

# Groovology and the Magic of Other People's Music

Charles Keil

While the word “groove” seems to be gaining ever greater currency, the explorations and wording of groove phenomena in "musicking" (Small 1998) does not seem to be a rapidly growing field of groovology per se.<sup>1</sup> This paper tries to explain the general lack of academic interest in groovology as a discipline and then argues that some important issues can't be grasped without it.

Every groove is both a mystery or Batesonian 'sacrament' as well as a practical, pragmatic or testable practice within a 'joyous science' of measuring "— ultimately, any 'difference which makes a difference,' traveling in a circuit." (Bateson 1991:xiii) The practical question is something like: what do we have to do with our bodies playing these instruments and singing in order to get their bodies moving, bobbing their heads, snapping their fingers, up from their tables and dancing? The mystery: how do people and musicking become consubstantial, a communion, communitas, a sacrament, the music inside the people and the people inside the music?

In Music Grooves (Keil and Feld 1994) and in the “Special Issue: Participatory Discrepancies” of Ethnomusicology (Vol. 39, No. 1, Winter 1995, articles by Keil, Progler, Alen, and 11 respondents) we have tried to persuade ethnomusicologists and other potentially interested scholars (in fields as diverse as political rhetoric, sermonizing, comedy-timing, sex-therapy, sports psychology, play, etc.) that in asking these two questions and in this wording of grooves, the “participation theory” or “participatory discrepancy paradigm” should prevail over, or at least have a kind of parity with, both the structuralist paradigms (syntagmatic, paradigmatic, musicology, semiotics, fullotics, etc.) and the various alienation theories (Marxist, feminist, critical, cultural, post-structural, post-colonial, deconstructionist, post-whatever, etc., etc.) if we want to know more about how musicking actually works and develop a comprehensive theory that better apprehends a sustainable world of ever-emerging realities.

I've also concluded that I must be doing something very consistently in my writing that sends a wrong signal that PDs (Participatory Discrepancies) are strictly organic, live, in the moment and never techno or digital. Not so. Synthesizers, computers

---

<sup>1</sup> Groovology as a field could count many founders (all the authors cited by Allen Farmelo in "The Unifying Consequences of Grooving" [1997] who came to grips with jazz grooves earlier in the 20th century) and many contributors like Keil & Feld, Progler, Alen, Farmelo (in bibliography) plus researchers and writers in Sweden (Bengston, Tove and Thorsen 1972) and Norway (Telif Kvifte, Jan Peter Blom) who have done some lab work to test hypotheses. Hans Weisethaunet hosted a conference in Norway that explored launching a "field" or "discipline." Tom Porcello's "Music Mediated as Live in Austin: sound, technology, and recording practice," (2002) is a neat example of important insights into "the Austin sound" derived from groovological theory and assumptions, and done without lab measurements. Similarly, Eduardo Lis (MA thesis at York University) finds lots of interesting things to say about samba in relation to jazz using a groovology terminology, but without really needing any measurements to make his points. My main point in this paper is simply that a separate "field" with theory, methods, lab measurements hasn't emerged anywhere yet, and a major paradigm shift within musicology or ethnomusicology has not occurred either. Musicologists in Europe use many different substitutes for groove and have proposed using "entrainment", a term borrowed from physics, that describes the way pendula of cuckoo clocks on a wall tend to get in synch with each other.

and studio consoles are now "instruments" we play and I am mystified as to why the engineers, producers of rap, producers of all the bass & drum, trance, ambient, jungle, goa, house . . . . new styles ad infinitum, are treated by ethnomusicologists as being somehow off limits to interviews about their craft, their skills, the tricks of their trade. Too much money being made? Researchers embarrassed to ask the simple, stupid questions? Are answers top secret? If it's all or mostly in the micro-timing (not just grooves, but a lot of the sound qua sound, the textures, are also generated by timing tricks, and notatable structures also have hooks in terms of time delays, etc.) then someone somewhere has to know or intuit how to make grooves, sounds, structural hooks work in digitally generated product x or y or z or in anything we're calling music. How, precisely, do you drop the samples into the samples? How are drum machines designed to generate "feels" of different kinds? Japanese engineers figured out a lot of this stuff 30 years ago for Roland drum machines. Has anybody interviewed them? In fact, the engineers, producers, techno-digital heads who design or engineer the music people dance to the most in clubs have long been the perfect people to talk expertly about all the PD issues. They control the micro-timed machinery, can probably get millisecond readings on what happens when, as they do it. They have knobs to twirl and buttons to push that will increase or decrease the participatory discrepancies incrementally. The organic groovers, the one's I've written most about, often don't consciously know or cognit what they are doing; they achieve grace and groove and magic through unconscious muscle-memory processes that are hard to talk about or easy to mis-gloss. Whereas the sound engineers and producers who work overtly with the machinery and the timing issues can more easily take you to the mysteries directly.

