Chapter 1

Introduction: Reflections on the Formation of an Ethnomusicologist

Robert Garfias

The ethnomusicology program at the University of Washington, which this collection of essays celebrates, began under fortuitous circumstances. I was lucky to have been able to play a part in its early stages of development more than 40 years ago. The seeds for the enterprise took root shortly before my arrival in 1962. A group of faculty at the University of Washington with a common interest in Japan submitted a proposal to the Ford Foundation for a five-year project enabling them to inaugurate a Center for Japanese Arts. These faculty members who clustered themselves around this idea had a variety of disciplinary interests in Japan, literature, theater, art and architecture, and the visual arts. The Ford Foundation responded positively to the idea but made two provisos. One stipulated that the focus of the center be expanded to a Center for Asian Arts and not just one that concentrated on Japan. The second stipulation was that an ethnomusicologist be added to the faculty. The founding faculty group quickly agreed to become the Center for Asian Arts and the College of Art and Sciences of the University of Washington created a new position for an ethnomusicologist, for which, in 1962, I was recruited.

Part of the plan for the new center was to allow the core founding faculty to invite scholars and artists from Japan and other parts of Asia to come to the University of Washington and to serve as visiting artists or visiting scholars. One of the faculty, Professor Richard McKinnon, was most intimately knowledgeable about Japan and was fluent in the Japanese language. At his suggestion Professor Shigeo Kishibe of Tokyo University was invited during the first year as a visiting professor, and his wife, Yori Kishibe, was invited to teach koto. (When she became the head of the Fujii branch of the Yamada tradition of koto playing, she was called Fujii Chiyoga II.) Dr. Kishibe and his wife thus first established the Japanese music part of the center’s activities at the University of Washington. I arrived in the fall of 1962 to take my place in the newly established regular faculty position in ethnomusicology at the University of Washington. Before talking about those early years at Washington it might be useful to put this all into some broader context. If, in the first decade of the twenty-first century, ethnomusicology has not yet become a household word, back in the 1960s it was certainly much less so. If anything it was still considered an odd and interesting subdiscipline of (Western) musicology. Ethnomusicologists were to be found at
only a very few institutions of higher education, some still considered themselves comparative musicologists, and the hyphen in the name of the new discipline, ethno-musicology, had yet to be removed (Jaap Kunst 1950 is credited with first naming the discipline in this way).

My own entry into the discipline, like much else that happened in my professional life, came about by chance and without a clear plan. I was born in San Francisco and lived there until I entered graduate school at U.C.L.A. in 1956. Both my parents were Mexican immigrants from different parts of Mexico who met and married in the U.S. (Figure 1.1). I grew up speaking Spanish and English at home, in part because my mother was fluently bi-lingual. She came to the U.S. at a very young age and completed elementary and high school here; thus I was able to begin elementary school without any language difficulty.
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My family was not particularly musical, although there was enough music around, mostly radio and records, to make for many musical associations during those early years. My father had taken up the saxophone after arriving from Mexico and had belonged to some sort of orchestra or band in San Francisco, although regrettably I neglected to ask him much about it while he was still alive. My father was from Tehauntepec, Oaxaca, where he was taught in elementary school by Jesuit priests from whom he learned a great number of things, including cabinet making, calligraphy, and cooking. At all these things he excelled, and I remember his excellence in all these skills. Particularly amazing to me were his knife skills in the kitchen. He would have become a professional cabinet maker or carpenter, but he arrived from Mexico in time for the depression, and it was difficult for Mexicans to break into that profession. He had a fine hand in calligraphy and practiced a beautiful old Spanish style of handwriting still seen from time to time in Mexico.

My mother was raised in a catholic convent in San Francisco, and thus her English was fluent and her knowledge of how things worked in this country was good. Neither of my parents talked much about careers or college. In retrospect I believe that my father deliberately avoided teaching me anything about carpentry in hopes that I might choose some other career that would offer more possibility for upward mobility. Alas neither did I master his excellent calligraphy. However, the image of my father cooking on the weekends and on important occasions did leave a lasting impression that has, outside of music, remained a long and fervent passion.

In the early 1940s, when I was about 11 years old and still in elementary school, I made a visit to Mexico for several months with my mother, grandmother, and younger sister. It was a marvelous experience during which I was allowed to wander on my own freely all over Mexico City. It also did much to improve my fluency in Spanish. After returning from Mexico my mother decided that she wanted me to learn to play the guitar. With the help of her older brother they were able to find a teacher. In retrospect I still find it impressive that they sought out a classical guitar teacher. At that time there were very few people who played classical guitar. It was far from the mainstream music world and considered something of an oddity. There were of course no established American music institutions teaching guitar. Interest in the classical guitar outside of Spain and Latin America did not come into the Euro-American mainstream until at least 10 years later.

