Migrating Musicians

In 2010 the Senegalese hip hop group Daara J Family were refused entry into the United Kingdom: they had not demonstrated that sufficient maintenance funding would be available to them during their stay. Robin Denselow, a contributor to this volume, described the circumstances in an article in the *Guardian* (Denselow 2010), noting that paperwork was just one of the difficulties that non-European musicians faced in travelling to the United Kingdom. He quoted a representative from Daara J Family’s record company, who expressed dismay that the musicians would not be present in the country for the launch of their own album. And he suggested that British music fans might find it increasingly difficult to hear live performances by musicians from outside the EU. The story suggests some of the circumstances that hold at the time of writing: the increasingly stringent immigration regulations that have accompanied a growing nativism, an economic recession, and anxieties regarding European multiculturalism. But it also reveals a context of global movements and fascinations, in which musicians and genres circulate, the latter increasingly in mass mediated form, and in which musicians and audiences alike are enchanted by the music of the other (as seems evident in the case of Senegalese musicians performing an African American genre for British music fans). In short, it points to the complex set of interlinked objects herein described as ‘migrating music’.

First, and perhaps most obviously, the story highlights migrants: in this case musicians seeking to cross a border to make their livelihood. The present volume, and especially the first part, ‘Migrants’, dwells on people who move physically to new places. It considers musicians and listeners, moving voluntarily and involuntarily,
temporarily and permanently, with papers and without. It examines how they maintain musical connections to home, but also how they reconcile their musical practices to new and unfamiliar contexts. Of course, not all migrants are musicians, let alone professionals who sell recordings and concert tickets. Even fewer are successful enough to make a living primarily through such activities. Accordingly we are concerned with amateurs as well as professionals, and listeners as well as performers.

That Daara J Family is a hip hop group points to a second kind of musical movement, namely travelling styles, instruments, and techniques. In the three or so decades since the emergence of rap, the genre has spread globally, as has the technology to make it (and indeed many associated elements, including dance styles, clothing, and graffiti art). Daara J Family’s appropriation of rap is hardly a rare instance of a migrating musical practice. Indeed, the group’s music evinces the influence of other, earlier-circulating genres, including reggae and soul. And of course musical styles and technologies travelled long before contemporary forms of mass mediation: African instruments (including drums and precursors of the banjo) and African stylistic characteristics (including complex interlocking rhythmic patterns) came to the Americas along with African slaves. Consequently, even very different practices like rap, reggae, and Senegalese traditional music share certain common elements of African musical style, and these similarities partly account for how amenable such genres seem to be to fusion with one another, as they do in the music of Daara J Family. There are abundant examples of ‘foreign’ musical styles enchanting musicians and listeners across lines of cultural difference. Shortly, we consider the complex dynamics of such appropriations and exchanges in terms of mimesis, a generative impulse to copy the music of the other. Further along, the second part of this volume, ‘Translations’, is devoted to the subject of genres in cross cultural motion.

A third kind of musical movement has implications for the first two. It is mediation: the circulation through print, broadcast, recording, and various forms of electronic dissemination, of musical objects that are separable in time and space from human subjects yet may also be activated and engaged by them (see Silverstein and Urban 1996). Mediation has had important implications for migrants and migrant communities. It has allowed them to preserve musical practices from home, and to
remake them in new contexts. For instance, North American immigrant communities have both preserved and cultivated valued song repertories through hymnals (see the contributions by Roeber, Bohlman, and Wulz in Bohlman and Holzapfel 2002). More recently, mediating technologies have permitted migrants to keep in touch in a nearly instantaneous manner with musical happenings vast distances away. Email, digitized music files, and video hosting sites permit migrants to track the latest trends and dance moves from back home, and just as importantly to celebrate and create a shared musical history with distant intimates. Mediation has also allowed migrant communities to join, and play a part in constructing, musical networks, that is ‘scapes’ (Appadurai 1996) or ‘publics’ (see Warner 2002) that cross regional and national boundaries. Here the ‘old’ medium of radio remains a crucially important channel, as the essays in Part 3, ‘Media’, demonstrate through what is an extended case study of the BBC World Service. While mass mediation enables all sorts of world-making activities it is nevertheless also the means by which important musical disparities are perpetuated. Through mediation the music industry has given the most fortunate musicians – in large part, although not exclusively, from western countries and advantaged backgrounds – the ability to address immense and far-flung audiences. Their works and performances have been made available to people and communities around the world, and rarely in any sort of reciprocal way.

