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Music plays a powerful role in both the construction and deconstruction of group identity and cultural territory. However, musicologists have tended to focus on the constructive aspects of this musical dialectic, often ignoring the ramifications of music’s darker potential. There are significant exceptions to this oversight: Martin Cloonan and Bruce Johnson offer an initial investigation into various issues surrounding the use of popular music as weapon (Cloonan and Johnson 2002); confronting a period teeming with issues of musical exploitation, both Shirli Gilbert and John Eckhard analyze the employment of music in concentration camps, which served to reinforce difference as well as to torment and ridicule prisoners (Eckhard 2001; Gilbert 2005); more recently, Suzanne Cusick, in her 2006 American Musicological Society presentation and article “Music as Torture / Music as Weapon,” made us aware of the CIA’s development of “no-touch” torture or torture through music, most often music generally coded masculine in United States’ culture, such as rap or the music of AC/DC. Though this is only a small sampling, work in this vein is still needed and, in some cases, long overdue based on a recent Google search for “music as weapon” that yielded over 7 million results.

With this in mind, I examine in this article a recent trend in destructive uses of music: the use of classical music in the government and business sector to repel and control teens—their activities and accompanying noise—in Australia, Britain, Canada, and the United States. In these countries, various authorities employ classical music as a crime deterrent in order to reduce hooliganism and ward off undesirables, including, in some cases, the homeless. This represents a new chapter in the mass culture wars—one in which the elite exploit classical music to banish sound they deem unacceptable, including in some cases popular music. Since teens seem to be the primary target of the technique, I focus in the following on the measure’s specific effect on young people. This use of music, transmitted in public spaces for all to hear, represents just one aspect of a musical soundscape.
that now accompanies our every move. Programmed music in other settings, such as restaurants, amusement parks, even on video games, are part of the world’s sound track and worthy of further study. However, by concentrating on the transmission of classical music to discourage teen activity, I am able to approach several questions that shed light on the times in which we live, the place of music within them, as well as current negative uses of music: Why and how is classical music able to repel teens? Does the technique harness classical music as symbolic capital, a marker of space, or as a moralizing force in the spirit of Plato, Sulzer, and the “Mendelssohnian Project”? What does the success of this measure say about the future of classical music? What does it say about the role of music in today’s society? To confront these questions, I examine newspaper articles and interviews in light of Bourdieu’s idea of symbolic power and Jacques Attali’s conception of music as repetition. In doing so, I begin to show how music—not just the violent, “masculine” music cited by Cusick, but also classical music —has become a weapon of aggression, replacing direct conflict and silencing the conversations and negotiations that ultimately lead to long-term resolutions.

The Manilow Method

In an effort to appease local residents, government officials in Rockdale, a suburb of Sydney, Australia, began a six-month trial program in July 2006 to deter local youths from late night loitering and general noise making, which included roaring car engines and loud, popular music. The program consisted of piping Barry Manilow’s greatest hits through loud speakers located by a local car park every night between 9 p.m. and midnight on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday (Lagan 2006). In this way, the authorities effectively initiated a sonic brawl by fighting noise produced by teens with noise controlled by the state. At the time, Deputy Mayor Bill Saravinovski explained that, in addition to the music of Manilow, they would use classical music: in other words, music of “all types” “that doesn’t appeal to these people” (“Manilow to Drive out ‘Hooligans’” 2004). This use of “daggy,” Australian slang for uncool, music to fight hooliganism, has been dubbed “The Manilow Method,” according to Word Spy (Tijs 2006), perhaps an appropriate designation since as of March 26, 2007, Barry Manilow was #1 on a list of the “Top 10 artists for the Terminally Uncool.” Manilow himself has responded to this technique of coercion through music in an article entitled, “Manilow unhappy with music-as-weapon-ploy”: “Frankly, I think if you played anyone’s music for that long you’d drive any rationally minded human out of their mind.” Manilow continued:
But have they thought that these hoodlums might like my music? What if some of them began to sing along to “Can’t Smile Without You.” Or lit candles when “I Write the Songs” was played? Or, heaven forbid, danced around to the infectious beat of “Copacabana”? What if this actually attracts more hoodlums? What if it puts smiles on their faces? (qtd. in “Manilow unhappy with music-as-weapon-ploy” 2006)

