

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Minors, Helen Julia (2023) Club Inégales, Curation and Processes of Public Musicology. In: EditorsEmailORCIDDormey, ChrisUNSPECIFIEDUNSPECIFIEDUNSPECIFIED, (ed.) Routledge Companion to Applied Musicology. Routledge, pp. 98-107

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/6854/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version: <https://www.routledge.com/The-Routledge-Companion-to-Applied-Musicology/Dromey/p/book/9780367488246>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repositories Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at
ray@yorks.ac.uk

Club Inégales, Curation, and Processes of Public Musicology

Helen Julia Minors

There are many issues to consider when curating a themed concert series, from design and programming, to engaging participants, including artists and audiences.¹ When curating a series of events that are tailored specifically to facilitate and critique the place of women's voices (in the broadest sense of the word) in the music industries, there are further concerns, not least tackling the multiple stereotypes and barriers that regularly and systemically impede women in these industries. This chapter offers a cultural and contextual overview of a series of events I curated at London's Club Inégales in 2019. It offers applied definitions of public engagement, accessibility, and public musicology in the context of curating such events, with a specific focus on artist-audience interaction through pre-concert panel discussions and artist question-and-answer sessions. The chapter then outlines the nature of the events and their aims, before reflecting on their creation and reception. Beyond chronicling the processes of creating such a series, it also comments on the connections, real and latent, between contemporary music-making and musicology.

To assess the role of public musicology, which is one domain in which musicology is applied in a live and immediate manner with audiences, it is necessary to offer specific examples of musicologists and artistic researchers engaging with live events, performances, and their curation. My aim in creating the events examined by this chapter, and in writing the chapter itself, is to develop new ways of fostering inclusive and diverse creative communities. The chapter therefore asks—of myself and my collaborators, and of the events themselves—several questions about the processes and activities that took place. For example, how did Club Inégales embrace approaches from musicology in an applied and creative manner? And to what extent was the role of a public musicologist central to “Women's Voices” (the title given to four of the six events)?

Public-orientated activity comes with a practical and moral imperative to assess how genuinely, and impactfully, it facilitates audience-participant engagement, accessibility, and inclusive design.² Our own activity was therefore an important and timely opportunity to collaborate with Peter Wiegold (Musical Director, Club Inégales) and his colleagues at the venue, whose agenda has long incorporated a focus on interacting with their audience and developing a dialogue that exceeds that of the traditional concert hall. As Wiegold notes: the club has ‘always striven to be a centre of debate and innovation.’³ Reflecting on my own role as co-organiser and co-curator, I will examine how curation and public musicology interrelate, drawing on comparable projects and scholarship, the project's planning notes, and correspondence with the events' creative collaborators, delegates, and concertgoers.

Women's Voices and Musical Leadership

Two multifaceted events underpin this chapter. The first is the “International Women in/and Musical Leadership” conference, hosted in London in March 2019 and co-chaired by Laura Hamer and myself. Attracting over 150 participants from over 20 countries,⁴ the event was a

response to the music industries' persistent gender imbalance, which as recently as 2013 saw conductor Marin Alsop lament from the podium at the "Last Night of the Proms" how "firsts" for women were still happening, and still needed, even in the twenty-first century. Alsop noted that evening's special concert was, and remains, 'an ultimate showcase for great artistry... [and that Henry Wood] would see this evening as a natural progression toward more inclusion in classical music', given how the diversity of its artists, music, and conductor had expanded.⁵ She went on: 'Quite a lot has been made of me being the first woman to conduct the "Last Night of the Proms"... I am still quite shocked that it can be 2013 and there can still be firsts for women. Here's to the second, third, fourth.'

