

10 FROM SCHIZOPHONIA TO SCHISMOGENESIS: ON THE DISCOURSES AND COMMODIFICATION PRACTICES OF "WORLD MUSIC" AND "WORLD BEAT"

S
T
E
V
E
N
Z
E
F
E
L
D

In every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized, and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality.

—Michel Foucault

Struggles over musical propriety are themselves political struggles over whose music, whose images of pleasure or beauty, whose rules of order shall prevail.

—Susan McClary

This chapter concerns "struggles over musical propriety" in the "production of discourse[s]" on "world music" and "world beat." In the first part of the essay I'm concerned to reveal a complex layering of representations and investments from voices who position themselves variously as academics, journalists, fans, musicians, indigenous peoples, critics, music industry insiders, and consumers. This overview of discursive practices, through critical reading and textual juxtaposition, reveals a play of shared and contested assumptions about what outcomes are at stake and about who is perceived to speak authoritatively and thus allowed to characterize, implicitly or polemically, such relative positions as "inside" versus "outside," "elite" versus "vernacular," "theoretical" versus "experiential," "progressive" versus "mainstream," "hegemonic" versus "counterhegemonic." The intertwining of these discourses indexes a social process of meaning negotiation; I employ the trope "schizophonia to schismogenesis"

to describe some dynamics of the mutualistic process by which ever more commercial and noncommercial music is subsumed under the heading of "global culture" (Featherstone 1990).

The second part of the paper infuses the discussion with a specific example of world music commodification, as I review my role in producing a commercial CD representing a "remote," "ethnographic" music culture and environment. My concern here is to locate the problematics of the larger narrative trope not merely as abstractions about discursive elsewheres but concretely in the practices surrounding the production and distribution of recordings. In the current "global ecumene" (Hanerz 1989), where cultural interactions are characterized by increasingly complex exchanges of people, technology, money, media, and ideology (Appadurai 1990), transcultural record productions tell specific stories about accountability, authorship, and agency, about the workings of capital, control, and compromise, and about the strategies and possibilities for valuing indigeneity as something more than essentialized otherness or generic opposition and resistance. By telling one such story I insert my own reflexively contextualized range of meanings into the discursive formation analyzed in the first part of the paper. My personal account is thus meant to traverse and link two sets of participatory spaces—that of the reader, analyst-critic, and consumer, and that of the producer, author, and advocate.

"Schizophonia refers to the split between an original sound and its electroacoustical transmission or reproduction," writes Canadian composer Murray Schafer, introducing his terminology of soundscape research and acoustic ecology in *The Tuning of the World* (1977c:90). While the tone of the term indicates Schafer's suspiciously anxious view of the impact of technology on musical practices and sound environments, it also has the familiar devolutionary ring of mass culture criticism. Schafer laments a deterioration in world acoustic ecology from hi-fi to lo-fi soundscapes, a proliferation of noise corresponding to the increased separation of sounds from sources since the invention of phonographic recording. His scheme is straightforward: Sounds once were indexically linked to their particular times and places, sources, moments of enunciation, and human and instrumental mechanisms. Early technology for acoustic capture and reproduction fueled a preexisting fascination with acoustic dislocations and respatialization. Territorial expansion,

imperialistic ambition, and audio technology as agent and indicator increasingly came together, culminating in the invention of the loudspeaker. Then came public-address systems, radio expansion, and after the second world war, the tape recorder, which made possible a new and unprecedented level of editing via splicing manipulation such that sounds could be endlessly altered or rearranged yet made to have the illusion of seamless, unbroken spatial and temporal contiguity. Summarizing his concept Schafer writes:

I coined the term schizophonia in *The New Soundscape* [1969] intending it to be a nervous word. Related to schizophrenia, I wanted it to convey the same sense of aberration and drama. Indeed, the overkill of hi-fi gadgetry not only contributes generously to the lo-fi problem, but it creates a synthetic soundscape in which natural sounds are becoming increasingly unnatural while machine-made substitutes are providing the operative signals directing modern life. (Schafer 1977c:91)

If Schafer were writing his book now, he would no doubt see digital sampling, CD-ROM, and the ability to record, edit, reorganize, and own any sound from any source as the final stage of schizophonia—total portability, transportability, and transmutability of any and all sonic environments. But for the moment forget this after-the-deluge rhetoric and the many social complexities Schafer ignores, such as the occasional hijacking of musical technology to empower traditionally powerless people and to strengthen their local musical bases. Rather, focus on the sense of nervousness in Schafer's lovely and precise *schiz-* word and what it means to evoke: mediated music, commodified grooves, sounds split from sources, consumer products with few if any contextual linkages to the processes, practices, and forms of participation that could give them meaning within local communities.

Schafer's schizophonia idea recalls Walter Benjamin's celebrated essay of forty years earlier, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." Although Benjamin's concern with the transformation from unique to plural existences centered upon visual-material art objects, his critical interest in "aura"—what is lost from an original once it is reproduced—first raised the assumption that also anchors Schafer, that "the work of art reproduced becomes the work of art designed for reproducibility" (Benjamin 1969:224). This view, in which social relations are announced in the codes of aesthetic inscription, has been most strongly

enunciated for music in Jacques Attali's *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*, where he argues that "repeating," the transformation from representation to reproduction in music, creates a new network for social organization:

In this network, each spectator has a solitary relation with a material object; the consumption of music is individualized, a simulacrum of ritual sacrifice, a blind spectacle. The network is no longer a form of sociality, an opportunity for spectators to meet and communicate, but rather a tool making the individualized stockpiling of music possible on a large scale. Here again, the new network first appears in music as the herald of a new stage in the organization of capitalism, that of the repetitive mass production of all social relations. (Attali 1985:32)

Like Benjamin's "aura" or Baudrillard's "signature" (1975, 1981) in the visual mode, Attali's "repeating" (1985:87–132) and Schafer's "schizophonia" help us focus critically not just on the process of splitting but on the consequent status of the "copy" and contestation of its "authenticity" as it seeks to partake of the "legitimacy" granted to an "original." The jeopardy to primal originality posed by reproductive technologies, once more a centerpiece of high-culture critical discourses on the vulgarity of popular culture, is now more substantially situated in the discourses of cultural analysis, mediation, and commodification. Schizophonia thus needs to be imagined processually, not as a monolithic move in the history of technology, but as varied practices located in the situations, flows, phases, and circulation patterns that characterize particular cultural objects moving in and out of short and long commodity states, transforming with the experiential and material situation of producers, exchangers, and consumers (Appadurai 1986), located in historically specific national and global positions vis-à-vis late capitalism and "development" (Castoriadis 1985), cultural domination (Schiller 1976), modernity and postmodernity (Berman 1983; Harvey 1989).

In the world of popular musical traffic such issues are centrally and critically grounded in the international ascendancy of the recording industries. In "The Industrialization of Popular Music" Simon Frith's typically broad strokes help to reposition schizophonia in the larger techno-economic arena of the pop music business: "The contrast between music-as-expression and music-as-commodity defines twentieth-century pop experience and means that however much we may use and enjoy its products, we retain a sense that the music industry is a bad

thing—bad for music, bad for us. Read any pop history and you'll find in outline the same sorry tale" (Frith 1988:11). Frith's own outline of the devolutionary shift from active music making to passive pop consumption (Frith 1986, 1981) sets up that straw version in order to forcefully defend both technology, arguing for the importance of rock as a mediated art form, and consumer tastes and choices, countering elitist assumptions about standardization and the passivity of pop music consumption. But Frith also retreats to a more ideologically stable bit of rock-critic turf:

Pop is a classic case of what Marx called alienation: Something human is taken from us and returned in the form of a commodity. Songs and singers are fetishized, made magical, and we can only reclaim them through possession, via a cash transaction in the market place. In the language of rock criticism, what's at issue here is the *truth* of music—truth to the people who created it, truth to our experience. What's bad about the music industry is the layer of deceit and hype and exploitation it places between us and our creativity. (Frith 1988:12)

These defenses of technology and of the rock consumer speak to the preoccupation in cultural studies with refiguring the Adorno-Frankfurt school dogmas on production, standardization, consumption, and passivity that typified much of the earlier academic pop music literature. But to move into the world arena it is necessary to move past two general problems with this angle on the industrialization of music. Frith repeatedly uses the word "pop" when what he typically means is "rock" and, specifically, the internationally marketed American- and western European-derived rock of the last thirty-five years. Generalizations about "pop" involve additional complexities when one attempts to account for the larger *world* popular musical picture with regard to industrialization. Similarly, Frith's notion of a popular music "colonized by commerce" takes on a *different range of meanings* when we move beyond rock to concretely observe third- and fourth-world realities, where people and music really have been colonized and not only by commerce. What is crucial here is a view of world music industrialization that views power relations as shaping forces in the production of musical styles and icons of cultural identity.