Some of the foregoing aspects of mediation are again evident in the case of Daara J Family. Interviewed by Newsweek, Faada Freddy, one of the founding members of the group, remarked:

The first time we heard American rap, it sounded no different from [tassou, a traditional genre practiced in Senegal]. Our theory is that it traveled to America during the slave era. It was slumbering in the deepest part of their souls, and then one day it was awakened. It reminded them of their roots. Then it conquered the world. And now it's back home. (Ali 2005)

The quotation suggests that mediation has allowed black musicians to become aware of their historical and musical connections to people in countries and communities far from their own. Faada Freddy’s theory that Senegalese music slumbered silently for centuries in the souls of African Americans might not stand up to a literal interpretation (although certainly, as noted earlier, African elements have been preserved in African American musical practices). But his history does suggest one of
the possibilities of mass mediation discussed above: namely the opportunity it presents musicians to build upon or even invent links with the music of other, imagined, musicians far away. Faada Freddy’s account undertakes multiple crossings of the Black Atlantic (Gilroy 1993), binding the music of Senegal and America together in a shared history. Certainly his rhetorical work might be interpreted as a canny strategy, on the part of an ‘outsider’, to position his practice as an authentic and ancient version of the American hip hop tradition – thus locating himself at the centre of it. But it does other work too: it contributes to the growing storehouse of discourses, performances, and recordings that move between black populations on either side of the Atlantic, helping to constitute an international network of diverse, circulating black expressive practices. If, following the work of recent theorists of public culture, publics (or ‘imaginaries’) come into being through the circulation of mass mediated performances and publications (see Berlant 2008, Warner 2002) Daara J Family is contributing to the ongoing work of building an international black music public. Finally, Faada Freddy’s words point to some of the disparities that exist between mass mediated performances and genres: some kinds of music ‘conquer the world’ while others seem to have much poorer chances. It is to such structural inequities we now turn.

**Political economy and history**

The globalization which has enabled networks of migrating music (such as the black music public just discussed) is of course nothing new: Marx (1967) famously described it in 1848 in *The Communist Manifesto*. More recently Immanual Wallerstein (1995) has traced the origins of a ‘capitalist world-system’ to the sea-born empires launched from Europe in the late fifteenth century. But whatever chronology we use, the systematic inter-connection of formerly remote parts of the world is clearly a precondition for many musical migrations. And it is capitalism and its precursor mercantilism that have been major engines in creating these networks, and in encouraging the circulation of European musical genres and instruments within them. Today, while global capitalism persists in its essential features, centres of power are changing, and the system itself seems to be becoming more unstable as deregulation and privatisation proceed apace. Indeed as Andrew Glyn (2006) puts it, in
the neo-liberal conjuncture of the late 1970s and after, we confront ‘capitalism unleashed’. There are two repercussions for migrating music.

One is a modest increase in the relocation of people from their homelands to other places, combined with a shift in the nature of that movement from North-South and South-South in the nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries, to South-North in the contemporary period (de Hass 2007: 822). Of the 191 million migrants across the world in 2005, Europe hosted 34 %, Asia 28 %, and North America, 23 % (UN n/d). Most of this movement has consisted of ‘economic migration’ in response to demand from employers seeking to keep down wages in the core of the world system (Glyn 2006: 102). The enforced movement of refugees and modern-day slaves has also played a part. We have already discussed some implications of these new diasporas for migrating music. Here we simply note a supervening tension in the neo-liberal ‘fix’: on the one hand, encouragement of the free passage of workers to the North so as to provide cheap labour; on the other, a pandering to racism among settled populations. Undoubtedly, these tensions contribute to the restless renegotiation of identity and difference at stake in the complex we call migrating music, and which make that phenomenon a profoundly ambivalent one.

The other way in which the advent of neo-liberalism has impacted upon migrating music is through the rise of the cultural industries and new communication technologies which have enabled the mediation of musics across the world – with or without the people who first made and used them. Having said this, we do not subscribe to a strong version of globalisation theory that supposes that the advent of global cultural networks has been sudden and recent (such as in Held et al. 1999 or Tomlinson 1999). This is simply not the case. For instance, African-American musicians were performing in Europe to large audiences in concert and music halls during the nineteenth century (Pickering 1990), while the tango spread via recording and films from its native Argentina to become a global phenomenon in the 1920s and ’30s (Gronow and Saunio 1998: 75-8). And of course European art music has assimilated, and then remitted, both court and people’s music from around the world since at least the seventeenth century (Taylor 2007: 15-110). If the material means for these developments have been augmented recently, what is at stake here is actually a steepening of the curve in a much longer upward trend in the carrying capacity of
mass media – from printed sheet music to the multi-media platform of the internet today. Contemporary forms of mediation give music increased potential to migrate more quickly, and to arrive in more places simultaneously, in very similar forms, than in previous centuries.

