-harp. Not widely known even in the USSR, this Siberian style of complex melody-building on a simple instrument was widely broadcast by the state media. According to Alekseev (1988), other groups with their own jew's-harp traditions were so impressed by the Yakut virtuoso sound they began to reconsider the possibilities of local styles. Alekseev calls this the "resonance effect," which in my terms means that within a closed system, raising the visibility of one music might cause sympathetic vibrations—and internal change—in others. This was probably not the intent of the original broadcasts, showing once more how culture flow occurs as much between the cracks as through the accepted channels.

In the foregoing, I have shown my respect for Appadurai's tentative analysis of global cultural flow as a stimulus for thinking about music. Sometimes lining up touchstone musical example yields a satisfying

matchup, while at other times the limitations emerge. As Appadurai himself concedes, his system has its own cracks and disjunctures. For example, he is admittedly ambivalent about the relationship between the nation-state and global patterning, preferring to talk about deterritorialization and the decline of central authority rather than take on the precise interplay of state and populace. He is equally reticent to set out the dynamics of state and commercial forces in any given society. Yet any cultural analysis must take into account the existence of sharply bounded nation-state entities, multigroup and problematic as they may be. Certainly, until very recently, the huge Soviet test case would have produced little of value in terms of global cultural flow. Until 1990, the "East bloc" had its own sub-global circulation of culture, as did China and, to a lesser extent, India—nearly half the human race. Of course, the pressure of global flow tends to break down local resistance, but one must look to the inner network while keeping an eye on cross-state linkages.

Watching both sides of the road has become a central problem in ethnomusicology. Geared as we are to "socially situated" music "in context," or "in culture," we have made little of intersocietal connections. Such cross-boundary studies as we have (the foremost probably being Wallis and Malm's work on the phonogram industry [1984]) tend to focus on just one or two -scapes, finding it understandably hard to delineate the whole plane of interaction of diverse, complex, and shifting units of cultural analysis.

*   *   *

I have tried to accomplish two things in this opening exercise. The first of these is to draw attention to the issue of the global vs. the local or, more properly, of the global within the local and vice-versa. For the remainder of these mini-essays I will stick to my chosen geographic domain, Euro-America. The second point I've tried to make is both how useful and how limited it is to work through any particular conceptual grid, to view things from a given perspective. Both the "-scape" and "visibility" gambits are suggestive and perhaps even explanatory, up to a point, and at that point, you put on a different pair of glasses. I don't mean to belabor the optical metaphors that crowd current theoretical writing; maybe it's because I've worn bifocals for some years that I'm comfortable peering over, then under, to reconfigure my field of vision. Switching to computer glasses, as I do to write these lines, provides yet another version of depth of field, focal length, and perspective, all appropriate analogies for what happens when you start to write. Of course, I am not alone in noticing that to take account of current expressive culture, you need to match your vision to the multifaceted nature of the material. Surveying American multicultural visual arts, Lucy Lippard argues for "the negation of a single ideal in favor of a multiple viewpoint and

the establishment of a flexible approach to both theory and practice . . ." (1990:14). As for terminology, she points out that "the fact that there are no euphonious ways to describe today's cross-cultural exchange reflects the deep social and historical awkwardness underlying that exchange" (ibid.:15). My own multiple viewpoint leads me now to turn to journey through an imaginary landscape of musical supercultures, subcultures, and intercultures.

Setting the Terms

Superculture

My notion of superculture has to do with the term "hegemony," which will occasionally make an appearance in these essays. Like so many others these days, I have been deeply informed by this Gramscian term as amplified by Raymond Williams (1977). There are four main lessons I draw from Williams's commentary on Gramsci's rather sparse texts (1971):

1. Societies (nation-state bounded regions) have an overarching, dominating—if not domineering—mainstream which is *internalized* in the consciousness of governments, industry, subcultures, and individuals as ideology. Let us call it hegemony.

2. Hegemony is not monolithic. There is no Board of Directors that monitors hegemony daily, adjusting and fine-tuning it. So it can be formal and informal, explicit and implicit, conscious and unconscious, bureaucratic and industrial, central and local, historical and contemporary.

3. Hegemony is not uniform; it does not speak with one voice. It is complex, often contradictory and perhaps paradoxical.

4. Hegemony is contrapuntal: there are alternative and oppositional voices in this cultural fugue which affect and shape the "themes." Points 3 and 4 mean hegemony may be dissonant as often as harmonious, since no one knows the score.

As much as I admire this formulation, I find that making it operational means running up against two unasked and unanswered questions: How do you know hegemony when you see it? If you find it, how do you apply it to a given component of culture, such as music? There are, in short, dangers here. Easy response to the first question might lead you to assume that almost anything is an example of hegemony, since there's no picture of it on the post office wall to compare with the suspect you've rounded up. Quick applications that avoid the second question can lead you to make facile generalizations (often seen in rock criticism) about the relationship of unexamined "dominant classes" or assumed ideologies to music makers or consumers.

I offer no easy answers, only intuitions, the hunches of an ordinary citizen. *It seems* that if social forces compel American record producers to

put warning labels on recordings of popular music there must be a dominant ideology at work about both the power and the suitability of music. *It would appear* that if 95% of American record production is controlled by a handful of companies, the relationship between this group and the remaining 5% must be unequal. *One can imagine* that if years of lobbying mean a "polka" or "Hispanic" category is added to the Grammy Awards of "*the* music industry" (note the definite article here), there have been some alternative musics which have been seeking recognition, and that they *want* to be co-opted into a mainstream, the definition of which both sides have accepted. If Hispanic listeners in Hartford or New York complain that local Spanish-language stations don't play the music they want to hear, *you might think* that even within a subculture, the needs of commerce take priority to those of consumers. In short, I imagine that a commonsense approach, rather than a high-theoretical one, would help best in trying to see whether and how hegemony is embodied in the daily musical life of particular populations.

This does not mean that the assumptions above are fully warranted. The commonsense observer is just as permeated by the ideology as anyone else. Since ideology reflects hegemony, this sort of analysis represents hegemony commenting on itself. This is frightening if you like observers to be "detached," less so if you see hegemony not as a plot, but as an everyday practice whose natives can be extremely articulate. Taken to this extreme, there seems little difference between "hegemony" and "culture." It is exactly this problem of knowing where hegemony starts and stops that makes it so hard to use as an analytical tool. Its strength, I think, lies in the kernel of its claim: that there is unequal distribution of power within societies and that this distribution is both formulated and contested on a daily basis by everyone, in both deliberate and intuitive ways.

This broad, compelling insight has helped generate a variety of refreshing retreats from approaching culture with industrial-strength intel-lectual solvents that would strip the veneer of everyday life down to the hard structure beneath the surface. Instead, we find increasing interest in "multiform, resistant, tricky and stubborn procedures that elude discipline without being outside the field in which [they are] exercised, and which should lead us to a theory of everyday practices" (de Certeau 1984:96). Perhaps beginning with Erving Goffman, the "everyday" has become the preferred plane of analysis: the arena of daily life as the showcase and battleground of hegemony. As a legacy of early modernist analysis of city life (the Baudelaire-to-Benjamin line) the streets become central to works like Michel de Certeau's "Walking in the City" (1984), an approach which can now be found even among cultural geographers, as in Allan Pred's astute analysis of the spatial quality of turn-of-the-century working-class cultural resistance in Stockholm (1990). Following paths broken by Roland Barthes

(1957), cultural theorists also seek out the mundane haunts of the beach or the video arcade (Fiske 1989). Unlike earlier analysts of power relations in modern culture, from Foucault's prisons to Mills's power elite, today's writers prefer shopping malls to the halls of Congress, bathrooms to boardrooms. Even when observers focus on cultural construction teams (for example, Gitlin 1983; Faulkner 1983), they tend to present the producing clique as a bunch of regular citizens who, thrust into a power position, try to psych out the everyday consumer or simply repeat successful formulas—no maniacal plotters of hegemonic control here.

Let me now introduce my word "superculture." Unlike "subculture" and "interculture," it is rarely used elsewhere to my knowledge, even though it seems a logical companion. Available terms like "collective mode of administration," "dominating classes," even "mainstream," seem unwieldy, simultaneously too specific and too vague. If hegemony is complex and contradictory, no single "dominant formation" can account for its action. A truly nebulous term like superculture does the job better for my purposes. It implies an umbrella-like, overarching structure which could be present anywhere in the system—ideology or practice, concept or performance. The usual, the accepted, the statistically lopsided, the commercially successful, the statutory, the regulated, the most visible: these all belong to the superculture.

In terms of music, the superculture would include at least three basic components:

1. An industry, including its alliances with techno- media- and finanscapes, consummated through the ceremony of advertising, justifying the ways of the superculture to man, woman, and child. The emergence of a *music* industry is surely one of the triumphs of capitalism, channeling the prerogatives of church, court, nation, and home through the energy of the talented individual, now raised to commodity. This harnessing of the unbounded spirit of music keeps tightening as packagers and distributors gain experience in the subtle techniques of co-optation and market penetration, most flamboyantly deployed in the United States. The easy way we accept the notion of Christian rock or ultra-orthodox Jewish pop, commercialized spirituality at work, shows how well hegemonic principles can diffuse throughout societies. The internal expressive policing of subcultures through systems like the "Hispanic" market's cable networks does more to draw its subjects into the superculture than do the public schools and the police. Boycotts against Univision for a TV columnist's interpretation of Puerto Rican life or a reluctance to buy the *Miami Herald*'s Spanish-language edition due to its politics (*New York Times*:10/15/90) tell us just how much subcultures care about outside control. Yet rarely is music, the silent socializer, the focus of protest against hegemony. You

simply have to try to ignore Julio Iglesias if he doesn't represent your particular musical roots—but he slips into your consciousness anyway. Like it or not, you end up having to identify with his success, as defined through sales figures and official recognition (for example, a Grammy Award), terms of achievement the superculture invents, then celebrates through the celebrity cult. Every Finnish- or Serbian-American knows the pantheon of commercially sanctioned winners the subculture has produced. Often the state acts as godfather to these children of the marketplace: for example, in 1990 Congress appropriated half a million dollars to turn the boyhood home of the mainstream bandleader Lawrence Welk into a landmark. The idea was to create a pilgrimage point for German-American culture in a "culturally depressed" area, generating tourist income by glorifying one man's skill at leaving his expressive heritage behind to achieve superculture success. Another hand-in-glove enterprise is the incursion of the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences (which invented the Grammys) into the classroom as part of a "Grammy in the Schools" project, explicitly meant to nurture an audience for NARAS members' commercial productions. This interplay of government and industry leads us to the second domain of the superculture.

2. The state and its institutionalized rules and venues. Governments have many tentacles for reaching deep into the citizen's musical life. Indoctrination begins in primary school, but we have no serious studies of the content of music books across time and space to sense what long-term strategies the state uses in its mandated hours of musical enculturation. We can guess that long-term immersion in nationalist and nostalgic songs leaves its traces. We know that in America, just as child-targeted television prepares little minds to be consumers, so school music-making draws steadily on merchandized materials to form the consciousness of citizens. In the United States, even the national classics—the songs of Stephen Foster—were commercially composed, the gap between the schoolroom and marketplace being exceptionally small. A glance at magazines for high school bands reveals an extraordinary commodification of team spirit, exalted through a thousand local parades, product endorsements, and television exposure of school and college football bands; where the state leaves off and commodification begins is almost impossible to tell, as already noted for the "Grammy" project.

This activity affects subcultures in two ways: through erasure and stereotypes. Erasure is implicit in the unsung melodies of a hundred micromusics, missing from the classrooms of Euro-America. Like the lack of one's language, the absence of familiar music sends a clear supercultural signal to children. Stereotypes crop up everywhere, often as a part of officially sponsored cultural pluralism. In American school music books, there has been a tendency to include songs from a variety of "homelands,"

each item brand-naming whatever subculture was depicted.

Outside the schoolhouse, governments everywhere control music through regulation, a separate topic too large to handle here. Let me just point out some implications for subcultures. In the old East bloc, official state regulation and erasure systems alternated with attempts to co-opt unofficial culture, as witnessed by, say, the ups and downs of jazz in the USSR (Starr 1980) or rock in Bulgaria (Ryback 1990). In Western Europe, attempts to shut down pirate radio have yielded to opening the skies to cable companies, a shift towards the American model, yet state manipulation continues at various levels of regulation. In a patchwork system like Yugoslavia's, until very recently one could find independent, regional record producers that nevertheless have to turn to the state (which takes a share of profits) to press their records (Ljerka Vidić, conversation) or a local government might decide to tax officially non-valued commercial musics to foster more acceptable styles (Radmila Petrović, conversation 1984). In the US, Congress was stymied for years in trying to regulate digital audio tape by not knowing whether to side with the producers of playback equipment (who favored it) or of sound recordings (who opposed it); examples abound of this cozy yet complex interaction of state and industry. In America, the government probably bows to the demands of commerce more often than in Europe.

Nowhere are the cracks and disjunctures of hegemony more apparent than at the margins of the public and private, where contradictory values are laid bare. In the US, the dialectic between community control of obscenity and free speech rights is foregrounded or backgrounded in a cyclical fashion, leaping to the forefront around 1990. Levels of government may disagree, ranging from town councils to the Supreme Court, and factions may disagree, as between Congress, the courts, and agencies of the executive branch. Indeed, even the latter may work at cross purposes when it comes to enforcing vaguely worded statutes on matters like licensing, royalties, and copyright. Despite the strains in this intra-superculture alliance of state and commerce, the tendency to paper over the cracks is very strong. In 1989, when local governments began prosecuting allegedly obscene art, records, or even posters advertising records, the music industry's response was defensive in terms of profits, not rights. Warning labels popped up on recordings and internal monitoring of lyrics and artwork intensified. Spokesmen assured interviewers that this was not self-censorship, just sound business: "A record company has the right to decide which records to put out. It's just a matter of where you draw the line. That's not censorship. Censorship is when someone *else* tells you" (Lawrence Kenswil of MCA Records, quoted in Browne 1990).

It is ironic that precisely at this juncture East European governments were loosening their hold on subcultural strivings and learning the value of co-optation. The great age of self-censorship there, so well described for

decades (see Haraszti 1987 for a classic statement), has passed over into American practice. This interchange of methods of control only demonstrates the greater interdependence of the Euro-American world. Equally unremarkable is the fact that each side chooses to ignore the lesson already learned by the other. Kenswil of MCA Records has probably not read Haraszti, while the emerging entrepeneurs of the old East are only slowly becoming aware of the painful complexities of balancing supercultural control with private creativity.

3. Less flagrant but more insidious strands of hegemony define the everyday, and circumscribe the expressive. There is a huge body of shared assumptions about every aspect of music-making. Stereotypes and career paths for professional musicians are quietly enforced. For example, a friend of mine who applied for insurance was advised by his agent to put down "teacher" instead of "musician" as a profession—and he does not even look like a "minority" person, for whom the tag would have been double trouble. Performance contexts and their evaluation are tightly defined, particularly for micromusics that need defending or, at least, public explanation, for their very appearance, most commonly at officially sanctioned events celebrating "diversity." Last, but hardly least, the superculture provides a set of standardized styles, repertoires, and performance practices anyone can recognize, if not like—a common coin of the musical national currency we all carry around every day.

Like any other hegemonic subsystem, music spreads to subcultures and individuals through various channels, often overlapping, sometimes conflicting. In classic state-controlled systems like pre-1990 East Europe/USSR, official and unofficial culture acted as parallel tracks with musical categories often jumping from one to the other. In Western Europe, state and commercial sources also offer a two-tier, interlocked system, while in the United States, it is primarily the multi-tentacled commodified culture that provides diversity and some dissonance. Just as cereal companies provide both heavily processed and "natural" products, with intermediate options, so changing and even hostile packagings like "soul," "country," "metal," or "rap" offer variety through commerce. A modest national consensus occurs when the national anthem is sung at sporting events, when a handful of standard Christmas songs streams relentlessly into every public space for several weeks at year's end, or when a commercial jingle penetrates the consciousness of children of all subcultures (for whom jingles form the major musical repertoire).

As always, the anomalous cases help clarify the main issues, and it is in that context that I would like to mention Yugoslavia—more specifically, the kind of music officially called "newly composed folk music" (henceforth NCFM), currently being studied by Ljerka Vidić in a dissertation in progress.

NCFM is a folk-based style which emerged from post-World War II urbanization. It has risen to great prominence in the 1970s and 1980s, becoming, from the point of view of sales, a "popular" music of great power. Its institutional framework is complex, consisting of state superculture components like radio and television stations and the official press. Given Yugoslavia's socio-economic structure through 1990, however, there is an equally lively industrial side to NCFM: record companies and unofficial press, seemingly still under state control but, as Vidić (letter 1991) says, "the fact that all of these institutions are government-founded is of little help in understanding how they actually work or what kind of music policy (if any) they apply." It seems that though record companies are supposed to be institutions of "special cultural importance," they are not government-subsidized. So while they fulfill the state command to produce tax-exempt classical and village music, they survive on the basis of a commercial market they create and manage. As a result, the authorities have no control over NCFM: "what seems to be the major concern of those involved in the music industry is the *lack* of controls over it." Meanwhile, the music itself "has from its inception both blurred and emphasized the boundaries between regional, ethnic, national, and foreign elements," and faces the new challenge of adapting to the greater assertiveness of local over national identity in Yugoslavia: "If record companies turn to their ethnically 'pure' audiences within the confines of their respective regions, NCFM could be, for the first time, in the service of state regimes."

Appadurai's -scapes seem to work well here in three ways: first, there is a great deal of slippage between the components of hegemony, since the articulation among techno- media- and finan-scapes lacks precise definition; second, the ideoscape as reshaping of imagined worlds holds the "swing vote" in the allocation and understanding of how resources will be used. Finally, the volatility of the ethnoscape (urbanization, probably also emigration for work) plays an important role in keeping the cultural flow lively. There seems little room for a cozy superculture partnership between state and industry in a society which never quite worked out their relationship and is now busily renegotiating even that reasonably stable balance.

The foregoing is just a sketch of some main features of the musical superculture, since my main concern will not lie with analysis of the inner workings of hegemony, but rather with the interplay of superculture and subculture, and extensions to the interculture, detailed below. Yet another important issue to be deferred is the relationship of individual music-makers/consumers to larger social units. To put it in the words of current theory, this is what de Certeau and others call "a contradiction between the collective mode of administration and an individual mode of reappropriation" (1984:96). As I shall argue below, this leaves a space, indeed a cavernous

hole, between the collective and the singular, where the subculture and its own subdivisions might be located. To bridge some obvious conceptual gaps, I need to turn now towards the subculture, the affinity group, the small-scale network of human bonding that fills in much of this theoretically troubling and socially contested space.

Searching for the Subculture

When we look at micromusics, what units do we choose; or, less clinically, which voices do we listen to? Starting with the strong role of the individual, there are other micro-units like the family, the neighborhood, the voluntary association, the festival organizing committee, the church board, and many others which we tend to lump together when describing "the group." Recent ethnic studies have begun to grapple with this issue; for example, Susan Keefe and Amado Padilla, tackling the large topic of "Chicano ethnicity," do so as an anthropologist-and-psychologist team precisely because they feel that looking either at the individual or the group fails to provide enough perspective, and that sociologists' overviews cannot stand alone. This leads them to talk about how both qualitative and quantitative methods need to be used, how intragroup differentiation at the smallest level of family life is of crucial importance to understanding the life of a subculture, and to stress the shaping nature of small-scale networks (1987). Similarly, Mary Waters opens her work on "ethnic options" by explaining how the confused nature of the all-too-detailed 1980 US Census reports led her to move towards qualitative work in targeted communities to sort out the situation (1990). In cross-cultural music research, Roger Wallis and Krister Malm's landmark work on the recording industry also begins with a statement about life beyond statistics, with a strong stress on the importance of key individuals to marketing innovations and trends (1984). All these caveats and suggestions resonate with some of my current feelings about how music-making needs to be studied.

To my mind, a partial groundwork for meaningful methodologies was laid by Georg Simmel back in 1922, in his *Die Kreuzung Sozialer Kreise*, rather awkwardly translated as "The Web of Group-Affiliations" (1955). He was probably reacting against a sociological tendency to view the hectic search for meaning in urban environments as wholly negative, choosing instead to find the relationship between individuals and their choice of affiliations to be constructive and positive: "from the combination [of chosen groups] he gains his maximum of individuality—the one group offering him opportunities for socialization, the other opportunities for competition." Or, more strongly, "opportunities for individualization proliferate into infinity also because the same person can occupy positions of different rank in the various groups to which he belongs." All of this "compensates for that

isolation of the personality which develops out of breaking away from the narrow confines of earlier circumstances," referring to set, almost ascribed roles in "tightly-knit primary groups" such as families, work, or subculture settings. Following out this approach, Simmel can baldly state: "Thus one can say that society arises from the individual and that the individual arises out of association." As for the individual, "he is determined sociologically in the sense that the groups 'intersect' in his person by virtue of his affiliation with them" (ibid.:150–63).

While not swallowing this whole, what I find very useful in Simmel's formulation is a perspective that sees just how complex and meaningful the interplay of personal choice and group activity can be both to individuals and to society. From the point of view of music studies, it is easy to blur the lines between single activists and whole traditions, between ensembles and institutions, and that is understandable, given the kind of data our methods turn up. We interview musicians as star cultural performers, look at bands as small groups carrying styles, and tend to jump from these micro-worlds to the "group" as a whole. The problem crops up in surveying other expressive forms as well, as in Lucy Lippard's otherwise admirable book *Mixed Blessings* (1990), one of the few works to consider the problems of the new art arising from what she calls "a multicultural America." Through-out, she moves from consideration of individual artists producing singular objects to more general statements about the groups these artists might belong to or represent, such as "the art reproduced here demonstrates the ways in which *cultures* see themselves and others" followed by remarks about choosing "younger and/or lesser-known *artists*" (ibid.:4; emphasis mine), where the linkage between the two italicized nouns is not made explicit. Yet I find the ways in which individual music-makers stand for, influence, are accepted or rejected by larger social groupings—subcul-tures?—one of the most profoundly challenging issues of analysis.

