

---

**FLASHBACK:  
DRUGS AND DEALING IN THE GOLDEN AGE OF THE LONDON RAVE SCENE**  
JENNIFER R. WARD

Cullompton: Willan Publishing, 2010.  
ISBN: 978-1-84392-791-4 (hardcover)  
RRP: \$84.95 (hardcover)

---

DOI: 10.12801/1947-5403.2013.05.01.05

SEAN LENEGHAN  
INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR (AUSTRALIA)

Originally developed for the treatment of blood-clotting by the German pharmaceutical company Merck in 1912, ecstasy was subsequently “rediscovered” by the Shulgins, who through their own experimentations and critical-self reflections had the remarkable foresight to anticipate the clinical use of the drug as an aid to psychotherapeutic practice. More recently, federally approved trials in the United States have openly sanctioned the legal use of ecstasy as an adjunct to psychotherapy in clinical trials treating people with post-traumatic stress disorder. Standing in contrast to this controlled use in strict clinical conditions is one of the largest socio-cultural movements of the 20th century: transnational club and rave culture. It is against the backdrop of the rise of the “chemical generation” that Jennifer Ward’s ethnographic research focusses on the socio-economic networks that sell and distribute ecstasy. What is impressive about this ethnography is the unflinching honesty through which the author dives straight into the deep end of the London drug scene to study the use of ecstasy and the socio-cultural dynamics of its dealing.

Although some qualitative research has addressed the significance and meaning of these activities, Ward addresses the paucity of ecstasy-based studies within the international research community as she describes and analyses the income generation and economic networks of ecstasy distribution. The central methodological orientation of this study derives from the ethnographic tradition generated by the Chicago School in the 1930s and 1940s with its emphasis on extended immersion in socio-cultural contexts. This orientation to ethnographic research allows the ethnographer to get a detailed first-hand sense of the

actions, meanings, emotions and projects of the individuals, groups or communities with whom the ethnographer is working. A central theme that emerges in Ward's work concerns the enterprising activities of rave and club participants. By focusing on this dimension, Ward moves away from stereotypical simplifications of ecstasy users (e.g. derogatory terms such as "pill-heads"), preferring to conceptualise these people as active agents within the socio-historical worlds they live in. Hence, what this ethnographic work accomplishes is an honest and detailed examination of the myriad activities surrounding the use and distribution of ecstasy.

Chapter One situates the study within the broader context of rave and ecstasy research, focussing on the theoretical and ethnographic debates and literature surrounding the field. Chapter Two discusses the numerous dimensions of the London rave scene, including detailed descriptions of Ward's own research and direct involvement in venues and milieus. Chapter Three explores the friendship networks, groups and styles associated with drug use and distribution. Chapters Four and Five look at the organisational dynamics of drug purchasing and selling within public venues as well as private networks of distribution. Specific attention is given to the safety strategies that are adopted by sellers to avoid being caught in the projects they are undertaking. Chapter Six provides a detailed examination of the role that women play in drug markets, overturning stereotypes and depictions of women as passive beings, and presenting them as active and central in the creation of networks. Chapter Seven discusses how drug selling operations were established and grew in proportion beyond their original scope. The obstacles that the people in these activities faced in seeking to move away from such lifestyles are also presented. The last chapter looks at the lives of these people after the study was completed. A summation of the ethnographic research is offered alongside theorisation of entrepreneurship, friendship and functionality in the London urban setting. A final synopsis of the London rave scene at the time of completion of the study is presented, looking at how, for example, mobile phones came to change the entire dynamics of clubbing and raving.

Ward's book strikes me as an accurate and informative study. Her approach is clear and astute as she presents these people's lives and the activities they are engaged in. There is no doubt that her direct involvement in hanging out/blending in with these people led her to an intimate position within the workings and changing nature of relationships and networks. It is not my intention here to take issue with the kinds of theoretical claims that Ward argues for in this study. Rather, I wish to draw attention to some of the issues that are specific to ethnographic fieldwork, with its focus on participant observation, especially in drug scenes that are outside of clinical settings. What impressed me about Ward's own approach was the tremendous courage and honesty in her observations and analysis of activities such as drug dealing. What is often overlooked in so much scientific thinking, whether ethnographic or clinical, is the centrality of the dynamics of the researcher's own psyche (the un/consciousness) in the generation of theoretical and empirical knowledge. My intention here is to draw attention away from our usual habits of thinking about the people within an ethnographic study, to looking at the observational situation itself. I am

aware of these dynamics precisely because I have undertaken ethnographic fieldwork in comparable drug scenes in Australia, which included direct participation in the use of ecstasy (Leneghan 2011). The aim of this methodology is to complement the observations of other people with a synthesis of one's own self-knowledge. Thus, I think it is important for the researcher to reflect on themselves and the kind of knowledge that is included and excluded (for whatever reasons) from completed ethnographic monographs.

It is in this sense that countertransference dynamics presented in the tradition of ethno-psychoanalysis are of the utmost relevance in the current methodologies of ethnographic practice. Whether one is aware of one's own un/conscious dynamics in the field, or whether one chooses to remain oblivious to them, our defensiveness, anxieties and conscious selections and deletions as thinkers is of the highest import, whether this is in the field, in a clinical situation, or at the writing-up stage. One of the praiseworthy aspects of Ward's study is her willingness to look at activities that are not only potentially dangerous but also illegal. In my own work in Sydney, this was the only area that I consciously chose to leave out of my ethnographic investigations and writing. This was because I was seen, by those who did not know me, as an undercover police officer.