Like Schafer's "sounds split from sources," Frith's notion of "truth to the people who created it" has particular consequences when the sounds, sources, and creators are truly exotic to the overwhelming majority

of their potential consumers. This is because enormous genres of sonic otherness from the reservations beyond Western European-derived art and popular musics are unlike other mediated popular musics and specifically unlike rock in major ways. In the bush, at the outposts and edges of empire, grass-roots musical styles and distribution have long sung undulating melodies of resistance and accommodation to the hegemonic rhythms of international copyright law and the practices of record companies. Moreover, exotic world musics will always be financially and aesthetically remote from the historical loci of international recording consolidation—control and ownership of approximately ninety-three percent of the world musical sales market is now concentrated among six European–North American–Japanese companies: Time-Warner, CBS-Sony, MCA, Thorn-EMI, BMG/RCA, and Philips-Polygram. The vertical and horizontal integration of the music production and publishing industries, of technology ownership and production control, has been closely linked to the power centers of technological invention in the West and, more recently, Japan (Boyer 1988). Western art, rock, and pop stars have, in the last twenty-five years, shared in that market growth in ways that are generally unknown and almost unbelievable outside of the West, even, say, in comparison to a non-Western star of the stature of Ravi Shankar.

Jon Pareles, in his *New York Times* Pop View column (19 March 1990), considers the “larger means fewer” world of music business consolidation as concentrating power vis-à-vis promotion, investment, distribution, and overall control: “As the record business enters the 1990’s it has developed a two-tiered system. Independent labels handle specialized styles and new performers—they have almost taken over scouting for talent and test marketing it—while the majors grab proven contenders.” This market strategy, a good illustration of Frith’s “coloniz[ation] by commerce,” is particularly colonial in the realm of world music. Consolidation leads to a profit strategy based on huge single hits rather than a variety of projects or broad dissemination of myriad musics. Huge hits inevitably come from a small group of pop stars who hold major label contracts and receive industry support and promotion commensurate with their sales histories and potentials.

Schizophrenia gets intensively schizoid here because of the ways the splitting of sounds from sources simultaneously implicates matters of music, money, geography, time, race, and social class. Still, many (some would argue most) researchers and writers have stressed the optimistic aspects of world musical contact and industrialization. Frith, for example,

in his introduction to *World Music, Politics, and Social Change*, a collection of early-1980s conference papers from the International Association for the Study of Popular Music, writes: "The essays here celebrate, then, the richness of local music scenes, and document the remarkable skill, vigour and imagination with which local musicians and fans and entrepreneurs take over 'hegemonic' pop forms for themselves. Popular music, even in the era of Sony-CBS, MTV-Europe, and Michael Jackson as global Pepsi salesman, is still a progressive, empowering, democratic force" (1989:5). And Andrew Goodwin and Joe Gore, writing about the debate over world beat and cultural imperialism in *Socialist Review*, conclude, "Although World Beat is itself largely an effect of . . . cultural imperialism . . . the complexity of the *results* of such practices are demonstrated in . . . transculturation" (1990:77), a position curiously close to Bruno Nettl's (1985) more mainstream ethnomusicological cheer for the world of "unprecedented" musical diversity. Such perspectives, drawing on the more normative conceptualization of a world in creolization (Hannerz 1987), risk confusing the flow of musical contents and musical expansion with the flow of power relations. Even if local musicians take control in remote locales, how progressive can the world of popular music be when the practices of a transnational culture industry steadfastly reproduce the forms and forces of domination that keep outsiders outside, as "influences" and laborers in the production of pop?

The commodification of world musics in the international marketplace intensified in the 1980s. Musics once very "other" are now entirely familiar. John Szwed's 1982 review of the *WOMAD Music and Rhythm* compilation record introduced the word "ethnomusicology" to the readers of the *Village Voice*, then just as quickly dismissed its modernist purism: "Who needs a Ph.D. when there are enough record stores stocked with product in New York, Tokyo, Miami, London, and Paris to give you permanent culture shock?" In a similar vein, here's the lead-in from an *Option* magazine series on world music in 1990:

Bored with the music you're listening to? Why not invite a Kenyan wedding band or a turbaned troupe of gypsies from the villages of the Nile into your living room? Musical treasures from the world's far-flung regions abound in record stores these days. And most of the credit for that goes to a few intrepid souls within the fringes of the pop music establishment, people who have devoted years to the thorny proposition of bringing state-of-the-art world music recordings to a mass culture. Ten years ago the international bin was populated

with high-priced French imports and muffled recordings on labels like Folkways, Nonesuch Explorer and Lyrichord—most of these licensed for a song from hungry ethnomusicologists out to cash in on their fieldwork. These releases tended to be academic, with sliced-up three minute selections, abrupt beginnings and endings, and didactic liner notes, stiff with classifications and musicological jargon. Not anymore. Aside from international pop, which has become an industry unto itself, traditional music veterans like Nonesuch Explorer and Lyrichord are forging into the CD market. But now they are being overtaken by more savvy and ambitious explorers, most notably Globestyle Records, the brainchild of restless musician and field recorder Ben Mandelson; Rykodisc's World Series, masterminded by Grateful Dead drummer Mickey Hart; and Real World Records, a project steered by Peter Gabriel in collaboration with WOMAD (World of Music Arts and Dance). These three new forces have no hangups about what is classical, traditional, folk, or pop. They are guided by a belief that the world's great music, presented right, can be commercially successful. (Eyre 1990:75)

So now, alongside international elite avant-gardes—artists such as Terry Riley, Steve Reich, Philip Glass, and the Kronos Quartet, who have promoted Asian and African musics through compositional experimentation and performance, or the prestigious New Music America Festival, which introduced Inuit throat-game vocalists and tango accordionists—we have elite pop stars setting the pace for discourses on world music, bypassing folkies, academics, and previous generations of collectors, authenticators, and promoters like Moses Asch and Alan Lomax. Folkways Records, now housed at the Smithsonian Institution, links this distant past to revitalized circulation through the Rounder distribution network. And in stores where the heading "Africa," or even "Europe," used to mark a small hodgepodge of recordings, now we find entire sections and subsections and subsubsections on the world music shelves, with multiple divisions and numerous recordings. Words like cajun, zydeco, polka, salsa, *soukous*, ska, tango, Afro-beat, *jùjú*, highlife, township, *conjunto*, and klezmer demarcate substantially diversifying and enlarging product sections mixed in with more established divisions by country and region, placed beside more familiar ethnic/regional genres like reggae or blues.

With those schizophrenic notes in hand we can momentarily zoom out to the land of the Iatmul in the Middle Sepik of Papua New Guinea, where forty years before Schafer entered the fray of schizo-suffixing,

Gregory Bateson coined the term “schismogenesis” to discuss patterns of progressive differentiation through cumulative interaction and reaction (Bateson [1936] 1958:171–97, 1972:61–87, 107–27). Schismogenesis, in Bateson’s more formal language, refers to “classes of regenerative or vicious circles . . . such that A’s acts [are] stimuli for B’s acts, which in turn [become] stimuli for more intense action on the part of A, and so on” (1972:109). Bateson identified two related patterns of schismogenesis, the second of which he called complementary schismogenesis. This pattern involves cycles “where the mutually promoting actions are essentially dissimilar but mutually appropriate, e.g., in cases of dominance-submission, succoring-dependence, exhibitionism-spectatorship and the like” (1972:109). In the complementary mode the progressive differentiation involves a mutually escalating reactivity whose continuance leads to a closer symbiotic interdependence of the parties. Simultaneously, anxiety, paranoia, and increasing distortions make the mutualism destructive and progressively impervious to forms of self-correction—unless of course the participants unite in opposition to an outside force, or mutually lessen the escalating distortions by attaining new forms of self-consciousness about their predicament. Bateson identifies three other possible end points for such cycles: fusion of the parties, elimination of one or both, or the persistence of both in a dynamic equilibrium (Bateson [1936] 1958:184). Bateson’s view of the limits of stability in large-scale systems goes considerably beyond seeing cumulative, interactive escalation as a one-way path to explosive destruction; instead, he focuses on forces of self-regulation, correction, and feedback in a variety of social formations.

