Cognitive Dissonance: Should Twentieth-century Women Composers be Grouped with Foucault’s Mad Criminals?
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ABSTRACT: This article considers recent books on twentieth-century music by Lester (1989), Kostka (1990), Straus (1990), and Morgan (1991) and their exclusion of women composers’ scores. Three hypotheses for this exclusion are proposed, based on writings of Margolis and Foucault, and recent history in academic areas of theory and composition. Finally, a supplementary one-semester assignment list is presented of twentieth-century women's compositions and analytical writings about the compositions.

1. The 1996 spring threads on the smt-list included an extensive discussion of appropriate texts for twentieth-century analysis. Consensus emerged that the recent books of Lester, Kostka, Straus, and Morgan represent the most-used texts in the area. The first three are reviewed by Wennerstrom, who references Morgan with Simms and Watkins, as books that “attempt[s] the complete stylistic/historical coverage. . .” (1) My writing below details my findings of the first four authors’ exclusion of women’s compositions, some postulations for women’s exclusion, and closes with a supplementary list of compositions by women, with associated readings. As coordinator of spring 1996 fourth-semester theory (the time period during which we introduce twentieth-century techniques) I reexamined these books to decide which one to recommend as a text for this coming fall. In a recently published review, (2) I stated my reservations to a music fundamentals package because of its exclusion of works by women and composers of ethnicities, so I paid particular attention to women’s compositions presented for study in the twentieth-century texts. This area is disappointingly incomplete, as detailed below through summary of the books in chronological order of publication. None of these four books presents a score written by a woman during the twentieth century, at least none that I could find.

2. In Lester’s Analytic Approaches to Twentieth-Century Music, (3) I can find only one reference to a woman composer: On page 234, he makes reference to an article by Elaine Barkin. Lester’s omission of women’s scores is particularly puzzling, in light of his supportive invited presentation to a 1995 session organized by the Society for Music Theory Committee on the Status of Women at the New York conference.

3. Stefan Kostka, previous to his 1990 book discussed here, has coauthored with Dorothy Payne, a well-known woman theorist. (4) Kostka references Laurie Anderson (page 317), Robin Mortimore (page 308), Pauline Oliveros (page 308), and

---

[1] The 1996 spring threads on the smt-list included an extensive discussion of appropriate texts for twentieth-century analysis. Consensus emerged that the recent books of Lester, Kostka, Straus, and Morgan represent the most-used texts in the area. The first three are reviewed by Wennerstrom, who references Morgan with Simms and Watkins, as books that “attempt[s] the complete stylistic/historical coverage. . .” (1) My writing below details my findings of the first four authors’ exclusion of women’s compositions, some postulations for women’s exclusion, and closes with a supplementary list of compositions by women, with associated readings. As coordinator of spring 1996 fourth-semester theory (the time period during which we introduce twentieth-century techniques) I reexamined these books to decide which one to recommend as a text for this coming fall. In a recently published review, (2) I stated my reservations to a music fundamentals package because of its exclusion of works by women and composers of ethnicities, so I paid particular attention to women’s compositions presented for study in the twentieth-century texts. This area is disappointingly incomplete, as detailed below through summary of the books in chronological order of publication. None of these four books presents a score written by a woman during the twentieth century, at least none that I could find.

[2] In Lester’s Analytic Approaches to Twentieth-Century Music, (3) I can find only one reference to a woman composer: On page 234, he makes reference to an article by Elaine Barkin. Lester’s omission of women’s scores is particularly puzzling, in light of his supportive invited presentation to a 1995 session organized by the Society for Music Theory Committee on the Status of Women at the New York conference.

[3] Stefan Kostka, previous to his 1990 book discussed here, has coauthored with Dorothy Payne, a well-known woman theorist. (4) Kostka references Laurie Anderson (page 317), Robin Mortimore (page 308), Pauline Oliveros (page 308), and
Joan Tower (page 171), but provides no scores by any of these composers. In the bibliography, he references writings by Gail de Stwolinsky, Robert Cogan and Pozzi Escot (a well-known woman composer), Louise and Jeanie Garéipy, Sarah Reid, Janet Schmafeldt, and Ludmila Ulehla.

