

1

2 **PROF. CAROL OJA [4:18]:** Hi everyone, I think we'll try to get started. So welcome
3 to "Making History," an oral history panel sponsored by the AMS Committee on the History of
4 the Society. Kay Shelemay is not here this evening – she is a bit under the weather so she
5 couldn't make it to the conference, so I'm Carol Oja and I'm filling in for her and reading from
6 the script that Kay handed to me. So she's thoroughly prepared this panel.

7 As part of this work to document the history of the AMS, the Committee on the History
8 of the Society has in recent years carried out interviews with former officers and active
9 individual members. Tonight we will follow up on this oral history initiative in a group format,
10 gathering individual testimonies from AMS members...

11 [Taruskin enters] Yay!

12 **PROF. RICHARD TARUSKIN [5:08]:** Sorry. [Laughter] I got lost.

13 **PROF. OJA [5:11]:** Oh that's OK. It's very easy to do here. Yeah.

14 **PROF. ANNEGRET FAUSER [5:16]:** We left you the empty chair!

15 **PROF. OJA [5:18]:** Yes. Alright I'll start that sentence again. Tonight we will follow
16 up on this oral history initiative in a group format, gathering individual testimonies from AMS
17 members through a participatory discussion on the topic of "AMS Milestones." A milestone in
18 AMS history may be drawn from a period in which the speaker was personally involved, or may
19 be an event or transition heard about through oral traditions passed down over the course of their
20 careers. Five AMS members who have been active in the society and involved in musicological
21 research, writing, and teaching, have been invited to lead off the session by offering their own
22 reminiscences on some aspect of this topic. And they are Michael Beckerman, J. Peter
23 Burkholder, Annegret Fauser, Bonnie Gordon, and Richard Taruskin who have all agreed to

1 participate as panelists. The session will be videotaped for deposit in the AMS archives, and the
2 committee asks that everyone present, by virtue of their attendance, agree to the use of recording
3 technologies. So I guess we all hold hands and say “agreed.”

4 [Laughter] Agreed – good.

5 [Inaudible discussion] ... Out of line already.

6 Here are some guidelines for session participation. Our five invited panelists will offer
7 brief comments of no more than six to eight minutes in length. Then participants from the floor
8 will be invited to contribute their own remarks, whether corrections or additions to one of the
9 speaker’s testimonies, or their own perspectives on a topic not yet discussed. Participants from
10 the floor may speak up to three minutes, a limit that will be enforced by the session chair. That’s
11 me. Remarks should be spontaneous and based on personal experience and memory. If you’d
12 like to speak please approach a microphone and be sure to state your name and place of
13 residence at the start. So let me introduce the members of our panel.

14 Michael Beckerman — and I’m doing this in alphabetical order — is the Carroll and
15 Milton Petrie Professor of Music at New York University. His longtime interests in Czech and
16 Eastern European music have resulted in multiple books on the musical worlds of Dvořák,
17 Janáček, and Martinů, and now a study of the music of Gideon Klein. Michael Beckerman has
18 served as Vice President of the AMS.

19 Peter Burkholder is Distinguished Professor of Musicology at Indiana University. A
20 former President, Vice President, and Director-at-Large of the AMS, he has written multiple
21 books on Charles Ives, as well as articles on topics from the Middle Ages to the twentieth
22 century. Peter Burkholder’s *A History of Western Music* is in its ninth edition.

1 Annegret Fauser is the Cary C. Boschamer Distinguished Professor of Music and Adjunct
2 Professor of Women and Gender Studies at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. A
3 former editor of JAMS and a member of a number of AMS committees, she has published on
4 topics ranging from French song and opera, to nationalism, to cultural transfer. Among her
5 recent books is the award-winning *Sounds of War: Music in the United States During World War*
6 *II*.

7 Bonnie Gordon is Associate Professor of Critical and Comparative Studies in the
8 McIntire Department of Music at the University of Virginia. Her interests in the experience of
9 sound and the potential of the human voice, body, and sense come together in her book
10 *Monteverdi's Unruly Women* as well as in many other publications. In the AMS, Bonnie has
11 served on the AMS council as chair on the Committee on Women and Gender, and as chair of
12 the Paul Pisk Award Committee.

13 And Richard Taruskin is the Class of 1955 Professor Emeritus at the Music Department
14 of the University of California, Berkeley. His research and writings span epochs and cultural
15 domains from the European Renaissance to modern Russia, not to mention his work as a critic,
16 performer, and conductor of early music. Among his many books are the six volumes of the
17 *Oxford History of Western Music*. In addition to serving on the AMS Board of Directors and as
18 current chair of the Kinkeldey Committee, Richard Taruskin has won a full gamut of AMS
19 awards: an Einstein, Greenberg, and two Kinkeldey Awards.

20 I hope that our speakers' remarks will spark your own recollections on the topic of "AMS
21 Milestones." We hope that this session will be lively, informative, and provide valuable
22 materials for the AMS archive. So let's hear from our speakers in alphabetical order. So that
23 means Michael, you start! [Laughter]

1 **PROF. MICHAEL BECKERMAN [9:52]:** Good. Do I need a microphone?

2 **PROF. OJA [9:52]:** You do.

3 **PROF. FAUSER [9:53]:** Yes, you do.

4 **PROF. BECKERMAN [9:57]:** Yeah, I was actually completely flummoxed by the
5 “AMS Milestones” topic. At first I was relieved because I thought it was Millstone [?] and I
6 knew I could speak about that. But I guess I’m going to share a couple personal reminiscences
7 with you from my early years in the society and then take it up to an event that happened a
8 couple of years ago that represents to some extent my coming of age in the society, and my
9 sense, which I imagine many of you have, of being both insider and sometimes very much an
10 outsider.

11 Well, like perhaps many young people in a field, I started very much feeling like an
12 outsider. I didn’t know anybody. Everybody seemed to be so competent and capable and very
13 precise and slightly pissed off. [Laughter] And I remember going to many sessions where there
14 was a lot of rancorous discussion, actually sometimes inversely proportional to what people
15 seemed to know about the subject, but this seemed – you know and I was quite intimidated by it.
16 Really I was.

17 **PROF. TARUSKIN [11:11]:** You’ve made up for it since.

18 **PROF. BECKERMAN [11:12]:** I’ve made up for it since, that’s right. [Laughter] Thank
19 you – well that’s... that’s to be seen. I just remember one incident from one of my first AMS
20 meetings where I felt like a complete zero, but I had just come back from Czechoslovakia and
21 someone who I had thought of as an eminent professor there had given me regards to — for a
22 famous senior scholar. And I thought, well this meeting complete loss, nobody knows me and I
23 don’t know anybody but at least I’ll be able to convey the greetings from this eminent Czech

1 professor to the eminent senior scholar. So I finally found this senior scholar and I went up to
2 the person and I said “Rudolf Petschmann [?] from Brno sends you his regards.” [Pause]

3 Nothing. [Laughter] No response at all. So I thought OK, I can do this again. So I said:
4 “I just wanted you to know that “Rudolf Petschmann from Brno sends you his regards” and the
5 person turned to me and said: “I heard you the first time.” [Laughter]

6 So this was my sense that maybe I would really be an outsider forever, and I had a sense
7 for a long time of the AMS as a bit cold-blooded, where there was a group of insiders who were
8 unaware of the effect that their insider status had on the rest of the people in their field. And I
9 carried this with me for a while and I’ll just quickly jump to a moment where I was able to really
10 put it in a different context. A couple of years ago you may remember this was a great deal of
11 difficulty about the situation with unions in the hotels in San Francisco. And there were many
12 people who were angry that we were having the meeting there, and some of my energetic
13 students at NYU came into my office when I was chair of the office and were just saying the
14 kinds of things about the AMS that I had thought when I was maybe their age. And after having
15 served on the board for, what, six years and been Vice President I was able to really honestly say
16 to them: “Look, you may think we’re a bunch of insiders, but basically what we do is we get to
17 these meetings really early and we sit around tables and we try to figure out how to give money
18 to people who need it to do their scholarly work.”

19 So I carry both of these images within me all of the time. That of someone who has
20 become Vice President and been in those meetings, who does sometimes feel like an insider but
21 is also very very wary of ever feeling like an insider in a field like ours which requires so much
22 time and energy and often at the end we’re not quite sure what we know. So, thank you very
23 much. [Applause]

1 **PROF. PETER BURKHOLDER [14:15]:** The milestone that I'd like to place at the
2 center of what I have to say tonight happened twenty-five years ago. It was the first session on
3 gay and lesbian topics at the AMS at the 1990 Oakland meeting. And to put that in perspective,
4 I'd like to begin when I began. My first meetings at the AMS – the first time I attended was in
5 1981, and I certainly felt welcome. The President of the AMS at that time was Howard Mayer
6 Brown, one of my own professors who was gay, and open about it, and so I certainly didn't feel
7 unwelcome. But there was no scholarly discussion of those issues, or very little of it, and there
8 was no group. And in 1985, which by coincidence was the one AMS that since 1981 I've missed
9 – it was in Vancouver and I was an impecunious Assistant Professor so I couldn't travel that far
10 – but Philip Brett called a social time. He just said "Let's have a party." And so gay and lesbian
11 people who were at the meeting gathered at the party. And so that became a regular feature.
12 And in 1989, for the first time, the — our group formed itself as the Gay and Lesbian study
13 group, and held a session on the schedule. I looked it up to check to make sure it really was on
14 the schedule and it's announced in the August 1989 AMS newsletter: The Gay and Lesbian
15 Study Group, meeting on Friday afternoon at noon for an hour.