In ethnomusicology, we might take a close look at the pioneering anthology on Euro-American musics compiled by James Porter (1978). One essay concentrates on a single fiddle tune, another on European connections of Cajun music based on historical principles, a third takes a more ethnographic look at a couple of individual Hungarian-American singers to make the same connections, a fourth focuses in on the ideology of song composition in a sub-subculture, while a fifth moves out from a genre study to suggest ideologies based on waves of immigration. As a set, this anthology admirably shows off the variety of possible methodologies in an embryonic field of study, and one cannot expect short articles to cover too much ground. Nevertheless, the overall format presents an almost bewildering mixture of levels and planes of analysis, leaving the reader to find some general vantage point from which to survey the whole landscape.

A closer look at a single essay in Porter's collection may show what I mean. Christina Niles's very informative essay on the "revival" of the Latvian *kokle* zither showcases the powerful role of two key individuals, one who adapted the instrument to American use and one who produced an instructional manual that facilitated group organization. This narrative is overlaid with a description of three types of music-makers in the community: rank amateurs, talented amateurs, and elite specialists, all three of whom interact with the newly emerging *kokle*. Niles introduces a third story, of waves of immigration, a fourth, relationship to the homeland, a fifth motif, superculture/subculture interplay in creating an ideology around zither ensembles, and, finally, interpolates a sixth theme, parent-child relations. She also briefly suggests a seventh theme, regional differentiation of musical scenes in America (Niles 1978). The hard part of this type of conscientiously thorough study is to put the pieces together convincingly. The strategy adopted here is to foreground one issue—the usefulness of *kokle*-playing as "a fashionable aspect of a more general 'back-to-tradition' movement among Latvian youth"—while throwing in as many other insights as one can manage. This means that many issues of equal importance will remain far in the background, while at the same time the highlighted topic of "identity" will get shortchanged as well. As admirable as this laying out of the complexity of a subculture's inner expressive life may be, it can only present some of the parameters and will find it hard to place the shifting circumstantial evidence in an integrated framework, since we have no general theory for the dynamics of subcultural life, just a set of rule-of-thumb possibilities. When is the pull of Niles's "Americanization" stronger than an interest in "revival," and why for a particular generation? Why is the moment ripe for the work of a couple of isolated activists to spread like wildfire through a subculture? When are generational concerns more important than family orientation or personal choice? Niles attempts a quantitative approach by interviewing fifteen students of two different age groups in one city to generalize about the latter issue, hardly a sociologists's dream sample, but as good as one usually gets in ethnomusicological studies. Conjectures are common: "rehearsals, concerts, and the annual kokle and folksong festivals are strong incentives for learning to play the instrument," but there is no backup data here. Evidence from both ethnic and non-ethnic ensembles might suggest that for young people, social conviviality and age-grade cohesion might be just as important (e.g., Pearce 1984 on drum corps in the Connecticut Valley; members of the Chicago Serbian community in Godmilow 1976). I am not specifically faulting Niles here; I find in my own work the same problem of welding the disparate strips of observation into a finished work of analysis. I am simply proposing that the problem lies not in the incompleteness of the ethnography, but in the lack of a unified model for subcultural expressive culture.

But even if one were to develop such a model, I would be highly suspicious of its explanatory power. Taking a wider view, "Latvianness" here can stand in for many such musical situations where focusing on "ethnicity" is part of the aim. Usually left untouched is Simmel's point about multiple identities, his "web of affiliations." Latvian-American kid-koklists may also play in rock groups and marching bands; Latvian-American adults may belong to barbershop quartet circles. To take a European example, there is an area of Sweden (Dalarna) considered the musical/folkloristic heartland of the country where the teenagers cruise the streets in 1950s American style, complete with old cars and rock 'n roll personae, then shoulder fiddles on Sundays to play in family and local "folk" events (Owe Ronström, conversation 1990). This is not just an issue of superculture-subculture relations, or intercultural interference, but part of a simple Simmelesque observation: "The modern type of group-formation makes it possible for the isolated individual to become a member in whatever number of groups he chooses. Many consequences resulted from this" (Simmel 1955:140).

I cannot go fully into all those consequences here, nor do I think Simmel himself does much more than sketch out the main lines of the problem of the interplay of "isolated individuals," "group affiliations," and the larger society. Nor do I think the recent literature on uses and meanings of leisure time activities (for example, Kelly 1983) goes deep enough into either the subcultural side of affinity groups or the aesthetic and transcendental value of musical involvement for participants. However, we do now have a consistent and comprehensive model based on a single, small urban area which addresses the issue of levels of analysis: Ruth Finnegan's book-length report on the English town of Milton Keynes, a very substantive account (1989). She was struck by the strong overlaps between local musical groups and national networks, family music-making patterns and institutionally based support systems (such as school and church), and tried to make sense of fragmentation by appealing to the notion of the musical "pathway." Finnegan is drawn to the term because anything else sounds too self-enclosed: "world" (from Becker 1982), "group," "community"—all have a limiting quality she found absent in the freewheeling cultural space of Milton Keynes: "The musical worlds thus to some extent interpenetrated one another. Their boundaries were shiftable—and were shifted—by their participants" (Finnegan 1989:181). However, there is little comfort in the term, since it does not explain, but merely describes, the problem: "There seems, then, to be no single answer to why particular people find themselves on one or another of the established musical pathways . . . musical paths are voluntary . . . but to this awareness of free choice must also be added the patterns and constraints and opportunities that . . . help to draw individuals towards or away from particular paths . . . chief among these the influences

of gender, of age, of stage in the life-cycle, the link to various other social groupings and . . . family musical background" (ibid.:317). In short, Euro-American societies allow considerable leeway for choice along the lines of voluntarism, but within a grid of limitations no one can change—indeed, which no one even thinks about. It is almost as if the many musical affiliations of Milton Keynesians were so many political parties in a multiparty liberal democracy, all of which are sworn to uphold the constitution, voting also being a function of family orientation, gender, age, tie to various other social groupings, and so on. Of course, music provides ever so much more variety and satisfaction than politics; yet the overall relationship of personal choice to fixed givens might be comparable.

My reason for this probably overstated analogy is Finnegan's admission that versatility and flexibility are rather circumscribed culturally: "The established pathways were in a sense already there, as a route at least to begin on; they were part of the existing cultural forms rather than something that had to be calculated afresh each time" (ibid.:307). In fact, there is a great deal of control at all levels of her system. Some pathways are mostly in the hands of state bureaucracies, notably "classical" music, based on "progressive admission through recognized grades, guarded by specialist teachers and examiners"(ibid.:134). Others, like church music, have a "dominant ideology" of "a close link between music and religion," so they involve deeply-rooted institutional support (ibid.:221). These ideologically-driven patronage systems mesh with the commercial motivation of enterpeneurs like pub-owners: "publicans wanted to encourage more women and saw music as one way of achieving this" (ibid.:232). The hidden hand of the superculture is evident throughout the extraordinarily rich musical life of Milton Keynes, so English in its choice of musics yet so much a part of the Euro-American mainstream. Were we to take the superculture's side, we would cheer on Finnegan's description of music's power to define social moments: "Music and musicians are thus recognized as having the special role of creating a space in social life and framing events as 'rituals' " (ibid.:336). We would also applaud the way music organizes people's lives by offering both transcendence and orderliness: "Musical enactment is at once a symbol of something outside and above the usual routines of ordinary life and at the same time a continuing thread of habitual action running in and through the lives of its many local practitioners" (ibid.:339).

Nothing Finnegan says hints at so much as a gram of the oppositional in every kilo of co-optation. Even rock turns out to be non-confrontational, its accepted image as youth or working-classss protest not being supported by her empirical data. "Perhaps the most prominent single characteristic . . . was a stress on individuality and artistic creation which accords ill with the mass theorists' delineation of popular music" (ibid.:129). All of Finnegan's people

end up feeling the same way about music, expressing "an unspoken but shared assumption . . . that there was something . . . unparalleled in quality and in kind about music which was not to be found in other activities of work or of play" (ibid.:332). Ultimately, music in Milton Keynes seems to function at two levels: as a kind of socially patterned mode of self-fulfillment and as a regular, satisfying exercise in Victor Turner's *communitas*, a socially-sanctioned feeling of oneness which both affirms and erases everyday boundaries. This account explains the problem of level-switching in analysis: are we looking at the personal or the social side of this somehow non-dichotomous yet binary situation? Music seems to have an odd quality that even passionate activities like gardening or dog-raising lack: the simultaneous projecting and dissolving of the self in *performance*. Individual, family, gender, age, supercultural givens, and other factors hover around the musical space, but can only very partially penetrate the moment of enactment of musical fellowship. Visible to the observer, these constraints remain unseen by the musicians, who are instead working out a shared vision which involves both the assertion of pride—even ambition—and the simultaneous disappearance of the ego.

This dilemma foils our analytical radar when we look at the structure of performance itself for social clues. They are abundant, ranging from physical grouping of performers through a hundred details of dress, leadership roles, and the ideology implicit in the aesthetic ideals of sound production, and have been mined by researchers ever since "performance" moved to the forefront in 1970s folklore and ethnomusicology studies. Yet performance is no more than a different perspective on the same issues. It tracks the social life into the pub and hall, but often does little to bridge the gap between the individual and the society, since while outsiders look for standard patterns, insiders may stress the rather ineffable notion of "musicality": "the achieved rather than ascribed nature of musical competence was one major theme in local music activity, when what you achieved musically was more important than who you were" (Finnegan 1989:307). This brings us into the realm of the aesthetic, and only rarely do studies of Euro-American micromusics show how *aesthetic,* rather than organizational/contextual aspects of performance betray a continuity between the social, the group, and the individual. One analytical moment of this sort can be found in Averill's work on American "barbershop" singing groups, where the singers' explicit notion of a "harmonic highway" which involves a satisfying return to "home" as part of an aesthetic complex that includes other elements such as the dominant subject matter of song texts (1990). This aesthetic might then be linked to the social situation of the ensemble as a whole as part of an overall analysis. It seems typical that such an approach is not surprising—indeed, even normal—in our view of African music-making yet so alien to the Euro-

American context, where the notion of an everyday aesthetic has been very late to be recognized. No doubt the ideology of how to study the Other vs. Ourselves has something to do with this imbalance.

Before turning back to this issue of "an overall analysis," let me tackle a single parameter to show the methodological tangle that arises in trying to comb out any one strand of a micromusic. I'll use class for purposes of demonstration. The cultural studies background to my approach politely but firmly tends to suggest class be foregrounded. Yet class is highly elusive when we get down to cases. Finnegan makes the flat assertion that "in the Milton Keynes study the concept of class turned out not to be of particular significance either for participants' own perceptions or for any overall analysis of local musical practice" (1989:329). The situation is further complicated by early cultural studies' problems in trying to map class onto music for subcultures. Briefly put, "style" features like clothing and music were seen as emblems of identity in youth subculture, a spin-off of a necessary "parent class," here the working-class (Hall and Jefferson 1975, Hebdige 1979). Already by 1981, Gary Clarke pointed out the reductive nature of this approach, which tended to essentialize all subcultural group members and freeze the meaning of trends and styles. More recent British formulations take account of the considerable complexity of class in today's societies; a good starting point is Paul Gilroy's trenchant remark that "class today is a contingent and necessarily indeterminate affair" (1987:35). Gilroy's concern is with distinguishing class analysis from issues of race in Britain, a good example of how "contingent" things can get: " 'race' can no longer be reduced to an effect of the economic antagonisms arising from production, and class must be understood in terms qualified by the vitality of struggles articulated through 'race' " (ibid.), and such issues are not confined to Britain. Surely the relationship of class to something like race is of enormous importance in a country like France today, and always has been in the US, and that is but one example of how hard it is to isolate class as a separable component.

In trying to sort out the relationship between micromusics and class, another phrase of Gilroy's might come in handy: "classes are only *potentially* constituted" (ibid.:31). In our terms, this means one might be able to identify a nice clean homology between music and class within a subcultural setting, as in Bourdieu's charts, where musical taste can be elegantly aligned with a variety of finely detailed class formations (1984), or in Manuel Peña's very articulate account of Texas-Mexican listening habits, which show that different clusters of ensemble/genre/style can be class-contested (1985). These seem to be cases where the potential for class expression through music has been realized. However, what often happens is that—particularly in popular music studies—outsiders make conclusions about the class-

related nature of a particular style, genre, or performer, despite the fact that, as Richard Middleton has pointed out, "particular cultural forms and practices cannot be attached mechanically or even paradigmatically to particular classes" (1990:8). Charles Keil's interest in the polka as a "working-class" phenomenon might be one micromusical scene to investigate more closely. He tends to feel that the polka, spread across many American subcultures from midwestern Euro-Americans to southwestern Native Americans, defines a proletarian praxis (Keil 1982, Keil and Keil 1984). Yet it is a bit of a leap from the empirical observation that many Central/East European urban communities share polka magic to the conclusion that this is class-related behavior. Virtually all of the same groups suggest, sometimes explicitly, that country and western music is their point of class orientation, even to the point of shaping their "ethnic" polkas, as a Connecticut musician says, describing the interaction of the genres: "We do a couple songs . . . which are country songs . . . But you can turn them around into a polka . . . they're for your old country people and not just for somebody living in a big house. And that's what most real polka people are. They're common people; they're not rich people" (Spalding 1986:75). Ellen McHale feels the same about the adoption of country music by the musicians she talked to in Franco-American Vermont (1981), and James Leary confirms the situation for another group of Euro-Americans, in the Midwest: "Such later forms as 'honky tonk' or 'hard country,' with its emphasis on the ruralite adrift in the city, were especially appealing to displaced Finnish-Americans of Michigan" (1987:212). Even in Britain, Finnegan says that the country and western world was the only one in town "it seemed appropriate to characterize in class terms at all." The problem is that while the music could be termed "working-class," "that was not how the participants themselves seemed to envisage it" (1989:99). On the one hand, aficionados in Milton Keynes see country and western as "a great leveler," thus not class-specific, while on the other, it is the type of music most involved in the handling of money, hardly an indication of working-class egalitarianism. To return to the Midwest, if polka and country coexist as favorite styles of a putative working class despite their very different origins, association with supercultural and commodified structures, and relationship to local groups' heritage, we can only term the music "proletarian" by willful exclusion of a great many contingent factors.

One such factor might be the existence of an internal hierarchy among the groups Keil lumps together as working-class. Though he is comfortable combining white American styles with other ethnic expressive forms to form a large category, insiders like Chicana writer Gloria Anzaldua may see it differently: "I grew up feeling ambivalent about our music. Country-western and rock-and-roll had more status" (1990:209). She does confirm Peña's

analysis of an*internal* sense of class: "In the 50s and 60s, for the slightly educated and *agringado* Chicanos, there existed a sense of shame at being caught listening to our music" (ibid.), which does not point to a proletarian brotherhood of taste.

Taste itself complicates the location of class in micromusics. According to Leary, " 'blues tonality' typifies the reed and brass playing of former and present day Wisconsin Bohemian brass bands" (1986:3). Do we simply assume that, due to race, "blues tonality," at least as universal in micromusics as country music influence or love of the polka, could not be a part of class orientation in the music of Euro-American subcultures? That would make common sense, but so does the generally accepted feeling that the blues, representing hard times and hard knocks, speaks to the human condition, which might suggest it suits the "working class." If Wisconsin Bohemian brass band players are vague on the subject of why they like "blues tonality," on what basis do we assign or not assign class feeling to this particular musical feature? Once again, the question of aesthetics vs. social structure makes any hard statement of linkage unlikely.

Within the same constellation of groups and styles, suppose we try out the intersection of religion and class. Take George Dybedal, Norwegian-American, who worked as a "millwright, boilermaker, and welder" as well as lumberjack, certainly a working-class profile. Dybedal sings both Scandinavian and country gospel songs as an amateur, in rest homes and churches, and has put the two together by playing Norwegian hymns accompanied by a guitar style based in "country-western honky-tonk and gospel tunes," with a vocal line that "echoes the church choir." As Leary says, "the resultant union is illustrative of an important recurrent cultural interplay between ethnic sacred and American secular traditions in the region" (1986:20), and I would add that it might well be a class-related set of repertoires, choices, and strategies, but not one much noticed in the literature.

Part of the problem of affirming a class identity for a given style or influence is the constant shifting of micromusical allegiance along the lines of other parameters, such as generation. The Finnish-American musician Leary discusses, Art Moilanen, "rejects contemporary forms regularly heard and played" in his region; "he plays little or no country music from that period following the late 1950s; nor does he play any polka music from much later than the mid-1950s . . . Art Moilanen's music is, in the 1980s, conservative, a definite throwback, exemplary of cultural lag," so that for his aging listeners, Art's music "conjures memories of other days—of a 'golden age,' perhaps" (Leary 1987:216). Keil feels that 1950s gritty Chicago polka music represents working-class musicians breaking through the facade of bourgeoisified, recorded polka styles (Keil and Keil 1984). Perhaps, but it

would only be a temporary, local tie-in with class. When the Chicago sound hit the East coast and changed Northeastern polka style, was it because the locals felt a renewed sense of class orientation when they heard it, or because it was more fun to dance to, or because it appealed to younger polkaphiles? In short, class is contingent on generation, history, and many other factors. As Richard Middleton says, Stuart Hall's "articulating principles" of class position "operate by combining existing elements into new patterns or by attaching new connotations to them" (1990:9). The problem is how not to create a circular argument by looking for the supposed "articulating principles" and then discovering them. Unless you feel that class *must* underlie all cultural expressions, isolating it from all other parameters will not only be difficult, but problematic.

Keil gets around this complex of issues by simply asserting that there are proletarian communities and that as proletarians and as communities, they engage in both "reworking of older forms" and "the incorporation of contemporary elements." Thus, their "joyful and catholic interest . . . absorbs all that is of use and swiftly eliminates everything not needed" (Keil and Keil 1984:8). He redefines the somewhat tautological nature of this approach elsewhere by noting that ethnicity and class are somehow intertwined, also interpolating the way individual bandleaders achieve economic success: by blending diverse ethnic traditions, all, however, presumably still being automatically working-class, even though he notes in passing that there are serious class differences within the ethnic groups of a single city. In the end, he distills his appeal to class by formulating a "working people's music that's not dependent on state subsidy or corporate mediation" (1982:58), that is, alternative, though not necessarily oppositional. Since working musicians are intimately engaged in commodification, even at a micro-level, it is only the absence of the big players that makes class identification possible. But since the micromusics are infused with products of corporations and are increasingly presented and represented by state-subsidized agencies (e.g., Leary's midwestern publications, the network of folklife festivals), it's still hard to find the direct link between the nature of people's jobs (his definition of class seems to involve "alienation of labor") and the music involved.

Another complication arises from the fact that people—particularly subcultural people—may try to wish themselves out of their class, and music is a good way to imagine you are somewhere else. Class analysts tend to think of attempts at upward mobility through music as part of hegemony's endless attempt to wipe out traces of opposition through co-opting the subordinate class. The problem is how to paste a class label on the all-American music that people respond to when they turn their backs on their micromusics. Is Lawrence Welk as a superculture standby in a different class (musically and socially) than the Lawrence Welk as a North Dakota polka

player he and his viewers left behind? Sure, Welk earns more than his fans or his Midwestern colleagues, but that might not be the place to locate class. On a grid like Bourdieu's, Welk would fit into a class category far from patrons of the Metropolitan Opera, but his following is probably as uniform in generation as it is in income and taste. This raises the issue elided by Keil of whether subcultures need to be oppositional, surely a class-related issue in any marxist tradition. A glance at the patriotic polka song text cited below (p. 67)—and it is hardly a unique example—certainly raises doubts. Thanking America "for the freedom and the good life" hardly seems an act of cultural rebellion, any more than using a country and western tune to accompany a Norwegian hymn is necessarily interpolating a working-class counterculture into petit-bourgeois piety.

Suppose we tried to isolate a point in time when a community shifts its economic base to gauge the possible effects of class on music. We might consider the period when people gave up house parties for the dance-hall atmosphere Welk grew up in. This happened somewhere in the 1930s or 1940s in the US, depending on locale. In northern Vermont, local Saturday night kitchen gatherings gave way to "intercommunity dances at town hall, granges, taverns, and other settings of essentially nondomestic identity" (Robert Bethke in McHale 1981:99). Why this happened is a subject of speculation. Bethke suggests urbanization and the availability of the automobile, possibly class-related factors. But the local bandleaders talk about issues of house design—dance halls were larger than their "small-built living room and a kitchenette"—and of taste: according to a prominent family of musicians, "as country music gained in popularity, the people, especially the young people, lost interest in old time fiddling and dancing and turned to other amusements and social settings" (McHale 1981:100). Whether or not the class formation of these Franco-American Vermonters actually shifted during this period and, if so, how important that might be for the music is not obvious, nor can we assume that country music should be considered more or less class-related than old-time Franco-American styles. Here we have the problem of the peculiar nature of country music cited earlier as being both a superculture product and an appeal to local sentiment at some level of *meaning* rather than point of production or even language of song text, a very attenuated class relationship at best. Using the Appadurai perspective, it is possible that ideoscape and ethnoscape are more important than media-, techno- and finanscape in the broad acceptance of country music. Whether class is involved remains an open question.