[4] Joseph Straus’ *Introduction to Post-Tonal Theory* is a book we have used previously for our twentieth-century segment of fourth semester. It provided no references to women composers, although Professor Straus has been remarkably supportive of women composers through his research, publications, and activities, such as editing of a collection of musical examples by women initiated by the Society for Music Theory Committee on the Status of Women and in collaboration with a number of other scholars (please see list of references for full citation).

[5] *Twentieth-Century Music*, by Robert Morgan, contains the most extensive references to women composers, but no scores. On page xvii, he mentions talking with Shulamit Ran and Ellen Harris. He references Tailleferre (page 162), and illustrates and discusses Laurie Anderson (pages 418–419), Berberian (pages 444 and 447), and Boulanger (pages 283–284, 286, 287, and 397). In addition, he mentions Carolyn Brown (page 363), Trisha Brown (page 418), Rene Char (page 384), poet Alice Goodman (page 450), Agnes de Mille and Martha Graham (page 290), has an illustration showing women performers on page 451, and one on page 355 identifying Yvonne Loriod as pianist and wife of Messiaen. Oliveros is referenced on pages 444, 456, and 483; her composition *Sonic Meditations* is referenced on page 454; *Sound Patterns* is referenced on page 444. On page 486, Morgan wrote: “Many gifted women are also contributing significantly to the contemporary musical scene. Zwilich, Tower, Musgrave, Jolas, and Gubaidulina might be mentioned as representative of a group that, at least in the younger generation, approaches parity in size and importance with its male counterpart.”

[6] I know all four of these theorists, and admire their professional accomplishments. To confirm my research, I sent a preliminary draft of this manuscript to all of them, and have received detailed replies from each of them. They seemed as surprised as I, pointing out their attention to women’s compositions in other areas of their published work.

[7] Morgan’s email contains this excerpt: “I was appalled to discover that I did not even mention Ruth Crawford, who was such a wonderful composer! I can’t imagine how that happened. I have even written about her elsewhere.”

[8] Joel Lester’s email reads in part: “My memory tells me that your survey of my index is accurate. The criteria I used in assembling pieces to analyze in my twentieth-century book included the following: that the pieces were widely available in scores and recordings, and that there was a tradition of analyzing them (so that I as teacher had access to numerous theorists’ ideas about them). The first criterion was, of course, the most important to me, as it would have been silly to have published a text aimed at a wide audience if the music being analyzed were not available in many colleges/schools of music, etc. . . My other activities in twentieth-century music included 22 years as a member of Da Capo Chamber Players—a group that performed the works of hundreds of twentieth century (mostly, but far from exclusively, American) composers. . . A very substantial percentage of those works were by women composers; indeed, one recurring theme in Da Capo programs was works by women composers—including concerts entirely dedicated to the works of single women composers.”

[9] Something inexplicable had occurred, considering the work of the Committee on the Status of Women of the Society for Music Theory, whose first meeting was held at the 1986 conference at Indiana University before the publication of these books. The meeting was attended by a number of men theorists. Women composers and their music constitute a large and expanding segment of twentieth-century literature. Omission of this group calls for examination of the cultural climate in which the omission occurred and consideration of additional causes.

[10] Those who have read my previous writings on feminist music theories know that I try to avoid simplistic binary oppositions, recognizing their inevitable referentiality in such words as “binary,” “opposition,” “but,” and “or.” I attempt to relate theoretical concepts along multidimensional continua of completion, rather than to make judgments of right or wrong. This construction allows me to retain a shred of previous objectivist research methodologies, which posit that facts are true only until proved false and that hypotheses can be tested for applicability and generalizability.