The measure, however, was successful and Manilow’s suggestion that the teens might be attracted to his music was met with a note of sarcasm in the article’s terse rejoinder: “the youths have now left the area.” Though Rockdale’s decision to use music in this way has generated numerous articles and jokes at Manilow’s expense, it is not a new idea and in fact calls attention to a distinct and widespread use of music, in most cases classical music, within crime prevention.

In fact, after reading about the situation in Sydney, I immediately recalled a similar measure in effect in my hometown of Santa Rosa, just north of San Francisco in the wine country of California. In a telephone conversation, Santa Rosa City Councilman Clint McKay explained that the Santa Rosa city council made the informal decision in 1996 to pipe in classical music, indiscriminately supplied by a classical satellite radio station, to clear off youths from the Old Courthouse Square. A teen interviewed at the time, complained, “I hate the music” (Smith 1996: 1), and this sentiment was shared by many of his peers, who left the vicinity and thus encouraged the city council to keep the measure in place. But how did this all begin? Where and how did this technique originate? Lately, classical music has been used as a crime deterrent all over the English speaking world: in Canadian parks, Australian railway stations, London Underground stops, and different cities all over the United States. With such widespread usage around the world, it is difficult to ascertain the technique’s point of origin. Its genesis is further complicated by its close connection to earlier uses of programmed music, such as Muzak, created in the 1930s as Wired Radio by General George Owen Squier (Lanza 2004: 23).

Muzak, a name change inspired by Kodak, was soothing background music, sold to hotels, restaurants, and other businesses. Today, the division between background and foreground music in Muzak and other programmed or ambient music is unclear. In the marketplace, music by diverse artists such as Elvis or Madonna drifts in and out of the foreground, in and out of our conscious awareness—all the while keeping us plugged into a
matrix of sound. Whether foreground or background, this music has become “ubiquitous music,” to borrow Anahid Kassabian’s terminology, as an ever-present hum that does not demand prolonged attention or disrupt the normal flow of daily life. We listen while simultaneously engaging in other activities (Kassabian 2001). But these activities are not completely unaffected.

Jonathan Sterne has observed the use of this ubiquitous music to enhance consumerism in malls and other retail centers (Sterne 1997). In this context, store-owners program music to encourage customers to spend lavishly, but consciously or unconsciously, through their choice of music, they are discouraging unwanted elements, such as teens. In our example, the by-product of discouraging certain individuals, which is not acknowledged on the muzak.com webpage, becomes the conscious primary purpose of music’s employment—a subtle turn that is not easy to localize. A New York Times article chronicling the new trends of 1990 credited a 7-Eleven store in Tillicum, Washington with this turn, when they cited the store’s “discovery” that classical music “drives away loitering teenagers” (Benzel and Stanley 1990: 1). An article of January 5, 2005 also ascribed the emergence of this measure to 7-Eleven stores—those in Canada, however (Sherman 2005). When I contacted 7-Eleven Corporate Communications representative Margaret Chabris, she confirmed that 7-Eleven was the first to purposely flip programmed music’s primary function from lure to repellent. Chabris released the following statement:

A number of 7-Eleven stores in British Columbia, Canada, were experiencing a loitering problem in 1985. It was not a problem confined to 7-Eleven, but more of a concern throughout the community. Our 7-Eleven management team there met with store personnel and psychologists to explore ways to deal with the issue of loitering.

Several good ideas came out of these brainstorming session[s] that, when combined, produced a successful program to reduce the incidence of teen loitering. One of the ideas was to play “easy listening” or classical music in the parking lot. The thinking was that this kind of music is not popular with teens and may discourage them from “hanging out” at the store (Chabris 2007).

