

Editorial: Globalization and Its Discontents

Philip V. Bohlman and Federico Celestini

In a moment of simple yet striking eloquence Daniel KL Chua, the new President of the International Musicological Society, placed a globe of the world on the table before him as he began his presidential remarks on March 22, 2017 at the General Assembly of the twentieth congress of the IMS in Tokyo. This globe, President Chua went on to explain, was in many ways the common subject of the IMS, its materiality representative of the world music scholars collectively strove to understand. Together, we occupied its common surface. Across centuries, that globe had shaped the geography of musical encounter and channeled the currents of cultural exchange. Collectively, the IMS and music scholars worldwide must and would embrace the challenges of their common journey into a future symbolized so strikingly by the globe Chua held in his hands.

The renewal of the IMS commitment to the music of a common world—to globalization and music—was hardly exceptional at its Tokyo congress. The theme of “Musicology and Globalization” had already served our Japanese colleagues in 2002 at the time of their international congress celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Musicological Society of Japan. Editorials in *Acta Musicologica* in recent years observed the expansion of global coverage in the pages of this journal, which had served as a beacon for music scholarship since its inception. *The History of the IMS (1927–2017)*, edited by Dorothea Baumann and Dinko Fabris, and appearing simultaneously with the twentieth congress, documents a history of musicological engagement with globalization, from the society’s prehistory through world war and shifting ideological and political alignments. The IMS has consistently been there, its members doing the good work that the common humanity of global music cultures demands of us.

The historical and renewed IMS commitment to common humanity so evident in the present moment, nonetheless, comes at a time when globalization is endangered by the actions of discontents around the world. Just as we celebrate our commitment, it is important to ask how we are responding to the discontents. The dimensions of discontent are by now well known. The political turn to nationalism and populism has determined the course of elections at every level and on every continent. The retreat behind walls and barricades designed to protect entrenched selves from desperate others has redeployed borders. There is scarcely a discussion of globalization that does not, in one way or another, bear witness to crisis and catastrophe. Globalism, globality, and globalization, the vocabulary of conditions that abundantly give to some only after taking from others proliferates. The culture of common humanity is under siege.

Can the IMS, with its renewed commitment to common humanity, actually stake out meaningful positions to forestall and resist the discontents railing against globalization? We do not mean this merely to be a rhetorical question, rather one question among many that were raised repeatedly at the Tokyo congress. In many different forms, moreover, this is a question that has increasingly appeared on the pages of *Acta*. The new responses to globalization by IMS members have engendered a parallel sense of responsibility. Panels on East and West, reflecting the congress theme of “Musicology: Theory and Practice, East and West,” took to task the practice of divisively parsing the world in an older musicology. Alternative and subaltern voices responding to the use and misuse of music in the spread of missionaries and colonial settlements were given a forum. Music history and music ethnography spread to times and places to which music scholars had rarely gone. Celebration of national traditions and the persistence of power through the canonic counterpoint of privileged theory and practice were placed in critical perspective.

We understand musicological globalization as the proliferation of musicological voices and the enhancement of the dialogical moment implicated therein. As the editors of *Acta*, we consider this to be a primary task of the journal, and we are committed to its realization. In practice, this takes at least two different directions, which are interrelated in many cases, namely the plurality of musicological cultures according to the different traditions of the many countries around the world, as well as to the different methods and objects of study in our sub-disciplinary discourses. A major consequence of globalization has been the profound transformation of the main areas in which musicology has traditionally been mapped out. Historical musicology, initially engaged almost exclusively with so-called Western art music, now ambitiously moves toward a global history of music, facing the enormous challenges posed by the history of colonialism and post-colonial criticism. Inspired by the breadth of global horizons, historical musicology is opening itself to the empirical methods of systematic musicology, as well as to the performance and context analysis of ethnomusicological research. In the meantime, the field of ethnomusicology has also been enriched by post-colonial discourse.

In this issue, we are delighted to offer *Acta* readers a partial record of the transformations that ethnomusicology has undergone during recent decades, reflected in the writing and thinking of one of its major protagonists, Bruno Nettl. Two further contributions document the efforts of the IMS—and of *Acta*—to bring sub-disciplinary discourses into dialogue. In July 2016, Philip Bohlman and Xavier Serra gave keynote addresses at the IMS conference on “Music as Art, Artefact and Fact” in Stavanger, Norway, the revised and expanded versions of which are printed in this issue. Bohlman’s investigation of song merges music-historical and ethnomusicological perspectives, imparting the object of his research with anthropological depth and global dimension. Serra focuses on digital traces of musical facts and artifacts, showing how computational musicology approaches the study of music cultures. Empirical and hermeneutic methodologies in musical and cultural studies

are seldom related to each other, but we witness here the ways it may be possible to conjoin different methodologies in order to approach various facets of the same object. Julia Merrill's article on the performance of the vocal part of Schoenberg's *Pierrot lunaire*, in which data from expert evaluations of performances over the past seventy years are analyzed statistically, points in this direction. Michaela Krucsay's essay confronts *Acta* readers with a case study of women's studies (*Frauenforschung*) in which cultural history, biographical research, and discourse analysis contribute to the restitution of the historical figure of the Viennese pianist Catharina Cibbini-Koželuch (1785–1858) and her transformations in the history of reception.

Globalization, as an accompaniment to the work of music scholars, might be said to be entering a new moment for musicologists. The global history of music, witnessed tentatively but clearly in several papers and panels at the Tokyo congress, is not separable from the Anthropocene, the world whose very being is made and unmade—increasingly the latter—by its human inhabitants. Climate change and ecological crisis are no less our responsibility as music scholars, for they transform our world and the lives of musicians. The new IMS commitment to globalization, moreover, acquired practical dimensions, among them specific changes that will make *Acta* available to a more expansive readership, through open-access media and the enhanced forms of collaboration they make possible. Surely all of us in the IMS were struck by Chua's gesture of placing the globe before us, and we quickly recognized that it was by no means simply symbolic. It was a call to action, surely one that guides our editorial work in *Acta Musicologica*, which will be critical to heed as music scholars take globalization and its discontents ever more seriously.