16 And out of that came a couple things. The first was this session in the 1990 Oakland
17 AMS. I was on the program committee that year and my colleague Malcolm Brown put together
18 the session. Papers on it included papers by Philip Brett and Susan McClary and Gary – I'm
19 blanking on his name, I had it a moment ago...

20 **PROF. BONNIE GORDON [16:33]:** Thomas?

21 **PROF. BURKHOLDER [16:34]:** Gary Thomas, yes thank you. Oral History, right.
22 Oral history off the cuff. And it was presented to the program committee as a group and my
23 memory is that we had no problem with that at all. We just immediately accepted it and said this

1 sounds like a great idea and put in on Sunday morning. And Sunday morning at the AMS, as
2 you know, is usually a time when people go home and they're tired. And we sort of had a
3 suspicion that maybe putting this session on Sunday morning would work really well and it did
4 because that was the best-attended Sunday morning session I've ever seen at AMS. There were
5 easily 200 people there, maybe 300, and that was probably, you know, more than everybody who
6 was at all the other sessions put together that morning.

7 And it was a really warm room. We were very happy to see this work being done. Most
8 of the papers, I think maybe all of them, got standing ovations. And there was just an enormous
9 sense of energy about the inclusion of this as a scholarly topic but also it felt validation for us as
10 people, those of who were gay and lesbian – which of course is not true of everybody there or
11 even everybody on the panel speaking.

12 Part of the energy that came out of that was a lot of people proposing papers on that topic
13 the next year, and I — by coincidence I happened to be on the Program Committee for the 1991
14 Chicago AMS as well. And there were something like a dozen proposals and we accepted most
15 of them. But we decided since there were too many to put on one session we would mainstream
16 them and we put them on sessions all over the program. I heard back from some people in the
17 run-up to the AMS that fall that they weren't going to come because there wasn't a session on
18 gay and lesbian topics and I guess they'd gotten used to it after one year. [Laughter] And I said:
19 “Well wait a minute! There's twice as many papers this time as there were last year! It's just
20 that you can't see that.”

21 So it was interesting that that was their reaction. But my sense very much was that it
22 didn't take long for this to become a mainstream topic. And I think it was the next year in '91
23 that the Gay and Lesbian Study Group was officially recognized by the Board of the AMS, and

1 one of the ramifications of this – the beginning of that group – was the invention of the study
2 group. The AMS had had no study groups before. And within a couple years the Hispanic Study
3 Group had formed in I think 1993, and soon after that other groups began to form such as the
4 Pedagogy Study Group, and now there are 11, I think, study groups covering a wide range of
5 issues and scholarly topics.

6 That has been a great stretch for the AMS because — for a number of reasons. First of
7 all, just speaking as a gay person, the validation of the group and the AMS taking us under its
8 umbrella has been really helpful, really impressive. But at the same time it's not just identity,
9 it's also a question of interest. And all of us — the truth is all of have interests and aspects to our
10 personalities that are perhaps a small minority in this gathering of a thousand or so
11 musicologists. And I remember when as a graduate student I met the other musicology graduate
12 student who was into folk dancing and choral singing and gay and a Quaker and 6'2" tall and had
13 a red beard and it was like – that experience of finding somebody who had so many things in
14 common with me gave me a sense of being welcome not just at the conference but also on the
15 planet.

16 So I think that there's something very important that has come out of this whole study
17 group movement – that all of us can find ways to connect with others at the AMS, people who
18 share our interests, the people that we really want to see year after year after year. So that I have
19 increasingly come to think of the AMS not as a single organization, but as a set of overlapping
20 constituencies, and therefore really vibrant and really strong. [Applause]

21 **PROF. FAUSER [22:29]:** Right. So I want to focus on two issues and a couple of
22 moments in my own relationship to the AMS. And I want to start with the year 1998, when I
23 received an email from the then JAMS editor Paula Higgins, as we were sort of working through

1 the text that had been accepted for publication which became the article “La guerre en dentelles”
2 that came out in JAMS. And Paula said, you know this is only the second time that we have an
3 issue that has three articles by three women authors in the fifty-one years of the history of the
4 entire society. There were still five of the six reviewers were men so they weren’t out there. The
5 third time this happened was in 2013 in 66-2, which was the penultimate issue I edited. Between
6 that issue and the issue that Paula edited, there were – I’m just trying to do the math very
7 quickly, fifteen years – and in those fifteen years, we had eleven issues with zero women
8 contributors and we had an entire year, 2007, without a single article by a female author.

9 To sort of make the point clear, this is not that we have editors who discriminate against
10 women. We did a bit of research, and I actually asked my colleagues as well and I did that
11 research: the acceptance of women authors for JAMS is directly proportional to the submissions.
12 It was an issue about submissions, and those of you have been around long enough you know
13 that during those three years I stood there every year and said: “Women, submit articles.” And I
14 looked up to them and said “Please submit articles.” etc.

15 So that gets me to my moment two. And my moment two is one where one of my
16 Editorial Board members, a wonderful colleague, sort of said: “You will love that story.” And I
17 thought, OK. So she said to me: “Guess what? I ran into this colleague” – this is after two years
18 of me being JAMS editor – “and that colleague said to me: ‘I can’t understand what Annegret is
19 all about. I mean just look at JAMS! It regulates itself.’” So the idea that things regulate
20 themselves – I thought that was highly comical. [Laughter]

21 And that brings me to my next aspect, which is gender a little bit more broadly concerned
22 in our field, and I think this is one of the issues I would like to talk more about. I would like to
23 remind ourselves of Susanne Cusick’s wonderful article that was for me also a personal

1 milestone reading it about the beginning of the society, where — as those of you who have read
2 the article — women were actually actively excluded. So, we have an issue from our very
3 founding with this. So things don't regulate themselves. And this doesn't go only with
4 questions of access, but also think in questions of welcome, which is what Peter just mentioned.
5 Are you welcome in who you are, and what does it mean to be a women within the society?

6 And that brings me to my third moment. And that's another email that I received in
7 2008. And that email came from Honey Meconi, who then was Vice President of the AMS, and
8 she in her home institution is the Susan B. Anthony Professor of Gender and Women's Studies.
9 That's an email that was followed up by a trip to a quilt store in Greensboro with the other
10 members of what we call ourselves, the Feminist Quilting quartet: Lydia Hamessley and Mary
11 Natvig. [Laughter.] Yay.

12 Some of you might remember the result: the AMS 75 Raffle Quilt that we created for the
13 2009 Philadelphia AMS. We were very much aware when we did that that we were pushing
14 boundaries. Boundaries of comfort. Because quilting is women's work, and not one that we do
15 when we are sitting in the archives. So how could we committed feminists turn to women's
16 work in the context of a scholarly society, and even if only for fundraising, when that same
17 society used to exclude women and was also still at that time often felt inhospitable? And so we
18 decided this quilt would be more than just a contribution to fundraising — and also fun, we love
19 to quilt. It would also be a signal of non-conformity, and a celebration of women's creativity.
20 So by creating and raffling this quilt so publicly, that is something that I would like to sort of
21 have as my second milestone. And I just want to mention that there might be a third milestone in
22 the making because there will be our second quilt coming. So the FQQ is writing again.
23 [Laughter] **And** it will be actually to fundraise for an annual lecture on women and gender given

1 by a distinguished scholar in the field that's going to be fundraised for by the Committee for the
2 Status of Women of the AMS.

3 So these are not earth-shattering milestones – it's not kind of you this first time ever thing
4 that I remember – but it has to do with being someone who is very much in one sense at the
5 center of things, as a scholar of what I do. I am by no means not mainstream, I am actually a
6 pretty mainstream person – and yet, often sort of feel very at the margins. And this gets sort of
7 to what Michael has said: as someone who had to deal with gender discrimination quite a bit in
8 my own career, but also saw it happening. And saw it happening with this feeling of not being
9 welcome to — or not being encouraged to submit to the journal. And so then we may still have
10 an issue there, I don't know, but it is something for us to think about going forward, even though
11 we are now doing history. Thanks. [Applause]

12 **PROF. GORDON [28:01]:** So I'm going to do something I think a little bit different.
13 And I wanted to think about oral history, and think about the project of oral history and the
14 collection of memories. And people have often done oral history as a way to collect stories,
15 unsung voices. And I'm going to suggest that that doesn't always do the trick. So I'm also
16 going to use the fiftieth anniversary of the Kerman and Edward Lowinsky's debate as a point of
17 departure. And this was a debate that took place in 1964 in Washington DC. And it was a
18 debate where Kerman made his claim for criticism as the way for American musicological —
19 musicology to go, and Lowinsky reacted rather vehemently. Kerman asked for a method that
20 would get rid of the alien elements, and Lowinsky in effect accused Kerman of using the rhetoric
21 that Nazis had used. And I've spent time writing about this debate and thought about it very
22 much as a story of double exile from Lowinsky's point of view.

1 Lately though I've been thinking about the idea of shouting. Whenever one talks about
2 the idea of this meeting, they talk about shouting. And I had a delightful Renaissance Society
3 Meeting maybe ten or fifteen years ago where everybody had a story about the shouting. And I
4 started to think: by then Kerman had already been the Chair of Music at Berkeley. Lowinsky,
5 although it's a story of double exile, was a Distinguished Professor at the University of Chicago.
6 So they were shouting from a point of great privilege. And they were not just losing their
7 tempers. They knew that they had a right to shout.