At first, only about ten 7-Eleven stores in British Columbia employed this technique, but with success, at one time, as many as 150 stores in the United States and Canada adopted it. Companies and communities
worldwide, who have employed music in this way subsequently, have achieved similar success. Figures from January 2005 showed that with the installment of transmitted classical music robberies in British subways were down by 33 percent, assaults on staff by 25 percent, and vandalism of trains and stations by 37 percent (Timberg 2005). These successes have fueled the perpetuation of this classical music program. In March 2006, residents in Hartford, Connecticut hoped to install a system of transmitted classical music in their parks, citing as inspiration to decrease the crime by 40 percent in parks in West Palm Beach where classical music is played over loudspeakers (“Group Thinks Classical Music Will Deter Hartford Crime” 2006).

As in Santa Rosa, the classical music selected is rarely carefully considered; though, according to Los Angeles Times staff writer Scott Timberg, the music is generally pre-Romantic, by Baroque or Classical-era composers with “a few assertive, late-Romantic exceptions like Moussorgsky and Rachmaninoff” (Timberg 2005).

These musical selections are quite different, on the whole, from those selected by the CIA for torture. As Cusick notes, online bloggers fantasized about torture through music linked with homosexuality or the feminine, such as Gemini’s “Feelings” and, interesting enough, the music of Barry Manilow, who is called by bloggers responding to the Sydney case, “Barely Man-e-nough!” and “Fairy Manilow” (“Sydney, Australia, using Barry Manilow”). However, the US government for the most part favors aggressive “manly” music for torture. This preference serves the ultimate goals of torture as defined by Elaine Scarry. The prisoner’s body and pain became “overwhelmingly present” as the imposition of loud, overpowering sound erases the prisoner’s voice and thus self. The violent sound acts for an unembodied torturer and makes his or her voice and self “overwhelmingly present” (Scarry 1985: 46, 49). Business and government leaders, who authorize the transmission of classical music, which Jonathan Sterne categorizes under the label “nonagressive music deterrent” (Sterne 2004–2006), do not aspire to obliterate the personhood of teens: they have a different intent and their selection of classical music reflects that. But what is this goal? And how does classical music achieve the desired results?

**Elevation or Relocation**

Some in the mainstream press cite the perceived civilizing force of classical music as key to its power to scatter hoodlums. Unlike heavy metal or rap, most popular music for that matter, classical music is seen
as somehow exalted with the ability to change individuals for the better. A Boston variety store owner who witnessed the use of light classical music to fight teen loitering near the Forest Hills subway stop maintains, “Music soothes the savage beast” (qtd. in Timberg 2005). In an interview in the Los Angeles Times, Robert Fink similarly explains the choice of classical music as follows: “They’re choosing it because the music is still in some ways exalted. It’s now ‘magical’: We’ll spray it around like some kind of incense” (qtd. in Timberg 2005). Perhaps through this process, as transit Police Chief Fleming states in his comments about classical music piped into Boston’s subways, the city “can lift the human spirit, even the spirit of a cynical teenager” (Hansen 2002). This idea that classical music has civilizing or ethical properties, though extremely problematic, is a long-held belief that, Edward Lippman notes, “seems to extend indefinitely into the past” (Lippman 1992: 10).