Finally, class analysis is particularly difficult in contemporary societies, where everyone has access to each other's musics. Take the Texas-Mexican *conjunto* music Peña located as class-related within that subculture (1985). As of the late 1980s it became simultaneously available from artists ranging

from unrecognized (or even nationally recognized) neighborhood bands in San Antonio through Los Lobos, an originally local, presumably lower-class-derived Los Angeles band who have moved into the superculture strato-sphere, to Linda Ronstadt, an established, perhaps middle-class identified, half-German, half-Mexican-American singer. The same music is regularly represented at local, state, and federally subsidized "folklife" festivals, even being taken to the Soviet Union in 1990 on that basis. Is it the performer, the arrangements, or some statistically verifiable audience we rate as class-affiliated? Does class reside among the producers, performers, or consumers? Class-ification is a difficult task given the fact that a broad mixed-income level audience of both subcultural and mainstream listeners buys the recordings in the United States. Class may be more a matter of reception patterns than simple analysis of either consumption patterns or even questionnaire-based survey techniques might show if there is a multiclass market. Tastemakers' trends may be more influential than inherited class leanings among listeners, moving us again from the group to the individual. Abroad, the same American music may have other implications, and belong to different social formations.

The somewhat intractable relationship between class and taste crops up throughout the findings of a very pragmatic, purely consumer-oriented methodology developed in the United States to match products and target markets. Called the PRIZM system by its inventor, Jonathan Robbin, it divides the country into "clusters," neighborhood types that pop up across the map, unified by a profile which aligns consumer choices to income level, household type, subcultural ascription, and political leanings, all on the basis of standard sociological measures. As summarized in *The Clustering of America*, this statistical survey often includes music as a measured param-eter, and provides fuel for some diverse positions on the class-taste nexus (Weiss 1988). One handy chart shows the top five clusters for music; for example, "country" is most listened to by lower-income, rural, predomi-nantly white Americans (although one included cluster is "Towns & Gowns," college-based communties). The table shows that "classical music lovers tend to live in upscale areas in and around big cities that have symphonies and classical radio stations. Jazz remains an urban phenomenon due largely to the prevalence of city clubs. As for heavy metal, its listeners come primarily from upscale family suburbs filled with rebellious teens" (ibid.:130). Generation, income level, race, and an urban-rural divide play into these profiles and cross-cut them. No one factor predominates; take the mix of clusters who support jazz at more than twice the national average rate: Black Enterprise (white-collar blacks), Urban Gold Coast (high-income city whites), Bohemian Mix (a liberal, mixed-race, both high- and low-income younger and older taste-driven cluster), Emergent Minorities (struggling,

predominantly black working-class), and Young Influentials (white yuppies). Here, race supersedes class as an identifier for blacks, but a mixed-class assortment of whites is just as enthusiastic about jazz. Some of these people are strongly Republicans, others staunch Democrats, the age level differs sharply, and this group of clusters has very few, if any, other tastes in common.

One more example from the clustering concept will close this commentary. "New Homesteaders" are moderate-to-low-income white families that have moved from urban to suburban areas and lead and outdoors-oriented life; they privilege country music. "Blue-Collar Nursery" folks have grown up in such suburbs and are quite similar to New Homesteaders in political outlook and income level, yet they seem attracted to 60s rock. Refining the internal dynamic—apparently not one related to "class" in the normal sense—which leads one cluster to spend its money on country and the other on sixties rock would take significant ethnographic digging of the kind we have yet to see being done for Euro-American local studies.

I have certainly not questioned class as a privileged parameter in micromusics in order to dismiss it—it is very relevant if only in terms of the power of the superculture to set the terms, define the scope, of everyone's expressive culture. My intent has been to give some sense of how looking at one variable introduces many others, elbowing any single factor and crowding the frame. Let me now circle back to the big picture, again using Simmel and Finnegan as foils. Neither is very interested in the notion of bounded subculture. Simmel somehow jumps from the individual/small affinity-group to the "society." Finnegan points out that a wide variety of small ethnic groups in Milton Keynes carry on musical activities, but beyond pointing out their relative isolation compared to mainstream British forms, she spends no time on them. This backgrounding is revealing of her general enterprise, which is to construct the local basis of a "normal" British musical culture. Her solid citizens do form an impressive bulwark of a highly ramified, articulated, and surprisingly coherent tradition of music-making, especially given the fact that Milton Keynes is a newly developed urban area with only pockets of older communal traditions in pre-existing villages. The abundance of local ensembles and events is staggering: Finnegan's city of about120,000 souls manages to support 100 choirs, numerous symphony orchestra and chamber groups, 5–8 main brass bands, and a dozen folk groups as a core of activity that includes 170 rock/pop bands and a vast apparatus of school music-making. Yet this seemingly all-embracing scene represents a local superculture which must make newly-arrived Sikh or Vietnamese immigrants feel somewhat alienated, a possibility Finnegan does not entertain or explore; she seems too comfortable with her compatriots to venture across ethnic boundaries. All this brings back the

vagueness of "subculture," which I already indicated was not likely to dissipate in these pages.

Still, we might make another attempt at definition by finally taking a familiar path on the road to the subculture, the "minority" route, an all-too-comfortable landscape featuring a "majority" population in charge of a state apparatus that defines and tries to control a number of "minorities." A recent comparative volume of essays on minorities (Gold 1984) divides this scene into three types: "immigrants" (with "not-so-distant" ancestry elsewhere), "national" (long-term residents of non-majority origin), and "aboriginals" (minorities that were there first), all of whom are covered by the term "ethnicity," a term of recent origin and much debate. Gold's handy volume offers an important perspective: the view that subcultures are very much defined by the superculture. This approach works for the state wing of the superculture, which cares very much about any potential competitors "out there" in the society. Whether through mindless bureaucratic efficiency or coldly calculated patterns of control, governments do a great deal to realize the notion of a subculture; there are important ways in which you can only be a subculture if the authorities say you are, part of a larger location of "identity" in what Stuart Hall calls "the social imaginary" (1991). Yet outside of the former USSR, those ways tend to relate more to the politics and economics of group life and less to its culture. Calling a dozen local groups "Hispanics" in Middletown, Connecticut, certainly puts some pressure on them to respond to that status, but will not necessarily create a unified culture beyond what the rather meager government funding for culture or local pressure for minority representation (marching in the Memorial Day Parade) will provide. In the US, the commercial branch of the superculture is much more effective than the state in cultural terms focusing the mediascape and finanscape on supply/demand patterns that dig deeply into cultural consciousness. The resulting ideoscape will probably overlap considerably with the state's view, but not completely, leaving that highly charged, creative space where imagined worlds meet commercial realities. From the industrial point of view, the distinction between immigrant, national, and aboriginal minorities is of little consequence save for the groups' potential as consumers. I will devote a section below to this sort of superculture-subculture interaction; here the point is to sort out possible ways of figuring out just what a subculture might be, and "minority" is only slightly helpful.

"Ethnicity" ought to be a beacon as we grope in this darkness. Surely it offers an illuminatory power to define a core of symbolic and expressive experience. Yet ethnicity is turning out to be a light that fails, having quite different meanings across the wide geographic expanse of our survey. Not only are those meanings diverse, but they appear attenuated in two ways: in some places (notably the United States) they are less important than they

seem for significant portions of the population, while in others (large parts of Eastern Europe) they gain so much importance they push towards a sharper sensibility, nationalism. In many middle grounds of Western Europe it is unclear whether we are talking about "ethnicity" as a general cultural construct, or just "country of origin" in terms of newcomers or "regional identity" for long-term subcultures. Heisler notes that while Western Euro-American group-ishness of the type we usually label "ethnicity" has proved more resilient than people thought, it is not what we might think (1990). That is, it does not represent (except in isolated, aggravated cases) a genuine drive for separation or a fierce passion for independent cultural identity, but rather a potential political stance—one among several—from which disenfranchised citizens might choose to negotiate their grievances with the rather tolerant welfare state. Politically viewed, musical expression can easily and naturally form a tactic in such a strategy, or merely serve as a rallying point for latent feelings of identity-flexing. The fact that such activities may also attract tourist dollars does not hurt; again, state and commercial interests may converge in terms of defining units of culture. Hugo Zemp (1987) and Sylvie Bolle-Zemp (1990) have eloquently shown how deeply ideological the "timeless" alpine music of Switzerland is in its formation and practice, a process also sharply profiled in Ronström's account of the bagpipe revival in Sweden (1989). Local and national identity make comfortable bedfellows with sentimental commodification in both contexts. Again, all I am trying to point out here is the need for overlapping perspectives, multiple viewpoints in sorting out the possible meanings of a given micromusic.

Let's take a closer look at "ethnicity" in the United States, where the term lives in very uneasy cohabitation with the word "race." From a time before the 1930s, when "race" was the term of choice for all subcultures, to today's fine census distinctions among "ethnically" defined populations, nothing has really been clear except the arbitrariness of designations. Mary Waters's recent book *Ethnic Options* at least provides some guideposts in this terminological wilderness (1990). Having followed up the rich 1980 census data with well-organized interviews among suburban Catholic "whites," Waters arrives at some stimulating suppositions. It seems that these people want to be ethnic when common sense sees no reason for it. After all, in recent times there has been a lack of recent immigrants from their groups (Irish, Slovenian, Italian . . .) and a very high rate of intermarriage. "Assimilation" into a vague Americanism should be the result. She conjectures that the reason for this survival of ethnicity is a drive neither for generational identity nor for political punch, but the happy chance that this loose form of affiliation allows one to combine the normally dichotomous demands of American society: belong to a group, a "team," but be an individual, "different." For her Euro-Americans, Waters implies that the

residual content of ethnicity can often be found in expressive forms: family ceremonies, public occasions, and food. Strangely and somewhat sadly, like many a social scientist, she misses the music in the scene she surveys. Even though she picked the most nonchalant ethnics, none of whom belongs to an ethnic organization, it's hard not to feel she impoverished her data by leaving out her informants' record collections, if not the music of the weddings they feel so strongly about. What we do learn from Waters is that this type of "white ethnicity" probably does not look like a true "subculture" these days but has some subcultural qualities, of which some kind of *belonging* seems a key component. So perhaps our problem in trying to come up with a comparative perspective hinges on trying to sort out this core verb "belong," recognizing its many layers in American society. For Waters also points out that this is a specific variety of belonging, concluding her study rather caustically by pointing out that her white Catholic suburbanites stay within the cozy world of their well-established, fellow Euro-American ethnics, so have a hard time understanding why things are so complicated for other groups, like "blacks" and "Hispanics." This strongly implies that for the less comfortable groupings—"blacks" (or perhaps now "African-Americans"), "Hispanics," "Asians," "Native Americans," "Pacific Islanders," to use the superculture's blanket terms—"belonging" has a different resonance.

These "non-Euro-American" social formations are what I call "involuntary" subcultures. They are constrained within well-defined administrative and cultural boundaries partly as a result of (very different) historical circumstances, but primarily by appearance: you can tell one when you see one, through the superculture's eyes—or, to put it the vulgar way, if you've seen one, you've seen them all. At the extreme, this leads to the randomly targeted attacks that dot the American social landscape: "Let's kill a ———— today" is an idea that actually occurs to certain citizens. This notion of subculture is as flexible as any other, in the sense that it doesn't have to be skin color; typical dress/hairstyle (for example, orthodox Jews), hangouts, or body behavior (for example, homosexuals) can guide the attacker to the victim: what are taken to be essential features will suffice. This puts those features in stark relief as not just inherited traits or adopted manner, but as major signal systems in the semiotics of society. Identification comes from all sides—individuals, government, and industry, the latter more interested in a target market than a target for assault, though the recent furor over a type of cigarette aimed at African-Americans implied the two may be interchangeable. At one level, then, it seems hard to deny that we are dealing with *recognizable* groups if only in the literal sense of the word. However, any relief at achieving a definition might be short, for we are interested in only one aspect of these people's lives, their music. The articulation between the externally-defined packaging and the actual lived experience of those in "the

group" may be—and frequently is—mapped for a series of linkages, but remains elusive in equal measure. For every explicit association of a community's music with its essence there is a supercultural move to generalize the style and erase, if not deny, the connection. Conversely, for every confident statement about how "black music" is tied to "black culture," there are eloquent silences that acknowledge the autonomy of aesthetic choices, both for individuals, small groupings, and even sizable "minorities" (which may have twenty-five million members).

The situation is just as complex in terms of gender. Ethnomusicology's attempt to grapple with this major factor in world music-making has done little more than lay out a number of local situations in which gender plays a role in certain contexts. Despite two anthologies (Koskoff 1987, Herndon and Ziegler 1990), music remains unintegrated with either the achievements of earlier feminist theory or the more recent multidisciplinary move into gender studies. Part of the reason might be the complexity of isolating gender, like the other factors I've brought up above, as a separate strand in the dense texture of micromusics. My own sole foray into gender studies (1990b), as part of a large historical-ethnographic study of the American cantorate, brought this home to me. Women officially entered the profession only in 1976 within one denomination of American Judaism (Reform), 1989 in another (Conservative), so the issue could be tightly framed. The fact that women could stand before a congregation as an aesthetic-spiritual ritual leader seemed a profound shift in an ancient religion. Yet as subcultural practice, this new en-gendering of an old music profession turned out to be closely linked to supercultural norms. The very fact that the action took place at all was a result of the concurrent drive within Protestant American religious life to empower women in leadership roles. And within the Jewish world, gender turned out to be no more prominent than professionalism itself among the female cantors interviewed. The cantorate is strongly split between ubiquitous part-timers, who turn up in a congregation to lead services once a week or only once a year at the time of the High Holidays, and full-time salaried professionals, who have with great difficulty wrung middle-class working conditions and respectability from synagogues only since the 1950s. These hard-won gains create an often bitter gulf between the part-time and full-time women, often overriding the question of feminism or gender roles among the practitioners. Among congregants, supercultural social trends seem to be speeding the acceptance of women as cantors, so it is a much more muted issue than might appear to be the case in, say, a 150-year-old synagogue that hires its first woman for the job. While it is perhaps not surprising that gender is no more separable than any other factor in a complex of micromusical practice, I do not think we have enough of a feel as yet for how it does function within subcultural settings to

understand its importance. For most Euro-American micromusics, it is by its absence that gender becomes most obvious, since the literature seems drawn magnetically to many spheres of male activism without defining them as male and still scants women's distinctive contribution in contexts where it counts.

One final note on levels of analysis. The more I look at subcultural scenes, the more impressed I am with *internal* supercultures that create a layer of definition and control which is exquisitely articulated with the mainstream system of management, both state and industrial. Hispanic cable TV and major radio stations consistently ignore the many subgroups within the vast multiethnic listenership covered by their sanctioned ethnic umbrella. Even in the smallest, white American micromusical worlds, ambitious community leaders dictate musical trends and allocate scarce resources arbitrarily. A major plane of analysis lies solely within localized settings, where even "micromusic" seems an overblown and contestable term. So any attempt to define a musical subculture for even the most identified groups will fall into the cracks we've been exploring: between the individual, the local formation, and the wider setting.

* * *

Having run through some of the problems of levels of analysis, I have no blueprint for the micromusical home. For the present, all I mean to do by way of going beyond critique is to suggest we work on defining three overlapping spheres of cultural activity: "choice," "affinity," and "belonging."

Choice. Simmel suggests individual choice lies at the heart of the matter for isolated individuals. This is in direct opposition to cultural pluralism's model (see Niles 1978 on being Latvian) of everyone starting off life in a recognizable subculture that spreads out from a nuclear family based in heritage and locale. Combining these two perspectives, it seems that we all grow up with *something*, but we can choose just about *anything* by way of expressive culture. Part of the reason for this is that we start with many "somethings"; my father's song repertoire, for example, draws on a huge range of childhood sources, from Russian and Yiddish folk and popular songs through Jewish liturgy and Christian chestnuts learned at a YMCA camp to American vaudeville and popular songs. Leary's copper-range Scandinavians and Texas Czechs are similarly eclectic, and the teenagers of Milton Keynes are as likely to find affinities with imported sounds as with older British pop. Today, the range of musical experience grows ever wider in Euro-American societies, so the gap between a supposed musical lineage and free choice constantly narrows. For the West, this means newer trends like world beat; for the former East, breadth means being able to go beyond bootlegged diversity to the world of open-market consumerism. Choices

have to be made; everyone is exposed to too much to take it all at face value. After all, the root meaning for "eclectic" has to do with selection, choosiness.

Affinity. This brings us to affinity, so essential to understanding choice, so necessary for affiliation, for choices are not random. At least, that's what the observer hopes, for we prefer pattern. Yet in the conditions of modern diversity, we may have to assume, rather than prove, affinity, since evidence may be hard to come by. Take the case of a student of mine who, after simply hearing a highland bagpipe band outside her window, became so attracted to the music that she became a professional piper, not an easy task for a woman in the 1970s. This is a type of "pathway" Finnegan does not explore. Do we psychologize this evident affinity, or do we invoke a kind of cultural Brownian motion, a random activity of musical free electrons attaching themselves to any available nucleus?

All that's clear at this point is that strong attractions exist, and fall into the type of affiliation-web Simmel describes. The overlap of memberships can be striking, going against any simple formulation of heritage equals membership, or even membership A implies membership B. Contradance enthusiasts in southern New England may also belong to "vintage" (nine-teenth and early twentieth-century popular dance style) groups as well as square dance, swing dance, and English country dance collectives. The listing confounds any sense of belonging out of regional revivalism or ethnic orientation. The only affinity seems to be to dance itself, and at one dance, 80% of respondents reported belonging to two or more groups (Dora Hast, dissertation proposal, 1990).

Belonging. So a choice to follow up one's affinity leads to belonging. Yet belonging is itself a complex act. How deep does it go—casual participant, part-time organizer, professional musician? Patterns of commitment can be intensive or desultory for leisure-time affinity groups, and also within ethnic collectives. For groups with flexible, playful boundaries, it's easy to be very Latvian one month, and unmarked American the next. Even for members of what I have called "involuntary" groups, whose physical appearance puts them permanently in a state of boundary awareness, the kinds and degrees of affiliation seem numberless. Belonging is not only situational in the face of challenges, but personal. Expressive culture is both what "we" do and what "I" do—and, as Simmel points out, the two are so intertwined as to be inextricable. To sneak the superculture back into the discussion, it's also what "they" do. No cultural rule says you can't pay allegiance to small, medium, and large groups simultaneously, and, as he points out, this may be very attractive to individuals, who can locate themselves variably—hence comfortably—in different groups. A blues scholar once told me that when interviewing a venerable singer, the old musician said Al Jolson was one of his models. This is politically incorrect, but musically plausible. There are

times when we should invoke the power of hegemony, but other times when the superculture seems just another strand in the web of group affiliations, chosen out of aesthetic affinity. Indeed the superculture itself is not a free-standing structure; as Finnegan notes, "the national framework affected local groups and players, but . . . there was also a sense in which the large national and commercial interests were themselves dependent upon the grass-roots musical tradition" (1989:184). Al Jolson, of course, starred in a supercultural scene which took old blues singers into account as source material.

To find some critical distance from the western Euro-American world Simmel and Finnegan represent, it might be useful to look at the social organization of subcultural music-making in the former USSR, using the suggestive model Eduard Alekseev has developed (1988:169). He identifies four types of micromusical life: musical folklore, professional music of the oral tradition, musical *samodeiatel'nost'*, and composers' music. "Musical folklore" roughly overlaps with our common-sense category of "folk music." "Professional music of the oral tradition" tends to be something like what ethnomusicologists used to (and still tend to) call a "classical" or "art" music outside the Western tradition, although it might also include certain kinds of professional folk musicians that stand out from the crowd of average music-makers in a peasant or nomad society. *Samodeiatel'nost'* is hard to describe, being a creature of the Soviet superculture. Translated roughly as "do-it-yourselfness," it covers a wide range of local, state-encouraged musical activity by amateur collectives. "Composers' music" is the work of officially-recognized, schooled, "classical" or "serious" composers. In Aleskeev's formulation, the distinctions among the four varieties are summarized in Figure 1.

Alekseev's scheme is quite society-specific, relying on the reader's tacit knowledge of a complex supercultural system of music organization, including national, republic, and local bureaucracies, institutions, and systems of support and reward. Traces of an old Marx/Engels/Leninist understanding of levels of culture and their evolution under socialism shine through the rubrics. The outsider's lesson I'd like to draw from the diagram does not require a long excursus on Soviet musical life. Simply put, I'd like to point to the interrelationship of suggested factors from the point of view of *where to find the music*: in individual or collective invention and performance, as esoteric or exoteric local knowledge, in mediated or unmediated transmission patterns, as packaged or variable items. Alekseev's job is, in a way, easier than mine, since he can begin with more clearly articulated bureaucratic/ideological structures. For example, there is a hierarchy of awards and medals the state dispenses to each type of individual and group in his categories, as well as a broad range of other perks, like facilities and touring possibilities. The whole structure is, in a sense, simpler

Figure 1. Alekseev's Micromusical Model

	Musical Folklore	Professional Oral Tradition	*Samodeiatel'nost'* Groups	Composers' Music
Creative Method	non-specialized	specialized	non-specialized, non-professional	specialized, professional
Origins	contextual, situated	autonomous	autonomous	autonomous
Circulation	esoteric	esoteric, exoteric	open	open
Means of Preservation	oral	oral	written	written
Manner of production	varied, multiple	varied, multiple	mainly opus-like	opus
Form of artistic conscious-ness	collective	collective, individual	largely collective	individual
Relationship to audience	unmediated	unmediated	mediated, unmediated	mediated

to analyze administratively than musically. For example, take a notion like *samodeiatel'nost'*, which is *largely* individual, mediated *or* unmediated, *mainly* opus-like in its repertoire. It may be "non-professional and non-specialized," but that is a simplification, both categories having a rather technical sense in a largely non-commodified music system. And it is very much a home-grown term; for the West, *samodeiatel'nost'* would cover too many types of music-making to be a useful empirical category, unless we simply defined it as "those organizations worthy of funding and recognition from the National Endowment for the Arts, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Library of Congress" for the American context, which would be altogether too exclusive: many commercially oriented groups have a "do-it-yourself" quality that *samodeiatel'nost'* implies. Yet if we boil down this system to its essentials, the situation is not all that different from the western Euro-American scene described earlier. We are dealing with an interplay of individual, small group, subculture, and the superculture. An implicit

hierarchy of musics, partly articulated through state support networks, which puts "classical" music at the top are true in both Soviet and Western worlds. Of course, unlike the West, the Soviet superculture has no competition from industry, and subcultures are much more rigidly determined; individual choice, due to the poverty of the techno- and mediascapes, remains more limited in the former USSR. Yet control by the state seems less effective than was formerly the case. A closer look at the mechanism which supports *samodeiatel'nost'* shows extensive cracks in the structure of hegemony. The "House of Culture," a Stalinist invention, was exported to all East bloc countries as a mechanism of social control, but tended to be weakest when it came to music: "the transitory nature of an arts performance as compared for example with a book, makes it much harder to enforce censorship regulations" (White 1990:72). Economically, too, local houses of culture needed to augment stingy state subsidies by selling tickets to concerts people really wanted to go to. But in general, the 1980s saw a decline in the basic significance of this regulative recreational outlet, with amateur art activity moving to the home from the house of culture, partly due to what even an official commentator had to call "an allergy towards official forms of cultural-leisure events and their content" (ibid.:148). Understanding this complex interplay of local taste, nationally-imposed trends, public and private activity, and many other factors would require more ethnographic study of the old East than anyone has done. In terms of the present rubric, "belonging," just what do Soviet/East European music-makers "belong" to at present? The war between allegiances—state, local, "national," "ethnic"— is beginning to come to a boil, with uncertain consequences for music.

