4-2019

At The Crossroads of Race, Class and Culture: Identifying the Unintended Consequences of Technology on the Agency of Blues Musicians

Michael D. Berghoef
Western Michigan University, berghoem@ferris.edu

AT THE CROSSROADS OF RACE, CLASS AND CULTURE: IDENTIFYING THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF TECHNOLOGY ON THE AGENCY OF BLUES MUSICIANS

by

Michael D. Berghoef

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Sociology
Western Michigan University
April 2019

Doctoral Committee:

David Hartmann, Ph.D. Chair
Douglas Davidson, Ph.D.
Susan Morris, Ph.D.

The Blues are the roots, the rest are the fruits.
Willie Dixon

Somebody has been cashing checks, and they've been bouncing back on us. And these people, the poor class of Negroes and the poor class of white people, they're getting tired of it.
Howlin' Wolf

Now that I'm getting' old enough to get some money, I'd like to have some money. I don't get much made, I need to conquer a big chunk of money. Not quit playin' but quit playin' so hard.
Muddy Waters

The Blues? It's the mother of American music. That's what it is - the source.
BB King

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to give special thanks to my dissertation committee, for the wisdom, insight and guidance they provided, and for their patience in this unique and challenging journey. I could not have asked for better mentors for this project. I feel very fortunate to have had the dream team committee consisting of Dr David Hartmann, Dr Douglas Davidson and Dr Susan Morris.

To my seven interview participants, I will be forever in your debt. It was a great honor to spend time with you Elder Statesmen of the Blues, and I was humbled by your generosity with your time and insights and trust. I truly treasure the time I was able to spend with each of you and am thankful for your patience with all of my questions. Thanks also for putting up with the awkwardness of the academic research protocols and tolerating the forms, formality, and finally, the aliases that you didn't ask for. Your hospitality and openness made this one of the best experiences of my life.

Special thanks to Barbara Newman, Blues Foundation President and CEO, and her team in Memphis for listening to my situation, coming to my aid, and generously connecting me with the Blues Hall of Famers who made the final stages of this project possible.

And special thanks to Drew Verbis for his help in helping me actually locate and connect with my research participants during my road trips and also for his incredibly informative and entertaining *Blues America* Public Radio series and podcast.

Thanks to Jimmy Stagger for years of entertainment and encouragement and now helping to connect me with some of the blues elders as well.

Tom Liszewski has been part of this project since the early inception of this idea, almost 30 years now, and I am thankful for your friendship and steady support through all of the ups and downs of my research process, and for setting me on the path to Memphis at just the right time.

Thanks to my editor Dr Katherine Harris for getting my manuscripts back on the right path.

Thanks to my student assistant Stephany Weller for finding and fixing my erroneous references.

And a special thanks to my library colleague Stacy Anderson who, as usual, was there at the beginning and at the end of my project.

Thanks to my two amazing children, Naomi and Jake, who put up with my seemingly endless projects and to my incredible wife Helen for all her sacrifices and patience with my research over the years. Time to celebrate.

Thanks to the vast pantheon of known and unknown blues artists, many lost to history, having contributed so much to our culture and yet somehow, not getting proper recognition, just compensation, sometimes not even headstones for their final resting place, living and dying impoverished while creating incredible wealth for other blues rockers

And finally I'd like to dedicate this project to my late brother-in-law Dr Paul Nonnekes, the consummate sociologist, for his role in helping me initiate this effort, for his past encouragement, and for his enduring inspiration to those who knew him.

Michael D. Berghoef

AT THE CROSSROADS OF RACE, CLASS AND CULTURE: IDENTIFYING THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF TECHNOLOGY ON THE AGENCY OF BLUES MUSICIANS

Michael D Berghoef, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 2019

This dissertation explores the impact the rapid evolution and implementation of technology has had on blues musicians and the music they created and shared with their audiences over the past sixty years. The past 150 years have seen the conversion of nearly all musical participation as live, unmediated and with close proximity of performer to audience, to an experience that is increasingly recorded, digitally mediated and often listened to in isolation from others.

While a great deal of live music is still performed around the world on a daily basis, the impact of the largescale cultural shift move to what might be seen as its polar opposite, the phenomenon of the ubiquitous solo "consumer" listening to recorded music through headphones, surprisingly remains largely unexamined. What potential social consequences occur with this shift from communal to private listening? What other interactive and more participatory possibilities might technology make available? This raises questions of the purpose of live performance, its social impact, and by extension the purpose of art. If live music continues to be increasingly replaced by recorded music, how many musicians are really needed? What will the future demand for live music generally? And will there be a resultant shift from performing artist to musical technicians?

While much of the history is known, though at risk of being forgotten with further distance in time, the role of technology has not been fully examined in blues music from the standpoint of the blues musician. This study attempts to give voice to the remaining living blues artists who lived through this time of great transition and hear from them directly about their experiences with the introduction of technology into the world of blues music and the effects on them, their artistry, and their social relationships.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background of the Problem 3

Statement of the Problem 5

Purpose of the Study 8

Research Question 8

Significance of the Study 9

Assumptions and Limitations 9

Conclusion 10

II. LITERATURE REVIEW 11

Ethcaste 11

The Blues 12

The Digital Divide and Digital Inequality 13

Unintended Consequences 15

Commoditization and Alienation 16

Conceptualizing Technology 17

Theoretical Framework 19

Marx 19

Bourdieu 20

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Simmel 22

Geertz 28

Review of Research 29

III. METHODOLOGY 39

Introduction 39

Research Design 40

Placement and Role of the Researcher 40

Population and Sample 40

Research Questions 41

Introduction 41

Setting 44

Participants 44

Recruitment 45

Risks to Participants 46

Benefits of Research 46

Informed Consent 47

Data Collection 47

Data Collection Procedures 47

Confidentiality of Data 49

Data Analysis 50

Conclusion 50

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS 52

Introduction 52

Findings Organized by Research Questions 52

Creative Process 52

Relationship Changes 77

Band Size and Composition 95

Live vs. Recorded Music 100

Business / Economics 109

Blues Appreciation / Legacy / Future of Blues Music 129

Conclusion 140

V. CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 142

Introduction 142

Summary of Findings 142

Discussion 149

Suggestions for Future Research 150

Conclusion 153

REFERENCES 155

APPENDICES

A. Questions and Prompts 172

B. Chronology of ICTs 177

C. Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Letter of Approval 178

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the last 150 years the activity of listening to music has gone from nearly 100 percent local live performance (with a few very interesting exceptions such as cylinder driven music boxes, bells and organs) with relatively unmediated amplification, to a very high proportion of prerecorded and distal music. While a great deal of live music is still performed around the world on a daily basis, the impact of the largescale cultural shift to what might be seen as its polar opposite, the phenomenon of the ubiquitous solo "consumer" listening to recorded music through headphones, surprisingly remains largely unexamined. What potential social consequences occur with this shift from communal to private listening? What other interactive and more participatory possibilities might technology make available?

This raises questions of the purpose of live performance, its social impact, and by extension the purpose of art. If live music continues to be increasingly replaced by recorded music, how many musicians are really needed? What will the future demand for live music generally be? And will there be a resultant occupational shift from performing artist to musical technicians? While it is incredibly difficult to track trend lines of numbers of musicians, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Occupational Employment Statistics as reported by the Future of Music Coalition, that the number of performing musicians has decreased over the past 15 years in the US (Future of Music Coalition, 2015). And in the not so difficult to imagine scenario, what are the societal consequences of the potential for avid music consumers to never have met a musician or seen a live performance? As the quality of recorded music continues to

increase, the remaining questions will be those that concern the social dimensions of the proportion of live to mediated music and the larger impact on the complex web of social interactions.

The following contrasting scenarios are fairly typical contemporary experiences and may be a starting point to illustrate some of the issues raised by this study. A young white male settles down after work and begins listening to music on his phone through earbuds. Incidentally, he no longer carries an iPod, since his smart phone has long ago made that an unnecessary extra gadget. He also no longer has a camera, watch, GPS, or PDA for the same reasons, these have all become one device. And he might easily have been listening to music his entire commute home from work in the same way. And he might just as easily be driving a car, waiting in an airport, sitting on the beach, or waiting in line at the DMV. He decides he is in the mood for blues, so he chooses a classic blues tune from his personal archive, from his custom blues playlist from iTunes. He listens to a song from Freddy King and then one from Otis Rush followed by one more from Jr. Wells. Then, feeling his appetite for the blues is satisfied, he moves on to some 90s Pop—or Country or Punk. Did this person have a 'blues experience? If he did, it was a highly limited one. It may even be that his lack of "sense of place" or of "being situated" from his highly abstracted digital experience could lead to a highly negative in person experience all around if he were to attend a live performance later and as an audience member did know how to behave in this live face-to-face situation due to lack of context, awareness and socialization.

In contrast, consider the experience of another listener walking into an historic Chicago bar. The music starts at 9 PM and good seating might mean getting there early if it is a crowded venue. The set list is developed by the lead singer/guitarist. There is a fairly mixed audience,

racially and ethnically diverse, mixed gender and multigenerational. In between songs the singer describes a bit of his background and some background on the song itself. There are a few requests forwarded to the front during the breaks between sets. Two sets, twenty songs and two hours later the listener heads home.

These two brief examples illustrate some of the common dynamics that may be important elements to examine in how live and mediated music impacts the performer, the listener and the rest of the participants who are involved in the performance and production of music. The agency in many ways on some level shifts from the lead performer to the paying consumer with many important tradeoffs. These tradeoffs might include the safety of listening at home rather than the risk of being out in a public setting; the convenience of choosing the time and place of a musical experience; needing to be at an exact location at an exact time; being alone or with friends rather than being out among a diverse crowd of people different than oneself and the predictability of listening to one's own set list, skipping and choosing among thousands of options, rather than listening to the one chosen by the performer with the serendipity and unpredictability that follows. The difference between hearing a perfect studio version of a song instead of a live rendering, complete with mistakes, recovery and improvisation. Perfect images on screens contrasted to live ageing bodies. How is the artistry reshaped when the social elements of music are drained out of it? What effect does this cumulative feedback have on the artist and the art form itself? What are the hidden costs of decontextualized music, despite all the conveniences it offers, when history, place and time all become optional and arbitrary?

Background of the Problem

For many, the ubiquity of digital technology and the internet and the relatively recent shift toward users increasingly putting their own content online seems a clear manifestation of

the promise of the 'democratization of the internet', others question the unintended consequences of these advancements and unequal distribution of the resulting benefits.

This research is aimed at exploring specific questions of how digital Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) have impacted the wellbeing, status and agency of blues artists of the past 60 years, and secondarily by extension, their students and their various audiences (face-to-face, proximal, distal, synchronous, asynchronous), through the narratives of blues elders who have performed and recorded over that time period. Their standpoints are unique and offer a lens essential to this study in that their lives have spanned a period where there has been unprecedented growth and enormous changes in technology generally and musicianship specifically. The disadvantages experienced by musicians resulting from changes in the recording industry have been described in a variety of classic popular books such as Willie Dixon's autobiography "*I Am the Blues*" and Buddy Guy's "*When I left Home*" as well as many others (Dixon, 1989, Guy, 2012, Jones, 1989, Palmer, 1981, Abrahamson, 2012). This study will explore the role of ICTs in either enhancing or disenfranchising the generation of artists of the past 60 years who are responsible for some of the most influential music in the world. The introduction of new technology is usually presented in the context of a narrative of change for the better, efficiency and egalitarian opportunities rather than as a colonizing or extractive dynamic. However, the unintended consequences of ICTs and widening gap of opportunity actually augmented by technology, originally referred to as the "digital divide," seems to have been the more common experience. The theories of European thinkers such as Marx, Simmel, and Bourdieu pertaining to disenfranchisement will be considered for their potential to shed light on the problematic social and economic relationships between artist and technological advances. This ethnographic study of the history of blues elders, these digital non-natives, will seek to give

voice to those who directly experienced these changes through semi-structured interviews with senior blues musicians who will be asked to reconstruct the impact that evolving technologies have had on their craft, relationships with their students, audiences, and the transmission of their culture to the next generations. Of particular importance to this study are the intersections, that is, the choice points or critical moments when a promising new technology was introduced, considered and perhaps adopted. These moments will be explored to determine if the accompanying promises matched or subverted the lived experience of the artist and impacted their agency. Several important conceptual frames will be considered for context, namely that of *Ethcaste* (Davidson 2001), the uniqueness of the Blues as an art form, the traditionally referenced 'digital divide' and the dynamic of unintended consequences, commoditization and alienation.

Statement of the Problem

This study attempts to explore the interplay between how technology has changed the social and economic dynamics of blues music, on the musicians, their artistic process, their collaborations, their audiences and their compensation for their artistry. While it is easy to trace the profound impact that blues music has had on many other genres, it is also easy to find great disparity between the wealth of some musicians

Stark examples of this disparity can be found by looking at non-profit efforts to mitigate the poverty that many of the original blues musicians experienced. The Killer Blues Headstone Project exists solely to "provide headstones for blues musicians lying in unmarked graves" as many blues musicians who played and recorded their entire adult lives died virtually penniless and could not afford burial costs (The Killer Blues Headstone Project, 2019).

The Blues Foundation in Memphis Tennessee, established the HART Fund, the Handy Artists Relief Trust, for Blues musicians and their families in financial need due to a broad range of health concerns. The Fund "provides for acute, chronic and preventive medical and dental care as well as funeral and burial expenses. Throughout the year at various events the HART Fund provides free health screenings for musicians, with services including but not limited to checking blood pressure, cholesterol, diabetes, prostate cancer, Hep C, anemia, thyroid, kidney and liver testing via blood work." (Hart Fund, 2019)

The Willie Dixon Blues Heaven Foundation in Chicago, Illinois, founded by blues legend Willie Dixon himself, describes their mission as helping "artists and musicians obtain what is rightfully theirs, and to educate both adults and children on the history of the Blues and the business of music." Famously, Dixon's blues song "You Need Love" recorded by Muddy Waters in 1962, was incorporated into the immensely successful Led Zeppelin rock hit "Whole Lotta Love" and resulted in a 1985 lawsuit which Dixon eventually won. Dixon established his foundation to assist other blues musicians who were not as successful as he was a getting at least partial compensation for his artistic works (Kot. 2018. para. 7).

The Rhythm & Blues Foundation in New York provides "financial and medical assistance to Rhythm & Blues artists of the 1940s through the 1970s, as well as a support system to help identify other sources of assistance. Foundation grants have helped artists and their families cover the costs of emergency needs such as prescription medications, dental work, hearing aids, hospital stays and homecare, as well as assistance with burial expenses." (Rhythm & Blues Foundation. 2019).

Signer songwriter Bonnie Raitt summarizes her reasons for becoming involved in the royalty reform movement through the Rhythm and Blues Foundation:

> A $1.5 million grant started a program to help with medical and financial assistance for these R&B pioneers who were basically the victims of unfair and dated royalty practices. At that time, artists were supposed to pay the entire cost of the recording out of approximately one percent—which was the standard royalty. And since then the record companies have sold and re-sold these masters to different labels without paying these artists. And even with each new format there's been no way that these artists could ever make any money. So 20 and 30 years down the line you have an entire population that is the foundation of our music business—rock and roll, soul music, and every other form of music that we all make our living from—who've still never been paid.
>
> When I heard about the situation, I—and most of the people in the world—didn't know that every time we bought a new Sam and Dave record those guys didn't get a piece of it. And it was not only rhythm and blues artists, it was all artists that recorded before about 1970 when royalty rates were customarily low. When the era of the singer-songwriter came in, the high-powered lawyers and managers started to negotiate for a more fair royalty rate….. Some of those artists still went to their graves because they weren't able to have a lifetime of health insurance. Pretty much all the greats except for a handful of superstars that have always made money have gone their entire lives without getting reimbursed for their work. (Hutchinson, 2011. para. 6-9)

This problem of appropriation of music has been discussed to some extent in popular literature but not studied through a formal sociological lens. There are many other technology related issues impacting the creative process of musicians and their relationship to their

audiences. Finally, many discussions have not fully included the musician's voice, the musician's standpoint.

Purpose of the Study

This study is dedicated to pursuing a better understanding of the experiences of blues musicians and the impact both positive and negative on their lives and works and on their social interactions with the music industry, fellow musicians and their audiences. This study endeavors to include the musician's voice in the recollection and discussion of historic changes and injustices in the production, performance and recording of blues music and how this has been impacted by the profound technological changes that have occurred over the past sixty years.

Research Question

This research is aimed at exploring specific questions of how digital Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) have impacted the wellbeing, status and agency of blues artists of the past sixty years and their relationships with their fellow musicians, their students and their various audiences including those they perform in front of face-to-face and through recorded music.

"How are the complex of social and economic relationships of these long term blues artists changed with the introduction of new technologies, specifically and cumulatively?" This question will be investigated through the narratives of blues elders who have performed and recorded over that time period through semi-structured interview questions.

The interview questions were informed by this core research question and they explore the interlaced impact of ICTs on blues music and musicians, specifically on their creative process, their relationship changes, their band size and composition, the quality and proportion of

live and recorded music, the business and economic considerations, and their perceptions and predictions about the future of the blues.

Significance of the Study

This study endeavors to capture the stories of those blues musicians who lived through the past six decades of rapid change. This time was a time of a type of colonizing of the blues. Music was appropriated and artists were disenfranchised. Part of this was made possible and easier through the use of various music technologies as well as laws around copyright that made it difficult for an uneducated artist to retain control over their work, especially once that work was captured in recordings and able to be stored or sold by the new owner.

This project explores the history of this lost or stolen music as well as other artistic and social changes from the standpoint of the blues musician. There have been many informal writings in magazines and blogs but little from a formal sociological perspective. The goal of this study is to shed light on the variety of sociological issues by listening to the voices of musicians themselves.

Assumptions and Limitations

The nature of this study is qualitative and exploratory. Therefore the sample size will necessarily be small and the application of theory will be limited as fits this type of study. The validity will largely rest on the authenticity maintained by listening to those most affected by the issues under investigation, the blues musicians themselves. The generalizability will also be limited as well due to the specific criteria of those participating in the study relating to age, race, gender, and life experience.

Despite the challenges inherent in qualitative approaches using life review interviewing methods, the interviews are believed to provide insights that are unique to the blues musician's

standpoint. As a beginning point for further research, this novel approach provides a window into a very specific experience of those who have firsthand knowledge of a time of profound social change due to the introduction of technology that transformed the way most people create, perform, record and experience music. The extent to which the interview process responses have commonalties or differences will be a marker of consistency and some level of reliability or the lack thereof.

Conclusion

This study represents a unique attempt to explore the issues around the impact of technology on blues music and the persons associated with it. Many issues have been discussed in popular literature and magazines and hundreds of interviews have been conducted. However, this study represents a distinct attempt to look specifically at this question of technology and the blues through a sociological lens, under the traditional subfield of the sociology of culture and the emerging subfield of digital sociology.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Ethcaste

In his book *Ethcaste* Davidson describes his core concept as an expansion of "ethclass" in that it explains "the consequences of systematic domination, exploitation, exclusion, and oppression of a group on the basis of an ascribed racial trait….Groups suffering under Ethcaste subordination also experience cultural exclusion, repression and assault." (Davidson, 2001. p. 154). Davidson describes this dynamic as more comprehensive and inclusive of race and class oppression and having more explanatory power in describing "domestic colonialism" than previous attempts to describe the Black experience in the US. This proposed study, of the lived experiences of blues musicians and the effects of ICT on their craft and livelihood, will explore these social, racial and class dynamics of the digital divide as they relate to the creation and recreation of blues music and the changing role of its musicians utilizing the concept of Ethcaste to give voice to these actors who have often had their voices silenced or coopted through various dominant oppressive systems. Davidson describes the importance of recognizing that

> "…constant economic expansion and technological acceleration are destroying America's (and the world's) natural resources at an ever-increasing rate and imperil the future for our children. So, we do not need only economic development. We need economic control; that is, we must struggle along with other progressive forces to gain control over the exploitive economic institutions of the international capitalist cultural elite. Realizing at all times, to paraphrase Brother Malcom X, that we have no permanent friends and no

> permanent enemies; just permanent interests, we must gain greater control over as well as transform the institutions and individuals impinging upon, constraining, and determining our lives. In initiating a new stage of struggle, we must be guided by imperatives generic to our cultural values and heritage." (Davidson, 2001. p. 197).

The Blues can be seen as a valuable cultural resource as rich in its contribution to giving expression to, and shining a light on, exploitation as it is sad in its history of recreated exploitation: "As a people with a cultural heritage rich in these values, African Americans have much to contribute to the humanization of a society currently led by an elite that is increasingly spiritually bankrupt, amoral and suicidal." (Davidson, 2001. p. 197)

The Blues

The Blues is examined in this context because of its unusually rich and pivotal artistic influence in US and world cultural history, while simultaneously providing a vivid example of cultural colonialism, where the differential benefits of information technology augmented the racial and class divisions. The Blues is a uniquely American art form, root stock for many other often financially lucrative musical genres. It has spawned huge commercial success for many offshoot artists and styles of music other than its originators. It is worth noting that one of the most iconic symbols in blues music is the crossroads. Perhaps the crossroads is an apt metaphor for this exploration of choice points. Traditionally the symbolism evokes colorful imagery of a bargain with the devil, perhaps in exchange for musical ability of fame or success, or a meeting of two realms, liminality. Many stories and songs, most notably in blues legend Robert Johnson's 1936 song Cross Road Blues, have versions of important intersection moments in an individual's life where a Faustian bargain was struck and the resulting consequences or dangers facing the protagonist.

"The Blues are the roots, the rest are the fruits" is the quote embraced by the Willie Dixon Blue Heaven Foundation. While this is an optimistic message from one of the blues most prolific writers, the problems of cultural colonialism are concrete and substantial from the effects on physical health (Brodsky, 1995) to the financial exploitation of musicians that Willie Dixon's foundation was set up to mitigate (Blues Heaven Foundation. 2019). How is it possible that some of the most prolific writers of an art form with global impact could die penniless? And what role did the technology and its associated narratives play in the last sixty years where the incredibly influential blues genre was born and blossomed to worldwide influence concurrently with the most intense proliferation of technological innovation and invention?

The Digital Divide and Digital Inequality

The digital divide traditionally refers to the gap between those who are highly advantaged by the Internet, high technology and digital communication, and those who are systematically disadvantaged by it. As early as 1995 the US government's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) released its initial summary report titled "*Falling Through the Net: A Survey of the 'Have Nots' in Rural and Urban America*" (NTIA, 1995) describing the concerns of growing disparities accelerated by ICTs. Despite the initial optimistic predictions of the Internet as a great democratizing force decades ago, it became apparent early on that not all groups benefited equally as stated by NTIA, "The 'digital divide'—the divide between those with access to new technologies and those without -- is now one of America's leading economic and civil rights issues" (NTIA, 1999. p. xiii).

Since that time the technology included in consideration of the digital divide has grown to encompass a much larger and sophisticated array of ICTs. While initial conceptualizations of the digital divide were mainly focused on numbers of computers and access to Internet there are

more current and relevant measures now that give a broader and more in depth analysis of the digital divide. According to Norris and Inglehart in the chapter on the digital divide in the *Handbook on the Digital Creative Economy* (Towse & Handke, 2013), proper assessment must now include technologies beyond home computing and Internet access such as smart phones, DVDs, TiVo, iPods, iPads, gaming systems, MP3 players, electronic readers, as well as comparisons of high speed, unfettered Wi-Fi access contrasted to slow dial up modems or other slow connections to the Internet. While crude measures are still made in the US Census and worldwide, and it is apparent that the divide is still an issue that falls out along the lines of race and income, it can also be assumed that much more nuanced analyses need to be made for these new ICTs that go beyond a simple count of computers and Internet connections. Norris and Inglehart conclude that

> Social inequalities in access to ICTs have also persisted in recent years, and most show no signs of closure, even within the richest nations, such as the United States, Sweden and Australia. Many recent technological accounts imply that information gaps are confined to the use of personal computers and the Internet, but the evidence indicates that these inequalities apply to other kinds of media exposure and reflect more deep seated social inequalities based on cognitive skills, socioeconomic resources, and motivational attitudes. (Norris & Inglehart, 2013. p. 99)

Many of the newer ICTs are converging and are integrated in ways that make a simple listing inadequate in that older technologies such as TVs, radios, cameras, are now new ICTs based on rapid advancements in digitization, high-speed computing, streaming audio and video and inexpensive large scale data storage. Further, it has always been important to differentiate between the lowest most basic task that can be performed on computers, such as rote learning,

contrasted to having the means to create, contribute and innovate. In recent years there has been an increasing shift toward users putting their own creative content online in the form of a websites, blogs, or music. This change is sometimes referred to as 'Web 2.0', the shorthand term to summarize this ability for users to upload their own content. These advances can be seen as specifically democratizing the processes of music production. Relevant to this study are all of the music technology advances such as low cost digital recording technologies, effect pedals, and those technologies that literally could replace musicians such as "Beat Buddy" drum machines or so called "Band in a Box" technologies. However these Web 2.0 changes can also be seen as creating a further division of those still left out of these creative processes, creating a second level digital divide based on limited access to the latest technologies.

Unintended Consequences

The formal study of Unintended Social Consequences often attributed to sociologist Robert Merton, highlights and contrasts the latent as well as manifest consequences of social change (Merton, 1936). He states,

> In short, it is suggested that the distinctive intellectual contributions of the sociologist are found primarily in the study of unintended consequences (among which are latent functions) of social practices, as well as in the study of anticipated consequences (among which are manifest functions) (Merton, 1949. p. 120).

Latent consequences can be considered functional, dysfunctional or neutral in effect. In the case of ICTs and the digital divide, it is necessary to explore the unanticipated negative, perverse or insidious systemic causes where racism and classism are not just reproduced but potentially magnified by a given technology.

The consequences in the music world may be seen in the example sometimes given of the orchestra who records a perfect performance of Beethoven's 9th Symphony. Once a 'perfect' digital version is recorded, with high quality audio and video, it can be shared worldwide at a fraction of the cost of attending live performances, to many who would never have been able to hear or see it otherwise, which Merton might describe as its "manifest function". However, once a perfect copy has been technologically captured, one might ask if there ever a need for another live performance. This would result in a reduction of the need for paid musicians, the dysfunctional consequence, a "latent function," or unintended consequence. There are obvious parallels to the blues world and in fact to all genres of music. It begs the question of the old 1960s bumper sticker that proclaimed "Live music is better!" If it is better, why is it better and then, what are the long-term social, economic, and political consequences of our rapid digitization and asynchronous experience of most forms of music?

Commoditization & Alienation

The role of commoditization was described by Marx as the means by which culture can become a traded thing to be bought and sold (Kamenka, 1983). While this can be used to advantage by artists in some cases, in other cases commoditization of culture can lead to extraction of value by the dominant culture or those in positions of power and sold for consumption with little gain for the original creative agent (hooks, 1992). Likewise, Marx's concept of alienation within a capitalist system can describe the distancing of artist from their artistic productions and help us understand the consequences of technologies that remove musicians from direct contact with their instruments, their apprentices and their audiences.

Developing this basic Marxist concept further in a later time, Middleton delineated two of the key elements of alienation as "self and cultural estrangement" (Middleton, 1963). One need

only contrast the student of the blues who 60 years ago sat face to face with the master, with the student now who "rewinds" and replays a digital reproduction over and over on her or his iPhone watching a YouTube video to get it "just right." Something is profoundly different between the mentor and "mentorless" scenarios. At the very least the social relations are qualitatively altered as far as the cultural transmission of this art form. Georg Simmel would also describe this dynamic in terms of "estrangement" and fragmentation and would advocate a more flexible and nuanced description of the interplay between technology and those artists. Anthony Bourdieu would describe this interplay as "habitus" or the complex field within which this activity occurred and would further identify the cultural, social, symbolic, economic capital involved in situating the actors in their social position. Each of these theorists has potentially useful theoretical explanations for the social and economic dynamics and the interplay between artist and the technology used and its impact on her or his art that may or may not contribute to a better understanding and will be discussed in greater detail subsequently.

Conceptualizing Technology

The ubiquitous presence of ICTs has occurred in a relatively short amount of time. So sudden and so pervasive that the ambient ICTs have become largely invisible, partly by design and partly because of the sheer magnitude of technology mediated aspects of life. Intimate human activities are now largely influenced if not dominated by ICTs such as Internet mediated online education with the accompanying unintended technological consequences of profligate plagiarism, (Baggaley, 2005; Ashworth, 1997; Pittman-Munke & Berghoef, 2008) and online psychotherapy (Freeny, 2000), where technology can be similarly problematized. Likewise, there may be applications to cross cultural situations in countries with varying amount of technological mediation of music and other forms of art. Of sociological interest and importance

is the degree to which areas of social life so intimate can be so profoundly impacted by such ambient, ubiquitous and largely unexamined technological changes, changes that are at once gradual and immense in their cumulative effect.

In some ways we can think generically about technological development. Traditionally there are three possible ways to conceptualize this development (Ess, 2018). First we can identify a mainstream conceptualization which I will call the utopian view of technology. This would be the view of technology as an extension of enlightenment thinking, a progressive movement, and often times fundamentally teleological. It is not utopian in the sense that problems are never identified, but rather that these problems are seen as of the type that can be inevitably fixed by further developments of technology. The solution to air and water pollution is not to cease an activity (e.g., reduce the number of cars) but to refine it (e.g., raise mileage standards, hybrid vehicles,). The development of this solution is often also seen as inevitable, a "given".

In sharp contrast we can identify another strain of thinking as the dystopian view of technology. In this view technology is usually seen as evil and destructive. Problems caused by technology are identified and are the main focus of attention. Technology is seen as a juggernaut, an unstoppable force that in the end just causes destruction and concentration of power in the wrong hands. This conceptualization focuses on injustice and power as issues that need to be addressed by a collective.

A third possible conceptualization could be thought of as a neutral view of technology. Technology is seen as a kind of bargain, a series of tradeoffs that always have the potential for benefit balanced against the possibility of unforeseen negative consequences. Technology is

always seen as necessarily involving a tradeoff between benefits and costs. Balance and optimization are seen as the realistic goals in decision making about technology.

Theoretical Framework

Marx

As noted above, clearly Marx's theories on alienation and commodification can help us understand some of the negative unintended consequences of technologies that separate artists from their art and leave them vulnerable to exploitation and "colonizing" of their artistic territories. Alienation was a central concept in Marx's critique of capitalism. Marx saw work as an essential aspect of human nature and as corrupted under capitalism. When a person's work life is in balance, they are connected to what they make, they are fulfilled by the process and their basic needs are met. They are in relative harmony with themselves, their fellow citizens and nature. The problem with Capitalism is the separation, making "alien" what was natural, disconnecting the worker/artist from the thing being produced and even from the means of producing that thing. The working human increasingly loses control and contact with the creative activity of work, and in turn with themselves. As alienation and exploitation increase, the circumstances for the proletariat become less and less tolerable. Specific to this study is the concern of how an artist's raw musical and lyrical material, his most personal creative production, becomes commodified, a product through the recording industry and the impact this has on personal agency, the ability to receive any economic or social benefit from this work, and the gradual changes that happen to the artist and artistic process over time. For example, when a great deal of a blues artist's work is recorded, copyrighted and then shelved, who decides when it will be released, if ever, once it has been technologically captured and potentially sequestered in this way?

Bourdieu

Bourdieu is concerned with how culture reproduces itself and in particular how structures related to power get reproduced. Key ideas in Bourdieu's discussions of power include his conceptualization of Habitus, Field, Economic Capital, Social Capital, and Cultural Capital. Additionally, his ideas of Symbolic Capital and Symbolic Violence develop unique theoretical territory. One of Bourdieu's important intellectual contributions is his expansion of Marx's conceptualization of capital, particularly from seeing capital as primarily or exclusively economic to being viewed much more broadly, specifically socially, culturally and symbolically. For Bourdieu, to understand power, and the reproduction of social hierarchies of privilege, one must understand capital in all its forms, including but not limited to Economic Capital. Capital, in Bourdieu's expanded sense of the term, includes anything of value or significance to the actors (Bourdieu & Johnson, 1993). Economic Capital is perhaps the easiest to understand and the most straightforward. However, Bourdieu also sees Social Capital as valuable referring to family relationships, friendships and other supportive groups and networks.

Cultural Capital consists of three subtypes that relate to the types of advantage that parents might instill in their children relating to knowledge and skills that would provide opportunities for advancement. The three subtypes are (1) the embodied, (2) the objectified and (3) the institutionalized state. Embodied Cultural Capital refers to that which is socialized or trained "into' the individual over time. Cultural skills relating to language or music may be example of embodiment. Objectified Cultural Capital refers to cultural items which can be owned, consumed or sold. Art, equipment or instruments may be seen as objects or objectified culture. Institutionalized Cultural Capital refers to degrees, credentials or qualifications that are institutionally recognized and valued as another type of Cultural Capital.

Likewise, forms of cultural capital, such as abilities and qualifications, can be seen as capital and accumulated invisibly by the privileged classes and passed on to children. Economic capital entails power as well and can contribute and similarly be used to accomplish and perpetrate symbolic violence as well. It is used to dominate like other forms of capital but in much more visible and obvious ways. The reproduction of hierarchies of power is fostered by many diverse elements beyond economics, though Bourdieu clearly saw wealth as playing a role and insinuated with privilege. But language is power. Social networks are power. Mannerisms, skills and dress can all be seen as reinforcing reproducing symbols of power and capital.

The role of ICTs and their mediation of the art form of the blues in this contested site forms the core of this study. Key to this project is the question of how intrinsic advances in technology are to the transfer of power and cultural capital. How are these networks and systems produced and reproduced to advantage those with a preexisting advantage? How are ICTs bound up with legal, economic, monetary and symbolic advantage, and how is this impacted by race and class? How is the art of blues musicians separated from the artist and passed along through different hands via technological means?

Ignatow and Robinson see Bourdieu as having the potential of fruitfully contributing to the study of the impact of technology on social life. They describe the emerging subfield of Digital Sociology as an area that can bring a Bourdieusian lens to help understand the changes that technology causes through a sociological lens. Of particular interest for this study is their adaptation of Bourdieu's ideas to inform the study of 'digital inequality' especially as it relates to his conceptualization of 'field' as a network of interrelated dynamics, forces and processes stating "Bourdieu's interrelated concepts of field, capital, and habitus have become central in

many approaches to inequality and stratification across the social sciences." (Ignatow & Robinson, 2017).