So, some ten years after the publication of *Music Grooves* (Keil and Feld 1994) and the special issue of *Ethnomusicology* (1995) I must report that at the microlevel we have not persuaded any grad student to measure "Participatory Discrepancies" (PDs) in a style, doing the -etics of it, much less check these measurements against what practitioners, listeners, passersby, or panels of experts are feeling and saying about the measured samples, doing the -emics of it. And at the macrolevel a larger paradigm shift in worldview or scholarship away from the prevailing theories doesn't seem to be occurring either. (See Endnote.) A theory is only as good as the people involved in its testing. Is the theory useful, practical, methodological, leading to new discoveries? While this particular PD "participatory theory" may be encouraging a few people to "throw more parties" or "dance more and footnote less" it is not, so far, inspiring a new wave of research and scholarship or raising an abundance of new questions based on the new paradigm.

Looking over the eleven responses to groovology in the special issue of *Ethnomusicology*, talking with leading scholars at conferences, reflecting on the apparent failure of this paradigm to win a host of new friends, influence many people, open a Department of Groovology somewhere, shift the prevailing focus from syntax to process, from structures to post-structural flows, I think there are five combined sources of discomfort or apprehension that reinforce each other whenever people start to think their way through the "PD paradigm."

1. The mystery of participation (consubstantiation/communitas/trance-dance, etc.) is too mysterious, illogical, paradoxical, touchy-feely, religious, new age, irrational,

romantic, Rousseauian, essentialist, and so forth. It's as if the response becomes, "Let's do an analysis that doesn't confront the mystery." Or, if musical involvement is first and last a mystery, then why bother with analysis?

2. Conversely, the practicality of measuring to the thousandth of a second with a Mac Digitizer (Progler 1995) or using a machine in Berlin (Alen 1995/1986) is seen as too scientific, analytic, reductionist, reifying, objectifying, crassly materialistic, an insult to artists and a severe diminishment of the actual complexity of any ongoing musical process. If "feeling," "inflection," "phrasing," kinds and qualities of "grooving" can be represented statistically, if the differences that make a difference (PDs) traveling in a circuit or feedback loop ("cohering consequences" or CCs)[Farmelo (1997) @ MUSE website, and Keil (2002) "They Want the Music but they don't want the people" ] can be described with some precision, this suggests that critics and interpreters may not know exactly what they are talking about; an insult to them too?

3. The idea of "discrepancies," the little gaps in timing and pitch, implies that great artists may be loose, sloppy, mistaken, not entirely in control, "wrong," generating 'differences that make a difference' that they may or may not be aware of, may or may not be able to talk about. Again, this insults artists or negates artistry, and could create annoyance or profound ill will among the people we study.

4. The idea that –emics (what is said from within a cultural system) might not match the –etics (what is measurable and describable in terms of an arbitrary calibration) because the PDs are at least partially subliminal or perfected unconsciously, suggests that great artists might not only be playing "discrepancies" that are "wrong" in some sense, but could be thinking and saying "wrong" things about their "wrong" playing techniques.

Who wants to interview Bo Diddley or Horace Silver or a great jazz drummer with the double assumption that they may have mistaken ideas or models in their heads about their most basic skills and/or that they may be unaware of these or still other skills? The truth is that some of the very best musicians do not know or want to know what they are doing. And this ignorance may indeed be their bliss and ours; you start thinking about the groove too much and you can tighten up "the necessary slippage" (Feld, informal communication) or lose it completely. Are the possible scientific gains worth anyone's artistic discomfort?

