Adelaida Reyes

URBAN ETHNOMUSICOLOGY: PAST AND PRESENT

From preservation to proliferation, from homogeneity to heterogeneity: those word-pairs suggest the quantum leaps that the ethnomusicological mind increasingly has to consider if it is to keep pace with the urbanisation that has been accelerating worldwide since the middle of the last century.[1]

For more than half of its life, ethnomusicology has leaned heavily on the first half of each of these pairs, largely as a result of its assumptions about the music it studied. The emphasis on authenticity, on fidelity to historic forms has favoured preservation. The emphasis on simple and self-contained societies as the source of the music to be studied has favoured a belief in homogeneity as a defining attribute of culture and its music. In his 1905 article, *Die Probleme der Vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft*, E. M. von Hornbostel emphasised the need for preservation with these words: "The danger is great that the rapid dissemination of European culture will destroy the remaining traces of ethnic singing and saying. We must save whatever can be saved …" (translated by Richard Campbell in Hornbostel 1975: 270). In Bruno Nettl's translation, the global homogenizing power of European culture and the danger that it will overwhelm the distinctiveness of discrete musics gains in emphasis: "There is great danger that the rapid diffusion of European culture will eliminate the last vestiges of song and story of foreign cultures. We must save what can be saved before […] the musical world becomes totally homogeneous" (Nettl 2006: 180–181).

Hornbostel's fears have not materialised. European culture has not brought about global homogenisation. The ease with which modern

1 "In 1950 when the world population numbered about 2.5 thousand million, just over a quarter lived in places classified as urban. By 1970, the world population had increased by about 50 % and twice as many lived in urban places. […] it looks as if by the year 2000, half the population of the world will be urban dwellers. […] For the less developed countries the rate of urbanisation is even greater than in the world as a whole." (Kendall 1974)

technology can spread cultural products worldwide seems to have promoted rather than prevented the proliferation of different culture groups and their music. Shortly before his death, Bernard Nietschmann, professor of geography at the University of California in Berkeley, supported this contention, citing Martin W. Lewis and Karen E. Wigen, geographer and historian respectively. They found that 90 % of the world's countries or nation states were multinational, i.e. culturally diverse (Nietschmann 1998: 8). Ten years after the appearance of Nietschmann's article, there is no indication that the trends toward diversity and urbanisation have been, or will soon be reversed.

But the full impact of urbanisation on ethnomusicology has yet to be fully realised. Much of the challenge comes from the dynamism of the urban world – the pace at which it grows, and the variety and complexity of the forms that it takes. But no less challenging is the hold of the discipline's past on the present.

At the threshold of a new field of investigation, namely, the urban area, the legacy of comparative musicology/ethnomusicology continues to make itself felt. The discipline's tradition of confining itself to non-Western musics and of favouring simple or rural societies as the context for its study kept asserting itself even as ethnomusicologists, in the mid 20th century, began to venture into cities. The attitudes toward things urban, spawned by long and almost-exclusive attention to the non-urban, pursued ethnomusicologists as they grappled with territory then perceived to be threatening in its unfamiliarity, its dynamism, its seeming disorganisation. The pull of history in one direction and of the present in the opposite direction has created a crossroad; choices have to be made from what the past has to offer so that the needs of the present can best be served.

THE JUNCTURE

To the best of my knowledge, the term urban ethnomusicology was first used publicly in 1974 at a *Society for Ethnomusicology* (SEM) conference in San Francisco, California. A year later, the first ethnomusicological study of urban musical phenomena as such, based on fieldwork in a major modern Western city in a developed nation was completed: *The Role of Music in the Interaction of Black Americans and Hispanos in New York City's East Harlem* (Reyes Schramm 1975). Shortly thereafter, the first book on music in urban areas, *Eight Urban Musical Cultures. Tradition and Change* (Nettl 1978), was published. Its very first sentence gave important clues on how ethnomusicological studies in urban areas were regarded within the discipline at the time. "This volume presents a group of ethnomusicological studies

devoted to the fate of traditional musics in modern cities of developing or recently developed nations of Africa and the Americas" (Nettl 1978: 3). The word 'fate' harks back to a long-standing belief in ethnomusicology that the urban threatens the assumed purity of the musics of simple, self-contained societies that were comparative musicology's and ethnomusicology's subject matter. Faced with a situation where the binary opposition between ideal types, rural and urban, had gained acceptance as a way to arrive at a characterisation of the urban, the book, in its exclusion of the industrialised and the capital cities of the developed Western world, took a position that reflected the conflicting claims being made on ethnomusicology at the time.[2] Anthropology had raised questions about the concept of simple societies and had legitimised entry into urban cultures, while the conditioning power of ethnomusicological tradition was making it hard for ethnomusicology to shake off the strong resistance to the urban.