Simmel

Like Marx, Georg Simmel was another important theorist who was concerned with the potentialities and problems of modern culture. Simmel who lived from 1858 – 1918, through another period of rapid technological change, both Simmel and Marx saw the dramatic consequences and burgeoning effects of the industrial revolution. However, despite some overlapping areas of agreement, these two thinkers also had profoundly differing analyses and drew significantly different conclusions. These differences lead to unique understandings of the world they were living in at the end of the 19th century. Of course both men were situated in their own times. Neither could forecast the social upheavals that would occur in the next century. Though both were forward looking thinkers, neither could have imagined the even more vast technical innovations and tremendous leaps that would bring us to our present age of "hyper-technology".

Marx and Simmel both address issues of alienation, or estrangement, and wholeness in at least some of their writings. For Marx his earlier writings especially seem to emphasize this more, while the term 'alienation' does not appear in his later writings. Some neo-Marxists reconcile this by noting his using the term more explicitly in his earlier writings and implicitly in his later writings. These themes of domination by culture and technology permeate Simmel's writings throughout his career. Marx saw alienation as multifaceted and characterized by workers being alienated from what they produced, workers being alienated from the process of production, workers being alienated from themselves, and workers being alienated from their community.

Similarly, Simmel saw the modern worker as freed from the undifferentiated confines of agrarian or feudal villages but increasingly surrounded by material products that limited his freedom, independent from the worker. Both men utilized the dialectical method attributed to Hegel. This often generated systems of ideas characterized by polarities. Later thinkers have criticized this tendency in sociology to assume polarities as excessive, countering that many of these areas may more properly and accurately be thought of as falling along continuums. However, most would agree that at least as an initial effort, many important philosophical and sociological territories were first explored by this way of conceptualizing sociological areas of interest with the dialectical method. Both also saw a process of externalization of labor where the products of the laborer, and his or her culture, become in some way dominated by these very same products. They were thought to take on some life of their own where some level of oppression comes unexpectedly from the products of the laborer. Both saw division of labor as having negative consequences and relating to class divisions.

Marx consistently brings his discussion of alienation back to issues of capitalism. This is consistent with Marx's focus on the destructive impact of capitalism and the need for an alternative. The limitation here is that his critique does not provide a framework to anticipate what may still be highly problematic with technological societies that are not capitalistic. It does not anticipate what might be intrinsically alienating in the technologies themselves. Marx does discuss money as "alienated essence" but does not develop this in a way that has much historic sense or predictive value. It is largely treated as an issue problematic only within a capitalistic system.

Simmel in contrast identifies estrangement more specifically as a form that may be found in capitalism, but may be found elsewhere as well, independent of any specific economic system.

As many see a more directly useful critique, Simmel details how the development of culture entails a tradeoff, a form of Faustian bargain, where greater independence and differentiation is gained at the cost of domination and a cluttered existence increasingly surrounded by less meaningful products. His treatment of money, currency and exchange in *The Philosophy of Money* is a much more detailed and rich description of the changes in social relations that occur socially between all classes in capitalist, communist and potentially all economic systems. Coser (1971) summarizes what was once considered a "neglected classic".

> When monetary transactions replace earlier forms of barter, significant changes occur in the forms of interaction between social actors. Money is subject to precise division and manipulation and permits exact measurement of equivalents. It is impersonal in a manner in which objects of barter, like crafted gongs and collected shells, can never be. It thus helps promote rational calculation in human affairs and furthers the rationalization that is characteristic of modern society. When money becomes the prevalent link between people, it replaces personal ties anchored in diffuse feelings by impersonal relations that are limited to a specific purpose." "Just because money makes it possible to limit a transaction to the purpose at hand, it helps increase personal freedom and fosters social differentiation; money displaces "natural" groupings by voluntary associations, which are set up for specific rational purposes. Wherever the cash nexus penetrates, it dissolves bonds based on the ties of blood or kinship or loyalty." "Money levels qualitative differences between things as well as between people; it is the major mechanism that paves the way from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft*. (pp. 193-194)

Coser contrasts Simmel's view of the problematic aspects of modernity and technology as more in line with Marx and German pessimism when he says, "His other view owes more to

Marx and to German cultural pessimism than to the optimism of British and French progressive thought. From this perspective, Simmel writes of the eradicable dualism inherent in the relation between individuals and objective cultural values. An individual can attain cultivation only by appropriating the cultural values that surround him. But these values threaten to engulf and to subjugate the individual. More specifically, the division of labor, while it is the origin of a differentiated cultural life, in its way also subjugates and enslaves the individual." (Coser, 1971. p. 189)

Marx, though critical of capitalism and its development, maintains in his thinking an ideal of progress much in line with the religions views he opposes. His conceptualization of revolutionary and evolutionary changes reveals an eschatology of a utopian conclusion to human history. Reminiscent of the "Great Chain of Being" the "Great Chain of Human History" would culminate in a communist state. It is difficult to anticipate in Marx's writings how technology would function in this state. One supposes from his teleology that it would be relatively non-problematic. Marx, like many 18th and 19th Century philosophers, seems to have thought human evolution was a given and he would appear to be a great believer in progress, even if it would be an eventual progress, except for the unnatural and dystopian impact of capitalism.

Simmel, on the other hand, seems to anticipate that no matter how economic systems evolve there will remain a more fundamental dynamic that persists attached more directly to the technology produced and not just the means or ownership of production. Technology may progress but result in complications in the social fabric. He does not suppose that there will be an inevitable evolution toward a better society but rather is warning that there are dualities to modern culture. He maintains that the desirable increased differentiation afforded by specialization will always be problematic in that Simmel "sees modern man as surrounded by a

world of objects that constrain and dominate his needs and desires. Technology creates "unnecessary" knowledge, that is, knowledge that is of no particular value but is simply the by-product of the autonomous expansion of scientific activities. As a result of these trends, modern man finds himself in a deeply problematical situation: he is surrounded by a multiplicity of cultural elements, which, although they are not meaningless to him, are not fundamentally meaningful either. They oppress the individual because he cannot fully assimilate them. But he cannot reject them because they belong at least potentially to the sphere of his own cultural development. "The cultural objects become more and more linked to each other in a self-contained world which has increasingly fewer contacts with the subjective psyche and its desires and sensibilities." (Coser, 1971. p. 193)

Though Marx is by far the most cited, most widely recognized and the most politically influential of the two thinkers, Simmel in many ways may end up having the most profound contributions to issues currently emerging in the age of “hyper-technology”.

Marx, though accurately bringing attention to the important issues of class, alienation, depersonalization, exploitation and other problematic dynamics inherent within capitalism, did not anticipate or articulate a strong critique of the technology of the industrialization itself. In this way much of his work is too limited to a critique of the problems associated with capitalism and an anticipation of the solutions associated with communism rather than exploring or anticipating the potential negative and autonomous effects of the technologies themselves.

Simmel on the other hand, was able to conceptualize a view of human cultural activities, such as development of technology, which addressed both the liberating and also the alienating and dominating dynamics intrinsically attached to technology, separate from and independent of class. The advantage that Simmel’s work affords is its ability to shed light on both the

complexity of human affairs under any historical societal conditions and also the complications of human interactions under specific problematic circumstances, such as capitalism, totalitarianism, socialism or communism. In this way he gives us a framework for evaluating the best and the worst of human culture, which though not easily resolved, gives us a richer more accurate view. This lends itself to an exploration of the Faustian bargain with attention to the tradeoffs and unpredictability of potential benefits and corrosive effects of technology as well as the "choice points" or crossroads moments where critical decisions are made.

Coser summarizes Simmel's views on culture in the following way, "Although committed in one facet of his *Weltanschauung* to the progressive liberal vision of those French and English thinkers who influenced him deeply, Simmel is equally bound to a tragic vision of culture. He combines in an original, though not fully resolved, way the uncomplicated evolutionary faith in the perfectibility of man of a Condorcet or a Spencer with the metaphysical pathos of a Schiller or a Nietzsche. Unable to relinquish the vision of a progressive liberation of the individual from the bonds of tradition and subjugation, Simmel yet foretells, with a sense of impending doom, "a cage of the future" (to use Max Weber's term), in which individuals will be frozen into social functions and in which the price of the objective perfection of the world will be the atrophy of the human soul." (Coser, 1965. p 23)

At this juncture of history we are witnessing many concrete examples of these very concerns. We see much of the prosperity forecasted by utopians and the hazards predicted by the dystopians. We see Internet technologies that increase our ability to communicate with others around the globe while simultaneously decreasing the quantity and quality of our social interactions with those closest to us. We see advances in cancer medicine develop alongside increased carcinogenic environmental risks to health. And we see artists of profound talent and

originality, whose work has been technologically reproduced by others to enormous financial advantage, die penniless, leaving families in poverty. Simmel may contribute important conceptual direction at this complex and complicated point in human culture.

Geertz

Clifford Geertz, cultural theorist and ethnographer, with his concept of "Thick Description" proposes a method of studying human behavior and its context, in the richest detail possible, so that its meaning can be communicated effectively to another. (Geertz, 1973) In "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture" he describes that the role of the ethnographer as one who "inscribes social discourse; he writes it down. In so doing, he turns it from passing event, which exists only in its own moment of occurrence, into an account, which exists in its inscriptions and can be reconsulted." Further, he describes "the aim is to draw large conclusions from small densely textured facts; to support broad assertions about the role of culture in the construction of collective life by engaging them exactly with complex specifics." (Geertz, 1973. p. 543)

Applying Geertz' principles to the questions of the changing technology, agency and lived experience of the blues musicians beginning in the 1950s to the current day, could shed light on these important dynamics. The goal of these life review qualitative interviews will be to use thick description methods to explore the nuanced aspects of the life of these artists and closely examine the choice points of adopting technological innovations and the unintended consequences these important junctures set in motion. As Geertz states, "It is with the kind of material produced by long-term, mainly (though not exclusively) qualitative, highly participative, and almost obsessively fine-comb field study in confined contexts that the mega-concepts with which contemporary social science is afflicted – legitimacy, modernization,

integration, conflict, charisma, structure,…meaning – can be given the sort of sensible actuality that makes it possible to think not only realistically and concretely *about* them, but, what is more important, creatively and imaginatively *with* them. The methodological problem which the microscopic nature of ethnography presents is both real and critical." (p. 23). Attending to the detail of technological changes, changes as seemingly mundane as amplification, recording medium and social media and their resulting impacts on social relationships, will hopefully result in a deeper understanding of when and for whom technological change produces the often time assumed increase in autonomy or merely the illusion of control.

As it relates to blues musicians and their craft, thick description will be critical to investigating the lived experience of those who have created an inestimably valuable contribution to music while simultaneously experiencing a neocolonial cooptation of their art enriching the colonizers and literally leaving the creators penniless and unable to afford a marker on their grave. The influence and contribution of the various technologies involved can hopefully be more fully understood through the detailed exploration of their stories from their voices. It will be critical to hear if the musician's descriptions of their lived experience echo the themes of dislocation, cooptation, marginalization and alienation articulated by the theorists discussed above. Of special importance is the lack of explicit mainstream legitimized voice of the racially marginalized blues artists, contrasted to the symbolic covert expression in their art.

Next it will be crucial to explore the impact technology has had in either amplifying expression or transforming it into yet another form or oppression and theft of artistic content.

Review of Research

Writing in the *Journal of Consumer Culture*, Paolo Magaudda, explores the impact of the digital "dematerialization of music" economically and socially from the perspective of consumer

studies in "*When materiality 'bites back': Digital music consumption practices in the age of dematerialization*" (Magaudda, 2011). He states, "The iPod has also become a powerful, key cultural and symbolic icon of the new century and, moreover, has opened up the marketplace for the development of further portable personal devices, such as the iPhone and the iPad. In the musical consumption context, which is characterized by a shift to intangible music digital flows, the iPod clearly represents a material object around which the digital music realm has been reconfigured, whether culturally, socially or economically." (Magaudda, 2011. p. 23). Interestingly, in keeping with the dynamic of Bryce's "Smaller Faster Lighter Denser Cheaper" predictions (Bryce, 2014), Magaudda's description of the iPod as the key ICT is already outdated as smartphone technology and streaming music services have subsumed the MP3 players of only a few years before. And it is not hard to imagine smaller, less "material" manifestations to be widely available soon. Wearable and embeddable ICTs seem to be a plausible next step. Magaudda concludes that economically there is little lost in "the process of digitalization of music consumption", when consumer technologies become less tangible and dematerialized. His study found that consumers readily switch to different media with little difficulty transferring symbolic or cultural meaning, though at times some raised concerns about "authenticity" despite their comparisons being between one ITC to another.

In "The Camera as Global Vampire" Janet Hoskins describes and deconstructs the stereotypes of colonial explorer's stories of the native who "fears the camera will steal his soul". While she identifies many ways that Western colonialists may have set the stage for such an interpretation in the distant past, she also describes wary and suspicious reactions to photographic technologies in her own work in Indonesia. Of interest to this study, regardless of the literality or "celestialization" associated with the fear of soul sucking photography, is the

generic and justified distrust of allowing a part of oneself to be "dematerialized" without certainty of how it will later be "rematerialized" and for what purpose. The instinctive distrust, that of practices of potential colonizing extraction of value though image and audio recordings, and the ensuing loss of voice, control, and agency seems to be the common explanation that binds this core cultural reaction across time and place, regardless of the technological sophistication of the subject. In speaking of indigenous peoples and photographic ICTs, Hoskins describes "the cutting edge of a postcolonial perspective on modernity. By reflecting on who has the power and the resources to produce and especially reproduce images mechanically, indigenous peoples articulate new forms of visuality, and new ways of engaging with restrictions placed on their visual culture…..in a stance of critical questioning of inequalities in global communication." (Robinson & Picard, 2009. p. 165).

In "Music Worlds and Body Techniques: On the Embodiment of Musicking" Nick Crossley describes the relevance and importance of physicality and presence in musical performance drawing on the work of Howard Becker. (Crossley, 2015) He describes "musicking" as a verb in the context "music world" in parallel with Becker's verb "art work" and use of "art world" (Becker, 1974, 1982). The concept of music worlds "seeks to capture the collective nature of musicking; the multiple relays of interaction, on different timescales and mediated in many cases by technologies, including recording technologies, within and between sets of artists, audience members and support personnel. He follows Becker's analytic foci of networks, conventions, resources and places to develop his sociological investigation of embodiment. "Embodiment," "body techniques" or "uses of the body" are contextualized in terms of the performance of the artist, the participation of the audience and the roles of the "support personnel," those who facilitate, coordinate, engineer, produce, promote or advertise.

Crossley describes the importance of the performer-audience interaction, seeing the singer reach for the challenging high note, dancing in response, the expertise of the support personnel, the fit of the venue territory. However, in drawing attention to the importance of physicality in musical performance, appreciation and support, Crossley has set the stage for a more critical consideration of what happens when performers, audience, support personnel, networks, conventions, resources and places become increasingly disembodied and disconnected. What changes when the "music world" becomes less physical and increasingly virtual?

In "Digital Recording and the Reconfiguration of Music as Performance" Jan Marontate describes the changes occurring in ICT mediated music that "are transforming the lived experience of music in ways that have the potential to reconfigure radically the relations between creators, mediators (e.g., record companies), and publics" (Marontate, 2005). By making it possible to record, store, copy, edit, and transmit sound files of good to high quality via the Internet—in ways that are relatively easy and affordable—these new technologies and practices (e.g., peer-to-peer sharing of files) have been at the center of public debates about conventions and laws that govern the ownership of musical creations, as well as access to and uses of these creations. In some visions of the future, new technologies should allow creators and consumers to participate in an electronic global marketplace with the potential to support unlimited accumulation of wealth in a frictionless "arena of exchange in which everyone wins"—a perspective called the "Internet Nirvana Theory of Intellectual Property" (Marontate, 2005. p. 1). In working with university students anticipating careers in the music industry she notes that many of the democratizing promises of the "Internet Nirvana" and ICTs are realized by rural students who would otherwise have little access to a variety of music or the means to pursue careers in music compared to their urban counterparts. However in her introduction Marontate

does acknowledge that "Digital technologies are transforming the lived experience of music in ways that may reconfigure relations between creators, mediators, and publics. Many uses of recorded popular music in the 20th century emphasized the canonical character of recordings rather than the performative nature of music making; it was no longer necessary to make music or be around musicians to hear music." (Marontate, 2005. p. 1). Critical to this project is this very question of the value and necessity of connection to live performers and original artists. If extensive digital collections are now the goal, what is the social price and what is lost in this transformation?

Simon Frith in "Live Music Matters" describes the potential decline in live music by saying "popular music sociologists and historians have documented the impact of recording technology on public and private uses of music, and shown how job opportunities for live musicians have declined while musical activity has been increasingly domesticated (see, for example, Frith, 1987; Sanjek & Sanjek, 1991). Cinema organists were made redundant by talking pictures; pit orchestras were replaced by pre-recorded tapes, pub singers by juke boxes, dance halls with dance bands by discos with DJs. As people spent more time listening to music at home (on record, radio and television), they spent less time going to hear live performers in bar rooms and public halls. At the same time, the domestic use of music has been personalized: family entertainment moved from the piano to the phonogram, from the living room radiogram to the bedroom transistor, from the hi-fi system as household furniture to the Walkman and the iPod as personal music accessories. For socio-cultural as well as economic reasons, then, the live music sector seemed doomed to extinction, surviving only as the result of state-subsidized conservation. (Frith, 2007). However, he goes on to say that in many cases the amount of live music in the UK has remained surprisingly substantial due to its importance in corporate music

industry financial strategies and partly due to secondary performance (Karaoke, Tribute Bands and the "Pop Idol" phenomenon). Frith retraces the changes made possible by ICTs from performance room to hall to theatre to stadium and festival and the accompanying rise in cost of attending live performances due to different economic pressures and opportunities. He describes a complexly changing marketplace for music where powerful entities wielding powerful technologies shape the interplay and composition of live and mediated music. Rather than the decrease long predicted since the early history of ICT mediated popular music (Baumol and Bowen, 1966) Frith still sees substantial live music but in a changing landscape of corporatized music industry interests and secondary performance venues. Addressing the issue of authenticity as one of the remaining attractions to live music in an age of private MP3 archives, Frith cites his colleague Krueger's coining of his hypothesis, 'the Bowie theory,' in reference to "David Bowie's prediction that 'music itself is going to become like running water or electricity,' and his advice to fellow performers that, 'You'd better be prepared for doing a lot of touring because that's really the only unique situation that's going to be left.' (Kreuger, 2005. p. 26)

Of interest to this study of blues elders is their predisposition to the technology that was steadily introduced into their art form. Were blues artists generally receptive to the technology and was this because of the narrative surrounding it? Or were there possibly justified technophobic reactions that anticipated the potential negative agency robbing aspects of increasingly intrusive and depersonalizing technologies? It is most likely that this group will have varied responses to these aspects of the interview.

This study of blues elders will investigate the parallels between increased access or quantity of exposure to music and musicians via the Internet and other forms of ICTs, in contrast

to the level of quality of those interactions, as manifested by perceived respect, evidenced by knowledge of the performer, history of the genre, live music etiquette and the emotional impact in the artists themselves.

It is not possible to know how Marx, Simmel, Middleton or Bourdieu would have reacted to our current technological revolution. However it seems that there are many parallel concerns to the early ideas of alienation, commodification and the current focus on technophobia. Products are often engineered that are not needed, comprehended, or welcomed. Technological change that impacts culture is increasingly accelerated and uncritically accepted. Many of the unintended effects of previous technologies have increased the convenience to privileged groups and disproportionately affected vulnerable populations through environmental contamination and a widening of the gap between the haves and the have-nots.

There has always been a concern in some circles over the inherent alienation in technology itself. This concern goes far beyond the issue of resolving or improving upon poor design. Rather it challenges whether or not a technological fix (faster computer, more integrated system, greater access) actually worsens the problems. There was an old saying that captured a criticism of modern Western society that refers to how specialized technology has become and out of touch with its workings we are: "We know how to work it, but we don't know how it works" highlighting for example how many people could operate a computer but how few could program one or how many people could operate a motor vehicle but not make simple repairs on one, in contrast to a higher level of skill, or integration of skills in the past. However, in many studies one of the areas measured is the degree to which people not only don't know how something works internally, but increasingly don't know how to work many of the features of the objects they have purchased. Others researchers address the hidden unintended effects of

technology on social life. As we continue to be part of a consumer society filled with increasingly subtle imbedded computerized items, alienation, estrangement and exclusion will warrant further empirical scrutiny. Are there specific instances that relate to the artist's loss of agency when technology becomes a larger part of the equation? Does technology drive a wedge between the artistry and the technique?

In *The 'discovery' and appropriation of African music and dance* Fryer describes the long history of appropriation in the US as it relates to dominant white musicians and music industry representatives "discovering" African talent and art (Fryer, 1998). The author traces the process not only for blues but jazz, ragtime, Big Band, Caribbean calypso and Cuban music all in the same fashion.

> So the picture we have is of black musicians playing for white dancers who enjoyed and responded to the music, then white musicians playing black music because that was what white people wanted to dance to, and that music in time becoming the traditional dance music played by rural string bands. For example, Old Joe Clark, played by Wade Ward on banjo and Glen Smith on violin was recorded in Virginia as late as 1963. Wade Ward, by the way, was born in 1892. The similarities between Po' Black Sheep and this recording of white musicians playing what is nowadays called 'old-time string band music', hardly need pointing out. There are the same intricate cross-rhythms, including that syncopated 'cakewalk' figure; the same use of a drone (this time on the fiddle as well, double-stopped in fifths and reinforcing the drone provided by the banjoist's thumb continually sounding his instrument's short string); and the same 'neutral' third. (Fryer, 1998. p. 5)

And regarding ragtime we see a precursor to more recent history

> Soon there were also recordings of ragtime by white artists like the banjoist Sylvester 'Vess' Ossman (1868-1923), who performed with some success in London in 1900 and played before King Edward VII three years later. Ragtime, 'the first great impact of black folk culture on the dominant white middle-class culture of America', (FN66) soon became a craze in both the US and Europe. Almost none of the black ragtime composers and pianists made recordings, though many did make pianola rolls 'which are notoriously bad documentation, owing to the ease with which they could be edited and altered'. In 1917, Scott Joplin, son of a former slave and by common consent the greatest of the ragtime composers, died in a mental hospital, in isolation and neglect. (Fryer, 1998. p. 13)

In light of these various analyses, additional questions begin to emerge as to what other unintended consequences exist since this historic inverse shift from live to largely ICT mediated music? What do musicians themselves have to say about what are now commonplace flawless studio reproductions of songs they play on stage? To what extent do performers feel pressure to reproduce the recording instead of the goal of the recording capturing the live performance with its risks of imperfections vs the benefits of creativity, improvisation and serendipity? Crossley cites Becker's emphasis on 'Places' in that "Art always 'happens somewhere', Becker observes, and where it happens often impacts upon the way in which it happens. Music is shaped by the places in which it is made." (Crossley, 2015. p. 4) But what is the cumulative effect of increasing proportions of "disembodied" and "dislocated" or what we may now call "alocational" music, where location becomes increasingly irrelevant? And if place truly becomes arbitrary and irrelevant, does it in fact function as an elite virtual location available to those with the requisite economic and social capital to gain access? What other dynamics

change as ICT shifts agency away from the performing artist and toward the audience, now seen as a listener/consumer?

Performing musicians may be able to provide some of the answers to some of the more nuanced questions of the impact of ICTs on both mediated as well as live music. What are the perceived cumulative impacts on the sophistication of the audience? Are they more or less acculturated to the music, knowledgeable, aware of the history, appreciative, respectful? Has the racial and gender composition of audiences changed? And how do the increasingly blurred lines of ICT virtual technology impact the performer and audience when for example a live performance is simultaneously broadcasted to the next room via closed circuit television while someone else watches the live performance on the screen of their smart phone while recording?

Frith still sees a great deal of live music despite the predictions that ICTs would greatly reduce the amount. He raises the questions "*why* does live music matter so much in popular culture, given the overwhelming presence and availability of 'piped' and 'canned' music or, to use less negative terms, the ever increasing size of people's private musical archives (whether as record collections or MP3 files)? To put this question another way: what is live music *for*?" These questions hint at the multitude of other questions that arise.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This exploratory qualitative ethnography will make extensive use of interviewing to learn what older musicians in their 60s, 70s and 80s can tell us about their artistry, race relations and class struggle during the different decades of their lives and at important decision points in their careers, especially as it relates to the introduction of new technologies. The advantages of this ethnographic retrospective interview approach will be the first person voice relatively unmediated and focused on the history both of technological advances and how this played out in terms of the conditions of the artists. The smaller scale of the study will allow for more in-depth interviewing and in-depth analysis of the complex issues addressed. The context will also communicate respect as the Memphis Blues Foundation has honored many blues musicians in its ceremonies, hall of fame and museum, and done a great deal to promote equitable treatment of blues elders. However, the small sample also introduced the potential for more bias. For example, retrospective approaches can suffer from inaccurate recall and a potential negative response set.

The interviews will be set against the technological development decade by decade, i.e. 1920s & 1930s for amplified acoustic guitar, the 1940s with the increased use of electric guitar, the 1950s with changes in broadcasting and recording, the 1960s with rival musical styles derived from old blues field recordings, the 1970s, 1980s & 1990s with increasingly digitized sound with more easily reproduced recordings. The transitions from unmediated live music, to

recording live, to studio & Multi track recordings and eventually sampling, the increasing ease and commercialization of broadcasting, the evolution from LP to Reel-to-Reel to cassette tapes to 8-Track to CD to MP3. Each of these technology innovations will be examined to see where the choices of adoption existed and what the intended and unintended consequences for each were. A copy of the Interview Question Outline can be found in Appendix C.

Research Design

Placement and Role of the Researcher

One of the primarily roles of the researcher will be that as interviewer, since in depth "thick description" ethnographic interviews will be the main method of date collection. The interviewer's expertise in this area comes largely from many years as a psychotherapist having conducted well over 10,000 therapeutic interviews and having taught a variety of therapeutic and research interviewing skills undergraduate courses over the past 20 years with special attention to race relations and antiracist pedagogies. Pattern detection and assessment are key activities in this form of interviewing and translate well to qualitative research methods. Part of what drives this particular study is that it provides a very specific window to a very particular historical moment and problem, and the social justice aspects of these musical art forms also has great potential to be fruitfully generalizable to other areas (education, art, psychotherapy) and to other cultures (specifically countries where technology has historically been less available, adopted and integrated).

Population and Sample

Musicians in their 60s, 70s or 80s will have lived their professional lives through a time of immense cultural and specifically technological change. Likewise, blues musicians of this age, most of whom are African American, will have witnessed profound disparities in the

development of the commercial industry surrounding their music and its offshoots. Between six to eight older musicians were sought for this study to participate in the in depth life review interviews. While there are many blues musicians in various places in the country, there is an exceptionally high proportion of them in the Chicago area, in the south and on the West coast, which are also the proximal to areas of the country that have substantial music industry entities with very different amounts of commercial success. Purposive sampling was employed with some additional snowball sampling to find an adequate number of participants. Information rich participants will be those of the target age, 65 and older, have been lifelong musicians and having spent the majority of their career playing in and recording blues music in and around the Chicago area, the southern states of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Tennessee, and California. Seven interviewees were identified with the help of the Memphis Blues Foundation and its members and affiliates.

Research Questions

Introduction

Six interwoven sets of questions were developed to identify the key issues defining the territory of how technology may have influenced and shaped the constellations of relationships around blues music and its long term musicians. For example, much has been reported of the capture of large amounts of recorded music that never saw release to the public and one might anticipate resentment of this use of technology, an application yielding the exact opposite of what it promised. And there may be more mixed responses toward the improvements of amplification, both extending the reach but potentially distancing and estranging the audience from the performers, with its extreme form of synchronous video streaming, potentially from a personal smart phone, perhaps having a qualitatively different effect on both. There might also

be fairly positive descriptions of the use of current digital technologies that allow for direct artist to audience means of distributing music that bypasses the subordinating impact of middlemen in terms of the recording companies and distributors.

The cluster of related questions this study hopes to shed light on can be summarized in the core question: "How are the complex of social and economic relationships of these long term blues artists changed with the introduction of new technologies, specifically and cumulatively?" These semi-structured interview question areas will examine the role that technology may have played and explore particular historic moments where identifiable decision points were made by the artists where positive or negative consequences could have been identified and anticipated. Are there ways that existing social problems such as racism, classism and colonialism were created, recreated, exacerbated, amplified or possibly even mitigated by various technologies? How does the adoption of various performing and recording technologies favor certain actors and disadvantage others? Are there specific examples of how their agency is impacted? Might there even be a taxonomy of technological tradeoffs where one can anticipate negative or uncontrollable unintended consequences in exchange for positive benefits?

This research question will be fleshed out through in the following specific areas:

1. What was the impact of technology on the creative process? What changes in the relationship of the artist to their craft, specifically blues songwriting and performing, relate to increasing levels of ICTs over the past 60 years?

2. How were relationships changed by the increased presence of technology? In what ways might technology have impacted the way they teach their students, interact with their audiences, or deal with fellow performers? Has technology impacted the diversity of blues players or audiences?

3. Did the changes in technology impact the size and composition of the band? Did the introduction of any technologies cause changes in band size, replace band members or cause an increase or decrease in the cost of performing or recording?

4. **How has technology impacted the quality and quantity of live and recorded blues music?** Has technology impacted the proportion of blues music experienced in live performances compared to listening to recorded blues music? What are the tradeoffs between the growing quantity of recorded blues music and current amount of quality of live blues music?

5**. What were the economic impacts on the business side of music production?** How has the music industry changed with the introduction of greater amounts of technology with collaborating and competing economic entities? How has compensation for blues artistry been impacted by the various performing, recording and distribution technologies?

6. **How is the future of blues appreciation and its legacy impacted by technology?** How has technology impacted the promotion, preservation, evolution, of the blues? What is the future of live and technology mediated blues music?

The rationale for the approaching these questions through the life review of Blues elders, is multifaceted. The unique standpoint of those who lived, created and performed through the relatively recent technological developments, through the civil rights era and through the huge commercial success of other forms of music, is of tremendous value in understanding the process of the art and its unfortunate cooptation. Therefore the timeliness of this study is significant. Many of the musicians who are now in their 80s began their musical careers in the 1950s or earlier. There is no richer source of direct information about those times and issues from that unique standpoint than those actual lived experiences which stand in contrast to a narrative of the inevitable emancipating promise of technological advances.

Setting

Interviews were held at whatever location the participants preferred. These locations ranged from meeting in their homes, to hotel lobbies before performances, to green rooms between performances, as well as other musical venues. Interviews were held throughout the US in five different states. As all participants had been interviewed many times before on different areas of blues history and culture, all were familiar and comfortable with the standard audio recorded interview. Less familiar was the necessity for informed consent per university research protocol. All interviews began with a full description of the informed consent process and its importance, and then the signing of the informed consent form. While insisting on face-to-face interviews involved considerably more time, cost and logistical coordination, it is hard to conceive of have such successful and rich interviews in and other manner. This was in part due to the nuanced nature of the study, and in part due to the advanced years of the research participants where technologically mediated means of phone or video conference communication would have been intrusive and created an unnecessary barrier.

Participants

All participants were African American blues musicians ranging in age from their seventies to nineties. Several styles of blues were represented as well as several geographic areas in the US. Initially, Blues Hall of Fame nominees and inductees were contacted by the Blues Foundation president. Potential participants were then referred by the Blues Foundation or one of its affiliates. Snowball sampling was utilized to reach the desired number of seven interviewees, the committee's recommended number having been between six to eight participants. Due to celebrity status of the participants a set of pseudonyms were substituted for

their actual names and identifying details were omitted from interview responses to ensure confidentiality.

Recruitment

The recruitment phase of this research had several false starts and resulted in a substantial delay to the overall project. Due to the celebrity status of the participants required for this study, there were certain protective barriers to overcome. Challenges to access to these musicians included protective family members, friends, lawyers, agents, assistants, staff, many of whom saw it as their role to protect the musician from pesky fans and interviewers. Therefore, collaborations with blues music foundations were pursued to develop a partnership, as many of these organizations include research into the history of the blues in their mission. However, several of these collaborations, while initially promising, did not provide any access to musicians in the end. This was due at times to insufficient size and resources in the organizations, for example, foundations running on shoestring budgets with high turnover of administration and minimal staff. At other times foundations were too large to be interested in providing access for an individual external research project such as this one.

In the end the ideal foundation partner for this research was found in the Memphis Blues Foundation. As a result of their call for participation by their president to blues hall of famers and various awardees, and the help of their partners and affiliates, musicians who were interested in participating were engaged. Seven invitees agreed to participation in the project.

Another potential barrier was the concern about interview fatigue as all of the participants had granted many past interviews. In the end, only one invited blues musician turned down the invitation to participate in this study due to this reason. Four other musicians were specifically suggested and invited but some did not respond, but this was likely an artifact of the layers of

protection around them to filter out these types of requests. Some of the suggested musicians were unavailable at the time of the interviews due to significant health concerns and were not contacted out of respect for their conditions. Despite these challenges seven high quality research participants were engaged who fit the research criteria and generously agreed to be interviewed for as long as was needed for this study. All interviews were conducted at the place selected by the interviewee.

Every interview was conducted face to face and digitally recorded and then the digital recordings were transcribed for data analysis.

Risks to Participants

While a two hour life review interview is a relatively low risk activity, there is still potential for painful material to be discussed. In fact, it is expected that some of the life stories will include chapters during which the interviewees may have been severely taken advantage of financially and deceived by those in the recording industry and their legal representatives. Also, all of these interviewees are well known public performers, and therefore, specific information may be more easily identified and traced back to their public life if great care is not taken to prevent this from occurring.

If particularly painful memories had been invoked during the course of the interview the interviewer was also a licensed professional therapist and proper steps would have been taken to determine the needs of the interviewee and make referrals as appropriate. While this was a possibility it was not considered to be a likely necessity.

