

## Introduction

Having become all ears for this phonograph dog, you transform yourself into a high-fidelity receiver, and the ear—your ear which is also the ear of the other—begins to occupy in your body the disproportionate place of the “inverted cripple.”

—Jacques Derrida, *The Ear of the Other*

Like a loyal pet delivering a newspaper, or fresh kill, I went to Jon Cohen, the president of the world music record company where I was a new intern with what I thought was a novel discovery resulting from my keen analytical capabilities; he rebuffed my excitement with a deadpan, thoroughly unimpressed reaction. “Most of our listeners *are* [white] women,” he said to me after I brought to his attention the counterintuitive discovery I had made: a majority of the people in the company’s consumer database were self-identified white women.<sup>1</sup> Jon’s matter-of-fact response caught me off-guard since I believed this data to be unrepresentative based, if nothing else, on my own anecdotal evidence (I was one of those listeners but not a white woman, and I knew of many others). Failing to register the significance of this interaction at the time (I never found it noteworthy enough to even write about in my field-notes), it took me many years to understand its significance.

Time after time, I returned to this scenario in memory unable to integrate it logically into any larger narrative I could tell; it was simply paradoxical. How could the president of a world music company claim that most of their listeners were white women? I was incredulous. Cohen, like any music industry executive, understood as truism what I found to be utterly confusing and assumed to be just plain wrong, until I began to dig a little deeper. It is this paradox that now rings like a bellwether organizing the movements made throughout this book. This white woman’s aural trace appears in shadows and mirrors, and while *Modernity’s Ear*

is not about *her*, she has made the chapters in this book resonant. The music produced by Kinship Records is made for her, whether or not she in fact consumes it. It is her *aurality* that preempts the logic of the Kinship Records sound. Let me explain.

Kinship Records is a pseudonym for the San Francisco-based, world/electronica record company where I worked as an intern, then marketing department employee, from 2002 to 2004.<sup>2</sup> I was initially drawn to Kinship as the label that published several artists I was interested in working with in conjunction with my ethnographic research. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, the label was known for releasing hybrid world music that blends classical styles and instruments from around the world with what they call “modern production values.” While numerous record companies were promoting this kind of music at that time, Kinship was unique in its promotion of music made collaboratively by diasporic artists from the global South and American and European producers and DJs. For this reason, I found my demographic discovery and Cohen’s reaction unexpected. How was it that this music, which I initially heard as by and for diasporic subjects, was in fact being made for white women?<sup>3</sup> Sure, a few white women frequented the late, great DJ Cheb I Sabbah’s Tuesday night residency at Nicky’s BBQ where I first heard this music, but most of us regulars were South Asian, Middle Eastern, and African diasporics and expats who flocked to this weekly event in the Lower Haight district of San Francisco where we could dance away the Tuesday doldrums. If anything, given the genre’s history of orientalist racial fetishism, I could have understood better if the majority of listeners were thought to be white men, but I could not understand the “fact” that they were white women, until I got to know *her aurality* better.

I encountered that white woman regularly over the following ten years as an apparition in the archives and as fantasy in the form of “the ideal listener” for whom the record label produced its sounds. She appeared in proxy form as the host of a radio show: the naïve-yet-enthusiastic correspondent I call Nancy Dayne with whom Cohen would share his world music expertise on a weekly basis. It is her imagined listening capacity, her *aurality*, that is fetishized by the record company most of all and the more I explored the world music industry’s history, the more I could hear her aurality archived within it. What I ultimately came to understand about the paradoxical truism “Most of our listeners *are* [white]

women” is that it has functioned as the fantasy forming the basis of the world music industry’s desire for the last century. *Her aurality* motivates the industry at the level of hardware, sound, and affect design. I’ve stopped asking myself whether or not she is real because she has become mythologized to the point of reification; she is the topos of the American world music industry.

## The Feminization of Listening

This is a book about the important biopolitical role that listening to the sounds of the other has played in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries in the United States. It is a book about the vast world music culture industry (WMCI), in both its academic and commercial guises. It is a book about bodies as sites through which the other’s sounds resonate, and the deeply libidinated practice of listening that American consumers have been trained in through the technological developments and epistemic transformations of the last hundred years. I argue throughout this book that the production of the WMCI is intimately tied to the formation of what many scholars have identified as the twentieth-century feminization of listening.