Our conference aimed to 'redress this [imbalance] by focusing upon the participation of women in musical leadership... and to promote academic-practitioner dialogue.'⁶ Its bringing together of "voices" incorporated two public performance events: Wiegold led the house band, Notes Inégales, for the opening evening, performing works by women graduates of the Club's composing Academy.⁷ The second concert featured The Improvisers' Choir (TIC), led by keynote speaker and composer Jenni Roditi.⁸ As Scott Burnham has persuasively argued: 'We hear music speak... by allowing it the capacity of its own voice.'⁹ Each event therefore challenged participants and attendees to scrutinise women's "voices" and allowed colleagues to give voice to each other through equitable programming choices; indeed, the conference was deliberately scheduled for 7–9 March, coinciding with International Women's Day (8 March), which aims to 'celebrat[e] the social, economic, cultural and political achievements of women... [and] marks a call to action for accelerating women's equality.'¹⁰ Both performances included a pre-concert panel discussion, featuring Wiegold, composers, and performers (Fig. 1). The conference also led directly to the publication of the *Routledge Companion to Women and Musical Leadership: The Nineteenth Century and Beyond*.¹¹

<Insert Fig. 1>

The second event grew from the conference: "Women's Voices" at Club Inégales comprised a series of concerts with informal, interactive pre-concert discussion. Our intentions were to amplify the voices of composers and performers, in addition to musicologists (who are traditionally tasked with giving, or transmitting, pre-concert talks), and thereby to also foster dialogue between artists in an open, accessible space. To help meet these aims, I attended each final rehearsal, speaking with the artists in order to tailor questions to details of their practice. Club Inégales was a perfect foil for the project's ambitions. Founded in 2010, the club describes itself as neither a jazz club, new music venue, comedy club, nor world music venue, but promises 'all of these [activities] do appear, as we search for the best of real new, spontaneous performance.'¹² The club lacks a traditional stage; everyone is on one level, removing a (literal) barrier between musicians and concertgoers. The front row is also unusually close to the performance space; most concertgoers sit on sofas and chairs in front of café-bar tables throughout each event. The "club" itself is, in fact, a network of interrelated activities, including Notes Inégales (an ensemble which performs score-based music, improvises, and blends styles from around the world) and Academy Inégales (which arranges summer schools and courses so young composers can work with Notes Inégales).

The common agenda, then, is to connect with wider and more varied audiences by showcasing relatable features a concertgoer would recognise from, say, a jazz club, a concert hall, a club, or even a community-based event. The venue's events, their interactivity (between house band, guests, and/or visiting ensembles), and programming decisions (including performing music by Academy graduates) serve to promote under-represented voices. Similarly, our own project sought to illuminate and address the music industries' stark gender imbalance, which was debated and challenged through discussion and performance. Precise figures are understandably difficult to calculate, but the overall picture is bleakly clear: in popular music, women comprise 21.7% of artists, 12.3% of songwriters, and just 2.1% of producers.¹³ Factors include a perceived lack of role models in popular music, whose industry is a notoriously closed network.¹⁴ In classical music, too, the organisation Donne: Women in Music, founded and curated by Gabriella Di Laccio, has shown that 'only 11.45% of the scheduled concerts worldwide [in 2020/21] included compositions by women. 88.55% included solely compositions by men.'¹⁵

The solution to this malaise is advocacy and activity, as Jes Skolnik has powerfully argued:

To change culture for the better, [making it] more representative and more equitable, those of us with the power to curate new canons... must both resist the tendency of capital to co-opt revolutionary impulses and be as critical of our own histories and perspectives as we are of others, keeping key contexts intact and always questioning who we are including and excluding, who we are letting speak and who we are silencing, by drawing new canons.¹⁶

There have been promising signs of recent change in *some* sectors of the music industry, albeit progress is stubbornly slow; gender imbalance is a structural problem driven, and perpetuated, by systemic biases. Large institutions such as London's Southbank Centre (Europe's largest arts centre) and New York's Lincoln Center have adopted rigorous and active strategies to uphold equality, diversity, and inclusion (therefore including, but not limited to, gender).¹⁷ The former takes a five-step approach (listen, reflect, plan, implement, measure) to ensure a holistic approach to inclusivity and as a way to self-reflect and monitor their decision-making. The latter interprets access broadly, offering "adapted tours" so patrons can access support for physical and sensory access, including touched tours (where audience members are guided to feel and experience the stage set, the costumes and the props), assistive listening devices, and other sensory supports.¹⁸