Juxtaposing Bateson’s *schiz-* word with Schafer’s may be useful in thinking about some of the material and discursive developments related to the intensified commodification and industrialization of world music. Sounds have increasingly been mediated, split from their sources, and, following the explosion of world musical products and marketing in the last ten years, we are in the throes of a major trend, where musical activities and the emergent discourse surrounding them exhibit a complementary schismogenetic pattern. The opposition or mutual differentiation scenario of this pattern rhetorically contrasts claims of “truth, “tradition,” “roots,” and “authenticity”—under the cover term “world music” (or, in the lingo of some zealous promoters, “real world music”)—with practices of mixing, syncretic hybridization, blending, fusion, creolization, collaboration across gulfs, all under the cover term “world beat.”

What “world music” signifies for many is, quite simply and innocently,

musical diversity. The idea is that musics originate from all world regions, cultures, and historical formations. "World music" thus circulates broadly in a liberal, relativist field of discourse, while in a more specific way it is an academic designation, the curricular antidote to the tacit synonymy of "music" with western European art music. In this latter sense the term is explicitly oppositional, markedly more polemical and political than in the former sense, contesting Eurocentrism and opposing it with musical plurality.

But it is as a commercial marketing label that "world music" is now most commonly placed. In this context the term has come to refer to any commercially available music of non-Western origin and circulation, as well as to musics of dominated ethnic minorities within the Western world: music of the world to be sold *around* the world. Here the term begins to discursively overlap with "world beat," and one hears them used synonymously to refer to the best-known commercial and popular varieties of world musical styles, like reggae, blues, zydeco, *conjunto*, or salsa. Calling attention to the dialectics of isolation and hegemony, resistance and accommodation, this discursive merger of "world music" and "world beat" draws out senses of commodified otherness and of blurred boundaries between the exotic and the familiar, the local and the global in transnational popular culture.

The "world beat" label usually has more specific referents. Introduced by Austin, Texas, musician and radio personality Dan Del Santo in the 1980s and picked up rapidly by the radio and music industry, the term refers to all ethnic-pop mixings, fusion dance musics, and emerging syncretic populist musical hybrids from around the world, particularly from urban centers. What rhetorically sets world beat apart is often the assertion of a new, postmodern species of "authenticity," one constituted not in isolation or difference but in creolization proper, an authenticity precisely guaranteed by its obvious blendings, its synthesis and syncretism.

But notice the marked word: "beat." That also reminds Westerners that it is "others" who have rhythm, make music of and for the body, music for dance, for bodily pleasure. Tied to a long history of essentializing and racializing other bodies as possessing a "natural" sense of rhythm, the invention of "world beat" reproduces a Western gaze toward the exotic and erotic, often darker-skinned, dancing body. These othered "beats" thus provide the pulse and groove for Western bodies to throw their inhibitions off on the dance floor. "World beat" then is a more marked term than "world music"—critically disparaged by some

as other (or just oppressed) people's party music commercially appropriated for white folks to dance to, while championed by others as a new, populist, honest, commercially viable form of dialogue or equalization between musics and musicians in different cultural spaces.

The escalating discourse of differentiation surrounding the notions of "world music" and "world beat" is located both in vernacular and academic forms. The vernacular form, popular with musicians and with journalists who like to side sympathetically with musicians, argues that market expansion, global stylistic contact, and the recognition of global musical diversity is inevitably accompanied by circulatory problems. Here commodification and promotion take a toll, graying out, vulgarizing, distorting, or maligning those who are supposedly benefiting from increased exposure. Expansion and advance in the musical style arena are thus often seen as the positive face of a process which inevitably involves contraction and mastication. The perception, common among culture producers and creators, that banality is part of the price one pays for exposure dictates that outsider musics and musicians must yield to Western pop stars and the recording industry when it comes to participating in a musical synthesis. World beat may be created from and inspired by outsider grooves, but the creators are led to understand that it is not exotic grooves that sell the music but rather the status and entrepreneurial role of pop stars and their access to the support systems of major record companies.

This anxiety is captured in the following paragraph, again from Jon Pareles's *New York Times* column (28 August 1988), titled "Pop Passports—At a Price": "When Paul Simon, Peter Gabriel and Talking Heads sell millions of records using Jamaican reggae and South African mbaqanga, their sources deserve a piece of the action. But to reach the world audience, how much will those regional musicians have to change—and for better or worse?" The piece continues in this vein, then about-faces toward a more tempered balance:

It's not fair to simply cry "Sellout!" . . . Local and outside influences have been tangled for decades, maybe centuries. As the musicians see more of the world they're bound to incorporate the ideas and rhythms they now live with. Beyond that, most popular music means to be hospitable, and one way to make listeners feel at home is to give them something they're familiar with. . . . It would be a double standard to suggest that Paul Simon and Sting can borrow whatever they

want while their sources have to stick to local or national styles—as if the colonies could only provide raw material for the empire's factories.

And finally, speaking of the specific non-Western musicians involved in world beat projects, Pareles concludes that “it will be up to them whether they're remembered as stateless pop bands or national standard-bearers.” Pareles here both sides with and puts the heat on the musicians, imagining that they have a degree of control that they surely don't. At the same time he tends to ignore the larger social and economic dimensions of the culture industries which do force musicians to “provide raw material” for the empire.

But Pareles's anxiety about “world beat” is balanced by his enthusiasm for “real world music.” In a column on the “roots move,” written a few months later (6 November 1988), Pareles praises Panamanian politician and *salsero* Rubén Blades and the Los Angeles-based rock group Los Lobos (at the time enjoying fame for their recording of “La Bamba”). Why? Because they were “telling listeners across the hemisphere that success in America is possible without cutting off roots, without jettisoning their own language and music, without assimilating and Americanizing. While slick, mainstream American pop blankets the world, they insist, with plinking harps and time-honored salsa rhythms, that diversity should not be lost.” That last sentence sounds to me like the pledge of allegiance for “real world music” pop patriotism, but it is perhaps more astonishing for the degree to which it ignores the multi-layered syncretism and synthesis underlying the music of both Rubén Blades and Los Lobos.

Moving into the academic sphere, I'll take my nervous self as a token of anxiety about the scene. My review of the politics of Paul Simon's appropriate mixing and copyrighting practices for the album *Graceland* (chapter 8) is perhaps more cynical and loudmouthed than Pareles's comments, but the anxiety is similar. It is an anxiety about an increasingly focused and intensified set of interactions whose consequences seem to grow in magnitude, not just from reproduction of asymmetrical power to control technologies, but within a space marked by a heightened symbolism of race and/or ethnicity. These discussions are situated within a larger yet equally anxious discourse on how musical ownership and copyright practices systematically reproduce the power imbalance between written and orally transmitted musics in the context of monetary

power and the communications industries. (On copyright, see the overviews in Frith [1987] and Schneider [1991]; Wallis and Malm [1984: 163–215] provides brief but excellent case studies of Jamaican, Cuban, and Malawian musics and the positioning of folk elites like Harry Belafonte and Pete Seeger in their ownership problems. Laing [1986] and Tomlinson [1991] locate these problems within debates on media and cultural imperialism.)