It would be interesting to know whether Ward kept a private research diary, incorporating her open field notes, observations and experiential self-reflections in the field. The latter, especially, are inclusive of the knowledge which is sanitised by the ethnographer, more often than not, through one's defensive manoeuvres. These insights would give more of a real sense of Ward's participation in the scene: how did she arrive at ethnographic knowledge in the partition/encounter between observer and the observed? Did she choose to participate in ecstasy use or distribution networks? If not, what are the situations in the field which preclude or dissuade an open discussion of these issues and dimensions to research? For me, these are not trivial questions, but are at the forefront of social science research in general.

I see Ward's study as a valuable contribution to ethnography. In examining these people on their own terms, this work is honest and courageous, investigating human social fields that are charged with anxiety arousing encounters. The scope of this ethnography and its theoretical analysis will be useful to students and educators from a range of fields in the social sciences and the humanities. Finally, this study could be used as a blueprint by future researchers wishing to undertake ethnographic research into the worlds of drug dealers and consumers.

## REFERENCES

Leneghan, Sean. 2011. *The Varieties of Ecstasy Experience: An Exploration of Person, Mind and Body in Sydney's Club Culture*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Press.

---

## THE ART OF RECORD PRODUCTION: AN INTRODUCTORY READER FOR A NEW ACADEMIC FIELD

SIMON FRITH AND SIMON ZAGORSKI-THOMAS (EDS.)

Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.

ISBN: 978-1-4094-0562-7 (hardcover), 978-1-4094-0678-5 (paperback)

RRP: £65.00 (hardcover), £19.99 (paperback)

---

DOI: 10.12801/1947-5403.2013.05.01.06

PAT O'GRADY

MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY (AUSTRALIA)

*The Art of Record Production* is a collection of essays offering significant theoretical contributions and frameworks for “a new academic field”. The book shares its title with the journal and association of the same name, where some of its chapters were originally published. Its three parts—historical approaches, theoretical approaches and case studies—outline the broad and multidisciplinary studies being undertaken within the field, and provide theoretical and methodological concepts that are relevant to both students and academics. In the opening chapter, Simon Frith and Simon Zagorski-Thomas consider theory, pedagogy and practice in record production, and reflect on the recent progress in record production scholarship, attributing much of it to the Art of Record Production conferences.

Part I: Historical Approaches moves chronologically from the 1950s through to the present. George Brock-Nannestad offers a historical overview of lacquer discs and their role in early home recording. The chapter provides broader context to the debate of analogue versus digital recording techniques, while also highlighting the fast pace at which recording technology has advanced since the 1950s. Susan Schmidt Horning's chapter, “The Sounds of Space”, looks at the development of acoustic treatment in studios since the 1950s, including the trend from dead (or non-reflective) sounding rooms to more live sounding rooms. She considers the importance of acoustics in record production and the implications of multi-track recording on ideas of space. Zagorski-Thomas' chapter, “The US vs the UK Sound: Meaning in Music Production in the 1970s”, offers a comparison between production aesthetics in the US and the UK. The chapter, which I found one of the most insightful of the book, offers a theoretical analysis of what Zagorski-Thomas presents as an established industry perception of practices over the period. The chapter is a reminder of while recording technology is largely transnational, there are significant cultural differences which inform local practices. Referring to Csikszentmihalyi's theory of creativity, he argues that cultural domains and social fields in the UK and US have influenced record production techniques. Paul Théberge, author of the seminal text *Any Sound You Can Imagine* (1997), follows on from his “Network Studio” article (2004) by examining the influences of the Internet on studios and highlighting the demise of large studio facilities.

Building on his previous work on musicological analysis, Allan Moore begins Part II:

Theoretical Approaches by searching for a framework for the musicological analysis of recordings and record production. Alan Williams contributes “I’m Not Hearing What You’re Hearing’: The Conflict and Connection of Headphone Mixes and Multiple Audioscapes”, an ethnographic study which outlines the practical issues relating to audioscapes in the studio, for instance, the difference in sound between a musician’s instrument in the live room and what they hear in their headphones. He also examines the advantages of personal headphone monitoring. Michael Jarrett’s chapter, “The Self-Effacing Producer”, is mainly a transcript of interviews he conducted with producers on their working practice, and while insightful, the chapter seems out of place in Part II, lacking the theoretical focus of other chapters. Phillip McIntyre’s chapter, “Rethinking Creativity”, again brings Csikszentmihalyi’s theory of creativity to record production, providing a systematic model for understanding it through Csikszentmihalyi’s concept of domain, field and agent. He conceptualizes the theory of creativity, which can be quite complex for those outside the field of psychology, through the inclusion of a series of popular musicians and bands.

Part III: Case Studies begins with Andrew Blake’s analysis of Suvi Raj Grubb’s stereo recordings of classical recordings, serving as the book’s first consideration of classical record production. Frith considers the ideology of the producer in the context of rock, which, like much popular music, is consumed by audiences as recordings. He examines how the prominence of the producer in rock, while increasing, is still largely ignored by critics. In “The Beach Boys’ Pet Sounds and the Musicology of Record Production”, Jan Butler continues a common theme present throughout the book of the recording as an object of analysis. She considers this through the context of the work of Brian Wilson, a pioneer in the confluence of recording practices and composition in popular music. In contrast to a lot of musicological analysis, Butler contemplates the sociological factors of the album *Smile*, which has only been widely recognized many years later. While the culture of practice is considered in the book, a broader examination of the culture among audiences surrounding recordings is not. The final chapter, “Recording the Revolution: 50 Years of Music Studios in Revolutionary Cuba”, by Jan Fairley and Alexandrine Boudreault-Fournier, offers a contrasting non-Western perspective on recording practice, providing cultural considerations for recording practices in recording studios in Cuba.