8 So I want to pause for just a minute to think about the silence and to think about the oral
9 history archive. Another thing I did was I asked – last summer I took my twelve-year-old twins
10 to see the movie *Selma* and I thought “Oh this was 1964. I wonder if anybody at the AMS talked
11 about the civil rights movement.” And I asked people: “Do you remember? Did you talk about
12 the civil rights movement?” And I'm sure they did – I can't imagine they didn't – but nobody
13 remembers. And as it turns out the hotel that this occurred in was the Statler Hilton, which was
14 also the headquarters of the Civil Rights March on Washington. And if you Google “Oral
15 History and Civil Rights Movement,” you come very quickly to fascinating documents of things
16 that happened in that hotel. Lots of people telling stories of watching Malcolm X be
17 interviewed. So that's a silence.

18 The other silence that I thought – you know I should say that I know Lowinsky cared
19 very deeply about the civil rights movement, and this I know from reading his personal papers
20 and talking to Bonnie Blackburn and talking to his children. He was very active in getting
21 Roland Hayes to Black Mountain College and I'm sure he wasn't the only musicologist who
22 cared deeply about those issues. The other thing that I started thinking about were: “Where were
23 the women?” There seemed not to have been very many there. 1963 was the year that Betty

1 Friedan's *Feminine Mystique* came out, and also Mattel Barbie started their fashion line. I think
2 that's a fact we all need. [Laughter] My own institution was eight years from being co-ed.
3 Princeton, where many musicologists were educated, was still five years from going co-ed, and it
4 would take twenty years before the AMS officially, quote-unquote, "discovered" women. There
5 was a famous 1988 meeting in which the AMS supposedly "discovered" women, and there was –
6 I wasn't a musicologist yet, but I hear and I'm sure that there are many people in here who were
7 there – that the Chair of the Programming Committee had gone to the Committee on the Status
8 of Women and asked for a panel on feminist methods, feminist musicology. So that's interesting
9 to me as well, to think that actually — there is — it requires top-down leadership to make
10 change.

11 And of course the other thing about that meeting is that women had been there for quite
12 some time. Judith Tick and Bea Friedland gave the first papers on women in 1973. And that
13 leads me to the last sense — thing was to think about, which is what the milestone might be right
14 now. And I think also about Bruno Nettl's article about the ethnomusicologist from Mars, which
15 I've always loved, and I wonder what would somebody say about us in, you know, from Mars.

16 And so one of the milestones about now that I've been thinking about is that in the last
17 five years I've contributed to *festchrifts* for Susanne Cusick, Ruth Solie, Jane Bernstein and
18 Judith Tick. And these are not *festchrifts* in the old sense of the word, just of students honoring
19 their teachers. These are theoretical statements and these books, all these publications, are really
20 showing the ways that these women have influenced the field tremendously, not just in terms of
21 scholarship, but in terms of the whole culture of the field. And then, in terms of where we are
22 now, I think about two panels that are tomorrow night – since everyone likes evening panels.
23 The one is called "What Must the Musicologist Know? The Musicology PhD Curriculum" and

1 the other is called “Feminist Musicology and Contingent Labor.” And these are two issues that
2 we all will simply have to think about. And these are issues that Kerman and Lowinsky didn’t
3 have to think about, but our students will need to think about the issue of contingent labor, they
4 will have to think about what it means to be a professor in the world of corporatizing the
5 university, and we do need to think about what our students need to know. We also are going to
6 need — to have to think very very hard about diversity. If you’ve been reading the newspaper in
7 the past few days, we cannot not think about diversity in the universities, and I’ve been following
8 the news about Missouri and Yale. And I certainly learned last year at UVa that the media is
9 rarely right, but it seems like these are very deep issues. These are not issues we cannot not
10 think about. And the other thing I think that we all need to think about is I think in this world we
11 will not get – none of us – few of us will get through our careers without having a large tragedy
12 at our institution. And I’m thinking about the sort of rampage of gun violence, and violence on
13 campuses, and I think that’s one of things we will all need to think of. So that’s my oral history.
14 [Applause]

15 **PROF. TARUSKIN [34:17]:** Well, I really am going to be different! Well we all have
16 been different. But I was very surprised when I was invited to be on this panel. I’ll explain why.
17 I’m sure the reason for my being invited is because Kay Shelemay and I are very old and very
18 dear friends, dating back to the time when we were both doing time at Columbia. She was really
19 suffering there from a kind of discrimination that I don’t think anybody younger than she would
20 have ever faced, but we bonded at that time, and so I felt a great affection and a great – well,
21 when someone you love tells you “I want you to do something,” you always say yes. Especially
22 since she didn’t tell us what she wanted us to do, as you may remember. And then she said we
23 were to remember some great event in the history of the AMS and memorialize it. And the

1 reason why I was so surprised to be invited is that I have not been active in the AMS. When you
2 introduced me, you mentioned my one service to the organization. I served a term on the Board
3 of Directors, and that was about thirty years ago. And my relationship to the AMS since has
4 been a distant one and actually rather full of friction. That may sound strange, odd, insincere for
5 me to say this if you know that I am an honorary member of the organization so obviously you
6 know somebody out there likes me. And I like the people, and the reason why you get to be an
7 honorary member is because the people who are in a position to grant the honor at the time when
8 you are in a position to be a plausible candidate for it happen to be the people who like you. And
9 so the AMS is, in one sense, a composite of all kinds of people who I like very much, and love,
10 and have known for a long time. And I come every year to the meetings and enjoy myself richly
11 because of all of the acquaintances that I am able to renew.

12 But there is also the corporate AMS, in which I have not been active, and as a matter fact
13 from which I was in a way barred from service. And if there's going to be something that I
14 should talk about, as an event in the history of the AMS, it should be that. It should be my
15 collision with the AMS. It happened in the early nineties, when I was having served on the
16 board, and having been I supposed fingered for future service, I was asked to chair the Program
17 Committee for the National Meeting. I forget where it was to have been. I also didn't even –
18 because Kay said — Kay said “Be spontaneous! Don't prepare,” so I don't even remember what
19 year it was, but it was the early nineties. And I began doing the job, and as you know it's a
20 really big job. And then I received a letter from the – we all used letter in those days, no email,
21 you know, well phone calls, but this was a letter – informing me that the board of the AMS had
22 decided to invest another committee to supervise the Program Committee to make sure that we
23 were following correct principles of diversity, having very much to do — this is an interesting

1 counterpoint I think to Annegret's and Peter's presentation, because this was exactly the time
2 that they were recalling, when the AMS started becoming more hospitable to minorities of all
3 kinds, and being conscious of the need to mainstream such members and such topics into the
4 basic work of the organization. Of course I was also very conscious of this and very approving
5 of it, but I was told that I was now going to have to submit the work of my committee to a
6 supervisory committee which would then review our work and request, if necessary, that we
7 make adjustments.

8 So the only reaction I could possibly have to that news was to resign as the Program
9 Chair, because it was a terrible vote of no confidence in the Program Committee. What I
10 remember writing back to the President is that what you've done is you've greatly increased the
11 amount of work we have to do and greatly decreased the authority that we have, and you're
12 making the job of serving on this committee very unattractive. So I think therefore the
13 committee that you've put in charge of the Program Committee should become the Program
14 Committee. And I yield my place.

15 Well, you see, this was a collision between the good intentions of the organization and
16 the sense that change has to come top-down, which is what Bonnie reminded us. This was a top-
17 down change that was to have ensured a good outcome, and yet I felt it impossible to comply
18 with what was being asked of me. And so I resigned and the next part of the story I think is a
19 good ending, because that committee did not take office. There was no supervisory committee.
20 I have a feeling it was because of my stand even though I was not reinstated as the Program
21 Committee chair. And I was not asked to serve in any responsible capacity at the AMS. I got a
22 very angry letter back from the President for what I said in my letter and I was not asked to

1 serve, although I would have been willing to serve, for a long time. So that's why I say my
2 relationship to the AMS was one of friction.

3 What's the moral of the story? Well I'm glad that whatever — for whatever reason that
4 committee was never invested, actually. The Program Committee was always thereafter trusted
5 to do the job with due regard for diversity issues and for fairness and for reflecting the interests
6 of the membership of the organization. Not necessarily the majority interests, because I
7 remember pointing out to those with whom I was arguing, back in the early nineties, the
8 argument was made that the meetings should reflect the actual interests of the membership. And
9 I said, well if the meeting is really going to reflect the active interests of the majority of the
10 membership, we'd have mostly meetings on editing Renaissance music because that was the
11 majority interest of the membership back then. Obviously that wasn't the issue, that wasn't the
12 desire, and that wasn't the right course for the AMS.

13 So we never had to have that committee, and I'm very glad that we didn't, and yet we
14 still made enormous progress, because of the general good will of our membership. So that's
15 why ever since then, and it's only been very lately that I've been gradually allowed back into the
16 positions of responsibility. This year I'm the chair of the Kinkeldey committee, I'm very glad to
17 be doing it, but it took decades. So that's why – I don't know whether Kay knew any of this – I
18 suspect she didn't because if she did she never would have asked me to be on this. [Laughter]

19 But I'm glad that I was asked because I think that this is a necessary counterpoint. The
20 moral, as I see it, is that this organization has two aspects. It's a collection of wonderful people,
21 and it's also a corporate entity, which like all such corporate entities, can easily become an
22 enforcer of conformity unless the individuals who also make it up are vigilant against that
23 happening, as I feel I was called upon to be back then in the early nineties. So if I was to

1 honestly report my relations with AMS in terms of an event, that would be the only event. So I
2 offer it in that spirit of constructive criticism. [Applause]

3 **PROF. OJA [42:53]:** Well, thanks to all of you, and I'd like now to open this up to the
4 audience, reminding you that if you would come up to the microphone and give your name and
5 home institution, if that's appropriate, please do. And you know we've heard about issues – just
6 to kind of summarize and think about some of the issues raised here — insider/outsider status,
7 about inclusion and exclusion, mainstream and margins. And I think, you know, what's
8 fascinating here is how there's some balance here in every individual of silences and of the
9 impacts. And that plural is very important of top-down decisions. So there might be something
10 totally unrelated to any of those themes that some of you would like to say, but is there a brave
11 soul to stand at that mic? Oh.