Listening came to be constructed as a feminized practice through its increasing domestication by the gramophone industry and the ascension of the bourgeois woman, the target market for the machine’s home use. As Theodor Adorno wrote of it, “It is the bourgeois family that gathers around the gramophone in order to enjoy the music that it itself—as was already the case in the feudal household—is unable to perform. . . . The diffuse and atmospheric comfort of the small but bright gramophone sound corresponds to the humming gaslight and is not entirely foreign to the whistling teakettle of bygone literature.”<sup>4</sup> In arguing that “the gramophone belongs to the pregnant stillness of individuals,” Adorno highlights the gendered temporality of listening that always awaited a future site for becoming.<sup>5</sup> The domestication of the practice of listening to recorded music shifted the labor from musical performance to performative listening, a concept I discuss in chapters 5 and 6. In chapter 1 I focus on the preponderance of white female sound collectors, or “songcatchers,” in the earliest period of field recording. They worked as comparative musicologists collecting for the Bureau of American Eth-

nology (and later for the Works Progress Administration, as well as the Smithsonian Institution) from the 1890s through the 1940s, and indexed their futurist political desires in the aurality with which they recorded. I examine the domestication of sound both among collectors and among listeners as a process that brought Native and African American noises under discursive control, rendering them legible “phonographic subjects.” This practice fed the desires of feminized, domesticated listeners who not only sought exotic sounds on the phonographs that replaced the pianos in their parlors, but also a new domesticated other on whom the white female listener had a social leg up.

The world music industry is haunted by the specter of this white female sound collector, her technological medium of choice—the phonograph—and the recorded other that she brought under discursive control during the industry’s genesis. Barred by jealous male colleagues from professing in the musical disciplines at the university level, her aurality found a home in the practice of salvage recording for the Bureau of American Ethnology. Not only was she willing and able to perform these salvage recordings, but being closer in social ranking to her subjects than her white male colleagues, she was seen as best suited for the task.

The salvage recordings made by female comparative musicologists became foundational for not only what would evolve into ethnomusicology after World War II but also became the business model of the burgeoning music industry, which had by the turn of the century established offices in every major city around the world and conducted recordings in many minor ones at that. As Pekka Gronow has chronicled, “By 1905 [the Gramophone C]ompany had already made recordings in most European and Asian countries, including such remote localities as Helsinki, Tiflis, and Rangoon. At the same time, Victor’s engineers toured South America and the Caribbean. The two companies obviously tried to penetrate every possible market from Tibet to Bolivia.”<sup>6</sup> Gronow reveals that the music industry has from its inception been global in scale; that the music industry, even at its most nascent, incipient moment of becoming, was always a *world* music industry.

These conditions of becoming for the genre inform how world music is heard and how it structures the listener’s relationship to recordings as well as the culture industry that produces and disseminates them. Generic developments through the twentieth century represent this in-

dustry's nimble capacity to respond to local markets and to rebrand its own archive in response to a demand that the industry itself helped to produce. In its inception, the industry managed all aspects of the commodity chain, from hardware (the phonograph) to software (the recorded voice, the field recording, the studio recording) and presented audiences with both folk/traditional and modern versions of themselves. All this infrastructural work paid off: As Gronow goes on to calculate, by 1926 this global music industry raked in profits of \$70 million in record sales alone.<sup>7</sup> Just as the film industry did for vision during this same period, the global music industry satisfied a yearning for a developing imaginary that I name the "aural imaginary" in chapter 2, linking far-away places with local subjects whose senses of themselves as moderns were contingent upon their fantasies of these aural others. The burgeoning music industry's profitability stemmed precisely from its globally expansive reach and its capacity to satiate the nostalgic desires of the newly displaced and dispersed immigrant populations for those imagined communities, those homelands left behind, and to reinforce their position as moderns. By beginning with the context of white, female sound collector as one genealogical strand for world music, its culture industry, and its listenership, *Modernity's Ear* traces the white woman's racialized-gendered desire for the aural other as that which has produced the modern listening self. I map the co-constitutive nature of this formation, arguing that this fantastical white female listener begot the (just as fantastical) modern listener.