[11] I propose three possible causes of the omission of women’s compositions from the books of these four authors. The first centers on Margolis’ *Patterns, Thinking, and Cognition*, the second on some of Foucault’s concepts in *Madness and
Definitions of music and theories are multiple but generally include concepts of music as patterned sound and theory as a method of seeking to determine these patterns. Margolis detailed his analysis of pattern cognition within cultural contexts. His analysis is useful for pattern cognition implicit in music's composition and analysis. Margolis argued for a pattern-seeking, pattern-dominated cognition, which he defined as “... all of cognition consists of being cued (not consciously of course) to whatever pattern we first find that satisfies the situation” (page 40). In addition, he proposed a continuum of cognitive entrenchment, as exemplified by the Copernican revolution: “[I]t was only after a complete turning of generations .. that we reach people free enough of the older habits of mind for the [Copernican] contagion to reach the stage of social knowledge.”

The book ended with a close reading of Galileo’s trial and conviction by the Inquisition during the reign of Pope Urban VIII, taking into account that Galileo and Urban were good friends. Although others of his time privately supported Galileo’s stance that the earth moved around the sun, the political climate of ideas and perceptions was such that Galileo had to make public recantation of what most serious scholars believed privately. Margolis summarized that, “Political polarization stimulates cognitive polarization;” and that the intensity of the polarization will depend on the degree of balance of the various points of view: if the balance is one-sided, supporters of the dominant view will have little incentive to see things in a balanced way. Margolis concluded that cognitive perception is intrinsic to cultural parameters and to human political behavior. Although his concepts can be applied to contemporary music theorists’ need to ignore works by women composers, his reasoning assumes that all of his protagonists are equally committed to defending their cognitive and political concepts. All of his examples are males. His description of the societal angst caused by the Copernican revolution may have even greater applications to controversies arising from the inclusion of women and minorities in college textbooks. Minorities, by simple definition, have fewer advocates than the majority. Culturally, women have been less inclined to insist on representation equivalent to men in texts, as evidenced by the exclusion of women’s compositions from the texts described here.

Margolis’ theories need additions to account for acculturated differences in groups. Research by Gilligan, Ruddick and others has shown that U.S. women are culturally conditioned to avoid conflict and to seek conflict resolution. For example, Gilligan advocated that “an ethic of care rests on the premise of nonviolence—that no one should be hurt.” Ruddick summarized, “All participants resist others’ violence and their own temptations to abandon or assault, persisting in relationships that include anger, disappointment, difference, conflict, and nonviolent battle.” Women may be reluctant to participate in the heated verbal and printed exchanges that have occurred in the dialectics defining compositional practices and their appropriate theoretical approaches. Many women composers and theorists display these characteristics. The verbal violence of some of these exchanges is relished by some of the participants, but may be frightening to others. In addition, when women composers and theorists do attempt to participate in these exchanges, our colleagues may perceive us as operating outside the traditional cultural roles of women and discount our opinions. Although trained through androcentric university traditions in the musical and intellectual crossdressing of defending our cognitive concepts, some of our primary acculturation remains and is reinforced by the popular culture in which we participate.

These cultural patterns of conflict resolution may restrain us from being advocates of equal strength for our music and theories. We are culturally predisposed to seek resolution of verbal conflicts and are not our own best advocates for our music. This complicates consideration of women's music. Men theorists and composers are culturally trained to compete, to make their best cases for their own compositions and theories. They can become impatient with women who retain conflict-averting cognitive patterns. On the other hand, both men and women can be startled by women who have adapted their cognitive styles to those more expected of men, or by men who have chosen to adopt conflict-avoidance styles. Cognitive styles which lack cultural recognition, when used in group communication, whether the communication is musical, verbal, or written, complicate group consideration of these different cognitive paradigms. Groups and their individual members may be left in a state of confusion and unease by unfamiliar perceptual and communicative modes. This can complicate the communication and cooperation between women and men members of the same profession, through political polarization within our discipline. We work in a continuum of cultural sites and perceptions; not all women consider themselves feminists and not all feminists are women.
Margolis’ description of Galileo’s conviction and silencing by the Inquisition provides an extreme example of political polarization around a conceptual paradigm change. There are musical analogues: as undergraduates, we learn to include Germaine Tailleferre as one of “Les Six.” Yet well over half of her compositions are still unpublished and unavailable for any analytical judgment. Her compositional relationship to “Les Six” thus remains analytically undeterminable. The absence of women’s compositions from twentieth-century theory texts does not require that we round up for a contemporary Inquisition “the usual suspects” (to paraphrase one of the last scenes in the movie “Casablanca”) of women composers excluded and demand their credentials for inclusion: perhaps alphabetically from Laurie Anderson to Ellen Taaffe Zwilich. However, their erasure from our analytical literature makes theories of another twentieth-century analyst, Foucault, relevant to our reflection.