Arjun Appadurai has characterized this intensification in global interaction as follows: “The world we live in now seems rhizomic, even schizophrenic, calling for theories of rootlessness, alienation and psychological distance between individuals and groups, on the one hand, and fantasies (or nightmares) of electronic propinquity on the other. . . . The central problem of today’s global interaction is the tension between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization” (1990:2–3, 5). Contrary to the pessimism of Jameson’s vision of postmodern schizophrenia (1990)—a pastiche of detemporalized surfaces, ahistorical dispersal, decontextualized stylistic diversity, authorial erasure, and the habit of being about itself—Appadurai sees more crucial space for struggles and creative contestations marking this schizophrenic condition. Music becomes a particularly poignant locale for understanding roots versus rootlessness, homogenization versus heterogenization, because, to state the case strongly, as Attali does: “Music is prophecy. Its styles and economic organization are ahead of the rest of society because it explores, much faster than material reality can, the entire range of possibilities in a given code” (1985: 11). If one finds such privileging of music suspicious, there is a more fundamental reason for music’s centrality to this rhizomic moment: Music is the most highly stylized of social forms, iconically linked to the broader cultural production of local identity and indexically linked to contexts and occasions of community participation.

These journalistic and academic discourses on musical worlds versus world beats are marked by the way they sense, anticipate, or feel the presence of escalation: a progressive, cumulative, interactive, pattern differentiation from intertwined mutuality, namely, complementary schismogenesis. If schizophonia, the splitting of sounds from sources, is the antecedent to life in today’s global and transnational world of music, then schismogenesis is a way of describing the resultant state of progressive mutual differentiation that is playing out in at least four ways: as (a) an escalating dominance-submission pattern of ownership among the majors and independents, paralleled by a similar relationship between

Western pop stars and non-Western musicians; (b) an escalating succoring-dependence pattern between world beat and world music; (c) an escalating exhibitionism-spectatorship pattern between third- and fourth-world creators and first-world fans; and (d) an escalating homogenization-heterogenization struggle in the realm of musical style. The practices of and discourses on world music and world beat are in an increasingly politicized, polemical zone in which the key struggles are over questions of authenticity—the rights and means to verify what Frith called “the truth of music”—and the dynamics of appropriation, particularly the rights and means to claim musical ownership.

If authenticity and appropriation are the sites of struggle, how is complementary schismogenesis located in the current practices of producing world music and world beat? One place to look is in the construction of signs of collaboration. Defenders of “world beat” point to ways in which it is a synthetic genre and a sign of international, cooperative collaboration. Musicians like Sting, David Byrne, Peter Gabriel, and Paul Simon have said such things in interviews, and most of their fans and many critics have no trouble presenting them in a positive and politically progressive light as a result. Moreover, there can be little question that many promoters, musicians, and media people are invested in “world beat” as a politically progressive and artistically avant-garde movement. One way in which this progressive agenda is articulated is through patronage, specifically, through the promotional and curatorial involvement of pop stars with real “world music” and the careers of its makers. This process has the positive effect of validating musicians and musics that have been historically marginalized, but it simultaneously reproduces the institutions of patronage and their attendant rights of validation, as well as their connection to long-standing patterns of cultivation central to elite avant-gardism. This situation locates musical practices close to visual-graphic ones, discussed vigorously in recent analyses of how local, “primitive” “crafts” are transformed into aesthetically and commercially significant ethno-“arts” through the rhetoric, sponsorship, and connoisseurship of Western artists, dealers, academics, collectors, and museums (Clifford 1988:189–251; Myers 1991; Price 1990:23–99; Torgovnick 1990:119–37).

One pattern for establishing merit and significance, and for expressing the nature of patronage and validation in the realm of musical recording, is through historical compilation projects in which documentation of emergent traditions is mixed with promotion of contemporary musics. These are good examples of safe genre statements of authenticity; they

show a concern for roots and express the desire to validate historically dynamic and evolving traditions. These practices are closely linked to the recent emergence of benign yet serious scholarly analyses of international pop genres. Good academic examples, in which professional ethnomusicologists have studied particular popular musical histories, are Christopher Waterman and Veit Erlmann's successful compilations of *jùjú* and *mbube* roots for Rounder Records, documenting the rise of major Nigerian and South African musical syntheses over the last sixty years. With these as models it is difficult to criticize the more high-toned, commercial compilations produced by major pop stars, like David Byrne's volumes of Brazilian samba classics and Cuban musics.

Likewise, who could criticize the extraordinary respect shown in the care taken to record the Gyuto Monks, Dzintars, Hamza el Din, Zakir Hussain or Babatunde Olatunji with state-of-the-art technology in Mickey Hart's Rykodisc CD series, *The World? Why not* join the sentiments of Kyle Kevorkian, who in a *Mother Jones* article titled "Evolution's Top Forty" (1990) says of Hart's series, "The World isn't 'world beat'—it's the real thing, unadulterated." Likewise, why be cynical about Peter Gabriel's Real World Studios and Real World Records and WOMAD Talking Book projects, projects that have produced neglected yet important recordings of recent years, like the music of Tabu Ley Rochereau and Remmy Ongala, or the extraordinary voice of Youssou N'dour, or the *qawwali* music of Nusrat Fateh Ali Khan. Why imagine that Gabriel isn't utterly sincere when he says, "We're trying to make these other artists as well-known as we are" (Cheyney 1990). And from the other side, expressing his optimism about collaborations with Gabriel, we have Nusrat Fateh Ali Khan telling interviewers that "the West should understand our music and culture, and vice-versa. With such collaboration, artistes [sic] can come closer to each other and come to know each other" (Khan 1991). Or Youssou N'dour, concluding the liner notes to his popular CD *The Lion* (1989, Virgin Records) with these words: "Special thanks to my friend Peter Gabriel for all that he has done for me and for music in general. Africa thanks him for being the biggest promoter of music without frontiers."

With the same pop stars increasingly involved in curatorial, promotional, and collaborative roles, as well as entrepreneurial and appropriative roles, it is possible to understand how, in the critical discourse surrounding the production and circulation of world beat, assertions of altruism and generosity appear as frequently as accusations of cannibalism and colonialism. But viewed more structurally, this mixing of curatorial,

promotional, and appropriative roles also means that genre lines between real “world music” and “world beat” are becoming increasingly blurred. So while fans and critics debate the political intentions of the artists or the implications of stylistic fusions for “the end of tradition” or “authenticity,” record companies profit substantially through market saturation and greater audience familiarity. In other words, escalating a blurred-genre market means that sales of world beat promotes sales of world music and vice versa. This leads to a situation where Peter Gabriel and Real World might make almost as much money from the soundtrack recording to *The Last Temptation of Christ* as from the *Passion Sources* compilation, which consists of extended selections from the soundtrack’s source material, including Pakistani *qawwali*, Moroccan wedding music, Armenian *duduk*, Zairian *soukous*, and Cuban *son-chanqui*, with Indian, Tanzanian, and Nile pieces as well. Of course this presentational spectrum helps sell both the specific artists and the Real World network by promoting the image of artists and musics as aesthetically, politically, and commercially unified. Patterns similar to the WOMAD/Real World Studios vision could be explored with regard to Mickey Hart’s *Planet Drum* CD/cassette (winner of the 1992 Grammy for World Music) and his productions for the World series; Ben Mandelson’s own band, Three Mustaphas Three, and his Globestyle Records projects; or David Byrne’s compilation activities in Cuba and Brazil and his *Rei Momo* project.

Such patterns have begun to extend into print media—for example, Mickey Hart’s *Drumming at the Edge of Magic* (Hart and Stevens 1990) and *Planet Drum* (Hart and Lieberman 1991)—and into television. The view of Brazilian trance rituals in David Byrne’s *candomblé* film *Ilé Aiyé*, made for television, provides another angle on the process of dissolving oppositional mutuality through genre blurring; arty and stylish, yet very much in the conventional mold of PBS “documentary” (syrupy narration featuring nuggets of ancient wisdom of the others, plenty of sunsets and gyrating bodies), the film predictably has no time or place for locating *candomblé* in local politics, economy, or society. Byrne the curator is so busy transporting us into a world of “purely musical being” that the question of musical control, as Amy Taubin pointed out in a typically acute *Village Voice* column (11 July 1989), only surfaces, in small print titles, at the very end: “Original score by David Byrne, performed by (long list of Brazilian musicians).”