World music has been instrumental in the formation of a twentieth-century cosmopolitan subject constituted alongside and through technologies and systems of knowledge production. The very term "world music" time-stamps the emergence of the cosmopolitical subject in search of a little bit of everything from everywhere as a way of indexing her own adaptive capabilities in a rapidly transforming world. Scholars quibble over the exact provenance of the term "world music." Some have attributed its origins to a marketing meeting held by a group of British music executives in 1987.<sup>8</sup> Others, like Steven Feld, have identified its origins among 1960s academics who sought to celebrate the world's musical diversity.<sup>9</sup> Across these differences of opinion, the focus on the world music genre and marketing categories as the brainchild of specific academics or industrialists works with the assumption of "if you

build it they will come.” I see the genre formation and the debates over its boundaries as symptomatic of a larger structuring logic that desires not only “ethnic sounds” but also racialized and gendered bodies. In this study, world music represents an aurality that is formative of the racialized, gendered, and classed subjectivities of listeners, as well as performers, in the context of an emergent late modernity. Furthermore, I locate the genre’s formation much earlier, linking it to the epistemic projects of settler colonialism and salvage ethnography contending that the academic study and commercial production of ethnic music are identical twin formations born as a national necessity at a particular techno-historical moment. Thus, I conceive of ethnomusicology and its commercial doppelganger, *world music*, as forming one culture industry, what I call the world music culture industry (WMCI). This single industry is characterized by a brokering—whether in exchange for actual or symbolic capital—in racialized gender. Ethnomusicology, its predecessor comparative musicology, and the world music genre trade in an economy of sound that is driven by desire that produces racialized and gendered fantasies and relations. This economy stages particular encounters within the recording, archiving, and listening event that constitute power relations that imagine and produce a pleasure-in-listening through fantasies of sonic racialized gender, the focus of chapter 4.

Kinship Records and other world/electronica record companies succeed in the marketplace because they function as interlocutors in a historical moment when cultural commodity exchange is in very high demand. The ascendancy of the record company coincides with the neoliberalization of the marketplace, offering equal footing to musical explorers and multicultural subjects who seek representations of themselves there. Kinship filters, packages, remixes, and represents various cultures to audiences in nonthreatening, legible ways. Thanks to the hybrid formula they promote, consumers are not alienated either by dissonant sounds, unfamiliar scales, and rhythmic structures, or by foreign time signatures, as every effort is made to take the work out of listening to the sounds of other cultures, leaving only pleasure and satisfaction to be enjoyed by the consumer. Difference is offered as an object to be enjoyed by consumers not only within the privacy of their own homes but, as I argue in chapters 2, 4, and 5, as an object to be incorporated into the self. By building a brand around the experience of cross-cultural musi-

cal collaboration, Kinship has distanced itself from debates of cultural appropriation waged over the last thirty years. Instead, musical hybridity is offered with promises of adapting the listener to a rapidly changing, multicultural world. As I discuss in chapter 4, hybridity's shadowy doppelgänger—miscegenation—interpreted as undesirable racial noise, is carefully hedged against through mixing and production work, as well as other framing devices like packaging and liner notes.

I argue in chapter 1 that early twentieth-century white female comparative musicologists left *aural traces* on their recordings that index the social positionality these figures occupied in their first encounter with the *aural other*. Akin to point of view in visual studies, her aural trace now informs the way the record company imagines its contemporary listener (despite the questionable empirical nature of this wish). I pursue the uncanny encounters world music stages in fantasy and the pleasure-in-listening that occurs when bodies interact in the context of what I call “the aural imaginary.” My location of this site of encounter within fantasy and the unconscious in no way limits how these processes matter or take material shape. In chapters 4 and 5 I argue that sound contributes to the materialization of bodies and figures bodies as gendered and racially marked within the listener's aural imaginary. Sound is therefore not only a vehicle in the communication of difference in world music but also contributes to the production of difference by materializing bodies in the imaginary of the listener. I develop this theory of materiality through the concept of “invagination” while considering the ear's symbolic work alongside that of the vagina's and contending with how both reproductive orifices overdetermine the gendering of sexual processes. Through a retooling of the Freudian concept of “incorporation,” I examine not only the ways in which racialized and gendered sounds are fetishized and how the culture industry capitalizes upon this through the promotion of a *libidinal economy* or economy of desire, but the simultaneous ways in which Kinship has distanced itself from legacies of fetishism and appropriation, for which the genre was scorned throughout the nineties and aughts.