In junior high school music there was an obligatory choice among chorus, orchestra, or band. The guitar did not connect me to any of these, and I stumbled into band. I was started out on trumpet and then, remembering my father’s saxophone at home, I asked if I could use that. So I began playing my father’s old Martin alto saxophone. With the encouragement of my junior high school band teacher I started jazz improvisation, and I also began to compose. Before long he introduced me to his own theory and composition teacher, and I began taking private theory and composition classes from him while still in junior high school. I began playing jazz and soon joined the Musicians Union. By the time I was in high
school, I was playing saxophone, piano, and bass and doing jazz arrangements while at the same time continuing to compose. I had a particular fondness for modern French music. I was especially fascinated by the music of Artur Honegger. I began studying the French language and was soon quite fluent, something which remained with me until the 1970s, when it was confused by my becoming fluent in Romanian. If I thought at all of a future for myself in those days, I would have imagined it either in jazz or as a composer or both. I also had a strong desire to go to Paris to study composition with Honegger.

On reflection something that I thought little of at the time now seems to be perhaps significant. My interests in music during high school were jazz and European classical music, mostly twentieth-century music. My study of the classical guitar had led a bit beyond that into other kinds of Latin music. During the late 1940s radio as a source of listenable music was very limited. Most of what was played was pop music with perhaps one classical music station that played only short selections, never a complete symphony and rarely chamber music. There were no jazz stations, but once in a great while one of the African-American stations that specialized in religious music or Black popular music might play a jazz record.

As I searched across the radio dial for something interesting to listen to, I frequently came across the nightly Cantonese radio program broadcast from Chinatown in San Francisco. I found the music strange and disturbing and quickly moved on. Perhaps because of the challenge of finding anything interesting on the radio I started listening to the Cantonese hour regularly. I remember thinking that there are people listening to this somewhere or it would not be on the air. I remember feeling challenged enough to see if I could make sense of it. Soon I was enjoying the music and even going into Chinatown when there was a Cantonese opera production being staged. So in retrospect, the ethnomusicological spark seems to have started even back in high school.

The first summer out of high school I was hired as a musician playing on one of the President Lines ships going to the Orient. That ship went to Hawaii, Japan, the Philippines, and Hong Kong. I was fascinated by all that I saw on that trip and on my return found myself listening to whatever music I could find beyond the West and reading everything I could find. It is important to remember that, in the early 1950s, there were very few non-Western music recordings available anywhere. Books and articles on non-Western music were as yet also very, very few. I still thought of myself as a composer hoping and dreaming of going to Paris to study with Artur Honegger while continuing to try to make a living playing jazz, which was not really possible. Even the very best jazz musicians found it difficult to find regular work. So I worked at several temporary jobs and then for some two years was back as a regular seaman working in the galley, chopping onions and washing dishes.

At some point during this period I decided that I might go to college and think about becoming a music teacher. I enrolled at San Francisco State in 1953 but almost immediately gave up the idea of music education. I continued to study
composition, but I also found anthropology very interesting and so I decided to take that as a major. During those years in college my interest in non-Western music continued and I pursued it as best I could outside of school. I learned of an older Japanese woman in San Francisco who was teaching Japanese koto. I believe that I actually began with the idea of learning something about the instrument in order to use this instrument in my own compositions. But I was soon absorbed in the traditional music itself. I studied the koto for about three years. In my second year of college the composer Harry Partch gave a performance with his ensemble, and I was amazed at the music and with his microtonal system and with the instruments themselves. I joined Harry’s ensemble and continued to play in it until I left San Francisco to enter graduate school.

In perhaps my last year at San Francisco State I learned about the Laboratory of Comparative Musicology at Northwestern University, at the time directed by Richard Waterman. I wrote to Waterman about the possibility of attending Northwestern in that program. As I recall in my own mind I was simply going to Northwestern to pursue the study of non-Western music and, if that was where it was being done, then I decided that I would go there. I had no clear vision of pursuing an academic career, although it should have been clear to anyone that this was the direction in which I was heading. I was only thinking about how I might learn more about this field.

Before actually applying to Northwestern University, by chance also during my last year as an undergraduate, the Dutch ethnomusicologist Jaap Kunst came to San Francisco. I had of course read his book, *Music in Java* (Kunst 1949). I had also read Colin McPhee’s (1946) *A House in Bali* and his 1949 *Musical Quarterly* article on Balinese gamelan music and had started a rather long correspondence with him, asking further questions about Balinese music. When Jaap Kunst arrived in San Francisco, I attended all his lectures, and once went out to meet him in Mill Valley near San Francisco, where he was staying with friends. It was Kunst who urged me to go to U.C.L.A., telling me that his student Mantle Hood was now teaching ethnomusicology there, that there was a Javanese gamelan, and that faculty and students all played together in it.

