

# The Musicological Elite

**Tamara Levitz**

Musicologists have been gripped by the desire to democratize, diversify, decolonize, and popularize their discipline. Driven by a growing moral demand to challenge the Eurocentric, heteronormative, exclusionary, colonial, settler colonial, non-diverse, and white supremacist legacies of a discipline plagued by its rootedness in European classical musical traditions, they have recently accelerated their efforts to expand the traditional canon, reform curriculum, and explore new mediums for the dissemination of ideas (for example, “popular” internet blogs over expensive academic monographs). In spring 2017, the Department of Music at Harvard University symbolically led the charge in this effort by announcing they would no longer require music theory and other courses, but rather ask students to pick “no more than two” of each type of course in their program, design their study plan with the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and include a rationale that outlines their path through the major. The only requirements left are the “Concentration Tutorials” that include courses on “Thinking about Music” and “Critical Listening.”<sup>1</sup> Harvard Professors stressed that this change would create more “flexible pathways” through their program, eliminate the class-based implicit requirements to enter it, and, most importantly, allow for a greater diversity of students and student interests.<sup>2</sup> Reactions to these plans on social media have been vehement and fiercely divided.<sup>3</sup>

That the standard curriculum in musicology programs has become an open wound or festering reminder of the labor injustice, class division, exclusions, structures of white supremacy, and inequality in the discipline became apparent again in October 2017, when an acrimonious debate, this time about eliminating the language requirements in musicology programs, erupted on the listserv of the American Musicological Society. A small, selective group of vocal subscribers posted a range of reasons to keep the language requirements. They argued that learning languages (primarily German and French) was crucial to being able to read primary and secondary musicological sources, useful on the job market, generally worthwhile, and necessary to being able to translate. They thought language exams should remain required because they always had been. Opponents stressed that it no longer made sense to learn primarily German or French and that there were problems of access to language courses. The language requirements raised labor issues, they wrote. Some argued that the exams

## Current Musicology

---

themselves failed to assure competency and fluency anyway. We are living in an age critical of the neoliberal individual's need to master all tools of the trade, one contributor wrote, and today we can ask colleagues to help us. Finally, some felt more flexibility was needed to meet students with diverse needs. For days the AMS musicological community was held hostage to an excruciating chat marked by bouts of cynicism, obstinacy, the numbness of unacknowledged privilege, self-righteousness, heartfelt confession, careful analysis, and cogent critique, as well as momentary celebrations of self-experience, a lack of appreciation for each other's views, and a practice of talking past each other that created a cocktail so explosive it precipitated the closure of that listserv.<sup>4</sup> Related discussions about changing the traditional music history survey in departments around the country have been characterized by similar ideological disagreement and intransigence.

In contrast to the tension that marks discussions of curriculum and language debates online, a much more optimistic attitude and sense of accomplishment has tended to accompany recent efforts to democratize musicology by utilizing alternative media, circumstances, and writing modes to reach out to new and more diverse publics. "Public musicology" appears a less disputed solution than curriculum change to the problem of musicology's exclusionary elitism, the move outward seemingly smoother than any attempt at internal change. This may be because public musicology has taken on the allure of a social justice project. More departments across the country are now offering courses in public musicology, the American Musicological Society maintains a lively, dedicated blog, and conference presentations on the subject abound.<sup>5</sup> Westminster Choir College has also become the first school in North America to offer a Master of Music program in "American and Public Musicology."

Yet recent efforts to expand the canon, reform curriculum, and make musicology public fall short in the project of decolonizing the discipline, in spite of their many obvious merits. One reason is that such actions address only one of the three core elements of the "coloniality of power" as theorized by Anibal Quijano, Ramón Grosfoguel, and others.<sup>6</sup> Whereas musicologists have gradually begun working toward decentering what Grosfoguel (2002) calls the "hegemonic Eurocentric epistemologies in the modern/colonial world-system" (205), they have tended to neglect systemic racialized power relations and the capitalist distribution of labor. Their impulse to bracket out material circumstances stems in part from their tendency to envision their discipline within the context of the "history of ideas," or as dedicated to investigating the formal properties of music alone, rather than in terms of its institutional history as an academic profession. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that there is still very little research

on the US history of musicology—a blind spot that weakens attempts to decolonize the discipline in that country.

In this article, I seek to rectify this situation by describing in detail how a small group of music scholars initiated the professionalization of musicology in the United States in the 1930s (or, more specifically, from 1929–1939). I choose to begin my story in the year in which the American Council of Learned Societies first took an interest in establishing musicology as a profession in the United States, and to end it in the year in which the AMS organized its first international conference—an event I consider something of a turning point. I have developed my historiographic approach in this article in response to Jo Guldi’s and David Armitage’s *The History Manifesto* (2014), which rejects microhistory (to which I have been partial in my work) in favor of a return to the Annales school’s notion of the *longue durée*. Guldi and Armitage suggest making long-term arguments—or telling stories of longer duration—by building upon microhistorical studies “of particular turning-points and watersheds in history, moments of revolution that destabilized institutions, climates, and societies” (2014, 36).<sup>7</sup> Enticed by this possibility, I am currently envisioning a history of the AMS based on microhistories of turning points, which will include the birth of the society (that I address in this article), the first international conference in 1939, the founding of JAMS in 1947, the annual meeting in 1961, the student revolutions in 1968, and the New Musicology.

I have structured this article to reflect how professions are formed, basing my approach on classic sociological texts. In 1964, Harold L. Wilensky argued that the job of the professional was based on 1) “systematic knowledge or doctrine acquired only through long prescribed training” (what he called its “*technical*” aspect, with its emphasis on the aura of mystery around knowledge); and 2) a set of “*professional norms*,” which include service ideals and codes of ethics (138). Professionalization occurred, Wilensky claimed, when people started doing full-time something that needed doing, leading to the establishment of training and professional associations. Those developments were generally accompanied by a “campaign to separate the competent from the incompetent” that included the self-conscious definition of tasks, the “contest between home guard” and “newcomers,” competition with neighboring occupations, political agitation to gain the support of the law, and so on (144–45). In her presidential address to the North Central Sociological Association in 1975, Marie R. Haug juxtaposed Wilensky’s view with that of Philip Elliot (1972), who argued from a historic perspective that status had preceded other professional attributes in Great Britain, leading to what he called the “status professional.” If status and autonomy came before the acquisition of esoteric

knowledge, Haug concluded, then “exclusive knowledge and humanitarian claims can be conceptualized as rationalizations developed to preserve antecedent privileges and powers” (1975, 199).

By clarifying the foundations of US musicology as a profession, I will expose how the contemporary musicological elite wields its power to dominate and exclude. I will consider in this article how and in what geopolitical context early US musicologists determined their object of study and professional norms, established the rules that distinguished them from the public as an intellectual elite, carved out their territory in competition with other subdisciplines, negotiated with the patrons and institutions that financially supported their labor, and promoted their status and prestige.<sup>8</sup> I trace how musicologists consolidated this elite position through their daily actions, documented meticulously in minutes of meetings. This exploration of the unspectacular will provide, I hope, insight into the often-overlooked but crucial difference between bureaucratic decision making (motions!) and conceptual thinking (historiographic or aesthetic choice) in the formation of scholarly disciplines. My analysis will show that musicology as a profession developed in a particular way in the United States that is different from how it developed in countries like Germany and Austria. In spite of a persistent myth to the contrary, its origins were not Austro-German but rather “international.” I will not provide in this article a comprehensive history of the profession of musicology in the United States, and I warn against drawing sweeping conclusions for the present from the early history I present. Instead, at the end of this article, I will return to the current debates about curriculum change, language exams, and public musicology, and reexamine them there through the lens of the history I have told. In this way I hope to show how minute archival analysis, even of a small moment in the history of the discipline, can reorient perceptions and conceptual frames and provide the firm material ground needed for decolonization.

### Exclusive Internationalists: The Founding of the Committee on Musicology of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Rebirth of the *Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft* (IGMw)<sup>9</sup>

The birth of musicology as a profession in the United States was inauspicious. One can argue that it began on July 11, 1929, when the Committee on Musicology of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) first met under the chairmanship of Carl Engel.<sup>10</sup> Waldo Gifford Leland—the indefatigable secretary (1927–39) and later director of the ACLS (1939–46)—appears to have had the idea to form this committee, which at first in-

cluded the music critic Richard Aldrich, the committee's secretary Donald Goodchild, Otto Ortmann (Director of the Peabody Conservatory and a scholar of piano technique), and Leland himself.<sup>11</sup> The committee's perspective on musicology was not German but rather "international." Leland was an internationalist who had played a key role in founding the ACLS to represent the United States in the Union Académique Internationale (International Union of Academies), and in 1926 had created the International Committee on Historical Sciences.<sup>12</sup> He also represented the Carnegie Institute in Europe, worked with the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations, and regularly negotiated with European colleagues about international disciplinary standards. He had enormous experience organizing archival practices in the United States in the early twentieth century. Upon returning from Europe to the United States to become secretary of the ACLS in 1927, Leland stepped up his actions to centralize and standardize professions in the humanities and distinguish them in their methods and goals from the social sciences. He received major support for his project from the Rockefeller Foundation, which granted the ACLS \$30,000/year for three years for operations in 1935 (Leland 1935c). At this time, Leland developed an interest in musicology.

Carl Engel shared Leland's internationalist perspective. Engel's prominence in the early history of US musicology stemmed in part from his role in the Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft (IGMw) and as chief of the Music Division of the Library of Congress, columnist and editor at *The Musical Quarterly*, and president of G. Schirmer Inc. Engel's publishing activities may have influenced his selection as chair of the Committee on Musicology of the ACLS: in Germany (with Breitkopf & Härtel) and in the United States (with *The Musical Quarterly* and G. Schirmer, Inc.), publishers played a key role in establishing a public sphere for musicology as a profession. Further, Carl Engel was the only US citizen who collaborated in the reinvention of the IGMw in 1927, and who was invited to be a member of its executive board for its first meeting in Basel, Switzerland in 1928.<sup>13</sup> Although he did not attend the board's annual meetings in 1928 and 1929, his contact with its members surely shaped his approach to musicological research as chair of the ACLS committee. In appealing to international models, he was also following a venerated US tradition: music teachers had participated actively in the Internationale Musikgesellschaft (IMG) until it dissolved at the outbreak of World War I.<sup>14</sup> Oscar Sonneck fondly remembered, for example, the gatherings of the US Section of the IMG at the annual conferences of the Music Teachers National Association (MTNA) before the war, and especially after 1907 (see Sonneck 1929).

The small group of European friends who resuscitated the IMG—which had lain dormant for over a decade—during the Congress on Music History in Vienna in 1927 pursued a very specific, nationally oriented model of internationalism.<sup>15</sup> As the elder of musicological study in Europe, Guido Adler's vision of internationalism dominated in these deliberations.<sup>16</sup> In the notes he scribbled on the back of flyers for the congress, Adler appealed to French models, describing the new organization as a "confederation" (*Confédération*) or "union of existing societies" devoted to the study of music. He was thinking transnationally, describing the new society as "internationally oriented yet with a full clarification of the national characteristics of all participants." In Julien Tiersot's and Curt Sachs's words (as jotted down by Adler in French in his notes), this was an "international grouping of professional musicologists with an office of information that would facilitate works and research in all countries" (Adler 1927a).<sup>17</sup> Prunières and Adler subsequently parted ways with Tiersot over their definition of internationalism (and specifically over the question of whether individuals could join the new society), with Tiersot taking the hardline stance that it could mean only a "federation of existing musicological societies."<sup>18</sup>

Adler and his colleagues indirectly addressed how they might move beyond a confederate model of internationalism as they prepared "propaganda" to recruit members for the IGMw in its first year. Financial concerns motivated their geopolitical strategies. In a long letter to Wilhelm Merian about a planned flyer from February 1928, Adler wrote about the "very dire" financial state of the society and about its lack of patrons—a situation he feared would keep the most "qualified and capable" musicologists from joining (Adler 1928a). He suggested they could attract members by combining Austria and Germany into one German-speaking territory on the flyer without "implying anything political." He also thought it would be "important and advantageous" to appeal explicitly to musicologists in Germany, England, France, and Italy, because the latter three nations could include their colonies and that "would be an asset" in recruiting members. "Then, after all," he wrote, "the individual colonies of these nations will hardly be able to build their own separate departments." Finally, Adler suggested reserving a place for North and South America on the board "for economic reasons," as a way of assuring greater financial support for the IGMw.<sup>19</sup> They tried to entice individuals, associations, institutes, libraries, and musicology departments to join the IGMw by opening their flyer with an idealist statement about how "art and science are not bound to any national barriers but rather need to have mobility across a country's frontiers to have their full impact," although they knew that they themselves could



not travel freely in Europe, not even to their own IGMw conferences, because of passport and visa regulations.<sup>20</sup> They established the Swiss Franc as their currency, requesting 5 CHF for regular membership and 50 CHF/year (or a one-time payment of 500 CHF) to become a patron—sums that would have prevented a vast number of people worldwide from applying.<sup>21</sup>

By the time of their first official board meeting, Adler and his friends seem to have settled into thinking of the IGMw largely as a confederation of European nations. On September 4, 1928 the executive of the IGMw met at the home (alternatively called “Antiquariat” or “Musikbibliothek”) of steel industrialist and music aficionado Paul Hirsch at Neue Mainzer Strasse 57 in Frankfurt.<sup>22</sup> The magnificently wealthy Hirsch was an important first patron of international musicology. The executive at that first meeting included president Peter Wagner (Fribourg, Switzerland), vice presidents Johannes Wolf (Berlin), André Pirro (Paris), and Edward Dent (erroneously described as living in London), secretary Wilhelm Merian (Switzerland), and substitute secretary Gaetano Cesari (Milan). The Honorary presidents were Guido Adler (Vienna) and Henry Prunières (Paris). Members of the board or “Direktorium” at this first meeting included, arranged on official lists according to nationality: Rudolf von Ficker (Austria), Charles van den Borren (Belgium), Knud Jeppesen (Denmark), Higinio Anglés (Spain) (consistently misspelled Higinio Anglès), Albert Smijers (Netherlands), Zdenek Nejedly (Czechoslovakia), and Carl Engel (“Amerika”).<sup>23</sup> Pirro, Cesari, Prunières, van den Borren, and Engel did not attend the meeting. This roster, and the general membership, was hardly international, but rather had a provincial flavor; the IGMw had simply formalized existing personal relationships between a network of privileged, mostly European intellectuals and friends.<sup>24</sup>

The ostentatiously national make up of this board was also no accident. According to item §12 of the IGMw’s statutes, planned and solidified that day, members of the board had to come from different nations—although the Swiss nationality of the secretary and treasurer “didn’t count.” The “four countries that lead the way in musicological research”—Germany, France, England, and Italy—had to be represented in the board, and three of them in the office of the society as well.<sup>25</sup> Adler seems to have pushed hardest to implement this form of national representation.<sup>26</sup> In his copies of the statutes, Adler consistently corrected “four countries,” or what his colleagues sometimes described as “four states,” to “four *nations*.”<sup>27</sup>

Yet board members did not welcome every nation into their midst, and may have discriminated in particular against musicological scholarship in Slavic countries. At the first meeting of the executive of the society on September 4, 1928, Johannes Wolf informed the members that Lucjan

Kamieński was annoyed Poland was not represented. Wolf pointed to Zdenek Nejedly (for reasons that are unclear to me, but perhaps hinting that there was already a representative of a Slavic nation) and emphasized that “not all states can be represented on the board.” Dent then advised that, “We should have only personalities, representatives of science [the branches of musical science] not nations.”<sup>28</sup> The board then contradicted itself and displayed something of its potential prejudice by suggesting Tobias Norlind become a member because “Sweden is a country of cultural high standing” (*da Schweden kulturell hochstehendes Land*). At their second meeting, in Paris on October 1–2, 1929, the board was noncommittal when Semyon Lvovich Ginzburg’s asked to have the State Institute of the History of the Arts represent the IGMw in the Soviet Union. Members agreed in principle as long as there was “no independent Russian section.” They wanted to arrange the details only with Mikhail Ivanov-Boretzky, but then dragged their feet about pursuing any plans at all.<sup>29</sup>

Members of the board consciously sought out models of internationalism to emulate. Their choices reflect the general influence at that time of the League of Nations—an institution established in 1920, yet which Germany joined in 1926, the Soviet Union in 1934, and which the United States never joined. Internationalism in the context of the League of Nations reflected less a notion of universal musical values or global cooperation than what Susan Pederson (2015) analyzes as a form of diplomacy that maintained Europe’s imperial control over labor and capital internationally.<sup>30</sup> Board members seemed to imitate this form of European diplomacy when they established as the mission of their society the pursuit of “musicological research and [the] easing [of] musicological relationships between countries” (“Internationale Gesellschaft Statuten” 1928, §1). Their belief that national boundaries limited scholarship led them to open an information office in Basel where employees would answer questions “that could best be answered on an international basis.” They saw it as the job of this office to facilitate contact between music scholars in different countries, share scientific material, make local research known, and create a central catalogue.<sup>31</sup> They used as their models the Union Musicologique, the Institute of International Education in New York City, and the League of Nations’ International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation.<sup>32</sup> They also made sure the IGMw was listed in its *Handbook of International Organizations* published in 1929.

Board members hoped to gain recognition for their society by appealing for financial and public support to the national governments in Europe they represented.<sup>33</sup> This transnational model of financial organization was one of the IGMw’s most innovative institutional strategies, but it was



an upward climb, and created power imbalances.<sup>34</sup> Like in the European Union today, members from countries with the best economies (in this case, for musicology) wielded the most power on the board. Although not acknowledged as a nation, Switzerland—more specifically the local government in Basel—played the largest role in funding the society.

The IGMw board discussed the society's finances in detail at their first meeting on September 4, 1928, joined by the society's treasurer, the Swiss banker Theodor Speiser-Riggenbach. He was a partner in the private bank, Speiser, Gutzwiller u. Co., which founded the first investment fund management company in Europe a few years later.<sup>35</sup> Deliberations that day give strong evidence of board members' unequal circumstances. President Peter Wagner remarked that the municipal government in Basel had donated 3000 CHF and expected others to do the same; the German government, thanks to his efforts, had donated 1000 CHF. Merian asked members to emulate Wagner in requesting funds from their national governments and attracting members in their respective countries. André Pirro apologized that there were so few French members and suggested holding their next meeting in Paris, and Gaetano Cesari said "propaganda" in *La Rassegna musicale* had not been successful. Edward Dent reported that "There are very few friends of musicology in England, the journals are not read," but that he hoped when he became president of the Royal Music Association in November things would improve. Rudolph von Ficker thought the Austrian government might give something, but was still recovering financially. Knud Jeppesen hoped the Danish government would be interested, Albert Smijers said the Dutch government didn't know what musicology was, Higinio Anglés thought only Catalonia might show interest (but received praise for recruiting many Spanish members), and Zdenek Nejedly offered 20 Reichsmark from the Czech Republic (see "I. Vorstandssitzung" 1928). A year later, Wagner announced at the annual meeting in Paris that the city of Basel, the German and French governments, and the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation had all funded the society and the Belgian government was also thinking of offering support ("II. Vorstandssitzung" 1929). This became something of a familiar pattern: at the third meeting of the IGMw board in Liège on August 30, 1930, Speiser-Riggenbach reported that Germany, France, Belgium, and Austria had given small one-time subventions, and that the city of Basel planned to give 3000 CHF/year and the Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge Foundation \$200/year ("III. Vorstandssitzung" 1930).<sup>36</sup>

The national jostling for power inherent in the IGMw's form of internationalism played out most dramatically in its publications. Adler was eager from the start to create a collective bibliography of all writings on

music, reviving the IMG's pre-war planned project of a *Corpus Scriptorum de Musica*.<sup>37</sup> He hoped the journal he envisioned would be available to all IGMw members who paid dues. In other words, it would be limited to a paying elite, constituting an initial form of exclusive academic publication. Members of the board determined that the society's business should be conducted and its journals published in five languages: German, English, French, Italian, and Latin.<sup>38</sup> They thought their bulletin should appear in German and French, however, to make it "linguistically neutral" ("I. Vorstandssitzung" 1928).<sup>39</sup> Although the question of languages was quickly resolved, debates about the journal—which eventually became *Acta Musicologica*—remained fraught. Board members worried about how the new international journal might negatively affect subscriptions for, and content of, the national journals (see Wolf 1929). Problems also occurred when the IGMw tried to break its contract with Breitkopf & Härtel in 1934.<sup>40</sup>

With the establishment of the Committee on Musicology of the ACLS, Waldo Leland, Carl Engel, and a small coterie of their trusted friends brought the spirit of the IGMw to the United States, laying the foundation for an internationally recognized, US-based discipline of musicology. They and others applied what they had learned from the model of internationalism established by the IGMw to centralize and nationalize musicological research in the United States—a strategy that had lasting consequences for how the profession of musicology developed there.

### Carving Out Scholarly Territory: The Foundation of the American Musicological Society

The activities of the IGMw and Committee on Musicology of the ACLS seem to have stirred musicological interest more broadly among a group of friends living mostly on the East Coast of the United States. On January 29, 1930, about six months after the ACLS Committee's first meeting, Henry Cowell, Otto Kinkeldey, John Redfield, Lazare Saminsky, Joseph Schillinger, Charles Seeger, and Joseph Yasser met to plan the New York Musicological Society (NYMS), with May de Forest serving as their secretary. Thomas Washington Talley—potentially the first African American in the society—and an unidentified individual named "Frace" attended as guests.<sup>41</sup> The men who met that day envisioned this society from the start as the "nucleus" for a national society they temporarily postponed. Their perspective, like that of members on the ACLS committee, was internationalist: they saw the NYMS as a continuation of the disbanded American Section of the original IMG. Seeger reported in the society's first bulletin that Waldo Selden Pratt and O. G. Sonneck had attempted in vain to revive

that society after World War I, but interest had lagged, with Sonneck becoming before his death “pessimistic in regard to the outlook in America” (NYMS 1931). Now, they were ready to try again.

The NYMS, like the IGMw upon which it was partly modeled, relied for its existence on the generosity of wealthy patrons, in this case Blanche Wetherill Walton, whose husband worked for Edward De Coppet. A patron of the arts and founder of the Flonzaley Quartet, De Coppet owned a company, De Coppet and Doremus, that managed trading on the New York Stock Exchange. Stock market trading, even in the depression, made the professionalization of musicology possible by enabling leisure time and a venue for musicological pursuits. Members of the NYMS and AMS later tended to obscure these material foundations and the financial capital that enabled the development of musicological expertise by historically ignoring these patrons. Although Blanche Walton “aided housed, fed, + even nursed (one or all things) very many struggling, poor, starving, sick musicians + composers who might never have arrived without her help,” as well as supported the AMS, provided her home at 25 Washington Square North in New York City as a venue for its first meetings, and funded publications until her fortune failed in the 1930s, she has been neglected and left unacknowledged in the organization to the present day.<sup>42</sup>

At first, members of the NYMS envisioned musicology as a broad discipline free of power struggles or hierarchies; they appeared determined to cast a wide net. Although Seeger reported in the first *Bulletin* that members preferred systematic over historical musicology, “stressing speculative and experimental methods in close liaison with the vanguard of the living art of music,” he also noted that they saw their group as the “nucleus for a National Society” that would be broad enough “to allow the organization of local groups upon a variety of subjects as sections of the parent society, without dominance by anyone” (NYMS 1931). Seeger loosely encouraged five chief sections to coexist: “(1) *science*, (2) *criticism*, (3) *history*, (4) *bibliography*, [and] (5) *comparative musicology*.” The fourth was already underway with the “American Music Librarians Association,” Seeger noted, and the fifth promised “a fast and healthy development owing to the tardy but sure awakening of a widespread interest in exotic or non-European musics.” A year later, members tried to ensconce this plurality in their constitution by specifying that the object of the society was “the encouragement of original research of a musicological nature” (NYMS 1932). They planned to focus on meetings, the advancement of research, education, and publications.

