

Re: NEH Comments

Natilee Harren <natilee.harren@gmail.com>

Thu 4/14/2016 10:01 AM

To: Michael Gallope <michael.gallope@gmail.com>;

Cc: John Hicks <JHicks@getty.edu>; Eric Gardner <EGardner@getty.edu>; Greg Albers <GAlbers@getty.edu>; Janelle Gatchalian <JGatchalian@getty.edu>;

"Analytical trifecta"—love it!

The reservations raised by Panelist 4 are important to keep in mind not only as we write our commentaries but also in the development of the design. How can the design reinforce the idea that we are not intending to foreclose or ultimately decide the meanings or proper realizations of these scores? John and Michael—let's also continue to be especially wary of our language throughout, maybe avoiding calling these things "objects" at any point in the final publication.

All in all, good news. I'm happy to see all those E's!

best,
Natilee

On Apr 13, 2016, at 4:18 PM, Michael Gallope <michael.gallope@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi All,

Happy spring everybody. Minnesota is now in the "LA" zone of decent weather again. Finally!

Below I have attached the peer review comments from the NEH grant that I received for the Scores Project. Keep in mind that the grant was for an individual only, so I had to foreground my contribution in the proposal (and thus the readers are primarily addressing my work). To give you a sense of the context, I've also attached my narrative proposal.

Basically, lots of encouraging excitement about the interdisciplinary appeal of the project, and the promise of making these intimidating scores newly accessible to people. Would be curious to hear others' thoughts.

Cheers,
Mike

As with all applications submitted to the NEH, your proposal was read and discussed by knowledgeable persons outside the agency, who advised the Endowment about its merits. The NEH staff commented on matters of fact or on significant issues that otherwise would have been missing from these evaluations and made recommendations to the National Council on the Humanities. The National Council meets at various times during the year to advise the NEH chairman on grants. The Chairman took into account the advice provided during the review process and made all funding decisions, as is prescribed by law.

Copies of the panelists' ratings and written evaluations of your proposal are included below. The range of possible ratings is Excellent (E), Very Good (VG), Good (G), Some Merit (SM), and Not Competitive (NC); (REC) indicates a

panelist Recusal. Please keep in mind that panels are the first stage of NEH review and that the panelists sent us their evaluations and comments online.

Evaluation from Panelist 1

Please enter your comments here:

This is a model of interdisciplinary collaboration, the musicological part of which is perfectly frame for a NEH Summer Research Fellowship. The money is used well for travel and collaboration; the outcome is innovative yet carefully framed; philosophically and methodologically, the project is at the cutting edge. While editorial work is integrated, there is enough original and, indeed, pathbreaking contribution (both in individual terms and in introduction interdisciplinary collaboration) to count as a major humanities contribution by a singular scholar. I find it deeply compelling.

Your rating for this project

E, Excellent

Evaluation from Panelist 2

Please enter your comments here:

I am especially intrigued by this proposal because this music, with scores that looked more like art than music notation, was rife when I was in graduate school, and we were all amazed and mystified by it; those of us who were also performers had to figure it out, and that wasn't always very easy (was seldom easy, in fact). I really like the idea of an e-book compilation, with explanation and performances, of representative mid-century scores of this sort; this will provide scholars with invaluable material (and help) and will be a huge boon for anyone teaching 20th-century music. This is a project MADE for the latest technology. Furthermore, it is carefully thought-out as an interdisciplinary venture, although I believe that Dr. Gallope's musical expertise will be necessary in explaining crucial aspects of every single score.

Your rating for this project

E, Excellent

Evaluation from Panelist 3

Please enter your comments here:

This is an amazing, exciting, original project. One of the greatest challenges in teaching avant-garde music (especially to undergrads and gen ed classes) is how to perform it, how to hear it, and how to decipher the meaning of a score. This e-book will solve that problem while historicizing the musical score and analyzing it philosophically. To have contributors from musicology/music theory, art history, and literary studies is an analytical trifecta. Although the topic of conceptual art at first glance may seem narrow, their charting of the score throughout the history of performance art will be of interest to a wide variety of scholars, as the authors' backgrounds indicate. That the Getty Research Institute is facilitating the project is significant. The technical challenges of creating animated scores will be time consuming, but there's no doubt in my mind that this project is worth investing in, and that Gallope has the intellectual apparatus to excel in doing it. The books and articles on his CV indicate his predilection for asking Big Questions over and over, and their number is impressive for a junior scholar.

Your rating for this project

E, Excellent

Evaluation from Panelist 4

Please enter your comments here:

"Animating the Score," the collaborative project proposed by Gallope (with Natilee Harren and John Hicks), represents the best in interdisciplinary collaborative scholarship. The avant-garde scores that Gallope et al. propose for e-book publication and analysis are often intimidating and/or mystifying to many musicologists and historians, not to mention most students and performers. By situating the scores in dialogue with other primary source media (correspondence, photographs, audio and video) and analytic mediations (digital animations, voice or video commentary), the project will make accessible to the wider public, in a way that remains true to the aesthetic intentions of the compositions themselves, a too often neglected body of avant-garde performance. One challenge (among many) will be to capture the plurality of realizations possible for many (if not all) of the fourteen scores proposed for inclusion. It would be a pity if the book (inadvertently) reifies a singular "decoding" of a musical notation better described as a "code of behavior" (that is, as a process) than as "encoded content" (that is, as a product). Indeed, the project's description of the various notations as "objects," each with an "object introduction" that describe the "work" seems a oddly traditional approach to a set of musical activities that actively challenge the "work concept" that the projects' objectifying language continually invokes. The project deserves the "Excellent" rating, but teeters on the edge of "Very Good" for this reason.

Your rating for this project

E, Excellent

<narrative.pdf>