As these varieties of homogenization-heterogenization dialectics intensify, one form of dynamic equilibrium that can emerge from the escalating

complementary schismogenesis of "world music" and "world beat" takes the following form: as the discourse of authenticity becomes more militant and nativistic, more complicated, and more particularized to specific interest and taste groups, the activities of appropriation get more overt and outrageous, as well as more subtle, legally sanctioned, accepted, and taken-for-granted. By placing the same pop stars, record companies, and media conglomerates in both the curatorial roles, as keepers of "truth" and "authenticity," and the entrepreneurial roles, as keepers of ownership and appropriative means, there will be a fusion of the parties for mutual business gain and unification against competing genres and business operations. Imperial transnational adaptation, or self-regulatory anticipation, here seems to be packaged, unfortunately, with a mechanism of "cultural greyout" (Lomax 1977). But greyout, and the devolutionary assumption that anchors it, need not prevail. The promotion of "world beat" has undoubtedly led to a great interest in and concern for the promotion and circulation of "world music" than ever existed before. Greater exposure and market power has improved the prospects for survival and development of local musics in unexpected ways. Additionally, the increasing blur of "world beat," as a more and more generic ethno-pop music, can also provoke marked and highly dramatic assertions of resistance-tinged local musics. Reggae is a prime example of this tension between genericization and stylistic markedness in the international arena. Its perception by indigenous peoples outside the Caribbean as an oppositional, roots ethno-pop form has led to its local adoption by migrants and indigenes in places as diverse as Europe, Hawaii, native North America, aboriginal Australia, Papua New Guinea, South Africa, and South East Asia. At the same time, the form has come to take on generic connotations that are often nonpolitical.

To bring matters back home, the position of rap in the black-white pop music scene is an urban American example of many of these dynamics. Rap is now a genre much more marked and oppositional than soul, rhythm and blues, or other black styles long ago appropriated or crossed-over. Rap's markedness derives from the ways it disrupts assignment of the label "artistry" to only those forms which participate in a particular discourse of originality. Digital sampling, the empire's own high-technology fetish, is subversively used here to resist and refuse to participate in Euro-world conventions of authenticity, to oppose them with an oral aesthetic of citation. In particular, this interferes with practices "naturalized" by Western legal codes of copyright and ownership.

Rap thus *recovers* an oral tradition long covered by outsiders. This inversion—the reappropriation by black artists of black and white musical material through sampling and digital manipulation—talks back to a whole history of white appropriation of black musical forms and styles (see Chapple and Garofalo 1977).

If, as writers and critics as diverse as Amiri Baraka and Robert Christgau rhetorically claim, black music today still is a reverberation of the rape of African rhythm by European harmony in slavery's brothels, then Public Enemy's "Fear of a Black Planet" rap should be listened to not just as a response to the rhetoric of "race mixing," but as an allegory of musical contact as schismogenesis. In this rap, a second voice emerges in counterpoint to the dominant verbal rhyme. Speaking deliberately, almost monotonically, with all the hip smugness of high performance art, the voice calmly delivers these lines:

black man . . . black woman . . . black baby
 white man . . . white woman . . . white baby
 white man . . . black woman . . . black baby
 black man . . . white woman . . . black baby

More than a vernacular promotional jingle for Afrocentricity, such lines confront stereotype through style, and ask:

white music capital . . . white pop stars . . . black roots grooves . . .
 white music? . . . or . . . black music?

Rap, now routinely seen as a site of struggle or contestation involving roots and rootlessness, race and ethnicity, identity and authority, marks a particular locale of social intensification. It is a powerful local example of the same schizophonia to schismogenesis dynamic now increasingly mapping world popular musical discourses.

What is at stake in the struggles about the meaning of the social world is power over the classificatory schemes and systems which are the basis of the representations of groups and therefore of their mobilization and demobilization.

—Pierre Bourdieu

[Music] makes audible what is essential in the contradictions of developed societies: an anxiety-ridden quest for lost difference, following a logic from which difference is banished.

—Jacques Attali

To explore now in a more experientially specific way how these anxieties over schizophonia and the world music–world beat schismogenesis dynamic enter into the documentation and commodification practices of ethnomusicologists, I will discuss the intertwined qualities of “struggles about the meaning of the social world” and the “quest for lost difference” in *Voices of the Rainforest*, my CD/cassette recording of music and environmental sounds from Bosavi, Papua New Guinea, commercially released on the Rykodisc label in April 1991. Having turned years of research into a popular object, I now feel the ironic obligation to turn that popular commodity into an object of research. To do that is to locate the intersection of local and global forces in these new forms of cultural production, an intersection that illustrates how participation in the commodification and circulation traffic of commercial “world music” provokes a potential case of what Renato Rosaldo (1989) has termed “imperialist nostalgia,” situations where highly positioned parties lament, indeed, may feel anger about the passing of what they themselves have helped to transform. In this context projects like *Voices of the Rainforest* can simultaneously encode messages that might be read as representing both ends of a moral and political spectrum.

This exercise in clarifying the nature of professional complicity in schizophonia can also be read as part of a critique of ethnomusicology’s practices of making and circulating recordings and, specifically, of its representational tendencies toward the construction of transparent, authoritative, realistic samples of “traditional music.” Given the centrality of recordings to the history of ethnomusicology, critical awareness of the positioned nature of representation is as important to the current state of the field as is the more politically obvious discourse on cultural ownership and repatriation. Although most of the exercises of unmasking conventions of ethnographic representation have concerned print, literary, visual, or filmic genres (e.g., Marcus and Fischer 1986; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Clifford 1988), discussions of “writing” culture or “inscribing” otherness can be readily transposed to problems of auditory “recording,” “magnetizing,” “ingraining,” “digitizing,” and “modulating.”

Surely it’s a mark of the contemporary moment that the collision of forces responsible for *Voices of the Rainforest* presents little surprise or sense of improbability. But substantial disjunctions are embedded in this particular cultural production. For example, there is the contrast of recording in Papua New Guinea, “the last unknown” (a phrase originated by Gavin Souter’s 1963 book title and still in popular circulation), where people of the highland interior have come into contact with outsiders

only in the last fifty years, and making a commercial ultra-high-tech CD with portable state-of-the-art equipment and experimental, even pioneering, field and studio recording techniques. Or, the contrast of recording the sounds of birds and music among a small group of isolated people, the Kaluli, whose rainforest environment and cultural future are now threatened by—in addition to twenty years of evangelical missionization—recent oil exploration that will yield multibillion dollar profits for American, British, Australian, and Japanese companies, as well as for the government of Papua New Guinea—a government that owns the rights to everything under the surface of the land, and hence is actively, whether or not unwittingly, creating fourth-world ghettos as it continues to provide more and more extractive riches, at the cost of civil unrest and violent protests.

Then there is the contrast of an academic anthropologist, linguist, and ethnomusicologist (me) who has studied Kaluli language, music, and culture over the course of sixteen years, working with a rock-and-roll drummer, Mickey Hart of the Grateful Dead, active in the preservation of musical diversity through educational funding, concert promotion (the Gyuto Monks tours of America), books (*Drumming at the Edge of Magic*, 1990, and *Planet Drum*, 1991), and recordings. And the contrast in the final product: my previous two LP field recordings (Feld 1981b, 1985) were published in relatively obscure academic series, while Mickey produces a successful and well-known series, *The World*, licensed to Rykodisc, a major independent label whose catalog ranges from popular world musics to some of the more esoteric (Frank Zappa) and more glittery (David Bowie) rock artists known today.

There are parallel contrasts in the realm of promotion too. The events that launched *Voices of the Rainforest* are extraordinary when compared to those typically surrounding the release of an academic product. The Earth Day weekend opening gala for the recording began in the Northern California Mountains at the very plush and very private high-technology screening room of George (*Star Wars*) Lucas's Skywalker Ranch, where Randy Hayes, executive director of Rainforest Action Network, and Mickey Hart spoke on the intertwined topics of rainforest survival and musical survival, and I presented a megawatt surround-sound CD preview and synchronous computerized slide show for members of the audio, radio, and record industry. The next evening the three of us presented the show again at San Francisco's Greens Restaurant and hosted a \$100-a-plate fund-raiser to benefit the Bosavi People's Fund, the trust Mickey and I established to receive royalties from *Voices of the*

Rainforest, and Rainforest Action Network's campaign against logging and rainforest destruction in the Kutubu-Bosavi area of Papua New Guinea.