Yet the NYMS’s lecture series gives a different impression of its members’ scholarly magnanimity (see Appendix I). There, members’ personal preferences and connections, as well as financial, educational, racial, gen-

dered, and social privilege came strongly to the fore. Papers given in the first and second seasons, 1930 and 1931, focused on what today would be considered a global perspective on music theory, or systematic musicology, with evidence of members' connections to the New School for Social Research. Members found some approaches more suitable to musicology. Seeger noted, for example, that when Mr. and Mrs. Sarat Lahiri came to demonstrate "rhythmic features of the music of modern India" on March 20, 1931 the event "was of musical, but not of musicological interest" (NYMS 1932).<sup>43</sup> He likewise considered Adolph Weiss's presentation on "A Comprehensive View of the Schönbergian Technic" on April 27, 1931 to be "adequate, but exception was taken to the use of the word 'systematic' in connection with the subject."

In designing their speaker series, members of the NYMS seemed to rely on the circumstantial coincidence of who happened to be in New York City at the time, or who might enjoy a personal connection with them—the main criterion for selection being that the guest had to be a music scholar of some sort. In its first year, for example, the NYMS worked closely with the "Russian Group of Musicologists of New York City," which included Russian and Russian-Jewish émigré composers, teachers, and scholars who met regularly to explore the science of harmony, as well as Russian, Ukrainian, and Jewish music (see Appendix I).<sup>44</sup> But by the second season (1931–32), the connection with the Russian émigrés—and with Jewish music—appears to have waned. At that time members considered inviting guests ranging from Percival Robson Kirby—a Scottish-born professor of music at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg who developed a colonial form of the study of the music of South Africa—and Mr. Gerald F. Warburg—a professional cellist who studied Schenkerian analysis and was the son of the philanthropist Felix M. Warburg.<sup>45</sup> Warburg, Seeger noted in the *Bulletin*, had "established a studio for experiment in the development of new art forms" in New York City, and "specific instruments have been constructed for the promotion of theoretical as well as of creative work" (NYMS 1932). Joseph Schillinger—a close friend of the society—was running the activities with Warburg and Mary Ellen Bute.<sup>46</sup> Bute also served as secretary of the NYMS; she was the fourth woman after May de Forest, Helen Heffron Roberts, and Blanche Walton to be welcome there, albeit in a limited capacity.

The NYMS's speaker series also gives evidence of a disjuncture between systematic and comparative approaches. This incongruence was evident as well in the publication series, "The American Library of Musicology," funded by Blanche Walton and incorporated in spring 1932. Designed to include "all the important musicological classics with original text and

English translation side by side” and “original works by Americans,” the series launched with Joseph Yasser’s (1932) *A Theory of Evolving Tonality*, and continued in 1933 with Helen Heffron Roberts’s (1933) *Form in Primitive Music: An Analytical and Comparative Study of the Melodic Form of Some Ancient California Indian Songs*.<sup>47</sup> Schillinger’s “Science of Musical Composition” was postponed, however, because of the general economic crisis, and the series soon collapsed into a morass of legal disputes and distributional nightmares.<sup>48</sup>

In the fourth and final season of the NYMS speaker series, historical musicology suddenly became more dominant with the arrival of Harold Spivacke and Carleton Sprague Smith (joining Kinkeldey, who had been there from the start). Seemingly trying to insert historical musicology into the society’s narrative about itself, Spivacke gave a talk on April 29, 1934 about “The Relationship between Systematic and Historical Musicology,” during which he “expressed the hope that the two branches may be brought closer together.” Spivacke had been elected secretary of the society and “charged with the special task of formulating a basis upon which a National Musicological Society could be founded.”<sup>49</sup> This was the first indication that the historical musicologists were about to take over (NYMS, 1933–34).

In the same years that the NYMS was establishing itself, a small group of comparativists decided to form their own society. Seeger had mentioned in the first NYMS *Bulletin* in 1931 that plans were in the works to form a “Society for Research in Non-European Musics” to work with the *Gesellschaft zur Erforschung der Musik des Orients* in Berlin. He felt the preservation of phonographs would be its first important task and that a Phonographic Archive needed to be established in the US comparable to those in Berlin, Vienna, Hamburg, Paris, Moscow, and Leningrad. In 1933, Dorothy Lawton, Helen Heffron Roberts, Charles Seeger, Henry Cowell, Harold Spivacke, and George Herzog established the American Society for Comparative Musicology (ASCM) in close association with Erich von Hornbostel, Robert Lachman, and the Berlin institutes.<sup>50</sup> Blanche Walton opened up her home to the comparativists, too, but they were so scattered geographically they found few opportunities to meet.<sup>51</sup> Three patrons supported the society as “corresponding members” with donations of more than \$10: Roberts, Walton, and Mary C. Wheelwright. The list of members compiled by Spivacke in 1933–34 included the names of 49 scholars, 21 of them women, who traditionally had more access to careers as folk song collectors than as university professors. It also included members from Bulgaria, China, and Hawaii (see Appendix II). Like their colleagues in Berlin, these comparativists had little support within the academy and few financial or administrative resources for establishing an international society (see Christensen 1991).

The ASCM dedicated itself to aiding the *Gesellschaft für Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft* in Berlin, which was under extreme duress with the rise of the Nazis. In the constitution finalized in 1933, members stated that the object of the society was “To advance musicology by the encouragement of research into the music of all peoples, primitive and civilized, Oriental and Occidental, for the purpose of preserving it and making it accessible to all for comparative study.”<sup>52</sup> They aimed to collect phonographs, manuscripts, instruments, books, and recordings, and to establish phonogram archives in the US. They also hoped to release records, publish a bulletin, and finance expeditions. The bifurcation of US musicology into historical and comparative halves at this moment in its history left a lasting mark on the nation’s musicological psyche: recordings and recording technology, preservation, phonograph collections, and non-academic institutes became associated with comparativists or folklorists, while university curricula and institutional power in higher education became associated with historical musicology.

Tensions between the subdisciplines represented in the NYMS may have led its members to call the meeting at Blanche Walton’s home on June 3, 1934 to dissolve their local society and form a new one—the American Musicological Association (AMA), later to become the American Musicological Society (AMS). Those attending included Carl Engel, George Dickinson, Gustave Reese, Joseph Schillinger, Charles Seeger, Harold Spivacke, W. Oliver Strunk, and Joseph Yasser, with Helen Heffron Roberts as a non-voting guest (“Minutes” 1934a).<sup>53</sup> Seeger, as chair of the NYMS’s Executive Committee, read a prepared statement about why he and his colleagues thought their society should be dissolved and replaced; they wanted to reorganize on a national scale. All those present unanimously agreed to motions to nominate and elect seven of their eight members (everybody except Schillinger) to serve on the Organizing Committee of the new society with Dickinson as chair. They also nominated and elected Reese as their secretary and Kinkeldey as their president. Kinkeldey belonged to their elite, was a member of multiple exclusive clubs, including the Andiron club, and actively traded with his brothers on the stock market. Since 1930, he had also held the first professorship in musicology in the United States, as well as a job as head librarian at Cornell University. And he brought with him an international perspective: like Engel, he became a member of the IGMw board (in 1933), knew Edward Dent, and regularly attended European meetings (see, e.g., Dent 1938).

Helen Heffron Roberts attended this first meeting as secretary and representative of the ASCM, with the goal of brokering some kind of association between the two societies. Two weeks later, at a second meeting, mem-



bers of the AMA/AMS Organizing Committee formally requested Roberts discuss such a merger with the ASCM, but when she got back to them later that summer, they hedged (“Minutes” 1934b). At their second meeting on September 15, 1934, they deferred any motion on the issue “until after the taking of definite action on the report of the Publication Committee.”<sup>54</sup> At the same meeting, they instructed the Constitution Committee to change the name of the organization to the “American Musicological Society” and to incorporate an article specifying that: “The object of the society shall be the advancement of research in the various fields of music as a branch of learning” (“Minutes” 1934c). Although this remains the core of the mission statement of the AMS to the present day, at the time it may have constituted an attempt on the part of a small group of historical musicologists to take over and exclude others.

Or, at least, Roberts seems to have read it this way. When she heard of the Organizing Committee’s plans, she expressed concern to Reese about how the group was becoming a society rather than an association, because of how this would affect comparative musicology. She worried that if the ASCM dissolved, Robert Lachmann in Berlin would lose crucial support for the *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft* (Roberts 1934a). She also complained bitterly to Lachman in Berlin about how the historical musicologists had acted. It is worth quoting her letter to Lachman at length because it gives striking and rare insight into the financial need that drove competition between the emerging subdisciplines of music scholarship in the United States in the 1930s, and into how acrimonious the split between comparative and historical musicology had been:

Now for the long promised news about the new society [the AMS]. An organizing meeting was held in New York last spring by about nine individuals and the sense then was to make it the American Musicological Association. Most of the members present at the meetings were dyed-in-the-wool historical musicologists and Dr. Kinkeldey (who is one of them, but not present) was elected president. It was understood at that time by some of us, at least, that this association would include in a larger membership, the memberships of various societies like the comparative and the society of acousticians. [Added in pen here: “and like before this would materially increase subscriptions to the Zeitschr (*Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft*)]. . . . I am sorry to say that some of these historical musicologists never responded in any way to our invitation [in pen: “two years ago”] to join the comparative society. . . . I have wondered if they refrained from joining because they belonged to the N.Y. Musicological society and resented our organizing on a national basis before they did, and if they were determined to stand back as a bloc. At any rate, last spring they disbanded the old society and formed the new one, of national scope, and after the initial [*sic*] meeting, they completely

changed the sense of the society they organized at the Spring meeting making it a society instead of an association, stiffening up on membership requirements, and in many ways springing a complete surprise on us who had not been present at the intervening committee meetings. Evidently the historical and not the comparative aspect of musicology is still to be very much in evidence, though I believe they will some day have to admit that the latter is the most important and all-embracing and give way. Those of us who had the comparative musicology at heart, however, did not make a scene at the meeting. After all, they have a right to organize what they choose, though really they had no right to change what was so clearly set forth last Spring without a vote. However, it was so far done, and nothing much to be gained by holding out against them, that those of us who disagreed silently accepted the situation, or almost so. There is a profession of cordiality to comparative musicology, and a not too clear indication that it will not be completely crowded out. Aside from this being a powerful group, they have arranged, through Mr. Engel and Mr. Reese, to have the *Musical Quarterly* as the official medium for short papers by giving over to the society 100 pages a year, and hope to finance later, still larger separate publications. So they have a set-up which is much stronger than ours. And the close similarity of names is going to be unfortunate. Of course, as far as the American Soc. For Comp. Mus. [ASCM] is concerned, we never had the membership of those I have mentioned, but what is a real menace to our society's life is the fact that a lot of our people have also been asked to join this one, and have. Naturally, there is more prestige for them at present. Most of these people are poor, too poor to belong to both, or they may think they are. Membership in each is \$3.00 a year, some very fine quarterlies are issued, or even monthly magazines, gorgeously printed and illustrated. Of course it could never be done without large subscription lists and strong backing, but people often do not consider that. (Roberts 1934c)

Board members of the AMS tried to maintain cordial relations with the ASCM after this historic break by stipulating in their bylaws that vice presidents had to be chosen from different branches of musicology, and by nominating Roberts and others as members-at-large or for officer positions (which they did not obtain).<sup>55</sup> But the damage had been done.<sup>56</sup>

By failing to establish a solid professional association with an independent society for comparative musicology, the AMS lost the membership and contributions of many women studying folk music, as well as input of scholars studying the music of the Southwest and Mexico, and also working outside the US and Europe. Roberts valiantly attempted to keep the ASCM afloat after this rupture, but received little help (see Frisbie 1991). The situation became dire in 1936, when the German society collapsed and Seeger attempted to transfer its activities to the United States—an action that failed to gain traction.<sup>57</sup> Roberts tried to help in reorganizing the society and having Elma Loines elected to the Council “as a safeguard against

high-handedness on the part of one or two members.” Unfortunately, she wrote to Loines, Otto Ortmann and Joseph Yasser were elected instead at the annual meeting.<sup>58</sup> Roberts’s many efforts to integrate women, broaden the society’s base, establish comparative musicology in the university and internationally, and help her endangered and persecuted German-Jewish colleges were in vain, and by 1937 the ASCM had for all intents and purposes ceased to exist, with its members—when they did continue their association with professional musical life—sometimes finding their place in the AMS. This led to a situation in which, I speculate, comparative musicologists and other music experts may have started to feel an amorphous sense of how they belonged to the ruling discipline of “musicology.” In spring 1936 Yale cut off Roberts’s funding and she left academia. She moved to North Carolina to take care of her father and devote herself to horticulture.<sup>59</sup>

Until the Society for Ethnomusicology (SEM) was founded in 1955—in other words for *twenty-one years*—historical musicologists defined themselves within a framework that included comparative musicology, acoustics, music theory, composition, systematic musicology, and other subdisciplines. The historical musicologists allowed scholars working in these subdisciplines to assert varying degrees of importance in their society, while working toward strengthening their own professional privilege and power. The dynamic they established in these years relied on the lack of general recognition in the United States for music theory, comparative musicology, and other subdisciplines as independent scholarly professions. During this period and for an extremely long time (well into the 1960s, when intense professionalization across the humanities in the US narrowed the playing field), the AMS was not a society dedicated solely to the study of Western classical music, although an aggressively stubborn myth persists in US musicology that it was. In the early years, musicologists studied non-Western music, popular music, and jazz.

The first Organizing Committee of the AMS wanted to distinguish its society not only from the ASCM and comparative musicology, but also from the Music Teachers’ National Association (MTNA)—a large, established organization with a sturdy membership, strong institutional affiliations, and an illustrious tradition of supporting the scholarly study of music. In the early years, AMS members seemed to view the MTNA in general as their more recognized and organized but intellectually impoverished cousin, although several were members of both organizations. At their first meeting on June 21, 1934, members of the Organizing Committee planned to discuss whether they should affiliate with the MTNA, Gesellschaft für Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft, and/or IGMw, and whether they should

publish in *The Musical Quarterly*, MTNA proceedings, or a new journal. They decided they would affiliate only with the IGMw and publish only through *The Musical Quarterly* (“Minutes” 1934b).<sup>60</sup> Although they then instructed the Constitution Committee to make sure there would be no association with the MTNA, they held onto the possibility of holding their annual meetings jointly with that association as a way of attracting participants and building their membership.

The decision to share conference space with the MTNA forced the musicologists to distinguish themselves professionally from music educators and to specify the unique object of their study. As a consequence, many of the most vital debates on the object and future of musicology occurred at the MTNA annual meetings in these years.<sup>61</sup> In 1936, Kinkeldey responded positively to an invitation from the president of the MTNA, Earl V. Moore, to plan a joint meeting in Chicago because he liked how working with the much bigger MTNA had brought out members “who came from long distances” in the past (quoted in Reese 1936a).<sup>62</sup> At the same time, Kinkeldey thought the additional AMS session would have to “be more technical papers, without interference between interests of the MTNA and AMS” (quoted in Dickinson 1936).<sup>63</sup> At the conference, president Moore praised the collaboration between the two societies in his opening remarks. At the general session jointly with the AMS, Spivacke, Ortmann, Donald M. Ferguson, Roberts and others explored the relationships between musicology and other subdisciplines and presented historical work (“Official Program” 1936).

A year later, when preparing another joint meeting, Moore wrote Engel that he wanted to work out the relationship between the two associations “in the most amicable manner,” and that maybe their presidents, secretaries, and treasurers should meet to discuss the issues. The AMS’s involvement caused him as president to want to distinguish the pedagogical aspect of the MTNA more than previously. Given the fine selection of AMS papers, Moore wrote Engel, “we have given more attention in the M.T.N.A. meetings to demonstrations and discussions of problems connected with teaching rather than research.” He also noted that MTNA members had submitted papers in musicology “but I have declined to accept them in view of the fine series which you have prepared” (Moore 1937). During the conference, members of the MTNA, NASM, AMS, and Phi Mu Alpha visited the White House to meet with Eleanor Roosevelt—the prestige of the MTNA having rubbed off on the ambitious but fledgling new profession of musicology (“Official Program” 1937).

This pattern of association and joint annual conferences with the MTNA continued for many years, until the AMS was able to establish

itself after World War II. The demise of the relationship at that time had a harrowing impact on the profession. As the AMS gradually severed its ties to the MTNA, it lost the potential membership and collaboration of a wide range of music teachers—many of them women—across the country.<sup>64</sup> They also lost the intrinsic connection between their enterprise and music pedagogy, as well as access to established institutional mechanisms for insuring curricular norms and change. I do not mean to overemphasize this shift away from pedagogy, given many musicologists remained active in the MTNA for years, and that other organizations, mechanisms, and strategies emerged to keep musicologists engaged in teaching. But I think the early musicologists' desire to distinguish themselves from music teachers gave the discipline its characteristic idealist positionality and approach to curricular change.

The AMS's separation from the MTNA weakened its material and practical foundation. Musicology became a profession concerned with relatively esoteric knowledge about music, somewhat untethered from mandatory requirements, assessment, or accreditation, and with an elusive relation *as a discipline* to labor relations and material history. Musicologists in the AMS could focus on the music itself because of their society's financial independence, which they gradually secured by appealing to the benevolence of rich benefactors, establishing an increasingly refined system of membership dues, achieving nonprofit status, and applying for grants from private institutions such as the Rockefeller Foundation and Carnegie Corporation. In spite of their disciplinary feelings of superiority, however, worries about being compared to colleagues in the MTNA persisted, causing AMS members to exaggerate their distinction. In 1969, Paul Henry Lang could still write William S. Newman, for example, that he felt grateful that "we no longer give the appearance of being a poor relation of the MTNA" (Lang 1969).

### The ACLS Committee on Musicology as a Laboratory for Inventing the Profession of Musicology in the United States

During these years, as the AMS gradually separated from the ASCM and the MTNA, a small group of scholars worked assiduously in privileged circumstances within the context of the Committee on Musicology of the ACLS to develop the US profession of musicology. That committee's attempts to create a profession out of what had been until then a diffuse and inchoate plurality of programs and resources related to music study in the United States distinguished how musicology developed as a discipline there from how it had developed in different countries in Europe since the nineteenth century. Although the ACLS Committee on Musicology and

## Current Musicology

---

the AMS sometimes shared board members, they differed in their goals, and the existence of the former did not assure the recognition of the latter. Minutes of the ACLS Committee on Musicology's annual meetings from 1935 to 1939 (with the exception of 1936, when no meeting took place), memos, peer evaluations, and correspondence give evidence of the many hours of largely unpaid labor its members devoted to inventing a discipline "in principle" and allegedly from scratch. They depended for their work on the benevolence of private organizations such as the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations, and they received no governmental support. This gave them considerable freedom: as experts, they were not really accountable to anybody.

Otto Kinkeldey's vision for musicology dominated in the ACLS after 1935, when he became chair of the Committee on Musicology, which then became more active again after a five-year period of minimal activity.<sup>65</sup> His team included Jean Beck, Glen Haydon, George Herzog, Otto Ortmann, and Oliver Strunk. The constellation of careers these men represented—historical musicologist, librarian, scientist, comparativist, French-born Medievalist—says a great deal about how members of the ACLS understood musicology, namely as a discipline led by a broad range of scholars who "knew" the field and emulated "international" models of knowledge production. It also demonstrates that even as the AMS narrowed its scholarly scope, the Committee on Musicology of the ACLS sustained a broader vision.

The ACLS Committee on Musicology continued to embrace an internationalist stance after Kinkeldey became chair. Waldo Leland had attended the seventeenth plenary session of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations in Geneva on August 8, 1935, and the influence of that international body on the Committee on Musicology's activities remained palpable (see International Committee 1935). But rather than, like the AMS, aiming to represent the United States in an international organization that established contact between national societies devoted to musicology (the IGMw), the Committee on Musicology hoped to gather information on US musical practices, archives, recordings, and scholarly literature to contribute to the League of Nations's Commission Internationale des Arts Populaires.<sup>66</sup>

Since its founding in 1929, the Committee on Musicology's primary goal had been to establish the discipline of musicology in the US. In its first year of operations, the ACLS had commissioned Oliver Strunk to conduct an inquiry into the "state and resources of musicology in the United States for the information and guidance of the committee in planning its future activities" (Strunk 1932, 5). With the help of Peter W. Dykema,



Otto Kinkeldey, George S. Dickinson, and the National Bureau for the Advancement of Music, Strunk had completed his report on library resources by December 1929, and on musicology by November 1931. He had discovered only three graduate course offerings in musicology in the fifty schools he studied: Kinkeldey's "Seminar in Musicology" for graduate students at Cornell, Jean Beck's "Seminar in Medieval Musicology" at the University of Pennsylvania, and graduate courses in paleography and musicology (as part of a music theory sequence called "Homophonic Forms and Musicology") at the Eastman School of Music. He had also noted up-and-coming developments at Vassar, New York University, and the University of Michigan. The schools singled out in this report (and others) gained a prestige in the musicological community that they have retained to the present day. But in spite of these hopeful developments, Strunk emphasized that musicology was not recognized in the United States; Harvard, for example, had not considered it on equal footing with theory and composition (Strunk 1932, 7–10).

In his report, Strunk made the first step toward professionalizing the discipline by separating musicology from music appreciation courses—confirming a distinction Carl Engel had made in an article on the discipline in *The Musical Quarterly* (Engel 1925, which Strunk cited). Engel had urged educators to think of musicology as defined by Guido Adler as a science and to reject music appreciation. "Imagine a university," he wrote, "devising courses in law for non-practicing, non-professional students of law!" (Engel 1925, 620). Engel had also recommended a precise list of courses he had taken in musicology, music psychology, and comparative musicology in Berlin and Vienna as models for the new US discipline. He had listed "international" (IGMw and not German) musicologists he admired.

Building on Strunk's work, members of the Committee on Musicology cobbled together a discipline one bureaucratic step at a time by following protocol, writing memos, and generating reports.<sup>67</sup> They focused on specific strategies: defining the scope of the discipline and documenting its activities and progress, preserving primary sources and research materials, designing curriculum, and building up a trustworthy personnel. In preparation for the first meeting with Kinkeldey as chair in 1935, secretary Donald Goodchild (1935a) sent committee members an agenda with items he hoped would convince the council to "seek support for a general program in Musicology" even though it could not currently fund any projects. He wanted the committee to decide whether it would concern itself "with all phases of musicological studies—historical, comparative, psychological, aesthetics, acoustic, etc.," or rather concentrate on the "needs and facilities" of specific areas. He hoped the committee would address material ques-

## Current Musicology

---

tions (specifically, the location, preservation, and collection of recordings of “primitive” and folk music), instruction (following on Strunk’s survey), personnel (who would practice musicology), and publications, especially for subdisciplines that lacked a forum for written work. He proposed a tentative list of members of the field (Appendix III), but then asked how “inclusive” it should be. He also proposed an annual or biannual report, duplicating European sources and making them available in the United States for the study of Medieval music, locating US sources for studying music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, making a list of instruments in US collections, finding sources for the study of US music, and extending facilities for re-recording phonograph cylinder collections (Goodchild 1935b).<sup>68</sup>

At the meeting itself on June 15, 1935, committee members decided to include as part of their mandate all fields of study related to musicology, taking into account that some (like acoustics) already had well-established journals (“American Council” 1935). They thought of organizing a musicology conference to explore their object of study. They also considered how they would begin surveying and cataloguing all musicological source material available in collections in the United States. They proposed an annual or biannual bulletin on “the progress of musicological studies in the United States,” modeled on the bulletin published by James F. Willard for the Medieval Academy of America.<sup>69</sup>

Yet even at this first meeting, members of the Committee on Musicology found it difficult to reconcile their all-encompassing view of what musicology should be with plans for a viable university curriculum. Although they had little power to implement such a curriculum anyway, this did not stop them from trying. Glen Haydon thought the committee should be advising university administrators on how to form musicology departments, and suggested sending those administrators Kinkeldey’s articles on “American Higher Music Education Compared to That in Europe” (1934a) and “Musicology in American Colleges and Universities” (1934b) to that end.<sup>70</sup> The committee listened to his suggestions and asked him to prepare a model curriculum for their next meeting. At that meeting, on June 24, 1937, Haydon presented the curriculum at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, which was based on the model of a Bachelor of Arts rather than Bachelor of Music (“American Council” 1937). At the same meeting, Strunk gave a preliminary report from the Committee on Graduate Study in Music of the National Association of Music and the MTNA on requirements for admission into a graduate program in musicology, which stipulated that students had to complete a four-year degree. Recommendations included the “usual” study of English literature and composition, reading

a foreign language, “skills and capabilities” in western theory and music history, enough pianistic ability to sight-read Haydn string quartets and Bach chorales in the original clefs, and focused “historical, philosophical, or scientific” preparation for graduate work. These requirements built on long-standing traditions of music education in the United States, and did not take into account the Committee on Musicology’s potential new perspectives. I think this lack of coordination between curriculum plans and conceptual understandings of the discipline—exacerbated by the lack of organized institutional coordination between the ACLS and institutions of higher education in the United States—became characteristic of US musicology.