What has this meant for the movement of music? First and most obviously, mediated music has become nearly ubiquitous (albeit on a more limited scale in developing countries) and with it genres of popular music honed in the core of the world system such as Tin Pan Alley standards, jazz, rock, rap and soul. Often these are predominantly, or strongly influenced by, African-African forms. Indeed it might be said that African-American music, made by the descendants of slaves transported in the Middle Passage, has become a kind of ‘primary’ migrating music which has then been re-diffused to the rest of the world. We have already seen how the hybrid potentialities of African diasporic music contributed to this development. However behind this movement, and indeed behind the global spread of Western music in all its forms, has been an economic mechanism: massive economies of scale and the affluence of domestic markets. These factors enable the recovery of costs at home followed by cheap exports around the world of music which has already been ‘market tested’ in the core, especially in the US (see Marvasti 1994).

Other channels of musical migration and alternative networks of circulation also exist, however. Musical mediation has enabled rarer instances of South-South movement, most notably perhaps the adoption of rumba rhythms (rumba was itself a strongly African form) by central African musicians through the distribution of recordings made in Latin America (Stewart 2003). It has furthermore facilitated the flow of musics from South to North. The tango has been mentioned, but other significant examples include Brazilian bossa nova (see Keightley in this volume) and Jamaican reggae which also has a strong South-South dimension (Toynbee 2007). Most recently there has been the phenomenon of ‘world music’: mainly vernacular forms from the global South (or its diasporic populations) which is then re-packaged on CD for a small middle-class niche market in the North (Stokes 2004). Finally, the emergence of new ‘regional blocs’ needs to be acknowledged. As Dave Laing (1997) suggests, Canto- and Mando-Pop in East Asia; Spanish language pop in the Americas;
and pan-European repertoire, especially dance music, now constitute distinct genre-markets.

Today music is being produced and disseminated across the world in complex ways, then, with flows reflecting the drive to accumulate of the cultural industries, and producing asymmetries and inequalities. Yet there are counter-tendencies too, in the form of bottom-up developments. Just one example: in North India a lively ‘cassette culture’ emerged after the arrival of this cheap recording technology in the mid-1970s (Manuel 1993). Peter Manuel suggests that it enabled a new kind of democratic interactivity, and closer connections between music makers and users, as well as posing a challenge to the corporate film music of ‘Bollywood’. Since Manuel did his research there has been a shift to digital media, and now Bollywood music itself is distributed on cheap ‘pirate’ recordings (explored in Beaster-Jones 2008). In the UK a recent report suggests that on market stalls where many people from the North Indian diaspora buy their music, 70% of Bollywood DVDs were counterfeited as compared to only 5% for Hollywood products (Cunningham 2008).

Accessible technologies of reproduction and so-called ‘piracy’ may therefore represent something like participatory payback, enabling music to move across the world on terms and conditions which favour ordinary people rather than the cultural industries. It would be wrong to present this as anything like compensation for a viciously unfair global political economy of music. But it does at least expose something of the contradictions of a world system in which the movement of music, as much as the people, while being presented as ‘free’ is actually tightly channelled and controlled.

**Migration and Mimesis**

In January 1938 the *Winnipeg Tribune* printed a memoir by Philip Godsell (Godsell 1938), an account of a masquerade ball held one Christmas Night in Fort Smith, Northwest Territories. Godsell’s story reflects in many ways the social divisions between white and indigenous people that existed during Canada’s high colonial period. Although the festivities took place in a single hotel, participants occupied two distinct spaces. The ‘high tone’ whites disported themselves in the dance hall, where radio equipment had been set up to receive a specially requested programme of dance
music. They dressed up as various ‘frontier’ characters: one man in drag as a Klondike femme fatale, two policemen in costume as a horse, and Godsell himself in ‘Indian war paint’. Next door in the dining room were the real ‘Indians’. And although they wore moccasins, they neither danced to drum songs nor wore ‘war paint’. Godsell writes:

Despite the fears of the color conscious the Indians didn’t attempt to mix. They piled into the large square dining-room, leaving the commodious dance hall for the “high-tone” people. Already Freddie Behrens, mounted atop a packing case, was sawing with all his might upon his fiddle while moccasined feet thumped through the Eightsome Reel.

Eventually, a number of the whites transgressed the colour line by invading the dining room. The policemen led the way in their equine manifestation, apparently dancing a confused mixture of ‘high-tone’ jazz from the dance hall and fiddle music from the dining room.

Into the crowd of Indians pranced Spark Plug, front feet jiggering to the time of the fiddles, hind feet independently following the jazz step. With tossing head and revolving tail the monster charged the square dance.