12 **PROF. CHARLES ATKINSON [43:54]:** I just want to make one correction. Richard,
13 you and I were both served on the Einstein committee in 1980 or 81.

14 **PROF. TARUSKIN [44:01]:** That was before all of this happened.

15 **PROF. ATKINSON [44:03]:** Yeah.

16 **PROF. TARUSKIN [44:04]:** Yes. Alright, well...

17 **PROF. ATKINSON [44:06]:** I suppose since I'm here...

18 **PROF. TARUSKIN [44:07]:** While I was still being a good boy. [Laughter]

19 **PROF. ATKINSON [44:10]:** Right. You paid your dues, and then they then named you
20 Program Chair. I had never heard by the way there was a move to have a supervisory committee
21 to oversee that the ...

22 **PROF. TARUSKIN [44:18]:** I suspected that few people knew.

1 **PROF. ATKINSON [44:20]:** Yeah, this is news to me, so I'm glad that it's here. I
2 suppose that I should say something about what I saw, or what I see as one of the important
3 milestones. I think certainly that the Lowinsky-Kerman debate was — that was one of the
4 defining moments of the society, that Bonnie has already mentioned tonight, and of course is
5 well-documented in JAMS. Both Kerman and Lowinsky published their contributions, and then
6 there was follow-up discussion in the journal. And Jim Haar, when he wrote his summary of —
7 his sort of review of what had gone back with the seventy-fifth anniversary that was published
8 then in conjunction with the Philadelphia meeting, also pointed out how important it was as
9 really a defining moment for the society. And when I interviewed Herbert Livingston, who was
10 also an eye-witness, this was clearly one of the... I don't think we've seen the like of that since
11 then, it's really — it was obviously a very very important meeting and discussion.

12 But I think one of the things that stands out in my mind is something that also involves
13 Joe Kerman. In 1985, we — I was the Program Chair for AMS, and we had this wonderful joint
14 meeting with CMS, SEM and SMT. And the four program chairs were asked by the board to
15 organize a plenary session, because all — this was the first time that all four societies had met
16 together. And so it was felt that we should organize something that would involve — would be a
17 plenary session involving all four of the societies. And we had a discussion at the Philadelphia
18 Program Committee meeting trying to figure out what we would do. And it was not easy. We
19 finally decided on the topic of "Fact and Value in Contemporary Musicology." And we — but
20 who could talk about that? Any choice you make you're going to be criticized for, so we
21 decided we would — that we would simply have the presidents of these four societies address
22 this topic that we had chosen, that they would address. And so we dumped that on them, well
23 laid that on them, whatever way you want to call it. And I remember Meg Bent was the

1 President and said contacted me right afterwards and said: “What have you done to me?” She
2 was really a bit upset about it — or maybe I shouldn’t say upset, but was wondering how she
3 could really address this topic adequately.

4 Well, it turned out Joe Kerman’s book *Contemplating Music* came back — came out in
5 the summer before the 1985 meeting. And the decision was made to have a respondent from
6 each society. Leo Treitler was the responder for AMS, and the paper that Meg gave was her
7 article “Fact and Value in Contemporary Musicology,” which really set out some of the most
8 important issues facing the field, as a response to Joe Kerman. And I think her response in
9 conjunction with Joe’s work again make up I think an important, I think, sort of status-taking of
10 the field, and also a sense of new directions. And it’s an important debate that then was carried
11 on in the field, in New Musicology and so forth. But that 1985 meeting turned out to be, from
12 my perspective at least, one of the really important moments in the history of the society.

13 **PROF. OJA [47:58]:** Are there others to speak? Or anyone among you who wants to
14 respond to one another?

15 **PROF. BURKHOLDER [48:06]:** I would like to remind you that we also just invite
16 your reminiscences, fun times. [Laughter] Anything you want to talk about.

17 **PROF. HONEY MECONI [48:16]:** Anyone remember when there was the film, the —
18 when there was popcorn?

19 **UNKNOWN SPEAKER [48:18]:** Yes!

20 **PROF. MECONI [48:19]:** Do you remember that? Yes, that was really cool, wasn’t it,
21 yeah. [Laughter]

22 Just a couple things. We have a lot of generations in this room, we have people who
23 probably weren’t born when I first started going to AMS meetings, which is a kind of sobering

1 thought. But those of who got our degrees in the eighties, or even before that, will remember an
2 incredibly different field. And I think that — I think it is important to take the long perspective
3 on things and realize that things have changed. I think we think they're all changed for the
4 better. About ten years ago I was on what was then the Committee on the Status of Women, is
5 now the Committee on Women and Gender. I try to think, well what can my contribution be to
6 this? So I decided to look into the aspect of gatekeepers, and who had been in positions to
7 influence what was happening within the society. So I went through, going back to about 1979,
8 and looked at all the Annual Meetings, and who had been the Program Chairs, and who had been
9 the Session Chairs for that. And I also look at committees, things like Kinkeldey, and the big
10 Award Committees — on the basis of gender of course — and what I found was, surprise,
11 surprise, there had been a lot more men involved than women. And what I thought was a really
12 correspondence was that the number of women Session Chairs... which is a position of
13 authority, you're the one that's up there running things, you're seen as a very visible person,
14 you're also calling on people to answer questions, and so on and so forth, and so there's a lot of
15 elements of authority involved. And the number of women session chairs was directly correlated
16 to how often a woman had been Program Chair, which was an extremely low number. And so I
17 pulled all that information together and I presented it to the... well, sent it on to the board, who
18 then changed things. Who then realized that here's... we can make a very direct and obvious
19 change, we can appoint more women to be on charge of the Kinkeldey committee, to be in
20 charge of the Program Chairs, and since that time there's been much greater equity in terms of
21 that component of the society. And that actually encouraged me enormously, that they could —
22 that they would go ahead and take that extremely simple step that has changed things.

1 And then also in connection with what Annegret was saying about the opus quilt, all of us
2 who helped make it sat at the booth at various times and took donations. And we got all sorts
3 of... one thing Mary Natvig did was to, yes it is women's work, but every single bit of her
4 quilting had a musicological theme to it. It was very cute. She had a guideline and things like
5 that. And there was a square for 4'33" which was blank. [Laughter] But we got lots and lots of
6 comments of people saying this could never have happened twenty-five years previously. This is
7 incredible and this represents the change that the AMS has had. So I know there are many things
8 that many of us find still incredibly problematic about the society, but if you're my age, you're a
9 baby-boomer, and have been able to see — I mean, like a panel like this would not have
10 happened twenty-five years ago. And people in — being a JAMS editor, that was — we know
11 now it's not such a big deal but back then it was a huge deal to have a woman JAMS editor, or
12 many of the other things that have happened up there. So I'm actually really optimistic about our
13 continuing to take two steps forward and one step back as we continue to change... to reflect
14 what the society means and what it matters to all of us and what direction it's going to take. So
15 I'm actually pretty positive. [Applause]

16 **PROF. JOHN YAEGER [52:28]:** So I'll be brave, or foolhardy. I would be interested
17 in hearing from each of the panelists about one paper that each of you has heard at an AMS that
18 you remember, and that you think has affected you in either your work, or the way that you
19 teach, or in the way that you think of the field. I think that would be a very interesting thing to
20 hear. So.

21 **PROF. OJA [52:52]:** So for the sake of the videotape, can you identify yourself?

22 **PROF. YAEGER [52:55]:** Oh. John Yaeger, Juilliard School.

1 **PROF. FAUSER [53:04]:** I think the paper that for me was the most important, and the
2 paper that was for me the most memorable of all the times that I came here was Susanne
3 Cusick's paper on the War on Terror and music and torture. And so yes. And so it has changed
4 my work, it has helped direct me to the study of music and war, it has made me think about a lot
5 of things including the impact not only of music, but also of musicology on how we engage with
6 such things as war and terror and other such things.

7 **PROF. BURKHOLDER [53:48]:** Mine was at a chapter session. It was the very first
8 AMS anything I'd ever gone to. It was in 1977. I had decided not to continue as a composition
9 student, and I went to what turned out to be the founding meeting of the Society for Music
10 Theory. And the Midwest Chapter of the AMS was meeting together with that and I'd had
11 enough music papers by Sunday morning and so I went to the AMS session. [Laughter] And the
12 last paper on that session was Robert Marshall's paper on the dating of Bach flute sonatas. And
13 he was teacher of mine at the University of Chicago. I thought, well this is going to be not that
14 interesting. But into this question of when were these flute sonatas written, he wove this whole
15 question of what was it like to be a musician in the eighteenth century, and the relationship of
16 Bach to this flute player from Dresden who had come over to Leipzig for the summer one year,
17 and certain cantatas could be dated then, and this sonata was similar in certain ways to this
18 cantata flute part. And I came away from that saying, if that's musicology, that's what I want to
19 do.