Members of the Committee on Musicology also hoped to establish musicology in the United States by creating opportunities for, and funding, musicological research. At the 1935 meeting, Kinkeldey had expressed concerns about students having to study in Europe because of lack of research possibilities at home. He had suggested establishing a program at the Library of Congress to train students in the study of “American music,” and scholarships to assist doctoral students in doing research at US libraries (“American Council” 1935). When the Committee on Musicology received \$1500 to implement such a grant program in 1936, its members decided to distribute summer fellowships of approximately \$300 each to graduate students for two months of archival research at libraries in the United States, primarily the Library of Congress (Goodchild 1936a, 1936b).<sup>71</sup> This model of research funding became foundational for the economy of US musicology as a profession.

Having initiated their program of summer fellowships, members of the Committee on Musicology realized they would need to establish criteria for evaluating applications. The assessment practice they established was based on determining expertise based on a person’s stature in the field—a model that embedded knowledge production in a harrowing power hierarchy and shaped how principles of free speech developed in the profession. They decided students would not be able to apply on their own, but rather would have to be nominated by one of the few scholars in the country who were training musicologists. The playing field was astonishingly small, and, at first, committee members seemed to think it might consist only of themselves. Goodchild wasn’t so sure. He wrote Kinkeldey that whereas he was confident the members “covered the field pretty well,” he thought they should still consider asking scholars at institutions not represented on their committee to nominate candidates as well (Goodchild 1936a).<sup>72</sup> They ultimately asked Paul Henry Lang at Columbia, Hugo Leichtentritt at Harvard, and Charles Fox at Eastman to suggest candidates for summer

## Current Musicology

---

fellowships (Goodchild 1936b). On June 3, 1936, Goodchild sent committee members the four nominations (in the form of brief evaluations of projects and rudimentary biographies with information about whether candidates were married or not) to vote upon. Two years later, members again struggled to find competent musicologists to nominate candidates (Goodchild 1936c). When Harold Spivacke recommended they consult Earl V. Moore, Goodchild questioned this and asked Kinkeldey for advice. "Like you," Kinkeldey responded, "I was not aware that the University of Michigan had anyone of real academic caliber for musicological studies" (Goodchild 1938d; Kinkeldey 1938b).<sup>73</sup>

The Committee on Musicology stepped up its efforts to found a profession of musicology in the United States after February 1, 1938, when the Carnegie Foundation awarded it \$10,000 over three years, with annual grants of \$4000, \$3000, and \$3000 for expenses and "grants-in-aid" (Goodchild 1938a, 1938b, 1938c). Leland told committee members at their annual meeting on April 16, 1938 that the Council had tended to look on "musicology as a relatively underworked field in need of systematic development," but that he was eager to see that change. He advised them to work on gathering information, cataloguing materials, funding research, and making scholarship available to the public. The committee responded by creating two subcommittees: the first, chaired by Strunk, to deal with cataloguing and the second, chaired by Haydon, devoted to "ways and means for the improvement of the academic quality of curricula and degrees in musicology" ("Committee" 1938; Leland 1938; Kinkeldey 1938a, 1938c).

Once the new funding arrived, the Committee on Musicology set to work updating a report it had in progress on publication and research in musicology and "allied fields" from 1932–38 (Daugherty 1938).<sup>74</sup> This was to be the first of what members hoped would be an annual bulletin, and it included names of journals, individuals, departments of instruction, libraries, papers read, grants, and publications in musicology. In his introduction to the freely-distributed, mimeographed document from 1938, D. H. Daugherty (1938) noted that the committee had assembled the information by sending a questionnaire to "persons assumed to be interested in musicological scholarship" (1), based on a list he had created of institutions where at least one person taught who was worthy of inclusion (see Appendix IV).<sup>75</sup> This approach created a hierarchy of institutions of musicological higher learning that would later be hard to dismantle. He reached out to 250 people, including "teachers in colleges, universities, and schools of music; music librarians; [and] independent scholars," but excluding those who taught music education or theory, which he and the committee considered "vocational rather than scientific" (2). Herzog and

other advisors assured that the list included many South American articles, but unfortunately cited several of them as appearing in the *Boletín Latino-Americano de Música* when they did not. Committee members also did not read all the materials they received or discovered, and acknowledged that their bibliography was thus probably uneven in quality (Daugherty 1938, 1–3).<sup>76</sup> Two years later, the committee published its first official bulletin, covering the period from October 1, 1938 to September 30, 1939 (Daugherty 1940). This time, they listed the scholars they had consulted, among them Frances Densmore, Eleanor Hague, and Lota M. Spell—the latter two of whom worked on Spanish-American and Southwest music. The arbitrary bibliographic method, sloppiness, and fluctuating rules of inclusion in this and other bulletins caused the content of the new field of musicology to become somewhat flexible and random, depending principally on the coincidence of scholarship at hand, and who was compiling the list.

The Committee on Musicology used some of the money it received from the Carnegie Corporation after 1938 to fund the AMS, which started applying regularly for grants. AMS board members knew that recognition from the ACLS was crucial to their success. They also knew that in order for their society to become a member of the ACLS, they needed to prove not the scholarly worth of musicology as a discipline, but only that they could conduct their business efficiently and remain financially solvent. Things started well in 1938, when the ACLS Committee on Musicology awarded the AMS a first grant of \$300 to publish the proceedings of the society's last annual conference (Reese 1938). But when Engel asked if the AMS was eligible for membership in the ACLS at the Committee on Musicology's meeting in April of that year, Leland had responded that such an application would be legitimate but that they should wait one or two years because the ACLS was not currently expanding its membership ("Committee" 1938; Leland 1938; Kinkeldey 1938a, 1938b). A year later, in 1939, the Committee on Musicology hesitated to award the AMS \$450 to publish its conference proceedings (as Engel had convinced them to do), because it worried that the 1938 bulletin of abstracts had not appeared (Reese 1939a, 1939b). A few years later, in 1942, the AMS treasurer reported that the chances of becoming a member of the ACLS had diminished yet again because the society was in debt as a result of its international conference and behind in its publications. At that time, members voted to empower the incoming president to take any steps necessary to insure their society's eligibility. The AMS executive responded by asking each member for a \$1 "voluntary contribution" to resolve the society's debt ("Minutes" 1942). The journey toward disciplinary recognition was long, and the AMS became a constituent member of the ACLS only in 1951.

### Prestige through Exclusivity: Membership Rules in the American Musicological Society as a Status Profession

Members of the ACLS Committee on Musicology created a public sphere for musicology by funding research, compiling bibliographies, and suggesting ideas for a standard curriculum. Separated from the daily working lives of music scholars and teachers in their committee work (but not in their lives), the tiny, elite group of seven chosen men focused on constructing a discipline in its own image. The AMS, in contrast, required members for its survival. Its executive board knew that it needed to attract music scholars from across the country, and that the best way to do this was to convince them that the profession of musicology was prestigious, and that belonging to a society representing it would give them a certain status. Board members lent their society prestige by implementing exclusionary rules of membership that implied a seniority of expertise. They gradually transformed musicology into a status profession in which the very act of belonging became a sign of one's ability.

In establishing membership rules, members of the AMA/AMS executive at first took their cue from the work already completed by the NYMS—to which many of them had belonged. They tended to maintain the distinction, established in the NYMS, between active experts and more passive guests or listeners. At the first meeting of the NYMS on January 29, 1930—which I discussed earlier in this article—organizers had spoken, for example, about keeping the membership “small, comprising only men of active musicological interest as shown either in publication, achievement, or in the reading of a paper by invitation.” They had resolved to invite Carl Engel, John Redfield, and Leon Theremin as members, and Joseph Achron, Leslie Leet, Paul Boepple, Adolph Weiss, Sarat Lahiri, Jacob Weinberg, Lazare Saminsky, Abraham Wolf Binder, Andre Illiashenko, Wallingford Riegger, Thomas Washington Talley, Frace Edward J. Stringham, Nicholas Slonimsky, and “Miss Crawford” (Ruth Crawford Seeger) as guests. Although Seeger had reported in the *Bulletin* that, “no particular distinction was made between the members and the guests,” their decision to distinguish them in the first place counters this claim (see NYMS 1931). It is notable that their first Bengali, African American, and female speakers were among these guests, but not invited to become members.

Within a year of its founding, a subcommittee consisting of Cowell, Seeger, and Yasser had enshrined such hierarchies in the constitution and bylaws for the NYMS by proposing two types of membership, based on a hierarchy of expertise: active members (resident or nonresident) who demonstrated “original work” and associate members who showed “interest in such work.” Both had to know at least one of the existing members



of the society and to have a general level of awareness of the topics being discussed—a stipulation that severely narrowed the range of the pool. Active members could bring guests, but they had to be able to “contribute to the discussion.” Further, item three in the bylaws stated that “Candidates for membership must be personally known to a member of the Executive Committee, who may propose his name, at any meeting of that committee to be voted upon. More than one dissenting vote shall exclude him.” Members paid \$3, nonresidents \$1, and associate members a whopping \$5 per year (see NYMS 1932).

Members of the NYMS had revised their thoughts on membership when they met to dissolve their society in favor of the AMA/AMS on June 3, 1934. Charles Seeger had reported in the *Bulletin* at that time that the NYMS’s members had wanted that day to create more formal membership requirements as they expanded into being a national society. They had envisioned two new classes of membership, based on the idea of establishing an even more exclusive expert elite: “(1) Fellows, who will be drawn from the leaders in the field,” and “(2) Members, who will be elected by a membership committee upon a basis of scholarship, interest or activity, to be determined later” (“Minutes” 1934a). Seeger’s remark that specific membership rules would “be determined later” proved prescient: for the next few decades, the changing boards of the AMS would struggle to determine the rules for membership in their society, while remaining convinced that such rules were foundational to their purpose (see “The Founding” 1936).

Discussions about membership rules had begun in earnest in the AMA/AMS when members of the Organizing Committee had met two weeks later, on June 21, 1934. That day the Organizing Committee had created a Constitution Committee made up of Seeger, Yasser, and Reese, and a Membership Committee made up of Engel, Strunk, and Spivacke, with Kinkeldey *ex officio* on both. In the spirit of the NYMS, the Organizing Committee had instructed the Constitution Committee to draft a constitution that established a hierarchy of members distinguished by their power to vote. It had requested that the Constitution Committee: 1) provide for full members and associate members; 2) provide that only full members had the right to vote; 3) define qualifications of members and associate members; 4) not preclude the possibility of creating “fellows”; and 5) figure out if corresponding members should pay dues by examining the constitutions of other societies.

Members of the Organizing Committee of the new AMA/AMS seemed most concerned about attracting a respected community of music experts to their project and obtaining their support. To that end they instructed the Membership Committee to prepare “a list of prospective members” to

## Current Musicology

---

submit to them. (“Minutes” 1934b). The list compiled in response included familiar names from the NYMS and had eight names in common with the ASCM membership list, corroborating Helen Heffron Roberts’s view that the AMS may have been poaching the ASCM’s members (see Appendix V). This time the list included 59 names, but, notably, only 3 women—a drastic reduction from the ASCM list. It is interesting to compare this list also with that compiled by Donald Goodchild for the ACLS about a year later (see Appendix III). Goodchild includes a wider range of music critics, composers, musicologists, comparative musicologists, systematic musicologists, acousticians, and music theorists from across the country (and including Nicholas George Julius Ballanta from Sierra Leone), with areas of research briefly noted. Goodchild lists 114 people, among them 13 women. These two lists give evidence of the arbitrary criteria implemented to establish the first US musicological elite: in both cases individuals assigned to create membership lists simply looked for any experts on music they could find among the people they knew or had heard about. This means that being invited to become a member of the AMS depended on one’s personal relationship to the few chosen men who had founded the organization, or on one’s general “reputation” among them.

The constitution Seeger, Yasser, and Reese drafted for the AMS in fall 1934 included categories of membership designed to increase the society’s prestige and encourage philanthropic support. It divided members based on their financial contributions, place of residency, and voting rights. Three categories of members were permitted under Article III: 1) regular voting members, or “persons, organizations, or institutions” who had a “serious interest in furthering the stated object of the Society”; 2) sustaining members who “contributed \$100 or more and did not pay dues”; and 3) non-voting corresponding members, who did not reside in the United States. This latter category also included “organizations or institutions of other countries that have made notable contributions to the furthering of the stated object of the Society” (“American Musicological Society Constitution” 1934). At the general meeting of the AMS at the Clubhouse of the Beethoven Association in New York on December 1, 1934, the assembly established a two-third favorable vote of the executive board to elect members of all classes. Dayton C. Miller successfully proposed a motion by which membership requirements would be made stricter (“Minutes” 1934d).

The AMS established its exclusivity not only with stringent membership rules, but also by adopting an “invitation only” policy for reading papers at annual meetings. A small program committee consisting of Spivacke and Dickinson invited colleagues to read papers, for example, at the general

meeting of the AMS on December 29, 1935 in Philadelphia. Conferences remained insular and focused on the work of executive members and their friends for some time.

From the start, the AMS executive board was torn between maintaining the AMS as an exclusive club of experts on the one hand, and expanding its enterprise by creating state chapters for local musicologists (a priority established in Article VIII of their first constitution) on the other. As the society grew, some members saw a contradiction between these two approaches, and began to worry about the quality of scholarship in the society. At the meeting of the executive board at the annual conference in Chicago in 1936, Dickenson lamented that the standards for membership had not been sufficiently strict. Leichentritt thought this lack of severity would do “no harm as long as the controlling positions were kept in the proper hands, and that the support of as many people as possible was desirable in order to enable the society to widen the scope of its activities.” This dialogue prompted Kinkeldey to appoint Dickinson and Reese as a subcommittee to advise on creating a policy on “open or restricted membership” (“Minutes” 1936).<sup>77</sup>

The lack of degree programs in musicology in the United States, and thus of standard certification, also made it difficult to assess expertise when determining membership eligibility.<sup>78</sup> At the Business Meeting on December 29, 1937 in Pittsburgh, AMS board members sought to resolve this problem by instigating peer review by experts. They tightened the application procedure by discussing an amendment to Article III.1 of the bylaws to require potential members to provide sponsorship recommendations from two society members, as well as a comprehensive statement. They also gave themselves increased control as gatekeepers by requiring under III.3 a positive vote from seven executive board members, rather than a two-thirds majority (“American Musicological Society Bylaws” 1937). At first Kinkeldey opposed these amendments and asked “to raise the number of negative votes that would blackball a nominee or applicant to 5.” Harold Gleason, Otto Ortmann, Leonard Ellinwood, Dayton C. Miller, and Glen Haydon discussed this point, expressing their concern about keeping “a high level of membership.” Some members suggested admitting “graduate students and other interested but not highly qualified persons.” Engel noted that the AMS wanted to become a member of the ACLS and should adopt its criteria of membership. Miller reminded everybody that the ACLS required a PhD and three publications, and that those without such qualifications were admitted as associate members with limited privileges. Ruth Hanna and Paul Henry Lang remarked that a PhD in musicology could not be required because it was awarded too infrequently

in the United States and that an equivalent for it had to be found. The issue remained unresolved (“Minutes” 1937).

Kinkeldey and members of the executive board of the AMS exacerbated the problem of musicological inbreeding by refusing from the start to relinquish their power. For quite a while, the list of officers of the AMS hardly seemed to change. During the Pittsburgh meeting in 1937, Benjamin F. Swalin requested that there be “more democratic election of officers,” noting that, according to the bylaws of fall 1934, officers were nominated by the nominating committee elected by the executive board and elected by an “absolute majority” of voting members at the annual meeting.<sup>79</sup> After considerable discussion between Ellinwood, Spivacke, Engel, and Kinkeldey, the consensus was that Swalin’s suggestion was “irrelevant,” given “the election of officers is being handled by a committee whose duty it is to proceed in a democratic fashion” (“Minutes” 1937). From this point forward, and to the present day, the AMS has remained an undemocratic institution, guided by the principle of an executive board electing committees that nominate candidates for office.<sup>80</sup>

As the AMS tightened the reins on its membership and became more exclusive, music educators and administrators moved in the opposite direction, reaching out to broader constituencies by establishing or continuing music appreciation courses in their revamped music departments or humanities divisions. Music appreciation sometimes functioned in this context as social uplift. Albert Sydney Raubenheimer, who became Dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences at the University of Southern California in 1937, saw it that way. A Boer from South Africa, Raubenheimer spent his first years at USC giving lectures on the “white man’s future in Africa” and championing the politics of white dominance that emerged from the celebration of the “Great Trek” of the Boers in 1938.<sup>81</sup> His presence at USC reflected the importance in higher education at that time of a larger network of South African and US educators and researchers involved in studying education transnationally through the efforts of the Carnegie Foundation.<sup>82</sup> Raubenheimer had studied with Lewis Terman at Stanford during the years when Terman was developing theories of Intelligence Tests for gifted children based on biased and prejudiced criteria of racial character.<sup>83</sup> Terman was a member of the Human Betterment Foundation, a Pasadena-based eugenics group founded by E. S. Gosney in 1929, and he was active in sterilization programs in California (Brigham 1923; Gosney et al. 1929; Seiden 1999). It is in this context that Albert Raubenheimer decided as Dean to integrate two years of music appreciation into the core curriculum of the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences, at USC in 1938 (Alderman, n.d.).<sup>84</sup>

The very year Raubenheimer implemented these changes at USC, concerns about lax criteria for admitting members to the AMS led to a revolt among its constituency—the paradox of reaching out to a broader constituency while closing ranks as a profession becoming characteristic of US musicology. In May 1938, Carleton Sprague Smith circulated a petition to dissolve the AMS. Davidson told Kinkeldey that he would not sign it because he was the head of the New England Chapter, but that he agreed with it, and that he wanted the society to be reorganized and to “command the respect other societies in the country do.” Davidson thought they should dissolve the membership and reinstitute the original members as the core of a new organization. “I would make membership in the society entirely dependent on the quality of publication,” he wrote Kinkeldey. “Unless that line is drawn there is a great danger that many who are not really eligible but who have the reputation of being scholars will become members.” Though this would mean “a relatively small membership,” he continued, “such a Society could properly lay claim to recognition by the Council of Learned Societies [ACLS] and it would command the respect which it ought to have.” He suggested there be a separate group of friends of musicology who were not connected at all with society but consisted “of musicians and others who had an interest in musical scholarship and a desire to see it furthered in this country, and whose function would be to support the official publication of the society” (Davidson 1938).

National chauvinism also played a role in determining membership eligibility for some board members. On May 9, 1939, Howard Hanson at the Eastman School of Music, speaking also for his colleague Charles Warren Fox, expressed to Reese his concern that six of the eight applications for membership they had received were from foreigners. Given how difficult it was, in his view, for “Americans” to be admitted into the society, he thought they should discuss the matter. “Both Dr. Fox and I believe,” Hanson wrote, “that one of the aims of the American Musicological Society should be to encourage American musicologists and give them opportunity for growth and development. We do not see how this end can be accomplished by admitting a majority of foreigners and apparently relegating the applications of Americans to the pigeonholes of the Membership Committee.” Hanson and Fox said they felt emboldened to speak because they knew that a lot of members shared their opinion on this (Hanson 1939).

Appearing not on the same wavelength as his Eastman colleagues, Reese sent Hanson’s letter to George S. Dickinson, chair of the Membership Committee. Reese noted that article II.B.3 of the bylaws did not specify nationality (Reese 1939c). Dickinson (1939a) responded that they needed a “clearer official definition of terms of membership.” He thought this

problem had to be resolved because the “reputation of the society, and, incidentally, of the membership committee is rather bad as far as prompt action is concerned.” The same day, Reese responded to Hanson (copied to Dickinson) that it was a coincidence that the batch of applicants they saw included so many foreigners, given no applications had been passed on in a year and they had piled up. “I believe you will see that I am correct in stating that the ratio of foreigners to Americans, in the whole lot, is not at all fairly indicated by that ratio in the first batch” (Reese 1939d, 1939e).

AMS members criticized the executive board not only for welcoming foreigners, but also for accepting members who were unqualified but needed to establish chapters in states with few musicological traditions. At the very moment when Reese was arguing with Hansen about foreigners, Warren D. Allen at Stanford wrote Reese to discuss how to create an AMS chapter in Southern California, given the lack of musicologists there. He wanted to nominate Albert Elkus at the University of California, Berkeley for membership to the AMS, although he was not eligible because he had no publications. “I am afraid that we would have a hard time getting a branch established out here without his cooperation because of his influential position,” Allen wrote. He suggested asking Elkus’s “close friend” Engel to second the nomination, so they could get the ball rolling (Allen 1939a). Reese passed this letter onto Engel, who felt irked enough to write Allen a response. He said he would second Elkus’s nomination, but not because he was allegedly his friend. Rather he admired Elkus “as a man of broad culture and as an excellent musician.” “I admit that it may be difficult to draw an exact line of division between those who are real ‘musicologists’ and those to whom the term applies loosely,” Engel wrote Allen. “But the Society will, sooner or later, have to draw such a line, and stick to it, unless two classes of members can be established: the one for ‘musicologists’ in the narrower sense (entitled to vote) and other class comprising the members admitted ‘by courtesy’ (excluded from voting). Only by some method of this kind will the Society avoid the dangers which are bound to spring from an indiscriminate extension of its membership” (Engel 1939). Allen responded that there weren’t many men or women “in this particular neighborhood” (California) who could qualify for membership according to Engel’s standards, but there were “an increasing number of young people interested in musicology,” and forming a chapter could “stimulate that interest.” Allen added that he himself had nominated Elkus in the hope of making Berkeley a “center for musicological research” (Allen 1939b).

A few days later, on June 21, 1939, James Coopersmith, motivated by his concerns about membership quality, wrote Dickinson, proposing a plan to dissolve the AMS that was almost identical to the one Carleton



Sprague Smith had suggested a year earlier. Coopersmith thought they should amend the constitution to include fellows who met the requirements, and associates who did not, and thus could not vote or be elected to any office, or appointed to any committee. The latter group could include “laymen, students, instrumentalists, etc.,” he explained. He thought fellows should have all or any of either “1. A graduate degree (Ph.D. or Mus.Doc.) from an institution recognized for its musicological activity” (but that this requirement could be waived if they had attended an equivalent number of hours of formal courses with established musicologists); “2. Publications either of books, music in scholarly editions, or periodical articles in journals of recognized merit—of “important research”; or “3. Unpublished research which can leave no doubt (after oral or written discussion with the candidate) that the candidate is a proficient musicologist.” He thought the committee’s selection had to be “autocratic.” Coopersmith realized that current members would not fulfill these criteria, and thus suggested either dissolving the society or adapting the “amended” requirements to the current group (Coopersmith 1939).