Plato described his idea of the ethical effects of music in his discussion of music education in the third book of Republic when he maintained that music education helps man become “noble and good” (see Lippman 1992: 11). Centuries later, Johann Georg Sulzer (1720–1779), a Swiss aesthetician and lexicographer, reshaped this view of music. He, like many at the time, thought that all people had in them a bit of the savage (Wilde), “an original human being who has yet to experience the effects of the fine arts” (qtd. in Riley 2002: 7). He claimed that the fine arts cultivate the ethical side of human nature, keeping that savage at bay. He wrote, “It is the happy influence of the arts that tames humanity’s natural savagery” (qtd. in Riley 2002: 14). Of the fine arts, he believed music had a special power to this end: “The first and most forceful of them [the fine arts] is that which makes its way to the soul through the ear: music” (qtd. in Riley 2002: 20). Within Romantic aesthetics, as conceived by Hegel, music was more consistently assigned an unrivaled power over the soul (Lippman 1992: 235), and this thinking was not lost on Romantic composers, such as Felix Mendelssohn, who wanted more than success; he wanted to further humanity, communicating ethical meaning through music (see Botstein 1991: 33). This goal, a part of what Leon Botstein terms the “Mendelssohnian Project,” resulted in several compositions, including the Lobgesang Symphony and the oratorios Paulus and Elijah. In these works, Mendelssohn sought to promote a sense of community, foster ethical sensibilities and faith in God, and educate society about tradition. Mendelssohn, in his use of music to promote morality, may have also been influenced by his grandfather, Moses Mendelssohn, and the aesthetics and theology of Friedrich Schleiermacher, who believed
music should heighten emotion in the service of religious faith (see Botstein 1991: 33).

Though the idea of music as a moralizing force has enduring currency, it cannot and does not account for the effectiveness of classical music in repelling teens. Music has no innate ability or special capacity to elevate. What is more, the popular press makes it clear that teens do not change their ways or become more ethical through the magical power of classical music; rather they take their activities elsewhere. Classical music is therefore successful not in elevating or rehabilitating hooligans, but in chasing them away. Commenting on classical music in London’s subways, Adrian North notes, “These juvenile delinquents are saying, ‘Well, we can either stand here and listen to what we regard as this absolute rubbish, or our alternative—we can, you know, take our delinquency elsewhere’” (Simon 2005). In this way, business and government leaders are seizing on classical music not as a positive moralizing force, but as a marker of space.

Just as birds designate territory through song, authorities territorialize space through classical music by marking certain area as off limits and thus creating an aural fence or “sound wall,” to borrow R. Murray Schafer’s terminology in The Tuning of the World (1997: 95). Of course government and business leaders are a bit more discerning than birds in their employment of music—endeavoring to use sound to include the wanted and exclude the unwanted. In other words, officials have found a way to use noise to unnaturally select, more like an ultrasonic pest repellent, which drives away offending rodents with sounds that do not harm unoffending house pets (see example 1). This unnatural selection through music also calls to mind a
device that, like our example, quite literally weeds out human “pests,” i.e., teenagers. Called the Mosquito, a Welsh security company developed an “ear-splitting 17-kilohertz buzzer” to disperse teenagers from loitering in front of their stores. Most adults lose the ability to hear such high frequency sound and are thus immune to the device. More recently, teenagers have appropriated the idea and developed a high frequency cell phone ring tone to circumvent rules forbidding cell phone use at schools (Vitello 2006). Though there is not yet an organized appropriation among teens of “The Manilow Method,” use of classical music to deter youth loitering and the Welsh Mosquito share certain similarities beyond their use of sound to repel teens: they both extend “the premises of CPTED into the acoustic realm,” as Jonathan Sterne astutely recognizes in the case of programmed music (2004–2006).

CPTED, or Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, is a concept coined by C. Ray Jeffrey, based upon the assumption that “the proper design and effective use of the built environment can lead to a reduction in the fear of crime and the incidence of crime, and to an improvement in the quality of life” (Crowe 1991: 1). The awareness within design communities that environment shapes behavior is not new. For example, Greek temples in the Sicilian colony were built to keep light out and thus produce fear (Crowe 1991: 28). But environmental approaches to crime have recently garnered interest thanks to Oscar Newman’s Defensible Space of 1972, which prompted a reexamination of CPTED (Crowe 1991: 3). The CPTED program, however, does not offer methods for solving broad issues of human behavior that underlie crime, but rather solutions limited to “variables that can be manipulated and evaluated in the specified man/environment relationship” (Crowe 1991: 29). As Jeffrey prefices his influential work, quoting R. Buckminster Fuller’s Utopia or Oblivion, “Reform the environment—not man…” (qtd. in Jeffrey 1971). Thus, as with our example, this program does not target the roots of crime in the psyche of man, but rather specific areas, locations, rerouting crime through three overlapping strategies: (1) natural access control; (2) natural surveillance; and (3) territorial reinforcement. The use of classical music to deter crime most closely falls under the third category, described by Crowe as follows: “The concept of territoriality…suggests that physical design can create or extend a sphere of influence so that users develop a sense of proprietorship—a sense of territorial influence—and potential offenders perceive that territorial influence” (Crowe 1991: 31). Though I have not found a manual on CPTED that includes music in its discussions, Crowe identifies features of the environment that may be used to affect
behavior, including heat, light, temperature, pressure, and sound (Crowe 1991: 79).