Benefits of Research

The potential benefits of this research partly lie in a more accurate and nuanced remembering of the important contribution of blues artists quite literally to the world's musical

heritage, while at the same time remembering the disproportionate lack of reward most of these original artists received, all at a time when technological advancements, and the promises of what democratization and emancipation they would offer, were in sharp ascendency. While this inverse relationship may have been more apparent and in the public awareness in decades past, albeit minimally then too, it seems all but forgotten now and still largely insufficiently analyzed. As more and more of social life is mediated by increasingly sophisticated forms of information technology, the cumulative effects may be large and substantial but also largely unnoticed if they are ambient and unexamined, created and recreated every day, without conscious awareness.

For this reason the benefits may also extend beyond this specific study and its participants and find parallel applications in other artistic spaces, in other cultural artifacts, or in other countries at different stages of technological development. If we fail to give voice to these stories of lived experience and marginalization despite the creative genius, we will have forgotten an important piece of cultural history, a forgotten history at risk of being repeated.

Informed Consent

All potential interviewees were contacted via email and phone to hear a description of the study and to request their participation. Once they accepted, times and places were arranged to review the consent document and conduct the interview. The consent document was presented and explained at the time of this meeting, with the option to continue and sign the document or discontinue the interview. A copy of the Informed Consent Form can be found in Appendix D.

Data Collection

Data Collection Procedures

Interviews were conducted at the location of the musician's choosing. All interviews were digitally recorded and later transcribed to provide access to both hard copy and digital text

for content analysis. The semi-structured interview format was followed to comprehensively explore the developments and resulting choices and conditions faced by these musicians over the decades. Interviews ranged from ninety minute to three hours culminating in over eighteen hours of dialog which generated over 275 pages of transcription. These ethnographic interviews were designed to obtain what Geertz describes as "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) to yield insights that could only come from direct experience, from a particular standpoint, over a broad span of time. Bresler describes a variety of qualitative ethnographic studies that explore complex phenomenological dynamics of musicians and their lived experiences:

> The qualitative paradigm manifests a transition from objective to constructed multiple realities. Accordingly, the qualitative paradigm draws upon primarily (but not exclusively) qualitative methods: participant observations, open-ended and semi structured interviews. These methods are adaptable to dealing with multiple realities. They expose directly the nature of the transaction between researcher and respondent, and hence make easier an assessment of the extent to which the phenomenon is described in terms of the researcher's own posture (Bresler, 1995. p. 2).

And in "Opportunities for ethnography in the sociology of music" Grazian describes the contributions of ethnography to our understanding of music history and culture:

> …ethnographic methods can enhance the historical and quantitative research currently conducted on the music industry itself. Over the past thirty years, the sociology of music has greatly benefited from the scholarly efforts made by those attempting to combine the fields of cultural production and organizational behavior. By treating the production of music as a commercial enterprise undertaken by large industrial conglomerates, sociologists have helped demystify the processes through which record

> labels and other media companies manufacture, market and distribute culture as a commodified form. In recent years, ethnographic work has contributed to this project as well by increasing our knowledge of how corporate cultures impact particular music genres; identifying the diverse artistic and economic interests that drive the production of music videos; uncovering how hip-hop impresarios rely on ideological considerations to successfully promote rap music; discovering how music critics organize themselves within the context of professional journalism; and exploring how the chaotic careers of session musicians are structured" (Grazian, 2014. "Section 7", para. 4).

At the time of the arrangement of the interviews it was unknown whether or not some of the participants might be in assistive care or have issues with physical mobility. Therefore, the interviews were all arranged to be conducted at the location designated by the interviewee to minimize inconvenience to the interviewees and reduce barriers and minimize intrusiveness of the research interviews.

Extraordinary care was taken to prevent identifying information from being distinguishable in the final published form of the dissertation. No actual names were used, aliases were generated for this dissertation, and identified themes are reported in aggregate and composite form to avoid identification to the extent this is possible.

Confidentiality of Data

All participants in the study were given pseudonyms rather than using their names to prevent identification. All information, codes, names, transcriptions, analyzed data, are digitized and stored in password protected files. All other paper and audio tapes are stored separately from the transcripts and will be destroyed once the study is complete. All identifying information was eliminated from the transcriptions. All raw data will be kept for a period of three years in

the primary researcher's office on a data disk, and removed from any hard drive on any computer. After three years, the data will be destroyed.

Data Analysis

The first step in data analysis was the transcription of the interviews, enabling initial work with both digital and hard copy. Next, basic data reduction techniques were employed to uncover common categories and themes that emerge from the interview content. Themes and subthemes were identified and categorized. NVivo Pro 11 qualitative analytical software was used to search for additional themes, however, none were identified that were not apparent from hand coding. From this analysis a rich description of the variety and commonality of experiences emerged. This was then compared to the anticipated issues that appear in the literature, such as themes of estrangement, alienation and loss of control of the creative process based on the ownership of recording studios, the recording technology and the structure of how studio session time was charged to musicians. However, the particulars of how technology impacted these musicians and their music was complex and the actual outcomes contained results that could only be discovered by in depth inquiry.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the methodological conditions were appropriate and effective in this investigation, in particular the design of life review examining technological changes over past decades. The questions were relevant and interesting to the participants, and despite being highly intertwined seemed to make intuitive sense to the interviewees. The setting of the interviews was effective and insistence on face to face interviews was worth the extra effort and expense as it is difficult to imagine accomplishing the same via phone or video conference. The

level of intimacy of subject matter and subtlety required the rapport only afforded to in person interviews.

These seven participants, though extremely difficult to recruit initially, once reached were extremely accessible and generous both with their time and frankness and willingness to engage in the research questions. They were all willing to challenge misconceptions and stereotypes in a direct and frank manner. The method of data collection was in fact less intrusive than originally thought as all had been interviewed many times previously by others on different topics relating to the blues and their careers. In the end the qualitative software did not generate additional information beyond what a thorough consideration of the data and emerging themes provided. But the software did confirm the themes and subthemes identified by the hand coding.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

Each of the seven interviews was highly informative on all five of the research question sub-areas of creative process, relationship changes, band composition, live music compared to recorded music, economics, and the future of the blues. Several additional themes that emerged related to pragmatism, authenticity, and evolution. Each of the interviewees were very generous with their time, willingly answered all of the interview questions fully, and saw the value in this inquiry. All participants were hopeful for the future of blues music generally but were also concerned about the future of the most authentic and traditional forms of the blues.

Findings Organized by Research Questions

Selected quotes are used in each of the six question set areas to illustrate the commonalities and variety of responses by each of the seven participants. Corden and Sainsbury discuss the benefits of the inclusion of minimal interviewer prompts in qualitative research interviews. Minimal interviewer dialog was included with the use of verbatim participant quotes for clarification, context, and efficiency, and to increases flow and clarity of the interview. (Corden & Sainsbury, 2006)

Creative Process

The purpose of the creative process question set was to explore how technology enhanced or intruded on the artistic process. While there was considerable variation in how each musician

tolerated or embraced technology in writing and preforming, there were certain subthemes of the importance of artistic control, which also connected to the discussion of economic considerations, and the fear of losing some intimacy with the essence of the song. When trying to describe the elusive nuance or subtlety of the music, the participants used language such as "feeling," "knowing it," "feeling it," "that special something," the "spirit" or the "soul" of the song. This was an overriding concern expressed by most of the interviewees, though each of them felt that they were able to navigate this by the choices they made around the type and amount of technology they employed.

Jerry described the subtle differences of eschewing digital tuning devices, preferring to let the guitar, the mood, the song, and the setting determine what tuning sounded best in the moment. Using an electronic tuner would create an unnecessary distance, a separation from the intimate connection between guitar, setting and musician. He seemed somewhat resigned that younger players would all be using the readily available and relatively inexpensive digital tuners, but insisted that this was critical to his artistic process. However, he was also graciously willing to tune electronically when the multiple player situation called for it.

> Jerry: I mean, I'm probably one of the few that's left that's basically tuning my guitar by ear.
>
> Mike: So if you were just playing by yourself, you would tune to ear, or "tune to heart."
>
> Jerry: Exactly. To my heart, to what I'm going to sing. And I want the guitar to put emotion -- I want what I sing to be transferred through my hand and into the guitar. So when I ask the guitar a question about what I'm singing, the guitar's going to answer in the same tune.
>
> Mike: And that's very different than the young guy that's always got the tuner on the neck and has everything perfect. Perfectly tuned, according to the machine, anyway.
>
> Jerry: And the type who-- I knew a lot of guys, their turn around, or their scale, or their type of bass, do what their heart told them to do. They do what the guitar told them to do.

And you've got a lot of listeners that can't relate to that.
Now I realize that these little young ones, they want to put a tuner on the neck of it and start bumping strings, and looking at the little reading on it. I don't do that. But I'll do it if somebody wants to play with me, and that's what they want to do. I understand that. They do that because of the changes, the counts. Four count, eight, count 12 bar, doing. But the way I do it is scale it in your heart, that's where your changes come from. When your heart and your soul tell you to change, do a turn around.

Of course I know that newbies play it on a scale, but it hasn't always been like that. If a keyboard player wants to play with you, and especially a pianist or a keyboard, because they're so used to doing the turn around after so many counts. Ain't nothing wrong with that.

Jerry related a time that a younger interviewer, who was also played guitar, tried to "correct" his out of tune playing:

Jerry: I had it tuned in the style that I play. First time I put my -- she goes "Your guitar doesn't sound right." I said, "Ma'am. Your guitar doesn't sound right." She couldn't relate. She was one of these younger people, she couldn't relate.

Mike: Right. Did she even know about your style?

Jerry: Had no idea. I asked her in one respect, I said "Well, the way I play it and the way my guitar sounds carry me all over the world performing."

Mike: So when younger folks want to play--

Jerry: It's not all the young folks. I've got two young guys who want to know how I got it tuned, he'll come out, he wants to show me how it's tuned. It's not all of them.

Regarding mentoring younger players, Jerry goes on to explain the importance of the feel of the music, the historical context, and the connection with the teacher. Much of what he tries to convey is this sense of immediacy and primacy of the blues as an art form.

Mike: So how do you teach a younger person how to get the right tune?

Jerry: First I might tell them you've got to have a passion for it. You've got to accept where it comes from. And I try and instill in all of their minds that whatever music you listen to today, blues is the root of all of it. It's the foundation of it, everything is built around the blues. A lot of them aren't aware of that.
But you cannot play a guitar or a piano without running some blues notes, or some blues licks. They're not aware of it. There's no way you can play a riff out of hip-hop, R&B, rock and roll, you cannot play unless you run some blues notes. They're not aware of

that.

In recalling his own early instruction he related another unique aspect of his specific writing and performing style, something many musicians could not fathom doing, playing with no written lyrics or set list. He stressed the importance of face-to-face sessions as superior to learning from something written down or in a book. He also believed that preconceived notions could interfere with the immediacy of the teaching and learning environment and therefore could present another barrier to overcome.

> Jerry: The guy I base my style from, he never had no intentions of being popular. He never had no intentions of being famous. He just did it. He just did it.
> Couldn't read nor write. Whenever I pick up the guitar, I think about him. For him to come up with the lyrics of a song, he had to have a four-star memory. Because he couldn't go home and pull this material, song out. Go over it.
>
> Mike: All in his mind.
>
> Jerry: Yep. When he did a program, he didn't have a set list. Because he couldn't read it anyway. And I try as much as I can to stay away from set lists. I'll do it sometimes. Not the lyrics, but the title of the song so I won't do the same song-- unless I get a request for it-- doing the same song during the same song. I try to keep it as original as I possibly can. People say it's just a gift. I mean, I just do it. Bottom line, I just do it.
> It's not going to sound the same playing it off the written note. It's not the same.
>
> Mike: So if somebody comes to you and wants to learn that style, then how do you-- what do you do?
>
> Jerry: In part, you can teach them, in part, you can show them. When you teach an individual, you put it on some paper. When you showing them, all you need is a good ear and eyesight.
>
> Mike: So in that way someone would have to be sitting-- at least for part of it would have to be sitting with you, face to face, to be watching what you're doing with your hands and be properly listening to it.
>
> Jerry: Exactly. And it is complicated for an individual to try and get started. But once you get the foundation of it, it's kind of-- I ain't gonna say simple.
>
> Mike: But it's in you, kind of, in a way?

Jerry: Right. And most of the people who come and sit, they make it complicated. They make it complicated.

Mike: So what they bring to it gets in the way?

Jerry: Well they bring their education, a part of it. You can't do that with this style, though. Well, you can, but you got to first grasp what I'm doing. Then you start adding the book knowledge to it.

Jerry also described a very pragmatic approach to utilization of technology. In his attempts to maintain the subtlety and soul of his music he described primarily using technology in it most basic form for the most basic reason – volume to project out to a larger audience. Beyond extending the reach of his music in this way, he had little interest in distorting his sound. To the contrary, his preference is a small intimate setting with an acoustic guitar, which while pure in his mind, is becoming rare. The exceptions he makes to this are for social reasons, for his audience, or fellow performers.

Mike: you plug in sometimes when you're playing--

Jerry: Yeah, I'll do it if that's what the sound man wants me to do or something. Not ordinarily.

Mike: It's not your preference.

Jerry: Give me some volume and let me roll.

Mike: So if you needed to get out the volume to the audience, you would do it. But if you had your choice, you'd just do acoustic.

Jerry: Most of my audience they don't see-- acoustic blues is almost non-existent. You got a lot of Chicago type where you're bending the strings and solid box guitar, all of that.

Mike: A lot of effects pedals, that kind of stuff.

Jerry: Right. But I don't need no extra. All I need is the volume.

Mike: So over the years, when everyone else is going that direction, whether it's Chicago or not--

Jerry: I'm not gonna change my style. Not the basics. Now I might see if someone wants to sit in with me, just to satisfy them. But for me, when I get booked to go to a festival, whatever, I'm gonna keep it original, that's why they booked me. They booked me because of what I do. And I know this. They don't want me to do nothing else but that. Nah, I take all of it serious. I take it all pretty serious. Big crowd, little crowd, big festival, little festival. I take it. That's what I'm there for.

In response to the question of ever saying "no" to new technology, he describes his sense for the possible unintended changes to the quality of the music. His hesitations stem from the concern that something other than what the artist created or intended will be replaced by how a sound engineer thinks it should sound.

Jerry: When you add a lot of modern technology, it's not original. It's not original, absolutely. It's not original. That's just my theory of it, now.
Mike: So it's changing the core of it, the substance of it?

Jerry: Well it's based on what they'll come up with it by way of computer. What they'll come up with. Cause say, this is what it's supposed to sound like. See if that had been the case, then there wouldn't be no need for the old guys to come up with what they did, if you're gonna let the computer do it all. Maybe you don't understand what I'm talking about.

Mike: I think I do. I think I'm trying. I'm trying.

Jerry: What I'm saying, original. Wasn't no computer. Matter of fact, it wasn't no amplifier. It was an acoustic guitar with a guy singing at the top of his gourd. That was it.

Mike: Maybe a harmonica with that, but--

Jerry: See, if you're gonna modify what he's doing, then that's not him. It's what the computer created him to be. It's not him. That's the way I feel about it.

Mike: So it's changing something important.

Jerry: What it boils down to, from that computer technician, "I'm making him sound like I want him to sound. Not him being himself. What I'm doing is taking the computer and making him sound not like him, but how I want him to sound."

Jerry described his creative process when writing songs as literally inspired, spiritual, and unencumbered even of the technology of writing. For him the immediacy and spontaneity were critical aspects of the genuine original process.

> Mike: And do you still continue to write? I know you're still recording and playing. But are you still writing songs?
>
> Jerry: I've never wrote a song in my life. I write a title.
>
> Mike: Write a what, a title? Not a song. Tell me about that. What--
>
> Jerry: I never took a pencil and wrote a page of lyrics, wrote two page of lyrics. I never did. I might write one or two lines. So thought it at first, I won't forget what I'm doing, but I don't write them.
>
> Mike: So tell me how that works. When you're performing a song, or when you go into the studio, you've got a title in mind?
>
> Jerry: Again, it's this gift from God. With God's permission, it comes into me. And he will carry, and help my music come to be. And I can put music to that.
>
> Mike: So that means that a particular song is going to come out different as often as not. Because you're spontaneously creating that song.
>
> Jerry: Based on who I travel with, or where I go, or who I come in contact with, or what I do.

And where some artists feel pressure to reproduce their studio recorded sounds, Jerry clearly felt no pressure to do so.

> Mike: So have you ever had folks want you to reproduce something the way they've heard it on one of your recordings?
>
> Jerry: I don't do that. When I get invited to come to a festival or a show, I have no idea what I'm going to sing when I get on the stage. I have no idea. All I know is I got to play tonight or whatever. And I go up there for a song, they come just like that.
>
> Mike: Not following a set list.
>
> Jerry: Sometimes I do a title list, just titles. I never did. I never did that.

Mike: I would guess, most people would have it all figured out ahead of time, and it's the same each time.

Jerry: 50% of my songs, if you hear me play one, I might do the same song, but the lyrics might be all different. Same song, title's the same, but I might have added or took away some of the lyrics.

Mike: So it doesn't matter if it got laid down in a recording a certain way. You don't feel bound by that, to keep it that way next time around? Or the time after that? That's how it came out during that one time in the studio, it's not necessarily going to be those--

Jerry: It's the way I did. It's a different song singer than yesterday. Why you want to do it like him?

Mike: You're not going to worry about that?

Jerry: I want to do me.

Similarly, Johnny described his process for writing and spontaneous inspiration. After decades of composing, performing and recording he also now forgoes writing his music and lyrics down. His rationale is similar too, keeping close to the subject matter, and the original blues experience.

Johnny: See, I never write a song now. When I go to the studio, what come out of my head, that's the way I do it.
Well, see, blues is life. If you ain't got no money, you got a problem. But if you got money, you got a problem, because everybody try to take it away from you.

Mike: Wants your money, yeah.

Johnny: So you still got the blues. Yeah. And you can look out here in the streets. You can write a song from the streets. If it hasn't happened to you, it's happened to somebody you know. So I don't have to write it down. I go in there and whatever my feeling is come off the top of my head.

Mike: That's unique.

Johnny: Oh I did before, you know. But that's the thing about life, that it's a song. A lot of people don't understand that. That's the way. That's the way I write them, they just come to my head, put it together.

To the question of saying “no: to any forms of technology, especially sound enhancing effects, he replied that these were often just distractions from real blues. His preference was to play it as straight as possible to stay in touch with the feel, the soul of the music.

> Johnny: Yeah, to me, that's bullshit. When it comes to the blues, you don't need any effects. You do what you feel. If I can't feel it, I can't make you feel it. So I do what comes from here.
>
> Mike: So to put an effect or a distortion on it makes it less real, or less you?
>
> Johnny: Right, makes it less real, right. So that's why I don't like that. You got to come from here. You can't use all that phony stuff. That's not the blues. If I changed my style, I probably could make more money. But I got to do what I feel. And I can't change that. I have to do what I feel. Yeah these guys I hear now, they're not playing no blues. They're playing bullshit. …. playing white folk blues now. You know, he's not playing from the heart.
> See, and like a lot of these guys now, they use all them different pedals and stuff. I don't like that. I want straight blues. Like on my mic, I don't use no reverb or nothing. Just straight, natural.

Johnny’s concern was that carelessly integrating different technologies caused a certain drift any from the true, natural roots blues. Places where many would assume traditional blues music was thriving had, in his mind, been overtaken with more generic blues rock. He described the audiences as well as some of the players as being naïve to true blues music. Others were just giving audiences what they wanted to hear. Other players just lost their way, forgetting “where they came from.”

> Mike: So all the Blues Museums, and the Blues Foundation in Memphis, do you think that they're helping-- like what's their role in all of this? Do they actually help?
>
> Johnny: Well, they help a little bit. But down there, that's a different blues. California, a different blues. Carolina, a different blues. But the guys from Mississippi, you think they really can play the blues.
>
> Mike: Nope?

Johnny: Man, I went down there, they wondered where I come from. Those guys can't play no blues down there, man. I'm telling you, it's a different-- Chicago blues is different.

Mike: Yeah.

Johnny: This kid rode up from Mississippi. His shit is much different as night and day from my shit. They don't understand how I'm real blues. Man, you would think they would know. We at a little club over there, and we sit in one night. This guy from Mississippi, he can't play my shit. It's totally different, man. I rocked it. But my shit is different. I couldn't believe it. They're from Mississippi.

Mike: Makes sense that the west coast would be different, right?

Johnny: Yeah.

Mike: So how would you describe it-- what's the difference with that current west coast blues?

Johnny: Rock.
Yeah, yeah. Because this guy's playing that Chicago blues. And like he-- he came here and played with me. I had to tell him, "Hold it, man. God damn, you done forgot where you from. Bring that shit down with you."

Mike: Caught a lot of that and--

Johnny: He got used to playing that other shit that-- forgot about the real thing. I said, "Slow down, man."

Mike: And did he?

Johnny: Yeah.

Mike: Proper respect. That's good.

Johnny: "Hold it, man." Shit. What you doing? You ain't in California. They play fast and loud. Like a lot of these men now do. You don't-- man all of them-- pedals, and, you don't need that shit.

Mike: All the pedals. All the effects, yeah.

Johnny's concern was not so much that changes were happening and that the music evolved in different ways. His concern is that people were mistaking this for true original blues. Additionally, his concern was that the defining feature that made a song real blues was the feel, the soul, the spirit of the music.

> Johnny: You don't need all the effects. Give me the straight blues. You know? You got to feel it. That's the lock of it. They do it for money. I got to feel what I do. If I can't feel it, I can't make nobody else feel it. That's the way I look at it, man. You know that. And this is why it's very hard for me to get players to understand what I'm doing. Because they don't understand the real blues. Take your time, don't rush it.
> I listen to the way they take music and they say, "This is so and so's organ, or something" and they play it so slow it's lost the feel, or so fast you didn't hear it. That's what I mean, turn it upside down. You know.
> Because I've heard some songs that people just messed up. Like Crossroads. Do do do do do do do do, "Go down to those crossroads," I got nothing against guys doing that, but there's no feel in that. You lost the feel of that Robert Johnson song Crossroads. When you get there and you do it so fast.
> "Oh I like the way so and so did it." But people are so tone-deaf these days. You know?

But again, Johnny was open to using technology creatively and pragmatically, in his case using early VHS technology to record and critique his own performances. When asked if there were times that the technology he used had a positive effect on his artistry he recalled those post-performance reviews.

> Johnny: And what I used to do-- back then, you know we didn't have phones like that. I'd have a guy with a VHS, you know record us performing, and then I'd bring it home, and I'd look at it. That way I see where I made my mistakes happen.
>
> Mike: So you'd study yourself after you got home, study the recordings. And that helped. Was that hard to watch?
>
> Johnny: You look at it and you go, damn, I should have did this a different way. That's what you gotta do.
>
> Mike: Yeah, that's good. So that really did-- that worked. All right.
>
> Johnny: Yeah

For Mickey, much of his concern was about the sound quality. He had an ear for what made for the right sound and as often as not it was a low tech solution that would go on to be imitated and reproduced in other ways. He would lament when technology would take the heart or soul out of a song. He reluctantly recounted a number of times when this occurred, at times a tradeoff of what was popular rather than what was best.

> Mike: So part of that song—you're talking about….
>
> Mickey: I hope I don't make nobody feel bad by saying this, but I can give them something to think about…
>
> Mike: That's exactly what I'm trying to figure out here, is what gets lost. Right? And you're saying sort of the soul of that song, the heart of that song, doesn't come through if it's played fast, and it's more popular in some ways. Made a bunch of money.
>
> Mickey: Yeah, but where was the sound? Was it anywhere? I always say, if you play it fast, you didn't play anything. If you played it loud, you didn't hear anything. You play it too slow, you lost the feel. Too fast, you lost the feel, too slow you lost the feel. You got to have-- someone got to have the same tempo to express the words. But you can't rush them, and you can't drag them. You got to be right on the button.

Mickey also had a pragmatic approach to using dubbing technology, to get the sound just right. He recounted fixing a famous hit tune that was missing a certain sound. The song was recorded live but he got the right sound inserted using an early two track recorder.

> Mike: So thinking of live music and live recording versus studio recording, do you worry about losing the feel, or losing that right spot, that right speed, that right sound? Between live music and recorded music?
>
> Mickey: Well, everything we did, we did it live. It was recorded live. And maybe every now and then we would do up something, but every time we would dub up something, most likely I did it. But nobody knew that it was done. Because my man had a good ear, and I got it from him. …… (in one of the early hit songs) … it sounds just like it was recorded when it was recorded live. But I dubbed it. Because I could hear that. I didn't read up on it, I heard it. I said, "Oh yeah, I got to have-- okay, I know what's missing in my ear. I went and got my ….stuff….. and I told him to spin it.

He described many early innovations capturing sounds that now are routinely produced digitally. Some of these techniques were captured and copied at the time. And he discussed how some sounds that are now captured and reproduced digitally can contribute that loss of the shared feeling of the band and the heart of the final song.

> Mickey: So therefore you had your natural sound and your natural echo at the same time. We didn't have no electronic echo like they have now. Because now they can hit a button, and you can hear the echo for 10 years, you know? But we just had that natural echo, just like you out in the woods, or at night walking down the street and clap your hands, you can hear.
> So they (a rival studio) copied that. They sent somebody snooping. And so they stole a little of it.
>
> Mike: And so now, you've got a machine. A computer that will make that kind of sound--
>
> Mickey: You can get some sounds. But people that don't know what it is, oh, they're trying to come bip bop, bop bop, bop. No, you not gonna beat that, feel that, not in your bones. You ain't gonna beat that from the heart stuff. You can use all the electric stuff you want to, you're not gonna beat from the heart. Did you want a coffee?
>
> Mike: Please, that would be great. Thanks.
>
> Mickey: But I like my stuff live, come alive. When everybody looking at everybody. And you gonna get the feel of it. If you just going in there and singing, then somebody come in, and they got it all on their phone, and--
> You are not gonna have the feel to that than if everybody was sitting in there alive. No way in the world.
>
> Mike: So even when you record now, you record live, with everybody there. Not everybody separate.
>
> Mickey: Everybody right there.

Mickey went on to describe how too much technology and engineering got in the way of the original raw sound of the music that they were making. Artistic control was lost when too much adjusting and too many additions were overlaid on the music. This also increased the production costs.

Mike: So do you have concerns, are you worried at all when you hear stories about people generating all of their music from a computer, and from a deck?

Mickey: I don't like it.

Mike: Specifically?

Mickey: You know, we recorded some songs recently, and-- oh, there's a lot stuff that we did. Where the guys said, "Oh, we got to send it to New York, we got to send it to Pennsylvania and final mix it."
I said, "Look, all this crap for everybody getting paid a big dollar for nothing. They're messing up the depth of it. When I can hear something," I said, "That's where it belongs." You want to put all that little crap running through this, that and the other. And you take out the quality of it. Any time you mess with it, you lose quality, you know? Leave it like it is, because that's why our stuff went so big, because it was raw.

Mike: Not because it was highly produced.

Mickey: It was raw. It wasn't all that. It got to read, and what quality, what frequency you're recording. We did this stuff right there, edited it, sent it to Nashville. Sent it to whoever. And there it is. Just like we wanted it. Nobody touched it. Anything was screwed up, we did it. But it never was. Or it was screwed up so bad nobody knew the difference, you know? Because if you do it wrong, do it right. And you got no faults. That coffee smell good.
Yeah, I want this done like I want it. Because I knew how I wanted it. I feel like it's-- Look, this is me singing this. I know what this music is supposed to sound like. Ain't nobody gonna tell me what I'm supposed to play behind my music. I'm writing this, I'm playing this music. I'm playing for the music, not for you. I'm playing for the music. And when I get through playing for the music, it should fit your ears.

Mike: So does that ever cause disagreements, or any tension between like other musicians, or producers, or---

Mickey: Oh, a lot of time, you have-- you out there on the stage, and somebody could say, "Oh, when we play it, when we play a certain change up, we play it like that."
And I said, "Well, I don't play it like that. When I play it, I play it like this. And if you can't play it like this, somebody else out there will. Or I'll play it myself."

Mickey discussed the importance of listening to other musicians in person when learning the blues. However, he was quick to point out that not everyone has the same capacity to learn,

even when face-to-face with their instructors. Persistence and having the ear for the music were key in mastery.

> Mickey: I just listened to people, but most of what I learned, I learned on my own. When I heard them playing, I fished it out and I got pretty close to it.
>
> Mike: So you'd have the ear for it.
>
> Mickey: Mmmhmm, that's what you got to have, you got to have the ear for it. You right, if you don't have the ear for it, can't nobody sit you down and teach you nothing. If you don't have the ear for it, you're never gonna learn nothing.
> But people think that oh, you can teach anybody. No, you cannot teach anybody music. You cannot. This lady, she was a music teacher. She would teach all the students. All the students could play except her. Because she just taught them the chords and the music for different songs. But she couldn't-- she knew what it was. But it wasn't for her to play it, because she didn't.
>
> Mike: Didn't have it.
>
> Mickey: No. But she could read it for somebody else, taught somebody else to read it all. And most of the kids that were playing, they were musically inclined anyway.
> The best ones was the ones that just sit down there and play the guitar or play the piano or something. Like little kids, play that piano because they hear it. And he hit that one, that don't sound right, so he-- okay. Don't hit that one again. You know? Until it's time to hit that one.

Minimal intrusion of technology was key to keeping the right sound for Mickey as well. He described the tendency for some to try to enhance what was already a good recording, risking changing the sound to something more produced but lower quality, less real. Spontaneous sessions were common and in his mind produced the best results, with minimal effects or engineering.

> Mickey: Well, all the time when I was coming in with (a writing partner) at the studio. He would sit down and write something, I would sit down and write something. And I'd play it and go turn on the machine, and record it, listen to it, something like that. And we always get on the phone, call (additional musicians) -- a lot of the time didn't have to call-- some of the guys were always around. But anyway, we'd just call the guys in, and go ahead and record stuff just like that. We didn't release nothing. We just got in and played it, that was it. Because everybody was familiar with that type of music because they grew

up with it. And we all-- they all were young and good ears. But after, over the years, just listening to it, I can say what could have been an improvement. But nobody knew. Nobody knew at the time, you know? That I had different ideas, but it wasn't no use trying to change those guys.
Like I always say, you can't have what you like, try to like what you have. It wasn't none of the stuff I recorded was slouch. No, all that stuff sold.

Mike: So were there ever times that new technologies would come around, either new ways of recording, or new effects, or anything like that that you just kind of said no to? That you were hesitant to embrace, or hesitant to include?

Mickey: No, but they didn't try it on me. So I didn't have to say a thing about it. Always just did it the way I wanted to. So I didn't have anything to fight about, because when we played something, then that was it.
"I like this cut, I like this one."
"No, let's do it again."
"Do it again for what?" I said, "The more you mess with it, the worse it's gonna get." A lot of this stuff, I would record it just one time. Just once. And that was it. Like my country-- Most of the stuff I just did one take on it, on my country songs. Just one.

Mike: So it sounds like they would be playing stand-up bass, piano, not keyboards. I mean it sounds like those were all, not all acoustic instruments, but probably not instruments with a lot of effects on them.

Mickey: We always had the little stick on mics that you just put them on. Or he'd set a mic right in front of him, and it'd always pick it up really nice and clean.

Mike: Yep. But no distortion, no effects, no other--

Mickey: No feedback, it's just beautiful. Pick up all of that, because the bass is just upright. And it's just acoustic all the way. And it's coming, and they're going into that box and coming out that mic. Oh, man, that's a great sound.

Mike: Those are some pretty creative sounds and techniques.

Mickey: I got all kinds of crazy stuff that works. And that's the good part isn't it? Everything I did in the studio worked for the music. Not for me, for the music.

Historically, one of the obstacles many budding musicians faced was the tension between the church and the juke joint. Parents who were church members or leaders often disapproved of the “devil’s music.” So music that was listened to in private, often times on the radio, and

practiced in secret was often music that was learned and played "by heart." Concealing a harmonica, or even a small electronic keyboard is one thing. But when your instrument of choice is a full sized piano; that requires a different approach. Willie described how his early years learning the blues, practicing in secret with a neighbor who was secretly his mentor, profoundly impacted his intuitive adult writing and playing style.

> Willie: Yeah, but I couldn't play no-- now, I could play the blues as a church song in mama's and my daddy's house. But my grandmother bought me a piano. I could play-- it had to be church songs. I couldn't play no blues, rock and roll, none of it in the house. That's the Devil's music. But I had me a bicycle, and that neighbor…
>
> Mike: So you learned some from your neighbor, some from the radio, some just figuring out for yourself. Where do you think she learned from?
>
> Willie: I don't know, but I know she could play.
> And now, I just know what I'm gonna do. I be knowing what I'm gonna do when I sit out there at the piano.
>
> Mike: So the idea comes first, and then you go to the piano and work it out.
>
> Willie: That's right.
>
> Mike: Yeah? How about for the lyrics, for all the--
>
> Willie: Well I just about know what I want to sing, too. See I've got all my songs figured out. The music just comes to me, and I sing with it to make the records.
>
> Mike: Right. So that process has stayed the same, largely then, over the years. You get an idea, and then you go to the piano and work it out. Was there ever a time where you felt the most creative, or felt the best about the music that you were doing, over all those years?
>
> Willie: Well, I don't know. There are quite a few guys who can learn young. How did you learn how to do this, how did you learn how to play, how can you do this? But it just comes to me, that's all. If I hear something one time, I can do it.
> And I've been about everywhere. I've played with about everybody.

Despite all the profound changes he has seen and experienced in digital recording, Jimmie seemed to enjoy most aspects of it. When asked about his preferences for playing in

front of a live audience or recording in the studio, he said he actually likes doing both a great deal. He described in detail what he likes about the current state of digital recording. An important aspect for him was actually the artistic control afforded by technology to get the perfect sound. He saw the freedom from schedules and place as giving him an artistic advantage.