By the final quarter of the 20th century, different orientations within the discipline had begun to coalesce around those two poles, the rural and the urban. The opposition between what had historically been ethnomusicology's focus, i.e. the non-urban and the non-Western, and that which the discipline now finds itself unable to ignore, i.e. the urban and the Western, was underscored.

This opposition fueled the emergence of what came to be known as urban ethnomusicology.[3] The term, at the time, signaled two things: 1) the introduction to ethnomusicology of a field outside its customary terrain, and 2) the implication that the opposition, which induced the term's creation was not likely to find resolution within what Thomas S. Kuhn called the 'normal practice' of ethnomusicology (Kuhn 1996).[4]

2 The use of ideal types in conceptualizing the city was adopted by Max Weber, the leader of the German School in urban studies which was centered in Heidelberg and Berlin and was most active in the first quarter of the 20th century. The concept of ideal types was subsequently used by sociologists and anthropologists led by the Chicago School of urban studies, notably by Robert Redfield who was most responsible for the concept of the rural and the urban as binary opposites. Weber's major work on the subject, *The City,* appeared in 1905. Redfield's most influential articles appeared in the late 1940s to the 1950s.

3 For a discussion of this subject, see Reyes 2007.

4 Throughout his book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1996), Kuhn used the term 'normal practice' to refer to *modi operandi* in research that have become standard practice or normative. Its entrenched expectations exert powerful influences on the way the research is conducted and hence, on its results.

Neither of these two points has been adequately explored. What urban ethnomusicology stands for has never been the subject of serious discussion. The term is therefore surrounded with considerable ambiguity. The question continues to be asked: Now that working in urban areas has become commonplace among ethnomusicologists, now that objections to doing so are no longer heard, do we still need the term urban ethnomusicology?

The question suggests that the issue is and has been no more than a matter of location, one that departs from what comparative musicologists/ethnomusicologists had been used to. Once the departure has been accepted, the issue can be considered resolved.

This is an oversimplification that conceals what could be a major contribution to ethnomusicology if the term urban ethnomusicology were to be explored in all that it implies theoretically and methodologically. At a time when what we study and what we consider its sociocultural context is growing ever more complex, the urban, by its intrinsic complexity can hold the key to new perspectives and to innovative thinking. If the urban were understood not just as a physical entity but, more important, as a congeries of dynamic processes, it could help us transcend or complement studies of music as types or genres or nation state-specific products. An understanding of music as more than these, or as not only these but also *as essentially urban phenomena* cannot help but energise and enrich the discipline as a whole.

This paper seeks to help disambiguate urban ethnomusicology by exploring grounds for a meaningful discussion of what it stands for. To this end, the paper will begin with a past-orientedness that will invoke history to shed light on the contemporary while allowing the contemporary to benefit from the past. Standing on this base, the paper will then proceed to explore present possibilities.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

The problems confronting urban ethnomusicology are twofold: those that come from the outside – from the subject that invites investigation – and those that come from within ethnomusicology itself. The degree to which problems of the first kind can be satisfactorily resolved is often contingent on how satisfactorily pertinent problems of the second kind have been resolved. Of particular concern in the present context is a class of problems from within ethnomusicology that are fundamental and yet often intractable because they have receded from conscious thought. Within this class of problems are those that have contributed significantly to the persistence of the opposition that induced the birth of urban ethnomusicology and that,

if properly addressed, could promote growth or, if left unaddressed, could inhibit it.

I am referring to certain habits of mind – procedures and ways of thinking that become so embedded in 'normal practice' that they are taken for granted, and, by virtue of having become habits, escape critical scrutiny. Overlooked and hence, unacknowledged, they are not addressed. Virtually unexamined, they continue in effect even when new data and new knowledge dictate a change or a re-evaluation.

Of these habits of mind, I would like to focus on those that are set into motion by: 1) sociocultural context (because it is essential to ethnomusicological explanation), and 2) a particular assumption that has become central to ethnomusicological method having supported some of the discipline's major achievements. Because habits are acquired through time and because their embeddedness in a discipline's way of thinking is the result of a long process, they must be seen in historical perspective.

HABITS OF MIND

The musics that comparative musicology and, after it ethnomusicology, traditionally studied were assumed to have originated from societies that were simple, monolithic, and self-contained – qualities that fostered and protected the homogeneity of their cultures. In the first decades of the discipline's life, this view of the musics' native socio-cultural environments was validated by the observations and reports of scholars, government officials, missionaries, travellers, and sojourners.