2021's BBC Proms was another milestone, including living and recent works by women (e.g. Ruth Gipps's Second Symphony, conducted by Mirga Gražinytė-Tyla, alongside 19 other women composers that season), and actively raising awareness about classical music's gender imbalance through broadcast seminars.¹⁹ In non-classical music, too, the festival sector is belatedly responding to grassroots pressure, driven by movements and organisations such as #bookmorewomen, ReBalance, and the F-List.²⁰ In principle, smaller venues such as Club Inégales are able to be more agile and responsive to the demands of inclusivity and accessibility, yet their financial precarity and comparatively lesser reach impede change: pre-concert talks are easier to arrange when the pool of potential attendees is bigger, or on the radio where interviews, discussion, and reviews are natural fillers before, after, and during the intervals of the concerts broadcast (a notable example, again, is the BBC Proms, which has scheduled and sometimes broadcast occasional pre-concert talks by experts since the 1990s). Nevertheless, such modes of engagement are also important to smaller venues' efforts to widen accessibility by broadening understanding and, consequently, by making

their audiences feel more welcome. Indeed, a more intimate, interactive audience experience can be nurtured at smaller venues, hence many amateur groups and local events make more regular use of informal discussion that engages, say, the soloist or conductor—a practice that professional ensembles have been traditionally reluctant to emulate.

My own experience with the Aldworth Philharmonic Orchestra is typical: pre-concert discussions strive to illuminate the thinking behind programming and planning and allow musicians and audiences to interact. Less ordinarily, a “concert virgin” scheme grants free entry to anyone who has not attended an orchestral concert before.²¹ The orchestra’s pre-concert discussions are therefore particularly helpful in the context of demystifying the concertgoing experience. A similar approach was taken at Club Inégales, where our panels comprised a Chair (myself), a guest musician (or musicians), and a musician from the house band. This design, the deliberate informality of the (two-way) discussion, and the venue’s layout prompted audiences to think differently: one delegate who attended Jenni Roditi and The Improvisers’ Choir’s concert recalled how ‘the discussion, before the performance, was really different—it challenged and shone a new light on what the music was really about.’²² The ‘light’ was connected to our aim to modernise classical concert-giving by raising the challenge of representation, rather than merely summarising the music’s context within the programme. Club Inégales thus joins other organisations in England—notable others include The Little Orchestra, The Third Orchestra (discussed later in this chapter), Multi-Story Orchestra, and the Orchestra of the Age of Enlightenment—in trying to modernise classical concert-giving.²³

Public Musicology as Advocacy

If musicology is ‘a process of study, inquiry and reflection’,²⁴ then public musicologists acting in a concert setting should map, and shepherd, this journey for audiences and artists alike. Our first performer, Hyelim Kim, remarked that she ‘found the pre-concert discussion took the whole event to a different context from where we normally place it... [bringing] up some cautionary keywords [feminism, women leaders, women role models] for creative practice generally, rather than focussing just on the artistic quality.’²⁵ Kim’s reflection chimed with another of our aims: to publicise and encourage consideration of the creative journey, thereby shifting emphasis away from a musical (and musicological) culture that tends to fetishise the finished “product”, towards an informed understanding of the role of each creative artist and their interconnectedness with contemporary society. The aim to widen access for women and to increase their opportunities (in more varied roles) are naturally connected; indeed, this work is ongoing, including co-mentoring to build capacity and develop confidence, and workshops to share experiences.²⁶

Musicology, then, is not limited to history: it is an active, applied practice through which to reflect, advocate, and enact change in the music industries and in society at large. One of musicology’s benchmarks, *Grove Music*, describes musicology as having eleven subdisciplines: historical method, theoretical and analytical musicology, textual scholarship, archival research, lexicography and terminology, organology and iconography, performance practice, aesthetics and criticism, socio-musicology, psychology, and gender and sexual studies.²⁷ Each of these areas relates, or is relatable, to the other, yet their *application*, which is central to enacting change in programming, engagement, and other practices across the

music industries, is not defined, much less codified. To strive for accessibility in the context of music-making can, and must, encompass not only gender, but also disability (neuro, physical, and sensory), faith, race, sexuality, and so on. This sense of inclusivity extends to education, outreach, and mentorship, supporting the next generation of thinkers and artists. As Deborah Rhode has argued, ‘Women need advocates, not simply advisors’.²⁸ For public engagement to be more than an aspiration, more than something promised in grant applications, it must interrelate with equality, diversity, and inclusivity strategies. The audience is an active participant. As Simon Frith put it, “‘listening’ itself is a performance.”²⁹