My previous description of the text authors’ surprise at their omission of women’s compositions can be related to Foucault’s explication of the purpose of punishment: “the penalty should be carried out in secret; the public was to intervene neither as a witness, nor as a guarantor of punishment”; (14) “the perfect image of prison labour was the women’s workshop at Clairvaux; the silent precision of the human machinery is reminiscent of the regulated rigour of the convent”; (15) and “a certain significant generality moved between the least irregularity and the greatest crime; it was no longer the offence, the attack on the common interest, it was the departure from the norm, the anomaly.” (16) Foucault’s writings defined a culture’s need to disguise and hide the mechanics of punishment from the cultural world at large. What better cultural punishment with its secret precision as defined by Foucault, can be devised (however unintentional) for women composers, than to ignore their work in the books which the theoretical community designates as central to learning twentieth-century compositional and theoretical techniques?

The historical relegation of women to a private sphere and many women’s consideration of such relegation to punishment has been documented by Spacks (17) and by Armstrong (18) among others. Music plays a central cultural role in religious ritual; silencing of women continues as a doctrine among a number of religions. Women composers, who have chosen to break these traditions with creation of organized sound performed in public, are so deeply criminalized by the centralities of our culture as to make the quotation of their music in a theory text nearly a crime in itself. How can we be surprised at the exclusion of women’s compositions from textbooks?

Additional reasons for exclusion of women’s compositions from 20th-century analytical texts can be deduced from Foucault’s Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason, where he stipulates: “Long after the diseases of the poor had again become an affair of state, the asylum would keep the insane in the imperative fiction of the family”; (19) and “Confinement, prisons, dungeons, even tortures, engaged in a mute dialogue between reason and unreason are the dialogue of struggle. This dialogue itself was now disengaged; silence was absolute; there was no longer any common language between madness and reason.” (20) Silence, culturally accepted for a group of some of its members (as is the case for women in many subcultures), militates against strong support of what that group might say. Does acceptance of such silencing advance the presence of women’s compositions in contemporary culture? The question of why there are no great women composers is still heard occasionally and is provided with radically incomplete answers. Women’s compositions are omitted from our field’s most popular texts on twentieth-century music. Does their authors being men increase the probability of women’s exclusion from subsequent editions?

The last half century’s importance of reason and mathematics to analytical systems centered on twelve-tone and set theory may provide an implicit basis for ignoring women’s compositions which might be well served through use of such analysis. Do we exclude analyses of women’s compositions because culturally we do not relate them to such objective analytical contexts? Even Lewin (a strong supporter of women) has written an analysis of Babbitt’s Philomel in which he describes the actions of the raped and mutilated woman: “Nothing lies closer to her than the laborious work of composing her piece, through Babbitt as a medium. In that manner alone can she portray her being, and make known her sufferings. To sing Babbitt’s piece is to weave her tapestry.” (21) Does the metaphor of tapestry weaving show us a woman giving public reasoned testimony of her wrongs, or of a woman confined to reveal her agonies in a culturally-approved private space through the repetitive physical actions required to make a tapestry? What roles of equivalent independence and joy have been recognized in women’s composition and analyzed by men theorists? What analyses by men theorists celebrate strength, logic and happiness in the music of women?
Could exemplifying analysis through compositions by women, who are defined by our culture to embody illogic, constitute an implicitly inappropriate pedagogical approach? Wennerstrom’s review previously cited notes that the books she reviewed concentrated on twelve-tone and set theory. Are women composers still faced with Gilman’s situation as recounted in her short story, “The Yellow Wallpaper”—a disguised autobiographical account—of a woman writer driven to madness by her “rest cure” that required that she never write again? Has the explicit cultural imperative of Gilman’s time become implicit for today’s women composers—that they should cease writing music and dismiss any possibilities of their music being included in analysis? What analyses have been published in music theory journals, written by men theorists about compositions by women, utilizing twelve-tone and set theory? There are multiple examples of the converse: women theorists, in their published analyses, have dutifully and skillfully applied current analytical techniques to men’s compositions. Would there have been such outrage against McClary’s analyses if she had centered on women’s compositions, instead of the “canonized” men’s compositions which she frequently analyses? Omission of women composers from twentieth-century texts is likely to be attributable to multiple causes arising within the field. Adrienne Rich’s phrase, “the dream of a common language,” still holds attraction for women musicians as did its choice as the theme of the first conference on Feminist Theory and Music, held in 1991. We still hope for the possibility of musical creations of both women and men being considered by us all.