20 **PROF. TARUSKIN [55:04]:** Yeah I would, when we were asked to reminisce like this,
21 I thought: "Hmm, can I really pick out one paper from all the papers I've heard?" Since I've
22 been coming since the 1970s to the meetings. But yes, there is one. And it was by Rose
23 Subotnick, and it was on at a session where I also gave a paper. I've forgotten my paper.

1 [Laughter] But Rose gave a paper, I've forgotten what it was called — you know what it was, it
2 was the 1981 meeting, it was in Boston. And there were some special sessions on 'Musicology
3 for the 1980s,' you know the New Musicology, but we — of course it wasn't called that, but we
4 had a sense that with the new decade we wanted to see some new things. The sessions were
5 rather disappointing, rather uninspiring, because very few people were talking about doing
6 anything new or different. But Rose was audacious and she was belligerent and she was having a
7 tough time, because not only was she was having all of the problems that women scholars had,
8 but because she was trying to bring Adorno into the musicological mainstream. For those of you
9 who came to musicology only in the last twenty years it may be news to you, but it wasn't
10 always — Adorno was not always one of those obligatory people to quote. Adorno was at one
11 time a very risky person to be talking about.

12 She was making a pitch for critical theory. I've never myself been much attracted to
13 critical theory as Adorno practiced it, but that we should think critically, and think
14 independently. And she said that "we've heard a lot about doing criticism" — and she was
15 making an oblique reference to Joseph Kerman, who was sitting right in front of her in the
16 audience — "but what we're hearing about isn't really criticism. This is criticism!" And she
17 started talking about Adorno. And she ended by I think, if I call correctly, comparing the
18 members of the American Musicological Society to Beckmesser. [Laughter] So I thought, my
19 God, I thought I was being spunky, but look at this. And it was a tremendous inspiration to me.
20 It really did change the ways I did things from then on.

21 **PROF. GORDON [57:32]:** Oh, here's one. Well, Annegret took mine. That's the one I
22 was going to say. So my second one is actually very full of levity. I remember Carolyn Abbate
23 gave a paper on castrati and she cracked up laughing, like could not stop laughing. Giggle fits.

1 And everybody in the audience laughed. And it was sort of a momentous moment because I
2 thought: these are people that you kind of read their names and like “Oh my God, they’re real
3 people.” They remind me of — a friend of mine in grad school had this story of seeing Leo
4 Treitler in a museum and nobody was looking at him but this friend. So it was just a momentous
5 moment for me of, like: these are just people, these famous musicologists. [Laughter]

6 **PROF. BECKERMAN [58:13]** I’d also like to mention Suzanne [Cusick]’s paper,
7 which was not only a wonderful occasion, and very exciting, but you know, was part of what led
8 our department to become a forerunner of downer studies broadly. Where if you’re not really
9 working on something depressing, you’re not really welcome. [Laughter]

10 But I want to mention just two other things quickly. One was a paper that Susan
11 McClary gave at a by-invitation-only conference on Mozart at Stanford. And I remember some
12 of what she spoke about, but what I really remember is that everybody was absolutely incensed
13 by what she said. And they were all screaming at her. And she sat there cool as a cucumber, you
14 know, like a 1930s communist. [Laughter] You know, just — no matter what they say, you
15 know she: “Well that’s very interesting, but I just look at it...” And I just thought, wow, that was
16 really extraordinary.

17 The one other thing I’ll remember was about twenty years before that, when I was a grad
18 student, I went to a session on Jewish music that was so unpleasant and rancorous that I went to
19 dinner afterwards with a group of people and I said: “If you ever hear that I’m doing anything
20 related to Jewish music, simply shoot me.” And as I’ve done some of that work people have
21 called up and said: “Bang!” [Laughter]

22 **SARAH SUHADOLNICK [59:54]:** Hi, my name is Sarah Suhadolnik, and I’m at the
23 University of Michigan, and I can share what seems like a fairly insignificant milestone for me in

1 comparison, but here goes. My first memory of the AMS Business meeting was – it’s been a few
2 years now – but the thing that was really striking for me was the President was a woman. And so
3 being a young graduate student that has issues with that and has mostly male teachers, it was a
4 really big thing for me to someone presiding over this giant ballroom who I could relate to. So
5 that’s my... [Applause]

6 **PATRICIA MOSS [1:00:42]:** Hello. I’m Patricia Moss, from the University of
7 Michigan as well. And another insignificant small moment, just personal for me. This is my
8 third AMS, and my first one was in San Francisco, and talking about the idea of inclusion vs.
9 exclusion, when I decided to change into musicology, a lot of people were silently saying: “Well
10 OK, good luck with that.” And I remember when the first day, the Thursday night, I went to the
11 opening reception and I’m looking around at all these big stars to me, whose names were on all
12 of our musicology books, and music history books, and I turn around and I see Dr. Burkholder.
13 And I was like: “What!” And I just kind of went up to him, and I stumbled, as I am now. And I
14 said: “Hello, I’m Patricia!” Like that meant something. It meant nothing. “I’m just so excited
15 to meet you.” And I gushed. And you just stood there, and you so very graciously said: “I’m
16 very happy to meet you too.” And I thought to myself: that’s amazing! [Laughter] I am a part of
17 something. Someone’s happy to meet me, and they’re famous! And maybe I can make it after
18 all.

19 And so I thought, in the course of that meeting, I also met other people who didn’t have
20 that same reaction. But because that memory stayed with me to my third AMS, I still believe that
21 at some point I can still be in this group of people. So, thank you. [Applause]

22 **PROF. PAUL CHRISTIANSEN [1:02:41]:** Hi. I’m Paul Christiansen, late of the
23 University of Southern Maine. Although it’s a little complicated, as they say on Facebook,

1 Google it, University of Southern Maine, you'll find out. Anyway, I really resonated a lot with a
2 lot of stuff that has been said on the panel, particularly what with what Michael Beckerman said
3 about feeling like an outsider. For many years I felt like an outsider in AMS. My first meeting
4 was as a graduate student, and I'd just finished my coursework, and I was at Phoenix in 1997.
5 And I just felt like I didn't know anybody, and I didn't know how to get to know anybody, and I
6 just kind of was like well, how do I meet people, and... I'm not very important. I felt like a zero,
7 exactly. That was the exact thing. Total zero.

8 And then, you know, I said, well I need to submit papers and things. So I was submitting
9 papers. So I submitted a paper on Romany music, and I submitted multiple papers on Czech
10 music at various times and it kept getting rejected. And I was just like, what is going on? It
11 seems to me there are a lot of panels on parody masses, but you know like let's get things a little
12 more expanded here, what's going on. But I was thinking well maybe I'm not good enough, you
13 know, that was kind of the other thing. I was thinking, God, maybe I'm just, you know, not ...
14 And I was thinking, well, I'm getting published, you know, in *Journal of Musicological*
15 *Research*, 19th-Century Music, I'm getting published but I'm not getting accepted by AMS.
16 What's going on?

17 But I don't know what's happened, but maybe in the last ten years or so, I've just been –
18 I've gotten — I've presented at Nashville on a panel, I presented at New Orleans, and now I'm
19 presenting here. In fact, I organized a panel for this meeting. And so I'm feeling more included
20 now. I don't know exactly what change happened, but I'm all for it. And — And I really do feel
21 a lot... you know I feel included now, and now I'm on a committee for career-related issues, and
22 it's good. So I have really good feelings on AMS. But I was so down about AMS for a while
23 that I even dropped my membership for a couple years, because I was just — I felt like such, like

1 I, you know, like I didn't belong. But I don't feel that way anymore, I feel good. So...

2 [Applause]

3 **WILL ROBIN [1:05:02]:** Hi, I'm Will Robin, I'm a graduate student at Chapel Hill. I
4 was wondering about the relationship between AMS over the years with living composers, in
5 terms of welcoming or not welcoming them into the community, in terms of them being a visible
6 presence at meetings, maybe thirty or forty years ago, if that was something that a part of the
7 culture, and whether that's changed, whether that's changed for the better or for the worse.

8 **PROF. TARUSKIN [1:05:31]:** You reminded me about the story about Roman
9 Jakobson, the linguist, at Harvard. You know this story, Carol? When there was an opening in
10 comparative literature, somebody proposed that they hire Vladimir Nabokov. And Jakobsen
11 said, "What, and the next time there's an opening in zoology we should hire an elephant?"

12 [Laughter]

13 That's sort of the relationship between musicology and composers for — as it used to be.
14 But there were exceptions, there were always exceptions. And the greatest exception was always
15 George Perle, because he was sort of a musicologist. He wrote some books about Berg, and he
16 wrote theory books, always with a kind of a historical orientation, and he took an interest in
17 musicology. You know, it's a two-way street. It isn't as though we are welcoming or not
18 welcoming — not all composers are interested in musicology. In fact, I think the interests of
19 musicologists in composers is on the whole greater than the interest of composers in musicology.

20 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:06:48]:** [Inaudible]

21 **PROF. TARUSKIN [1:06:50]:** Well you said we have to be depressing. [Laughter]

22 **UNKNOWN SPEAKER [1:06:54]:** We'll we're getting there!

23 **PROF. OJA [1:06:56]:** It's like a Quaker meeting.