Frith’s truism followed in the footsteps of Christopher Small, whose concept of “musicizing” has proved so influential in socio-musicology.³⁰ One of Small’s feats was to critique the collective “doing” of music: that everyone—performer, concertgoer, ticket-seller, porter—plays their part in making the musical event happen.³¹ Arguments about musical meaning can also be recast by thinking inclusively, that is, by diversifying repertoire and engaging with a wider range of voices in the discipline. We might, for example, heed the advice of Lawrence Kramer, who emphasises music’s multimodal reality:

[The] role of music in this more-than-language game is such as to change the very notion of music. Instead of forming a soundtrack that supports or distracts us from the clarity of image or utterance, music becomes the embodied form of that semantic energy or spirit which images and utterances channel into intelligibility, which they temporarily localize and concretize and into which they release themselves to be carried onward, backward, and away from post to post. Music means by interpreting this flow so that something, in passing, stands out.³²

It follows that to expand musical canons is to include a wider variety of people while cultivating links between the practice of musicology, music-making, and, ultimately, judgements about whether musical events achieve inclusivity. At present, canons are constructed by those who select repertoire for performances, recordings, and publication, yet this process, even today, rarely strives to be inclusive. If canons—rooted by definition in decisions taken in the past—are to develop and modernise inclusively, then musicologists must adapt institutional structures. Inclusivity does not need to be seen as antithetical to quality, and nor, musicologically, should the ‘gap between music as event and as object... be severe.’³³

Such arguments directly informed the planning and content of “Women’s Voices”. Pre-concert discussions introduced relevant issues to educate (i.e. about their existence) and to prompt reflection, while establishing links to the music itself, e.g. “Why are these works significant in themselves, and to the aim to advocate for more equal representation of women in live performance?”, “how have prior experiences affected the careers of these artists?”, and “why do women who have “made it” not see themselves as successful?” In this way, these ostensibly musical questions looked to emphasise the relevance of their issues to everyday contexts and experiences. Although the reach and cultural capital of musical events such as “Women’s Voices” tend to be proportional to their size, all such events have the power to challenge and influence musical practice from the perspective of musicians and concertgoers alike. Because the impact of grassroots events, and of those which seek out collaboration, are particularly potent,³⁴ we decided to feature members of women’s collectives during the first two events, including Sounding the Feminists (STF, f. 2017), another organisation that addresses representation in the concert hall.³⁵ Their feedback was invaluable, as it instilled an ethos we could emulate, namely that all art should be made available and accepted whether or

not it is accompanied by an explicitly advocative agenda—rather than art by underrepresented groups being interpreted through an exclusively advocative lens.

To similar ends, during each discussion I repeated to the panel member from Club Inégaes similarly-worded questions, e.g. “how have you selected your programme?” and “what informed your decision-making process?”, in order to inform audiences about the events’ diversifying agenda. At the fifth event, I cited Lydia Goehr’s belief that ‘subservience to composers and their works has generated pressures both political and aesthetic.’³⁶ Her argument, that a blind acceptance of the “master” composers limits our access to more diverse music, set a musicological context not only for our discussion, but also the performances. The audience’s reactions to this statement were striking, sparking questions about the difficulties programmers and curators face when sourcing and rehearsing music by underrepresented voices. On one occasion, the statement also prompted more informal discussions during the interval about how the classical music canon has been “exported” (to quote one concertgoer) around the world almost as a pre-packaged set of works, i.e. a fully-formed, if limited, canon.

Another participant called for more “open door”, free concerts, while another noted that canons can be re-enforced by “manuals”, radio shows and events that highlight, for example, the “Top 100” or “Top 300” pieces of classical music (probably a reference to Classic FM’s longstanding annual “Hall of Fame”). Discussion also cited how the “pressures” of funding can become perpetual (a common fatalistic trope in discussion about classical music), but that such concerns were not only political, but also related to audiences themselves, i.e. consumer demand. At the same time, it was also suggested that experiments in concert-design and location could yield greater engagement for both non-traditional and traditional concertgoers—a proposal explored elsewhere in this volume.³⁷ More generally, there was consistent feedback, both verbally and by email, that advocacy and activism through non-traditional concert programming could help alleviate the pressures Goehr cited and also foster inclusivity.