Data on music, however, was much harder to collect. People who had direct access to the music of other cultures needed to have skills in transcription to bring the materials to those who had the musical expertise to study and analyse them. Documentation was problematic and the accuracy of musical data was difficult to verify filtered as they were through the ears, perceptions, and documentary tools of Western collectors. Verification through fieldwork was a difficulty few scholars of the late 19th and early 20th century could overcome. Studies of these musics therefore rested on assumptions about the music based largely on what was known about the cultures they came from or on what the investigator knew about his or her music which was then projected onto the music under study.

One of the most powerful of these assumptions was the homogeneity of the musical cultures under study. The music was believed to be governed by a unitary musical system in a manner analogous to the way a unitary linguistic system governed all utterances in a monolingual community. This assumption became the principal basis for analysis in ethnomusicology. It

remained in force until the third quarter of the 20th century even as the ethnographic information that had supported it no longer applied, and even as the circumstances that had made it defensible and necessary originally had already been altered by technology, developments in transportation, world events, and new findings in the social sciences.

By the end of the Second World War, it had become evident that boundaries guarding the insularity of simple societies had in fact been less than wholly insular or had become fluid and porous. A rapid decline in the number of such societies – ethnomusicology's traditional 'hunting grounds' – followed. To the dramatic shrinkage of its territory and the rapid incursion of urban areas, ethnomusicology responded in two ways. First, it adjusted its description of the music it studied by shifting its focus from the 'primitive' and 'exotic' to the folk and traditional musics of the non-Western world. In so doing, it broadened the scope of its subject matter. But more importantly, it attenuated – and eventually removed – the requisite cultural distance between the culture of the music investigated and that of the investigator.

This underappreciated development[5] facilitated the second response. Ethnomusicologists began to work in cities, familiar environment if not home to many of them. They were motivated, however, not by an interest in the urban as such but by an interest in following the musics they had traditionally studied as 'the folk' – the music makers and users – migrated to cities. To all intents and purposes, therefore, the progress that came in the form of expanding fieldwork sites to include urban areas produced little conceptual and methodological change.

By the 1970s, the practice of studying folk and traditional music in cities while ignoring the urban as the music's sociocultural context began to raise important questions. Articles such as *Is there a folk in the city?* (Dorson 1971) and *The folkness of the nonfolk and the nonfolkness of the folk* (Seeger 1977) exemplified the growing discomfort created by the lack of fit between the

5 It is often forgotten that the focus on the 'primitive' and the 'exotic' as objects of ethnomusicological investigation derived from European colonial attitudes and from ideas drawn from theories of evolution. They therefore had strong intellectual and ideological roots which conditioned the way ethnomusicologists, almost all Westerners until the mid 20th century, regarded their subjects of study. To anthropologists and ethnomusicologists, there was the added cache of the romantic (Fox 1972). The transition from a commitment to the culturally and geographically distant, with all its associations, to the urban was thus tantamount to a transition from the almost-mysterious to the commonplace. The difficulty of the transition had its methodological consequences.

prevailing notions of 'folk'[6] and the realities of the urban area to which the folk had migrated. In a very real sense, ethnomusicology was caught between, on the one hand, the undeniability of changes in the character of the environment in which the musics now functioned, and, on the other, the assumption about such musics that did not take those changes into account but was nonetheless difficult to abandon. Thus, the oppositions between the rural and the urban, between habitual ways of thinking and contemporary realities persisted.

Even after ethnomusicology had laid to rest its insistence on non-Western environments, even when ethnomusicologists found themselves in field sites then unfamiliar to ethnomusicology, methods based on the old assumptions hardly deviated from established practice. This was rationalised through a tacit insistence that migrant musics are not native to urban areas; they are replications of the music of the non-urban cultures from which they originally came – cultures that ethnomusicology had traditionally studied. The music, therefore, continued to be conceptualised as rural, albeit an unusual kind of rural music (Nettl 1975: 18).

Maintaining this way of thinking meant adherence to the belief that the musical lives of migrants now resettled in cities retain their pre-migration forms, or adapt only to the extent necessary to maintain what was presumed to be the authenticity of their music in an alien or threatening environment. It meant arguing that the culture of origin is the context within which the music is to be explained; not the urban area to where the music and their makers and users have migrated, and where these now live and may have lived perhaps for generations.