In September 1939, Dickinson, exasperated, asked in response to these debates to be relieved of his duties as chair of the Membership Committee. “I am sure that there is considerable diversity of opinion on the question of appropriate membership qualifications,” he wrote Reese, “and I am afraid that I have little to contribute to the resulting conclusion. In any case there will be obviously marked difficulties in the operations of a membership committee for some time to come under the present terms” (Dickinson 1939b).

By the end of the 1930s, the executive board’s personalized procedures for selecting members had led to a majority white, male membership. Some women were active in the society in these years, but giving papers rather than serving on the board or as officers.<sup>85</sup> On occasion, the issue of women’s role in the society did arise. During the 1939 meeting, Jacob Coopersmith, who was on the nomination committee, nominated himself for vice president. The president of the Society that year, Carleton Sprague Smith, admonished him for doing so and suggested a female candidate: “Mr. Engel made the suggestion that a woman nominee would be diplomatic at this time, and I entirely agree with him. After all, a vice president is a little like a fifth wheel on a carriage or a third person in a love duet. It means very little. As president of the Society I am keeping in pretty close touch with the general psychology of the organization and I should like to suggest the name of Helen Roberts for your consideration. I doubt whether she will be elected against Harold Spivacke, but I feel sure that many of our members, particularly the comparative musicologists, will approve of this

choice” (Smith 1939). Helen Heffron Roberts was nominated, but did not win the election.<sup>86</sup> It would take sixteen more years until Louise E. Cuyler became the first woman to be elected as an officer of the AMS, when she became secretary in 1955. Janet Knapp became the first female president in 1975, and Eileen Southern the first African American member-at-large the same year (but only for one year).

The prestige the AMS gained through exclusive membership rules led to a situation in which the public began to respect, fear, and exaggerate its expertise. A gradual shift in public perceptions occurred as professional musicologists replaced critics and intellectuals as spokespeople for music. How professionalization affected intellectual life is evident in Theodore Wiesengrund Adorno’s application for membership to the AMS from around 1941. Alfred Einstein and Walter Rubsamen had nominated Adorno—the latter as part of his larger efforts to strengthen the AMS chapter in Southern California. In contrast to the case of Albert Elkus, described above, Adorno appeared almost overqualified in terms of the kind of information the AMS required. In his application, he provided a daunting list of achievements—his pedigree seemingly exceeding the limits of the AMS’s mundane form. Although asked for statements, he provided lists, reducing his experience of exile into a one-line entry in the chronology of his training (“1933: expelled by the Nazis”) (see Appendix VI). As was characteristic at the time, Walter Rubsamen, Adolph Weiss, and Arnold Schoenberg focused in their recommendations on Adorno’s character and on generalities rather than the content of his scholarship. “Although one may not always agree with Dr. Adorno,” Rubsamen writes, “his contributions to a musicological discussion are always original and penetrating. He would make a valuable member of the Society.” This form gives evidence of the bureaucratization of knowledge within professional musicology as represented by the AMS: to be an expert, Adorno’s general worth and character needed to be verified by other experts, his output quantified, his life reduced to a timeline (Adorno, n.d.). Independent music scholars working across the country began submitting to this regime when the AMS nationalized the profession by creating chapters. They made compromises in multiple directions to fit into the rubric as musicological expertise became standardized.

The story of Albert Einstein’s involvement in the AMS leads me to similar conclusions about how professionalization affected intellectual life. When invited to speak on a joint AMS-MTNA panel at the annual meeting in Cleveland in 1940 on “the musical scientist” with musicologist Alfred Einstein responding with a talk on “the scientific musician,” Albert Einstein responded that “I see myself, cause of incompetence, unable to accept this friendly invitation.”<sup>87</sup> If Albert Einstein felt incompetent, AMS

members were clearly doing a good job of promoting musicology as a status profession.

I have dwelt here on archival details about the struggle to establish membership rules in the AMS in its early years because I believe such minutia reveal the most about how status came to precede knowledge production in the society. The cronyism and nepotism that resulted from such rules, and that characterized the AMS well into the 1970s and beyond, lead me to conclude that the quest for professional status compromised scholarship in the AMS and prevented it from becoming a meritocracy.

### The Decolonizing Profession

It is a long road from the exclusive early years of the AMS to debates about the future of the discipline of musicology today. If I have taken that path, it is because I think the exercise of uncovering the mundane bureaucratic decisions and material circumstances that determined how musicology became a profession in the United States may be the best way to reorient current discussions about decolonization. My premise is that musicologists need to know which actions were undertaken, and on what material basis, in building their elite, white, exclusionary, patriarchal profession before they can undo them.

I have learned several things from undertaking this exercise. First, I have understood more clearly the geopolitical position of US musicology, which is grounded in and continues to support the form of international intellectual cooperation championed by the League of Nations in the interwar years. Although US musicologists have extensively critiqued the Eurocentrism of their field, they have not fully acknowledged, or perhaps even known a lot about, their profession's internationalist basis. They do not know that it is their *choice* to continue to perpetuate interwar Western models of internationalism that subjugate or objectify peoples of the global south, and that it is their *choice* to bracket out intercolonial collaborations, as well as pan-African, pan-Asian and other global networks as a basis for their work.<sup>88</sup> Rather than research the historical specifics of international relations, musicologists have tended to romanticize and even naturalize internationalism as an idea. A general lack of dialogue with scholars of international relations, and failure of imagination about geopolitical possibilities within the discipline, has prevented musicologists from developing a grounded strategy for promoting equality in musicological research. It has also led some US musicologists to believe the language exams they require—in French, German, and Italian (sometimes Spanish)—reflect values they have, rather than their country's geopolitical priorities. Language exams in US musicology are neither innately positive nor representative of

a superior pedagogical tradition. *Any* language can be required in musicology, and that choice is always arbitrary and geopolitically determined.

I have also learned that the AMS executive has consistently bluffed about the society's object of study and that this has been a power play, a way to receive advantages and acquire cultural capital. To this day, the AMS has retained, with slight modifications, the mission statement crafted by Kinkeldey, Dickinson, Seeger, Strunk, Yasser, and Reese at their organizational meeting on September 15, 1934: "The object of the society shall be the advancement of research in the various fields of music as a branch of learning" (see "Minutes" 1934c).<sup>89</sup> That this statement has endured so long is remarkable, especially given it is generic and untrue: the AMS has never advanced research in "various fields" of music, but rather has always, in spite of efforts in its early decades, prioritized—and even considered its sole domain of expertise—historical musicology. As I documented above, the first AMS executive used this statement to assert power, annex disciplinary territory, and exclude others (especially the comparativists). The illusion of doing something grander than it does has served the AMS well since that time, in that it has allowed it to dominate among scholarly societies devoted to music scholarship in the United States. Fewer people would find the AMS so central to academic music studies if it admitted to its limited research methods and repertoire.

My investigation has also helped me to develop a more cogent critique of curricular changes at Harvard, because it has shown me that establishing musicology as a profession had little to do with deciding upon a standard curriculum or canon of musical works and everything to do with securing financial support, gaining access to powerful institutions, creating an exclusive public sphere and rules of entry, and asserting white male privilege. It is helpful to remember this when considering the Harvard Music Department's decision to change their music theory requirements—a case that exposes in a dramatic way the social inequality built into higher education in the United States. Although colleagues in the Department of Music at Harvard will surely make their program more flexible by eliminating music theory and other requirements, this will not affect the entrance requirements to the university, which focus heavily on determining a student's character, interests, and potential (Harvard College, n.d.).<sup>90</sup> In his study of Yale University, where similar curricular changes are now taking place (Turner 2018), Joseph A. Soares (2007) investigated how such character assessments came to be used in determining admission to elite schools and how they have contributed to perpetuating class privilege. In contrast to scholars of higher education who assume old Protestant institutions like Yale and Harvard became meritocratic after the introduction of

SAT tests and launching of the American College Testing in 1959, when “universalistic academic criteria” for judging applicants replaced social pedigree, Soares argues that SAT scores correlate with class (Soares 2007, 8–9).<sup>91</sup> He describes how Yale and other schools circumvented even such allegedly objective criteria by focusing in their selection processes from the 1960s onward on character assessments that helped in determining leadership qualities, at first because they needed a mechanism that would allow them to exclude Jews and other minorities (16, 39–41). Such criteria for admission—which can be instrumentalized to include or exclude depending on admissions committees and underlying administrative goals—still dominate, if Harvard’s process is any indication. Recent studies on Harvard corroborate Soares’s view that financial aid—which was consolidated in the “Ivy Group” in the early 1960s and intended to ensure that student bodies in elite colleges not remain exclusively upper class—has not altered the class makeup at the elite colleges as expected it would (66–70).<sup>92</sup>

Learning about the economic elitism of Harvard’s student body altered my view on the faculty’s decision to relax the music theory requirements in the Department of Music. From an economic perspective, curricular change appears to reinforce class distinctions by offering exceptionally wealthy students a more omnivorous education (see Drott 2012; Peterson and Kern 1996). Such an approach appears premised on the false assumption that the consciousness of an enlightened elite will ultimately trickle down and create an enlightened general population. It fails to address the material conditions of the adjuncts and teaching assistants who may ultimately end up teaching students in these new classes, and who may have little say in curricular change.<sup>93</sup> Here, I share Ghassan Hage’s concern about whether the struggle to decolonize the curriculum is a way of “creating decolonized bubbles in an otherwise colonized social space,” or of “creating a generation of cultural fighters who extend the struggle for decolonization from the university to its outside.” Have we thought enough about what Hage calls the “respect for the elders”—decolonial and anti-capitalist ways of consuming academic texts (Hage 2018, 110)? Yasmin Nair (2018) speaks in a related context of how “radical” academic discourse eclipses genuine labor concerns.<sup>94</sup> In other words curricular reform allows tenure-track professors to maintain the illusion that they are doing something to promote equality when in fact they may not be. In a worst-case scenario, curricular change may merely stand in symbolically for equal access and economic justice.

I also have doubts about the specific nature of current curricular change, which is often based on wedding musicological content to a student’s identity. Minorities, the argument goes, should be able to study the

music that represents their cultures. Although I emphatically agree with creating an equitable and just classroom, I wonder whether students' racial, ethnic, gendered, sexual, and class identities can be correlated so easily with specific repertoire or traditions, and whether such assumptions about cultural background and taste are anachronistic in the current streaming/global listening age. I worry about administrators and faculty extracting identities from their social, intersectional context and mapping them onto music for the purpose of imbuing their teaching with moral purpose, and reinvigorating the humanities as a social justice project. Although I think a rigidly canonical, exclusionary curriculum causes epistemological and personal harm, I might at first agree with Jacques Rancière that it is not course content that matters but rather how it is taught, the critical positionalities of all involved, and the degree to which students achieve emancipation.<sup>95</sup> That said, I doubt myself on this point, because I know that the majority of professors are still white, and arguments of this kind can be seen to justify racial exclusion. I also wonder about the soundness of a curriculum designed to promote "diversity" in the neoliberal university, and of the hollowing out of epistemological and conceptual grounding that occurs when the survival of the disciplines is at stake. All in all, I remain concerned that the current focus on curriculum may be, in part, a diversion that allows academic musicologists to evade the job market crisis, class and racial inequality in higher education, the erosion of their profession, and labor injustices.

I can best clarify my position on curriculum in reference to the critical work of la paperson (an avatar created by K. Wayne Yang). In *A Third University is Possible*, la paperson draws on Marcos's *México Profundo* and Third Cinema to theorize the university as an "amalgam of first, second, and third world formations." The first university is an academic-industrial complex committed to capitalist and brand expansion, accumulation of debt, patent, publication, and prestige, procuring state resources to govern, and technologies of power associated with institutions of "policing, bordering, incarceration, illegalization, and militarization." "The ability to turn anyone into a debtor is what fuels the first university toward inclusion," he argues. The second university hopes to transform the first, and society, through critique. It is made up of thoughtful academics who teach literary and social critical theory, for example of the Frankfurt school, but mistake "personalized pedagogy of self-actualization for decolonial transformation." The music scholar who aims to decolonize through curricular change, or the pedagogy of Jacques Rancière that I evoked above, fall into this category. Teachers in the second university assume people will "naturally" produce freedom, and that "freedom's doppelgänger is critical



consciousness.” The second world university is a pedagogical utopia that depends materially on the fees, debt, and land accumulated by the first university (La paperson 2017).

In my view, most musicologists, including myself, have been trapped in the first and second university. We confuse decolonization with liberal critique, embrace utopian notions of inclusion that support the first university’s project of expansion and debt, create new curricula based on nostalgic notions of self realization, and remain intransigent about changing the material circumstances of our professional privilege and committing to radical action. In order to decolonize we would have to enter what la paperson calls the third university, which exists within the first, and which he compares to Black radical film as “assembling,” “strategic,” “timely,” “vocational,” “unromantic,” “problematic,” and “anti-utopian.” In the third university, teachers talk about rematriating land, disciplining scholar-warriors rather than “liberating” students, acting upon financial systems rather than just critiquing them, helping to accumulate third world power rather than simply disavowing first world power, supporting a school-to-community pipeline rather than a community-to-school pipeline, and so on. The third university is made up of “scyborgs,” la paperson explains in his last chapter, who have the technological condition of being embedded in the “assemblage” of the university, and from there “assemble decolonial machines.” They develop “far-reaching transformative radical projects” from within existing structures, creating a decolonizing rather than decolonized university.

The final lesson I have learned from undertaking this investigation is how indebted US musicology still is today to the model of academic professionalism established by the ACLS in the mid-twentieth century, and to the work of professionalizing the discipline undertaken specifically at that time by the ACLS Committee on Musicology. That committee funded research with grants and fellowships from private sources—committing to a model of humanistic scholarship built on the capitalist ventures of industrialists of the gilded age (the Carnegies and Rockefellers). It also tried (but only minimally and unsuccessfully) to suggest a standard curriculum in universities across the country, establishing the boundaries of the knowable within the settler colonial/land grant university. It created an exclusive musicological public sphere by gathering bibliographies, supporting publications, contributing to the development of a system of peer review, aiding in the expansion of library collections and archives, and assuring the accessibility of primary sources. With these concrete strategies, the committee established a blueprint for how to build musicology into a successful “first and second” profession (to use la paperson’s terms).

But today, there are cracks in the mirror of this elite profession—which has become parasitic of the first university yet survives morally by promoting social justice on the basis of the second. The crisis in higher education has damaged its foundations, and now many of its strategies are failing and in need of rethinking: the number of people applying for funds far exceeds available resources; major bibliographies and library collections are no longer necessary for a pluralistic discipline to thrive in the Internet age; academic articles and monographs are not being read; and peer review is under harsh scrutiny. The “decline in authority and autonomy” of the professions that Marie Haug spoke about in the 1970s has progressed to a point where the boundary between public and professional knowledge about music has all but disappeared, causing the profession to lose its *raison d'être*. As the professional foundations of musicology have collapsed, graduate programs in musicology around the country have accelerated the professionalization of their students—a dynamic that speaks to me of the current desperation to keep up appearances. Graduate programs in musicology offer students professional status and prestige divorced from financial security and the possibility of obtaining a job, entrance into an elite without the standard of living that once went with belonging to one, the skills required to *act* like a professional without the defined knowledge to be one, professional boundaries without a territory to bound, and a dissipated multiplicity of public spheres no longer supported by major publishers. Many recent graduates face a landscape that has become almost impossible to negotiate, except as unpaid volunteers.

This situation leads me to ask whether it is time to undertake serious reconsideration of what it means to be a professional musicologist in the twenty-first century and whether US musicologists should not rebuild their profession on a more sustainable and equitable basis, or abandon professionalism altogether. What would be the blueprint for building musicology as a decolonizing, rather than decolonized, profession today?

It is in this context that I question the current trend toward public musicology—the “AMS” or professional form of which I distinguish from university outreach programs and the work of public intellectuals. I admire the public musicologists within the AMS, but I want to ask them some questions. I wonder how they feel about the fact that musicology as an expert profession has had a long, conflicted, sometimes paradoxical relationship with music appreciation and public outreach, and that they may be repeating history. I wonder if they are aware of how their predecessors created a musicological elite through rigid membership rules and exclusionary practices, and whether they think such a finely tuned and long-standing social formation can be broken down with rhetoric—a shift away

from expert speech—alone. Does public musicology not evade the crisis of professionalism by embracing a faux populism? Does it not ignore the fact that knowledge about music history *was* public in the United States before musicology professionalized in the mid-twentieth century and that attempts at “outreach” of multiple kinds have occurred regularly since then and may in fact constitute one of the musicological elite’s most well-worn mechanisms for distinguishing itself? Where do public musicologists stand on strengthening the school-to-community-pipeline, scyborgs who assemble decolonial machines, and the third university as described by la paperson? Do they not reify the profession of musicology within the first and second university, rather than transform it?

I like to think of public musicology in terms of Antonio De Lauri’s (2014) argument about the “bourgeois academic” who dominates in the university and who perpetuates the status quo by producing “a specific bourgeois knowledge particularly in relation to social inequality.” I recognize standard musicological practice in De Lauri’s description of the bourgeois academic as somebody who transforms “the highly factual and brutal dimension of social suffering and marginality” into issues of representation in their scholarship, and who champions resistance yet functions increasingly as a bureaucrat whose relationship to the institution is marked by “moral ambiguity, corporativism, and formal obedience.” As the university becomes the preparatory institution of neoliberal efficiency and pragmatism, De Lauri writes, academics who still largely identify as bourgeois have supported the political forces that “impede the non-bourgeois knowledge that could destabilize the social order.”

No amount of public musicology will erase the guilt of belonging to an exclusionary, elite profession forged and maintained by white patriarchal privilege. Having gained insight into the mechanisms of US musicology as a profession by exploring the archive of its early history, I am convinced the main goal now should be to reinvent it.

## Appendix I: Speaker Series of the New York Musicological Society, 1930–1934.<sup>96</sup>

### 1930

**February 19:** Round-table discussion of Joseph Yasser's *The Future of Tonality*

**March 13:** Otto Kinkeldey, "Some Japanese Polyphony"

**April 1:** Leon Theremin, demonstration in his laboratory of certain electrical instruments, and exposition of some theories in connection with them.

**April 22:** Round-table discussion of *Consonance and Dissonance* with Otto Kinkeldey, Henry Cowell, and Charles Seeger

**May 14:** Charles Seeger, "Dissonant Counterpoint"

### 1931

**January 14:** E.G. Stringham "Music Reviewing"

**February 16:** Joseph Schillinger "Classification of Scales within the Equal Temperament"

**March 5:** Henry Cowell "Some Aspects of a Rhythmic Harmonic Series"

**March 20:** Mr. and Mrs. Sarat Lahiri, "a special meeting for a demonstration of some of the rhythmic features of the music of modern India."

**April 6:** Round-table discussion of *The Classification of Tonal Chords within the Equal Temperament* (following on the event on February 16)

**April 27:** Adolph Weiss, "A Comprehensive View of the Schönbergian Technique"

**May 18:** Joseph Yasser, "The Past of Tonality"

**November 9:** Joseph Schillinger, "A System of Tonal Harmony"

**November 30:** Charles Seeger, "A Modern Neume Theory"

**December 28:** Nicholas Slonimsky "Consonant Counterpoint in Mutually Exclusive Tonal Systems"

### 1932

**January 10:** Henry Cowell, "Some Aspects of Comparative Musicology" (during which Cowell also told of his studies in Javanese music with Raden Mas Jodjana).

**January 31:** Leon Theremin, "Light and Sound"

**February 21:** Round-table discussion of *The Relation of the Composer and Performer*

**March 31:** John Redfield, "Is a Just Chromatic Scale Possible?" [lecture cancelled]

**April 10:** Helen Heffron Roberts, "Some Ancient California Indian Songs"

**November 29:** Joseph Yasser "A New Method of Harmonization for some Biblical Cantillations, Medieval Chants, Negro Spirituals, and Russian Folk Songs"

### 1933

**January 9:** Henry Cowell, "Evidence against Some Axioms of Musical Theory"

**January 23:** Informal discussion of George Herzog's paper, "The Connection of Language and Music in West Africa"

**February 5:** Otto Kinkeldey, "Scale: Mode and Tonality"

**February 26:** John Redfield, "Is a Just Chromatic Scale Possible?"

**March 19:** Joseph Schillinger, "Rhythm in Art Continuum"

**April 3:** Edward J. Stringham, "A Modern Space-Time Nerve-Grouping Theory of Hearing and its Application to Standardized Pitch Discrimination Tests"

**April [typo]:** Charles Seeger, "Musical Logic and the Linguistic Logic of Music"

### 1934

**January 17:** George Herzog, "Speech as a Factor in Primitive Music"

**February 25:** Charles Seeger, "The Method of Criticism"

**March 18:** Helen H. Roberts, "Some Primitive Musical Instruments and their Culture Connections"

**April 8:** Symposium on "Objective and Subjective Factors of Musical Taste"

**April 29:** Harold Spivacke, "The Relationship Between Systematic and Historical Musicology"

**May 15:** Carleton Sprague Smith, "The Performance of Old Music"

### The Russian Group of Musicologists, meetings 1930–1932<sup>97</sup>

**1. February 10, 1930:** Joseph Yasser, "The Theory of the Supra-Diatonic Scale"

**2. March 23, 1930:** Alexandre Gretchaninoff, "On the Influence of Secular Russian Music upon Church Music"

**3. April 16, 1930:** Nicholas Slonimsky, "Consonant Systems of Harmony"

**4. Spring 1931:** Joseph Schillinger, "The Process of the Formation of Harmonic Tissue"

**5. October 18, 1931:** Solomon Rosowsky, "New Analytical Theory of Biblical Cantillation"

**6. Winter 1931:** Alexandre Koshetz, "Ukrainian Folk Songs, Past and Present"

**7. February 4, 1932:** Joseph Schillinger, "The Varieties of Musical Experience"

## Appendix II: "Members [of the American Society of Comparative Musicology] During 1933 and 1934."<sup>98</sup>

### Honorary Member:

Hornbostel, E.M. von	c/o The New School 66 West 12 <sup>th</sup> Street	New York City
----------------------	---	---------------

### Contributing Members:

Walton, Mrs. B.F.	25 Washington Square, North	New York City
Wheelwright, Miss Mary C.	c/o C.C. Wheelwright 344 Atlantic Avenue	Boston, Mass
Roberts, Miss Helen H.	Room 245, I.H.R. 333 Cedar Street	New Haven Conn.