None of the events employed traditional programme notes: credits for the entire series were made available online. We wanted to discourage individuals from reading long programme notes in isolation, a medium that, as Goehr also argued, ‘came to be designed to help an audience adopt a suitable aesthetic attitude.’³⁸ In guiding audiences, programme notes also impede representative concerns by promoting a single, authoritative voice.³⁹ There are two specific problems here: how this ‘voice’ is recruited; and a difficulty, inherent to the medium, not to “decree” a singular aesthetic perspective. Our aim, instead, was to generate conversations that empowered audiences and artists alike to formulate their own ways of thinking, while challenging the status quo. Audiences in this context were able to give verbal and written feedback, to interject with questions, and even to speak directly with the artists and performers during the interval. Hearing from individual concertgoers, and not only those on or from the stage, created (to adapt Kramer) a malleable narrative in which meaning was co-constructed. As Wiegold noted in his review of these discussions, they ‘were carefully shaped to provide insight into women in a wide variety of roles, as a performer, reading or improvising, a composer and ensemble director. The participants revealed myriad ways of negotiating contemporary “cross-overs” both musical and social.’⁴⁰

Our recruitment of Kim and Roditi for the first two performances (those events linked to the conference, which we anticipated would attract the largest and most diverse audiences) was

strategic: Kim has wide experience of performing her Korean flute with contemporary dance and in a cross-genre, improvisatory context; as a composer and improviser, Roditi has worked with many vocal ensembles and has developed a unique approach to vocal tai-chi.⁴¹ Their shared interests and advocacy—for greater intercultural understanding and for fairer gender representation in musical practice, blurring the boundaries of composition, improvisation, and performance—informed and inspired the two days’ events. Through talks and roundtable discussions, many women told their stories, highlighting, for example, the importance of mentorship, creative networks, and support for women with caring responsibilities. Through workshops, both artists shared their own approaches to cross-cultural programming and to ensemble leadership.

To plan the subsequent events at Club Inégales, I met with Wiegold to discuss the benefit to the club of presenting them and what changes might be made (in light of how the conference had unfolded) to maximise their impact. The synergies between the venue’s ethos and ours were immediately apparent. Indeed, Wiegold was plotting to pursue very similar aims by launching The Third Orchestra (f. 2019), which also strives to diversify musical practice by bringing together musicians from different cultures and genres.⁴² The aim of the collaboration to attract and engage distinct audiences, i.e. academics, Club Inégales regulars, musicians, and followers of the ensembles that participated, was duly agreed, sealing our decision to embrace the interrelationship of performance, public engagement, and socio-musicological advocacy.

Final Reflections

Understandably rare among most musical events, this blended approach allowed us to achieve one further aim: to oversee events that accord with Jochen Eisentraut’s three levels of accessibility, developed in the context of how people engage with music, namely ‘physical contact’ (e.g. a somatic experience of the musical event), ‘personal reception’, and ‘participation’.⁴³ Each of these types of engagement was experienced by audiences and artists alike during “Women’s Voices”, in particular. One review, co-authored by three attendees, praised how The Improvisers’ Choir, for example, ‘poignantly reaffirm[ed] the power of the individual voice, and the difference it can make as part of a collective.’⁴⁴ It did so, specifically, through a novel “guided” approach, whereby Roditi signed through hand gestures prescribed information to the singer,⁴⁵ such that each member of the choir was prized, had independence, and could effectively be a soloist, rather than being obliged to “blend in” with fellow choir members (as a choir would typically require).