To me at that time, a performing musician who had spent some three years studying Japanese music through playing the koto, the idea of studying a music by playing it was immediately appealing. I dropped the idea of applying to Northwestern University and wrote to Mantle Hood. The following summer of 1956 I entered the graduate program at U.C.L.A. The effect on me of that first year at U.C.L.A. was momentous when you consider that I had been interested in the discipline for five or six years and now at last there was a place where one could go and study it.

At U.C.L.A. there was a graduate seminar in ethnomusicology each semester and an undergraduate course in world music cultures. Mantle Hood firmly believed that ethnomusicology was a subdiscipline of Western musicology, not in the sense of what the Western musicologist was studying but rather that there was only one discipline and ethnomusicology was part of it. To that end he believed the only
way to train an ethnomusicologist was by requiring a complete proficiency in Western historical musicology. At U.C.L.A. this meant for me that I had to take a full battery of qualifying exams in conducting, basic piano playing, sight singing, score reading at the piano, music analysis, and so forth. These were required before one could proceed to regular graduate status. While Mantle Hood appreciated that I had an undergraduate degree in anthropology and often mentioned it, he, for some reason, did not allow me or any of the other graduate students in ethnomusicology to take courses in anthropology.

I was intensely interested in what each of the ethnomusicology students at U.C.L.A. was studying. Some of us would go into the greater Los Angeles area and seek out various cultural and ethnic enclaves. It was at this time that I made my first contact with the large community of Okinawan musicians in the area. Also during the mid-1950s the first recordings that gave a better picture of the various musics of the world were beginning to appear. Alan Lomax’s World Library of Folk and Primitive Music had started to appear on Columbia Records, Hugh Tracey’s African Music Library recordings were now available, and Ducretet-Thompson had released a large anthology of North and South Indian Classical music. Ali Akbar Khan and Ravi Shankar had just begun to give concerts in the U.S., and musicians such as these were easily accessible to those few of us who were intensely interested in their music.

I now see this all as part of the increased accessibility of international travel and readily available information that occurred after World War II. It was no longer quite so difficult to travel or to get information about what was going on in other parts of the world, although such travel and accessibility were still much more limited than today. During my first year of graduate study, Mantle Hood asked me what culture of the world I would like to pursue as a focus of my graduate studies. At the time this was a difficult question for me. I wanted to study Chinese music, Indian music, African music, and Indonesian music; in fact, I was ready to go anywhere in the world to which I might be pointed. Mantle Hood suggested that I consider working on Japan since I already had had a good start in studying Japanese music in San Francisco. However, he had two ideas which affected my path of study. One did much to define the channels through which I was to pursue my study: for the sake of the ethnomusicology program he was trying to create at U.C.L.A., he wanted to have ensembles from different countries. The other idea was that each of us was strongly encouraged to find something like mode, raga, pathet, or makam in the music we were studying. He suggested that I study gagaku in Japan since this tradition had a large and varied ensemble. I was fascinated by the few recordings and live performances that I had heard of gagaku, and so I readily agreed.

During my second year at U.C.L.A., and before going to Japan, Mantle Hood went to Java for a year to carry out research, and I suggested that the music department invite Professor Shigeo Kishibe from Tokyo University as a visiting professor. Kishibe had written on music at the Tang Dynasty court, and this had a direct bearing on the origins of gagaku in Japan. Kishibe’s arrival was a great aid to
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1 my preparation for study in Japan. Furthermore, since he came with his wife, Yori, 1
2 I was able to continue to study the koto and to write a graduate paper on Yamada 2
3 ryu (school) koto music. Kishibe had in his possession a very unusual undated 3
4 eighteenth-century gagaku manuscript. Someone, perhaps wishing to understand 4
5 this music better, had created a score notation of the three wind instruments and 5
6 the two string instruments of gagaku written side by side, something that was very 6
7 unusual in Japan. I took this opportunity to use my analysis of this manuscript 7
8 as the basis for my master’s thesis in 1958. At the same time, with the help of 8
9 musicians from the local Tenrikyo church in Los Angeles, I started a gagaku 9
10 ensemble at U.C.L.A. made up of staff and students, including the architect Frank 10
11 Gehry, then studying at U.S.C.
12
13 In 1958 with the aid of a Ford Foundation Foreign Area Fellowship I went to 12
14 Japan to begin a three-year period of study. Professor Kishibe had also introduced 13
14 me to a group in Japan that played and taught gagaku. While the gagaku 15
15 tradition was primarily continued by the musicians of the Imperial Palace Music 15
16 Department, a few Shinto shrine and Buddhist temple musicians also played this 16
17 music, still considered rare and unusual in Japan generally. The group to which 17
18 I was introduced, the Ono Gagaku Kai, met at a local Shinto shrine, where the 18
19 musicians came to learn and to play together. The instructors for the group were all 19
20 musicians from the Imperial Palace Music Department (Figure 1.2).
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Figure 1.2 Robert Garfias in Tokyo in 1958
By extraordinary effort and some considerable luck, the International House in Tokyo succeeded in having me admitted to the Imperial Household Agency as a student in the Music Department. This had never happened before nor has it ever happened since to the best of my knowledge. Miraculously, I was admitted and, while the pretext was to allow me to study in the palace, it also allowed me regular entry into the Imperial Palace so that I could attend all performances and rehearsals in the palace music department.