### Regular Members:

Achron, Joseph	2631 Beachwood Drive	Hollywood Calif
Barry, Phillips	5 Craigie Circle	Cambridge, Mass
Boulton, Mrs. Laura C	c/o Division of Birds Field Museum Natural History	Chicago, Ill.
Burrows, Edwin G.	c/o B.P. Bishop Museum	Honolulu, H.I.
Chamberlain, Miss Gladys E.	437 East 58 <sup>th</sup> Street	New York City
Chao, Yuen Ren	1 Chi Ming Szu Road Nat. Research Institute of Social Science	Nanking China

Appendix II (continued)

Coomaraswamy, Ananda K.	Museum of Fine Arts	Boston, Mass.
Cowell, Henry		Menlo Park, California
Flower, Mrs. Elisa M.C.	168 East 63 <sup>rd</sup> Street	New York City
Gibbs, Dr. Becket	99 Claremont Avenue	New York City
Grainger, Percy	c/o Antonia Morse 9 Cromwell Place	White Plains, NY
Hague, Miss Eleanor	640 Hillside Terrace	Pasadena California
Hammel, S.G.	209 West 14 <sup>th</sup> Street	New York City
Harrington, J.P.	Bureau American Ethnology Smithsonian Institution	Washington D.C.
Haydon, Prof. Glenn	Department of Music Univ. of North Carolina	Chapel Hill, N.C.
Herskovits, Melville J.	Department of Sociology Northwestern University	Evanston, Ill.
Herzog, Dr. George	Room 249, I.H.R. 333 Cedar Street	New Haven, Conn.
Hinman, Mrs. Mary Wood	353 West 57 <sup>th</sup> Street	353 West 57 <sup>th</sup> Street
Katz, Miss Adele T.	277 West End Avenue	New York City
Kazarova, Mme Raina	Vel Tarnoviz	Sofia, Bulgara
Lathrop, Francis C.	50 Orange Street	Brooklyn, N.Y.
Lawton, Miss Dorothy	121 East 58 <sup>th</sup> Street	New York City
Lehmer, Derrick N.	2736 Regent Street	Berkeley, Calif.
Lewisohn, Miss Irene	133 West 11 <sup>th</sup> Street	New York City
Loines, Miss Elma	3 Pierrepont Place	Brooklyn, N.Y.
Marks, Robert W.	500 Riverside Drive	New York City
Mayer, Clara W.	66 West 12 <sup>th</sup> Street	New York City
Ortmann, Dr. Otto	Peabody Conservatory of Music	Baltimore, M.D
Parsons, Dr. Elsie Clews		Harrison New York
Potter, Mark	414 West 118 <sup>th</sup> Street	New York City
Quackenbush, Mrs. Dorothy	Killam's Point	Branford, Conn.
Russell, William	182 Claremont Avenue	New York City
Samaroff, Madame Olga	1170 Fifth Avenue	New York City
Seashore, Dean Carl	Graduate School University of Iowa	Iowa City, Iowa
Seeger, Charles L. Jr.	c/o The New School 66 West 12 <sup>th</sup> Street	New York City
Serly, Tibor	c/o George Herzog, Room 249, I.H.R., 333 Cedar Street	New Haven, Conn.
Spivacke, Harold	Library of Congress, Music Division	Washington, D.C.
Street, Mrs. W. D.	4 Ridgeview Avenue	White Plains, N.Y.
Swadesh, Mrs. Mary Haas	Room 250, I.H.R.,333 Cedar Street	New Haven Conn.
Tozzer, Prof. A.M.	7 Bryant Street	Cambridge, Mass.
Vasser College Library	Poughkeepsie	New York
Vrionides, Christos	Villa Byzantium, P.O. Box 871,	Babylon, L.I., N.Y.
Winne, Miss Jane	2065 Lanihuli Drive	Honalulu, H.I.
Yale University, Library of The School of Music	Yale University	New Haven, Conn.
Yasser, Joseph	7 West 83 <sup>rd</sup> Street	New York City

Appendix III: "COMMITTEE ON MUSICOLOGY. List of persons interested in Musicology, January, 1935. (Note. This list does not include all persons addressed, but only those who have given information concerning fields of interest, publications, etc.)"<sup>99</sup>

Ethel G. Aginsky	Linguistics-Musicology (Ethnology)	Edward Ballantine, Department of Music, Harvard Cambridge, Mass.	Composition, Pianoforte Players. Analysis of works of Mozart, Brahms
Richard Aldrich	Musical history	J. Murray Barbour 416 W, Seneca Street Ithaca, N.Y.	Musicology
Nicholas George Julius Ballanta, Freetown, Sierra Leone, Africa	West Africa	Phillips Barry, 5 Craigle Circle Cambridge, Mass.	Folk-song and folk-music

# Current Musicology

## Appendix III (continued)

Charles R. Baskerville, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.	Elizabethan literature; Popular drama	Will Earhart 215 Lothrop Street	Music Education - Folk- Music, Pittsburgh Primitive Music
Marion Bauer 40 West 77 <sup>th</sup> Street New York City	Musical Composition, lecturing on music, writing—critical critical and analytical	Albert I. Elkus 3323 Clay Street San Francisco	Music generally. I am an active musician with a strong interest in various aspects of musicology.
Arthur V. Berger 31 Conant Hall, Harvard U. Cambridge, Mass.	Music and Opera in 16 <sup>th</sup> century English theatre	Herbert Elwell 2502 Mayfield Road Cleveland Heights, Ohio	Criticism, biography, analysis, etc.
Martin Berstein, NYC, Washington Square East New York City	17 <sup>th</sup> and 18 <sup>th</sup> Century Orchestral Music Wagner	John Lawrence Erb Connecticut College for Women New London, Conn.	Music History and Music Appreciation
Lowell P. Beveridge, Columbia University New York City	Choral music before Bach	Karl Henry Eschman	Form in Modern Music; new methods Granville, Ohio
William P. Bigelow, 2 Orchard Street Amherst, Mass.	Producer of Choral and Orchestral works. Conductor	Paul Randolph Farnsworth 715 Salvatierra Stanford University, Calif.	Experimental Aesthetics and Social Psychology
Paul Boepple 9 E. 59 <sup>th</sup> Street New York City	Musical Rhythm	Ross Lee Finney, Jr. 79 West Street Northhampton, Mass.	Composition. 17 <sup>th</sup> Century instrumental style
Laura C. Boulton, 5750 Island Avenue Chicago, Ill.	African Music; S.W. American Indian Music	William Arms Fisher, 359 Boylston Street Boston, Mass.	History of Music in America
Charles N. Boyd, 131 Bellefield Avenue Pittsburgh, Pa.	Harmony and History	Charles Warren Fox 64 Cambridge Street Rochester, N.Y.	Psychological acoustics; bibliography
Carl Bricken, 5727 University Avenue Chicago, Ill.	Music	Karl William Gerhkens Oberlin, Ohio	Music Education and Musicology
Mrs. Elizabeth Stuart Brown, University of California Berkeley, Calif.	History of Music	John I. Geiger, Meridian Apartments Indianapolis, Ind.	Teacher, Voice, Opera, Appreciation
J.M. Coopersmith, 3720 81 <sup>st</sup> Street Jackson Heights, New York	Music of the 18 <sup>th</sup> Century Georg Friedrich Handel	Becket Gibbs 92 Claremont Avenue New York City	Sacred Music
Henry Cowell 66 W. 12 <sup>th</sup> Street New York City	Comparative musicology and contemporary creative music	Harold Gleason Rochester, New York	Medieval Music
Edmund A. Cykler 13625 Califa St. Van Nuys, California	Music History	Percy Goetschius 120 Claremont Avenue New York City	Mus. Theory
Arthur Kyle Davis, Jr. Box. 1151, University of Virginia	Ballad and folk song	Julius Gold 1101 Green Street San Francisco, Calif.	History of Music Theory
Archibald T. Davison 22 Francis Avenue Cambridge, Mass.	General	Wallace Hoodrich New England Conservatory of Music, Boston, Mass.	Musical Education
Miss Frances Densmore Red Wing Minnesota	The music of the American Indians	Howard Hanson Eastman School of Music Rochester, N.Y.	Composition
Clarence Dickinson, NYC, 99 Claremont Avenue New York City	Sacred Music; Medieval Music and art	Glen Haydon University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, N.C.	Musicology-Theory
George Sherman Dickinson 155 College Avenue Poughkeepsie, N.Y.	Various subjects in the border-line field between music history and theory	George Herzog 333 Cedar Street New Haven, Conn.	Comparative Musicology, Folk New Music, Anthropology
Ralph William Downes, 9. Aiken Avenue Princeton, N.J.	Gregorian Chant and Medieval Music	Erich M. von Hornbostel 66 W. 12 <sup>th</sup> Street New York City	Musicology, Anthropology, Psychology, Physiology of the senses
Henry Purmont Eames Claremont, California	Musicology	Charles William Hughes 28 Ralph Avenue White Plains, N.Y.	Early instrumental music, Chamber music
		Royal D. Hughes Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	Music (before Bach)



Appendix III (continued)

A. Z. Idelsohn Hebrew Union College Cincinnati, Ohio	Jewish music and Folk poetry	Milton Franklin Metdessel University of Southern California Los Angeles, Calif.	Human voice, Folk music, Bird music
George Pullen Jackson Vanderbilt University Nashville, Tenn.	Folk-song	Charles H. Mills 2119 Jefferson St. Madison, Wis.	The Development of the Fugue in the 17 <sup>th</sup> and 18 <sup>th</sup> Centuries
Melville Jacobs University of Washington Seattle, Wash.	American Indian languages; Ethnology of American Indians (Oregon, Washington)	Earl V. Moore Ann Arbor, Michigan	Musicology
Guy B. Johnson Chapel Hill, N.C.	Primitive peoples, American negro; Racial differences	Stephen Morrisett 111 Jefferson Road Princeton, N.J.	Chamber music, especially the string quartet
Vern O. Knudsen University of California at Los Angeles Los Angeles, Calif.	Acoustics	M.D. Herter Norton 1 Lexington Avenue New York City	Music Education and Research
A. Walter Kramer 113 West 57 <sup>th</sup> Street New York City	Music and music journalism	Otto Ortmann Peabody Conservatory Baltimore, Md.	Musical Research and Bach
Ernst C. Krohn 3806 Junista Street St. Louis, Mo.	History of American Music, History of Music in America - Missouri - St. Louis	Mrs. Oliver H Payne (May de Forest) West Neck Rd., Cold Spring Harbor, L.I.	Physical Basis of music
Max T. Krone Indianapolis, Ind.	Choral Music	Abe Pepkinsky 2349 Bourne Avenue St. Paul, Minn.	Church Music
Jacob Kwalwasser Syracuse, N.Y.	Music Pedagogy, Psychology	Carl F. Pfatsicher 173 Maine Street Andover, Mass.	Medieval Spanish, Philology and Music
Samuel L. Laciari Public Ledger Philadelphia, Pa.	Chamber Music	Isabel Pope 5 Concord Avenue Cambridge, Mass.	General subject of Musicology
Paul Henry Láng, 601 Journalism Building Columbia University, New York		Louisa Pound 1632 L Street Lincoln Nebraska	History of Music - 17 <sup>th</sup> century and early 18 <sup>th</sup> century
Roberta Campbell Lawson 1008 Sunset Drive Tulsa, Oklahoma	Folk music - also collecting	Miss Margaret C. Prall 1420 La Loma Avenue Berkeley, Calif.	Church Music
Hugo Leichtentritt 198 St. Paul St. Brookline, Mass.	Composition, Musicology	Waldo S. Pratt 86 Gillett Strett Hartford, Conn.	History and Theory of Music: Organ
Leland Avery Coon Madison, Wisconsin	Music of the Clavecin Period Modern French Music	James T. Quarles University of Missouri Columbia, Mo.	Musical Acoustics
Leo Rich Lewis 20 Professors Row Tufts College, Mass.	Foundation of Musical Style Parity of Music and Math- Ematics	John Redfield 45 Redfield Road Fairfield, Conn.	Medieval and Renaissance Music
Arthur W. Locke 96 Round Hill Northampton, Mass.	1) Bach and his predecessors; 2) Music and the Romantic; 3) Modern Music	Gustave Reese 3 East 43 <sup>rd</sup> St., New York	The Life and Works of J.S. Bach
John A. Lomax University of Texas Station Austin, Texas	American folk-songs (omitting Indian songs)	Albert Riemanschneider 10001 Edgewater Drive Cleveland, Ohio	Psychology of Music; psychology of emotion
Clifford T. McAvoy 124 E. 81 Street, New York City	Opera Libretto	Christian A. Ruckmick C206, East Hall Iowa City, Iowa	Modern Music, Folksong of the Near East
Glenn Douglas McGeoch Ann Arbor, Michigan	English Music of Seventeenth Century (Italian Influences)	Lazare Saminsky 1 East 65 New York	Music, poetry, biography, essays
Henry Lowell Mason 134 Beacon Street Boston, Mass.	Biography	Robert Haven Schaufller c/o Dodd, Mead and Co. 443 4 <sup>th</sup> Ave., New York City	Psychology of Music
Arthur Mendel 3 East 43 <sup>rd</sup> St., New York City	Criticism	C.E. Seashore Iowa City, Iowa	
A. Tillman Merritt J-11 Eliot House, Cambridge Mass.			
Frank J. Metcalf 901 Ingraham Street Washington, D.C.	Sacred Music, Hymnology		

# Current Musicology

## Appendix III (continued)

Charles Seeger 66 West 12 <sup>th</sup> St. New York City	Musicology and Comparative Musicology but more particularly the methodology and the systematic orientation	Archer Taylor University of Chicago Miss Jean Thomas 3201 Cogan St., Ashland, Ky.	Folk music; music of folk songs Research in folklore
George Sherburn University of Chicago	The Eighteenth Century	Randall Thompson 30 East 42 <sup>nd</sup> St., New York	Music
Berrian R. Shute Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y.		Wm. Treat Upton 221 Forest St., Oberlin, Ohio	American music
A. Mackay Smith Farnley, White Post Virginia	Chamber music before 1800	George A. Wedge 120-130 Claremont Ave., New York	Theory of Music
Cecil Michener Smith 5757 University Avenue	History of Choral Music History of Dramatic music	R.D. Welch 101 Prospect St., Northampton	History of Music
Leslie Spier New Haven, Conn.	Ethnology, Indians of W. North America	James Woodside 822 Steinway Hall 113 West 57 <sup>th</sup> St. New York City	Research in the Historical Evolution of song
Hazel Martha Stanton 522 Fifth Avenue, New York	Psychology, Aesthetics Music	G. Wallace Woodworth Music Building Cambridge, Mass.	J.S. Bach
Edwin S. Stringham 500 West 121 <sup>st</sup> St. New York City	History - Acoustics (musical)	Joseph Yasser 7 West 83 Street	Scales, Modes, Tonality
Oliver Strunk 110 Maryland Avenue N.E.	15 <sup>th</sup> century polyphony Music of Joseph Haydn	Frederick Yeiser 2950 World Avenue Cincinnati, Ohio	Byzantine Music
Thomas Whitney Surette 21 Lexington Road Concord, Mass.	Music	Karl Young 195 Everit Street New Haven, Conn.	Medieval Music
Alfred J. Swan 1 College Lane, Haverford, Pa.			

## Appendix IV: "INSTITUTIONS OF WHICH ONE OR MORE MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY HAVE BEEN INVITED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE REPORT ON MUSICOLOGY, (Feb. 26, 1938) (\*indicates some answer has been received. Notes in brackets refer to answers received not to letters sent.)"<sup>100</sup>

*Amherst Arizona Arthur Jordan Cons. Baldwin Wallace Cons. Bennington *Boston Univ. *Brown *Bryn Mwar Buffalo *California *Calif. at L.A. [physics only] *Carnegie Tech. [psychology only] Case [physics only] *Catholic Univ. *Chicago *Chicago Musical Col. Claremont *C.C.N.Y. Univ. of Colorado *Columbia	*Cornell [one grad. stud. only] *Denison *Eastman Sch. of Mus. Field Mus. of Nat. Hist. Fisk *Grosvenor Library Hamilton *Harvard *Haverford Huntington Library Illinois Indiana *Iowa State *Univ. Iowa [psychology only] Kansas Kentucky Library of Congress Louisiana State MAILAMM (library) Miami, Ohio *Michigan State	Univ. Michigan Mills Minnesota *Missouri Mt. Holyoke Mus. Library, 58st, NY Nebraska New England Cons. New York Pub. Lib. *New York Univ. *North Carolina *N. Caro. Woman's Col. *Northwestern [anthropol. only] *Oberlin *Ohio State Ohio Univ. *Oklahoma Univ. Oregon *Peabody Cons. [one teacher only]	*Pearl River Pennsylvania State *Rutgers San Diego *Smith *South Carolina [folksong only] So. California *Stanford *Syracuse Texas *Tufts *Tulane Utah *Vanderbilt [German and psychology only] Vassar, Virginia [English only] *Univ. Washington, Wellesley, *Wella, Western Reserve. *Westminster Chior [sic] Sch. West Va. *Wisconsin, *Yale
---	--	---	--

Appendix V: "American Musicological Association, Proposed list of active members."<sup>101</sup>

Aldrich Richard 317 West 74 <sup>th</sup> Street New York	Kinkeldey, Otto 29 East Avenue Ithaca, New York	Seeger, Charles Louis Jr. 66 west 12 <sup>th</sup> Street New York City	Riemenschneider, Professor Baldwin-Wallace College Berea, Ohio
Beck, Prof. Jean B. Dept. of Music, Univ. of Penn. Philadelphia, Penna.	Krohn, Ernest C., jr. 3806 Juniata Street St. Louis, Missouri	Smith, Carleton Sprague New York Public Library New York City	Schillinger, Mr. Joseph 315 East 68 <sup>th</sup> Street New York City
Boyd, Charles N. 131 Bellefield Avenue Pittsburgh, Penna.	Kwalwasser, Jacob 860 Livingston Avenue Syracuse, New York	Strunk, W. Oliver 110 Maryland Ave., N.E. Washington, D.C.	Spivacke, Dr. Harold Library of Congress Washington, D.C.
Coopersmith, Jacob Maurice 3720—81 <sup>st</sup> Street Jackson Heights, N.Y.	Leichtentritt, Hugo 118 St. Paul Street Brookline, Mass.	Thompson, Randall 30 East 42 <sup>nd</sup> Street New York	Swalin, Dr. Benjamin 706 Locust Street Greencastle, Ind.
Cowell, Henry New School for Social Research 66 West 12 <sup>th</sup> Street New York	Mattfeld, Julius National Broadcasting Company Astoria, L.I., New York	Upton, William T. 221 Forest Street Oberlin, Ohio	Pepinsky, Prof. A University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minn.
Davison, Archibald T. 22 Francis Avenue Cambridge, Mass.	Metcalf, Frank J. 901 Ingraham Street Washington, D.C.	Woodworth, Wallace Music Building Cambridge, Mass.	Boas, Dr. Franz Columbia University New York City
Densmore, Miss Frances Red Wing, Minn.	Metfessel, Milton Franklin University Park Los Angeles, California	Yasser, Joseph 7 West 83 <sup>rd</sup> Street New York	Waters, Edward N. Library of Congress Washington, D.C.
Dickinson, Clarence 99 Claremont Avenue New York	Mills, Charles H. University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin	Yeiser, Frederick 2950 Wold Avenue Cincinnati, Ohio	Lomax, John Avery University of Texas Station Austin, Texas
Engel, Carl 3 East 43 <sup>rd</sup> Street, c/o G. Schirmer New York City	Miller, Dayton C. Case School of Applied Science Cleveland, Ohio	Barbour, Dr. J. Murray 416 West Seneca Street Ithaca, N.Y.	<u>Additions.</u> Fansworth, Paul R. Dept. of Psychology Leland Stanford University Palo Alto, California
Fletcher, Harvey 342 Madison Avenue New York	Ortmann, Otto Peabody Conservatory of Music Baltimore, Maryland	Fox, Dr. Charles W. Eastman School of Music Rochester, N.Y.	Locke, Arthur W. 96 Round Hill Northampton, Mass.
Haydon, Glen 2136 Eunice Street Berkeley, California	Pfateicher, Carl F. 173 Main Street Andover, Mass.	Herzog, Dr. George institute of Human Relations Yale University New Haven, Conn.	Redfield, Mr. John Redfield Road, Fairfield, Conn.
Hornbostel, Erich von New School for Social Research 66 West 12 <sup>th</sup> Street New York	Pratt, Waldo S. 86 Gillett Street Hartford, Conn.	Jackson, Prof. George Pullen Vanderbilt University Nashville, Tenn.	Stringham, Prof. Edwin J. 509 West 121st St., Apt. 407 New York City
Howard, John Tasker, jr. 47 Lincoln Street Glen Ridge, N.J.	Reese, Gustave c/o G. Schirmer 3 East 43 <sup>rd</sup> Street New York	Lang, Prof. Paul Henry Department of Music Columbia University New York City	Donovan, Richard Yale School of Music New Haven, Conn.
Hughes, Royal D. Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	Roberts, Helen H. Institute of Human Relations Yale University 333 Cedar Street New Haven, Conn.	Morrisett, Dr. Stephen Westminster Choir School	Gold, Julius 1101 Green Street San Francisco, California
Idelsohn, A.Z. Hebrew Union College Cincinnati, Ohio	Seashore, Carl E. State University of Iowa Iowa City, Iowa	Pope, Miss Isabel c/o Mediaeval [sic] Academy of America Cambridge, Mass.	

# Current Musicology

Appendix VI: Theodore Wiesengrund Adorno's Application to become a Member of the American Musicological Society, no date, c. 1941.<sup>102</sup>

Please supply, as full information as possible

Date

AMERICAN MUSICOLOGICAL SOCIETY

CANDIDACY FOR MEMBERSHIP

Statement of Applicant

1. Name of applicant Theodore Wiesengrund Adorno

2. Statement concerning training and degrees (give places and dates)  
1924: Ph. D. Frankfurt a. M. (summa cum laude)  
1931: Associate Professor, Frankfurt University  
1933: expelled by the Nazis.  
Since 1938 with International Institute for Social Research, Columbia University, New York.  
1938 - 1941: Musical director, Princeton Radio Research Project, later Office of Radio Research, Columbia University, New York.  
Since 1941: with Los Angeles Branch of Institute for Social Research, Columbia University, New York.

3. Statement concerning research

(a) Published (give dates) (only major publications)

The societal position of music, in "Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung"	1937
On Jazz,	1936
The Futurist character of music etc.	1938
Fore-chapters of book on R. Wagner,	1939-40
On Popular Music, in "Studies in Philosophy and Social Science,"	1941
The Radio Symphony, in "Radio Research, 1941"	1941
Co-author of the book on Alban Berg (together with H. Reik and E. Kröner),	1937
numerous articles in Periodicals	

(b) Completed but not published

On a Social Critique of Radio Music	} at files of Office of Radio Research, N.Y.
Analytical Study of the N.B.C. Music Appreciation Hour (1939-40)	
Philosophy of advanced music (1941)	} at files of Institute of Social Research.
6 more chapters of book on Wagner	

(c) In progress

A study on the patterns of temporary mass culture, with special regard to music.

(over)

Appendix VI (continued)

4. Statement concerning musical interests and activities other than research  
 Composer. Studied with B. Sektles in Frankfurt and Alban Berg in Vienna.  
 Numerous works performed.  
 1928-31 co-editor of "Arbeitsblätter", Vienna.  
 1929-33 director of "Musikstudie", Frankfurt, an organization  
 for contemporary music. All its concerts were under my artistic direction.  
 1940 organized and directed a cycle of contemporary concerts open  
 Station WNYC, New York City.  
 Permanent collaboration and critic of many periodicals and  
 journals, such as "Musik", "Pith und Taktstock", "Neue Musikzeitung",  
 "Frankfurter Zeitung", "Vossische Zeitung" and many others.