What to make of these musical migrations: on the one hand indigenous northerners who enthusiastically fiddle and square dance, and on the other whites who dress up like ‘Indians’ and subsequently break in on the indigenous revels taking place next door to them? It should be emphasized that such phenomena are relatively widespread. Many indigenous communities across northern North America embraced the fiddling, step dancing, and quadrille traditions transmitted by British and French fur traders, even before the period of high colonialism. Conversely, certain spectacular forms of indigenous music and dance have proved attractive to non-indigenous Westerners. Powwow dancing and drumming are draws for non-aboriginal people across North America and in parts of Europe. Indeed, North American and European ‘wannabes’ have appropriated powwow regalia, song, and choreography, and, in Europe, even organize powwows (Welch 2007, Paskievich 1996).

Such musical appropriations have been accounted for in various ways. In the case of non-western adoptions of western music and dance, scholars and vernacular commentators have often voiced concerns about cultural and musical homogenization,
a process sometimes lamented as westernization or cultural grey-out (on the latter see Lomax 1968). Yet, as other scholars point out, many forms of musical and cultural distinctiveness have endured in the face of longstanding contact and even despite attempts to extinguish difference; African practices that survived the Middle Passage and slavery are a dramatic example (see Merriam 1964: 306–07). There exists a somewhat more complicated model of cultural persistence, however, one which takes into account the frequent fact of appropriation. Many have suggested that adoptions of western music, while seemingly indicating a slide towards homogeneity, may actually be strategies for preserving and extending cultural practice or ‘producing locality’ (the phrase comes from Appadurai 1996). Such theories place the emphasis on what people and communities *accomplish* by adopting foreign musical practices, a concern that also informs the theoretical frameworks shortly to be outlined.

Scholarly writing has also examined a converse trajectory of appropriation, namely the longstanding appeal to Western publics of the musics of non-Western others, Western minorities, and peasant and working-class communities. Often this appeal has been discussed in terms of the dynamics of exoticism. Timothy Taylor’s 1997 *Global Pop* identifies several ways in which western musicians and audiences conceptualize the music of the other, including as a site of authentic spirituality, emotionality, and primality, and as a source of sounds, ideas, and musicians that can refresh stagnating Western traditions. It is also possible to perceive Western fascinations in a more benign light, as (admittedly sometimes faltering) steps towards engagement and mutual understanding.

The writing of Michael Taussig (1993) offers another, wholistic characterization of cross cultural adoptions, one that takes into account both of the trajectories just discussed. In *Mimesis and Alterity* he suggests that cultures and communities draw upon mimesis (imitation) as a strategy for assimilating misunderstood or potentially threatening alterity (cultural difference). Although mimesis is characteristic of all kinds of encounters, Taussig suggests that it is particularly heightened in contexts of colonial domination, where dramatic encounters with cultural alterity engender crises in both colonizers and colonized. Through mimesis, both powerful and subordinate groups appropriate and transform aspects of one another’s difference, and in doing so attain power over that otherness. As Taussig puts it, ‘the making and existence of the
artifact [or, it might be added, music] that portrays something gives one power over that which is portrayed’ (1993: 13). Again, mimesis is not a unidirectional process: it is not only colonized people who imitate and appropriate from colonizers, but also colonizers who copy their indigenous others. Moreover, mimesis is not a process wherein one ‘primitive’ group borrows from another, ‘advanced’ group, thus ‘catching up’ historically. Rather, it is a coeval (i.e. simultaneous) relationship made possible by the fact that groups share a time and space of encounter – in the cases Taussig investigates, a context of colonialism and domination.

Consider again Philip Godsell’s account of the Christmas ball in Fort Smith. Emulation clearly moved in two directions. Again, the aboriginal people at the hotel celebrated the holiday with fiddle music and choreography that had at some point been appropriated from Euro-Canadians, while certain Euro-Canadians imitated the ‘war paint’ of distant ‘Indians’ and the jigging of the ones next door. Moreover, in this colonial context, copying is not only highly visible, it is employed in ways that both perpetuate and contest structural inequities. The ‘high-tone’ colonizers initially made their distinction and technological privilege evident by eschewing the ‘sawing’ of the fiddle and the ‘thumping’ of dancing feet and arranging for an unprecedented radio broadcast. But they also asserted their power through symbolic action: by transforming their bodies into indigenous ones (adorning the face with paint in one case and doing the jig step in another) and moving into the social space of the other. Mimesis was also at work on the other side of the social divide. Decades before Godsell arrived in Fort Smith aboriginal people from north-western North America had begun to appropriate European music and dance. Contemporary accounts do not offer much insight into the reasoning behind these adoptions. But at a basic level they may have stemmed from a need to accommodate strange new people and ways within existing indigenous cultural categories and practices. At the time that Godsell was writing, these practices probably accomplished something else: they quietly demonstrated that indigenous people were every bit as capable as Euro-Canadians of employing musical technologies (such as the violin) and valued, expressive forms of choreographic corporateness (such as quadrille). In short, these practices transgressed the boundaries that the ‘colour conscious’ sought to maintain. Yet paradoxically they also affirmed indigenous difference – for what could be stranger for many Euro-
Canadians than the sight of indigenous people who ‘should’ be wearing face paint instead dancing the Eightsome Reel?