Peer Pressure, Familiarity, and the Coolness Factor

It is my assertion that sound is able to reinforce territory as a symbolic language by signaling to those who belong and rejecting those who do not, thanks to an encoded system of associations. In our example, classical music, within a socially agreed-upon hierarchy of cultural practices, is connected to the “uncool”—as journalist Melissa Jackson explains, “It’s pretty uncool to be seen hanging around somewhere when Mozart is playing” (Jackson 2005). Put another way, it is not that classical music itself is unpleasant; it is the accompanying baggage as Rob Kapilow, composer and conductor, recognizes: “They listen to this sound, and what comes with it is this whole association of its packaging, which is unpleasant: ‘We don’t want to be part of that elitist, white-tails, concert-going kind of world’” (qtd. in Timberg 2005: 3). The authorities are, likewise, choosing to employ classical music not because of the actual sound of the music, but because of its symbolic capital: “Of all the packages that come to mind quickly, which one is furthest from our images of those thugs? . . . ‘Be quiet, be well-dressed, be polite.’ They’re choosing the whole world of classical music and not the music itself” (qtd. in Timberg 2005: 3). These associations are effective among teens, at least to some extent, due to peer pressure. Though some young people might enjoy or be indifferent to classical music, concerns about losing status through proximity to such associations ensure the success of classical music as a teen deterrent. During the teenage years, peers take on heightened importance and fear of ridicule or loss of status are powerful mechanisms for inducing conformity (Warr 2002: 46–55). Thus a teenager with some sympathies for classical music might leave an area with piped in classical music to avoid even the risk of peer rejection.

The associations with classical music—white, old, elitism, rich—also point to the role of class in the selection of classical music and its consequences, a role explicitly stated by the Business Owners Association of University Avenue. This group implemented the measure on University Avenue in Seattle to create “an upscale environment . . . that the youths would hate” (Hernandez 2002). The connection between class and musical taste has been demonstrated by Pierre Bourdieu, who writes “nothing more clearly affirms one’s class, nothing more infallibly classifies, than tastes in music” (Bourdieu 1984, 18). This has to do, in part, with the access to learned culture class grants. Studies on the psychology of music have recognized a
connection between a pleasure response to music and familiarity or repeated hearings of a musical piece (see Mursell 1964: 216–217; Levinson 1997: 60–61; Hargreaves 1986: 111). Jerrold Levinson explains, “Yet it is plain that conscious realization of thematic or structural relationships... do commonly provide a certain distinct pleasure” (Levinson 1997: 60). Unless teens have become familiar with classical music through music lessons or trips to the symphony, they most likely will be unable to understand and thus enjoy a classical composition. They will then typically express their taste for popular music, especially rock, which in the 1960s assumed significance as a symbolic language for expressing social distance (Trondman 2004: 374).