When linguistics was a prestige science it was because it could make distinctions between etics and emics, use an etic grid to question emic judgments, and make controlled or systematic comparisons between languages and cultures. Micromeasuring creates the possibility of an emics and etics for musicking, style by style, and jam session by jam session, player by player. I continue to believe that the PD paradigm could lead to important breakthroughs in our understanding of how music works, but it comes at a time in history when science, as it has been practiced, is being challenged and questioned as never before. We wonder about the wisdom of slicing and splicing genes and now someone suggests finer slicings and splicings (those djs and producers are in their studios matching tracks, dropping samples into samples, and creating ever more precision-tooled grooves for dancers as we speak) of the musical continuum?

5. Notice how #1 and #2 are contradictory, a double bind, a paradox: how can a theory be both too mysterious/ expansive and too rational/ reductionist? Notice how #3

and #4 constitute a negation and a negation, a double doubt, possibly “wrong” ideas about possibly “wrong” playing practices in, or not in, the minds of musicians—way too complicated and negated for us to comprehend and say something “right” about. Put these two pairs together and the old structuralist and alienation paradigms we’ve been working with for decades and even centuries seem very friendly and comfortable, a safer place to be ontologically in order to know what is knowable epistemologically.

I might go back to the musical structures as ‘texts’ myself at this point if I hadn’t already convinced myself that as structures they are empty of feeling and meaningless. No symbolism. No semiotics. No fullotics. All the emotion and meaning is in our heads, not in the music. All the emotion and meaning is in the relationships of the musicking moment. All the emotion and meaning is in the ‘motion and feeling’, in the grooves and sounds .... in the moment .... in our heads. Long arguments with Tiv over the contingency of meanings, much thinking over the interview with “Gail” in My Music (Crafts, Cavicchi and Keil 1993: 94-98), finally convinced me that searching for stable meanings in the music as object or design was pointless. To the extent that melodic shapes and melodic/ harmonic relationships can become interesting again it will be because structural discrepancies, deviations, forms evolving in the moment as they respond to the forces of groove and sound, can be calibrated in our heads or on “semantic differential” scales as we listen (Keil & Keil 1966) and then talked about later as part of the PD paradigm (Cowdery 1995).

I don’t want to belabor these emotion and meaning points here, but I do want to set the stage for arguing that all that is most interesting in other people’s musicking or “the music of the Other” (to put it in the more alienated lingo of the text interpreters) is better understood in terms of groovology, however undeveloped, and the PD paradigm, however confusing and discomfiting its core assumptions may be.

The Kaluli of Papua New Guinea say that all their music comes from nature and neighbors. Individuals like Ulahi, a woman whose songs are much appreciated by both the Kaluli and their ethnographer Steve Feld, make up new songs but in the patterns set by genres borrowed from neighbors or by melodic shapes given to the Kaluli by the birds. All the musicking is modeled by significant others and these significant others model “lift-up-overing,” the Kaluli trope or way of layering melodies in marvelous non-unisons. I wonder if this understanding isn’t a prototype or archetypal information and typical of egalitarian societies. Finishing up a book about lower caste Romani “instrumentalists” in Greek Macedonia, I am convinced that they are playing a Balkan or ‘Ottoman ecumene’ mix of Bulgarian, Turkish, Pontic Greek and mainland Greek songs because the tips flow best when all the relevant classes, castes, ethnicities, are dissolved in wordless sounds and grooves that include the histories and identities of all the relevant ‘others’. Centuries of hierarchy, literacies, bureaucracies, and capital accumulation are overthrown as people throw money away and “get down” into the dance via the music of Gypsy ‘others’ who stop being marginal and become the center of concentric circles of inclusion the instant the music starts. There must be some rule I can’t quite formulate precisely that would say, “music always seems to come from outside us, finds its way into us from ‘others’, binds us to the world, constructs the major psychic bridge between our ‘others’ and ourselves.”