*   *   *

The foregoing attempt at tinkering with levels of analysis and trying to sort out the relative independence of variables is just a sketch. A more comprehensive methodology must be deferred until we have a better grasp of choice, affinity, belonging, and the intense interplay of all three in terms of several parameters and for a number of societies: (1) the sphere of the individual, a one-person group with an intense inner aesthetic life that draws on any and all available sources; (2) the charmed circle of the affinity group, a jointly imagined world which arises from a set of separate strivings temporarily fused at a moment of common musical purpose; (3) the overlapping, intersecting planes of multiple group activity which may range across a wide scale of magnitude, ideology, and audience. To pretend to a clarity of analysis of any musical grouping, moment, style, or context is to bypass this complexity for the sake of oversimplification or even outright essentialism. And, as I argue next, staying within the bounds of any particular society provides a very limited point of view.

Interpolating the Interculture

There is a plane of analysis that extends beyond the issues just raised of the lively, charged, and even tumultuous interaction of parts of a "society" within nation-state bounds. This is the perspective of the farflung, expansive reach of musical forces that cross frontiers. For this vantage point I've adopted the compatible term "intercultures," no easier to define and describe than the earlier words. In fact, though I started by thinking I was coining a term, I've seen it pop up rather comfortably in a variety of writings, of course used variously. My strategy once again is to talk around the term until a profile, or at least a problem, emerges.

At present, I visualize three types of intercultures. The first, the *industrial interculture,* is the creature of the commodified music system that popular music commentators often cast as the villain, a corporate octopus whose tentacles stretch menacingly across the world, dominating local scenes and choking off competition. In a more measured way, Wallis and Malm's classic study of the international phonogram industry paints the picture of a somewhat confused cartel that unhesitatingly uses its hegemonistic powers to intervene in local musical worlds. The researchers deliberately chose small countries as their database, which maximizes the importance of the big boys on the block. The issue of survival of local creativity is foregrounded, and the interculture becomes a kind of large-scale superculture, where whole societies act the role of subcultures. Of particular interest is the fact that for small countries at this level of analysis, musical scenes differ little: "Even a study of developments from around 1900 to the early 1970s in countries as different as Sweden, Tanzania, Tunisia, and Trinidad shows interesting similarities in the patterns of change within their music cultures" (1984:12), though the changes are staggered across the decades, with Sweden feeling them the earliest.

In trying to account for this similarity among disparate nations, Wallis and Malm cite a triad of ideoscape ("value systems and knowledge spread through the European education system"), technoscape ("changes in the economic and production systems") and, most recently, mediascape—the new mass media, magnified in their impact due to the small scale of the populations involved (ibid.:17). This fits right in with two current intellectual trends. The first is to see the "master-narrative" of the Englightenment as crucial to the spread of a global culture based on portable principles of education and liberal democracy, a view not invented by, but well popularized by Benedict Anderson (1983). The second tendency is to stress the technoscape's role as the handmaiden of monopoly capitalism. Yet Wallis and Malm also detail the enormous role of a handful of local enthusiasts, who act as counterweights to the mass of the media, and they end on an ambiguous note as to who will prevail: the giants or the pygmies.

It appears that the ethnoscape is of great importance, and that there may be more than one ideoscape in sight in these countries.

In fact, the industrial interculture plays with two partners, the consumer and the state; and when three players sit down to the table, power plays, bluffs, strategies, and reactions create a very complex game. For the consumer's perspective, we would need more reception studies than we have, and that is very few indeed. Even the little that we know indicates that despite the homogeneity of the product, the diversity of its reception is striking. The local domestication of Anglo-American rock music by European regions, from Slovenia (Barber-Kersovan 1989) and Italy (Fabbri 1989) and the German-speaking lands (Larkey 1989) to the former East bloc (Ryback 1990, Troitsky 1987) is an eye-opening, if uneven and disorganized, field of research. A quick survey shows how localized the impact of the presumed rock juggernaut has been, as it changes course to fit the local musical roadways and traffic conditions of each society, including such widely varied factors as the presence of well-entrenched regional styles that refuse to give way, the typecasting of rock as the property of a certain subculture, political group, or generation, and the benign or hostile effects of governmental interference, intervention, and control. As Edward Larkey puts it, "previous assumptions of increasing ethnic and cultural homogeneity . . . need to be re-examined as new cultural traditions, language usages . . . and musical innovations have emerged in response to the challenge posed by the internationalization of culture" (1989). Some phases of this process repeat themselves in more than one society, such as an early period of listening only to Anglo-American bands followed by an attempt to create a local counterpart. This happened in the1970s in German-speaking countries, much later in the Soviet Union, where only in the late 1980s did graffiti praising Soviet rock groups began to compete for attention with the ubiquitous wall writings in honor of Western groups like the Beatles (Bushnell 1990:97). The state is not a passive player in this expansion of intercultures; Larkey points out a complex intermeshing of governmental and industrial guidance in West and East Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. Even in a liberal Western democracy like Sweden, a government commitee might turn up the following sort of language in 1976: "It is important that the state is continually aware of technical advances and is able to take action to direct the results of those developments into channels consistent with the aims of state cultural policy" (quoted in Wallis and Malm 1984:11).

So the industrial interculture is no easier to pin down than any other hegemonic force, subject to internal fracturing and widely differing buffeting forces, forced to make compromises, co-opt competition, and come up with new strategies to make a living. For example, it was by no means clear that a category of "ethno-pop/world beat/world music" should or could emerge

in the late 1980s, with the potential to recast whole studio and production practices in the intercultural economy and ideology. Although empirical evidence is lacking, it seems the movement might have been from the grassroots, rather than from the top down, though the industry was, as usual, adroit in co-opting the trend; according to Krister Malm, in 1986 a group of recording company executives decided that "world music" was a definable and viable style category (conversation, 1990). Simon Frith has pointed out that the concept of a global style pool has in fact reshaped the way the industry works (1988:88–130). Instead of building up groups through the studio system, producers (who might be outsiders like Paul Simon or David Byrne) can simply identify, shape, and promote available talent worldwide. This may just be the old industrial octopus with a new suit on, but the ramifications for world musical sensitivities and the role of local musicmakers might be profoundly changed. Aggressive self-fashioning and promotion, as in the Guadeloupe group Kassav's invention of commercial *zouk* music cited earlier, now fits into a global marketing scheme rather than featuring as insignificant local energy bought out, then abandoned, by the major labels.

Another limitation on the monolith model is the internal activity of groups whose music is commodified. For South Asians in Britain, Sabita Banerji found that "the South Asian music market proceeded to evolve in its own way, largely independent of the mainstream music economy, reflecting, perhaps, the isolation of the community at large, and increasing that of its musicians" (Banerji and Baumann 1990:141). This includes statistics like "piracy may have accounted in 1988 for some 25 per cent only of cassettes played at home" (ibid.:149), threatening the existence of "legitimate" companies. A case like that of *bhangra*, the genre Banerji and Baumann describe, is very instructive for the complexities the industry faces when intruding in subcultural music production. Their account stresses the aggressiveness of internal self-definition and promotion techniques in the face of the "majors' " interest in finding a crossover value to a style which might then be marketed to the mainstream.

Mentioning this type of in-group activity brings us to the second type of interculture: the *diasporic interculture*, which emerges from the linkages that subcultures set up across national boundaries. One way of visualizing this variety of interculture is to imagine North America and Europe as a set of clear plastic overlays on a political map. We would use a different color for each subculture's distinctive network, connecting points of population concentration: Yugoslavs, Greeks, Jews, Indians, Chinese, Gypsies . . . and the thick, colorful pileup of overlays would eventually describe the grand diasporic interculture pattern of our region, with lines stretching off the map to the other continents. We have only a sketchy sense of how these scattered populations keep in touch with and influence each other, though case

studies are starting to accumulate.

One point should be stressed: there is no simple relationship to a "homeland." A look at a survey of diasporic situations I cited earlier (Gold 1984) provides a nice foil for this issue; there, the term "mother country" is favored. Right away, the editor points out that while the "mother country" is quite important to people, "not much attention has been paid to its meanings" (ibid.:1). He also immediately identifies the notion of mother country as being controlled by insiders, not outsiders, "not just a label attached to an immigrant—its imagery is very much his (her) property" (ibid.:2). We have no systematic way to explore how that imagery—what Anderson might call an "imagined community"—is created or evolves over time. But there are even greater challenges to working on diasporic scenes: there might not be just one "mother country." As Paul Gilroy (1987) has argued cogently, for "blacks" in Great Britain, one must take into account African, Caribbean, and African-American influences, equally true when looking at the other three regions of this four-sided diaspora.

Such diasporic networks are very different and have a complex internal structure. For while they may make a point-to-point connection with a homeland population and style, they might also conjure up new networks abroad. Let us take the case of *bhangra* in Britain just cited. "It is performed and enjoyed by Punjabis of Sikh, Hindu, Muslim, Jain and Christian religious orientations throughout the India-Pakistan borderlands" (Banerji 1990:139). Since the Punjabis "dominate the cultural scene among South Asians in Britain, a community that includes, among others, Sylhettis from Bangla Desh, Gujaratis, Bengalis, Tamils, and the descendants of South Asians who had previously emigrated to east Africa," *bhangra*'s boundaries have spread to many representatives of South India abroad. Its popularity also means its network extends to "the USA, east Africa and Australasia" (ibid.:137). Part of the success of this mushrooming genre of the mid-1980s lies in the eclecticism of Punjabi culture itself, "rooted in a region characterized by immense cultural diversity and intense cross-fertilization for most of its history" (ibid:138). One can view these Punjabis from the same perspective I found helpful in trying to understand the ability of Jewish musicians to move from immigrant tenements to recording studios and Hollywood almost instantaneously, using their homegrown versatility to good effect.

Another vantage point for diasporic networking is that of the individual. Consider the case of a Turkish musician living in Sweden, Fikret, as described to me by Anders Hammerlund (letter, 1990). Fikret is trying to create an individual fusion of Turkish and western music, which creates a "very complicated and ambiguous situation," since the Swedes see him as a representative of Turkish folk music, which they are glad to support as a good liberal superculture does for its minorities. However, Fikret has learned

his Turkish music mostly in Sweden since he comes from a family for whom music would have been an unacceptable choice of profession. Meanwhile, the Turks in Sweden have not much use for his music, but have backed his state-supported record as a matter of ethnic pride. Finally, Fikret's work is returning to his homeland, where it has helped "pave the way for music as an independent field of social activity." Cases like Fikret's show just how complex even a single musician's relationship can be to his place of origin, when the putative "homeland" has to be understood as a complex of locales, styles, and even families. At the same time, the "host country"—or is it his new "homeland?"—has offered him a new imagined community (Anderson 1983) or even structure of feeling (Williams 1977) by opening up a creative space denied by the "homeland." Meanwhile, his relationship to his compatriots in emigration is problematic, since their "homeland" ideals, as well as their notion of proper Turk-ness while abroad, seem to differ sharply from his.

That nothing is simple in the world of diasporic music-making is elegantly illustrated by the anthology called *Klangbilder der Welt,* produced by the International Center for Comparative Musicology and Documentation in (former West) Berlin, the result of contacting over 150 musical organizations in the city, which were recorded and interviewed extensively. Nearly all the groups represent diasporic intercultural networks, but the range of approaches and histories of formation, activity, and stylistic choice is enormous, a data bank too rich to easily summarize here. One of the parameters of present interest might be the extent to which the groups stay within community bounds or try to reach out to a wider population of both other diasporic groups or Germans. A complementary factor is whether ensemble membership is all-immigrant or part-German. As in Swedish situations, this mixture within diasporic music-making can be a result of the infectious nature of the sounds/cultures or can simply be the outcome of a shortfall of newcomer musicians, requiring Europeans (or Americans in US examples) to fill out ensembles to the proper size.

As in all diasporic contexts, musical scenes vary according to how those abroad think of those "back home." In the US, we have the long history of the older immigrant groups, like the Germans and Irish, to document the way musics are tied to politics. Both are complicated. In the German case, the fact that America went to war twice with the homeland led to many a twist and turn in ethnic music-making; here the superculture sets the tone of internal evolution. Yet back in the "good old days" of the nineteenth century, the German community could be more concerned with their own crises, like the war with the Danes, which passed without much comment in mainstream America (though was likely noted among Danish-Americans). For the Irish, the tortured relationship to English hegemony has remained a major point

of orientation for 150 years now, spawning countless songs and marking the careers of innumerable musicians. For more recent groups, the situation is similar. Lithuanian- (and other Baltic-) Americans have for over half a century identified with the cause of the "captive nations," seeing themselves as victims of a colonizing Russia. This brought them into an alliance with like-minded Ukrainians, who may appear at the same concert events. The slow emergence of a new national identity for the Baltic states has caused a seismic ripple through the Lithuanian community, making itself felt in expressive culture. Were there to be an independent homeland, how would we relate to it? was hypothesis in 1990, a reality in 1991, so a homegrown event or a concert by a visiting Lithuanian rock group has a resonance in 1991 that was not there in l981. Meanwhile, Americans who have grown up as Lithuanian Scouts find, on visiting Vilnius, they can teach ethnic traditions to the friends they make there, since the Scouts have been banned in Lithuania for 50 years (Julija Gelaziš, class report, 1991).

It is particularly striking that many diasporic musical scenes involve this sort of oral transmission—real, old-fashioned face-to-face contact— as well as disembodied modes of communication, unlike the industrial intercultural scene. If Arab-Americans in Detroit or Yugoslavs in Germany absorb their music live, it has a subtly different meaning as cultural nourishment, akin to preparing dishes from fresh ingredients instead of eating out of a can. Measuring yourself as immigrant or "ethnic" against a group of homeland musicians who are standing right in front of you is not the same as flipping on a cassette of voices from somewhere in space and time, just as in America, talking to an anonymous operator at an undisclosed location reached by an 800 number is not the same as interacting with a live salesperson in a store. Take the example of Mike Orlich of Wakefield, Wisconsin, on the shores of Lake Superior, hardly a center of Serbian culture. His experience and impact are recounted by James Leary: "Mike first heard tamburitza music in south Chicago in 1937 after hitchhiking from Upper Michigan. In 1946 Pete Markovich of Milwaukee toured the Gogebic Range and showed Mike how to play and where to order tamburitza instruments. Orlich keeps up on the latest developments in the tamburitza field, buying mail order records and tapes and attending the Tamburitza Extravaganza, an annual convention of tamburitza combo musicians. Thus he has taught the orchestra many newer popular numbers from Yugoslavia, a comparative repertory among Slavic musicians of the north country" (1986:17).

Here the commodified, mail order side of networking plays a less important role than the direct contact among like-minded musicians. Hitchhiking hundreds of miles just to make a linkage is a strong expression of commitment, fortified by the annual pilgrimage to a micromusical convention.

Live transmission does not have to be confined to in-group situations; Latin American refugees teaching protest songs to reindeer herders in Norway also engage in intense diffusion of musics through an intercultural network. As mentioned earlier, I doubt that many of the millions from South African to Japan who have sung "We Shall Overcome" learned it from a sound recording. In fact, the spread of the protest song, from its roots in American union/leftwing/civil rights soil through its flowering in Latin American *nueva cancion*, implies a third type of interculture, a global political, highly musical network which has not been comprehensively studied. Then there is the somewhat allied post-peasant "folk" music movement which drew inspiration from the American "folk revival" and grew to dominate a certain segment of youth music across Europe. Bands from many lands learn from each other's records, but more profoundly from direct contact at the many festivals which sprang up to service a transnational performer-audience interest group. Such situations seem to ask for declaring a third type of cross-cutting system, which I tentatively title the *affinity interculture*. Musics seem to call out to audiences across nation-state lines even when they are not part of heritage or of a commodified, disembodied network, and it seems particularly the case that transmission is often of the old-fashioned variety—face to face, mouth to ear. Just as within modern societies Simmel could find that affinity groups are powerful and tenacious for the average citizen, so contemporary global culture allows anyone anywhere to be attracted to a music of choice, many of which can now be heard close to home. The mobility of youth in the Euro-American world since the 1960s has accelerated this rather random bonding of individuals to musics. Any "folk" festival has a lively interactive scene of tradition-transfer just outside the concert hall or even built in as "workshops." The ever-larger Falun Folk Festival in Sweden now has a weeklong camp for children where young Scandinavians absorb as much as possible from several visiting musicians' style and outlook; the year I saw it, it was simply called "Ethno 90," turning one of our favorite cultural prefixes into a festival event. The rhetoric of the advance flyer for the 1991 youth music camp spells out four goals for the 15–25-year-olds being solicited by the Falun Festival and the Swedish branch of Jeunesse Musicales:

　　—create contacts and understanding between young people from different countries and cultures through music
　　—give vitality to a music culture generally not associated with youth culture
　　—stimulate a world ethnic music culture full of nuances
　　—strengthen inheritage and cultural identity among young people

Now, this could of course be seen as a supercultural move; certainly the

rhetoric is resonant with the phrases of liberal democracies, cultural pluralism, and intercultural goodwill one associates with administrative pronouncements. Yet the Falun Folk Festival does not emanate from the state, and although the Jeunesse Musicales' international network is given as a resource, it is not an intercultural bureaucracy on the order of the major phonogram companies. Most importantly, the camp promises direct exposure to and exchange of musics in a deliberately counter-cultural manner; no profit motive or hegemony move is apparent on the surface, and the creation of an affinity group seems the immediate goal despite the heady verbiage about eventual benefits.

Hearing one another's music or even playing in each other's bands, as in Berlin, Stockholm, or Massachusetts, has led to new ways of music-making among groups that play at the same concerts or festivals, whether in the city itself or while on tour abroad. Even a nation as huge as the United States has a number of well-developed venues and circuits at which representatives of diasporic micromusics meet. Often enough, the superculture lends a hand by creating such contexts, like the annual American Folklife Festival in Washington, D.C. Of course, record stores also provide food for musical thought; both industrial and diasporic intercultures are available in both live and disembodied versions in any given locale. A given city, festival, or shop can create a musical world without frontiers that seems to exist across, or somehow suspended above, national lines, to stretch my definition of interculture even further. A tendency to very particular types of intercultural affinities may even be a national tradition: "the most ardent of non-American would-be Indians are Germans, who support "hundreds of Western lore clubs," a well-grounded institutional framework since the end of the nineteenth century under the influence of the novelist Karl May's novels about a fictitious Native American hero. Such affinity groups can even create new intercultural patterns: "Some Indian servicemen who were stationed in Germany have been inspired to research Indian cultures after finding themselves the subject of adulation" (Kealiinohomoku 1986:119). Ultimately, like the other -cultures, the interculture needs to be looked at from an individual perspective: it is not only around us and between us, but inside us. This play of meaning at many levels of societies and among its various strata of cultural production leads me to move from a consideration of my -culture terms to a closer look at how they interact as a final overview for this section.

Terms of Interaction

The only way the -cultures exist at all is through interaction. That is a statement of faith or, at the least, of current thinking, which tends to deny

essentialism, avoid reductionism, affirm the situational. I have no quarrel with that stance. This means that it's worth a bird's-eye view of interaction before coming down to earth for close-up analysis of subcultural practice.

Of course, there are several slants on interaction. If we see things in terms of struggle and strategy, we identify the political dimension of expressive culture and foreground the conflict between superculture and both subculture and interculture. This is not hard to do. Evidence abounds of attempts by both the state and industry to manage people's music-making. There are many tools at the disposal of controlling or repressive forces. Governments can use stick-and-carrot approaches through funding, set regulatory agencies to work to monitor and master the airwaves, enact restrictive legislation, enforce statutes through the judicial system—and, in the United States, do this through three overlapping and competing levels of government (local, state, federal). I write this at the outset of the 1990s, when the American habit of cyclical application of such control has moved into a well-publicized and coordinated movement for state intervention of "the arts," from the Congress to the local sheriff, with a strong ripple effect out to the private wings of the superculture (foundations, publishers, entertainment industries).