Similarly, the idea of the collective was a deliberate performative feature in the third sections of all six events, which saw the house band and the guest soloist/ensemble perform together, exchanging musical ideas and shaping a distinct, collective musical voice. The core motivic ideas were provided (e.g. Wiegold introduced some melodic licks as a basis for improvisation), but their development, orchestration, and adaptation were all improvised, with Wiegold leading from the front, using his own coded hand gestures to sign to the group to adapt, take a solo, or to develop the ensemble.⁴⁶ “Conversations” were therefore both musical and verbal, with the latter encompassing not only dialogue with concertgoers, but also the reflections we invited from participating artists. Kim, for example, was moved by her event to draw a line between her identity and her musical practice:

One of the themes [our event] dealt with was equality and diversity in relation to women's voices... My particular position, as 'East Asian', 'female', and a 'Korean traditional flute player', made me constantly conscious of the hegemonies in the music industries, therefore I deal with the issue of women's rights as an equality issue, for those people who are disadvantaged due to power imbalance.⁴⁷

This perspective highlighted for us the significance of the closeness of personal and musical identities, and of how different individualities intersect, i.e. our primary focus on gender unavoidably implicated nationality and race.⁴⁸

Roditi's reflections, meanwhile, concentrated on how public engagement shaped her voice as a composer. She remembered how the 'pre-concert talk... allowed the audience to meet the artists involved, as people, prior to meeting us as musicians, similarly to the activities of the Multi-Story Orchestra, who also interact with their audience prior to the performance.'⁴⁹ This additional insight had two main benefits: to foster dialogue with concertgoers (and her fellow artists, whose creative responses are inseparable from her own work); and to position Roditi, as the event intended, as an authoritative female voice working in a specialised field:

It was a chance to talk about my working methods and explain a little of why, as a composer, I have gone towards conduction. I am the only woman composer that I am aware of who is leading a conduction ensemble in public performances. It was important for the audience to see me explaining why I had chosen to do that. I am effectively acting as female role model in this niche field, which can only be a good thing!⁵⁰

Sadly, the pandemic paused the next stage of our work; nevertheless, the events served their immediate purpose, shedding light on and giving a platform to women in a variety of artistic roles: performers, improvisers, composers, ensemble directors, and, of course, musicologists. As one delegate remarked: 'This is what it's about! Experimenting in a safe public safe, sharing the processes as much as the product.'⁵¹

What next steps might be taken to develop our approach? Does a union of performance, public engagement, and socio-musicological advocacy have a long-term future? One step I have taken more recently, working with fellow musicologists and practitioners, was to start conversations about what equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) really mean (or should mean) for our field—firstly through two closed workshops (2019, following meetings with Music HE colleagues (the UK's higher education subject association), the Royal Musical Association, and the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music), then through a 2020 conference. These events were a launchpad for a new nationwide EDI Music Studies Network (which I co-chair with Laudan Nooshin), intended to examine and help address the discipline's EDI-centred barriers, including in relation to race, faith, gender, sexuality, ableism, and neurodiversity.⁵² It does so because now, in the 2020s, there is an urgent need, driven by societal concerns, music's precarious infrastructure, and a post-pandemic recovery we nervously await (at the time of writing) to reconsider how musical practices are designed and enacted.

For now, it is clear that curation begets choices: about aesthetics; about the extent to which enjoyment, understanding, and engagement are nurtured; and about advocacy, including whether (or how) to break down musical and socio-political barriers in a meaningful rather than cosmetic way. How to (re-)engage audiences will surely be a dominant theme as we

emerge from the pandemic. Through its openness to a type of public musicology that embraced and centred audience engagement, reflections on and about performance, and social issues, Club Inégales shows the important role venues can play in supporting critical engagement and inclusive programming. In this context, to “curate” was to bridge industry-centred and scholarly concerns, calling out the inequities inherent in musical practice, while also giving voice, literally, to more equal gender representation.

¹ This chapter could not have been written without the collaboration and friendship of those participating in the events discussed. Special thanks to Peter Wiegold, Martin Butler, Laura Hamer, Joel Bell, Hyelim Kim, Patrick Allen, and to all the performers, composers, delegates, and concertgoers who were involved. I am also grateful for the support and active involvement of some of the female lawyers from Allen’s firm (Hodge Jones & Allen Solicitors LLP, long-term hosts of Club Inégales), who participated in one of the panel discussions, and to the project’s funders: Arts Council England, the Royal Musical Association, the Institute for Musical Research, and the Open University.

² See Chris Dromey, ‘Taking about Classical Music: Radio as Public Musicology’, in *The Classical Music Industry*, ed. Chris Dromey and Julia Haferkorn (New York: Routledge, 2018), 183–246.