In the American society that I know best and in a remarkable number of other societies as well, it is the 'others' who make the best music, the most interesting music, the most necessary music, the soul-satisfying music, the grooviest and richest sounding music, the music that is finally most characteristic of 'us' as well as 'them'. Think of the African-Americans and Latino-Americans in the USA, the ex-slaves throughout the Caribbean, Middle and Latin America, the Gypsy musicians in all the European countries and the Balkans, the Jewish minorities that once had special musical status all over the Arabic and North African world, the griot castes of West Africa, the national minorities whose musics are taught in all the primary schools of China because the Han believe that their minorities (N= 55) are all more natural, less repressed and civilized, and, when it comes to music and dance .... much groovier.

I can remember sitting in a theater in Beijing, spring of 1980, as performing troupes from peasant communes in many different Chinese provinces brought their "folklore ballets" to the big city. Some Han groups did "Tibetan" dances to show their love and respect for the energetic, stomping, dynamic styles of the Tibetan peoples. Later in the show some actual Tibetan minorities did the actual stomping dances and they were indeed groovier, much groovier, indisputably the grooviest! The Han peasant troupes were certainly trying hard to stomp and spin and be dynamic, but they were very stiff and formal by comparison to the actual Tibetans. And the actual Tibetans, of course, were presenting themselves as a calmed down and domesticated "folkloric ballet," a rehearsed dance-drama from the provinces designed to make a good impression in Beijing. I sat thinking to myself that this might be as close as I was ever going to get to seeing white minstrels in blackface and black minstrels in blackface on the same stage circa 1870 in Cincinnati, Ohio or Chicago, Illinois.

Who "owns" the best grooves? How did they get them? If grooves and sounds are the "make-you-dance" magic, the means of losing your self in the music, the power to pull people into the music, the energies that fuel the will to party and the pursuit of happiness, then how did these ethnic others, these lower class or caste others, get to "own" the best grooves and sounds? Why are the 'lesser/lower/other' peoples groovier on four continents? Let's make that five continents and concede that the Aboriginals in Australia not only still do their own didgeridus better than their growing number of imitators but they also do country & western with more authenticity (Knox 1983) than anyone in Nashville, Tennessee or Austin, Texas can muster these days.

What are we to make of a Seneca Indian group, Al Parker and his family, playing Average White Band 'covers' from the Scots and Irishmen of the United Kingdom to a Polish-American polka audience in a tavern not far from an African-American neighborhood in Buffalo where the original sound and groove that AWB 'covered' could once be heard? Thanks to the mass mediation of "other people's music," the good grooves of neighboring others can come to us by roundabout routes.

How and why do the 'lowers/lessers/others' get to make the best grooves every time? I really don't know. How and why do many of the twentieth-century 'uppers/greaters/insiders' like Cage and Stockhausen and Braxton strive for groovelessness? Are the 'uppers' trying to transcend the body, nature, the funk, the rhythms of the flesh so that their artistic souls will be immortal in heaven? Are the 'lowers' trying to affirm their immanence, the body, nature, funk, rhythms of the flesh, as

their right to exist here on earth? Get down! “Can’t get enuf—of that funky stuff” (Kool and the Gang). There may be some subtler correlations or generalizations to make here, but I think I will let others look for them (Cardew 1974; Radano 1998, 1993).

I only want to point out that none of these observations, correlations, generalizations, specific assertions, anecdotes and speculations are testable except through groovology: measuring PDs and collecting evaluations from panels of co-cultural and non-co-cultural. Suppose that I assert, “Hungarian Gypsy fiddlers and just plain Hungarian fiddlers are playing most of the same forms, structures, tunes, but the Gypsies attack notes a little differently, accelerate certain passages a little more, take more liberties, add more schmaltz, phrase these differences together, never read music, insert just the right amount and speed of vibrato, play more appropriately to the customer in the restaurants.” Is this description a stereotype or a reality? Or a stereotype based on a reality? Will ethnomusicologists have anything more rational or grounded to offer in answering these questions than a mere recitation of prevailing prejudices, or a mere interpretation of prevailing prejudices, or the merest critique of an interpretation of prevailing prejudices?

There are passages in Tim Rice's (1994) account of Bulgarian music this century in which one can sense that a transition from Gypsy bagpipe playing to state-supported non-Gypsy players making the official folk music at the radio station must have represented, if not a loss of certain grooves and participatory discrepancies, at least a shift in consciousness toward recognizing two folk musics, two ways of playing, two different modes of “filling your soul.” Since these differences in playing techniques and degrees and kinds of participatory discrepancies play out as ethnic differences, or class differences, we are suddenly not just talking about degrees of grooviness or soulfulness, but about whether a style is “Turkish” and “treacherous,” whether aesthetic preferences are evidence that a name-change or a conversion-experience should be imposed upon certain darker citizens when state policies are formulated and acted upon to purge or cleanse the ‘lessers’ and ‘others’.