The Art of Record Production journal and association promotes a hybrid mix of theorists and practitioners. This mix is reflected in the book, where short—at times perhaps too short—commentary from industry practitioners is featured as an interlude to the three main sections. Where the contributors are guided by Zagorski-Thomas’ questions, they provide some interesting insights, but where brief criticisms are made of concepts in the main chapters, it becomes awkward, particularly given it is an academic work. Mike Howlett’s contribution originally appeared in issue 6 of the journal, but is here reduced to a two-page extract in the second interlude. The extract fails to properly present his ideas by omitting the scholarly context of his study. His wider argument is destabilized by missing the body of his paper, and leaves it somewhat less convincing than his original work. In an academic field which is largely practice-based, it seems that dialogue between scholars

and practitioners is important. However, a recent lecture I gave to record production masters students reminded me that the hybridity of practitioners and theorists can prove problematic. While I was presenting an introduction to scholarly thinking in record production, a professional with much skepticism of a particular scholar's theory on multi-tracking interjected: "oh, well that person obviously hasn't done much recording". A similar tone is at times evident in this book.

The book takes a significant step forward in establishing theoretical frameworks and also presents a roadmap for further research. In a book which merges both theory and practice, and is presented as being intended for students, greater focus on contemporary digital audio workstations (DAWs) seems appropriate. Debate on preferred DAWs is frequent among practitioners, while students learning about audio production will, no doubt, spend much of their time interfacing with one or a number of DAWs. Furthermore, despite being situated in a field which deals with constantly changing and emerging technology, this book does not clearly outline when each chapter was originally written. Recording technologies and discourses can quickly date, and providing the reader with information on the time of the work gives much needed context. Overall, this book is enjoyable and informative. Those who are moderately familiar with literature on the topic will have already read much of the content. I, however, discovered some new and interesting material.

## REFERENCES

- Théberge, Paul. 1997. *Any Sound You Can Imagine: Making Music/Consuming Technology*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.
- . 2004. "The Network Studio: Historical and Technological Paths to a New Ideal in Music Making". *Social Studies of Science* 34(5): 759–81.

---

## THE SOUND STUDIES READER

JONATHAN STERNE (ED.)

New York: Routledge, 2012.

ISBN: 978-0-415-77130-6 (hardcover), 978-0-415-77131-3 (paperback)

RRP: US\$120.29 (hardcover), US\$38.52 (paperback)

---

DOI: 10.12801/1947-5403.2013.05.01.07

CARLO NARDI

INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR (ITALY)

Readers often reflect an attempt to legitimize a newly formed field of study through the ex post facto selection of eminent forefathers and texts. Undeniably a qualified figure to pursue this endeavor, Jonathan Sterne is a point of reference for everyone interested in the cultural

study of sound, mostly thanks to his groundbreaking book *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* (2003), not to mention, among others, his examination of the role of commodification and psychoacoustic models of hearing in the development and success of the MP3 format (2012), his critique of the concept of orality according to writers of the Toronto School (2011) and his investigation of the use of music as a crime prevention tool (1997). With this reader, however, Sterne does not intend to establish a new academic field in the traditional sense, that is, by cocooning an embryonic discipline within a given set of theoretical concerns and epistemological boundaries, but rather to advance a dynamic and open concept of sound studies as “a name for the interdisciplinary ferment in the human sciences that takes sound as its analytical point of departure or arrival” (2). This volume is a welcome addition to a range of scholarly texts aimed at organizing the interrelated although not coinciding topics of sound-, aural-, auditory- and, more generally, sensory studies. It will thus be of interest firstly for anyone whose research interests are in such fields as music, sound art, cinema, media (including radio, television, video games and the Internet), linguistics, drama, dance, sound design, architecture, disability, sound storage and reproduction, telecommunications and psychoacoustics, that is, where sound is already a central object of study. Secondly, it can engage students and scholars in areas (for instance, political communication or education) where sound plays a relevant part and, nonetheless, is often (literally) overlooked due to the prevalence of ocularcentric paradigms. Finally, sound—sound knowledge, sound practices, sound imagination—is intended as a conceptual framework that, by encouraging unorthodox interpretations of the world, can profitably extend its reverberations (the temptation to speak in metaphors is strong) to other fields of knowledge.

Extremely wide-ranging and definitely substantial even for a reader, the book contains forty-five chapters, including an introduction by the editor, and is organized in six groups of readings: “Hearing, Listening, Deafness”, “Spaces, Sites, Scapes”, “Transduce and Record”, “Collectivities and Couplings”, “The Sonic Arts: Aesthetics, Experience, Interpretation” and “Voices”, each with a brief introduction. It is not only that its abundance makes it impossible to do a comprehensive review of the content, but also that the selection is consciously aimed at eschewing synthesis. In his introduction, Sterne provides a list of references that serves as well as an extensive bibliography and includes a list of collections of previously published and unpublished works that, as compared to *The Sound Studies Reader*, tackle the issue of sound/audition from different angles. Among these, the most similar in scope to the present book are Bull and Back (2003), Drobnick (2004) and Pinch and Bijsterveld (2011). It is no surprise, then, that the introduction is dedicated in significant part to a clarification of the specificity of this anthology. As Sterne explains, this reader places culture at the center of the definition of sound: “To think sonically is to think conjuncturally about sound and culture” (3). Nevertheless, the relationship between sound and culture is not unproblematic. Formerly, Sterne conceptualized sound as a primarily human-centered problem: “. . . the hearing of the sound is what makes it. My point is that human beings reside at the center of any meaningful definition of sound” (2003: 11). Here, however, he