As Penleric insists to Bledsoe in the 2000 Maggie Greenwald film *Songcatcher* that I read in chapter 1, people down the mountain will want to buy mountain music because they are driven by a desire for an affective relation with the way the other's music “makes you feel.” *Modernity's*

*Ear* theorizes the desire for the other in sound as a means of constituting the listening self and the particular culture-industrial harnessing of this systematic process. If we consider the historical structuring of listening as a feminized practice and take the example of the female comparative musicologists I discuss, we must ask how and why mass culture, and in particular phonograph recording and listening, became her entrée into the public sphere. This opens up an opportunity to read a rather queer context of power play. Here, the female comparative musicologist, as the paradigmatic feminized listener, achieved her newly won agency through the seemingly masculine practice of the phonographic subjectivation of the Native American as her necessary inferior. What I would more specifically term the *white feminization of listening* thus comes at a cost: the racialization of recorded sounds by an upwardly mobile female masculinity.<sup>10</sup> The modern practice through which the white bourgeois woman achieved agency—listening—structured her as the phonographic subject's superior, both in social standing and in racialized, gendered standing. And it is the titillatingly disruptive qualities of this “queer power play” that the WMCI has harnessed for profit. While the form of pleasure brokered by the WMCI is a feminized, invaginated, incorporative pleasure, it is nevertheless motivated by a phallic desire; I map in the following chapters how this positions the listener vis-à-vis the “aural other.”

“Listening is a directed, learned activity: it is a definite cultural practice,” writes Jonathan Sterne. “Listening requires hearing but is not simply reducible to hearing.”<sup>11</sup> Sterne associates this turn toward listening in modernity with the development of “audile technique” or “a set of practices of listening that were articulated to science, reason, and instrumentality and that encouraged the coding and rationalization of what was heard.”<sup>12</sup>

Listening is distinguished from hearing as a faculty of perception that is learned, and that is historically and culturally variable. But it is no mere faculty at Kinship; instead consumers are referred to as listeners, understood as subjects by way of their faculties of aural perception. By specifically addressing listeners' ears and staging interactions with the aural other there, the ear is constructed as the site of agency production. I focus not only on listening but aurality because of the significance ascribed to the ear and on the biopolitical instrumentalization of listening



as an “audile technique” promoted by the WMCI that has had material consequences with raced and gendered implications.

What is the history of the WMCI’s imaginary and fantasized ideal listener—that white woman between her late twenties and early forties—and how has an entire industry been structured around fantasizing about her fantasies? What you have before you is a critical examination of the WMCI and its racialized and gendered fantasies of sexuality in sound. In so many respects, this is a partial story about world music, Kinship Records, and the culture industry. Other stories, less amplified in these chapters, explore the varied meanings ascribed to these commodity forms by counterpublics and the ways in which artists have resisted the efforts of the industry to colonize sonic representations. Take, for example, the fact that many of the artists with whom I worked at Kinship Records participated in transnational networks of musical exchange, performing their music in sites beyond the well-worn paths traveled by first-world musicians. Live musical performance is an entirely distinct experience that elicits different meanings than those experienced on record. I have chosen not to explore live performance and the various manifestations of cultural exchange that transpire under those circumstances.

Ethnographic fieldwork performed within a capitalist organization presents a shift in the axis of power between ethnographer and subject. The ethics of ethnographic representation take on a particular form in the context of this book, as I am obligated to uphold as much as possible the anonymity of the events and subjects presented here. My methodology was partly inspired by a deeply rooted investment in moving beyond an analysis of world music that looks only at lyrical text and charismatic musical personalities, or listens only to musical style. This is not a musicological study of style, notation, or score. Rather than performing a textual analysis of lyrics or the transcription of a song into text, I attempt to practice an analysis of the sounds that I encountered through fieldwork experience and within American popular culture. The characters, companies, newspaper articles, and events I describe were inspired by actual people, real businesses, press clippings, and lived experiences, but as the author, I have taken great liberties in the re-presentation of this material, employing pseudonyms throughout.