This connection between class and familiarity may explain a statement by Drew Cady, general manager of the San Diego Symphony, who insists the music “that seems to do the best job of driving people away... is Baroque...” (Sherman 2005). For a teen unfamiliar with classical music, music from the Baroque period may sound the most foreign. To overgeneralize, if I may, in the Classical period, bringing pleasure was important to composers. Repetition and prominent, memorable melodies were significant compositional components to that end—components that allowed audiences to quickly become familiar with a piece. In the Baroque period, a different aesthetic prevailed and the resulting polyphonic counterpoint and artifice of much music of the Baroque, especially Bach’s instrumental music, hardly lent the music to ready accessibility. Students in my music appreciation classes can quickly recall the first theme from the first movement of Mozart’s Symphony No. 40 in G minor, K. 550, but are hard-pressed to hum any portion of a Bach fugue. The accessibility of many Baroque compositions, or lack thereof, may explain Cady’s statement. At the very least, Cady’s statement points to the role of familiarity in this program of public sanitization through music.

This role is connected to that of a class, which is further connected to associations that violate teenagers’ sense of self—all of which contribute to classical music’s special disfavor among most teens. Authorities have consciously or unconsciously recognized the symbolic power embedded in these values and attributes of classical music by harnessing classical music as a marker of space and sonic boundary. This use of music could only be possible in our contemporary times and is an instructive example of Jacques Attali’s formulation of power’s use of music as repetition.

Attali recognizes music’s connection to power, explaining “Any music, any organization of sounds is... a tool for the creation or consolidation
of a community, of a totality. It is what links a power center to its subjects, and thus, more generally, it is an attribute of power in all its forms” (Attali 1985: 6). In *Noise*, he outlines three strategic uses of music by power: music to forget, music to believe, and, more recently, music to silence. In the third zone, music is a tool of bureaucratic power “silencing those who oppose it” through repetition (Attali 1985: 19–20). The first innovation that made possible this use of music as repetition was improvements in music technology, specifically recording. Those with power control and possess recording technology and can impose their own noise to silence others (Attali 1985: 87). Though such potential is mainly sidelined in favor of producing youth-oriented recordings of popular music, crime prevention through classical music is a concrete example of Attali’s envisioned use of music by power and thus, in a certain sense, the elite’s reappropriation of sound technology. Attali looks forward to an age of “composition” that very well may be upon us. However, this case study points to our presence in the age of repetition—an age that, in my more flexible reading of Attali’s category of repetition, will overlap with new trends, disappear, and reemerge in new guises, new places, and new times. In our current incarnation of the age of repetition, business and government leaders are making use of music broadcasting and recording technology to control space, replacing negotiation with youths or plans for rehabilitation with noise—a noise that ultimately silences.

**Moral Considerations**

Some find this use of classical music troubling. Robert Kahle, former co-director of the Urban Safety Program at Wayne University in Indiana, sees this trend as antidemocratic: “...decisions are made about how to keep the 35- to 50-year-old affluent types, while routing out kids” (Egan 1997). Jonathan Sterne also acknowledges “this class-polarization of public space” and insists “we need better more egalitarian forms of urban media design” (2004–2006). This measure, as well as other forms of primary crime prevention, which focus on the offence rather than the offender, is part of a larger trend in criminology toward exclusion and segregation. Criminologists Clive Coleman and Clive Norris explain the financial appeal of primary prevention measures; the state can pass the costs of crime prevention on to businesses and private citizens. However, they clearly connect support of such measures to a “fortress mentality” with a propensity toward discrimination (2000: 146–175). Primary crime prevention also seems to offer no long-term solutions to crime and hooliganism—merely
causing spatial displacement that some argue just moves crime around the corner.\textsuperscript{8}