5. List of publications and other evidence submitted with this application

*all my major publications available through  
 Fashick of Social Research, Columbia University,  
 New York City, 429 W 117 Street.*

6. Sponsors (two present members)

Name Dr. Alfred Einstein

Address Dept. of Music, Smith College

Name Dr. Walter Rubsamen

Address Dept. of Music, University of California  
 at Los Angeles

7. On the basis of the above qualifications, I hereby make application for membership in the American Musicological Society

Signed *Th. Wresengrand - Adorno*

Address *316 So. Kenten Ave.  
 Brentwood Heights  
 Los Angeles, Cal.*

Please return this form to:

Gustave Reese  
 Secretary of the American Musicological Society  
 3 East 43rd Street  
 New York, New York



# Current Musicology

---

## Appendix VI (continued)

Please supply  
as full infor-  
mation as pos-  
sible

Date

### AMERICAN MUSICOLOGICAL SOCIETY

#### CANDIDACY FOR MEMBERSHIP

##### Statement of Sponsor

1. Name of candidate

T.W. Adorno

2. Statement concerning the quantity and type of the candidate's research, and concerning the quality of his scholarship:

(a) from direct personal knowledge

*Dr. Adorno is a well-known scholar in the fields of musical aesthetics and the sociology of music. He has contributed to many journals, and was co-editor of Der Anbruch from 1928-31. Some of his publications are: in the Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung, the articles "Zur gesellschaftlichen Lage der Musik," (1932); Jazz (1936); "Über den Fetischcharacter in der Musik," (1938), "Fragments über Wagner," (1939); in Die Musik, (1928) an article on Schubert; the chapter entitled "the Radio Symphony," in Radio Research 1941, N.Y. 1941; etc. He has also a co-author of Willi Reich's book on Alban Berg.*

(b) From indirect sources (give names)

(over)

3. Statement concerning the candidate's training, interests, and activities

*Dr. Adorno was Privat-dozent for aesthetics at the University of Frankfurt before Hitler, and is now a prominent Member of the Institute for Social Research of Columbia University.*

4. Other remarks

*Although one may not always agree with Dr. Adorno, his contributions to a musicological discussion are always original and penetrating. He would make a valuable member of the society.*

5. I sponsor this candidate as a person in my judgment properly qualified for Membership in the American Musicological Society

Signed **Walter W Rubsamen**  
Address Dept. of Music, University of California  
Los Angeles, California

##### Please return this form to:

Gustave Reese  
Secretary of the American Musicological Society  
3 East 43rd Street  
New York, New York



Appendix VI (continued)

Please supply  
as full infor-  
mation as pos-  
sible

Date

AMERICAN MUSICOLOGICAL SOCIETY

CANDIDACY FOR MEMBERSHIP

Statement of Sponsor

1. Name of candidate

T.W. Adorno

2. Statement concerning the quantity and type of the candidate's research, and concerning the quality of his scholarship:

(a) from direct personal knowledge

*I know that Mr. Adorno (Wiesengrund) has contributed several articles to "Der Anbruch", a famous German music periodical; also to Willie [sic] Reich's "23" a Viennese brochure for musical polemics, where he used the pseudonym Kurt Weiler.*

(b) From indirect sources (give names)

*Mr. Arnold Schoenberg gave me the following information: "Mr. Wiesengrund Adorno studied with Alban Berg for several years. Mr. Berg thought highly of him as a composer and musicologist. I know of several articles he has written in a very thorough and scientific manner on the analysis of some of my works, which I found extraordinarily interesting. He obtained his Ph.D. in a German University and I heartily endorse his application for membership in the America Musicological Society.*

*Arnold Schoenberg*

(over)

3. Statement concerning the candidate's training, interests, and activities
4. Other remarks
5. I sponsor this candidate as a person in my judgment properly qualified for Membership in the American Musicological Society

Signed **Adolph Weiss**  
Address **1803 ½ N. Bronson Ave**  
**Hollywood, Cal.**

Please return this form to:

Gustave Reese  
Secretary of the American Musicological Society  
3 East 43rd Street  
New York, New York

### Notes

I would like to thank Erin Brooks, Jamie Currie, Kyle Kaplan, Ben Piekut, Alejandro García Sudo, Pradeep Kannan, Schuyler Whelden, and Tom Wetmore for making crucial intellectual interventions that greatly helped me to strengthen the critical argument in this article. I am indebted to all of them for the time and care they spent with this piece, and especially to Tom for his exceptional editing. I also feel immensely grateful for the feedback I received from so many thoughtful students and colleagues, especially Martha Feldman and Carol Oja, and for the intense conversations about this topic in response to related lectures I gave at Cornell University, Princeton University, New York University, Northwestern University, the Society for American Music, the University of California Riverside, and the University of Arizona, as well as at the "Essence and Context" conference in Vilnius, Lithuania. Finally, I am grateful to Alex Rehding for his insightful responses to my queries about Harvard, and to Benjamin Court and Kyle Kaplan for their help as research assistants in photographing archival materials.

1. See the Harvard Music Department's web pages: <http://music.fas.harvard.edu/news.shtml> and <https://music.fas.harvard.edu/currentugrad.shtml>. See also Valia P. Leiper (2018). Harvard was not the first university to make such changes, but their actions received the most public attention. I am grateful to Alex Rehding for his clarification of this curriculum in an email to me dated April 23, 2018.
2. See, for example, Professors Alexander Rehding, Suzannah Clark, and Anne Shreffler, quoted in Robin (2017).
3. See, for a small sampling, the discussions on: <http://slippedisc.com/2017/04/you-dont-have-to-read-music-to-study-it-at-harvard>; <https://www.jazzguitar.be/forum/theory/60094-harvard-drops-music-theory-requirement.html>; and <https://phys.org/news/2017-05-insidious-class-music.html> (Ian Pace). Composer John Adams caught the most attention, and polarized the discussion, by rejecting the new requirements on Twitter.
4. Although the AMS-list was scheduled to shut down in fall 2017, it is still operating. One can become a member at: <http://www.ams-net.org/ams-l>. As far as I know, the AMS-list debate about language requirements was not archived publically.
5. William Robin gives an excellent bibliography of recent online discussions and significant secondary literature on public musicology in a syllabus for a course he taught in the School of Music at the University of Maryland in spring 2017: <https://willrobin251824868.files.wordpress.com/2018/08/musc-699p-syllabus.pdf>.
6. I discuss the coloniality of power in "Decolonizing the Society for American Music" (Levitz 2017). See also the bibliography included in that article.
7. I am grateful to Brigid Cohen for introducing me to this work.
8. My understanding of the musicological elite's expertise is shaped by my conversations and collaborations with Benjamin Court, whose work on amateurism inspired me in thinking about this topic, and taught me so much. See Court (2017).
9. The proper abbreviations for this society are: Internationale Musikgesellschaft (IMG), (1899–1914); Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft (IGMw) or Société Internationale de Musicologie (SIM) (1927–), and International Musicological Society (IMG) (1949–). See Kirnbauer (2017, 11n1).
10. Engel understood this moment as the birth of US musicology. In his presidential address to the AMS in 1937, he described how Leland approached him at the Library of Congress to create a Committee on Musicology at the ACLS after reading his tribute to Oscar Sonneck. See Engel (1929, 1937).

11. Leland wrote Engel on February 9, 1929 to inform him that the ACLS, “believing that the history and science of music constitutes an important branch of learning” had voted to ask the Executive Committee to appoint a standing committee on musicology and “to take such other measures as may be calculated to promote research and education in that field” (Leland 1929a). He asked Engel to help him select the other members, five in all. On the same day, Leland asked Kinkeldey to become a member. He was very disappointed when Kinkeldey said no, because he viewed Kinkeldey’s “cooperation as indispensable in our efforts to promote musicology as a field of learning” (see Leland 1929a; Kinkeldey 1929a; Leland 1929c; Kinkeldey 1929b; Armstrong 1929). Leland also requested Kinkeldey’s approval of the candidates Engel had suggested: Otto Ortmann, Frances Anne Wister, and Olin Downes. He thought Jean Beck would make a good member, but Beck had applied for funding and was thus disqualified (Leland 1929b).

12. See J.P. Chamberlain (1920). On Waldo Gifford Leland, see Wosh (2001). Leland’s papers are kept at the Library of Congress: <https://www.loc.gov/item/mm78029900>.

13. See the list of members of the Direktorium (board) included in “Einladung” (1928). In a letter to Merian from February 1928, Adler had suggested Carl Engel, Oscar Sonneck, Waldo Pratt, and Albert Stanley as possible US members of the board (Adler 1928a).

14. The reports of these gatherings in the annual proceedings of the MTNA from 1899 to 1914 give evidence of the IMG’s influence on musicological practice in United States before WW I. See, for example, Stanley (1910). Programs for the IMG’s conferences are available in the *Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, available online at <https://archive.org/details/ZeitschriftDerInternationalenMusikgesellschaft011899-1900/page/n133>. See, for example, Schering (1906).

15. The Congress on Music History was held as part of the Beethoven Centennial celebrations in Vienna from March 20–27, 1927. There has recently been much interest in exploring the history of the IGMw. See, for example, Baumann and Fabris (2017) and the conference “A ‘Musical League of Nations’?: Music Institutions and the Politics of Internationalism,” Institute of Musical Research, Senate House, London, June 29–30, 2018, <https://www.music.ox.ac.uk/research/projects/musical-league-of-nations>. I also found Yves Balmer and Hervé Lacombe (2017) immensely useful. On the founding of the IGMw, see also “Centenaire de Beethoven” (1927). This unsigned article (written by Julien Tiersot) reports that the new “international federation” was announced at the closing ceremonies of this congress in Vienna in 1927, and that Guido Adler, Julien Tiersot, Hermann Abert, André Pirro, Henry Prunières, Johannes Wolf, Karl Nef, Henryk Opienski, and Carl Engel were on the commission to organize it. See also “Die Gründung der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft” (1928) and Häusler (1977). Materials related to the organizers’ deliberations during the first 18 months, before their first official board meeting in September 1928, are kept in Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.

16. Edward Dent also played a large role in defining the internationalism of the IGMw as its president from 1931 to 1949. Dent (1936) told Adler in a letter from March 17, 1936, in the context of preparing the First International Congress for Music Education in Prague, that he felt “like an ‘unfortunate atlas’ of the international music world” (*Ich fühle mich wie ein ‘unglückseliger Atlas’ der internationalen Musikwelt.*)

17. “*groupement intern [sic] de musicologues professionnelles avec un bureau de renseignements pensant faciliter les travaux et les recherches en tous pays.*” Adler’s vision corresponds to what Patricia Clavin and Jens-Wilhelm Wessels (2005) describe as a standard view on international organizations as an “an instrument through which nation-states seek to wield power in international relations” (466).

18. “Beethoven-Zentenarfeier” (1928). Julien Tiersot wrote this unsigned review. In a letter to Adler from March 21, 1928, Prunières apologized for Tiersot’s “malicious attitude” (*l’attitude malveillante*) in the *Revue* (Prunières 1928). Tiersot had been an “enemy” of their project of an international society from the start, he complained, but would no longer obstruct their plans because Prunières had made sure he would not be reelected as president of the French society.

19. “Unsere ökonomischen Verhältnisse sind wie Sie wissen sehr drückend so dass ich Bedenken habe ob sich eine grosse Zahl von Teilnehmern finden wird und gerade die Berufenen und vielleicht auch die Tüchtigsten werden sich aus dem genannten Grunde fern halten müssen. Es fehlt auch bei uns an Gönnern. Indessen wollen wir die Hoffnung nicht aufgeben, aber Geduld und wieder Geduld. Momentan bin ich mit verschiedenen dringlichen Arbeiten ungemein in Anspruch genommen, allein ich behalte die Sache im Auge. Es wäre vielleicht am besten wenn Deutschland und Oesterreich vereinigt würden, also deutsches Sprachgebiet, ohne jede politische Tendenz. Es wäre ferner gut wenn es in dem Aufrufe an die Freunde der Musikwissenschaft hiesse: Deutsch, Engländer, Franzosen und Italiener. Dies wäre auch aus dem Grunde wichtig und vorteilhaft weil dann bei den Letztgenannten die Kolonien hinzukommen könnten und das wäre eine Bereicherung, denn schließlich werden die einzelnen Kolonien dieser Nationen doch keine Separatabteilungen bilden können. Auch würde ich meinen dass mit Rücksicht auf die ökonomischen Verhältnisse zu erwägen wäre ob nicht für Amerika sowohl für Nord—als auch für Südamerika, eine Stellung eingeräumt werden könnte, so wie sie für die 4 Nationen geschaffen wurde. Wollen Sie dies mit Prof. Wagner eingehend beraten” (Adler 1928a).

20. Secretary Wilhelm Merian promised board members from Germany and Austria visas for the first IGMw conference in Liège, Belgium in 1930. At the same time, the organizing committee eased passport regulations for all conference attendees. See Merian (1930); “II. Vorstandssitzung” (1929).

21. “Kunst und Wissenschaft sind an keine nationalen Schranken gebunden, bedürfen vielmehr zu ihrer vollen Auswirkung der Bewegungsfreiheit über die Landesgrenzen hinaus.” See “An die Freunde” (n.d.). For an example of how board members referred to their advertising as “propaganda,” see Merian (1928). The IGMw’s treasurer, Theodor Speiser-Riggenschbach suggested lowering a patron’s lifetime contribution to 200 CHF at the second meeting of the executive in Paris in October 1929. See “II. Vorstandssitzung” (1929).

22. See “Internationale der Musikwissenschaft” (1928); *Neue Preussische Kreuzzeitung* (n.d.).

23. See “Einladung” (1928).

24. The society included members from more countries than were represented on the board. At the meeting on September 4, 1928, Peter Wagner announced that the society had acquired 182 members in its first year, with “members also in America, Africa, and Asia.” See “I. Vorstandssitzung” (1928). The members are listed in “Erstes Verzeichnis” (1928). This list includes Michel Bourla, living in Jaffa, Palestine as the one “Asian” member. Charles Ribeyre (engineer at the Compagnie du Canal du Suez, Egypt) and Jules Rouanet, living in Algier, were the two “Africans.” “American” members included Albert Stanley, Charles Seeger, O.G. Sonneck, Robert J. Talbot (from Québec), Ernst Krohn, Julius Gold, Mrs. Janet Rowan Hale, John Patterson, Erich Weiler, and Carl Engel. There were only two members from “Middle and South America”: Luiz Lavanère from Jaraguá-Algoas, Brazil, and Emirto de Lima from Barranquilla, Colombia. The lists of members included in the *Mitteilungen* from 1928 to 1930 shows that the number of European members—whether individuals, institutions, musicological societies, or libraries—increased, but the international members did not, with the exception of a few new members from the United States. There were notably

large contingents from Germany, Switzerland, and the Czech Republic. New members from the United States in 1930 included Abraham Idelsohn, Alexander Mackay-Smith, Dayton C. Miller, Walter Williams, the New York Public Library, and the Library of the School of Music at Yale University. The only new member from Central and South America during these years was André Sas (Peru). The membership of the IGMw remained this insular well into the 1950s and beyond. See Häusler (1977).

25. See “Internationale Gesellschaft Statuten” (1928), item §12. In his letter to Merian from February 1928, Adler wrote that “even though the office is located in Basel and the secretary and treasurer of the society have to be Swiss, the state concept of being Swiss is not decisive in this, but rather —along with the still fluctuating idea of being neutral—the convenient location of Switzerland and specifically Basel, which, by the way, is quite far for us Austrians” (Adler 1928a). (Noch möchte ich bemerken dass die Nennung der 4 Nationen auch für die Schweiz vorteilhaft wäre, denn wenngleich der Sitz in Basel ist und Sekretär und Schatzmeister daselbst sein müssen so ist dabei der Staatsbegriff des Schwiezers [sic] nicht Ausschlaggebend [sic] sondern neben der noch immer fluktuierenden Vorstellung des Neutralen, die günstige Lage der Schweiz rekte [sic] Basels. -Allerdings für uns Oesterreicher ziemlich weit.)

26. On Guido Adler’s role in the development of musicology as a profession, see Stumpf, Posch, and Rathkolb (2017).

27. A second copy of the statutes in the Guido Adler Papers has the word “Länder” changed to “Nationen.” Adler probably made this change. In the French version of the statutes the word is “nation” from the start. The “Beitrittserklärung” (n.d.) uses the word “Staaten,” but Adler again changed it in the margins to “Nationen.” Adler wrote Merian in February 1928 that he wanted the term “Staaten” changed to “Nationen,” especially for Germany and Austria (Adler 1928a). These materials are all kept in Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.

28. “Wolf teilt mit, dass Kamienski etwas pikiert sei, dass Polen nicht im Vorstand vertreten sei. Prof. Wolf hat auf Nejedly hingewiesen und betont, dass nicht alle Staaten im Vorstand vertreten sein können. Das Telegramm von Kamienski an die Gründungsversammlung war ungeschickt abgefasst; er gibt es zu. Kamienski ist wieder versöhnt, hat Prof. Wolf beauftragt, uns mitzuteilen, dass er eine polnische Gesellschaft gegründet habe.” Dent responded, “es ist ausgeschlossen, dass die Vertreter aller Nationen in unseren Vorstand gewählt werden. Nur Persönlichkeiten in unseren Vorstand, keine Repräsentanten der Nationen, sondern der Wissenschaft.” See “I. Vorstandssitzung” (1928). During the congress in Vienna in March 1927, Adler had jotted down a list of possible members for an envisioned international society that included “Jachim” from Poland, by which I assume he meant Zdzislaw Jachimecki (Adler 1927b). In 1928, Adolf Chybinski was the only Polish member of the IGMw. Alicja Simon joined in June 1929. They remained the only two Polish members in 1930, which means that Kamienski did not join after his correspondence with the board. See the list of members and supplementary lists in the *Mitteilungen der IGMw* from October 1928, September 1929, June 1929, and July 1930.

29. My view on the IGMw’s relationship to Russian musicologists differs dramatically from that of Häusler (1977). See “II. Vorstandssitzung” (1929); Merian (1930a). Adler had suggested Boris Asafyev and Oskar von Riesemann as potential Russian members in the list of personnel he wrote up in March 1927 (see Adler 1927b). But Mikhail Vladimirovich Ivanov-Boretzky had remained the only Russian member of the IGMw until 1929, when Boris Asafyev, Anna Chochlowkina, Semjon Ginsberg, Alexander Nicolsky, and Zenaide Ssawelowa joined. See the lists of members and supplementary lists in the *Mitteilungen der IGMw* from October 1928, September 1929, June 1929, and July 1930.

30. On the role the League of Nation's internationalism played in reconfiguring academic disciplines, see Ken Osborn (2016).

31. "Auskunftsstelle für alle Fragen gedacht ist, die nur oder am besten auf internationaler Basis gelöst werden können. Dieses Bureau steht allen Mitgliedern für Auskünfte, Anregungen, und Nachforschung zur Verfügung. Seine Hauptziele sind vorerst vornehmlich die folgenden: Herstellung der Verbindungen zwischen den Musikforschern der verschiedenen Länder; Vermittlung von Anfragen und Auskünften; Beschaffung oder Vermittlung von wissenschaftlichen Hilfsmitteln wie Handschriften, Kopien, Photographien; Nachweis über Themen, die in den verschiedenen Ländern in Bearbeitung sind; Errichtung einer bibliographischen Zentralstelle." See "Beitrittserklärung" (n.d.). The society's secretary was assigned to run the bureau, but most likely Miss J. Schaefer did. (See "III. Vorstandssitzung" 1930.) Miss Schaefer also took the minutes for the board's meetings in the early years.

32. At the first meeting of the IGMw executive, Dent told his colleagues that he thought the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations could help them in determining the legal status of their society. That organization was planning to create a law to prevent such societies from being dissolved in war time. Dent noted that whereas the IMG had been dissolved in World War I, the English one (the Royal Music Society) had not been, and that this was important. See "I. Vorstandssitzung" (1928).

33. In his notes from March 1927, Adler had commented that "governments will be approached and asked for funding for the confederation" (Adler 1927a).

34. The IGMw struggled financially throughout the 1930s. In 1936, for example, Edward Dent wrote Adler about the suggestion they approach Robert Mayer as a potential patron to "save" the IGMw (Dent 1936).

35. For a brief history of this bank, see [https://www.gutzwiller.ch/assets/content/GUTZWILLER\(ALL-GB\).pdf](https://www.gutzwiller.ch/assets/content/GUTZWILLER(ALL-GB).pdf)

36. Guido Adler (1928c) had requested funds from the Bundesministerium für Unterricht in Vienna in a letter dated December 11, 1928. They gave the IGMw 200 Schillings in August 1930 (Merian 1930).

37. Adler announced these plans as early as 1927 in the flyer "Commemoration of the 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Beethoven: A Congress of Music History" (Adler 1927c). See also Guido Adler's different French version of this announcement in the same folder. He explained the new journal in detail in his "Promemoria" to Wilhelm Merian (Adler 1928b).

38. See the statutes, §18. In his initial notes on the IGMw from March 1927, Adler had remarked that the journal's languages could be "freely chosen by the authors" (Adler 1927b). But in his Promemoria from October 1928, he wrote Merian that he wanted the journal to be in the five languages listed here (although he suggested Latin as tentative) (Adler 1928b). A year later, Johannes Wolf suggested adding Spanish, bringing the list of languages for the journal up to six (Wolf 1929). It is indicative of European linguistic hierarchies that the board did not at this time include Spanish or Czech among the IGMw's official languages, even though a significant contingent of Spanish and Czech members joined the society after 1930. Latin was removed and Spanish added as an official language of the IMS only decades later. On the current language politics of the journal, see Celestini and Bohlman (2011).

39. Minutes of meetings were also in German, and I assume the meetings were conducted in that language.

40. Dent (1934). This letter and other materials relating to *Acta musicologica* are kept in Folder 23:19, Guido Adler Papers.



41. Nancy Yunhwa Rao (1997, 376n10) provides this information based on a surviving memorandum of the meeting in the Joseph Schillinger Collection, NYPL. She notes that the name of the society was still up for grabs at the first meeting. In the bulletin from 1931, Seeger listed only himself, Cowell, Kinkeldey, Schillinger, and Yasser as present at the meeting (NYMS 1931).

42. Roberts expressed her dismay about how Walton had been treated in a letter to Gustave Reese, September 26, 1946 (Roberts 1946a). She requested Walton be given a lifetime membership. In a second letter to Reese from November 28, 1946, Roberts regretted that Reese had passed on her request to Charles Seeger, who rejected it, as she expected he would. "It happens that Mr. Seeger is one of the worse offenders in the way I mentioned. However, the damage is done" (Roberts 1946b). The online descriptions of materials in the collection in which they are found do not always match labels on individual items in the archive. For this reason, in the references section I have indicated simply the box in which materials can be found and the label on the box if it is clear.

43. Sarat Lahiri taught Henry Cowell Hindustani classical music and performed in his New School series. See also, from these years, Lahiri and Sargeant (1931).

44. Members included: Joseph Achron, Yuri Bilstein, Mikhail Bukinik, Vladimir Drozdoff, Eugene Fuerst, Alexander Gretchaninov, Alexander Koshetz, Nina Koshetz, Vassily Kibaltchitch, Nikolai Medtner, Leonard Mestechkin, Eugene Plotnikoff, Benjamin Levine, Nicholas Slonimsky, Lazare Saminsky, Joseph Schillinger, Konstantin Shvedov, Alexander Siloti, Nicholas Stember, Léon Theremin, Sergei Tarnowsky, Sergei Touchnoff, Jacob Weinberg, Joseph Yasser, and Moïse Zlatin. Seeger noted in the first *Bulletin* that Joseph Yasser, Alexander Gretchaninov, Nicholas Slonimsky, Joseph Schillinger, and Solomon Rosowsky had already given papers in joint encounters with the NYMS (NYMS 1931). Materials on the "Russian group of Musicologists of New York City" are kept in Folder 31, Box 6, Yasser Collection.

45. On Gerald F. Warburg, see "Gerald F. Warburg" (n.d.). See also Kirby (1934).

46. See NYMS (1931). Mary Ellen Bute may have served as secretary for the New York Society for a time. A note at the end of the second *Bulletin* indicates that copies of *Bulletins* nos. 1 and 2 could be obtained from "Miss. M.E. Bute, 2 West 67<sup>th</sup> Street, Apartment 10F, New York City (Telephone E.Ndicott 2-2395)."