In situations where a ‘minority’ has an absolute monopoly on a musical style, for example the Romani instrumentalists of Greek Macedonia who take their zurna and dauli (two double-reed shawms and bass drum) trios to all the important rites of passage, there is no measure of lesser or greater ‘soul’, ‘authenticity’, ‘intensity’ to make, but the dancer patrons who hire the Romani trios can compare them in different ways and say what they bring to an event. We could measure and assess a bass drummer’s timings, bring panels of listeners together to find out who does or does not hear the mysterious “Tartini tones” and what effects they may be having on those who hear them. Here the questions that groovology can best answer have to do with how it is possible for instrumental music to transcend linguistic and cultural differences, enabling all kinds of Greeks—Vlach, Pontic, Thracian, Slavic, Albanian, Romani, etc.—to party together in such trust that individuals can attain the deeply satisfying emotional state that Greeks call *kefi*. (Blau, Keil, Keil and Feld 2002) It is crucial to the success of these parties that the instrumentalists are lower caste ‘others’ who will provide excellent music in complete support of the dancing patrons and never compete with the dancers for status, virtuosity, attention. Here again the structures are time-worn, familiar, ancient modes and melodies, and people who speak different languages in the home can hear their own words inside the instrumental

process. It is the groove and sound that get people up and dancing; PDs in the public domain power up the dancing lines and make kefi possible across all linguistic, ethnic, geographical, class barriers.

But where did these differences, barriers, boundaries, ‘others’ come from? What nationalist and academic discourses created them? From a “participation theory” point of view, in the moment, we are us, having a party, seeking and finding kefi. Does someone have a problem with this? Not groovologists, we just want to know exactly how it is done.

There is another stylistic phenomena found around the world these days that a developing groovology could help us to understand more profoundly and that is the spread of a symphonic or bolshoi model—the “big unison sound”—being applied to local traditions in order to make them competitive as “high popular culture” or “dignified, we’s-as-good-as-you-is, MTV” in western and global markets. Very subjectively, that is how I see and hear it; a primal other meets the west and becomes “US,” a big orchestra and/or chorus with a conductor. The video “Djabote: Senegalese Drumming and Song from Master Drummer Doudou N’Diaye Rose” is a perfect example of this trend. Is this a Senegalese groove? Magnified? Unified? Perfected? Made “Bolshoi?” Made “bourgeois”? Or what?

The “River Dance” out of Ireland. The “Jujuka” CD of massed double reeds and drums from Morocco. The “taiko” or big “martial-arts drum ensembles” out of Japan. I don’t have a specific Brazilian example in mind, but many of the giant samba schools share the pattern of what I would describe as high frequency rhythmic interlocks and ‘fascist thunder riffs’ of unison drummers. A large number of people massed, or strung out in a long “Rockettes” line, performing what used to be done in a small improvising group of a few instruments and a solo dancer, has a magical and very profitable effect (the “River Dance” choreographer made more money than Michael Jackson— over a two year period!). What is so powerful about the long Irish clogging dance lines, recorded in a way that reverberates, creates a grand canyon vista, an audio version of “panavision?” In groove terms these people are really keeping together in time (McNeill 1995). No improvisation. No intimacy. Total unison. The conductor/choreographer or a single controlling force is the focus of all energies.

I hear that “audio panavision” sound in common but I don’t know if it is the recording techniques, the mixing, the ‘fixing’ of what has been recorded, that creates this effect or if it is in the musical processes themselves. And I hear a ‘black groove’ in common, an African-American ‘edge’ to the groove, perhaps what the French call “le black feeling,” and it is in the Irish and Japanese examples as well as in the African and African diaspora examples. But is this my projection, my fantasy, my fear of “participation” writ large as fascism, projected into these mediated patterns of sound?