When the state intervenes, it denies any intention to interfere with the expression of subcultures, appealing to general principles of decency, unity, history. Yet subcultures strike back, sensitive to encroachment, creating interaction, trying to disarm through dialectic rather than remain silent. The 1990 case of the rap group 2 Live Crew, judged obscene by local authorities, is a classic case in point. African-American commentators attempted to cast the case in a discourse of subcultural meanings and rights: the sexual hyperbole seen as a threat by judges and the police became a logical extension of black street talk, and the band itself challenged white authorities to clamp down on equally bad-talking white acts. Spokesmen for African-American expressive culture rejected as selective and ethnocentric the seemingly neutral notion of universal standards of decency and the Supreme Court's policy of allowing local criteria of obscenity to prevail, creating a superculture-subculture confrontation. The fury on both sides shows just how seriously everyone takes "entertainment."

Classic control situations are an extreme form of interaction. At the opposite end of the spectrum lies the superculture's ability to effect an *erasure* of interchange. This occurs in subtle ways, as in the strict guidelines for plots that children's book publishers demand of writers, or the self-imposed rating system of the film industry or, now, record producers. Often subcultural voices are unheard due to the seemingly natural laws of the marketplace: ethnic broadcasting is transient and weak simply because of

the way advertising dollars flow, down sidestreams into the main channels rather than the reverse.

Between control and erasure lies a vast domain of interaction among all units of the society and out into the intercultures. Interplay can take many surprising turns, as in the case of how micromusics should deal with enthusiasts such as the people Kealiinohomoku (Frisbie 1986:111) calls "would-be Indians" in the US, who have for generations engaged in imitations of Native American life in an institutionalized way through agencies like the Boy Scouts. "Some Indians endorsed this romanticized appreciation of their cultures, while others resented it. Still others were uncomfortable with the resulting paradoxes." As one Native American puts it, "Can you imagine a group of non-Christian children pretending they are Catholic for an evening once every two weeks . . . taking communion, making a crucifix, or saying Hail Mary?" (ibid.:115).

Although less relevant for indigenous peoples overwhelmed by new-comers, it is important to remember that in most cases, supercultures and subcultures are, historically and structurally, built from each other: "it is clear that 'ethnic groups' and 'nations' are of the same stock" (Chapman et al. 1989:18). However, studying interaction means you have to look at both sides, and ethnographers of all persuasions have their biases: "We might feel . . . that the study of nations was implied and required by the study of ethnic groups. It remains true, however, that anthropologists have tended to be happy to study ethnic groups, and have been much less happy studying nations, as if the latter were defined out of their vision and capacities" (ibid). Surveying the totality of the ideology and lived musical experience from both the supercultural and subcultural perspectives is too much to do here or even within the longer essays below; I'll try my hand at a couple of de-tailed examples to give a sense of the range of possibilities, beginning with Ukraine.

Interaction is strikingly depicted in a 1987 documentary called "Tomor-row is a Holiday" (Bukovsky 1987), an intense, bleak, oppositional film that details the horrors of life on a large, successful poultry farm, centering on the privations suffered by the women workers and mothers of the 2500 factory families: little or no hot water, laundry facilities, recreation spaces, cultural events, or free time to tend to children. Music pops up frequently in this eighteen-minute epic, which shows a visiting music teacher training a chorus to sing a stock supercultural song, in Russian, exhorting them to bellow the refrain, *vpered, vpered, vpered!* ("forward, forward, forward!"). In contrast, the filmmaker includes the women's own habit of forming a sisterhood of singers to do Ukrainian folksongs. A spokeswoman says their informal song group keeps them from crying or cursing, but has been the

target of control by the authorities. The final sequence shows the dismal May Day parade with the triumphant supercultural song ringing out despite the women's well-articulated scorn of holiday celebrations.

Musically, "Tomorrow is a Holiday" juxtaposes what are usually called "official" and "unofficial" culture in so-called socialist countries, meaning anything the superculture dishes out as opposed to everything ordinary people or gifted artists produce that is oppositional or alternative. Here the folksong, once a staple of a peasant superculture, has become a standby of resistance for the oppressed women of the chicken factory as superculture and subculture clash. To see this sort of interaction as part of a larger pattern, let me play it off against what I saw in 1990, also in Ukraine, as part of a Smithsonian Institution delegation to the Second International Folk Festival, an event sponsored by the Soviet Ministry of Culture in Kiev.

Two local supercultures were involved: the federal bureaucracy and the local Ukrainian organizers. The aim was to spotlight troupes from abroad as well as to showcase the entire range of Soviet peoples, from minority groups within the Russian Republic (Siberian, Caucasian, and so forth) through sample ensembles from the other Republics down to all the regions of Ukraine itself. This was done by staging (1) a parade down the main street of Kiev, (2) a file-by of troupes in a big soccer stadium, and (3) a second parade, this time with elaborate floats, stereotypes on wheels. The Smithsonian group protested this regimented approach to folklore presentation, so far removed from the American notion of a folklore festival. The Moscow bureaucrats tried to distance themselves by passing the buck to the Ukrainian organizers, showing a slippage among supercultures that has become increasingly the norm in the USSR. Meanwhile, the entire operation was under the umbrella of yet another superculture, one with intercultural implications: a branch of UNESCO which oversees festivals, headed by a Frenchman who kept broadcasting greetings to the crowd.

So much for the framework; I turn now to the content, of which there was very little. With only two exceptions, each troupe was costumed in standard uniforms meant to signify a particular regional or ethnic subculture, and performed characteristic items. The standouts were the Americans, a deliberately diverse and relaxed group (New Orleans black funeral band, Tex-Mex conjunto, bluegrass, Hawaiian ritual song and dance, tap dance), and the Latvians. The latter demonstrated their distance from the various supercultures by dressing mostly in street clothes, featuring members from at least three generations, and performing in an amateur, unpolished style. This disregard of etiquette by these two national troupes served as an exception that proved the rule of regularity, only underscoring just how firmly entrenched the basic interaction pattern really was. Yet each

conformed to its own supercultural dictates: the Americans to the doctrine of informal cultural pluralism, the Latvian group to an emerging consensus of national sovereignty, part of which demands uncoupling from the Soviet mainstream notion of how to "do" folklore. The actual membership of the troupe probably represented a subcultural version of this new Latvian superculture. Only patient research could have ferreted out the counterpart meanings of each ensemble, from the Cuban pirate costumes through the Siberian shaman drums. What would probably have emerged would have been a nuanced aesthetic of presentation whose implications are constantly in negotiation between a number of supercultures and a variety of subcultures.

Beyond this battle of facades lies the question of what the folk music/dance presented at the festival really represented. The local Ukrainian case will suffice for present purposes. In the context of Kiev that week in May 1990, the International Festival was just part of a street celebration called "Kiev Day," which included both the visiting and local "official" troupes and rural singers imported from nearby villages. The same musical styles were thus presented in two formats: large platforms blasting out standardized, amplified ensembles and informal singing circles roaming the streets. It was possible to see small knots of Kievans singing along with the villagers just beyond the range of a platform's loudspeakers. While both versions of the Ukrainian folk song represent the superculture in action, there was an infectious sense of subculture in the spontaneous sidewalk singers that was missing from the staged ensembles. The odd part about folklore in this Ukraininan example is that it can serve as both official and unofficial culture simultaneously, showing that a war of ideoscapes can take place on a single city street with both sides using different varieties of the same cultural weapons within the liminal context of a festival.

The foregoing examples from Ukraine show the complexity of super-culture-subculture interaction, and point up the importance of ritual moments like holiday celebrations and parades as focal points for cultural confrontation. An American example might show the usefulness of compara-tive analysis; it comes from Jo Anne Schneider's description of Polish and Puerto Rican parades in Philadelphia (1990). Kiev and Philadelphia both offer opportunities for local subcultures to display their identity publicly under state-sanctioned auspices, and both celebrate and downplay internal differences within the group, with music being a standardized referent for ethnicity. The superculture's insistence that all groups are equal and, in a sense, identical, appears in both venues. For the Soviet scene, it is the relentless, literal uniform-ity of costume that is most striking; for America, it is the pervasive rhetoric announced by a television reporter : "Everybody is

Polish today." Schneider says that Philadelphia's view of "ethnos as the basic unchanging foundation of self" overrides "differences in class, time, and experience" (ibid.:50), a perspective shared by Kiev.

A back-and-forth glancing between the two cities shows both similarities and differences. The presence of commodification presents a major distinction. No T-shirts, buttons, or bumper stickers were sold in Kiev. In Philadelphia, not only was commercialism present, it structured the entire event: "The parades last approximately two hours, including commercials . . . the televised version adds theme music . . .'It used to be that the parade started around one-ish, give or take an hour. And now we realize that we're going to be on television, so it's caused us to be more organized' " (ibid.:35). This industrial takeover is, however, nuanced by the fact that there is a triangular relationship between television, the city, and ethnic organizations. As usual, there is both complicity and competition between the wings of the superculture; and, as is often the case, an internal hegemony of subcultural leaders makes it a three-cornered game: "collusion and contradiction are everywhere evident, especially in speech and symbols" (ibid.:52). Here the Kiev-Philadelphia similarities surface once again. The small knots of festival goers singing along heartily with visiting villagers showed contradictions in the official ideology of the Soviet festival just as the cracks showed through the patched-together solidarity of Poles or Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia's parade. The hints of conflict between Moscow (read "Russian") and Kiev ("national Ukrainian") interests in the Soviet celebration displayed a tension that is not just administrative—feuding among levels of the superculture— but ethnic, just as the absence of the black mayor of Philadelphia in the Polish parade revealed strong rifts among American subcultures. So, leaving aside important issues of mythology based partly on the difference between a society of immigrants and a empire-based confederation, the public interaction of micromusics and the mainstream suggests considerable overlap.

The American parade behavior only hints at the complexity of boundary maintenance, pride, and upward social mobility, tightly intertwined factors that seem present at nearly all subculture musical events that draw a mainstream audience. Su Zheng's work in New York's Chinatown provides a helpful example (1990). The Chinese Music Ensemble of New York performs in two venues: downtown in Chinatown for an in-group audience and uptown in standard concert halls for a general public. The program notes for a downtown community concert explain that the event is meant to "help Asian-Americans to be conscious of their cultural heritage and come to a better understanding of it," whereas uptown, the point is to "introduce Chinese music to, and share its wealth with the American public" (ibid.:26). As the backdrop, an American ideology of tolerance and toleration, pluralism, and upward mobility informs the thinking of everyone involved.

Similar notions appear in most Western liberal democracies. In Britain, the situation of one particular group of South Asian musicians has been deeply shaped by this outlook: "In the Indian caste system . . . the Khalifas had a low rank as hereditary musicians. In Britain they live in a society where higher value is placed on music . . . In the British context the Khalifas are an upwardly mobile community whose members may realize that the profession of musician is unlikely to match other available professions in terms of income and security, but still they feel an attachment to music-making" (Baily 1990:164). This allows the Khalifas to have their cultural cake and eat it too, and provides a niche for Baily's interlocutor, Ghulam. Ghulam has a particular history and outlook as an individual. Under the conditions of British life, he has been able to reconcile orthodox Islam's condemnation of music with a Western stress on the value of the arts and of personal choice. Hegemony begins at home, with the penetration of ideology as part of every citizen's inner life, which brings us to *superculture-individual* relations. I can only skim this huge topic, but would like to point out its power.

Let me start with an everyday example. Perhaps most people in Euro-American societies have a private collection of recordings, expressing the much-vaunted individualism of Western man/woman/child. Pierre Bourdieu has shown us that these choices may produce predictable curves on the graph of socio-economic realities (1984). Yet his standardized categories allow for little flexibility in terms of personal passion, location in an ethnic subculture, or shifts due to, say, aging. John Fiske, on the other hand, is quite eager to show consumer choices as productive "poaching" on the territory of hegemony as not-so-passive buyers produce meanings from canned popular culture products (1989). Writers on youth subcultures look for the "alternative" and "oppositional" nature of musical activity (see, for example, Hebdige 1979). Yet they come no closer than Bourdieu to the truly idiosyncratic nature of personal music-making, buying habits, and listening choices. Ellen Koskoff (1982) has tried to systematize the very odd networks which help create personal repertoires, but even she is forced to simplify to create a readable diagram.

This is because people are often driven by a mixture of memory and desire in their choice of musics, which swings closer to Roland Barthes's passionate *jouissance* than to any set of predictable strategies or methodical mapping. The superculture turns out canned songs the way it turns out coffee cans, and in neither case is it clear what the consumer will do with the product. We can no sooner imagine all the uses the average citizen might find for a song than we can for what he or she might do with an empty coffee can. This notion of song as free-floating commodity is sometimes touted as being new, or even postmodern, but is as old as the industry, which I would date to the widespread circulation of lithographed sheet music in the early

nineteenth century. If only through the commonplace practice of parody, we know that people were working hard at producing meanings from packaged musical texts long ago.

I'd like to take an historic example to point out continuities in this individualization of superculture materials. In 1920, Henryk Rubinlicht, a worldly Warsaw Jew, parodied the text of Schubert's classic song *Staendchen* ("Serenade") as a farewell to his girlfriend on the eve of his departure for the Polish army. His description of that evening (in the film *Image before my Eyes,* Waletsky 1980) is suffused with a lyric romanticism quite suitable to the song's aura, though selectively used: Rubinlicht imposes his own text on Schubert's melody to capture the mood of the moment. His family was rather offbeat in being both middle-class and strongly drawn to the raffish world of the Polish and Yiddish theater scenes. The supercultural components of this tale include exposure to and appropriation of a Schubert song, preference for Polish over Yiddish culture, and orientation to urban entertainment genres.

Compare the Rubinlicht "Serenade" to another version by a second East European Jew, Lifsha Schaechter Widman, who grew up at the turn of the century in a remote Bukovina town, within Austria-Hungary but literally across the bridge from Russia. In her rendition, she modifies the same song's melodic structure to shape it like her familiar, beloved Yiddish folksongs, changing Schubert's through-composed form into a strophic song based on a quatrain (unpublished interviews c. 1975 for the YIVO Yiddish Folksong Project in the possession of Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett). Unlike Rubinlicht, though much less educated than he, she keeps the original German text, albeit with a strong Yiddish accent. Widman learned the song either from her one year of formal schooling or from an aunt who had lived in Vienna. Superculture here is a combination of institutional and oral transmission of official culture, but of a very shallow and transient type, a personal choice to graft a bit of hegemony onto her strongly rooted subcultural stock.

Rubinlicht and Widman, many miles apart, belonged to the same Central European superculture, though in radically different lands and ways. The persistence of a single song across these gaps testifies to the strength of musical hegemony. They also belonged to the same ethnic-religious subculture. Yet the two creative singers bring highly charged, varied sensibilities to bear on the same canonical item as a result of place, time, background, and circumstance, but also temperament. Widman liked to sing Ukrainian songs, as well as an Irving Berlin item from one of her American periods (she emigrated twice), showing her willingness to learn from more than one superculture.

How are we to read these varied responses: as "poaching," "opposi-tional," "alternative," or merely idiosyncratically creative? In a way, the

Schubert "Serenade" is like one of those superculture photographs Barthes discusses in *Camera Lucida*, where he distinguishes the informative cultural data—the *studium*—from the striking detail that catches the imagination—the *punctum*, which varies from observer to observer (1981). For Rubinlicht, the notion of a serenade and the attractive tune captured his view of the song; for Widman, it was a part of the melody she could interpret in her individual way. The space between the hegemonic drive and the individual's imagined world is more than a workroom for the *bricoleur;* it is a meeting-place of the overdetermined and the accidental. The resulting union is unpredictable. At best, we read tentative regularities into the outcome; these could only be of the most general sort in the Schubert/Jewish example. At worst, we tease out teleologies, and find examples to prove our theories.

Music is at once an everyday activity, an industrial commodity, a flag of resistance, a personal world, and a deeply symbolic, emotional grounding for people in every class and cranny the superculture offers. Bourdieu offers a reason: music "says nothing and has nothing to say . . . music represents the most radical and most absolute form of the negation of the world, and especially the social world, which the bourgeois ethos tends to demand of all forms of art" (1984:19). Ethnomusicology argues otherwise: it is not that music has nothing to say, but that it allows everyone to say what they want. It is not because it negates the world, but because it embodies any number of imagined worlds that people turn to music as a core form of expression.

*   *   *

There are so many types of interactions in the highly articulated, media-dominated societies under review here that a sample of interaction patterns is all I can manage; raising a few additional considerations here may suggest just how many angles of vision are needed.

Interaction among subcultures is rarely the object of scholarly study (for exceptions, see Leary 1984, Slobin & Spottswood 1984), yet at the local level it may be a force to reckon with as groups cooperate or compete for attention and dollars. There is a constant conversation of subcultures among themselves, creating a musical dialectic that both parallels and is affected by superculture-subculture interaction

Interaction within subcultures, the productive intramural—often internecine—play among factions, is one of the last frontiers of ethnomusicology, posing a set of crucial issues about the way people organize their social and aesthetic lives. In my own New England town, a shift in the 1980s from bumper stickers saying "I'm Proud I'm Italian" to "Proud to be Sicilian" told the tale. In the Jewish world, music-making cannot be understood without delving into the very complex internal politics of factions based on place of origin and time of immigration, as true for Sweden

and France as for the United States, and yet noted in only a few studies like Schneider on parades (1990) or one remarkable monograph on the three-continent, multi-factional complexity of Canadian Mennonite singing (Klassen 1989). The growing body of writings on music in American pan-ethnic movements (summarized in Sommers 1991) testifies to the power of fragmentation by demonstrating the enormous efforts made to overcome it, either for internal reasons or because the superculture demands it, the two causes being hard, if not impossible, to separate. Returning to Zheng's New York Chinese example, the fact that the Ensemble chose to locate in Chinatown and that its membership is very heterogeneous (as to place of origin, generation, class, gender) are connected: basing oneself in the kind of subcultural "home" an ethnic neighborhood represents clarifies and underscores commitment. It also stereotypes the group in the sense that Chinatown is a brand-name commodity for the uptown audience, strengthening the reciprocal relationship between internal and external definition of self.

For individuals, choosing among micromusical options can be a form of creative identity, and for some people it can be painful, as in the case of the young half-white, half-Yaqui Indian Kealiinohomoku cites who decided to "discover" herself "by becoming active in a large urban Indian center on the West coast" where her associates are largely of Sioux origin. "Many of the Sioux do not accept her. They fault here because her heritage is from the "wrong" tribe, and because she is half-white. Her distress is expressed by periods of rage alternating with periods of deep depression" (1986:121).

Still within subcultures, *local/interculture intersections* can be very important for diasporic groups, as when New York Greek musicians hear what their colleagues and competitors back home are playing. In John Cohen's eloquent film *Pericles in America* (1988), the vintage Epirot clarinetist Pericles Halkias rails against younger musicians who have lost a sense of local identity, moving to modernized styles that blur older boundaries. The film is one of the only depictions of American micromusics to present the music and musicians both in the US and "back home" in Europe to make a point about the way locales fit onto an intercultural map.

Interaction among intercultures goes on among all possible players, as in the case of subcultural crossover musicians who operate both at the diasporic and the international industrial levels, very noticeable in the "Hispanic"-American market from solo superstars (such as Julio Iglesias) to upwardly mobile local bands (such as Los Lobos and Miami Sound Machine). The creation of pan-Hispanic cable systems alongside mainstream networks opens up a parallel-track system linked by advertisers where interculture-hopping can be the norm. The 1988 bilingual release of the film "La Bamba," a first for Hollywood, is an example of superculture-subculture intersection.

Then, with export, the film becomes an intercultural item as well, showing just how complex the powerful concatenation of the finanscape, mediascape, and technoscape can be in the service of tracking and pocketing ethnoscape markets. In the process, certain ideoscapes are fleetingly activated. The curious quality of the particular product called "La Bamba" is that the plotline portrays exquisitely stereotyped Mexicans/Mexican-Americans in a way that could have been seen as supercultural aggression, but in this case tended to be overlooked in favor of the "positive" aspects of bilingualism and the foregrounding of subculture music. The soundtrack band, Los Lobos, seemed to gain strength from its association with Hollywood, intensified by its then releasing a strongly in-group album for balance. Linda Ronstadt, the crossover queen, intersected several audiences and markets successfully in 1988 by emphasizing her father's musical lineage, making a Mexican intercultural connection as well as blurring the superculture-subculture boundary.

To my mind, one of the most fascinating examples of a micromusic built to be interactive is modern country music. This musical complex—for it is hardly unitary—operates at all three levels of analysis I've offered here, and moves freely among them both consciously at the point of production and "out there" among its consumers. Part of country music's image, so well cultivated and even parodied, is its "plain folks" appeal, which operates in two ways. At the level of subculture, there are still local and regional audiences for whom various generational streams of country music offer the reassurance of looking and sounding "downhome." Nationally, for nearly seventy years, this rustic veneer has served as a wedge for country's penetration into farflung rural and urban markets, well documented in the literature on the upper Midwest (Leary 1984), the Southwest, including the subcultural zones of Cajun and Native American musics, and even northern New England (McHale 1981). These factors have made country music look supercultural in two ways: first, as the overarching, hegemonic system of its original home base in the heartland, and second, as part of the mainstream American consensus, albeit at a lower level of power than pop musics. What impresses me about this musical formation is the ease with which it projects a simultaneous appeal, finding new formulas for varied audiences in a chameleon-like fashion.