A second objection, however, which I cannot condone, is the belief that this measure somehow harms classical music. British music columnist Norman Lebrecht rails against programmed music to repel teens, writing “Music is a vast psychological mystery, and playing it to police railways is culturally reckless, profoundly demeaning to one of the greater glories of civilization” (qtd. in Timberg 2005: 2). In a similar vein, one Santa Rosa citizen bemoans the effect of this measure on the classical music listener, calling piped in classical music “an insult to listeners of classical music” (Wilson 1999: 6). These reactionaries forget that music has always performed different functions in different contexts; neither the music nor the listener, by proximity, is beyond reproach. Like a sword in a museum, its past as a weapon in battle effaced for a future as an object of history or even art,\textsuperscript{9} music can be both a weapon and a tool, depending on the context. Throughout history, music has also defined who we are and who we are not—excluding and including in troubling ways, especially during the Nazi period. What makes this example different is how selectively the negativity of this dialectic in music is being harnessed by the authorities. Of course, this darker potential is always in music, disguised or overshadowed by the positive, affirming flipside. Nonetheless, it is a part of music and will always be a part of music. The real concern here should be the effects of this measure on people, on dialogue and social policy. To illustrate, I would like to quote the Society of Ethnomusicology’s (SEM) recent condemnation of music as torture: “The SEM is committed to the ethical uses of music to further human understanding and to uphold the highest standards of human rights. The Society is equally committed to drawing critical attention to the abuse of such standards through the unethical uses of music to harm individuals and the societies in which they live” (“Ethnomusicologists Against Music as Torture” 2006). In this statement, which has generated ridicule but also support with its approval in April 2007 by the US Branch of the International Association for the Study of Popular Music, music is not cast as the innocent victim. Rather the SEM condemns how music is being used and rightly focuses on its potential effect on people. For those that oppose crime prevention through classical music, the consequences of music’s use should similarly serve as the basis of their disapproval. Music serves too many positive and negative functions to be exclusively conceived of as an exalted, autonomous art for art’s sake.\textsuperscript{10}
To summarize, in our example, we see a new negative use of music’s darker potential—one that differs from the use of aggressive music as torture. Rather, here, music is used as a marker of space, signaling inclusion to some and exclusion to others. For teens on the whole unfamiliar with music associated with a different class, the choice is clear; take their activities elsewhere. No one has to speak or to understand the position of the other. Music replaces war and silences. But does this measure raise some of the same ethical concerns as the use of music for torture? Does this use of classical music harm society, creating hierarchies reinforced by sound? More importantly, do we have the power or right to fight music’s new place in this age of repetition?

Notes
I first presented on this topic at the American Musicological Society-Southwest Meeting on March 31, 2007. I would like to thank the audience at this event, who provided me with invaluable suggestions and insight. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers of the Journal of Popular Music Studies for their helpful criticism and recommendations.

1. Search for “music as weapon” yielded 7,150,000 results on January 29, 2007.

2. In Feminine Endings, Susan McClary explains of femininity and masculinity in music: “These codes change over time—the ‘meaning’ of femininity was not the same in the eighteenth century as in the late nineteenth, and musical characterizations differ accordingly.” Today, the genre of classical music, in contrast to heavy metal and rap, may be seen as gentle or refined—characteristics that are linked with femininity (see McClary 1991: 7–9).

3. The muzak.com webpage explains Muzak as “audio architecture” that translates the store owner’s “brand into a language that speaks to the heart” and thus encourages customers to spend money. See <http://www.muzak.com/muzak.html>.


5. Hargreaves proposes an inverted-U representation of the relationship between familiarity and enjoyment. That is to say, with repeated hearings, a listener’s enjoyment of a given piece will typically increase steadily until he or she becomes overexposed to the piece. At this point, enjoyment will steadily decrease (111).
6. Symbolic power is “a power of constructing reality,” which enables one to transform the world, obtaining “the equivalent of what is obtained through force (whether physical or economic) . . .” (see Bourdieu 1991: 166, 170).

7. Kahle is currently president of Kahle Research Solutions, Inc.

8. Other criminologists argue to the contrary, supporting such focused crime prevention (see Weisburd et al. 2006: 549–591).

9. Within museum studies, the transformative power of context has been discussed by scholars such as Philip Fisher, who argues that objects can be effaced and remade within the museum, acquiring a new significance in a new setting (Fisher 1991).

10. For a history of the problematic idea of aesthetic autonomy in music, see Taruskin (2006).
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