During the next two months I traveled across the United States with the slide-show preview to venues ranging from classrooms to zoos to nightclubs to malls. Free presentations were coordinated with radio and popular press interviews, release parties, and appearances at book and record shops; when his concert schedule permitted Mickey participated too. The coordination of these activities required constant effort from the management and technical staff of Mickey's company, 360° Productions, as well as from the marketing and publicity staff of Rykodisc. In Australia, in April 1992, Festival Records coordinated over fifty national and local radio and press interviews. The scale of these activities provides a major, indeed outrageous, contrast to both the material wealth of the few thousand Kaluli people in Bosavi and to the typical funding and promotion for most academic research and publications.

The process that resulted in *Voices of the Rainforest* originated in a powerful confrontation that highlights a number of the disjunctions mentioned above. During the course of several periods of field research between 1976 and 1984 among the Kaluli people of Bosavi, Papua New Guinea, I produced two recordings. *Music of the Kaluli* (1981b) was published in Papua New Guinea to inaugurate the record and cassette series of the Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies; *The Kaluli of Papua Niugini: Weeping and Song* (1985) was published by Bärenreiter as the third volume in the Musicaphon Music of Oceania series edited by Hans Oesch. Both series are prestigious in academic ethnomusicological terms, but distribution for each disc was minimal; each sold just a few hundred copies, and neither was reviewed in scholarly journals, much less heard over the airwaves. Most of the people who read any of my Kaluli work never heard any of these recordings.

On the other hand, a radio program titled "Voices in the Forest" that I produced for National Public Radio in 1983, featuring a twenty-four-hour soundscape of the Bosavi rainforest, was an instant popular success (Feld 1990a: 264–68). More than ten million people around the world heard this program, and it has been rebroadcast on several continents, even though it wasn't formally published until 1987. As a result of these experiences, the media of popular radio and grass-roots cassettes and the audiences I could reach through them seemed to offer a much more interesting approach to the sharing of the audio riches of my Papua New Guinea research. I had no desire to make another record.

Then I met Mickey Hart. That happened in 1984, when Thomas Vennum, Jr., an ethnomusicologist at the Smithsonian Institution's Office of Folklife Programs, and Fredric Lieberman, an ethnomusicologist at the University of California at Santa Cruz, were helping Mickey assemble information for his book projects about world percussion; they suggested that he talk with me about Papua New Guinea drums. Mickey called when the Grateful Dead tour passed through Philadelphia. We talked about drums, and I invited Mickey to listen to my recently completed NPR soundscape tape. He did, occasionally interjecting amazed questions about the sources of the sounds he was hearing. When the half hour, encompassing the sounds of a whole day in a Kaluli village, was over he looked at me and said, "That's incredible, and it's much too important to be kept an academic secret." I somewhat defensively countered that this wasn't an "academic secret" but was intended for National Public Radio. He said, "Highbrow, man," and offered to play it during intermission at that night's Grateful Dead concert! If I was stunned by the offer it was mostly because Mickey was completely casual and matter-of-fact about his populist vision of a new world order of musical consumption. This created a vantage point from which I could recognize that the shift from academic records to NPR wasn't radical at all, both channels being circumscribed within securely respectable, politely bourgeois institutions and consumption locales. I gulped: "You want to play *this* at a Grateful Dead show?" Mickey smiled devilishly: "Of course! Twenty thousand Deadheads will turn into tree-climbing monkeys about two minutes after I crank up the volume." When he said that I had a strange sensation. I felt embarrassed that I hadn't thought of this music as something that could appeal to a large audience, something that many others could enjoy as I had. Part of me knew that my recordings of the Kaluli should be heard by as many people as possible. Then I felt equally embarrassed by the realization that academia punishes popularizers, that I could easily succumb to guilt over both the urge to have the music heard and the knowledge that I might be contributing to an escalation of audio voyeurism, exoticism, and crass capitalism if I really participated in the kinds of commercial productions that would make it heard.

After years of ambivalence I finally decided to do a major project with Mickey, and the decision forced me to confront how world music commodification encodes multiple significances, from the benign and noble to the suspect and crass. As the first compact disc completely devoted to indigenous music from Papua New Guinea, *Voices of the Rainforest* signifies

an effort to validate a specific culture and musical region otherwise generically submerged in American record stores in a bin labeled "Pacific." While the recording would not have been possible without my research background and long-term connection to Kaluli communities, *Voices of the Rainforest* is not principally a research document (for its research background, see chapter 4 and Feld 1990a). Rather, it is an unabashedly commercial product meant to attract as large an audience as possible through the appeal of superb audio reproduction and vibrant musical and natural sounds. Press coverage, radio play, and sales of ten thousand copies during the recording's first year on the market indicate some success at this agenda.

Voices of the Rainforest evokes twenty-four hours in the life of Bosavi in one continuous hour. We begin before dawn with a section entitled "From Morning Night to Real Morning," which features the overlapping voices of birds waking up a Kaluli village. A segment of morning sago-making follows; women sing as they scrape and beat sago starch, and their voices are overlapped by those of children, some echoing the song melody with whistled imitations of the birds whose calls are heard in the distance. Another morning work activity follows: groups of men sing, whoop, and yodel in echoed polyphony as they clear trees for a banana garden; after the trees are down women clear the brush with machetes, singing as they go. These morning sections are followed by two midday tracks illustrating leisure music making, first a series of bamboo mouth harp duets with bird calls and cicada rhythms, then a woman singing at, with, and about a waterfall. A return to ambient sounds follows this section. "From Afternoon to Afternoon Darkening" chronicles the transition from afternoon bird volleys, to the dense electronic-sounding interplay of insects, to frogs of dusk. An evening rainstorm follows, with interspersed voices of frogs, insects, and bats. Next is a ceremonial sequence, first with a group of drummers and then a ritual song performance that moves an audience member to tears. The recording closes with an ambient segment, "From Night to Inside Night," in which voices of frogs, owls, kingfishers, and night insects pulse through misting winds into the hours toward dawn. In total, Bosavi is presented as a coordinated world of continuously overlapping sound clocks, of ambient rhythms and cycles intermeshed with human musical invention, performance, and spontaneous interactions.

Voices of the Rainforest departs aesthetically and structurally from the typical, commercial world music CD to take a major musical risk: the recordings, although conventionally numbered as cue bands, are fused

and continuous, and they include equally the natural environmental sounds and local musical expression found in Bosavi. All of these sounds, ambient and musical, are edited together to produce one fluid sixty-minute soundscape, a metacomposition that evokes, through my technological mediation, ways Kaluli experience and express the music of nature as the nature of music. Without academic explication, the recording allows the listener to enter and subjectively experience what the Kaluli call *dulugu ganalan* “lift-up-over sounding.” Kaluli invoke this idea to explain the overlapping, interlocking, alternating nature of all sounds, ambient and human, and the textural density and in-synchrony but out-of-phase organization in their vocal and instrumental genres. The vocal and instrumental tracks on the disk are inspired both sonically and textually by natural sounds, and the editing makes it possible for a listener to experience how Kaluli appropriate these sounds into their texts, melodies, and rhythms, merging with the musical ecology of their place. In work, leisure, and ceremonial contexts, Kaluli musical invention is illustrated to be of a piece with the sounds of birds or waterways or the pulses of frogs and crickets. The recording thus illuminates how “lift-up-over sounding” is the Bosavi rainforest groove, the



Jubi and Steve recording bird voices; Bosavi, Papua New Guinea, 1982. Photo Shari Robertson.



Voices of the Rainforest, cover, 1991, Rykodisc. Art by Karyl Klopp, photo courtesy of 360° Productions, Rykodisc.



Mickey Hart and Steve mixing *Voices of the Rainforest* at Studio X. Photo © John Werner, 1993.

transformative pulse that simultaneously makes nature sound so musical and their music feel so natural.