The consequences of pursuing this line of thought are obvious. First, a methodology that ignores or defies relevant information on something that is as observable and verifiable as the urban setting invites skepticism. Reducing the urban to insignificance in studies of urban musical phenomena is such an instance. Second, the risk of distortion in the image of the music and of the city in which it resides is high. "When studies of music *have* taken place in a city, they have rarely given much specific consideration to the urban environment as such, but have concentrated rather on enclaves that have preserved authentic rural traditions …" (Nettl 1978: 5; italics in original). Confining the study of presumably rural musics to enclaves for the sake of reproducing the music's original environment is a manipulation of data

6 "'Folk' in the traditional sense means *vulgus in populo* … rural people living in little communities in the countryside […] Relatively isolated from the more progressive urban centers, the folk […] accepts outside impulses only to a limited extent, adjusting them to the traditional pattern" (Degh commenting on Dorson 1971: 53).

that is, at best, of dubious value. And presuming that enclaves represent the totality of urban influences on a music is no less so.

Thus, there came about a serious disconnect between ethnomusicologists' pursuit of the homogeneous in the folk and the traditional musics they had customarily studied, and the environment in which they now sought those musics: a sociocultural milieu that is intrinsically heterogeneous.

Habits of mind are not all that account for the above developments, but they were a powerful force in the pace at which those developments unfolded and in the direction they took. Such habits go a long way toward explaining how urban areas, observable and open to investigation as they are, were nonetheless ignored for a long time as contexts for musical life. The assumption of homogeneity, by virtue of its function as premise, operated largely outside conscious methodological control. Together, these habits became what the linguist, Paul Friedrich, called debilitating premises – premises that had once been "wisely accepted […] [as] part of the intellectual history of a field of knowledge" (Friedrich 1979: 2) but had become debilitating through habitual and uncritical use.

These were the contingencies that pushed the study of urban musical phenomena outside of ethnomusicology's normal practice to a place where the past, particularly its insistence on the explanatory potential of sociocultural context, can be explored anew and where the present can be seen from a refreshed perspective. These were the contingencies that led to urban ethnomusicology.

CITIES, CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND URBAN ETHNOMUSICOLOGY

Cities are the paramount exemplars of the urban area. They are also relatively easy to identify; individual cities are named and they have designated boundaries. Along with the city, as the category to which they belong, cities will be my focus as a context for music and musical life.

In all their forms, cities are distinguished by the heterogeneity of their population, the density of human interactions that take place in a relatively small space, and the complex dynamics that govern human relations as well as the relations between the city's people and the city as the place where they live. Many more attributes – demographic, economic, or administrative – have been proposed as distinctive of cities, but this paper will focus on one that is of particular interest to ethnomusicology – its cultural diversity.

The sociologist, Louis Wirth, offered what he called a 'minimal definition' of the city. It is a "relatively large, dense, and permanent settlement of socially heterogeneous individuals" (Wirth 1969: 148). But it is not, as

Robert Park, the leader of the Chicago School for urban studies has pointed out, a mere physical entity. It is a:

> state of mind, a body of customs and traditions, and of the organised attitudes and sentiments that inhere in these customs and are transmitted with this tradition. […] It is involved in the vital process of the people who compose [the city which] is a product of nature, and particularly of human nature. (Park 1969a: 91)

The city, therefore, is place and people bound by relations of reciprocity; the one shapes the other and vice versa.

Most, if not all, cities owe their demographic density more to migration[7], than to internal growth (birth rates); urban dwellers tend to be more mobile than their rural counterparts. Hence, in the city, the association of native-ness with membership in a culture is far from automatic; cultural identity is more fluid and multiplex in cities. Identity markers – rituals, institutions, symbols – are not easily transferable from one cultural context to another. Establishing them and then maintaining them is made difficult by the character of migration to cities and their effects on human relations. Migrants seldom come in sufficient numbers from the same region of the country from which they migrated. This pattern reinforces the predominance of non-kin relations in cities. What emerges as ethnic culture is thus almost inevitably a composite of elements from the 'old country' and those created by contingencies in the new home.

Voluntary migrants (as opposed to forced migrants, often called refugees or asylees, who often constitute mass population movements) gravitate toward cities for the wide range of opportunities – economic, cultural, educational, etc. – that cities offer. The relative anonymity that a large and mobile population affords allows newcomers to adjust to a new way of life or to create their own without attracting too much attention. At the same time, that very diversity makes possible encountering people or groups among whom one can find a sense of belonging. All these factors have historically made the city:

> a most favorable breeding ground of new […] cultural hybrids. […] It has brought together people from the ends of the earth because they are different and thus useful to one another, rather than because they are homogeneous and like-minded. (Wirth 1969: 150)

7 Migration is used here in its generic sense; it includes in-migration, emigration and immigration.

Whether or not one agrees with Wirth's view of why people migrate to cities, the hybridisation that is bred by cultural difference is hard to dispute. Borrowing, appropriation, cross-fertilisation, fusion, border-crossing and similar terms all suggest some form of hybridisation or exchange on every level of social and musical life. It is an almost inescapable consequence of location, its effects on human relations and the products that result from those relations. Being where culturally diverse groups are thrown together in close quarters over a period of time in an environment where difference encourages – even demands – adaptive creative activity.

