

FROM THE ACADEMIC DIRECTOR

General

When CIM began in Graz in 2004, it was difficult to predict how it would be received by international colleagues in diverse relevant disciplines. Would they support the aims of the conference? Would they perceive the relationship between its aims and its procedures? Would they like the argument that the academic growth of recent decades and the corresponding specialisation of individual researchers means that collaboration has almost become a *prerequisite* for good interdisciplinary work? Would they resonate to the idea of unifying musicology by promoting interactions between disciplines that are methodologically and epistemologically distant? Would they accept that a truly interdisciplinary research presentation should begin with a detailed exposition of background material in two relevant but distant disciplines? Would they agree that a clear statement of a project's aims is necessary to allow reviewers to judge its academic or social interest and relevance? Would they support such aims, arguments and procedures out of personal conviction – and not merely because we required them to do so?

The first two CIMs (Graz, 2004; Montreal, 2005) gave the CIM project clearer contours. Today, the future of CIM is looking promising. All the questions posed in the previous paragraph may be realistically (if cautiously) answered in the affirmative. Moreover, plans are in progress for three future CIMs. CIM08 will have the theme of *musical structure* and be held in Thessaloniki, Greece, 2-6 July 2008; please note that the deadline for abstracts is 30 November 2007. After that, we are planning a CIM in Paris in 2009 on *monophony versus polyphony*, and a CIM in Sheffield, England in 2010 on *culture*. What started out as a somewhat risky and radical project is starting to look like an established landmark on the musicology conference circuit.

The first CIM had no specific theme beyond the obvious requirement of musical or musicological relevance. While that may have been an appropriate way to get started, it soon became clear that the aims of CIM would be best achieved if each conference focused on a specific theme that is of interest to scholars in contrasting disciplines – a *bottom-up* approach to the integration of musicological subdisciplines. I am grateful to Caroline Traube of the Université de Montréal for suggesting that the second and subsequent CIMs have specific themes, and for being the driving force behind CIM05 on *timbre* in Montreal. During the next few days, we will make progress towards an integration of those various academic disciplines that contribute to an understanding of the phenomenon of *singing* in its diverse historical, geographical, social and cultural manifestations.

In the remainder of my introduction I would like to take the opportunity to comments on two related issues that I believe are of central importance to CIM and its future development: the visible and invisible *power structures* that pervade and surround musicology, and the related question of *collegiality*.

Power structures

It is no coincidence that the term *integration* is associated with power relationships between stronger and weaker social groups such as ethnic majorities and minorities, or established and emerging disciplines. Integration often involves strategies for overcoming such power differences, such as the assertion of minority rights.

At the start of the 21st Century, musicology finds itself in a paradoxical situation: outside of musicology, the humanities have too little power, whereas inside those traditional institutions that bear the label of “musicology”, the humanities arguably have too much power. Both of these imbalances may be inhibiting musicological productivity.

In universities as a whole, the humanities (of which musicology is often – for historical reasons – considered a part) have seen better days. While the humanities were centrally important in the universities of the 19th Century – in part for their role in the construction of cultural and national identities – science and technology had a much greater impact on everyday life in the 20th Century, with the result that the sciences now enjoy much more prestige and financial support, both within and outside universities. The unique contribution of the humanities to culture, identity and quality of life is not adequately recognized. Perhaps more could be done to make this contribution visible: for example, one might argue that the humanities can contribute to a solution of one of the most important threats facing the world today, namely culturally based global conflict.

But within “musicology” (in the narrow sense), the humanities have the upper hand. Scientific musicology is often performed outside of musicological institutions (e.g. psychology, physics, or computer science). The term “musicology” continues to be used interchangeably with “historical musicology”, or somewhat more broadly in the sense of humanities approaches to musical questions, as if the other kinds of “musicology” did not exist.

During the 20th Century, the systematic and ethnological subdisciplines of musicology grew faster than the historical ones. The total volume of published research in these three main subdisciplines would now appear to be roughly equal – or at least not significantly different from each other. More fundamentally, we seem to be approaching a new global balance among musical humanities, musical sciences, and practice-oriented musical scholarship (such as research in performance and composition).