I honestly don’t know the answer to these questions. And many other perceptions these days raise unanswerable questions in my mind. Whose music is this? I hear a piece of music that has an African “groove” but a Celtic “sound.” I hear another piece of music that has an African “sound” but a mechanical, made in the studio, groove. A rapidly developing groovology would not be entirely adequate to this task of figuring out forces, influences, similarities, differences, but it would certainly give us some ways to sort

things out more systematically along dimensions other than the empty and meaningless structural one.

Consider, for instance, the old Jean-Luc Ponty acoustic/electric violin jam “New Country” (1976). Is this jazz ‘swing’? Bluegrass ‘drive’? Parisian ‘le black feeling’? A ‘redneck rock’ groove? It’s a great groove but whose is it? Is that “soul clap” at the beginning mechanical or are actual hands coming together? Is this a French version of how black and white American music can be brought together? The fiddle and mandolin sound is ‘white’ while the groove is ‘black’—is that what makes this feel so good? It feels like US, U.S.A., American, but I’ve been assuming it was recorded in France. Is this groove grounded anywhere? Locatable? Is schizophonia compete? All recorded grooves are ungrounded and have been that way for quite a while? The ‘magic’ is inside this very ungroundedness? A stomping, integrated barn dance comes to us through the air from machinery? How come I can smell the straw and bales of hay?

And of course a series of questions like these can easily be generated for any recording of music these days. PDs are being manipulated, sampled, mixed, in thousands of studios all over the world for fun and profit. And who knows what the consequences are? Is there a pattern that connects? Any integral relation between music and culture any more? No wonder the “ethnomusicology” assumption seems more quaint and nostalgic with each passing day, and the PDs of live performance a peripheral puzzle not worth taking the time to solve.

I’ve been saying for about 40 years now that the most important aspects of all musicking are the groove and the sound. But when we commonly attribute more groove and more sound to the ‘lessers/lowers/others’ in our midst or elsewhere, when we attribute more magic, more body wisdom, more ‘touch’ and more ‘feel’ to ‘them’ and give ‘them’ star status or believe in their shamanic healing powers, we honor and reward their groundedness and grooviness, but we are probably adding energy to the othering processes: the stereotyping, the racism. A persisting Cartesian mind/body dualism is at the heart of racism based on expectations that whites will mastermind and blacks will supply the muscle. In a continuing Cartesian context, ‘we’ whites (the tired old story goes) have the minds, intelligences, sensitivities to see and hear what great body wisdom ‘they’ (e.g., James Brown) have. I still think putting minds back in bodies and celebrating the unconscious processes, the wisdom of the body, etc., is one way of fighting against racist, sexist, class assumptions. But would a science of PDs, systematic measurements and panels of compared opinions, do anything to lessen, puncture, debunk the selective or excessive projections of greater grooviness on to the underclass?

What is the way out of an ever more deeply divided class society and increasing racism (as evidenced, for example, in overall USA incarceration rates 5 times the world average, and, for black men, 40 times the world average!)? What is to be done about the mind/body split? During the 1990s I put most of my activist energy into building a non-profit organization, Musicians United for Superior Education, Inc., with the goal of incorporating the muses and nurturing creativity in the dancing, drumming, singing body-minds of children where it belongs. And the cure for alienation on the high culture, high minded side of the mind/body, owning class/ working class divide is also, of course, more participation, getting into the groove, abandoning the transcendent bolshoi-bourgeois art projects and getting down. Most of us do not want to attribute the pan-

human traits of minds, intelligences, sensitivities, to whites only, but it gets done anyway in the ways we run our universities and public schools. Budget problems in the primary schools? Let's get rid of the music and dance, the body stuff, and tighten the focus on the mind. Is there a primary school anywhere in America—just one?—that privileges drumming and dancing body-mind integration in different cultural traditions, a school that values song and dance skills above (or even on par with) the literacies in preK through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade? Isn't the prevailing idea of "school" all about making believe that children don't have bodies that need educating? I've elaborated agendas for changing all this elsewhere. (Keil 1984, 1995, 1998a, 2000)

In sum, I can see a future for “Applied Sociomusicology and Performance Studies” (Keil 1998b) but I am beginning to think that groovology—a rational understanding of grooves, sounds, our feeling-filled involvement in musicking—may not be a central or necessary part of this future. This is one area where knowing more, a better epistemology, will not necessarily improve the ontology, how we are in the doing of the grooving. Quite the contrary; too much consciousness of “how to groove” can get in the way, a misappropriation for consciousness, perhaps, of what should have been put in the four necessary levels of unconsciousness during early childhood and then left there (Bateson 1972/2000:128 ff). Will bringing groove processes to light (whatever damage it might do to actual grooving) help the struggle for justice, improve cross-cultural understanding, make a contribution to social life? That's a question I'm opening in this essay, but I don't have a confident answer.