Everything that has been said so far argues *against* the validity of discounting the city as context for the musical universe that takes shape in the city as part of its cultural life. But more importantly, it argues *for* the need to go beyond the components of urban life – its ethnic and regional groups, the different forms of expressive culture (e.g., music, literature, the visual and performing arts) – and to study their relations. The dynamic processes at work in those relations are what mould a culturally heterogeneous population into a cohesive and coherent social organism. In these processes, I think, lies the key to understanding urban culture as such – as a distinctive whole that is not just the sum of separate cultural 'islands', each occupying its part of the city's geography. That whole is not merely a locus. It is a focus of investigation, an essential ingredient in the creation of urban musical phenomena that functions beyond the specificities of ethnic and regional identity.

BRIDGING PAST AND PRESENT

Insights into the past can be difficult to translate into strategies for dealing with new realities. Apart from some of the impediments discussed above, the wealth of information that the literature offers can be confusing and overwhelming. I would therefore like to return to an article mentioned earlier in this paper which, to my mind, encapsulates an intellectual journey from familiar terrain to a frontier, from the scholar's mastery of his discipline's normal practice to a confrontation with challenges to the expectations that normal practice raises. The account serves as an abbreviated account of a transition that could serve as a metaphor for ethnomusicology's transition from a simple society-oriented discipline to one that is face-to-face with the complexity of societies ethnomusicology must now deal with – a complexity that is exemplified by the city.

Richard M. Dorson was an eminent scholar, a historian, who eventually became best known as a folklorist.[8] At about the time when anthropologists, folklorists, and ethnomusicologists were grappling with the issue of the urban, and its relevance to their respective disciplines, Dorson wrote the article *Is there a folk in the city*? (Dorson 1971). It was based on fieldwork in the city of Gary, Indiana in the United States. As was the case with most ethnomusicologists then, Richard Dorson's frame of reference and point of departure was folk society, specifically that of North Uist in Scotland which Dorson described as a simple, rural society, "a classic illustration of […] the concept of folk" (Dorson 1971: 21).

Gary was clearly a contrastive case. Its population was described as heterogeneous; a complex of ethnic and regional groups. Following a common pattern, Dorson organised his research according to the major groups: Serbs, Croats, Greeks, 'Latino', i. e. Puerto Ricans and Mexicans. His findings straddled old expectations and new observations. 'Genre folklore' – those forms conventionally collected by folklorists such as songs and narratives – were becoming "increasingly displaced by other kinds of oral tradition" (Dorson 1971: 42). This did not mean that folk culture was about to disappear. Folk culture, Dorson noted, was in fact 'present and pervasive', its manifestations organised[9] by churches and civic organisations around festivals, saints' day and national holiday celebrations, and cuisine. It was thus evident that transformations were taking place. These, Dorson implied, were attributable to social dynamics in Gary that involved more than a linear process of migration, preservation and maintenance, or decline and eventual disappearance of traditional practices. He concluded that "city folk are different from the country folk of yesteryear …" (Dorson 1971: 52). In other words, the folk can no longer be presumed to be an undifferentiated population that is resistant to change. The difference is expressed in the opposition country-city, a parallel to the more familiar rural-urban opposition.

This conclusion put Dorson at a methodological frontier. It challenged the assumption that migrants from rural areas retain their character as

8 In the United States, the relations between ethnomusicology, anthropology, and folklore are particularly close. Many members in the *Society for Ethnomusicology* are also members in the societies of the two other disciplines and vice versa, and many articles by ethnomusicologists are published in the journals of anthropology and folklore.

9 In her comments to the article when it was initially presented as a paper, the folklorist Linda Degh used the term 'fabricated' in lieu of 'organised', and included the media and voluntary associations as agents for the propagation of cultural practices. (Degh's comments were appended to Dorson 1971.)

members of the same rural culture from which they came, support for which necessitates disavowing the role of the urban in the life they now live. Dorson's response was to espouse neither position: migrants from rural to urban areas did not need to be denied their rural roots; neither did the effects of their urban residence need to be ignored. In differentiating between country and city folk, he put both members of a pair in binary opposition, where (as in linguistics) one member does not reject or invalidate the other but, through contrast, illumines it. As a pair, they share some general facts. As opposites, the members of the pair de-emphasise what they share to call attention instead to how they contrast with each other. Thus, what C. Seeger called 'folkness' is shared by country and city folk, but under certain conditions, what they do not share is what becomes significant.