> Jimmie: Well, it's changed a lot. With the modern day and with the digital age of music and everything. Where everything is done so different from what it used to be done. You know same siding with the track recording, and that never used to be.
> It used to be just two tracks, or maybe three or four tracks, and that's it. But with the invention of track recording, it made an entirely different way of doing it. And a whole different concept of what's going on.
> I like both. I like recording live, and I like working in the studio. Depends on the kind of project I'm working on. It requires a certain amount of technology to put it together. So that's good too.
> It's also good to have the advantage of doing it this way. You can do one track, and if you want to put another guitar track with that track, you can do it just by pushing a button. That never used to be. You used to have to go in a studio and record everything at one time.
>
> Mike: Right. Everyone at once, everyone in the same place, yeah.
>
> Jimmie: So it's real good, but then it advanced so much from that. So you can just do an album, piece by piece by piece until you put it together. You get one track this month, and do the next track six months later, or eight months later, if you want to.
> It's going on in and punch a few buttons, and sit down with a guitar and a microphone, and do vocals, or whatever. So I prefer both. Because both are necessary under many conditions.
> I come together with the sound that I'm looking for. And that, I have to have in my head. I have to hear what that needed to sound like.…·When you get to the level you want it, and-- say your vocal tracks, and be able to separate them from the music tracks.
> And you have to hear the perfection of it. To say, is it balanced right? Where it floors when it's supposed to. Yeah, yeah. You have to know what you're looking for. That's where producers have to know how to do.
>
> Mike: So in that way, the control is a big advantage.
>
> Jimmie: Big advantage, absolutely. You can move tracks from here to here, if you want to. If you want the track over here, you can move it from here and put it over here…. doing my stuff in the studio. But one vocal track is just a little out of sync. We can just move it with the machine. Just move it over. And push it where it's supposed to be. Where it blends with the other track.

Mike: And like you say, it could be a week or a month or a year later.

Jimmie: Right, you can go back and do it. Because once it's digital, you can always go back and work with it. Modern day technology is many things. Good in their own way, but in their own way, both of them are a lot of work. But yeah, it's enjoyable because you feel like you're creating something. Hopefully, you're trying to create something that will be accepted by people. That's never been in existence in that sense before.

He was also insistent on the importance of the direct musical experience, that the original content was of high quality and reflected authentic human experience. However, he used his experiences with the blues great Otis Rush as an example of how both the original and technological reproduction can contribute to blues artistry. He appreciated how both the spontaneous creation of something new by the artist, and the use of technology through sampling, could generate further creativity from the original art and artist.

Jimmie: So you feel like-- just like some songs, I've heard people say, listen to Otis Rush, the way he bent that note on that certain song. And when Otis did that note, maybe he just-- that's the way he felt in his mind. And he said, well, I'm gonna bend it this way. It comes out so effective. So that's something new that was created some fuss. People were concerned, because they never heard it that way before. And maybe Otis Rush never heard it either, until he played it. When it comes out great.

Mike: That kind of connection.

Jimmie: Absolutely, the connection. It's an original kind of a feeling thing that he slipped in. And this thing you think of may be something that you originated, or are creating, that you have never realized what it coming to be like Muddy Waters. Some of his songs, he just had some lyrics that he was singing about conditions.
And years and years later, it's "I got my mojo working, but it just won't work on you." That lyric's okay. But what is it about? It's about the way he felt about someone, about some lady or something. And he was trying to get her attention. And she wouldn't pay attention. So he wrote a song, "I've got my mojo working, but it's just not working on you."

Mike: So now – if Otis' guitar playing is sampled – if it's all sampled from somebody else, the guitar part, even the vocals…. Do you have any concerns-- When you talk about Otis Rush hitting that note that certain way, that's creating something new as opposed to always--

Jimmie: Right, the way he'd bend it, maybe it's never been done that way before. Because I've talked with Otis, and he said, "Sometimes I don't know what I'm doing when I get the guitar. I just get it and play what I feel." That's what the originality of it is. What's coming from him?

Mike: So if everything's coming from something sampled-- from a drum line, and you put in a bass line, and all those other things. Is there a concern about losing the new, the creative, because you're always borrowing from someone else's…?

Jimmie: No, I don't think so, because ideas, I think, will continue to create or generate themselves, somehow or another. What people that have certain talents, talents just to feel and hear certain things, I think will continue to surface, I think so. In one form or another. A creative way of doing it, yeah. A new way of expressing it, yeah.

However, he described his own creative style as always beginning with just him and low technology instrumentation to work out the ideas and sounds he is working out. Only after that process was complete would he go into the studio to begin recording and using technology to enhance the sound. Additionally, there seemed to be some creative interplay between his use of technology and musical choices such as chord voicings that would result from his time in the recording studio. When asked about his song writing process he described the progression from piano to guitar to studio work.

Jimmie: Right. In my head first, yeah. And then I'll check the chords on a piano, just to try and hear what I need to hear for the combination of different instruments.

Mike: Even though you're writing it for guitar? Still on the keyboard or with the piano?

Jimmie: Yeah, oh yeah. I can hear the voicings on the piano, the chord changes. So I go that route. So there's a few things I'm doing a little different chord changes. Then I try to find it on the guitar and try to put it together like that. Yeah I think when I did the last album I did, the last studio project, for that album. I think I felt a good groove. And my engineer came over and he worked with me. I think we got out of it what we was aiming for, we're satisfied with the outcome of it.

Mike: And that was in the studio, you were laying down the--

Jimmie: Studio, yeah. The last track….. So with this one I want to, the next one I want to try and put a little bit of the advanced technology into a couple of the songs. Just to try and bring out some of the ideas I have inside of my head.

Mike: Right, some different chord structures---

Jimmie: Right, exactly.

Jimmie emphasized the importance of his working relationship with skilled sound engineers. He discussed their role in both enhancing, bringing out the essence of the sound, but not interfering with the creative process of the musician. It was clear how highly he valued what a skilled engineer brought to the studio and to the recording process.

Mike: So is that easier to do in the studio, when you're bringing in new elements like that? New sounds, new chording, or new phrasing?

Jimmie: Oh no, well, good engineers, they don't care as long as you can be as creative as you feel you want to be. Because somehow or another, good technicians, they're well up on that--

Mike: They're going to capture that.

Jimmie: They capture it, yeah. They can hear what you're doing for some reason. Even if it's going in the opposite direction. As long as any of the patterns fit, they can figure out how to place it and produce it.

Mike: So that sounds like that's not in the way. That they actually-- if you have a good sound engineer.

Jimmie: A good sound engineer, they'll just have a concept of what you're doing. And they can work with it. Because they do this every day. And they can hear stuff that other people probably wouldn't here. And feel stuff that a lot of people outside of the production would not hear it.

Mike: And you feel like you've got good people that you were working with on this last project?

Jimmie: Oh, yeah. Mine, he's a good guy to work with. Him and his other engineers. He's the main engineer, but he's real sharp.

While quite at ease with technology and digital recording, Jimmie was also deliberate in his choice of how much technology to integrate into his music. Rather than negativity or suspicion of technology, he was more focused on what it either could contribute or the potential for it to distract from the music.

> Mike: And was there ever a time when you were hesitant to adopt or suspicious of technology and felt like maybe--
>
> Jimmie: No, usually I try to stick with the basic technology. But so far as different pedals and stuff like that, I try and stay away from it. I try and stick to just the original sound that's coming from the instrument. And what's it like saying in the microphone, a little bit of echo or something for the voice in certain spots, whatever. That I can deal with.
> The only technology I probably deal with once in a while if a song requires a sound that sounds a little bit like a wah wah pedal. But I don't get off too far into that. I want to stick to the basics-- not to the wah wah, I just want to stick to the basic sound of it. And leave the technology to the engineers, what they want to do with it.
>
> Mike: That's true, yeah. Because they could add that in later.
>
> Jimmie: Now you have it. I like to stick to the music.
> Oh yeah, well, if there's a song that say, doesn't-- say a wah wah pedal doesn't fit. If a wah wah pedal doesn't do the song any justice, I'll tell them right away. I have no trouble telling my guitar player, do away with that wah wah pedal.
> Because it's not fitting the pattern that I want. I just tell him to cut the wah wah pedal out. In certain spots in certain songs, it's okay, a little of it. But too much of it can be more of a hindrance than it is a help.
>
> Mike: So it could get in the way of a song. And the sound that you're trying to get.
>
> Jimmie: Oh, yeah. Definitely get in the way of it.
>
> Mike: It sounds like you have been pretty open to new ways of doing things, as long as it doesn't get in the way--
>
> Jimmie: As long as it makes sense and it doesn't get in the way, yeah. Exactly.

As with many musicians his early formative years were influenced by musical family members playing live and listening to recorded music on the radio when it was allowed and available. With that foundation Jimmie, like many others, was self-taught, listening to recorded

music and trying to emulate it. He describes having the feeling for it and how that impacted his creative process.

> Jimmie: Well, my uncles. They used to have old acoustic guitars that they'd jam around the house. But I didn't-- I never had access to a lot of equipment until I got grown and purchased it myself. I just had to listen and just kind of work with whatever.
> But I never recorded with an acoustic guitar until after I was grown. I did a couple of songs on acoustic. It's always been electric.
> Mostly the radio in the South…. and stuff like that. And a jukebox once in a while. But I never was listening to any live performances then. Because I was too young to get in clubs.
>
> Mike: Right, so just picking it up from what you heard on the radio, on the jukebox.
>
> Jimmie: Yeah, I could hear things by John Lee Hooker, with the "boom, boom, boom".
>
> Mike: And you just figured out—
>
> Jimmie: Right, then Chuck Berry, I would check his riffs out and go, oh, that's pretty cool.
>
> Mike: It takes a little while to work those out.
>
> Jimmie: Yeah, oh yeah. I just had a feeling for them, and I could-- And then Muddy Waters. Like Baby Please Don't Go and stuff like that.
>
> Mike: So that was kind of you alone, then. With a guitar and listening to whatever you could get from radio.
>
> Jimmie: Whatever I could hear, yeah. Lightnin' Hopkins. Later on I got to work with some of them. That was a great-- oh, yeah.
>
> Mike: Full circle?
>
> Jimmie: Yeah, absolutely. Full circle, that's right.

Jackie described a creative style, partly informed by the history of stolen work. He was cautious about sharing anything before it was ready to record for fear of it being appropriated by someone else. For this reason his writing was always done in private, working out ideas on paper and with his instruments, and only when it was fully formed, sharing it in the studio.

Mike: So when you are-- when you're creating, when you're writing, what's your process? Are you-- how does that work, is it in your head, do you play it out with other musicians, by yourself?

Jackie: I never play it out with other musicians until I'm ready to record. My songs, what I do, I put them together to myself. That's the way I do it. I never play it with other guys, because-- one reason I don't do that because it's so easy for guys to steal your songs. You take-- if you're out there doing the song with the other guys before they record it, if they hear it then they might record it before you do. So that's why I don't do that. I never play my song; they never get a chance to hear my song until I'm ready to record. And then we go in and rehearse and put it together like that. I never play my song with the guys before I record it myself.
Because I've known guys that have lost their songs like that. There's some great songs that other guys heard them playing, and they went and recorded them before they got them recorded. So that's why I don't do that. The only time they ready to hear my song, I'm ready to put it on the wax. That's how I do that.
What I do, I do it both ways. Paper, then my head. I put it together how I'd like for it to go, and so that's the way I do it. I've got a whole bunch of songs that's written out that's not been recorded yet.

He also addressed the importance of writing, playing and recording 'from the heart'. As with several others, he described some of the racial dimensions of the blues regarding what audience to target. For his artistry it was important to transcend that and make the music he felt, that was real to him, and then put that out for all audiences of the blues.

Jackie: Because I hear guys say now, and then before, "I'm gonna record this because I think white people like this. I'm gonna record like this because I think this is what black people like." I record what I feel, and hope everyone like it. It's not a black and white issue with me. It's about the love of the music. I record good music and I hope you like it. It's not a black and white issue with me. It's the love of the music. That's what I do. And I'm at a point in my life now, I'm not trying to prove nothing to no one.
What I'm gonna talk about, that's realness. You follow me?

Mike: You got the poetry.

Jackie: Right.

Lennie also discussed the complicated history of race, oppression, theft of music history of racial history and contemporary context of the blues. For him there has been a long interplay between the roots of blues and the authenticity and immediacy of the experience and how that translates to the music. For him this interplay also begins to explain the various attractions to the blues by different audiences. The blues, as a form of communication, has a unique and complex contribution.

> Lenny: Yeah. Let me say to you, I never met you before, but god has given me a gift to discern you. I can discern a lot of things; I'm hoping that I can say a few things that enlighten people. Because the blues have been pretty much talked about in the same patterns, in the same way. But even in slavery, some of the big slave drivers were slaves themselves.
> It's like writing a book. You can only write about what you know about. When you sing the blues, you can only write about where you've been and what you've been through.
> I was in the time when they invented the wah-wah. A wah-wah is a foot pedal that creates (crying/wailing) sounds.
> And most of the time, the white guys created and was playing them, because they want the sound close to the black guys, the Bobbys, Jimi Hendrix, oh yeah. But they don't buy them that much anymore.
> But now the black guys are buying them, trying to sound like the white guy who's trying to sound black. And that's kind of when I laugh about those kind of things. You know?

Conclusion

What we can take from these exchanges are the tradeoffs that can either enhance the 'realness' and intimacy of the music, such as "tuning by heart" or embracing technology through a digital tuning device to more accurately join with other, often younger, musicians and more easily get in tune with other instruments and other players. This happens with an acknowledgement of a loss of connection, soul or nuanced connection with the instrument. The patterns that emerge are a deliberate use of and refraining from the use of certain technologies. There is a pragmatic approach to incorporating technology where it "makes sense" and does not obviously distract from the artistry of the blues.

Of interest in this section of questions is the intersection of creativity with issues of economics and business. As several participants described, the issues around ownership and theft of music impacted how they were able to create and share their art. This will be developed further with the questions directly addressing economic issues.

Technology was utilized and seen by all as positively contributing to the dissemination of blues, which for many was their *entre* to hearing and learning the blues as children and young adults, listening to recorded music on the radio or jukebox. Most had some concern about the interference of too much technology, as it has the potential to distort or distance the player and especially the listener, from the original experience being expressed.

Relationship Changes

The questions relating to changes in relationships encompass multiple aspects of the constellation of social interactions around the blues experience and how technology has potentially changed these relationships. These questions attempt to probe the changes that the blues musicians had with their mentors, peers and apprentices. They also addressed the potentially changing relationships with band members, though this is addressed in more detail in the next question set. And finally, they explore the issue of the changing composition of their audiences and their relationships with them.

When Jerry was asked about changes in his audience that he noticed, he was largely unconcerned about this. He seemed to enjoy a close bond with his audience, partly due to his style of blues. His preference for acoustic blues seemed to contribute to this as well. His assessment of his fans was largely positive and he saw them as fairly knowledgeable and discerning about the blues. With this discernment came the freedom to play exactly what he wanted to play and always play what he felt. Likewise, he felt the commitment to play "real

sincere" and be as real as possible which even involved details like his unique style of "tuning by heart" which he felt his audience would understand. He wants them to "grab" their blues experience.

> Jerry: My fans, the true fans of the old school blues. True fans. They're not sitting there just passing time. A lot of fans find out that I'm in town, they come to hear me play old school blues and nothing but that. They don't come to hear me play while they're waiting bigger hit live to play. They come to hear me. And I appreciate that. Definitely appreciate that.
>
> Mike: So these are not people who have watched the Blues Brothers movie and come in because they think they know what the blues are about. These are people that know what you're about, and what your style's about.
>
> Jerry: They either coming to hear me, or coming to get some pointers. I understand that. I learned from old with some old guys. I play and they play to satisfy themselves. And at times you might kind of lose your audience, and get a feel for what they want you to do. And then you kind of add that in.
> The guys I learned to play from, they'd play the chords the way they feel. Because if you play or sing a song based on what you have experienced the audience can relate to that. Hard times in the cotton field, a bad relationship with your girlfriend or your wife, or you ain't got no money.
> Now if you set an audience with me in there that have never got drunk or never had a bad relationship and have no idea what I was talking about. You follow me?
> Now, you listen to me on the basis of what you know about music, not with that person feels they're doing to music that's why some people say, "Well, I really don't like the blues, I can't relate to blues". They never had blues experience. Let me take that back. They have had a blues experience, but they won't grab it.
> Because a lot of people are stereotyping blues as about hard times, lonesome, bad days. No, it's not. Blues, some blues is about good times.
>
> Mike: Right so it's bigger than just hard times.
>
> Jerry: Way bigger. Way bigger.
>
> Mike: So you've got to feel that. And that starts with the tuning.
>
> Jerry: Exactly. So you say it serious, not as a joke. This is what I'm going to do. I tell them, I say, "If you're coming here for anything other than old school blues acoustic, you might be at the wrong stage." Because I can't make you dance, I can't bend no strings, but I can play the guitar. And try to sing. I tell them that. I'm being real sincere. Because I don't want them stumbling upon my particular stage, and my set, and they're expecting

something and they go, “That ain’t what I thought.” I let them know before I start playing. Old school acoustic blues, that’s it. That’s it. That’s it.

Mike: Alright, so that’s what they’re getting. So for those folks-- Well, usually, I don’t assume too many people leave. That’s what they want.

Jerry: Oh, they don’t go. They know what they’re coming in for. See before I do every song, I always have a conversation. I just don't-- like a lot guys they jump from song to song. I don't do that. I talk to the people what I'm singing about before I sing. That way I get their attention.

When asked about the intrusiveness of cell phones, and the ease of video recordings and selfies, Jerry was very pragmatic. He didn’t see this as much as an enhancement of the experience, but an inevitability, just the ways things are now. He was very clear-eyed on the limits of what can be done about pirating music and posting his videos online. While he would prefer that it wouldn’t occur, he seems aware of what is out of his control and did not seem to worry about it much.

Mike: So, at one of your shows, somebody pulls out their phone and starts recording. Any thoughts on that?

Jerry: There isn't much you can do about it. Unless you find it online or if you see something and say you don't want it to be done. But other than that, you can't worry about that. That's the modern technology.

Mike: Yeah, I see it all the time.

Jerry: A person actually asks, "Can I take your picture," I tell them yes. Because they're going to take it anyway. You're not getting your way anyway if you say no. "He's just being crazy when he asked me not to take a picture of him. He's just being crazy." He's going to get the picture one way or the other.

Mike: Right, whether you say yes or no.

Jerry: When he asked me, he was just being polite.

Mike: Is that okay with you if people are wanting to take pictures, or pictures with you?

Jerry: I ain't got no problem with it. I've got no problem with it.

Mike: You're performing. It sounds like that's not something you'd put a lot of energy worrying about.

Jerry: Oh no, no, no, no, no. What good would it do?

Johnny described the importance of storytelling and contextualization in the blues. While setting the stage of a song through storytelling still happens fairly regularly in live performances, this can often get left out of the recorded blues experience. For him, storytelling has multiple benefits. Storytelling gibes background and educates audiences. It also holds their attention in a way that just listening to song after song does not. For these and other reasons, he included storytelling even in his recorded works.

Mike: So you feel it's important to give them some history, some story, some context.

Johnny: Right.

Mike: Yeah. And that doesn't happen in recordings very much, right? Nobody hardly puts that on their records.

Johnny: I do.
That way you get the people's attention. But if you jump from song to song, and they're talking, they're not paying attention what the fuck you saying. Just like when you go to church, the preacher gonna tell you where it's at, he's gonna phrase it right, right? So you tell them what your songs are singing about.
It's important to get the people's attention. See, and like a lot of guys, they stay up on the bandstand. I got a wireless mic, I walk down in the crowd to the people. You need the people, the people don't need you. A lot of people don't understand that.

Johnny addressed the complex issue of race in blues music, blues performers and blues audiences. He described playing in Europe and elsewhere worldwide. He described completely different experiences when in other countries, in terms of sophistication of the audiences and their attitudes toward African Americans compared to audiences, attitudes and attendance in the US. He also tied the concerns about gun violence and safety in his community to the choice of

safer mediated experience that someone could enjoy in the safety of their home rather than taking a chance by going out to a club, even when that might be their preferred experience.

> Johnny: Only way you know you black, you got to look in the mirror. Ain't none of that prejudice shit there (in Europe).
>
> Mike: Were there ever any negative experiences overseas?
>
> Johnny: Nuh-uh.
>
> Mike: All positive, all good. Wow.
>
> Johnny: I'm telling you, the only way to know you black there, you got to look in the mirror.
>
> Johnny: The young blacks (in the US) not into the blues. And the older blacks now, a lot of them afraid to come to the club because some of this stuff going on.
>
> Mike: And sometimes I wonder if people are just comfortable. If they want to hear music, they can do anything. They can turn on the TV, they can turn on their phone, they can look on the internet. And less reason to go out, or easier to not go out.
>
> Johnny: Right. And a lot of them afraid to go out, because there's so much stuff going on. Every time you look around, somebody getting killed.
>
> Mike: I've seen it sometimes where people are a little over-familiar, a little too comfortable, and I don't know what that's from. Like that they feel like they know you because they saw you on YouTube or something like that.
>
> Johnny: Well you'll find that people come up and talk to you, you know. But they treat me nice.
>
> Mike: But appropriate, I mean it seems good. Feels respectful? Do you think they appreciate it?
>
> Johnny: Yeah, that part is still there. I don't have no problem.

Mickey had used technology for decades in very creative ways, but saw the non-creative, anti-social aspects of technology as problematic. While he was concerned with the impact of

technology generally on social interactions, he was optimistic that the music was fairly immune to the negative effects.

> Mike: People still listen to some live music, but almost everything they listen to, they listen on a phone or on an iPhone, or on an MP3 player, or streaming off the internet and everything like that. And you've lived through and seen all that.
>
> Mickey: Oh yeah, but you know what? You see people at the restaurant sitting across the table, they're just quiet as church mouses. Talking to each other? That is a waste of time! No, we don't talk much anymore. We text, though. What? It's stone nuts. I want you to look at me when you're lying to me. I don't want you punching buttons.
>
> Mike: So in terms of making music, you've seen those changes too, as far as recording live music and recording in a studio. So what have you seen changed over all those years, and changes in the quality of it, and what it's like for you as an artist?
>
> Mickey: Oh, yeah, I've seen a lot of changes in it. They took music and turned it upside down, a lot of it. But that blues and country gonna be here forever. They ain't going nowhere. And jazz, it's not going nowhere. You can't mess up the blues.
>
> Mike: That's the roots.
>
> Mickey: Yeah, that's from the heart. The roots of music. Old country. I got country songs I've recorded already. And I got some good ones on there. And they never was recorded. I mean they was recorded, but they never went nowhere, because nobody took it.

However, he still saw the importance of in person face-to-face mastery of the blues, combined with innate talent and some reliance on recorded music. He saw that as the combination necessary for bringing up a young blues apprentice.

> Mickey: And that boy, he is something. He can go-- He'd go home, and he won't play it. He'll sleep on it, and then he'll play it next morning. And then they go to school. Then they come back, he'll play it again. But he wouldn't-- if he hears me play something, he wouldn't play it right then. He'd sleep on it. When he'd get up, he'd play it. Because he got it all-- he write it down on his mind. And people think it's no sense a thing is sleeping on something. Always think twice before you speak, you know? But he's good at it. Playing the blues
>
> Mike: Wow, so he's just working it out at night. In his mind, while he's sleeping at night.

Mickey: Oh, yeah. Oh he's a great kid. He's 26 now. He's in Portland. We just talked to him yesterday. Yeah, I talked to him yesterday. Oh, he's a great kid, I just love him. He is one of the greatest kids. She have only one, and that's him.

Mike: So how did he get started playing? How did he get started, did he learn from you, from somebody?

Mickey: Just being around, and he said, "Man, I want to do that." And he meant that. And he did it. And now he's doing it.

Mike: So is he listening to you, or to other people play, or listening to recordings, or?

Mickey: Yeah, all those records I got, he got everything I recorded practically. And he sits down and play that. And when he was here-- when was he here? About a month ago or something like that. He was here, and he and his friend, and first thing, he comes right here, sit down and play music. And play slide-- oh he's good. Whenever he's here, he plays it. And that is great.

One of the important areas involving changes in relationships that emerged in this set of questions was the difference in racial composition both of the blues players and their audiences. Stevie Ray Vaughn stated that one of his proudest achievements was "taking the color out of the blues." When Mickey was asked about differences in his audiences over the years, he noted that they were larger, and whiter. While his crowds are still racially diverse, he saw that proportionally there were greater numbers of whites than blacks attending blues shows. In reference to the now famous Stevie Ray Vaughn quote about "taking the color out of the blues," Mickey was not familiar with the quote or ensuing controversy, nor was he offended by it. He saw the increased audiences, regardless of race, as a good thing not to be disparaged or taken for granted.

Mickey: Yes, indeed. I think we have a greater audience now than we had back then. Because we got everybody, all races, you know. We don't have any discrimination against music. We have more of the white people out there than we do the black people for the blues.

Mike: So that's been a change?

Mickey: Oh, man. You talk about it. When you go out there and you say, "Oh, we got a blues show coming up." Man, all the white people out there like flies around a bucket of guts. I mean they are-- that's your biggest support. You got to the festivals--

Mike: And that's a big shift over those years? Whiter audiences?

Mickey: Yeah. I mean-- man, they got so many white people blues lovers. And so many that's playing blues. And they got some great, great, great blues guitar players. And great blues harmonica players out there. They got a lot of-- they got more white harmonica players than they got black, now. Oh yeah.
Places like Austin and Dallas, it was a great mixed audience. But in New Orleans, everybody's outnumbered. You've got a great, great audience and people from all over the world. So that makes a lot of difference. It's great to be out there to see the change in the way it used to be. No more going to the back door.

Mike: I think it was Stevie Ray Vaughn that said something about-- that he felt like his contribution was taking the color out of the blues. Or some line like that. I think he got a lot of grief for that, right? Kind of not-- maybe not appreciating the history enough or something. Or maybe taking the color out of the blues wasn't a good thing, or--

Mickey: What he said and somebody was offended or something?

Mike: I think so.

Mickey: Well see, people be offended-- a lot of things you say, and it makes sense and people be offended about it, because they don't think before they think. You know. They think things and run off with it with-- no you don't do that. I mean, understand what somebody's saying before you go the wrong way, take it the wrong way.
Some of the reasons for whiter audiences could be attributed to demographics he said.

Other reasons he cited were the greater awareness of roots music and the larger role it plays culturally. Interestingly he noted that prior to attending a live performances, audiences wouldn't know anything about the race of the musicians if they had only experienced them from listening to recordings of them. He then recalled that was his own situation when he was young and didn't realize Charlie Pride was African American having only heard him on the radio and assuming he was a white country musician.

Mike: Alright. So with the audiences changing, and becoming whiter over the years, is there a downside? Does that mean that there are less black people in the audience that are listening to blues, or? Like if you think about Austin or Dallas?

Mickey: Well when you're in clubs, mostly when you're doing clubs. … Well, mostly the audience is 99.9% at least. I tell you what. Say you ain't got many black people here in the first place. So it can't be half the night there. But you go to (a larger city) right now, because you got a mixed crowd. Yeah, because they from the South.
Well I'm taking that white people are learning more about it, because they appreciate it. And from the looks of it, they're learning more about it and the roots of it.
But most of the time, when you see a band playing anywhere, it's not just a black or white band. Most bands are mixed anyway. Yeah, that's a lot for the audience. Because you hear a band playing, you don't know who the guys are until you see them.
Because once you learn something, you know it. I mean, nothing will take it away from you. You could play just as good as anybody else. Because the people who heard me do country music, they didn't know. And I didn't even know Charley Pride was black when I was young.

When asked about technology and how people are learning music, listening to music, learning the history and culture around music, he did have some general concerns.

Mike: As far as listening to blues and learning blues through gadgets, versus learning it sort of face to face with somebody? Or kind of more directly from musicians? Any concerns about that, or thoughts about that?

Mickey: Yeah, every time you see somebody, they got earphones on. Or your iPod, where you're recording things. And a lot of people they don't go to listen to live music, because they got those things that you go a million and a half songs on one. They just go, sit down with your phone, and texting, and listening to recorded music. It is good? Huh?

Mike: I was in Chicago about a year ago, trying to think of who I was seeing. Eddie Shaw, maybe.

Mickey: Oh, from the Wolf gang!

Mike: Right! It seemed like all they knew about blues was from when they watched the Blues Brothers on TV or something. Not very knowledgeable or respectful.

Mickey: That's right. Too much distraction off of that phone. That smartphone. And they leaving people dumb as hell with their smartphone. You give a kid $10 and tell them to go get you a pound of rice, how much change you supposed to have? And you rice costs

such and such a thing. They don't know. Give them a pencil and paper.

Willie still plays live shows every week and has a close rapport with his audiences who crowd around his piano. He expressed little concern over changes with his relationship with his audiences for whom he still clearly enjoys performing.

> Mike: So over the years, have you noticed any change of how-- a change in audiences at all? Because I'm thinking there was a time when everybody listened to live music. And now a lot of people just listen to it on their phone or whatever. But your audiences are still face to face with you, and live.
>
> Willie: Yeah, man. Here people you don't even know are nice. People treat me nice, you know. Some guy may come up to ask me to play this, or play this. Because I know so many different songs that I just about know any song they want to hear, I just about know it.
>
> Mike: Right, so I heard somebody come up and ask for Stagger Lee.
>
> Willie: Yeah, he did.
>
> Mike: And you played that for him, that was good, that was great.
>
> Willie: I know just about everything that they want to hear. I know I can sing it and play it.

Jimmy discussed what had changed from the days working with a whole band together in the studio at the same time, the tradeoffs, what was gained and what he misses about it. He said that both ways of recording required preparation and patience, but in different ways and at different times. Different skills came into play as well as different demands.

> Jimmy: I missed it at first when it first went to the advanced way. If one instrument is out of tune, you don't have to worry about that so much. Because they can fix that. But I missed the days when you had to go in the studio with, say, four or five guys. And you had to make sure you were right in tune with one another. Otherwise, the way it comes out on the tape, that's the way it's gonna be.
> But that's not story anymore. You can do many different things, technically, with it now. But it needs to sound like it's original. That it's coming from the person themselves, the music. Not just all technology. Otherwise, you lose the depths of it. The soul of it. Like Quincy Jones, he is-- he knows if it's right, he knows if it's wrong. He'll tell you.

Mike: Yeah, so is that harder to do, if you're not in the room with five guys, is it harder to keep that soul in there?

Jimmy: I wouldn't say it's harder. It just takes more persons to deal with it. Because you're dealing with so many things that have to go into that one thing. So they have to really set it up where it's right. Be harder in this way than it was the old way.
In this way it might be harder because you have to take more time and pain with what you're doing. They do one track, and you may say, "You come back and do the other track, we have to do it another way." Or something.
But when you're there with four or five guys, you have to make sure you've got it together, before when you walk in the studio. And now, vocalists can go in one line at a time. And sing one line, okay, that's enough. Then you add somebody else singing the next line after he fixed that line. It requires a lot of patience. So I wouldn't say it's harder, but it takes a lot of patience.

Jimmie's take on changes to audiences were mostly appreciative of the growing size of blues fandom. The high level of enthusiasm for blues music offset the physical distance imposed by larger crowds. He credits the wide dissemination of the various technologies with spreading the influence, acceptance and popularity of the blues.

Jimmie: No, I don't think so. As long as the audience feel like you're being true to yourself, I think they'll be more accepting. If they feel like they're getting what's coming from you, what you really feel. Not trying to fake it, to make it be something else that it's not. As long as what I truly feel coming from, I think they'll be pretty accepting towards that. Because your originality could be-- you could hear different things different ways at different times. And then if you express it, the way you really feel it from your heart, I think that's the best that they can expect from you.

Mike: And as the audiences have gotten larger, does it ever feel harder to connect?

Jimmie: Oh, yeah, no. Audiences have definitely gotten larger. Because there's more acceptance now for this music than there used to be. It's expanded a lot with the young people getting involved with the blues. There's much more young players coming on the scene. That's really helpful to the entire cause of it. Which is a very good thing.

Mike: And do you think that technology has helped with that?

Jimmie: Yeah, I think so.

Mike: With getting more exposure, wider audience?

Jimmie: A wider audience that's more accepting of the-- a lot of white people that never would have listened to blues, never knew about it. So they just never listened to it. They had never been exposed to it. But now they're exposed to it. And I think it's getting accepted much wider. Which is a good thing. I hope so.

Jimmie was familiar with the novice blues fan, the "Blue Brothers fan" who may not have much background and knowledge of the blues, and may be overfamiliar and lacking a sense of their place in a real life blues bar, a bar that bears little resemblance to what they've seen on television or in the movies. His response was quite generous and inclusive. He framed them as young in their learning experience of the blues, even with the intrusion of cell phone technology in the performing space. Neither did he see any obvious drawbacks to using the same technologies to learn to play the blues. In terms of the Blues Brothers fans in the audience he said:

Jimmie: Oh yeah, that's their concept of the blues.

Mike: Right, and that's about as deep as it goes. But have you ever run into that? Where people just don't know, like are missing a piece of it, or missing the culture or the history. Like they're too familiar, in a way?

Jimmie: Well, I don't really know. Because I've never paid much attention to it in that sense. But I think as long as they're there, I just kind of apply it to-- if they don't already know what the concept of the blues is, maybe they're in a learning stage of it. To say, well, I didn't know you have to react to it a certain way, or whatever.
What I think is just they're being taught this is a kind of music that's got its own feelings, its own makings. Either you can accept it, or maybe you can learn to accept it at some point. It's like you said, a lot of people don't really realize where it really came from, or who it really came from. They think, like you said, they think, well, the Blues Brothers' version of it. That's blues. That's the way it was created. Which is not true.

Mike: And it seemed like those would be the songs that they would request, because that's kind of about what they would know.

Jimmie: Right, what they would know.

Mike: They'd be pretty anxious to get a picture, you know, do a lot of cell phone selfies and recording you. All of that. But it doesn't sound like that bothers you very much. You see that as beginners.

Jimmie: It could be a learning stage for that person. For that person's-- yeah.

Mike: That's a very gracious way of looking at it. So maybe not so different, then? How younger folks are listening. They listen, and then they go out-- hopefully, they go out for some live music and see how people are playing.