During the second year of my stay in Japan, with the vision and energy of Lincoln Kirstein of the New York City Ballet, the gagaku musicians were invited to perform at the U.N. by Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold. With this invitation in hand Kirstein proposed a performance tour of the U.S. for the court musicians. The Imperial Household Agency asked me to join the musicians on this tour as an interpreter, and for this purpose I was officially made an attaché of the Imperial Board of Ceremonies. In the course of the performance tour of the U.S. I got to know each of the 23 musicians very well, and this close contact with each of the palace musicians was of immense value to me in the final stages of my research in Japan.

Upon my return to U.C.L.A. after study in Japan I concentrated on the preparation of my research while at the same time participating in the seminars in ethnomusicology and playing in the performance groups. In addition to the gagaku ensemble that I continued to direct, there were two Ghanaian drummers in residence, the result of contacts that Hood had made during his stay in Ghana. There were also two Balinese musicians and so there was much activity in the area of Balinese gamelan. During the same time Colin McPhee was invited to U.C.L.A. as a visiting faculty member, and so after years of correspondence I at last met him and joined his seminar on the old style of Balinese music.

I must confess honestly that even as I was writing up my doctoral dissertation I was not particularly thinking about what came next, which is to say about securing a teaching position in an academic institution. It was intimated, not directly but by hearsay, that I might be invited to stay on at U.C.L.A., which to me at the time only seemed like a continuation of what I had been doing. In retrospect Mantle Hood was indeed asking me to do a number things that helped to lighten his burden, such as taking over the teaching of some of the courses.

When the new position in ethnomusicology was opened at the University of Washington as part of the new Center for Asian Arts, Mantle Hood submitted my name and gave me strong support. I went directly from being a lecturer at U.C.L.A., not yet having completed the dissertation, to becoming a junior professor at Washington without going through the sort of anxiety and doubt that one should have felt at such a transition. Let me add quickly, that it was not some great sense of confidence that enabled me to slip easily from one place to another but rather with the feeling that it was all happening too rapidly for comprehension.

Professor Kishibe, whom I now knew very well, and his family were already in Seattle when I arrived in 1962. They were both teaching in the Center for Asian Arts program. The activities of the Center for Asian Arts were well underway.
There were Japanese woodblock artists of high repute, a troupe of Japanese kyogen actors, Indian playwrights, and specialists in Japanese landscape architecture. Kishibe had proposed a plan whereby he would recommend a visiting koto teacher for each of the five years of the program. The first one was his wife, who was there with him. I started a gagaku ensemble in one of the small ensemble rehearsal rooms. Without realizing it I embarked on a plan that resembled what I had seen at U.C.L.A., with some important differences. There were at first only a handful of graduate students. As the broad survey of world music course took hold on campus the number of people coming into the program increased. After Kishibe returned to Japan, I was the only person teaching ethnomusicology. I taught the survey course and a graduate seminar. There were two possible performance music activities: instruction in koto playing; and participation in the gagaku group. I continued in the model of research based on participant observation. By the time I left U.C.L.A. I had the uneasy feeling that the performance groups were becoming just that, performance groups, rather than a group of people primarily interested in understanding the music.

Clearly the U.C.L.A. model for an ethnomusicology program was firmly imprinted on me. There were also some things that from the very beginning I felt differently about. For one, I felt the link to anthropology was important and from the beginning of my appointment at the University of Washington I held a joint appointment in the anthropology department. I thought of the performance groups more as study groups. The aim of each enterprise was not to prepare for a public performance, but if such a request or interest was expressed from outside it seemed fair and rational that the groups should attempt to comply. Later, when we had a regular program of rotating visiting artists, I never pushed public performance on them. But if the visiting artist felt that he or she wanted to demonstrate publicly the accomplishments of the students then this was perfectly acceptable. Ultimately there were many performances, because there was a growing interest in what we were doing. I was nevertheless satisfied that we were not making the performances an end in themselves, which I feared was happening at U.C.L.A. I must admit that at U.C.L.A. the important development of the academic program and the creation of its excellent facilities might not have been allowed to develop without the regular stream of public performances by the various student ensembles. It also now seems clear that without the successful model of what had developed at U.C.L.A., the resources to build the University of Washington ethnomusicology program might not have been found nor might there have been the will and sympathetic support sufficient to sustain it.