To better appreciate the bridge from the past to the present that Dorson had constructed, and to explore its implications for urban ethnomusicology today, let us review the particularly instructive facets of Dorson's article.

First, Dorson, noting his past-orientedness by referring to his work in North Uist, began with what was customary. He looked for 'old familiar genres' that replicated forms from the culture of origin. In her commentary to Dorson's paper, Linda Degh, referred to those forms as "the vanishing relics of the traditional and self-contained ways of life preserved in various isolated enclaves" (Dorson 1971: 53–54). The interest in conservation is unmistakable. Without re-contextualizing the forms, these were placed in their historic rather than their contemporary context.

Second, Gary, Indiana as host society to the migrant groups under study, was not accorded the role of a majority; hence, there was no reference to minority groups. In the absence of a majority, the different ethnic groups were studied not as minorities but as isolates – as wholes in themselves. A very important set of processes with great explanatory potential – those revealed by majority-minority relations – was missed as a consequence.

Up to this point, Dorson was following 'normal practice'. But more questions seemed to emerge than could be answered by that practice. These led Dorson to explore other ways of thinking about familiar phenomena.

1) Along with the displacement of old forms, Dorson noted what he called a 'new lore'. Instead of themes and concerns drawn from each group's rural life – themes that would have been group-specific and hence, different from each other – Dorson noted themes that cut across those differences. There were stories about working in the steel industry (which employed many of the migrants); about the problems of communicating among different ethnic groups, about crime and shared fears. These were clearly urban concerns that transcended group differences and referred to Gary as a shared environment that gave the groups a common living

experience. These were data that led Dorson to acknowledge the city as the context without which it would be impossible to explain the 'new lore' or excise it as insignificant. Taking the city as context, in turn, allowed him to accept the differences between city folk and country folk within the framework of a shared 'folkness'.

2) In a section of the article that he titled *Urban Synthesis* he noted the boundaries that created "ethnic separation" (Dorson 1971: 45). Dorson dealt with what seemed to be conflicting processes through the concept of cultural pluralism. The term had quantitative and qualitative connotations. Whereas the quantitative was immediately observable in the number of groups studied separately, the qualitative was an acknowledgment of group interaction. It was an acknowledgment that separateness in urban life is not absolute but relative and contingent. This was evident in the way the groups Dorson studied crossed each other's 'zones'; but the degree to which they were allowed to do so varied on different levels. Certain groups, for example, may mingle and socialise freely but tolerance and social integration stopped short of intermarriage. Marriage was a 'zone' where the inclusionary tendencies in other zones no longer apply; marriage was a zone where exclusionary tendencies became the rule.

At this point, it is clear that Dorson had either stretched normal practice or stepped outside its boundaries.

Like cultural diversity, cultural pluralism also presupposes a number of culture groups engaged in social interaction. But the two terms differ in emphasis. Pluralism leans toward ethnic separation (the exclusionary aspect of the uniqueness that Dorson attributed to each of the groups); while diversity underscores the inclusionary aspects of the group interaction that he later observed. Indeed, the difference may not be readily visible on the surface, but the distinctions are useful for analytic purposes. Inclusivity and exclusivity can alternate rather quickly or may operate simultaneously on different social levels in the course of daily life in the urban environment.

It is important to note that what Dorson saw in Gary was not specific to that location and to that particular society. I saw it in the course of fieldwork undertaken in New York City at roughly the same time that Dorson was doing his fieldwork in Gary (late 1960s, early 1970s).

In East Harlem, a section of Manhattan in New York City which was then predominantly Latino (Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Cubans) and African-American, members of the community, regardless of ethnic affiliation, participated in a weekly activity intended to fight drug trafficking and drug use in the community. People gathered in an easily accessible

place – a church or a school – and then marched in procession to a place where drug-related activities were said to be going on. There, the procession stopped, the participants sang and danced together to bring the location to the attention of the community. The intent was to bring what was hidden, clandestine, or possibly criminal to public notice, to put the people involved to shame, and in general, to discourage association with the designated place. The rallying song of the community groups was *We shall overcome*, which became nationally known when it became associated with the civil rights movement of the 1960s. In East Harlem, for the activity just described, the verses of the song were sung alternately in English and Spanish to signify a community-wide, non-ethnic-group-specific initiative.