Jimmie: Right, exactly. They hear it, and then they feel it. You have to feel it within yourself.

Mike: Alright. And back to learning how to play the blues, do you think it makes much of a difference, how people learn? By recordings? YouTube?

Jimmie: Not really, as long as you can feel what you're doing. How you can feel it.

Jackie too was not bothered much by the naïve "new to blues" fan and said he always enjoyed his audiences, even the large ones, maybe especially so. In response to the larger crowds enabled by technology, he too was appreciative of the increased interest in the blues. As we looked at a picture together of a large European concert of his it was striking how many cell phones and iPads were in the air capturing video of his performance.

Mike: You don't mind if people are recording it? They're all having a good time, clearly.

Jackie: Yeah, it didn't bother me at all. It sure didn't. Not at all. It didn't bother me. And like I said, the crowds don't bother me ever.

Mike: No. The last time I was in Rosa's and the last time I was in Kingston Mines, I had a question about that. I was watching-- Jimmy Burns was playing at Rosa's. And there was a smaller crowd in there.
And it kind of felt like folks were-- well they were certainly beginners, I guess. They were kind of the Blues Brothers crowd. I think that that's kind of their idea of the blues. And kind of wanted to hear Mustang Sally and didn't know much past that.
Have you ever had experiences where it seemed like crowds are a little-- don't have much background in the blues, or much of the history, or?

Jackie: Well, you know what, so far they've been pretty good. The crowds that I have, they seem to love what I do. Yeah, it makes me feel good, you know, that what I do, they love.

Mike: Yeah, clearly that crowd is pretty into it there!

Jackie: Yeah. Exactly.

He was more skeptical about learning blues from those videos though. His concern was that something might not be conveyed in a video recording that would be present in a face-to-face teaching environment. They would certainly learn something in his mind, but perhaps not the "real", original, old time blues. This might require in person mentoring, as well as seeing lots of old time blues played in a live setting.

Mike: So, young folks learning the blues sitting at home through YouTube or--

Jackie: Yeah they got a different way of learning the blues. I mean, they done heard the real blues, but that's-- And they may even be trying to play it that way, but it just don't come out like that. So I don't know what it is.

Mike: What's that missing something.

Jackie: Something missing on that. It just don't come out like that for some reason

Mike: So we were just talking about that missing something that maybe some of the younger performers aren't quite capturing, maybe related to how they're learning the blues?

Jackie: Yeah, they learn it. But I don't think they never really play the blues, like the old time blues. I don't never think they even do that. Because the style that they play it just won't fit in. So I call it a different type of blues. I don't think they'll ever be able to play that. So that's called a different type of blues, what they play. It's blues, but--

Mike: It's blues that's never been-- It's a new--

Jackie: Yeah, exactly.

Mike: Interesting.

Jackie: Definitely not the old blues style.

Mike: And do you think that's from not seeing enough of the original players?

Jackie: That's exactly what it is. See they learn how to play. And not seeing enough of the old style blues, so that's why they really can't play that. They want to play it. But it ain't there because when they was learning how to play, then they didn't get that feeling of the old type blues. And it's hard as heck for them to play something that they just don't have. They don't have that.
And they'll never get that. Because they didn't hear enough of it. They'd have heard enough of it, they'd have learned how to play it. But see, they didn't hear enough of it. They can play the blues, but like I said, it's a different type of blues.

Mike: Yeah, hearing enough of it. And is it important to see it, to actually see it played, too?

Jackie: Well, it's important to see it, too. It's important to see how it's done. And they never experienced it, see? They just heard about it. They heard about blues and they get up there and start playing, they playing, but it's a different type of blues.
It don't come out like that old school blues. It don't come out that way. Because they didn't hear enough of it. They learned how to play, and they playing the blues, but it's a different type of blues. It ain't the kind of blues, that old school blues. It's not that kind. They didn't hear enough of that. So it's what that is.

He was encouraged by the resurgence of interest in seeing live blues, blues played by older traditional performers. While he felt there is still growing in the US, he said that Europe has a much greater appreciation for classic old style blues.

Mike: So partly because of how they're learning it. Do you have a sense that young people still see the importance of live music?

Jackie: Well, they do. They do.

Mike: Certainly in Europe, right?

Jackie: They see the importance for it. Definitely, there's no question about that. And I tell you, they have a lot of people overseas that can play the blues. You know, every time I went over there, I got with a different band. Those guys, we sit down and listen to my records a little bit. Those guys, they can play the blues.

Lenny started off having to play out of sight of his white audience before clubs were integrated had “where they wanted to hear my music, but didn't want to see my face.” From his

perspective the preponderance of recorded music to live music is concerning if "all that social has been drained out of the music." Whereas he is certainly not against recording, having a long and prolific career in the recording business, his concern is what is lost if technologically mediated music is the primary way music is experienced. He discussed the tradeoffs of the prefect studio version of a song versus playing and hearing it live or only hearing music "played" by DJs. He compared it to global warming/climate change where the changes come on gradually and regularly and it is more difficult to notice.

> Lenny: Yeah, yeah, yeah, when I was playing, you just--
>
> Mike: And it all sounds perfect.
>
> Lenny: Yeah. Oh yeah, it all sounds perfect. That's it. It sounds too perfect.
>
> Mike: So do you ever worry about that? For the blues and for music in general, but for the blues specifically that a lot of these, not just younger folks, but DJs and--
>
> Lenny: Yeah, I worry about it. Because when you do all that, you take the entertainment out of it. You take the entertainment out of it, because this ain't singing business, it ain't guitar business, it's entertainment. What you do.
> I'm an entertainer. You take the entertainment out of it. You know? You want to get it right, but don't have to be so perfect to be right. Just want to get it right. Not so perfect. Because you don't have to be perfect to be right.
>
> Mike: Was there ever a time when you saw some new technology coming in where you said, I'm hesitant about that, or that's gonna take the soul out of it?
>
> Lenny: Yeah, I saw it when the drum machine come in. But I understood that it was new, and people weren't gonna take to it because they need to see the drummer. Because what you see don't mean-- What you see and understand don't mean it's not there.
> Because you may not understand the weather change now, but it's sure there. You know? The climate change. You may not see it, per se, because it comes so slow and rise up on you, but if you look back on 50 years from now, there's been a change.
> Because in my music, I can't record like I did in 1950, because the people who listened to me in '50, most of them not here no more. So I adapt to what's going on now in that way. Because there's nothing new under the sun. Everything remains the same, it's just a different approach. You know? What we talked about,

In response to the changing whiter audience and the naïve “new to blues” Blue Brothers fan, Lenny, while still very generous in his response to them, did have some concerns. His concerns were regarding sense of history and sense of place. He also discussed the complex racial cycle, the racial dynamic of whites denigrating the blues, blacks leaving the blues.

> Lenny: When I go into a club. You know, if I'm in Chicago, you look around and see who's there. And sometimes it'll be just an entirely white audience.
>
> Mike: One of the things that I worry about sometimes, they've all got their phone out and they take a picture of you, and selfies, and spend all their time doing that. They'll request a song they heard off the Blues Brothers movie, you know, something, something, and they kind of don't know how to behave.
>
> Lenny: That's funny.
>
> Mike: It’s like they don't know their place, they don't know the history, they don't know who their--
>
> Lenny: I'm so glad to hear you say that. But you see, I catch this a lot of time. And the young whites, they don't know how to behave. They don't mean no harm about it, but they don't know. That's all they know. That's all they know. They don't know. You can't get mad with them either. Because it's what they know. I know you may get upset, but you can't get bent off about it. You know?
> Earlier I said, it's just like writing a book, you can only write what you know about. You know, I tried to do, I try to talk about things honestly. Try to talk about things where I'm-- that'll be education to people. Where it come from, where it's going.
> But you understand that if it wasn't for the white blues singer and blues player, what would we do? Because some of the black guys don't want to be associated with the blues. They don't want no parts of it.
> I guess the reason why-- and I can analyze this through my thinking, that because white people ahold of it, and wrote about it being less than something else. Nobody want to be in something less than something else. You know?
> But again, I'll say it to you. If these guys didn't take it and do something with it, that wouldn't have kept it alive. You know, regardless of how you like it. Because the blues is kept alive because of young white guys doing it. Because the black guys, they want no parts of it. Now, I can't blame them for not wanting parts of it, because people wrote down about it.
>
> Mike: Treated it less than.

Lenny: They wrote about it were like something less than something else. That's what they wrote about it. If they had wrote about blues being the best thing in the world since bubblegum, they'd be in it.
They want to see a picture of a blues guys sitting with some white socks on, with old overalls on, and paying him $2 a day. Who in the hell want to do this? You know? But now what you see-- British white guy up, they got his overalls on, he making $100,000 a day, now the cats want to do it.
But thank God-- if they didn't do, hadn't did it, and didn't do it at all, Blues wouldn't be what it is today. Although it's created from the black guys, but it wouldn't have been what it is today. Muddy Waters wouldn't have been as popular as he was if it wasn't for the white guys who imitating Muddy Waters. You follow me?
The audience has been 99% white on this tour.
How many black guys you know, bluesmen can draw 2,000 black folks? You know? Bobby Bland could do it.
BB could do it 50 year before but-- he couldn't even draw 100 peoples in his hometown, black. That's because crossed over and crossed out. Not intentionally. Not intentionally.

Conclusion

Several participants discussed their observations around the changing racial composition, the 'whitening' of their audiences, and to some extent the 'whitening' of the younger generation of blues musicians. They saw this as universally good in the sense that it has kept the blues alive and has actually grown the demand for blues music. They attributed this to wider exposure of blues music to more varied audiences in the US but especially abroad in Europe, Asia and South America. They also discussed how in some ways, learning the blues is different, through more technology such as YouTube, but always that to some extent learning has always occurred through listening to radio and jukeboxes. But all still stressed the need for in person contact with experts and the advantages of learning face to face with blues mentors. Unpredictably, all of these musicians were incredibly generous to the uninitiated fans new to the blues. In the overly familiar "Blues Brothers fan" scenario each participant inclusively framed these novice fans as beginners in need of more education and acculturation. Unsurprisingly, many participants

discussed missing the old ways of recording in a "band on stage" recording arrangements but all were also taking advantage of new opportunities afforded by current studio technologies.

Band Size and Composition

The questions around band size and composition explored a variety of issues of how technology could impact blues music. This could range from how many musicians were needed if it were possible to replace live performers with technology such as an electronic drum machine. But it is also now possible to have just one performer lay down a vocal track in the studio and have a sound engineer build up an entire song around that single original track with no other musicians involved.

For Jerry, little had changed over the decades that he has been playing. He has stayed true to his original band lineup and sees little reason to change it. Playing solo or playing with a small three person band suits his preferred acoustic style of blues and his style of traditional performance.

> Mike: One of the trends that you've seen is that a lot of people, and probably more people in Chicago, get bigger bands, more musicians, more instruments. That's been something that you've stayed away from.
>
> Jerry: I've stayed away from that.
>
> Mike: Your preference is to be--
>
> Jerry: Maybe a bass player, maybe another guitar player, a harmonica player, and a drummer. That's it. I'm not interested in keyboard player, piano player.
>
> Mike: Or horn players, whatever?
>
> Jerry: Yeah, that's about it. I'm so used to three-piecing it. Bass, guitar, and drummer. And maybe a harmonica player. That's it. That's the way them guys did it. They could rock the house. This accompanying saxophone, accordions and all that kind of stuff. I don't-- For your southern soul, blues, some of your Chicago style blues, yeah. But Delta blues, my style of blues and hill country, you don't need that. You don't need it.

One of the main advantages to having a low tech, small and flexible band arrangement is the reduction in pressure, "no drama," and the flexibility for him to play solo if the situation calls for a solo performance. It also allows him the flexibility to incorporate any number of musicians who want to spontaneously sit in at one of his performances.

Mike: So that was a choice you made for the music, not necessarily for worrying about paying more musicians or something like that.

Jerry: Right, exactly. And my philosophy is only way my show don't go is I don't show. I ain't got the weight of no drama, piano, harmonica, on their way. When you book me, the only way my show don't go, is I don't show. Ain't got to sit around waiting on nobody else but myself.

Mike: So that way you've stayed playing with the same lineup that you've been playing with since--

Jerry: I go play if somebody want to sit in with me, I don't got no problem with that. But it's not like I've got to have it.

Mike: If you were putting it together you would choose pretty minimal--

Jerry: I don't deny anyone that says, "Can I sit in on a couple songs?" Yeah. "Can I blow harmonica with you a couple songs?" Come on. And I'll always, especially a bass player, "Look now, I'm not scaled. So if I lose you, don't stumble to it. Just back off, and keep your ears open, that beat come and you can jump right back in.

Mike: Right, because you don't want the bass player driving you.

Jerry: Right. I tell them, "If I lose you, back off." Music wise. Because if you listen to me, you can hear the beat and fall back in, come back in.

Mike: So I'm thinking about some musicians that use the-- I already know what you're going to say about this…. But they use like a drummer in a box or an electronic drummer or an electronic bass, very machine-driven, right?

Jerry: I prefer a drummer with a snare, a cymbal, and a big bass drum. That's it. High hats and all that, and they be running around with all the different cymbals, flip bass, little snare and a big snare. And let it roll. And let it roll.

Mike: So the perfect, computerized machine bass or drummer, that'd be in your way, it sounds like.

Jerry: I mean, why would I want to play old school blues, and make it sound modern? You got me? Old school blues, but then I want to make it sound modern.

Mike: Yep, sort of against the nature of it--

Jerry: I want it to sound like just what it is, old school acoustic blues. That's the way I want it to sound, that's it.

For many of Jerry's performances and recordings he has played solo. This affords him the freedom to keep his sound true to his style and preserve what he values about traditional blues. Again, this allows him the freedom to incorporate other musicians who may want to be record with him or learn from him.

Jerry: Most of my recordings, I've recorded, I've been by myself. There was nobody else waiting in line. I go.

Mike: So it's you solo.

Jerry: It's me solo, right.

Mike: Vocal and guitar.

Jerry: Exactly.

Mike: This last time, was that the case? Or did you have a harp player with you?

Jerry: It was some more guys trying to sit in. To be a part of recording, I didn't mind. They wanted to be able to record with me, I didn't mind.

Johnny had a pragmatic standard arrangement with his local performers, but traveled solo when performing abroad. In those situations the hosting country would provide a band that was familiar enough and competent to perform his songs.

Mike: Nice. So when you're traveling, you've got a band with you that you're traveling with.

Johnny: No, when I go over there, they have a band for me.

Mike: They put it all together for you, wow.

Johnny: But they put together who know my stuff. Everybody can't--

Mike: Do you ever travel with your own band?

Johnny: Yeah, I have. I used to. But now, it cost. So they figured they'd bring me, and spend their money that way.

Mike: And when you're playing locally?

Johnny: Well, I've tried to keep the band simple. Why it don't change from my records. Like a lot of people go in the studio, they have keyboard and all these different things. But when they get out there, they can't afford to pay that many people, so that's why they sound so much different.
They put that shit together so quick now, man. Back in the day, they had them go over it and go over it. Don't do that no more. They can take out what they want to take out, and put in--

Mike: Change that voice a little bit. Get you in tune.

Johnny: Man like, I did a record with someone, they didn't like the bass player. They took it out and put another bass player in there.

Mike: Just erased it.

Johnny: He got mad, man I didn't know they did it. He thought I had something to do with it. I didn't even know.

Mike: Wow, that's interesting. Because you can do that now.

Johnny: They left him on one song, and put another bass player on the rest of the CD. And I didn't know it.

Mike: But he was mad at you.

Johnny: Yeah. Thought I did it.

Mike: Right.

Johnny: I didn't do it, because, hell, I didn't know nothing about it. Be surprised at how they change shit around, but it's something I didn't know about.

Jimmy did not feel that technology really impacted his band choices so much directly. He saw it more as straightforward economics as to how large a band he could afford. He outlined the exponential expenses of increasing band size. Ancillary expenses add up as band size and the ensuing logistics add up. However, technology, in terms of additional sound and mixing equipment for performances, did make up some of the additional cost of traveling with a larger band.

Jimmy: Yeah, the personnel of it changes. But the amount of musicians, I always use four musicians, all total, combo, yeah.

Mike: Has technology changed that at all? In terms of who would be in your band, or what instruments? Or has that always been pretty much the same?

Jimmy: It's been pretty much the same. Just the amount of musicians is usually for economical reasons. Because, say you could have five, eight, 10, musicians in the city, that's one thing. But what about when you're getting ready to tour. Then there goes much more expenses. Because you've got the expense of having to be a vehicle big enough to carry that many people around in. And then when you get there, you got to have enough hotel rooms for eight or 10 people then.

Mike: People got to eat, and--

Jimmy: Yeah, that could be more. Economically, that could be more. And then, the amount of hotel rooms, and your travel along instruments and stuff. Much more with the more people you have, the more accommodations you got to have. So then the club owners, a lot of them, they can't afford to pay that much, and then pay your salary on top of the expenses.

Lenny described the loyalty that he had between himself and his band members. Even though he could play with other bands and it would be easier to use pick up bands, he felt a profound loyalty to his band, akin to family.

Lenny: I got nine peoples in my band. Some of the guys be with me 40-something odd years, close to 40 years. Most of the guys be with me over 25 years.

> If these guys wasn't with me, I wouldn't get me a new band and just pick up a band here and there. Wouldn't worry about no band. But the guys have been with me so long, their grandchildren, their children, man, come on. I got obligations to these guys. Obligation. Yeah. Got a drummer been with me 38 years, my driver been with me 25 years, keyboard been with me 30 years, one keyboard with me 32 years, another guitar been with me 18 years, bass player with me about 12 years, I guess about 12. Two dancers, one been with me 20 years, one been 18 years. That's a long time. Yeah. I'm obligated with the guys, you know.

Live vs. Recorded Music

Central to this project is the question, if many people historically assume live music is better, why is it better? What specifically is better about experiencing music in a live format? And what specifically is lost if the music is experienced in any other way? Blues music is identified by its raw and original nature, roots music. None of the participants were purists or Luddites in the sense of eschewing recorded music. But all identified a partiality to live performances in varying ways. And many tied the issue of live music to the future of blues music.

In Jerry's situation, it is clear that live music drives all other ways of experiencing music: "What I do is absolutely live, you know."

> Jerry: I always tell my audience, I say "If you come here, anything other than old school blues, you still got time to leave." And I don't mean it being funny, I mean it being truthful. Because sometimes they'll name it blues, I get the strings bending. I said, "If you're coming here anything other than some old school blues, you might be at the wrong stage."
> I said, "Now, I can't make you dance, but I sure as well can tell you a story with this here guitar. I be being honest about it, because I don't want-- When, I get started, I let them know what I'm going to do.
>
> Mike: So for you there is never pressure to reproduce a studio sound. I've heard of that happening to musicians.
>
> Jerry: Willie Williams made the song Wine Headed Woman. See when he went in the studio, he had top musicians. But then when he go out on the road, he didn't have them

guys. So people didn't believe that was him. Because it was different from his record. So I try keeping my stuff simple where when I got out, the people know.

Mike: And the storytelling part of it. Through the songs and-- is that an important part for you to kind of set the stage for the song, what it's about?

Jerry: Right, exactly.

Mike: Does that ever happen on your recordings, or is that usually just when you're playing live?

Jerry: Most of the stuff I record, if I hadn't experienced it, I know someone that did. I'm not going to record a song just because I liked the lyrics. I'm pretty much going to do any song that I can relate to, or I know someone who could. And if you do it that way, you won't hardly forget it.

Mike: And so some of them, probably, I mean the songs themselves are stories. So you don't necessarily need the lead up to-- So that the song kind of explains itself.

Jerry: Explains itself. Right, right.

Jerry's minimalist style carries over from his live performance preferences to his studio preferences. In general he prefers a few high quality pieces of equipment, and not much else. A good microphone and adequate simple amplifiers.

Mike: So obviously studio technology has changed a lot.

Jerry: Yeah, I went to a couple of them and I didn't really like it. They had too much sophisticated material in them. I really don't like that. I mean I went ahead and did it, but when you've got all these switches, they got knobs on the walls, they got to get this right. And hold on, they've got to get something else right.

Mike: Kind of gets in the way of the music? Let's check this, let's check that, then.

Jerry: Right. But those all here. And I got a couple studios, I went to one ….that's just got every day common stuff. I had speakers and I had amplifiers and a nice mic. The engineer's got a big computer screen to make everything level like he want, though. And then he's ready to go. He gets you plugged in, and tell you ready to roll.

Mike: So that's your preference. A little less of the high-tech stuff getting in the way.

Jerry: Getting in the way.

Mike: So there is kind of a balance point where it's like here's a good use of technology, have a good microphone, you don't necessarily need--

Jerry: A lot of extra stuff, yeah. A good microphone.

Mike: But not all the extra, yeah, yeah. Nothing too hyper.

Jerry: Basically, a good sound. From the instrument and a good vocal mic and I'm ready to go. I'm ready to go.

Mike: So take advantage of some of those improvements, that you have a nice clean sound, true sound on the microphone.

Jerry related the time he was recorded live on site with a mobile recording unit. He discussed the tension between capturing a good recording, complete with actual background of the people there, and the ability to scrub out some of the undesired sounds. Too much background noise makes for distraction, but too much scrubbing makes a live recording too sterile. And when discussing the future prospects of live music Jerry felt certain that live music would increase, though in different forms.

Jerry: Well, a couple recordings I did, this guy in a mobile studio, he brought all his stuff and he set it up in here. When I say mobile, all his stuff and his equipment traveled. Took him about an hour to get everything all set up.

Mike: To get it all set? That's actually not too bad, though right?

Jerry: He was good.

Mike: So the recording just happened here.

Jerry: He's going to take-- the guys back to the studio, he can go fine tune it like he wants. I can get the rough stuff, if he'd hear a part he didn't like, he'd take it out. Well you know, the computers can do that.

Mike: Yeah, it's kind of weird they can do that.

Jerry: There was some background noise he didn't want. And one guy said, well, it's live, we been down here, he said if you want to take the background noise out of you, it ain't live. What do you expect to hear when you come to a juke joint?

Mike: Your people.

Jerry: My people.

Mike: Clinking bottles.

Jerry: Tell them to be quiet. Well then it's not being authentic. You come here, what do you expect? Not just so much that the noise overrides what I'm doing, but you expect to have a good amount of sound going. Some hand clapping.

Mike: Kind of sterilizes things, the being able to take things out and being able to erase stuff--

Jerry: But they don't take it all out. Maybe like the TV playing. The computer can take that out. Stuff like that. But other than that.

Mike: So you've never compromised with the pure sound, and wanting things to be authentic, and wanting it to be real.

Jerry: Well, I'll tell them, I'll give them my opinion about it. If you want it real, then you can't take everything out of the background. If you want it real. They want something, they ain't never had no problem when they record it. That's freight train constantly blowing, they want that.

Mike: Yep, they want that one in there. Yep, I get that. That is kind of cool. But not too much.

Jerry: But not too much. Two or three minutes, it's going to pass anyway. They really want the whistle blowing.

Mike: So the future, do you think there's going to be more or less live music as it gets easier and easier for people to listen to music on their--

Jerry: It might not be all blues, but there will be more live music.

Mike: But not necessarily blues?

Jerry: There are guitars, but not blues.

Mike: There's that whistle blowing again. That's funny.

Jerry: They like that.

Johnny described similar challenges with keeping the sound real rather than very clean. He also recalled a blues musician who had such polished recordings that audiences didn't believe it was him when he played live. While he didn't worry about reproducing the studio sound, he said there could be expectation from live audiences' expectations and pressure to "sound just like the record." He said this was another benefit of going into the studio with the same lineup he used in live performances.

Mike: They think it's going to sound just like the recording.

Johnny: Right.

Mike: Right, so everything was so perfect in the studio that it didn't sound-- lost the live sound.

Johnny: People didn't believe him.

Mike: And somehow people expected a different sound, or it to be more perfect or whatever that is.

Johnny: Man, they had his record playing-- I'm talking about, on the radio, everywhere you go, you'd listen to it. On his bandstand, it's different. Because he didn't have all the musicians.

Mike: And people were expecting what they heard from the recording.

Johnny: Exactly.

Mike: Yeah, that was the real thing. Because the realer thing. The real thing was the recording. That kind of weird, right? The real thing not being the live--

Johnny: It was something difficult. He didn't have all the musicians. So I try to keep mine where I can control it. There are a lot of people that don't understand that.

He described his approach to bringing the live performance sound into the studio. He also described the challenges of doing this. Some were newer and some were perennial challenges.

Johnny: I do in the studio like I do live performing. So that way you keep it together.

Mike: So what are your thoughts on early recordings, where everything was live and everybody was in the same room? When you're recording, either--

Johnny: Well, when you're recording, they never put everybody in the same room.

Mike: Okay, how about 40 years ago, though? Like at Chess or something?

Johnny: Well, what'd they do? The put the singer in a booth by himself. And you have headphones. That's the way they do that.

Mike: So does that get in the way at all? Instead of all being in the same, and being able to see each other, or--

Johnny: Well, you see each other, but you got the headphones on. So you hear the music through it.

Mike: So that part works for you, that's not a problem.

Johnny: Nuh-uh. See, when I record live, then everybody's in the same-- they're recorded live in a club.

Mike: Right, so everybody have to be on the same page, and in tune, and no fixing it later.

Johnny: See, and like a lot of these guys now, they use all them different pedals and stuff. I don't like that. I want straight blues. Like on my mic, I don't use no reverb or nothing. Just straight, natural.

Mike: No special effects or--

Johnny: I don't want that effect.

Johnny talked about the even greater appetite for live music, especially live blues music, in Europe. He said audiences were not just hungrier for it, they were more knowledgeable.

Johnny: That's why most of my shit is in Europe.

Mike: And that's because there's a different appreciation. There's all the recordings there, too, obviously. You got a wall full of records in this photo.

Johnny: Yeah. Man, they be studying the blues. This is where it's at. This is where you make your money at though, over there you can.

Mike: So even though it's all captured on vinyl, and captured digitally like you say, they're studying it. Instead of just listening to it and-- So when the opportunity for live music comes, they're all over it, going way out of their way for it, they're paying for it.

Johnny: Oh yeah. Yeah, like in Finland. Norway, they're crazy about the blues. You don't find that here. Now when I play in Finland, the place will be full. For the blues. Only places around here that are full, they're playing tourist shit. So they really don't know the blues.

Mike: They know tourist blues. Blues Brothers blues, I always think of it.

Johnny: Yeah, exactly, that shit right there. Not no real blues, so. This is why I have to get on that plane. Once there, I be something. That's where the blues at, across that pond.

Jackie said he had been recording for so long that he was comfortable with all of it. He had adjusted to all the changes of how recording was done in the 1950s and the progression since then. He felt at home with the studio environment and the recording technology involved. He said it did not feel that different from when musicians weren't in separate booths for recording. He did say that he missed some of the vintage pre-digital era equipment.

Jackie: Yeah, in that studio, everybody was in their own booths, there. I was in one by myself, and they was in one. You know, like where they was, they wasn't just in like a box. I was in a closed booth, myself. But I could see them with no problem. So it's pretty much the same thing.

Mike: Okay, so similar in that way to how it used to be.

Jackie: Yeah, I could see them with no problem. And there was no problem, but I hear everything was going on. So it just worked out good for me. Recording, you know, I'm used to doing it. I've recorded so many songs, I'm used to recording. So I don't get frightened when I go in and record. I'm just like I am going on a stage. That's how it seems to me.

Mike: Yeah, so whether it's the stage, or a live recording, or a studio recording, it doesn't really-- the technology doesn't get in your way? And it doesn't change your approach to it, then?

Jackie: No, not at all.

Mike: That's interesting.

Jackie: No, it don't get in the way at all. It just comes naturally to me. I'm used to doing that stuff.

Mike: You mentioned the recording in that studio in San Francisco, that you felt like that had better clarity. Better equipment, classic equipment.

Jackie: Well, that studio really did. It reminded me of the old Chess stuff and it was so good. If it was possible, I would be happy to record on that again. You know, yeah. I'd be happy to record there again.

Jackie said he often gave background stories to his songs when performing them live. He did this more when he was performing a show as a headliner or by himself. However, this is something Jackie acknowledged was not something that ever made it to his recorded studio music.

Mike: As far as the storytelling, and the history, and the context, do you do much of that in your live performances? Do you give some of the background to the songs?

Jackie: Well, at times, when I have time. Like sometimes, you know, when I'm on the shows with other peoples, I don't talk about it too much. But if I'm doing a show myself, just myself, then I do. When I'm with other people I don't get into that.

Mike: Sure. And I imagine that'd be tougher to do on recordings. The recordings are kind of the song, and you're not spending time setting that up.

Jackie: Right, I don't do it when I'm recording. I don't talk about it when I'm recording. I just go in there and cut the CD, and that's it. You know, that's what I do. Just like this last on we did, I went in there, and I just laid it down. And we got it over with, and it was ready to go.

Lenny was very deliberate in his use of technology, in particular overdubbing, as he felt it was the wrong direction. He too was conscious of the dilemma of have a studio version that was

too different, too polished, in comparison to the live performance. Not only did it create a dynamic where the recorded sound was difficult to live up to, it created a less authentic sound in the end.

> Lenny: But if you notice that I went back kind of-- I didn't do no overdub with my last album. There's no overdub. Everything, psh.
>
> Mike: So do you worry about that, that direction of just everything's dubbed?
>
> Lenny: Yeah, I worry about that, because see, when you do things like that, that means you've got to beat rehearsal, and be up on your game to have it right. That means when you get your game right, you can record it right. Because when you record like most of the guys recording now, you don't have to learn it.
> And most of the time, when you go see it live, you can tell the guys don't know it. You can tell. Artificial, you can tell. Yeah, you can tell, you know?
> You know, I want it to be like, you know. I'm a team player.
>
> Mike: That seems like the other thing that's changing is that people don't have to be part of a team, because you can all be in the studio separately.
>
> Lenny: Yeah, do stuff separate.
>
> Mike: Maybe we don't even need a drummer, because I got a--
>
> Lenny: Got a machine. But that bother me, though. Because you can't take place-- I don't think it'll ever be taking place of the soul. You know, the soul. You can have a machine, but you can't put soul in it. And that bother me. That bother me. Modification don't bother me, but the soul of it bother me.
> It ain't been long, you and I couldn't do interviews like this. 25 or 30 years ago, you had to have a machine, set it up and you know. Knobs, reel to reel, knobs, tape cutting. And you miss something, you got to go back and slice out and cut out, and put it back together.
> See, let me say this to you. This can go in the-- Modification is important. But you also have to know what's still intact.

In this critical area, several themes stood out. Live music was seen as a crucial part of the blues experience. However, the preservation and promotion of blues through recorded music was vital to keeping blues alive and spreading it to new fertile areas, of which Europe is the most striking example, though Asia and South America were also important areas where blues was

greatly appreciated and these artists were highly sought after. The successful use of technology usually translated as which recordings were most able to capture the live performance, the soul and feel of being there in person.

Business / Economics

The questions around the business and economic considerations of the music business and its impact on the blues artist were designed to explore issues of fairness, pragmatism and agency. There are many biographies, magazine articles and blogs that describe the history of disenfranchisement, appropriation and cooptation, where many blues musicians lost control of their creations while others made millions of dollars from their artistry.

> Mike: So I'm of an age where I grew up on a lot of the English rockers who were making a lot of money and getting a lot of fame from blues songs that their audiences didn't even know came from real blues artists. So back in the 60s with the Rolling Stones or with Led Zeppelin, those are songs that they obviously made a lot of money off of. Was that ever a concern as you were going through those years? Seeing people make such huge amounts of money off it, and other people who had written the music not making so much?
>
> Jerry: Nah, I never had an ambition of even getting on a stage, much less making money. I just wanted to do it because I was sitting in on guys like that guy. I wanted to do what they'd been doing. Never had an ambition, I want to be famous, I want to be on a recording. That was never my ambition. Never.
>
> Mike: You just wanted to play the true music.
>
> Jerry: I wanted to be a good player. I wanted to be a good player. That was my goal. Sure was, that was my goal. They either come to hear me, or come to get some pointers. And they'll actually, sometimes say, you got some of your CDs, and I'll be like "No." "Can we get them online?" No, I won't let them online. Because you don't get that money. They tell me. I say no. I don't let them online. Because if you buy them online, then they're cutting you out for the sale. But I don't worry about that.
>
> Mike: But it's better if they would get it directly from you.
>
> Jerry: Yeah. And I say they can go ahead and get it "offline", from me.

Mike: So people are still buying CDs, and that's pretty common throughout?

Jerry: Oh yeah.

He talked about music that had been taken without his permission in violation of copyright laws. While it seemed obvious that it was the right thing to do, to go after those abusing the musicians rights, he was also hesitant. He had some concerns that opening up this copyright issue could be more trouble than it was worth. And in the end, might not result in much financial remuneration.

> Mike: And did you or any of your friends that you played with ever have music that was yours that got stolen or got appropriated by somebody else? That somebody else got the credits, or the copyright, or the money for?
>
> Jerry: Yep, I'm going through that right now. You know, people come in. Like I said, it really isn't about the money, I have a passion for it, I enjoy doing it. I enjoy people wanting to hear me do it.
> But you'll never be able to follow up on where all the money's going and stuff like that. I don't even want to start it. That could start trouble for me. A lot of people think right now that makes a lot of money. They'll be saying, "Man, you are all over YouTube, you're all over everywhere."
>
> Mike: All over the world, you've been playing, yeah.
>
> Jerry: Not the first one. I'm serious, not the first one. People say, "Man, you're getting ripped off." Maybe I am, what can I do about it? I'm 70 years old, what can I do about it? And I try not to color that all negative stuff. It's gonna be what it's gonna be.

He recalled some of his seniors that were always suspicious of those who wanted to record them. It was as if they instinctually knew that the technology used to capture their music could also be used to separate them from their music and make it possible for others to use it in ways they didn't intend or give their consent.

> Jerry: The only thing about that I do understand, a lot of the old timers, they wouldn't play if they thought you were going to record them.
> They could have it in the back of their mind, it's just you, they probably will. They won't play. I had a guy, another guy, who said he wouldn't play if he had-- first thought that they're going to record him, he stopped playing.