reviews his position, conceding an alternative stance that, while acknowledging a degree of reflexivity between the conceptualization of sound and that of hearing, “assumes the physicality of sound and then considers its cultural valence” (7). While this dualism seems to be inherent in the nature of sound, Sterne crucially contends that a distinctive trait of sound studies is the adoption of a critical stance towards the role of sound within wider formations of power and subjectivity: “. . . without critique, it is art, technical discourse, science, cultural production or training practice ‘about sound’, and not sound studies” (5).

The culturalist approach of several contributions suggests that there persists a permanent rift, at both the theoretical and epistemological levels, between the study of sound and the senses as cultural constructions and their understanding within physics, biology, experimental psychology and neuroscience, that is, the disciplines that have conceptualized the “physicality of sound” as we know it. This rift has arguably triggered at least two tendencies, both owing to the fact that, in its early days, the sociocultural study of the senses was posited as a conscious reaction to a prevailing attitude in the “hard sciences” to both universalize and reify human sensation: firstly, cultural studies have generally overemphasized the malleable and variable features of the senses at the expense of their biological substance; secondly and for similar reasons, too often scientific objectivity has been sacrificed to the advantage of a self-referential dialectic that sociologist Franco Ferrarotti tagged “aestheticizing radicalism” (1977: 469), a form of scholarship that possibly reveals more about the writer’s ideological mindset than about the real functioning of sensory processes. This second trait is more noticeable in texts inspired by literary studies and, to a certain extent, philosophy, which also have a significant presence in the reader and about which I will say more later.

There is a further, more general concern related to focusing on just one sense. Several chapters, such as Jacques Attali’s “Noise: The Political Economy of Music” and Emily Thompson’s “Sound, Modernity and History”, underscore the need for a reappraisal of the study of hearing to counter the tendency to privilege sight in scholarship.<sup>1</sup> This legitimate claim, however, might lead to an underestimation of the intersensory nature of the human experience, or, borrowing David Howes’ words, “the multi-directional interaction of the senses and of sensory ideologies” (2005: 9). In fact, an exclusive emphasis on hearing might contribute to the reproduction of a compartmentalized model of the senses, that is, a paradigm typically developed under the aegis of modern science and backed by a specific ideology that pervades academics as much as laypersons. Regarding this, Sterne himself elsewhere equates an aspect of this ideology to an “audiovisual litany [that] renders the history of the senses as a zero-sum game, where the dominance of one sense by necessity leads to the decline of another sense” (2003: 16). On the other hand, the choice to focus on sound rather than on hearing has at least two advantages. In the first place, it provides physical phenomena with a substratum of objectivity—and one that exists beyond the human body—that is often mystified in the most radical constructionist accounts of perception. In the second place, and inducing me to rethink my objection, it acknowledges that the ear is only one of many human receptors resonating with vibrations. In so doing, while keeping its focus on the cultural dimension of the senses, *The Sound Studies Reader*

avoids a common objectifying idea according to which the internal sensory processes are understood as an extension of the external sensory organs (see Mazzolini 1989).

Sterne must be given credit for offering asylum to an extremely wide selection of approaches that without any doubt will satisfy every palate. This task, however, as it promises liberation from the strictness of epistemology, risks ipso facto to dissolve into the many streams of mutually contradictory paradigms and, at times, even self-contradictory ones. Regarding the latter, I refer in particular to those (few) chapters, such as Kodwo Eshun's "Operating System for the Redesign of Sonic Reality" or Steve Goodman's "The Ontology of Vibrational Force", that deal with idealistic conceptions of sound or discharge the scientific method tout court. In particular, Eshun contends that, "[f]ar from needing theory's help, music today is already more conceptual than at any point this century, pregnant with thoughtprobes waiting to be activated, switched on, misused" (452) or, more succinctly, "[p]roducers are already pop theorists" (451). Inspired by Eshun, Goodman, envisaging an ontology of sound that highlights "the in-between of oscillation, the vibration of vibration, the virtuality of the tremble" (71), argues that theory should be subordinated to the object of study: "[W]e place theory under the domination of sonic affect, encouraging a conceptual mutation" (70). However, the idea itself of an ontology of sound, as much as it is at odds with the study of actual historical formations, threatens to reduce multifaceted phenomena involving sound and hearing to a mechanistic metaphysics unable to grasp the real, let alone to affect social change. Many readers will undoubtedly feel comfortable with texts that, imbued with metaphysics and literary theory, display a prose dense with portmanteaus, neologisms, metaphors and other stylistic liberties at the expense of rigor and, alas, clarity, or where everyday knowledge is promoted to theorization, and bewilderment and paradox are used as critical tools in their own means. As a matter of fact, anticipating any possible misunderstanding, Sterne explains that "there is no a priori privileged group of methodologies for sound studies" (6). Furthermore, it is probably true that, at this stage, a less inclusive choice would have encountered different but equally insurmountable problems, reflecting only a limited portion of the "interdisciplinary ferment" above mentioned. Nonetheless, I fear that the lack of a consistent epistemological approach and, in particular, the departure from a scientific mindset, might prevent not so much the development of sound studies as a fruitful scholarly interest in its own right, but, more importantly, it might undermine its critical potential. In fact, I doubt that there can be critique if theory is disengaged from a realist philosophy of science. In fact, certain essays made me wonder to what extent empirical criteria of validation or falsification are relevant for the sake of an argument. I will illustrate this point with an example.