At the same time, on another issue, many of the same people who participated as members of a solidary community in the anti-drug campaign broke down into opposing groups when confronted with government-supported English-as-a-second-language programmes. Seen as benefiting only the Latinos, the programmes in essence drew a line that separated Latinos from African Americans.

THE CITY TODAY

From the legacy of the past through the transition to the present, represented in a single piece of research by an individual scholar and packed in a nutshell in Dorson's article, two things come into view: 1) we catch a glimpse of the time it takes to become conscious of habits of mind and to address them; and 2) we see the place to which that transition from past to present has taken us. We have entered a field marked prominently by complexity not in the common sense meaning of the term as complicated or difficult to solve, but in a more recent usage according to which nonlinearity is an essential component.

Patterns of behavior that exemplify inclusionary and exclusionary processes are not difficult to discern once the strictures of normal practice are put in proper perspective.[10] They are part of the social dynamics that accommodate and order difference for the sake of creating and maintaining a cohesive whole in places like cities where heterogeneity and cultural diversity prevail. They are part of the binary oppositions – the global and the local, the cosmopolitanism and the provincialism, the majority and the minority –

10 Other examples are in Reyes Schramm 1975 and 1982 (New York City), Reyes 1999 (Vietnamese in the Philippines and the United States), and forthcoming (Sudanese and Ugandans in Kampala).

that give urban life its character. They are what make the heterogeneity of the city systemic and orderly.

I began this paper with pairs of terms – preservation-proliferation, homogeneity-heterogeneity – each pair separated by the word 'to' as though they represented a point of departure and a destination. This is the way those pairs of words have been commonly presented, as one following the other in some kind of narrative progression or as one replacing the other. The 'quantum leaps' seemed to reinforce the sense of linearity and unidirectionality. I hope that the discussion that followed served to present an alternative way of thinking, namely, taking those pairs as binary oppositions presented to the ethnomusicological mind for consideration. For ethnomusicology's world has now come closer to the city as a model of the context in which more and more of the musics we study reside. It is a context that conforms to what the Nobel laureate Murray Gell-Mann called a complex adaptive system which is characterised by a "mix of simplicity and complexity, regularity and randomness, order and disorder" (Gell-Mann 1994: 119–20). It is a mix that the city as a complex adaptive mechanism requires, for too much order and regularity stifles the incentive to innovate while a sense of disorder and irregularity provokes the social organism to respond adaptively and creatively to the heterogeneity and cultural diversity that are inherent in urban environments.

> United Nations experts […] say [in 2000] that their early projections show that… the European Union as a whole [would need] about 35 million immigrants if the Europeans want to keep their ratio of older people to active workers at the 1995 levels; the Union would need 135 million immigrants by 2025. (Crosette 2000: 1)

Ten years earlier, the distinguished Polish philosopher and historian of ideas, Leszek Kolakowski had written:

> There is no doubt […] that without so many religiously or politically motivated expulsions and self-expulsions, without all those wanderers and refugees, European intellectual and artistic life would be much different from what it is. […]We have to accept, however reluctantly, the simple fact that we live in an age of refugees, of migrants, vagrants, nomads […]. (Kolakowski 1990: 58–59)

Growing urbanisation has given us an inevitably and necessarily culturally diverse population and with it, a culturally diverse musical life. Interactions among a culturally diverse population constitute some of the most complex and challenging kinds of social dynamics that make cities not only highly

promising environments for creating, performing, using and marketing music. They are also laboratories for the study of collective human behaviour – for music as cultural expression, as something we might make our own as individuals but "whose meaning entirely comes from its being in the public world" (Toulmin 1995: 193).

If we owe anything to the urban area, it is an awareness of a new (ethnomusicological) reality. In compelling us to confront a complex musical world, urban ethnomusicology as the study of urban musical phenomena, arouses something that may be dormant in us – that tendency demonstrated by a line of thinkers from Galileo to Charles Sanders Peirce to Alfred North Whitehead: "to make relations the primary reality and relata secondary" (Shapiro 1991: 18), to make cultural diversity a system of relations that creates a dynamic musical world and challenges ethnomusicology to bring to it a fresh perspective.

References

Adler, Guido. 1885. Umfang, Methode, und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft. *Vierteljahresschrift für Musikwissenschaft 1:* 5–20.

Crossette, Barbara. 2000. Europe Stares at a Future Built by Immigrants. *The New York Times,* 2nd January: 1, 4, Week in Review.