He'd sit up there all day and play for beer and stuff like that, but if he thought somebody was going to capitalize on what he was doing financially, he wouldn't play. He made a lot of-- hell of a guitar player, he could sing, harmonica player. And he always felt like he was being had. And I'd tell him, I'd say, man, don't you worry about that. You do what you enjoy. The thieves are gonna get caught.

Mike: But there was part of him that couldn't let that go, that there was someone who was stealing from him. I kind of get that, too.

Jerry: I guess it was just the idea of it, for him. But I don't let that bother me.

He was also skeptical of the traditional performing rights organizations such as ASCAP (American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers) and BMI (Broadcast Music, Inc.) to properly connect him with his royalties. Like many others he was discouraged and resigned that there was little those at the "bottom of the totem pole" could do against all the abuses of copyright and royalty laws.

Jerry: Nah, that ain't gonna help. All these people like BMI and ASCAP, they want you to sign on with them for an annual fee, and they guarantee you're going to get your money. They don't help. SoundExchange, it don't help. I've tried all of them.
Not ASCAP, another organization called SoundExchange. They were supposed to be making sure if you had anything that was sold, if you had anything to do with it, they were going to make sure you get a little of it, nah, nah, nah, nah. But I know BMI, I deal with them. BMI and ASCAP, all they want is that you can take out a membership with them, four or five hundred dollars a year. Ain't nothing in it for you.
Because I asked them. Gave them a call, and asked, "What would it benefit me to just become a member?" I said, "Are you going to help me retrieve some money?" They can't tell you that. They go so far as even saying, well, you can't play that guitar if you don't, it's against the law for you to play music if you don't have a BMI license or an ASCAP license. And I said, that don't mean nothing if I'm gonna play it or not. I'm gonna play it one way or the other. "It's against the law to play music." Probably so. It's probably so. You can't play music for an audience unless you got a license.
But anyway, it's all about money. Everybody gets a piece of the pie except the men at the bottom of the totem pole. That's the bad thing about it. You got these big lawyers coming up with their big forms, they're gonna protect the musician. They're gonna guarantee his-- well that ain't gonna happen. It ain't gonna happen. It ain't gonna happen. But anyway, I don't even worry about that type of stuff. I don't even worry about that type of stuff.

Johnny was proud of standing firm on insisting on getting a DVD made of his performances. After meeting with prolonged resistance he got his DVD which turned out to be

very successful for him. For him, this was an example of getting out ahead of the current technology and bringing it to the blues, where it hadn't been before.

> Johnny: Well, been a lot of changes. Like years ago, you didn't have DVDs. So I recorded for this label, they wanted me to record again. I said no, you're gonna give me a DVD. My wife said, "They ain't gonna do it." I went, then fuck it. They don't get no record. Took me two years but I was the first one with a DVD on. Right. I said, "You gonna give me a DVD."
>
> Mike: Yeah. But their figuring everything is gonna go iTunes or YouTube, that's what--
>
> Johnny: Once I got it started on DVDs, they put DVDs on all the guys. But I'm the one that started doing DVDs.
>
> Mike: So they weren't even gonna bother with that?
>
> Johnny: Nuh-uh. They had never did it before. But I seen DVDs on other people, I was like, "You gonna give me a DVD."
>
> Mike: So a DVD instead of--
>
> Johnny: Instead of just a CD.

He described getting tangled up between record companies, not understanding all of the complexities of the legal obligations of signing with another publisher when his original arrangement went dormant. With some good legal advice he was able to resolve that situation fairly successfully.

> Mike: As far as copyrights, and royalties and that sort of thing. Did any of that ever happen to you back in the day? Where you got cheated out of your music?
>
> Johnny: Well, yeah. Because see like now, a guy-- I had a publisher. A publisher get more money than the writer. He's deceased now, so now I got to get a lawyer and get my publishing. I'm gonna put it in my wife's name. That way the money come to her --
>
> Mike: So that did happen for you and some of your work.
>
> Johnny: Yeah. I didn't understand-- when we sent the stuff to Washington, I didn't understand about the publishing stuff. But what happened, I had signed with another

record company before I recorded with them. Then they wanted to sue me. But for five years, they had did nothing on me.

Mike: Sue you for?

Johnny: Going with another record company. So this guy, he helped me get out of that trial there. But he knew what he was doing. So now, I get me a trial and take my publishing. And write me a name, put it in my wife's name and-- but my royalty checks, I still get them, you know.

Mike: So how long ago was that, that that when down in terms of getting the publishing rights off to the publisher and away from you?

Johnny: Well that was in the 1980s.

Mike: So knowing what you know now, if you could go back, you would have arranged that different and had more control.

Johnny: Right.

Mike: Was that over-- so that was over writing, right? Copyright. Did that ever happen with recordings, too?

Johnny: No, no. See, now, if somebody records your songs, BMI, the money don't come to you. So it's different now. When you get a copyright, the royalties don't come to the writer.

Mike: So if I wanted to record one of your songs, then I would need to pay-- the money would go to BMI, right?

Johnny: Right, and then they'd send it to me. Right. There are songs I didn't write on there. Whoever wrote it, their name is there. So you can record anybody's stuff, because BMI gonna make sure they finally get the money. See when I first started out, I was singing people's songs. I got to think about me. That's when I started writing my own songs. See, if you don't have your own stuff, they don't want you in New York. You got to have your own.
So like, every six months, that's when I get my royalty checks. They got it showed how much percent-- I get more money from overseas than I do in the United States.

Mike: From BMI, from other people doing your songs? On the radio, too?

Johnny: On the radio, too.: Yeah. On TV and whatever.

Mike: So if it's your original that you performed, then that royalty comes to you. Most of it comes from Europe.

Johnny: Yeah. I don't know how, but $500 from Europe and maybe $20 from the US. My music all in Belgium, and Japan.

Johnny also described a time when skilled black musicians in Chicago were unable to play blues for lack of instruments. This was during the same time when white "European Invasion" performers were making millions of dollars playing Chicago style blues songs.

Johnny: So a lot of time, years ago, had guys could play. But they didn't have anything to play on.

Mike: Right, might not have an instrument, might not have wheels to get places.

Johnny: "Man, I ain't got no guitar." I'd say "I got a guitar, come on." You have to be prepared, man. I got a friend was playing with down there.
Yeah, look at what they do now, you know. Just like telephones. Put music on a phone and shit. Things have changed, you know, it's made a big difference. Now people take your music and they download it, burn copies.

Mickey spoke about the positive side of the "European Invasion." For him it was an example of how recorded music was a good thing from the perspective of sharing of ideas and promoting blues abroad. He credits much of the blues revival coming from this cultural exchange through recorded music. He says he holds no resentments for money that should have been paid to him, stating he feels like he is the lucky one, still alive to tell the story when so many have passed on before him.

Mike: So that's pretty cool that audiences all over the world know your music and are familiar with it already.

Mickey: Oh, yeah. I mean they was playing it before we went over there. You know, because people are always saying the wrong thing. But they're saying what they think. Man those guys over there just taking your music, man.
I said, "No, they're not taking nothing." "They stealing your music." "They're not stealing music."
I said, "Those guys is doing us a favor." Which they did. If it wasn't for those guys over

there play our music, we would have never crossed the ditch. We would be still on this side of the bayou. We would have never gotten over. Because that's what-- It's cheaper for one guy to go over there than 10 guys to come over here. So that's how this got started, you know, in my idea.

Mike: So like back in the early '60s, with the British invasion and all of those guys?

Mickey: Look, the Brits recorded one of my tunes. (A British band) did this one, you know. I recorded in before they recorded that first album. That was one of their top tunes on it. And they wasn't mad, that was a big song for them. That sold that album. So I'm proud of that.

Mike: So that's fantastic. And then, obviously, more people hear it then. You know, to a bigger audience. …. did you feel like they did right as far as royalties and credit to you?

Mickey: I didn't get any money yet. But I'm glad I didn't get-- You know, people say, "Man, you sound-- that sounds crazy." Man, all this money so and so made us, where are they? They dead. But all the money-- they dead. But see, I didn't get that money. I couldn't buy that early death like those guys. So I had no other choice but to live. They say, "That sounds stupid." I said, "It does sound stupid. But it's true.

Mike: But…

Mickey: I lived to tell you what happened.

Part of his nonchalance over having music stolen was the prevalence of it. It was a common occurrence and common knowledge that it happened frequently. Many of his recording cohort have passed away and so their copyright situations may never be resolved for their surviving family members.

Mike: There were other songs right? In terms of somebody else taking the credit, somebody else getting the money?

Mickey: Oh, yes indeed. I mean, we all got that. We all got bit by that snake. But I mean, a lot of us lived through it. A lot of them didn't. Like we're all ok right now. That's the only ones left from our stables, from my studio that's living right now. We're the only ones.

Mike: So it felt pretty common then, for people to create music, perform it, then have somebody else kind of take that and make maybe a lot more money off of it?

Mickey: Oh, yes, indeed. And they're always willing to put the name onto something as a co-writer. I remember one time, when we released a song, I was cutting the grass, and the phone ring. And my friend came up and said, “Mickey, this man on the phone want to talk to you. Mickey, get down here."
"I can't, I'm cutting my grass."
"Get down here, they're gonna sue our asses."
I said, "Sue who for what?" When I got down there. "Oh, that song that we just put out. That's somebody's song."
I said, "I wrote that song." He done put (his name) on it. Guess who wrote that song? This Mickey guy wrote that song. Me. I said, "You know you got that other name on it, you know."
"Well that's to protect our artists."
From what? Protect the artists from getting their money?

Mike: So was your name not on that one at all?

Mickey: Oh yeah, my name was. And his.
Everybody up in the neighborhood had that record. You could walk down the street and hear somebody, dun dun dun dun, It was one of the big sellers. But I got paid-- educated about how they earn that stuff. That's the best education you can get, you know. You live through it. Somebody can't tell you what you learn. You learn by being there. You don't read up on this. But I made it.
And he say, "Oh, we'll take his case. We'll take his case. That's your friend, we'll take his case." So when they come back in town, they're gonna jump on it. Because I've got all the catalogue of record numbers and all that stuff, I got that. And I got to get it to them and-- because somebody last year got sly. $5 million, sliced on. And my name was the way that I was born, actually. See? And they got all this money right there in California right now.

Mike: So that's something that's actively being pursued now, is to make that right. In terms of some of the royalties and copyrights from-- This is from a ways back, right?

Mickey: Oh, yeah. I got my blank papers from BMI that I should fill out. BMI, Broadcast Music. I don't have anything with ASCAP, but BMI did it all
.

Sometimes the theft was more direct. When a coworker in charge of delivering pay to the musicians would take their cut before the delivery. Mickey related a story of that happening to him.

Mickey: This new guy was bringing the envelopes with the money in it, and he brought me mine. So I put it in my pocket. So he would just go pick up the money. And he got his already. But he's gonna rip me off of some more.

Yeah. But see, I knew all the time. But after we met, I said, "Oh, this gonna be some different crap here."
So after he found out, "You guys, I went to get your money, but you already got it. Don't you trust me anymore? "
I said, "Do you trust you?" I said, "Do you trust you?" Oh, he was pissed big time. So he didn't get a chance to rip me off of some more. Boy, I had my little $20s, some $100s, I got it some right. But he didn't get a chance to short change me again.

Mike: So that was it, for working with him?

Mickey: Oh, we did a couple more things together. But he just went on his way-- He said, "Well, I can't rip him off no more."

Mike: Wow. And how much came to you after that?

Mickey: Not enough, but some of it.

Jimmy said he never had music stolen from him. He realized though that this was a common occurrence. Jimmy attributes his success at avoiding the theft of his music to early advice he got from several blues pioneers known for taking control of their works. When asked about how he knew to protect himself he expressed gratitude that there were mentors who were looking out for him to alert him to the hazards of being taken advantage of by record companies and publishers. Early in his career Jimmy was actively performing, but was doing other blues artist's material, not his own. He was encouraged to begin both writing his own songs and making sure he was properly credited for his work.

Jimmie: Well, I've never felt that way. And I'll tell you why. I was fortunate enough, early in my career, I was fortunate enough to meet people like Willie Dixon and Chuck Berry. And a few other people, but mainly Willie Dixon and Chuck Berry. That taught me a lot about protecting your rights as a copyright owner and owning the rights to your songs and your publishing.
And Willie Dixon, the first thing he told me when I approached him, what do you know about making records, and being in the recording industry? He said, with a big voice, the way he used to talk, "Let me tell you something, if you gonna go in this business, you have to make sure you protect yourself, first of all.
If you write a song, so you don't just get up night after night and sing other people's songs—'cause you're not going to get any credit for it, it's other people's songs. So you

can sing it all you like, but you're not going to get the credit that, say Muddy Waters got. Because he wrote the song."

He went on to describe how the Willie Dixon and the Willie Dixon Blues Heaven Foundation he founded, helped him, as was also the case with many other blues musicians. Dixon's hard won expertise in securing fair contracts and royalty arrangements benefitted many other musicians who did not have the connections, the legal representation or the experience to know how these systems worked.

Jimmy: Willie said, "You got to write your own stuff. And make sure you protect it, with your publishing, and your writer's royalties." And he showed how to go about starting my own publishing company. How to write to the Library of Congress and get the copyright on your songs. Then if anything ever comes of it, you get the benefit of it. Because it's your stuff. And that's the road I chose to travel, because I listened to what he was saying. And God rest his soul, he gave me a precious thing when he gave me that.
I told his daughter that a couple of months ago. I was down at that Blues Heaven Foundation. And his daughter was there. I said "Your dad gave me a lot that could last me the rest of my life and my career." And I told her what her dad taught me about the business of show business.

Mike: And that's really what that foundation-- part of what the foundation was set up to do, was to help musicians get what they were entitled to.

Jimmy: Right, to protect their-- what you created means nothing if you don't protect it. Because who does it belong to? I don't know. There's no benefit there. You say, "I wrote the song, but I didn't get it copyrighted." Too bad, it's gone. So that has happened in the business, way more than what should have.

Mike: But not to you. Because you got that advice early on.

Jimmy: I was smart enough to just stay with that, if I write a song. And now I get a little bit of royalties for some of the songs that I wrote that I have forgotten all about now.

The benefits of those early decisions compounded in a positive way. In contrast to the many blues musicians who died penniless, having never received the fruits of their artistry, those who protected themselves early, benefited financially throughout their lifetimes.

Jimmy: I was smart enough to just stay with that, if I write a song. And now I get a little bit of royalties for some of the songs that I wrote that I have forgotten all about now…. Once in a while, I receive a royalty check from that song I wrote that I had never even sung hardly in my entire career. But then I relate back, I say, "Oh, I wrote that song, didn't I?"

Mike: But somebody's playing it. Somebody's recording it.

Jimmy: Yeah, in Europe. I see that a lot. I went to Germany, as a matter of fact and it was on the jukebox in Germany, my song. I said, "You remember that?" I said, "That is a song I wrote."

Mike: Was it somebody else that had recorded it, or your recording?

Jimmy: Yeah, my recording of it. But they was playing it on the jukebox.

Jimmy was grateful for the early career advice he got. But he was also aware of those who were not so fortunate. Many others only got partial compensation for their work. Others musicians received none at all. In this way, Jimmy's story was the exception, early awareness and early protection from having others take advantage of his long and productive career as a writing and performer.

Jimmy: Yeah, Chuck Berry. Chuck Berry, that's the first thing he did when he went with [Chess]. He made sure his songs was copy written in his name under the publishing company. He made sure he got paid for whatever he did. So he-- a great move. He was one of the people that was smart about the business, and he went about it in a very smart way.

Mike: Right. And passed that on to you.

Jimmy: Oh, absolutely.

Mike: So what year do you think that was that you got that advice, from either Willie Dixon or Chuck Berry?

Jimmy: Was in the late 50s. Yeah, late 50s.

Mike: But you saw it with people around you, with other people that did not protect theirs?

Jimmy: Oh yeah, I seen so many people, I heard so many stories about musicians writing songs that became major hits. And they never got a dime of royalties. Like for instance, for a long time, the song You Ain't Nothing But a Hound Dog, the one that Elvis recorded, and made a smash hit off it. But this black lady wrote it. I think maybe I'll be able to think of her name. You Ain't Nothing But a Hound Dog.
But then they finally paid her some royalties. But it didn't go the way it was supposed to have gone. Because they gave other people the credit for the writing of it. And many other songs. That's why Willie Dixon was really smart with that.
No, I have never felt-- maybe I missed something in there. But I tried to cover all of my bases. Because my attorney …. There's two attorneys, one with the publishing and one with the recording contracts and stuff like that. So I could get my royalties from (his record company), they're very good with that. I give my agent a lot of credit. Any time I do a statement, he's usually right on time.

Jimmy was guardedly optimistic about the future of increasing availability of his music. He knew that there was a great deal of his music out for free, unmonitored on the internet, on YouTube for example, for which he would likely not ever get compensated. He seemed fairly unconcerned. He say the exposure as a good thing. It showed interest in blues in general, and in his music in particular. But he also had some hope that soon there would be a way of tracking and compensating for a wider variety of both live performances and also internet mediated content.

Mike: And so your music out on YouTube, for example, people can see a lot of your performances on YouTube.

Jimmy: Absolutely, they're all over the place, yeah.

Mike: And I guess there's two sides to that. One is that it's kind of out there for free. On the other hand, it's more people seeing your music.

Jimmy: Right yeah, that's something that's kind of debatable now. Because I guess some of the companies are trying to figure a way to capitalize on the fact that they're using a lot of music for free, not paying for it. So BMI is trying to find ways to get compensated for all of that.
Oh, yeah. Lots of places it can go. Because-- Oh, don't lose your point. See, for instance, I didn't know for years that when I do live performances-- let's say a theater. I go and do four, five theaters in a row. And I perform all of my original songs.
Besides the money I get from BMI, those theaters, they now have to pay a right. They

have to pay a fee for the use of your songs that you performed that night. Let's say I do 10 of my songs in one theater, and I go to the next theater and do 10 of them. Then those theaters have to pay for me using those songs, as well as pay me the salary for working that night on the stage.

Mike: So they're paying for the use of your songs, even though you're the one playing your own songs.

Jimmy: Exactly. I didn't know that until BMI came out with a BMI Live. Where they have to pay for your live use of those songs. My agent enlightened me to that. And then I kind of built up a little bit of a little bank account with-- I call it found money. Because I never knew that this existed.
He said "There's another royalty that you're supposed to be receiving. It's called BMI Live." And then he looked into theater, because of you using your copyright every time you go and-- if they pay you for working that night, physically working, then also you're using your songs. And they're getting that for free. Because they're not paying you for the use of the songs. They're figuring out a way to get another royalty other than they did.

Mike: Wow, so is BMI Live relatively new? Fairly recent, then?

Jimmy: It's been out a few years, but I didn't even know about it. Because somebody made my agent aware of it, some lawyer or somebody. And then he brought it to me. And he brought it to a couple of other musicians that I know. And sure enough, it existed right there, about BMI Live. But if you don't know about it, you just don't know about it.

Mike: Right, you don't know to ask for that compensation.

Jimmy: Yeah. Then what we did, we took our same bank that we use. We took and set up an account for BMI Live music. When they collect it, they put it in that account. So it adds up.

Jackie also felt he benefited from an early awareness of the potential for getting ripped off and the importance of being properly represented and protected. His early association with a trusted lawyer and his arrangement with BMI afforded him proper compensation for most of this work. But he was also aware that this was not case for everyone. He said everyone knew that most musicians were taken advantage of by someone, sometimes the record labels and producers, and sometimes by other musicians, when they were vulnerable and not adequately knowledgeable about the inner workings of the music industry.

Mike: So we were talking earlier about some blues musicians who didn't get their royalties and didn't get their copyrights. Was that ever something you experienced? Did you ever feel like--

Jackie: Well, you know what, I never really experienced that. I was dealing with the BMI back-- actually that started in the early 70s. I got with them and so they've been pretty well with me. And then I had this guy, he's like a musician lawyer. You know, he takes care of-- handles all my stuff for me.
So I just let him handle it. And it works out pretty good for me like that. So I don't have to worry about it. He just keeps the paperwork on whatever's going on and I don't never have to worry about it. So he takes care of it for me. Which is good.
Well, put it like this. Every musician gonna loss every musician. I mean, somehow it ends up that every musician has loss. And back in the early days that was out there, a lot of the guys-- a lot of these guys that's out here now, they don't know about this stuff way back then. And I try to discuss it with a lot of them, but they don't know what I'm talking about.
Because they didn't have no experience with that stuff back then, I guess.

Jackie went on to discuss the important role of blues radio and how critical that promotion and exposure was to emerging blues musicians, even though appreciation for that technology's impact is often forgotten now.

Jackie: Like, you get this radio station called WOPA. That made a lot of the blues guys back in the day, but a lot of people never heard of that station. I mean, some have heard a little bit about it, through by hearing other people talk about it.
But the newer generation, they don't know nothing about that station. But it helped a lot of the musicians back in the day.
And another radio station that-- what was that? WDIA. They help a lot of musicians in Ernie's Record Mart. They helped a lot of musicians back in the day. A lot of people, the younger people, don't really know anything about Ernie's Record Mart back in the day. That was a station from way back and a lot of people don't know about that.

Mike: And they would help by just getting the music out there, getting it in more peoples' hands?

Jackie: Yeah, they'd play the music, and get it out there. And lots more people could hear it. They got a few stations, like this FM station that plays blues. That's a pretty good station, they play a lot of blues. I've heard my records on it quite a few times.

Jackie felt that things have improved in recent years regarding musician's rights and compensation compared to the earlier days of blues musicianship where everyone had a loss of

some of what they were entitled to, being taken advantage of at some point. He still stated that this was still a challenging time for the blues genre, but for different reasons now.

> Jackie: Well, like I said, pretty much all the old musicians that you talk to, they'll tell you that they kind of lost, back in the day. Pretty much any of them you talk to, they can tell you that. It was kind of a loss, but hey, they lived through it, though. Yeah, they kept it moving, so that's the way it goes. They lost. Pretty much all the old musicians. They lost.
>
> Mike: So there was a time when, like I said, everybody had some loss with that. So would you say it's better now, in terms of fairness?
>
> Jackie: Well, it's some better now than it was then. It's a little tough out there right now. It's a little tough. But what you have to do is you just have to keep up with what's going on. Peoples are more wise, the musicians are more wise now than they was back then. So you just have to kind of keep it going.
> You gonna, even to now, music business is a tough business. But you know, I guess it's always gonna be like that. But I'm gonna say it's a hard business, but you know what, all you gotta do is just go with it. Go with it and it'll work out.
> That's the way I do. I roll with the flow and it treats me well. So I'm satisfied. Yeah, I'm satisfied with it.

In additional to the music business still generally being tough, long hours traveling, late nights playing, risk of being a self-employed entrepreneur, he described how the rapidly changing way that music is being consumed impacts his ability to be paid for his work.

> Mike: And the role of live music versus recorded music? How much people are listening to on their phones, versus coming out to the club and listening to?
>
> Jackie: Well you know what they do here, they don't buy music here like they used to. The way they do it here now is like they mostly go on that Amazon, iTunes, and they'll buy like maybe one song. You know, that's how they do now, instead of buying a whole CD.
> I still sell them in the club. A lot of the time, I can sell maybe 10, it depends on how many people be there, maybe 15 in the clubs.
> But mostly people they can only buy it if they go on Amazon, or iTunes, they can buy it, like I said, from $1 to $2 for one song. And that's what they go for.
>
> Mike: So it's still much better for you to sell whole albums, CDs in person, than one song $1 at a time on Amazon.
>
> Jackie: Yeah. Still be paying that $15 to $20 a CD……

Lenny saw a pattern of big fish eating littler fish. And littler fish eating the littlest fish. He recounted the many times he saw publishers and record companies appropriate music from blues musicians. But he also recalled many times where blues musicians took advantage of other musicians, those with even less access to, knowledge of or leverage with the workings of the music industry. He described how this often happened, where an apparently well-meaning fellow musician would take and change a song, and then associate their name with it.

> Lenny: So if you have something, (a new song), he'd say "Okay, I can't record this, but let me doctor it up." Whatever he did, maybe change a line or two or whatever it was, then it was a (their) song.
> I want to say again, I started off talking about that because what (some other blues musicians) did, what (they) got-- not blamed for, credit for. All the things they did, lead into the technology of the day. That was the technology then, because you couldn't hardly get into a record company but to come through an A&R man (Artists and repertoire man), they called them, for a company.
> And most time, the A&R man was in a position to take your songs and turn them into what he want for a piece of the action of them. For a piece of the publishing, a piece of the writer, just any little thing, to get a piece.
> And sometimes, not only a piece, he got most of it. Because a lot of time then, even the writer who was smart enough to write didn't have enough wisdom about what he was doing to take the advantage out of publishing. Because they didn't know who paid to the writer. The publishing pays the writer.

He described how various middle men would get a piece of a piece which eroded what the original artist would get at the end of the process. Unless a blues artist was very savvy, they would end up realizing only a quarter of compensation for a song. And often times less than that.

> Lenny: If you got $100,000, that means the one who wrote it, and the publisher gets $50,000 apiece. But if you got a piece of the publisher, a writer, you only got $25,000, you know what I'm saying?
> Because the publisher's gonna get 50%, plus they get 50% of a writer, which is another 25%. Now the writer only gets 25%. And it don't have to always be into the contract who submit the license to BMI.
> Because your name can be on a record, that don't mean nothing. But the contract who submit it to BMI or ASCAP. That happened to me a million times.
> So maybe you got 25%, maybe a lot less.

Mike: So this would be very hard to navigate for someone who wasn't an insider.

Lenny: Oh yeah, because if the publishing pays the writer, that means the record company can pay the publisher, and the publisher is obligated to pay the writer. And he always count the writers in the dark. The writer never knows.
Because he gets his statement from the publisher. If I published—say you and I wrote a song together, and I published it, then I could say what it sold because the counts come to the publisher. I got it first hand, because the publisher pays the writer. The writer don't pay the publisher. And hopefully I wrote the song.

Lenny gave his appraisal of the how recent technological developments have impacted current financial arrangements. While some dynamics have changed, some remain the same. The usually white music industry representatives would produce the black musicians, disadvantaging them in a variety of ways.

Mike: So it sounds like that was a pretty common thing.

Lenny: Oh it was common. It is common, but technology brings about a little change. But everything that has changed remains the same.
Back in the past earlier, when you recorded a record, the back end of the producer got the money from the record companies. If you sold 100,000 records, the producer got his money from the record company. Now, since records ain't selling, so there's no backend for a producer.
Because most of the time, the producer was a white guy who produced the black guy. They was guys who held a pencil for the black guy, but the black guy really were producing themselves. Now there ain't no money in the backend.
If the company make $100,000, they say, "Well, the producer got to have $50,000 of this money." The record company look out for the producer, because they in the bed together. And the producer, most of the time, be a white company and a white producer, produced these black guys. So the company pays this producer, who's in the cahoots with him anyway. So you've got half the money left for the artist, who he deducts from his overhead and the recording of the record, and the promotion of the record out of the other money.
When I'm dead and gone, how you think my grandkids gonna feel about they granddaddy being ripped off? And I know the real story of it. You follow me? I know that that's never been talked about.

Lenny likened this to a sharecropping arrangement. After all the company's ancillary expenses were paid, there was little to nothing left for the musician. There were lots of

relationships, lots of rights, to keep straight, or to obfuscate in the service of appropriation. In the current state of the industry, this has changed largely because of the proportion of downloaded music. And downloaded music is compensated differently again. So this creates a new set of rules to be learned and navigated.

> Lenny: Because most of the time, it's like sharecropping. It's not enough money to pay for it. But the producer got his money. Because the producer and the record company in it together. Now just ain't no backend.
> But even if you don't sell records, you still can get artist right, airways right, and then when it sell, you can get sales right. And if you get played, you can get publisher's rights. It's a lot of different rights, if you know what I'm saying.
> Because you can have a record get played 20 times a day, and that publisher can make money although it didn't sell. They report how many times it gets played. Now, if it sells quite nice, you're gonna make money from the sales. So since record's not selling now, guess who's getting the money? The downloads. So now-- No backend now. No backend for the artist.
> The big company make more money not selling records than they do selling records. Because they're getting a piece of the app, the downloads, the apps. It's about five record companies. It's about five record companies. And I ain't getting to name calling.
> All the little guys, they ain't getting no money. On my download, I get hits on some of my downloads. Sometime, over a million hits. I get $13, $14. But the big company who made this big deal-- you know where I'm coming from. The big deal.
> They getting paid big. So the less records they sell, the more money they make. So they get paid not to sell records. So the download, they, they big record company, in with the downloads.

Lenny described the progression as an example of things both changing and staying the same. As he went down the list of the progression of music technologies he described a pattern of the industry being enough ahead of the changes to always be in a position to maximize profit in a way that musicians could not. He recalled his early days earning $7 per night. So as he looked back he felt that on the balance things had gone very well for him professionally despite all these challenges.

> Lenny: The downloads. Somebody saw this coming many years ago. They saw it coming like you did-- we had seventy eights, to 33s, then they got 45s, then they went to tapes. From tape, they went to eight tracks, CDs, and so on.

Mike: You're following my list right here, yeah.

Lenny: Eight tracks, you know what I'm talking about? Now you got the CDs, now the MP3s. And pretty soon it'll be something else. Anything to keep control to keep from paying for the service of it. You follow me?

Mike: So that part has stayed pretty steady over the years.

Lenny: Oh it's steady because whatever the MP3s are, you can't listen to it unless you go to some app, or some listening device. How you gonna hear it? How you gonna get it? Who owns how it coming to you? You follow me?
Sometimes you get $7 a night for the shows, and $5 for band leader. In the '50s, sometimes I'd make $25 and $30, man that was a lot of money in 1950. And working five days a week? Are you kidding me? Yeah. That was some up, some down, but my up overtakes my down. My good overtake my bad.

Lenny talked about having been on all sides of the process, and having learned many of the lessons the hard way. This has contributed to him having learning the skills to operate more independently than other blues musicians. He is now able to detect potential cons and call it out because he feels he has seen it all.

Lenny: I don't like about the rip-off. But the rip-off been good in some angles.
Because anything ain't worth stealing, ain't worth having. I didn't say it wasn't good or right. But if you don't want to steal anything, it ain't worth having.
Ain't too many guys who did that independently. Because wasn't no record company doing this. It's hard work, hard work.
Day in and day out, I'm my own promotion man. I spent three days a week calling radio stations. Other time, I'd go to work. I pick one day to rest, three days a week calling radio stations, one a week pressing. Day in and day out
So if someone tried something I say Come on, now. Come on, now. Just who you talking to now. You're talking to the creator of it. You're talking to the rip off creator. Yeah. So I can get a lot of things done.
And that where I come in at, over the years been a producer, first of all. Produced enough records for myself to have done well. Because I learned this because I was gonna be a producer until I found someone to produce for me. I was gonna write until I found a good writer. I was gonna manage myself until I found a good manager. I was gonna record myself until I found somebody to record me.
After all these years, I'm all of these guys, you know? So I know how to manage me well. And just that I'm smart enough to know when I outgrow myself. I have to turn that over to someone else. It just wasn't happening for me.

Lenny described his current recording situation. Because of his decades of experience, he was confident in his ability to pick and choose what he would manage himself and what he would entrust to other reliable associates.

> Lenny: I kind of outgrew the things I can do for myself. But at least I knew that. At least I know that. So I let somebody handle some of that for me.
> (Regarding the next recording session) It won't be low-tech production. It'll be high-tech, but it's gonna be did on an economical basis.
> Because when you know what I know, when you've been around as long-- I know how to cut corners. I'm not gonna cut corners in products, or the quality.
> I just know a lot of people who want to rip me off. When you know what I know, it's hard to rip me off now. You know?

The economics of the music industry as it relates to blues musicians has a complicated history. In the exploration of how technology has impacted the business side of the blues, a variety of subthemes emerged, usually relating to who got compensated generously and who got shortchanged by the various processes.

"Appropriation" was one such subtheme as each of the participants knew of blues musicians who had been ripped off to some degree, by both those in the music industry and at times, by other blues musicians. Most had this happen to them. Some even described doing it themselves to some degree. The role of technology in appropriation usually occurred during some technological modification of the music. Once the music was recorded it was potentially out of the musician's hands. Some musicians preemptively refused to be recorded as the one effective way to prevent this.

The subtheme of "pragmatism" emerged in part as a response to the pervasive appropriation that existed. Several participants dispassionately described the dynamic of getting ripped off, and ripping others off, as something that happens to everyone to some degree and was an unavoidable part of being in the music business as a blues musician. Being thankful for at least partial credit and partial compensation was common. A "Big fish eat the littler fish and

littler fish eat the littlest fish" expectation was more common in the earlier days of the blues than now, though there was still a concern that this dynamic was perennial.

Finally there was the subtheme of technological gatekeeping where the industry always had the most advanced technology and therefore the upper hand in the production or distribution of the music, if not both. One musician made the comparison to sharecropping, where if the industry representatives were always paid first and paid well, the musician at the end of the process would usually come up short. This industry gatekeeping of the process or "sharecropping" and the resulting control of compensation occurred through a variety of channels. Changing the content and then changing or "sharing" authorship before or after the recording process was common to several participants. Under the guise of "repping" or helping, a small change to the original content would then change authorship rights and then the resulting compensation.

While extensive appropriation was common, a pragmatic view of the role of technology was the norm for these participants. All saw the importance of technological dissemination of the blues. But equally, all saw the need to be vigilant to the ways that being technologically separated from their music, their authorship, and their rights has occurred and continues to occur. The role of technology in the economics of the blues is highly intertwined and complicated and in some cases greatly unresolved.

Blues Appreciation / Legacy / Future of Blues Music

The final set of questions focused on a comprehensive forward looking appraisal of the future of the blues and the potential impacts of the proportion of live and recorded music, the changes in type and style of blues, the evolution of new blues music out of the older traditional

styles. The questions of legacy and the impact of technology on the blues afforded the opportunity to revisit all the previous discussions through the lens of future directions.