In the first years of the program at Washington I followed a modified version of what I had seen at U.C.L.A. However, at that time the ethnomusicology program was only one part of the Center for Asian Arts activities. The program of visiting Japanese koto teachers from the Yamada school tradition had been firmly put in place by Professor Kishibe. It took another two or three years before it was apparent to all that of all the enterprises begun by the Center for Asian Arts, the ethnomusicology program was the only one to develop into a regular graduate
and undergraduate set of programs and to become a solid and regular part of the university’s academic program. The students who were attracted to it were of the highest caliber and the status and merit of the program as distinct from the Center was gradually recognized on campus and beyond.

At about this time, the mid-1960s, the School of Music was attempting to find a new director. Eventually, the position was offered to William Bergsma, a composer who until then had been associated with the Juilliard School of Music. Bergsma had a strong and clear vision of what he wanted to create. He wanted a school of music that would be unrivaled on the West coast, perhaps in all of the U.S. He wanted a jazz program, a contemporary music program, and a Western music program that would be the best. Early during his tenure he made a visit to U.C.L.A., where he saw the Institute of Ethnomusicology, and he decided that Washington should have something like it. In truth the beginnings of an ethnomusicology program were already there, but they could not have developed without Bergsma’s help and support. He advocated for and found the funds to develop the subbasement area and turn it into a set of excellent office spaces and study rooms. When one considers that so little like this has been developed anywhere else since then, one comes to appreciate the energy, vision, and stubborn persistence of a person like Bergsma.

In 1965 I had a conversation with Porter McCrea, then director of the J.D.R. 3rd Fund, a small private foundation of John D. Rockefeller III devoted entirely to projects in Asian Arts. McCray wanted to establish national archives of film and sound recordings of traditional music in Korea and in the Republic of the Philippines. The archives would reside in each of these countries. He asked me if I knew anyone who could do this and, although I had not previously used a film camera, I told him that I could. I talked to a number of people about how to approach this challenge. Mantle Hood (1964) had just completed his film Atumpan. I spoke with Alan Lomax, and he made an important suggestion: visit the Folklore Archive in Bucharest, Romania. It had been established by Constantin Brăiloiu, and Lomax said it was the finest in the world. I also spoke with Henry Jacobs, a San Francisco-based video and sound recording technician, and he advised me to look at what Wallace Friesen and Paul Ekman were doing in their documentation of nonverbal communication at Langley Porter clinic at the University of California, San Francisco. They basically pointed a camera at the subject to obtain the maximum amount of information with a minimum of editing. Alan Lomax seconded this, and when I murmured that this technique would make for rather visually uninteresting films, they countered that these films were difficult to watch precisely because what they were showing was everything and thus almost too much information.

Knowing that everyone has been exposed through current feature films to increasingly sophisticated film editing, cuts, time lapses, fades, and changes of camera angle, my fear was that these films would be dismissed as old-fashioned ethnographic films. However, as Hugo Zemp later said when we were on a panel together and he was defending his ‘Are-‘Are films, “Some people want to make a
story with their films. They should better write a book instead.” I was convinced that this was the way to go, particularly since I would be going to the Philippines and Korea with a single graduate student, Harold “Bud” Schultz. Attempting to make a story-type film would severely limit our ability to do much of anything else while we were in the field, and thus our primary objective of producing documentary recordings and films would be severely hampered. In truth, although I was concerned about the response, I really believed that the approach suggested by Jacobs and Lomax was the better way to go. People in the film world often say that in order to make a film you had to expect a 10-to-one ratio, which meant that you had to shoot 10 times more footage of film than would end up in the final cut. I also reasoned that, barring technical difficulties, and we certainly had them, we could count on a much higher ratio for the final useable film. Although I carefully considered which route to follow in the making of film documents in the Philippines and Korea, in fact the final process was almost predetermined. The main purpose of the project was to document as much of the tradition of each of the cultures as would be possible in a short time. In that light, treating the film as a moving visual sound recording rather than a feature documentary was the only thing we could have done within reason and with any hope of satisfying the intent of the project. In retrospect many did find the films uninteresting. However, now some 40 years later, looking back on the 64,000 feet of film that I shot and knowing that most the artists in the films are now dead, I see their value as a priceless document of valuable performances. In 2004 I created a website dedicated to streaming versions of the digitized copies of these 16mm films (https://eee.uci.edu/programs/rgarfias/films.html). It was my hope to be able to place high-quality versions of the films up on the web. While the digitized versions of these films are preserved in DV CAM or Beta Cam or are very high quality, at this writing the bandwidth required to show them remains out of reach and I have had to settle for lesser quality streaming versions for the moment. I continue to add to these and make them available as funding for the digitization process permits. In the first three years since I put the website up, it has had over 26,000 viewers and has been the source of numerous inquiries and comments. The field work in the Philippines was completed with the assistance of Professor Jose Maceda of the University of the Philippines, whom I had known in graduate school at U.C.L.A. He made suggestions as to where we might film and record, and either he traveled with us or connected us with someone he knew in the region who could assist us. At other times we set out on our own or followed leads we had been given by local residents in the field. We covered much of the Mountain Province in Northern Luzon, documented a significant amount of the Hispanic culture of the Ilocos area of Northern Luzon, and then covered the Sulu Islands, Mindanao, and Palawan. We missed the central Hispanic cultures of the Visayas and Southern Luzon. In Korea we received a lot of assistance. I already knew, from my first visit to Korea in 1960, a number of people connected to the arts, such as Professor Lee Hye-ku and the kayagŭm player and composer Byungki Hwang as well as the
1. *p'ansori* singer Kim Sohŭi. They were all a great help, but especially Kim Sohŭi because she knew everyone in the Korean music world and had a clear view of what we were looking for and thus who would be good for the documentation project. With the assistance of these excellent advisors we were able to film and record a wide sampling of Korean court music, *sanjo*, *p'ansori*, folk music, and folk theater from all over Korea. We made hundreds of recordings and hundreds of films in Korea and the Philippines and gave prints of these films, copies of all the recordings, and a Nagra tape recorder towards the establishment of the archives in each of these countries.