To fully evoke this rainforest groove, Mickey and I, as technological intermediaries, assembled the best field recording package we could imagine. Given the unreliability, in rainforest humidity, of current portable digital tape technology, as well as its tendency to thin out critical high frequencies that we wanted to be as warm and saturated as possible in recording birds, insects, and water sounds, we were committed to analog recording. We combined a customized Nagra tape recorder with a Bryston portable Dolby SR noise-reduction unit and an Aerco preamp, which optimized response from our phantom-powered AKG microphones. The noise-reduction unit, which had not previously been used in a remote rainforest locale, plunged the noise floor of the analog system and allowed me to record extremely soft ambient sounds with no appreciable increase in noise.

Microphones are to ears what camera lenses are to eyes, reductive technological devices that imitate human sensory apparatus by performing specific ranges of limited functions from which perceivers then recreate fuller perceptual cues. Using two cardioid capsules in an XY configuration—the ends of the microphones criss-crossed, one on top of the other to make an X—images the broadest stereo sound field in the density of the forest. But without multiple microphones and portable mixing capabilities it is impossible to simultaneously record, with full spatial dimensionality, the height and depth of the ambient rainforest environment, either alone or as musical backdrop to other sounds. Knowing that one real-time, two-track recording would not produce a full audio image, I decided to record the forest's height and depth dimensions separately and to add them back together at Mickey's studio using multitrack recording technology. This meant often mixing two or three sets of stereo tracks to re-create the full audio atmosphere of any particular time of day or musical occasion.

Obviously such a practice violates the spatial and temporal integrity of any given recorded moment or event, but in return it offers the possibility of optimizing the sense of a layered sound environment. These field and studio practices were not simply a case of *trompe l'oreille*, experimentation occasioned by a desire to transcend the technical limitations of microphones and live two-track recording. They were also stimulated by the nature of the Kaluli sound world. I had always wondered if the local idea of "lift-up-over sounding" indicated that the temporality of

sound was literally imagined by Kaluli as spatialized height arching outward. Recording component audio tracks in the field allowed me to experiment informally and attempt to further understand the “lift-up-over sounding” aesthetic of sonic density. Playing back transfers of component tracks on two cassette recorders, I asked Kaluli assistants to adjust volume controls on the two machines until the composite sounded good to them. When the tracks combined musical performances and environmental surround sounds, Kaluli tended to amplify the surround tracks, particularly of the middle and upper forest canopy. Comments made to me on these occasions elaborated others I had heard previously, to the effect that, in the presence of musical performance, the sounds of the forest heights are copresent and equally significant. This sort of bush premixing studio put Kaluli in a directly dialogic editorial role in the project, extending my earlier experiments with dialogic editing (Feld 1987a). Back at the mixing studio, where I worked for four months to edit and mix the one-hour master from eighteen hours of original recordings, I was able to incorporate these Kaluli ideas into the editing and mixing, pursuing and acknowledging the socially negotiated and constructed ethnoaesthetics of the production.

Other studio practices similarly violated the basic tenets of documentary realism, creating instead a hyperrealism that I find justified by both technoaesthetic and ethnoaesthetic ideals. In Bosavi I frequently recorded birds close-up, without parabolic reflectors, from blinds, perches, or tree houses. By quickly playing back birds’ calls I was often able to get them to come closer and repeat their calls, and in some cases, after a few days or weeks, I was able to record them almost as close-up as I did Kaluli singers. To enhance our ability to reproduce the textural density of “lift-up-over sounding,” studio engineer Jeff Sterling and I digitally sampled seventy-five bird, frog, and insect sounds from my close-up recordings, then, using real-time guide tracks that I made in the field on cassette, rerecorded the samples onto the multitrack master, which allowed us to locate them with greater spatial and temporal specificity in the mix of forest height and depth. The clarity of the digital samples also helped to optimize the lucidity of the bird and human mix, and thus to create an ambience in which the listener experiences, as one does in the rainforest, the strong sense of avian audio-presence in the height and depth of the canopy. Because birds have inspired Kaluli music, are considered singers in their own right, and are also *ane mama*, “gone reflections,” the spirits of dead, their presence is experientially intensified for

Kaluli in the forest. Our editing and mixing was intended to underscore this intensity by bringing the birds into the audio foreground as they are in Kaluli imagination and experience.

Apart from these considerations of *Voices of the Rainforest's* experimental audio practices, one must scrutinize the potential for techno-aesthetics to mask technofetishism. Mass culture criticism raises the significant argument that such projects fulfill the economic and social needs of their makers, reproducing their positions of privileged access and their ability to define just what kind of adventure may be had. But it is equally important to explore the potential for technoaesthetics to create cultural respect and musical empowerment. For many years indigenous peoples have taken a second-class ride on cheap recording equipment as part of a process of "othered" record production—the dignified but masking term is "noncommercial." Minimal audio quality was often accompanied by a lack of concern for circulation and a tacit assumption that there would be no royalties to speak of, certainly none to return to the musicians or communities where the music was recorded. Such practices have been central to both the rhetorical traffic and the actual commodity circulation of musical diversity. Lack of circulation, like lack of royalties, has come to be inextricably linked to claims for authenticity; marginality in the marketplace has been the central sign or indicator of "real," "authentic," "ethno" music. Equating popularity with both vulgarity and loss of authenticity thus locates ethnomusicological projects in the elitist discourses that validate "other" musics by creating for them an imitation of the autonomous arena musicologists once created for western European art music.

But do such practices actually engender respect for musical diversity? Couldn't they as easily be interpreted as signs of the reproduction of musical colonialism, the redistribution of bounty in the form of recordings whose exotic content is indexically signaled by muffled grooves? Hart's alternative, in which I am complicit, surely has its own imperial implications. It insists that the best equipment, engineers, budgets, and distribution networks can and should be shared beyond the world of symphony orchestras and high-tech rock and roll. Mickey locates himself as an activist for the technological redistribution of wealth and musical empowerment and positions me, the Kaluli, and listeners as beneficiaries of that activism. He also positions Kaluli as principal beneficiaries of the recording's royalties. This is complicated to decode; the move simultaneously strikes back toward equity and empowerment, yet substantially

reproduces the entrepreneurial and curatorial positions of the already empowered.

As liner notes I wrote an imaginary letter to Mickey from the rainforest. This device allowed me to speak in a vernacular voice and to maintain the emphasis on being there and taking the listener there. In addition to describing the contents and contexts of the recordings, the notes acknowledge the irony of the disc: just as the music receives international recognition as a volume in *The World* series, Kaluli songs, along with their other cultural practices, are transforming or vanishing, and the environment of the Great Papuan Plateau is being threatened by oil pipelines, roads, and logging. Drawing attention to the relationship between cultural and ecological destruction in rainforests, the notes use the term “endangered music,” provoking the listener to imagine how the ravages of artistic loss suffered by indigenous people are linked to the loss of species from their local flora and fauna and the degradation of their waters and lands.

The ways these multiple dimensions of world music are figured in relation to *Voices of the Rainforest* as a commercial production are obviously connected to current debates in anthropology and other fields about the politics of cultural representation, about dimensions of control, authority, ownership, “authenticity,” and power relations. Many anthropologists were once content to celebrate and embrace local intellectuals and their societies, particularly small-scale ones, for their integrity; inspired by myriad forms of inventiveness and experiential patterns that challenged their conventional senses of self and other, they celebrated diversity in idealized terms. Now, when it is widely assumed that there is much less cultural diversity or integrity left on the planet, many anthropologists have become critics of state-indigene relations, resistance cheerleaders, or cultural survival advocates, inspired to their own vision, alienation, or need to struggle, by the intensity of chaos and harm so powerfully and recklessly visited upon the others they chronicle. The politics of being an engaged and responsible researcher are now bound up with giving voice to people whose validity, indeed, whose humanity, is denied or silenced by the world’s dominant cultures. Because the practices of anthropology are so firmly located within this discursive side-taking, the field’s intellectual products—talk, writings, recordings, films—have been subjected to increasing scrutiny from both inside and out, by the community that undertakes the research and the community that is its subject (see Said 1989).