Jerry's perspective on the future of blues was that live music will always be important. However, he also saw some inevitability in the change of the form. Some of this change will depend on how much music is performed and listened to live and how much is mediated by technology he said. He felt the older styles were almost non-existent already. Some of this was due in his mind to economic factors and by people experiencing blues in more popular styles and commercially profitable recorded forms. But he thought technology may also have a role in preserving the rarer, less mainstream forms of traditional blues.

> Mike: So do you worry about that? That so much is going through a computerized change, and a filter?
>
> Jerry: Particular type of music I do, audiences don't even know it existed before someone doing it live. First of all, it's not a big market value-- oh, the education part of it. It'll always be around if the professor who's teaching it is knowledgeable enough to try to keep it original, to make it so students know what he's talking about. Other than that.
>
> Mike: It's not the big money maker that's going to draw--
>
> Jerry: You can always make a little money, but you're not going to get rich. Now maybe somebody might do what you're doing, and bring it up to par with what a computer wants them to be. They might make a big buck. But if you keep it original, you'll make a few dollars here and there. For the sake of people who understand what it's all about.
> And first of all, if you're looking for the fame and fortune in what you're doing, you're gonna be worth a fig only. My mama told me that. You do what you can do to the best you can perfect it. Anything else gonna happen. Anything else gonna happen.
> From my standpoint-- other than the old school guys, and they're pretty much all dead and gone-- true blues, country blues, they don't consider or don't give a second thought about the modern technology computer lab stuff. That doesn't mean nothing to them. I mean, I'm probably one of the few that's left that's basically tuning my guitar by ear. Nah, but it'll be some blues lyrics, but the music won't be the same. You've got a lot of hip-hop and R&B doing a lot of blues lyrics, but the music is different.
>
> Mike: So it's blues, at least the roots are still the blues. But pretty different styles and Rhythm & Blues, hip-hip.

Jerry: Hip-hop, southern soul,

More specifically, Jerry thought that acoustic blues was particularly at risk for being replaced by newer less traditional forms. He did not attribute this to a reduction in talented musicians. Rather, he saw this a as a function of economic forces pulling young players toward genres that were more popular now and more financially rewarding.

> Mike: Do you think there will always be some folks keeping the more original forms of blues alive, or is it at risk of--
>
> Jerry: Not the type I do. That's almost non-existent. There ain't someone out there who knows anything about-- it's almost, it's almost-- What I play is I go to a lot of festivals, they're not there. I go to a lot of festivals. And old school blues, solo, acoustic is not there. It's not there.
> Not a lot of it. That's what I say, you've some great musicians. But not in the old school blues category ranked up. I will give some credit. There are some great musicians. But when it comes to old school blues, it's not there. Not there.
>
> Mike: Why do you suppose that is?
>
> Jerry: Bottom line, you don't get rich quick doing it. I'm thinking in the days that agree with you, you don't get rich quick on it. Me and you, the chances of getting rich doing it, no, it ain't gonna happen. It won't happen.
>
> Mike: You think education might be part of it? Like I said, I sometimes worry that a lot of young folks, and not-so-young folks, don't know where their music really came from.
>
> Jerry: That's a big part of it. That's a big part of it. They've got no ideas of what they're doing or where it comes from. They've got no idea. That's got a lot to do with it. A heck of a lot to do with it.
>
> Mike: That's part of what I'm hoping to do with this project. I'm not sure if anybody is going to read it, but if they do, that will be part--
>
> Jerry: Some of them will read it -- just out of curiosity.

So one of the more important technological contributions in his mind was that the future of the blues preservation would be through live performances, audio and video, captured and used to educate later generations. Even though there might not be live performances, there would

be the opportunity to see archived performances. This seemed to be small consolation. On the one side, technology mediated dissemination of the music was costly and risky. And it favored types of music other than the old traditional styles. And on the other hand, it did bring exposure to a different kind of music to many who otherwise would never have stumbled onto it.

> Jerry: It'll come to the point that maybe we won't be able to see anyone really live in person doing old school blues. But technology wise, there will always be somebody who's got some stuff they kept from years ago.
> They're going to preserve it. And they'll maybe do workshops and show you this is what we did here. And this was done back in the blah, blah, blah. Nobody else out here doing that, but this is what it was back then, everybody's. And that's one part that technology plays a big part of.
>
> Mike: The preservation.
>
> Jerry: Exactly. Mostly the part of the blues-- a big part of it is promoting it. Things like YouTube and that type of stuff, it plays a big part in promoting old school blues. Because if I wanted to hire a person, instead of promoting myself, it would cost me an arm and a leg. To use TV, that's out of my depth.
> But for me, 100%, I'm promoting my own music and myself. If I didn't have that, I wouldn't be able to do it. I'm not saying the other avenue's not making money off of it. But then, wouldn't have gotten done for it my sake. And it don't be from other people promoting it.
> You probably wouldn't even be here if you hadn't heard something or seen something about me.

Johnny described concerns over the disconnect of subsequent generations of musicians and fans as from traditional roots music experienced live, to current styles listened to in some mediated form other than live performances. He described some of the socioeconomic reasons as well as the racial dynamics underlying some of these changes. He sees this manifested in more white audiences and players learning the blues, and less interest by young black musicians and black audiences for a variety of reasons.

> Johnny: Well, what happened with the blues --- black people are not into the blues no more. This been happened like - I'd say close to 20 years ago. You know, the young white guys into the blues. Rolling Stones came here for four nights, and made $12

million. If it weren't for white people, there would be no blues. They're the ones supports the blues.
What it's about, to me, the young blacks don't know that our forefathers created blues. And a lot of them, they don't understand. And I think in our time, a lot of blacks were ashamed of the blues. So they went to something else. But see, the young white people now, they're into the blues. My whole band is white. You can't find black people that want to play the blues.
But once they learn, they're gonna leave you, and go on their own. But there's always another one that will take his place.

Johnny describes a different dynamic in other countries though. In Europe, Asia and South America he sees a different hunger for traditional blues played live. Young musicians learning the blues are keener to learn the traditional forms while in the US there are fewer young people interested and less interested in the older styles. He also saw a shift in how people congregate. Much of this he attributed to increased drug use and how this impacted different generations of listeners. If younger generations are using drugs he said they are less like to go to bars to drink. In predominately African American neighborhoods where there is more perceived or actual drug use and illegal activity, older generations will stay home listening to recordings of blues for fear of traveling around in dangerous neighborhoods. Johnny described an increasingly common pattern of greater numbers of people staying home listening to recorded music resulting in a reduced need for live musicians and fewer venues needed for live music creating a vicious cycle moving away from live music played locally.

Johnny: When I was in South America, there's a little kid there. I been going to South America since 2008. He knows my shit. I don't have to tell him nothing, he knows it. And he got all my records and DVDs. He's only 33. But he knows my stuff. When I first met him, he was a little unpolished. But I kept explaining to him, and now I don't have no problem.
We only got one kid here locally. He's playing, still playing the blues. That's the only black kid you got in this city that's really playing the original blues. He's the only one left. Everybody else has changed

Mike: Less authentic traditional blues and more tourist attraction blues?

Johnny: All the real blues clubs closed now. Used to be on every corner you could find a blues club. The young crowd got into drugs. They're not drinking.

Mike: So not in the bars, anyway.

Johnny: Right!

Mike: And there's not as many.

Johnny: Right. And then a bar can't make no money if you're not drinking. There's a big difference. And now, the young whites, that's what you've got. In South America, seems every young kid you see, you got a harmonica, a guitar, a set of drums, trying to learn the blues….. It's a big difference now. If it weren't for whites, there wouldn't be no blues. Because black not supporting it.
Yeah, years ago, man, I could play six nights a week right here on the Westside in black clubs. Six nights a week. That don't happen no more. You ain't got nothing but tourists. Tourist blues.

Mike: Yeah, where else is there?

Johnny: That's about all you got. There used to be a club right down the street at 5105. I played there for nine years on Sunday night.

Mike: And now?

Johnny: Gone. At 345, I played them two clubs 11 years. Ain't there no more. Because now, the drugs.

Mike: So not drinking in the club.

Johnny: Right. Ain't none of the older black people that used to come out. Now a lot of them are afraid to come out, because so much shooting and shit going on. So the young whites, that's your crowd now. You go out now for blues at (a famous blues club), you count the blacks be in there.

Mike: Not very many.

Johnny: Right.

He continued and detailed some of the dynamic of the whitening of the audiences and even the players. Johnny credits white performers, mainly British, for saving the blues from

extinction. He sees the future as probably more white as well. But his concern is that the "whitening of the blues" will inevitably change it into a less true, less traditional form.

> Mike: I do, when I'm in the clubs I look for that. Yeah, I've noticed that very much. And I also-- so it's white, and it seems like less-- partly because they're young, but less informed. They just know less about the blues, or don't quite know—
>
> Johnny: They really don't know the blues. So anything you give them, they think is the blues.
>
> Mike: Right, because it's a black guy up there, it's got to be the blues.
>
> Johnny: Yeah. Well, I can understand it, because they really don't know real blues. They trying-- whatever they hear, they see a black guy, they're gonna think it's the blues. But it's not blues.
>
> Mike: Trying to capture that.
>
> Johnny: These guys aren't playing the blues-- Yeah.
> Well, what it is now, white people is singing the blues now. If it weren't for them, the blues would be gone. Black people going to rap and shit. Young black kids, you can't teach them no blues. They don't want-- they don't take time to listen.
> My grandkids tell me, "Granddad, you playing that old time shit." They don't understand. But the young whites are taking the blues. Look at that. Millionaires over what Howlin' Wolf and Muddy Waters made.
>
> Mike: Right, like you said, Rolling Stones come in and make $12 million.
>
> Johnny: In four nights!
> They don't know their own history. And they don't try to learn it. So if you don't want it? The blues be gone. And most of the real blues players now is all dead. So now they got that bullshit out there. And they don't know no different, because they haven't researched.

However, again, in a combination of archived original old style blues and a willingness to pay for and travel to see live blues, the situation is different in Europe and elsewhere. Keeping the blues alive in other countries means supporting live music and studying the recorded archives. If anywhere, he says, blues will be preserved by the interest outside of the US. Within the US he sees a continuing trend toward more commercially popular forms of blues, variations such as blues rock.

Johnny: But the peoples across the pond, they know. And you'd be surprised. And then guys can play the blues. They're not bullshitting. They're playing. Playing better than some guys here in Chicago.
Now, this fest I just did now in South America. I had one guy from Mississippi, and another guy from Chicago. We was the only three blacks there. All the rest of the band white. So they keeping it alive over there better than her in America, the real blues. They can't save it, but they be trying. And some of them is pretty good. Gonna be standard now.
Right, right. You can't hardly find a black-- and like I said, one boy. He the only black kid here in Chicago still playing the real blues. Nobody else. This guy from Toronto, Canada, he just come up. People, they think it's the blues.
He's not playing no fucking blues. It's bullshit. Not many playing the blues no more. It's a shame, but that's the way it is. No blacks are trying to stay traditional. They putting different shit in there, it's rock blues. They can make more money that way. Because when people don't know no better, they thinks it blues.

Mickey was more optimistic in his assessment of the future of the blues generally. Based on his experiences and his travel he was impressed with the desire for more live music. He forecasted a steady demand for the blues both in the US and in Europe. He was inclined to believe that interest in the blues was actually on the rise.

Mickey: I know it's gonna be forever, it ain't going nowhere. It's just gonna get better. It's gonna be just like Jack Daniels, just get better with time. With age, or whatever.

Mike: So you're not worried about the future of the blues.

Mickey: No, it's not going nowhere. It's gonna be here forever.

Mike: And as far as live performance of the blues, you feel like that's--

Mickey: Oh yeah, it's gonna be. I know there's more people-- like you just looking at this, or what we're doing these live performances in Spain, and Portugal, Holland.

Mike: Finland.

Mickey: Finland, Sweden, Norway. All of this, it's just great. I'm so glad I'm still around to be part of it. A lot of my great music buddies is gone and left me here to keep it alive. I'm trying to help everybody I can in this, to keep it alive. Because we're not gonna be here forever. At least I'm not.

Mike: Ha! I don't think anybody is, forever, right? But do you feel like there's enough people that are learning it, and are receiving it, and appreciating it enough? Keeping it

alive?

Mickey: Yeah, it's not going down the ditch. No. It's gonna be here forever.

Jimmy was also clearly optimistic about the prospects of more live music, in the US as well as abroad. He too saw the desire for blues, and more live blues, as likely to increase. When asked, as someone who has recorded music extensively for many decades, if he could identify what specifically would be the draw to live music venues rather than streaming video for example he offered a number of factors.

> Mike: I've heard some people are concerned that live music seems to be-- you know there's just so much recorded music, and it's so easy, and it's on YouTube, and iTunes, and streaming. But your experience has been that there's still a lot of demand for live music.
> So in terms of the future of the blues, do you think that there will be more live blues, in terms of live music? Less live, and more recorded? What's different? What's important? Can you kind of-- what's your sense?
>
> Jimmy: I think there's going to be more live blues. Because there's so many people that's never heard blues live. And I think there's an atmosphere that goes with the blues when you hear it live, as opposed to just hearing it recorded. It's a whole atmosphere that goes with being in a blues environment, a blues club or something. There's a good atmosphere of it.
> So I think that more of that is going to-- it's going to escalate, I think. With all the young players that are coming out now, they want to play blues in front of an audience, where they can hear all what they can do. So it's a good thing.
>
> Mike: So there'll be a lot of players that want to play. And you think that there are going to be audiences that want--
>
> Jimmy: They come to see them play.
>
> Mike: So it doesn't sound like you're too worried about the future of the blues.
>
> Jimmy: No, I think the future of the blues is in pretty good hands, I think so. The direction it's going, I think it is. No, I don't think so. I see a lot of people that are concerned about it, but I see the optimism of it. I think that they're very optimistic about the fact that there's going to be a lot of live, young players.

Jimmy saw a variety of factors increasing the interest in blues from university in person educational programs to the various foundations increasing awareness and appreciation of the blues. He saw his role as a kind of ambassador of the blues, his role, his opportunity to give back to the community. He welcomed any opportunity to meet personally with interested students and other community members to promote the blues.

> Mike: And when you're at a venue like university program, how would you describe the audiences there in terms of-- Is it kind of a college audience, younger, racially mixed?
>
> Jimmy: Oh yeah, a college audience. Racially mixed, college students, and then grown-ups, all there. They were all there.
>
> Mike: From the community.
>
> Jimmy: They were all there in the auditorium at the university, yeah. And they was really there for the blues, you could see. And the people that were promoting it from the university, they were students also, that promoted the concert. Which struck my interest, the fact that they were involved in putting on a blues concert, with all blues.
>
> Mike: So alive and well in Chicago, then.
>
> Jimmy: I think I'm going to continue what I'm doing, and being a merchant of the blues. And an enthusiast. I just want to be-- continue to and try and give back as much as I can to the blues. Because when you're given a precious gift, you should be able to and willing to share it with other people.
> Like, for instance, the younger people that are coming up now. That's what's going to carry the blues into the next generations. So I want to be as instrumental with that. Just like when I got the information, from the Memphis Blues Foundation, that you were coming over. I said, "Well, you just coming over to talk about the blues. We can talk about that." I appreciated it, you know.

Jackie also expressed concern that the future of the blues would entail less traditional and more hybrid and popularized forms of the blues. While he and a few others were keeping old style blues alive, he saw this as a likely direction that would be difficult to change. He and a few friends were the last keeping the old style alive.

Jackie: Yeah, I feel good. I put it to you this way, the type of blues that's mostly going now, they call it blues, but it ain't what you call the real blues. It's only a few peoples out there that's playing the real blues now. It's a very few now left that's playing the real blues.
They playing the blues, but it ain't-- it's a different style of blues. It's not like the blues that come from down-- back in the early years up until now, pretty much all of that is gone now. It's only a very few peoples.
I'm gonna say it's no more than five peoples that's doing the real blues. I mean, you know, blues like it was back in the day.
Some of the older guys still do. But some, you know, they plays the blues. But their blues is not what you call the totally true type blues, but he can play blues. The younger guys, they play blues, but it's a different type of blues that they play.
They don't play the old style blues, they don't play that kind of stuff. So the kind of stuff I do, it's really only a few people do the kind of stuff that I do.
Like I said, we're pretty much into a different blues now. And that's pretty much what it's going to be, as I can see it now, that's what it's coming into. And I think that's what it's going to be. Because the old school blues is gonna be going out, because there ain't gonna be nobody can do it, that's what the problem is. Ain't gonna be nobody can do it. That's what that's gonna be about.

Jackie too saw benefit in preserving old school, traditional blues through recordings. Though he saw traditional performers as being fewer and fewer in number, archived blues would enable future generations to appreciate the different feel and style of the kind of blues he plays. He described some of the nuanced differences between his style and that of younger players, a more laid back style less rushed and with more feeling.

Mike: So that won't be live, that will be just through the recordings. Through capturing those recordings.

Jackie: Yeah, it's going out, because it ain't gonna be nobody out there can do it. So it's got to go. The guys that's playing now, they can't play that kind of music. I can play it myself, but there's guys that can get on the bandstand, they're lost when it comes to that kind of music, because that ain't what they played. They just can't play it.
And it's not that hard to play, but you've got to know-- I'm gonna tell you how they play. Like in my music's, kind of laid back. You don't rush the singing. You're kind of laid back and give them a chance to get in there. But the new blues that these guys are playing today, it's just a straight through. It ain't no laying back, just steady playing all the way through. So that makes the difference right there.
So like the old school blues like I do, you don't just rush and do it like these guys. When they're trying to play it, they don't give you no breaks to get in there or anything, just

steady playing. The kind of stuff that I do is kind of a laid back, and you give the singer time to get out front, there. But the new stuff, it's not like that.
They play straight through, no breaks in there, don't give you no breaks. They'll start playing, you just got to get in there and start singing. That's the way it works with them. And when I get up with them guys, that's what I do. I just get in there and start singing, just keep on singing straight on through. Because that's the way they play it, so that's how you got to do it.

Mike: So you can't teach those young dogs new tricks, it sounds like, once they've learned it the other way.

Jackie: No, you can't do that. You can't do that, for sure. That you can't do.

Each musician was optimistic about the future of the blues generally, but several voiced concerns about the most vulnerable types of blues, the original, "old school" traditional blues. Interestingly, the regional styles of blues were quite different, southern delta blues, Chicago style blues, west coast and country blues, however, the concern was similar. They agreed that some kind of blues would survive and probably thrive, but it would be a more mainstream popular blues, more of a blues rock hybrid, rather than the type of blues for which these musicians were known.

Conclusion

Though highly overlapping and intertwined, this question set was effective in fleshing out some of the expected areas of concern regarding technology and its effect on blues music and musicians, and also some unexpected responses. Issues of the potential problem of compromising the 'realness' of traditional blues were common. But technology could also make it easier to collaborate with other younger musicians. The racial makeup of both audiences and band members have changed. All noticed a "whitening" effect but all also saw this as having a net positive effect on the demand for blues music. Styles of learning the blues were seen as always being medicated by technology to varying degrees. And all were extremely tolerant and

accepting of the newcomers to blues fandom even if they were not knowledgeable of the history or context of the blues. Each participant said that they had not changed their band composition much and they were all quite deliberate in their choices. This may in part be attributable to their success. There was an interesting interplay between live and recorded music in terms of extending the reach of blues music to new and expanding audiences. This was particularly evident in the success with European audiences. Appropriation of music was common as was expected. However, what was not expected was the amount of appropriation of authorship that occurred between fellow musicians. All musicians saw the blues thriving moving forward. However they did express concern about the loss of true, original blues.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

The results of these seven interviews revealed a complex picture of the impact of the most common music industry technologies and the lives and artistry of these musicians over the past 50 years. These interviews yield both areas of commonality as well as substantially divergent experiences of the interviewees and their contemporaries. Some interviews reinforced the common narrative, while other produced some unexpected insights.

Summary of Findings

This qualitative exploratory was designed to explore the social impacts of the profound technological changes that have occurred in the last 60 years, specifically to blues music and the artists who have produced it. A variety of ways were identified where technology had an impact on the music and social relations around it, both positively and negatively. Considerable variety was found within the responses of the participants with several areas of commonality as well.

After a great deal of time and several unsuccessful foundation partnerships, seven musicians who fit the research criteria responded to the call to participate initiated by the president and CEO of the Memphis Blues Foundation. These interviews were held at various locations in five different states widely dispersed in the US, all at the place of the interviewees choosing. The interviews took place from fall of 2017 to spring of 2018.

Establishing the necessary 6 – 8 participants was severely complicated by their celebrity status and the resulting protective efforts by agents, lawyers, staff, and family members, who saw their role as keeping the public, including researchers, at bay. Further complicating this was the related issue of each of these musicians having a long history of granting many interviews, introducing the potential issue of interview fatigue. While they had all been interviewed, some several dozens of times, the subject matter of this project was novel and fortunately of interest to all of them in the end. All were very engaged in the interviews and generously granted all the time needed to exhaust all of the interview questions, even if this entailed spending several hours doing so. While there are many interviews available in various other formats, such as magazines and blogs, none had looked specifically at the impact of technology over the past 60 years of accelerated change.

These semi-structured interviews consisted of six intertwined question areas relating to creative process, relationships changes, band composition, live music vs recorded music, the economic aspects the future of the blues, and blues appreciation, context and legacy. (Appendix A) The interviews produced rich and nuanced results. There were no "all or nothing" responses to the impact of technology on their craft and the surrounding relationships. Rather, each participant had a unique take on what was needed to successfully navigate the changes that had occurred during the many decades of their writing, performing and recording the blues.

Of the theories considered, the conceptual work of Bourdieu and of subsequent Bourdieu scholars seemed to have the most resonance with the themes, issues and language used by the participants. This study is intended to be an inductive exploratory project, attempting to create a starting point, focusing on the standpoint of the musicians, rather than making or committing to specific theoretical claims. However, theoretically looking through the Bourdieu's sociological

lens helps organize some of the dynamics identified. The main constructs offered in the Bourdieusian framework provide a way to begin to define the dynamics within a particular conceptual vocabulary.

Bourdieu's concept of fields can be instructive in looking at the interaction between overlapping settings such as that of performance of music and the field of the music industry with its different technicalities and legal intricacies. While musician agency is expected high in the performance arena, it is quite variable in the overlapping fields of the music industry. Each complex network of relations constitutes a different game with its own unique rules. Each has its own distribution of various types of capital which can be accumulated and reinvested. The more advantaged and privileged actors have the opportunity to amass more capital. And these fields are increasingly be suffused with technology. Technology has the potential to amplify power and can be seen as having the potential to increase or decrease the power differential in relationships through the various kinds of capital.

Bourdieu's conceptualization of *habitus* as it relates to the blues could be seen to be the individual musician's set of acquired schemata relating to blues knowledge and skill, their aesthetic sense and the unique styles and preferences they have relating to their music and the music of their fellow musicians. *Habitus* would also relate to who they learned their skills, from how they learned them and the resulting techniques and on a deeper level, their sense of feeling and the "soul" of their music. The learning process of blues musicians and how much it may or may not be mediated by varying amounts of technology, would be especially important as is this very subtle and nuanced feeling, realness or "soul" of the music that was most important to retain for reasons of being true to the music. Each participant reported this concern numerous times.

The various kinds of capital identified in Bourdieu's framework can also be helpful in understanding the field of blues music. The traditional forms of capital, economic, social and cultural, may also be enhanced by the newer categories of digital capital and information capital, though these may be better thought of as subcategories of the original three forms.

Economic capital takes several forms in the responses of the participants. Sometimes capital was literally having access to the most basic musical technology, the instruments themselves. At other times it might be the monetary means to produce music by having access to studio time or the ability to travel to performances. Or it may take the form of the ability to afford to retain a certain amount of inventory of their own recorded music that individual musicians sell directly to their audiences at live performances in order to realize a larger proportion of the profit.

Social capital took several forms unique to the blues music field. Several participants described having mentor relationships where they were forewarned to protect themselves against others in the industry who might take advantage of them directly by literally lifting part of their cash payments from their pay envelopes, or indirectly by inserting themselves in the writing process and taking some of the authorship credits. Social capital can also be seen as at play when fellow musicians help each other out by securing live performances or recording studio opportunities.

Cultural capital can be seen as the stature of mature successful blues musicians and the demand they command. The demand generated by the cultural artifacts of classic albums collected by committed fans in other countries can be seen as another form of cultural capital. This can then be reinvested by live performances overseas which is then again a reinforcing

capital. And at the base of all of this is the expertise and mastery in musicianship that each of these participants possesses.

"Digital capital", while not a traditional type of capital in Bourdieu's works, may prove to be a useful subcategory of economic, social or cultural capital or subcategories of each. (Ignatow & Robinson, 2017) The knowledge of computers and digital musical interfaces can be seen as a type of cultural capital that can be accumulated and would leverage further development of additional capital of various types. Several examples of this emerged in the interviews. An example of this type of capital is illustrated in Johnny's insistence on having his work released as a DVD with all the enhancements that accompany that format, despite his studio disagreeing and not providing this medium initially. Having trusted and skilled connections to highly skilled sound engineers with even more advanced digital skills is a type of capital several participants described as important to continuing to build on their digital competence.

Misrecognition and symbolic violence seem especially relevant given the dynamics described by the participants. Under the guise of doing business in an everyday manner, part or all of one's artistic work was routinely coopted by a producer, an agent and even by a fellow musician. Sometimes the victims of this cooptation were conscious of the abuse, either vaguely or fully. At other times they were completely unaware that this was taking place. And in other cases this was simply seen as the way of doing business and would then be reproduced in the treatment of less aware fellow musicians. The role that technology played in the perpetuation of symbolic violence was largely the increasing ease with which those with advanced recording technology could capture and transform an artist's work. This recorded form was then subject to

complex legal technologies that potentially distanced the artist from their work, further reducing their agency.

It may be too early in this exploratory stage of research to fully integrate a specific theoretical approach. However, with the further development of the subfield of Digital Sociology as described by Ignatow and Robinson, and others, this may be a fruitful application. Undoubtedly there will be other theoreticians in addition to Bourdieu's followers who will contribute to an increased interdisciplinary understanding of the impact of technology on a variety of aspects of social life. Future researchers may also benefit by developing out the connections between Bourdieu's theoretical approach.

Of note for each of these performers was that part of their success was the deliberate use of technology, a willingness to embrace and "roll with the changes" that this necessitated. It also follows that their successful careers may have resulted in less of a need to change their band size and composition if what they were doing led to sufficient demand and pay for their music, whereas it could be expected that more economically distressed less successful bands would be more likely to need to consider downsizing.

Unexpected responses were given around two areas in particular. One scenario, informally referred to as the "Blues Brothers question" dealt with the concern of younger fans coming to blues bars and feeling an overfamiliarity with the performers, not knowing their place, not acculturated to blues culture and unaware of the long and storied histories of older blues performers, rather basing their expectations on what they have seen about blues in popular culture, for example the Blues Brothers movies. While it was expected that the musicians would express some understandable amount of exhaustion and exasperation, the opposite was the case. Instead while each participant, while aware of this dynamic, expressed a very generous

interpretation of this behavior, attributing it to lack of education and lack of exposure, and then framing it as the beginning steps of a blues fan's journey.

The other question, the "taking the color out of the blues" question was a reference to a Stevie Ray Vaughn quote where he once said one of the things he felt best about contributing was "taking the color out of the blues." At the time Vaughn's statement was met with a variety of responses, some highly critical of this and seeing the "whitening of the blues" as highly problematic. Again, each interviewee had a very generous response to this, seeing in his comment an acknowledgement of the practical result of exposing the blues to a wider, and whiter, audience and the positive effect this had toward keeping blues alive. This pragmatism was reflected in many responses regarding how art changes, evolves, and how it was championed by white artists and audiences.

While the appropriation and theft of music and authorship was well known previously, an unexpected aspect was that musicians would also do this to fellow musicians. The thinking there, also very pragmatic, was that many did it, sometimes to each other, is what it is – you've got to watch out for yourself. The more fortunate were forewarned by older more experienced musicians who advised them to watch their backs. Others learned the hard way after being taken advantage of. Having fellow musicians and other music industry people watching your back was an important form of social capital that showed them the ropes and how to more skillfully play the game.

The theme of pragmatism also intersected with that of originality. Each participant described an approach to music technology that consisted of using a particular new technology for what it was good for and being suspect of when it might introduce too much unwanted change or intrusion on the artistic process and result in an inauthentic sound or blues experience.

These musicians all presented themselves as confident and relaxed with their positons as "blues elders" at this point in life. Most were working on side projects such as writing biographies, participating in educational workshops, doing educational tours, and participating in films about the blues. They all described being very grateful of their lives of making and playing the blues and saw their current contribution as giving back to their communities as an expression of thankfulness.

Some referenced the new Progress in the Music Modernization Act of 2018 as a sign of progress, especially the aspects of this law that address the pre-1972 sound recordings. Generally each was optimistic about blues music continuing as an art form. However, each worried about the loss of the more traditional earlier forms of the blues, styles that they all were still performing and promoting.

Discussion

While there have been many discussions about blues music and its history from a popular culture lens, there have been few from a formal sociological perspective. The growing subfield of digital sociology will undoubtedly add increasing depth to this discussion. Additionally, looking at this history through a social justice lens will inform the discussion further into areas where African American music was colonized by an industry that enjoyed tremendous profits while some musicians who authored the works that were so successful dies penniless.

With this very small very specific sample of blues musicians there are of course limits to the amount of generalization that is justified. These interviews all represent very successful musicians who adapted to technological changes and did well as a result. All were associated with the Blues Hall of Fame as award winners, inductees or nominees and therefore do not represent those many blues musicians who did not realize such levels of success.

There was a need to extensively limit biographical material. It was difficult to filter out so much interesting detail, but many details needed to be omitted due to the celebrity of all of the participants, as adding those details too much would reveal their identities.

The use of older participants to explore technology issues across the past sixty or more years of change was critical to this project. Also critical was maintaining a focus on the musician standpoint, hearing the voices of the musicians, rather than following the usual recommendations of interviewing previous interviewers, industry executives or historians, as was often suggested when gaining access to the musicians proved so difficult. The unique contribution to this project was the voices of the musicians themselves unmediated by the industry.

Finally, in hindsight it was extremely important to conduct face to face interviews rather than phone or video conference as had also been suggested. There were a number of obstacles that could only have been overcome by meeting in person. Changing addresses, confusion about the dates, the times, difficulty with hearing over the phone, establishing rapport, all would have led to compromised material had these interviews not occurred in person.

Suggestions for Future Research

This qualitative exploratory study was able to begin the exploration of the important question of the impact of technology on the social relations of blues musicians and their associates and audiences. The beginning point, of interviewing older African American male blues musicians, was very fruitful. And having this narrow definition of participation requirements in this study was necessary. However, this also sets the stage for a variety of fruitful variations on these parameters.

While beyond the scope of this study the standpoint of female blues artist would certainly bring even more important considerations regarding marginalization in a male dominated field of industry workers and musicians. However, this would likely present additional recruitment challenges to whoever attempts a study of this nature. All of the obstacles faced in contacting and engaging research participants would exist and then from an even smaller and shrinking pool of candidates. However this would be a fascinating direction to explore.

Using older adults in a retrospective way reflecting on the profound changes introduced by huge technological disruptions was extremely effective and produced valuable results. However, as previously noted, this is a population that is shrinking in size and due to their advanced years, their ability to participate in research of this type will become more difficult due to problems of health and cognitive functions, in particular memory. With the passing of time it will likely become more challenging for researchers to overcome these obstacles and engage a suitable number of older blues musicians male or female.

Younger musicians and audiences were an indirect part of this study. Researchers looking at younger musicians and audiences may wish to explore the different sensibilities about the importance of live music in this population. This may turn out to bifurcated between those who see the need for live roots music and those who are less interested in that issue and willing to have increasingly technologically produced and mediated musical entertainment. This too could have profound social implications.

Of particular related interest to the study of digital sociology might be the introduction of the conceptualization of "hyperability." Hyperability could be seen as a side effect of technology more generally characterized by a desensitization and ahistorical experience of the social and physical. With effortless access to seemingly unbounded resources and ease of mobility to them

an individual would lack an experience context and a sense of place due to the mediating impact of technology. The parallel to the usual conceptualization of disability would be that this is something that might be difficult to overcome and would place unique counterintuitive limitations on an individual. This concept could be used to begin to explore and explain the dynamic of a lack of context or place discussed above. A technologically medicated hyperability would enable young fans to have certain kinds of knowledge and exposure to vast amounts of recorded music without ever having met a musician, seen a live performance or visited a blues bar or festival. Certain kinds of knowledge would be overrepresented while others were lacking. It is easy to project how this dynamic could increase in coming years with further developments and greater reliance on technologically mediated musical experiences.

While this study focused on blues musicians who have been performing and recording for sixty or more years, this could be seen as a kind of "success bias". Less successful blues musicians may have a very different view of the role and impact of technology over the same period of time. These seven musicians were largely as busy as they wanted to be, and did not have to make extensive painful decisions about downsizing their bands, literally letting musicians go. However, from the standpoint of those less successful, displacement of live musicians by recorded music would mean literally being put out of work by this change. For musicians who now play alone, with partial or total digital accompaniment, the effects of decreased proportions of live to recorded music would feel much like other industries, for example auto workers being displaced by increasing proportion of robotics.

While this study focused on older African American musicians, it would be instructive to explore similar issues with other races and ethnicities. For example, it may well be that musicians in Latin America experience some version of these same issues. Similarly, it would

be interesting to explore these dynamics cross culturally and internationally. The colonization of music may have common themes despite international borders. Likewise, other genres could be explored in a similar manor i.e. jazz, folk, or indigenous music.

While interviewing older adults, those who have experienced the substantial changes of the last sixty years, was extremely satisfying for this project, future researchers should be aware of the health limitations, cognitive and physical, that may impede the interview process. However, this should not deter from the fruitful interviewing of senior adults in a life review model when exploring the exponential changes of the past century.

Perhaps the most significant dynamic for further study is the pattern described by several interviewees of some musicians reproducing the exploitation of their fellow musicians in light of the discrimination they experienced in the Jim Crow era. The pragmatism that was employed to determine how to best accommodate technological changes may have also been a critical aspect of their response to oppressive systemic conditions beyond their control. Grudging compliance to a system where many African American musicians experienced disempowerment was certainly a central theme to traditional blues lyrics.