47. This was announced in NYMS (1932).

48. See, for example, the materials in Folder 15, Box 4, Yasser Collection.

49. William J. Mitchell (1965) later joked about Spivacke's role, highlighting, perhaps, how unusual it was: "Who was this Dr. Harold Spivacke? Observe that in 1934 he was appointed assistant Chief of the Music Division of the Library of Congress. Was he charged by his superiors in Washington with the execution of a secret, callous operation? Was it his assignment to wrest from New York City its own society and federalize it? Was this bureaucracy on the move? Who was his superior?"

50. I explore this history in much more detail in an article in preparation, "The White Supremacist Foundations of the American Musicological Society."

51. I have been able to find the minutes of only one meeting of the ASCM, on April 4, 1936. Copies of these minutes are kept in the archives of Joseph Yasser, Helen Heffron Roberts, and Harold Spivacke. Helen Heffron Roberts presided over this meeting. The following members attended: Helen Heffron Roberts, Harold Spivacke, Joseph Yasser, Irma G. Labastille, Marion Bauer, F.C. Lathrop, Christo Vironides, and M.H. Haas.

## Current Musicology

---

52. See “American Society” (n.d.). The society issued at least one recording of “Navaho Indian music” as a way of recruiting members. It was sent to all members who paid their dues (see Roberts 1934b).

53. The box in which these minutes are found is now kept in the archive as a single microfilm, labeled, on its first page: “Minutes of the American Musicological Society.”

54. Roberts had sent a memo to Reese, which he had included in the agenda he sent members before this meeting. See Gustave Reese’s (1934a).

55. See “American Musicological Society: By-Laws to the Constitution” (n.d.), with a typed note “Adopted December 1, 1934,” and yearly ballots kept in Box 27, AMSR. In the second draft of the AMS constitution from summer/fall 1934, one member commented that, “The remarks that vice-presidents shall be chosen from different branches is well made but it is, as it stand [*sic*], very dangerous. The next generation of musicologists will probably be more like Curt Sachs than like [Arnold] Schering or [John William Strutt] Rayleigh. However, this can easily be remedied by leaving some kind of a loophole to the nominating committee—something about the availability of suitable men, perhaps.” See “American Musicological Society: Constitution (2nd Draft),” no date but c. summer/fall 1934, Folder 16, Box 5, Spivacke Collection.

56. Charles Seeger later confirmed his inadvertent role in enabling the historical musicologists to take over the AMS. In a letter to Oliver Strunk from January 23, 1960, Seeger recalled: I “made a plea for formal statement of dual interest [historical and comparative musicology] and tried unsuccessfully to incorporate it in the Constitution [of the AMS], of whose drafting committee I was secretary. I reminded the other members, Kinkeldey and Spivacke, of my fears in the drafting of the first, historical orientations would swamp both the comparative musicological and systematic interests. But I had to agree with them that constitutional concern with the matter would be inept. The old Society for Comparative Musicology had to die because there were not enough serious students interested in its aims” (Seeger 1960a). In the same letter, Seeger reveals how he later drafted a constitution for the Society for Ethnomusicology (in 1955) and “patterned it as closely as the small membership allowed, upon that of the AMS, with eventual merging of the two societies not only hoped for but expected.” Seeger repeats the story of how he drafted the constitution of the SEM to match that of the AMS in a letter to Dragan Plamenac, March 30, 1960 (Seeger 1960b). I wonder about how Seeger’s constant maneuvering behind the scenes affected the discipline at large, given the enormous role he played in the AMS, ASCM, Committee on Musicology of the ACLS, and Pan American Society.

57. See Roberts (1937). This letter is followed in the archive by two official, undated letters to all members of the society about the plans to transfer the activities of the German section to the United States and create an international society. At this time Charles Seeger was president, Henry Cowell and Harold Spivacke vice-presidents, F.C. Lathrop corresponding secretary, and George Herzog secretary. The council consisted of Laura Boulton, Edwin G. Burrows, Arnold Bake, Eleanor Hague, Philips Barry, Ananda Coomaraswamy, and Derrick N. Lehmer. Roberts’ correspondence with Lachmann gives detailed information about how all these developments unfolded. These letters are kept in Group No. 1410, Series No. 1, Box No. 3, Folder 89, Roberts Papers.

58. Roberts wrote Elma Loines on April 9, 1936: “For the past three years, the Society has been run largely by two or three individuals because most of the membership is so scattered and so few people were willing to take responsibility. I felt, however, that the interest would be much keener if a number of people had an active part in it. Moreover, I have been saddled with most of the work and it has gotten to a place where I simply cannot carry it all, so I have

insisted on a full slate of officers being elected and a Council who could, if necessary, hold to account one or two of our officers, who, while able, are most dilatory and even irresponsible in business matters” (Roberts 1936). See also Roberts (1934b), in which she describes how she has taken on secretarial duties for the ASCM even though she was not elected secretary.

59. Roberts lost her job at Yale when funding was cut at the end of the winter semester 1936. See Roberts to Elma Loines, April 9, 1936. In a letter to Seeger from February 5, 1937, she writes about the rather desperate state of the ASCM (Roberts 1937).

60. See also the agenda for this meeting (Reese 1934b), created by Reese and dated June 16, 1934.

61. A collection of yearly proceedings is online at: <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000046672>. In order to get a sense of how musicologists distinguished themselves in the MTNA in these years, it is helpful to read the annual presidential addresses. See, for example, Smith (1938).

62. Reese (1936b) wrote Dickinson on August 20, 1936 that 2/3 of the board had sanctioned the plan for a joint meeting.

63. AMS members received a photostat program that included only the musicology sessions at the MTNA conference. This program is included in Folder 2280, Box 78, AMSR.

64. I explore the racial and gendered consequences of these ruptures in greater depth in my article in preparation, “The White Supremacist Foundations of the American Musicological Society.”

65. In February 1935, Leland asked Kinkeldey if he would replace the music critic Richard Aldrich on the committee, and then succeed Carl Engel as chair. Leland had been corresponding with and visiting Kinkeldey since 1929, when he had first asked him to join the Committee on Musicology; Kinkeldey had also served in these years as an evaluator for fellowship and grant applications. Although Kinkeldey had been hesitant, this time he said yes. In a way he and Engel traded places: in 1937, Engel became president of the AMS, a year after Kinkeldey took his place as chair of the Committee on Musicology. See Engel (1932); Kinkeldey (1934); Leland (1934); Leland (1935a); Kinkeldey (1935a); Leland (1935b).

66. On the work of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation and the Commission Internationale des Arts Populaires, see Bjarne Rogan (2006).

67. For a brief overview of the Committee on Musicology’s activities in this period see Daugherty (1938, 5–7).

68. Goodchild noted that Oliver Strunk had helped him compile section C of this list, on “concrete” suggestions.

69. The committee was referring here to *Progress of Medieval (and Renaissance) Studies in the United States and Canada*, published from 1922–1960.

70. Goodchild and Kinkeldey subsequently corresponded about whether to send out these two articles to university administrators. Goodchild noted that he liked the MTNA one, but he felt sending such articles to university administrators was a delicate undertaking. Kinkeldey did not want to push the issue, and it is unclear whether the articles were ultimately sent. See Kinkeldey (1935b); Goodchild (1935c); Kinkeldey (1935c).

71. Kinkeldey (1936b) talked about these summer fellowships for graduate students as the primary achievement of the Committee on Musicology in his first year as chair in a letter to Leland, November 21, 1936. Extensive materials relating to students’ applications and nominations for these summer fellowships are kept in Folder 6-26, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers. For a list of recipients of grants, etc., see Daugherty (1938, 5–7).

## Current Musicology

---

72. Goodchild wrote in the same letter that the “big job” was to get scholars to “consider themselves collaborators with us rather than advocates of their students.”

73. Goodchild and Kinkeldey seemed to get along very well.

74. Materials pertaining to this survey, including sample questionnaires, responses, and bios, are included in Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers. Goodchild stressed how important this work was to the “developmental program” of the Committee on Musicology. See Goodchild (1940).

75. See Daugherty (1938b). In his letter, Daugherty mentions that he has sent the questionnaire to almost all members of the AMS, some teachers, and individuals recommended by the committee.

76. On this publication and the questionnaire, see Goodchild (1938b); Daugherty (1938a, 1938c, 1938d, 1938e, 1938f).

77. George S. Dickinson, Glen Haydon, Otto Kinkeldey, Hugo Leichtentritt, Oliver Strunk, and Gustave Reese were present (“Minutes” 1936).

78. Carl Seashore (1937), an emeritus professor at the University of Iowa, lamented to Gustave Reese in a letter from October 9, 1937 that musicology had still not had the time to define its “field.” He was of two minds about how this should happen. “It must be a natural evolution and the survival of the fittest,” he wrote on the one hand. “Perhaps, on the other hand,” he added, reconsidering, “the great diversity of interests may lend a charm to the undertaking.”

79. See Article IV of “American Musicological Society: By-Laws to the Constitution” (n.d.).

80. See “Proposed amendments” (2017).

81. See, for example, “Dean to Speak” (1939).

82. See Golden (2004); Willoughby-Herard (2015); Carnegie Commission (1932); Magubane (2008). I explore these connections in more depth in my article in preparation, “The White Supremacist Foundations of the American Musicological Society.”

83. Albert Sydney Raubenheimer’s dissertation was published as Raubenheimer (1925).

84. Alderman (n.d.) writes that Raubenheimer regularly attended concerts of the Los Angeles Philharmonic and strongly supported the music department during his time as dean.

85. Dorothy Lawton was one of the first women to become a member in 1935. Isabel Pope and Olga Samaroff Stokowsky were other early members. Marion Brauer, Mary Martha Briney, Anabel Morris Buchanan, Barbara Duncan, Ruth Hanna, Miriam Johnson, Hertha Schweiger, and Edith Woodruff gave papers in the society before 1939. I explore this topic in greater depth in my article in preparation, “The White Supremacist Foundations of the American Musicological Society.” See American Musicological Society (1984); Grassl and Szabó-Knotik (1999).

86. See Ballot (1939). That year, Ruth Hannas was nominated to be a member-at-large. Roberts had been nominated for vice president in 1936, running against Carleton Sprague Smith, and also as a member-at-large in 1937. See the ballots dated December 16, 1936 and October 27, 1937, Box 27, AMSR.

87. “Ich sehe mich wegen Inkompetenz leider nicht in der Lage, die freundliche Einladung zu akzeptieren.” Albert Einstein, quoted in German in Alfred Einstein’s (1940) letter to Reese, August 7, 1940. Warren T. Allen (1940) had suggested inviting Einstein in a letter from July 17, 1940. See also Reese’s (1940) response to Allen, July 31, 1940.

88. See, for example, Pham and Shilliam (2016); Raza, Roy, and Zacharia (2015); and Shilliam (2015).

89. This became Article II of the first constitution of the AMS from 1934. In the first draft of this constitution from June 26, 1934, however, the mission statement, listed as “II. Objects,” had read: “The objects of the Association shall be to promote intercourse among those who are cultivating musicology in different parts of America, to co-operate with other learned and artists societies and institutions, to give a stronger and more general impulse and more systematic direction to critical and scientific research, and to procure for the labors of musicological scholars increased facilities and a wider usefulness.” See “American Musicological Association: Constitution (Draft),” included in Reese (1934c). A second draft of this constitution, completed at a second meeting, provides the original on the left-hand, and alternate suggestions from the constitution committee on the right-hand side of the page. Here, the members suggested that the object of the association could be: “1. to promote in the U.S.A. the cultivation and appreciation of musicology as a branch of learning; 2. to facilitate and stimulate the relations between individuals interested in musicology; 3. to further the cooperation of the Association with other learned bodies in America and abroad; X. The objects of the Association are the study of the History of Music, musical Aesthetics, and Musical Theory; X. A clause modelled [sic] after: ‘The object of the Association shall be the advancement of research in modern languages and their literatures.’ (From the constitution of the Modern Language Association).” See “American Musicological Society: Constitution (2nd Draft),” no date but c. summer/fall 1934, kept in Folder 16, Box 5, Spivacke Collection. Article II of the current bylaws reads: “The object of the society shall be the advancement of scholarship in the various fields of music through research, learning, and teaching. The Society shall be operated as a nonprofit corporation exclusively for this object.” See the AMS “By-Laws” (AMS 2017).

90. See also Fitzsimmons (2009). Harvard is currently involved in a law suit concerning alleged discrimination against Asian American candidates for admission. For an update with links, see Franklin and Zwickel (2018).

91. Soares cites several authors who represent this view, but directs his critique at Nicholas Lemann’s (1999) *The Big Test*. See Soares’s bibliography in footnote 22, page 204.

92. Today, 67% of Harvard’s students come from the top 20%; 4.5% from the bottom 20%. See “Economic Diversity” (2017). See also Bolotnikova (2017). These studies indicate, however, that there *has* been long-term progress, and that the situation has improved from what it was decades ago.

93. Harvard hires less adjuncts than other universities in the United States. See College Factual (n.d.); Aspellund and Bernhard (2015). Labor conditions at Harvard are reflected in the bitter debate over the unionization of Teaching and Research Assistants (see HGSU-UAW, n.d.; Office of the Provost, n.d.; Avi-Yonah and McCafferty 2018).

94. Nair quotes Steven Salaita as arguing that “the preservation of academic freedom as a rights-based structure, in other words, shouldn’t be the focus of our work. We should focus on the development and maintenance of just labor conditions and the disengagement of our institutions from the exercise of state violence.” Nair’s larger argument is that radicalism is “not a matter of gesture, of experimental tweeting or ad hominem editorializing.” And it is not about defending free speech. Rather, it “requires speaking from and recognizing context,” i.e., the material conditions of the university as revealed in acute problems of access and economic inequality.

95. See Jacques Rancière (1987). On critical positionalities, see Dylan Robinson (forthcoming).

96. NYMS (1931, 1932, 1933-34).

97. “Minutes” (1930–1932).

## Current Musicology

---

98. This document is kept in Folder 1, Box 6, Spivacke Collection.
99. Enclosure included in Goodchild (1935a). Kinkeldey's name is written in pen at the top of this document. Somebody has also scribbled in pencil on the r.h. corner "encl. 6.12.35."
100. D. H. Daugherty included this typed, mimeographed document in Daugherty (1938c).
101. This list is kept in Folder 16, Box 5, Spivacke Collection.
102. On these documents, regular text indicates the original typed application form, italics indicates typed recommendations from sponsors, and text in bold indicates the sponsors' signatures in pen. A high-resolution scan of Adorno's full application is available in the online supplement to this article at <http://bit.ly/2CIb4eJ>. This application is kept in Box 35, AMSR. I am grateful to Robert Judd, Executive Director of the AMS, for permission to reproduce it.

### *Published References*

- AMS (American Musicological Society). 1984. "The American Musicological Society: 1934–1984." Philadelphia: The American Musicological Society. [http://www.ams-net.org/resources/Anniversary\\_Essay.pdf](http://www.ams-net.org/resources/Anniversary_Essay.pdf).
- AMS (American Musicological Society). 2017. "By-Laws." American Musicological Society website. <http://www.ams-net.org/bylaws.php>.
- Aspellund, Karl M., and Meg P. Bernhard. 2015. "In Flux: Non-Ladder Life at Harvard," *The Harvard Crimson*, May 28, 2015. <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2015/5/28/in-flux>.
- Avi-Yonah, Hera S., and Molly C. McCafferty. 2018. "Harvard Will Bargain With Grad Union" *The Harvard Crimson*, May 2, 2018. <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2018/5/2/univ-will-bargain>.
- Balmer, Yves, and Hervé Lacombe, eds. 2017. "Un siècle de musicologie en France: Histoire intellectuelle de la *Revue de musicologie*, vol. 1." Special issue, *Revue de Musicologie* 103 (2).
- Baumann, Dorothea, and Dinko Fabris, eds. 2017. *The History of the IMS (1927–2017)*. Basel: Bärenreiter.
- "Beethoven-Zentenarfeier, Festbericht [sic] vorgelegt vom Executiv-Komitee [sic] der Feier.—Id. Internationaler Musikhistorischer Kongress, Vienne, 1927, Universal-Edition." 1928. *Revue de musicologie* 9, no. 25 (February): 44.
- Bolotnikova, Marina N. 2017. "Harvard's Economic Diversity Problem." *Harvard Magazine*, January 19, 2017. <https://harvardmagazine.com/2017/01/low-income-students-harvard>
- Brigham, Carl. 1923. *A Study of American Intelligence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carnegie Commission of Investigation on the Poor White Question in South Africa. 1932. *The Poor White Problem in South Africa: Report of the Carnegie Commission*, 5 volumes. Stellenbosch: Pro Ecclesia-Drukkery.
- Celestini, Federico, and Philip V. Bohlman. 2011. "Editorial," *Acta Musicologica* 83 (1): 1–3.
- "Centenaire de Beethoven: Le Congrès de Vienne." 1927. *Revue de Musicologie* 8, no. 22 (May): 101–2.
- Chamberlain, J. P. 1920. "The International Union of Academies and the American Council of Learned Societies Devoted to the Humanistic Studies." *The American Political Science Review* 14, no. 3 (August): 499–503.
- Christensen, Dieter. 1991. "Erich M. Hornbostel, Carl Stumpf, and the Institutionalization



- of Comparative Musicology.” In *Comparative Musicology and the Anthropology of Music*, edited by Bruno Nettl and Philip Bohlman, 201–9. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clavin, Patricia, and Jens-Wilhelm Wessels. 2005. “Transnationalism and the League of Nations: Understanding the Work of Its Economic and Financial Organisation.” *Contemporary European History* 14 (4): 465–92.
- College Factual. n.d. “Adjuncts at Harvard.” <https://www.collegefactual.com/colleges/harvard-university/academic-life/faculty-composition/chart-adjuncts.html>.
- Court, Benjamin. 2017. “The Politics of Musical Amateurism, 1968–1981,” PhD diss., University of California Los Angeles. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/67j2r8vg>.
- Daugherty, D. H. 1938. *A Report on Publication and Research in Musicology and Allied Fields in the United States 1932–1938, compiled for the Committee on Musicology of the American Council of Learned Societies*, with an introduction by D. H. Daugherty. Washington, DC: ACLS.
- . 1940. *A Bibliography of Periodical Literature in Musicology and Allied Fields and A Record of Graduate Theses Accepted No. 1 October 1, 1938–September 30, 1939*. Committee on Musicology of the American Council of Learned Societies. Washington: American Council of Learned Societies.
- “Dean to Speak Today: Raubenheimer Tells Faculty About Boers in Africa.” 1939. *Daily Trojan*, May 24, 1939.
- De Lauri, Antonio. 2014. “Bourgeois Knowledge.” *Allegra Lab Post*. December 13, 2014. <http://allegralaboratory.net/bourgeois-knowledge>.
- Dent, Edward. 1938. “Otto Kinkeldey.” *The Musical Quarterly* 24, no. 4 (October): 405–11.
- “Die Gründung der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft.” 1928. *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft/Bulletin de la Société Internationale de Musicologie* 1, no. 1 (October): 1–9.
- Drott, Eric. 2012. “What Inclusiveness Excludes.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 65, no. 3 (Fall): 825–29.
- “Economic Diversity and Student Outcomes at Harvard University.” 2017. *New York Times*, January 18, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/projects/college-mobility/harvard-university>.
- Elliot, Philip. 1972. *The Sociology of Professions*. London: MacMillan Press.
- Engel, Carl. 1925. “Views and Reviews.” *The Musical Quarterly* 11, no. 4 (October): 617–29.
- . 1929. “Postscript.” *The Musical Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (January): 149–51.
- . 1937. “An Address.” *Papers Read by Members of the American Musicological Society at the Annual Meetings* (December 29 and 30): 38–44.
- “Erstes Verzeichnis der Mitglieder der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft September 1928” (1928). *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft/Bulletin de la Société Internationale de Musicologie* 1, no. 1 (October 1): 10–14.
- Fitzsimmons, William R. 2009. “Guidance Office: Answers from Harvard’s Dean, Part 1.” *New York Times*, September 10, 2009. <https://thechoice.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/09/10/harvarddean-part1>.
- “The Founding of the Society.” 1936. *Bulletin of the American Musicological Society* 1 (June): 1–2.
- Franklin, Delano R., and Samuel W. Zwickel. 2018. “Harvard Makes Final Bid to Avoid Trail in Admissions Lawsuit.” *Harvard Crimson*, August 28, 2018. <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2018/8/28/harvard-admissions-trial>.
- Frisbie, Charlotte J. 1991. “Women and the Society for Ethnomusicology: Roles



- and Contributions from Formation through Incorporation (1952/53–1961).” In *Comparative Musicology and Anthropology of Music*, edited by Bruno Nettl and Philip V. Bohlman, 244–65. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- “Gerard F. Warburg.” n.d. *Schenker Documents Online*. <http://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org/profiles/person/entity-000934.html>.
- Golden, Marita. 2004. “Carnegie Corporation in South Africa: A Difficult Past Leads to a Commitment to Change.” *Carnegie Results* (Winter). [https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer\\_public/f3/54/f354cbf9-f86c-4681-8573-c697418ee786/ccny\\_cresults\\_2004\\_southafrica.pdf](https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer_public/f3/54/f354cbf9-f86c-4681-8573-c697418ee786/ccny_cresults_2004_southafrica.pdf).
- Gosney, Seymore, Paul Popenoe, and the Human Betterment Foundation. 1929. *Sterilization for Human Betterment: A Summary of the Results of 6000 Operations in California*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Grassl, Markus, and Cornelia Szabó-Knotik, eds. 1999. *Frauen in der Musikwissenschaft/ women in musicology: Dokumentation des internationalen Workshops Wien 1998*. Vienna: Bundesministeriums für Wissenschaft und Verkehr. <https://www.musikgeschichte.at/beiträge>.
- Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2002. “Colonial Difference, Geopolitics of Knowledge, and Global Coloniality in the Modern/Colonial Capitalist World-System.” In “Utopian Thinking,” edited by Ramón Grosfoguel, special issue, *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 25 (3): 203–224.
- Guevara, Che. 1965. *El Socialismo y el Hombre en Cuba*. Havana: Ediciones Revolución.
- Guldi, Jo, and David Armitage. 2014. *The History Manifesto*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Open access at: <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:25620510>.
- Hage, Ghassan. 2018. “Afterward.” In “Canon Fire: Decolonizing the Curriculum,” edited by Andrew Sanchez, special issue, *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 36, no. 2 (Autumn): 107–112.
- Handbook of International Organizations*, compiled by the League of Nations (Geneva: League of Nations, 1929).
- Harvard College. n.d. “What We Look For.” <https://college.harvard.edu/admissions/application-process/what-we-look>.
- Haug, Marie R. 1975. “1975 NCSA Presidential Address: The Deprofessionalization of Everyone?” *Sociological Focus* 8, no. 3 (August): 197–213.
- Häusler, Rudolf. 1977. “50 Jahre Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft.” *Acta Musicologica* 49, no. 1 (January–June): 1–27.
- HGSU-UAW. n.d. Harvard Graduate Students Union – United Auto Workers website. <http://harvardgradunion.org>.
- Kinkeldey, Otto. 1934a. “American Higher Music Education Compared to That in Europe,” *Volume of Proceedings of the Music Teachers National Association*, Twenty-Ninth Series, Annual Meeting in its Fifty-Eighth Year, Lincoln, Nebraska, December 28–31, 1934, edited by Karl Wilson Gehrkins, 20–28. Hartford, CT: Music Teachers National Association.
- Kinkeldey, Otto. 1934b. “Musicology in American Colleges and Universities.” *Yearbook of the Music Educators National Conference* 27: 125–31. Chicago: The Music Educators’ National Conference. [https://archive.org/stream/yearbookofthemus011058mbp/yearbookofthemus011058mbp\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/yearbookofthemus011058mbp/yearbookofthemus011058mbp_djvu.txt).
- Kirby, Percival. 1934. *The Musical Instruments of the Native Races of South Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirnbauer, Martin. 2017. “A ‘Prelude’ to the IMS.” In *The History of the IMS (1927–2017)*, edited by Dorothea and Dinko Fabris, 11–19. Kassel, Ger.: Bärenreiter.