Alexander Weheliye's chapter "Desiring Machines in Black Popular Music" tackles a subject that might possibly be of interest for the readers of this journal, namely the twofold use of technology as signifier and signified in contemporary R&B, concluding that "segments of mainstream black popular music . . . [i]nstead of dispensing with the humanist subject altogether, . . . reframe it to include the subjectivity of those who have had no simple access to its Western, post-Enlightenment formulation, suggesting subjectivities embodied and

disembodied, human and posthuman” (517). As emancipating as this statement sounds, my qualms derive from the fact that Weheliye’s argument is based on an erroneous assumption that might sound trivial to most but, instead, points to methodological issues regarding the challenges of interdisciplinarity. Weheliye interprets voice processing as a development of an anti-naturalist “mechanized voice” (513) first codified by Roger Troutman and Zapp in the eighties, but he mixes up the vocoder for the actual instrument that Troutman used in the examples cited (and for which he is still well known among funk and hip-hop fans), namely the talk box. As any music maker or listener familiar with the two devices will confirm, the vocoder and the talk box function in different ways (in terms of articulation, performance skills and additional instrumentation needed), produce different audible effects and, as the case in question shows, are associated with different performers.

This does not necessarily imply that Weheliye’s thesis should be easily dismissed—or that my hasty confutation would be sufficient for such purpose. Nonetheless, the lack of empirical evidence raises concerns that are worth considering. In fact, if a premise is wrong, how can the conclusions that are derived from it still be considered valid? More in general, does empirical evidence contribute to define criteria of validity in similar cases or are we just in the domain of metaphysics? If the latter is true, how can scholarship be truly critical?

This is clearly an epistemological issue that affects also our understanding of what we mean by methodology, and whether we choose to consider it an uncountable noun, that is, a common platform for selecting, discussing, comparing and evaluating research methods, or we surrender to its multiplication in irreconcilable paradigms. The real question is, what is the advantage of substituting methodology (rather than “methodologies”) with dialectical skills, thus devaluing discourse as an end in itself (see Gouldner 1970: 12–14)? Aware that this space does not allow for a full discussion of this topic, I would like to conclude quoting a passage from this same reader as it apparently voices similar preoccupations for idealistic conceptualizations of sound. Rick Altman, in his examination of “film fallacies” in screen sound (previously published in Altman 1992), claims that, in order to “restore a sense of sound’s role in creating our sense of the body, we must depend on historically grounded claims and on close analyses of particular films rather than on ontological speculations that presume to cover all possible practices” (228). Accordingly, sound studies at large should reflect how historical actors experience and conceptualize sound. In fact, a genuinely critical theory of sound, both as a *modus operandi* aimed at dismantling forms of structural inequality and domination and as emancipatory praxis, not only cannot be detached from real actors, but also should reveal actual contradictions in order to encourage actors to change reality. As Boltanski writes, “[t]he idea of a critical theory that is not backed by the experience of a collective, and which in some sense exists for its own sake – that is, for no one – is incoherent” (2011: 5).

*The Sound Studies Reader* provides so much food for thought that, in this brief space, I could only give some hints of its reach, the issues it addresses and the problems it raises. Needless to say, it will likely become a benchmark for anyone interested in this topic.

## ENDNOTES

- 1 Attali contends that, as music is capable of anticipating changes in the structure of society, we must learn to sharpen listening skills: “Today, our sight has dimmed; it no longer sees our future, having constructed a present made of abstraction, nonsense, and silence. Now we must learn to judge a society more by its sounds, by its art, and by its festivals, than by its statistics” (29). Thompson examines the intersections between the cultural history of acoustics and that of the urban environment in American cities: “[M]y work addresses an aspect of construction long neglected by visually oriented architectural historians. I challenge these historians to listen to, as well as to look at, the buildings of the past, and thereby suggest a different way to understand the advent of modern architecture in America” (123).

## REFERENCES

- Altman, Rick. 1992. “Four and a Half Film Fallacies”. In *Sound Theory/Sound Practice*, ed. Rick Altman, 35–45. New York: Routledge.
- Boltanski, Luc. 2011 [2009]. *On Critique: A Sociology of Emancipation*. Trans. Gregory Elliott. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bull, Michael and Les Back, eds. 2003. *The Auditory Culture Reader*. New York: Berg.
- Drobnick, Jim. 2004. *Aural Cultures*. Toronto: YYZ Books.
- Ferrarotti, Franco. 1977. “Intorno al Metodo della Sociologia Critica” [Issues of Method in Critical Sociology]. In *Storia del Pensiero Sociologico, Volume III: I Contemporanei* [History of Sociological Thought, Volume III: Contemporary Thinkers], ed. Alberto Izzo, 461–73. Bologna, il Mulino.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1970. *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Howes, David. 2005. “Introduction: Empire of the Senses”. In *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader*, ed. David Howes, 1–17. New York: Berg.
- Mazzolini, Renato. 1989. “Schemi e modelli della macchina pensante (1662–1762)” [Schemes and Models of the Thinking Machine (1662–1762)]. In *La Fabbrica del Pensiero. Dall'Arte della Memoria alle Neuroscienze* [The Factory of Thought: From Art to Memory in Neuroscience], ed. Pietro Corsi, 68–143, 198–200. Milano: Electa. (Engl. tr., “Schemes and Models of the Thinking Machine (1662–1762)”. In *The Enchanted Loom: Chapters in the History of Neuroscience*, ed. Pietro Corsi, 68–143, 198–200. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.)
- Pinch, Trevor and Karin Bijsterveld, eds. 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Sound Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sterne, Jonathan. 1997. “Sounds Like the Mall of America: Programmed Music and the Architectonics of Commercial Space”. *Ethnomusicology* 41(1): 22–50.
- . 2003. *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- . 2011. “The Theology of Sound: A Critique of Orality”. *Canadian Journal of Communication* 36(2): 207–25.
- . 2012. *MP3: The Meaning of a Format*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

---

## MUSICAL RHYTHM IN THE AGE OF DIGITAL REPRODUCTION

ANNE DANIELSEN (ED.)

Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.

ISBN: 978-1-4094-0340-1 (hardcover), 978-1-4094-0931-1 (ebook)

RRP: US\$93.47 (hardcover), US\$72.90 (ebook)

---

DOI: 10.12801/1947-5403.2013.05.01.08

STEFANIE ALISCH

UNIVERSITY OF BAYREUTH (GERMANY)

The field of (ethno)musicological groove research spans about two decades if we see Charles Keil's article "Participatory Discrepancies and the Power of Music" (1987) as a beginning. Two central tropes in the debate around groove are 1. the relevance of microrhythmic variances; and 2. their production through interaction between musicians. This being so, groove discourse has been marked by overt and covert technophobia and a cultural pessimism that favors hand-played rhythms over electronically produced ones, decrying the latter as soulless, stale and unable to bring about community making processes (see Keil 1995). *Musical Rhythm in the Age of Digital Reproduction* offers a timely update of this discussion through close readings of the micro-rhythmic makeup of tracks from r&b, trip hop, US and UK garage, varieties of house, techno, pop and abstract electronica.

Some might remember Anne Danielsen's in-depth study *Presence and Pleasure: The Funk Grooves of James Brown and Parliament* (2006), itself a staple of the groove discourse. Between 2004 and 2009, "Rhythm in the Age of Digital Reproduction (RADR)" ran as a group research project under Danielsen's guidance at the University of Oslo, where she is a professor of musicology. The volume presents results of the project that was funded by the Norwegian Research Council (<http://www.hf.uio.no/imv/english/research/projects/rhythm/>). Contributors range from Danielsen's then PhD students to established figures of rhythm research like Eric F. Clarke and Tellef Kvifte. The project pivots on the question: "what happened to the sound and rhythm of African-American-derived, groove-directed popular music styles when these grooves began to be produced and played by machines?" (1).

Danielsen's introduction summarizes key concepts of groove research such as basic pulsation; the synching of different rhythms on a material level or a perception level called "entrainment"; the idea that an abstract model of a rhythm exists and that each played actualization diverges from the abstract model; and the notion that inter-onset-intervals are the fundamental criteria for perceiving the structure of a rhythm. Danielsen advocates a focus shift in three aspects: a) the move away from discussing rhythm purely in terms of inter-onset-intervals on a time line and towards an inclusion of timbre and sound as

constituting elements of a groove; b) leaving behind the idea that bodily-performative practices serve merely as illustrative expressions in favor of treating body movement as a vital element of groove; c) abandoning the idea of Digital Audio Workstations (DAWs) as dehumanizing and instead exploring how they enable the development of new musical gestures.

The volume is divided into three parts: I) Microrhythm and Rhythmic Structure; II) Groove and Embodiment; and III) Mediation and Music Production. Choosing depth over comprehensiveness I introduce here one contribution from each section.

In Part I) Danielsen analyzes the pulse of D'Angelo's neo-soul hit "Left and Right" according to three different models of microrhythmic deviation: the metronome model, which focuses purely on impacts on a timeline; the local time shift model which also works with inter-onset-intervals, but includes relations of time-spans; and her own innovative beat bin model, which recognizes the "shape of the beats at a categorical level that is the dynamic feature of the groove" (33). A beat bin has a certain extension in time, but instead of just marking a beat's beginning and end point, this model considers the sound qualities (transients, bass rumblings) on the sound's material level and rhythmic tolerance on the listener's perceptual level. The beat bin has a shape similar to the letter U, which is placed on a rhythm's timeline with steeper or flatter lines indicating the beat's extension in sound beyond note-onset-points. Beat bins can be placed in equidistant fashion and still contain within themselves varying sound events of shifting position. Danielsen's contribution provides not only a meticulous analysis of the D'Angelo track, but also a concise overview of pulse models while challenging classics of groove and rhythm theory. The bin metaphor evokes a sense of three-dimensionality (not just a one-dimensional onset-point on a two-dimensional time-line), thus including sound perception and body movement of the listener.