1 **PROF. BRIAN LOCKE [1:06:57]:** I've been sitting here thinking what is one of the
2 biggest memories that shaped me from towards the beginning of coming to AMS. My second
3 AMS meeting was in 1998 in Boston when I was still a doctoral student at Stonybrook. And that
4 was the year that there was a rather sort of infamous evening panel involving one of the six of
5 you up on stage. It was the "Shostakovich Reconsidered" panel. And I was really kind of at the
6 very beginning of understanding scholars as personalities, and who would take very bold and
7 brave stances, whether well, shall I say considered, reconsidered or not. Nevertheless, it was
8 should I say a very fascinating moment watching musicology come alive. So, and I have to
9 admit, that it made such an impact on me, especially the moment, Richard, when you emerged
10 from the audience, after having been sort of dissed by the panel — I believe you had been invited
11 to be a respondent to the panel and refused but had prepared anyway — and this was just
12 fascinating.

13 **PROF. TARUSKIN [1:08:23]:** Oh I didn't prepare for the session. Life had prepared
14 me.

15 **PROF. LOCKE [1:08:26]:** Sure! Right, right, right. Well, it was clear that you brought
16 a tremendous, you know, impact to the room regardless. And I always remember sort of the
17 moment you stood up. It was like an eruption. It was like: [growl]. And I also have to admit
18 that I reenact this for my graduate students when I teach research as kind of, when... When I'm
19 teaching them to read — you know these beginning graduate students in their first semester —
20 they are starting to go from this sort of undergraduate model from looking, reading a text from
21 the index looking for the point you're trying to make in your paper to reading a whole article
22 even, and then understanding the author as a person with a real passion for what they do. And I

1 put on my acting boots and I reenact the whole thing. So it's kind of... it really had a kind of a
2 — I just, it sent a shockwave through me and I try to...

3 **PROF. TARUSKIN [1:09:31]:** The next time you do this I'll come and catch your act.
4 [Laughter]

5 **PROF. LOCKE [1:09:37]:** It's pretty memorable! And I just I — I think I'm trying to
6 convey that forward for my own students, so there you go. [Applause]

7 **PROF. VIRGINIA HANCOCK [1:09:56]:** This is not intended as a dig at the previous
8 speaker. But I do — I'm Virginia Hancock, I teach at Reed College in Portland, Oregon. And it
9 seems to me that one of the things that's always bothered me is that when you ask folks to
10 identify themselves and they don't, and the assumption is that if they don't have to, or if they
11 do... that's my comment.

12 **ESTHER CRISCUOLA DE LAIX [1:10:31]:** Hello everyone.

13 **PROF. HANCOCK [1:10:34]:** Please! Identify yourself, yes.

14 **MS. DE LAIX [1:10:36]:** That's all right! Esther Criscuola de Laix, A-R Editions. Yes
15 that is my institution, it is A-R Editions incorporated. I work at a publishing house. I've outed
16 myself now. And this is going to be sort of two-fold. It's going to be sort of a little bit of a
17 reminiscence that segues into a question for the panel. And it does have to do with kind of with
18 my place of employment. For myself, actually, getting this job out of the academy, ended up
19 making the AMS a much — in certain ways a more comfortable place. I felt, you know when I was a
20 student, I felt very much under — you know I would come to AMS and you had to behave very
21 properly and never say the wrong thing and be very, you know, careful, you know, about what
22 you say to whom, and it all felt very — it made me very nervous. And I was often very nervous
23 going to AMSes as a student. And then when I got on the other side of the table, so to speak,

1 job-wise, even though it ended up being outside of the academy, it was — wow, I feel all free
2 and easy now! I don't have to be nervous. I can just, you know, be here and enjoy myself, and
3 enjoy, you know, seeing all these wonderful people and renewing these acquaintances and it just,
4 took so much pressure off. And I think — I think well part of that is just getting a job in general,
5 but part of it is also, I want to say, from a point of outside the academy, it kind of made it, well,
6 I'm not sort of part of the politics as much, so to speak. And so I wanted to ask you, the
7 committee, since you have been part of this organization a lot longer than I have, what your
8 experiences have been, what you know about how the society has taken to people who are — its
9 members that work outside of academia, in jobs like publishing, or arts management, or anything
10 along those lines. What has the society's attitude been toward those people over the years?

11 I've had sort of a mix of experiences so far. It's been mostly fine, although there were a
12 few places I was worried, although I expect the whole history of the issue goes back further and
13 that's what I'm curious to hear about from you. Thanks.

14 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:13:14]:** If you don't mind, I will say something about that,
15 but I wanted to say that — to Ginny, that Brian... Brian! I wanted to say while you're here, that
16 the previous speaker before was Brian Locke, who is as modest...

17 **PROF. HANCOCK [1:13:17]:** I know.

18 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:13:18]:** ... as modest a person as I know.

19 **PROF. LOCKE [1:13:18]:** I'm sorry, I forgot and I was embarrassed mid-speech. So
20 Brian Locke, Western Illinois University.

21 **PROF. ATKINSON [1:13:45]:** I think I also forgot to identify myself. I'm Charles
22 Atkinson at Ohio State. [Laughter]

1 **HONEY MECONI [1:13:51]:** I'm Honey Meconi from the University of Rochester.

2 [Laughter]

3 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:13:58]:** Go ahead, someone else.

4 **PROF. GORDON [1:14:00]:** Well I think, I mean, you'd have to ask... we are all not in
5 those positions, so you'd really have to ask people who are in those positions. I mean what I can
6 say is that I think is that's the sixty-million-dollar question for every academic society because it
7 gets back to the question of not only alt-ac jobs, but contingent labor. That it just doesn't work
8 the way it did when the society started. I think everybody could expect that they would have a
9 nice tenure-track job, and the stories I was hearing when I was in graduate school were like so-
10 and-so who taught at so-and-so called their friend and so-and-so got a job. And we have just
11 come a very long way from that, and...

12 What I can say from when I was Chair on the Committee of Women and Gender and
13 when I sat also on the — what is the other committee you sit on when you do that, the one where
14 there — about professional development and things like that...

15 **PROF. BURKHOLDER [1:14:46]:** Career-related issues.

16 **PROF. GORDON [1:14:47]:** Yes, career-related issues, thank you. Certainly, from the
17 top down there's a lot of interest in those — in figuring out how to incorporate and make feel
18 welcome. And as Michael said also, that one does also spend quite a lot of money trying to
19 figure out how to give money to people who are in non-academic jobs, independent scholars,
20 graduate students. So I don't know the answer to that, and I'm sure that I wish it was better, but
21 it's not... you know, there are some efforts.

22 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:15:20]:** I guess I want to say that, you know, it's a tricky
23 issue, because to be honest, you know, we're in a society. Many people in the society are very

1 ambitious, and they want to be, and it's natural for many scholars to have a group of other
2 scholars they want to impress, and therefore they're focused on that group. And it's not that they
3 intend to ignore other people, but they're focused on this group they want to impress or to be part
4 of. And so I think just as we've said various things about: no it doesn't work... this is not self-
5 regulatory for gender, it's not self-regulatory for race, it has to be thought about in various ways,
6 that the issue of how to deal with people who are not in sort of necessarily the competitive
7 structure of the field really requires us to continually remind ourselves to be more sensitive to
8 those issues, and to identify with them and take special care to treat everybody in exactly the
9 same welcoming way that we would want to be treated ourselves. I think.

10 **PROF. GORDON [1:16:26]:** I think, also there's one more thing I just thought of.
11 There's a gendered history to the question of publishing industry in particular, and this was an
12 accidental oral history. The night before I left I had dinner with someone whose mother was a
13 musicologist who taught at CUNY in the, like, fifties, forties. And now I'm going – and she
14 basically, as her son, told the story, she was not able to get an academic job and every time she
15 would apply for a job, she would come up, and then you know a man would get it. And you
16 know, what they were telling women in those days was: you can't be a professor. And this is
17 oral history from this woman's son. So you can't be a professor but you can go be in publishing.
18 So I do think — and when you look at, you know the article Susanne talks about with that early
19 letter, where they said, you know, “we have to be careful of women because they knit...”

20 **PROF. FAUSER [1:17:13]:** Well that quilt!

21 **PROF. GORDON [1:17:13]:** And Ruth Solie knits through every paper by the way, or
22 used to. And so they... so yeah, I think there's a gendered question too. So for a long time the

1 jobs thought of as alt-ac were really going to women. So there was a history of kind of double
2 exclusion.

3 **PROF. FAUSER [1:17:33]:** I also think, and this is maybe a slightly different
4 perspective, that in a sense where the AMS is now going, and where things are heading in that
5 direction, is something that I found normal. I'm, by upbringing, by birth German, my education
6 was in Germany when I did my Ph.D. We all knew, maybe one of us, or maybe two of us would
7 end up in academe. Most of us didn't even want to be in academe. I wasn't actually wanting to
8 be a musicologist when I started a Ph.D. in musicology at all. That wasn't what I was planning
9 on doing. I was planning on being dramaturgy in the theater, or a lot of other jobs that were part
10 of coming out of academe. So I think that's also a very uniquely U.S./Canada kind of
11 environment, maybe a bit of U.K, that if you're doing a Ph.D. in musicology, you think you're
12 going to be a musicologist in this kind of system. And what's happening now is a shift because
13 the economical structure is changing, but also maybe an opening up of the field because it's
14 actually quite healthy if there are musicologists with a Ph.D. who go into things like theater and
15 opera and other such places rather than — and I'm going to sound absolutely horrible in a very
16 Germanic way — rather than amateurs. [Laughter]

17 **BENJAMIN ROBERTS [1:19:03]:** Hi, my name is Benjamin Roberts. I'm a high
18 school choir teacher in Dallas, Texas, and my question is, as somebody who has recently come to
19 a love of musicology, and dealing with high school students on a regular basis, especially in
20 today's world, we've talked a lot about how musicology has been in the past, and AMS in the
21 past, how do you see the society we as teachers and educators of music, how do you see us
22 moving forward? How do you see us inspiring this generation of students that are very
23 apathetic?