During my absence in the field I persuaded the school of music to hire Willem Adriaansz, who had just completed his Ph.D. at U.C.L.A. Adriaansz had been one of Jaap Kunst’s last students and we had known each other well in graduate school. He also worked on Japanese music: the *shamisen kumiuta* as practiced still in the Kyoto area. The ethnomusicology program had been steadily growing all this time with regular graduate and undergraduate courses and students. Because of this the music school was persuaded to open a second position in ethnomusicology, and Adriaansz was retained.

Upon my return from field work in the Philippines and Korea I began to think seriously and more clearly about the future of the ethnomusicology program. The five-year plan of *koto* teachers recommended by Professor Kishibe was now at an end. I was anxious to expand the program into broader areas beyond Japan. In order not to make the transition too abrupt I invited as a visiting artist, a teacher of the *shamisen kumiuta* known to Adriaansz, Miss Tsuda of Kyoto. The following year I invited an excellent Ikuta school *koto* teacher, Keiji Yagi. Following on this I began to invite visiting artists from other cultures: Hamza El Din from Nubian Egypt, Dumisani Maraire from Zimbabwe, Tao Chu-shen from Taiwan, Mohammad Omar from Afghanistan, and others.

I also began to think more about the Ph.D. program and decided to formalize the course work to incorporate anthropology and linguistics. Most likely the students saw these requirements as additional and unwanted burdens, but I was concerned about how we were preparing ethnomusicologists to do their best. In point of fact a degree in music still left out much in the way of preparation for further research in ethnomusicology. Because no existing undergraduate curriculum was adequate to prepare for graduate work in ethnomusicology, the completion of an M.A. thesis before going on to the doctorate became standard. Course work comprised studies in musicology, anthropology, and linguistics, all usually being taken at the M.A. level. I also changed the entry requirements so that any formal musical experience would be accepted, rather than a strict B.A. in Western music as had been the rule at U.C.L.A. Thus a number of the new graduate students who no longer fit the narrow pattern that had been defined at U.C.L.A. were admitted. As an example, a person like Usopay Cadar, who came from a musical family in Mindanao and who had a college degree but neither formal training nor a degree in Western music, was accepted and completed an excellent doctoral dissertation.
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Of the programs in ethnomusicology in the U.S. at this time there were only three large ones: U.C.L.A., Washington, and Wesleyan University. The number of practicing ethnomusicologists in the United States at the time was few. At the 1965 New Mexico meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology, which I had to miss because of being in the field, the entire membership attending the conference could fit in one group photo. But the number had grown considerably from the second meeting I attended in 1962 in Bloomington and certainly more than the first meeting I attended in 1960 in Berkeley where we were just a few mixed together with the American Musicological Society. In the few short years between 1960 and 1966 it was clear that the discipline was growing and would continue to grow. Likewise, I could foresee that other programs in ethnomusicology would soon be developing. The field did continue to grow, more ethnomusicologists were being hired, and in a number of places there were now more than one or two. Some new programs did not follow the pattern of U.C.L.A., Washington, and Wesleyan and give a key role to participant observation. Why they did not was not apparent to me until much later. I thought and assumed that, if there were to be other centers in the future, this was the opportunity to mold a program that would in my own view best prepare ethnomusicologists for their future.