As a condensed example, let me offer a made-for-country-cable music video of Randy Travis I saw in 1990 of a song called "Heroes and Friends." Travis's status as a member of the (apparently non-oxymoronic) group of country singers called "new traditionalists" assumes a back-to-basics subcultural approach that is also proclaimed by his plain clothes and no-frills cinematography, showing him simply dressed, perched on a stool in a bare old-fashioned recording studio, and singing in a pronounced regional

dialect. The confessional nature of the song underscores this stance, as Travis relates how as a kid he watched western movies, adopting their stars as his personal heroes. Images of Roy Rogers are regularly interpolated as direct confirmation of his commentary on the steadfastness and reliability of heroes. At video's end, Rogers himself appears, first waving to Travis through the studio's glass wall, then in a photograph of the the two stars side by side, which closes the video. "Heroes and Friends" simultaneously positions Travis as a subcultural consumer of supercultural stardom, then raises him to parity with his chosen hero. Somehow, the ideology of country music makes this gambit believable, seamless, and heartening. The potential crack between "country" and "western," which, after all have different histories and are not always allied (see Finnegan 1989:90–102 for an English example) is elided here; even more, it serves as grounding for the naturalness of Travis's packaging. However, as a product of Hollywood, Roy Rogers is hardly a purely subcultural idol, and the message about heroes and friends is an all-American statement.

As it happens, the next video on the same program reinforced my interest in these strategies of interaction and inclusion that country uses to move between the subcultural and the supercultural. In it, another Travis, last name Tritt, offers a second confessional song about a singer's aesthetic and ideological orientation. The song tells us how Tritt grew up listening to the legends of his generation (the "outlaws," Waylon Jennings and Willie Nelson), then moved on, sensing his southern audience's responsiveness towards a new rock-based sound that puts "some drive in country." Suitably, the video is couched in MTV quick-cut, girl-centered imagery that under-scores the song's rhetoric. Grounding himself in a subcultural music genealogy, Tritt reaches out to mainstream visual/musical aesthetics he claims are what his (still downhome) audience now wants. This positioning both inside and outside the subculture can be read as just another version of the other Travis's dual appeal. This dance on the edge of two music-cultural spaces was well presented in the 1991 Grammy Awards ceremonies by the Alabama Headhunters. The group came to the stage to accept their award dressed in torn jeans and tee shirts. In a strongly southern-tinged voice, the spokesman first thanked the folks back in Alabama, Arkansas, and Kentucky who "put out their bucks" to support the band in local clubs. So far, the plain folks stance and the "country" category of the award were in harmony. Then he closed out the speech by saying how great it was to be on the same stage with John Lennon (who had earlier received a posthumous lifetime achievement award), since the Beatles had been the point of departure for the group's starting off in music. Ironies abound here in the evocation of Lennon as a now-sainted superculture hero, given the defiantly anti-hegemonic thrust of much of his work. Interaction of other layers of

superculture and alternative/oppositional subcultures pervade this sort of referencing, reinforced by having Tracy Chapman introduced as a socially conscious singer who could appropriately sing Lennon's "Imagine," a text proposing the possibility of a non-religious, non-capitalist world being sung in a glittering celebration of commodified music punctuated by winner after winner placing God as the first one on their list of those to thank for their success.

*   *   *

The reader may be a bit dizzy from this constant changing of viewpoints, angles of vision, and kaleidoscopic swirls of interaction. It is time to turn to a closer consideration of the way these energies operate at work and play.

Subcultures at Work and Play

The Modes and Means of Expression

Having defined the space within which subcultures express themselves, the next step is to look at how they do it. This section is about techniques—musical approaches and materials. Taking a cue from sociolinguistics, I'll talk about codes first, then strategies. The underlying assumption is one that crept quietly into ethnographic studies and then took over: that people draw on available resources, reshape them for current needs (*bricolage*), re-evaluate, and start over, building a culture day by day, following strategies, adapting to change. I have found this a useful perspective in some of my work on Euro-American musics, and will summarize the approach here, then look for implications, limitations, extensions, that widen the focus just a bit.

I remain surprised that ethnomusicology has not had more interaction with sociolinguistics, an obvious sister discipline. Although as early as 1974 Dell Hymes thought that "musical terminology will prove a great resource for exploration of speech styles" (1974:443), few ethnomusicologists have returned the favor by noticing that many terms, concepts, and methods from sociolinguistics might stimulate our discussion of music in culture. In the case of studying subcultures, I find the notion of codes and code-switching particularly helpful, since small groups both generate their own distinctive styles and interact with the styles of the superculture. For my purposes, Labov's old definition of code-switching will do: "moving from one consistent set of co-occurring rules to another" (1972:134–5). Beyond this bald statement lies a well-documented feeling that "codeswitching is a conversational strategy used to establish, cross, or destroy group boundaries; to create, evoke, or change interpersonal relations" (Gal 1988:247). Particularly important for a focus on subcultural activity is current thinking that a group's language practices "are part of the group's actively constructed

and often oppositional response" to the superculture (ibid.:259). Finally, analysis is multidimensional, not just situated in one sphere of culture contact: "The approach proposed here is, then, historical, ethnographic, and multi-level" in terms of varieties of interaction, of individual style, and of community practice (Heller 1988:269).

As Heller's useful 1988 reader on code-switching in anthropology shows, many issues remain highly ambiguous and unexplored in this nearly thirty-year-old field of research, but what the anthology also illustrates abundantly is how well-developed and ingenious the available methodologies are, and how much light the results can shed on the interaction between superculture and subculture. So it is worth trying to imagine a musical analogue to the notion of code-switching. To begin with, however, there is the knotty question of what a musical "code" might be. "Style" is an admittedly slippery concept, but it is intuitively clear, at least in terms of being a "set of consistent rules." For present purposes, "style" can stand for the commonplace categories of everyday music, as in the particular mix of repertoire and mode of presentation that we anticipate when we buy an album or go to a concert, or that dance-band musicians offer as their set of musics for hire. A future, more sophisticated sense of musical code might want to evolve more precise terms that would take account of "languages," "dialects," "levels," and "registers"—all of which count as "codes" for sociolinguists. Local understandings must predominate; the term "moderns" as a style category makes sense only as the opposite of "polka" for a Connecticut band described below. As either musical consumers or producers in Euro-America, people are highly sensitive to finely-tuned distinctions in style, as I have learned by talking to a range of insiders from undergraduates to professional musicians. In terms of my interests here, it would be hard to find subcultural music-makers that aren't aware of supercultural styles, those of parallel small groups and, of course, the many modes of expression of their own micromusical colleagues. The resources even bathtub singers can draw on are numerous enough: popular, patriotic, seasonal, advertising, and many other materials are on the tip of the tongue. The really problematic question is: do musicians switch from style to style on purpose? When a jazz musician quotes Beethoven, when a Latino singer mixes English phrases into his Spanish, when an ultra-Orthodox Jewish songwriter sets Hebrew texts to a rock tune we can hardly imagine they do so accidentally. Exactly why, where, and how players and composers code-switch is no easier to determine than it is for speakers, though I'll try my hand at a few examples below.

One more, crucial point about music: it's richer in codes than language. True, utterances can be combined with intonation patterns and gestures to add layers of meaning, but even highly expressive speakers draw on fewer

variables than musicians can. A band playing a song can pull together not just text and tune, but timbre, rhythm, and instrumentation for several performers simultaneously in a stratified system I call code layering, style upon style upon style—then shift any number of the variables in the next section to produce a new kaleidoscopic code combination. Analysis becomes a process of untying a musical knot and seeing where all the strings come from before proceeding to the next node in the fabric. Another metaphor would suggest reconstructing the work of the Sunday do-it-yourselfer by taking apart his contraption to figure out what materials he used and how he put them together. You hope the process will illuminate his motives, but you can't really be sure without asking—if he remembers and wants to tell you his secrets.

Let me begin with a clearcut example of sharp, stark code-switching. A Jewish-American comedy number of the late 1940s by a talented duo (the Barton Brothers) begins with a perfectly standard recitation of the hoary all-American poem by Longfellow, "The Midnight Ride of Paul Revere," accompanied by a trumpet-and-drum rendition of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," layering patriotic code upon code. The diction and dialect of this Barton Brother are standard, slightly pompous, American English. Suddenly, this nationalistic reverie is broken by a brief silence and a highly dramatic code switch to a band playing an east European Jewish dance tune that accompanies the other Barton Brother. He uses a heavy Yiddish intonation and delivers a parody of the "Midnight Ride" ("of Paul Rabinowitz") in a Yiddish full of English lexical intrusions. A short section of this Euro-American mishmash is followed by a break which introduces the return of the all-American Longfellow code. The two components of the performance alternate in unbroken succession until the duo covers the entire poem: musical superculture and subculture take turns in a strictly ordered progression of solo turns. Such "block" code-switching is rather rare, particularly the perfect alignment of codes within each section; the incongruity of precise juxtaposition dominates, rather than startling overlays.

What did the Barton Brothers have in mind? I could do an elaborate analysis on the basis of long acquaintance with Jewish-American expressive culture, which I will spare the reader here; the point for the present is that code-switching is of great strategic value as a musical resource, and that it probably implies strong sentiments. Whatever the performers' intent, they had no control over the audience response, so simple ethnography will not provide a full answer; such materials can point in many directions, and they change over time. The numerous meanings the community produces at any one point give rise to ever new implications as cultural vistas open up. Let's compare the Barton Brothers' use of patriotic material to that in another Jewish-American popular song, back in 1917. In *Onkel sem* ("Uncle Sam"),

code-switching is equally dramatic. An opening section in minor with a strong European voice quality for the Yiddish song text explains that having found a happy home in America, the Jew must be ready to shed his blood for his new fatherland. A short pause separates this style from the song's conclusion, which consists of (1) the opening bars of "The Star-Spangled Banner," and (2) the closing phrase of George M. Cohan's patriotic song "You're a Grand Old Flag." While *Onkel sem* and "The Midnight Ride" diverge widely, if not wildly, in the way they use nationalistic materials, they share common codes and strategies.

Let's give ethnography its due and see what fieldwork can turn up by way of motivation for code-switching/layering. A 1986 interview with a successful modern religious songwriter in the Jewish tradition (I'll call him David) produced a very clear self-analysis of technique. At the point where we enter the conversation, it's about defining the "new" popular religious music which is a major trend among American Jews:

> *David.* That's another harmonic distinction of the new music—that lowered leading tone (demonstrates on guitar).
>
> *Slobin.* Does that come out of rock, you think?
>
> *David.* Yeah—no; it don't—it doesn't, it comes out of Jewish music, and it comes out of Israeli music. That's probably to my mind the single most prevalent melodic tendency of Israeli music. Any Israeli song has that lowered leading tone.
>
> *Slobin.* It's also what the Beatles and other people . . .
>
> *David.* You have that in rock too. . . . so my music has that lowered leading tone influence. There's little of that (plays tonic-dominant-tonic progression) because to me, that's ordinary, that's Stephen Foster . . . Now my new music has gotten a little more—Jewish in character. Because I've assimilated more, and I start to think about what I want to leave here (plays what he calls a "middle period" song, illustrating components). That's the lyricism—but it has a nice neat pop ending. And here are the "third chords"—jazzy feel. I was pretty happy with that melody.

In David's case, strategy is foregrounded. He is trying to write a personally satisfying song that will catch on with a broad audience. He tunes into current trends for both reasons: he is a child of his time, and so is his (largely younger) audience. He is not only aware of switching codes, but can identify them for an interviewer, and in doing so makes some motivations clear. The ethnicity of the music needs to be unquestioned, so he would rather identify the "lowered-seventh chord" as being Israeli than rock in origin, while conceding it could be either. For David's style, standard codes include "Israeli," "Mediterranean," "jazz," "pop," "rock," "old-fashioned, Stephen Foster," and a few others (for example, "Hasidic") that didn't come

up in the quoted excerpt. But they are only melodic/harmonic/rhythmic codes: the use of Hebrew sacred texts, with an insistence on "correct accentuation," is a bedrock assumption of all his songs and is non-negotiable, the presumed authenticity being indispensable to validate the songs and the songwriter for socio-religious reasons.

David's case shows it's possible to untangle the meanings and resonance of musical codes, given articulate musicians, of whom there are many in European/American societies, and to move towards understanding their strategic value. Subcultural musicians keep one eye on their in-group audience and the other on the superculture, looking out for useful codes, successful strategies, with a third inner eye seeking personal aesthetic satisfaction. No wonder there are so many detours along the path, since all three audiences are restless. Indeed, the musicians' own creations contribute to internal change and outside re-evaluation of subcultural life, leading them to further alteration as they adjust to personal, inner, and outer imagined worlds of music, just as the modes and meanings of linguistic resources are in constant motion. A young composer/performer like David can speak of a song being "from my middle period," revealing a strong historical perspective which means that any current statement about his creative stance could only be provisional.

There may be larger processes at work that are more durable. Pulling back from the microworld of individuals, a bird's-eye view reveals fairly stable ways that the larger subculture tends to work on its musics, a set of basic strategies—of which code-switching is but one—that may be con-scious or intuitive. I think of these as a set of relationships to resources, attitudes towards the huge range of available choices. Some involve responses to the superculture, while others center on decisions about internal repertoires, styles, genres, texts, and contexts. My approach here boils down to a bunch of -tion words to indicate accomplished act-tions. My interest is in trying to be fairly precise about terms without being pedantic in the interest of avoiding overgeneralized, often overdetermined -tions like "acculturation" or "assimilation." Jewish-American examples, where I can vouch for plausibility best, might predominate, but I'll throw in others as counterweights and controls.

The first perspective involves the way subcultures use the superculture's musical materials. This includes several approaches and a vast variety of items; as such interactions lie at the heart of a subculture's definition of itself and its boundaries. Writing or lecturing on this topic, scholars tend to use many words, often very loosely, from the most general "syncretism" to rather pointed terms, like the currently fashionable "appropriation." It might be best to follow the lead of the art historian Michael Baxandall's utter condemnation of the all-too-vague phrase "influenced by" (a term not

unknown in ethnomusicological circles), "which I must spend a couple of pages trying to kick just enough out of my road to pass on" (1985:59). Speaking of artist X "influencing" artist Y, he finds the concept "impoverished" because it is richer to "think of Y rather than X as the agent." Translating this to music might make X=the superculture, Y=the subculture, and we might agree with Baxandall that then "the vocabulary is much richer and more attractively diversified": "Draw on, resort to, avail oneself of, appropriate from, have recourse to, adapt, misunderstand, refer to, pick up, take on, engage with, react to, quote, differentiate oneself from, assimilate oneself to, assimilate, align oneself with, copy, address, paraphrase, absorb, make a variation on, revive, continue, remodel, ape, emulate, travesty, parody, extract from, distort, attend to, resist, simplify, reconstitute, elaborate on, develop, face up to, master, subvert, perpetuate, reduce, promote, respond to, transform, tackle . . . everyone will be able to think of others" (ibid.). All of which boils down to: "responding to circumstances, Y makes an intentional selection from an array of resources in the history of his craft," not far from the type of cultural improvisation I have been and will be describing.

So one way to handle the terminology of music-cultural processes might be to use as many words as possible, each conveying a rather specialized approach, then talk about overlaps. Suppose we try out a term I've already used earlier—"domestication"—on music brought into the subculture from the superculture. "Domestication" literally means bringing into the house, and implies the harnessing of something wild, uncontrollable, and putting it to good household use. Playing the dictionary game, we let the Oxford English Dictionary (1968) give us both "to attach to home and its duties" and "to tame or bring under control." Many cases of "borrowing" seem to have this thrust, or at least it can be seen as a component of musical transplantation. "Domestication" in both the OED senses comes very close to the mark in describing the practice of Hasidic Jews in both Europe and America when it comes to the use of superculture materials. The charismatic sectarian leaders of Eastern Europe took over non-Jewish materials in which they sensed an imprisoned sacred "spark" that needed to be released. So a Napoleonic march of a passing French army or a banal tune being cranked out by an organ grinder in a dusty town square could be turned into a celebratory, even ecstatic song by nineteenth century European Hasidim, while in America, pop songs and even advertising jingles (Koskoff 1978), symbols of the impure, dangerous Gentile secular world, can be turned to good use within the Hasidic spiritual "home."

Let's try a radically different case: a record of an American "Middle Eastern" night club-style music which features an "orientalized" version of "Yesterday." That song being *the* most recorded item in musical history, it

is hardly surprising that it can be domesticated to do its duty of entertaining. On the record, it acts as a sharp code-switch from the previous track's "homeland" style, suggesting the band's complete mastery of its audience's tastes, which span the in-group and the mainstream spheres. The fact that the ensemble subjects "Yesterday" to a rather intense defamiliarization might suggest domestication—the song has certainly been effectively harnessed. Interviews would help fix the performers' intent, but tell us little about consumer reception: how do listeners hear the code switch, perceive the playing around with a canonical pop text? Certainly some of them smile, as do most listeners to whom I play the tape; the incongruity of piece and overlaid parody makes people laugh. Is the process at work domestication? borrowing? appropriation? eclecticism? acculturation? assimilation? Americanization? Some words seem more suitable than others for this example, though the multivalent nature of the musical text means no one term can cover possible meanings, resonances, nuances. Trying out a large vocabulary, rather than settling on one blanket term for many differing cases, would at least push the analyst to consider the broad range of motivations and receptions a subcultural move can represent.

Let's return to "The Midnight Ride of Paul Revere" in its Yiddish incarnation. Here the disjuncture between superculture and subculture sounds more shocking than the transition from in-group sound to "Yesterday." The original and its parody are segmented and performed in strict alternation with short breaks between units. The Barton Brothers do more violence to the original than do the Middle Eastern band, and the all-American text is not only patriotic, but nearly sacred; their intervention is a musical equivalent to treading on the flag. Perhaps this kind of vehemence might bring the term "appropriation," even "confiscation," into play. Certainly such militant domestication suggests that "home" is a combat zone which mirrors the "Battle Hymn" and militarism of the Longfellow segments.

Continuing the theme of patriotism, Ray Henry's "Bicentennial Polka" might help crack this particular code. The piece opens with a flourish of trumpets and drums in a march beat, suggesting nationalism. A code switch brings the same instruments into line with the Polish-American polka sound, in which they also feature prominently, over the same 2/4 beat common to both polka and march. Henry enters singing the following text:

> When I look back into history
> So many long years ago
> In the greatest country ever
> Which I love and do adore.

The opening flourish returns, now confirmed as being patriotic, the polka backup re-enters, and the text continues:

> Started right here in New England
> Some two hundred years ago
> With the call of Paul Revere
> Which echoed 'round the world.

> Since then she's had her ups and downs
> In peacetime as well as war
> She always has defended
> The freedom of one and all.

Finally:

> And now I would like to thank her
> From the bottom of my heart
> For the freedom and the good life
> That here we all enjoy.

The happy coincidence that trumpets, drums, and a steady 2/4 rhythm characterize both the patriotic and the polka sound allows Henry to make a statement that is simultaneously of the subculture and the superculture; the result is almost a code "fusion." The situation is underscored by his singing in English instead of introducing the Polish-English code-switching that marks off some polka songs as "ethnic." The fact that Henry's message is being projected from the small stage of a subculture to the large arena of national ideology pushes the listener to define a cultural space for the music, or at least to turn up a term. Certainly a kind of "accommodation" has been reached, and the coziness of the internal-external rapprochement suggests domestication of the patriotic as integral to the expressive home. Far from the Barton Brothers' assaults, here Paul Revere stands firmly on his pedestal, even acquiring the "heard round the world" tag line that belongs to the "shot" fired in another Longfellow poem about the first battle of the American Revolution.

The comparison between these two ethnic Paul Reveres brings us back by a circuitous path to the question of code-switching, viewed from sociolinguistics. In a closely-argued, empirically-based study much more typical of that discipline than of ethnomusicology, Shana Poplack discusses "contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities," Puerto Ricans in New York and French-Canadians in Ottawa-Hull, Ontario (1988). The contrasts are many, among them the Puerto Ricans' view of code-switching as "emblematic of their dual identity, and smooth, skilled switching is the domain of highly fluent bilinguals," whereas for the French-Canadians, "highlighting, flagging, or otherwise calling attention to the switch" is important. Poplack does not venture far towards telling us *why* this is the case, but cautions that "the striking contrasts . . . do not augur well for any

simple deterministic view of bilingual behavior" (ibid.:237–38). She can draw on 1700 examples of code-switching per group, can define her codes with considerable precision, and can determine issues like grammaticality, to name just three tools in her analytical workshop, none of which are "readily" available for music; at least, I know of no ethnomusicological study that can draw upon so extensive and precise a database. Yet the closer she scrutinizes the scene, the more wary she is of drawing comfortable conclusions.

However, such care is itself a source of comfort. The questions become ever more acutely posed, the troublesome issues more strongly spotlighted. For example, Poplack spends some anxious moments worrying about how to tell loanwords from code-switches, deciding there may not be any *a priori* way of doing so. " 'Momentary' borrowing has to be distinguished from incomplete acquisition and language loss [and] all of these phenomena should be distinguished from speech errors which involve elements of both languages and which may be properly considered 'interference.' " This caution leads to the payoff statement that "what appears to be the same phenomenon may have a different status from one bilingual community to another" (ibid.:239). So elaborate precision in one field site, with a similarly rigorous follow-up elsewhere, leads to an exquisite appreciation of the highly situated nature of all language use and a helpful skepticism about terminology. We have a long way to go in music studies to reach such a plateau; most of our ethnographic studies are still one-shot surveys or broad historical overviews. It is hard to imagine a fieldwork project that would compile 1700 examples of musical code-switching in one small community. My hunch is that if we *did* do such research, we probably would end up in the same place; separating patterned use from error, borrowing from code-switching and extending the findings to comparison among communities would certainly be just as complicated, but also very rewarding in what we might learn about how micromusics work—and play, since both are involved here.