In Part II) Hans T. Zeiner-Henriksen's chapter "Moved by the Groove: Bass Drum Sounds and Body Movements in Electronic Dance Music" also explores the impact of sound variations within an individual rhythmical element. Starting with the popular DJ trick of depriving the audience of the bass drum sound for a couple of bars only to provoke euphoric reactions when the bass drum finally returns, the chapter demystifies the ubiquitous association between rhythm and body movement by taking a close look at a crucial rhythmic element of dance music, the bass drum. In an earlier study, the author investigated body movements on the up-and-down axis with relation to rhythmic structure in EDM. He found that downward motion of head, foot and upper body tend to occur on the downbeat, usually the place of the bass drum. Upward movement is associated with the upbeat, usually the place of the hi-hat. Within an individual bass drum sound in EDM, there is very often a descending in pitch, and it becomes unclear what should be regarded as the beat. Is it the bass drum's onset-point in time or the moment when the lowest pitch is reached? Touching on music psychology and neuro-scientific models such as affordance, entrainment and mirror neurons, the chapter links descending pitch in a bass drum sound and downward body movement on the downbeat through the concept of *primary metaphor*. The discussion of frequency ranges, transients and pitch shifts within certain bass drum

sounds shows an increasing trend to deploy bass drums with descending pitch shifts over the last three decades. The aesthetic result is a push and pull effect between a downbeat that feels late and an upbeat that feels early. Zeiner-Henriksen's exploration of the "inner dynamics" (139) of bass drums in quantized music in relation to bodily movement concludes that "the downbeats of a dance track are crucial in providing not only pulse but a specific sensation of pulse, which affects the way all other rhythmic patterns and sounds are experienced" (139).

Considerations of sampling as discussed in terms of copyright (infringement), as supposedly subversive practice, and as mainly connected to hip hop and not musicologically as an aesthetic practice across genres serve as the starting point for Paul Harkins' "Microsampling: From Akufen's Microhouse to Todd Edwards and the sound of UK Garage" in Part III). Harkins moves away from the notion of sampling as "sonic quotation and the reconfiguration of existing sound recordings" (179) and towards discussing "some of the ways in which the digital sampler, as a creative tool, has shaped the music of producers" (178). Harkins reminds us of the four uses of the term "sampling" as defined by Kivifte: 1. the conversion of sound from analogue to digital; 2. relating to the use of hardware or software samplers; 3. "integrating existing recordings into a new recording as a recognizable sonic quotation" (180); and 4. the "use of tape splicing or digital editing to enhance studio recordings" (180). Canadian producer Akufen records "random fragments of obscure songs and mistuned white noise" (184) from the radio and arranges them into "abstract sound paintings" (186) with straight drum patterns. Todd Edwards, on the other hand, developed a distinct house style that is marked by 1. a trademark swing owing to the Ensoniq EPS sampler's "16 triplet-quantizing feature" (191); and 2. "a choir of sampled voices" (188) comprising minute pieces of r&b and disco vocals singing "meaningless melodies" (188).

Several themes run through the volume. Affordance serves as a theoretical framework that links groove perception and production while dynamically linking them with the specific context of the listener. Furthermore, Danielsen, Bjerke and Zeiner-Henriksen include "timbre, pitch, dynamics and texture" (15) in the groove discussion, thus expanding established notions of the attack-sustain-decay-release model of sound events and the note-onset positions as defining elements of a groove. While in some cases the use of visual representations is clear and strongly tied in with the verbal analysis (Danielsen), in other cases it is of a rather illustrative nature. Succinct metaphors capture the aesthetics of certain grooves. Images like the "seasick time-feel" of D'Angelo's tracks (21), the "ill, tight sound" of Timbaland (179), and the "stuttering effect" that "recalls a skipping CD" (171) make the musicological analyses appeal to the senses of the reader.

Overall, *Musical Rhythm in the Age of Digital Reproduction* is a precise, lucid and superbly edited compendium and a rich source of literature on rhythm and groove that lends itself as advanced teaching material. I wish there was a CD with this book, because the selection of musical material is brilliant, and listening to the analyzed tracks while reading is a must.

## REFERENCES

- Danielsen, Anne. 2006. *Presence and Pleasure: The Funk Grooves of James Brown and Parliament*. Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Keil, Charles. 1987. "Participatory Discrepancies and the Power of Music". *Cultural Anthropology* 2(3): 275–83.
- 1995. "The Theory of Participatory Discrepancies. A Progress Report". *Ethnomusicology* 39: 1-20.

---

**THE INTERNATIONAL RECORDING INDUSTRIES**

LEE MARSHALL (ED.)

Abingdon: Routledge, 2012.

ISBN: 978-0-415-60345-4 (hardcover), 978-0-203-83466-4 (ebook)

RRP: £80.00 (hardcover), £80.00 (ebook)

---

10.12801/1947-5403.2013.05.01.09

PAUL OLDHAM

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (AU)

The majority of analyses of the recording industry typically zone in on the West and the activities of major record labels at the expense of other international markets and non-major labels. Even discussion of the global fortunes of the majors will commonly veer towards discussing the music industry as if it is a coherent and homogenised entity and there is no difference in the ways the majors operate from region to region. Thankfully over the past two decades there has been a welcome move in popular music studies away from the restrictive and discriminatory West-centric and major label angle—found typically in English-speaking countries—toward a much more inclusive perspective of the recording industries. This academic anthology is part of that process and I welcome the approach.

The anthology is organised into two parts. The first is a contextualising introductory section spanning three chapters, while the second is comprised of seven, alphabetically-arranged, region-specific case studies. These cover three of the largest selling regions of the hegemonic mainstream (Japan, France and Brazil) alongside two which are tightly integrated with the “legitimated” (3) industry (Finland and South Africa) and a further pair of peripheral regions (Czech Republic and Ukraine). Given that a substantial number of these markets have only rarely been subject to an English-language examination, the intrinsic value of this section is significant. While the book lacks a formal conclusion, editor Lee Marshall’s scene-setting introduction does a decent enough job of threading the anthology’s themes together to make one seem unnecessary.