I thought of the process of training ethnomusicologists as having two main goals. One was to prepare for work in the field. This would be based on an exposure to the existing corpus of research and the preparation in depth for the specific area of research. It followed of necessity that the new ethnomusicologist would become a specialist in areas and subject matter that might be little known to the faculty of the program. As Harry Powers once told me in the process of submitting his dissertation on South Indian music to his committee at Princeton, someone on his committee said to him, “Well, I suppose that if we had a time capsule and could send you back to the Middle Ages we would have to assume that you knew more about it than anyone else.”

This expansion into heretofore uncharted areas seemed necessary if the field were to grow. But how best to prepare for field work in a subject or region of which little was yet known? My thought was that preparation should include exposure to as wide a range of different possibilities as could be made available. This was still a challenge in those days because not very much had yet been published in the field. However, it was also true that in the little that was published there was a very great variety of approaches and methods. I believed that the other important means of addressing this problem was in the performance study groups. Rather than thinking of them as performing groups as they had been at U.C.L.A., I saw these groups as a means of helping to break down preconceptions about what might come up in the field. The first steps of learning someone else’s music begin naturally with a view and approach growing out of that particular cultural context, one very different from initial expectations. While there is no way to prepare one for all of the many different approaches to music that exist in the world, the experience of learning new musics would at least help in breaking down some preconceptions and thus better prepare the ethnomusicologist for study in the field.
For this reason, the visiting artists were changed every year or two and all graduate
students were required to participate in at least one study group. In this way we
thought of the visiting artists as informants whose most important function for the
program would be to help to break down stereotypes.

The second important goal of the training was to help to prepare the graduates
for their eventual role as college or university teachers. For some reason, which
did not seem unusual to most people who were not ethnomusicologists, it was
expected that the ethnomusicologist was a person who was knowledgeable about
all the music of the world. There was of course no way to prepare for that, but it was
inevitable that a newly hired ethnomusicologist would be asked to teach courses
about subjects beyond his or her special area of concentration and would very
likely be asked to offer some sort of world music survey course. The responsibility
would be to explain in part what ethnomusicologists do rather than only what any
one ethnomusicologist does.

This assumption was born out again and again. What I was not prepared for was
the unhappy fact that as other regular music majors, not in ethnomusicology,
were graduated from the University of Washington, their new institutions,
knowing that Washington had a program in ethnomusicology, would ask them
to teach a world music course in addition to their specialty, something for which
they had no preparation whatsoever. Sadly for the entire 20 years that I was at the
University of Washington School of Music, music majors were not permitted to
take courses in ethnomusicology. During those years when the national college
music accreditation organization, the National Association of Schools of Music,
was placing a high premium on institutions that offered a world music course,
Washington was acclaimed by that organization, but they did not seem to realize
that the program was operating like a separate unit having nothing to do with the
rest of the school, a situation certainly not of our choosing.

During the 1970s I continued to make films of all the visiting artists on the
faculty during the period of their residence. I also managed to make films of as
many musicians as I could who passed through Seattle. We had the camera and
tape recorder, and the challenge was to find money to pay the artists and to buy
film. This I managed to do over the years, but there was never enough money to do
much with processing these films or even to buy more than three ten-minute reels
of film at any time. Many of these films remained developed and synched, sound
and picture, in a dual system that could only be viewed with special dedicated
equipment. They were never transferred to optical prints for more general viewing.
There was simply no money for that. They remained that way until 2004 and 2005
when I began the process of digitizing them. Many of these films I had not seen since I watched them through the camera lens. I continue to regard this collection of films as an extremely valuable and important documentary resource.

As the artists appearing in these films pass on, the value of this documentation only increases.

Over the years since Willem Adriaansz left to take a position in Australia, a
number of ethnomusicologists joined the ranks at the University of Washington in
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1 the ethnomusicology program: Robert Kauffman, Robert Brown, Nazir Jairazbhoy, 1
2 Roderic Knight, Larry Godsey, Jihad Racy, Fredric Lieberman, Lorraine Sakata, 2
3 Daniel Neuman, Ter Ellingson, and, since my departure to the University of 3
4 California, Irvine, Philip Schuyler, Shanon Dudley, and others. In addition there 4
5 have been countless outstanding visiting artists from all cultures of the world and 5
6 a great number of outstanding graduate students, each of whom has gone on to 6
7 accomplishments elsewhere. Each has contributed something to the program and 7
8 added to the legacy that lives on at the university today, a legacy partly captured 8
9 by the essays in this volume.

