

...ethnomusicology has often joined musicology in contending that research on music must be founded on aesthetic advocacy of the music to be studied. As in musicology, this may entail a kind of entrancement by the musical object; but it also occurs when music acts for the ethnomusicologist as a synecdoche for a romanticized conception of the 'people', against any assumption of their cultural or musical inferiority. In contrast...anthropologists, despite adhering on occasion to a similarly romanticized understanding of non- Western peoples, are commonly not led to idealize their subjects since ethnographic fieldwork invariably demands that they confront the full spectrum of human behaviour, from the redemptive, creative and beautiful to the cruel, authoritarian and ugly.

—Born, pp. 216-217.

- Do you agree ethnography necessarily allows you to be more objective? Why or why not?
- Do you think liking/idealising certain types of music can get in the way of research?
- What would objective research look like (and is this a trick question)?

The first order equates to the practice turn: here music produces its own socialities in performance, in musical ensembles, in the musical division of labour, in listening. Second, music animates imagined communities, aggregating its listeners into virtual collectivities or publics based on musical and other identifications. Third, music mediates wider social relations, from the most abstract to the most intimate: music's embodiment of stratified and hierarchical social relations, of the structures of class, race, nation, gender and sexuality, and of the competitive accumulation of legitimacy, authority and social prestige. Fourth, music is bound up in the large-scale social, cultural, economic and political forces that provide for its production, reproduction or transformation.

—Born, pp. 232.

- Born suggests we should not be separating these levels of social relations but analysing across them. Do you agree?
- Is the social necessary to popular music?