Let me return to what we can attempt with the materials at hand. So far I have stayed close to code-switching or simple layering by language substitution, but a large body of subculture musics engage in complex layering, piling code upon code. Take for example the case of Ukrainian-Canadian country-western music, ably described by Klymasz in one of the earliest incisive accounts of a North American subcultural style (1972). Pick up any record: a band can take a standard American country song like "Please Release Me," translate the lyrics into Ukrainian and sing them with a non-standard timbre, add at least one European backup instrument like the cimbalom, shift the rhythmic emphasis, and so on, so that a hybrid genre is born. One might begin to reach for -tions like "reconfiguration" and

"recontextualization," to characterize the shifting, kaleidoscopic patterns of codes that subcultures can create by modifying superculture musical materials, a sort of "customization" of assembly-line products.

Yet a great deal of the subculture's musical energy goes into working over its *own* music in a process I call "reevaluation." Over time, new perspectives cause a re-ordering of group priorities, a changed understanding of what is "authentic," what represents "us" best to outsiders, what sells best to a new generation of listeners, or what is now "ours" that once was "theirs." Such shifts often accompany significant social change in the superculture or a particular historical moment in the life of the subculture. Recent Jewish-American musical trends are exemplary here. Somewhere around 1960 the Jews stopped being considered a "minority group" and started figuring as a unmarked member of the American majority from the point of view of bureaucrats, courts, and college administrators. This moment coincided with a general rise in comfort as part of postwar suburbanization and affluence. So it is perhaps not surprising that from the1960s on, the internal diversity, even playfulness, of in-group music-making has increased sharply. Take, for example, two performances of a Yiddish folksong, *Di mame iz gegangn* ("Mama went to market") from the late 1950s and the mid-1980s. The first, by Theodore Bikel, a Hollywood actor-cum-folksinger, comes from his record of Yiddish folksong favorites that seemed to be in every Jewish home at the time. The format and delivery of the song stick to the mainstream folk revival sound of the period: steady tempo, clean melodic and instrumental lines, guitar backup, precise diction that sounds slightly distanced from a European base. The second version, by the New York *klezmer* band Kapelye (even the Yiddish-English term "klezmer band" for such ensembles did not exist until the late 1970s) offers a striking contrast in every parameter of performance. The backup band is diverse, from tuba to banjo, and often raucous. The tempo shifts from opening recititative style, with instrumental interjections, to accelerating, then bracing, breakdown speed. The singer Michael Alpert's Yiddish is broadly European. A street or dance-prone audience seems envisioned, far from the suburban living-room setting the Bikel version conjures up.

As much as I dislike psychologizing a subculture, it is hard for me not to believe that this sort of unbuttoned ethnic music-making by young Jewish-Americans is tied to the fact that for Jews, ethnic boundaries are now erected more from the inside out than from the outside in. You don't have to be as careful with your daily life if no one is peering in the window. You might dust off some skeletons in the closet, or reconsider your embarrassment at the way your old relatives behave, perhaps viewing them as interesting eccentrics—or even as role models.

A more dramatic internal musical shift than *Di mame* is provided by the recent Hasidic song boom among non-Hasidic American Jews. A word of

explanation is in order. For decades, the garb and folkways of the ultra-Orthodox, sectarian Hasidim was a subject of ridicule or scorn by mainstream Jewish-Americans. The idea that such patently foreign, insistently Yiddish-speaking insular Jews could represent a rapidly suburbanizing, increasingly affluent minority group would have made no sense at all in 1940 or even 1960. Yet by 1980 the Hasidim were seen as the authentic, quintessential Jews, and their influence over Jewish-American culture has been growing at a rapid rate despite their constituting only a small percentage of the ethnic group. Hasidic tunes have found their way into the worship services of many congregations and sell very well, prompting non-Hasidic composers to imitate the style to catch the wave of popularity. The Hasidim have not changed their dress, language, or habits, but occupy a new cultural space; even *The New York Times* has featured a Hasidic apartment in its prestigious front-page "Living" section slot.

This is precisely the sort of "re-evaluation" I have in mind. A shift in outlook causes one to stop and reconsider even deeply felt views about the validity of elements of one's own subculture. Since ethnicity of the sort at work here is symbolic and not socially serious in terms of one's status in the superculture, why not play with cultural forms? After all, there are expressive rewards. Congregants find weekly services much more enjoyable when they can sing catchy, rhythmic Hasidic tunes and even clap their hands rather than sit back and listen to the authority figures—rabbi and cantor—run the show. For young people, this sort of participatory appeal is particularly strong. Curiously, it comes at some cost to the earlier, powerful appeal of Israeli music. A de-emphasized reliance on Israel as emotional focus may be the backdrop to this decline in musical influence. Complicating the picture is the diasporic network of Hasidic communities and their imitators, which sees American musicians populating Israeli scenes while the Israel-based Hasidic Song Festival sells out large halls in New York.

This brief foray into the internal life of a single subculture shows just how complex and intense even small-scale community musical life can be in the large multigroup nation-states under discussion. It also displays the cyclical life of codes, which flicker in and out of communal consciousness. Once parodied mercilessly on the Yiddish stage in the immigrant era (1880s through 1920s) and beyond, the stylized Hasidic codes are having their day at the forefront of Jewish-American expressive culture. The penetration of this particular code complex into the superculture needs to be mentioned: the musical traffic flows in both directions. In building *Fiddler on the Roof*, its creative team turned to Hasidic celebrations as a source of material for dance and the old, unaccompanied, meditative *nign* tune as inspiration for the ethnic tinge the Broadway sound needed to set off the show—just listen to Tevye's "yob-a-dob-a . . ." in "If I Were a Rich Man" (for a detailed account, see Altman and Kaufman 1971). The creators of *Fiddler* being Jewish, the

construction of a Broadway landmark proceeded from an internal discussion of how subcultural codes and messages might successfully be built into the supercultural space. In general, I think the reciprocal relationship between superculture and subcultural has been downplayed in our enthusiasm for locating hegemony.

*   *   *

I have demonstrated very few tools of the analyst's workshop in this section, partly to keep the discussion condensed and partly because I have tried out illustrations elsewhere (for example, 1988 on iconography). I have also not done much cross-referencing of concepts. For example, *Fiddler on the Roof's* triumphal spread around the world as a classic American musical brings in the interculture, while the whole process involves shifting of visibility levels, from local to regional to transregional. A working knowledge of intra-subcultural music-making at the smallest levels of technique is not just of local interest culturally or analytically, since the various planes and levels are continuously cross-cutting.

So looking at the modes and means of micromusical work and play cannot be a self-sufficient approach. The embodiment of trends and tropes happens in performance by easily identifiable groups; a short account of their patterning follows.

Ensembles: Band-ing vs. Bonding

Ensembles define everyday music-making in Euro-American life like nothing else can. As collectives, they stand for individuals bonded by belonging, or for the whole group in microcosm. For outsiders—for the superculture in general—ensembes often *are* the micromusic, since that's what appears at display events like parades, folk festivals, night clubs, or concert halls. For my purposes, they come in two types: *bands*, that is, performing units of professional or semi-professional musicians that play for the pleasure of paying customers, and *affinity groups*, charmed circles of like-minded music-makers drawn magnetically to a certain genre that creates strong expressive bonding. With these two varieties of ensembles, we can further map the subcultural space between individual soundworlds and the products of the superculture.

Bands are particularly adept at placing themselves anywhere in this territory: at the center of the subculture as focal flashpoint, on the margins as musical adventurers, or even abroad, posted as ambassadors to the superculture. Often they position themselves on the fence, the way a band at a Hasidic wedding plays on the wall between the male and female dancers, both sides sharing the acoustic space but doing different steps, or in the manner of Gypsy ensembles serving as similarly non-gendered, almost non-

human dance-makers at a wedding in Greece (Cowan 1990). Any subcultural ensemble might perform for several audiences at a single event (audiences of different generations, for example) or on alternate nights for different crowds, making sure to please them all. Affinity groups, however, locate themselves at a determined point and may even build walls around their musical strongholds. They serve as nuclei for the free-floating units of our social atmosphere, points of orientation for weary travelers looking for a cultural home. A look at some selected small musical groupings can stand in for the grand survey we so badly need.

I'll start with bands, collectives that play for a crowd that is either listening/eating or dancing. Bands are flexible, since we are dealing here with specialists who have put a great deal of time and energy into approaching a certain ideal of musical sound. Whose ideal that might be is what is under discussion: their own, reflexive imagined world, or that of an audience of listeners or dancers who are paying for the pleasure of commanding a performance. Audience-pleasing is certainly a central concern. Let me begin with the eloquent testimony of Lawrence Welk, an extraordinarily succcessful American band leader, of the universality of one basic cultural demand: "I found out all over again that people everywhere who liked to dance had one thing in common, whether they danced in an empty garage in Coldwater, Kansas, or in the most ornate ballroom in the country. They wanted music with a good strong rhythmic beat and a tune they recognized" (Welk 1971:162). Oddly enough, ethnomusicology has not produced a general account of the formation, hiring, and reception of the dance band, although it is a staple of societies around the globe. My own experience in Afghanistan would back up Lawrence Welk's opinion; looked at in such basic terms, the strategies of band-leading have little to do with geography. Nor does the basic relationship of performer to audience in such situations have much to do with a folk-popular divide, or even a superculture-subculture gulf. In Welk's case, the basic performer-audience contract varied little from the days when he toured smalltown North Dakota as a German-American accordionist to his heady heyday as a bandleader in metropolitan hotels. His enormous success on television shows how possible it is to transfer a style from the danced to the watched modes. Conversely, the neo-*klezmer* movement of 1970s and 80s Jewish dance music quickly moved from concert format to audience participation, turning a ticket-paying crowd into a fascimile of wedding guests. What attracts the analyst here are the strategies, the ways to win over whatever audience is at hand, well observed for the Moroccan scene by Schuyler (1984), but sparsely described for Euro-America. For this is commercial music, and the object is to keep the jobs coming in week after week, season after season. Precisely because the musical resources are so rich in our times, musicians can find the right

combination for a particular crowd. So the distinctions between superculture and subculture bands might not be all that great at the level of crowd-pleasing. Ray Henry, a durable southern New England polka band leader, has stayed within micromusic bounds, unlike the roughly contemporary Lawrence Welk, but his commentary is not far in spirit from Welk's: "I would say there's two types of musicians: there's a good one and there's the smart one. You have to adapt yourself quickly. You play your own stuff and you watch them, and in no more than half an hour, you're going to play *their* way. If you see they're dancing fast, you better play fast, and if they like a lot of polkas, you better play a lot of polkas. That's what it's all about" (Spalding 1986:71). Bruce MacLeod's dissertation, aptly titled *Music for All Occasions,* is still the only study I know of the everyday Euro-American big-city "club-date" musician's life (1979, forthcoming as MacLeod n.d.). Although the New York scene he describes has drastically shrunk due to the incursions of recorded sound for private parties, his study holds up very well as a general description of the demands on the working live musician who provides expressive marking for celebrations, whether corporate/political or per-sonal/life-cycle. The scene can be what musicians call "a lobster in the woods" (private mansion) or a catering hall near the freeway, and the musicians can be MacLeod's all-purpose members of New York's Local 802 of the American Federation of Musicians or an unregistered band fresh off a plane from Greece who will head back to Europe in a couple of weeks. All show that while "he who calls the tune must pay the piper," the payment circumscribes the musician more than the customer. The important point here is how viewing things from the perspective of band life illuminates the other planes of our discussion of micromusical life. An excellent case in point comes from Ruth Glasser's study of New York's Puerto Rican Musicians in the 1920s and 1930s (1990). By zooming in on a particular "ethnic group's" professional musicians, Glasser broadens rather than narrows the focus of analysis, which includes several key issues:

Superculture interaction. Like recent work on Jewish musicians of this period (Slobin & Spottswood 1984), Glasser's research shows it is impossible to understand even the most "in-group" of music-making without factoring in the demands of industry. "The influence of large American record companies on the popularization and even the formation of various genres of Latin music cannot be overstated" (ibid.:70). Meanwhile the superculturally-produced and media-packaged lumping together of a wide variety of groups as "Latins" led Puerto Rican bands to become "complicit in their stereotyping as interchangeable Latins by adopting Mexican, Argentine, or Cuban musical images and forms" (ibid.).

Intercultural implications. The commercial connection meant that New York musicians colonized their compatriots: "The companies also counted

on the versatility of their musicians to efficiently provide records for a large portion of Latin America" (ibid.). At the same time, diasporic intercultural linkages paralleled those of industry, as, say, Puerto Rican bandleader Rafael Hernandez "returned from years in Cuba" and brought in new styles (ibid.:69).

Inter-subcultural dealings. Much of Glasser's short article details the way Puerto Rican band members interacted with both their "Latin" cousins and with Afro-American ensembles, as in Juan Tizol joining Duke Ellington's band or less celebrated players finding work in black reviews during the Harlem Renaissance. Important here is that they did not switch "loyalties" out of desperation, but simply relied on the versatility they had to begin with back in Puerto Rico in municipal bands. Here again the Puerto Rican experience jibes with that of immigrant East European Jewish bands or Punjabi musicians in Britain weaned on eclecticism in their homeland and able to turn it to advantage in club or recording dates in the West.

Intra-subcultural variety. Every subculture, each micromusic, is a world unto itself. The variety of homeland repertoires just mentioned is a starting point: Puerto Rican casinos had included fox-trots, two-steps, one-steps, mazurkas, and waltzes . . ."since at least the early twentieth century" as well as the local "long-time love affair with the Argentine *tango*" (ibid.:65). There are always class differences, such as those Peña carefully spells out for Texas-Mexicans, equally true for Caribbean musical life. Glasser sums up the situation among New York's early Puerto Rican bands this way: "These musicians evade the archetypal historical image of an ethnic population's culture crumbling and succumbing to American forms, instead suggesting endlessly creative combinations and recombinations of a variety of ethnic musics" (ibid.:69). Far from presenting the image of a constrained ghetto community, Glasser offers the picture of a lively microworld in which "the smallness and newness of the Puerto Rican community did not mean that either musicians or audience members retreated to some sort of geographically and culturally cohesive world" (ibid.).

Glasser's historical perspective is important, since so often current American subcultural expressions are portrayed as novel departures, post-1960s shifts from established patterns. Our viewpoint is all too limited by the lack of solid surveys of a large number of earlier micromusics. At this point, it might help to turn to bands of older, Euro-American immigrant populations to see how rather more attenuated ties to the past work themselves out on the dance floor. Mary Spalding (1986) spent considerable time with the Irene Olszewski Orchestra of the New Britain/Hartford, Connecticut area, and this Polish group can provide some points of orientation. The band plays two kinds of "jobs," "polka" and "modern" (mainstream). I'll focus just on the former here, as I'm more concerned at the moment with in-group habits than

mainstream aesthetics. Still, even a polka job in a polka hall may not be for an all-Polish audience. Non-Polish spouses or polka job habitues may also need to be brought into the spirit of the evening; any notion of "interiority" of subcultural expression has to be strongly qualified. Another complicating variable is the type of Pole in the crowd, since there are two periods of immigration represented in Connecticut: Polish-Americans descended from both the great wave of the early twentieth century and relative or complete newcomers, subdivided into pre- and post-Solidarity periods. A band member explains the difference in taste while describing a job with "predominantly Polish immigrants . . . a lot of them were not able to speak English. Well, they had a whole different idea of what a polka should be like. They like it fast! They're more for waltzes as opposed to polkas and, typically, they're big on tangos" (ibid.:47). There is a further constraint: polka job crowds are older, "over forty," and have rather fixed expectations, which extend from wanting the band to look "tailored and professional" to playing many audience requests.

Faced with an urgent need to please, Olszewski must also respond to another professional drive: the commercial imperative of being original, memorable. So she opens with one of the band's own tunes: "It's something they haven't heard before unless they've heard us. I like to start by saying we're different, we're unique. I always try to establish our identity right from the start" (ibid.:53). This type of originality is one of the distinguishing marks of the micromusic band as opposed to its mainstream counterpart. MacLeod's New York club-date musicians may play ethnic numbers for subcultural events like Italian weddings or Jewish bar mitzvahs, but have no real need to prove themselves as "original"; if anything, they downplay distinctiveness in favor of reliability. While the Olszewski Orchestra can hardly afford to play all their own material, they do need to come up with something that will make them stand out from a crowded micromusical marketplace where the gigs are few and the stakes are low.

After the opening "signature" tune, the bandleader provides a "road map" for the evening through announcements to the audience, simultaneously leading them through a set of tunes she hopes will get them happy and following the crowd, as it interrupts with requests. Many items played are polka standards, "songs that have been recorded by thousands of bands over the years with thousands of different arrangements. They've probably been played in every club in the country . . . they've endured where others haven't," says Irene (ibid.:57). As in all such canonical dance-tune repertoires, from jazz through Broadway-based "society" band books, standards provide musicians with butter on both sides of their bread: they show the group off as being reliable and knowledgeable while they showcase virtuosity through allowing for new arrangments of old standbys—within

limits. Bands can "add their own touch to it to sound a little different . . . as long as you don't change it too much where people don't recognize it," says Joe Olszewski (ibid.:58). His statement helps draw a line between the dance-band musicians' rules and those of an "art" or "concert" group that can enjoy pushing audience expectations without having to worry about dancers tripping up their partners. After all, it is the dancers that pay the piper, and you have to keep them not only happy, but healthy: "After four polkas, you're ready to break down a little bit, and the people are ready to breathe a little bit. Polkas are strenuous: people can have a heart attack dancing the polka. And that's a legitimate sentence because I've seen it happen! . . . Some of it is also physical for us. We might just need a break . . . but it's for the people. We have to really gear first for them" (ibid.:60). As in other danceband contexts, a higher percentage of standards (and heart attacks) signifies an older crowd: "if everyone there were younger—thirty-five and down—I would probably play more recent tunes" (ibid.:59).

So it would seem that factors of type of job, generation, and wave of immigration might make gigs predictable, allowing for safe strategies. Yet surprises are yet another variable: "Hopefully, in the first three songs, you have your audience pegged for the night. But there are a lot of trick crowds that will not display any kind of pattern until halfway through the night, and they are difficult to play for" (ibid.:71–72). Irene's helpful insight shows not just how delicately bands must move through the affective minefield of a dance floor, but also the way the ensemble negotiates between pattern and chaos, standard practice and mood swings, the canonical and the unexpected. You can almost feel the bandleader's remembered desperation as she describes stock patterns of audience behavior, then the shock of unpredictability: "There are also clapping crowds who do not dance or anything, but all they do is sit and clap to you . . . There are other crowds who dance and never clap, and you're never sure if you sound good. There are other places where people just listen like you're in a concert, but don't clap at all . . . the nondancing, nonclapping people are scary!" (ibid:72). The idea that your relationship to your audience can be "scary" is an aspect of the inevitably commercial relationship of what I'm calling "banding" here.

In "bonding," the interplay is radically different; take for example the Connecticut Valley tradition of Ancient Fife and Drum Corps: "These groups [are] usually associated with a township . . . drum corps men, women, and children have established themselves as a society complete with rituals, life cycle events, genealogies, and traditions. Usually organized by age and sex, they meet on a weekly basis" (Pearce 1984:1). Dance bands do not have "chaplains" who read a "Company Prayer" that includes lines such as "we thank you for the great company of Ancient musicians . . . we commend all who have marched before us into Your safe-keeping . . . we ask Your

protection for fifers and drummers throughout the land" (ibid.:11). In this simulated society, "babies teethe on drum sticks." When the child is old enough he or she joins a junior unit . . ." Romances among Ancient teenagers often culminate in marriage; "this is vehemently encouraged by other Ancients." Finally, "many members are buried in uniform" (ibid.:78–83).

What the Ancients' tradition does is to "turn the tables on the hyphen-ating of Americans," according to Nancy Pearce, in the sense that instead of splitting off into separate heritage lines, Ancients—usually of Euro-American origin—amalgamate their pasts in the old "melting pot" model into a presumed "ancient" American patrimony of expressive culture, as expressed in one handbook: "Our antecedents may rest assured that the sounds of shrilling fifes and thundering drums are still to echo on and on" (ibid.:91). While it is true that some form of fife and drum corps is as old as the American colonies, the Ancients tradition is an invented one in the classic style described by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (1983). This is particularly evident in the case of formations like The Ancient Mariners, who stage pirate-style theatrical scenes along with their music-making. Certainly today's "musters," as group events are called, bear little resemblance to either the assembly of citizen-soldiers in American wars or to the factory bands of New England that also serve as historical backdrop.

To a great extent, the Ancients are based in locale rather than heritage, each town producing a group that often bears more relationship to the high school marching band model than to any eighteenth century concept. Town and family ties, romance, drinking, and fun combine in what Pearce calls "acceptable exhibitionism," as important here as history. All of these elements define a kind of social bonding that mark thousands of Euro-American ensembles. In a way, Pearce's Ancients seem most kin to Alan Dundes and Alessandro Falassi's *palio* fanatics in Siena, Italy, where the competition among wards of the city, centered on the annual horse-race, is even more micro-localized for more centuries than the Connecticut drum corps (1984). Most bonding ensembles are not as extreme, being a kind of affinity group one can enter and leave at will as an isolated free agent, rather than as a member of a family or locale.

If the Ancients represent one end of a spectrum of bonding activity, Finnegan's British amateur musicians fall somewhere around the middle. Comfortable with the various traditions available in the newly-developed town of Milton Keynes, they find what she calls "pathways" among forms as varied as classical ensemble, brass band, church choir, or jazz, pop, country western and rock. On this view, bonding is both hereditary and environmen-tal, personal and cultural, an implicit -scape of the local ecology. The oppositional, the purely arbitrary, and the "exotic," in terms of undescribed minority micromusics, seem airbrushed out of the picture.