After World War II and the Korean War, many young men composers went to college on the GI Bill. Their subsequent return to academic institutions as composers brought them back to places where they had experienced freedom and growth. Babbitt strengthened their desire to return, by calling for contemporary composition to center in academic institutions: “I dare suggest that the composer would do himself and his music an immediate and eventual service by total, resolute and voluntary withdrawal from this public world to one of private performance and electronic media. By so doing, the separation between the domains would be defined beyond any possibility of confusion of categories, and the composer would be free to pursue a private life of professional achievement.” Men composers’ seeking private academic lives coincided with decreases in the percentage of women as members of university faculties, documented by Jessie Barnard. In recent years, there is an increasing number of women and men composers in comparison to the number of university positions available. Competition for these positions has become fierce. What effect does this competition have on men composer/theorists? Does it decrease their professional and cultural security, their likelihood (however unintentional) of promoting and analyzing the works of women composers?

The reduction in percentage of women on university faculties may have had unintended consequences on the education of younger contemporary composers and theorists, who may have had minimal opportunities to study theory or composition with women composers/theorists. For many current theorists, women composers have not been available as teachers or as role models. Although these theorists are aware of women as composers, their choice of compositions to illustrate twentieth-century techniques would more likely be drawn from their early role models and mentors. Theodore noted the continuation of this reduced influence: “The status of academic women had remained virtually unchanged from 1970 to 1983 . . . and they barely were visible in the male-dominated academic departments and professional schools, both public and private, large and small.” This is quite a change from the late nineteenth century belief that music was a womanly occupation, as documented by Ives’ continual railing against effeminacy he thought that he detected in compositions or performances.
women composers well known by students from their performance repertoire, written by composers such as Musgrave, Zwilich, Larsen, Tower, and many others, are not used in theory classes. Students develop an increased sense of alienation of the relationship of music theory and music through omission of women's compositions from their theoretical studies.

[24] Based on the foregoing and on my previous writings, I consider twentieth-century texts providing compositions written exclusively by men, to be radically incomplete. I acknowledge the cultural basis of such a selection, but question whether it represents the conscious decision of the majority of music theorists. There is considerable feminist theory in other fields that advocates a somewhat different position within analytic traditions, such as Battersby's Gender and Genius. "Men would not have insisted that creativity is a male prerogative unless men were afraid that women's creations would be taken seriously."

[25] My summary invokes concepts of Korsyn, Ginsberg, and Christensen, as well as aspects of poststructural feminism, which provide an effective way to formulate relationships of women and music as the site of multiple truths without acceding to a total relativity of truths. In 1987, Weedon wrote of this multiplicity: “The meaning of the signifier ‘woman’ varies from ideal to victim to object of sexual desire, according to its context. Consequently, it is always open to challenge and redefinition with shifts in its discursive context . . . However, a feminist poststructuralism must pay full attention to the social and institutional context of textuality in order to address the power relations of everyday life . . . Social meanings are produced within social institutions and practices in which individuals, who are shaped by these institutions, are agents of change.” Women musicians, in their multiply-overlapping roles of composers, theorists, performers, and listeners, are change agents who are shaped by cultural institutions and contexts.