My methodology grew out of the limitations presented by “studying up” or working with elites, statesmen and -women, aristocrats, capital-

ists, and other members of society who sit more comfortably in social hierarchies. I analyze the world music industry as both a site of cultural production as well as a site that promotes the accumulation of capital through aurality, the spatial production of acoustics, and the embodied specificity of sonic phenomenology. I ask: What does a song's staging of space and time, with its movement through the stereo spread, tell us about not only the performer but also the listener? What about the levels of sounds in the mix, the presence and distance attributed to various sounds, and the timing through which sounds enter and exit the song? How can all this be considered alongside the relevance of the album packaging and copy, which work to curate the experience of hearing the music? These texts narrate a story about the artists, collaborators, the record company, and the historical context in which the album was released, but they also tell us about who they imagine we are and how a cultural logic is structured in that imaginary.

Because sound is not the *lingua franca* of the academy, I have struggled with the untranslatability of certain sonorous ways of knowing. Perhaps in response to a similar limit point, Fred Moten asks, "What happens in the transcription of performance, event, ritual? What happens, which is to say, what is lost in the recording? . . . What is the proper form of my endeavor?"<sup>13</sup> On the way to developing his improvisational method, a method that occupies the space of the break, that theorizes in the meter of jazz, he writes, "Sound, suspended brightness, unrepresentable and inexplicable mystery of (music is the improvisation of organization) ritual is music: principled (*archic*) (spatial) organization that constitutes a kind of nonverbal writing: transparent or instrumental, uninflected by the transformation of a buzz-grown extension, bending whistle, hummm."<sup>14</sup> In the spirit of such an ethical magnetism toward the form I work within, I echo Moten's call to poesis and improvisation in writing about/with/through/in and of sound. Taking heed of Moten's response of poesis to the call of music, I render here an attentiveness to and an ethical awareness of sound's form and remain leery of the limits of translating between sound and words. And while I make no promises of poetics in prose, I do *play* with language and form and struggle with translation through neologizing. This practice indexes the radical queer ethical drive that motivates the project, the "playing by ear" that I describe in the Preface. While I chronicle in the following pages how queer

and feminist modes of relating and materializing have been coopted by the culture industry, it is ultimately with the aim of imagining another horizon of possibility for a utopian, feminist, queer aurality, a liberationist praxis akin to “playing by ear,” one that brings the listener and sound into a copresence of becoming together, one that does not reify heteronormative logics of pleasure and power but exists in a state of play, an ontology that can imagine a different imaginary order.

\* \* \*

The chapters in *Modernity's Ear* are organized around the particular ways in which sound's form is instrumentalized and utilized by the world music culture industry writ large to produce racialized and gendered encounters in the listening event. The familiar tropes deployed in the critical examination of world music—hybridity, appropriation, identity, authenticity, orality, and field recording—are upended in six chapters that reread these formations instead as miscegenation, incorporation, *signifiante* (loss of self), aurality, and refusal. This reorientation toward the embodied encounters and subjective outcomes staged by the WMCI enables me to critically engage the utopian claims about music that motivate this very study. This is the tautology on which the book revolves: motivated by a utopian drive toward listening to uncover the cooptation of the utopian drive toward listening by the WMCI. Along the way I discover the complex workings of desire and fantasy in bolstering the discourse of adaptability and fitness within multiculturalism, finding that even in the imaginary site of fantasy, racialized and feminized bodies are put to work in constituting that more highly adaptive, modern cosmopolitan listener. Gender and race have an exchange value within the world music marketplace way beyond what I initially thought. Yes, there are actual musicians exploited for their labor and grossly underpaid in comparison to the profits collected by producers and record companies. But preceding that context of exploitation, that political economy, is another economy of flows—a libidinal economy—in which the conditions of possibility for political economic exploitation are formed.

While the book is a critical examination of the ideological structuration of listening in the world music culture industry spanning its history from comparative musicology at the turn of the twentieth century

through the contemporary ubiquity of world music, the concluding chapter offers an alternate and parallel history of listening to the other in modernity through an examination of recordings made of and by Zora Neale Hurston in various recording expeditions between 1935 and 1939. This contrapuntal Epilogue focuses on recordings that I argue offer an alternative listening relation to the one I chronicle in the other five chapters, one that is as firmly rooted within modernity but refuses the social structuration and symbolic formations that I map in the WMCI. This concluding chapter presents a different origin story of recording than the one I chronicle in the book, offering the starting point for the liberationist genealogy that the book wishes for.