Conclusion

Many questions remain to be explored in the area of sociology of culture generally and in around the phenomenon of blues music in particular. As the subfield of Digital Sociology matures, these studies will also undoubtedly be explored in more depth with increasingly sophisticated sociological tools and theories. Rapid societal changes disrupt many areas of life impacted by in the uses of technology and concerns about disruption, displacement and decreased quality of social interactions. We now see profound shifts in areas as wide ranging as education, psychotherapy, agriculture, entertainment, law and medicine. The perspective of

older adults whose standpoint looks back over a time of great acceleration of technological change will always have great value and we should listen and learn from their unmediated voices while we still have time with them with us.

The role technology plays generally, and in blues culture more specifically, is complex and varied. However, for all its impact, there are still aspects that are relatively under-examined in proportion to their consequence. This study has attempted to shine a light on some of them. By listening directly to the voices of older blues musicians, their standpoint has been put forward. What we hear from them is that there is value in adaptation. But caution must be exercised. While each of them has successfully navigated the changes of the last 60 or more years, there is also reason to be concerned about what is lost. One of the unintended consequences of accelerated change is the potential loss of original, authentic, older styles of music that may not be possible to recover. But technology may have a role in the preservation of these aspects of culture as well by creating a detailed archive. The picture these seven artists paint for us is one of opportunity, of creativity, expanding audiences and access, of engaging younger and more diverse musicians and audiences. And they also imagine a future with unknown changes that will continue to be increasingly mediated by the technologies involved in the producing and experiencing music, encouraging us to be cautiously hopeful in the future of the blues.

REFERENCES

Alvarez, S. E., Dagnino, E., & Escobar, A. (1998). *Cultures of politics/politics of cultures: Re-visioning Latin American social movements*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

The American political science association. (2007). Retrieved from http://www.apsanet.org/.

Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., & Thorne, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eye? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education, 22*(2), 187-203.

Avanti, P. (2015). Captivating Technologies. *Technology & Culture, 56*(1), 150-183.

Avoiding plagiarism is too hard! (2007). Retrieved from http://www.coedu.usf.edu/~dorn/Tutorials/plagiarism/toohard.htm.

Axelrod, C. D. (1979). *Studies in intellectual breakthrough: Freud, Simmel, Buber*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Baggaley, J., Spencer, B. (2005). The mind of a plagiarist. *Learning, Media and Technology, 30*(1), 55-62. doi:10.1080/13581650500075587.

Barnes, L. (2004). *Senate ad hoc committee on plagiarism,* Dalhousie University.

Basalla, G. (1988). *The evolution of technology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Batagelj, Z., Lozar, K., & Vehovar, V. (1998). ``Who are nonrespondents in Web surveys?''. In *9th International Workshop on Household Survey Non-response.* Bled, Slovenia.

Baumol, W., Bowen, W. (1966). *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.

Bayton, M. (1989). *How women become rock musicians (*doctoral dissertation) University of Warwick, Coventry: England.

Becker, H. (1974). Art as collective action. *American Sociological Review 39*(6), 767–776.

Becker, H. (1982). *Art Worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Becker, H. (2004). Jazz places. In Bennett A and Peterson R (Eds.), *Music Scenes* (17-30). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Behr, A., Brennan, M., & Cloonan, M. (2014). The cultural value of live music from the pub to the stadium: getting beyond the numbers.

Behr, A., Brennan, M., & Cloonan, M. (2014). Cultural value and cultural policy: some evidence from the world of live music. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 1-16.

Bell, D. (2001). *An introduction to cybercultures*. London; New York: Routledge.

Benjamin, W. (1968). *Illuminations, 241*(2). Random House LLC.

Bennet, A. (2005). *Culture and everyday life*. London: Sage Publications.

Berger, P. L., & Luckman, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Berry, W. (1996). *The unsettling of America: Culture and agriculture*.

Bielby, D. D. (2008). The depth of shallow culture. *Contemporary Sociology, 37* (5), 448-50.

Blakley, T. J. (1994). Strategies for distance learning. *Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 6*, 4-7.

Blues Heaven Foundation. (2019). Retrieved from http://www.bluesheaven.com/about-1.html.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). *On television* (P. Parkhurst Ferguson Trans.). New York, NY: New Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Braumoeller, B. F., & Gaines, B. J. (2007). Actions do speak louder than words: Deterring plagiarism with the use of plagiarism - detection software. Retrieved from http://www.apsanet.org/content_12743.cfm.

Brodsky, M. (1995). Blues Musicians' Access to Health Care. *Medical Problems of Performing Artists, 10*(1), 18-23.

Bryce, R. (2014). *Smaller Faster Lighter Denser Cheaper: How Innovation Keeps Proving the Catastrophists Wrong*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.

Bryson, B. (1996). "Anything but heavy metal": Symbolic exclusion and musical dislikes. *American Sociological Review, 61*(5), 884-899. Retrieved from http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-1224%28199610%2961%3A5%3C884%3A%22BHMSE%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0.

Bull, J., Collins, C., Couglin, E., & Sharp, D. (2006). *Technical review of plagiarism detection software report*. University of Luton and Computer-assisted Assessment Center: The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Calhoun, C., Rojek, C., & Turner, B. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of sociology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Carnevale, D. (1999). Colleges strive to give disabled students access to on-line courses. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 46* (10), A69-A69.

Carr, S. (2000). Companies Use Online 'Universities' to Lure Customers. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 46* (42), A47-A47. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com/article/Online-Universities-Created/106567.

Carroll, J. (2004-05). A handbook for deterring plagiarism in higher education. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education,* (1), 119.

Chung, W., Chen, H., Chang, W., & Chou, S. (2006). Fighting cybercrime: A review and the Taiwan experience. *Decision Support Systems, 41*(3), 669-682. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2004.06.006.

Clifford, J., Marcus, G. E., & School of American Research (Santa Fe, N.M.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography: A school of American research advanced seminar*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Coe, J. A., & Elliott, D. (1999). An evaluation of teaching direct practice courses in a distance education program for rural settings. *Journal of Social Work Education, 35*(3).

Coe, J. A., & Menon, G. M. (Eds.). (1999). *Computers and information technology in social work education, training and practice*. New York, NY: The Haworth Press.

Collins, M. E., & Amodeo, M. (2005). Responding to plagiarism in schools of social work: Considerations and recommendations. *Journal of Social Work Education. Special Issue: Innovations in Gerontological Social Work Education, 41*(3), 527-543.

Corden, A., & Sainsbury, R. (2006). *Using verbatim quotations in reporting qualitative social research: researchers' views* (pp. 11-14). York: University of York. Retrieved from https://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru/pubs/pdf/verbquotresearch.pdf.

Coser, L. A. (1965). *Georg Simmel* (Vol. 119). Prentice-Hall.

Coser, Lewis A. (1971). Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in historical and social context. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, Inc.

Cowen, T. (1997). *In praise of commercial culture*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Crane, D. (1995). *The sociology of culture: Emerging theoretical perspectives*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Croall, S. (1981). *Ecology*. New York, NY: Pantheon.

Crossley, N. (2015). Music worlds and body techniques: On the embodiment of musicking. *Cultural Sociology*, 9(4), 471-492. https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975515576585.

Culwin, F. (2006). An active introduction to academic misconduct and the measured demographics of misconduct. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. Special Issue: Plagiarism: Prevention, Practice and Policy, 31*(2), 167-182. doi:10.1080/02602930500262478.

Curran, J., Gurevitch, M., & Woollacott, J. (1979). *Mass communication and society*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Cushman, T. (1995). *Notes from underground: Rock music counterculture in Russia*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

DeCurtis, A., Henke, J., & George-Warren, H. (1992). *The rolling stone illustrated history of rock & roll: The definitive history of the most important artists and their music* (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.

DeNora, T. (2000). *Music in Everyday Life*. Port Chester, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Doğantan Dack, M. (2012). The art of research in live music performance. *Music Performance Research, 5*, 34-48.

Douglas, M. (1975). *Implicit meanings: Essays in anthropology*. London, Boston: Routledge & Paul.

Douglas, M. (1986). *How institutions think* (1st ed.). Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

Ebo, B. (Ed.). (1998). *Cyberghetto or cybertopia? : Race, class, and gender on the internet*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Eliasoph, N. (1998). *Avoiding politics: How Americans produce apathy in everyday life*. Cambridge, UK; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/catdir/description/cam028/97027918.html; Materials specified: Publisher description http://www.loc.gov/catdir/description/cam028/97027918.html.

Elkins, W., Cohen, D., Koralewicz, L., & Taylor, S. (2004). After school activities, overweight, and obesity among inner city youth. *Journal of Adolescence, 27*(2), 181-189.

Ellis, F. (2002). Political correctness and the ideological struggle: From Lenin and Mao to Marcuse and Foucault. *The Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies, 27*(4), 409-444. Retrieved from http://www.reason.com.

Ellul, J., Wilkinson, J., & Merton, R. K. (1964). The technological society (Vol. 303). New York: Vintage books.

Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, Il: The University of Chicago Press.

Epstein, S. (2008). Culture and Science/Technology: Rethinking knowledge, power, materiality, and nature. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 619*(1), 165-182. doi:10.1177/0002716208319832.

Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the third world*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press. Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/prin031/94021025.html.

Evans, R. (2006). Evaluating an electronic plagiarism detection service: The importance of trust and the difficulty of proving students don't cheat. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 7*(1), 87-99. doi:10.1177/1469787406061150.

Freeney, M. (1998). *Terminal consent*. Orlando, FL: W. Austin Publishers.

Frith, S. (2007). Live music matters. Scottish music review. *Indeterminacy and Technology*, *1*(1), 1-17.

Freud, S., & Sigmund Freud Collection (Library of Congress). (1962). *Civilization and its discontents. Uniform title: Unbehagen in der kultur. English* (1st American ed.). New York: W.W. Norton.

Future of Music Coalition. (2015) Retrieved from https://money.futureofmusic.org/.

Fryer. (1998). The 'discovery' and appropriation of African music and dance. *Race & Class*, *39*(1-20).

Gallaway, T., & Kinnear, D. (2001). Unchained melody: A price discrimination-based policy proposal for addressing the MP3 revolution. *Journal of Economic Issues*, *35*(2), 279.

Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual review of sociology*, *18*(1), 373-393.

Garland, D., & Escobar, D. (1988). Education for cross-cultural social work practice. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *24*(3), 229-241.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures; selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Giles, J. (2005). Taking on the cheats. *Nature, 435*(7040), 258-259. doi:10.1038/435258a.

Gitlin, T. (1978). Media sociology: The dominant paradigm. *Theory and Society, 6*, 205--254.

Gitlin, T. (2003). *The whole world is watching.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Glendinning, C. (1990). *When technology wounds*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Globalization and feminist activism. (2005). *Women & Environments International Magazine,* (64/65), 4-40.

Goling, S. (1997). *The eight technologies of otherness*. London; New York: Routledge.

Goodwin, A. (1992). *Dancing in the distraction factory: Music television and popular culture.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

GovTrack.us. (2019). H.R. 4706 — 115th Congress: Music Modernization Act of 2017. Retrieved from https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/115/hr4706.

Grant, G., & Grobman, L. (1998). *The social worker's internet handbook*. Harrisburg, PA: White Hat Communications.

Griswold, W. (1981). American character and the American novel: An expansion of reflection theory in the sociology of literature. *American Journal of Sociology, 86*(4), 740-765.

Griswold, W. (1987). The fabrication of meaning: Literary interpretation in the United States, Great Britain, and the West Indies. *American Journal of Sociology, 92*(5), 1077-1117.

Griswold, W. (1987). A methodological framework for the sociology of culture. *Sociological Methodology, 17*, 1-35.

Griswold, W. (1992). The sociology of culture: Four good arguments (and one bad one). *Acta Sociologica, 35*(4), 323-328. doi:10.1177/000169939203500405.

Griswold, W. (1994). *Cultures and societies in a changing world*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press. Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0655/93044571-d.html.

Griswold, W. (1992). The sociology of culture: four good arguments (and one bad one). *Acta Sociologica, 35*(4), 323-328.

Halsey, A. H. (1994). Sociology as political arithmetic (the glass memorial lecture). *The British Journal of Sociology, 45*, 427-444.

Harding, S. (1998). *Is science multicultural? Postcolonialisms, feminisms, and epistemologies*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Harding, S., & Narayan, U. (2001). *Decentering the center: Philosophy for a multicultural, post-colonial and feminist world*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Hart Fund. (2019). Retrieved from https://blues.org/hart-fund.

Heidegger, M. (1977). *The question concerning technology* (pp. 3-35). New York: Harper & Row.

Hill, M, Hartshorne, S & Jacka, L (2014). 'Live music performance in virtual worlds: six musicians' experiences', in J O'Regan & T Wren (eds), *Proceedings of the 2013 IASPM-ANZ Conference: Communities, Places, Ecologies*, Queensland Conservatorium, Griffith University, 24-26 November, IASPM Australia/New Zealand, Brisbane, Qld., pp. 23-32. ISBN: 9780975774779.

hooks, bell (1992). Black Looks: Race and Representation. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Hoskins, J. (2009). The Camera as Global Vampire: The Distorted Mirror of Photography in Remote. M. Robinison, D. Picard (Eds.) *The framed world: Tourism tourists and photography*, Ashgate, London (2009), pp. 151-168.

Hutchinson, L. (2011, November). Bonnie Raitt's Life of Giving Back to the Blues. *Performing Songwriter*, Retrieved from http://performingsongwriter.com/bonnie-raitt-rhythm-and-blues-foundation.

Ignatow, G., & Robinson, L. (2017). Pierre Bourdieu: *Theorizing the digital. Information, Communication & Society*, 20(7), 950-966.

Inglis, D. (2005). *Culture and everyday life*. London: Routledge.

Jackson, W. (1990). *New roots for agriculture*. Lincoln, ME: University of Nebraska Press.

Jacobs, M. D., & Hanra, N. W. (Eds.). (2005). *The Blackwell companion to the sociology of culture.* West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Jacobus, P. (2002). *CNET:* Are you afraid of the internet? Retrieved from https://www.cnet.com/news/are-you-afraid-of-the-internet.

Jepperson, R. L., & Swidler, A. (1994). What properties of culture should we measure? *Poetics*, *22*(4), 359-371.

Jones, L., & Baraka, A. (1963). Blues people: Negro music in white America (p. 106). New York, NY: Morrow.

Kamenka, E. (1983). *The portable Karl Marx*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Kilbourne, J. (1999). *Deadly persuasion: The addictive power of advertising*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Trade.

Killer Blues Headstone Project. Retrieved from http://www.killerblues.net.

King, A. D. (1997). *Culture, globalization, and the world-system: Contemporary conditions for the representation of identity*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Kot, G. (2018, September 01). *Willie Dixon's Heavenly Legacy*. Retrieved from https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/ct-xpm-1993-12-17-9312170308-story.html.

Kraut, R., Lundmark, V., Patterson, M., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W. (2000). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well-being? *American Psychologist, 55*(9), pp.1-10.

Kreuger, A. (2005) 'The Economics of Real Superstars: the Market for Rock Concerts in the Material World', *Journal of Labor Economics*, *23*(1), pp.1-30.

Kreuger, L., & Stretch, J. (2000). How hypermodern technology in social work education bites back. *Journal of Social Work Education, 36*(1), 103-114.

Kuhn, T. (1996). *Structure of scientific revolution.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: The social construction of scientific facts*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Macdonald, R., & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism--a complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. Special Issue: Plagiarism: Prevention, Practice and Policy*, *31*(2), 233-245. doi:10.1080/02602930500262536.

Magaudda, P. (2011). When materiality 'bites back': Digital music consumption practices in the age of dematerialization. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *11*(1), 15-36.

Mahon, M. (2000). Black like this: Race, generation and rock in the post civil rights era. *American Ethnologist*, *27*(2), 283.

Mander, J. (1978). *Four arguments for the elimination of TV*. New York, NY: William Morrow & Co.

Mander, J. (1993). In the Absence of the Sacred. Athabasca, AB. *Trumpeter*, *10*(4).

Mannheim, K. (2012). *Essays on the Sociology of Culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

Markham, A. N. (1998). *Life online: Researching real experience in virtual space* (Vol. 6). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Marontate, J. (2005). Digital recording and the reconfiguration of music as performance. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *48*(11), 1422-1438.

Marsh, C., & West, M. (2003). The Nature/Technology Binary Opposition Dismantled in the Music of Madonna and Björk. *Music and technoculture*. Pp 182-203.

Martin, L. H., Gutman, H., & Hutton, P. H. (1988). *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

McCullough, M., & Holmberg, M. (2005). Using the google search engine to detect word-for-word plagiarism in master's theses: A preliminary study. *College Student Journal, 39*(3), 435-441.

McKeever, L. (2006). Online plagiarism detection services--saviour or scourge? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. Special Issue: Plagiarism: Prevention, Practice and Policy, 31*(2), 155-165. doi:10.1080/02602930500262460.

McKenzie, J. (1998). The new plagiarism: Seven antidotes to prevent highway robbery in an electronic age. *From Now on: The Educational Technology Journal, 7*(8) pp.1-22.

McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media: The extensions of man.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McLuhan, M. and Fiore, Q.(1967) The Medium is the Massage, New York, NY: Bantam. Retrieved from http://www.alibris.com/subjects/entertainment/feature-author.

Merton, R. (1968). *Social theory and social structure* (1968 enl. ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Meszaros, I. (1972). *Marx's theory of alienation*. London: Merlin P. London.

Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. *Adult Education, 32*, 3-24.

Middleton, R. (1963). Alienation, race, and education. *American Sociological Review*, *28*(6), 973-977.

Miller, J. (1980). *The rolling stone illustrated history of rock & roll* (Rev. and updated.). New York, NY: Rolling Stone.

Mills, M. (1997). *Turning away from technology*. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.

Mortera-Gutierrez, F. (2006). Faculty best practices using blended learning in E-learning and face-to-face instruction. *International Journal on E-Learning, 5*(3), 313-337.

Murray, J. A., Bradley, H., Craigie, W. A., & Onions, C. T. (1933). *The Oxford English dictionary* (Vol. 1). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Murray, L. J. (2008). Plagiarism and copyright infringement. *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: Teaching writing in the digital age*, 173-182.

National Telecommunications and Information Administration. (1995). *FALLING THROUGH THE NET: A Survey of the "Have Nots" in Rural and Urban America | National Telecommunications and Information Administration*. Retrieved from http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fallingthru.html.

Neyzi, L. (2002). Embodied elders: space and subjectivity in the music of the Metin-Kemal Kahraman. *Middle Eastern Studies*, *38*(1), 89-109.

Nie, N., & Erbring, L. (2000). Internet and Society: A Preliminary Report. Stanford Institute for the Quantitative Study of Society (SIQSS). *Stanford University, and InterSurvey Inc. Zugriff am*, *10*(07), 2014. Retrieved from http://www.nomads.usp.br/documentos/textos/cultura_digital/tics_arq_urb/internet_society%20report.pdf.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (2000). *Mount Holyoke Finds That Web Publishing Improves Class Instruction*. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com/article/Mount-Holyoke-Finds-That-Web/104995.

Pappenheim, F. (1959). *The alienation of man*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Pescosolido, B. A., Grauerholz, E., & Milkie, M. A. (1997). Culture and conflict: The portrayal of blacks in U.S. children's picture books through the mid- and late-twentieth century. *American Sociological Review*, *62*(3), 443-464. Retrieved from

http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-1224%28199706%2962%3A3%3C443%3ACACTPO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-J.

Peterson, R. A., & Berger, D. G. (1975). Cycles in symbol production: The case of popular music. *American Sociological Review, 40*(2), 158-173. Retrieved from http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-1224%28197504%2940%3A2%3C158%3ACISPTC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-4.

Peterson, R. A., & Berger, D. G. (1996). Measuring industry concentration, diversity, and innovation in popular music. *American Sociological Review, 61*(1), 175-178. Retrieved from http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-1224%28199602%2961%3A1%3C175%3AMICDAI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-2.

Pittman-Munke, P., & Berghoef, M. (2008). Plagiarism & fair use webography: An annotated list of web sites related to plagiarism and fair use. *Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics, 5*(1).

Pittman-Munke, P., & Berghoef, M. (2008). Tackling plagiarism: Linking hi-tech, lowtech & no-tech methods for detection. *Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics, 5*(1).

Postman, N. (1993). *Technopoly, the surrender of culture to technology*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Press, A. L. (1994). The sociology of cultural perception: Notes towards an emerging paradigm. In D. Crane (Ed.), *Sociology of culture: Emerging theoretical perspectives* (pp. 221-245). London: Basil Blackwell.

Hamlin, L. S., & Ryan, W. T. (2003). Probing for plagiarism in the virtual classroom. The iDeal Reader, 214-17.

Robinson, M., & Picard, D. (Eds.). (2009). *The Framed World: tourism, tourists and photography*. Ashgate, London: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Rosen, L. D., & Weil, M. M. (1995). Adult and teenage use of consumer, business, and entertainment technology: Potholes on the information superhighway? *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 29*(1), 55-84.

Rhythm & Blues Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.rhythmnblues.org.

Schiller, H. (1991). *Culture, INC.: The corporate takeover of public expression.* Oxford, England, UK: Oxford University Press, Incorporated.

Schumacher, E. F. (1989). *Small is beautiful: Economics as if people mattered*. New York, NY: Harper Trade.

Sheehan, K., & Hoy, M. (1999). Using email to survey internet users in the US: Methodology and assessment. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communications, 4*(3), 1.

Silverstone, R. (1994). The power of the ordinary: On cultural studies and the sociology of culture. *Sociology, 28,* 991-1001.

Simmel, G. (1959) *Sociology of Religion* (Curt Rosenthal, Trans). New York, NY: Philosophical Library, Inc.

Simmel, G. (1950). *The sociology of Georg Simmel* (K. H. Wolff Trans.). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Simmel, G. (1955). *Conflict, the web of group-affiliations* (K. H. Wolff, R. Bendix Trans.). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Simmel, G. (1968). *The conflict in modern culture and other essays* (K. P. Etzkorn Trans.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Simmel, G. (1971). *On individuality and social forms; selected writings*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Simmel, G. (1978). *The philosophy of money*. London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Solomon, J., & George, C. (1999). *Attachment disorganization*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Spicer, E. H. (1965). *Human problems in technological change*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review, 51*, 273-286.

Szabo, A., & Underwood, J. (2004). Cybercheats: Is information and communication technology fueling academic dishonesty? *Active Learning in Higher Education, 5*(2), 180-199. doi:10.1177/1469787404043815.

Tenner, E. (1997). *Why things bite back, technology and the revenge of unintended consequences*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Tenner, E. (2003). *Our own devices, the past and future of body technology*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Thompson, P., & Lashua, B. (2014). Getting it on record: Issues and strategies for ethnographic practice in recording studios. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *43*(6), 746-769.

Twain, M. (1917). *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's court*. New York, NY: Harper.

Vaughan, N. (2007). *Perspectives on blended learning in higher education*. *International Journal on E-Learning, 6*(1), 81-94.

Vernon, L., & Lynch, D. (2000). *Social work and the web*. Stanford, CT: Brooks/Cole.

Vernon, R. F., Bigna, S., & Smith, M. L. (2001). Plagiarism and the Web. *Journal of Social Work Education, 37*(1), 193-196.

Volvic, T. (2000). *Author warns that the digital age will be no utopia.*

Walther, J. B. (1997). Group and interpersonal effects in international computer-mediated collaboration. *Human Communication Research, 23*, 342-369.

Waterhouse, S., & Rogers, R. O. (2004). [*The Importance of Policies in E-Learning Instruction*] *Educause Quarterly, 3*, 28-44.

Weber, M. (1958). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (Student's ed.). New York, NY: Scribner.

Williams, R. (1995). *The sociology of culture/ Raymond Williams; with a new foreword by Bruce Robbins*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wolff, J. (1999). Cultural studies and the sociology of culture. *Contemporary Sociology, 28*(5), 499-507. Retrieved from http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0094-3061%28199909%2928%3A5%3C499%3ACSATSO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-I.

Appendix A - Questions and Prompts

Interview Guide: **Questions and Prompts**

Introduction, confirmation of demographics, background

Confirm stage name, legal name, age, band information

[Initial prompt: How long together? Composition? Your role? Primarily live performances? Recording history?]

1. Creative process

1. Can you describe any changes in your creative process from the introduction of new technologies over the years, for example ways that it impacted your song writing, working out lyrics, melodies, harmonies? [Prompt: Did ICTs put you more or less in touch with creating, performing or recording the blues?
2. Was there ever an ideal period when enjoyed your music most or felt the most creative? [Prompt: Or accomplishment most proud of? What do you attribute that to? ICT involved at that time?]
3. Do you recall any changes that occurred in stage presence or performing due to the introduction of new technologies? [Prompt: Ways that you had to adapt? Or new opportunities? Possible examples, cameras, wireless mics]
4. Were there ever times when you were hesitant to embrace new technologies that became available? [Prompts: Describe the reasons for your hesitancy. Describe any pressures to adopt. Did you/could you say no? Generally are you hesitant/suspicious vs eager to adopt? Nostalgic? Pragmatic?]

2. Relationship changes:

5. Has your audience or your relationship with the audience changed over the years you've been performing? [Prompt: Age, class, race, gender? Knowledge of songs from recordings/lack of knowledge of songs/iPhones due to technology?]
6. Has your band changed over the years you've been performing?
7. Have the Producers/Support personnel/Executives changed? [Prompt: Prompts: Age, class, race, gender mix?]
8. Can you describe how you learned to play the blues? [Prompts: Records? People? Radio? Different than those learning now, i.e. Mentors or Technology now in learning the blues? Recordings? YouTube? PowerTabs? Lit fret board or keyboard?]
9. Were there any particular technology advances that you can recall that especially impacted you personally over the years? For example, Albums? Reel to reel recording tapes? 8 tracks? CDs? Movies? CCTV? Streaming audio? iPhones? MP3s? Yelp? www.findmeabluesbarnow.com

3. Band size and composition:

10. Has your band size or composition changed over the years? [Prompt: Increased or decreased over time? Reasons why? Economics? Other? ICT changes that might have contributed to this, i.e digital drummers/drum replacement, amplification, effects or keyboard enhancements?

4. Live vs recorded music

11. Do you think Blues music has been changed by the introduction of music related technologies? [Prompt: Positive effect? Negative? Mixed? Can you describe how? Has technology made you or your music more accessible? Has this been positive overall? Negative? Mixed?]
12. What are your thoughts on the quality and the experience of live vs recorded or digitized music? [Prompt: What is either gained or lost in sound or with a specific technology? Advantages/benefits of F2F w performers?]
13. Do you ever feel pressure to reproduce what has been recorded? [Prompt: Perfectionism, Audience expectations? Set list selection? Requests from yours or someone else's catalog?]
14. Has your relationship (closeness/distance) with the audience changed over the years? [Prompt: Due to any of the changes in the technology present? CCTV, Atmosphere? Preoccupation with phones/selfies/videos/sharing?]
15. Has the easy exposure to blues online changed the type of audience member in live shows? [Prompt: Either a more or a less educated "Blues Brothers" type audience members? Has it changed the "etiquette" or knowing how to behave or knowing one's place in a blues club? Inappropriate level of intimacy, boundaries or overfamiliarity?]

5. Business / Economics

16. Was recording music a significant part of your career? [Prompt: Was your recording studio experience enjoyable? Just work? Tedious? Better from ICTs?]
17. Have you experienced a change in the level of control over artistic decisions in your recorded music?
18. How would you describe the fairness of your financial compensation compared to others involved in the process of live performance? In the recording process?
19. Was there ever an issue with credit for your written material? Or recognition? Money? Copyright? How did that occur?
20. Has the introduction of music technologies directly affected you financially? In what ways? Has it affected others you've known? [Prompt: Examples where the use of technology helped you financially? Disadvantaged you? Both/mixed? i.e. CD sales, Napster/illegal downloads, legal downloads/file sharing, online exposure, direct streaming, CCTV, MP3s]

6. Blues Appreciation / Legacy / Future of Blues Music

21. Tell me about the importance of history and storytelling in the blues?
22. Has technology impacted this? [Prompt: Proportion of live/recorded]
23. What is the importance of a "sense of place" in the blues? [Prompt: Is being in Chicago important as opposed to anywhere else? Or anywhere?]
24. Have you felt a change in the level of respect over your career? [Prompt: Audience members knowing history? How are audiences "trained" by ICTs? Knowing one's place in F2F interactions? – i.e. unwarranted intimacy or overfamiliarity]
25. In the future do you think there will be more or less live blues music? [Prompt: A good direction? Bad? Is it Problematic? Both? What do you think would be the right proportion of live to recorded music?]
26. Have you encountered young people who are concerned or think live music is less important? Or more?
27. Does it matter if more young people are learning through "gadgets" rather than people? [i.e. YouTube, Lit fret boards or keyboards?]
28. What do you think will happen next in blues music? [Prompt: Is that future OK? Problematic? What do think the future of blues and technology will look like?]
29. Is there anything else you'd like to tell me about being a blue's musician using technology over the years in your craft?

Appendix B - Chronology of ICTs

Chronology of ICTs of Interest for Prompts

Amplification
Radio
45s/LPs/Albums
Recording tapes
Recording studios?
Movies?
8 tracks
Band in a Box or Dr Drum digital drummer / Drum replacement software/hardware?
CDs
CC TV on monitors?
Band or venue web sites?
Digital music formats?
MP3s
Napster/Online File sharing
iPhones / Smartphones (Selfies or recording live performances?)
Yelp or "Find me a blues bar.com"
Audio streaming i.e. Pandora, Tidal, Spotify?
Video streaming i.e. YouTube?
Band or venue websites or Facebook pages?
Learning technologies, lit fret or keyboards, PowerTabs, virtual instruments

Appendix C - Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Letter of Approval

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Date: July 6, 2017

To: David Hartmann, Principal Investigator
Michael Berghoef, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 17-06-09

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled "At the Crossroads of Race, Class, and Culture: Unintended Consequences of Technology" has been **approved** under the **expedited** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may **only** be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project (e.g., ***you must request a post approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under "Number of subjects you want to complete the study***)." Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: **July 5, 2018**

1903 W. Michigan Ave., Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5456
PHONE: (269) 387-8293 FAX: (269) 387-8276
CAMPUS SITE: 251 W. Walwood Hall

Western Michigan University
H.S.I.R.B.
Approved for use for one year from this date:

JUL 06 2017

HSIRB Office

Informed Consent Form
Western Michigan University
Department of Sociology

Principal Investigator: Dr David Hartmann
Student Investigator: Michael Berghoef

Title of Study: At the Crossroads of Race, Class and Culture: Identifying the Unintended Consequences of Technology on the Agency of Blues Musicians

You have been invited to participate in a research project titled "At the Crossroads of Race, Class and Culture: Identifying the Unintended Consequences of Technology on the Agency of Blues Musicians". This project will serve as Michael Berghoef's dissertation for the requirements of the PhD in Sociology. This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?
This study aims to explore the influence of new technologies on the economic and social relationships of blues artists across the past 50 years. Specifically did advances in technology benefit the artists and their communities, or did technology create a greater divide between the artists and the economic and social benefits of their music?

Who can participate in this study?
You can participate in this study if you are a blues musician/performer/recording artist who has been playing or recording for at least 40 years.

Where will this study take place?
The interviews will take place at the The Blues Foundation, 421 S. Main St., Memphis, TN, or at an alternate more convenient location of the interviewees choosing.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study?
The interview should take approximately 2 – 4 hours. A follow up meeting may be requested for clarification if this is agreeable to the interviewee.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?
Interviews will consist of life review of the past 40 – 60 years of blues musicianship with particular attention to the changes in technology over that period of time and how those changes have led to either benefits or disadvantages as an artist.

What information is being measured during the study?
The purpose of the study is to identify themes of the impact of emerging technologies throughout the past 5 decades and how they have either helped or hindered the musicians who used them.

What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized?
The intent of this study is to better understand the experiences of musicians who were impacted by the dramatic changes in performance and recording of blues music with an eye toward when specific technologies were actually helpful and liberating, and when they were not. As in all research there could be risks to the participant. One potential risk of this project is that it may be uncomfortable recalling some past injustices during your career. Another risk is the possibility that you could be identified by readers of the research. There will be no identifying information in the study. If there were some clearly identifiable characteristics about you that would be identifiable through the context of the study, these would be removed. I will honor any request by you not to share sensitive information.

What are the benefits of participating in this study?
One benefit from participating in this study is the ability to tell your story from your perspective in as much detail as you want to promote a more accurate understanding of the history of the blues. This research is being conducted in hopes that directly listening to the voices of musicians will help learn about both the positive and negative effects that technology has on the arts in general, but specifically on the blues. What is learned from this study may also have applications to other populations, racial and ethnic minorities, other art forms and other areas of culture, for example technology and education. Hopefully, a benefit for the participating musicians will be that this study will help tell their stories from the musician's perspective, highlighting both their contributions to American culture and shining a light on any intended or unintended injustices that have occurred in the coevolution of the blues art form and the technologies that transmit it to its audiences.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study?
The interview will be audio taped, and transcribed. You will be given a copy of the written results of your part of the study before it is completed to make sure I have captured the essence of your story, and to ensure that you do not feel you can be clearly identified in the study. I will honor your request to leave any portion of your information out of the written dissertation. This study is being done to fulfil of my doctoral work and will be published as a doctoral dissertation. To protect your confidentiality, names in the dissertation will be changed.

Western Michigan University
H.S.I.R.B.
Approved for use for one year from this date.

JUL 06 2017

x

HSIRB Office

What if you want to stop participating in this study?

You can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason. You will not suffer any prejudice or penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience no consequences if you choose to withdraw from this study. The investigator can also decide to stop your participation in the study without your consent.

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary investigator, Dr David Hartmann at (269) 387-5281 or david.hartmann@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

I have read this informed consent document. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. I agree to take part in this study.

_____

Please Print Your Name

_____ _____

Participant's signature **Date**