Taussig’s theory of mimesis and alterity suggests that copying does not necessarily result in sameness. Rather, and perhaps particularly in cases of colonial domination, it affirms and reinstatates difference (perhaps not least for those who see themselves ‘distorted’ in myriad uncanny reflections). This raises questions about the possibility of the hopes some have for migrating music, for instance that learning (and learning about) the music of others will reveal a shared humanity, or that mutual musical engagement will enable conviviality and understanding. Certainly the account of the Christmas celebrations reveals the potential for structures of power to remain in place even as everyone ‘dances together’. But are there representations of musical alterity – and ways of taking up the music and dance of the other – that escape the dynamic of knowing but not knowing?

**Translation**

Copying inevitably involves some kind of translation. That is, in ‘doing’ another’s music you have to bring it across into your own system of conceptual and aesthetic categories, in which it makes sense and has value. Translation is a creative move, then, and one with the potential to transform musical practices and sounds into ones that operate or signify in ways quite distinct from in their old context.iii And this may help to explain how it is that certain practices, instruments, and sounds – some appropriated in the heightened mimetic context of colonial or imperial encounter – become thoroughly indigenized in their new contexts (thus the harmonium is as indigenous in India as curry in the United Kingdom). In fact in many cases the copy undergoes further transformations and developments in response to the specific demands of its new cultural and aesthetic context, so much so that the original object of copying fades from view, as the following vignettes suggest.

First vignette: in their conquest of present day Portugal and Spain the Moors brought with them the *ud*, an ovoid, plucked, stringed instrument with a sound bowl and fretted neck. Miniatures from Castille c.1260 show Moorish and Christian musicians playing *uds*, as well as a variant called the gittern. By the fourteenth century, as it
spread across Northern and Central Europe, the *ud*-like lute became distinguishable from the *ud* as shown in those miniatures of the previous century (Spring 2001: 1–7). Then in the early fifteen hundreds there is documentary reference from Italy to a plucked instrument called the *chitarino*, and towards the end of the century a chart from Bologna shows tablature for a *viola* (the generic term for a waisted, stringed instrument). James Tyler is in no doubt that ‘the instrument intended is a guitar-like (plucked) instrument’ (1980: 17-18). Finally from around 1500 in Spain a *vihuela* survives. This is a plucked stringed instrument with a flat top and bottom, figure of eight profile, and six courses of strings (20). It is recognizably a guitar. The waisted profile of viols in general, it should be noted, derives from the medieval, European fiddle (Woodfield 1984: 38).

Now although we have no conclusive evidence, it seems likely that behind this chronology is a continuous process of emergence which can be reduced heuristically to the following stages. The plucked *ud* is brought to Spain by invading Muslims; conquered Christians take up the *ud* in a mimetic (and therefore also othering) act; other Europeans, having a considerably more distant relationship to Muslims, develop the lute, a related but distinctive instrument; lastly, a plucked stringed instrument (morphologically a guitar) emerges with a waisted sound box, historically a European feature.

Second vignette: In the 1950s the main form of musical entertainment for working-class people in Kingston, Jamaica was the weekend dance where records were played-back over ‘sound systems’. The repertoire was mixed, but the predominant style was African-American ‘jump’ rhythm and blues. Records were bought in the US and brought over to Jamaica either by the sound system operators or scouts who worked for them. Towards the end of the decade the style preferred by Kingstonians, in which there was a walking bass-line and an accented offbeat falling on the ‘ands’ of the beat in 4/4 time, stopped being produced in the US. So sound system operators began to hire local musicians and singers to re-create the sound of jump blues in the two recording studios which were now operating in the city. Almost from the start of domestic recording around 1958 musicians began to increase the accent on the offbeat, and by 1962 a new term was coined to describe the resulting music; ska. The walking bass line quickly disappeared now, while the offbeat was voiced by more and
more instruments including horns, piano, guitar and harmonica, leaving the drummer to pick up the backbeat on the snare on beats 2 and 4 – a trope which had been imported from rock’n’roll (White 1998).