How then might one further scrutinize the representational politics of *Voices of the Rainforest* simultaneously as commercially avant-garde cultural production and as “world music”? One way is to acknowledge that *Voices of the Rainforest* presents a unique soundscape day in Bosavi, one without the motor sounds of tractors cutting the lawn at the mission airstrip, without the whirring rhythms of the mission station generator, washing machine, or sawmill. Without the airplanes taking off and landing, without the mission station or village church bells, Bible readings, prayers, and hymns. Without the voices of teachers and students at an airstrip English-only school, or the few local radios straining to tune in Radio Southern Highlands, or cassette players with run-down batteries grinding through well-worn tapes of string bands from Central Province or Rabaul. Without the voices of young men singing Tok Pisin songs while strumming an occasional guitar or ukulele at the local airstrip store. And without the recently intensified and almost daily overhead buzz of helicopters and light planes on runs to and from oil drilling areas ranging over thirty miles to the northeast.

Does this mean that *Voices of the Rainforest* is a falsely idealized portrait of Bosavi's current acoustic ecology, romantic at best, deceptive at worst? Certain critical viewpoints could position it that way, and an honest response could only accept why those concerns are voiced and acknowledge the currency of their politics. After all, *Voices of the Rainforest* transparently embodies the highest of postmodern ironies: it presents for us a world uncontaminated by technology, but one that is hearable only because it has been brought to us courtesy of the most high-tech audio field and studio techniques currently available. But it is also important to insist that the recording is a highly specific portrayal, one of an increasingly submerged and subverted world of the Bosavi soundscape. Clearly, it is a soundscape world that some Kaluli care little about, a world that other Kaluli momentarily choose to forget, a world that some Kaluli are increasingly nostalgic and uneasy about, a world that other Kaluli are still living and creating and listening to. It is a sound world that increasingly fewer Kaluli will actively know about and value, but one that increasingly more Kaluli will hear on cassette and sentimentally wonder about.

Lest it seem that I am hedging, let me state the stakes more bluntly and personally. I find the sound world in Bosavi to be powerful and unsettling; more importantly, it can still be heard. Because my role in *Voices of the Rainforest* is equal parts researcher and sound artist, I feel a need to amplify that world unashamedly, in the hope that hearing it might

inspire and move others as it has inspired and moved me. The recording then is no illusory denial that both nature and culture in Bosavi are being drowned out by “development,” the apologist’s euphemism for extraction and erasure. Rather it is an affirmative “counterdrowning” of “development” noise through the aggressive assertion of a coevolved sonic ecology and aesthetics. As a celebration that is also an alarm, my representational re-erasing is motivated equally by affection and by outrage, acknowledging both the memory of florescence and the escalating sense of loss that characterizes Kaluli life today. *Voices of the Rainforest* speaks to remembrance at a moment of forgetting, talking back from my feelings of revulsion over the way mission and government rhetoric about “development” and a “better future” has meant more vulnerability, less autonomy, less culture, and diminished integrity for Bosavi people now.

The notions of “endangered music” and “endangered culture” also demand scrutiny: equating music and culture with animal and plant species may give the impression that the project is promoting protectionist purism, cultural zoos, reservations, or conservation parks. Preservationist agendas often have very conservative political slants, and invoking the notion of endangerment may dredge up fears of control, of desires to freeze time and place. There can be no doubt that the use of the “endangered” label is problematic, is potentially dangerous, and may be deeply insulting to indigenous peoples in the context of their struggles to control the terminology and imagery with which their interests and identities are represented.

On the other hand, aligning the status of certain musics and cultures with that of “endangered” species encourages a potentially important intellectual and political alliance. Every current instance of the thinning out of biological diversity is connected to the real or potential thinning out of cultural, linguistic, and artistic diversity. Environmentalists and ecologists are becoming increasingly aware of important ways in which interactions between humans and plants and animals not only shape processes of adaptation but define the very nature of regions and communities. Linking the struggles for rainforest environments with the future of the people indigenous to them is an essential aspect of promoting the integrity, indeed the survival, of people and place and of local rights. Besides, anthropologists have virtually let the environmental movement freely create the illusion that the only thing at stake in ecodestruction is cute and cuddly animals and the plants that Western pharmacy needs to cure cancer. It is critical for us to insist, to the contrary, that the struggle

for these places is the struggle for the survival of people whose knowledge of the animals and plants is critical both to balanced management and future deployment for global medical betterment.

Obviously, intersecting issues such as these, the editorial politics and aesthetics of *Voices* are dense and complicated. So are the consumption concerns that extend from them. So far nobody has thoroughly confused the recording with the New Age meditation tapes whose titles, while similar, indulge and seduce with promised echoes of the audio-idyllic. But as we all know, in popular culture subordinate social formations are always the sources of fantasy and relaxation for the dominant classes or societies. *Voices of the Rainforest* hence undeniably contributes to both enhanced Western primitivist fantasy and voyeurism, allowing a listener to enjoy an hour of yuppie green politics, or audio-leisure tourism, perhaps even while feeling righteous about wealth trickle-down. "Release" from the modern world and into the "awesomeness" of nature is central to the nostalgia promulgated by the New Age movement, refashioning prior romanticisms and recreating them as quasi-spiritual experiences that connect "us" to "them." Does any of this neutralize my intentions or the potentials of the recording to work against the grain of destabilization?

Once a recording is in the marketplace one has little control over how it is consumed. Notes and contextualizing material, as well as interviews and other media interventions, may indicate one's desire to take responsibility for representation but cannot control what happens once the decision to commodify has been made. That is, significantly, also true for "merely academic" recordings (see Seeger 1991a, 1991b), even those framed by obscure jargonized notes, musical transcriptions, or specific invocations. For example, when recordings of Aboriginal Australian or Sepik (Papua New Guinea) music carry the explicit label, "Do not play this recording in the presence of any females or uninitiated male members of the [relevant] society," does this actually control who hears the music? Does discharging one's ethical duty by way of a cover sticker have any greater effect than prescribing "proper" forms of reception and consumption through notes on meaning and intention?

An additional problem in this case is that anthropological and political debate on control of and responsibility for representation is circumscribed in almost entirely realist and literalist terms. The most typical criticism of *Voices of the Rainforest* is framed in that way, as an insistence that destruction and domination be treated in more overt, "serious" terms. That critique strikes me as sincere but naive. The only response, and an old one at that, is that artistic projects are, for some of

us, equally overt and serious, however much greater risk their subtleties bring to the realm of cultural politics.

Mickey and I dedicated ourselves to the hope that state-of-the-art audio techniques and a combined artistic and political vision would make the recording not only the best possible audio document but a dramatic statement of current environmental and cultural survival issues in Bosavi, an evocation of both the florescence and the loss of rainforest musical ecology. In a world where fifteen to twenty thousand species of plants and animals a year are destroyed by the logging, ranching, and mining that escalates rainforest destruction (Caufield 1984, Collins 1990), *Voices of the Rainforest* was meant as an assertion that we must be equally mindful of the precarious ecology of songs, myths, words, and ideas in these mega-diversity zones. Massive wisdom, variations on human being in the form of knowledge in and of place, is a cocasualty of the ecocatastrophe. The thinning out of ecological systems may proceed at a rate much slower than the rubbing out of cultures, but cultural rub-out is a particularly effective way to accelerate ecological thin-out. The politics of rainforest ecological and aesthetic coevolution and co-devolution are one, and Mickey's initial reaction to hearing the Bosavi rainforest was eerily appropriate in the larger political economy of musical and cultural destruction: this *is* too important to remain an academic secret.

The representational issues embodied in the recording, editing, marketing, and royalty distribution of *Voices of the Rainforest* are closely situated in the larger process I've called schizophonia to schismogenesis. Once sounds like these are split from their sources, that splitting is dynamically connected to escalating cycles of distorting mutuality, which in turn is linked to polarizing interpretations of meaning and value. "Schizophonia to schismogenesis," concretely located in the creation and circulation of "world music" for consumption, provides an example of a generalized social experience central to our historical, discursive, and cultural moment: Just as "tradition" was constructed as the nostalgia of modernity, so its vaguer cousin, "memory" is inserted as the nostalgia of postmodernity. In this context I must acknowledge that my passion for sharing what I've been privileged to experience cannot mask my complicity with institutions and practices of domination central to commodifying otherness. Hence a necessary engagement with the problematics of what Rosaldo has called "imperialist nostalgia" and the parallel necessity to explore how projects embarked upon with self-consciously progressive political and aesthetic agendas are neither innocent of nor discursively free from postcolonial critiques.