This point is best understood in its historical context. Applying the modern meanings of “musicology”, “systematic”, “discipline” and so on to the ancient world, we may assert that musicology was originally systematic: it was interdisciplinary but neither historical nor ethnological, and it involved “systematic” disciplines such as physics, psychology, mathematics and philosophy. Following the Enlightenment and the rapid emergence and development of the humanities, musicology became predominately historical in the 19th Century. Since then, ethnomusicology has been growing steadily in both importance and volume of research output. At the start of the 21st Century, it is possible, perhaps for the

first time, to envisage a united musicology in which no subdiscipline is considered either central or peripheral. This vision of *unity in diversity* in musicology is, I believe, what we are trying to achieve in CIM.

CIM is not exactly on course toward this goal. The first three CIMs have appealed more strongly to systematic musicologists and ethnomusicologists than to music historians. The reasons include the “systematic” qualifications of CIM organisers and the existing interdisciplinarity within systematic and ethnological musicology. If CIM is to achieve its goals, it must address this problem. In the short-term, speakers at this conference might make a point of emphasizing and integrating humanities issues (in particular historical and cultural). In the longer term, humanities may be emphasized more strongly in future CIMs. At CIM08 and CIM09, we should strive to achieve a better balance between, on the one hand, historians, cultural anthropologists, theorists and analysts, and, on the other, psychologists, acousticians, empirical sociologists, and computer scientists (remembering that all such disciplinary lists are incomplete). At CIM10 on *culture*, the tables will be turned, and the challenge may be to attract enough scientists.

Collegiality

The specialisation of scholars in recent decades means that it is becoming increasingly difficult for individual researchers to work across disciplinary boundaries. Interdisciplinary research is more likely to be recognized in relevant disciplines if it is performed by a team of internationally recognized specialists. This point has important ramifications for musicology. What problems do researchers from distant disciplines face when they try to work together? Often, they do not understand each other’s methodologies and epistemologies and sometimes, they feel they have good reason to reject them.

To maintain constructive interdisciplinary interaction under such conditions, there must be a prior agreement that academic quality in a given discipline is best evaluated within that discipline and not from the viewpoint of other disciplines. Each member of a research team should ideally regard all team members and all relevant disciplines as important and valuable, both intrinsically and in the potential contribution they can make to the specific issue being addressed. Beyond that, researchers should not pretend to be experts in areas where their expertise has not been established by recognized courses of training and contributions to respected journals.

This logic suggests that not only *collaboration* but also *collegiality* is a prerequisite for successful interdisciplinary collaboration. Collegiality is democratic: Colleagues respect each other’s aims and abilities and regard each other both personally and professionally as fundamentally equal, despite obvious differences in seniority and reputation, or specific responsibilities or abilities. Collegiality is goal-oriented: common goals motivate the team to be collegial, and collegiality helps the team to reach those goals. Collegiality is transparent: Colleagues are honest and realistic about their individual strengths and weaknesses and correspondingly open to objective quality control procedures. Collegiality promotes excellence: Successful research teams continually strive to improve

academic standards in both productivity (quantity) and creativity (quality) by developing valid and reliable evaluation procedures. In all these respects, a musicological research team is, or should be, no different from any other research team.

A collegial academic culture can evidently be promoted, but not regulated. This raises the question of how collegiality can be promoted most effectively – or whether it can be promoted at all. In the context of CIM, it may be interesting to explore in detail how collegiality may be improved within musicology, given its specific history and traditions and the specific disciplinary backgrounds of musicologists. Such an exercise could promote not only the quality and quantity of musicological research but also the long-term productivity, relevance and survival of musicology.

Speaking of collegiality, it was a pleasure to be part of the team that organised this conference and to work together with Jaan Ross, Kaire Maimets-Volt and Manuela Marin (to name only a few). I hope that all participants will experience the conference as a rich source of concepts, colleagues and creativity.

Richard Parncutt