In chapter 1, “The Female Sound Collector and Her Talking Machine,” I revisit the scenes of phonographic recordings made by white female Bureau of American Ethnology comparative musicologists of Native Americans. In addition to consulting archival materials and autobiographical accounts, I look to the 2000 Maggie Greenwald film *Songcatcher* as a prism through which to historicize the merging of comparative musicology and the phonograph industry. This chapter sets the stage for the following five chapters by making the case that a figure like *Songcatcher*’s main character Lily Penleric represents both a female-masculine entrepreneurialism and a commitment to ethnographic knowledge production and that her particular way of perceiving these Native American phonographic subjects—what I term her aurality—has been captured as a trace in the recording process. I argue that the “aural trace” of the conditions of phonographic production is as audible as what I call “the aural other.” The world music culture industry is in the business of selling both.

In chapter 2, “Listen, Inc.: Aural Modernity and Incorporation,” I perform close readings of transcriptions of a nationally syndicated, travel-themed radio show—to which Kinship Records president Jon Cohen was a regular contributor—and of the recent popularity of the “Afro-Indie” genre, which is understood as those African-derived musics in U.S. indie rock. This chapter develops the concept of “aural imaginary” as that mechanism through which the aural other is instrumentalized in the constitution of a listening self not simply through appropriation but through incorporation into the subject. I read sound as a representational medium but more specifically narrow in on sound’s capacity to materi-

ally structure social relations, formations, and actors. I argue here that the WMCI, as represented in Kinship Records, has disassociated itself from the shunned and taboo practice of cultural appropriation and has assumed a new business model, what I call “aural incorporation.” Aural incorporation represents that means by which listeners structure racialized sounds to which they may have no birthright into their origin narratives, laying claim to various musical traditions as their own. In this chapter I chronicle these as biopolitical tactics employed by the WMCI.

In chapter 3, “Losing the Listening Self in the Aural Other,” I deploy Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes’s term *signifiante* to further theorize the desire that drives the listener to world music. This is a desire that works counter to signification or processes of identification. It explores the theme of subjective transcendence testified to by many listeners of world music through *signifiante* in order to theorize the loss of the self (which Barthes opposes to identification). Through several case studies from fieldwork as well as through the close reading of a song from the Kinship Records release *Arabian Journeys*, I examine the production processes that choreograph the “loss of the self” in sound.

In chapter 4, “Racial Noise, Hybridity, and Miscegenation in World Music,” I critically read the ethos of cross-cultural collaboration promoted by this culture industry through the trope of musical hybridity. By theorizing the links between hybridity and miscegenation and their relationship to Darwin’s theory of natural selection, this chapter interrogates the heterosexual imperative at work in musical tropes of cross-fertilization and chronicles the gendered division of sonic labor. I begin by surveying work on music and cultural mixing (e.g., syncretism, hybridity, fusion), insisting upon an analysis of the sexual implications at the heart of these metaphors and interrogating their heterologic as a holdover of eugenicist practices of “artificial selection.”

In chapter 5, “The World Music Culture of Incorporation,” I discuss how the blurring of the lines between commerce, industry, and knowledge production has been the legacy of the world music culture industry. Desire and yearning for the sounds of the other has helped to structure modern, so-called ultramodernist, and popular music forms in dynamic and aesthetic tension, continuing into the contemporary moment. This structure of desire has helped to train first-world listeners and music producers to listen for racialized gender and to structure their own lis-

tening subjectivity vis-à-vis, and often in opposition to, this alterity. But thanks to incorporation, the commodity chain has been delinked. The listener, now also in part the producer, aurally lays claim to sonic traditions and constitutes a key site of production. This chapter critically engages a long history of both Marxian and Freudian theorizing on fetishism in an effort to understand a recent shift to what I call the WMCI's post-fetishization of traditional sounds, which coexists alongside the fetishism to which we've grown accustomed.

In the Epilogue, "Modernity's Radical Ear and the Sonic Infidelity of Zora Neale Hurston's Recordings," I examine a collection of recordings made by Zora Neale Hurston where she breaks from ethnographic convention to develop a performance methodology in which her own body and voice are employed to represent the African American musical traditions of the South. I juxtapose this practice against the practice of "phonographic subjectivation" I establish in chapter 1—that process whereby the comparative musicologist brings the previously unintelligible sounds of the Native American into discourse through phonographic recording and archiving. "Modernity's Radical Ear" is a contrapuntal endnote, a "feminine ending" that functions as a "dominant" to the tonic processes I map in the previous chapters.<sup>15</sup>