Then, quite quickly over the spring and summer of 1966, the tempo of the records slowed from a median 125 bpm to around 90, while the voicing of the offbeat shifted to the guitar on its own. Much smaller horn sections played antiphonal riffs or melodic decorations. Immediately named rocksteady, the lighter, slower new style was hegemonic for two years or so, until another catastrophic change occurred with the advent of reggae – faster, funkier and more frenetic – in 1968 (White 1983). Critically, the subsequent history of Jamaican popular music has been one of successive developments of this sort where quite sharp changes are followed by relatively stable aesthetic regimes (Toynbee 2007).

Of course these examples of the emergence of the guitar in Europe and of idiomatic Jamaican popular music are radically different in terms of time, space and scale. Nevertheless what they have in common is key for the process of migrating music, namely that following an original moment of mimesis the copied music undergoes further developments and transformations. And although the original moment of transfer might have involved an anxious attempt to contain a threatening alterity, the copied object often becomes familiar, localized and indigenized and is then elaborated in response to the most pressing concerns of the people who have appropriated it.

In cases where mimesis occurred in the heightened context of colonial or imperial encounter, the copied object (instrument, metre, timbre, costume, dance step …) may lose its associations with a threatening otherness as copiers acquire cultural power or feel less beholden to those they copy. In fact the two vignettes suggest variations on this theme. In the case of the emergence of the guitar a critical factor was the so-called Riconquista which began soon after the Moors invaded. By 1492 they had been entirely driven out of the Iberian peninsula. Just as important, though, were political and cultural connections between Christian northern Spain and Italy in the later middle ages. It was in Italy, as we saw, that some of the key developments seem to have taken place. And northern Italy was beyond the area of conflict with Muslims. To put it in the terms we have using here, once the plucked lute became available
outside the othering-space where it had first been copied it was no longer a copy, but rather an indigenous instrument, and therefore liable to be modified.

In the case of ska, the power differential between copiers and copied was much less to start off with. Black Jamaicans had connections through migrant friends and relatives with black Americans. What’s more rhythm and blues radio stations from the southern states could be received in Jamaica (Katz 2003: 6-7). Above all, though, this was music from another branch of the African diaspora, and had nothing at all to do with the despised colonialists. (Indeed, it might be characterized as another example of the way black musicians have forged an international network through the production and circulation of mass mediated performances.) Interestingly, when the moment of break-out from mimesis came in the late 50s it was prompted by an unwillingness to accept change in the target culture, namely a shift in taste among African Americans towards a new style – what would become known as soul music. In an important sense, then, the object of mimesis had been made parochial in Jamaica. The elaboration of this originally ‘copied’ music – a kind of localized aesthetic labour – became more important than the work of maintaining a relationship of emulation with African Americans. This could also account for why stylistic innovation was so quick and so intense when local production began. The semiotic exhaustion of jump R and B may have already been latent given that dancers had been listening to it for eight or ten years. When variation was offered by local musicians it was strongly endorsed by listeners.

There remains the question of why, once music has been translated and a first round of changes made, it might continue to change. One implication of the pre-history of the guitar is that the introduction of elements from the home culture may be an important factor. The lute, whose character depended on quite minor developments from the *ud*, remained just that, a lute. The significant change which yielded the guitar was then the addition of a waisted body and a flat or flattish bottom, derived from the bowed European fiddle. In Jamaica rhythmic change in popular music kept on happening in the 1960s partly for a similar reason, namely the addition of indigenous elements including aspects of the older national folk music, mento, but also various forms of drumming from the countryside in which there were strong African retentions (Bilby 2006). There was also the introduction of new elements from
contemporary African-American music, especially Chicago soul. This represented a second stage of translation from the earlier target culture, but one which was now, from a Jamaican perspective at least, set on much more equal terms (Toynbee 2007). Ultimately, it seems likely that behind these moves is the historical given-ness of Caribbean culture to mimesis and translation (Puri 2004), itself partly a function of the Caribbean’s crossroads position in the world system. This points towards the immense significance of geography – of networks, staging posts and conduits – for migrating music (see Part 3, ‘Media’, and Part 4, ‘Cities’, later in the book).

For Taussig, the mimetic act is one in which cultural actors – both weak and powerful – establish semiotic control over threatening or disturbing alterity. Once such control is established, ‘copied’ musical objects are available for further transformation and creative innovation (perhaps particularly so when the heightened power differential that held at the moment of copying recedes). We have focussed in this section on the appropriations of the less powerful, leaving un-discussed those myriad cases where the copier is the dominant one: Debussy, the Beatles, Paul Simon, John Cage, Stravinsky … the list is a long one. Here perhaps the key point to make is that the powerful are powerful too in their ability to obliterate or obscure the first act of copying (or just as prone to forgetting that what now sounds quotidian had its genesis in a traumatic moment of confrontation with alterity). Rock music, which emerged as a translation of the blues from African America, has excised the story of its emergence, and remains, within its own mythology at least, an ex nihilio product of the creative generation of the (white) baby boom.