³ Peter Wiegold, correspondence with the author, August 2020.

⁴ See also Byron Dueck, ‘International Women in/and Musical Leadership Conference’, blogpost on “International Women and/in Musical Leadership Conference”, 7–9 March 2020, Senate House, London, <http://www.open.ac.uk/blogs/music/?p=2281>.

⁵ Marin Alsop, speaking during the traditional speech from the podium to conclude 2013’s “Last Night of the Proms”, Royal Albert Hall, London, 7 September 2013.

⁶ Laura Hamer and Helen Julia Minors, ‘Conference Overview’, <http://fass.open.ac.uk/iwmlc..>

⁷ Founded by Peter Wiegold and David Purser, Notes Inégales comprises: Max Baillie (violin/viola), Joel Bell (electric guitar), Hyelim Kim (Korean taegum flute), Christian Forshaw (saxes), Torbjorn Hultmark (trumpet, live electronics), Jon Banks (accordion, santori); Martin Butler (piano), Ben Markland (bass/electric bass), Jackie Shave (violin), Simon Limbrick (drums, percussion), and Wiegold (keyboard and director).

⁸ The programme for the event is available at <https://fass.open.ac.uk/iwmlc>.

⁹ Scott Burnham, ‘Theorists and “the Music itself”’, *Journal of Musicology*, 15/3 (1997), 326.

¹⁰ International Women’s Day, ‘Aims’, <https://www.internationalwomensday.com/>.

¹¹ See Laura Hamer and Helen Julia Minors (eds.), *Routledge Companion to Women and Musical Leadership: The Nineteenth Century and Beyond* (New York: Routledge, 2023).

¹² Club Inégales, <http://www.clubinegales.com/about>.

¹³ See Caitlin Kelly, ‘The music industry still has a long way to go for gender equality’, *Forbes* (6 February 2019), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/caitlinkelley/2019/02/06/music-industry-study-annenberg-gender-equality/#525a3c805f81>.

¹⁴ See Kristin Samuelson, ‘Women grossly underrepresented in the music industry’ (17 September 2019), <https://phys.org/news/2019-09-women-grossly-underrepresented-music-industry.html>.

¹⁵ Donne, *Equality and Diversity in Concert Halls: 100 Orchestras Worldwide* (2021), <https://donne-uk.org/equality-diversity-in-concert-halls-2020-2021/>.

¹⁶ Jes Skolnik, ‘Beyond Representation: In Music And Media, Gender Equality will take a Revolution’, *NPR* (7 August 2018), <https://www.npr.org/2018/08/07/634725840/beyond-representation-in-music-and-media-gender-equality-will-take-a-revolution?t=1597309092941>.

¹⁷ See, respectively, Southbank Centre, ‘Diversity and Inclusion’, <https://www.southbankcentre.co.uk/about/diversity-inclusion>; and Lincoln Center, ‘Accessibility’, <http://lincolncenter.org/visit/accessibility>.

¹⁸ I led one such tour with colleagues during 2013’s Macerata Opera Festival, walking audience members through the large stage set for *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, drawing their attention to the trees, the location of a sports car, and the size of the props, before walking backstage to touch the costumes to help convey a sense of the textures and contrasts of each character’s representation. This activity was part of the AHRC-supported project *Translating Music*, which I co-led with Lucile Desblache. See <https://www.translatingmusic.com>.