10 In my own view we had an ideal academic program; one might even go so far 10
11 as to say that it is a model program. However if that were true, one would have to 11
12 wonder why there are no others that followed this model. With the passing of time 12
13 some questions like this seem now much easier to answer. Much of my view of 13
14 this question, much like my view of the status of the discipline of ethnomusicology 14
15 today, is colored and informed by a number of processes and engagements in my 15
16 own career. From the late 1970s through the late 1980s I was active as a university 16
17 administrator. What I gained most from that experience was a vast amount of 17
18 information from many sources and a broad perspective on the role and function 18
19 of academic institutions and their place in the larger society. Not everything in 19
20 that administrative experience was useful and positive, but what was of value I 20
21 continue to hold in high esteem. Again by a twist of fortune, I was able to spend a 21
22 good 15 years in public policy, working with the National Endowment for the Arts 22
23 and the Smithsonian Institution as well as state and local arts agencies all over the 23
24 country. From this perspective, I can look back at the two questions I wondered 24
25 about some 40 years ago: first, how would ethnomusicology take its place in the 25
26 world of research and teaching; and second, assuming that I was correct that the 26
27 best training for ethnomusicologists was to be gained from places like U.C.L.A., 27
28 Washington, and Wesleyan, what shape would these institutions take. 28
29 I would back then have been surprised had I known that ethnomusicologists 29
30 would find themselves working in either anthropology departments, which 30
31 understand the aims of the discipline but regard any of the arts as relatively 31
32 unimportant elements in the study of human culture, or in music departments, 32
33 where ethnomusicologists are seen as people who worship false gods. In spite of 33
34 these handicaps the field has continued to develop, and the discipline moves on. 34
35 Important new research and new methods continue to develop steadily. It seems 35
36 clear that the present state of research in ethnomusicology continues without 36
37 being entirely dependent on the large graduate centers. There are of course a 37
38 great number of reasons why new centers have not been developed, not the least 38
39 of which is a lack of resources needed to create one. There is also the natural 39
40 tendency for academic institutions to be pragmatic and very conservative, and as 40
41 a consequence they very often get things wrong. Resources and money usually 41
42 go where the glitz is: new scientific breakthroughs or where donors wish to see 42
43 their names on a plaque, a law school, a concert hall, a school of medicine, and 43
44 so forth. I believe strongly that ethnomusicology is today still in need of large 44
centers of study like Washington, U.C.L.A., and Wesleyan, centers that regard
performance as a vital key to understanding a music culture. I do not believe that
every ethnomusicologist should be devoted to the study of music qua music, but
neither should we lose sight of that which sits at the center of our discipline, the
music itself.

The other part of the question that faces the discipline today is whether we
are doing fine just as we are or is there a need still for institutions with several
ethnomusicologists working together. Most of the established academic disciplines
with a research thrust developed out of environments in which several specialists
working together cooperatively made strides in defining the methods and tools
needed for the questions being asked. The analogy of several blind men trying to
describe an elephant on the basis of only the part they are touching is not apt for us,
because much of the work of ethnomusicologists is about those discrete parts. But
if the discipline is ever to make a contribution beyond the specific and discrete,
the questions will need to be placed into a larger context, one that no single
ethnomusicologist can answer alone. Do we need a theory of ethnomusicology
that transcends the theory used for the now thousands of specific studies before
us? I think we do. I am constantly reminded of John Blacking’s chiding question,
“Ethnomusicology for what?”

It is a big question, and consequently any answer must have to be framed into
a very large context. While I would not say that ethnomusicology as an entire
discipline should return to a concentration on the music itself, I strongly believe
that much of the value of the discipline still lies there. One of the most important
to another culture, another way of thinking, another humanly organized set of
preferences and values lies in the music. Nothing, I believe, tells us quite so much
about another person or group as what they listen to. Whereas adherents of various
musics may strenuously advocate for their own preference, as ethnomusicologists
the value of our potential contribution must lie in what we can tell about differences.
In the 1990s national policy seemed to be seeking to understand differences and to
explain them, but today I have the strong impression that we have all but given up
on that and are in a dangerous process of balkanization. The systematic study of
different forms and modes of human musical expression may be vital in stemming
this process.

Clearly, it is not a good time for proposing such large solutions. Corporate-
style thinking increasingly dominates the development of academic processes at
most universities. Gone is the old generation of powerful people with insight, like the Rockefellers, Fords, and Guggenheims, who could use their resources
and influence to fulfill a vision. I still firmly believe that if we find music of some
form in every human society we have encountered, then music fulfills a function
for humans that far exceeds in importance the role to which it has been relegated
in our society. In order to begin to see music in its larger light, I think it will take
several of us working together cooperatively in concerted research (Figure 1.3).
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Figure 1.3  Robert Garfias in 2005