Why Migrating Music Now?

It might reasonably be asked why this volume on migrating music is being published at the present moment. One reason has to do with the production of knowledge. Following pitched battles in the social sciences and humanities a kind of detente seems to be emerging as regards the ideas of identity and globalization. Whereas both of these have been the subject of polarized debate in the past, scholars seem increasingly to be moving to intermediate positions (see Stokes’s 2004 review essay on literature on music and globalization), acknowledging that concepts such as culture and identity can be discussed without falling into the trap of essentialism, and seeing
‘globalization’ as a phenomenon that might reasonably provoke both scepticism and guarded optimism.

Meanwhile, as Sara Cohen’s contribution to this volume suggests, a language of movement, which can be traced to writers such as Clifford, Appadurai, and Gilroy writing in 1990s, seems to have been adopted for discussing both cultural transformation and the circulation of people, objects, and expressive practices. Cohen remarks ( ) that scholars are moving away ‘from fixed and bounded notions of culture’ and have taken up ‘a language of mobility – of travel and flow or “scapes” – to describe culture in a context of contemporary globalization’. Her statement suggests two kinds of movement. On the one hand it points to migration: the movement of people, objects, practices, and sounds, as elaborated earlier in this introductory chapter. On the other hand, it points to modulation: to the dynamism of expressive practices, cultures, and societies – to the potential fluidity of the traditional objects of the humanities and social sciences. Scholarly discourse still acknowledges genres and structures, but it is increasingly rare that it depicts them in static ways.

Accompanying this language of modulation and migration, is another set of terms that suggests qualified forms of persistence. Appadurai (1996) describes the ‘production of locality’, and we have used the term ‘translation’ to characterize the ways that new objects and practices are integrated, accommodated, and elaborated when they are appropriated in a new context (for a related use of ‘translation’ see Chakrabarty 2000). Indeed, we have suggested that even moments of copying (‘mimesis) do not necessarily produce sameness, but often, paradoxically, alterity. So, while contemporary writing, including by the authors in this collection, increasingly acknowledges change and mobility, it also recognises the resilience of culture and the agency of groups and communities in affirming their distinctiveness.

To sum up, academic representations of cultures have become less static, acknowledging that dynamism is not only evident in how cultures change, yet also in the ways they persist and endure. Meanwhile, the discourse concerning globalization has increasingly come to acknowledge its contradictions. Our goal here, accordingly, is to consolidate this trend with a collection that explores music in motion through migration, cross-cultural appropriation, mass mediation, and cosmopolitan fusions.
These issues are considered in the four parts of this volume. The first, ‘Migrants’, focuses on musicians and listeners who cross borders and continents, and the musical means by which they and those back home bridge these distances. The second part, ‘Translations’, explores migrating styles and genres. It considers how groups and communities adopt circulating music, and how agents make strategic use of it, but also how they translate it, adapting it to particular cultural and political contexts. The third part, ‘Media’, considers the technologies by which music moves into new contexts – and by which migrants and the people they have left behind stay connected to one another musically. Its chapters examine how migrating music comes into contact with new audiences. They also explore the emergence of transnational public cultures that unite migrants and those at home. The fourth part, ‘Cities’, explores musical cosmopolitanism, addressing its most privileged site of instantiation, the metropolis. The cities in these essays are nodes in networks of musical migration: They are destinations for migrants. They are sites of musical encounter, wherein various migrating musical styles compete or fuse, are mimetically appropriated, and undergo further translations. And they are centres of mass mediation. In this sense they are motors which push and pull music in and out across the world. Thus the volume culminates with a section that permits reflection on all of the foregoing themes, since the cities considered are hubs for migration, translation, and mass mediation.

The authors of the chapters that follow live and work for the most part in the United Kingdom or in north-western Europe. Perhaps not surprisingly, a good deal – but by no means all – of their subject matter concerns areas close to home. Exceptions include chapters by Finnegan and Nooshin, which examine the effects of globalization on non-Western societies. Those by Baily, Landau, Steil, and Stokes, meanwhile consider connections between north-western Europe and communities ‘back home’. But it seems important to acknowledge that the views of migrating music presented here have a default geographic centre. Of course from another angle this is by no means a contingency. As we noted above more than one third of migration in recent years has been to Europe making it the most important region of destination for migrants around the world. Given this specificity it seems right to
conclude by reflecting on elements of the current European context that make the subject of ‘migrating music’ especially important at this moment in time.

Two issues seem particularly salient. One is that an abundance of contemporary evidence suggests that certain European ideals of civil society and musical sociality are not as universal as they aspire to be. The other involves growing concerns over immigration in Europe.