These case studies reveal that, with a few exceptions (such as Hong Kong and Mexico),

the overall trend in most countries over the first decade of the 21st century has been a notable increase in domestic market shares and local repertoire. Each territory is discussed through a detailed analysis of specific circumstances which have led to this, and the figures included here indicate that “music fans have been more loyal to local artists than global hits” (2). Several of the authors suggest a key reason for this is that, broadly speaking, it is more difficult for fans to illegally download or file-share music by local artists than that by international mainstream artists such as Katy Perry.

The anthology commences with a contentious piece by John Williamson and Martin Cloonan which problematizes much of the previous writing on recording industries and argues that these industries are indeed far from homogenous and best studied in terms of component parts (notably recording, live music and publishing). Additionally, they underline an economic and ideological shift of power away from the recording industry (which according to them should be pronounced dead or, at the very least, extremely unwell) to the live music industry, and how this has affected artists and record companies. An examination of the industry’s dominant companies of 2011—Live Nation and the “Big Four” major labels (Universal Music Group, Sony, Warner and EMI, prior to EMI’s absorption by UMG and Sony in 2013)—shows that most have resorted to adopting the 360-degree (or “all rights”) model pioneered by Sanctuary to generate revenue from publishing, live performances, merchandising, sponsorship, endorsement deals and more across the music industries.

Dave Laing offers a valuable analysis of the history of the 20th century music industry in five sections and ambitiously tackles approximately 20 years per section, engaging with: technological innovation (from Edison’s cylinder to the MP3 format); intellectual property law and disorder (from the 1909 US copyright law to tape piracy); changing hierarchies of consumer media (print to online); musical and demographic trends (dance crazes to youth cultures); and wider economic forces from the micro (the firm) to the macro (the global economy including the rise of consumerism). Here Marshall picks up again to investigate the immense difficulties faced by the recording industry (particularly in the US) in the first decade of the 21st century (which echoes three comparable crises from the 20th century). Marshall’s historical analysis offers a valuable and balanced perspective on the dramas of the past decade. Like Williamson and Cloonan, Marshall’s prognosis for the US industry is not good, though he does admit with a back-handed compliment that, while the “Big Four” remain in the top five biggest music sellers, their clout has diminished and their dominant position is far from assured. He also suggests that a larger focus on big investments in international stars and the imposition of 360-degree contracts on all locally signed artists could become the norm.

The case studies section begins with three chapters which tackle larger-selling regions, each with different concerns. For instance, Masahiro Yasuda reveals Japan as a market lucrative enough to overtake the dwindling US market but one which also currently stands at a curious crossroads between the two contradictory trends of centralising dynamism—which brings the Japanese recording industry in line with more conventional markets

via locally embedded commercial practices such as “so-called ‘tie up’ production(s)” and 360 deals (154)—and a decentralising tendency towards “more diffuse participatory creativity”(168). He also outlines the specific set of peculiar issues it has presented to the four transnational major labels which, though highly profitable, hold an equal if not lesser influence on the market than the thriving domestic labels. This, he argues, is due to local practices such as the limited diversity of radio stations and once-strong, domestic J-pop tie-up productions which would simultaneously plug product to all strands of the “complex web of consumer services” (154) including transnational megastores, karaoke boxes and record rental businesses. Yasuda also discusses Japan’s idiosyncratic and more open approach to copyright protection and P2P sharing. Hugh Dauncey and Philippe Le Guern’s chapter on France focuses on how and why the French government developed one of the world’s most aggressive and proactive legislative responses to the problem of digital piracy, leading to the controversial and repressive HADOPI (*Haute Autorité pour la Diffusion des Oeuvres et la Protection des droits sur Internet*) law adopted in 2009 to protect creativity and profitability. Similarly, Sam Howard-Spink discusses how rampant P2P and mobile-based piracy have negatively affected Brazil’s relations with the US since the 1990s. He also reveals that on the other side of Brazil’s notorious wealth divide (and beneath the radar of its official statistics) exists a legion of dynamic cultural economies such as organised and established independent labels which are attuned to Brazilian market sensibilities.

Two further case studies describe how music retail has survived in the smaller markets which are closely integrated with the dominant industry. Pekka Gronow explains how the small but strong Finnish domestic market has benefitted greatly from favourable copyright laws on secondary uses of music (such as broadcast) which see all income taken from foreign recordings used to support local production. In contrast, Tuulikki Pietilä argues that for the highly fragmented ethnicities and distribution of wealth of South Africa’s 50 million strong population, most of the activity in the non-major industry, such as sales at live shows, is unaccounted for by the International Federation of the Phonographic Industry.

The two case studies which focus on peripheral regions where global labels have little if any influence in the domestic market are perhaps the most fascinating. C. Michael Elavsky describes a Czech music culture that is both fully integrated into global industry practices but highly resistant to the Westernising cultural imperialism of copyright and intellectual property regulations. Here piracy, rather than being just a matter of legality, takes on a different ideological purpose among low-wage earners. This brings up the importance of considering how the issue of piracy has a different meaning depending from which side of the corporate power dynamic you are looking at it. This point is also addressed by Adriana Helbig in her chapter on the even more peripheral market of the Ukraine, where the crackdown on piracy by national and international organisations has not been effective due to widespread political corruption. This, she says, is exacerbated by global online corporations such as Apple’s lack of presence in the region, coupled with the fact that international and local Internet sellers refuse to accept Ukraine-issued credit and debit cards.

*The International Recording Industries* offers a series of important insights into the turbulent recent history of the diverse global industries and different localities of what Marshall describes as “the first major content industry to have its production and distribution patterns radically disturbed by the Internet” (1). All readers will discover something new in this absorbing anthology.