1 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:19:41]:** Look, different groups of students, different teachers,
2 different techniques. I think, you know, my sense has always been that the issues and questions
3 surrounding music and its meaning and its significance are so difficult that one should never be
4 afraid to invite even novices into the discussion. And if they think that they have a stake in
5 trying to help solve problems, instead of being talked to and lectured at, then I think there's
6 always the chance of generating enormous excitement. So if these things are collaborative, and
7 it doesn't mean that the teacher doesn't know anything, but that — you know, is willing to really
8 risk including students in how things work, then I think you get students who are invested in the
9 process. And then what you want is not for them to only be fired up when the big teacher is
10 around, but to be firing each other up when the teacher isn't around.

11 **PROF. OJA [1:20:47]:** Well in some ways I think that question gets to one of the
12 primary anxieties of musicologists, doesn't it, that is anything we are doing relevant? And it will
13 it matter to people beyond those in the room? And there's — at least in my time in the AMS
14 there's been a growing engagement with public service, and with outreach, and trying to stretch
15 beyond the tiny little classrooms that we teach in. So I hope some of your high school students
16 in some ways maybe feel that reach.

17 I want to throw in a story right now that has to do with the founding of the Committee on
18 Cultural Diversity, which happened in the early 1990s. We've been talking about inclusion and
19 exclusion in all sorts of ways. And that Committee came out of the council, and its original
20 chairs were me and Lucius Wyatt Jr., who is — he's now retired, but he was teaching at Prairie
21 View A&M in Texas. And there was a really dedicated group of people around us who were
22 really eager to see change happen and realizing that the music of the country we were living in,
23 the demographics of the country we were living were not reflected in the people who were

1 attending the meetings. So the beginning of this story is not very happy. So in 1991, it probably
2 was, we petitioned the board to have a standing committee on cultural diversity, and we were
3 turned down. And so we then a year later, might have been two, again made for a second time
4 that petition, and that time the committee was approved. And that was sort of consonant
5 chronologically with a lot of the changes many of you have been talking about. So that was one
6 of those periods I think, in the society, where many people were waking up to the sense of
7 having to expand beyond the boundaries that had been – that felt, I can say as a female, that they
8 were very carefully in place.

9 So, a big event though for that committee was in 1995, at the New York meeting, when
10 we had our first group of undergraduates, undergraduates of color mostly from historically black
11 colleges, who were given travel stipends to attend that meeting. A number of people from that
12 group have since become part of the profession. And that momentum, while not intense enough
13 – I mean it's just, there are just so many issues connected with it to face — nevertheless, it's still
14 in place. The Committee on Cultural Diversity continues to meet and that many people continue
15 to work on the issue. It's one of those issues, though, that I think we need much more action
16 with.

17 So now I jumped out of the role of moderator. Now I'll go back to it. Kay had left a
18 couple of questions to throw out, and one of them was to ask what issues have loomed large in
19 AMS history. Some of you have been touching on such questions — such issues, but you might
20 be thinking of something else. She also asked if there were any moments that proved to be, in
21 retrospect, of great importance years even, or months after that happened. And especially with
22 listening to papers that can be the case: that you often find out much... many years after it's
23 happened that someone had some impact. Yes, please.

1 **PROF. CAROL MARSH [1:24:33]:** Hi, Carol Marsh. This isn't exactly addressing
2 your question but I... My first AMS meeting was in 1960. I was two years old. [Laughter] But
3 I've been fascinated over the years by seeing the relationship between performance and
4 musicology. And I think that's something that hasn't been addressed so far. And I've seen it be
5 very — lots of interest, particularly in early music performance, and then a waning. I've been at
6 meetings where there's been almost no performance as part of papers, and it seems to be
7 something that goes up and down, and I'd love to hear the panel's reflections on this issue.

8 **PROF. OJA [1:25:15]:** Anyone have any thoughts about performance?

9 **PROF. GORDON [1:25:18]:** Well I mean, I think one thing that's interesting – certainly
10 when I was starting graduate school, which was, when was it, 1992... well, Michael Beckerman
11 made it possible for me to take my GREs in Slovakia. So otherwise I wouldn't be a
12 musicologist. But I remember I was a pretty serious viola player and I remember people just
13 saying you can't be a musicologist and a viola player, you need to move on. And that just
14 doesn't seem to be the case anymore. So I would say that that seems to be – and that may not
15 have been everywhere, but certainly the grad programs I was applying to really frowned upon
16 playing. And it does seem like that has changed hugely.

17 **PROF. BURKHOLDER [1:25:51]:** I think that was a difference from one institution to
18 another. At the University of Chicago, my graduate program, there was no way to take
19 performance study for credit. Somewhere between three quarters and ninety percent of us were
20 performing in one way or another: in the Collegium Musicum that Howard Mayer Brown ran, or
21 in the orchestra, or in one of the university choirs. So I think that isn't necessarily something
22 that has changed over time, but I think it is something that more of us may have become aware
23 of.

1 I think in most cases, you scratch a musicologist and you find a performer. I like to say
2 at Indiana University, which has lots of performers at it, that I hold down the “Amateur Chair.”
3 [Laughter] And I make sure I perform in front of my classes. Every class sees me perform.
4 After all they’re doing amateur music history and they ought to see amateur performance.
5 [Laughter].

6 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:27:03]:** I mean, the way the field sets these things out is odd.
7 I mean, I guess I should ask this question. I mean, is there a single tenured performer at an Ivy
8 League institution now? Today? I’m not sure there is.

9 **PROF. OJA [1:27:18]:** Vijay Iyer.

10 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:27:19]:** Well maybe Vijay, OK. But you know, it’s still the
11 way the institutions fall out, and what’s accorded prestige, and what’s considered important. So
12 I mean I think it’s a very tricky issue about how those things fall out. And there, you know,
13 when I – I guess, just at the end of the time, when I entered the program, there was a renewed
14 interest in performance, but there were still maybe people who felt that a musicologist absolutely
15 didn’t... it wasn’t that it was a bad thing to be a performer, but that the field of musicology was
16 so demanding in terms of its time and energy that you simply couldn’t pursue a double career.
17 Now, it’s almost the same thing. Because, you know, if you’re trying to do a sort of dual life as
18 a musicologist and critical theorist, and you’re reading your forty-seven hours a week, which you
19 have to read to keep up with everyone else who is reading fifty-two hours a week, that also
20 makes it very difficult to have — to perform at a certain level.

21 Now I agree with Peter that many of us perform, but the difference between the way we
22 perform and the way a performer considers the... is so radically different that they’re almost
23 unrelated in various ways. The kind of discipline it takes to be a certain kind of performer is

1 very different from the kind of, what it takes for me to get up in front of the classroom and you
2 know, bash something out. And I think it's always been a challenge for anybody in our field to
3 keep up, and you know very few of us have managed to keep up a real double strength, ongoing
4 double strength as performers and scholars.

5 **PROF. FAUSER [1:29:00]:** Before I hand this over to Richard, who I think — do you
6 want the mic? I would like to be the kind of other voice here. My most hated question, when I
7 say “I’m a musicologist” or “I’m a music historian” but definitely when I say “I’m a
8 musicologist,” and it is someone who is not a member of the AMS, the first question I will get is
9 “What instrument do you play?” I loathe that question.

10 **PROF. TARUSKIN [1:29:36]:** Yeah, well, I get it too. We all do. Actually, for a while
11 I was maintaining a dual career.

12 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:29:43]:** I know that!

13 **PROF. TARUSKIN [1:29:44]:** It lasted until I went to Berkeley, when I had to pull up
14 my stakes as a performer and no longer had established network of people to play with. Plus, I
15 started having a family, and all – you know mine. But I didn’t find it to be as difficult as you
16 seem to be implying, but I did think that the two sides of my life were unconnected, and that was
17 in a certain sense regrettable.

18 But one of the reasons for that was that musicology had, I think, some silly ideas about
19 performance in those days. Which is one of the reasons why when I identify with my performing
20 friends I really had a different mind then when I was talking to my musicology friends, and I did
21 not seek to join them in my own work. Because my work — my ideas as a performer were too at
22 variance with the conventional wisdom in musicology, which was extremely normative where
23 performance was concerned. The idea was what that musicologists were going tell performers

1 how to perform on the basis of historical musicology. Of course, musicology is a lot less
2 arrogant now in every way then it was thirty years ago. But it was because I was an active
3 performer, I think, that I started to have all the heretical ideas that I had about questions of
4 performance practice, and so-called historical performance, and authenticity, even though I was a
5 historical performer. Just because I did associate with professional performers and I understood
6 their way of thinking about things, and I couldn't help but feel that professional performers felt
7 more the way – my friends, the professional performers – felt, in all those historical periods,
8 where we felt we were entitled to lay down the law. So I did see a disjunction between those two
9 worlds, even while I was maintaining a toehold in both.