In relation to the first of these, by summer 2010 North American and European governments were beginning to plan, if somewhat tentatively, for withdrawal from military interventions in Afghanistan, with rising costs, pessimism about the possibility of ‘winning’, and growing disillusion and opposition from citizens all playing their part. The hope that these interventions might perhaps succeed in generating vibrant, organic civil societies also seemed to be fading. ‘Parachuted’ civil societies on a dominant western model seemed to be having difficulties, and their universal viability was called into question. This dilemma has a broader musical counterpart: emerging public cultures that appear ‘too musical’ or ‘not musical enough’ from a certain European perspective. On the one hand are publics whose contents are regarded by some as embarrassing: emotionally ebullient and centred on problematized religious practices or melancholy sentimentality (see Stokes’s contribution in this volume). These ‘overly musical’ publics – here we nod to music’s stereotypical associations with unruly feelingfulness and embodiment – seem removed from visions of civil society as a sphere of rational and critical discourse (see Warner 2002). On the other hand there are public cultures where music has a problematized place, as for instance in Afghanistan (see Chapter 11 by John Baily) or Iran (see Chapter 6 by Laudan Nooshin). The question of repression in these societies is complicated by the question of recognition. That is, for many Europeans, in whose public life music typically holds a prominent and auspicious place, these cultures and societies may seem ‘not musical enough’. In both cases the apparent promise of mass mediation to enable musical and social communion is undermined by evidence that certain models of musical sociality are not exactly universal.

The tension, indeed downright conflict, between these competing notions of culture and the place of music have undoubtedly contributed to the emergence of the second issue we want to raise, the growing climate of fear about difference, and in turn about
migration, within Europe itself. Official policy, it is true, has tended not be overtly xenophobic until recently at least. Nevertheless the War on Terror has been accompanied on the ‘home front’ by a policy framework in which xenophobia, racism and their causes are neatly sidestepped. Instead, cultural differences are contained under the banner of ‘diversity’. As Alana Lentin and Gavan Titley show ‘diversity is mobilising because it potentially includes everybody’ (2008: 19). The authors’ argument is that this is a woefully inadequate response to rising populist racism and opposition to migration.

In conclusion, then, this volume, and the conference that preceded it, come into being at a moment of increasing anxiety over migration in western countries and Europe in particular. Certainly, nativism and resentment of immigrants are often heightened during periods of economic instability such as the one that holds at the time of writing. Concerns that migrants are taking the jobs of nationals, or taking advantage of social welfare programmes, become particularly acute. But there are also fears that precede the current economic climate: that migrants are transforming the societies in which they relocate – including through the ‘overly’ exuberant or abstemious forms of public culture they contribute to. And of course supervening above all these causes, is the increasingly desperate prosecution of the War on Terror. We end this first chapter on a pessimistic note, then, if only to throw into relief the optimistic mood of many contributors to the present book who rightly hear migrating music as a boon to humanity.
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**Notes**

i As various chapters in this collection show.

ii It can be added that mediation technology also allows migrant communities to be ‘overheard’ by mainstream populations – upon scanning radio and television and radio stations, or even walking down the street in many neighbourhoods in the city of
Chicago one will be as likely as not to hear some duranguense, a genre of popular music created by Mexican Americans in that city and now popular in Mexico as well (see Hutchinson 2007).

iii 'Vernacular' translations perhaps being a little less concerned with fidelity to the original context than 'scholarly' ones.

iv One way to conceptualize this is as a break-out from the intense mimetic relationships that occur in contexts of unequal power. How does the break-out occur though? It is difficult to gather empirical evidence about this because when it is entwined with relations of power mimesis is so often obscured or distorted in the minds of both copiers and copied. Quite simply the mimetic act is scandalous, even shameful, and is therefore subject to ideological regulation such that few can speak easily or clearly about it. That is why at the end of his book we find Taussig advocating a tactic of 'mimetic excess'. This creates 'reflexive awareness as to the mimetic faculty', and when 'potentiated by post-coloniality provides a welcome opportunity to live subjunctively as neither subject nor object of history but as both, at one and the same time' (1993: 254-5). Given the persistence of unequal relations of political, social and economic power, which invariably extend into the domain of culture, this may be a somewhat optimistic claim. Nonetheless the tactic of mimetic excess, an 'owning up' to mimesis, is surely to be endorsed.

v However during the summer of 2010 the Sarkozy regime launched an open and indeed highly publicised policy of summary deportation of Roma people from France. It was roundly condemned as ‘shameful’ by the European Union Justice Commissioner, Viviane Reding. The consequences of this policy and its public rebuke are unclear at the time of writing.