[26] Segments of poststructural theories, particularly those which propose a multiplicity of truths, are useful in determining a place for women's works, both musical and literary. The central truths abstracted from the canon of men's works are not about to be replaced by some “politically correct” revision. I am not advocating substitution of Bacewicz for Berg, Clarke for Cage, Shulamit Ran for Stravinsky; I ask that our cognitive perception be extended to include the former as well as the latter. If we can expand historically accepted sources of musical concepts to include women's work as having equal valence, we will have accomplished a great deal. As Ginsberg concluded: “But one of the projects of American feminists has been to claim our right to participate in the making of meaning.” More complete musical analytic truths (no matter how partial they remain) will emerge from our inclusion of women's compositions in the music that we analyze and help our students learn to analyze.

[27] Both music theory and I as a theorist are expanding and changing our methodologies. In 1989, I first had the temerity to discuss with a graduate student the question with which I had been concerned for some time: What might constitute feminist music theories? His response was, “I can't imagine what feminism and music theory might have in common.” As Christensen wrote in 1993: “Every composition exists along a plurality of continuums: the composer's own artistic development, the historical unfolding of a given genre or style, evolving social and aesthetic forces, and so on.” The pluralities of cognitive perceptions of music will continue to increase.

[28] Our students are ahead of their teachers now, and we might well run to catch up with them. In this spirit, I propose one of many possible supplementary study lists for an undergraduate one-semester course on twentieth-century music analysis. This in no way proposes a new canon. If I articulate a problem, feminist theories advocate that I present a possible solution: I believe that the lack of women's compositions used in our analysis texts is a significant problem. The music and articles are a compilation relying on many with greater expertise than I; most of my research and teaching have been in sixteenth- and eighteenth-century music. In responses to my email for help, members of the International Alliance of Women Musicians’ electronic discussion list produced far more music and references than I can include here. Works included in the assignment list were chosen, in large part, because I was able to find secondary literature to assist in their analysis. A number of significant women composers, including some of my personal favorites, are omitted because I could find no secondary resources. I hope this will bring outcries of, “How could you have missed the article/book on X?” The assignment list needs expansion.

[29] Change in our professional endeavors is likely to be both exhilarating and unsettling. Korsyn has written of possible changes; “If analysis is to capture the rhetorical relationship between speaker and audience . . . we may need to find new
styles of writing about music.”(34) Some will question whether my writing is an appropriate method of framing the problem. Nearly a decade ago, Anderson discussed phases of curriculum change; my proposal here is both partial and conservative, the sort often referred to as, “add women and stir.”(35)

[30] In the future, I hope that the amount of music by women composers in our curricula more accurately mirrors the percentage of women who study with us and go on to become professional musicians, frequently including in their repertory a great deal of music written by women. Curricula changes of this magnitude will discomfit many theorists in the field today. I take comfort in the words of bell hooks: “If women always seek to avoid confrontation, to always be ‘safe,’ we may never experience any revolutionary change, any transformation, individually or collectively.”(36) Can her words be extended to women's compositions and to feminist music theories as well? Music theory needs to develop cognitive patterns past a silencing of women composers. Addition of women's compositions to twentieth-century analytical texts can aid us all.

SUPPLEMENTAL TWENTIETH-CENTURY ASSIGNMENT LIST

1-SEMESTER UNDERGRADUATE ANALYSIS COURSE

The proposal below is problematic in several ways: the list assumes standard categorization of historical styles and periods, without reexamining them. Many of the women composers whose works are listed have composed in a number of styles and may not be well served by my categorization. My reasons for utilizing current twentieth-century categories are that both texts and course structures often use such an approach. Thus, instructors can “plug in” a segment of the list with minimal restructuring of their current syllabi. I hope that this article engenders significant discussion and revision proposals, both of my approach and of those approaches I have implied as “standards.” Resources on women's compositions and on the composers themselves are being developed so quickly that even an electronic journal listing of this sort is incomplete. I recommend that those who want additional information start with the electronic data bases maintained by the International Alliance of Women Musicians, the American Musicology Society, and the Society for Music Theory Committee on the Status of Women.