-
- ¹⁹ The concert featuring Gipps took place on 5 August 2021. Its related seminar, in which I was interviewed by Georgia Mann, included discussions of inequalities in the context of the treatment Gipps received as an orchestral oboist, composer, and conductor. For further details, see <https://www.bbc.co.uk/events/edmj6q>.
- ²⁰ See, respectively, <https://www.bookmorewomen.com/>, <https://rebalancemusic.com/about-us/>, and <https://thef-listmusic.uk/>.
- ²¹ See <https://www.aldworthphilharmonic.org.uk/apo-concert-virgin-scheme/>.
- ²² Personal communication between a conference delegate (after their first experience of the club) and the author.
- ²³ For more on this evolving scene, Julia Haferkorn, ‘Dancing to Another Tune: Classical Music in nightclubs and other Non-Traditional Venues’, in *The Classical Music Industry*, 148–71.
- ²⁴ David Beard and Kenneth Gloag, *Musicology: The Key Concepts* (London: Routledge, 2005), x.
- ²⁵ Hyelim Kim, correspondence with the author, August 2020.
- ²⁶ I refer here to my ongoing work (co-led with Hamer) to develop women’s representation in the music industries by supporting training and mentorship through the AHRC-funded network Women’s Musical Leadership Online. For further details, see <https://fass.open.ac.uk/research/projects/wmlon>.
- ²⁷ See Vincent Duckles, Jann Pasler, Glenn Stanley, Thomas Christensen, et al., ‘Musicology’, *Grove Music Online* (2001, rev. 2020), <https://doi.org/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.46710>.
- ²⁸ Deborah L. Rhode, *Women and Leadership* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 33.
- ²⁹ Simon Frith, *Performing Rites: Evaluating Popular Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 203.
- ³⁰ See Christopher Small, *Musicking: The Meaning of Performing and Listening* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1998).
- ³¹ Small, *Musicking*, 9–18.
- ³² Lawrence Kramer, *Interpreting Music* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 75.
- ³³ Alastair Williams, *Constructing Musicology* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 6.
- ³⁴ Indeed, ‘grassroots’ was a term cited in each event, whether by an artist, an audience member, or by myself in response to questions. Grassroots activism is discussed in more detail in Hamer and Minors (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Women and Musical Leadership*, esp. Part 6.
- ³⁵ See <https://www.soundingthefeminists.com/>.
- ³⁶ Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 236.
- ³⁷ For example, Ties van de Werff, Veerle Spronck, and Imogen Eve’s chapter “‘Mahler am Tisch’: Experimenting with Imagined and Emergent Audiences”.
- ³⁸ Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*, 240.
- ³⁹ Single voices can naturally limit perspective, unlike co-constructed discussions that amplify wider voices, especially in order to understand lived experiences. Such issues are discussed further in Sonya Sharma, Elena Catalano, Heidi Seetzen, Helen Julia Minors, and Sylvia Collins-Mayo, ‘Taking Race Live: Exploring Experiences of Race through Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Higher Education’, *London Review of Education*, 17/2 (2019), 193–205.
- ⁴⁰ Personal communication with Peter Wiegold, August 2020, reflecting on “Women’s Voices”.
- ⁴¹ Roditi uses signed hand gestures to guide her group, for example to denote solo, accompaniment, development, dynamics, change, and so on. The technique invites comparison with other signed methods, including soundpainting and conduction. See <https://www.vocaltaichi.com/>; <http://www.soundpainting.com/soundpainting/>; and Helen Julia Minors, ‘Soundpainting: A Tool for Collaborating during Performance’, in *Artistic Research in Performance Through Collaboration*, ed. Martin Blain and Helen Julia Minors (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 113–38.
- ⁴² See <https://thethirdorchestra.org/mission>.
- ⁴³ Jochen Eisentraut, *The Accessibility of Music: Participation, Reception and Contact* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 21–23.
- ⁴⁴ Abigail Bruce, Ann Grindley, and Chamari Wedamulla, ‘Conference Report: International Women in/and Musical Leadership’, *Royal Musical Association Newsletter* (2019), <https://www.rma.ac.uk/2019/03/31/conference-report-international-women-and-in-musical-leadership-7-8-march-2019-london/>.
- ⁴⁵ See note 41.
- ⁴⁶ This is a Club Inégales calling card. Guest musicians and the house band regularly work in this way, such that the venue’s events conclude with musical happenings that are neither planned nor predetermined.
- ⁴⁷ Hyelim Kim, correspondence with the author, 2 April 2020.

⁴⁸ See Christina Scharff, 'Inequalities in the Classical Music Industry: The Role of Subjectivity in Constructions of the "Ideal" Classical Musician', in *The Classical Music Industry*, 96–111.

⁴⁹ Jenni Roditi, correspondence with the author, 14 August 2020.

⁵⁰ Roditi, correspondence with the author, 2 April 2020.

⁵¹ Quoted from a delegate who attended on 8 March, their first visit to the club.

⁵² For further information, see <https://www.edimusicstudies.com/>.