10 **PROF. BURKHOLDER [1:31:49]:** I'd like to add another corner to this. I think there's
11 been a lot of interesting work done lately on performance as a historical — performance and
12 performers as a historical question. I think of Gretchen Peters' work on minstrels in France. I
13 think of work done in — Pamela Starr's work on Johannes Cordier as the great star performer of
14 the fifteenth century, who was not a composer. I think of the increasing work on virtuosos in the
15 nineteenth century, on singers. So there's a lot of ways that musicologists are now paying
16 attention to performers and performance, whereas thirty, fifty years ago, the focus was almost
17 exclusively on composers.

18 **PROF. TARUSKIN [1:32:43]:** On texts, anyway. I think that's a lot of what I had in
19 mind when I said musicology has become less arrogant towards performance. And you know,
20 we've been under... well, we have been tending in that direction for a long time. To look at
21 music as an act, to look at music in the act of performance, not to be as textually oriented as we
22 used to be. And that's all been very very salutary for the field. But I'm not sure that that means
23 that there are stronger bridges between musicology and performance than there used to be.

1 There always was a certain contingent of musicologists who were very good performers, and
2 who kept the two things I think just as separate as I did.

3 **PROF. ANTONIA BANDUCCI [1:33:33]:** Hi, Antonia Banducci from the University
4 of Denver. I just want to say that when I go to hear papers, musicology papers and there's no
5 music, it's all talking, that for me there's something missing. And so in two ways, I think,
6 without — I couldn't do my work without performers. I work on Jean-Baptiste Lully, *les*
7 *tragédies en musique*, and I couldn't look at those scores and hear everything that's going on.
8 Without those performers I couldn't do my work. And so when I give a paper on that topic, then
9 I absolutely include the DVDs and the names of the performers. And I think that for me to hear
10 – in fact I heard a paper today that uses musical examples without any credit for the performers,
11 that really bothers me. And for me that's the connection, you know. Without performance,
12 without performers, without the music — I keep telling my students, “it's all about the music,
13 it's not about the textbook, it's about the music.” And so for me it's imperative that we are
14 together in this endeavor. [Applause]

15 **PROF. FAUSER [1:34:55]:** I think one of the things that might be quite interesting to do
16 is to go back in historical terms in thinking about that. Because so many of our forefathers – not
17 foremothers, unfortunately – have kind of roots in other things and other connections. And if
18 Will is still there, I don't know if you are there, about composers, that would be very interesting
19 to think through. And the person I'm thinking about, just to start off with, is Edward J. Dent,
20 who was a trained composer and continued to compose throughout, who was the President, the
21 Founding President of the International Society of Contemporary Music, who was also the
22 second president of the International Musicological Society.

1 So I think what's happened is that we as a field have changed because there's also a
2 question of specialization, a question of institutionalization, where something like the AMS also
3 plays a role. So yes, I mean, it's great to think about this as a personal union, but I'm getting
4 back to what Michael has said. There are only twenty-four hours in the day. We might want to
5 have some sleep. We may even want to have a family, or other private obligations. We may
6 even want to eat. And we may want to do all kinds of things. So there's only so much time that
7 we can dedicate to what we are doing. And I think the field has become so big, so demanding,
8 so complex, that there are also certain things that we as professionalized musicologists now do
9 that maybe, as much as I adore him, and I actually admire him, Edward J. Dent did not have to
10 do.

11 **PROF. OJA [1:36:41]:** Are there are any final words from anybody in the audience?

12 Yes!

13 **SHANTI NACHTERGAELE [1:36:45]:** Hi, I'm Shanti Nachtergaele. I'm a first year
14 master's student at Penn State. I just finished a masters in early music, which was very
15 performance-based, and they wanted us to write a thesis on performing and it had to be practical.
16 And my topic at first was not OK because it was "too musicological." And now I'm doing music
17 theory and history and they want it to be "more musicological." And I'm wondering, is it worth
18 trying to bring my views as a performer to my conclusions as a musicologist, or I do I have to
19 separate them to be... yeah, to have a future in this field at all?

20 **PROF. BURKHOLDER [1:37:31]:** Well, just a week or two ago I heard from Angela
21 Mariani, who's a product of Indiana D.M. in Historical Performance, now at Texas Tech, that her
22 work on invention and improvisation in the Middle Ages has been accepted by Oxford
23 University Press. I think that's correct. And she did this – she's a performer, primarily, but she

1 has some musicological background. She's married to a musicologist who is also a performer
2 himself, Christopher Smith, and the work that she's doing is enormously illuminating, building
3 on the work of musicologists like Anna Maria Busse Berger and others who have been talking
4 about memory, and building on work on various medieval treatises about how to perform, how to
5 improvise, how to invent on the spot. She gives her performers exercises in invention and
6 improvisation, works it out as a kind of class in how to be a medieval musician from the
7 perspective of an education that is broader like it would have been being a musician at the time.

8 She's not alone. There are lots of other kinds of enterprises like that that build both on
9 musicology and on insights gained as performers. And I think that that's wonderful. Each of us
10 comes from a different perspective. I started off as a composer. Most of my work has to do with
11 composers. I get into how did so-and-so think, what problems did this composer face, what were
12 they trying to solve, how can I think my way through that same problem and retrace it. Others
13 come from other perspectives and pursue other interests. And I think that's part of what I like
14 and treasure about the diversity of this society. If you believe in what you're doing, do it.

15 Like Yogi Berra said, when you come to a fork in the road, take it. [Laughter]

16 **PROF. OJA [1:39:46]:** Do you want to say something?

17 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:39:47]:** The thing that — well one thing that's — you know,
18 since people who are more or less successful and have taken risks talk about the risks that
19 they've taken to be successful, it sounds like all risks pay off. But many of them don't. So that's
20 always something to consider. But you know I think it's important. You know everyone has
21 spoken in their way about coming up against sort of really difficult things, whether it was issues
22 of gender in the society, or gay and lesbians being welcome, or even Richard's story about the
23 committee. So on the one hand these are things that can be discouraging, and they can also be

1 difficult, but you also I think could gather from everybody's statement that in a way they all had
2 pride in having pushed up against something that had to happen. And so I think as you decide
3 what you want to do, you know, you have many choices about whether to pursue an easier or a
4 harder course and how to push up against it. I think you — I think at the end of the day you want
5 to believe that you did something that was right for you, and maybe if people didn't like it at
6 first, they'll come around. And I think that's the question that many people in this room have
7 asked at one time or another about what kind of work to do. And I guess all of us probably
8 believe that it's better to take some kind of risk and push ahead with things then to sort of accept
9 a less interesting but safer status quo. Or maybe it's me.

10 **PROF. FAUSER [1:41:25]:** No, you go ahead.

11 **PROF. GORDON [1:41:26]:** Well I was just going to say that what your question made
12 me think of actually, Elisabeth Le Guin's book, *Boccherini's Body*. But there's also, you know,
13 the question of risk taking, what you have to do to get through graduate school and what you get
14 to do once you're done are not always the same thing. And everyone has to work that out in
15 their own way.

16 **PROF. BECKERMAN [1:41:44]:** Right, right. Absolutely.

17 **PROF. FAUSER [1:41:46]:** I think that's a very wonderful thing, but I also want to
18 reminisce about a personal thing and taking risks and sometimes actually paying the price. That
19 takes me back to being a young scholar, and among my various fields, as some of you may
20 know, are women musicians. And also musicians from France, who when I started out —
21 French music was not a mainstream field. It is now. I would say, hopefully, women musicians
22 are moving into a mainstream field as well. Worse, I was working on French women composers.
23 And I very vividly remember a mentor, someone who meant extremely well — so this wasn't

1 trying to put me down, it was trying to help me, because he thought I was a promising young
2 scholar. He said to me “Frau Fauser, you are such a gifted scholar. Why do you waste your
3 talent on these minor figures?”

4 I’ve never forgotten... it sounds even worse in German. I’ve never... [Laughter] It was a
5 pretty good way of, to pick up another, to pick up one of my French women, saying “quand
6 même.” Now I will do it all the more. So yes it’s always risky, and yes you have to pay the
7 price, because you know I wasn’t working on Beethoven and I wasn’t working on Wagner. He
8 continued actually in saying that I should be working on either Beethoven or on Wagner because
9 those are the composers worth working on. So, yeah, you can kind of situate that. But that is a
10 kind of situation where you have to make a choice. And it may be a choice that doesn’t pay off.
11 And you know, I mean, there were some jobs I didn’t get.

12 I can’t... nobody can answer... I think that is the answer you gave. I think there are
13 things you have to do and if you don’t do them you have to be prepared to pay the price.
14 Sometimes you make it lucky and you may end up with a job, or sometimes you may not. And
15 as a society – and this is where we are getting to the top-down thing we are talking about, with
16 the various committees. What we are trying to do is open things up. Creating this kind of space.
17 It’s one of the things I was trying to do with the colloquies in JAMS when I was editing the
18 journal, as a sense of, you know, there are possibilities. And I think that is what you were trying
19 — telling about, you know, the Committee for the Status of Women, the Committee for Cultural
20 Diversity, and the Committee... LGBTQ Committee. Sorry, Study Group. Which are really
21 important spaces to feel safe as a scholar, because we all also need to feel safe in who we are.
22 Hence the story about the quilts.

1 **PROF. OJA [1:44:50]:** Are there any final thoughts? Well I think we'll wind up. And
2 there have been so many issues and memories shared here, and to me, I think a fundamental
3 point that we've been talking about, as an organization that has changed in relation to the world
4 around it. And that's very important for any group of people.

5 Anyway I want to thank our panelists and I want to thank all of you who have shared
6 your memories. [Applause]

Transcription: Daniel Walden (6/19/2016)