Weeks 1 and 2: Extended Romanticism and Nationalism


RECORDING: CD4011, Virgin Classics.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: Turnabout TV-S34556 (page 16, Cohen discography).

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: Cambria.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


Weeks 3 and 4: Early 20th c. French Post-Tonality


RECORDING: Cassette Two, Historical Anthology of Music by Women, Compiled by James R. Briscoe, Indiana University Press.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


Week 5: Free Atonality


RECORDING: Leonarda, LPI103.
ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: VOX SVBX5353.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: CRI SD 401 Composers Recordings, In., 270 W. 74th St., New York, NY, 10023.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


**Week 6: Early Serialism**


RECORDING: MGM E3359 (1956); Bussoti, Piano; MGM Orch.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: London Argo 425; Argo, ZRG5425.
ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


**Week 7: Neoclassicism**


RECORDING: Calcante, CALCD006.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: ASV-CD908 Maggini Quartet.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: “Landscapes,” CBCRC110.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


**Week 8: Modernism**

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: Blustine, Da Capo Players, CRI, CD582.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


*Weeks 9 and 10: Tape, Aleatoric, Electronic*


RECORDING: Grenadilla Records.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: CRI, 1984, SD338. (Cohen discography, page 4)

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: Capstone CDS, 8607.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


**Week 11: Popular and Film**


**RECORDING:** Hester Park, CD 7701.

**ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:**


**RECORDING:** Hester Park, CD 7701.

**ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:**


**Week 12: Minimalist and Performance Art**


**RECORDING:** Live recording, property of composer, duplicates available on request.

**ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:**


**Weeks 13 and 14: Synthesis of Contemporary Techniques**


**RECORDING:** KC7279.

**ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:**


ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: GM Recordings, No. 2045.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: Vienna Modern Masters Vmm2003.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


RECORDING: CRI SD 411.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


*Week 15: Performance Art, Multimedia*

RECORDING: Warner Brothers CD 23192.

ANALYTICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:


SELECTED REFERENCES


**SELECTED BOOKS AND DISSERTATIONS ON WOMEN COMPOSERS AND FEMINIST COMPOSITION SINCE 1980**


**ANTHOLOGIES**


Perone, James E. *Musical Anthologies for Analytical Study: A Bibliography*. Music Reference Collection No.48. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995. (Although this is not an anthology per se, it lists current anthologies in which women composers’ music can be found.)

**JOURNALS**

*IAWM Journal*
Sasha Kennison, IAWM Administrative Assistant
Department of Music
George Washington University
The Academic Center B144
Washington, DC 20052
PH: (202) 994-6338
sasha@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu

*Women and Music: A Journal of Gender and Culture*
Department of Music
George Washington University
The Academic Center B144
Washington, DC 20052
available to IAWM members as part of the current dues structure and to non-IAWM members for a fee.

Women of Note Quarterly
Vivace Press
N.W. 310 Wawawai Road
Pullman, WA 99163-2959
PH: (509) 334-4660
FAX: (509) 334-3551

A PARTIAL LIST OF MUSIC PUBLISHERS AND RECORDING SOURCES

Clarnan Editions
235 Baxter Lane
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Composers Recordings, Inc./CRI
Joseph R. Dalton, Managing Director
73 Spring Street, Room 506
New York, NY 10012
PH: 212-941-9673
FAX: 212-941-9704

Furore-Verlag
Naumburger Strasse 40
3500 Kassel, GERMANY
PH: 561-897352
FAX: 561-83472

Greenwood Publishing Group
Nora Kisch, Director of Marketing
P.O. Box 5007
Westport, CT 06881
PH: 201-226-3571
FAX: 203-222-1502

Hildegard Publishing Company
P.O. Box 332
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010
PH/FAX: 610-649-8649

Elizabeth Hinkle-Turner's A-Z Discography
http://music.acu.edu/www/iawm.discography.html
hardcopy listing, pages 15–23, IAWM Journal 1
(October 1995).

International Female Composers Library
Antje Olivier, Director
Postfach 1430
Nicolaistrasse 2
D-59423 Una, GERMANY
PH: 2303/23111
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