I have little real argument with this portrait of Milton Keynes, not knowing the cultural climate firsthand, but tend to locate it somewhere between a tight, self-selected, *welded* sense of bonding visible in many micromusical scenes and, at the opposite end, a very loose, temporary, almost arbitrary affiliation which I'll illustrate from another New England context—recent Sacred Harp singing groups—using Susan Garber's study: "Sacred Harp singing in New England is characterized by diversity. Participation cuts across boundaries of age, sex, ethnicity and religion" to the extent that the obviously religious basis of this old Protestant style "is one area of discomfort and disagreement among singers" (1987:258). Though loosely based on a Southern adaptation of an eighteenth-century New England style, the genre has gone through re-adaptation in its home region, a kind of "revisionism" which "is evidence of a growing attempt among singers to personalize the music" (ibid.:257). Garber's study is shot through with evidence of the "invention of tradition" as each newly-formed group re-interprets an older style. Like the Ancients, Sacred Harp singers are aware of history, but not overly, more interested in the excitement and immediacy of creating their own heritage from week to week. The resulting bonding occurs at several levels: (1) with a New England past, largely unknown but offering an aura of authenticity; (2) with recent Southern practice, contacted directly by reciprocal visits between the regions; (3) with the emerging neo-New England tradition: "each of these northern groups has developed a nature of its own, at the same time holding characteristics in common with other New England singings" (ibid.:256). The urge to bond has moved rapidly across the literal and cultural landscape due to key activists and institutionalization. Folk music camps, public school workshops, college courses, church, museum, and convalescent hospital visits, and even an appearance of a southern Sacred Harp leader in a Hollywood film have caused new roots to sprout from an old stump. All this has happened within a micromusical world that is no more than twenty years old.

The nature of this bonding is complex and somewhat indeterminate, some ensemble members being drawn by the mere sound and the possibility of fellowship, others making an analogy to familiar forms of Protestant singing. Yet despite these internal differences and the strong distinctions to be noticed among groups as disparate as black gospel choirs, the Ancients, British brass bands, and both southern and northern Sacred Harp groups, a common thread running right through the fabric of each recurs in many members' descriptions of such musical fellowships: the *transcendence* that live performance offers. The "quasi-trance state" one Vermont singer reports is shared by many, and is not a common feature of interviews with dance band musicians. John Bealle's study of "old-time" revivalist dancers in Indiana offers some support and some shadings.   For his "old-time"

dancers in Indiana, John Bealle cites as a basic organizing principle "euphoria as a transcendental ideology" (1988:177), related to Csikszentmihaly's general theory of "flow" in human behavior (1990). Yet he points to nuances between what I call "banding" and "bonding" in the case of dancers who slowly drift into becoming dance callers and musicians. For these people and their dancer comrades, the line between the two activities is blurred as monetary reward and changed status of what Bealle calls "the expressive job" shift the participants' perspectives. At one extreme, a dancer "who enrolled in a Masters of Business Administration program reported less than empathetic reactions to the news of her enrollment" (ibid.: 239).

*   *   *

Ethnomusicology has long noticed the ensemble as a microcosm of expressive culture, or even as metaphor for the social contract as a whole (Waterman 1990 being an excellent recent example), but Euro-American data have been largely noticeable by their absence. Yet particularly for subcultural music-making, the small performing group encompasses the full range of communal enterprise, from the mundane commercial life of the hired band through the transcendent fellowship of song, including links to local and intercultural industry, diasporic and intercultural contact networks, cross-subcultural rapport, and a sweeping sense of history which can bridge centuries or can almost instantaneously invent a tradition. De Tocqueville is often cited as pointing out the importance of voluntary associations for Americans as part of their national character, but it is hard to imagine that many of the benefits performing ensembles offer are limited either to the United States or to the notion of democracy he defines so cogently. Surely one of the strengths of Soviet *samodeiatel'nost'* groups and the newer amateur singing circles of the various regions of the USSR is their ability to tap the source of fellowship otherwise lacking in that society. N. Degteva, Yu Boiko, and E. Burdzhi's (1984) poignant account of how displaced villagers and wartime buddies gather in the parks of Moscow and St. Petersburg to play out literally their need for group performance tells us that the fellowship of music is well implanted across the whole of Euro-America. Though subcultures live in the individual and in large collective acts like communal celebrations, a middle level of affiliation can often be the most intense—as well as the analytically most fruitful—sphere of lived experience.

Closing Thoughts

Ending a work which stresses disjuncture, I would like to close this set of mini-essays by pointing out some gaps and cracks of my own. The point is not to disarm critics but to suggest what else needs to be done to cover the field of micromusical studies I have outlined.

Some gaps are here because I did not have the data at hand to consider many, many possible cases among the population of nearly one billion world citizens being surveyed (counting the former USSR). To take an egregious example, I know of scarcely any literature on the abundant micromusics of present-day France beyond those of the long-term regional/ethnic groups like the Bretons. Yet Paris is a major center for subcultural and intercultural musical commerce and creativity. Many other European countries are also absent from the discussion; I may simply be unaware of relevant studies. To expand our base of knowledge, I am working on an anthology with contributions from European and American colleagues.

There are many issues and a great deal of literature on some topics I have only briefly tapped. For example, to the extent that I have subsumed material relating to the music of African-Americans, I have tended to talk about it in its intersections with other factors, such as class and gender, as is often done today. For example, in the opening sentences of Hazel Carby's excellent study of "the sexual politics of women's blues," she says the paper "focuses on black women as cultural producers and performers in the 1920s" while seeing their story as "part of a larger history of the production of Afro-American culture," yet simultaneously she intends to "consider its marginality within a white dominated feminist discourse" (Carby 1986:9), a reasonable overlapping of planes of analysis. An underlying question this approach suggests is whether African-American music should be treated like any other micromusic. I think there are some grounds for this perspective, suggested by the newly-coined ethnonym itself, ranking "United States citizens of African descent" as another diasporic community. I would be the first to admit that there are also deeply compelling arguments for not doing so. The widespread preference by group members, cited in recent polls, for the term "black" over "African-American" (72 per cent to 15 percent as of January 1991, according to the *New York Times*) should tell us that the people involved have very divided views on the subject. Basically, I feel a comprehensive treatment of this complex situation lies both beyond the scope of the present work and of my research competence, particularly since the issue is now tied to a broader, emerging American tendency to distinguish between "people of color" and other types of subcultures. This movement itself is part of a process of restless redefinition of standard approaches to group identity, including those based on gender and sexual preference as well as heritage, with strong implications for the evolution of micromusics. I feel it is too soon to incorporate these fast-moving trends into an analysis of contemporary societies. Part of the reason lies in the particularities of local understandings and definitions. For example, as an American, I was taken aback by an anthology called *Black Music in Britain* (Oliver 1990) including music of South Asian immigrants. British colleagues tell me this was part of a tactical move in their society which made sense for a time, but which is now somewhat dated. The weakness of any comparative

insight is, of course, the impossibility of taking both global generality and local specificity into account.

Along those lines, I have also been reluctant to make separate arguments for indigenous peoples, refugees, guest workers, members of long-standing regional/national groups and other such categories despite recent suggestions to do so (Schramm 1989; Hirshberg 1989). The point of the present exercise has been to identify common features of micromusics, which I think specialized perspectives tend to overlook in favor of distinctiveness. Whether or not such commonalities outweigh group differences enough to make comparative methodology worthwhile is up to the reader. As I said at the outset, the point here is not to arrive at a solution, but to raise stimulating suggestions.

Finally, I might mention the necessarily disjunct way I have scattered material from case studies throughout the mini-essays. The attentive reader may notice the same source (for example, Finnegan 1989) or style (for example, country music) being cited to different effect in the various sections. This is because as you go from musical moments/settings to cultural analysis, the evidence forces its multivalence on you and flies from the pigeonhole. I think we should celebrate these intersections and connections, piling up a number of overlays rather than looking for underlying blueprints.

Enough mixed metaphors. I hope the reader will move into action, responding and lending a hand in understanding this vital and volatile world of micromusics of the West.

References

Alekseev, Eduard
    1988   *Fol'klor v kontekste sovremennoi kul'tury.* Moscow: Sovetskii kompozitor.
Altman, Richard, and Mervyn Kaufman
    1971   *The Making of a Musical.* New York: Crown.
Anderson, Benedict
    1983   *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.*
            London: Verso.
Anzaldua, Gloria
    1990   "Taming the Wild Tongue." In *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary
            Cultures,* ed. Russell Ferguson et al., 203–12. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Appadurai, Arjun
    1990   "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Public Culture* 2(2):1–
            24.
Applegate, Jane
    1989   "Pepsi Recruits Madonna to Help Fight Cola War." *Los Angeles Times,* 26 January.
Averill, Gage
    1990   "Four Parts, No Waiting: The Ideal of Male Camaraderie in Barbershop Harmony."
            Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology, Oakland
            CA.
Baily, John
    1990   "Qawwali in Bradford: Traditional Music in a Muslim Community." In Oliver
            1990:153–65.

Banerji, Sabita, and Gerd Baumann
    1990   "Bhangra 1984–8: Fusion and Professionalization in a Genre of South Asian Dance
             Music." In Oliver 1990:137–52.
Barber-Kersovan, Alenka
    1989   "Tradition and acculturation as polarities of Slovenian Popular Music." In Frith
             1989:73–89.
Barthes, Roland
    1957   *Mythologies*. Paris: Editions de Seuil.
    1981   *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. New York: Hill and Wang.
Baxandall, Michael
    1985   *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. New Haven: Yale
             University Press.
Bealle, John
    1988   "American Folklore Revival: A Study of an Old-Time Music and Dance Community."
             Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
Becker, Howard
    1982   *Artworlds*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Bolle-Zemp, Sylvie
    1990   "Institutionalized Folklore and Helvetic Ideology." *Yearbook for Traditional Music*
             22:127–40.
Bourdieu, Pierre
    1984   *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard
             University Press.
Browne, David
    1990   "The Music Business Watches its Own Step." *The New York Times*, 23 September.
Bukovsky, Sergei
    1987   *Tomorrow is a Holiday*. Film produced by the Ukrainian News and Documentary
             Film Studio, Kiev.
Bushnell, John
    1990   *Moscow Grafitti: Language and Subcultures*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
Carby, Hazel
    1986   "It Just Be's Dat Way Sometime: The Sexual Politics of Women's Blues." *Radical
             America* 20(4):9–22.
Chapman, Malcolm, Mervyn McDonald, and Elizabeth Tonkin, eds.
    1989   *History and Ethnicity*. London: Routledge.
Clarke, Gary
    1990   "Defending Ski-jumpers: A Critique of Theories of Youth Subcultures." In *On Record*,
             ed. S. Frith and A. Goodwin, 81–96. New York: Pantheon.
de Certeau, Michel
    1984   *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
Clifford, James
    1990   "Traveling Selves, Traveling Others." Paper presented at conference, Cultural Studies
             Now and in the Future, at University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, 5–9 April.
Cowan, Jane
    1990   *Dance and the Body Politic in Northern Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University
             Press.
Cxikszentmihalyi, Mihaly
    1990   *Flow: the Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
Degteva, N., Yu Boiko, and F. Burdzhi
    1984   "Fenomen bytovoi kul'tury sovremmenogo goroda—parkovyi piatachok," in
             Zemtsovskii 1984, 54–79.
Dundes, Alan, and Alessandro Falassi
    1975   *La Terra in Piazza: An Interpretation of the Palio of Siena*. Berkeley and Los Angeles:
             University of California Press.

Fabbri, Franco
    1989   "The System of *Canzone* in Italy Today." In Frith 1989, 122–42.
Faulkner, Robert R.
    1983   *Music on Demand: Composers and Careers in the Hollywood Film Industry.* New
            Brunswick and London: Transaction Books.
Finnegan, Ruth
    1989   *The Hidden Musicians: Music-Making in an English Town.* Cambridge: Cambridge
            University Press.
Fiske, John
    1989   *Understanding Popular Culture.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.
Frisbie, Charlotte, ed.
    1986   *Explorations in Ethnomusicology: Essays in Honor of David P. McAllester.* Detroit:
            Detroit Monographs in Musicology.
Frith, Simon, ed.
    1988   *Facing the Music.* New York: Pantheon.
    1989   *World Music, Politics, and Social Change.* Manchester & New York: Manchester
            University Press.
Garber, Susan
    1987   "The Sacred Harp Revival in New England: Its Singers and Singings." M.A. thesis,
            Wesleyan University.
Gal, Susan
    1988   "The Political Economy of Code Choice." In Heller 1988: 245–64.
Gilroy, Paul
    1987   *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack.* London: Hutchinson.
Gitlin, Todd
    1983   *Inside Prime Time.* New York: Pantheon.
Glasser, Ruth
    1990   "Paradoxical Ethnicity: Puerto Rican Musicians in Post World War I New York City."
            Latin American Music Review 11(1):63–72.
Godmilow, Jill
    1976   *The Popovich Brothers of South Chicago.* Film produced by The Balkan Arts Center,
            New York.
Gold, Gerald, ed.
    1984   *Minorities and Mother Country Imagery.* St. John's: Memorial University of New-
            foundland.
Gramsci, Antonio
    1971   *Selections from the Prison Notebooks,* ed. Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey N. Smith. New
            York: International Publishers.
Guilbault, Jocelyne
    1990   "Cultural, Social, and Economic Development through Music; Zouk in the French
            Antilles." Unpublished paper.
Hall, Stuart
    1991   "The Question of Identity." Paper presented at the University of California, Santa
            Cruz, 21 March.
Hall, Stuart, and Tony Jefferson, eds.
    1975   *Resistance through Rituals.* London: Hutchinson.
Haraszti, Miklos
    1987   *The Velvet Prison: Artists under State Socialism.* New York: Basic Books.
Hebdige, Dick
    1979   *Subculture: The Meaning of Style.* London: Methuen
Heisler, Martin O.
    1990   "Ethnicity and Ethnic Relations in the Modern West." In *Conflict and Peacemaking
            in Multiethnic Societies,* ed. J. Montville, 23–52.

Heller, Monica
    1988   *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de
            Gruyter.
Herndon, Marcia, and Susanne Ziegler, eds.
    1990   *Music, Gender, and Culture*. Wilhelmshaven: Florian Noetzel.
Hirshberg, Jehoash
    1989   "The Role of Music in the Renewed Self-Identity of Karaite Jewish Refugee
            Communities from Cairo." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 21:36–54.
Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds.
    1983   *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Horovitz, Bruce
    1989   "Pepsi Plans No New Ads to Sub for Pulled Madonna TV Spot." *Los Angeles Times*,
            20 April.
Hymes, Dell
    1974   "Ways of Speaking." In *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking,* ed. Richard
            Bauman and Joel Sherzer. New York and London: Cambridge University Press.
Kealiinohomoku, Joann W.
    1986   "The Would-Be Indian." In *Explorations in Ethnomusicology: Essays in Honor of
            David P. McAllester*, ed. C. Frisbie, 111–26. Detroit: Detroit Monographs in Musicol-
            ogy.
Keefe, Susan E., and Amado M. Padilla
    1987   *Chicano Ethnicity*. Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press.
Keil, Charles
    1982   "Slovenian Style in Milwaukee." In *Folk Music and Modern Sound,* ed. W. Ferris and
            S. Hart, 32–59.
Keil, Charles, and Angeliki Keil
    1984   "In Pursuit of Polka Happiness." *Musical Traditions* 2:6–11.
Kelly, John R.
    1983   *Leisure Identities and Interactions*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
Klassen, Doreen Helen
    1989   *Singing Mennonite: Low German Songs among the Mennonites*. Winnipeg: Univer-
            sity of Manitoba Press.
Klymasz, Robert
    1972   "Sounds You Never Heard Before: Ukrainian Country Music in Western Canda."
            Ethnomusicology 16(3):372–80.
Koskoff, Ellen
    1978   "Contemporary Nigun Composition in an American Hasidic Community." In Porter
            1978, 153–74.
    1982   "The Music-Network: A Model for the Organization of Music Concepts.
            Ethnomusicology 26(3):353–70.
    1987 *Women and Music in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Labov, William
    1972   *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.
Larkey, Edward
    1989   "Ethnicity and Cultural Policies: Popular Music in the German-Speaking Countries."
            Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology,
            Cambridge MA.
Leary, James
    1984   "Old Time Music in Northern Wisconsin." *American Music* 71–87.
    1986   *Accordions in the Cutover: Field Recordings of Ethnic Music from Lake Superior's
            South Shore*. Northland MN: Northland College.
    1987   "Reading the 'Newspaper Dress': An Expose of Art Moilanen's Musical Tradition." In
            Michigan Folklife Reader, ed. C. Dewhurst and Y. Lockwood, 205–23.

Lippard, Lucy
    1990   *Mixed Blessings: New Art in a Multicultural America.* New York: Pantheon.
MacLeod, Bruce
    1979   "Music for All Occasions." Ph.D. diss., Wesleyan University.
    n.d.   *Club-Date Musicians.* In press at University of Illinois Press.
McAllester, David, and Charlotte Frisbie
    1984   *Navajo Blessingway Singer: The Autobiography of Frank Mitchell: 1881–1967.*
            Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press.
McHale, Ellen
    1981   "French Canadian to Franco-American: A Study of the Music Culture of Derby,
            Vermont." M.A. thesis, Wesleyan University.
Middleton, Richard
    1990   *Studying Popular Music.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
Niles, Christina
    1978   "The Revival of the Latvian Kokle in America." In Porter 1978, 211–39.
Oliver, Paul, ed.
    1990   *Black Music in Britain: Essays on the Afro-Asian Contribution to Popular Music.*
            Buckingham: Open University Press.
Pearce, Nancy
    1984   "The Ancient Fife and Drum Culture of the Connecticut River Valley." B.A. thesis,
            Wesleyan University.
Peña, Manuel
    1985   *The Texas-Mexican Conjunto: History of a Working-Class Music.* Austin: University
            of Texas Press.
Poplack, Shana
    1988   "Contrasting Patterns of Code-Switching in Two Communities." In Heller 1988, 215–
            44.
Porter, James, ed.
    1978   *Euro-American Traditional Music.* UCLA Selected Reports in Ethnomusicology 3(1).
Pred, Allan
    1990   *Lost Words and Lost Worlds: Modernity and the Language of Everyday Life in Late
            Nineteenth-Century Stockholm.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Reyes-Schramm, Adelaida
    1989   "Music and Tradition: From Native to Adopted Land through the Refugee Experi-
            ence." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 21, 25–35.
Ronström, Owe
    1989   "Making Use of History: The Revival of the Bagpipe in Sweden in the 1980s."
            Yearbook for Traditional Music 21, 95–108.
Ryback, Timothy
    1990   *Rock around the Bloc: A History of Rock Music in Eastern Europe and the Soviet
            Union.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
Schneider, Jo Anne
    1990   "Defining Boundaries, Creating Contacts: Puerto Rican and Polish Representation of
            Group Identity through Ethnic Parades." *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 18(1):33–57.
Schuyler, Philip
    1984   "Berber Professional Musicians in Performance." In *Performance Practice: Ethno-
            musicological Perspectives,* ed. G. Behague, 91–148.
Simmel, Georg
    1955   *Conflict and The Web of Group-Affiliation.* Trans. K. Wolff and R. Bendix. New York:
            The Free Press.
Slobin, Mark
    1979   *Code Switching and Code Superimposition in Music.* Working Papers in Sociolinguistics
            #63. Austin TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
    1983   "Rethinking 'Revival' of American Ethnic Music." *New York Folklore* 9(3–4):38–43.

1986   "Multilingualism in Folk Music Cultures." In *Explorations in Ethnomusicology: Essays in Honor of David P. McAllester*, ed. C. Frisbie, 3–10. Detroit: Detroit Monographs in Musicology.

1988   "Icons of Ethnicity: Pictorial Themes in Commercial Euro- American Music." *Imago Musicae*, 129–43.

1990a   *Chosen Voices: The Story of the American Cantorate*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

1990b   "Engendering the Cantorate." *YIVO Annual* 19, 147–68.

Slobin, Mark, and Richard Spottswood

1984   "David Medoff: A Case Study in Interethnic Popular Culture." *American Music* 3(3):261–76.

Sommers, Laurie Kay

1991   "Inventing Latinismo: The Creation of 'Hispanic' Panethnicity in the United States. *Journal of American Folklore* 104, 32–53.

Spalding, Mary

1986   "The Irene Olszewski Orchestra: A Connecticut Band." M.A. thesis, Wesleyan University.

Starr, Frederick

1980   *Red and Hot: The Fate of Jazz in the Soviet Union, 1917–1980*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Troitsky, Artemy

1987   *Back in the USSR: The True Story of Rock in Russia*. Boston and London: Faber.

Vander, Judith

1989   *Songprints*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Waletzky, Joshua (director)

1980   *Image Before My Eyes* (16mm). Produced by YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, New York.

Wallis, Roger, and Krister Malm

1984   *Big Music from Small Countries*. New York: Pendragon Press.

Waterman, Christopher

1990   " 'Our Tradition is a Very Modern Tradition:' Popular Music and the Construction of Yoruba Identity." *Ethnomusicology* 34(3):367–80.

Waters, Mary

1990   *Ethnic Options*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Weiss, Michael

1988   *The Clustering of America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Welk, Lawrence

1971   *Wunnerful, Wunnerful! The Autobiography of Lawrence Welk*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.

White, Anne

1990   *De-stalinization and the House of Culture*. New York and London: Routledge.

Williams, Raymond

1977   *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Zemp, Hugo

1987   *Youtsen et yodlen* (film). Produced by Centre National des Recherches Scientifiques, Paris.

Zemtsovski, Izali, ed.

1984   *Traditsionnyi fol'klor v sovremennoi khudozhestvennoi zhizni*. Leningrad: LGITMIK.2.

Zheng, Su de San

1990   "Soft Boundaries and Situational Strategies: A Chinese Immigrant Music Group in New York City." MS.