- Lahiri, Sarat, and Winthrop Sargeant. 1931. "A Study in East Indian Rhythm." *The Musical Quarterly* 17 no. 4 (October): 427–38.
- La paperson. 2017. *A Third University is Possible*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Online at: <https://manifold.umn.edu/projects/a-third-university-is-possible>.
- Leiper, Valia P. 2018. "Music Department to Adopt New Curriculum Beginning Fall 2017." *The Harvard Crimson*, March 22, 2017. <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2017/3/22/music-concentration-changes>.
- Lemann, Nicholas. 1999. *The Big Test*. New York: Ferrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Levitz, Tamara. 2017. "Decolonizing the Society for American Music." *The Bulletin of the Society for American Music* XLIII, no. 3 (Fall). <https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.american-music.org/resource/resmgr/docs/bulletin/vol433.pdf>.
- Magubane, Zine. 2008. "The American Construction of the Poor White Problem in South Africa." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 107, no. 4 (Fall): 691–713.
- Merian, Wilhelm. 1930a. "Bericht über die Sitzung des Direktoriums in Paris/ Rapport sur la séance du Directoire à Paris." *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft/Bulletin de la Société internationale de Musicologie* 2, no. 1 (January): 2–8.
- NYMS (New York Musicological Society). 1931. *The New York Musicological Society: Bulletin No. 1*, November 1931.
- NYMS (New York Musicological Society). 1932. *The New York Musicological Society: Bulletin No. 2*, November 1932.
- NYMS (New York Musicological Society). 1933–34. *New York Musicological Society Bulletin No. 3*, November 1933–34.
- Nair, Yasmin. 2018. "Exalted Slogans: The Curse of Radical Academic Discourse." *The Baffler* 39 (May). <https://thebaffler.com/salvos/exalted-slogans-nair>.
- Office of the Provost. n.d. FAQs about Graduate Student Unionization. Harvard University. <https://provost.harvard.edu/unionization-faqs>.
- Osborn, Ken. 2016. "'Creating the 'International Mind': The League of Nations Attempts to Reform History Teaching, 1920–1939." *History of Education Quarterly* 56, no. 2 (May): 213–40.
- Pham, Quynh N., and Robbie Shilliam, eds. 2016. *Meanings of Bandung: Postcolonial Orders and Decolonial Visions*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Pedersen, Susan. 2015. *The Guardians: The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Peterson, Richard A., and M. Roger Kern. 1996. "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore." *American Sociological Review* 61 no. 5 (October): 900–907.
- "Proposed Amendments." 2017. AMS By-laws. American Musicological Society. <http://www.ams-net.org/By-laws-ballot-2017.php>.
- Rancière, Jacques. 1987. *Le maître ignorant: Cinq leçons sur l'émancipation intellectuelle* (Paris: Fayard, 1987); translated with an introduction by Kristin Ross as *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Rao, Nancy Yunwa. 1997. "Partnership in Modern Music: Charles Seeger and Ruth Crawford Seeger." *American Music* 15, no. 3 (Autumn): 352–80.
- Raubenheimer, Albert Sydney. 1925. *An Experimental Study of Some Behavior Traits of the Potentially Delinquent Boy*. Princeton, NJ: The Psychological Review.
- Raza, Ali, Franziska Roy and Benjamin Zacharia, eds. 2015. *The Internationalist Moment: South Asia, Worlds, and World Views, 1917–1939*. New Delhi: Sage Publications India Pvt Ltd.
- Roberts, Helen Heffron. 1933. *Form in Primitive Music: An Analytical and Comparative*

## Current Musicology

---

- Study of the Melodic Form of Some Ancient California Indian Songs*. New York: American Library of Musicology.
- Robin, William. 2017. "What Controversial Changes at Harvard Mean for Music in the University." *National Sawdust Log*, April 25, 2017. <https://nationalsawdust.org/thelog/2017/04/25/what-controversial-changes-at-harvard-means-for-music-in-the-university>.
- Robinson, Dylan. Forthcoming. *Hungry Listening: Between Indigenous Ontologies of Song & Settler Colonial Musical Logic*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rogan, Bjarne. 2006. "Folk Art and Politics in Inter-War Europe: An Early Debate on Applied Ethnology." *Folk Life: Journal of Ethnological Studies* 45 (1): 7–23.
- Schering, Arnold. 1906. "Zweiter Kongress der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft vom 25. bis 27. Sept. 1906 in Basel: Gesamtbericht." *Zeitschrift der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft* 8, no. 1 (July 8): 1–6.
- Seiden, Steven. 1999. *Inheriting Shame: The Story of Eugenics and Racism in America*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shilliam, Robert. 2015. *The Black Pacific: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Oceanic Connections*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Smith, Carleton Sprague. 1938. "Presidential Address: Music Teachers and Music Scholars." *Papers Read by Members of the American Musicological Society at the Annual Meeting* (December): 1–7.
- Soares, Joseph A. 2007. *The Power of Privilege: Yale and America's Elite Colleges*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Sonneck, Oscar G. 1929. "The Future of Musicology in America." *The Musical Quarterly* 15, no. 3 (July): 317–21.
- Stanley, Albert A. 1910. "The International Music Congress in Vienna, 1909." In *Studies in Musical Education, History, and Aesthetics, Fourth Series: Papers and Proceedings of the Music Teachers' National Association at its Thirty-first Annual Meeting, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, December 28–30, 1909*, 204–22. Hartford, CT: The Case, Lockwood & Brainard Co. for the MTNA.
- Strunk, Oliver. 1932. "Foreword" and "Part I. A. University Instruction in Musicology: Introduction." *State and Resources of Musicology in the United States: A Survey Made for the American Council of Learned Societies*, edited by Oliver Strunk, 5–6; 7–10. Washington, DC: American Council of Learned Societies. <https://archive.org/details/stateresourcesof00stru>.
- Stumpf, Carl, Herbert Posch, and Oliver Rathkolb, eds. 2017. *Guido Adlers Erbe: Restitution und Erinnerung an der Universität Wien*. Vienna: V&R Unipress/Vienna University Press. [https://bibliothek.univie.ac.at/sammlungen/objekt\\_des\\_monats/images/OdM\\_Dez2017\\_Beitrag\\_MonikaSchreiber\\_9783737007214.1.301.pdf](https://bibliothek.univie.ac.at/sammlungen/objekt_des_monats/images/OdM_Dez2017_Beitrag_MonikaSchreiber_9783737007214.1.301.pdf).
- Turner, Rianna. 2018. "No More Mayonnaise Rice: A Music Major for the Masses" *Yale News*, September 7, 2018. <https://yaledailynews.com/blog/2018/09/07/no-more-mayonnaise-rice-a-music-major-for-the-masses>.
- Wilensky, Harold L. 1964. "The Professionalization of Everyone?" *American Journal of Sociology* 70, no. 2 (September): 137–58.
- Willoughby-Herard, Tiffany. 2015. *Waste of a White Skin: The Carnegie Corporation and the Racial Logic of White Vulnerability*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Wosh, Peter J., ed. 2001. *Waldo Gifford Leland and the Origins of the American Archival Profession*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists.
- Yasser, Joseph. 1932. *A Theory of Evolving Tonality*. New York: American Library of Musicology.

*Archival References*

- “I. Vorstandssitzung der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft, 4 September 1928, vormittags 10 Uhr, in der Musikbibliothek Paul Hirsch, Frankfurt a. Main, Neue Mainzerstrasse 57.” 1928. Folder 23:17, Adler Papers.
- “II. Vorstandssitzung der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft, Dienstag und Mittwoch, 1. und 2. Oktober 1929, im Sitzungszimmer der Revue musicale, Paris, Boulevard Montparnasse 132–36.” 1929. Folder 23:17, Adler Papers.
- “III. Vorstandssitzung der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft, Samstag, den 30. August 1930, nachmittags 3 ¼ Uhr, im Saal 1 des Konservatoriums in Lüttich.” 1930. Folder 23:18, Adler Papers.
- Adler, Guido. 1927a. Scribbled notes on the back of a flyer for the “Congress for [the] History of Music, Vienna, March 26<sup>th</sup>–31<sup>th</sup> [sic] 1927,” Folder 23:17, Adler Papers.
- . 1927b. “Personalien.” Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.
- . 1927c. “Commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of Beethoven: A Congress of Music History.” Flyer. Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.
- . 1928a. Guido Adler to Wilhelm Merian, February 1928. Folder 23:17, Adler Papers.
- . 1928b. “Promemoria” to Wilhelm Merian, October 1928. Folder 23:17, Adler Papers.
- . 1928c. Letter to the Bundesministerium für Unterricht in Vienna, December 11, 1928. Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.
- Adorno, Theodore Wiesengrund. n.d. Application to Become a Member of the American Musicological Society. Box 35, AMSR.
- Alderman, Pauline. n.d. “Chapter 12: A Year of Change 1937–38,” from “We Built a School of Music,” manuscript monograph, Box 39, Folder 13, Alderman Papers.
- Allen, Warren D. 1939a. Letter to Gustave Reese, May 16, 1939. Folder “Board Correspondence May–June 1939,” Box 15, AMSR.
- . 1939b. Letter to Carl Engel, 29 July 1939. Folder “Board Correspondence May–June 1939,” Box 15, AMSR.
- . 1940. Letter to Gustave Reese, July 17, 1940. Folder “Annual Meeting 1940, Cleveland,” Box 79, AMSR.
- “American Council of Learned Societies, Committee on Musicology, Minutes of the meeting of June 15, 1935.” 1935. Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers. Donald Goodchild took the minutes at this meeting.
- “American Council of Learned Societies, Committee on Musicology, Minutes of the meeting of June 24, 1937.” 1937. Folder 6-27, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- “American Musicological Society: Constitution.” 1934. Box 27, AMSR. Somebody has typed at the top of this document “Adopted December 1, 1934.”
- “American Musicological Society: By-Laws to the Constitution.” n.d. Box 27, AMSR. With a typed note “Adopted December 1, 1934.”
- “American Musicological Society: By-Laws to the Constitution [“As Amended on December 27, 1937”].” 1937. Box 27, AMSR.
- “American Society for Comparative Musicology: Constitution and By-Laws” n.d. Box 6, Folder 31, “Musicological Societies; minutes of the Russian group of musicologists, message of Romain Rolland, 1930–1949,” Joseph Yasser Collection.
- “An die Freunde der Musikwissenschaft: Beitrittserklärung.” n.d. Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.
- Armstrong, Edward C. 1929. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, February 26, 1929. Folder 6-24, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- Ballot. 1939. “Ballot dated August 29, 1939 to be voted upon at the annual meeting in the

## Current Musicology

---

- Beethoven Association Club Rooms, 30 West 54<sup>th</sup> Street, New York, NY, 11 September.” Box 27, AMSR.
- “Beitrittserklärung ‘An die Freunde der Musikwissenschaft.’” n.d. Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.
- “Committee on Musicology: Minutes of the Meeting of April 16, 1938.” 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- Coopersmith, James M. 1939. Handwritten letter to Dickinson, June 21, 1939. Folder “Board Correspondence May–June 1939,” Box 15, AMSR.
- Daugherty, D. H. 1938a. Letter to Kinkeldey, February 14, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938b. “INSTITUTIONS OF WHICH ONE OR MORE MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY HAVE BEEN INVITED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE REPORT ON MUSICOLOGY. (Feb.26, 1938). [\* indicates some answer has been received Notes in brackets refer to answers received not to letters sent].” Included in his letter to Members of the Committee on Musicology, February 28, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers
- . 1938c. Letter to Members of the Committee on Musicology, February 28, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938d. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, June 27, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938e. Letter to the Members of the Committee on Musicology, July 16, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938f. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, August 18, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1940. Memo “To the Members of the Committee on Musicology,” December 7, 1940. Folder 6-32, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- Davidson, Archibald T. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, May 11, 1938. Folder 1-12, Kinkeldey Papers.
- Dent, Edward. 1934. Letter to Guido Adler, January 23, 1934. Folder 23:19, Adler Papers.
- . 1936. Letter to Guido Adler, March 17, 1936. Folder 23:19, Adler Papers.
- Dickinson, George S. 1936. Letter to Gustave Reese, August 13, 1936. Folder 2280, AMSR.
- . 1939a. Letter to Reese, June 1, 1939, Folder “Board Correspondence May–June 1939,” Box 15, AMSR
- . 1939b. Letter to Gustave Reese, September 29, 1939. Folder “Board Correspondence May–June 1939,” Box 15, AMSR.
- “Einladung zu einer Sitzung des Direktoriums der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft auf Dienstag, den 4. und Mittwoch, den 5. September 1928 in Frankfurt im Antiquariat Paul Hirsch, Neue Mainzerstrasse 57.” 1928. June 12, 1928. Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.
- Einstein, Alfred. 1940. Letter to Gustave Reese, August 7, 1940. Folder “Annual Meeting 1940, Cleveland,” Box 79, AMSR.
- Engel, Carl. 1932. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, January 12, 1932. Folder 6-24, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1939. Letter to Warren D. Allen, 16 June 1939. Folder “Board Correspondence May–June 1939,” Box 15, AMSR.
- Goodchild, Donald. 1935a. Letter to the Members of the Committee on Musicology, June 12, 1935. Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1935b. “American Council of Learned Societies, Committee on Musicology, June 15, 1935, Suggested topics for discussion.” Included in his letter to the Members of the Committee on Musicology, June 12, 1935. Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.

- Goodchild, Donald. 1935c. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, August 21, 1935. Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1936a. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, February 19, 1936. Folder 6-26, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1936b. Letter to the Committee on Musicology, April 29, 1936. Folder 6-26, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1936c. Letter to the Otto Kinkeldey, June 3, 1936. Folder 6-26, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938a. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, January 24, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938b. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, February 2, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938c. Statement “To the Members of the Committee on Musicology” Included in the letter to Otto Kinkeldey from February 2, 1938 and with the note in pencil, “[encl. 2.2.38.]” Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938d. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, February 3, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- Hanson, Howard. 1939. Letter to Gustave Reese, May 8, 1939. Folder “Board Correspondence May–June 1939,” Box 15, AMSR.
- International Committee on Intellectual Co-Operation. 1935. “Report of the Committee on the Work of its Seventeenth Plenary Session.” August 8, 1935. [https://biblio-archiv.unog.ch/Dateien/CouncilMSD/C-290-M-154-1935-XII\\_EN.pdf](https://biblio-archiv.unog.ch/Dateien/CouncilMSD/C-290-M-154-1935-XII_EN.pdf).
- “Internationale der Musikwissenschaft: Frankfurt Erster Tagungsort.” 1928. *Stadt-Blatt der Frankfurter Zeitung*, September 5, 1928. Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.
- “Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft, Statuten.” 1928. Original copy kept in Folder 23:17, Guido Adler Papers. Also published in German and French in the *Mitteilungen der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft/Bulletin de la Société Internationale de Musicologie* 1, no. 1 (October 1928): 2–4; 7–9.
- Kinkeldey, Otto. 1929a. Letter to Waldo G. Leland, February 14, 1929. Folder 6-24, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1929b. Letter to Waldo G. Leland, February 16, 1929. Folder 6-24, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1934. Letter to Waldo G. Leland, December 7, 1934. Folder 6-24, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1935a. Letter to Waldo G. Leland, February 12, 1935. Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1935b. Letter to Donald Goodchild, August 3, 1935. Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1935c. Letter to Donald Goodchild, August 25, 1935. Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1936. Letter to Waldo G. Leland, November 21, 1936. Folder 6-26, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938a. Letter to Dr. Harry M. Lydenberg, April 19, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938b. Letter to Donald Goodchild, February 3, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938c. Letter to Waldo G. Leland, April 25, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- Lang, Paul H. 1969. Letter to William S. Newman, May 11, 1969. Box 5, AMSR.
- Leland, Waldo G. 1929a. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, February 9, 1929. Folder 6-24, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.



## Current Musicology

---

- Leland, Waldo G. 1929b. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, February 14, 1929. Folder 6-24, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1929c. Letter to Kinkeldey, February 15, 1929. Folder 6-24, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1934. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, December 10, 1934. Folder 6-24, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1935a. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, February 9, 1935. Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1935b. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, February 15, 1935. Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1935c. “Memorandum to the Members of the Council and Advisory Board, The Secretaries of Constituent Societies, and The Chairmen of Committees,” December 17, 1935, Folder 6-25, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- . 1938. Letter to Otto Kinkeldey, April 19, 1938. Folder 6-28, Box 6, Kinkeldey Papers.
- Merian, Wilhelm. 1928. Letter to Guido Adler, January 21, 1928. Folder 23:16, Adler Papers
- . 1930. Letter to Guido Adler, August 20, 1930. Folder 23:17, Adler Papers.
- “Minutes of the Meetings Held by the Russian Group of Musicologists in New York City, 1930-1932.” 1930-1932. In Folder 31, Box 6, Yasser Collection.
- “Minutes of the organization meeting of the American Musicological Association held Sunday, June 3, 1934 at 25 Washington Square North, New York, NY, preceded by a meeting of the New York Musicological Society held for the dissolving of the latter.” 1934a. Minutes taken by Gustave Reese, Secretary. Box 27 (microfilm), AMSR.
- “Minutes of the Meeting of the Organizing Committee of the American Musicological Association held on Thursday, June 21, 1934, at 3 East 43rd Street, New York, NY.” 1934b. Minutes taken by Gustave Reese, Secretary. Box 27, AMSR.
- “Minutes of the Meeting of the Organizing Committee of the American Musicological Society, held Saturday, September 15, 1934, at 3 East 43rd Street, New York, N.Y.” 1934c. Minutes taken by Gustave Reese, Secretary. Box 27, AMSR.
- “Minutes of the General Meeting of the American Musicological Society held Saturday, December 1, 1934, at the club-house of the Beethoven Association, 30 West 56<sup>th</sup> Street, New York, N.Y.” 1934d. Box 27, AMSR.
- “Minutes of the meeting of the Executive Board of the American Musicological Society, held Tuesday, December 29, 1936, at the Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois.” 1936. Box 27, AMSR.
- “Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the American Musicological Society, held Wednesday, December 29, 1937, at the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the third session having been held jointly with the Music Teachers National Association.” 1937. Minutes by Paul Henry Lang. AMSR.
- “Minutes of the Annual Meeting (being a Business Meeting) of the American Musicological Society, held Tuesday, December 29, 1942, at Schirmer Hall, 3 East 43<sup>rd</sup> Street, New York, N.Y.” 1942. Box 27, AMSR.
- Mitchell, William J. 1965. “Introduction: A Hitherto Unknown—Or—A Recently Discovered... (Remarks delivered on December 10, 1965, at the Harvard Club on the occasion of the Thirtieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Greater New York Chapter of the American Musicological Society.)” 1965. Folder 47, Box 8, Yasser Collection.
- Moore, Earl V. 1937. Letter to Carl Engel, November 1, 1937. Folder 2281, Box 78, AMSR.
- Neue Preußische Kreuzzeitung*. n.d. Untitled notice. Folder 23:16, Adler Papers.
- “Official Program of the Meetings of the Music Teacher National Association, National



- Association of Schools of Music, American Musicological Society, and Phi Mu Alpha (Sinfonia) Fraternity, Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois." 1936. Folder 2280, Box 78, AMSR.
- "Official Program of the Meetings of the Music Teacher National Association, National Association of Music Schools, and American Musicological Society, William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, December 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31, 1937." 1937. Folder 2281, Box 78, AMSR.
- Prunières, Henry. 1928. Letter to Guido Adler, March 21, 1928. Folder 23:17, Adler Papers.
- Reese, Gustave. 1934a. Memo to the Organizing Committee of the American Musicological Society, September 8, 1934. Box 27, AMSR.
- . 1934b. Meeting Agenda, Organization Committee of the AMS, June 21, 1934. Folder 16, Box 5, Spivacke Collection.
- . 1934c. Letter to Harold Spivacke, July 3, 1934. Folder 16, Box 5, Spivacke Collection.
- . 1936a. Letter from the "Secretary of AMS" [Gustave Reese] to Otto Ortmann, July 27, 1936. Folder 2280, Box 78, AMSR.
- . 1936b. Letter to George S. Dickinson. Folder 2280, Box 78, AMSR.
- . 1938. "Report of the Secretary (December 30, 1938)." Box 27, AMSR.
- . 1939a. Letter to Dayton C. Miller, June 16, 1939. In "Board Correspondence May–June 1939," Box 15, AMSR.
- . 1939b. "Report of the Secretary (September 11, 1939)." Box 27, AMSR.
- . 1939c. Letter to George S. Dickinson, May 15, 1939. Folder "Board Correspondence May–June 1939," Box 15, AMSR.
- . 1939d. Letter to Howard Hanson, June 8, 1939. Folder "Board Correspondence May–June 1939," Box 15, AMSR.
- . 1939e. Letter to George S. Dickinson, June 8, 1939. Folder "Board Correspondence May–June 1939," Box 15, AMSR.
- . 1940. Letter to William T. Allen, July 31, 1940. Folder "Annual Meeting 1940, Cleveland," Box 79, AMSR.
- Roberts, Helen H. 1934a. Letter to Gustave Reese, November 1, 1934. Box 7, AMSR.
- . 1934b. Letter to Robert Lachmann, March 24, 1934. Group No. 1410, Series 1, Box 3, Folder 89, Roberts papers.
- . 1934c. Letter to Robert Lachmann, December 5, 1934. Group 1410, Series 1, Box 3, Folder 89, Roberts papers.
- . 1936. Letter to Elma Loines, April 9, 1936. Group 1410, Series 1, Box 1, Folder 3, Roberts papers.
- . 1937. Letter to Charles Seeger, February 5, 1937. Group 1410, Series 1, Box 1, Folder 11, Roberts papers.
- . 1946a. Letter to Gustave Reese. September 26, 1946. Box 7, AMSR.
- . 1946b. Letter to Gustave Reese. November 28, 1946. Box 7, AMSR.
- Seashore, Carl. 1937. Letter to Gustave Reese, October 9, 1937. Box 8, AMSR.
- Seeger, Charles. 1960a. Letter to Oliver Strunk, January 23, 1960. Box 8, AMSR.
- . 1960b. Letter to Dragan Plamenac, March 30, 1960. Box 8, AMSR.
- Smith, Carleton Sprague. 1939. Letter to James M. Coopersmith, August 22, 1939. Folder "Board Correspondence May–June 1939," Box 15, AMSR.
- Wolf, Johannes. 1929. Untitled, Typed Notes on the Journal of the IGMw. November 24, 1929. Folder 23:17, Adler Papers.

## Current Musicology

---

### *Archives Referenced*

Guido Adler Papers, Hargrett Rare Book & Manuscript Library, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia (cited as Adler Papers).

Pauline Alderman Papers 1930s–1980s, undated, USC Thornton School of Music Records, USC Libraries Special Collections, Doheny Memorial Library, University of Southern California, Los Angeles (cited as Alderman Papers).

American Musicological Society Records, Ms. Coll. 221, Rare Book & Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania (cited as AMSR).

Otto Kinkeldey Papers, #14-20-1000, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, <https://rare.library.cornell.edu/services/reproductions> (cited as Kinkeldey Papers).

Helen Heffron Roberts Papers, Yale University (cited as Roberts Papers).

Harold Spivacke Collection, Music Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC, <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.music/eadmus.mu011011> (cited as Spivacke Collection).

Joseph Yasser Collection, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City (cited as Yasser Collection).