Niederkorn, William S. 2002. A scholar recants on his "Shakespeare" discovery. *New York Times,* 20th June, Arts section, Midwest edition.

Dorson, Richard M. 1971. Is there a folk in the city? In *The Urban Experience and Folk Tradition,* ed. Americo Paredes and Ellen Stekert, 21–64. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Fox, Richard. 1972. Rationale and romance in urban anthropology. *Urban Anthropology* 1(2): 205–233.

Friedrich, Paul. 1979. The Symbol and Its Relative Non-Arbitrariness. In *Language, Context and the Imagination. Essays by Paul Friedrich,* ed. Anwar Dil, 1–61. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Gell-Mann, Murray. 1994. *The Quark and the Jaguar. Adventures in the Simple and the Complex.* New York: W. H. Freeman and Co.

Kendall, Sir Maurice. 1974. The Exploding City: Facts and Theories. *The Exploding Cities.* Transcript of a conference sponsored by the United Nations Fund for Population Acitivities and The Sunday Times (London). Worcester College and the Taylor Institution: Oxford, 1st–6th April.

Kolakowski, Leszek. 1990. *Modernity on Endless Trial.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,* 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Originally published 1962.

Lewis, Martin W. and Karen E. Wigen. 1977. *The Myth of Continents. A Critique of Metageography.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mugglestone, Erica. 1981. Guido Adler's "The Scope, Method, and Aim of Musicology" (1885). An English Translation with an Historico-Analytic Commentary. *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 13, 1–21.

Nettl, Bruno. 1975. The State of Research in Orally Transmitted Music. *Working Papers of the XXIIIrd Conference of the International Folk Music Council* (no. 1), Regensburg: IFMC.

—, ed. 1978. *Eight Urban Musical Cultures,* Urbana, IL: The University of Illinois Press.

—. 2006. We're on the Map. Reflections on SEM in 1955 and 2005. *Ethnomusicology* 50(2): 179–189.

Nietschmann, Bernard. 1998. Wrong Division. *Natural History,* April: 6–8.

Paredes, Americo and Ellen J. Stekert, ed. 1971. *The Urban Experience and Folk Tradition.* Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

Park, Robert. 1969a. The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment. In *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities,* ed. Richard Sennett, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 91–130. Originally published 1916.

—. 1969b. Human Migration and the Marginal Man. In *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities,* ed. Richard Sennett, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 131–142. Originally published 1928.

Reyes, Adelaida. Forthcoming. Asymmetrical Relations, Conflict, and Music as Human Response. In *Music in Conflict: Ethnomusicological Perspectives*, ed. John Morgan O'Connell and Salwa el-Shawan Castelo Branco. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

—. 2007. "Introduction" and "Urban Ethnomusicology Revisited". In *Cultural Diversity in the Urban Area: Explorations in Urban Ethnomusicology,* ed. Ursula Hemetek and Adelaida Reyes, 9–24. Vienna: Institut für Volksmusikforschung und Ethnomusikologie.

—. 1999. *Songs of the Caged, Songs of the Free.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Reyes Schramm, Adelaida. 1975. *The Role of Music in the Interaction of Black Americans and Hispanos in New York City's East Harlem.* Unpublished Ph. D. diss. (Music), Columbia University.

—. 1982. Explorations in Urban Ethnomusicology: Hard Lessons from the Spectacularly Ordinary. In *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 14, 1–14. (Japanese translation in *Eureka*, 1990, Tokyo).

Seeger, Charles. 1977. The folkness of the nonfolk and the nonfolkness of the folk. In *Studies in Musicology 1935–1975,* 335–343. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press. Originally published 1966.

Sennett, Richard. 1969. An Introduction. In *Classic Essays on the Cuture of Cities,* 3–19. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shapiro, Michael. 1991. *The Sense of Change. Language as History.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Toulmin, Stephen. 1995. Descartes, Descartes … In *A Glorious Accident. Understanding Our Place in the Cosmic Puzzle,* ed. Wim Kayzer, 177–210. New York: W. H. Freeman and Co.

von Hornbostel, Erich Moritz. 1975. Die Probleme der Vergleichenden Musikwissenschaft/ The Problems of Comparative Musicology (English translation by Richard Campbell). *Hornbostel Opera Omnia*, ed. Klaus Wachsmann, Dieter Christensen, Hans-Peter Reinecke. 247–270. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. Originally published 1905.

Weber, Max. 1958. *The City*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press. Originally published 1921.

Wirth, Louis. 1969. Urbanism as a way of life. In *Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities,* ed. Richard Sennett, 143–164. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.