Groovology might have unambiguous and urgently needed contributions to make in the human potential or child development field and in countering what might be called the “pathologies of groove” ranging from stuttering, autisms, Tourette's syndrome, through all the many symptoms lumped together as “attention deficit disorders” to just plain boredom and fidgetiness. But that is another cluster of essays (see *Born to Groove* website).

## References

- Alen Rodriguez, Olavo 1986/1995. *La Musica de las Sociedades de Tumba Francesa*. (Article in *Ethnomusicology* 39/1.) Havana: Casa de las Americas.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1972/2000. "Style, Grace and Information in Primitive Art" in *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* pgs. 128- 152. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1991. *Sacred Unity: Further Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Rodney Donaldson, Ed.
- Blau, Dick, Charles and Angeliki V. Keil, Steven Feld 2002. *Bright Balkan Morning: Romani Lives and the Power of Music in Greek Macedonia*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Cardew, Cornelius. 1974. *Stockhausen Serves Imperialism*.
- Cowdery, James R. 1995. "Responses" p. 73-74. *Ethnomusicology* 39/19
- Crafts, Susan, Dan Cavicchi, Charles Keil. 1993. *My Music: Explorations of Music in Daily Life*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Farmelo, Alan. 1997. "The Unifying Consequences of Grooving: An Introductory Ethnographic Approach to Unity through Music." [musekids.org](http://musekids.org)
- Keil, Charles 1966 "Motion and Feeling through Music" in *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 24:337-49. (Now Ch. I in Keil and Feld, 1994)
- Keil, Charles and Angeliki V. Keil. 1966 "Musical Meaning: A Preliminary Report" *Ethnomusicology*.
- Keil, Charles. 1984. "Paideia con Salsa: Ancient Greek Education for Active Citizenship and the Role of Latin Dance-Music in our Schools". In *Becoming Human through Music*. Reston (Virginia): Music Educators National Conference. And at [musekids.org](http://musekids.org).
- Keil, Charles and Steven Feld. 1994/2005. *Music Grooves*. Fenestra Books.
- Keil, Charles. 1995. *The Theory of Participatory Discrepancies: A Progress Report*. In *Ethnomusicology* 39/19:1-19.
- Keil, Charles. 1998a. "Incorporating the Muses." In *Radical Teacher*. No. 52. And at [musekids.org](http://musekids.org).
- Keil, Charles 1998b. "Applied Sociomusicology and Performance Studies" in *Ethnomusicology* Vol. 42, No. 2, Spring/ Summer 1998, pgs. 303-312.
- Keil, Charles. 2000. *Dance Daily. Dance Early. Dance Now*. In *First of the Month* 2:3. And at [musekids.org](http://musekids.org).

Keil, Charles. 2002 "They Want the Music but They Don't Want the People" in *City and Society*, 14/1.

Knox, Roger. 1983. "GIVE IT A GO" Enrec 001 cassette tape, Tamworth, Australia

McNeill, William. 1995. *Keeping Together in Time Dance and Drill in Human History* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ponty, Jean-Luc. 1976. "New Country."

Progler, J. A. 1995. "Searching for Swing: Participatory Discrepancies in the Jazz Rhythm Section" *Ethnomusicology* 39/1.

Radano, Ronald M. 1993. *New Musical Figurations: Anthony Braxton's Cultural Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Radano, Ronald M. 1998. "Hot Fantasies: American Modernism and the Idea of Black Rhythm" in *Music and the Racial Imagination* Philp Bohlman and Ronald Radano, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rice, Timothy 1994. *May It Fill Your Soul*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Small, Christopher. 1998. *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Hanover: Wesleyan Univ. Press.